

File Name: ISH4 26th September 2023 Part 1 .mp3
File Length: 01:41:54

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:29 - 00:00:38:14

Good afternoon, everyone. It's now 2 p.m. and time for this hearing to begin. Kind of just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly. Thank you. Can you also confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording event has commenced? Thank you. I would like to welcome you all to this issue. Hearing number four on environmental matters. This is part of the examination of the application by Surf Unlimited for an order granting developer consents for the proposed solar farm.

00:00:39:02 - 00:00:47:15

My name is Mark James. I've been appointed by the Secretary State as a member of the panel to examine this application and ask my colleague to introduce himself.

00:00:49:06 - 00:00:52:26

Good afternoon. My name is David Cliff and I'm the lead member of the panel.

00:00:54:01 - 00:01:26:07

Thank you. Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application. Also present today, as I'm sure many are familiar with you, Hansen, who is the case manager for the application, along with Ben Chan from the from the case team. And I'll deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Can everyone please set telephones to silence or switch them off to avoid any unnecessary disruptions? Please? The location of the toilets is for the main entrance and rooms.

00:01:26:09 - 00:01:43:08

The right. So some of you may have already found. So far there are no plans to fire alarms today. If the alarm does sound, please exit the building through one of the fire escapes, which is to my left here or through the main door, Syria and through the conservatory.

00:01:45:10 - 00:01:58:28

Moving on to the agenda and logistics of the meeting itself. The agenda for the meeting was published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on Tuesday the 19th of September. Can this be displayed on the screen, please?

00:02:07:26 - 00:02:09:20

She'll be writing for that,

00:02:11:09 - 00:02:46:03

certainly. And we may add other considerations as we move forward with the with the discussion today. As you may have seen from the hearing agenda so far, we tend to split issues specifically for and there's a session afternoon where we'll try to cover up to agenda item five in relation to water and flood risk. Perhaps we'll carry on as well. On that point, if you have time later in the session. And that said, there are further time slots allocated tomorrow for issue specific four as well as potentially on Thursday morning as well.

00:02:46:06 - 00:03:21:11

If we don't conclude the remainder of issue four within today or tomorrow, the main sessions that we have a lot in the timetable. If you can answer any questions today or you require further time and get the information requested, please can you indicate that you intend to respond in writing? The hearing

is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning that some of you are present in the room today, but there are also participants. Online using Microsoft, teams will make sure that everybody attending in either formats will have opportunities to input into the process.

00:03:22:23 - 00:04:00:00

For those of you in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. Those of you attending virtually, please use the Raise Your Hand feature in Microsoft teams and we will come to you as soon as we can. A recording of the hearing today will be made available on the solar farm section of the National Infrastructure Planning website and made available as soon as possible after the hearing is finished. This in mind. Please speak clearly into the microphone each time you speak. Express your name and your role. If you're not at the table with a microphone, there is a microphone available and one will be brought to you by a member of the case team.

00:04:00:25 - 00:04:05:11

For those of you with microphones at tables, please make sure they are muted when you are not speaking.

00:04:07:05 - 00:04:40:06

A link to the planning. Inspectorate's price notice was provided in the notification. To this hearing, we assume that everybody today has made themselves familiar with that in terms of data protection and how we manage data with our customers. So don't intend to go over that. But if there are any comments, queries, concerns, please raise them with the with the case team. Moving on specifically just to discuss the purpose of the hearing this afternoon is to address matters identified by the examining authority that will require further clarification on at this stage in the process.

00:04:40:22 - 00:04:58:08

So it is not intended for a general discussion around the topics on the agenda. And there are a series of specific questions that the examining authority wish to go through. Following on our review of responses to further written questions so inspections and subsequent submissions to date.

00:05:06:08 - 00:05:26:17

I'm now going to ask those of you participating today to introduce yourselves. When you state, please state your organization's name when introducing yourself. How you wish to be referenced. So Mr. or Mrs. or Ms.. So we can get that correct as we're going through them. Can we start with the applicant, please, and their advisors?

00:05:27:29 - 00:06:00:15

Yes. Matt Fox, Senior associate at Pinsent Masons. Legal Advisors for the applicant. To my left is my colleague Gareth Phillips, partner at Pinsent Masons. To his left is Peter Duncan from Design, who's lead. And to her left Liam Nevins, who is our water specialist. We have Claudia Ritchie, who's our transport transport consultant, and John Baker, our ecologist.

00:06:01:29 - 00:06:06:15

If we get there, our soils specialist, Mr. Tony Kernan, will also join online.

00:06:10:27 - 00:06:11:14

Thank you.

00:06:14:11 - 00:06:39:06

Moving on to other organizations and individuals who have given notice to speak, moving on to the local authorities to begin with. Um. I believe we have a. With three representatives from Lancashire County Council online, Mr. Willis, Mr. Gillespie and Jan Allen. Would you like to introduce yourselves, please?

00:06:45:00 - 00:07:01:21

X, y, Z. John Mark Willis, Lincolnshire County Council. Um. No, Mr. Willis, please. I'm here to answer any questions today. And as you say, just if in first instance. John Allen, please.

00:07:04:24 - 00:07:09:15

Hello, sir. I am John Allen. I'm the archaeological advisor for Lincolnshire County Council.

00:07:13:10 - 00:07:14:15

And know. Mr. Gillespie.

00:07:15:15 - 00:07:22:22

Hi, I'm Kevin Gillespie. I work for RH as a landscape architect appointed by Lincolnshire County Council.

00:07:24:16 - 00:07:25:03

Thank you.

00:07:26:24 - 00:07:34:23

And moving on to Rutland with Mr. Thrower and Mr. Johnson. Thank you, sir.

00:07:35:03 - 00:08:01:17

Yes, sir. Justin Johnson from Rutland County Council with me, Nick Thrower and Principal Planning Officer. And then online, we will hopefully have as well, Julie Smith, um, who's our lead local flood authority advisor and highways engineer, and also Richard Clarke from Leicestershire County Council who provides archaeology advice.

00:08:03:03 - 00:08:04:11

Thank you for that.

00:08:05:27 - 00:08:11:04

Moving on to South Kesteven District Council. Mr. Jordan.

00:08:13:14 - 00:08:23:06

Thank you. Good afternoon. Phil Jordan, South Kesteven District Council. Um, Mr. Jordan's Fine development management and enforcement manager there.

00:08:25:12 - 00:08:31:28

Thank you. We have a number of parish councils, I believe, attending today as well. Um.

00:08:33:24 - 00:08:37:28

We have a reference from Bracebridge and Will Thorpe Parish Council.

00:08:41:29 - 00:08:44:18

Just grab the microphone, please.

00:09:02:05 - 00:09:07:26

But my name is Susan Burgoyne and I'm representing Bracebridge and Woolsthorpe Parish Council this afternoon.

00:09:08:18 - 00:09:09:05

Thank you.

00:09:12:02 - 00:09:14:07

Are you joined by a colleague?

00:09:17:24 - 00:09:20:26

I'm just an interested party. My name's Diana Holden. Okay.

00:09:20:28 - 00:09:21:15

Thank you.

00:09:23:09 - 00:09:35:20

I believe we have a representative from Grace Parish Council who may also be representing the Malpass Action Group as well. Is that correct? Mr. Britton. That is correct, yes. Phil Britton Griffin Parish Council.

00:09:36:02 - 00:09:43:12

Past Action Group. And I'm joined by Tony and Jason from Griffith Parish Council as well here in the audience. Thank you.

00:09:46:01 - 00:09:48:11

Mr. Fields from Essendon Parish Council.

00:09:49:06 - 00:09:52:19

Trevor Birchfield Essendon Parish Council. Thank you.

00:09:55:15 - 00:10:02:07

Moving on to other interested parties. And Mrs. Holloway from the Malpas Action Group and her colleagues.

00:10:04:02 - 00:10:26:21

Mrs. Holloway for Malpas Action Group, have on my left, Mr. Always Mr. Tony Always. And on my right Mrs. Helen Woolley also have some experts for ecology Dr. James Williams and Mrs. Carly Tinkler for landscaping visual who join us at the appropriate times. Thank you.

00:10:26:23 - 00:10:31:24

Thank you. And think we have Mr. Radley online.

00:10:33:20 - 00:10:37:13

Mr.. Would you like to show yourself? Here we go. Hello.

00:10:38:01 - 00:10:44:29

My name is Dr. Geoffrey Radley. I'm a retired conservation professional. Mainly interested in item nine.

00:10:46:10 - 00:10:46:28

Thank you.

00:10:51:15 - 00:10:59:02

And believe we have an Alan James from Cambridge, Peterborough, also online.

00:11:01:00 - 00:11:01:16

Yep.

00:11:01:18 - 00:11:11:26

I'm Dr. Alan James. I'm the chairman of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. And as we don't have a Lincolnshire at the moment, I'm interested in cross-border issue.

00:11:14:15 - 00:11:15:29

Thank you, Mr. James.

00:11:19:10 - 00:11:24:17

And Linda Davis was in the room. Mr. Davis.

00:11:26:12 - 00:11:26:29

Thank you.

00:11:30:10 - 00:11:44:15

Is there anybody else who is in the room or online who wish to speak on the agenda items today? If you could please introduce yourselves if anyone else. Yes, thank you. There's a hand at the back. You can have the microphone, please.

00:11:59:24 - 00:12:12:20

Hello, I'm Tony Barker. I'm Bradford Parish Councillor. I'm also a chartered surveyor dealing specifically with commercial property, but with a lot of development experience.

00:12:13:14 - 00:12:13:29

Thank you. Mr..

00:12:18:16 - 00:12:23:28

Yeah. Jason Hall also Retford Parish Council, and I'm also the deputy flood warden for Retford.

00:12:25:12 - 00:12:25:29

Thank you.

00:12:28:13 - 00:12:32:13

Is there any else online who hasn't introduced and yet who would wish to speak?

