

File Name: ISH4 27th September Part 3.mp3  
File Length: 01:41:40

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:26 - 00:00:11:09

Okay. Welcome back. Everybody can just check the live stream and recording has started, please.

00:00:20:01 - 00:00:28:17

Okay, Ron, to item eight on the agenda, which is landscape and visual matters.

00:00:32:00 - 00:00:48:16

And for the applicant we have Mr. Crute. Think Good afternoon. And for mild action group, Ms.. Tinkler and for the local authorities is Mr. Gillespie.

00:00:50:24 - 00:00:51:22

With us?

00:00:52:12 - 00:00:54:01

I am, yes, virtually.

00:00:54:06 - 00:01:05:18

Are you your virtual? Aren't you? Yeah. Okay. Welcome. And are any of the local authorities wishing to speak? On this item in detail.

00:01:09:28 - 00:01:12:17

And I think we've got a dog. Sorry. Phil John.

00:01:12:20 - 00:01:19:01

South of the council. Not in detail, but I'm happy to answer any questions. Okay. The usual discussion.

00:01:19:09 - 00:01:28:23

Procedure. Okay. And I think we've got Dr. James from the. Were you intending to speak as relevant on this item?

00:01:29:20 - 00:01:35:12

I think I'll see what other people who may be more expert than me say first, if I may, sir.

00:01:36:24 - 00:02:14:22

Okay, okay, that's fine. And I would open by saying, obviously we've already there's been lots of evidence on landscape and visual effects we've already had here in session on it, and there's been quite extensive written evidence on it. So don't propose to return to those areas today because on most areas on landscape and visual, whilst there are disagreements between parties, we're clear on the reasons for those disagreements and what those disagreements are. And of course those will be set out in the relevant statements of common ground and other representations. So again, primarily I want to well, very much so want to go through the items that we want to ask as a result of the evidence that we have in so far.

00:02:15:14 - 00:02:39:03

The only one caveat to that is think in the action group Deadline six response or the letter accompanying that think there's an issue about resolving key points on assessment, methodology and conclusions drawn. I'm all for resolving key points, but what was your thinking in terms of that was a suggestion for things to be considered today? What was your.

00:02:39:05 - 00:03:12:26

Well, it was feel that none of us want to revisit disagreements about the interpretation of three and we are, I think, very, very far apart. I've had an opportunity to read some of the more recent responses and they haven't changed their position in terms of interpretation of method. So I wondered whether on matters of dispute in terms of three methods and approach.

00:03:13:29 - 00:03:43:28

Could hence ask for clarification from the Landscape Institute's Geo panel. It's what they're there for. So one could put one could agree the wording of the matters of dispute. For example, double counting mitigation as enhancement and conflating landscape and visual effects so we could completely park those today if necessary, and then take those to the panel and they normally respond quite quickly. So that was my recommendation.

00:03:44:03 - 00:04:14:16

I think that would be quite an unusual thing to do. And it's our job as examining Specters to come to conclusions on these things. Our recommendation and of course then for the Secretary of State to make his or her currently her decision on it. So I think that would be quite an unusual sort of step to take. As I say, we understand the disputes between the parties and the disagreement. So I think from our position at the moment, I've not got a feeling that we would need to do that, but we can think further further about that. That's that suggestion ourselves. Any comments from Mr. Fox on Mr.

00:04:14:18 - 00:04:16:21

Watson? No, I would.

00:04:16:23 - 00:04:19:05

Agree and think would would also just

00:04:20:24 - 00:04:23:02

kind of reflective of that emphasized. I think

00:04:24:22 - 00:04:58:06

there's a slight mischaracterization of our position in terms of bring in Mr. Group if need be. But the points around double counting or mitigation is harm. Um, we we've dealt with those particularly in double counting and explained it's not it's not a question of methodology there think it's a question of either we are or we aren't. And I think we've set out clearly why we would say that we're not. Um, but I can appreciate, I don't want to kind of descend into the detail of that because I'm conscious which stick your agenda but would agree with your position if it is for you to.

00:04:59:02 - 00:05:01:06

Take eight party submissions and make your own view.

00:05:01:17 - 00:05:07:02

And what would be helpful from the point of view of examining authority and this could be done in the statement of common ground with

00:05:08:26 - 00:05:42:04

is just clarity, absolute final clarity on where those matters of disagreement are. That sort of thing is always helpful to us within a statement of common ground or relevant position paper. I think as we

discussed very, very briefly yesterday and as we'll probably discuss tomorrow, it may well be a useful thing as well in this examination. Just have an opportunity at one of the final deadlines for parties if they wish to set out their position, their final positions on relevant matters as they wish.

00:05:42:06 - 00:06:03:00

Because obviously there's been lots of movement in the new information examination, etcetera. So that's another opportunity to set out final positions to. And then we then have the job of trying to, not trying, but we have the job of actually coming to our own conclusions on, on the evidence before us, which is what, what we, what we do and all sorts of matters. Mrs. Holloway.

00:06:03:20 - 00:06:19:26

This is Holloway from our Price Action Group. Um, taking on what you said earlier about the suggestion, um, if it were not appropriate for the planning inspector to ask the Landscape Institute, would you have any objections if, if

00:06:21:19 - 00:06:28:24

and the applicant, if we were to work together and agree the wording to put to the Landscape Institute did that ourselves?

00:06:29:14 - 00:06:53:24

Have you wish to liaise the applicant about that then? By all means. By all means do as say again. We're coming as before, quite close to the end of the examination. So in terms of fairness, everyone has a chance to comment on relevant documents submitted, etcetera, etcetera. There needs to be a sort of an opportunity for that to be for that to be done. I think they'll have to leave that between you and the applicant if you if you decided to decided to do that. And also you've obviously got your own relevant

00:06:55:11 - 00:07:03:19

witness as well. Very, very helpful examination as well, has already provided, uh, visual evidence as well. So thank you. Okay.

00:07:05:07 - 00:07:11:10

Right item implications of the proposed 60 year operational time limit now.

00:07:13:02 - 00:07:38:15

In one degree. This could be circumvented by the fact that the applicant we agreed yesterday is going to provide a more detailed statement on what the implications of the 60 year operational time limit is or would be for each of the chapters and for any other relevant information in the application. So in some ways and then there'll be an opportunity for for parties to comment on that at the deadline after that. So in some ways I wouldn't want to sort of like.

00:07:41:07 - 00:08:01:04

It's sort of considered that in advance in too much. In many ways. We could just go straight to the next item unless people want very brief comments on that. But given the goal, can provide a detailed assessment of that in a in a statement to Deadline seven, everybody will have a chance to comment. Is there any need for any further comments on that now?

00:08:02:06 - 00:08:21:07

Sorry about that, folks. What I would say is and appreciate you have asked for more more detail on the point, but obviously we set out our position 95 and impact to respond at that 96 with their view that they disagree. I don't know that necessarily.

00:08:22:24 - 00:08:28:11

We provide information. Think the parties positions are still going to be the same as they already are. And it may well.

00:08:28:13 - 00:08:57:10

Be as said before, even though even if the applicants conclusions that there's no significant changes, justification of that would be would be needed as well as part of the update statement that you provide. So I'm don't particularly feel the need to be a great discussion of this. When this agenda was done before we had the deadline. Six responses would add as well. So I'm in no great sort of haste to have that sort of discussed in detail today, given we've got the deadlines. While that can be considered in in detail in writing this. Tinkler.

00:08:57:27 - 00:09:11:14

You'll be relieved to know. I agree with you, sir. The only point I'd like to make is that I've found a decision by the Secretary of State that's relevant. So if I could put that, I can either read it out quickly to you now or put that into a written submission.

00:09:12:06 - 00:09:21:03

Puts it into the written submissions. We haven't got a chance to consider it, but just say what the headline title of it is. Don't know the site. Is this an appeal decision?

00:09:21:17 - 00:09:23:12

Yes, it was.

00:09:23:22 - 00:09:25:10

Or an unsafe decision.

00:09:27:00 - 00:09:43:02

I'm actually not certain, but the secretary of state simply said that 30 years is a considerable period of time and the reversibility of the proposal is not a matter to which he has given any weight. He considers that a period of 30 years would not be perceived by those who frequent the area as being temporary and that the. Okay.

00:09:43:24 - 00:09:48:14

Just just the headline of it is fine in terms of what side have you provided that already? Because think I've read some.

00:09:48:17 - 00:09:51:13

No, I haven't, sir. But I can give you the appeal reference.

00:09:51:17 - 00:09:57:06

I'll give you per reference. And then just for the for the record and then we can provide us in detail at that point.

00:09:57:08 - 00:10:09:16

C95069506W Yeah. 15 Yeah. Three zero. Yeah. 6387.

00:10:10:16 - 00:10:11:10

And the site.

00:10:11:20 - 00:10:12:16

I don't know, sir.

00:10:12:23 - 00:10:15:12

Okay. But okay. Is that going to be enough for.

00:10:16:27 - 00:10:17:12

That's it.

00:10:17:21 - 00:10:18:06

That's it.

00:10:19:16 - 00:10:21:07

Emily Farm in Hampshire.

00:10:22:19 - 00:10:33:27

And Mr. Fox and the applicant. It does. But don't think that is the same point as you're asking us to talk to. You're asking us to talk to you. What is the difference in assessment? Previously we'd assessed think.

00:10:33:29 - 00:10:57:22

Yes, understand that this is a point about the fact that that had a 30 year commission on and the implications of that. So I'm happy that it will come in and you'll have a chance to respond to it at deadline eight Agree. I agree. It's not directly related to the but it's it's a semi related matter. So I'm happy for that to come in and for you to comment on. That's definitely good. Okay. And.

00:11:00:01 - 00:11:26:14

There's been. Across some discussion on the proposed fencing and security considerations of that. And again, without going back over ground that's already been covered. I have a few questions on that. The first of all is. I think Rutland County Council and South Kesteven District Council were. Think this is in response to one of our written questions

00:11:28:01 - 00:11:40:20

recently. Is there any update on any consultation that's being carried out with relevant design art crime officers or whatever the relevant person is called because they're not always called that for the two councils?

