

File Name: ISH4 27th September Part 4.mp3
File Length: 01:52:28

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

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

Okay at the time is now 325. It's time to continue with issue specific hearing number four.

00:00:19:21 - 00:00:23:20

Thank you. Kind of just confirm with the case that the live streaming and recording commence.

00:00:26:03 - 00:00:37:14

Thank you. Okay. So moving on to agenda item ten. Transportation and traffic. Item In relation to the traffic regulation measures,

00:00:39:25 - 00:01:23:22

one in relation to the extends the temporary measures along Bond Road in S9. And just to point clarification in terms of the the of the proposed 30 mile an hour speed limit, which seems to replicate the existing 30mph speed limit through. Essendon. I don't know if they could. Perhaps just clarify that point. Also, note from the outline construction traffic management plan, paragraphs 4.7.1 and where it refers to a 20 mile an hour speed limits, whereas the other plans refer to a proposed 30,000,000 hour speed limits, which again, as I say, mirrors the speed limits already in existence through the village.

00:01:24:05 - 00:01:35:07

And it's the clarity that can be provided from that point. I think it's one of the concerns or issues that you raise being a point that could be quickly rectified earlier on in the day. So, Mr. Fox, if you could like to deal with that, please.

00:01:36:17 - 00:01:52:02

Yeah, I will bring Mr. Chancellor, But in my initial reaction is I think that is an error on the plans and they should read a 20 to be consistent with the TMP and the DCA. But I'll just get Mr. Ricky to confirm that.

00:01:54:05 - 00:01:59:11

Hi, everyone. Claudia Rich, on behalf of the applicant. Yeah. Believe that's a typo. We need to amend the plan.

00:02:01:04 - 00:02:02:07

To 20 miles an hour.

00:02:03:09 - 00:02:07:06

Thank you. That does clear things up. That's very helpful.

00:02:08:25 - 00:02:09:10

Um.

00:02:10:25 - 00:02:14:24

Any further comments on that before you on? Don't think it will be actually fairly straightforward point.

00:02:17:06 - 00:02:17:26

This is Holloway.

00:02:18:27 - 00:02:29:11

This is Holloway Plus Action Group. It's just really for clarity sake that 20 miles an hour also applies for most of the traffic restrictions around the site as well. Is that is that correct.

00:02:31:16 - 00:02:32:06

Mr. Ricky?

00:02:33:24 - 00:02:42:19

Search on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that's correct. It's just a bit of context where we're proposing temporary traffic signals for any potential two, seven, eight works.

00:02:44:29 - 00:02:45:22

Mr. Fairfield.

00:02:46:16 - 00:03:04:10

Trevor Birchfield Essendon Parish Council. And so you're going to put a 20 mile an hour temporary restriction through the middle of time, which is fine. Is that for the whole period of the construction period? Or is that for just whilst you're putting the cabling in place?

00:03:05:08 - 00:03:07:06

It's just for the cabling.

00:03:08:09 - 00:03:38:28

Just for the six weeks of the. Yes. Okay. Currently there is Trevor Parish Council. Currently there's an incident currently going north of Toft where Anglian Water installing a very large water main and there's 40 mile an hour limit through there with temporary signs, traffic restriction signs. It's on a 60 mile an hour piece of the road. I can assure you that nobody and mean nobody travel that route very, very frequently adheres to the 40 mile an hour.

00:03:39:04 - 00:03:43:07

So what enforcement will you have for that 20 mile an hour route, please?

00:03:45:01 - 00:04:04:05

There's two points there. One one is that Mr. Richard said it's so stated with alongside the traffic signals, so they would probably have to slow down to meet signals, then go through that short space of the village. And but in any event, in terms of enforcement, the controls in the

00:04:06:04 - 00:04:33:06

are essentially akin to if a regulation order was done by local authority under the regulation or the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. So. To the extent essentially we as an applicant, we wouldn't have the powers of a police officer or a traffic control officer. So to the extent that there were breaches, we don't have active enforcement powers.

00:04:35:24 - 00:04:36:13

Mr. Bayfield.

00:04:38:06 - 00:04:55:22

Thank you for that and appreciate that. Any breach of the DCO is a criminal act. However, unfortunately, this is for you, sir, not the applicant. Are woefully understaffed in the area of enforcement officers currently.

00:05:00:15 - 00:05:16:28

Think think we just just for clarity think is that the the the power in the is the ability for that speed limit to be put in place. A breach of that speed limit by anybody is not a breach of the data itself.

00:05:18:15 - 00:05:34:09

And so the question of enforcement of the speed limit is, is. Applies here, what you say about RCC, but I think there's not much more we can we can do in that instance because we don't have the power of the highway authority, the policing matter and the standard way.

00:05:35:28 - 00:06:07:11

Noted. Thank you, Mr. Fox. I'm should move on to the next question then in relation to the provision for access to the industrial estate, including the sites, again, matters arising from further in questions where the examining authority sought reassurance that the access maintained to those premises, in particular in the event of any accidents or major events during the construction phase with the proposed development.

00:06:09:21 - 00:06:45:03

Defence response sets out that the construction traffic manager plan will manage those arrangements and that Article 15 of the also requires notification to the Police and traffic authority of the traffic management measures as there is some advance notification. Also note from Rutland County Council and the Environment Agency that they observe the view that access must be maintained to that site at all times, including during the construction phase of the proposed development. And note what the applicant says around details within the current construction traffic management plan and the notifications.

00:06:45:19 - 00:07:17:15

Um, but just to make sure that the issue and the sites are given sufficient recognition, is there any merit in further revising the outline construction traffic management plan to make it clear that those properties do exist and there should be clarity around maintaining some access of access? Apologies to those particular sites just to make that sure it's not an issue that's missed or forgotten about at a later point in the future. And then a related question as well in terms of notifications.

00:07:17:17 - 00:07:45:20

So there's a requirement. Not common Article 15 and which requires notification to the Police and traffic authority. The traffic management measures that would apply here. And just a question around how businesses within the industrial state, particularly those within the sites, would be notified of those timings of works that may disrupt access to the premises and whether they would be given sufficient notice in advance those works.

00:07:47:07 - 00:08:19:05

The applicants are two points there. Paragraph 3.5.4 The TMP. Says the traffic management for all cabling works. We plan to ensure that suitable access is maintained. All properties, including maintenance of access into an industrial estate. Um, on the point about advance notification. I think this is what we had meant. But we can make it clearer in the camp where we talk about the community liaison officer having to liaise with the community about access and the programme for the cabling works.

00:08:19:07 - 00:08:44:25

We will make clear that that includes the business community as well as the as well as residents. So that covers the notification point. We'll also look, I'm conscious that that paragraph in the TMP talking about the traffic management and you're asking specifically about the cable works. Um, we'll look at

that wording and capacity wording in the camp just to. Make sure that the businesses in the industrial state are in the same position as everybody else in terms of the measures we put in place.

00:08:45:22 - 00:08:50:00

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Solloway, did you any comments?

00:08:50:03 - 00:09:31:16

Thank you, Mrs. Holloway, for my price action group. Something that I picked up looking at the various management plans was there seems to be sort of two working groups and it might not be perhaps the most efficient way of dealing with things. So you've got a new one that's appeared called I think it's the WG Traffic Management Working Group. Think I've got that right. But then you've also got the community liaison group and think you perhaps need to find one forum for the local community because think if there's two different groups which might be in principle covering similar issues, because obviously the consumer customer liaison group will cover construction related issues, which will include traffic.

00:09:31:18 - 00:09:34:13

It doesn't make sense for for the to be to.

00:09:36:05 - 00:10:08:12

Just so that you can say yes. The commitment to the working group has been something we've had from the start, and the Community Liaison group is. And you can say we'll have a look at there's crossover. But the important point about the Traffic Management Working Group is that it's not limited to the village. It's about traffic management relating to the whole scheme for the lifetime of the development. But we can certainly look at putting some kind of wording in one or both of the plans to ensure that there's the sharing of the same information when it comes to aspects in the village.

00:10:08:15 - 00:10:25:24

Think no group would relate to just asinine, whether it's the customer liaison group or the traffic management working group, they should relate to all all people affected across the site, across all the different communities. Yeah. So, yeah, think there should be a way of streamlining that process.

00:10:27:21 - 00:10:49:21

For the applicant. I think the difference is, is that the. Yeah, sorry. Mrs. Holloway is correct in terms of the community liaison group, it's not related to the commitments we've made in terms of comms on specifically the cable routing and the works, retaining access to the village, obviously through that group as well. I can say we'll look to do.

00:10:51:10 - 00:11:20:20

Sure there's the sharing of the same information, but I'm. Keen that the traffic management workgroup isn't lost because that has a very specific function. At the moment, residents aren't intended to be invited to that traffic management working group because it's very much a body relating to the management of traffic as you usually would with any kind of construction project with the relevant authorities. So I think the key is making sure that the community aren't losing sight of the traffic management measures that are going to affect them and are informed accordingly.

00:11:24:13 - 00:11:26:16

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Fairfield.

00:11:27:00 - 00:11:43:14

Trevor Birchfield. And I'm Parish Council. I've got a comment on Traffic Management group. Do you want me to put it in now or later? And equally, it's relevant to the community liaison group, which was

going to save for tomorrow but can talk about traffic management now if you want. The traffic management group.

00:11:43:16 - 00:11:53:05

The group? Yeah. Um. Was going to raise a point about that shortly. If we actually can introduce it at that point in time, that would be helpful. Thank you, Mr. Barfield.

00:11:55:09 - 00:11:56:04

Okay. Um.

00:11:58:10 - 00:12:01:06

Moving on to the next question then.

00:12:04:25 - 00:12:34:22

In response to further written questions, the applicant came back at deadline sex in relation to the length of closures and stated that would be subject to construction phasing and would be confirmed by the principal contractor within the detailed construction traffic management plan, which is secured by requirement 13 of the draft. There are concerns, though, that have been raised around the length of time there may be restrictions in place with traffic control measures.

00:12:36:09 - 00:12:54:10

Does the outline construction traffic plan need to make further comments or reassurance that any disruption closures, measures that are put in place that are temporary are kept to a minimum period as possible to minimize those disruptions for the communities that.

00:12:56:14 - 00:12:59:17

A measure that could be implemented in the outline management plan.

00:12:59:29 - 00:13:32:03

Let's focus on behalf of the applicant. I'm going to say no to that because somebody's idea of what is a minimum compared to another is a qualitative judgment. I think the point is we can't use any of those powers without being approved, which will set out, as the outline makes clear, sets out all of the traffic management measures we're proposing, which include the length of time. And if that's not approved, then it's it's not approved. But I don't want the question of whether it's approved or not to be.

00:13:32:05 - 00:13:44:21

Is that minimum or not? The authorities will see it as a package. And if they disagree, then then they can do that. But I don't want the question to be as a minimum, it's just as a package. Does it work or not?

00:13:48:21 - 00:13:55:19

Noted. Thank you. Noted the opportunity for the local authorities to review that again at a later date with the with the detailed plan.

00:13:59:03 - 00:14:00:13

Okay. Um.

00:14:04:02 - 00:14:38:00

Moving on to B and the point around the group Mr. Bethel does come up and to be and and and this relates to. The possibility of issues that may arise should. National Highways 847 one for the southern scheme and be delayed. Think their response back at further written questions was there is no overlap anticipate at the moment between the two construction periods, but if their project were to be delayed,

that could occur and I think their view was that it wouldn't have any consequences for their construction program.

00:14:38:02 - 00:14:46:02

But there could be implications for the proposed development. The applicant has come back and.

00:14:47:19 - 00:14:54:07

Responded to in terms of the approach that could be taken with the outline construction traffic management plan and.

