

File Name: ISH5 13th March 2024 Part 4.mp3
File Length: 01:33:24

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:06:13:02 - 00:06:13:24

Back everyone.

00:06:19:06 - 00:06:51:15

And I shall resume, um, this issue specific hearing five. Just looking through the, um, remaining elements relating to, um, landscape and visual. Um, and these referred to the, the management of control of hedgerow and tree removal and management of mitigation enhancements, post measures, post consent, and also the assessment of cumulative landscape and visual effects. I had I just had a few specific points to raise under those items.

00:06:51:27 - 00:07:27:18

Um, and so I'm going to suggest that I move those into my, my, my section of the written questions, um, rather than address them here, which would allow us to move on to start agenda item five, which is cumulative impacts. So, um, I'm going to ask whether, um, any of the other parties present wanted to, to raise matters relating to, um, the, uh, items for C and for D before we move on to cumulative.

00:07:29:03 - 00:07:30:12

Uh, impacts.

00:07:39:11 - 00:07:41:01

Yes, Mr.. Mr. Sheikh.

00:07:43:01 - 00:07:59:04

Some Somerset West Lindsey District Council. Yes, ma'am. Relatively straightforward point. Firstly, in relation to sea. Um, it may be that the applicant is addressing this. Anyway, I'm told that it might be something that's not going to be in dispute, but it relates to, uh, article 39.

00:08:01:00 - 00:08:07:13

And it's in relation to the power to remove protected trees.

00:08:11:15 - 00:08:41:00

Um, so it's true, subject to preservation tree preservation orders. Our position on that is that as currently drafted, it, it doesn't reflect the advice. Note 15 guidance on this, which indicates that, um, such articles really ought to specifically refer to certain or specified TPUs as opposed to just being a blanket, uh, ability to remove any typos. It's as simple as that at this stage.

00:08:43:29 - 00:09:01:26

Thank you, Mr. Shaikh. And that is something that I have actually noted in, in, in the schedule of, of written questions, I believe. So I don't know whether the applicant wants to respond to that here or respond to respond in writing. Um, Miss Broderick, have you got your hand up or is it is it somebody else?

00:09:03:10 - 00:09:50:15

Uh, no I didn't. I just have my hand up and determination to moving on to the next agenda item. But I we will we will provide a response in writing it. The same comment was made in relation to the Cottom examination. We've got a detailed written response going through the various guidance

elements. So we'll provide that response in writing rather than going rather than going through it here. Um, my other comment was just in relation to moving on to cumulative, whether whether we were still going to deal with cumulative landscape and visual effects such that it was necessary for, um, the landscape and visual, um, persons to stay, stay on call, they very much can do if, if there were questions that, um, overlap ecology and and landscape and visual.

00:09:50:17 - 00:10:02:14

But I just I wasn't quite clear because we've got we had agenda item 4D which was cumulative landscape and visual effects. I wasn't quite sure whether we, we just putting those in agenda item five or whether we didn't have any questions. That was a.

00:10:08:17 - 00:10:16:13

I do have some specific points. In relation in the in section five on landscape. Um.

00:10:20:19 - 00:10:28:29

So, so helpful. If they could stay for for an hour, please. Um, sorry. I'm losing track now. Mister. Mister McBride.

00:10:30:26 - 00:10:53:18

The commanding Brightlingsea County Council. Yeah, it was a similar sort of point really, and it was just, uh, to clarify whether we were going to pick up cumulative issues in the agenda item five. Um, and if not, then I was going to invite Mr. Brown just to say anything else that he wanted to say under that aspect, because it's clearly an important topic to us. So it was just really for that clarification. Yeah.

00:10:53:26 - 00:11:00:04

There are some other points to, to, to raise, underwrite and five. So if you could hang on that would be that will be helpful. Thank you.

00:11:02:03 - 00:11:10:23

All right. Um. So, uh, moving on then to to agenda item five. Um.

00:11:16:27 - 00:11:48:12

So the first part of this item asks the applicant to give us an overview of how cumulative effects have been considered, including the methodology employed. Um, any updates and the approach to ongoing collaboration? Um, I note particularly that, uh, an additional document has been submitted at deadline for. This is the technical note on cumulative effects of additional schemes with reference to three additional schemes, um, that meet the criteria for assessment.

00:11:48:26 - 00:12:25:13

Um, and this is the one Earth solar solar farm, the Great North Road solar park and Stow Park solar farm. It also sets out that three further schemes have been excluded from consideration, one of which is um, the steeples renewables uh solar project. Um. So in terms of the, of that technical report, um, the purpose of this is to look at the cumulative effects of additional schemes, um, uh, that that have emerged since the, uh, the start of the Joint Interrelationships report.

00:12:25:24 - 00:13:04:24

Um, though it's not clear, um, how this additional information has, has informed a holistic understanding of cumulative effects. Um, so, for example, the technical note on cumulative effects provides an assessment of potential significant environmental effects resulting from these projects cumulative with the West Burton scheme, but not with the others considered in the Joint Report on Interrelationships. And so, as part of the the review that we've asked the applicant to give to start off

with, it would be helpful if we could have some clarity on how these additional projects have informed and understand, uh, an understanding of possible cumulative effects overall.

00:13:06:10 - 00:13:11:06

Um, so could could I ask the applicant to, um, to start us off, please?

00:13:13:27 - 00:13:46:26

Uh, the applicant, uh, let, um, the set the introduce herself in a moment. In terms of the approach to the methodology, I guess one of the initial points, just to make clear, is that the interrelationships report, um, was a document that was specifically requested originally in the gate. Burton examined it purely to consider the cumulative effects of the of the four inset projects that had been identified as part of um as part of that examination. So that was get Burton, Cottam, West Burton and the tail bridge scheme.

00:13:47:06 - 00:14:21:24

Um, so the content of that interrelationships report is therefore limit because of how it was dealt with during the gate Burton examination. Um, is limited to addressing only those four projects. Um gate Burton examination has obviously closed um since more information has become available. So as this examination is ongoing, um, and we have access to that information, we have updated our cumulative assessment. Just to be clear, we're not looking up the applicants. Cumulative assessment is considering the cumulative impacts of all of the schemes.

00:14:22:09 - 00:14:50:27

You know, all schemes together. It's just set out within two separate documents. Because the interrelationship report was very much limited to those four schemes. As a result of the Gate Burton application, we have considered the totality of cumulative impacts as part of our scheme, but we weren't able to add the additional projects to the joint interrelationship report because the Gate Burton project had finished. So that's why we've done it separately. Separate technical note, um, in order to ensure that, um.

00:14:52:29 - 00:15:27:16

Potential that separation, I suppose, and to take account of that, that the gate that an examination has has closed. And obviously the Secretary of State requires more information in the respect of that scheme than, than, than he or she would ask for it at the relevant time. But I just wanted to make that point clear, is it's just a presentational issue. Not that we have failed to consider the cumulative impacts of all of the different projects. And together. But in terms of the methodology, I can hand over to the city, if you had, you require an overview of the approach that we've taken.

00:15:28:03 - 00:15:31:01

A brief one, please, bearing in mind where we're up to. Thank you.

00:16:08:11 - 00:16:13:00

Not quite sure what we're waiting for. This is.

00:16:16:21 - 00:16:20:08

Okay. Coverage of that. Are you able to hear us now? Yes.

00:16:20:10 - 00:16:21:02

Yes.

00:16:22:02 - 00:16:25:00

I thought that he might speak again. I think we lost. Um. Sam.

00:16:25:05 - 00:16:26:12

Okay. All right then.

00:16:28:00 - 00:16:59:11

Part of that is, um, on behalf of the applicant, um, the applicant that they claim to have that methodology in chapter two. Um, in section 2.5, they learn that the community element, including appendix 3.3 of the year, which are a 59, um, and then shortly that presented with a technical chapter of the year, which is a topic for debate. And they've done that on methodology and application, including the goal of other development and development that fall within the town of England.

00:16:59:13 - 00:17:00:22

But due to by my chapter

00:17:02:15 - 00:17:29:05

and the chapter, um, there are deductions that that are identified. And then the chapter 23, which is a summary of the year, which is that we do I tend that that the summary of the beginning of that, um, came to that and by. The document included um, cotton data product, which is a cloud, um, dominating gate button, and they're closed until a big rigid blade.

