

File Name: ISH4 6th Dec 2023 Part 1.mp3  
File Length: 01:39:58

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

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

Good one. Everyone can just check that. You can all hear me. Great. Thank you. Um. I'm recording as the live stream started. Excellent. Well, it's 10:00, and I'd like to start by welcoming you all to this. The fourth issue specific here into the quantum solar project. My name is Rory Cridland. I'm the lead member of the panel of examining inspectors, appointed by the Secretary of State to consider the application and report back with a recommendation. Yesterday, at issue specific hearings three and four, we considered various aspects of the environmental statement.

00:00:42:12 - 00:01:15:07

And at the hearing this morning, we'll be looking more particularly at cumulative effects. As with all of the hearings this week, a digital recording is being made. And so I'd be grateful if you could clearly identify yourselves when you speak. As with all of the hearings, again, the recording will be retained and published on the national infrastructure website for a period of five years following the Secretary of State's decision on the application. And so can ask you all once again to try and avoid mentioning anything that you consider to be private and confidential. As with the other hearings, this hearing will also be live streamed on the internet.

00:01:16:02 - 00:01:53:27

If you participate in today's show, and it's important that you understand that you will be recorded and you consent to the retention and recording of that information. This is a blended event, which means some of you are attending again via Microsoft teams. Others are present in the room to avoid disrupting the meeting. Can ask you all to keep your microphones turned off or sorry, all of you turned off. And that applies to those of you in the room and on Microsoft Teams can also ask you all to switch off or mute your mobile phones, unless you're using them to join the meeting this morning, and can ask those of you on Microsoft Teams to also try to minimize any background noise.

00:01:55:23 - 00:02:05:01

If you're watching on the live stream it. Please be aware that if it's stopped at any point during adjournment, you will need to refresh your browser to view the restarted hearing.

00:02:07:07 - 00:02:28:09

We'll find it useful to have a copy of the agenda that we published on the 28th of November to hand, but relevant parts of it will be displayed on the screens, in the room and on the Microsoft Teams platform as we move through the meeting. I'll hand over now to my colleague, Mr. Henley, who's going to introduce himself, take us through the rest of the introductions, and then say a few words about the purpose of the hearing and how it will be conducted.

00:02:28:19 - 00:03:01:03

Thank you and good morning. My name is Darren Henley. I'm the member of the panel. I'm now going to ask parties to introduce themselves, but beforehand, please remember to unmute your microphone when you speak. And if you're joining via Microsoft teams and are comfortable to switch on your camera, please switch them off again when we move to the next speaker. There's also a roving microphone that's available for anybody in the room who wishes to speak, but it doesn't have a static microphone in front of them. It is important that all contributions are made using the microphone, so they are captured for the formal record.

00:03:02:18 - 00:03:04:18

So who's the lead speaker for the African Plains?

00:03:07:12 - 00:03:29:11

Good morning. My name is Claire Broderick. I'm a legal director at Pinsent Masons LLP, solicitors for the applicant Bottom Solar Project Limited. I'm joined by a number of members of the applicants team will let those who are speaking on the first couple of agenda items introduce themselves now and then. Others will introduce themselves at the relevant points in time.

00:03:32:19 - 00:03:39:09

Good morning. My name is Eve Browning. I'm a senior project development manager at Island Green Power, who are the developers of the scheme.

00:03:42:07 - 00:03:42:29

My name. My name.

00:03:44:21 - 00:03:45:28

On behalf of the applicant.

00:03:49:19 - 00:03:53:21

Daniel Kempin. On behalf of the applicant, their climate change consultant.

00:03:56:12 - 00:03:59:15

Thank you. And Lincolnshire County Council.

00:04:00:29 - 00:04:30:19

Morning, sir. My name is Stephanie Hall. Happy to be Ms.. Hall. Counsel instructed by Legal Services, Lincolnshire. At my left sits Mr. Neil McBride, head of planning at Lincolnshire County Council. And to his left, and Mr. Oliver Brown from landscape. On behalf of Lincoln County Council, we are potentially going to be joined online by a fourth team member and Mr. Andrew Fletcher when we get to public rights of way.