00:14:56:13 - 00:15:28:12

National highways that also highlights the possibility of diversion through Peterborough City Council's highway area and the possible need to liaise with Peterborough City Council. Um, just wondered whether there was a need to include Peterborough City Council on the Transport Working Group. Let's just make sure they were involved in that process. That point in time, if there were to be an overlap within the construction periods to make sure there was that engagement with them on any implications around the diversions that may be in place.

00:15:29:06 - 00:15:33:15

Um, the applicant think, um, we

00:15:35:05 - 00:16:16:28

don't think we need to go so far as to put them on the management group. What would suggest is the wording that we added, which was at section 5.2 of the TMP, which talks about the traffic officer from the applicant coordinating with members of the group to identify the schemes. And then, and then the detailed plan will um, so the committee development schemes which may affect flows and then the detail would then account for that in the measures it proposes. I think in there we could put some wording around that, um, that um, in having undertaking that liaison, you must identify whether as an, as a consequence, diversion routes, we need to go through Peterborough and that we would then have to go talk to Peterborough.

00:16:18:06 - 00:16:26:28

Think think getting to be part of the group just creates more bureaucracy than it needs to think. It's just a process of making sure we talk to them if that requirement is needed.

00:16:27:20 - 00:16:31:05

Thank you. Mr. Bayfield. You had a point on the management group.

00:16:32:04 - 00:16:33:24

Trevor Bayfield has no power to cancel.

00:16:35:25 - 00:16:47:20

Clearly traffic is going to be an issue. The applicant has decided he needs a group involving approaching 15 people or 15 bodies.

00:16:48:17 - 00:16:49:03

Um.

00:16:50:00 - 00:17:06:06

The parish councils. Never asked for this development. But they will have a significant issue in being able to attend and support all of these particular groups.

00:17:07:28 - 00:17:16:04

Parish councillors are not paid in any way at all. So myself, for example, in these three days of hearings, I'm not being paid by anybody.

00:17:17:29 - 00:17:38:14

We would request that the applicant thinks about some way of compensating the parish councillors or the parish councils to provide quality people to those particular groups to be able to assist the applicant to deliver a quality traffic management group. Thank you.

00:17:41:16 - 00:17:48:28

Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Don't start the conversation to be had outside the. Hearing Mr. Fox conversation had with Mr. Burchfield.

00:17:49:24 - 00:17:55:17

So, yes, answer that today. Think what we can do afterwards.

00:17:56:15 - 00:17:57:02

Thank you.

00:17:58:27 - 00:17:59:21

Mrs. Holloway.

00:18:00:09 - 00:18:46:23

Mrs. Holloway from Menlo Park Action Group. Just to correct Mr. Fox regarding the Traffic Management Working Group, when he said it didn't involve any of the sort of the public, if you like, exactly what Mr. Barfield said. Actually, there's a whole number of parish councils on there. So they are two working groups that have got the parish councils repeated twice across them. That wasn't the point I intended to make. The point that I wanted to raise is in relation to the Hartley, in relation to the ones for the Sutton scheme, because look that up and there is a possibility, quite feasible that there could be coinciding and that actually involves the shutting of the a47 by the Wandsworth and Sutton scheme.

00:18:47:04 - 00:19:14:07

But it brings me back to the routing plan, which is a fundamental aspect of the whole construction process for this scheme, which if you just bear with me for a couple of minutes to explain it, and if you wouldn't mind if it's possible to bring up the latest construction contract. Construction traffic management plan I think is Rep 6-15. I had asked for it to be available on the deck.

00:19:16:15 - 00:19:49:05

Perfect knew exactly where was going. This is this has been updated, um, at the last deadline. It's just been a function of actually changing the colors around. However, the point wanted to raise was take a typical construction vehicle move and HGV movement, where it starts on the A1 at the start of the orange, goes on Route one through rail and to the substation. You can see it there in the middle of the site. And then it leaves the site has to leave the site on Route three.

00:19:49:28 - 00:20:24:21

So it goes out north on the green route all the way to Bowen and round and back past market Deeping heading up to Peterborough and then and then the green line just sort of abandons itself on the a47. Now if you started as an driver coming off at Great Casterton in the morning and that's your sort of starting point, head to the construction site and you've come from the north and you're going to have to get back to that point in the evening. So that green line should show it as a closed loop to back to where they start.

00:20:24:23 - 00:20:59:12

And that's 40 miles. Now, I just don't think it is feasible to expect all these lorries to leave the site en route three, if they were coming from the west or from the north on the A1 and have to go all the way back round on a 40 mile loop to then head off on their whatever it is homeward journey there, they're just not going to do it. It's, it's, it's not practical. It's actually not even fair on the drivers to expect them to do that and don't understand why.

00:21:01:00 - 00:21:37:01

The Route three green line just sort of finishes abandoned on the a47. Because they obviously start at the point of the orange line potentially, that, you know, they could come from any other part of the site. But it is a huge loop and you can see that just by the length. If you look at Route one in to the site versus Route three out, and that's not even completing the loop. So, you know, whatever enforcement you want to put to ask these drivers, I would have thought any construction firm would be aghast, but expecting their drivers to do that.

00:21:37:12 - 00:22:11:09

And that's why it raises concerns, because we know full well if you draw a straight line from the site, you just go right through the middle of the villages and cut half of that out. And that's what will happen. And that's happened today with numerous contracting jobs that are going on in the area. And just think we need a bit of realism as to a practical solution for entry and exit to the site. If was the driver, just go back the way I came in the morning because it only took me ten minutes.

00:22:11:11 - 00:22:14:19

I'll go back through great Casterton, which is not what we're supposed to do.

00:22:17:19 - 00:22:29:07

Thank you, Mrs. Holloway. Um. I don't think there is some agreement on construction traffic routing with the highways authorities. But Mr. Fox, I don't know if you'd like to come back on the concerns that raised there about Mrs. Holloway.

00:22:29:26 - 00:23:11:27

And yes, I'll bring Mr. Ritchie and think all I would say is, yes, these routes have been agreed with the authorities. It's not about a loop. It's about getting them back to the strategic road network. And that's good in the TMP. And if there's a breach, then complaint can be made and we would have to fix it. I think the other point to make is that I think it is actually quite an assumption to assume that the vehicles would be needing to go back to the point in which they came off of the A1 because of construction traffic movements and not just a simple case of an driver living north in the A1, coming to pick up his stuff and then coming to come to come to our site.

00:23:11:29 - 00:23:20:17

The construction logistics works in all manner of ways of lorry drivers having to go pick up what they've got to pick up. They might come from the east to go to get to the resources to come back this way.

00:23:21:01 - 00:23:32:12

Whether they come south, west or north, which is a huge loop. Acceptors are coming from the east in the first place. They've got to do part of that loop but is absolutely huge.

00:23:34:06 - 00:24:01:15

Conflict. Yeah. Think in a way. Don't really know what to say. This is what? This is what? We're secured. This is what we've committed to. It may be considered unrealistic or realistic. The point is, that's what we're secured. And I appreciate there will be concerns about that will be flaunted. That's the point of the regime. And it being a breach can just bring Mr. Richie in. Just to explain how kind of these were developed with the local authorities.

00:24:02:16 - 00:24:03:12

Robert Ritchie.

00:24:04:19 - 00:24:44:16

Claudia Ritchie on behalf of the applicant. So just kind of to dial back into how we actually came up with these routes. Kind of assumption is that the panels will be delivered to a port in the UK. And so to give our sort of best access to those ports, the routes were how we get from the strategic highway network in as the most efficient manner as possible. So that is how we ended up with the three routes. And Route one does give you the most direct access to the A1, which is part of the National Highway Strategic Road Network. And then the options were either go back along Route one and potentially cause a load of other environmental environmental impacts or access the strategic highway network.

00:24:44:18 - 00:25:06:20

Another way, which is how we ended up with Route three. But as Mr. Fox said, that this isn't a loop, it's just access to the strategic highway network. And actually if you zoom out in the context of them arriving to and from a port where the materials are likely to come from, it's actually not a very big diversion. In the context of a much larger journey that they would be making.

00:25:10:01 - 00:25:10:16

Keep.

00:25:10:23 - 00:25:34:24

And just to finish. It's a secure through as it is. Then, obviously, contractually, we're going to continue to contract with the contractor to say, you know, we've got this, so you therefore need to comply with it. And therefore, it's a contractual commitment for them to do it, which means financially, whoever looks after supervisors, the driver is going to be incentivized to make sure they do what they do and do what they need to.

00:25:37:11 - 00:25:43:06

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Keen to move on. But, Mr. Britten, if you've got a brief point.

00:25:43:09 - 00:26:07:11

Yeah. Just briefly. Um. Retford is it struggles with or it suffers from unauthorised movements from the local quarries. I've mentioned this before and I'll representations, but, um, Mr. Fox did mention that signage could be deployed. We would welcome the deployment of signage to stop mallard pass traffic using side roads to shortcut through the villages, if that's a possibility.

00:26:09:19 - 00:26:12:18

To Fox. Do you have any response to that point?

00:26:17:28 - 00:26:24:25

Yes. So section 3.6 of the TMP. First, a temporary signage being erected along construction traffic routes.

00:26:26:11 - 00:26:30:14

And the key junctions and the locations of that are to be agreed with and RTC.

00:26:31:28 - 00:26:34:21

Okay. Okay, Mr. Bayfield?

00:26:38:10 - 00:27:06:28

A question for probably Mr. Richie got through, Mr. Cox. You might reference Mr. Richie to the importation and delivery of the panels, which the panels will either come in via Felixstowe or probably Southampton. But what about all the muck away, i.e. the tipper trucks that are going to be required prior to the panels being delivered? What is the construction routes for those 30 tonne tippers? Please.

00:27:09:06 - 00:27:11:19

Mr. Fox let Mr. Michie respond.

00:27:13:18 - 00:27:23:10

Claudia Ritchie on behalf of the applicant. So our assumption is that they will use the same routes because that's what we're applying for in the DCA. And that would just be a contractual agreement.

00:27:26:17 - 00:27:51:01

Over the birth of the lessons. I'm proud to have not worked in Transport or HGVs for as long as my colleague behind me, Kevin. But I have worked in transport for more than 30 years and a number of those years were very heavily involved with heavy vehicles, big trucks and tippers traditionally. And on generalizing here, Tipper drivers do not follow the routes.

00:27:54:17 - 00:28:45:29

Think we've perhaps covered that point, Mr. Fields So shall move us on to the next question, which is around some of the updates, the outline construction traffic management plan and the outlying camp that seek to address matters, including construction, traffic, parking provision of will wash systems and the safe maneuverability of vehicles at construction compounds. And there are a number of changes that were made to the outline construction traffic management plan Deadline five And again, think in the interest of time and efficiency, think it would be helpful if Rutland County Council in particular think have raised a number of those points, but other interested parties who may wish to comment on those updates, if you could do so, please, by deadline seven.

00:28:46:01 - 00:29:00:26

So if they do address any outstanding concerns that that you may have on that document, notwithstanding any possible further updates that may be forthcoming. But we've got to get some feedback on the latest version of that, please, if possible, by deadline seven.

00:29:16:14 - 00:29:17:13

Okay. Um.

00:29:19:20 - 00:29:38:10

Leaving on to. I don't see in relation to the applicant's updated EMP, which aims prevents maintenance activities from not causing materially new or materially different environmental effects from those reported in the

00:29:40:20 - 00:30:12:26

previous reference to ad hoc levels of construction traffic. The applicant is now introduced a limit of five Two-Way daily movements with the intent of quantifying the extent to which there will be no new or materially different effects during the construction phase or during the operational changes to say sorry when there is any maintenance works ongoing. It's been discussions previously about possible effects on maintenance and the removal and replacement of of panels.

