

File Name: ISH5 28th September 2023 Part 3.mp3
File Length: 01:43:16

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:18:05 - 00:00:28:00

Okay, everybody, time to reconvene the hearing and just make sure the live recording and stream has started, please. I can confirm that both have started.

00:00:29:17 - 00:00:38:06

Thank you. So we've got to. Schedule one, the authorized development on the agenda. Um.

00:00:46:08 - 00:00:59:07

Mr. Fox, could you just provide justification for the final? Again, the generality of the final paragraph in schedule one. We've got the work, two numbers, and then there's the

00:01:00:25 - 00:01:17:27

in connection with further associated development list, which is, you know, itself quite expansive list. And then there's the further paragraph on any of the further associated development. Just clarification on why that is needed for this project. These must applicant am.

00:01:18:18 - 00:01:49:01

Smiling there because obviously in the first thing I was going to say was very much well precedented in a range of orders ranging from Tilbury to a Port Drax Repower A33 A14 tunnel and they are important limited to being within the northern limits and only related to being in connection with the authorised element. And that is the key point because the question that was asked earlier, can we back to that? And this is the this is the permission, so to speak.

00:01:49:14 - 00:01:49:29

Um,

00:01:51:07 - 00:02:29:24

it's because there is a scenario where because the DCA was saying this is what you have permission to do in order to build the scheme. It allows us to be able to do something we might not have thought of right now, um, but has a control on it to ensure that it's nothing. It's not outside what would be assessed. That is, um, I think the quality of if this was taken out, which was if there was something that we had to do, wasn't specifically listed, we'd have to go get separate planning permission, despite the fact that it's to facilitate the construction of a scheme that has already got the consent through the DCA.

00:02:30:21 - 00:02:48:12

But what we're talking about here is small, minor aspects. I'm about to point out Mr. Phillips has raised previously. It's essentially when we come to detailed design that also has to show that it's that it's neat. So there's nothing here that allows us to go outside of what we've assessed.

00:02:52:10 - 00:02:52:25

Up.

00:02:55:19 - 00:03:11:22

Obviously the promoter sort of as a developer has a good idea of what's needed. Why isn't all that covered within the works? And the other the other things are actually quite expensive in themselves when you're authorised. So the strategy development list is sort of it's quite expansive in itself.

00:03:13:13 - 00:03:24:01

I take your point that there is the caveat on materially new or materially different environmental effects? No, it has been precedent, but not in all these years by any stretch of the imagination from what I from what I'm aware of.

00:03:26:01 - 00:03:28:23

It does leave some uncertainty that there might be some works that.

00:03:30:12 - 00:03:39:29

Uh, aren't included. Haven't been considered. Uh, we know that the new material materially different environmental effects. Caveat.

00:03:41:24 - 00:04:06:14

This is something that the applicants obviously got to come to a view on, but it's not clear cut, is it, as to what might or might not cause different environments and effects that you know, who in terms of who actually sort of determines that. Take the point which you'd probably talk about. The council has enforcement powers, but in terms of sort of clarity for everybody about what has been included in the what is included in the DCO, it just seems to create an extra, an extra layer of uncertainty.

00:04:08:19 - 00:04:12:14

Um, well, so yes. Um.

00:04:14:09 - 00:04:37:07

It does. But the point is, you asked me to give an example. I can't give an example because if I could think of that example, it would be in the list. And that's essentially the point. So the the yes is enforcement. Yes. There's about the the detail design of the scheme has to be signed off pursuant to requirement six. So that that would be the check. Don't.

00:04:40:27 - 00:04:43:14

Yeah. Can't give you examples because that's the point.

00:04:47:26 - 00:05:18:23

It's what I would say is is the reason. And as you rightly do, keep asking you about this scheme. But the principle here is whether is that for any scheme? This is this is a scenario when you're building a scheme, especially a large one, there are things that you can you possibly didn't think of when you're thinking about listing out what you're seeking consent for. And that's why it right mentioned a port scheme, highway schemes and energy projects.

00:05:18:25 - 00:05:26:15

It's not to do it's not the principle isn't necessarily to do with this scheme because any scheme has this problem.

00:05:29:25 - 00:05:52:00

Is there any given the requirement, five includes the ability for amendments to any of the approved developments. Sorry, approved documents, rather plans, details and schemes, as we've we've discussed that before. It doesn't wouldn't that cover anyway the potential for other things to happen, or is that more amendments just to existing things that are known?

00:05:52:10 - 00:05:58:12

Well, no, in two ways. So firstly, because schedule one isn't caught by requirement five.

00:06:02:28 - 00:06:18:18

And secondly, because it comes back to the point that schedule one is what we got concerned for. So if we didn't have this and we needed to do something in connection with the with the authorized development, then we wouldn't have plan commission for it, never mind the requirements.

00:06:24:00 - 00:06:26:10

Any further comments on this from anybody?

00:06:27:28 - 00:06:28:25

Any party.

00:06:31:09 - 00:06:37:22

So Justin Johnson, Rutland County Council. And I think the way.

00:06:37:24 - 00:07:35:04

We have sort of approached it or looked at it is that, um, inevitably on large schemes, you know, it does happen that something's cropped up, like Mr. Fox has said. And suppose it's the extent to which which it is potentially used in the future, if it's used akin to something like a non-material amendment application on a normal planning application, then it's not a problem. Um, and that would be quite reasonable. It's, it's, it's this, um, it's the scale to, to what harm something might, might have could still be a relatively big change to, to the what's envisaged of the approved plans albeit have limited environmental impacts and that would be you know arguably the concern that that we might have as a council.

00:07:36:04 - 00:07:58:28

Is there any are there any examples of things that might not be caught by the caveat on the environmental effects assessed in the environmental statement? Are there any examples that you you can think of or will be aware of where things might be caught, might might occur under this, which might not be caught by that, but potentially might have other implications.

00:08:00:19 - 00:08:43:02

I can't give a specific example, sir. No. Think the concern for me is, like I say, that, um, where the best analogy is can give is a minor material amendment or something like that. A relatively small or non-material amendment, small amendment to a scheme and to allow some flexibility because we appreciate it's a big scheme, something may come up that's not not envisaged. I think the the only concern comes is that if it is used for something where there is a quite a significant change to the the approved scheme, albeit that it doesn't have any greater environmental impacts.

00:08:44:17 - 00:08:53:28

Does does that. And point at the bottom of schedule one and allow for that. And that that will be a concern if if it did.

00:08:56:09 - 00:09:19:05

This was not the applicant. So think. But that's where requirement six would come into play because requirement sets requires us to to build and operate the scheme in accordance with the details that have been approved by the LPA. If we then had to change them, we'd have to re discharge that requirement and then so you'd be able to consider acceptability of that or not within the context of how all the requirements work currently.

00:09:20:14 - 00:09:23:29

Sorry. So that's under Article six requirement requirement six. Right.

00:09:25:18 - 00:09:32:01

And this comes back to the point of what this is doing of being at the end of Schedule one. It's giving us planning permission for that.

00:09:34:11 - 00:10:07:05

And if the undertakers view on what's materially different, environmental effects differed from, say, the local authority, his view on that and something was done which actually the local authority thought was a new environmental effect. The only remedy for that would presumably be enforcement. There's no prior check or prior approval or prior notification is that it would requirement sectors for. No, but under just under this under schedule one, the final paragraph for any of the further associated development. Or are you saying that any other associate further associated development would come under?

00:10:08:08 - 00:10:42:18

And had a bit of say because the paragraph at the end of chapter one, it's giving us permission to do things that aren't listed. And then schedule two requires us to get approval of the detailed design of of the authorized development. So I'm not I'm not saying that requirement six needs to be referring to that, but in a sense, because they're going because they are going to be approving the detailed design. Um, if we needed to do something that isn't listed and that's what would be being considered at the time of considering requirement six because there are.

00:10:42:20 - 00:10:50:09

Some things in the paragraph we're talking about which would probably could, could potentially fall out of the detailed design approval list A to H.

00:10:51:07 - 00:11:26:21

They could. But then think, um, think about other. Requirements as well in terms of if it's related to stuff we need to do in the street. Then there's the the missions, the articles that deal with that. If it's to do with somebody with a landscape and you've got requirements seven fencing requirement, eight drainage crime and nine there are enough controls. But, but ultimately, I think it comes down to the point that if the Secretary of State already considers this something acceptable for large games, whatever they are, then.

00:11:28:07 - 00:11:38:14

And there is this control and enforcement, etcetera, then in a sense this is a consequence of any major project. It's not even necessarily because it's this one.

00:11:39:17 - 00:11:41:22

And there are SEOs without this paragraph, aren't there?

00:11:41:25 - 00:11:43:05

Yes, but.

00:11:44:28 - 00:11:48:06

Well, you'd have to check each one. That wasn't to ask whether they even applied for it, so.

00:11:50:02 - 00:12:03:21

All true. True. Okay. Well, I think I've heard. What? Yeah, I think we've exhausted probably the discussion. Unless anybody else has got. Anything to say on that matter? Is there anything else would schedule one?

00:12:03:25 - 00:12:15:19

Sorry. Sorry about that. I think what I would say is I'm not aware of any example where there's been asked for. It's actually just struck it out and given it, which I think is the right question. Yeah.

00:12:19:15 - 00:12:32:16

Okay. Anything further anybody else wants to raise on scheduled one? Authorized. Development. I think there was a point raised by Rutland County Council in the.

00:12:35:08 - 00:12:44:24

It's appeared. Think in your. Yeah. I've got your help for Mr. Fox deadline for submissions which is the response to local planning authorities responses. And it was an issue about the.

00:12:51:17 - 00:12:54:27

But there were two issues raised by Rutland County Council.

00:12:59:16 - 00:13:10:11

In it. One was about piles, one was about off site highway. Is there anything outstanding that Rutland County Council wants to raise? On that earliest and those earliest submissions that were made about schedule one.

00:13:12:02 - 00:13:20:12

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. No, we're. That's all satisfied for us. Thank you.