00:17:31:07 - 00:18:01:26

Um, mentioned earlier, um, we have I put that down the inflation uh, report, um, the recent update to that included the additional tools and agriculture, um, which is included in the Bert and um, yeah. Um, rather than with an economic puppet. I think that the gate button and updated by some with the deadline there. Um, I mentioned they did a live document under the updated further do an examination poster, and it would be updated in the download and do their application.

00:18:02:01 - 00:18:04:21

Um, but it had been submitted and adapted.

00:18:06:08 - 00:18:28:18

Um, yeah. But they provided an additional technical note. Um, at the deadline for which is four divided by three, which provides an assessment of the cumulative and additional claim which have not already been considered within the statement. Because at the time that we prepared, there was no not sufficient information in public domain for the project to be converted.

00:18:30:05 - 00:18:42:24

The claim. The additional tactical note includes an attachment of potential genetic and environmental impact. The Dalton Family Product Committee within the team, including Park Runner and Great New Road.

00:18:44:20 - 00:19:01:12

We are also providing an update to the deadline by to incorporate Green Bin Data Farm and Beacon Van, which had been buried by another deadline for submission. That is the idea of where we are and what we have done and methodology.

00:19:02:03 - 00:19:11:12

Thank you. And you're very helpfully preempted. My next question. So so that's good. I was going to refer to the, um, 7000 acres submission. Um.

00:19:13:00 - 00:19:47:22

So so so the point is, and it's been made that this is a fast moving situation with new applications emerging and others progressing. Um, and greater clarity as to the, the form and nature of, of new and existing applications. Um. Going forward all the time. It seems. So. Um, I don't know whether the

applicants got any any further comments on the extent to which, um, this changing landscape can and should be, um, uh, considered or before the Secretary of state in determining the application.

00:19:47:24 - 00:19:57:21

I know you've already commented, um, briefly on this, Mr. Broderick. I don't know whether you would say anything further or whether, um, the host authorities have got any any comments in that respect.

00:20:01:07 - 00:20:03:02

Mr. McBride, what would you like to say?

00:20:05:03 - 00:20:35:20

Okay, mom. I was going to wait until Mr. Broderick spoke, but, uh, I'm happy to, uh, speak now, if if you wish. Uh, I think it was really just a bit of clarification again. Uh, from from what the applicant was saying that the original purpose of this joint relating to relationship report was just to pick up the four schemes, uh, within the West Lindsey area. But, uh, the plan that accompanies that document obviously includes schemes which are much further afield than, um, just within the West Lindsey area.

00:20:35:22 - 00:21:30:09

So it was really, uh, a little bit of a clarification on that point. And finally, as you just mentioned, in terms of the change in landscape, uh, there's another scheme that has emerged in Lincolnshire in February, the Meridian Meridian Solar project, which is, um, not too far away from Beacon Fen. So again, it's sort of as you've highlighted, that was the purpose of this document, just to pick up, um, the schemes very much in the micro area around, um, West Lindsey or as perhaps we understood it to be, to, to look at perhaps a more of a macro scale to, to look at the, um, sort of the, all the schemes in, in Lincolnshire, but also obviously given the proximity of Nottinghamshire, uh, to, to the site that um, they should be included as well.

00:21:30:11 - 00:21:35:24

So I'm a little bit uncertain as to where the terms of reference are with this, with this document now.

00:21:41:28 - 00:21:57:12

So just handing back to the the applicant in terms of of of what what what could and should reasonably be the, the, the um the approach to dealing with cumulative impacts, bearing in mind this, this changing landscape.

00:21:59:21 - 00:22:57:09

Garbage can? Yes. As I said, because of the way in which the interrelationship report was first requested on Gait Burton and what was required by the examining authority in respect of that particular application. Um, the interrelationship report is therefore limited to considering those four projects, albeit that all of the all of the applicants for the various schemes have committed to updating that port to make sure it remains up to date as and when new information becomes available. So for example, as Mr. mentioned, um, as and when the bridge DCO application um is submitted, which we understand will happen prior to the close of this examination, um, we should be able to update the interrelationship report prior to the close of this examination to confirm whether or not the, um, conclusions on the assessment of cumulative impacts and, you know, need to be changed or whether they remain the same as we'd assess them at the at the stage.

00:22:57:11 - 00:23:34:12

So we're hopeful that there will be another update to take into account to bridge DCO application in respect of this interrelationship report. However, because of the way it was specifically requested in the Gate Burton application, um, there isn't um. An appetite to increase the scope of that particular

document. However, as we said, the applicant has considered other projects that have come forward and the way that it's decided to do that is via the technical note that's been submitted. And as we said, that will be updated again to, um, refer to the projects listed by 7000 acres.

00:23:34:24 - 00:24:18:02

Um, we've made a note of the further project that Mr. McBride has just mentioned, and we will have a look at that and see what stage it's at and where that needs to be. Um, taken into account based on the information that's publicly available at that. So it's very much our intention to keep the assessment of cumulative impacts up to date throughout this examination. Um, whether the Secretary of State requires action when he or she comes to make a decision is a matter for the Secretary of State to consider at that point in time, and that will no doubt depend on what may or may not have happened in in the intervening period between when, uh, when the examination closes and when they come to make a decision.

00:24:18:09 - 00:24:24:08

Um, but we're very much committed to making sure we've kept up to date on cumulative impacts throughout the examination. Um.

00:24:25:27 - 00:24:54:24

And just, just following on from, from that, does that also, um, relate to how does that then relate to the, um, the cumulative impact assessments that have been undertaken in the relevant chapters of the environmental statement, bearing in mind this this fast moving situation and the, um, the emergence of schemes, new schemes, um, do those cumulative considerations need to be reviewed? Uh, on those on the, on the, on, on on those relevant topics?

00:24:58:00 - 00:25:02:11

And, um, I'll hand over to Mr.. And respond on that particular one. Thank you.

00:25:02:28 - 00:25:27:29

So, um, we are we're kind of in there claiming that, um, and we will be doing an updated committed but um, addendum which will be, um, written down all the relevant chapter updates, um, that have been provided through different connect and relationship support that would be submitted at deadline by that that will capture all of you update, um, that we are talking about in one plane.

00:25:30:07 - 00:25:45:21

And so that will look at each of the relevant chapters of the environmental statement in terms of, um, whether an update to those those particular considerations, those particular topics needs to be needs to be given. It needs to be undertaken.

00:25:46:17 - 00:25:56:20

The fact that there would be, um, a section, um, chapter, um, and there'll be an update. I do, um, wrap into what the updates are and how that happened.

00:25:57:09 - 00:25:58:06

Okay. Thank you.

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

Oh my. Dude. Do any of the parties have any comments on.

00:26:07:01 - 00:26:35:00

On where we're up to before we move on to the final elements of this, this part a of um, uh, agenda item five, um, relates to whether an appropriate level of detail has been considered. Um, at a

construction, operational and decommission stages. Um, I suppose we can move on to that now as well. Um, any particular comments? I've got some specific questions to pick up. Yes, Mr. Shaikh.

00:26:36:09 - 00:27:09:14

Somerset West Lindsey District Council. Yes. It's just a position in respect of the level of detail in relation to coordination. We note that there is an interrelationship report, um, and that there is anticipated or speculative coordination between parties in relation to different projects. Our only concern is that there's nothing technically to secure that because it's obviously, um, a coordinated approach depending on whether consent is granted. And it's understood that there are practical limitations to that.

00:27:09:16 - 00:27:14:28

But it, it is relevant insofar as they aren't secured. And that has to be given appropriate way.

00:27:16:17 - 00:27:24:00

Okay. Um. This project. Do you have anything to say by way of response to Mr. Sheikh's point?

00:27:24:27 - 00:27:58:12

And so we're having the applicant we have included. Um sections within the management plans to um require. So for example, in the outline construction traffic management plan, there is now a paragraph which um, refers to the requirement to put in place a um joint construction traffic management plan or joint measures should there be that temporal overlap between the projects. So it was mentioned in the interrelationships report, and it was noted during the examination that that principle hadn't been secured.