00:30:15:06 - 00:30:38:07

Just the initial question raised to, again, Harry's authorities, and they may wish to choose to respond at the line seven. But again, we welcome some feedback from Harry's authorities on that approach and also the the threshold that's been applied to the 5 to 8 daily movements, which comes from the from

the guidance of the applicant at that point. Could just elaborate on that that particular point in the basis as to why it's 5 to 8 daily movements.

00:30:38:25 - 00:30:39:27

And to do that, please.

00:30:40:07 - 00:30:40:22

Thank you.

00:30:43:07 - 00:31:15:09

Mr. Ritchie, on behalf of the applicant, say the five movements comes from the aim of guidance and the threshold of 10%, triggering the need or for any kind of further assessment when it's a 10% increase in HGVs. So what we've done is we've taken a look at all the traffic data we collected and applied a conservative sort of review of that and took the lowest number. And that's where the five came out. There's a bit of context. If we chose the next, the next sort of level up, that would be 14 daily movements.

00:31:16:18 - 00:31:17:09

Okay, it goes.

00:31:17:26 - 00:31:21:02

And just add to that that that lowest figure came from Huffington Lane.

00:31:22:21 - 00:31:28:00

Just lowest baseline flows of 48 to 10% at 48 by.

00:31:29:22 - 00:31:35:23

Thank you. Yep. Mrs. Smith. See you have your hand up online. Did you have a point on this item?

00:31:39:25 - 00:32:24:15

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, yes, I'm surprised at that figure, especially if we're talking, as we have done previously, about wholesale replacement. So I think the key thing is it is it maintenance or is it wholesale replacement? Um, so that would be our concern. Um, and as I've made a point previously, you know, if, um, depending on the hauliers that are taking away the old units and bringing in the new, um, obviously that, that could virtually double, um, the initial construction phase in terms of traffic generation.

00:32:25:08 - 00:32:32:10

Um, the other point I'd like to make on this document, um, and the, uh.

00:32:34:23 - 00:33:15:01

But I think it's in the construction traffic management plan as well. Note the outline Environmental management plan and the outline Operational and Environment Management plan. They both refer to public rights of way footways being one metre wide and bridleways being two metres wide, which are well below the recommended standards at Natural England and on the normal sorry, the normal government website.

00:33:15:08 - 00:33:22:01

Department for Transport. Um, so we'd like to see an increase in those as well.

00:33:23:20 - 00:33:24:09

Thank you.

00:33:24:13 - 00:33:26:03

Mr. Fox. The point on the width.

00:33:26:05 - 00:33:58:26

Yeah. So think, think this is a separate point. So this is to reflect, um, response to the feedback we got at design five. This is specifically talking about the extremely limited temporary public right of way of diversions we might need to do where our access tracks are being repaired that crossed them. We're not talking massive routes. We're talking small sections where we've said that we'll reinstate them once that's been done to the to the minimum widths of one metres and two metres provided ways which we'd taken as understanding as that was.

00:33:59:28 - 00:34:23:19

The minimum width that they're supposed to be, um, in response to that feedback from the RPAs. So if they are now saying they want the minimum widths to be higher, we just be clear what width they are saying they want for passing by the way to be because I have to say my experience and most of other schemes is that two meters, by the way, tends to be pretty standard. But if it needs to be more, we'd be grateful to hear what the number should be.

00:34:27:23 - 00:34:28:10

Mrs. Smith.

00:34:29:18 - 00:35:03:08

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Yes, there's. It wasn't particularly clear within the in both paragraphs how whether this was for temporary and what that temporary period would be for. I mean, if, you know, it's a two year project, probably longer. Um, if that temporary period is six months, then I would say that's not really temporary for the sake of horse riders.

00:35:03:10 - 00:35:13:17

Um, so I think we probably need a little bit more discussion and clarification on exactly what that temporary period is. Thank you.

00:35:16:05 - 00:35:17:00

Mr. Fox.

00:35:17:19 - 00:35:35:24

The applicant. We don't know what that temporary period is yet, but the point is, is that that will be signed off by you because we can't do it until the relevant management plan has been signed off. So you would be able to consider that and agree whether we've done what you want, essentially.

00:35:38:08 - 00:35:56:29

Yes, there is opportunity at the detailed management planning stage to consider those those matters. And again, as previously think, given there are ongoing conversations around common ground, etcetera, if there is anything to do between the two parties in the meantime to to work together towards a solution, we would welcome further conversations and issues.

00:35:57:01 - 00:36:27:16

Yes, sir. Think I think we were just just I suppose at a point in public just to say if we can ask for specific changes to the wording, because at the moment there's been kind of back and forth of conceptually, if we want wording to be changed, I think that would be that would be useful. And just before we move away from that, because we've got just that kind of sidetracked from the first part of your question, which was the, the five movements. Um, just just coming back to that and response to Mr.. Smith And just, just to confirm here.

00:36:27:18 - 00:37:01:00

So the, the, um, the, um, the maintenance period and this is what the, the talks about, the fact that when we provide our detailed maintenance schedule, we have to provide both the traffic and environmental information to show that we're not providing materially worse effects than those assessed in the S and the assumed ad hoc movements so essentially assessed there would be no impact, um, because we didn't even need to assess the traffic impacts. But we're conscious that doesn't give some kind of level of quantification.

00:37:01:02 - 00:37:30:18

So that's why we've now said that that level is to show that we wouldn't be over five five. And as Mr. Richie said, the reason we've said five movements is because that isn't something you would even assess using a guiding force. So, Mr. Smith, your concerns around that we'll be doing something with the amount of traffic movements at the same as construction. What this is doing, it's ensuring that doesn't happen. So so the question is whether five that is our limit. We can't go above it is seen as a suitable number.

00:37:33:26 - 00:38:02:18

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Again, as I say, I'd encourage the two parties to have that. That conversation. And I'd like to bring in Lincoln County Council as well at this point just to get their their views on on that approach as just set up by Mr. Fox and in the updated management plan. Mr. Willis. If you have any comments on that in terms of the five Daily Two-Way movements being. An appropriate figure. Thank you, sir.

00:38:03:00 - 00:38:30:23

Mark Wallace, Lancashire County Council. No. Think. Think. We are fairly content with what's been put in the draft. Well, the outline plan, accepting that there's a control for a detailed plan to come in on that on that cap, if you like, for traffic movements. And I'll just briefly touch on the point about which I think we had a similar issue about the question about the width, but I will take that away and think we can quite easily probably remedy that by having a discussion to embed that within the outline as well.

00:38:32:09 - 00:38:33:25

Thank you, Mr. Bill. We welcome that.

00:38:38:10 - 00:38:43:18

Okay. Unless you have any further comments on transportation. This is Holloway.

00:38:45:00 - 00:39:19:23

This is Holloway for Malabar Action Group. We haven't got any issues with the five way movements and how that's been set. But if you look at the change in circumstances to 60 years, I believe that if all the panels were replaced, that would be 1040 foot containers. You can do the maths because think you had the number for the the amount of panels per container, but it works out at around about 1000 containers, which means that you would have to do that replacement cycle over 200 days now.

00:39:19:25 - 00:39:20:18

I just.

00:39:22:05 - 00:39:53:22

Any replacement of panels when they've come to the end of their useful life is going to have to be done in a relatively efficient way, you know? I'm sure the applicants aren't going to be able to do it in a piecemeal way as every bit like a light bulb popping. Um, and therefore, the likelihood of that replacement cycle taking place over 200 days and not breaching these five way movements seems

rather unlikely. And that's excluding whether you break these 40 foot containers down into loads to get to the access locations.

00:39:53:24 - 00:40:26:20

It excludes any other associated traffic that goes with it. Traffic involved to change fencing every 15, 20 years in terms of the wooden poles. Um, so as I say, don't have an issue with the five way standard that's been set, I just think it's completely unrealistic and therefore. Needs to be reviewed in that context. Unless the applicant, of course, is saying that it will be spread out over such a huge amount of time, 200 days.

00:40:27:02 - 00:40:27:27

We just don't see it.

00:40:29:15 - 00:40:49:20

Mr. Fox, could you comment on the the implications of any maintenance regime of of that of that limit? Um, I think what you said previously, it will be ad hoc whether there'll be a continuous replacement of all the channels over a short period of time or not. I don't know what your thoughts are on that. Please. Be useful to elaborate.

00:40:49:23 - 00:41:22:05

Mr. Fox's mouth. The applicant. So the first thing I'd say is, obviously we've we've committed to an annual, um, schedule being provided so people will be able to see what's proposed for the year ahead. Secondly, the applicant has put this control forward so they would have to manage, uh, any replacement, um, in that context. And I'm afraid to say I think we've heard a lot this afternoon, it's just unrealistic or it's unacceptable. But this is essentially. The price of the applicant's consent or all of these controls that are put on it.

00:41:22:23 - 00:41:26:27

And we have to comply with them and don't see that.

00:41:28:17 - 00:41:36:25

Some may consider it unrealistic if the applicant gets this consent with this control in place, it would therefore manage its maintenance activities accordingly.

00:41:39:07 - 00:41:52:10

The point. The point is that and I doubt this would happen, but even if you did 200 days of fiber movements, this causes no effect. It's not even assessable, you know, in terms so

00:41:53:28 - 00:41:57:18

you wouldn't even notice. In terms of.

00:41:59:15 - 00:42:01:01

Thank you, Mr.. Mr. Fox.

00:42:03:01 - 00:42:06:08

We see. Mr. Orvis.

00:42:08:25 - 00:42:09:21

I think we're getting.

00:42:09:23 - 00:42:10:15

A little.

00:42:10:17 - 00:42:13:03

Away from reality here because.

00:42:13:09 - 00:42:45:03

It seems to be, on the one hand, that acceptance from the applicant that all these panels will have to be replaced. And no clear. Intention or no clear guidance on how it will actually happen. And all we seem to be going back on is, well, it's part of the DCO and it's up to that. That will be informed by the DCO. Well, I can't see why we're discussing something that can be informed by the DCO.

00:42:45:05 - 00:42:46:16

That's actually not possible.

00:42:48:15 - 00:42:59:17

You know, the arithmetic doesn't make it possible. So it's doomed to failure. You cannot. They'll come into force.

00:43:02:23 - 00:43:03:15

Mr. Fox?

00:43:04:19 - 00:43:37:27

Yeah. I'm not sure I entirely follow the argument. I suppose what I'm saying is that the, um, the grants is the consent to the scheme. Um, if we were, if we were going to replace the panels, then we have, you know, whether it's 25 or 40 years to plan how we would do that. And we've got to provide a schedule for the coming year to the, to the authorities to for them to see what we are providing and to show that it's not more than what we've assessed in the.

00:43:37:29 - 00:44:11:03

Yes, ultimately, um. This is a question about whether or not the panels are replaced. What we're seeking consent for in the first place is for them to be able to be built. And from the outset, um, we are from the start said we were only going to make our top replacements. So that has been the starting point throughout. All we're doing now is putting a level of control on what that actually means in some quantitative, quantifiable sense. And. The starting point is the applicant is seeking consent for for the solar farm.

00:44:14:07 - 00:44:26:12

Thank you, Mr. Fox. I'm. I have no further questions on transportation, so I'll move on to agenda item 11.

00:44:28:05 - 00:44:59:12

Sorry, just slight interruption in terms of just clarify the program going forward because we've got socioeconomics which are going to come on to next, then noise of which there isn't much to raise, and then some items on matters relating to residential living conditions. Assuming that social economics goes on till 5:00. Which is a an assumption, but there is scope for some items of this issue specific hearing for to go over till tomorrow is your specific hearing.