00:11:43:03 - 00:11:57:15

South seventh District Council. And we don't have a substantive response yet, but I've made contact with the designing Crime Officer at Lincolnshire Police on that point and can commit to making written comments for Deadline seven.

00:12:00:10 - 00:12:17:29

Okay. So Justin Johnson, Rutland County Council and similar. We have sent consultations off to the the police design crime officer and we will chase the response for deadline seven. Okay.

00:12:19:06 - 00:12:32:20

Thank you. And I'm not sure if there's a relevant similar officer or person for Lincolnshire County Council or whether or not it's actually the two local authorities who would cover that and.

00:12:35:28 - 00:12:37:21

Mr. Gillespie, can you help with that?

00:12:41:05 - 00:12:44:13

If I may, sir, it's Mark Willis. I'm sorry, Mr. Willis.

00:12:44:15 - 00:12:45:01

That's fine. Yeah.

00:12:45:04 - 00:12:55:24

Yeah. No, we would. Or, you know, on on projects we involved, we would perhaps involve the Lancashire Police. So I'm satisfied if South Kesteven are dealing with that, that will pick up that response.

00:12:57:09 - 00:12:57:26

Okay.

00:13:04:21 - 00:13:06:01

Okay. Thank you. And.

00:13:07:28 - 00:13:15:23

Mr. Fox or Mr. Crook is appropriate. I think the actual design guidance in this regard has been updated at deadline five.

00:13:17:09 - 00:13:25:23

I think it's design guidance parts 3.5 and 313 as a result of comments that have previously been made.

00:13:27:17 - 00:13:32:18

Could you just explain those changes to the design guidance in that regard of the the issue regarding.

00:13:34:09 - 00:13:37:00

Security, fencing, perimeter fencing.

00:13:37:25 - 00:13:44:17

And I'll let Mr. Crew answer about the changes were made, but then will come back to that some important context.

00:13:47:05 - 00:14:19:21

Yes. Good afternoon, sir. Ben Cruet for the applicant. You're correct, sir. Yes. The. We have updated the design guidance in the design and access statement 5058 for deadline five. And that included a number of updates in terms of the design guidance, including to fencing. I'd noticed there's an item on the agenda. So in terms of D, I appreciate the document is is not easily tracked change. So in terms of highlighting those, I'm not sure if you wanted to come back and can run through the full updates at that point.

00:14:19:23 - 00:14:34:00

But they have been updated to include reference to to the installation of the fencing and how that would look So happy to go into the detail now, sir, or we can kind of come back to that as Part D.

00:14:35:05 - 00:14:52:21

And Mr. Fox, in terms of what's in the project parameters as well, which obviously is important. I think the project parameters talks about a fence and then wooden posts and wire mesh up to two meters in height. So that's what actually is proposed as part of the application in terms of the parameters, isn't it? Yes, sir.

00:14:54:01 - 00:15:31:15

And I think this is important context here. So we've got the parameters, we've got the guidance, we've got the detailed design requirement, we've got the fencing requirements, all of which point to the the need to be consistent with those documents. And we also obviously consulted, as we are required to under stack on to the police and to local authorities. Um, the point I want to make here is we've

committed to what we've committed to. If we have to change, if we need to change that, then requirement five is evolved and that has to show that we won't show.

00:15:33:03 - 00:16:03:01

A need to materially new materially different effects to those we assessed in the. Yes. But right now we've got an insurance broker that's said that we can ensure that and appreciate the impact. Um, put some submissions in at deadline six casting some doubt on that. But in the end. That's irrelevant because what is secured is secured. And if we had to change it, that's the applicant's risk and we'd have to show to the RPAs that that is acceptable in comparison to the. Yes.

00:16:03:03 - 00:16:34:23

So within say, I don't know, 3 or 4 years time, whenever the detail is two, three, four years time, whenever the details come forward. And it's determined by the applicant that actually a three meter high fence is required of a different form and nature to a, um, a defense. And. Say that was required as a result of the need then, for example, to get insurance or for whatever other security a security need. That couldn't be done under those parameters and it couldn't be dealt with under the requirement.

00:16:34:27 - 00:17:04:03

Or could it? Because the bit about do not give rise to any material in new or materially different environmental effects than those identified in the. It comes a point, doesn't that where actually, for example if a 2.2m high fence was stipulated by the applicant's insurance company and actually at what point does the materially different environmental effects kick in in that regard, in relation in the context of proposed fencing? So to what, what what extensive changes could actually be allowed under that?

00:17:04:06 - 00:17:34:19

So just a spokesman for the applicant as a process point, it's requirement five because we'd be changing the parameters and design guidance in order to then be able to discharge requirement eight. So that would be the process point and the question of what's materially new and which different. Without having what that change could hypothetically be. I don't think that's not easy to say at what point that would change, but that's a judgment for the LPA, who are right to make that judgment at that time.

00:17:36:14 - 00:18:07:27

And looking at the EPA's are the local planning authorities because potentially that would the local authorities who would get that particular application say well there might be some changes needed to this? Are the local authorities happy with the way it is set out in in that regard? So what I what I'm conscious of is that. At the moment. Obviously, there's there's mixed evidence about whether or not the fencing is going to be appropriate or not. And obviously, the secretary of state can put condition requirements on and we can recommend requirements to the secretary of state.

00:18:08:02 - 00:18:42:18

But we're examining the need to be content and as does the secretary of state, that that requirement is actually capable of being complied with and it be sort of slightly uneasy to recommend a requirement that's not capable of being required because it might mean the scheme's not implemented. That doesn't seem to sit very comfortably. So so as examining fraud, we want to be sure that any requirement is capable of being discharged to allow the scheme to go ahead. And at the moment it's the mixed evidence on that which is which has already been provided in in writing. But other local planning authorities happy with the relevant processes in place in that regard.

00:18:43:18 - 00:18:47:04

Justin Johnson Rutland County Council. Um,

00:18:49:10 - 00:18:53:14  
happy might be going a bit far and think.

00:18:53:24 - 00:18:55:12  
Okay, do you have any concerns?

00:18:55:14 - 00:19:03:06  
I think I'll, I'll concern our concern is that we end up with details.

00:19:03:08 - 00:19:03:23  
That.

00:19:03:25 - 00:19:15:14  
We're at disagreement with with the applicant, but accept that the DCO has a process in which we could refuse that and. The applicant.

00:19:15:16 - 00:19:16:01  
Could.

00:19:16:27 - 00:19:19:11  
Go through the appeal process for it.

00:19:24:21 - 00:19:25:06  
Okay.

00:19:25:08 - 00:19:25:23  
And it's

00:19:26:19 - 00:20:00:18  
about the applicant. So. Yes. Would you agree with that? Um, I think there's two points here. The first thing is the concern that has been raised to the parties is ensuring and the concern that authorities often have is ensuring that the conclusions of the in terms of the significance effect. Um, and that we're not there's not going to be a change from that because, you know, develop the scheme in a new way and that's what we have secured In terms of your your point about need to ensure that requirement can be discharged.

00:20:00:20 - 00:20:32:22  
Of course, that relates to both requirement five and eight. Um, and I think the point is our client is a sorry, the applicant is a well experienced road operator who wouldn't have made all of these commitments understanding what that would mean without understanding that that would be able to be brought forward as a scheme for fencing. And we've had the conversations with insurers and. I don't know what I suppose my point would be. I'm not quite sure what else we could do to.

00:20:33:21 - 00:20:34:23  
Apart from that.

00:20:41:16 - 00:20:42:06  
Gareth Phillips the.

00:20:42:08 - 00:20:42:23  
Applicant.



00:20:42:25 - 00:20:53:13

Think also need to take take a step back again. This is very similar to the normal condition you'd find on a consent. So the deer fencing being proposed here is the.

00:20:53:15 - 00:20:54:07

Same for.

00:20:54:09 - 00:21:00:09

Many, many projects under 50MW across the country, and it would be the same same process.

00:21:00:11 - 00:21:00:26

As.

00:21:00:28 - 00:21:04:15

Has just been described. So there would be a condition on the consent.

00:21:04:17 - 00:21:05:12

Saying certain.

00:21:05:14 - 00:21:09:01

Type of fencing if then when the developer came to build it.

00:21:09:03 - 00:21:10:26

Out, there was an issue with the fencing.

00:21:10:28 - 00:21:13:26

They'd have to go back to the local authority, perhaps.

00:21:13:28 - 00:21:16:05

With either a non-material amendment application.

00:21:16:07 - 00:21:47:04

Under section 96, or it would be a section 73 application to vary the condition. In order to do that. In the circumstances, the local authority, just like it would here, has the discretion to say yes or no. I understand that. And then there's an appeal process. And if they if they did, they did refuse it, say on. Because obviously the point we're making by the resident association is that a high fence would change the landscape and visual effects of the scheme. So say the local properties refused it and then it was dismissed on appeal.

00:21:47:06 - 00:22:21:12

Yeah. There's possibility the scheme might not be able to go ahead. Well, the scheme. Would it be able to go ahead? Would it. But but then they would they'd have to be a decision then because obviously the scheme is providing for despite the the let's say it was a secretary of state that the scheme provides for significant energy, for example, hypothetical situation. That. That was the case then. How much of a factor would that be in the local authority's decision and the secretary of state's decision at appeal as to whether or not to allow a higher fence at that stage? I've fear we do.

00:22:21:14 - 00:22:55:03

We do keep looking at these hypotheticals that that job too. Well, but but we are talking about fencing that has been approved up and down the country for many, many, many hundreds of solar parks. So we're dealing with a hypothetical that think doesn't with respect, it doesn't relate to the reality of what of of what is going on up and down the country every day. And it's the same, you could argue, 50

megawatt solar project and say ten of them is just, you know, it's just as important to the national need for energy as one one larger one.

00:22:55:12 - 00:23:28:06

Each of those 50 megawatt projects we get, it's planning permission. They appoint an to build it and the turns around and says, sorry, can't do that fencing. Then you go to the local authority same circumstance goes to goes to appeal dismissed no good. So those projects should never have been applied for or shouldn't have gone through, through, through the committee? Or do you get my point? This is something that happens every day in the planning system. And my question is responding to evidence that's been put forward before the examination. And it's obviously our job to ask questions about those, which is what what is being done.