00:12:34:13 - 00:13:06:22

Isn't a pass out. She'll move on. Um, in terms of the timing of the sessions today, we will aim to have a mid-afternoon break. The time of that will depend on how far we get through the, the agenda. Um, we'd like to adjourn round about 3:05 p.m. but that will be dependent on how far again we progress, as I said previously, would like to try and complete or at least get as far as item five and what's on flood risk and get through that today. So that's that's the aim of the session.

00:13:07:18 - 00:13:11:02

Um, with some flexibility if time allows.

00:13:12:27 - 00:13:30:16

If anybody speaks today, if they could please provide a written summary of the oral representations by deadline seven, which is Tuesday the 10th of October. Um, before we move on to the main item of the agenda, does anybody have any questions or queries around the process for today?

00:13:34:08 - 00:13:41:26

Okay. We will now move on to agenda item three regarding Common Ground. And I'll hand over to my colleague, Mr. Cliff.

00:13:43:16 - 00:13:54:10

Thank you, Mr. James. This is really just a quick update item. So, Mr. Fox, it's really just an opportunity to update on any progress made with the statements of common ground.

00:13:56:00 - 00:14:03:18

Following further submissions and expectations in terms of when statements of common grounds are likely to be agreed.

00:14:04:21 - 00:14:41:09

Yes, some parts of the applicant so running briefly through the various parties. Rutland Um, we received um, version of it back yesterday, I believe, which would be looking at and I think for both Rutland and the other authorities will be aiming to produce another version for Deadline seven. Um, for South Kesteven, the last latest version of that was submitted deadline six on last Tuesday with various points under discussion and similarly for Lincolnshire.

00:14:42:28 - 00:15:16:20

Um, natural. England, Um, in a sense, in a final form. You just need to get their signature on it. And historic England as much as a couple of points still under discussion. But you would have seen that they've not they've not really practically got involved in examinations. So it's quite hard for us to get them to kind of bottom things out. But we're trying and have been since deadline for, um, from an agency, um, that relates to the discussion this morning about just getting the, the final point resolved.

00:15:16:22 - 00:15:53:02

And then once we've done that, that would be able to be signed, uh, next year. Wildlife Trust final signed version four. Uh, same with Anglian Water and with Impac. There was one submitted at deadline six. Um, and another maybe deadline seven. Um, not yet decided that. I think obviously we have to, um, just consider that with Mrs. Holloway. Um, I think don't speak for us, but most of, in terms of the list of things that are agreed in that document, I think that's pretty much there.

00:15:53:12 - 00:16:00:11

Um, and so it would just be making sure it reflects the most up to date position as we go through examination.

00:16:01:18 - 00:16:14:04

Okay. Thank you. Um, natural England. You said that's in its final form. ZP expectation for that to be submitted as a signed and completed statement for Common Ground by 97.

00:16:14:14 - 00:16:16:06

And with Environment Agency.

00:16:17:22 - 00:16:19:29

Yeah. Okay.

00:16:21:23 - 00:16:30:24

And in terms of the ones with the local authorities presume they're not going to be the final, final versions for deadline seven. And what you've said.

00:16:31:04 - 00:16:49:07

Think there's still matters to be discussed. Think we'll come to them as we go through the agenda today and tomorrow and Thursday. We think for quite a lot of things, getting to a position where we're either agreed or agree to disagree. Okay.

00:16:57:22 - 00:17:10:07

Okay. In the statement of Common Ground with Mallard Pass Action Group. Mrs. Holloway, are you in agreement with what Mr. Fox said in terms of where you are with with that.

00:17:11:23 - 00:17:43:10

Mrs. Holloway family action group? Yes, more or less. We've, you know, tried to move it forward. But I think the more we've tried to move it forward, the more it's seemingly sort of got pulled apart in terms of justifications from both parties as to why their what their their reasoning is on the subject. Um, so it's it would be nice if the final one that we could have something that feels it's more constructive and we've made some, some progress.

00:17:43:24 - 00:18:03:29

I also wonder why we're sort of omitted from the statement of commonality. I don't know if it's because of the number of red traffic lights that we would add to the color coding, which is not ideal, but we've been sort of taken out of that framework of the statement of commonality and are not included. That might be a procedural thing.

00:18:04:22 - 00:18:09:27

Okay. Well, was it included in it originally? No, don't think about that.

00:18:10:06 - 00:18:36:04

We had a paragraph to essentially say that we were going to seek to do one. Two minutes. I can't remember right now where we are in terms of where that paragraph is in or not in that document. The reason that it isn't in that traffic light table is because the US has a different format from all the other ones. So that table doesn't really correlate to what that what how all the other rest of the series in terms.

00:18:36:06 - 00:18:38:29

Of the issues. The list of issues.

00:18:39:22 - 00:18:54:14

Well, yes. And it's just it's whereas the ones are split into different tables for different topics and either red, yellow, green with the impact. The vast majority of things are nuances about the way we're saying we're disagreeing.

00:18:56:05 - 00:18:56:20

Okay.

00:18:58:08 - 00:19:30:21

It would be worth the statement of commonality, including whatever it is it needs to be included for the Mars Protection Group. Or not, it's added to a table of colors or whatever for completeness. Um. Do that. That would be that would be helpful. And so is it expected that the statement of common ground with this action group is. Going to be finalized shortly. Is that your expected expectation is following putting any pressure on us? It's another thing to have to do, etc..

00:19:30:23 - 00:19:31:08

As I know.

00:19:32:02 - 00:20:02:13

Mrs. Holloway from our past action group think, um, you know, initially we were led by the structure that the applicant provided us to work around and tried to work within that framework, which is what we've continued to do. Um, so, you know, think we can try and look for areas of opportunity, um, but think it's going to be a challenge. But we have very much still done it within the topic areas, within the environmental assessment that are still run through in that vein.

00:20:02:15 - 00:20:13:15

But yeah, we will, we will endeavour to do a closing stock and also something within the statement of commonality for advice and guidance on that.

00:20:13:24 - 00:20:44:08

Okay. Okay. Yeah. That would be that would be useful. There's another matter coming up actually, which I'll bring come on to in one of the next agenda items where it could be incorporated into the the, the statement of common ground you have with the applicant if possible as well, which I'll come on to. It's about figures and calculations about output and climate change, which there was talk of that being included. So anyway, we'll come on to that when we come onto it shortly in the in the agenda. Okay. Um. Okay.

00:20:44:10 - 00:20:53:27

Think that's a quick but helpful overview. Any of the local authorities got any comments on that or is that agreed what Mr. Fox has said about progress?

00:20:56:01 - 00:21:07:11

Dustin Johnson, Rutland Cancer Council agreed. We're working with the applicants and a lot of the points are being cleared up and will be think significantly more hopefully after the next couple of days.

00:21:07:13 - 00:21:32:08

And as said before and think you are doing particularly with the not just particularly for all of them, but use the articles and. Requirements as an example where there is remaining disagreement to have a sort of as clear as possible summary on what that disagreement is. And if there's, you know, alternative drafting that's proposed, if you disagree on something proposed, alternative drafting to have that have that have that clear set out. Yeah.

00:21:33:02 - 00:21:45:26

I think we're we have got a table in the statement of common ground that has got the items that are agreed or not. And again, we will update that to ensure that it picks up those parts of the as well. Okay.

00:21:46:01 - 00:21:50:06

Thank you. Think the same for the other local authorities to I don't know if you wanted to comment as well or.

00:21:52:01 - 00:22:04:13

That fills your self-esteem District council. Now, that reflects the same position we're in, and I think it's fair to say we've the points which are getting towards agree to disagree on a becoming.

00:22:04:15 - 00:22:05:00

Much.

00:22:05:12 - 00:22:06:10

Clearer. I think.

00:22:06:12 - 00:22:07:19

The points which are still under.

00:22:07:21 - 00:22:08:19

Discussion are largely.

00:22:08:21 - 00:22:09:25

Related to.

00:22:10:24 - 00:22:15:05

Detail in the management plans and so on.

00:22:15:12 - 00:22:22:01

Okay. Some of which will come on to in the next in the next day or so. Okay. Okay.

00:22:23:17 - 00:22:24:02

And.

00:22:30:01 - 00:22:38:27

Lincoln shared. Any comments from yourselves on that? Mr. Mr. Willis Are you happy with what's been said?

00:22:40:11 - 00:22:51:22

Mr. Willis. Lincoln County Council Now agree we're working with the applicant on it and said, as the others have said, I think we hope to at least give clarity about what's agreed or what's not in the next version. Okay.

00:22:52:22 - 00:22:59:01

Okay. Thank you. Okay, let's move on to the next item then, which is.

00:23:02:24 - 00:23:33:04

Matters relating to the scope of the proposed development. Getting quite hot in here as well. Think it's getting warmer as the day goes by. So think. Yeah. Don't feel your need to keep your jackets on. I'll be the last to take my jackets off. Inevitably. Possibly. Particularly now we're on video but think yeah it is getting quite hot actually. So don't miss anything we can do. Think the windows are all. But. Windows appears to be open and windows around there or anything else.

00:23:33:06 - 00:23:36:12

I feel like we need to breeze through. It's windy outside as well, so it's quite frustrating.

00:23:37:15 - 00:23:38:12

And that one here.

00:23:43:08 - 00:23:43:25

Okay.

00:23:47:20 - 00:24:18:25

So matters relating to the scope of the proposed development and the first issue. Obviously we've had a session on this before and don't want to go back over old ground on matters that have already been discussed and where we've had submissions. And just generally on this agenda where we just because we don't raise something doesn't mean to say it's not a point of importance to us or it's not something we're thinking. Okay, It's just that we don't need any further information on it. At this hearing, following all the questions we've asked in previous hearings.

00:24:19:02 - 00:24:50:00

And so these are all the matters that we just feel we need some further information on basically to help us when we make our recommendation to the secretary of State. It is by no means a list of the current top issues in the in the in the in the examination. It's more where we want further clarification or information. And. Okay. The applicant's proposed operational time limit of 60 years was introduced at deadline five. Think it was Mr.

00:24:50:02 - 00:24:50:17

Fox and.