00:44:59:14 - 00:45:32:15

Five We're doing the draft tomorrow, which certainly needs at least I think probably half a day to do that in the of the issues as well. Or is it worth just now agreeing now how far are we going to go today? What we're going to do tomorrow? It was left like that on purpose. The agenda in case it's so difficult to know how much time we need for each of these items. So one option is we do socioeconomics today, we adjourn after that, and then we pick up noise matters relating to the residential living conditions tomorrow morning and then follow that with the and 1 or 2 other related matters.

00:45:32:18 - 00:45:34:02

And is that Mr..

00:45:34:16 - 00:45:35:01

That

00:45:37:12 - 00:46:12:25

had to say was quite surprised because was expecting the living conditions and noise to take longer the socioeconomics. So think that mean that that is fine to be honest I mean my initial reaction was to say would it make sense to actually do noise now and then do socioeconomics and residential living conditions together and say that predominantly because issues around public rights of way and permitted paths by interested parties have been raised as kind of an issue about their living in the community and it is a community resource.

00:46:13:25 - 00:46:27:21

Whereas whilst appreciating noise does affect living conditions. I think the points there, especially in terms of your agenda, are. And don't actually go so much to that point. Although, of course, what questions you were going to ask.

00:46:27:23 - 00:46:31:17

But but given the noise, yeah, there's not much noise.

00:46:31:23 - 00:46:36:27

Given that we have already in answer to 12 A, we've given what they wanted to on.

00:46:36:29 - 00:47:01:20

Yes. I mean, this was written before deadline six. So noise actually maybe depending on what is raised. From my point of view, it's potentially a sort of 10 or 15 minute, right as I see it, based on all the questions that I've got and where we've got to on Deadline six, which is the I'd, I'd be happy to do that now but then would be that'd be half four and then we'd be into sort of doing economics.

00:47:01:22 - 00:47:02:15

Well I mean if we've.

00:47:02:17 - 00:47:09:08

Got to look at if that is related to living with living conditions as you say, and that might be a longer discussion. Um, this is.

00:47:10:05 - 00:47:29:26

Yeah. Mr. Solloway Action Group, Just one very quick consideration for perhaps Mr. Croft, who I don't know if he's online. He was certainly intending to be. Obviously he's the residential one affects him because of North Lodge farm bungalow. And it would have been nice for him to at least have the opportunity to

00:47:31:11 - 00:47:34:29

be here for that agenda point. Now, if he's not online, I don't know.

00:47:38:25 - 00:47:44:19

Is Mr. Croft, actually. I'm not going down as one of the potential speakers for this hearing. But is he?

00:47:44:21 - 00:47:48:12

Well, he was he was intending to. So, Mr. Croft.

00:47:48:14 - 00:47:54:20

On online. Mr. Croft. Can you? Alternatively, we could ask him to be online tomorrow morning.

00:47:54:22 - 00:48:01:14

Yeah. So I'm just sort of saying we could consider the agenda in the light of that. I might be able to get him because it might make it more relevant if he's.

00:48:02:17 - 00:48:08:09

So Mr. Croft isn't online now, but he might be online in the morning. Well, that would be one. That would be.

00:48:08:25 - 00:48:16:15

So I was thinking, if we can deal with noise in five ten minutes, we could also deal with socioeconomics and then just leave residential living conditions to tomorrow.

00:48:18:20 - 00:48:37:13

Yeah. Mean I've got no particular. Issue with that is. Supposed to raise it now. So people who were expecting to speak today know they don't have to speak today and can go and do other things as necessary. Uh, which we should we do noise. And then think we're not going to get beyond noise and socioeconomics would expect.

00:48:46:24 - 00:48:47:09

Yeah.

00:48:49:14 - 00:48:53:12

Okay. Yeah. Everyone happy to do noise. Okay. And.

00:48:55:27 - 00:48:59:21

As I say, there's some of it has been superseded by the

00:49:02:24 - 00:49:16:14

submissions at Deadline six, because the first item that I wanted to raise was consideration of Stephens District Council's deadline for representations regarding an acoustic validation assessment and.

00:49:19:06 - 00:49:21:25

Mr. Fox, who is speaking online.

00:49:22:02 - 00:49:57:29

I think we have got Mr. Can. No, actually, it's just me because. Because on this one we we have the submitted deadline. We've given them what they asked for, which was essentially not just the commitment that we already have, which is to design, to meet the levels that we've committed to, but also to do a validation. Once you start kind of get going to show that that is still the case. And if there were any issues to then do additional mitigation as necessary, and we've committed to doing that.

00:49:58:03 - 00:50:05:20

Okay. And I've read that, Mr. Jordan, the you now content on behalf of the District Council.

00:50:06:23 - 00:50:12:24

That fills you himself. Steve. District Council. Yeah, we've checked the updated. Um,

00:50:15:07 - 00:50:28:26

it's the correct plug for it and say that wording has been updated so I'm not sure what the latest statement of common ground or the one that's in discussion, but that particular point has now been updated to. Agreed.

00:50:29:24 - 00:50:31:25

Okay. Thank you. Okay.

00:50:35:10 - 00:50:54:22

That covers that. The next item is really the potentially a short item on the latest versions to the relevant environmental management plans. Are you able to give just an update for everybody on those? Mr. Fox So that's. That's information that's quickly available for you.

00:50:54:24 - 00:51:26:09

Yes, sir. The applicant. So think for the Kemp. The main thing we added was a table because we were conscious that actually reading across different paragraphs wasn't as clear as it could have been in relation to working hours. So we put in one definitive table. Table two one on page 13, setting out our other proposals in relation to working hours, taking account of various submissions and commitments we'd already made in the examination and.

00:51:28:14 - 00:51:32:29

And I'm working hours. Can you just briefly describe what those changes are so everyone is aware?

00:51:33:16 - 00:51:45:02

So, um, we've committed that, um, no precursor piling will happen in the 400m of residential properties on Saturday mornings at all.

00:51:47:10 - 00:52:00:26

In fact on Saturdays at all. Sorry. Um, and the and during the week it can only empty between two periods of four hours between 8 and 6. And.

00:52:02:15 - 00:52:11:02

I think that was the main thing. We've defined. What we mean by works like to generate substantial levels of noise. That's not your question. I think those are the two things.

00:52:14:12 - 00:52:16:24

Okay. Any comments from any party on.

00:52:17:00 - 00:52:24:14

Oh, sorry. Should we put the starting point also? We change the hours to nine till six on Saturday. Yeah.

00:52:24:22 - 00:52:27:08

Okay. Nine till six on the Saturday.

00:52:31:00 - 00:52:33:10

Wasn't there a lunchtime cutoff on Saturdays?

00:52:33:18 - 00:52:53:01

Oh, yes. Yes. Sorry. Yes, that's wrong. So no. So Saturday mornings we can do all activities except precursor planning. After the afternoons, we can't do deliveries worth likes generate substantial levels of noise or precursor poverty. So yes, there is a cutoff for.

00:52:54:22 - 00:53:00:14

And the start Time for Action works on Saturday morning has been moved to 9:00 from 8:00.

00:53:08:28 - 00:53:17:25

Okay. Any comments on those changes that have been made to the management plan on the last deadline, including construction hours?

00:53:19:25 - 00:53:22:20

Okay. Mr. Barfield.

00:53:23:21 - 00:53:35:25

Trevor Berthold Parish Council on the outline Construction Traffic Management plan. 2.3.1. Think there's a word missing in that paragraph on percussion piling.

00:53:47:01 - 00:53:50:26

And we will check that 2.3.1.

00:53:50:29 - 00:53:51:14

Okay.

00:53:52:29 - 00:53:56:05

Not immediately say, but then we'll check that.

00:53:56:27 - 00:53:57:16

Okay?

00:53:59:15 - 00:54:30:00

The only other issue I wanted to raise in relation to noise, because obviously we considered noise before and had various submissions, so don't go back over that old territory. But in relation to the one draft and one paragraph 527, the paragraph which talks about the avoidance of adverse effects and then the need to mitigate and minimise the other adverse effects, etcetera, etcetera. I think there was an answer provided to that. I think it's probably in the planning statement in the one of the appendices. You've got to the planning statement.

00:54:30:06 - 00:54:59:06

I don't know whether or not is any need to slightly update that in relation to anything that's any movement during the examination. That was my only point on that. I'm not expecting an answer to that now, but that can just be looked at in case there there is in terms of how the application addresses that paragraph. 5.2. 17. It might not need changing, I don't know. But that can just be considered because obviously that's something that is a draft policy requirement because actually is one of the it's a draft policy, but it's quite a sort of long standing policy and.

00:55:02:07 - 00:55:06:19

And that's all I've got on noise. Any further points of noise, Mr. Hughes?

00:55:11:08 - 00:55:15:06

Mm hmm. So you just wait for the microphone. Sorry.

00:55:22:22 - 00:55:54:26

John Hughes interested party in relation to working hours and the Saturday work hour time from nine till one. Saying all activities except percussive drilling within 400m of residential properties. So does that mean percussive drilling can take place on a Saturday as long as it's outside the range of 400m from a property? Because what I'm conscious of is the noise and the drift of sound.

00:55:57:00 - 00:55:59:25

Mr. Smith. Applicant The answer is yes, but only up to 1:00.

00:56:01:26 - 00:56:02:17

Okay.

00:56:05:06 - 00:56:07:04

Up to nine from 9 to 1:00.

00:56:07:13 - 00:56:09:25

It says the document here says 9 to 1.

00:56:10:24 - 00:56:20:13

Yes. So 9 to 1, it says we can do everything except 400m of residential properties and then from 1 to 6 we can do everything except for any percussive item.

00:56:24:14 - 00:56:27:09

So we can't classify them between 1 and 6.

00:56:29:28 - 00:56:31:04

Okay, Mr. Hughes. Thank you.

00:56:38:01 - 00:56:42:08

Okay. As I say, that was a short item as expected. Um.

00:56:44:04 - 00:56:45:22

So we now move on to.

00:56:47:12 - 00:56:48:09

Social economics.

00:56:49:29 - 00:56:50:21

Mr. James.

00:56:52:22 - 00:57:29:22

Thank you, Mr. Cliff. So item 11, as was on socio economics and matters arising from responses to our further written questions regarding the rights of way and permissive paths. And first of all, there was a question around whether or not a single separate rights management plan would be necessary. There's a bit of discussion on this point. The previous round of hearings and the applicant's response maintains their position that that is not necessary.

00:57:30:07 - 00:58:00:28

I believe Lancashire County Council concur with that view and have Rutland County Council. These things have changed their position from that expressed at the previous round of hearings. I think their response to written questions was that perhaps a separate rights of way management plan would be appropriate. The applicant have come back again to reiterate the basis for that think deadline six. So again, it's probably in that bracket of perhaps if Rutland County Council.

00:58:01:00 - 00:58:01:15

Could.

00:58:02:00 - 00:58:17:09

Review that response and kind of reflect on the position and come back at Deadline seven with an update that could be reflected as well in a future state. Common ground. I think that'd be helpful way of proceeding on that on that particular point, if that's acceptable. Mr. Johnson.

00:58:19:09 - 00:58:20:16

So thank you.

00:58:23:11 - 00:58:23:26

Um.

00:58:26:17 - 00:59:04:09

In relation again to rights of way permissive pass, particularly around some of the concerns have been expressed during the examination around the effects on users of those rights of way permissive paths, visual effects from from planting and also noise effects. And the applicant have updated the design guidance at 4.2. We should now provide some consideration of making allowance for alleviation of noise effects along rights of way and permissive paths beyond 50m.