00:27:58:14 - 00:28:28:17

And it's therefore been secured via the outline construction traffic management plan. So we do believe that those measures are secured, but they're not going to be. They'll only be delivered if there is that temporal overlap, which obviously we're not able to confirm whether there will or will not be at this point in time. So it's very much the intention to develop. Develop those measures as and when they're appropriate. Um, to end on the the the phase or which schemes get consent start with um should they not all be given consent.

00:28:28:19 - 00:28:47:02

And then if they are actually being constructed at the same time. But if there is additional wording that West Lindsey District Council would like to see added to the management plans, then we would obviously welcome that being submitted. And we can review that. But um, we have included wording to that effect in the in the management plan.

00:28:49:01 - 00:28:52:08

Thank you, Miss Broderick. Mr. Shaikh, how would you respond to that?

00:28:52:22 - 00:29:03:14

Westlands District Council? Ma'am, I think it's sensible that we take that point away and consider if there is alternative word and we can propose that that might be suitable. And so we'll respond in writing to that.

00:29:04:01 - 00:29:04:18

Thank you.

00:29:12:10 - 00:29:27:18

Okay, I'm going to move on to, um, the next item, the topic based discussions. Um. So the first of these relates to climate change. Um.

00:29:30:10 - 00:29:32:16
So looking specifically at.

00:29:34:04 - 00:30:13:18
The joint report Hendrix E! This refers to significant beneficial cumulative effects in terms of climate change that each of the projects in isolation. Um, and then there's a cumulative beneficial effect identified, um, in relation to Cottam and West Burton, um, on the basis of the four schemes being developed at the same time, how it sets out that a more conservative approach has been taken in relation to gate Burton until bridge, suggesting there'd be no additional cumulative beneficial effects of the four schemes being developed, and it suggested that this is based on a on differences of professional opinion in interpreting the guidance.

00:30:13:21 - 00:30:37:26
I just just wanted to be clear on on how that that position has been reached and, um, and its implications, um, noting particularly that for a topic like climate change, which is a more overarching area of analysis, you perhaps expect conclusions to be aligned, um, in comparison to with other topics which are going to have more site specific implications. So, um.

00:30:40:02 - 00:30:44:07
I don't know whether the applicant is able to assist with that. Please.

00:30:45:05 - 00:31:21:08
Uh. I will let Mr. Kaplan introduce himself, who can deal with it in more detail. And what I would just like to highlight is that we are purely talking about additional cumulative beneficial effects. Each of the both the Gate Burton scheme and the Tilbrook scheme have concluded that their scheme alone has beneficial. Um. Uh, yes. That's what what the disagreement is whether there is any additional cumulative beneficial effects. It's not. They're definitely not saying that their individual schemes don't have a beneficial, um, impact from a climate change.

00:31:21:21 - 00:31:22:06
So I just.

00:31:22:08 - 00:31:24:14
Wanted to do that. Yes, I understand that, yes.

00:31:24:20 - 00:31:29:21
But I'll hand over to Mr. um, to respond in terms of the difference of approach. Okay.

00:31:29:23 - 00:31:30:08
Thank you.

00:31:30:28 - 00:31:32:20
Hi there. Daniel Clamping, um.

00:31:33:15 - 00:32:04:21
Climate change consultant for the applicant. Um, yeah. Uh, I think that's been summarized there by Miss Broderick. So the difference in opinion, I think, comes from the specific, uh, consideration of the different, um, solar projects. Um, and looking at the cumulative effect on them, which, yeah, as is each of them has in isolation, been determined to have a beneficial effect on climate change. Uh, we consider it was reasonable to have that cumulative, beneficial, um, conclusion.

00:32:05:29 - 00:32:21:27

Um, where that difference has come in is, um, the kind of difficulty of, um, assessing the sort of cumulative impact of multiple schemes, um, in terms of climate change, because the kind of scale of the impact is that that sort of national or international scale. Um.

00:32:23:20 - 00:32:32:00

Where the effects of climate change will be felt, um, rather than that kind of localised impact, which you would normally assess as part of an EIA.

00:32:34:05 - 00:32:35:00

All right.

00:32:36:18 - 00:32:40:27

Thank you. So as a consequence of these, um.

00:32:42:18 - 00:33:10:07

Different differences of professional opinion in terms of suggested benefits that the applicant has suggested in um, looking at its appendix A that the sector state may decide to place limited weight on the beneficial um c e a identified um or but the. So I just wanted to understand, um what what that means what how in terms of the the applicant's position.

00:33:12:10 - 00:33:14:26

Yeah. Sorry, sorry, Mr. Crampton.

00:33:17:09 - 00:33:17:27

Mr. Duncan.

00:33:18:05 - 00:33:49:11

No, no, no. Mr. clamping for the applicant. Um, yeah. The. I guess the, the, um, summary of the kind of limited way is, um, just acknowledging that that. Yes. Well, there's the, the, um, cumulative beneficial impact of the, the solar farms coming forward, um, where there is that difference of opinion. Um, it's it's around the, um, that kind of wider impact on climate change from other cumulative developments.

00:33:49:13 - 00:33:51:16

I think, um, it's broader.

00:33:52:26 - 00:34:32:17

Uh, yes. I think that, as I understand it, um, we have placed, um, some weight on the, um, beneficial, um, impacts of these schemes coming forward together around the same sort of time based on the fact that they've all got very similar grid connection dates, and therefore we're saying the combined total of renewable energy generation and that will be delivered by these schemes cumulatively within a short space of time, will will have a beneficial, um, impact cumulatively, because they will be able to achieve a greater degree of renewable energy in a short space of time compared to each of the and just individual schemes alone.

00:34:32:19 - 00:35:06:15

But we do recognise, um, that, uh, that the Secretary of State may not be, um, may not be persuaded or may not want to put too much weight on that and therefore may decide to, um, agree with, uh, the gate Burton until bridge um, uh, position, which was a very conservative approach, which was that no additional benefit should be given. But we do think that the the is the time frame. So the ability to deliver by and amount of generation prior to 2030 should be given some, some beneficial element.

00:35:06:17 - 00:35:10:18

But um, we know the difference in professional opinion okay.

00:35:10:26 - 00:35:15:26

So thank you. Mr. Sheikh, what would you like to say to me?

00:35:15:28 - 00:35:58:16

Sheikh Westlands district council. Ma'am, it's a point that relates generally to the interpretation of differences in professional judgment. When considering cumulative effects and the joint interrelationship report, it does apply to climate change. It also perhaps applies most importantly to landscape. But I thought helpful to raise at this point because it's not entirely clear from our perspective, given the differences in judgment in terms of cumulative conclusions for different projects. When put together, there's a clear difference in professional judgments, how the applicant is inviting you to consider those differences, uh, in light of, um, different either if it's based on professional judgment, how you are invited to assess which which one is correct.

00:35:58:25 - 00:36:13:19

And because we have come to the same conclusion, which is we're not entirely clear how we put the differences in conclusions together to come to a judgment on the cumulative effects. Given that there are there is a disparity between those conclusions as.

00:36:15:07 - 00:36:30:00

Write this. Understood. Thank you. Um. All right. We'll we'll we'll give that some. Give that some thought and. Are there any other comments on planet change before we move on to the next topic?

00:36:34:10 - 00:36:43:12

Okay. All right. I'm going to hand over to, um, Mr. Medlin to to pick up the construction management. Traffic management point. Over to you, Jonathan.

00:36:45:12 - 00:37:18:02

Thank you. Okay. Um, so I'm going to run through a few questions is entitled Construction Traffic Management, but may more reasonably be construction and traffic management. Try to group these questions and keep them specifically to cumulative impact. Um, obviously reserve the right to include questions in the forthcoming written questions to develop them further. And the first point is around.

00:37:20:28 - 00:37:50:25

On construction traffic and the KT MP. So in the joint report. That that has set up. There is uncertainty around timings and obtaining implementing consent, and therefore it may not be possible or appropriate to commit to a joint TMP. This was touched on an earlier issue. Specific hearing. The extent of cooperation possible so far appear to relate in the main to access points.

00:37:53:16 - 00:38:08:04

The fact that construction activities are taking place simultaneously, there would be a greater impact locally. Was raised by West Lindsey District Council in the joint report on interrelationships between SIPs, specifically in technical note.