00:24:53:09 - 00:25:17:17

What? Let's start by just getting think you sort of think your introduction of the 60 year time limit came in response to some of our written questions. It just be useful, sort of like expanding on a few of those strands that were raised. And just first of all, just for clarification, the applicant's reason for introducing the 60 year operational time limit into the into the DCO.

00:25:19:03 - 00:25:36:26

So think the what the time limit does is just give certainty to something that was already considered to be happening in terms of impacts or reversible. And we've just said at the time that that will will happen. And the.

00:25:39:06 - 00:26:03:14

You know, we heard what people had to say at the last hearings and we heard what people have said in submissions and in your written questions. And so we responded accordingly. We set out in our answers, you know what that means. And then it will come to it in this agenda in terms of assessments, etcetera. Um, and I think, you know, what I would say is that, um,

00:26:05:03 - 00:26:23:06

the 40 years is something that the simply says is typical but doesn't prescribe it and allows for it to be longer. Um, and goes on to state that putting a time limit make ensures that you have a finite period of your impacts and that's what we've given here. Um.

00:26:24:21 - 00:26:48:22

Specific point make is that long field in its decision talking specifically about impacts talked about 40 years being um long term. It's still temporary. And 60 years is is essentially the same in that sense in terms of the impact. It is still long term. But the point is that it now gives certainty to the fact that it is not permanent with a capital P.

00:27:01:12 - 00:27:09:19

And well, six years was chosen just on the basis of what made sense to the applicant in terms of a commercial position.

00:27:12:14 - 00:27:14:06

And think what I would say is that.

00:27:16:10 - 00:27:50:07

I think. Well, we'll come on to it. Don't want to prejudge your questions, but think that the fact that it's 60 or any other periods is essentially there's no planning reason for it to be a shorter amount of time, because the impacts if you say, for example, there are impacts we acknowledge and always have done, they are a generational impact. So the fact that it would be 40 rather than 60, there's no planning reason. The fact that you'd have 20 years is still a generational impact. And similarly for the soils, as it's quite a long field there.

00:27:50:17 - 00:28:21:07

We've always said that the impact on the soils is not loss of the BMV, the stays, the soils are not lost. The point is that the use changes. And you know, at this point we've we've committed to this essentially is a one generation of farming that's that's lost. But whether that's 40 or 60 years, you know, and I don't want to say in farming families, then people decide to retire whenever they want to. But the point is there's still a essentially generational impact.

00:28:21:09 - 00:28:30:28

So there's no planning either that as of consistently said, either that change of use is acceptable or it isn't. In planning terms, the fact that it's 40 or 60 doesn't make a difference.

00:28:36:04 - 00:28:36:24

First position.

00:28:38:26 - 00:28:41:06

Please help us understand. That's.

00:28:49:27 - 00:29:00:27

But just generally for a for a promoter of a solar farm, what does 60 years sort of. Why is that particularly helpful to to the applicant rather than, say, 40 years?

00:29:02:00 - 00:29:04:08

Put it bluntly at 60 years of income rather than 40.

00:29:08:18 - 00:29:13:12

In the context that. It. It doesn't matter in relation to the attachments.

00:29:13:25 - 00:29:16:15

Okay, Well, yeah, we'll. Come on. We'll come on to that. Um.

00:29:19:27 - 00:29:31:13

Is there any change at all in terms of does the 60 years cause any sort of changes to any activities that are proposed or any details of the proposed development?

00:29:32:06 - 00:29:32:21

Um.

00:29:33:23 - 00:29:35:12

Does it change in any way?

00:29:36:29 - 00:29:47:18

I don't want to get into the details now, but does it change in any way? What's been talked about previously about. Panel replacement and maintenance.

00:29:48:24 - 00:30:18:24

So we was not going to go there because of the item on this being on the agenda. But we were cognizant in putting in the limits and the questions that you've asked both in writing in the last hearings about that point. Um, and you know, at the moment, the lifetime of, of panels is roughly 40 years, but that could improve over time. What we've provided for in, in the changes to our specifically is that, you know, there will be a case where.

00:30:20:13 - 00:30:54:03

They become faulty because they've reached the end of their life and that we would be able to place them. But A, we have the controls, which means that you cannot replace all at once. And specifically because of comments and others about seeking to put words like large in that's such a qualitative term, which is why we specifically put in a control. Whatever we do can't have more than five HGV two movements, which is the and that's won't go into more detail on that because there's a larger agenda item on that.

00:30:54:05 - 00:30:55:05

Yes, but there was a reason that.

00:30:55:15 - 00:31:05:28

We walked back onto that year and wanted to talk about that later on at the hearing of the maintenance definition. But it's not the case that six years has been chosen because. And.

00:31:08:12 - 00:31:42:09

Panels are expected to have a life of about 30 years. So the applicant sort of changed their mind in terms of, well, actually, yes, we could six years gives us one set of panels and then the second set of panels which might in itself be beneficial in terms of energy, etcetera, in terms of repowering, if you like, of the scheme. But that's not that's not been that's not been proposed. It's, it's not the intention to say now that, well we'll have these panels are expected to last for 30 years, subject to technical, technical, technological advancement. And after 30 years we might over a few years period gradually change them to

00:31:44:03 - 00:31:48:05

have a completely new second set of panels, which would then take them through the next 30 years.

00:31:48:19 - 00:31:54:06

And well, well, it allows us to do that. But that wasn't the reason that we chose 60.

00:31:55:07 - 00:32:02:20

Okay, We'll come back. We will come back to that issue. Just wanted to drop that question in now just to get an understanding of what the the applicant's

00:32:05:09 - 00:32:09:23

commercial reason was for for the six years and in the context of the. Yes.

00:32:12:03 - 00:32:51:05

The IRS is. You said this is on a permanent basis, but it does include it has assumed a 40 year operational lifespan. Uh, and that's outlined in the project description. And the flood risk assessment has assumed an operational lifespan of 40 years. For the purposes of the EIA and think climate change assessment has assumed an operational design life of 40 years for the purposes of the the several instances where there is an operational lifespan of 40 years. Why? Why, though in this case then has six years been chosen when quite a bit of the year is based, even though this has been done on a permanent basis, as I understand it.

00:32:52:25 - 00:33:08:17

It does talk like a lot about indicative 40 years or operational lifetime. And some of the assessments in the are actually in terms of climate change for example are based upon based upon that. Why was 40 years not chosen? Because that would seem to fit in quite comfortably what what is in the US. So excuse me.

00:33:08:24 - 00:33:41:12

There's two aspects to that. Mr. Fox on behalf of the applicant. So a year was chosen in order to essentially create a something that you could model. And we are application stage. We have not assessed sorry, we have not applied for a time limited consent, but for some aspects of assessment you need to pick a year in order to give some kind of level of quantification. So that's that's where essentially that's where the references to 40 years come from.

00:33:42:07 - 00:34:18:16

We have given our response to second rate question 1.03, which went through on the topic by topic basis. But think we can talk specifically about flooding in the next agenda item perhaps. Yeah. But on on on climate change, I'm conscious that have raised that in the deadline six submissions. Um, but the two things to that a um, obviously we made the commitment in the camp that we've got to show that we have a positive balance overall.

00:34:19:03 - 00:34:26:20

Um, but think, um, what I'd like to do is, um. Bit. Bring this to get it up.

00:34:26:22 - 00:34:28:00

To the table. Simon.

00:34:30:03 - 00:34:33:01

Just to go into a bit more detail on this.

00:34:53:20 - 00:35:25:19

Actually, Mr. Gillick, can I just say that you do your best in a few minutes because. Can I just ask another couple of questions before get on to. Yeah, partly because it's just suits the order of my questions and I'll end up getting mixed up and missing questions out. But you were you want to talk about climate. You want to. Ms.. That's yeah, we'll come on to that because I've got that as one of my questions. What of in your answer, Mr. Fox, not your answer to the applicants. Answer to one of the written questions.

00:35:26:18 - 00:35:48:15

It's said to allow for technological innovation. So the six years was to partly allow for technological innovation. What did that? What did that mean in terms of. Panels or the fact that panel life lifespan might get so much better in the next five years or so that.

00:35:50:04 - 00:35:51:25

Predominantly. Predominantly, yes.

00:35:52:21 - 00:35:54:19

The pedals. Is that likely?

00:35:56:08 - 00:36:04:00

They would do to the extent that it would mean that 60 year apparel lasting 60 years would become a sort of feasible and feasible proposition.

00:36:05:03 - 00:36:13:07

Well, panels have changed in the past five years to be more efficient. So I can't give a definitive answer to that right now.

00:36:13:09 - 00:36:23:14

But this seems quite a big jump from the currently sort of talked about, I don't know, 30 years and I've seen 25 years mentioned elsewhere. But to go to six years seems quite a big jump forward in that.

00:36:24:08 - 00:36:43:25

Well, I mean, there's reference to I mean, the itself talks about approximately 40 years of starting point. But come back to the point of that, that is a guide. If the wanted us to to. Be limited to 40 years. And it would have said that on a specifically says it's a guide. Um,

00:36:46:04 - 00:36:46:19

yeah.

00:36:49:03 - 00:36:51:02

Kristen. Okay. And.

00:36:56:02 - 00:36:58:18

And in terms of the ease.

00:37:00:27 - 00:37:06:21

Because there's some paragraphs added into your written response which deal with the.

00:37:09:17 - 00:37:42:19

I think it's question. 103. Think the applicant states that the overall the conclusions in the s would remain largely the same and there would largely be no change to the conclusions of the topic assessments, which is and this a sort of brief, very brief summary, point by point summary of, of the topics. But it's very brief. And the fact that the answer to the question says would largely be no change to the conclusions obviously creates questions in our heads in terms of well, which bits, which bits have changed and.

00:37:44:01 - 00:37:55:06

I know it's been put by my partner action group and will ask Mrs. Holloway her comments in a few moments that in their view, they're asking the question, does this amount to a material change, to the to the application? You've seen those submissions.

00:37:57:28 - 00:37:59:12

Just first in terms of the.