00:59:04:11 - 00:59:19:21

Where that is appropriate. Paragraphs five 116 and five 117 of the lamp also now commit to engagement with the Community Liaison Group on planting proposals prior to the submission of the detailed lamps.

00:59:22:04 - 00:59:57:16

Interested to hear some feedback from the local authorities in the first instance as to whether or not. Those two particular updates. The management plans may. And assists in addressing some of the issues raised around noise effects on rights of our users, but also visual effects. So perhaps could they could the working group and the chance it will have through through that secure through the have the opportunity to perhaps try and mitigate or manage any potential corridor effects from planting on either side of the rights or permissive paths.

00:59:57:18 - 01:00:12:12

Is that something that perhaps could be seen as a beneficial amendment to the management plans? Or do you have any wider comments on those two updates? And Mr. Johnson, please. And Rutland County Council.

01:00:12:14 - 01:00:12:29

Thank you.

01:00:13:01 - 01:00:13:16

Sir.

01:00:13:18 - 01:00:22:19

Justin Johnson and County Council. And I think with regards to the, um, the actual management.

01:00:22:21 - 01:00:25:05

Group being able to, to discuss the.

01:00:25:07 - 01:00:28:11

Planting, I think that's going to have limited impact, if I'm honest.

01:00:28:13 - 01:00:31:07

The you either do the.

01:00:31:09 - 01:00:34:29

Do the planting and, and it provides the screening and and.

01:00:35:01 - 01:00:37:27

And therefore. And creates.

01:00:37:29 - 01:00:41:10

The corridor effects that that that we are envisaging.

01:00:42:00 - 01:00:42:21

Or.

01:00:42:25 - 01:00:44:15

If for instance you were to put.

01:00:44:26 - 01:00:54:06

Um something of a lower level and then it's not going to be providing the screening that that's desired. So I think it has limited impact if, if I'm. Mr..

01:00:57:09 - 01:01:08:24

Back. Mr. Johnson, on the noise point, whether you may have comments on that now or again, whether that's a deadline seven written submission, the updated design guidance in relation to how noise effects.

01:01:09:15 - 01:01:11:26

We'll pick that up at deadline separately for that occasion.

01:01:12:17 - 01:01:18:06

Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Um, Mr. Jordan, did you have any comments on this at this point in time?

01:01:19:24 - 01:01:51:15

The Phil Jordan South Kesteven District Council. No, I think we'll sort of continue to you know, we're looking at this issue through the statement of common ground and trying to distil out those issues of noise, impact, visual impact and how they sort of, you know, interact with the both the existing public rights of way on the and the permissive paths. We have split out those issues in the latest version of the statement of Common ground and tried to agree positions where we can.

01:01:52:00 - 01:01:57:29

So I think we'll leave our detailed comments to that particular document, if that's okay.

01:01:59:12 - 01:02:04:15

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. That's. That's fine, Mr. Willis. Lancashire County Council.

01:02:06:20 - 01:02:10:18

There's many points to that. It's a case of a deadline seven submission.

01:02:10:20 - 01:02:13:09

Yeah, absolutely. Please would do the same, please.

01:02:14:04 - 01:02:15:06

Thank you, Mr. Willis.

01:02:19:05 - 01:03:13:09

Just add just add an additional reference to that consideration, which is just the updated deadline five added text around. That when we provide detailed, we've got to show how we've ensured that our noise levels don't exceed 50 db on both of them. Public rights of way and the permissive paths. And we also made the change in relation to monitoring and keeping logs and those be able to be viewed on request. Um, and I suppose just, just on that and on and on, um, visual, Um, I think I would just say that this position is, I don't think there's anything more we can, we can do in that regard in terms of the scheme, the noise effects, you know, we've shown that they're not going to be causing any significant effects and we've put the controls in to make sure that's the case.

01:03:14:00 - 01:03:46:12

And the visual we've assessed and we've made our mitigation assumptions the the kind of give on liaising with the community on that was kind of response to what we've heard in examination about people's concerns. Um, and don't think just to be clear, I don't think we were suggesting that that makes. The changes, anything about the conclusions of our work or what the mitigation would have to be? It's just a chance for me to be involved in that, given they've raised concerns about it. Ultimately, the details would be approved by the RPAs pursuant to the UN requirements.

01:03:46:14 - 01:03:47:04

Seven anyway.

01:03:48:16 - 01:04:06:02

Thank you, Mr. Fox. And yes, thank you for raising those additional updates. I think it was useful for the interested parties mentioned previously to comment on on the totality of those updates in relation to this particular issue by deadline seven. We have a hand at the back Mrs. Crump in.

01:04:12:03 - 01:04:47:02

Just interested party. We talk a lot about visual, but we actually haven't seen anything. And I know I asked early on from the developers, could we have some artist's impressions? And I have sent to you today the one artist's impression I've seen from the developers, plus a couple of my own artist's impressions of what it's going to look like because we have to be realistic. The planting is only going to be of of a hedge is only going to be 12in big when it starts.

01:04:47:04 - 01:05:19:12

So in 20 years time, it will be mitigating, but not until 20 years time. And I've also submitted a photograph of rail substation which has a five year old planting, and those plants are now 12in high. And and you can see if you'd like to show them the photograph. I have sent it to Mr. Chan's got it there so that you can see that it's going to take 20 years.

01:05:20:17 - 01:05:30:24

Thank you, Mrs. Crampton. Perhaps it'll be helpful for the examination if you could submit those images alongside written some of your statements today. So we've got that alongside what you've just said. That'll be helpful.

01:05:33:19 - 01:05:45:19

Pretty If you could make that a deadline seven, please set it. Bottom line then tying with you've written submission, your submission that we've just heard. Now that'd be useful. Thank you. Okay. Um.

01:05:49:01 - 01:06:13:12

Moving on. I did have a question around the point that is raised by Rutland County Council in relation to the widths of rights of way, but we've we've dealt with that particular point already. And so that

brings unless you have any further final points on socioeconomics from anybody. And that brings us to the agenda item to a close.

01:06:19:04 - 01:06:36:06

So sorry for me. I'm just going to say, conscious of what was said about North Lodge Farm bungalow. I'm also conscious that the agenda was fairly involved. So it may be that we could at least do glint and glare and talk about Wood Farm now and leave North North Lodge to tomorrow.

01:06:37:07 - 01:06:46:16

Yes, as a my estimation was way out on social and economics. I think we might as well use the time that we have available. So yeah, I'm happy to do so. Who's there?

01:06:48:05 - 01:06:58:02

Mr. Crouton? Glyn Sinclair. Yes. Okay. Uh, just bear with me while I. Catch up. I'm asking questions on this.

01:07:40:00 - 01:07:40:15

Yeah.

01:07:41:22 - 01:07:50:23

Okay. On Linton Glen this is specifically in relation to. And the effect on dwellings.

01:07:53:09 - 01:08:22:15

And the assessment in the. Glinton Claire study sort of ranks the effects, doesn't it, in terms of there's those properties where there's a low effect, and then there's those properties where there's a. I think, a moderate effect where it says expert and expert assessment is required to determine the, uh, mitigation requirements. And whether mitigation is required.

01:08:25:15 - 01:08:28:12

And for both types of.

01:08:29:28 - 01:08:46:12

Model types. The only properties that sort of come through that test of expert assessment is think its number 166, which is actually two properties and it's the properties that we visited we couldn't get into, but we look from outside which is and.

01:08:51:07 - 01:09:10:06

Wood farm cottages. And it's agreed that that's two properties, isn't it, rather than one property. I think the assessment indicates it's one property, but plainly it's clearly two. And could you just try some more detail? You probably didn't write the assessment, did you? But if you're in a position to be able to answer a questions about that.

01:09:11:05 - 01:09:20:04

Then I'm the landscape architect for the scheme. So if the questions are in relation to planting and kind of the mitigation that we've proposed, I can answer those. If your.

01:09:20:06 - 01:09:21:00

Questions are more.

01:09:21:02 - 01:09:21:21

Of a technical.

01:09:21:23 - 01:09:23:24

Nature. Obviously I'm not a.

01:09:24:04 - 01:09:26:21
Specialist, but but the my.

01:09:26:23 - 01:09:27:09
Understanding is.

01:09:27:19 - 01:09:28:08
As how you've.

01:09:28:10 - 01:09:29:07
Characterized it.

01:09:29:12 - 01:09:32:04
Just now. So in terms of there was a.

01:09:32:06 - 01:09:32:23
Potential for a.

01:09:32:25 - 01:09:33:19
Significant impact.

01:09:33:21 - 01:09:37:00
On that property, albeit there are two.

01:09:37:02 - 01:09:38:21
Dwellings there and we have sought to.

01:09:38:23 - 01:09:45:15
Mitigate that through the planting as we saw on sites through that small, small copse of woodland.

01:09:47:02 - 01:10:24:05
And understand, because there is some detail obviously in the study on how that expert assessment was utilised or made in terms of angles to from the properties to the to the array areas. One of the things in it is obviously, I think it sort of indicates that it's ground floor rooms that are taking into account or give you like giving more weight than first floor rooms. Which is. Is that correct? Actually, the first four rooms of all those properties that are have a potential effect or have a moderate effect.

01:10:24:12 - 01:10:27:25
It's only the ground floor rooms that are looked at and not the first floor rooms.

01:10:30:19 - 01:10:33:25
The bank group for the applicant again. So may have to come back. Back to you on that.

01:10:34:03 - 01:10:39:22
Maybe that's a question to sort of take away. The other question was. That on?

01:10:47:07 - 01:11:18:01
Again the draft in three on Glen Sinclair think it's paragraph 310 125 says the applicant should consider using in some cases the Secretary of State may require solar panels to comprise of or be covered with anti-glare anti-reflective coating with the specified also of a specified angle of reflection

continuation for the lifetime of the Commission. Obviously for for the panels and whilst only that one property makes it beyond the the technical assessment test if you like, and appreciate the mitigation being proposed for that.

01:11:18:09 - 01:11:58:07

In terms of the other properties where there's still more than a lower effect, is there any need for. The solar panels in this case to be covered with anti-glare and reflective coats, because I'm not sure they are. I know the glinting glare assessment looks at it in terms of the maybe like the worst case scenario. So they're without that coating. Think that's correct isn't it? It sets the worst case scenario that all the panels will not have that coating. But for those properties that have a larger than a low effect. And is there not some justification or need for the panels to have the Anti-glare anti-reflective coating in order to.

01:11:59:06 - 01:12:03:15

Minimize any effect on those particular properties.

01:12:05:02 - 01:12:11:19

And it may be that something which needs to be considered separately rather than from a landscape visual point of view, because obviously it goes it goes beyond that.

01:12:11:21 - 01:12:20:28

But then for the applicant to say, I'm afraid that yes, if if we can take that one away, we will come back to you. We may.

01:12:22:22 - 01:12:30:03

Yeah, I mean, the short point is how how the how the application address is or how we should consider paragraph three point 10.1, two five of the draft.

01:12:30:18 - 01:12:49:23

So think, think we understand that the panels will be coated. But the reason I think the assessment was done on the basis of none is because the the type of depending on the type of panel with the change type of anti-reflective covering that's put on. But we alone would definitely take that away.

01:12:49:27 - 01:13:01:18

And they are going to be coated then and that needs to be included in whatever management plan it would need to be. Then that would be helpful in terms of glint of glare effects.

01:13:02:01 - 01:13:20:10

Just just on your first question, sir, on the assessment that was done on the basis of of, um, I think both flaws because the assessment refers to views are only accessible from there are only views from top floors which are not considered to be the main living space. So that was my understanding. But we will, we will confirm that.