00:13:21:16 - 00:13:26:17

Okay. Thank you for that clarification, Mrs. Smith. Okay. Let's move on to.

00:13:32:01 - 00:13:35:18

Schedule two, which is the requirements for.

00:13:38:07 - 00:13:58:29

Again, I've got some questions that we want to ask on these. But if there's another requirement, which anybody has a comment they want to make, then this is an opportunity for that as well. Interpretation has been a definition of relevant highway authority, which I'm assuming is pretty uncontroversial to everybody. And.

00:14:13:20 - 00:14:24:21

Similarly, requirement two is very clear. Requirement three is phasing of the authorized development and date of final commissioning.

00:14:26:26 - 00:14:34:07

And Mr. Fox, can you just outline the reasons for the addition of three four?

00:14:35:22 - 00:14:36:26

Three, Clause four.

00:14:39:05 - 00:14:59:06

Um, yes. So think. Well, partly. You had asked why a data final commissioner was in the title. Um, and it's also relevant in the context of the Amendment three for, for the changes to requirement 18 to work.

00:15:08:25 - 00:15:14:07

Okay. Any comments on anybody on that? On the additions to requirement three or any other points on requirement three?

00:15:25:18 - 00:15:35:11

It also includes, doesn't it, the plan identifying the phasing areas, which I think was a point made by Rutland County Council, which you've you've included. Okay. We'll move on to.

00:15:39:19 - 00:15:46:05

I think a requirement for is straightforward. Requirement five The amendment made to this.

00:15:48:06 - 00:15:54:18

Regarding Mr. Fox, you just clarify what that is for the people. For anybody who's not aware.

00:15:55:19 - 00:16:19:17

Of the applicant says yes, as we talked about yesterday. Um, this is to allow um, essentially provide for without having to amend the whole DCA, um, or any requirement seven to allow for once we've submitted the limps and we've agreed what the metric is, if they're required to be some level of tweak to the net gain units that are referenced in requirement seven and that can happen.

00:16:23:21 - 00:16:26:10

Okay. Any comments on that? I've got no questions on that.

00:16:28:18 - 00:16:29:03

And.

00:16:38:00 - 00:16:47:13

And then requirement six detailed design approval. Again, some alterations to this. Mr. Fox just like to summarize those so everyone is aware.

00:16:48:01 - 00:16:50:28

Yes. So Amendment 262

00:16:52:13 - 00:17:02:26

so that when we submit the detailed design details must show that we've held take into account the results of the archaeological investigations or evaluations carried out pursuant to the outline I.

00:17:05:02 - 00:17:08:21

And we talked about Power five earlier. I'm talking about the highways articles.

00:17:21:17 - 00:17:22:02

Okay.

00:17:25:20 - 00:17:26:28

Any comments on.

00:17:28:01 - 00:17:28:26

Particle.

00:17:30:21 - 00:17:55:28

Six. Mrs. Holloway, there was a point to think Malabar Action Group raised at a recent deadline about what would happen in this scenario where not all the land might be required for, for example, a raise. Think the applicant responded to say that would be covered in the approval of requirement six and A, for example, the layout does does that satisfy that earlier concern of yours.

00:17:57:19 - 00:18:36:28

Mrs. Holloway, from Low Pass Action Group? Not really, because it doesn't really tell us, you know, what corrective action will be taken and from the sort of discussions that have been had, um, it would appear that the applicant does not intend to move any of the kind of boundaries as a result of that. So, um, if the order limits and all the sort of key areas of the site, whether it's, they don't intend to, um, perhaps compress, which is perhaps what we were looking for, you know, do they need that much land if they find that they don't need to use X, Y and Z, should there be something in the DCO that says that should be reflected?

00:18:38:22 - 00:18:39:07

Okay.

00:18:41:08 - 00:18:42:00

Mr. Fox.

00:18:42:17 - 00:18:50:24

And that couldn't mean that. Considers the requirement sex. The EPA approves it, and if they've approved it, then we must.

00:18:52:19 - 00:18:55:05

Build the scheme in accordance with that detailed design.

00:18:58:07 - 00:19:03:09

Is there something in the outline? One of the management plans in this regard as well.

00:19:07:03 - 00:19:08:01

I don't believe you, sir.

00:19:10:05 - 00:19:25:07

No, We've discussed the point about what would happen. Think at some length at the last hearings about what would happen in the event that not all the land was needed. And a detailed answer was provided by yourselves in regard to that. We have we have that submission and.

00:19:32:07 - 00:19:45:08

So mean. Yeah, there's not much, much more I can add. The requirement. Six. Set up the layout on the scale for the super. And once they do, we have to. We have to be in accordance with that.

00:19:47:02 - 00:19:54:02

And then, you know, that ties into Article 20 and policy acquisition powers. Presumably it's what's required.

00:19:54:27 - 00:20:13:07

Obviously it's possible. And a requirement six that if ever, for example, an area of land shown in the work plans for wasn't actually needed because of whatever reason, then that wouldn't appear in the details to be submitted. So that would be it would be caught in that way. It's something beyond that that you're.

00:20:16:06 - 00:20:51:00

I think our main concern was that once the applicant had understood what area of land that they needed, that there would be some kind of mechanism to ensure that adjustments were made potentially to the order limits, um, and the sort of the configuration of the site. Um, but it feels like, you know, even, even if, I don't know, 100 less acres are required or whatever that the same scheme out, you know, the order limits are still going to be the same.

00:20:51:02 - 00:20:53:28

They have no intention of reducing that.

00:20:57:05 - 00:21:04:00

Okay. Anything final to say on that, Mr. Fox? Okay. We've heard the submissions on. On that. Thank you.

00:21:05:17 - 00:21:37:04

So it's just in Johnson County Council if can just raise one point didn't know whether um requirement seven on the landscaping would be relevant to that if there's large area that's not going to be developed for any reason, would that not pick up an element of that just to be shown on the landscaping? What would what was likely to take place? Um, anyway, if it's not going to be developed, presumably it would either be left as, as field or landscaped.

00:21:37:06 - 00:21:54:11

I still think there's something in one of the management plans that we've talked about and that would have maybe that can be checked for line seven. Just to just to just to confirm. But I'm sure there's something in the outline landscape environmental management plan that refers to should all the land all be required, but might be I might be wrong.

00:21:56:27 - 00:22:04:07

Because let me take it away and just confirm that deadline seven, unless you can quickly find it now or all of us can find it now.

00:22:08:22 - 00:22:34:19

Just. Just while I'm trying to find that, I think that I would I would just add that obviously requirement six says it needs to be consistent with requirement seven. So the two would work together. Then what we have said in response to written submissions is to the extent that we don't build out on any area of land and then that would be used for either agricultural purposes or for for landscaping.

00:22:34:21 - 00:22:38:06

Mean that's the point that's in one of the management in the landscape environmental management plan.

00:22:39:03 - 00:22:41:10

We can get that. Can't can't immediately find it.

00:22:47:19 - 00:22:54:08

Okay. If that can be checked and confirmed, we don't need to necessarily look for that now unless someone's absolutely closed. Have you found that?

00:22:54:21 - 00:23:00:18

No, but think think the point you've made is probably correct. But I think the point that Mrs. Holloway.

00:23:00:26 - 00:23:47:02

Had and Willie, on behalf of Mama, pass the point that Mrs. Holloway was trying to ask or get clarification on was would the outline of the order limits be changed to reflect that? Think what you are suggesting is that the order limits would remain the same, but the configuration of the panels within it may change. And I think those are two different questions. And the question we were after was what is it? Is it possible that there may be a request to to change the outline if it was found that

less land was needed to deliver the same energy output with all the appropriate mitigation, depending on the design and the technology advancements that we discussed earlier?

00:23:47:04 - 00:23:53:04

If that was the case, what I've heard Mr. Fox's answer on that, but that was the case. What benefits would that bring?

00:23:55:27 - 00:24:27:13

Well, it would depend on how the order limits were were realigned. But if you're taking less land out of production, then assume that the land would remain with the landowners and it would be their choice as to how they would continue to to actually manage and farm their land. And it would reduce the amount of one assumes it would potentially reduce the amount of compulsory acquisition that would be required across whatever the new order limits were.

00:24:29:21 - 00:24:38:17

We don't know unless the the actual boundaries are ever likely to change. And certainly from what I've heard, that seems unlikely from what the applicant has said.

00:24:39:11 - 00:25:06:03

Mr. Fox have thoughts about that? So, yes, we wouldn't we wouldn't be opposing to say some mechanism for the word limits to to change the the controls in terms of land take are what we've discussed at the last hearing in terms of we're only able to use it for the land that's required. And if we've had requirements six um, discharged, um, then the other land won't be required in the powers wouldn't be able to be used.

00:25:06:17 - 00:25:12:27

So we're stating the order limits, but it wouldn't necessarily be required. That's a possibility, Yes. Yeah.

00:25:17:06 - 00:25:18:24

Okay. Um.

00:25:20:07 - 00:25:38:12

And sorry just just to finish on that. Mean obviously that has been the situation for all CEOs or CPAs or hybrid bills they've become. You have the powers and you have have the controls. But I've never seen any kind of mechanism for or limits changing. In some kind of future time.

00:25:39:21 - 00:25:45:14

Right? I can think of one, but it was very bespoke circumstances and technology.

00:25:45:16 - 00:25:57:05

Mrs. Holloway, from a low pass action group, you mentioned technology advances. That might be a key, key reason for why you could need potentially less land. Having said that, there are lots of opportunities for improvement there based on what you know today.

00:25:57:07 - 00:26:03:11

But that that was actually. Mr.. Gave an answer to this, I'm sure at one of the earlier hearings that that's

00:26:04:29 - 00:26:17:18

going to repeat that answer, possibly to just clarify, because I think we've been I think we have had a response on this. Yeah. I'm just going to say there's no advantage to reducing the order limits, because effectively what's happening here.