00:38:02:19 - 00:38:44:27

It would seem helpful to us that there's more of a detailed assessment made with this revision to the time limit from permanent to 6 to 60 years on A. Chapter by chapter basis, which deals with what are the potential changes or what are the changes to each of the chapters and their conclusions, and then with a justification for that outcome, i.e. there's no change or there's a slight change, we'll get on to the detail on things like water or landscaping in the late in the later discussions, but it would be helpful from our point of view to get somewhat more than what has been provided so far in terms of what are the implications for the conclusions in the ES and for any of the document.

00:38:44:29 - 00:39:15:26

And there might be changes needed to the planning statement. For example, we've touched already on climate climate change, but you know, even the average, the average, you know, output figure in, say, 50 years, what's that likely to be? Do those figures actually change? So I think from our position. On that will be. It seems that some more detail is needed in. Some sort of statement or whatever you want to call it, which just draws everything together in terms of what the implications of this time limit are.

00:39:17:12 - 00:39:48:28

What's that mean? Yes, I can say that we will do that. Um, but I have to say, I'm not sure what much more we can say because, eh, people have been pushing for this. B We've gone from something which was unknowable to knowable in terms of effects. So for the reason we said, largely it's gone from

permanent to semi-permanent because we now have a time at which we can say the impacts will go away and it's the application of the guidelines.

00:39:49:11 - 00:39:55:24

But for the other the other topics that we've set out in that response, that there are no implications arising.

00:39:56:06 - 00:40:30:18

So that might that might be some more of an explanation or an assessment of why that is. Would be quite beneficial. And then obviously 1 or 2 areas where there might be you know, there aren't be some small changes to the nature of the actual assessments, but the conclusions might be the same. I mean, we'll talk about landscaping, water and flood risk we've touched upon. But there are a few where even if even some of your comments I'm BMV, there might maybe some you know, there's changes which they might not actually go anywhere in terms of the final conclusions in those chapters.

00:40:30:20 - 00:40:58:22

But I think it would be helpful to the very least tie things up to sort of explain what the changes of any there are and then a justification for that. And if there aren't any changes or conclusions and just just provide justification for that. So I think that would be helpful for my point of view in order to understand, particularly given that not so much particularly, but you know, where the answer does say the assessment conclusions will remain largely the same. That does raise quite a few sort of questions in my mind as to, well, what's changed?

00:40:58:27 - 00:41:29:14

So I mean, think think would say that that is an unfortunate shorthand word because the bullet points in the answer sort of. Then explain that. But we can we can definitely expand on that. But I would just emphasize is that much of the impacts that this so this game has in any of this game has is in the construction phase. Once we have operational impacts, there's operational impacts by the last forever as the these was based on or they have a certain time period.

00:41:29:16 - 00:41:36:17

But those operational impacts are still the same because it's still a solar farm. It's not like a highway scheme, for example, where the traffic flows might change.

00:41:36:19 - 00:42:11:15

And we could probably in each of the topics we go into, have a short discussion on are there any changes as we as we go forward And we're not I'm not suggesting we're going for a situation where you proposed a 40 year time limit and then you change that to a permanent time limit, which might sort of not might not be as so uncomplicated in that respect. But think for deadline seven, if possible. In fact, Deadline seven should be possible to have a whatever you want to call it, a sort of just a statement or a something in a bit of detail going through each of the chapters in the years to say, are there any changes? And then if there are any changes or even if there are no changes, what are the.

00:42:13:04 - 00:42:39:09

What's the reasons for those for those for that outcome? And any other document? Does any of the document need to be changed as well, or does it need a short addendum to it? You know, for example, the planning statement leaps out to me is one which probably has this need to be an update to that, even if it's a few paragraphs to say what that update is or if there's no update, then and fine. I think in terms of the itself, the only thing that changes is presumably the decommissioning requirement.

00:42:39:11 - 00:42:39:26

Think

00:42:41:01 - 00:42:41:20
time. Don't think.

00:42:42:16 - 00:42:51:07
Yeah, on Thursday, if anything does. I'm sure that will be erased. Erased then. But I think from my point of view that would be very helpful.

00:42:53:17 - 00:43:00:19
So everyone can just understand and the secretary state can just stand whatever any implications there are for this. Uh.

00:43:02:15 - 00:43:05:07
Can you bring this to get it in? Climate change.

00:43:09:13 - 00:43:11:09
Ye. Yes.

00:43:14:06 - 00:43:15:07
Spending a second.

00:43:32:06 - 00:43:41:10
Okay. We'll bring other parties in as well at some point. Appreciate you might want to comment on on this. So in terms of climate change, what were you going to. And.

00:43:44:04 - 00:43:50:06
Mr. Gillet, what were you going to explain? Just just to make sure it's right for the context of what we're discussing? Certainly.

00:43:50:08 - 00:44:09:01
So the applicant was going to describe very briefly the broad effects of broad additional benefits that we see should be associated with a scheme which is modelled over a 60 year life versus a 40 year life, which was the modelling in the application. Okay.

00:44:09:03 - 00:44:10:08
Okay, that's fine.

00:44:11:18 - 00:44:14:10
Thank you, sir. May continue. Yes, you can. Thank you so.

00:44:16:03 - 00:44:28:18
Just stepping through a kind of a quick a quick summary of kind of where we were and what's the certainty of a 60 year operational life has on the scheme

00:44:30:03 - 00:45:04:21
in our excuse me and our deadline three Responses to Interested Parties. Deadline two Submissions. We set out a detailed description of the full life cycle carbon costs and benefits associated with the scheme. Um, based on a 40 year operational life. And what that analysis showed is that the scheme would deliver taking into account lifecycle costs or take into account a net benefit so it would deliver a net benefits after ten and a half years of operation.

00:45:05:20 - 00:45:23:13

Which essentially means that at the end of ten and a half years of operation, including degradation, etcetera, the scheme would be delivering from that point on. Um a pure decarbonization benefits within the framework of the the analysis that we've delivered.

00:45:25:19 - 00:45:34:18

So against a 40 year operational life that is a 30 year pure carbon benefit or carbon reduction benefits associated with the 40 year life.

00:45:36:19 - 00:46:12:15

A couple of points on that is firstly, we very focused on 2015 net zero targets. But think it. That doesn't mean that climate change stops at 2050. We don't know where we're going to be at 2050. The actions that we're taking now, while trying to get certainty over where we are going to be in 2050 and make that an acceptable place to to be. Um, and I'm modeling also shows that at the end of a 40 year operational life, the generation from the site is not zero.

00:46:12:21 - 00:46:44:11

There's still quite a lot and don't have the number in front of me, but it will be around two thirds of the initial annual generation from the site, which sort of says at the end of that 40 year period there may still be intrinsic decarbonization benefits in operation, the continued operation of the scheme without doing anything more and without incurring any additional carbon costs. And that is part of.

00:46:45:18 - 00:46:58:20

A justification for a reasoning behind having an operational period which allows that benefit to be captured and used. Um, at that time. Are you 60? Not not 40. Um.

00:47:00:06 - 00:47:14:25

That's the first point that I wanted to to make. The second point that I wanted to make and. And. As part of our British submissions. Sorry. In response to your second series of questions

00:47:16:13 - 00:47:45:06

where we spoke about the 60 year operational life we did, and I'm quoting, that there will come a time be said that there will come a time when the panels may need to be replaced as they've reached the end of their operational life and become faulty, although that's not a given, and we're committed to that. We do not intend to undertake large scale replacements of panels. So if we imagine a scenario where over a 60 year period.

00:47:46:22 - 00:47:53:13

We are replacing panels as they break and we replace all of those panels over. Over those 60 years.

00:47:56:09 - 00:48:14:20

The worst carbon cost that scenario could entail would be twice the carbon cost of the initial install. It would likely be less, but it would be less than less than twice. Which means that that ten and a half year payback.

00:48:16:09 - 00:48:23:21

If you double the carbon cost would be 20 years and degradation may be 22 years. The payback.

00:48:25:09 - 00:48:58:29

Leaving. 38 to 40 years of pure carbon benefits associated with the development of a 60 year operational life. Without even taking into account the additional generation that may come out of replacement of panels that had degraded. So the purpose of saying that is just setting out that you kind of you double the cost and you don't add any more benefits. Other than the extended period and the scheme is still significantly positive.

00:49:00:06 - 00:49:09:12

In terms of its carbon benefits within the framework of the analysis that we have presented at various stages through through the application.

00:49:12:15 - 00:49:36:14

And just to add to that, the framework that we have in our assessment is inherently precautionary in terms of the comparisons to the savings compared to a high carbon, for want of a better phrase, a production. And also in terms of the figure, in terms of what we say is the cost, which will only improve over time.

00:49:39:28 - 00:49:45:04

Mr. Geller, is that assessment which you just summarized? Is that based upon.

00:49:47:24 - 00:49:56:29

In terms of panels that might be replaced. What's that based upon in terms of the proportion of panels that might be replaced? Putting aside what it says in the maintenance definition of the

00:49:59:09 - 00:50:05:25

whole of etcetera. But is that is that literally based upon some point every panel being replaced?

00:50:07:09 - 00:50:29:27

So get it for the applicant. Absolutely. That very simple analysis was based on replacing every panel and assuming that the carbon cost of replacing every panel is the same as the carbon cost of installing every panel. But even without. Accounting for the additional generation benefits of having replaced any panels. So it's a worst case benefit.

00:50:30:05 - 00:50:42:19

So it's assuming that the new panels would just be as degraded as the ones that have been lost. Um, well, what's a broken panel? How would you define a broken panel?

00:50:44:06 - 00:50:46:01

It's like the one that doesn't work.

00:50:46:03 - 00:50:55:27

So what does that mean, though, in terms of what point would a decision be made by the applicant, by the undertaker to. Replace the panel.

00:50:56:22 - 00:51:00:00

If it's not producing electricity anymore, it's not fulfilling its function.

00:51:02:01 - 00:51:06:03

What is producing electricity or it's producing only 50% of the electricity? It was.