01:13:20:26 - 01:13:34:09

Yeah. Queried about that is it's not necessarily the case that all houses are raised in that fashion. Yeah, people might have living rooms on first floors and bedrooms on ground floors and goodness knows what else. But it's.

01:13:36:15 - 01:13:53:15

But mean, which is where I thought you might be going with that question and think the answer to that would be that is the standard that is used for essentially all there assessment probably is say, think, think, think where we've identified impacts we've mitigated.

01:13:53:24 - 01:14:02:22

And presumably in this case, there's no knowledge of what's on ground floor and what's on first of all properties. And that was actually looked at that in a way would have been an advancement from the general assumption.

01:14:03:16 - 01:14:40:18

Yes, the answer to that is no. But think what would come back to so is to focus here where the the where there's been an effect mind predominantly is at wood farm cottages and where we went to mitigate and just wanted to hear something that we did talk about last time. But let's be clear on that, that that that property is owned by the landowners who have. After we now have a deal with and the way the scheme is designed around them, which is item item B, um, it's done on the basis of the land that they were prepared to offer to us for solar.

01:14:40:23 - 01:15:09:22

So, um, we've, we've mitigated the impact there are any likely significant effects in terms of, of living conditions. There are setbacks with which Mr. Croup can talk to, but think that's very important context of who the receptor is in this instance. And I know you said last time that someone could move in, but if someone moved in, they would do so with the scheme in place. Knowing what they are and that they're not the receptor. They're there. It's the residents who have accepted that impact, which is not significant.

01:15:10:25 - 01:15:11:10

Okay.

01:15:12:01 - 01:15:32:00

Okay. Understand that. I'm assuming the property's properties will be rented out and they aren't. You're saying the only the future tenant would move in? There is a point that sort of lingers about actually providing appropriate living conditions for all properties, no matter who owns them, and no matter how they might go. And it might those properties could be sold in the in the future.

01:15:32:24 - 01:15:39:06

And would it be helpful for me to explain the design in and around that house where we see that? Yeah.

01:15:39:08 - 01:15:39:24

Two houses.

01:15:39:26 - 01:15:51:24

Yes, two. But I suppose just wanted to set that context. It's important, but also the fact that we don't think that there is a negative effect on living conditions and the starting point, it's great.

01:15:59:11 - 01:16:15:24

It's a big thank you to the applicant, so I'm not sure it's often helpful to have a plan. I'm planning to pull up and I'm just minded. If not. Not too much trouble to to turn to the planning rep. 5066.

01:16:17:18 - 01:16:22:03

Is that going to go up on screen or do you want me to look at it on my own screen, isn't it?

01:16:23:12 - 01:16:23:27

I

01:16:25:05 - 01:16:26:04

think it can go on screen.

01:16:26:06 - 01:16:26:21

Yeah.

01:16:26:23 - 01:16:27:29

What's the rap? Do we know the rap?

01:16:29:24 - 01:16:40:14

Rap? 5066. It's basically the plan that's contained within the landscape and ecology management plan. But essentially that and as we as we talked about on site,

01:16:42:00 - 01:16:50:26

we're aware of the potential glint and glare issue for those two properties. Um, and you can see on the plan, think it's let.

01:16:50:28 - 01:16:53:10

Me just catch up with you because I'm just trying to get it on my own screen.

01:16:53:12 - 01:16:56:15

Yeah, it's just on the join unfortunately sheet for.

01:16:58:25 - 01:17:01:29

Oh, hang on. It's on the screen now. The main screen. Oh, we've got.

01:17:02:01 - 01:17:03:08

An overview plan.

01:17:03:10 - 01:17:05:05

I don't know if that can be okay.

01:17:30:29 - 01:18:18:09

Just on screen now is sheet four. But you can just see and unfortunately, it just straddles the two the two sheets there. But there's the block of Woodland Square, block of woodland in a khaki kind of color just at the bottom of the plan. That's then also repeated on on the sheet below. They're just being highlighted. So that's that's the block of woodland that that was specifically been planted to mitigate that potential effect in terms of glints and glare. And as Mr. Fox has touched on already, you can see in terms of the panels that that are near to that that property that they lie across Uffington Lane in field 48 believe those are set back behind the woodland, behind the existing hedgerow that distance to the north.

01:18:18:11 - 01:18:23:11

So the panels, panels to the north is about 100m before you get to the

01:18:25:04 - 01:18:38:29

panels for the north along Uffington Lane and then obviously to the south there are no panels proposed. So there is a scale on the plan so that you can kind of go away and take measurements yourself. But.

01:18:40:28 - 01:19:00:09

But the glare assessment, as say, required that specific mitigation that was put in. We've done a residential, residential visual amenity assessment of part of that on those properties, and that hasn't concluded in any significant effects. And the planting that we're proposed, we're comfortable with that.

01:19:00:25 - 01:19:07:10

And the planting needs, what height is the planting need to get to to have enough to be effective in that mitigation?

01:19:08:14 - 01:19:13:12

In terms of the visual, sir, or the glinting glare or both interlinked.

01:19:13:20 - 01:19:42:23

Those probably interlinked, Yeah, I suppose. Yeah. Because I'm as I understand it, the planting is there to block the literally block the glint and glare effect because it won't occur because there's planting in the way. There's a separate question. I think we might have asked this at the last the last one of the last hearings about does that introduce a sort of a loss of openness and all of us again and but in order to remove the glint and glare effect, what height do they need to be?

01:19:44:21 - 01:20:15:10

Thank root for the applicant. So think that's. Well, the point. The point I'd make is that there is already a hedgerow there that is providing some screening to the lower lower floors. The upper floors would need to. I can't give you an exact measurement, but it would obviously need to be higher than it currently is, knowing that the panel, maximum panel heights, we have a 3.3. Now, I'm not not suggesting that we need screening of 3.3 per se, given the aspects, but maybe it's something we can come back to.

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

You presume that would cover the ground floor by

01:20:19:27 - 01:20:30:00

would almost certainly cover the ground floor, wouldn't it? Yes. We're not particularly high properties, but the first floor, I don't know what windows that were at the front can vaguely remember, but.

01:20:33:03 - 01:20:54:27

Yes. A bank route for the applicant. So so yeah, in terms of first floor residential houses that whether the apex of the house, my experience can be anything from 8.5m to 9.5. So it's the windows that potentially a couple of meters below that that's not necessarily you need kind of 7 or 6.5 meters of screening to them and eliminate that that glare effect.

01:20:55:06 - 01:21:06:17

The simple solution would be to find out what the first floor rooms of those properties are, which must be information that's obtainable given it's. One of the given what Mr. Fox said about being one of the landowners. And then.

01:21:12:19 - 01:21:14:24

That could be reflected in whatever heights required

01:21:17:09 - 01:21:18:02

bankruptcy applicants.

01:21:18:09 - 01:21:32:29

Exactly that if there are specific heights that need to be maintained or provided from from one, as it were, that's something that we can do in our power as part of the detailed landscaping ecology management plans. Okay.

01:21:35:15 - 01:21:37:12

Mrs. Davis, did you have your hand up? Sorry.

01:21:47:01 - 01:21:48:22

Davis interested.

01:21:48:24 - 01:22:08:00

Party. I was just wondering how this assessment has been done, because from what I understand, the panels are going to be different. Some fixed, some not. If the movable ones are going to be moving, Um, how will we know what is going to be affected?

01:22:08:05 - 01:22:20:11

I think I can probably answer that by saying that they're both. They're both been modeled. It's the worst case scenario of the two that is all over the site, as I understand it. Yeah. Yeah, that's my understanding of that.

01:22:20:14 - 01:22:23:07

And all over the roads. Because there will be drivers.

01:22:23:09 - 01:22:54:21

Yes. Yes. Mean the document is available to look at some of the time of the time of the rep and it is it's not a particularly long document. So it's something that can be if it's something you're interested in, then that can be you can get that in our examination library. It's about 104104. And that does go through the process on what has been done in terms of dwellings, road, rail, aviation and. A horse Riders think.

01:22:54:24 - 01:22:55:26

And not birds.

01:22:57:10 - 01:22:57:27

Of course.

01:22:59:21 - 01:23:00:20

That document doesn't cover.

01:23:00:26 - 01:23:03:13

The note, but the ecology chapter considers

01:23:05:00 - 01:23:07:01

the impact on birds. Yeah.

01:23:12:03 - 01:23:14:19

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

01:23:19:00 - 01:23:25:06

Okay. That's. Everything had to raise on Clinton. Mr. Barfield didn't make a point.

01:23:26:12 - 01:23:38:19

Thank you, sir. Trevor Berthoud Parish Council. Beamish has not been able to attend today due to a family matter, and she's asked me to read a statement out. Would you accept that?

01:23:39:02 - 01:23:40:19

Sorry. Say, this is.

01:23:41:21 - 01:23:42:06
Mrs..

01:23:42:08 - 01:23:49:04
Beamish. Okay? And this is in relation to this glint and glare. Which property?

01:23:50:18 - 01:23:51:04
Church farm?

01:23:51:06 - 01:23:51:27
Yes.

01:23:52:03 - 01:23:52:18
Isn't.

01:23:54:18 - 01:23:56:08
Of course. Yeah. And.

01:23:58:00 - 01:24:00:03
I've got no objections. You happy with that?

01:24:00:21 - 01:24:04:26
I think this is very short. I'll read it off my phone. Yeah. It's not here.

01:24:04:28 - 01:24:07:18
It's related to the subject matter. I don't see a problem with that.

01:24:08:16 - 01:24:19:08
Um, so do forgive me while I look at my phone. From the initial announcement of the proposed solar farm by wind energy and solar farm declared my personal medical condition to them. It might be.

01:24:19:10 - 01:24:24:28
Better that it is in writing, and then relevant bits can be taken out. Just be very careful about data protection regulations.

01:24:25:00 - 01:24:25:15
And

01:24:26:27 - 01:24:58:00
if you don't mind, interrupt just for a moment. I'm pretty sure. Um, so we, we met with the woman on Monday and she raised this, which is that they have a concern about the hedgerow and on top of the vineyard and the medical concerns about glint and glare. If the hydro doesn't build quick enough, sorry isn't high enough in order to protect her from from the glare from those panels. I think what I'll say is we'll make a commitment in writing about how we're seeking to to deal with that.

01:24:58:02 - 01:25:02:13
But probably the best way of dealing with this. But yeah, that's, that's about right.

01:25:02:22 - 01:25:08:23
Yeah. So, so we've already taken away the action from Monday with a meeting from her to look at what we can say in the lamp on that.

01:25:08:25 - 01:25:13:29

Okay. In a way, it's a similar point to the heights of the landscape we were talking about before. But yeah, thank you for raising that.

01:25:16:28 - 01:25:17:19

Okay.

01:25:20:21 - 01:25:25:29

Those are the questions that I had on glinting glare effects on

01:25:27:21 - 01:25:29:16

residential properties.

01:25:32:28 - 01:25:35:07

Is Mr. Croft. Do we know him? He's definitely coming tomorrow.

01:25:37:19 - 01:25:38:24

Well, this is Holloway.

01:25:38:26 - 01:25:49:13

From Past Action Group. I've emailed him. I've not had a response. I mean, he was going to attend today, so I don't know why that didn't happen. But he you know, it's probably his work commitment.

01:25:49:15 - 01:26:11:28

I know he's made a written representation, that deadline. 5 or 6. Definitely. We have read one is written representations. Mean if you wanted to attend tomorrow morning first thing and make a short representation on his what he wants to say then I've got no I don't see a problem with with that. Out of fairness, just one.