00:26:17:20 - 00:26:58:14

In this scenario, we've got two scenarios private acquisition of land between our client and landowner or compulsory acquisition. So those are two scenarios that we're dealing with in the private acquisition arena. We would be saying to the landowner this, this is the area we are trying to use for the project. We now selected our technology, we've selected the panels, we've done detailed design that's all been approved by the local authority. And essentially at that point the land required it is fixed, if you like, and that forms the basis of the lease that is then granted by the farmer or the landowner to us.

00:26:58:28 - 00:27:31:23

So we don't go beyond that area of land in the alternative scenario where it's a compulsory acquisition. We would be seeking the same area of land for that. So there is no land creep and nothing, nothing turns on where the original boundary is shown in the is, because essentially we've only taken the land privately that we needed to. And in the compulsory acquisition world we can only we're not allowed to take anything further. So there's the red line boundary becomes irrelevant in both contexts.

00:27:32:15 - 00:27:33:22

Okay. Thank you.

00:27:34:20 - 00:28:05:01

Mrs. Holloway. Similar action group. I suppose what we were alluding to is there may have been the opportunity to reduce some of the impacts of the development by taking land out of the scheme. So it wasn't referring to it so much in terms of compulsory acquisition differences, but more in terms of obviously there are impacts of the boundaries of the order limits to different receptors. I'll give you one example. Field 37, north of Colby Road.

00:28:05:18 - 00:28:35:18

Um, you know, it's purely down there as a Skylark plot. I mean, it would be incredibly easy just to, you know, in terms of the allocation of where Skylark plots are. You have one one plot of land that is just over a main road, but yet you still retain it within the order limits for for no need. There are other examples around the site and I'm just saying there are there could be opportunities to reduce the order limits to reduce the impacts on certain areas around the site.

00:28:36:10 - 00:28:59:11

The streets. Just respond to that. All very good points, but but separate ones. So those those points would be dealt with through detailed design and the approvals by the local authority where there would be consideration to where is the best best from an ecological perspective, where's the best place for the blocks and things like that. So it's dealt with through detailed design and approvals rather than where the red lines.

00:28:59:19 - 00:29:17:02

And I've just had the point is, is that once once we've had the drainage, the detailed design principles in place, they are we can only build out in accordance with them. So there can be no impacts, even if there were limits or wider than the areas we've had approved.

00:29:17:08 - 00:29:29:13

And interest in terms of process about how these things work. When you submit your details and requirements for layout in particular and all the other requirements in terms of landscaping areas. There.

00:29:32:25 - 00:30:03:16

Actually in terms of what the local authority would actually look like, the relevant would look at in that respect, Would they look at the fact that there's actually or be able to look at the fact that there's actually a. A better alternative to lay out if it was indicated that actually not all of the site is required for arrays or whatever it might be, that there was some room for maneuverability, would that be a consideration where somebody could say, well, actually you're better off if you're going to lose a bit of the site for actual development, that that field there might be better for that than the other field.

00:30:04:02 - 00:30:41:28

Absolutely guaranteed the applicant. Just like with the planning permission where you you've an outline planning permission where you submit details for for approval. There is a consultation process on that. So there will be relevant consultees for, for considering that the design that's put forward, I suspect it may be that where the panels are put consultees might not have so much to say about that because they are linear in nature and fit their put in, but certainly how they have a bearing on, say, the skylight plots and amenities, but you know, the landscaping and things like that, there may be opportunities to influence.

00:30:42:00 - 00:30:53:10

But but the point is, when this detail gets submitted, there will be an opportunity for everyone to comment on it at that stage and query, you know, scrutinize what's what's been put forward.

00:30:59:18 - 00:31:00:12

Was the.

00:31:03:17 - 00:31:09:09

This work. Number one, just a side question does work. Number one for the arrays.

00:31:10:25 - 00:31:12:12

Include scope for landscaping.

00:31:13:18 - 00:31:19:13

Mr. Fox? Yes, because the catch all at the end. Of and.

00:31:23:04 - 00:31:23:21

This one.

00:31:25:15 - 00:31:26:00

Okay.

00:31:29:13 - 00:31:30:08

I was in.

00:31:33:02 - 00:31:47:01

I see an associated development. Yes. So it is possible that if it came to that, that not all the land allocated for at the moment for was turned out not to be needed, then some could be allocated towards landscaping. Yes.

00:31:49:17 - 00:31:52:20

Okay. Anything further on?

00:31:54:22 - 00:31:55:15

That issue.

00:31:58:02 - 00:31:58:17

Okay.

00:32:04:27 - 00:32:17:05

On requirement seven. Which is landscape and ecology management plan. This game has been updated, hasn't it? Mr. Fox to reflect the latest being.

00:32:18:24 - 00:32:19:17

Position.

00:32:21:24 - 00:32:30:19

A Lake County council has been added, I think as requested as well. Uh, do you want to quickly just clarify the. In this respect, it was anything further to add than what you said before?

00:32:31:06 - 00:32:57:20

Um, yeah. And don't, don't think the things that add to what I said yesterday, we put, we've put the percentages for both the habitat units and the hydro units on the face of DCA. I think it's more accurate than just referring to biodiversity net gain because that's not how the metric works and that when we submit the lamp, we've got to say which metric we've used, and that creates a process for discussion and debate as to whether the agreed that's appropriate a metric.

00:33:03:09 - 00:33:08:02

Okay. Any comments from on that? Local authorities.

00:33:13:06 - 00:33:14:09

Mr. Willis.

00:33:15:11 - 00:33:30:06

Yeah. Thank you, sir. We're listening. So just say no. We content with that and mindful that we will and clarify that in our statement of common Ground as well. Because think we gave a commitment to deadline six, which we didn't do. So we can seek to do that at the next version.

00:33:31:02 - 00:33:32:17

Okay. Thank you.

00:33:38:23 - 00:33:42:18

Article. Sorry. Article requirement.

00:33:45:09 - 00:34:10:18

Eight. Is fencing another means of enclosure? And this has been amended to include consultation with Lincolnshire County Council. Also that the details submitted must be in accordance with the parameters and the design. Guidance without going over again evidence that we've considered and discussed on merits of fencing and security or anything anybody has to raise on this requirement.

00:34:20:03 - 00:34:23:00

This is holy. We were tempted to say something, but.

00:34:26:14 - 00:34:27:10

Okay. Sorry.

00:34:34:20 - 00:34:39:21

I think the basic premise is this is the fencing has to be submitted and approved by the relevant local authority.

00:34:42:26 - 00:34:50:25

Okay. Uh. Requirement nine is surface water surface and foul water drainage and.

00:34:57:12 - 00:35:01:19

Does the surface water drainage aspect of this?

00:35:03:10 - 00:35:04:01

Cover.

00:35:06:23 - 00:35:09:04

Drainage during construction and operation.

00:35:10:22 - 00:35:20:03

It's not something name. That's why they're separate. So just operation one and two is dealing with operation three and four is dealing with construction.

00:35:27:03 - 00:35:33:28

By three and four. You mean parts three and four of this condition? Yes. So it does cover both operation and construction.

00:35:34:03 - 00:35:35:23

But the two different documents. Sorry. Yes.

00:35:36:23 - 00:35:37:18

But the requirement.

00:35:37:20 - 00:35:38:21

The requirement covers both. Yeah.

00:35:39:00 - 00:35:51:15

So at the moment, I think we alluded to this point yesterday or the day before, we've got requirement nine and then at least two, possibly three of the documents.

00:35:55:20 - 00:35:59:05

Anything. Although this covers two of those documents, doesn't it?

00:36:00:27 - 00:36:03:07

You've only got teeth for water issues.

00:36:05:00 - 00:36:24:26

Is there any benefit in having a document which covers given what was talked about at the early hearing on the issues of surface water drainage? Possible implications of that. And there was various strands in various different places which.

00:36:27:23 - 00:36:43:08

There is a concern that things that don't might get missed in those, uh, or might be overlooked. Is there a. Benefits in having everything to do with water drainage in a single. Document?

00:36:45:22 - 00:37:20:29

I don't think so said. Because the point is, is that during construction. The way that you manage water is very different from the way that you manage water during in terms of, sorry, the design of your

drainage systems essentially, and the design of the scheme and how that takes account of drainage issues. Hence requirement six also referring to specifically requirement nine one. So paragraphs of paragraphs three and four of requirement nine are dealing with all the various construction management methods because there are going to be different considerations at the construction phase as there are compared to the operational phase.

00:37:21:01 - 00:37:46:24

That's the reason why they're, you know, both 20 to 30 page documents and. And this is very much a standard approach in terms of there being two separate plans. Is often sorry just at that point. Often the the construction water management plan is in a even mentioned in the requirement. It's just put into the camp and it being something needs to do pursuant to a camp.

00:37:48:27 - 00:37:58:26

Anything for the local authorities on. These. Are you concerned with the way these are all organized in terms of particularly for surface water drainage matters?

00:38:01:15 - 00:38:27:26

But Justin Johnson, Rockland County Council. Um. Yeah. Appreciate what you're saying. So in terms of having it in a single document and I don't see why they can't be in a separate, a single document, albeit with separate, you know, chapters for, for construction and for operation. Um, but other than that, no, um, I think we could operate with what's put forward as well. Okay.

00:38:28:05 - 00:38:36:05

Thank you. It may be they just need to be checked for cross-referencing in some respects because it's a small sort of management plan as well, which is relevant to this.

00:38:40:16 - 00:39:01:16

Yeah, I think that to the organization two of the actual contractors and to make sure that they're properly briefed and they actually make sure that everyone doing those jobs is fully aware of everything, this does come down. The success of it does come down to that, doesn't it? That. The liaison, the coordination and the monitoring of those things becomes essential at that stage when these projects are actually constructed.

00:39:03:06 - 00:39:10:00

And yes, I think we can take away we can look at where the requirements 1914 need to talk to each other.

00:39:14:10 - 00:39:43:26

To ensure that those issues are considered together. I think that's a different point to the management of soils during construction management water. We talked yesterday at length about the interactions there and can see that there are. Other crossovers that I need to manage. And so we'll look at that. But but in terms of the management of water in the construction phase versus making sure you've got a drainage strategy for your design, I think asked for a separate questions.