00:51:08:09 - 00:51:16:07

It was intended for. At what point does the undertaker decide need to replace that panel? Because there's not a case of it being sort of hit by fire? Don't know.

00:51:19:00 - 00:51:41:04

Can't imagine how a panel would break. But if it got broken by a bird strike or something. No idea. But anyway, yeah, there's obviously there must be isolated ones that are broken like that which just become broken because a maintenance vehicle crashes into them or something like that. Clearly those

needs to be replaced, but other panels that need to be replaced. You know, at what point in their output life would that decision be made?

00:51:41:27 - 00:52:11:26

So it's like if the applicant don't think there is a specific number. Don't think there is a specific threshold. You are right to say that some panels may break because of impact or potentially bird strike, as you say, could be other other things. And panels may go faulty if if wiring breaks and panels may degrade at different rates from each from each other. These are all hypothetical possibilities. Um. But I don't think any of that.

00:52:14:06 - 00:52:33:16

Changes the kind of the commitments set out around. We're not intending to undertake a large scale replacement of panels and there are commitments within. And our answers to the second written questions around how those panels would be replaced and. Stuff could happen.

00:52:33:23 - 00:52:34:08

Or it.

00:52:34:10 - 00:52:37:18

Could not happen. And and panels could

00:52:39:06 - 00:52:49:28

continue to generate above expectation, i.e. they degrade less than expectation. Something may for for the life of the project.

00:52:51:13 - 00:53:19:03

And if we can just conclude in this Mr. Box and I think the point here is that we're allowing for 20 years additional benefit. And when there is no planning reason to change between 40, 60 and where we've controlled any level of replacement to extremely low level. Given the controls and the traffic movements. So. Think we've got to say that there is this benefit for essentially no change in impact.

00:53:20:25 - 00:53:21:10

And if

00:53:22:26 - 00:53:28:04

not just on the point. Think this thing I was going to say is that going back to our discussion five, ten minutes ago about.

00:53:30:28 - 00:54:04:04

An assessment of what implications there might be for a change. Mr. Gillette's actual summary, there is quite a useful example of what is would be needed for that one, where you're arguing there is no change to the overall outcomes, but actually to get there is, you know, needs quite a bit of thought and needs evidencing as well actually. So I'm at deadline seven. Obviously you'd be doing an update on your old submissions anyway or a summary of those, but just setting out clearly what you've described, what with the evidence to support that in terms of any sort of calculations as well, just to support that.

00:54:04:06 - 00:54:09:17

That position I think would be helpful as well as just a summary of what you've you've said.

00:54:09:21 - 00:54:10:06

Absolutely.

00:54:11:01 - 00:54:11:16

And.

00:54:14:07 - 00:54:19:25

And. In terms of on a related point.

00:54:21:23 - 00:55:03:24

Would there be any implications of the 60 year time limit in terms of the average annual power generation? And the figure, the figure the approximate number of homes that developed the development may power over the 60 year period. Those points that we've had discussions about with multiple action group and and what what what if any changes would there be to that. I'm not asking you to answer that in detail now, but that might be something which would be useful to put in or not useful, but we would require to put in there the paper or statement or whatever you want to call it, that we requested at deadline seven because I presume those would have to change as well.

00:55:04:03 - 00:55:50:28

So for the applicant. So yes, you're absolutely right. Since we since we last spoke, we have spent some time with representatives of Mallard Pass Action Group in order to explain our, um, the evidence behind load factor degradation, how that turns into an average annual output. But clearly as a degrading panels, life is extended, then the average will be lower and that will. But but of course that could be a disingenuous number because, um, it would be a lower average over a much longer period, which overall delivers more low carbon megawatt hours to the grid.

00:55:51:12 - 00:56:03:29

Um, you operate a plant for 60 years versus 40 years. You get more low carbon, uh, megawatt hours out of it. So just needs to be careful about how those numbers are presented and what we infer from them.

00:56:04:18 - 00:56:26:18

Okay. Well, I think it would be good to get that. Well, I think that information we would require that at deadline seven as to what applications there are for those. Figures and. All yourselves and action group close to any particular agreement on those calculations, because this was one of the things I was going to say wouldn't be quite useful thing to have in your statements for Common Ground. Yeah.

00:56:28:16 - 00:56:29:01

Whoever wants.

00:56:29:03 - 00:56:57:28

To. Mrs. Holloway, for Price Action Group, it does depend to certain extent. If they were to review the figures based on 60 years, what some of their baseline assumptions were in those figures. So, for example, the replacement life cycle, you know, was it 40 years and it's 40 plus 20 or it's 30 plus 30 and looking at some of the implications there. So we'd need to know that first and then sort of discuss. Obviously if we're on board with their numbers or not.

00:56:59:26 - 00:57:33:25

It would be helpful from our point of view of those discussions continued rather than having some sort of a debate here in detail about those specifics, which if you're happy to engage in that, then that would be that would be helpful. And if you have a position where you agreed you are, then you have a position where you don't agree you're not. But look, the other thing is also if, for example, I'm thinking about the load factor disagreement, where what is it, 11.5 against 10.6 might be not quite right with those figures, but has that been I don't know if that's still a concern on the load factor, for example, then this would actually be.

00:57:33:27 - 00:58:11:20

Yeah. Mrs. Holloway, for this action group, we have gone into that with some detail with with, we'd be able to continue to get it. Um, and obviously data that wasn't available to us before by means in the satellite data, which is how they arrived at it. We were working on the best information, which was based on government information from Dukes, which is perfectly plausible baseline. And there were many of the application documents that did also make reference at different points to 10%, 10.5%, 11.4%. So somewhere along the way it has ended up arriving at 11.4 and we are okay with that.

00:58:12:12 - 00:58:14:08

Um, we do accept that.

00:58:16:03 - 00:58:21:22

Okay, thanks. That clarification, which I won't say what I was going to say.

00:58:23:24 - 00:58:26:25

Okay. Well, any updates on this in the statement of Common Ground in terms of

00:58:28:15 - 00:58:37:08

the things we've talked about just now would be would be helpful if they can be agreed. If not, then obviously, as usual, you know, the reasons for why that.

00:58:38:21 - 00:58:49:22

Would it just be possible, Miss Holloway, for this action group, would it just be possible to sort of give our overarching view on. The change to do so.

00:58:50:09 - 00:58:55:15

I was going to ask you yourself for your read your presentations on that. So yeah, please do.

00:58:55:21 - 00:59:30:24

Obviously, as this is an end set project, it's an end for a reason that it's a national infrastructure project and therefore has to be considered in the light of the wider implications and 60 years depending on how you're looking at it. It is certainly we accept that compared to the unlimited time we had before, which meant we didn't know which direction the applicant was going in. But sustainable development is defined as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

00:59:31:10 - 01:00:06:20

Um, there's a lot of things that can happen over a period of 60 years which none of us know the answers to. None of us in reality know what's going to happen with climate change, probably even within the next ten years necessarily. And therefore, by committing this application to 60 years means that, um, if you like, the government is unable to respond to changing environment that we're faced in, whether it's climate change, whether it's technology, it's different priority, different ways of using the grid.

01:00:07:17 - 01:00:41:28

The the government itself has been quite open to looking at repowering in the future if it's appropriate. Um, and they have also said in three 1058 that a time limited consent of certain would not prevent the applicant at a later date seeking to extend the period. So we cannot see why you would commit to such a long period of time when there are so many unknown implications across the different areas.

01:00:42:17 - 01:01:09:01

It's 50% more than what the numerical assessments have been based on the ones that have been done. It's 50% more than typical solar farms. It's 50% more than what the talks about. That isn't a huge

amount of time. We believe, as you have identified, that it would be right to review and update all the environmental topics within the to understand the full implications.

01:01:09:20 - 01:01:10:05

Um.

01:01:13:04 - 01:01:44:07

I think. We also need to consider in 60 years time first only it might only be in five, ten, 20 years time. Potential implications for food security. We can come back to some of these topics, perhaps when we go into each area, whether it's flooding, whether it's whether it's land use. And we would welcome the opportunity to do that so that we don't tie up the time. Now, can I just in relation in response to Mr. Gillet, just let my colleague, Mr.

01:01:44:09 - 01:01:53:14

Orbis, speak, just to qualify and explain a couple of things, particularly in relation to replacement panels. Carbon That's possible. Thank you.

01:01:55:01 - 01:02:18:00

Well, firstly, you could have knocked me over with a feather when I read that the applicant was going from 40 years to 60 years simply because the applicant spent has spent so much time in trying to persuade us that it would be permanent stroke 40 years. And now for some reason, which I don't think has still been fully

01:02:19:15 - 01:02:49:20

explained, apart from something to do with the commercial requirements of the developer, we end up with with 60 with 60 years. Now, what astounded me even more. Is that the applicant says it's not considered that any material significant changes between decommissioning 40 years and decommissioning 60 years for the purpose of this assessment. Well, as Mr.

01:02:49:22 - 01:03:29:09

Gillette has already explained, one of the things that's going to be very different is we're going to have to have a whole new lot of solar panels, 530,000 of them. And if we. If we need any support on that. Can I quote Kate Burton? Um, a project which should be familiar to the applicants because they are acting for them. Um, it says operational maintenance from the replacement of components during the design lifetime of the scheme are based on replacement rates for similar schemes and based on the life of the components.

01:03:29:11 - 01:04:00:08

It's assumed that all of the PV panels will require replacement once during the scheme's design life, which is 60 years, and a further 10% required to be replaced to cover equipment failures at a constant rate. All of the inverters and this doesn't apply and best sellers are assumed to require replacement twice a third or 50%, requiring replacement to cover equipment failures at a constant rate throughout the life.