00:04:34:03 - 00:04:38:00

Thank you, sir. Thank you. And West Lindsey district council.

00:04:38:19 - 00:04:56:10

Sir. My name is Shmuel. I'm also of counsel and also instructed by Legal Services. Lincolnshire. That's my left sits Mr. Russell Clarkson, who's the development management team manager at West Lindsey District Council. And to his left is Mr. Alex Blake, who's an associate director at Atkins.

00:04:58:10 - 00:04:58:26

Thank you.

00:05:00:27 - 00:05:02:28

And Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:05:06:01 - 00:05:13:20

Good morning, sir. My name is Stephen Poynter. I'm team manager, planning policy at Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:05:15:03 - 00:05:20:21

Thank you. And is anyone in attendance from Bassetlaw District Council today?

00:05:25:05 - 00:05:25:20

Thank you.

00:05:29:11 - 00:05:46:24

Not gonna move on to the interested parties. Again, please give your name and explain your interest in the application and how you wish to be addressed during the hearing. And also please advise how many people you are representing. So firstly, I will start with Jamie Allen from 7000 acres.

00:05:47:14 - 00:05:48:06

Good morning sir.

00:05:50:08 - 00:06:14:23

My name is Jamie Allen. I'm the chairman of the 7000 acres Group. We're a single issue campaign group set up about 18 months ago in response to the multiple industrial solar developments proposed for this area. We act on behalf of 1000 plus members and other supporters, and we're advocating against these proposals. And my colleagues speak for themselves.

00:06:16:14 - 00:06:19:18

Good morning, sir Mark Pryor. 7000 acres.

00:06:22:07 - 00:06:24:14

Thank you. And Simon Skelton.

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

So yes, I'm.

00:06:28:03 - 00:06:30:05

Skeleton affected person.

00:06:31:28 - 00:06:46:04

Thank you. And I also have again Alastair Wood, Phillip Raven and Allan Stone. Relation to group and the Blyton Park driving centre. There's a microphone just coming to you now.

00:06:48:28 - 00:06:56:03

Good morning Allan McLaughlin, representing Blyton Park driving centre and affected business to the north end of the development.

00:06:58:00 - 00:07:06:12

Morning. My name is Alastair Wood, planning and development manager for the group of companies including Blinds and Park Driving Centre.

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

Thank you.

00:07:10:07 - 00:07:18:19

That is all the introductions for now. If you haven't introduced yourself to speak, their opportunity to do so later when we invite you to speak.

00:07:20:09 - 00:08:00:02

So I'm now going to move on to agenda item two. Obviously agendas being kindly displayed on the on the screens, which is helpful. Um, for those of you who have attended or viewed all the hearings

we've held in September or yesterday or as part of the examinations you may already be familiar with. Um, and for the benefit of those who are watching on the live stream, the hearing today will take the form of a structured discussion led by us based on the agenda which we've sent out, and also the questions which we will ask. The purpose of the hearing is to explore some of the issues that arise in relation to the cumulative effects, and also to give an opportunity to make oral presentations on the items listed and where appropriate.

00:08:00:04 - 00:08:03:23

Expand on the points you've already made. Written responses to date.

00:08:05:24 - 00:08:32:16

We've structured the hearing today so that you will have an opportunity to raise anything relevant to this hearing when we invite you to speak the relevant, relevant points on the agenda. Please keep your microphone muted until we invite you to speak. And each time that you do speak, please give your name and the organization that you're representing. So that is picked up for the formal record. Also, please direct all comments, questions and answers through us rather than directly to any of the party.

00:08:34:16 - 00:08:52:18

So we're now about to complete agenda item two, which is one final point. Subject to progress, we intend to take short comfort breaks of intervals of around 90 minutes or so, and depending on progress, we may ask for responses to some of the questions on the agenda to be providing writing rather than during the hearing itself.

00:08:54:20 - 00:08:59:19

Does anyone have any questions about the purpose of this hearing or how it will be conducted at this stage?

00:09:03:27 - 00:09:10:21

Okay. Thank you. In that case, I'm going to hand back to Mr. Cridland. Your take us through the first part of item three.

00:09:12:06 - 00:09:13:20

Thank you. Gentlemen. Um.