00:39:49:00 - 00:40:03:20

But in terms of how these things are actually in general, how these management plans are adhered to, enforce, monitored, etcetera. Early liaison with the local authority on such matters is always very always very useful and.

00:40:09:23 - 00:40:12:27

Any further comments on. Where were we?

00:40:14:18 - 00:40:18:00

And nine surface and fire water drainage.

00:40:24:12 - 00:41:00:04

Ten certainly probably passes the test for precision. Now in terms of the shortness of it. For archaeology, we've discussed this, haven't we? Yesterday you've expressed your position that this is your final position in terms of the the wording. And obviously we have some data, as I say, yesterday as link beyond what we said the other day in the hearing when we considered archaeology. Does a Lancashire County Council or Rutland County Council have anything further on particular wording of this?

00:41:02:01 - 00:41:03:00

Requirement.

00:41:05:15 - 00:41:29:19

Thank you, sir. Mark Willis, Lincoln County Council. No, not not to say too much other than obviously we've set our position on that. We did make a commitment to look at the outline written scheme of investigation and provide some commentary on that on the basis that if that was to be accepted as it is, that we can try and at least incorporate elements we wish. But I think we've pretty much said what we need to say on that as far as we can.

00:41:31:05 - 00:41:42:26

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Fox. You said the other day that there was going to be amendments to the outline written scheme investigation in terms of or including in terms of the procedures for approval, etcetera.

00:41:43:11 - 00:41:54:21

We missed out, so sorry. So that's not quite right. So the point is schedule 16 Will. Be amended to ensure that it applies to the approval of site specific.

00:41:55:03 - 00:41:56:00

16 will be amended.

00:41:57:24 - 00:42:02:00

Because it's been raised in a variety of things today.

00:42:03:20 - 00:42:05:18

That needs to be looked at for any kind of.

00:42:07:00 - 00:42:12:01

Scheme investigation will be approved using those or not approved using those.

00:42:12:03 - 00:42:23:26

The site is site specific, not the outline. So the outline is what the outline is that tells us what we need to go get approved and we'll make that. Schedule 16 applies to the process of approving those.

00:42:25:12 - 00:42:28:15

Okay. Does Rutland County Council have any comments?

00:42:29:22 - 00:42:30:12

No, sir.

00:42:35:14 - 00:42:36:06

Okay.

00:42:39:22 - 00:42:44:22

Has anybody got any comments on. My next question is in relation to.

00:42:46:09 - 00:42:47:21

16.

00:42:52:03 - 00:43:02:08

Is there any comments on requirements 12 Operation Environmental Management Plan 13 Construction Traffic Management Plan 14 Sports Soil Management Plan and 15 ground conditions.

00:43:05:05 - 00:43:07:10

Mr. Fox just to

00:43:09:00 - 00:43:18:28

emphasize a better phrase. It was the discussion yesterday, Mr. 13 about, um, during that, um, if for whatever reason we were only submitting an act

00:43:20:18 - 00:43:41:20

to one authority, we were only building, say, half the scheme first and then we're doing another one, that we would still send a version of it to the other authority to um, consider or be aware of at least, um, decided yet whether that would be an amendment to that requirement itself, but that it may lead to an amendment. Okay. So that. Yeah.

00:43:42:17 - 00:43:43:09

Yeah. Okay.

00:43:47:12 - 00:44:06:19

And on operational noise. Okay. There's some amendments made to this at the previous deadline, weren't there? The point from Saka Steve and District Council, as I understand it, has now been dealt with. I think that was a response to this requirement, but it's been dealt with in the. Yeah.

00:44:17:00 - 00:44:21:20

Are the local authorities now satisfied with with requirements? 16.

00:44:28:19 - 00:44:47:06

So. Justin Johnson Rockland County Council. Um, just to clarify the, the wording of the, the, um, is that the requirement for the validation report? Yeah. In which case, yes. Happy with that? Thank you.

00:44:47:08 - 00:44:49:25

Okay. And requirement 16 itself.

00:44:52:26 - 00:44:53:11

Right.

00:44:59:14 - 00:45:11:23

And. We then come on to. But no questions about the skills supply chain and employment requirement. I don't think that's been amended from the previous versions as it was.

00:45:14:12 - 00:45:35:24

And then we come on to 18 decommissioning and restoration, which has been obviously amended and. Uh, without going back to the detailed discussion we had about the 60 years. Mr. Fox, can you just outline the the way that will work? The amendments to that requirement would work.

00:45:35:26 - 00:46:07:05

Please, sir. So the change requirement 18 and should say I think that last sentence about 60 years we'll put a separate paragraph, I think just cleanness. So we've changed requirement 18 to remove reference to the time limit. So timing of them to just require that it's prior to us doing the decommissioning work. So we have to get that done sign signed off. So that is for us to manage.

00:46:07:14 - 00:46:37:17

But that is because the changes here need to be seen in conjunction with the addition of Section 2.4, the outline which has provisions in relation to decommissioning, which we've added kind of in response to comments about kind of wanting more certainty about decommissioning happening, if that needs to happen before the time limit is up and the process by which that happens.

00:46:38:05 - 00:47:11:13

Um, and just in brief summary. Um, so what happens is that we must provide notice to the relevant planning authority. Um, once any part of the authorised development stops generating electricity for maintenance reasons. If within 12 continuous months of the date of that notice, the authority of that part of the evidence is not regenerate electricity, then decommissioning works for that part of the authorised minimum must commence. So that has that kind of 12 month process and the requirement that says we had to get the signed off before we do them.

00:47:11:22 - 00:47:22:06

So within that 12 months, you know, it's incumbent on us to do that. Otherwise that 12 month period would run out. Would run out. Um, we've then allowed for.

00:47:24:09 - 00:47:55:06

Some exceptions to that 12 month period which relate to where there's a force majeure event or because the stopping to do something to do with National Grid undertaking activities to the substation or the wider transmission network. And if that happens, then we must provide updates every three months to confirm either the latest program by which we think we're going to regenerate electricity or that it doesn't intend to. Um. And.

00:47:57:18 - 00:48:05:06

Where. And then if the notice is to say we don't intend to see, then that 12 month clock starts.

00:48:09:20 - 00:48:23:23

And. Welcome to the second. Couple of questions from me where it says so that the date of final commissioning is the trigger for the 60 year period. Yes, as I understand it.

00:48:26:03 - 00:48:37:12

Okay so the scheme was done on a. Phase by phase basis, it would be the date of commissioning of the final phase. And if.

00:48:39:08 - 00:48:40:07

Whatever reason.

00:48:42:03 - 00:48:43:26

The undertaker decided that

00:48:46:10 - 00:48:55:13

three of the four set of four faces and three of the four faces were constructed, and Undertaker decided that the four phase was not required. What would happen then? Would the date of final commissioning be?

00:48:57:29 - 00:49:07:14

But they're being accused of being hypothetical. They're here. I don't know. But the does the date of the does the does. You see what I mean? It's the date is not the first commissioning is it's the final commissioning.

00:49:07:22 - 00:49:08:07

But.

00:49:08:09 - 00:49:08:29

It's when the whole.

00:49:09:05 - 00:49:26:05

Yeah. It's definitely related to the last notice. So we've only built three under requirement three for three of the four phases for example. At the end of phase three. That would be that would be the last notice if we never serve another notice. And that's when the six years the.

00:49:27:21 - 00:49:30:05

Okay. And.

00:49:32:12 - 00:49:37:12

A-Team four, which talks about the decommissioning.

00:49:39:26 - 00:49:54:01

Is that clear enough order to ensure that the entirety of all the parts of the developer proposed to be decommissioned are actually fully decommissioned? Within a within a suitable timescale or is or is that level of detail actually will be included in the.

00:49:54:26 - 00:49:55:12

Uh.

00:49:56:18 - 00:49:58:03

Decommissioning management plan.

00:49:59:19 - 00:50:03:03

And the latter, sir. I'm just trying to find the equipment.

00:50:03:17 - 00:50:10:12

Just to make sure there's a commitment in that. To make sure that obviously. Everything is decommissioned rather than.

00:50:12:06 - 00:50:13:06

Whatever reason.

00:50:15:01 - 00:50:21:07

Early part of the development or small parts of the development obviously could have longer term effects.

00:50:22:14 - 00:50:35:02

Yes. So Section 2.1 of the outline talks about what the decommissioning works would involve and what they don't involve and that the MPs would set out the program. All that,

00:50:37:05 - 00:50:42:25

including when the decommissioning works are expected to complete. So it would be as part of doing that, we can look at

00:50:44:21 - 00:50:49:01

oh, look at Section 2.1 or 2.2 of the outline, just to make it absolutely.

00:50:49:06 - 00:50:56:14

Straightforward, there's no because suppose 2.8, make sure it's all decommissioned, but be the timescale for that overall decommissioning. Yes.

00:50:56:16 - 00:51:01:02

So the latter is in there. It's a former that we can perhaps more provide more clarity on.

00:51:02:12 - 00:51:03:01

This is all the way.

00:51:03:21 - 00:51:37:09

This is solely for my action group. I was wondering whether there should be and I don't know whether it would be within the temple within here, rather than just an expected date for completion, that there is a maximum time from when the notice is served to an end date for the decommissioning should be finished because otherwise it, you know, it could start. But if there's no enforcement on, you know, even five years, two years, it could be there for a long time.

00:51:37:22 - 00:51:47:01

Would that be picked up in the need for the dam to be to include the. Time frame for the.

00:51:48:15 - 00:52:01:24

The commissioning that was intended by reference to the fact that we added that the program must be included in in the demo. And so that would be signed off. And so if we then went outside that then enforcement action could be taken. Okay.

00:52:02:16 - 00:52:07:22

So that would be up to the local authorities to agree if that timing was suitable. Yes.

00:52:07:24 - 00:52:10:25

Yes, because that'd be approving the detailed. Okay. Yeah.