01:26:13:24 - 01:26:33:25

Perhaps we think wood farm cottages in terms of residential effects. It's been covered in terms of North Lodge farm bungalow. It's one of the properties we're getting. We visited on our site inspection. There's one question of clarification. At the back of North Lodge farm bungalow, there's think it's North Lodge Farm.

01:26:35:13 - 01:27:04:24

House or is it something else? But there's a property at the back. Which we didn't go and visit. And think I think it was mentioned that it's not lived in or it's even not it's even there's nobody lives there. But there is a property there isn't there? Because I can't see it. We can't see it because we can't get public access. Obviously around there, we didn't go and see it on the site inspection, but I'm presuming it's a two story property. Does anybody know?

01:27:08:26 - 01:27:26:29

Is Holloway for the Action Group. Don't think anyone else lives there. And also there's different names, so it can be a bit confusing sometimes. Think it might be a land registry name, which is one name for the property and then another name that's used. So sometimes it looks like there were two properties there. But don't think there are two habitable inhabitants.

01:27:27:19 - 01:27:28:23

Is it habitable?

01:27:29:28 - 01:27:30:13

Also.

01:27:31:19 - 01:27:33:21

And can help you there.

01:27:35:24 - 01:27:45:24

The game. One of the game keepers used to live there many, many years ago. He died many, many years ago. The property was sold. I don't know who to, but it's derelict.

01:27:47:00 - 01:27:57:17

We've not had any representations from anybody who lives there. You say it's derelict and. Okay. I mean, it has been taken into account, hasn't it, in the visual amenity assessment?

01:28:00:06 - 01:28:11:12

And thank you for that. Yes. Yes, it has. But obviously, since the accompanied site visit, it was confirmed that it was derelict. And that was my understanding as well. Yeah. Yeah, that was it was.

01:28:11:25 - 01:28:13:08

That I heard there.

01:28:15:15 - 01:28:21:25

Okay. Okay. Well, just wanted to get a clarification on that. Um.

01:28:25:09 - 01:28:30:10

If it became habitable, then I think a lot of the same considerations would apply. Yes, you're being.

01:28:30:12 - 01:28:37:07

Assessed. I'm not saying I'm not being assessed. It's been assessed, just more trying to find out actually, does it actually exist and what is at stake?

01:28:37:18 - 01:28:40:16

I think it would be fair to say. Helen Woolley on.

01:28:40:18 - 01:28:41:07

Behalf of.

01:28:41:22 - 01:28:45:18

Action Group. My understanding is that there is a property there and it is owned by somebody.

01:28:46:11 - 01:28:46:26

As far as.

01:28:46:28 - 01:28:49:13

We're aware, it is not lived in by anybody.

01:28:49:19 - 01:28:50:17

But there.

01:28:50:19 - 01:28:51:12

Is a potential.

01:28:51:14 - 01:28:55:28

That that person may wish to do something with the property at a later date. So I don't think you could rule.

01:28:56:00 - 01:28:58:11

Out the fact that somebody may wish to.

01:28:59:23 - 01:29:01:03

Do something with the property.

01:29:01:05 - 01:29:02:05

But at the moment.

01:29:02:07 - 01:29:03:22

I think it'd be fair to assume it's not.

01:29:04:10 - 01:29:14:00

I think that's the way it's been considered by the applicant, but it has been considered in the in the in the assessment. Obviously, we've not been able to go there, but we know where where it is.

01:29:15:23 - 01:29:43:17

Okay. Thank you. Think in terms of North Lodge farm bungalow. If Mr. Croft wants to make representation tomorrow morning, then he can. First thing. Obviously, he's already provided a submission in writing, and his property is not one that's been assessed in the Glen Sinclair assessment or it's not even got to the low. And I presume that's because of the screening around the property.

01:29:46:23 - 01:29:50:25

Bankrupt the applicant yet. That's my understanding too. So yeah, no issue in terms of. Okay.

01:29:51:29 - 01:29:57:20

My only question. Think it's could leave this till tomorrow morning. Mr. Croft is here in terms of.

01:29:59:16 - 01:30:16:13

Potential noise effects in any visual effects and any of the effects that he's sort of talked about in terms of his living conditions, how those have been considered, if you like, in combination as part of the assessments in terms of his his overall living conditions.

01:30:20:18 - 01:30:23:25

Let Mr. Crewe answer the visual. I'm just going to bring something up in the nice.

01:30:25:22 - 01:31:01:29

Then create for the applicant. Yes. So in terms of the visual and think we've talked about the distinction between living conditions and residential visual amenity assessment, which is what what are two separate things? And what we've got got the technical report on in terms of that 0557. So in terms of the residential visual amenity assessment, the conclusion was moderate impacts to the visual amenity. I have to say the site visit was incredibly helpful in terms of just understanding some of the visual amenity of that property in more detail.

01:31:02:10 - 01:31:26:19

I don't think it changes kind of those assessment that we've concluded. And again, happy you'll see for yourself, sir, from the green infrastructure plan in terms of some of the offsets that we've made to to mitigate that. So moving panels away to to the south and to the to the east, I think it was. So yeah.

01:31:26:21 - 01:31:29:25

In terms of the visual amenity assessment, this is a general point.

01:31:31:15 - 01:31:33:24

Onyx. There are several properties where there's a

01:31:36:13 - 01:31:37:13

moderate effect.

01:31:38:29 - 01:31:39:16

Think.

01:31:49:16 - 01:31:58:06

Forgive me while I get the document. Okay. It's appendix 6.4, isn't it? Of the landscape and visual residential damage assessment. And in looking at the.

01:32:01:04 - 01:32:11:17

The tables at the table, one which has the results, the several properties that come up in terms of significance of effect that come up as

01:32:16:16 - 01:32:17:09

moderate.

01:32:19:14 - 01:32:32:11

For example. Yeah. North Northland farm bungalow being. Being one of those. And what North Farm being another North Lodge farm is the property at the back, isn't it? Think that's the way it's been. Termed in this.

01:32:34:06 - 01:32:37:16

And then it's got mitigation in the next column. It's got mitigation measures.

01:32:39:03 - 01:32:40:25

But I'm not quite clear about.

01:32:42:04 - 01:32:42:20

Is.

01:32:44:14 - 01:33:04:17

Is the significance effect of the fact taking account of those measures or do the misinformation measures, if you like, after the significant effect? But if so, it's not clear. And actually what that moderate effect goes to. I'm not quite don't know unless I miss some small print somewhere which is always possible that.

01:33:06:21 - 01:33:13:11

Is actually the effect staying as moderate for those properties? Or does does does the mitigation actually alleviate that?

01:33:13:13 - 01:33:55:12

Yeah. Thank thank you for the applicant again. So we're kind of into the great gray territory of mitigation and enhancement. But but essentially, yes, you're correct. There are three properties North Lodge Farm, North Lodge Farm Bungalow and Wood Farm cottages, which in fact are two separate cottages that have moderate significance of effects. And essentially that that assessment has those mitigation measures built into the assessment. So with those mitigation measures, some of which are

design responses in terms of pulling away, some of which will be detailed through the detailed lengths, that's the significance of effect in terms of the visual impact.

01:33:55:14 - 01:33:55:29

So.

01:33:56:01 - 01:34:20:06

Right. So the the actual. Significant effect reported is the like the residual effect after mitigation? The residual effect, Yes. Okay. Yeah. And. I'm presuming that for this because it's part of the methodology from the point of view, those are being considered as Non-Significant because they're moderates don't want to get into that discussion about are they, are they not? But but that's the correct.

01:34:20:08 - 01:34:23:21

So it's based on the methodology. Right. And threshold.

01:34:24:14 - 01:34:26:17

Right. Okay. Thank you. I understand

01:34:28:25 - 01:34:29:15

this is woolly.

01:34:31:14 - 01:34:31:29

Yeah.

01:34:32:01 - 01:34:33:11

I'm looking at.

01:34:33:13 - 01:34:34:02

The.

01:34:34:24 - 01:34:35:10

Appendix.

01:34:35:12 - 01:34:36:12

15.3in the.

01:34:36:14 - 01:34:45:13

Glitz. And lastly, and I'm using our case as an example, but to ask a more general question, Helen, will you speaking on behalf of Class Action Group.

01:34:45:15 - 01:34:47:03

We're identified within.

01:34:47:05 - 01:34:47:20

The actual.

01:34:47:22 - 01:34:49:12

Study rather than the table that you.

01:34:49:14 - 01:34:55:20

Were just looking at, um, as a receptor with a moderate impact of glint and glare. There's some.

01:34:55:22 - 01:34:57:08
Identified screening based on.

01:34:57:10 - 01:35:30:02
A disc based review, but the recommendation is no mitigation. My question is, if it's found when the actual scheme is in place, particularly as most of this has been done as a disc based review, are there opportunities for that then to be addressed if it's found that on those properties which have identified as moderate but no mitigate, no further mitigation is recommended that there is some attention paid if it's found in the future, the scheme goes ahead.

01:35:30:07 - 01:35:41:19
That glinting glare is an issue for some of those residential properties that have been identified as moderate, but where no further mitigation is recommended at this stage. Given this is all based on disc based review.

01:35:42:27 - 01:35:48:16
As far as the applicant, we'll take that away. I don't think I can go dancing right now. That.

01:35:51:15 - 01:35:54:00
Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Woolley, for that question.

01:35:55:21 - 01:35:58:28
Yes. If you're sorry, give your name again, please. Just for the. Just for the recording.

01:36:00:29 - 01:36:01:14
And.

01:36:02:24 - 01:36:05:12
Several problems with.

01:36:05:14 - 01:36:13:18
Printing glare with properties that haven't been identified. Um, is there anything with that? Can Mr. Fox take that away as well?

01:36:14:02 - 01:36:17:25
I think that's what Mr. Fox is taking away. That that very point. Yeah.

01:36:18:00 - 01:36:19:28
Yeah. Think. Think. The,

01:36:21:18 - 01:36:32:13
um. Yes. Yes. We'll take it away. I mean, I suppose the starting point would be where we stand by our assessment, as we do for all of our settlements. But I appreciate the concern and we'll put something in writing on that.

01:36:34:02 - 01:36:35:23
Just coming back to north.

01:36:37:25 - 01:36:39:17
Uh, Lodge Farm

01:36:41:05 - 01:37:11:18

Appendix 10.5, which deals with the noise, um, there and without mitigation at a level of 36. A noise rating level of 36dB or a pure noise level of 32. I think we've talked about before how 35dB is essentially the volume of someone talking, but then that is reduced even further once we apply mitigation down to.

01:37:15:29 - 01:37:16:21

Like 35.

01:37:18:01 - 01:37:26:20

Understand the noise assessment for that, that property and other residential properties. So yeah, I'm clear on how that's been carried out.

01:37:28:17 - 01:37:53:26

It might be that Mr. Tomorrow can talk about this too, but think he's in his reputation. He raises issues from the existing when the existing substation was constructed, uh, things like things being delivered to his house continuously. I'm not quite sure how one addresses that, but that was one of the things that was raised, but also in terms of. Noise in terms of actual construction, does the construction traffic actually would that actually pass? It wouldn't pass his property, would it? Would it pass.

01:37:55:12 - 01:38:04:06

Yeah, there is isn't there. So it's, it's just getting this sort of the feel for where a property's got several different effects.

01:38:07:18 - 01:38:14:11

Now that has been sort of factored in and take into account into the overall effect on in combination effect on the living conditions of the occupiers.