00:38:09:20 - 00:38:40:13

Appendix D, so that's the technical note on transport and access cumulative effect. There is further reference to uh the other end CIPs in the local area gate Burton and so on with good connection corridor, which has potential to be shared with West Burton Cottam project and tail bridge. So for the purpose of transport access the states, it is considered that a shared grid connection corridor would reduce potential cumulative effects associated with the scheme.

00:38:43:19 - 00:39:01:17

Similarly, this refers then on to a joint theme to CCnp, which could be prepared between the schemes and the IGP project. So my first question is really to get an update on any progress or thinking on the joint TMP.

00:39:03:03 - 00:39:23:23

Aligned to that. There is there is a question around cumulative impacts and the joint report on interrelationship. So in the joint report on interrelationships between NIPS doesn't appear to be anything further added to that which is already set out in the environmental statement. The joint report.

00:39:25:27 - 00:40:02:20

As I say, there's no further substantive evidence beyond stating that there would be no changes from the environmental statement. The environmental statement does put together it 14.9.5 and its conclusions on cumulative effects on the highway network. There is a. Some confirmation and clarity around the relationship between those two documents. Should there be anything further provided in the joint report? Those are my my two questions that relate to cumulative impact on transport relating to the joint report.

00:40:02:22 - 00:40:34:06

I would appreciate any update if there is anything to add on. Um, West Lindsey District Council's response to State Park solar project and the possibility of. Joint toll roads or joint construction traffic, if there is anything further to update on that. So I will put that those questions first of all. Two, if there's anything the applicant and the applicant's representatives would like to update.

00:40:34:08 - 00:40:34:24

Thank you.

00:40:38:21 - 00:41:13:28

Absolutely. I'll just deal with the, um, uh, the point around joint construction traffic management plan, which I touched on, um, a few moments ago. Um, so section 7.2. Um, subsection 20. Uh, so, uh, 25, um, has been added, um, to a new paragraph has been added in there to provide that commitment to providing the joint construction traffic management plan between, um, in the areas of overlap between the Cottam solar project, the Burton Solar project and the Tilbury solar project.

00:41:14:00 - 00:41:52:15

And so that primarily does relate to the shared cable route. We, um. We did go through in quite some detail the previous issue specific hearing about the fact that there is actually very limited overlap in terms of the routes being used for construction traffic, for the other elements of the scheme, and therefore limited potential for um impacts or the need for mitigation measures to reduce those. So we are very much looking primarily at the shared cable route, but, um, I can, um, let the applicants, um, transport consultant provide some more, more information if that would be helpful.

00:41:52:17 - 00:42:29:00

I think I maybe this is clear, but I wasn't entirely clear on the on the second question, in terms of obviously, the interrelationship report has gone through was based on the traffic numbers that were available in each of the project's, um, uh, preliminary environmental information report. And then part of the joint Relationships report was to go through that and make sure to see whether the final figures that were included in the DCO application would change the conclusions of the assessment. And obviously, then the interrelationship report, um, concludes, whether whether it does or not, but I, I wasn't maybe Minister

00:42:30:17 - 00:42:36:18

has some a greater clarity on it, but that if not perhaps you could repeat that. The second part of the question.

00:42:38:13 - 00:43:11:20

Okay. Yeah. So it's really just seeking clarification from the applicant and the advisors about whether or not we, as examining authority, should expect anything further out of that joint report. Um. And whether it will build on or if there's going to be any further evidence building on the environmental statement, chapter 14, and those conclusions around cumulative effects on the highway network. So that would be appreciated. And I can see that there's a.

00:43:12:23 - 00:43:21:10

Wishing to speak on this point, is it, Mr. Rowan? It's. Mr. Rohan is.

00:43:21:12 - 00:43:51:19

Yes, yes I am. Robert Round for the applicant. Um. I can just respond on that point. Um, in short, um, that we're not expecting there to be any significant update to the cumulative impacts, um, in terms of traffic and access. Um, I would draw your attention and apologies. I don't have the reference at hand, but there was a there was a note on cumulative impacts for additional schemes that weren't initially picked up within the ES, including schemes such as Snow Park Farm, as you mentioned in your in your initial question.

00:43:52:04 - 00:44:25:10

Um, so there is further evidence available there just in terms of State Park Farm. Um, it's only at scoping stage at this at the moment. So we don't have a significant amount of detail. But they they do talk about the length of time the construction period may go on, for, which is 34 weeks, and the number of HGVs per trip per week, which is three. So a very tiny impact essentially on, on on the scheme. And those vehicles were used to A500, which will have some overlap with with the West Burton traffic. But as I say, the impact of that scheme is quite minimal.

00:44:25:12 - 00:44:29:22

So there won't be any change to the cumulative effects on the basis of that information.

00:44:30:20 - 00:44:44:15

Okay, okay. That's helpful. Thank you. Uh, Mr. McBride, Lincolnshire County Council, any comments on cumulative? Impacts of transport at this point.

00:44:44:26 - 00:45:15:16

Yeah. Thank you sir. Neil McBride, Lancashire County Council. I suppose it just follows on to a point that we made during the issue specific here in dealing with the development consent order. Um, in connection with, I suppose, our, our desire to have, um, a process similar to a section two, seven, eight in place. And the reason for that was to make sure that in terms of any works within the highway, but we sort of have some ability to, um, to control that.

00:45:15:18 - 00:45:53:25

So where it comes down to cumulative impacts, if one scheme was doing roadworks at the same time as another scheme, then we have an ability to sort of to manage that, to make sure that there isn't a sort of undesirable, um, consequences to traffic management and highway safety. So it's just really, um, whether there's any sort of update in terms of, um, what can be put in place for us to ensure that in terms of permitting any, um, sort of, um, works within the highway to make sure that we can do that in a coordinated way.

00:45:53:27 - 00:46:14:07

So obviously, if Gate Burton was doing some roadworks and at the same time that West Burton was that, you know, that could be controlled. So, you know, it didn't cause congestion in that, uh, in that sort of, um, you know, part of the highway. So it was really for see where the applicant's able to give us any more sort of, um, certainty or clarification on that.

00:46:14:27 - 00:46:25:18

Okay. Thank you. So I will pass that over to Mr. Broderick or Mr. Roney before moving on to Mr. Shaikh. Uh, Mr..

00:46:27:26 - 00:46:28:11

Mr.. Maguire?

00:46:29:07 - 00:47:05:25

Yes. Thank you for the applicant. Um, so we addressed, um, one of the concerns about sort of, I guess the knowledge element was that, um, by including in requirement to an obligation to confer, uh, provide a written scheme setting out the phase or phases of construction. And that was in response to comments made by, um, the local authorities in terms of having that wider overview of when the when the construction of the various schemes were going to come forward. So we've included that provision in requirement two to the latest version of the draft DCO.

00:47:05:29 - 00:47:38:03

In addition, um, as we've said, we've tried uh, we've combined where there's shared accesses. So um, where there is going to be works being undertaken by, uh, multiple projects. Um, we have included some wording in the um, outline RTMp to make it clear that, um, where the design of that access for one particular scheme, um, has been approved, then that would be, uh, an approval for each of the, each of the schemes. So there was a lot duplication. Duplication of work.

00:47:38:05 - 00:48:11:29

Um. Obviously we don't know the level of overlap that there may be at this point in time, which is why the wording in relation to the production of the, um, a joint construction traffic management plan is fairly high level at the moment, but the intention is that the final version of that plan, once there is information available about the construction programmes of the other schemes, would include the level of detail Mr. Proprietaries is seeking in terms of when work is going to be carried out. Um, if there is going to be an overlap, um, timing perspective.

00:48:12:01 - 00:48:31:09

But we didn't argue. Is that because there's a multiple different scenarios that could take place? Um, it wouldn't really be appropriate for the outline management plan to try and address all possible configurations that there could be. It would be something that should be contained in the detailed version of the plan that we need, wouldn't need to approve in any event.

00:48:33:00 - 00:48:54:24

Okay. Thank you, Mr. McBride. Does that go to answering at least the question and signposting you to the part of the draft relevant consent order, which which may resolve that issue. Obviously, you can then respond to this at the next deadline.

00:48:56:07 - 00:49:30:00

Yeah, I think so. Um. Obviously the phasing element would be, uh, would be helpful to see that. And, um, I suppose it's just making sure that, uh, uh, whilst I think that, um, will be discharged by the district council so that, uh, but just so that we're potentially involved in that as a highway authority so that we can make sure that if one scheme is undertaking some work at a particular time, then we have an ability to, um, to influence it if there's, if there's any duplication.