00:23:28:08 - 00:23:57:10

I understand the point you're making, and that's why they want this discussion to take place on. Okay. So I'm thank you for the very submissions on that. In terms of the. I know this hands up online, but I'll just ask my questions first. On the CCTV cameras proposed as well as part of the scheme at. Intervals of somebody. Remind me what the parameter is on. On the intervals of

00:23:59:04 - 00:24:00:24

CCTV cameras.

00:24:09:17 - 00:24:14:21

I don't think so, Mr. Fox. I don't think that we've committed to a specific.

00:24:15:03 - 00:24:23:23

3.5m high, but not. But they'll have to be approved. What what help is in. Providing for.

00:24:25:11 - 00:24:26:26

Helping towards security.

00:24:28:05 - 00:24:48:10

I mean, it's suppose it's as much relevant to a question of a solar farm as any other area where it's a deterrent. And it helped catch the person who committed the crime. In due course. But I suppose what I'm getting at is that question can be asked of any scheme that ever proposes CCTV.

00:24:48:13 - 00:24:50:11

Absolutely. What are the views of.

00:24:54:11 - 00:25:24:08

And Phil Jordan for South Kesteven District Council could just clarify as well, because I think I understand the point around I've got the design guidance shape and specifies the, you know, fencing requirements and CCTV. Where does that cross reference to the parameter plans? So can look at the whole thing together because I think we raised some points around that and then we referred back to the parameters in a different, different place.

00:25:24:24 - 00:25:26:10

The parameters for CCTV.

00:25:26:25 - 00:25:33:18

Know, for the well, collecting the fencing and think there's a height of the CCTV cameras as well, not the spacing.

00:25:36:15 - 00:25:46:08

So the camera heights in appendix five one, which is the parameters and there are various fencing and pole

00:25:48:03 - 00:25:55:00

parameters in that. And then the design guidance has in the dust has some other elements on that.

00:25:55:09 - 00:26:36:00

Yeah, we've got the document now. I think my my point was going to be when we get the comments from the or further comments from the designing out crime officer, I think we can put those things holistically in as security measures. So it would be the type of fencing in addition to the CCTV, you know, does that effectively allow us enough scope to be satisfied that the the security of the scheme is sufficient? Um, I think, you know, I agree that it's not just the fencing, it's the fencing in addition to the CCTV, which all forms part of the relevant security measures.

00:26:36:20 - 00:26:37:05

Okay.

00:26:37:24 - 00:26:38:09

Thank you.

00:26:38:14 - 00:26:48:02

So the applicant also just wanted to come back on the question You you asked for Mr. Phillips, which was just in terms of the appeal mechanism under schedule

00:26:51:15 - 00:27:20:07

16. Yeah. Um, I think I'm not actually aware of that actually having ever been used to date so far in the system. But if I can draw a comparison to, um, who acts in the various appeals, um, the, the question that I think would be asked on appeal, the Secretary of State Inspector on his behalf or her path is, is just, um. The process of the requirement discharge or the question requirement five Is it materially

00:27:21:22 - 00:27:33:02

different from those reported in? And that was the same question that the secretary of State would be asking. So it's purely on the question at hand, not on. But it is. But it's okay because it's free. Okay.

00:27:33:24 - 00:27:36:03

Thanks for clarifying that, Mrs. Holloway. Did you want to.

00:27:37:10 - 00:28:08:10

Mrs. Holloway from a low price action group. Two points. One is actually a question. I'm just wondering if the process differs in any way pre consent and post consent. So let's say the sites being constructed already with deer fencing and subsequently, as happens, you know, you get too much flooding in Bradford and people can't insure their houses any longer. And so on that kind of scenario, things change. You know what happens post consent in that situation from a process point of view.

00:28:08:25 - 00:28:40:05

But going back to the CCTV, we're kind of talking about equipment. We've not seen any indication of what kind of security measures would be put in. Is the purpose of the CCTV to be linked into someone in an office somewhere that actually you have onsite security people that go out there or are you expecting the police to turn up? Because I think our nearest police station that will be able to get there will be outcome probably wouldn't even get there within 20 minutes.

00:28:40:15 - 00:28:47:00

So CCTV, without any other robust security measures for the site Seems that it.

00:28:48:19 - 00:28:49:04

Uh.

00:28:50:01 - 00:28:50:27

Lacking.

00:28:50:29 - 00:29:22:00

Okay. Thank you for the question. That does link back to my question about how does what role does CCTV in making the site secure? Uh, based upon the fencing that we have. So. So the applicant CCTV is used worldwide as a deterrent for for criminal activity. It's not just about the ability to catch a perpetrator after the event. It's the fact that the CCTV, that that possibility or that likelihood is there as a deterrent to prevent the crime from being actually undertaken.

00:29:22:02 - 00:29:56:27

It provides that, if you like, it protects from the fear of crime, because any perpetrator who carries out a crime under the view of the camera is likely to be caught. So so that's why CCTV is effective in terms of where it is linked to. Don't see that that is relevant in material consideration in the context of a local impact, because fundamentally, if this project suffers, um, you know, some criminal activity, then it's just like any other premises, whether it's a Tesco superstore down the road or somewhere else, it will, it gets put right and it carries on.

00:29:57:06 - 00:30:36:02

That's the world we live in and we deal with on a day to day basis. But I am concerned we are getting into such minutiae of detail here that it's taking us quite far away from the key points, key impacts of this project. Um, one wonders if we were to submit the detail of of ten CCTV cameras and managed to find somebody somewhere that says it's one of those doesn't work. Are we going to need to go and find another ten in order to answer the question? So I do think we need to come back to the principle key impacts of the project rather than pick apart the fence and CCTV, which is standard security for development.

00:30:36:04 - 00:30:42:13

About what role does play in resolving this problem about security and what weight can be given to that? That's the essence of my question.

00:30:42:23 - 00:31:15:06

So and just just to answer that, partly as Mr. Phillips said, five paragraphs, five point 11.1, five point 11.2 of the is set out and 5.1.3, in fact set out the system talks about cameras and that it would be monitored remotely. Um, and just to answer Mrs. Holloway's point, would just the, um, it's, as we've been saying this week that last week the controls on the scheme once are permanent.

00:31:15:08 - 00:31:41:19

So the requirements at the moment in respect to that, that we updated the manual examination will say that whatever we put in place have to be maintained for life, for the lifetime development. So essentially that is a requirement upon us. If we therefore had to change for whatever reason, fencing or anything else apart from our scheme, in order to avoid being not in compliance with the we'd have to then go get it amended at the time.

00:31:42:15 - 00:31:45:23

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Willis. Put your hands up. Been online for a while.

00:31:48:04 - 00:32:18:09

Yeah. Thank you, sir. Mark Wallace, Lancashire County Council. I think to be fair, it's probably exhausts itself through the conversation that's followed on Think the main point really wanted to make was it was just this clarification between asked to recognise the parameter plan sets the fencing height definition. It's this different potential difference between security fencing and likely deer fencing. And I think it goes back to this point of if there's not clarity at this stage about the need for security, that we assume it's deer.

00:32:18:11 - 00:32:56:24

If in the event at requirement discharge stays, it does differ. There is that risk. And it's just been confident that, um, everybody's aware of what that is because think defence and security fencing can be visually quite visually different and that could therefore take into effect that kind of the materially different part of the requirement. So think I hear what the applicant has said. Um, I think it's just flagging it that it could be a potentially if it can be clarified now, all the better to avoid an argument or a situation later down the line, recognising the control that's in place already.

00:32:58:18 - 00:33:00:26

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Willis. Missed all this.

00:33:09:25 - 00:33:13:06

Tony Robbins, my class action group. I take Mr..

00:33:13:08 - 00:33:43:26

Phillips point about boxing to involved in the minutia and just for the information we don't have at Tesco Superstore just down the road. Um, but I really was going to say to an extent what Mr. Willis said, and that is that what is proposed here is not a security fence. It is a deer fence. The objective of that fence is to prevent deer from going in onto the road.

00:33:44:10 - 00:34:12:09

It cannot be a security fence. Okay. I have a pickup truck. I could get through that so-called security fence in 30s. And that is what people will and can able to do. And I think size is an issue here because there's some permitted pathway that's going through this that are absolutely ideal for anyone who wants to break in to do so undetected.

00:34:13:18 - 00:34:23:00

Okay. Thank you. And before. You can round up on this. Is this a new point that you want to raise? Sorry.

00:34:26:03 - 00:34:27:13

Can you give your name, please?

00:34:27:15 - 00:34:56:18

Sorry. Polling Trump and interested party members of public. I don't think this is a small issue. We're talking about the size of Rutland water. So do we all know what the perimeter will be? We're talking about perimeter fence of 22 miles long. I don't think that's insignificant. And to think that some people will have these security cameras very close to their own homes is rather appalling. Okay.

00:34:56:20 - 00:35:20:18

Thank you. Thank you. One last point, Mr. Fox. This is completely separate point, but I'll raise it now so you can just pick it up in the in the project parameters on the palisade fencing, which of course is around the proposed substation. It says palisade fencing will be up to three meters in height. Does the project parameters just need to be clarify that that is just for the substation. It's a small separate point of drafting. So yes.

00:35:20:20 - 00:35:22:02

We can add the substation.

00:35:23:19 - 00:35:34:12

Anything further on. Security, fencing. I think we have exhausted the topic. There's evidence on it and we have to go away and make our own conclusions on it. But I'm clear on the views of all.

00:35:34:19 - 00:35:35:13

Have my hand up.

00:35:38:10 - 00:35:39:15

Sorry, Dr. James.

00:35:40:04 - 00:36:12:07

Yeah, just two very quick points. Um, on CCTV, there are GDPR implications and rules which we've come across in another planning application. I don't have the detail to hand. I tried to look it up but haven't come across it. But there are GDPR implications of CCTV. Um, and the second point is I come from a farming family and, um, I'm well aware that wire fencing doesn't last forever.

00:36:12:09 - 00:36:38:14

It has to be replaced. So probably about every 15 to 20 years. And if it gets damaged a lot more frequently and the wooden posts also have to be replaced. And I just wonder if that effect has been put into the carbon life cycle analysis because you know, that's going to emit carbon, replacing 22 miles of fencing every 15 years.