00:52:10:27 - 00:52:11:12

Thank you.

00:52:16:25 - 00:52:17:13

Okay.

00:52:21:08 - 00:52:25:27

Sorry, Mrs. Davis didn't see you're behind the various cameras and what have you. So I missed you.

00:52:30:12 - 00:52:33:16

The concrete feet that hold these?

00:52:36:12 - 00:52:37:01

Yes.

00:52:47:22 - 00:52:59:01

Okay. Those are the issues that we wanted to raise on the requirements. Are there any comments from any party on any other requirements or indeed the need for any other requirements?

00:53:15:04 - 00:53:15:22

Mr. Hughes.

00:53:20:00 - 00:53:21:13

The microphone's on its way to.

00:53:31:05 - 00:53:33:04

John. He's an interested party.

00:53:35:04 - 00:53:54:25

Just going back to the detailed design approval and the landscape and ecology management plan. Am I correct in that with regard to what is submitted in the DCO? That. The the detail.

00:53:56:19 - 00:54:11:18

This goes back to the substation. Obviously, there's going to be the bun generated, but there is no detail to it. To where is it, the local, the LPA, the local planning authority that actually has the final say on what that detail will be.

00:54:13:29 - 00:54:17:17

They're able to approve it. They're responsible for the approval of that.

00:54:17:19 - 00:54:24:29

They're responsible for the approval of it. However, with regards to the detail and the detail of it, that should be in the.

00:54:27:23 - 00:54:40:16

I think the detail would be in it by virtue of what's in the. So that would require the submission of that by the applicant and it would be for the local authority or the local authorities to approve it. Over the wire.

00:54:41:26 - 00:54:46:15

With regards to amendments to it. Because if we haven't looked detail, how can we question it?

00:54:48:21 - 00:54:50:25

How could you question it as well?

00:54:50:27 - 00:55:11:07

Where I'm going from we know now with regards to the substation is going to be a band around it. However, with regards to the height of that band, I don't know what the height of it is with regards to the effects and the visual impact, whether what has been proposed will still be visible from viewpoint 11 and Glen Crescent, etcetera.

00:55:12:21 - 00:55:23:15

It would be open for the local authorities in considering the submission to consult as they see fit with Residents.

00:55:25:08 - 00:55:29:02

So once it's submitted, it would then come back to us as residents to say yes.

00:55:29:15 - 00:56:01:18

Because we're the local authorities. It's something that the local there's also the community liaison details as well. We're not to be included in that. Don't know. We've got an item on that, but that would be down to the there's no requirement, as I understand it, in the development consent order for the local authorities. Well, there's not to consult with residents, but the local authorities now have their own consultation processes depending on different types of applications. So that would be down to them. Also don't know Mr. Fox about Pre-application submissions in respect of these submissions.

00:56:01:20 - 00:56:11:20

It's often at that time when things such as this can be resolved. So don't know what if there's any actual scope for that included in the actual any of the details of the application.

00:56:14:24 - 00:56:22:00

Can take that away. I wouldn't expect so, sir. We'll submit the details to the to them to approve and we would leave it to them to decide what they want to do.

00:56:24:20 - 00:56:28:08

Okay, So those details will be submitted, but then.

00:56:29:18 - 00:56:37:22

I think it's a question really probably between yourselves and the local, the relevant local authorities in what publicity they will do for these submissions.

00:56:40:23 - 00:56:45:02

But there's nothing in the. Which requires such such publicity.

00:56:45:12 - 00:56:50:12

Well, it's not insane publicity. Where I'm referring to is the detail.

00:56:50:22 - 00:57:05:05

No, but so for you to be aware, understanding what you're saying is that you would like to be aware of these proposals and potentially make your comments for the local authorities to be taken to account when they determine those applications for those detailed landscaping matters?

00:57:05:08 - 00:57:13:22

Correct. Like the height of the Bund only says it's going to be two meters, but the actual structures are five. It's not going to be effective and it needs to be five.

00:57:13:24 - 00:57:18:00

Well, that would be for the local authority to to consider and potentially consult with you.

00:57:19:09 - 00:57:22:23

Okay. So it's the local authority then. Okay. Thank you.

00:57:28:21 - 00:57:29:14

A Phil.

00:57:29:16 - 00:57:30:07
Jordan for.

00:57:30:09 - 00:57:30:24
Self-esteem.

00:57:30:26 - 00:57:31:27
This mean.

00:57:31:29 - 00:57:32:29
Can just add to that.

00:57:33:09 - 00:57:35:06
This would be new.

00:57:35:08 - 00:58:14:15
Territory for us. But typically for something like this in all planning applications, irrespective of conditions published on a weekly list and suspect rather than do the same. So there would be full public access to it. But think something like this. We would at least consult directly with all the parish councils and. But I think, you know, there would be that ability for members of the public to make their comments. It would be very difficult to send direct letters to members of the public because of the, you know, the sort of wide reaching nature of the scheme and which parties were interested in which were.

00:58:14:17 - 00:58:20:24
But I think it would be, you know, publicly available members of the public would be able to comment on it.

00:58:21:00 - 00:58:49:18
But it's probably similar to a reserved matter planning application on an outline planning application, which I think has been mentioned before by the applicant. It's probably a similar to that, but as to how that's done is really up to the local planning authority. But there's nothing actually in the DCO. The only thing I would have to say as well in all these things, uh pre-application liaison is quite important as well. So whether or not that can be incorporated in through, I don't know, for a community liaison group or such like don't know, don't know.

00:59:05:09 - 00:59:14:27
Absolutely. Absolutely. Think that's points been being dealt with but think it would be you know it's down to local authorities. That's what they do is not really a matter for.

00:59:16:18 - 00:59:24:23
For us, it's for the local authorities because they're responsible. They're responsible for considering and doing what they need to do in order to determine those.

00:59:26:08 - 00:59:33:07
So the local authorities then can actually influence the applicant in what their final Well, they can.

00:59:33:09 - 00:59:35:26
Choose to refuse them if they so wish then.

00:59:37:22 - 00:59:51:28

And what happens in I mean, I'm going to say what happens in practice is that there are situations where there's negotiations that can take place. The comments that are received, there are indeed pre-application submissions often for these things, which can be very, very helpful. Mr. Fox, is there anything that you.

00:59:52:13 - 01:00:24:02

Know about that Just. I'm just trying to give a direct trying to give it a direct answer as possible. The details of that band and the details of that substation both need to go to the LPA to approve or not approve. Whether they then engage with the community is for them. But it is the case that the level information we currently have about the substation and the band is not going to change from where we are now. Before the consent if before if consent is granted. But post consent if granted.

01:00:24:25 - 01:00:49:19

Pursuant to requirement six and seven, the details of the band and the substation will go to the LPA to approve. In doing so, we have to prove that our effects are not materially new and materially different from those in the ES. So if the substation within the parameters we've set for it was a little different from what we're saying now in considering that they would also be considering if the bond is appropriate in relation to that design of the substation.

01:00:50:07 - 01:00:59:10

Okay. So in theory then it can be readdress. Yes. That's a later stage with the with the council. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

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

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hughes.

01:01:11:12 - 01:01:30:05

Item seven is to cover schedules 3 to 14. And Mr. Fox. I think the only addition to the DCO, apart from a small change to the first column of some of these from district to area, is.

01:01:31:25 - 01:01:35:05

Part two. Temporary road closures.

01:01:40:09 - 01:01:50:00

Yes. So that was to add in with Road. But we had the discussion that we had on Tuesday and so that will be coming back out again.

01:01:50:19 - 01:01:51:13

Of course. Yeah.

01:01:53:08 - 01:01:53:27

Okay.

01:01:57:23 - 01:02:03:17

But any comments on Schedules 3 to 14 that anybody wanted to make?

01:02:10:01 - 01:02:23:05

On schedule 13. Just ask the applicant to make sure that there's obviously. I'm sure you will. It's obviously there's a ferry check of documents and plans to be certified to make sure those are absolutely up to date with correct dates, everything else.

01:02:25:02 - 01:02:25:22

Thank you.

01:02:31:10 - 01:02:53:05

Okay. That takes us to schedule 15, which is protective provisions. And think we think we've had an update on these already at this hearing. So unless there's anything anybody wants to particularly raise, we're not to any of the statutory consultees here. ET cetera or undertakers, rather. And any further update required I'm not necessarily asking for because I think it's all been covered.

01:02:54:00 - 01:02:57:00

Yes, sir. Just the left. That should be by seven.

01:03:03:20 - 01:03:06:08

And that takes us to schedule 16,

01:03:08:27 - 01:03:10:01

which is.

01:03:11:23 - 01:03:17:28

The procedure for the discharge of requirements.

01:03:20:04 - 01:03:22:14

Again, Mr. Fox, just a quick summary of.

01:03:25:11 - 01:03:26:16

The latest updates.

01:03:28:11 - 01:03:29:27

So So we haven't

01:03:31:14 - 01:04:03:10

changed the weeks since we did a deadline for in terms of the time periods of discharge. And as I said to start, we won't be making any further change and this state can start accordingly in light of the submissions we added. To make sure that we submit a copy of our applications to consultees at the same time as we submit to the approving body so that there's no kind of delay in that. And we have added provision on fees.

01:04:04:12 - 01:04:32:29

We have been asking for that. We did originally put forward a suggestion in terms of how fees could work. But in light of both Long Field and Boston turn of energy facility, having this provision say in practice, it's kind of in and out. But I think we accept that essentially the rules that apply to reserve after application fees apply here. So. That is the position.

01:04:39:08 - 01:04:48:24

Okay. Do the local authorities want to provide any submissions now on their latest position on schedule 16?

01:04:48:26 - 01:04:52:18

Just quickly. Justin Johnson Rutland County Council

01:04:54:12 - 01:05:30:14

will make further submissions on the on the timings here, what the applicants say in terms of not likely to change their position on that just in light of the debate that we've just had. You know, increased time does allow us to do further consultation with interested parties at the submission stage.