01:04:00:15 - 01:04:36:17

Old transformers are assumed to require replacement once because a further 10% requiring replacement to cover equipment failures. Now, um, I don't see how, um, how the applicant can possibly say that in moving to a situation that Burton is at is how this won't make a material, um, material change. Um. And I don't see how in trying to argue for

01:04:38:26 - 01:05:09:24

permanent. Straight 40 years makes any sense of this, particularly as said, the applicant was so vociferous in arguing that, as Mr. Phillips said, these panels can last up to 40 years. Perhaps remind

ourselves as a Canadian solar one of the organizations, and say that their panels last for 25 to 30 years and. And I assume they would know.

01:05:10:21 - 01:05:11:06

Um.

01:05:11:17 - 01:05:23:12

So I. I cannot see how the applicant can possibly say that basically all this can happen without any change whatsoever.

01:05:27:01 - 01:05:57:14

Again quoting Bert Burton. And the impact of the above is taken into account in the Burton's project output and carbon calculations. The replacement of equipment has similar emissions as the output as Mr. said original construction and contribute 95.9% of carbon emissions made during the construction. So. It is going to have an impact and mean frankly, you don't have to be an engineer or anyone.

01:05:57:19 - 01:06:30:22

It's just it's just logic, isn't it mean? Well, think it is now. Let's talk about replacement and when. Because that's also important. Now, given all the components used in the project, will commence operating at the same time. I would suggest that it follows within a bit that each component will require each component type will require replacing at the same time within a period.

01:06:30:27 - 01:06:55:07

Except that there is some variability. You know, it might be 29 years, 30 years, 31 years, but it's not going to be five years and it's not going to be 55 years. And all of these things will be put in over a period of two years. So in my view, the panels and other things will reach their economic life at the same time requiring replacement.

01:06:56:12 - 01:06:57:01

Now.

01:06:58:08 - 01:07:29:07

Again. To me, Logic says that replacing the panels earlier than 25 years would not make maximum use of those panels because they haven't expired in terms of their life. And but similarly, replacing the panels after 30 years would require their existing panels to go beyond their economic life. And you wouldn't get the full economic life from the panel that you've replaced you used to replace.

01:07:29:19 - 01:08:02:27

So. It is my view that whatever happens and in spite of what has been said in previous hearings, all of these panels are within the bit going to be replaced at the same time. We're also going to have, of course, removal and recycling of those panels. So not only will be installing these panels effectively twice, we are removing them and recycling them twice. And again, if I could quote Kate Burton very quickly.

01:08:03:23 - 01:08:37:25

And it is applying the same embodied carbon and transportation and missing factors used to quantify the impact of construction. The replacement of these components is estimated to result in an embodied carbon emissions of 435,000 tons of CO2 equivalent and additional emissions from their transportation of country of origin. This is around 50% of the total emissions of 899,000 being admitted over the entire scheme.

01:08:40:04 - 01:08:52:14

I mean, I think it stands to reason if you're going to replace everything, then it's just like installing them in the first place. And as Burton said, this is this is going to increase the

01:08:54:09 - 01:08:59:11

emissions by 50% of the total emissions saved in the.

01:09:00:15 - 01:09:01:09

By the project.

01:09:02:05 - 01:09:32:06

So I cannot see anything other than this is a fundamental change and I cannot see that replacing all of the all of the panels and cannot affect generation downtime. Um, carbon embodiment traffic. Presumably we're going to have this greater amount of traffic or more in replacing the panels and taking the old ones away as we did at the beginning. There's going to be soil damage.

01:09:32:14 - 01:09:32:29

Um.

01:09:34:15 - 01:09:58:16

So disturbance, habitat damage, perhaps noise accentuated. And so therefore, in my view, I would take the opposite opinion of the applicant. I don't think there would he has shouldn't be reviewed because there was no material change. I think he should be reviewed because there demonstrably will be some material changes.

01:10:06:06 - 01:10:07:03

Quite a bit to.

01:10:07:24 - 01:10:08:16

Come back on.

01:10:10:22 - 01:10:16:12

Mr. Gullet Yes. To come back at some points and further points in days. They want to respond at deadline seven. But.

01:10:17:05 - 01:10:50:18

And yes, Mr. Fox and part of that will bring in Mr. Gillet. Think think, though I can cover quite a few of them by bringing us back to what the controls are and what the starting point is. The starting point is what did the is assess? Yes. The best permanent scheme for climate for for carbon. I accept there there is further data to be provided. But 40 years was chosen because we had to pick a number because in order to be able to quantify something you have to choose a number. But the is the basis of the assessment we've put the controls in.

01:10:50:20 - 01:11:10:22

Since any level of replacement can only be five HGVs worth of basement. So the concerns that you've raised, Mr. Obvious, won't the resources raised sorry won't arise because the doesn't allow them to. And. In terms of the points around, and that is I'm not close to

01:11:13:06 - 01:11:24:26

make the mix, but we put in the controls that are necessary to make sure that the starting point and that's the question of materiality, of change is what is the success? And we bring you.

01:11:25:11 - 01:11:33:22

Just on that point, do you agree that. It is possible within the scope of. This application.

01:11:33:27 - 01:11:34:18

For.

01:11:35:19 - 01:11:40:27

That say the majority of the panels to be replaced at some time during the life. There is scope for that.

01:11:41:11 - 01:11:42:27

You've said that not not at one time.

01:11:43:10 - 01:11:57:02

Not at one time, but there could be over a two year period. So there is that there is that scope for just about all the panels to replace presume as is subject to the things in the that you've added to the various management plans, etcetera.

01:11:57:08 - 01:12:30:29

Over a period of time. But that is what the is assessed. Yes. Is assessed ad hoc replacements. We've put a number to ad hoc, which is five movements, which is based on a lower sensitivity sensitivity link and the volume of guidance and what even you bother to assess. And we can come back to that when we come to talk to transport. So and just to make the point, which is Holloway was raising in terms of things change over time. Our starting point was obviously we wanted a permanent consent and Secretary State would have had to make that decision now.

01:12:31:12 - 01:13:01:29

There is a certain limit of a certain level of certainty to it, but would draw a comparison to example for offshore wind, which has both offshore and onshore impacts and has equipment eventually runs out, but they don't have time limits on them. We have done this and put a time limit on it to have some level of certainty and issues around soils and food security or whatever it may be. They're either acceptable or they're not.

01:13:02:27 - 01:13:14:19

The fact that it's 60 compared to 40, that's still an impact. We don't know now what happens in year 40 and we don't know now what happens in year 60. There's no reason to limit the numbers.

01:13:15:06 - 01:13:36:27

And the point raised by Mr. Always. But it's not just the panels that might need replacing things like inverters might need replacing as well. Uh, giving the example of gate burden. Don't know the details of Great Britain, but. Is that something that is likely to be required in this case as well, as well as just panels needing to be replaced and other elements of equipment that would need to be replaced as well?

01:13:37:02 - 01:13:39:01

Yes, there is. That is a possibility.

01:13:42:16 - 01:13:59:00

But that's still. It's embedded in our figures. I'll bring in Mr. Gillet on that. But it's sorry, I'm going to get to that point. Is that it? Those controls that we put in place for any kind of maintenance activity that we might need to do, not just limited to the panels.

01:14:00:21 - 01:14:01:06

It's a good.

01:14:01:20 - 01:14:03:28

Cycle for the applicant. I just wanted to.

01:14:06:10 - 01:14:11:10

Okay. So just cover something off that I'm sure you're absolutely aware of, sir, which is that the

01:14:12:27 - 01:14:49:21

conservative assumptions of one project should not be articulated as a crystal ball that says how the industry will run. And what will happen at each individual solar farm as it comes forward. And therefore was just concerned as I was listening to Mr. Orvis, that he was construing those assumptions at Gate Burton. Which I'll. And if you read that climate change, conservative assumptions that they have assessed as conservative assumptions as construing that those are kind of how the future will be.

01:14:50:16 - 01:15:43:13

And we have assessed in a slightly different way, but we have also assessed conservatively and therefore earlier when said that if we put an operational limit on the 60 years and then we considered what would happen if panels were fully replaced, that was not me saying we need to replace panels over those 60 years, which again is what heard Mr. Orvis said. That said, it's a conservative assumption to demonstrate that even with the full replacement or a carbon cost equivalent to the carbon cost of construction and additional carbon costs are equivalent to the carbon cost of construction that the site still returns positive carbon benefits over 60 years.

01:15:43:15 - 01:15:44:09

So just wanted to.

01:15:44:24 - 01:15:45:10

Know to make.

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

That point, sir.

01:15:47:04 - 01:15:51:13

Okay. Thank you. Can we briefly want to move on to some other items so

01:15:53:18 - 01:15:54:03

there's.

01:15:54:05 - 01:16:24:01

No doubt that it will need to for pricing? Mr. Fox has a habit of saying probably, possibly it's definite. I think anyone who knows anything about it would say that they that they have to. Secondly, if the 60 years is now such a great idea, why wasn't. Go forward in the first case. We could have saved all of this. Dancing around handbags about him and then it wasn't.

01:16:24:22 - 01:16:49:15

And and the third thing that I would say is that I think it is right to bring forward things like gait, but and with respect. Many of the people. Some of the people involved in that were also involved in our past. So think there's another reason why it's fair to come to compare the two.

01:16:52:05 - 01:16:54:25

Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Holloway. Did you want to. Okay.

01:16:57:04 - 01:17:26:05

It's just before. Come back. Any further comments on this issue before? Ask Mr. Fox for final comments on this and then any further comments people want to make. Obviously, you can do it at

deadline seven on what's been and what's been said today. And if it were going to come back to some of these themes as well as we go through the next two two days as well, including the maintenance definition of the DCO there. There's one hand up at the. Yes. So in the back corner, it gives your name, please.

01:17:37:00 - 01:17:41:21

Sorry if you start again. You've got the microphone. Sorry. Just talking.

01:17:41:27 - 01:17:42:12

About the.

01:17:42:14 - 01:17:42:29

Commercial.

01:17:43:01 - 01:17:43:24

Benefits that.

01:17:43:26 - 01:18:10:18

You spoke about. You mentioned just the one which was increased revenue over time. Surely there's also an increase in your financial business plan attractiveness, so you're going to improve net present value as well. So any potential buyers in the divestment, which will improve their chances of lending money to then buy into the solar farm.