01:38:15:06 - 01:38:48:09

And yes, we can come back. I'll come back to you on that. Mean think would say on the answer to that question about the the traffic movements that's not the the main route for the HGVs. So there would be a small amount of route to get from the primary to any secondary compounds there. But we talked there that all movements go to the primary and then there are buses down to the secondary. So we're not talking great traffic movements there. I do take the point about noise and and we did do the in combination assessments and found none that significant.

01:38:48:14 - 01:38:54:27

But appreciate your asking specifically about these individual receptors. So because of living conditions you know come back to you on that and.

01:38:55:04 - 01:39:04:22

Maybe Mr. Croft can elaborate on this tomorrow himself if he wants to come along. But he has done representations on this. So, again, they can be they can be responded to in writing as well. Okay.

01:39:05:15 - 01:39:29:04

Yes. And we'll do that. But think asking your point and correct me if I'm wrong is that given the setbacks that we we've given, the things that are already existing in terms of hedgerows, the big land that's kind of outside of his garden, when you show in the plans, the big kind of patch isn't his garden, it's that is already okay. Um, you know, we've specifically reacted to that property.

01:39:29:14 - 01:39:42:18

Yeah. Understand. And it was useful to go to all the residential properties that we went to on the Friday of the site inspection as well. So thank you for everybody who arranged visits for that for that day because that was very, that was very helpful to us. Um,

01:39:44:14 - 01:39:58:23

okay. Subject to Mr. Croft making a representation orally tomorrow if he so wishes, without any pressure on on him to do so. Those are the questions I wanted to ask on residential living conditions.

01:40:01:02 - 01:40:06:13

In which case we've done well to get to just past 5:00, which.

01:40:10:07 - 01:40:20:01

Pink covers. All the issues that we wanted to. Get through this one, doesn't it? Mr. Levine? Okay.

01:40:24:21 - 01:40:34:17

Okay, so 15 is accidental arising which Mr. James, can you go through those of your any other relevant matters before we just confirm the actions arising,

01:40:36:07 - 01:40:43:21

things that have been discussed today? We did yesterday's actions yesterday evening, so it was just the actions from today's sessions.

01:40:47:00 - 01:40:48:09

Mr. Change not to go through those.

01:40:48:11 - 01:40:48:26

Okay.

01:40:50:06 - 01:40:55:15

Yeah. So just to confirm some of the action points that we've recorded during today's.

01:40:57:00 - 01:41:03:23

Hearing. So. This session on archaeology.

01:41:08:19 - 01:41:09:15

First of all.

01:41:12:06 - 01:41:37:27

As you go through the journey for the applicant and deadline seven and last night stay otherwise and an action to revise the outline risk and scheme of investigation to remove paragraph 3.7. Um, an explanation of the role of the coroner. This was the debate around, um, treasure and human remains and whether or not we had some involvement in that particular process that was offered to provide some clarification on that.

01:41:39:28 - 01:41:51:09

Um, to amend schedule 16 of the draft to include consideration site specific written scheme of investigation and the determination process around that.

01:41:57:08 - 01:42:05:07

I think there was an action as well for the Tas to consider the wording of requirement six for tomorrow. Is that correct?

01:42:08:22 - 01:42:09:24

Yes.

01:42:13:11 - 01:42:14:15
I'm at six being.

01:42:16:16 - 01:42:17:01
And so,

01:42:18:16 - 01:42:19:16
yeah, it was.

01:42:21:14 - 01:42:27:21
Sadness and think that was because we put in wording around the detailed design, needing to take account of the

01:42:29:14 - 01:42:33:09
results of the results of the archaeological investigation. Sorry.

01:42:36:10 - 01:42:43:26
Okay. They were all the actions under the archaeology item. Moving on to land use and soils.

01:42:46:24 - 01:42:49:27
The Afghans provide information on soil health.

01:42:52:04 - 01:43:03:18
Raleigh County Council response. The latest versions of the relevant outline Management plans Outline Solar Management Plan. The Alarm. On the operational management plan as well.

01:43:04:21 - 01:43:05:06
Um.

01:43:05:22 - 01:43:14:27
The applicants to respond to the parties, including Dr. Williams and Ms.. Tinkler, in relation to concerns on the establishment and management of grassland and related points.

01:43:17:03 - 01:43:24:04
Response to the question from the EC and related points from my PS on the ceiling and downgrading of cultural land.

01:43:25:26 - 01:43:28:06
Yes, just on that, think we need to be clear

01:43:29:24 - 01:43:50:26
clear on that because think your question to Mr. Kernan was what does the guidance say about even to temporarily sale. Does that still count as a permanent impact because. We changed our Chapter 17 conclusion on the basis that we said that that's not the case. So think just to be specific, it's about does temporary seeding equal a permanent impact or not? Think it's a question.

01:43:52:21 - 01:44:13:21
And it was I think yeah looking back it was it was the question as to whether or not that being assessed and how it been assessed. Given that the guidance does refer to the need to consider temporary effects, I think the view was that the forget the appendix it was it was 12.2 suggests that it hadn't been assessed as a temporary on a temporary basis. So just clarification on that point.

01:44:16:08 - 01:44:18:19

And moving on to landscape and visual.

01:44:20:05 - 01:44:30:16

An action for both South Kesteven District Council and Rutland County Council. I think you're both seeking feedback from respective designer crown officers on the fencing issue.

01:44:32:14 - 01:44:41:02

And then the applicants to explain the extent of changes to the design guidance with the various iterations against the deadline. Seven.

01:44:43:08 - 01:44:54:11

For Western Ecology and Action for Rutland County Council and South Kesteven District Council response to the applicant's ecological monitoring measures as discussed.

01:44:56:09 - 01:45:00:01

Applicants who respond to submissions made on potential ecological monitoring measures.

01:45:01:22 - 01:45:13:12

And also to provide an update on the possible need for signage and extensive Holywell Road in relation to the issue and the possible traffic effects that was discussed.

01:45:17:21 - 01:45:29:21

Moves on to traffic and transportation and an update that measures plans to show. Correct them to reflect a 20 mile an hour temporary speed limit and the.

01:45:30:01 - 01:45:30:16

Schedule.

01:45:30:18 - 01:45:31:03

As well.

01:45:31:05 - 01:45:31:25

Yes.

01:45:32:00 - 01:45:32:15

Yep.

01:45:34:10 - 01:45:55:27

Um, update the outline Kemp and outline Construction Traffic management plan and including the liaison with private businesses and sharing information with relevant groups. Um, and the extent to which, um, Peterborough City Council would be involved in that process, albeit they wouldn't be included within the management group itself.

01:45:58:05 - 01:46:03:18

Yeah. To consider support to parish councils in their participation of a traffic management group.

01:46:05:18 - 01:46:06:03

Um.

01:46:06:25 - 01:46:32:20

And then again respective local authorities Lancashire County Council, the County Council and South Kesteven and other interested parties as they so wish to provide responses to the latest version of the outline construction traffic management plan to see if they address any outstanding concerns. Um, and then the County Council, Lancashire County Council. Um.

01:46:34:12 - 01:46:42:08

As it points in information bridleway reps with Surrey Rutland to provide details, including the drafting that they'd like to see

01:46:43:23 - 01:46:45:06

which thinks Deadline seven.

01:46:50:04 - 01:46:57:18

Another one. Check paragraph 2.3. One of the TMP is consistent with the camp as well on ours.

01:47:01:22 - 01:47:02:07

Okay.

01:47:04:28 - 01:47:05:13

Okay.

01:47:08:14 - 01:47:11:06

Sorry. So that was check 2.3.1.

01:47:11:14 - 01:47:15:11

Yes. Of the TMP to make sure it's consistent with the temp.

01:47:24:12 - 01:47:24:27

Okay.

01:47:27:09 - 01:47:27:24

Um.

01:47:29:24 - 01:47:31:06

The noise.

01:47:31:08 - 01:47:37:03

I think there was a query from Mr. Field as to whether or not there was a word missing from the outline construction traffic management.

01:47:37:09 - 01:47:38:03

That was that point.

01:47:38:05 - 01:47:39:19

Oh, same point. Yeah.

01:47:42:24 - 01:47:53:05

Uh, socioeconomics, wrote the County Council to provide comments on the applicant. Deadline five Response on the need for a separate split right away management plan.

01:47:55:17 - 01:47:58:19

And then again, action for Rutland County Council. Sorry, Mr. Fox.

01:47:58:21 - 01:48:04:09

Just on noise. The other point was the policy tracker update on minimizing noise.

01:48:15:29 - 01:48:16:14

Yeah.

01:48:20:27 - 01:48:21:14

Um.

01:48:22:00 - 01:48:32:15

An action for Rockland County Council and staff Steven to provide an update on the map regarding rights of way and feedback on that.

01:48:34:00 - 01:48:49:03

And then moving on to the final item matters relating to residential conditions and also the applicant over Deadline seven to consider whether the panels will be coated to minimize glints and glare effects. I think it's going to be confirmation of the approach to that.

01:48:50:02 - 01:48:50:17

Um.

01:48:51:04 - 01:48:56:07

A response to Mrs. Willy's query again around glints and glare,

01:48:57:22 - 01:49:05:00

and then finally on my list. Clarification on the extent switching accommodation effects considered in relation to think it's wood farm cottages.

01:49:07:21 - 01:49:09:26

So corresponds you just.

01:49:10:21 - 01:49:12:06

Add a couple more, which was.

01:49:13:02 - 01:49:15:08

In a summary. We could clarify whether the,

01:49:16:23 - 01:49:47:07

uh, the Clinton assessment approach to the ground floor versus first floor. And relatedly, to the extent that we're able to wood farm cottages to confirm, um, if the living rooms are on the first floor or not, um, there's also the point on, um, Mrs. Beamish and her query around hedgerows and top of the Vineyard. Um, there was queries from, um, Mrs. Willie and the back of the room. Apologies. Forgotten names.

01:49:47:09 - 01:50:03:21

Um, in terms of. What if the wind and glare proves to be worse than we've assessed? And then the last one tonight was the um, just for impact in relation to the updated the independent oil.

01:50:05:00 - 01:50:05:15

They?

01:50:12:21 - 01:50:13:06

Thank you.

01:50:22:19 - 01:50:27:01

Dr. James, you've got your hand up. Is there something you wanted to say?

01:50:28:23 - 01:50:47:27

Uh, yes, sir. If I may believe there was an action on the applicant arising from my question in item eight, and that was have the carbon emissions resulting from fence maintenance been included?

01:50:49:27 - 01:50:51:21

And the applicant agreed to go and check that.

01:50:54:18 - 01:50:55:06

I recall.

01:50:55:08 - 01:50:56:03

That's correct. Yeah.

01:50:56:16 - 01:51:02:03

And there was also that we need to update the parameters to make clear that palisade fencing is for the substation only.

01:51:07:21 - 01:51:11:05

Thank you. Mr. James will add that to the list or add those to the list.

01:51:11:22 - 01:51:12:09

Thank you, sir.

01:51:15:23 - 01:51:16:10

Okay.

01:51:18:16 - 01:51:56:14

Those are the actions arising. So as usual, the recording of this hearing will be published on our website as soon as practicable after the hearing, and reminder that if you've spoken today, it would assist us if you could provide a written version of your submissions by Deadline seven, which is Tuesday the 10th of October. Thank you for everyone's submissions. I'm sorry participation for your submissions today. Tomorrow we've got the, uh, issue specific hearing five, which will be very much predominantly based upon the draft development consent order.

01:51:56:16 - 01:52:22:13

And there's an agenda published for that on the Planning Inspectorate's website for anybody who's not attending that and here virtually or in person today, uh, to say thank you for all your submissions, oral submissions throughout the examination and we'll see all those people are attending tomorrow, tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.. Okay. Thank you, everybody. This hearing is now closed.