The other question I've just got on on the the fee section that's been put in and I was reading that and seemed to be relating to the discharge of planning conditions and the fees associated with that.

01:05:31:09 - 01:05:38:15

Mr. Fox Are you saying that it also includes fees related to reserved matters? Because that's, that's the bit that I wasn't clear on.

01:05:38:22 - 01:05:47:15

Sorry. That was that I think was being too summary there. Think regulation 16 one of those is the same as for conditions isn't it.

01:05:48:10 - 01:06:18:28

So yeah so my my question then and it's possibly for a discussion outside of here, but obviously the information that you submitted to us previously included the higher fees that related to. Preserve matters and the sums of money related to those application fees, whereas this would be limited or appear to be limited to only paying discharge of condition fees, which would be significantly lower. So just looking for some clarity on that.

01:06:19:26 - 01:06:20:11

Thanks.

01:06:23:07 - 01:06:24:06

And we'll have to take that away.

01:06:29:28 - 01:06:32:01

Okay, Mr. Willis.

01:06:33:17 - 01:06:50:12

Thank you, sir. Mark West, Lancashire County Council. No, I think Mr. Johnson's picked up the point about the fee. I think the time frame from his perspective, again, same as the applicant. I think we set our position and that's where we would be. It's now a matter to be decided by ourselves and Secretary of State.

01:06:52:21 - 01:07:14:00

And so you can just ask a question to the CPAs on that point about fees and reserved matters. Um, are you saying you would want the reserved matters fee for all of the requirements or. Um, if we were, for example, to have it for the detailed design approval only. Just want to get a handle on what your position is.

01:07:16:08 - 01:07:30:16

And yeah, I think we'd have to look at it. But yeah, that that was sort of the approach that I thought we were going for, was that it was for the, the, the approval of significant details such as the substation and things like that.

01:07:32:18 - 01:07:33:22

Take that, right? Yeah.

01:07:33:27 - 01:07:40:20

That discussion perhaps can continue offline, so to speak. That might be helpful. Mr. Jordan, did you have anything you wanted?

01:07:40:22 - 01:08:00:22

Yeah. Phil Jordan first. Steve. Yeah. Happy. Think the point about the timescales. I think we've reached the same position. I think that's now, you know, will be cleared up in the statement of common ground. It will be agreed to disagree and but on the fees think we're. Yeah welcome a bit more discussion and.

01:08:02:19 - 01:08:17:24

What's in there at the moment is different to the proposal put forward previously. I think there is some differentiation between the different types of requirements. So happy to have that discussion outside of this meeting and hopefully we can agree a position on that.

01:08:21:09 - 01:08:39:27

And in terms of. Issues where you do disagree. In the statement of the common ground. If you could set out your any alternative drafting or suggested drafting where there is disagreement. But that is as always, that is helpful.

01:08:42:07 - 01:08:42:22

Okay.

01:09:11:07 - 01:09:13:22

Okay. Any further points on schedule 16?

01:09:27:16 - 01:09:33:15

No. Okay. Thank you. So that covers the draft development consent.

01:09:35:12 - 01:09:39:19

Border. Thank you for all those submissions. And

01:09:41:07 - 01:09:50:21

as I've just alluded to, remain any points. Disagreement and see if those can be included in the statements of common Ground

01:09:53:00 - 01:09:56:24

or other submissions for other parties who are not doing statements of common ground.

01:10:01:19 - 01:10:04:15

Right. Where are we now? On the agenda? Uh.

01:10:10:17 - 01:10:27:06

Item ten is the proposed community liaison group provisions. And I think, Mr. Fox, that the applicant has. Included some content in the latest outline. Construction Environmental Management Plan 5059.

01:10:28:24 - 01:10:29:09

Can you just.

01:10:29:11 - 01:10:35:14

Provide an update on where? Yes on that. And I'll just ask for any comments from interested parties.

01:10:35:28 - 01:10:48:04

To the applicant. Say we provided that we will create a community group and the appendix. We've set out the terms of reference, which includes members.

01:10:50:20 - 01:11:03:11

The process of how meetings are arranged when they're happening. Um, agenda for the first meeting and then a process by which agendas continue to be able to be agreed. Um, and that.

01:11:05:00 - 01:11:10:12

Many more minutes to them and meet the later costs of them happening and.

01:11:13:15 - 01:11:15:05

Think. Think as much as I need to say.

01:11:22:03 - 01:11:47:28

I mean. I mean, suppose it started when would say the idea of it is supposed to be quite open. We just have what we think would be make sense for the first agenda item on the basis of the nomination discussions with the commitments we've made in the lab. But otherwise the idea is supposed to be an open forum where an agreed chair is able to work with us and the members to come up with agendas for each session. Okay.

01:11:48:06 - 01:11:49:19

Thank you, Mrs. Holloway.

01:11:50:27 - 01:12:25:18

It's all the way from my past action group. Um, can't remember when it was some. Some weeks back. Back when, um, Sarah Price approached me regarding the CLG and in principle, obviously was supportive of an idea of liaison group because we need to find some way of working with the communities where this to go ahead. However, the response that the Action Group gave at the time was that it needed quite a bit of consideration and consultation with other people.

01:12:25:21 - 01:12:56:16

Didn't want to give an instant answer as to whether the terms of reference that were presented here were good, bad or indifferent. Certainly looking at them could see quite a few things that didn't look right and didn't want to rush it. We're very much. Very busy in the examination and felt that it was just too early at this point for everybody to engage in getting all the terms of reference right and know that the applicant is very keen to get this bedded down before the end of the examination.

01:12:56:18 - 01:13:27:06

Think they made a comment in respect if they want to do it quicker than long field which has taken a bit longer. But I think we need the time as a community for people to get together, have a think about it, look at the mechanisms and processes and accountability. It's it's quite complex of, you know, how you run a group like this, how big it is, how small it is, how frequent the meetings, what kind of resource, what about the funding? There's a lot of things to think about. And I would say that we don't want to rush this.

01:13:27:08 - 01:13:48:00

It needs to be done properly. And I'm sure other fellow parish councils may, you know, obviously they'll hold their view as well, but that would be the position of the action group. We need more time and think while we're finishing off the examination. We can't give it that due consideration fully at the moment.

01:13:49:06 - 01:13:57:15

Okay. Thank you. Any more views from any interested parties? Mr. Birchfield Mike Trevor Birchfield Parish Council.

01:13:58:19 - 01:14:00:24

Um, whilst I concur with.

01:14:01:20 - 01:14:02:15

Mrs. Holloway from.

01:14:02:21 - 01:14:35:22

Past Action Group. There's a few things I can add now to hopefully the take away. The particular parishes that they include within this group amount to roughly 2600 people. That's just a piece of information. They're suggesting a group of approximately 20 people. 19 are from local bodies, one from Malpas Farm and one from the developer housing liaison officer.

01:14:36:29 - 01:14:37:14

Um.

01:14:38:03 - 01:15:02:01

There is no material benefit to the Andean and local communities. We didn't ask for it. We didn't want it. What should the be approved? This is just adding a huge amount of financial burden and stress to local communities and in particular the four parish councils. I'll count the one parish meeting for the purposes of this. As a parish council

01:15:03:29 - 01:15:09:27

looking after 2600 people, parish councils are completely underfunded as they are.

01:15:12:07 - 01:15:29:22

We don't have unlimited resources. So fundamentally, I'm asking for the developer to pay for people or persons from the community to represent the community, not just salary, but operating expenses as well.

01:15:32:05 - 01:15:32:21

Now.

01:15:33:07 - 01:15:47:03

You know they can roll their eyes. Of course they can. Right. But subsequently, we're not asking for huge amounts of money. You know something, in the region of point 14, which is roughly £13 an hour.

01:15:48:25 - 01:16:12:24

Which is not a huge amount of money to pay a person to take on, which will be, in my estimation, a massively stressful and painful job. Right. Particularly in the early days and particularly when the construction commences. It's got another point on it. But perhaps Mr. Fox would like to respond appropriately.

01:16:14:23 - 01:16:21:25

As far as behalf of the applicant. Apologies If you look like I was rolling my eyes, wasn't I was asking if I could come in to respond and

01:16:23:13 - 01:17:00:20

think we had what you had to say on this yesterday, Smithfield and did promise to take this away. Um, I think one aspect of it is thinking about the practicalities of how that would happen if it were to happen. Um, so that's what we need to think about in terms of whether we would give that commitment. Um, I should say that the, what we've committed to in the terms of reference is that the applicant would be paying for the kind of practical operation of the group, um, in terms of, you know, making sure adverts go out and hire who are hiring the venue, hiring the equipment, etcetera.

01:17:01:03 - 01:17:39:00

Um, so think that um, uh, take away the principle, but think any kind of payment would need to be, um, thought about how we do that and make sure we're paying for the relevant activities relevant to this group. Um, in terms of Holloway's point. Um, I think that what we can do is add something to the terms of reference to allow them to change for the first meeting and to allow, um, the membership to change if necessary, so that we can have the first meeting.

01:17:39:02 - 01:17:57:12

And if that first meeting is actually a discussion of how it's going to work and that needs to change, then that can be done in the context of the terms of reference, um, being able to change. So we'll look at, we'll look at updating that to allow for change and discussion on that change.

01:17:59:22 - 01:18:05:17

So there will be some opportunity for because it's only the outline management plan anyway. So

01:18:07:06 - 01:18:10:14

there'll be some there will be opportunity for the final details.

01:18:13:03 - 01:18:13:18

To be.

01:18:13:20 - 01:18:18:11

To be to be established at a later stage. Bearing in mind what Mrs. Holloway said.

01:18:18:25 - 01:18:49:18

Think at the moment, because that would just be through the signing of the requirement. I wouldn't want the sign off of the camp to be held off by writing about what the terms of reference about the look like. And what I'm saying is that what we've committed to is the detail camp will provide for the creation of the with those terms of reference. But we will allow. We were right into terms of reference at the first meeting. We will discuss those terms of reference and if there thought they need to change, then that can happen and you go on from there.