01:18:12:06 - 01:18:19:15

Okay. We can note that online. Mr.. I'm struggling to say. Mr.. James Is it Mr.. Allen James?

01:18:21:14 - 01:18:21:29

Sorry.

01:18:22:01 - 01:18:23:15

I'm a gentleman.

01:18:23:17 - 01:18:25:09

Online. I was referring to Mr. James.

01:18:25:11 - 01:18:28:11

It's actually Dr. Alan James from. Sorry.

01:18:28:25 - 01:18:29:12

Alan. James.

01:18:29:28 - 01:18:44:06

And I'm by training originally a material scientist, and I used to work for a large electronics manufacturer who made silicon chips for telephone exchanges. And

01:18:45:24 - 01:19:24:10

we're talking about 40 year and 60 year lifetimes here. But, um, firstly, we're not even sure that there will be enough silica sand to make future panels. The Institute of Materials has recognised that the specialist sands that are used for these purposes and for making silica chips are running out already. Um, secondly, I would draw an analogy with the telephone industry which introduced chip based exchanges, electronic exchanges in the 1980s.

01:19:25:06 - 01:19:37:25

And because it hasn't maintained those exchanges at all or changed them. The manufacturers have gone out of business. And so now we're being faced with having to put in, um,

01:19:39:17 - 01:19:58:26

Internet based phones in this country. So we're talking about replacing silicon panels, but and their components. But I would say if we're only talking of changing them this infrequently, I would ask, will there actually be anybody to make them?

01:20:00:12 - 01:20:37:11

And then the other consideration about all this equipment. It is mounted on things, mostly metals, either aluminium bordering around the panels or steel poles in the ground. How long are those going to last? And I suspect they're not going to last 40 years, let alone 60. And so there will be another replacement issue. So I think really this much of this conversation is a little bit like going to the fairground and asking the lady with the crystal ball what's going to happen.

01:20:37:13 - 01:20:46:18

We actually don't know because the science has not been done over such a long period of time and we just do not know.

01:20:48:15 - 01:20:51:12

Okay, that's clear. Mr. James. Dr. James. Thank you.

01:20:53:11 - 01:21:14:28

Mr. I can just ask you a question on that. The climate change carbon submissions that you made about the replacement of the panels. Given what's been said about inverters and what Dr. James has just said about the panel supports, is such things factored into the assessment that you summarized a short time ago as well, or was that just in relation to the panels?

01:21:15:13 - 01:21:27:05

It's like the applicant. Yes, absolutely. Everything that was factored in. So by doubling the the initial install carbon cost, you're covering everything and there's still a carbon benefit.

01:21:28:13 - 01:21:40:06

Okay. And if you could incorporate those points into your deadline's seventh submission as well, that would be helpful in response to what's been said and the questions that have been asked. Mr. Fox, anything briefly you want to summarize with?

01:21:40:12 - 01:21:43:23

Yes, Mr. Fox. I think that essentially

01:21:45:28 - 01:22:19:22

there's a question here is we're trying to produce a low carbon renewable energy scheme, maximizing benefits for the the greatest amount of time. Our starting point was permanent. And to do that, we chose 40 years because we had to pick a number in which to balance a certain amount of benefits against the costs to work that out. But the fact is, is that we're trying to bring forward a scheme that that has those benefits for the longest possible amount of time. There are impacts. We've sought to manage them, the impacts that arise from the scheme being there.

01:22:20:20 - 01:22:57:00

After the examiner, authority and secretary to determine whether that's acceptable or not. But they are there, whether it's 60 years or whether it's permanent, whether it's 40 years. So what we're really talking about there and there's discussions about the greenhouse gas is about what how much is the

benefit. So the the choice of the applicant to choose 60 years in the commercial factors that may or may not be relevant is not really the question. The question is, what does that mean for our assessments when we've already assessed the impacts of a permanent scheme? And as you said, you've asked more detail on that and we will provide it.

01:22:57:16 - 01:23:02:06

But our starting point has been the impacts don't change.

01:23:04:10 - 01:23:37:18

Okay. Well, I'll look forward to your deadline. Seven submissions on that, and obviously people are able to comment on that as well. And inevitably, it's a matter that we'll have to grapple with during our recommendation and the secretary of state will have to grapple with during her decision making process as well so we can end that item. Now. Thank you. Those submissions are very helpful and I think we will touch back on issue specific matters in relation to the time limit a little bit as we go on as well, inevitably over the next two days.

01:23:37:20 - 01:23:59:12

That's been a helpful overall submarine introduction on those issues. Thank you. So item B is also relating to scope matters relating to the connection agreement with National Grid. This is the Connection Nets, which is a national grid's electricity transmissions response to our second written questions. At deadline five. Where?

01:24:01:24 - 01:24:03:05

National Grid raised it.

01:24:05:13 - 01:24:37:02

A number of points in relation to the grid connection and what might need to be done, what might not need to be done in terms of the grid connection and the existing or the existing substation. And in some ways. Being honest, it sort of raised more questions than it actually answered. And we have asked National Grid to attend today, but they have chosen not to. So we can't ask them the questions to themselves. Obviously, we can ask further written questions if we so if we so wish.

01:24:37:15 - 01:25:02:11

And. The central point. Which probably puts him into the applicant. Is that. It just creates a little bit of doubt into our mind in terms of. Is everything, actually. Or whatever thing be ready to go without any changes to the substation by 2000 and. 28. Because you have the.

01:25:05:01 - 01:25:26:13

The connection agreement. But it seems from National Grid's response that there are still lots of other matters that they are still having to consider and those other matters might result in, I don't know, might result in changes being need to be made to the substation. And I presume Mr. Fox should have seen the risk. Of course you have seen that their response and did have a number of questions for them on, for example.

01:25:28:07 - 01:25:44:01

They talked about the no negative phase sequence. There have been no negative phase sequence issues, so no further studies are required for negative phase sequence. I'm going to ask them to provide more detail on what those actually are and.

01:25:46:20 - 01:26:24:11

That they can go on to say they've initiated front end engineering designs, proposed detailed designs to accommodate the connection at the existing rifle substation and within its operational boundary. And this work will identify any potential impediments to the applicant's proposed connection. And

this work, the field work is ongoing. So the question obviously arising from that would be, well, what potential impediments might there be and what implications would that have for this scheme connection to the the grid and the, if you like, the connection date of 2028? And also in relation to further approvals consents, they say they can't advise it on this until the field work is complete.

01:26:24:28 - 01:26:26:26

They go on to say that.

01:26:28:15 - 01:27:04:15

They agree with the timeframe 1st of January 2028 be the timeframes for for the connection and the last response in relation to the available capacity at the substation. They say the network surrounding the recall has no further electrical capacity. Further networks reinforcements are required in the region to accommodate more capacity in any physical capacity at recall will be confirmed after the feed work. So it just seems as though there's quite a lot of uncertainties as to from that response as to whether or not the scheme that was built as proposed is going to be able to connect to the grid in 2028.

01:27:04:17 - 01:27:10:23

Unfortunately, they're not here. So as said, we can't ask them the questions that we had for them.

01:27:12:23 - 01:27:15:11

Miss Fox, can you help with any clarity?

01:27:15:29 - 01:27:23:04

Mr. Fox, on behalf of the applicant, what I would say is that particularly the latter couple of answers.

01:27:25:02 - 01:27:56:12

Are essentially a statement of fact. Think in that. Essentially, I think they've answered it with a very straight bat. Yes. If if there were things that needed to be done outside of their operational boundary, then, yes, planning permission would be would be required. And that is a statement of fact. There has been no indication in discussions with the applicant that that's something that's necessary. But they've obviously said that given the tenor of your question. Think think it is. I can't speak for them, but that is a statement of of of facts.

01:27:56:14 - 01:28:30:03

And in terms of their other answers around carrying out the studies, etcetera. That is what what you would expect to be in this position until we get consents there. They're not going well. If we were to get consent, then that's when they would finalize the process. You'll be aware from the news Germany National Grid obviously doing a lot of work in terms of the processes for people connecting to to the substation, which I imagine is playing as part in deciding what they're prioritizing or not in terms of completing feature studies.

01:28:30:07 - 01:28:54:16

As you imagine, there's lots of studies happening all over the country right now, but don't miss their answer. Well, that's as helpful as it could be, doesn't it Wasn't a surprise to us because that is reflective of where we are. Further detail studies would need to be do to do the connection, but it's the same position for for essentially any solar farm. Is it possible.

01:28:54:18 - 01:29:08:28

That the results for the study might result in, for example, as use the word might might result, for example, in changes being made to the existing substation, which might require further further planning approval, for example.

01:29:09:07 - 01:29:16:14

At the moment, are the Atkins discussions with not suggested anywhere close to that being a possibility?

01:29:16:16 - 01:29:51:21

And I probably can't raise this in terms of the situation with the examination on Heckingbottom fen think it is. Don't know much detail about it other than I know that notice they've got a grid connection agreements and then they had to make a change to the application to bring in extra land and make changes to the substation. That's about all I know of what, what I've seen on my sort of scant looking at what's happening under the current schemes. But. Is a risk that might happen on this, that actually it's further down the line after. Obviously, you've got the the connection agreement, but then there's actually a chance that further works are required.

01:29:51:23 - 01:30:14:09

Obviously, that can't be brought into that's not going to affect this examination. But further consent might be needed at further stage. And that means that the actual if consent was granted for the past when it connects to the grid, might not be 2028, might be further down the line by X number of years. Don't know. Are there any implications for that in terms of the the benefit of the scheme in providing for

01:30:15:29 - 01:30:21:15

electricity quickly, which is one of the obviously one of the benefits that's been stated by by the applicant in the.

01:30:23:09 - 01:30:23:24

Applicant

01:30:25:12 - 01:30:27:15

were I can say is from our

01:30:29:02 - 01:30:36:20

discussions with with there's been no reason to say and they've said in their response that they see no reason why that connection date can't be met.