00:49:30:02 - 00:49:53:04

So I think that would just be, um, a slight concern there. But the second part, in terms of updating the, um, um, traffic management plan in terms of putting that detail, but obviously, uh, that that will come to us. So we will have an ability to, to look at that and, uh, to make sure that, that, that sort of meets our requirements in terms of coordination.

00:49:53:26 - 00:49:55:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:49:57:04 - 00:50:02:06

Okay, Mr. Shaikh Lindsey District Council. Any comments?

00:50:02:12 - 00:50:31:15

Thanks so much. West Lindsey District Council, just a quick point of update, which is that we have sent a skeleton framework in relation to a suggested approach to coordinated approach for the joint TMP in relation to the bottom end CIP we proposed to. Depending on the applicant response to the same applicant. We we intend to do the same for this. We may wait until we have the response on that one so that the approaches are aligned. Um, but that's our suggested approach in this, um entity.

00:50:33:03 - 00:50:44:18

Thank you for that. Okay. So that depending on the response from the applicant, a similar version will be submitted into West Burton examination.

00:50:47:23 - 00:51:18:01

Okay. Okay. I think. I raised a question there about Stoke Park. I think Mr. Ronan has covered that. Which case I will. Provides some further to my further questions. I'll hold them over into written questions, which would be published next week on certainly for my transport questions here. So it moves us. Onto item three, which is cultural heritage and doctor McGinn.

00:51:19:06 - 00:51:34:24

Thank you. Yes. So in relation to cultural heritage, I don't have any additional points to to raise. Um, I don't know whether the. The local authorities have any particular points to raise?

00:51:36:18 - 00:52:17:20

Does not like it now. So. So moving on to landscape. I just have 11.2 to raise here. Really? Um. So, but the appendix of the joint report, um, sets out that in relation to the Elvia, and no significant cumulative effects have been identified for West Burton. Um, the applicant's answer to written question, 1.8. 19, explains how cumulative moderate adverse impacts are identified for Gate Burton, with West Burton noting particularly the presence of the AGL at at Gait Burton.

00:52:18:23 - 00:53:05:07

And I just wanted to pick up the point that West Lindsey had raised in their written representation about the geographical coverage, um, of three projects which would span over 121km. Um, uh, North. Uh, well, uh. From the southernmost point to the north, the northernmost point, um, and the transformation of the landscape. And we've talked about this this earlier on, but I note in, in response. Um, to this, um, the applicant has referred to the cumulative assessments undertaken, but this appears to suggest that the in combination effects have been assessed with projects individually rather than altogether, for example, West Burton with Gate Burton and then West Burton with cotton.

00:53:05:09 - 00:53:19:06

So I just wanted to clarify the basis on which those, um, uh, those cumulative effects have been assessed, please. I don't know whether, um, Mr. Topping and Miss Wright can help with that.

00:53:20:19 - 00:53:37:18

I'm not something for the applicant. Um, I believe that's how they have been assessed. So the the site was first on site in combination with gate Burton, and then in combination with Cottam and in combination with Hill Bridge. I believe that site assessment has been undertaken. Um.

00:53:38:10 - 00:54:09:02

Right. So and I suppose the, the point following on from that is that that perhaps doesn't address the point that, um, has been raised about the geographic, the effect of the geographical coverage of, of these solar schemes, um, in combination. Um, and that that does seem to be a valid point. Um, again, I don't I don't know whether the applicant wants to to perhaps give that if that point some more consideration in terms of how that's been assessed.

00:54:09:29 - 00:54:29:02

But not something for the captain. Um, I will take that away, mum. And it's something I will discuss with, um, Mr. Jackson when he returns, as well as lead author. Just. Just so I don't pre suggest what he's he's, um, he's already, um, considered. So we'll come back on that point with further clarification.

00:54:30:05 - 00:54:31:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:37:29 - 00:54:53:15

Okay. I'm. That's the only question I wanted to raise in the hearing. And does anybody else have. The host authorities particularly have any comments or or queries in relation to cumulative landscape assessment? Yes. Mr. Schaake.

00:54:54:26 - 00:55:29:18

It's Westlands Judicial Council. Yes, ma'am. The first thing is, Mr. Blake has had to leave the hearing, as I alluded to earlier. So it may be that I have to caveat being able to respond to anything. And I'm also informed that the rest of the my, my team. So, um, Mr. Clarkson and Miss Reece need to leave shortly. I think we can probably deal with the point briefly, though. So the first point is, as I alluded to earlier, the inconsistency in the conclusions in landscape terms, and I've already made that point. Um, the second point is really a more general point around, uh, the approach taken to the cumulative assessment of various projects.

00:55:29:22 - 00:56:06:14

You'll be aware from our written representations that we've indicated the cumulative approach taken by the applicant, which I think is accepted by the applicant, is that it's all or nothing approach. There isn't a in combination assessment of the cumulative effects between just two of the projects. For instance, it's either all three of them or the project by itself. Um, and so we do see that as a limitation in the instance that the Secretary of State would wish to consider the combined effects of just two of the three projects that would, would have been recommended and considered under examination.

00:56:06:16 - 00:56:24:23

So that's that's our point. I don't need to labour the point. It's the same point we've made in relation to all of these, uh, NCF examinations. And I think that the point which is accepted by the applicant is, well, that's that's how it's been assessed. It's all three. But we do see that as a limitation and the methodology for cumulative assessment.

00:56:26:03 - 00:56:26:18

Stood.

00:56:28:01 - 00:56:31:27

Thank you. And, um, Mr. Brown, what would you like to say?

00:56:32:07 - 00:57:03:22

Yes, sir. Oliver Brown, Lincolnshire County council. Um, yeah. I mean, I won't go into too much detail, but just sort of want to reiterate, um, the position that we have in regards to the, to the cumulative landscape and visual effects, um, and the concerns that we have. You know, we've, we've, we've judged that there will be, uh, adverse effects at all, all stages of the project. Uh, and what we can do, um, is that we can provide further information just in our written, uh, representation, but we just want to make sure that was, uh, indicated today.

00:57:04:01 - 00:57:09:28

All right. Thank you, Mr. Brown. Um, Miss Broderick, did you want to come in?

00:57:11:09 - 00:57:44:18

Uh, Clark Kent. Um, just initially, I don't know whether the case officer might want to stop, wish to stop sharing their screen because I don't believe it's the agenda in law, um, that's being shown. Yes. It's true. Um, so that was just to point that out in case she hadn't realized. Um, but in response to, um, the representations made on behalf of West Lindsey District Council, um, the applicant's position, as we've stated before, is that we've assessed the worst case, um, and that's sufficient for purposes of the cumulative effects assessment.

00:57:44:26 - 00:57:57:26

Um, but but I don't think we've got anything further to say on that point. It's appropriate, proportionate to consider the worst, the worst case, rather than a variety of different combinations that Secretary of State may or may not wish to consent. Thank you.

00:57:58:21 - 00:58:01:00

All right. Thank you, Mr. McBride.

00:58:03:21 - 00:58:34:04

And I think she kind of canceled. Yeah. I just really wanted to, uh, just to sort of reemphasize that, uh, the county council do very much support, uh, the points made by West Lindsey in terms of a all or nothing approach. I think we we have got concerns about that. And, uh, we'll, we'll, we'll put that in into sort of our final comments. But I think West Lindsey have summed it up particularly well. And I just wanted to, uh, concur with exactly what they've said. It's a point that we also, uh, wish to make as well.

00:58:34:06 - 00:58:37:22

And I think that's it's been made very well and we support that.

00:58:38:04 - 00:58:39:03

Okay. Thank you.

00:58:41:23 - 00:59:02:06

All right. Um, moving on. Very, very conscious of the time. And, um, I think wherever possible, myself and Mister Medina are diverting questions to, um, to, to to written questions. Um, I'm going to hand back now to, um, Mr. Berlin to to pick up biodiversity and ecology.

00:59:06:17 - 00:59:08:22

Thank you. Okay.

00:59:11:15 - 00:59:42:08

Okay, so we had previous discussion at some length really about the different approaches to securing being within disease, which varies nationally and possibly even regionally or between schemes.