01:18:50:01 - 01:18:58:09

Okay, but I'm not proposing that the detailed Kemp requires a terms of reference to be signed off because that seems entirely disproportionate.

01:18:59:00 - 01:19:03:19

This is all we have got to the point, Mr.. Mrs. Holloway, just want you further on that.

01:19:03:22 - 01:19:22:03

Mrs. Holloway Action Group. Yes. I mean, we obviously need some flexibility, I think, as it stands. Yes. It's an initial outline, suggested terms of reference, but there are a number and don't mean it rudely. There are a number of holes in it. And also there needs to be a consideration how it interfaces with the

01:19:24:07 - 01:19:56:13

because just note in here talks all about the construction and traffic and all the rest of it. You're not going to get the proper sort of engagement and working if we've got to have two working groups sort of running in parallel with each other. It just needs a lot more thought. It really is quite complicated. You might have to have subcommittees or something for certain things because you need a lot more detail on a certain subject. It's not going to be easy to run a meeting with 2025 people, not if you're needing to make decisions and get things done.

01:19:57:11 - 01:20:06:04

So as long as there is complete flexibility on the other side of the DCO, then that's okay.

01:20:08:03 - 01:20:44:01

That just comes in. Mr. Fox and the applicant. So we'll look at that. I think we committed yesterday to look at how the and work together, noting that whilst the parishes will be on both and it wasn't the intention that impact or some of the other members of the would be on that we appreciate the point and think we will look at those terms of reference and the wording that introduces them to ensure there is the necessary flexibility. But what wanted to make sure and think this is what you want, sir, is that we talk to everybody about how this is going to work and that's what we want to do.

01:20:44:09 - 01:21:15:20

Yes, that is important. Recognise Mr. Holloway's point to that in terms of the work that Malcolm's group are doing in terms of the examination, the why, why the Community Liaison group, final terms of reference details on necessarily top of the agenda. So I'm sure that the provision can be incorporated through wording to make sure that those matters can be clarified and agreed at later stage. Don't the authorities are can be involved in that, obviously in that as well. I don't know how much there's a community liaison officer or expert at local authorities.

01:21:15:22 - 01:21:19:03

I'm not sure. I'm not I'm not sure if there is no there are some, but.

01:21:25:01 - 01:21:26:18

Mr. Berthold, you had another point.

01:21:27:08 - 01:22:04:09

Yeah. Trevor Bethel Parish Council. Thank you, Mr. Fox, for taking that away. And I'm sure we can find a mechanism if you can find roughly 30,000 a year. Now, the £250 million project to be able to accommodate paying for a person. So thank you for taking that away. This probably comes on two terms of reference. Um, but section 2.3 of the appendix states from time to time additional group of parish council representatives or members of the public with an interest can be co-opted on its full members of the code.

01:22:04:17 - 01:22:25:18

If all members of the agree, that's a massive hole, right? It should be a simple majority because you know. You're never going to get 25 people to agree whether person or person be conjoin. But that's one of the holes that I'm sure Mrs. Holloway is talking about.

01:22:27:17 - 01:22:32:17

Thank you, sir. Okay. Thank you. Is that noted, Mr. Fox? Okay.

01:22:35:15 - 01:22:38:03

Okay. Anything further on the community liaison?

01:22:39:00 - 01:22:39:15

Group.

01:22:46:03 - 01:22:47:27

Okay before we go on to.

01:22:49:25 - 01:23:00:28

Oceans are rising. Are there any other relevant matters other than the timetable, which I intend to just come back on to now as well? Anybody wishes to raise.

01:23:04:16 - 01:23:11:10

So on the going back to the timetable, uh, amendments, which I.

01:23:13:14 - 01:23:15:07

Enabled his potentials this morning.

01:23:19:03 - 01:23:25:11

I come to Mr. Fox last on this. Any comments, first of all, from the local authorities?

01:23:27:13 - 01:23:28:10

On what was said.

01:23:31:02 - 01:23:36:12

Filter on Steam Industry Council now was happy with the suggestions.

01:23:38:08 - 01:23:41:19

Put forward. So there's no issues from our side.

01:23:42:29 - 01:23:44:04

Okay. Thank you.

01:23:44:26 - 01:23:49:16

Sir Justin Johnson, Rutland County Council. Likewise. Am happy with the proposed changes.

01:23:52:06 - 01:23:53:22

Okay, Mr. Willis?

01:23:54:06 - 01:24:10:22

Yeah. Similarly, balancing with other echoes in the process. But yeah, I think we can certainly accommodate that. And I assume we also include that Mr. Fox's 24th of October. Think you incorporated that. That's the suggestion, wasn't it, in terms of comments on the DC?

01:24:11:06 - 01:24:24:09

Yes, that was Mr. Fox's suggestion, which I understand obviously we've got to this week final timetable. But yes, there was no sort of outward objection to that when it was raised at the time. So yeah, so.

01:24:24:12 - 01:24:25:03

Have supported.

01:24:25:24 - 01:24:28:09

Consider that and we've a look to incorporating it.

01:24:29:11 - 01:24:30:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:24:31:09 - 01:24:31:27

Okay.

01:24:32:06 - 01:24:34:18

And Mrs. Holloway.

01:24:36:21 - 01:25:09:00

This is all away from this action group. Uh, broadly speaking, we're happy with the changes to the deadlines and the addition of deadline ten. However, we're concerned that the closing submission by all parties should be at the very end of the examination, i.e. the new D10, not the new D9, with no opportunity for anybody to make further comments after that. So this would assume no new information or evidence will be submitted at this final stage.

01:25:09:02 - 01:25:16:02

And this would give a level playing field to all parties in giving their final summary statement.

01:25:17:09 - 01:25:18:21

So you're saying.

01:25:20:22 - 01:25:32:17

Your suggestion would be for the final position statements. Whatever word we use for them would be all submitted at deadline ten, which would be affected the last day of examinations and.

01:25:33:06 - 01:25:41:00

Yes, and it would be for yourselves as the examiners to look at those closing statements and obviously draw your conclusions.

01:25:41:18 - 01:26:18:24

I mean, the point about is a good point you raise about there being no evidence. It's very important that they don't raise or bring in or introduce any further evidence. It's really a summary of all the representations and evidence or the relevant bits that have been put before the examinations in the parties positions on particularly where there are still disagreements and similar, I suppose the closing submissions you might get as a planning inquiry and. And they can be very useful documents in that regard. Normally it would be the applicant who has the final comment on such matters.

01:26:19:06 - 01:26:20:07

What do you think about.

01:26:20:11 - 01:26:45:28

I was going to say actually think think. We're happy with that and really great. And think also because if we're saying that the final I think the idea would be the final, final management plans. Everything would be at nine. And whilst. It's only six days and I'm imagining the closing submissions would have already started to be drafted, but at least then everyone's closing submission on that last day is responding to the very final version of everything.

01:26:46:26 - 01:27:18:15

Yep. That's is advantage of that. So. So the closing submissions could be on a suggested by Mrs. Holloway on the final date. You'll have anybody from the councils have any comments on on that. So that would be on Thursday the 16th of. November. And again, it's very important they don't contain any late evidence because clearly they come in on that day. Not much time for us to talk about it.

01:27:18:29 - 01:27:19:14

Yeah.

01:27:25:27 - 01:27:30:09

Okay. Anything further on those? Mr. Belfield.

01:27:30:24 - 01:27:46:17

Trevor Berthold Essendon Parish Council. So this is not flippant at all. There have been issues with people uploading documents and if everybody is going to fire everything on the 16th. Can your staff please ensure that you've got a computer that works okay?

01:27:46:20 - 01:27:47:05

Uh.

01:27:47:24 - 01:28:04:06

Well, yes, we'll we'll we'll ensure that, Yeah. Think for the number of documents that you should expect. It should be fine. But take your point. And I understand occasionally there is problems with that from time to time. I strongly suspect that. Shouldn't it be? It shouldn't be a problem. Um,

01:28:05:25 - 01:28:17:21

and what is the what is the actual. A good question is I don't know the answer to is what actually is the actual deadline drop deadline for the end of the examination. And presuming it's, uh, do we actually say we say 2359.

01:28:18:02 - 01:28:19:20

We actually said not.

01:28:20:16 - 01:28:35:10

So it must be yeah, it must be effectively. 1159 is the time. Now. Sometimes we put in the timetable, the actual time. Uh, so yes, it is actually 11:59 p.m. on the.

01:28:35:12 - 01:28:36:00

16th.

01:28:36:02 - 01:28:42:03

Of November would be the last opportunity for those submissions.

01:28:44:08 - 01:28:47:00

Okay. So what we will do is.

01:28:50:00 - 01:29:05:15

Obviously consider what's been said this week and as I said earlier, proposed to issue the procedural change for the revised timetable a week tomorrow, next Friday, on the same day as the release will be issued.

01:29:19:10 - 01:29:23:28

Right and think we should review the actions arising. Mr. James, are you.

01:29:25:21 - 01:29:27:19

Okay to go through those?

01:29:27:21 - 01:29:28:17

Yes.

01:29:28:19 - 01:29:29:05

Thank you.

01:29:29:20 - 01:29:33:05

Okay. Fairly long list. Um.

01:29:34:24 - 01:30:01:02

All actions for the applicant and deadline seven and last date. Otherwise, just somewhat repeating myself too much. The first one, though, is for the local planning authorities with comments on the cumulative effects list that was submitted by the applicant. Um, then we have the applicants Review Past Action Group Deadline six Comments regarding the Draft Consent Order.

01:30:04:04 - 01:30:04:23

You said that again.

01:30:04:25 - 01:30:10:19

Didn't the applicants review the past action group Deadline six Comments regarding the developed concerns. Order.

01:30:13:05 - 01:30:13:20

And I

01:30:15:02 - 01:30:28:06

think really that was then made comments about the definition maintain and the clarity on whether the new wording what that actually applies to specifically that point which is taking the action to do. Yeah. Um. Yeah.