00:36:39:24 - 00:36:45:02

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. To round up on this issue before I move on to item C.

00:36:46:18 - 00:36:57:23

Can we explained how the replacement, if that is needed, it's something we would have to do because it's a requirement. Um, and we'll take away the point of carbon.

00:37:00:06 - 00:37:24:00

Okay. Thank you. The next item is in relation to proposed mitigation and enhancement measures, and there's been an ongoing discussion about the Malpass Action Group points about the measures being. Combined or double counted, if you like, and just wanted to give this script for absolute clarity. Just to summarize the applicants position on this, please.

00:37:24:15 - 00:37:26:27

Yes, Thank you sir. Ben Crute for the applicant won't.

00:37:26:29 - 00:37:34:18

Get you to. Sorry to outline the issue because I think the issue has been well outlined in your representation, so just give Mr. Cruz opportunity to respond to that.

00:37:34:20 - 00:38:23:01

I think. Well, obviously the applicants position is set out in our rep 3032 reference, but it also we return to it as part of your second written question, sir. 5015 in response to your second written question of 805 and essentially the mitigation that we've proposed aligns with with the character area studies, and we set that out in that that, that that representation. I think where the confusion has arisen in terms of mitigation, what is mitigation, what is enhancement is is a gray area as think we've discussed and think it can be different for different topics as I think we're in agreement with them in that case.

00:38:23:03 - 00:39:04:00

So the obvious, it can also be different, I should say, in terms of the time and the temporal element to it. So there are a number of factors in terms of whether what you're proposing is mitigation, whether it's enhancement, whether it starts off as mitigation then becomes enhancement. So it, uh, all of that has been found into the and assessed as part of the design. But if we take the classic example of planting, clearly planting from a landscape and visual perspective is mitigation, or certainly from a visual perspective, you're looking to, to screen screen views from a biodiversity perspective, that's obviously a benefit you're planting and there's some ecological value to that planting.

00:39:04:02 - 00:39:36:25

So and then flipping back to, to landscape and landscape character in particular, once that planting is established and matured and the development, which is a temporary development and we've discussed about the permanency and we do have a limited light time frame on it now 60 years. So post 60 years that planting will remain in place. And as we said, it was mitigation for visual screening once the development was there, it's the legacy. What would the legacy legacy feature? It is then essentially an enhancement that that remains post development.

00:39:36:27 - 00:39:49:00

So hopefully so that just kind of articulate some of the the nuances of mitigation and enhancement and how it can flip not only between topics but also between periods and time frames. So.

00:39:52:10 - 00:40:05:03

Okay. Thank you. Understand that. I've got no further questions on that. Distinctly drawn to Please respond to that or set out if you disagree with that. Maybe you set that out in the statement of Common Ground. No. Now with you.

00:40:06:19 - 00:40:11:25

We are miles apart with three, so that will be in my maps.

00:40:12:10 - 00:40:13:22

Yeah. No, just understand that position.

00:40:13:24 - 00:40:16:19

Yeah. Okay. So actually. Yes. No, that's fine. I'll write it down.

00:40:16:28 - 00:40:18:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:40:19:27 - 00:40:30:19

Moving on to the updated design guidance. Going back to what we were talking about before, we don't just run through now what's been done in terms of the latest additions to the design guidance, please.

00:40:30:24 - 00:40:31:24

Yes, Thank you, sir. Thanks.

00:40:31:26 - 00:40:33:09

Thanks. Landscape and visual matters.

00:40:33:11 - 00:41:04:00

Yes. Thank you, sir. Thank you for the applicant. And as as, say, apologies from our part, it's because of the nature of the document. It's not like a word document where there are track changes. So it's

difficult to can be difficult to pick up. But in terms of some of the updated design guidance that we've added to to the updated design and access statement, which is Rep 5058. Um, in terms of P 3.4, we've added some further information, won't read this out in detail.

00:41:04:02 - 00:41:48:07

So you can, you can go and look at the details. But in terms of, in terms of the additions or amendments to additional existing guidance, 3.4 in relation to the cable route designed and temporary road closures. 3.17 In terms of lighting of the on site substation, P 4.2 in terms of the location and of solar stations and storage containers. P 4.3 again, in terms of the location and offset of solar stations and storage containers, 3.23 in terms of the on site substation and the platform created for that, Can you just.

00:41:48:09 - 00:41:51:10

Outline what that one is in a bit more detail please, on the substation.

00:41:51:12 - 00:42:21:24

So certainly so. So in terms of in terms of the on site substation, which no was a topic we discussed a lot previously and provided more information on in terms of levels and the sides and elevations and including the photo montage in terms of the onsite substation 3.23 added to the design guidance states, the onsite substation platform shall be cut into the landform, allowing for accessibility, engineering and electrical design considerations. So think so.

00:42:21:26 - 00:42:48:24

The intention of that one is, is that the the substation, there's an acknowledgement of some level change in there. We know that the substation site and field 11, I believe is has that gradient down to the west. Glen And clearly there would there would be need to kind of create a flat platform in that so that that guidance essentially acknowledges that and then brings in some controls in terms of how that that that should be managed.

00:42:48:26 - 00:43:21:11

And so just to be clear on that, when the indicative drawings were provided of the substation in relation to the slope following the discussion we had at the last issue specific hearing on this matter, there were one showing it cut into the slope, but the one's also showing it, if you like, the slab level, if you like protruding above the slope with a sort of almost like a retaining wall structure. But now as a result of that, as I understand it, it's only the cutting into the into the slope option that's in the design guidance. So the other there was indicative draws the drawings, the one showing it protruding away from the slope.

00:43:21:13 - 00:43:22:29

That's irrelevant.

00:43:23:01 - 00:43:47:03

Is that the bank route to the applicant. That's correct. So should just caveat that that that could be still be within the order limits so it will be cut in, but it could be the kind of higher end of the slope, but not at the top. It could be in the middle, it could be lower down. But the principle of terracing essentially terracing into the hillside to create that level level slab is secured through that additional 3.23 of the design guidance.

00:43:48:12 - 00:44:02:06

Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this point on the updated design guidance, bearing in mind where we are now in the examination in terms of final, the deadline for Finalise the documents coming in is relatively soon. Mrs. Holloway.



00:44:02:26 - 00:44:34:08

Mrs. Holloway from Action Group, was one of the people sad enough to sit there and compare the two documents side by side, which is the only way to do it. But the question that stuck out to me in terms of clarity was p 4.2 and 4.3. In respect that the statement was pretty much the same apart from dated storage containers. And I was wondering what the storage containers related to because you had you talked about solar stations, which I understand, but you added storage containers. So that was the change.

00:44:34:13 - 00:44:40:22

Just wondering what the storage containers are and how many of them will be across the site.

00:44:41:01 - 00:44:43:12

That 4.2, 4.3.

00:44:44:18 - 00:44:51:15

Uh, four. Yeah. Yeah. 4.2. 4.3.

00:44:52:14 - 00:44:53:19

Okay. Mr. Fox or Mr..

00:44:54:24 - 00:45:15:06

Mr. Fox. So there are the both the parameters and table five six of the. Yes, help. Talk to that. We've not given a precise number. We've assumed one container per 30MW of installed capacity and it's essentially to store spare electrical parts to allow for the maintenance.

00:45:17:02 - 00:45:24:03

Okay. I would I would just add that the the change to those was also welcome to it, I'm sure to do with

00:45:25:21 - 00:45:28:22

the noise issues and being away from

00:45:30:21 - 00:45:38:25

being further away than 50m if that considerations design considerations allow us to. Okay. Thank you.

00:45:41:18 - 00:45:42:03

Okay.

00:45:42:09 - 00:45:45:28

Any further comments on design guidance?

00:45:47:10 - 00:46:15:16

If I may, sir, just just a banquet for the applicant. Just. Just to finish up on the two. The two amends. Appreciate this has always gone through the the task of comparing to two. But in terms of the two additional mentioned design guidance, those 4.8 in terms of access to the installation of secure access gates and P 4.9. Again, we can put this in writing for you, sir. So you're clear on where the events have been made.

00:46:20:09 - 00:46:28:06

Okay. If there is a. If there is a for any future versions of this, if there are any that can be tracked, change is a way of doing it, then that would be helpful to us as well as to Mrs. Holloway.

00:46:30:20 - 00:46:38:15

But obviously there's a technical reason to do that, because you can do a number of documents, but that is always quite helpful if that it's possible on.

00:46:40:20 - 00:46:41:05

This talk to.

00:46:41:07 - 00:46:51:14

Me was just gonna say there is. We can see what we can do on that. But just say at the very back of the document there is a schedule of changes and we'll look to see if we can make that more detailed. Yeah.

00:46:51:16 - 00:47:00:25

And the schedule changes as with the is a very useful document to track all these changes for both us and I'm sure for other interested parties as well.

00:47:04:23 - 00:47:33:29

Okay item is any further matters in relation to the outline landscape environmental management plans. Again, looking at where we are in the examination, are there any particular matters that anybody wants to raise on the landscape environmental management plans? And if not, you're think again in terms of getting any potential points. Your points need to be very, very soon in order that they can be incorporated into the final documents. But obviously that is a matter between parties in the applicant.

00:47:35:07 - 00:47:35:22

Okay.

00:47:37:26 - 00:47:56:01

Okay. I know we've not covered lots of areas of landscape and visual matters today because looking for all the evidence, I just understand the points for various parties and I just don't think it's particularly useful to go over points that we've already gone over. Also at the site visit, the complete site visit. We have obviously had a comprehensive look at the site

00:47:57:16 - 00:48:42:07

and we are going back to the site in October, but don't know the dates when we're going to go back and be on our unaccompanied and announced basis. But we'll be looking at other footpaths and walking. Other footpaths have not done already, as well as looking at distant views from the site. And one of the things we'll be using to do that is the document which Action group submitted some time ago. Now, with some proposed points of view and footpaths around the site, so away from the site and we'll be doing that with in mind the various representations on more distant views of the site and those distant effects, etcetera.

00:48:42:09 - 00:49:06:27

But I'm very clear on the points that we made on that, so don't need to go over those again today. If there are any, don't. It's not our intention to publicise a particular itinerary for that because we'll do it on the points that we feel we need to look at if there are any particular points that are not being raised already that you think it'll be useful to have others to see, which we've not already, then do let us know by deadline seven.