00:09:15:05 - 00:10:09:03

I think the first thing for me to say is that we're not quite as pressed for time today as we were yesterday, so hopefully we'll get to all of the agenda items and it won't be won't be rushed. Moving on to item three on the agenda. As you can see, this is really an opportunity for the applicant to provide an overview of its overall approach to cumulative effects, including the methodology used, a summary of the other projects that they've included in their assessments, and the likely significant cumulative effects that they've identified. And in addition, a summary of any updates to the content of its report on the interrelationship between the other nationally significant infrastructure projects, including those submitted at deadline two following the applicant overview, then invite the councils and other interested parties to confirm whether they consider an appropriate level of detail, has been considered for the other plans and projects, or identify any other plans or projects that they consider need to be included in the cumulative assessment.

00:10:10:00 - 00:10:10:20

This project.

00:10:12:14 - 00:10:18:29

Collaborate with the applicant. I'm going to hand over to Ms.. Sethi. You'll provide an overview of the approach to cumulative assessment.

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

Thank you. Thank you.

00:10:22:12 - 00:11:04:01

On behalf of the applicant. The applicant is that the cumulative of that methodology in the chapter two at seven in section 2.5. The loan letter came included in appendix 2.3. At 35. The list had to burn the shortlist presented with an each technical chapter of the Environmental Statement for Technical Discipline, and it copied the debate based on their own methodology and justification, including the goal of other development, the development that fall within the zone of employment of each environmental aspect, and if their potential for any temporal overlap between the scheme and other development.

00:11:05:06 - 00:11:44:16

In each of the chapter, touching but identified, and in chapter 23, the time of birth at that time of the committee. Identified. We have looked at other national infrastructure budget and the notable ones that are included in the assessment across all topics are the Comptroller Budget, which is an examination gate, Burton Energy Park or damnation until the dollar which had appeared stage and is expected to be admitted into damnation reduction in Q1 2024.

00:11:45:24 - 00:12:20:00

Um, the intimidation report that's out, the key about better deed and the approach that had been taken across multiple podcasts and other projects that are being considered. Um, we have submitted that deadline to an updated version of the internet relationship report. We we committed a deadline. We. Is a live document may be updated further through the damnation page to go down to a black, but it's omitted and any other information that other team coming forward in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire.

00:12:21:22 - 00:12:39:07

There are 2 or 3 kind of notable product coming in. Um, that would be considered and updated. The \$1 project. There's a great North Road Taylor project and another the project all reviewed are being considered.

00:12:39:09 - 00:12:44:02

I'm awfully sorry. Didn't catch the last one was too busy. Right. So one earthquake north.

00:12:44:04 - 00:12:53:19

Yeah. And people of renewable project. Thank you. Ought to be to be updated, reviewed and updated by deadline for appropriate.

00:12:55:27 - 00:13:05:22

The interrelationship report added live and it's being updated throughout between the different projects. I'm continuing to review any further information.

00:13:08:12 - 00:13:09:08

Thank you very much.

00:13:12:15 - 00:13:29:24

In fact, very useful to set the scene of where we are in terms of cumulative effects. I'm going to now invite the host authorities to comment on whether they consider any appropriate, sorry, whether an appropriate level of detail has been considered. Firstly, what he thinks the county council's position on this matter all.

00:13:32:15 - 00:13:42:13

Because think we we're our view is that the list of projects is at the moment complete. But it is an evolving picture. But we don't have any specific projects to add to that list at the moment.

00:13:42:24 - 00:13:46:01

Thank you very much. And West Lindsey District Council, Mr. Sheikh.

00:13:46:06 - 00:14:01:17

76, West Lindsey District Council. Our position is the same in respect of the list. So I'll make submissions or representations on other points in relation to the interrelationship report in due course. But at this stage the list is complete, albeit evolving.

00:14:02:00 - 00:14:16:12

Presumably. Mr. Sheikh, any comments you have on the interrelationship report will relate to the agenda items or is it a more general point? If it's a more general point, we can hear it. Now. If it's a specific point related to the agenda items, we'll deal with it as we move through the hearing.