01:30:37:03 - 01:30:47:02

No. Well let's see what they did. Just repeat the sort of the timescale without providing any. They don't say, but this is under threat because we think there might be a serious risk, I admit. But.

01:30:48:03 - 01:31:28:12

Oh well think and think that's it's a they've they've reported essentially what the process is and a statement of fact that and bear in mind that National Grid also have fairly extensive rights. So if we were talking a substation extension outside of their operational land, then yes, that would require planning permission. And the planning permission on that would have to be considered at that time. Um, but there was nothing, nothing in our discussions with them to suggest that there were any issues. And this is, um, you know, the standard position the applicant find them is someone who's involved where National Grid did change their minds.

01:31:28:14 - 01:31:50:27

We had to make a change for that, but that's because they told us they need to make a change. Nothing. There's no and we had to do that as a precautionary step because they still hadn't decided. But they were saying it looks unlikely. That proposal you have is acceptable. So we have to make the

change to make sure that the what's the backstop was possible. There's been nothing like that in our discussions with and so far on this project.

01:31:51:23 - 01:31:52:28

And the final point on.

01:31:54:14 - 01:32:29:02

When we ask about the available capacity of the rival substation, they say the network surrounding rival has no further electrical capacity. Further network reinforcements are required in the region to accommodate more capacity. And if physical capacity at rival were confirmed following the field work, that almost implies they're not even sure that the current substation can actually handle the actual electricity produced by Mallard Pass. And that actually not not just works at the substation might be required but works to the. Surrounding network might be required in terms of reinforcement works, which might be might be what happens.

01:32:29:04 - 01:32:47:01

I don't know. I don't know why I would like them to be here to ask them these. These questions. It also might be that when they say the network surrounding rival has no further. Electrical capacity, does that mean that the network surrounding rival has no further electrical capacity? But that takes into account that there's already a connection agreement with Malabar, and that.

01:32:47:03 - 01:32:56:25

Is that I think that is how I read that response because we wouldn't be able to have a connection agreement if. And nobody said that. They said that there was capacity.

01:32:59:01 - 01:33:01:29

That's a commercial agreement they've entered into into us with us.

01:33:02:01 - 01:33:24:21

And again, I think we'll have to probably probably ask them further questions ourselves for Rule 17 requested at some point soon and know that the application didn't respond to this particular representation at the last deadline. Seven In your response to submissions put, but it would be quite helpful to get me. I'm sure you'll provide it as a result of today's discussion anyway and.

01:33:26:24 - 01:33:37:24

The applicant's position on where this is? And is there any risk that actually the scheme won't be able to connect in 2028? And other implications of that for the for the benefits of the scheme?

01:33:39:19 - 01:33:56:07

We can do that in summary. But if the applicant think we would give a firm note to that and set up more in the summary. But essentially a connection agreement creates a creates the process by which everybody works together to to reach the date that's in that agreement.

01:33:59:17 - 01:34:04:03

One final question in terms of the connection to the substation.

01:34:06:29 - 01:34:35:23

Because the details before us as part of this examination are quite brief in terms of the actual physical connection. You've got the cables that will go under under the road and then they'll go into the substation existing substation complex. What actually happens when they go and what works are required then when they actually go into the existing substation complex. So they simply sort of plug in somewhere, presumably. And what work is required for that? Because there's nothing in this application which covers that, is there?

01:34:35:25 - 01:34:56:07

No, because well, essentially we just. Go up to the door to do that because we don't need to because they would our understanding today literally been would essentially just plug in. So if there's any development at all, would it be well within rights mean we can look to come back with some more on that it would help because.

01:34:56:20 - 01:35:10:15

There is as I say, there are question marks. And you know, you may be absolutely correct in your assessment of it. They're not here for us to ask questions of. And but understand, there are processes that they have to go through in all these all these things. So.

01:35:12:01 - 01:35:18:26

Okay. And then presumably you're in discussions with them as well continuously, presumably about such matters. So there's any.

01:35:19:10 - 01:35:20:03

And we.

01:35:20:22 - 01:35:30:23

You have with them and then you can get further clarity on these things through them. That would be quite helpful. Yeah. Yeah. As I say, we'll ask our own questions in any case.

01:35:32:07 - 01:35:42:16

Yes, we will do that. Mean we we sent them the question to encourage them to answer it. So we will continue to encourage them to provide more information. Very sure. Yeah.

01:35:44:03 - 01:35:44:21

Okay.

01:35:47:12 - 01:35:48:22

Does anybody want to comment on?

01:35:50:15 - 01:35:57:09

That particular issue about the grid connection and nets response. This is Holloway.

01:35:57:25 - 01:36:22:27

This is Holloway for an action group. It's slightly left field, but it's a question in respect of is it possible to have a grid connection agreement without actually having a grid connection and draw your attention in particular to two other concepts, Foss Green and Springwell, which you may find actually have an agreement that they don't actually have a grid connection? Um, these are.

01:36:22:29 - 01:36:26:15

The two that you raised in your submission I think, aren't they? Potentially, yeah. Last deadline, Yeah.

01:36:26:25 - 01:36:27:10

Um.

01:36:28:04 - 01:36:44:26

I don't know enough around the detail, but I'm just saying that it may be possible to be in a scenario whereby you can have an agreement for something that might may happen at a later date, even if everything isn't in place to to make it happen when you want it to happen.

01:36:46:09 - 01:36:46:24

Okay.

01:36:47:02 - 01:36:53:24

And this goes on like that. The issue with those two projects is there is not actually a substation. There's not actually a substation that's being said.

01:36:53:26 - 01:36:54:13

Yeah. Yeah.

01:37:03:02 - 01:37:03:28

I'm going to get it.

01:37:04:22 - 01:37:38:13

Sorry, Mr.. Get it for the applicant. The The grid connection agreement between an applicant and National Grid is for a connection at a location, at a date. And within that connection agreement is an appendix that says where National Grid say, here are all the things that we need to do to make that happen. So in the example think um, Mrs. Holloway mentioned Spring World and Foss Green. One of those things will be build a substation. That is not within the agreement that Mallard Pass have with National Grid.

01:37:40:01 - 01:37:46:24

The agreement that several National Grid provides to connect into the existing substations.

01:37:46:26 - 01:37:55:24

So was there any particular things raised in the grid? I don't think we've actually seen a copy of the Grid connection agreement. I presume it's not a public document, is it? Or is it.

01:37:56:29 - 01:37:59:07

Is it is commercial confidential? Is it.

01:38:00:09 - 01:38:07:27

Is. Was there anything raised in that that said that further work in terms of the works required? I'm presuming it wasn't because otherwise it would be referenced in the application.

01:38:08:05 - 01:38:08:20

Yeah, exactly.

01:38:09:14 - 01:38:09:29

Um.

01:38:14:00 - 01:38:27:28

So it's like the point I was trying to make is that part of that grid connection agreement for those two sites will be to build the substation to which they are going to connect, which will impact on the dates of delivery. ET cetera. That's that's the standard process of how these things.

01:38:28:00 - 01:38:46:17

So the grid connection agreement is quite well. Obviously early on in the process and that there are still uncertainties beyond that. It's not quite so simple as saying there's a grid connection agreement. So absolutely guaranteed you're going to go in 2028 or whatever the date is. There might still be some impediments which might require works. It's a possibility. I assume.

01:38:47:17 - 01:39:03:25

That, yes, in concept. But the point is you've both contractually agreed that you're going to be and the we're going to have to plug in at that date. So both parties are supposed to do certain things in order that date is met. So if you

01:39:05:18 - 01:39:13:27

don't do what they that agreement says they need to do and we aren't able to connect at that point, then they're in breach of contract and they're financial penalties.

01:39:16:03 - 01:39:19:13

Yeah. Yeah. And they set the date. The date came from them?

01:39:19:15 - 01:39:21:29

Yeah. Okay. Okay.

01:39:23:29 - 01:39:27:21

Thank you. Elders, hand up. Mr. Willis, is it?

01:39:29:19 - 01:39:30:09

Online.

01:39:30:19 - 01:40:00:20

Yeah. Thank you, sir. Mark Wallace, Lancaster County Council. Yeah. Think I'd just like to say. Guess that you've already addressed the question, but I think it does need clarification because listening to what Mr. Gillett said is the connection agreement requires them to connect to the substation. But as you've rightly pointed out, we need clarity about whether or not that's infrastructure already exists to provide that connection or whether there's further works. And obviously that further work may in itself give rise to issues and impacts that haven't been assessed. So I think we certainly do need that clarification.

01:40:02:20 - 01:40:04:09

Okay? Yeah. Thank you.

01:40:07:22 - 01:40:08:07

Okay.

01:40:11:03 - 01:40:26:10

Right. Thank you, everybody. It's 340, so I think it's high time we had an afternoon, uh, break and then we will move on to the next item on the agenda, which is water and flood risk. Uh.

01:40:27:11 - 01:40:30:10

So excuse me, I've got a quick question for my hand.

01:40:30:12 - 01:40:35:19

Sorry, Doctor James didn't see your hand up. Was this on the last item? Yeah. Or on general question?

01:40:36:03 - 01:40:59:19

No, it's a question on the last item. And that is, um, has the um, carbon lifecycle analysis of the work required by National Grid. Been taken into account in this project. I haven't seen anything that says that it has. But clearly, if they're going to do work, that's going to emit carbon. And think it should be.

01:41:02:24 - 01:41:10:08

Okay. Mean, notwithstanding that, we don't know what work is going to be required at the moment for that it seems. Mr. Fox, do you want to just respond?

01:41:10:10 - 01:41:19:21

Yeah, we'll we'll come back and writing. But I think the starting point has always been we don't believe that any kind of work because any kind of sometimes standard level of work is required. So.

01:41:20:19 - 01:41:22:02

Okay. Thank you.

01:41:23:20 - 01:41:25:02

Thank you for that point, Dr. James.

01:41:31:19 - 01:41:47:17

Break now until 355. So 5 to 4. And then we will return with drainage and flood risk water and flood risk, which is item five. Thank you.