Deadline for submission. The draft DCO does contain numbered units within requirement nine, but also includes a buffer. My only question at this point on. Ecology.

00:59:42:10 - 01:00:06:24

Biodiversity relates to biodiversity net gain. If the applicant could expand on possibly the consistency of that approach with other insects locally that they may be aware of. Are other insects adopting a similar approach to this, including the buffer? What does that mean and what's that? What does that look like and mean cumulatively for being?

01:00:10:03 - 01:00:10:24

Mr..

01:00:12:26 - 01:00:23:08

Box or Miss Broderick. Temperature. The point is about consistency and cumulative impacts of securing being in that way.

01:00:25:26 - 01:01:07:22

Um, so the first point to note, I think, is we made at the, you know, all our written submissions last time round is that the applicant is committed to delivering all of the mitigation measures that are set out in the Landscape Environmental Management plan. So the question about giving a buffer was, is relates solely to allowing for the flexibility if the metric changes between now and when the scheme is, um, going to be constructed, that would mean that those mitigation measures that we've committed to do for one reason or another and now don't equate to the same level of being as we have assessed them to be, using the metric we did at the time that the DCO application was put forward.

01:01:07:28 - 01:01:43:10

Um, this sort of approach to including a buffer to take account of that uncertainty, um, was used on the Mallard Pass, um, DCO application. Um, so that's, um, an example. The Gate Burton application doesn't include, um, doesn't have a specific requirements setting out percentages in it. Um, and um, so those are the sort of the two working examples at the moment. But as I think we've mentioned before, it is an evolving area. And it may be that when the day comes to make a decision, there is more certainty on this point.

01:01:43:12 - 01:02:18:06

We're awaiting regulations for how the metrics are going to apply to any projects going forward as well, which is another thing that's been taken into account. But in terms of, um, the actual buffer, um, Mr. Box can sort of. Give some more information about how we're very confident we can deliver the BNG that we've, um, set out to be quite conservative, but we need to allow that flexibility because of the way that the DCO works. And we'd have to amend the DCO if it turned out that the metric meant that there was a very small change, okay, to accounting.

01:02:18:14 - 01:02:22:27

But if you if you wanted a more detailed list of what it's available to provide it.

01:02:24:12 - 01:02:31:19

Mr. Fox, if you've got anything to add to that, and then I will invite any comments from other IP's.

01:02:33:06 - 01:03:14:14

Uh, nothing substantial to add. Um, Mr. Fox, for the applicant, I should say, uh, nothing substantial to add. Uh, but just to reiterate that, um, the methodology or our, um, approach to undertaking the assessment in terms of setting targets for habitat conditions have been, uh, influenced by our extensive experience on, um, uh, solar projects of a smaller nature, but, um, also by, uh, the monitoring of, um, of existing and operational sites.

01:03:14:20 - 01:03:31:25

Uh, that has meant that we've taken a very precautionary and pragmatic view and, um, have tried, wherever possible, to retain a very, um, achievable, uh, approach in the selection of habitat types and their, their condition targets.

01:03:33:15 - 01:03:35:05

Thank you. Okay.

01:03:37:24 - 01:03:38:12

Eh?

01:03:39:01 - 01:03:49:15

I don't see any. Hands up. Is there any other comments anybody would like to make at this point on cumulative biodiversity or ecology related issues?

01:04:03:09 - 01:04:03:24

Okay.

01:04:06:01 - 01:04:09:16

Thank you then for providing those. Update.

01:04:11:03 - 01:04:14:13

And leave us on to item. The next item.

01:04:16:12 - 01:04:20:01

Six, four, six. Uh, so as an agriculture.

01:04:25:25 - 01:05:09:09

So the applicant has stated that the scheme. The scheme. Thanks loan that the the language scheme would be available for agricultural purposes. However, there's no firm commitment to making the land available for such purposes. The environmental statement. Chapter 19, for example, states that during operation grass below and between the solar panels will need to be managed. This management can include grazing by livestock where appropriate. Furthermore, paragraph 19.10 point eight states that during operation, opportunities for farm enterprises to use the land within the sites will be limited to periods of grazing small livestock.

01:05:11:02 - 01:05:43:18

There's no guarantee that land will be used for grazing and that there is a there is a decision made on whether it is appropriate to do so. If it is utilised, that use will be limited as impact in the environment. Statements concluded as being a significant benefit. Significant beneficial effect. Despite the scope and availability of land for the production of food being significantly reduced. So I'd like to invite the applicant to explain how at West Burton proposal and.

01:05:44:20 - 01:05:51:12

And this links cumulatively to other projects. It's concluded that there would be a significant benefit.

01:05:53:15 - 01:06:14:18

Cross-reference here. West Lindsey district council. I'm conscious that these concerns in a deadline for submission. So the question is to the applicant about those cumulative impacts on agriculture. And I will hear any other comments from IPS. Following on from the applicant.

01:06:20:01 - 01:06:24:22

Project. Um, I'll let Mr. Bird introduce himself. Sponsor points.

01:06:25:29 - 01:06:56:13

Okay. Hello, my name is Daniel Burnham, the soil scientist working on behalf of the applicant. Um, in terms of, uh, agriculture. Um, there is, of course, no, uh, commitment for the current, um, occupants to make use of land, uh, for agricultural production at the moment. Um, we're seeing the introduction of, uh, the phase in of the new sustainable farm initiative, um, which is a replacement for the old Common Agricultural Policy.

01:06:56:18 - 01:07:33:21

Uh, and it continues the drive of the Common Agricultural policy to move towards what's called cross-compliance, where farms are paid for environmental goods and services rather than, uh, paid a price, support for agricultural commodities or paid an area payment for uh, land under arable crops with 10% of uh set aside with no um, agricultural use permitted. Uh, that we used to have, um, uh, extremely popular in, uh, areas of, uh, heavy arable land such as, uh, we have at this site.

01:07:34:02 - 01:08:09:10

Uh, the measures for, um, putting arable fields down to either, uh, wild bird food. So, uh, a plant mix designed to deliver, uh, seeds to feed, uh, wild birds. So there's there's no, uh, cropping or grazing, uh, of that or entirely down to, um, flowering plants which provide a, um, nectar and pollen for invertebrates. And again, there's no agricultural production of that. Um, the land under a solar farm is available for continued agricultural use.

01:08:09:12 - 01:08:47:27

It can be grazed, uh, grazing by, uh, small animals such as sheep is, uh, pragmatic because you're not having to pay, uh, for mowers and operatives to, uh, go up and down between the rows. Um, also sheep uh, and like, er, flail mowers or, um, cylinder mowers never throw stones. And throwing stones is not what you want inside of a solar farm. Um, so we have a situation where, uh, the under the solar farm, there will be no more commitment, uh, for continued, uh, or continuous, uh, agricultural production than there is at present.

01:08:48:08 - 01:09:15:00

Um, but we'll be delivering, um, renewable energy, uh, and, uh, delivering the environmental goods and services which many of the sustainable farming payments seek to deliver, such as, uh, improvements to soil health, um, improvements to, uh, water infiltration, um, reduction of, uh, runoff and, uh, erosion of sediment, uh, into watercourses. Um.

01:09:16:23 - 01:09:51:17

In terms of there being a beneficial effect that stems from the provision of a new diversified enterprise to each of the owner occupier uh units, um, with land within the scheme. Um, for this, uh, significant, um, new diversified enterprise, uh, they do not have to a input more, um, farm capital, more farm labour, more farm machinery time.

01:09:52:01 - 01:10:14:00

Um, the, uh, so it's a significant boon to the economics of the farm business. Um, uh, so it's a hard to regard that steady thing, but a positive beneficial effect to each and every one of those four owner occupier farm businesses.

01:10:15:22 - 01:10:22:09

Thank you. Okay, Mr. McBride. So, anything you'd like to comment on this point?

01:10:24:12 - 01:10:58:06

Efficacy. Brightlingsea County Council. Um, I think we heard very much the same response at issue specific hearing, uh, 3 or 4 from Mr.. But I think where we're sort of looking to for this particular question or this particular section is the cumulative impacts. Um, so here very much, you know, what he's said in relation to, to this one scheme. But then if you look at potentially ten, 12 solar projects across the county, each uh, applicant says very much the same with what Mr.