00:49:11:17 - 00:49:19:27

Okay. Hope that's clear. We will do a note of that satisfaction shortly afterwards as well. So everyone knows where we have we have gone.

00:49:24:23 - 00:49:32:00

Okay. Any other relevant matters on landscape and visual effects? Anyone wishes to rise. Before we move on to item nine.

00:49:37:03 - 00:49:52:06

Though. So think if you're happy to accept my notes will cover previous responses that I hadn't seen. So there will be a little bit of repetition, if you'll forgive that. But and then perhaps I'll just wrap up today. But I think that's been really helpful to keep it short today.

00:49:52:10 - 00:49:55:01

Okay. And yes, that is fine. And.

00:49:57:13 - 00:50:16:01

That would be very useful in either within the statement of the common ground or in a in a in a separate in a separate paper or document. Thank you. Okay, that is item eight. We're now moving to item nine, which is biodiversity and ecology and Mr. James to lead on this item.

00:50:18:21 - 00:50:51:04

Thank you. Um. Item A is in relation to the Shadow Habitats Regulation assessment and did have a question at this point for natural England. However, given they are not present here today, I intend to skip over this particular agenda item. But what I would say is just a reminder in terms of the timetable and we are due to publish the release, the assessment of European sites next Friday, and we'll invite comments on that by deadline eight.

00:50:51:06 - 00:51:02:07

So that's just a reminder on that particular point. And unless anybody has any points arising that I shall move on to item B in relation to biodiversity net gain.

00:51:04:02 - 00:51:18:08

Okay. So on that particular point, um, in response to the examination Authority's further written questions, 3.0.1 the applicant put forward a revised approach to the consideration of A.

00:51:19:25 - 00:51:31:19

There was a percentage specified in the previous version of the developed consent order. The applicant have now revised the again requirement five and seven as well as the

00:51:33:06 - 00:51:59:27

effectively allows local authorities to consider the appropriate percentage at the time and also that would be informed by consideration of the version of the metric that was in place at that time, with the caveat that there should be no new or materially different effects from those assessed in the in the. Yes. Um, requirement seven now also identifies a minimum net gain for hedgerow units of 36%. Um.

00:52:01:16 - 00:52:10:16

I'll be interested to receive any feedback from the local authorities in particular on that approach and also whether.

00:52:12:03 - 00:52:39:22

The degree of uncertainty now about the final percentage of net gain it could be achieved, could perhaps be an issue in terms of the weight that could be forward to that as a potential benefit to the developments. Rutland County Council. Mr. Johnson, if you'd like to comment on those two points, please. So the overall changes in the principal around that decision being taken at a later date in the process effectively updates the data and the requirements as well as the weight question as well, please? Yes, think.

00:52:40:28 - 00:52:44:08

Generally, we we welcome the changes that.

00:52:44:17 - 00:52:45:29

That have been put forward in.

00:52:46:01 - 00:52:46:28

Terms of.

00:52:47:03 - 00:52:49:26

Um, in particular setting out the.

00:52:50:06 - 00:52:53:06

Thresholds in, in the relevant.

00:52:53:08 - 00:52:54:07

Documents.

00:52:54:21 - 00:53:01:17

Um, and overall, we were fairly happy with the, the approach that had been been put forward.

00:53:01:29 - 00:53:02:27

And to didn't, didn't.

00:53:02:29 - 00:53:03:24

Have any objections.

00:53:03:26 - 00:53:04:11

To those.

00:53:08:18 - 00:53:32:21

Thank you. The points around whether or not the potential uncertainty around the extent of what percentage of that could be achieved now, that that will be determined by a future consideration of the version of the metric that's in place at the time? In your view, would that have any implications for the degree of weight that could be attached to as a benefit to the development? Um, well, my, my understanding.

00:53:32:29 - 00:53:33:17

Was that.

00:53:33:19 - 00:53:34:18

The.

00:53:34:20 - 00:53:35:05

Um.

00:53:35:15 - 00:53:37:21

The documents that were submitted as part of the.

00:53:38:06 - 00:53:53:26

Had had the threshold, had the percentages set out within them to um, to what, what should be achieved. Um, and so if the metric changed, um.

00:53:55:22 - 00:53:56:12

My understanding.

00:53:56:14 - 00:53:59:14

Was that those those set percentages.

00:53:59:16 - 00:54:00:19

Would still have to be met.

00:54:04:18 - 00:54:05:10

Mr. Fox.

00:54:05:14 - 00:54:30:03

Mr. Fox, Martha Applicant. So think slightly concerning to these questions about certainty. The certainty is in the requirement. It requires us to do to achieve these things. So that is achieved. The only reason it would change is if that was agreed later on. But the starting point is that we've committed to it in the DCA and what we've said previously, and the reason that we

00:54:31:23 - 00:55:09:28

given that the way the regime is going, long field wording where they said use 4.0 or some other replacement version is not the same as what we have currently done. So and given that the notwithstanding today's news that is being pushed back to next year, um, this morning, um, there is going to be a new statutory metric. It's not even 4.0 will be the right version. So the reason that we've allowed for the change is because we have secured the percentage in the. But we wouldn't want to be in breach of that because the metric has changed and for whatever reason, it's not um, achievable given the commitments in the lamp.

00:55:10:00 - 00:55:40:18

And I'll come back to what I said to you at the first set of hearings. The base the base position is that it's secured by dint of the fact that we had to be substantially in accordance with the ownership which has all of that grassland, which is a large percentage of what achieves our BMG number. We've gone further than that in putting the number actually on the face of the requirement, and that is the certainty is because it's on the face of the of the. Content. It's a benefit can be placed on it.

00:55:42:07 - 00:56:17:00

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Jordan. Stephen, have any further comments? Phil Jordan. Self esteem. So not really much to add to what's been said already. I think we welcome the change. We've moved from what started off as target of 10% biodiversity net gain and that's now been specified at a higher percentage for both habitats and and hedgerows. So we welcome that and think we accept that, you know, subject to those targets being met, that would be a benefit of the scheme.

00:56:18:16 - 00:56:24:20

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Mr. Willis. Does Lancashire County Council have any views on this point?

00:56:25:07 - 00:56:48:18

Yeah. Thank you, sir. Mark Willis, Lancashire County Council. Know the same. Really welcome the increase and the commitment. Recognise that that is more than the 10%. Um, I think we're fairly content with the wording that's been suggested and it would be a positive. So um, obviously afforded some positive weight in terms of the balance balance therefore.

00:56:51:20 - 00:56:56:03

Thank you, Mr. Wallace. Dr. Williams, did you have a comment?

00:56:57:26 - 00:57:03:11

Thank you. James Williams, on behalf of Pass Action Group. Excuse me just a second. I'm going to slightly.

00:57:06:12 - 00:57:08:10

Apologize. My ass was slightly playing up.

00:57:11:21 - 00:57:16:27

It is helpful that the figures are now higher.

00:57:19:06 - 00:58:11:06

The likelihood of being able to achieve the hedgerow gain or enhancement, I think is probably relatively high. Go back, however, to the point I made at the previous hearings with respect to the landscape and the grassland. That is not net gain that is chosen because it will not be able to be continued forwards and it is dependent entirely on the establishment of the grassland, which we discussed earlier on in terms of how easy that was going to be and in terms of things like soil microbiology potentially being affected by compaction, both in terms of the mycorrhiza but also in terms of soil organisms.

00:58:11:08 - 00:58:41:17

And think it was Mr. Preston yesterday referred to issues of compaction in terms of how the land is treated compared with the farming scenario where drum lines are used. I think there are some really big issues with respect to being able to establish that grassland on high nutrient soil, and that applies to all of the types of grassland. If I may, will just quickly quote from.

00:58:44:08 - 00:59:31:06

Robert. So for seeds with respect to the seed mix one, which is what I believe is being suggested for under the solar panels. Endeavour to select ground that is not highly fertile and does not have a problem with perennial weeds. Good preparation is essential to success, so aim to control weeds and produce a good quality seedbed before sowing. The issues around the way in which the land will be managed and the way in which the order in which the panels or the grassland may be put in is material to whether or not that biodiversity net gain is established.

00:59:32:03 - 01:00:14:17

And it is it's clear with respect to the other site, the other sites, which are the mitigation sites, as opposed to where the panel sites are, that the similar issues with respect to sort of fertility exist. And in fact, the issues around establishment that I've just read out on the website for those types as well. So I actually, despite the assurances that the applicant has been giving us, I am actually distinctly doubtful how much grassland will be able to be established and at what quality it will be established.

01:00:14:27 - 01:00:37:16

And we then come on to issues around management of that grassland in terms of being able to keep it in good quality, which relate very much to the way in which it is either grazed or mown. And in terms of the issues around.

01:00:39:23 - 01:01:17:22

Cutting every two years is not the way to establish a meadow. And if you do that, you will not end up taking off your risings in the first year, which of course will then rot down and increase the nutrient status of the soil. So that is a bit of a own goal feel. I therefore feel that the whole issue around the establishment of the grassland and the management of the grassland. There are some other issues want to raise around monitoring perhaps in relation to a different point are overblown in my estimation.

01:01:20:18 - 01:01:22:03

You don't, really. Mr. Fox? Yeah.

01:01:23:12 - 01:01:54:29

I will bring in Mr. Baker Leavesden online momentarily in relation to the latter points about the establishment and maintenance. But just to come back in the principal points, which is a, um, that point about it being churned, the, the calculation of it being gain is done in um, using the metric natural England has developed and is the industry standard for how net gain is calculated. Secondly, um, and Mr. Baker will come in about why we think that there's these, um.

01:01:56:07 - 01:02:07:08

Concerns are not necessarily the case. But the fact is, is that we are required to deliver it pursuant to our limp. So if there were any problems, we'd be in breach of of everything that means.

01:02:09:02 - 01:02:09:23

Mr. Beckerman.

01:02:11:09 - 01:02:12:12

Thank you, Mr. Baker.