01:30:32:09 - 01:30:41:21

And ask for five in the clarified and no materially new or different effects from those assessed and the operational phase can occur during maintenance.

01:30:43:28 - 01:31:02:18

The action for the applicant and the local authorities around the chassis drafting to address concerns regarding the lack of approval for maintenance. The maintenance schedule and the LPA is to be given the opportunity to confirm or otherwise that there are no new or materially different effects from those assessed in the

01:31:05:21 - 01:31:11:16

review of the definition of maintained. Clarify that the intention is that does not allow replacement panels all at once.

01:31:13:26 - 01:31:28:29

An action for the applicant and Rutland County Council. A discussion between the parties. Regarding the council suggestion of passing bays and improvements on Offerton Lane would need to be kept or reinstated to support maintenance.

01:31:39:24 - 01:31:46:04

Clarification on the rate of technological improvements. Think this is around panel efficiency.

01:31:48:03 - 01:31:48:19

Um.

01:31:49:17 - 01:31:52:09

Continued liaising with the internal drainage board.

01:31:52:24 - 01:31:53:17

Sorry, Sorry, sir.

01:31:53:28 - 01:32:19:24

Didn't follow that that last item. Because think, um. And there's an action there necessarily. The point is. It doesn't matter what the replacement rates could be. But do not want to be had the conversation we had earlier. But the controls are controls are. Unless you're asking. If you only had five. How long would it take you to replace the whole scheme? If that's what you think.

01:32:19:26 - 01:32:24:26

That's an officer of a conversation with the county Council on that as a as an issue.

01:32:27:18 - 01:32:47:20

Right, because I think that's that's related to your previous action. So the question is, if we've got you can only do fives movements over however long that would take if we were going to do that to replace it is whether that requires junction improvements and passing places. And it's really about replacing, right? It's just all those works needed on the controls that we've got.

01:32:49:28 - 01:32:51:25

Okay. This is Smith. This.

01:32:53:28 - 01:32:56:15

Because if you on this is an action point, that's all.

01:33:03:25 - 01:33:32:07

Thank you, sir. Julie Smith, Rutland County Council Highways. Um, no, I don't think I was. I think the point I was making was that whether passing by, whether the passing bays could just remain on the basis that there will be obviously the decommissioning stage and also now potentially a lot of activity associated with replacement of the panels. Um.

01:33:34:20 - 01:33:41:07

So I think it's the discussion between us and the applicant is about whether they could remain.

01:33:43:00 - 01:33:51:28

Yeah. Yes. Yeah. We'll talk about whether they need to think is with one coming from and would just add on the passing place. Of course we've committed to restoring them for ecological reasons.

01:33:52:16 - 01:34:28:14

Yeah. Think the action was a discussion between the two parties on that particular point. And then the next action was discussion around panel efficiency in the future and they potential extent to which there may improve was giving some clarification or supporting documentation on that points. Um, and then liaison or continued liaison with the Internal Drainage Board and Lynch County Council in relation to issues around the application of Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act to resolve any standing issues.

01:34:30:02 - 01:34:33:25

And that was before the exam. The examination deadline's seven now.

01:34:34:13 - 01:34:40:27

Well, I mean, think the point is, we need to get their consent. So the discussions are ongoing to achieve that. Yeah. Yeah.

01:34:42:09 - 01:34:58:02

And revise Article eight one to address its issue around that. Um, the next one didn't quite catch which requirement, but there was a reference to the need to refer to junction improvements

01:34:59:18 - 01:35:00:04
equipment.

01:35:00:06 - 01:35:06:18
662. I'm adding a junction. Improvements in parking and passing places.

01:35:08:20 - 01:35:21:15
Okay. Um, clarification of requirements. Six five in response to feedback from Lynch County Council. Yep. Add the word prior to article nine five.

01:35:23:28 - 01:35:38:25
This is one of the Lincoln County Council suggested revisions to the applicant for consideration in relation to asking 12 on put rights to this issue. There was a commitment to feedback to the applicant before deadline seven.

01:35:41:26 - 01:35:50:01
And then to review that subsequent information and respond back in examination by deadline 7 or 8. Yep.

01:35:51:28 - 01:36:04:17
And one action for the applicant and local authorities to continue working on the side agreement against the Section 278 and submit that examining authority before the exam before the end of the examination.

01:36:07:02 - 01:36:27:26
Amend Article 21 be to refer to authorised residence not undertaking so swapping those terms rather think it was the suggested change. Um, clarification for Mrs. Holloway regarding the issues discussed around compensation.

01:36:31:15 - 01:36:55:26
So well. Think, think discussion. There was a workshop last week had said that the applicant was prepared to listen to people if they had their subsoil rights taken, instead of them having to go off to the tribunal to go get £50 or whatever it would be worth. Um, and I said, we've already made that commitment on the website and we're not going to be putting it in the data. So don't think there's any, don't think.

01:36:58:19 - 01:37:02:28
I thought there was enough to take. Take it away and concern about. Fine. Remove it.

01:37:07:20 - 01:37:15:13
Uh, check if there's a reference in the lamp that refers to a scenario when less land is needed and how that particular situation may be managed.

01:37:17:09 - 01:37:34:00
It where the requirement nine and 14 need to cross-reference each of us is the relationships in the water and so related issues Update Requirement 18 to refer to the 60th time limits on a separate line for clarity.

01:37:35:18 - 01:37:38:18
Review sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the.

01:37:42:00 - 01:37:50:06

Let's consider the scope for reference in the DCO to preparation consultation with the community prior to submission to the LPs.

01:37:50:22 - 01:38:19:00

And so just on the previous item, think the specific amendment to the ident was around. The will set out the. The a confirmation that all decommissioning works that we've committed to will happen. Um and then on on that pre consultation point, there's not really an action there from our point of view because I don't think we're going to be offering anything more than this currently in the end documentation.

01:38:19:28 - 01:38:22:20

Sorry, which action was that to the.

01:38:23:12 - 01:38:28:06

The one after the. Sorry. So um, so the application compensation.

01:38:28:13 - 01:38:29:10

Yeah. Yeah.

01:38:30:01 - 01:38:32:14

We see that. As for the LPs to decide.

01:38:37:00 - 01:39:13:00

And the response to Rutland County Council's comments and Schedule 16 regarding fees. And with further discussion between the various parties on the fees issues with subsequent dates and the state's common grounds, that discussion with Rutland County Council, Lancashire County Council as well as South Kesteven District Council. And then finally, consideration of the terms of reference of the Community Liaison Group to allow discussion on the membership of the group and also consideration of wider improvements that could be made to that document in light of feedback.

01:39:13:27 - 01:39:15:29

And flexibility in the future. Germany on it.

01:39:17:29 - 01:39:24:17

That concludes my list. If there's any further actions that people have been missed from that, I.

01:39:24:19 - 01:39:29:29

Think there's an action for us to go back to Mr. Belfield on the parish councils, of course.

01:39:31:15 - 01:39:37:29

Yes, I think that was recorded yesterday. But but yeah, can can note it again.

01:39:39:21 - 01:39:40:06

Thank you.

01:39:42:22 - 01:39:43:07

Okay.

01:39:49:00 - 01:39:50:02

Timetable.

01:39:51:25 - 01:39:52:10

We'll see

01:39:54:21 - 01:39:55:15
in the 16th.

01:39:58:18 - 01:40:02:23
After that date on spectrum. Accept any further.

01:40:03:19 - 01:40:04:17
Submissions.

01:40:04:27 - 01:40:05:28
We have.

01:40:06:07 - 01:40:07:04
Three months to.

01:40:07:06 - 01:40:16:16
Make our recommendation or recommendation report after the 16th, and that would be due in 1616.

01:40:16:18 - 01:40:18:08
February.

01:40:18:10 - 01:40:34:15
2024. That go to the Secretary of State and she will have three months to make the decision on the application. Unless that period is extended for any reason.

01:40:43:11 - 01:41:04:25
The usual reminder that the recording of the hearing will be on the website as soon as possible after the hearing, and it would assist us, as always, if you could provide a written version of your submissions by deadline seven, which is the 10th of October. Any further matters, housekeeping or otherwise, before I close the hearing?

01:41:17:27 - 01:41:19:12
Can I just ask then, that.

01:41:19:14 - 01:41:25:26
This is the last time that the public will be at any meeting? There's no meetings. This is the last hearing?

01:41:25:29 - 01:41:34:27
Yes, the last hearing in the examination. Obviously, there are still seven, eight, nine. Yeah. 3 or 4. Which were written deadlines. Yes.

01:41:34:29 - 01:41:43:04
Accessed on the library, but not. And are we allowed to respond to those? Yeah. Because it's the next deadlines. Yeah.

01:41:43:06 - 01:41:43:23
Yes.

01:41:43:26 - 01:41:52:29

If you want clarification on that then do do talk to about that. After after the hearing you'll be able to just clarify any point in relation to that. But there are yes, this is the last.

01:41:53:21 - 01:41:54:06

Oral.

01:41:54:08 - 01:42:11:16

Hearing for oral submissions, but there will be opportunities through the remaining deadlines for written submissions in accordance with their timetable, which is going to be revised. And we'll confirm the final revised timetable next Friday, which will be largely in accordance with what was discussed a few moments ago.

01:42:11:19 - 01:42:12:08

Thank you.

01:42:12:10 - 01:42:12:25

Okay.

01:42:15:29 - 01:42:50:06

Okay. Well, thank you for everyone's submissions both today and at previous hearings and all the written submissions that have been made so far in the examination. And of course we look forward to receiving further representations as needed at subsequent deadlines. We also appreciate the effort, endeavour and time that has been put into the engagement by all parties, including obviously the local residents and the work done by the action group, which is appreciated, obviously the applicant and the local authorities as well.

01:42:50:08 - 01:43:09:03

So everyone's involvement is very much appreciated by us in responding to our questions and in making representations. So thank you for those all those submissions and all your related work. And so it remains me to say thank you, everybody. The hearing is now closed. Thank you. Thank you.

01:43:09:05 - 01:43:09:10

Sir.