01:10:58:08 - 01:11:38:15

Burgess said. Then, um, how confident are we that, uh, you know, that's going to be the case across the whole of the county for, you know, what might be 15,000 hectares of land that potentially could be, uh, impacted by, um, by solar development. So very much here and understand the response in relation to this one site. But if every developer says the same thing, then, you know, the sort of tipping point then gets missed, because clearly at some stage there will be some, um, impacts from the, you know, if all these schemes, uh, proceed.

01:11:38:17 - 01:12:15:06

And I can't believe that for every scheme there'll be, um, the same sort of approaches. You know, Mr. Bird has just set out. So I don't really think that, um, the cumulative question has been addressed. It's very much, um, responded to, um, the similar sort of question you, uh, you asked at the last specific here in which I don't have any, um, problems with that response, but I don't think it goes to the heart of your question in terms of looking at it cumulatively. Of all these ten, 12 solar farms take place, then, um, how is that going to be assessed?

01:12:16:17 - 01:12:19:25

Thank you. Uh, Miss Broderick, I see.

01:12:22:11 - 01:12:23:09

You have your hand up.

01:12:24:15 - 01:12:34:07

And I'm not sure if Mr. Byrd has the information available to him, but if he doesn't provide it in writing. Um, but I think the question being asked is, you know.

01:12:36:19 - 01:13:01:08

In terms of the cumulative effect of, in terms of relative to the amount of available farmland within Lincolnshire and then also within the UK, is that is that more the question that was that was being posed here in terms of the conclusions as, as no significant emotive effects rather than the availability of the. Of the land for agricultural.

01:13:01:22 - 01:13:25:06

But it is two. It is the two sides of the the coin. So yes, that is an important aspect. And Mr. Baird may not have that information, in which case we will obviously hear that through deadline five submissions if that's okay. Mr. Baird, is there anything you'd like to add in response to Miss Broderick and Mr. McBride just said.

01:13:26:17 - 01:14:26:16

Um, yes, certainly. I don't have the information to hand so I can respond to that in writing. But, uh, also, um, to, uh, be aware that, um, county wide and, uh, nationwide, uh, the same, uh, master supply farmers are embracing, um, payments where they don't have to, um, farm the land at the moment, particularly in areas of heavy land like this where they have, um, uh, in particular, uh, growing problem with, um, an arable weed called, uh, black grass where we're losing, uh, ability to control it through the loss of, uh, effective herbicides and, uh, increasing resistance to the herbicides that are still retained, uh, to that farmers are, um, also a there's a continued decline in numbers employed in farming as, uh, uh, has been a long term continuous trend.

01:14:26:18 - 01:14:59:14

And, uh, despite that, farms are continuing to have difficulty in attracting employment. Um, so uh, and options such as this, which allows them to make an income off the land for a, for a set period, uh, whilst, uh, offering a recovery in soil health, um, and not requiring, uh, machinery time, farm labor time, uh, is a significant opportunity for these farm businesses.

01:15:01:15 - 01:15:14:12

Okay. Thank you. I think, Mr. McBride, you want to come back on that? And I think I will move on to the next topic. Subject to any further hands that go up, Mr. McBride.

01:15:15:25 - 01:15:54:23

Yeah, but Brightlingsea County Council, I think a bit helpful to, uh, um, look at this from the Lincolnshire perspective. I think there was some work done towards the end of last year, so the figures might not still be correct. But, uh, in terms of the, um, solar projects across the country, um, in relation to the area of land covered, um, for, for Lincolnshire, um, the figure was that, um, there's two and a half more times, um, solar projects in Lincolnshire compared to all the other sort of counties, um, put together.

01:15:54:25 - 01:16:30:25

So, um, whilst, you know, I hear, um, you know, what you're talking about nationally and things like that, but I think it's a very bespoke and specific issue to, to Lincolnshire. So I think, um, perhaps we need to sort of drill down a bit to the Lincolnshire example rather than just using national sort of statistics, which, you know, might, uh, apply across a bigger, a bigger area. But when you're talking about the amount of solar that's proposed in Lincolnshire, then I think, uh, perhaps it does justify a more bespoke response rather than the national picture.

01:16:31:21 - 01:16:50:12

Okay. Thank you. That yes, that that's noted and certainly will invite that a response to that through the next set of questions and a deadline. Five but I don't think we will. Pursue it further in right now.

01:16:52:04 - 01:16:52:20

Um.

01:16:53:05 - 01:17:01:11

Thank you for everyone's input on that item. I will move on. Unless there's anything anybody else wants to say on sort of an agriculture.

01:17:03:00 - 01:17:05:06

Move on to the next item.

01:17:07:15 - 01:17:09:16

Socio economic again.

01:17:12:06 - 01:17:19:20

Moving some of these questions to written questions as. We are able to do.

01:17:21:08 - 01:17:26:19

So the first question on socio economic, which is item seven of

01:17:28:17 - 01:18:02:26

item number seven of this item of the agenda. Now in the implications that the implications in terms of community seventh are recognized in the joint report. But um in relation to only. So and that's

particularly in terms of the effect on public rights of way. First question is. Is. From this, are we to deduce that there is no impact on community severance within the other schemes? It has been highlighted as an impactful bridge only.

01:18:04:15 - 01:18:05:00

Um.

01:18:08:29 - 01:18:09:24

I think I will.

01:18:11:25 - 01:18:16:18

Leave my questions to that one. It might be something which.

01:18:18:16 - 01:18:19:29

Is taken away.

01:18:23:05 - 01:18:23:23

This project?

01:18:25:22 - 01:18:26:07

Yeah.

01:18:27:00 - 01:18:31:26

I'll let Mr. Flynn introduce himself. He might be able to address you. Distinction.

01:18:33:15 - 01:18:36:07

Uh, how about Stephen Flynn on behalf of the applicant?

01:18:36:24 - 01:18:37:27

Um, you know.

01:18:37:29 - 01:18:38:24

The the.

01:18:38:26 - 01:18:39:11

Assessment.

01:18:39:13 - 01:18:40:05

For West.

01:18:40:07 - 01:19:23:07

Burton? Um, this scheme, um, both, um, considered sort of in isolation and, um, in our consideration of the sort of the cumulative effect is that there would not be a significant cumulative effect on community service. Um, we are confident that certainly within this scheme, um, that the mitigation measures set out in the public right of way management, um, um, are sufficient to ensure that those public rights of way within the scheme are able to, um, remain sufficiently open during construction and then salute the open during operation of the scheme, um, to ensure that there is no impact on community.

01:19:23:09 - 01:20:00:07

Um, um, the isolation in that respect. Um, and we believe that is the same for the cotton solar project and for the decommissioning, um, um, project as well. Um, in our review of the aspect for Hill

Bridge, we didn't consider that to be a sort of, um, a note for the, um, fact, um, even noting that given the sort of the layout of the Tilbury scheme being a sort of large singular entity, um, we did not think that there was going to be apologies.

01:20:00:11 - 01:20:10:19

We did not think that there was going to be a, um, a significant first effect on the ability for people to move around, either by the local highway network or by public works way.

01:20:12:24 - 01:20:46:17

If you can just add. So obviously the position that stated in the appendix to the interrelationships report, and that's the position that Tilbrook had at their peer stage. And so we're fully expecting that to probably change in their full environmental statement, because they will have more detail available to that point in time. Plus, they will obviously have developed their management plans considerably more than they had at the peer stage. So that reflects their conservative approach at the stage of assessment. So we expect them to come to the same conclusions of the other schemes have done in their full environmental setting.

01:20:47:14 - 01:20:47:29

Okay.

01:20:50:25 - 01:20:51:11

Thank you.

01:20:53:12 - 01:20:53:27

Uh.

01:20:54:09 - 01:21:05:25

I had a number of other questions which I will hold over into the next set of written questions. Does anybody else have anything you'd like to raise relating to socio economic matters at this point?

01:21:13:01 - 01:21:17:13

No. Okay. Moving on to waste.

01:21:19:07 - 01:21:40:13

Who notes that the joint appendix E refers to a moderate or large adverse effect on landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire during the decommissioning phase with Kate Burton, Cottam and Hill Bridge, we noted as well the concerns raised by Lincolnshire County Council, previous issues, specific hearings and through written submissions.