01:02:14:20 - 01:02:50:09

Thank you, sir. Mr. Baker, on behalf of the Mint. Yeah. Sorry. Did take notes as Dr. Williams was speaking there on the various points. Um, I think we did come back on a few of these already and mentioned it earlier on the high nutrient status. Um, we are aware of issues with nutrients and grassland creation. Um, we, there is also so to stay on that point for a second. We did make a realistic aim of the grassland, the condition and grassland type. We're not claiming to be creating unimproved, calcareous grassland or anything of the sort on arable without some serious interventions.

01:02:51:03 - 01:03:25:00

Um, we are going for a much more realistic other neutral grassland. Um, which you know, and speak. Um, even those on the green infrastructure plan, which I refer to as neutral grassland with calcareous species, we're not talking about a calcareous grassland. Um, the microbiology. Well, again, this is soil that's been. Mr. Colonel slapped me again if he were nearby. The farmers have been going at this for a while. The microbiology is, you know, stopped and destroyed and put back every time you plow.

01:03:25:05 - 01:03:56:06

So we're going to be doing something very positive for the microbiology of the soil. We've brought this up at the soil point, and I'd like to bring it up again. Um, you know, for his own guidance on creating grassland on former arable. So it will increase the the soil health and the microbiology of the soil by allowing it to settle, which is why certain more conscious, conscientious farmers are taking up the no dig approach because you don't destroy the mycorrhiza every time. Um. EMAs gates I take the point. Yes, endeavour to select low nutrient soils.

01:03:56:09 - 01:04:31:21

Um, again, the quicker use the the lower the baseline for nutrients, the higher your or the quicker you get to a load, a low nutrient, high diversity grassland. But again, we are doing this through management and as as I've said, I want to reiterate it again, we're not going for a massively diverse, very difficult, unimproved, calcareous grassland creation with a very conscious at that point. Um, the point about arising is rotting. Well, if this a plant grows out of the soil and dies, it's it's a it's an overall net but nutrient, it doesn't add to it.

01:04:31:23 - 01:05:03:26

It just grows out and then dies. And these are there. Um, currently the soils are being added to overall we will stop adding nutrients. Even the sheep won't be supplementary fed if, if some when grazing takes over. Because again, if you feed the sheep they're eating more than they're so they're droppings. Um, so if everyone has had lunch we'll go back into the soil and rot down so we won't be supplementary feeding. The sheep will be on rotation. Um, the and yes. As so Mr.

01:05:03:28 - 01:05:39:07

Fox has already alluded to the grass and churn. Sorry biodiversity net gain not rather than churn the biodiversity net gain says this is secured if you do it for over 30 years. That is the that is the assumption in the metric. This is going to be done for over 30 years as a as a requirement. So we are not just churning it about pretending to do it for a bit and then getting rid of it all. This is definitely a biodiversity net gain. Again, we have had statutory authorities look at this and a review by a peer stantec peer company, Stantec.

01:05:39:09 - 01:05:44:02

They have reached the same conclusion and and have stated that our conclusions are solid.

01:05:45:27 - 01:05:46:14

Thank you.

01:05:48:00 - 01:05:56:13

Thank you, Mr. Baker. Conscious. We have touched on some of these points previously. But, Dr. Willens, if you've got any immediate response back to that before we move on, please.

01:06:00:19 - 01:06:09:28

Thank you very much indeed. Thank you to Mr. Baker for his comments. Um, I think the issues I'm stating are.

01:06:11:15 - 01:06:21:00

Actually more than is being said by the applicant and will just come back on the churn point if may.

01:06:23:02 - 01:06:36:10

Lot of us think that game has been put in place by the government in order to try to improve the opportunity to improve biodiversity. When development proposals take place.

01:06:38:02 - 01:07:13:14

But as an ecologist, changing something for 30 years or 60 years, it's actually not going to give you a overall increase in biodiversity. And that is why am referring to churn, because as far as am concerned. What we've got is a change and then a change back. The fact that it's got some biodiversity enhancement in the middle and don't doubt that. Don't dispute that does not actually mean that at the end of the period we have biodiversity net gain.

01:07:13:26 - 01:07:54:20

And that is the problem that we have in terms of the strategic requirements to be able to meet the UK's involvement in the global biodiversity goals agreed in Montreal last year through the Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Those are hugely ambitious. The government is currently looking at how does it make commitments with each of the four devolved administrations to be able to say this is what we are putting in place for being able to improve biodiversity within the UK as a contribution to the global halt?

01:07:56:28 - 01:08:50:03

We aren't going to achieve those gains if we don't start taking a more strategic approach to planning as a whole. I appreciate that that is slightly difficult for you to deal with the inspectorate because you



have to deal with the case that's in front of you as a whole. Um, but to me, this is a big important strategic issue about how do we use the limited amount of land that we have for its best purpose in terms of the different ways in which it could be used and in terms of trying to make sure that we actually avoid creating dis benefits and achieve win win solutions and am not convinced that this is the right application in the right place at the right time for that.

01:08:50:19 - 01:09:05:07

And disagree that the. Achievement of biodiversity. Net gain is therefore the answer. Because. Don't believe. Don't believe. It's solving a strategic long term problem.

01:09:09:16 - 01:09:12:24

Miss Fox. Don't know what you'd like to come back to at this point.

01:09:14:04 - 01:09:25:06

No, I don't think so. Um, we've done our work in compliance with government policy and government calculations and think that's we need to stay on that.

01:09:26:20 - 01:09:27:19

That's it. Thank you.

01:09:30:14 - 01:09:32:17

100 back Mrs. Cramping.

01:09:35:23 - 01:09:38:06

This in relation to this point around biodiversity net gain.

01:09:41:13 - 01:09:41:28

Um.

01:09:43:17 - 01:10:16:12

About how. This solar panel farm is going to improve our local environment. Certainly it will improve the whole planet, but it will not improve Rutland and Leicestershire. And I'm very concerned that they have managed to get this metric sorted out so that it is a net gain. I'm concerned because when I look at the plans. All the small copses, the small woodlands on the site have been removed.

01:10:16:14 - 01:10:47:04

Now, whether they intend to cut down these mature trees or whether they just intend to put a high security fence around them so that no wildlife can get there, I do not know. I'm also concerned that in their second or third plans that they've drawn up, they have shifted their site away from the roads and think, why, how nice. So we don't have to see them when we drive past.

01:10:47:06 - 01:11:17:18

Not at all. We will see them because they're 3.3m high. What they're doing is they're removing from the site all of the mature. Hedges that have grown. For hundreds of years in this area. Some of these hedges are something like 3 or 4m high and some of them are only two meters high. They are providing a very important environment for the wildlife in this area.

01:11:17:20 - 01:11:33:15

And I haven't heard the word what the word wildlife mentioned once. And for me, this is the most important thing about what is about to be ruined in this area. Thank you.

01:11:38:05 - 01:11:38:24

Mr. Baker?

01:11:41:07 - 01:11:41:22

Yes, sir.

01:11:41:24 - 01:12:13:09

Mr. Baker. I'll respond to the points about wildlife specifically, rather than do shed or landscaping visual impact assessment. Maybe one of my colleagues will respond to that one. None of the woodlands are being cut down. They are being retained in the strongest possible terms. All hedgerows, with the exception of small sections which we've identified in the chapter, are being retained. If anything, there will be a stepping back from them in terms of land use.

01:12:13:11 - 01:12:50:14

The ploughing will be stepped away even further from the hedgerows. All hedgerows are staying. There is no plan to box in the Woodlands, especially towards the centre of the site to the west of Essendon. There's lots of little copses that was identified at a very early stage and was driving the connectivity points. We want to connect them up with more woody scrubby vegetation which is exactly what we did in the design process. Um, I would say that there's already fencing in some of them to keep pheasants in and foxes out, and by keeping foxes out you keep a lot of other animals out.

01:12:51:10 - 01:13:06:21

So the woodlands are being retained in the most absolute terms. Yes. Otherwise they would show as a biodiversity net loss and that would be quite substantial. Of course, we're not cutting down any of the woodlands and all the hedgerows as much as possible are being retained. Thank you.

01:13:09:14 - 01:13:12:04

Thank you for that, Mr. Baker. Mrs. Holloway.

01:13:13:05 - 01:13:44:12

Mrs. Holloway from my past action group is, as I understand it, looking at the order limits. Certainly, since the application went in, all practically all the woodland areas were removed. So every little woodland parcel is encapsulated by the order limits, but it's not part of the order limits. Therefore, I'm not sure how you can say that they're promoting and encouraging biodiversity and connectivity habitat corridors if they are not the responsibility of the applicant.

01:13:44:14 - 01:13:51:18

I'm not even sure how the landowners are really supposed to even look after the woodland areas because they'll be surrounded.

01:13:53:14 - 01:13:57:11

But I think that is a point that's been raised previously. Mr. Fox, if you've got any.

01:13:57:26 - 01:14:31:02

Sympathy for the applicant. So think yes, the word removed think has more meant being removed from the order limits, which is did happen between stage one and the application gone in. But that was done because the the landowner specifically asked us to do that because they want to be able to maintain them. And I'll let Mr. Baker correct me. But the point I think he was making in terms of connectivity was if they are there on the edge of the site, still existing and we are providing improvements within the order limits, then you are creating that connectivity.

01:14:34:03 - 01:14:53:08

Thank you. Okay. Should move on to the next item. Around ecological monitoring. Um, in relation to the responses to our further written questions particularly. Version 3.0.5. Um.

01:14:55:07 - 01:15:04:10

In response to which we had a variety of feedback from the local authorities around the level of detail in terms of monitoring indicators.

01:15:05:06 - 01:15:05:27

Excuse me, could I.

01:15:05:29 - 01:15:10:23

Just make one a last point on the biodiversity net gain before you move on? I'm sorry.

01:15:12:22 - 01:15:18:04

Um, briefly provided specifically in relation to that, the metric and the question that we've just had. Yes.

01:15:19:00 - 01:15:21:03

I noticed that the

01:15:22:18 - 01:15:59:05

statement of agreement between natural England and the developers says that there's no net gain in relation to the river corridor. We we touched briefly on this yesterday. Um, and um, I think there would be a very clear logic for a more coordinated approach to combined flood storage and habitat enhancement in the West Glen corridor, which would have benefits for flooding and benefits for biodiversity and would help ensure that the biodiversity net gain.

01:15:59:07 - 01:16:04:15

Um. The rationale was was robust against future changes. Thank you.

01:16:08:01 - 01:16:32:24

That the applicant so the around the west Glen River Anglian water doing their own proposals in that regard and we've made clear in examination that we have essentially left them the space to, to do that, um, as an already in kind of existing project in, in development. And there's no net gain because we essentially don't affect any river habitat.

01:16:36:01 - 01:16:36:24

In the first place.

01:16:37:27 - 01:16:38:26

Thank you, Mr. Fox.

01:16:40:21 - 01:17:11:10

Shall return to item C then. And so, as I was saying. Feedback in relation to the ecological monitoring and the level of detail that should be provided, particularly in the in the brown monitoring indicators and also around the frequency of monitoring that should be undertaken and that the applicant has responded to those comments. Deadlines six. However, I'm not aware yet of the local authority's position on the applicant's response.

01:17:11:13 - 01:17:35:10

I think in the interest of time and the fact that there are perhaps discussions ongoing at the moment in relation to the statement of common ground, perhaps there could be something else that the local authorities could take away in feedback on it, deadlines in terms of whether or not they think that the response from the applicant deadline six was appropriate and perhaps that could be reflected in the statement of Common Ground. If that's an action that could be taken away, please, for Rutland and Lincolnshire, please.

01:17:43:11 - 01:17:49:02

Do you have any further points or comments on ecological monitoring before we move on? Dr. Williams.

01:17:52:07 - 01:18:38:20

Thank you very much. James Williams, on behalf of Mallard Pass Action Group. I think the issue of monitoring is actually critical to showing whether or not net gain is being achieved. As we were just discussing and think there are some issues here about the frequency of monitoring, which I believe should be annual throughout the period of the proposal and think that it should also be very clear where the results from that monitoring made available in public so that the applicant can be held to account for any changes that may be perceived as being negative or congratulated on any positive changes that they are able to produce.

01:18:39:26 - 01:18:51:06

There are some real issues here about what monitoring is undertaken, and I'll just mention that as an example just to illustrate the problem.

01:18:52:25 - 01:19:29:07

Bats are a mobile species that don't necessarily occupy the same locations year to year, for example, for bats. Under the monitoring program, the results from roost monitoring, the results from field monitoring have been found to be somewhat different. And part of that is that the bats for purpose trails operate a fish and fusion model in terms of where they are actually nesting or have their maternity roosts and where they have their hibernation roosts.

01:19:29:26 - 01:20:20:06

And as a result, for the biodiversity indicator on bats, it was necessary to actually remove the roost count data from the use in the composite indicator and just rely on the field count data. Because we were there were contradictory results were being obtained and think it's that level of detail that needs to be understood in terms of whether or not simple garden find something is still there or not is sufficient and think it's therefore important that there is monitoring of all of the potential receptor groups across the period of the proposal because otherwise we won't actually know whether biodiversity has been adversely affected or not.

01:20:20:08 - 01:20:20:26

Thank you.

01:20:24:02 - 01:20:25:14

Thank you, Dr. Williams.

01:20:27:01 - 01:20:37:02

Mr. Fox, would you like to respond? Thank you. General point in response. Deadline six was that would be more detail in the detailed lamp example, if you'd like to expand on that.

01:20:37:08 - 01:20:39:24

Yes, I think that's generally the position.

01:20:41:20 - 01:21:15:25

The the the impact during construction. So we have lots of commitments both in the camp and the lamp in terms of monitoring and surveys, etcetera. And um, after construction. Um, the monitoring is undertaken every five years, the details of how that would be carried out. Proposals on that would be in the detailed length. But suppose, um. It's coming back to the submissions that are being made at the

moment. Our commitment is five years every five years because that is the standard across a range of schemes, not just solar.

01:21:16:24 - 01:21:42:23

And we don't see, especially once the scheme is operational, where the vast most of the species impacts, at least most, if not all of them would have would have happened if they were to happen in terms of an operational solar farm as compared to construction of it. And we think that's an appropriate level. Um, but obviously people want to make other submissions about why a year is is. More appropriate, we will respond accordingly.

01:21:44:17 - 01:21:49:17

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Any final points, Dr. Williams, before we move on?

01:21:50:16 - 01:22:55:23

Just a quick one, if I may. James Williams for Malabar Action Group. Thank you to Mr. Fox for that. I think my concern here is that this is a very big project and we've not actually got any data really on the implications of field based monitoring, field based and solar panels for many species of wildlife. This is actually an opportunity to provide those data and it's actually something that I think that the applicant, if they approached a number of universities, might find that they were interested in taking part in a long term monitoring scheme and that potentially would actually help in the future in terms of understanding some of the implications of this sort of proposal, because there are emerging research findings, but some of them are contradictory and some of them need to be considered further in terms of whether the issues are negative or not.

01:22:55:25 - 01:23:22:21

So for example, there's a study that was recently published in the Journal of Applied Ecology with respect to foraging of that species across solar panel farm. And there are some issues there about the way in which species will use a modified landscape. So think that this is actually something which is quite important in terms of understanding the implications of an enormous project. Thank you.

01:23:25:03 - 01:23:42:27

Thank you, Dr. Williams. Mr. Fox. Note There's a similar commitments made now in response to comments from natural England around long term effects on soil health. I don't know if there's a comment you could add in relation to the ecological effects as well as I think.

01:23:42:29 - 01:23:48:09

I would say that we've talked about the applicant. We've heard Dr. Williams has said, and we will take that away.

01:23:48:24 - 01:23:50:11

Thank you. Okay.

01:23:51:26 - 01:23:55:17

And with Mr. Radley online, we hand up.

01:23:56:08 - 01:23:57:03

Thank you. Yes.

01:23:59:03 - 01:24:40:16

I. Dr. Adley, retired conservation professional. I spent 20 years working on agri environment schemes, so I have some experience in this area. I would like to really just reinforce the importance of what Dr. Willis has just said. As you all know, I've raised the issue of the what I think is possibly an inadequate mitigation for Skylarks, but I accept that there are many uncertainties, and I think this would be a

really good opportunity to do some long term monitoring, to look at look and see how Skylarks and other farm birds operate in this new mixed environment.

01:24:40:18 - 01:24:50:04

And then if it does show that my fears are justified, then appropriate additional mitigation could be undertaken. Thank you.

01:24:52:25 - 01:24:53:24

Thank you, Mr. Bradley.

01:24:55:22 - 01:24:56:20

You have to say its name again.

01:24:57:26 - 01:25:05:14

Thank you. Okay. I can't see any further hand, so I'll move on to item D,

01:25:07:27 - 01:25:38:27

which relates to highways measures and possible issues arising with traffic and may affect the royal posture and little Warren versus triple C. And again, there was a question on this further in questions 3.0.3 where the applicant stated that they felt it was unlikely to be an issue, although they recognized that there were perhaps certain stretches of Holywell Road that perhaps weren't fully wide enough to accommodate to HGVs passing.

01:25:38:29 - 01:26:11:07

At the same time, um, the view was that it was likely because of the traffic movements that would likely be prevalent in the area, although there is an update to the outline travel plan which is more focused on the risks associated with possible construction staff living in the vicinity of Holywell. Believe. Note from parties action groups comments that they are of the view that perhaps the traffic implications are much broader and that it may be used more broadly for access to the A1 or from the A1 as well.

01:26:12:06 - 01:26:12:22

Um,

01:26:14:09 - 01:26:43:23

at this point, I'd like to just bring in the local authority. I think it's Rutland County Council, whether they have any. Views or insight into the extent to which that road is used and whether they are of the view that there is a risk. Think in your written response that. You weren't particularly convinced that there was a great use of the road. But if you get any particular feedback on the Action group's comments about being used as a little bit of a cut through and through the A1 effectively.

01:26:44:11 - 01:26:55:13

So Justin Johnson from Rutland County Council, I think we've got online. My colleague Julie Smith from the Highways team. So if I defer to her on on that point. Okay.

01:26:56:22 - 01:26:58:05

Thank you, Mrs. Smith.

01:27:04:27 - 01:27:36:09

Thank you, sir. Um. Julie Smith. Rutland Kent Council Highways. Um, yeah, I'd provided a response in the written response. Um, after assessing it, I've driven the route. Um, I'm of the. Yes, there are some odd places where it's slightly narrow. Um, there's no evidence sort of, um, in any particular location that there's a, you know, a severe issue already that would be exacerbated.

01:27:36:11 - 01:27:37:14

So, um,

01:27:39:23 - 01:28:13:11

I'm not overly concerned that there's going to be a lot of overrunning of the verges, you know, in one particular location. Um. There is a an agreement within. I think it's, um, maybe the outline construction traffic management plan that there would be surveys of agreed sections of roads. Um, so I appreciate this isn't really an environmental.

01:28:14:11 - 01:28:35:00

Thing, but it could possibly offer some mitigation if we include the section of road that there's concerns about. Um, as part of that pre-construction survey highway survey, which would obviously include the verge areas as well. Thank you.

01:28:38:13 - 01:29:11:22

Thank you, Mr. Smith. Did you have any particular views and you did consulting this and your response? But just to come back on the Action Group's view that perhaps the road is is more used and perhaps is recognized? Think there's a view from the action group and I'll bring you in in a moment. And that people do try and avoid great casting, for example, and use this as an alternative routes. Is there any evidence or information that you may have that would support or counsel that particular view at the moment?

01:29:13:26 - 01:29:51:24

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, no, there's no sort of traffic surveys or evidence that we have that that's, um, used as a as a cut through. I'm sure it does happen. I'm sure I'm in pretty much all the rural roads will be used as cut through for people that know those routes. Um, uh, most of them, whilst they would be shorter perhaps to, um, get access to the strategic road network.

01:29:51:26 - 01:30:06:10

Um, you know, there's, there's pros and cons to going the main roads and there's pros and cons to go in the rural, you know, on the much more rural roads. But we have no evidence that it's excessive.

01:30:08:23 - 01:30:09:14

Thank you.

01:30:10:07 - 01:30:11:12

Thank you, Mrs. Smith.

01:30:11:25 - 01:30:12:10

Um.

01:30:13:08 - 01:30:16:14

So we have Mrs. Holloway and Mrs. Wally from the Action Group.