01:21:42:09 - 01:22:25:20

We now have a revision 300 Enpi submitted deadline for which has been updated to include further details relating to waste management. Uh. So question to Lincolnshire County Council and others if necessary, and the applicant has previously requested additional assurances relating to future waste arising from the project and other similar projects. Can the applicant and LTC come in on progress and set out, uh Lincolnshire County Council's Waste Authority concerns regarding the impact of waste, both from West Burton solar project and also cumulatively.

01:22:25:22 - 01:22:36:08

So any. Any outstanding concerns and any progress on that document, which was submitted at deadline for.

01:22:40:17 - 01:22:43:11

Mr. McBride. I'll come to you first.

01:22:44:24 - 01:23:19:10

Thank you, sir. Brightlingsea County Council. Yeah, I think this is a point that sort of emerged relatively recently in terms of waste. And I think it's, uh, um, basically from a, um, examining authority's question whether it was in relation to this examination or perhaps one of the other examinations that, uh, there would be a percentage of, um, panels or other infrastructure coming to the end of their life each year. And I think the, the figure for that that was given was about 0.4%.

01:23:19:28 - 01:23:58:27

Um, and I don't know what the calculations are for, for West Burton, but uh, uh, for Cottam, um, that could amount to 5 or 6000 panels per year. Um, I haven't, I haven't got the, the information for West Burton, but, uh, I suspect it would be slightly less given it's a smaller area. And I think the concern that sort of, um, beginning to emerge is that, uh, previously we were sort of under the impression that a lot of the, um, the need to, to deal with end of life panels and other infrastructure would come at the decommissioning stage.

01:23:58:29 - 01:24:48:24

But clearly, um, it's going to be an issue much earlier on in the operational life of the development than what we'd previously expected or projected. And again, um, whilst, uh, the numbers for one project on their own perhaps don't seem to be too great, if you, uh, multiplied that across 10 or 12 solar projects, then, you know, you could be talking, um, 60,000 panels a year that need to be dealt with and, uh, obviously conscious that, uh, that doesn't include the the projects in Nottinghamshire and, uh, as has been indicated that, um, the landfill situation in Nottinghamshire, uh, is um, is not great and not that perhaps we'd want to see panels being put in landfill.

01:24:48:26 - 01:25:21:25

I would hope that, you know, you could find a more sustainable way of dealing with them. But, uh, um, if that's the the applicant sort of current approach is that they would go to landfill and, uh, perhaps that's disappointing, but, you know, we'd hope that we would find a more sustainable way of dealing with them. And I think that's really comes to the heart of where we're coming from. But we'd like to see some sort of effort or some sort of, um, progress made in looking at how the this sort of infrastructure could be recycled in a sustainable way.

01:25:21:27 - 01:25:53:23

And we don't feel that it should be left, um, to much later in the cycle, the operational stage, it should be something that almost needs to be, um, considered and uh, um, actioned right at the very start. So, you know, once the project is commissioned, we'd like to see, um, you know, information coming forward as to how the, um, the, the applicants, uh, intend to, to deal with these end of life, uh, um, materials.

01:25:53:25 - 01:26:26:00

So I think that's, um, um, where we're coming from, uh, in terms of, um, the information, if I'm honest, I've not looked at it in detail. You're probably be aware that the Cottam, um, closing, uh, closure of the examination was last week, and we were rushing to get the statements of common ground, uh, agreed with the applicant for for Cottam. Um, I suspect that the information that's been provided for West Burton is similar in relation to, um, the information that was provided for for Cottam.

01:26:26:02 - 01:26:45:14

So without having had the opportunity to look at it, if it is largely similar, then I suspect we are working towards some some resolution, but it would be useful to have a bit of time to review those documents and then, um, you know, to, to then, um, provide our responses in due course. Okay.

01:26:45:25 - 01:26:53:16

Thank you, Mr. McBride, for assessing that out. Was Broderick, is there something you'd like to respond to in what you've heard?

01:26:54:20 - 01:27:25:01

And the applicant? Yes. It was just obviously noting. Mr. McBride said he hadn't had the opportunity to review the deadline for documents yet, but it was just to give him a high level overview, which is that we have copied across, um, the measures that were agreed in relation to the cotton project. And that includes both, including in the draft, DCA, a specific, um, requirement to have a uh, waste management strategy forming part of the Operation Environmental Management plan.

01:27:25:03 - 01:28:00:06

So requirement 14 has been updated. And it also says that that waste management strategy must be submitted and approved by the Waste Planning Authority, which was a concern that they had, that it would be dealt with at the district level rather than going to themselves as the waste planning authority. So we've included that commitment and then the outline operational management plan itself, um, which is rep for five five, has been updated in line with the similar provisions on cotton to provide a lot more detail in terms of the waste, uh, management strategy that's going to be put in place.

01:28:00:08 - 01:28:32:13

And the regular reporting, including, um, a hierarchy of um, uh, waste disposal. So prioritising recycling wherever possible. So, um, obviously Mr. Burbridge will have the opportunity to review that prior to deadline five. And obviously, if there is any additional wording, um, that they would like to be included, then we can we can consider it this ongoing engagement between the applicant and the county council generally between examination deadlines. So we will seek to include any additional wording if that, if that's needed. But that's just an overview for Friday's benefit noting here.

01:28:34:24 - 01:29:05:12

Thank you. Okay. So that will be continued work in progress between various parties and leading up to deadline five for any comments or or even updates to that document with wording provided subject to timing and. Progress being made. I. Won't ask any further questions relating to waste having heard that discussion, does any other.

01:29:06:12 - 01:29:11:10

Party here. Have any queries or comments on waste at this stage?

01:29:14:29 - 01:29:25:01

No. Okay. Thank you. That takes us. Into item six. Other matters. Doctor McGinn.

01:29:26:27 - 01:29:40:10

Yeah. Um. I suppose. First of all, does anybody have anything further to raise in relation to cumulative assessments before we move towards closing the hearing? Yes, Mr. Shaikh.

01:29:41:10 - 01:30:04:04

Somerset West Judicial council. Mum, I probably ought to just reserve our position on the last few agenda items and this agenda item, because most of those who have instructed me have had to leave by now, because those, I understand, some had to leave at five and others have to leave at half five. So I'm not in the position to indicate what the position is. Um, we may just need to respond in writing in respect of anything in the last half an hour.

01:30:04:20 - 01:30:34:07

That's yes, I understand. And yes, we are where we are. And um, uh, yes, please, if obviously we will, we will take into consideration anything that's submitted to, to us in writing. Um, uh, obviously holds, as we've said, frequently holds, um, equal weight to anything that's, um, expressed orally. So very happy to, to receive that. Um, so, uh, on agenda item seven, does anybody have any further points they want to raise today?

01:30:39:00 - 01:30:44:03

Okay, so, um, moving on to, um. Uh.

01:30:46:12 - 01:31:03:07

Closing the meeting. Now we do. We do have, um, a long list of action points arising from the meeting. And rather than read through all of those today, um, we will we will take these away and refine them a little bit and, um, publish them on the website as soon as possible.

01:31:04:25 - 01:31:24:07

So, um. Uh, yeah. All all that remains, uh, is for me to thank everybody for their participation today. And for those of you still here, and thank you for hanging on those of you who have been hanging on, and obviously to all of those who've participated during today's proceedings. Um, and just to confirm that at.

01:31:41:09 - 01:31:45:02

We've lost an hour and I assume that's the same.

01:31:45:29 - 01:31:46:27

3007.

01:31:48:09 - 01:31:50:07

Yes. Yes, it is I.

01:31:52:01 - 01:32:04:25

I'm just. I'm just going to see if there is a deeper problem or if doctor McGinn had anything else to add, and I may just give her a second, otherwise I think.

01:32:06:00 - 01:32:07:00

We are all.

01:32:07:16 - 01:32:19:08

Aware of what she was about to say. Just give me one second if you can. Um, obviously people need to leave. They may just check that the doctor is okay. Bear with me.

01:32:55:23 - 01:32:56:09

Okay.

01:33:01:09 - 01:33:16:11

I think doctor McGinn was about to say that, obviously, having thanked you, that at 542 issues hearing meeting five is closed and thank you.