01:30:16:26 - 01:30:48:08

But Mrs. Holloway, for the Action Group. Um, we're not necessarily saying it's excessive at the moment. What we're talking about is the kind of lgv and staff traffic that there might be in the future. And once they realize that great Casterton isn't perhaps something they want to get tied up with. Um, and they're coming from a certain direction west or from the north. Then they will come off at Castle Bispham or Stratton and come across that way because they can and don't think it's possible to enforce.

01:30:49:03 - 01:31:19:04

Have any, any method of enforcement to stop people coming across that way. Now, it does even go single carriageway between Holywell Hall and down to the bottom of collision in places. So it is a high risk, but it's not something that we can measure at the moment because we can't quantify what this lgv and staff traffic is going to be. Um, so think the baseline now is not the baseline to judge it from.

01:31:19:06 - 01:31:28:05

It's it's how much traffic potential is there from the construction workers and the construction transport as well.

01:31:29:00 - 01:31:29:15

Thank you.

01:31:29:17 - 01:31:30:04

Mrs. Woolley.

01:31:31:00 - 01:31:31:28

Mrs. Woolley, on behalf.

01:31:32:00 - 01:31:32:17

Of the Action Group.

01:31:32:19 - 01:31:34:00

As a resident who uses both.

01:31:34:02 - 01:32:10:04

Of those routes extensively. Um, really, just to to build on what Mrs. Holloway has said, if you go to Google Maps, it will send you one of three ways to the A1. If you go north and it will pull you off one of three ways if you're coming south. So, you know, Google Maps as a as a very regularly used, um, satnav tool will use all of those that will use the Holywell Road particularly to bring you down into the effectively the middle of the site, whether it's across to Essendon, whether less likely for us than down, but certainly where we are.

01:32:10:06 - 01:32:18:13

And so the north of the site and as far to the far east of the site as you're going out towards Retford, it'll bring you that way.

01:32:19:20 - 01:32:21:03

Thank you, Mrs. Woolley. Um,

01:32:22:28 - 01:32:42:14

Mr. Fox, appreciate there have been some changes to that line travel ban and recognition that that there is a a degree of risk and I guess the extent to which is is debatable. Um, natural England also did comment on this particular point and they suggested and perhaps some temporary signage might be put in place just to reduce that.

01:32:42:16 - 01:32:43:03

Risk.

01:32:43:16 - 01:32:58:22



Further. Think your response to that was that signage could create some damage or harm to the. I wasn't quite sure. However, the case is that if the signage is placed in an appropriate location and if you comment on on that and then come back on the points raised by the action group as well.

01:33:00:05 - 01:33:32:18

So think in simple terms. If the roads are as narrow as their suggested to be. If you want to put traffic along without putting it in the way. Where else? There's no other place that can go than than the Verge. And I think the point I'd make is that the two things first of all, we updated the outline travel plan and yes, outline travel plan to make clear that we will tell drivers that they're not able to use only one road. And second of all, don't we need to talk about the numbers we're talking about here, the transport assessment shows.

01:33:33:23 - 01:33:45:18

105 lives daily. Bearing in mind not all of them are going to use that route. And bearing in mind that we're providing for shuttle buses.

01:33:47:18 - 01:34:19:25

That's not 105 daily movements going across Holywell Road. That's that's, you know, wouldn't want to give a percentage. So we're talking small numbers and there's already a control that we've now put into the document. Well, I think I can say in terms of the signage point, we we can look at perhaps adding some wording to say, um, if we consider if signage is possible if there's an issue, but if we've already told the drivers not do it and we're required to do that. And if it becomes an issue, then we can look at if additional measures need to be required.

01:34:19:27 - 01:34:25:19

But I think that has to be in the context of only if it doesn't cause an impact that we're trying to avoid in the first place.

01:34:26:03 - 01:34:31:07

Okay. So that's another possible updates to the outline plan by deadline seven.

01:34:33:02 - 01:34:33:17

Thank you.

01:34:35:15 - 01:34:36:22

I think we had Dr..

01:34:37:07 - 01:34:54:03

Sorry, I should add. Go ahead and realize that Mr. Ricky was on the. Was on the teams. But the other point is that the time that the our workers are coming is not the peak time. So our workers are coming massively before the peak. And so that's likely to be

01:34:55:25 - 01:35:01:03

needing to run because they're not going to be facing traffic and be for the for their to be much traffic anyway.

01:35:02:22 - 01:35:11:07

Thank you, Mr. Fox. Mr. Bradley. Doctor, apologies online. You got your hand up. Would you like to? Okay. Thank you.

01:35:11:09 - 01:35:50:18

Yes. Just. Just as a point of information, I also use that route fairly regularly. Um, and I noticed that the the Highway Authority had just recently put quite a lot of stone in at the margins where the verge

is already being overrun. So I think it's not true to say that there isn't something of a problem already. Um, and I do welcome some of those assurances about, um, about future regulation of traffic. But just going back to our previous discussion, I think this is another area where it's really important to monitor the impacts and to take remedial action if adverse effects occur.

01:35:50:25 - 01:35:51:15

Thank you.

01:35:53:26 - 01:36:00:28

Thank you, Dr. Radley. We have some hands up towards the rear of the room. Kind of a microphone, please. From the case team.

01:36:03:06 - 01:36:04:09

As Mrs. Crampton.

01:36:12:02 - 01:36:44:00

Likes pulling cramping. Interested persons think there's a lorry ban from Holywell Quarry. They're not allowed to take that route, so can't see how the construction lorries will be allowed to take that route. Um, and it is a very narrow route. Can't see that they're going to want to go past Casterton College because according to our MP Alicia Kearns, in two years time that is going to be rebuilt. So they're going to have their own construction lorries in two years time.

01:36:44:02 - 01:36:59:02

So that's going to be a bit of a bottleneck. So I see that there is a real problem exiting the A1 and getting to the site and they can't come through Colby because the bridge is too low. So it's a bit of a conundrum.

01:37:01:14 - 01:37:08:01

Thank you, Mrs. Crampton. Yes, the gentleman in the audience. If you could just introduce yourself, please.

01:37:11:01 - 01:37:11:16

Yes.

01:37:11:23 - 01:37:29:08

I'm Kevin Corby, am the represent county councillor representing Customs Royal, and I have also 40 years experience in transport and haulage operations. Um.

01:37:31:28 - 01:38:02:00

What puzzles me about this project in terms of TVs is that certainly when I've been involved in jobs with like two, there's been always very clear directions for traffic. And I struggle to understand why traffic coming from southbound is not taken off at Coles to Earth and northbound off at Peterborough or the A47 and all traffic is directed to site from bourn.

01:38:02:21 - 01:38:07:12

I just wondered if that had been considered and if it has been considered. Why is it not being implemented?

01:38:09:02 - 01:38:28:06

Thank you for that question. Perhaps slightly straightening away from the agenda item which is around biodiversity. Appreciate this is a relates to highways issue, but it's not in relation to HGVs, it's in relation to speckles and possible effects on this particular road. So perhaps we can pick that up and relations under Mr. Birchfield.

01:38:28:27 - 01:38:29:29  
I think some confusion.

01:38:30:01 - 01:38:30:16  
In the world.

01:38:30:18 - 01:38:31:15  
About HGVs.

01:38:31:17 - 01:38:40:02  
And lives. HGVs were HGVs and now they're called officially large goods vehicles, which.

01:38:40:04 - 01:38:41:23  
Is called lives.

01:38:42:23 - 01:38:44:20  
All right. So everybody.

01:38:44:22 - 01:38:45:07  
Needs to be.

01:38:45:09 - 01:38:46:18  
Congruent with whether we're.

01:38:46:20 - 01:38:48:11  
Talking big trucks or.

01:38:48:13 - 01:38:48:28  
Transit.

01:38:49:00 - 01:38:49:25  
Vans. Then we'll.

01:38:49:27 - 01:38:50:21  
All know what we're talking.

01:38:50:23 - 01:38:52:13  
About. Thank you.

01:38:53:25 - 01:38:58:27  
Thank you, Mr. Bayfield. And we have. But then back. Mr. Stansbury.

01:38:59:06 - 01:38:59:21  
Yeah.

01:38:59:23 - 01:39:15:16  
A downstate resident of Down also run the Community Speed Watch program in relation to item 10.1 proposed 30 mile an hour speed limit. We already have one in the village.

01:39:16:02 - 01:39:20:20  
But we're not on agenda item ten just yet. Okay, we'll go into that shortly.

01:39:21:00 - 01:39:21:15

Right.

01:39:21:17 - 01:39:22:02

That's okay.

01:39:22:04 - 01:39:46:25

Well, let me just say that we have constant flouting of rules with HGVs currently in the village, and we have currently many of the verges already churned up, which are protected verges and triple S's. So it's all very well saying you're going to put these management procedures into place, but we have large scale flouting of it currently.

01:39:47:28 - 01:39:55:10

Thank you, Mr. Staines. Okay. Unless you have any further comments on. This point, Dr. Williams.

01:39:56:10 - 01:40:00:29

Thank you. Drive that route, particularly going from.

01:40:02:19 - 01:40:18:10

I'll be across to Holywell and across through to clips and greetham on a very regular basis. The route from Holywell to Calypso is effectively a single road with passing places

01:40:20:01 - 01:40:25:10

when there is a problem on the A1. There is an awful lot of traffic on that road.

01:40:27:04 - 01:40:52:00

If you have two vehicles larger than two cars, it will be extremely difficult for them to pass in that restricted section. And therefore, I do think that there is a real issue there about the transport along that route and the danger of an accident is fairly high.

01:40:56:21 - 01:41:05:03

Thank you. Once again, perhaps we're straying into the next agenda item. But Mr. Fox, if you've got any final points on that before we think we're close for a comfort break fairly shortly.

01:41:05:18 - 01:41:07:00

Yes, I would only repeat myself.

01:41:08:08 - 01:41:23:12

Thank you, Mr. Fox. On that basis then, it's now 3:11. Just to be a 15 minutes comfort break before we move on to agenda item ten, which is transportation and traffic. Thank you.

01:41:27:00 - 01:41:30:03

So if we turn by, should we say 25%? Thank you.