00:14:16:21 - 00:14:19:12

I'm happy to deal with it in more specific general items.

00:14:19:26 - 00:14:20:21

Thank you very much.

00:14:23:08 - 00:14:28:23

And Nottinghamshire. Nottinghamshire have any comments on the cumulative assessment?

00:14:30:17 - 00:14:41:03

Thank you sir. Nothing to show. Yeah, we are happy with the list that is being published and obviously developing. Thank you.

00:14:42:06 - 00:14:54:07

Thank you, Mr. Potter. Does anyone else just comment on the extent of the projects considered by the applicant in the cumulative assessment? This stage 7000 acres.

00:14:55:16 - 00:15:27:24

Good morning, Mark Pryor for 7000 acres. Um, first of all, perhaps a question for you, sir. When do we expect an update to take it into account? The one Earth and the spire schemes. Because the actual ground that they will cover is known. The general scope of those projects are known. And so we believe they can be assessed as part of this overall cluster of four that now becomes six.

00:15:29:01 - 00:15:42:18

We might not know exact features such as the height of the panels and so on, but they have certainly declared the bounds of each scheme, so we believe they should be in scope at this point.

00:15:43:17 - 00:15:49:07

Mr.. If understood correctly, the applicant's position that that update is coming in at deadline three years. That correct?

00:15:51:05 - 00:16:07:05

With the applicant? Yes. That's correct. So the scoping reports that have been recently published are currently being reviewed, and the outcome of that review will be included in the version of the interrelationship report that's submitted at deadline three.

00:16:07:18 - 00:16:10:13

Thank you, Mr. Murdoch. Mr.. Prior to that, answer your question.

00:16:10:18 - 00:16:12:07

Yes it does. Thank you sir.

00:16:12:18 - 00:16:19:18

Does anyone else have anything they wish to raise at this point in relation to the list of projects included by the applicant in the cumulative assessment?

00:16:23:00 - 00:16:24:22

Nope. Okay. Thank you very much.

00:16:26:23 - 00:16:44:08

In that case, we can now move on to the main items listed under Agenda Item four. And before we do so, Ms.. Broderick. Is the applicant aware of any changes to the available information on other plans or projects that we need to be aware of? It's already been included in the cumulative assessment.

00:16:46:09 - 00:17:16:22

Back to the app. So as we just mentioned, the scoping reports for the project have recently been published. So there will be an update to the interrelationship report as mentioned in relation to those projects. We are also aware of a non project that West Lindsey referred to in their responses to the first written questions.

00:17:16:27 - 00:17:58:04

That's at the early stage of the planning process. We have that's the Stow Park solar farm, and it submitted an screening request back in June 2023, and has subsequently been determined by West Lindsey District Council as being development. There was some limited information submitted as part of that screening request, which is being considered at the moment. However, as far as we're aware, and we checked this morning, um, they haven't submitted a request for scoping and they haven't submitted a planning application yet.

00:17:58:06 - 00:18:17:24

So there is limited information available in the public domain in respect of that particular project. However, there is an interaction between the Cottam cable route and that proposed. Okay, so you're keeping that under review. The state park. Solar farm.

00:18:21:13 - 00:18:32:16

However, the applicant is in discussions with the developers. That project will be it that don't believe we've aware of what date they're proposing to submit their planning application.

00:18:34:05 - 00:18:36:21

Thank you. And in terms of the position on Delbridge.

00:18:40:08 - 00:19:34:05

Care of the applicant. As mentioned, the latest information we have is that their application for A will be submitted in quarter one of 2024. It is likely that that may be submitted after the close of the cotton. Examination. However, during whilst the West Burton Solar project is still in examination. So there would be an update to the interrelationship report submitted as part of the West Burton examination and obviously the Secretary of State when they come to make their decision and may wish to ask for a copy of that to be provided at that point in time, noting, obviously the examination will have closed so you wouldn't be able to receive a copy of that.

00:19:34:27 - 00:19:45:15

But it would be useful for us if you could provide us a deadline. Going to say deadline six think we've got six deadlines. So the final deadline, just an update of the position there. And then we can include that.

00:19:45:17 - 00:19:46:18

Information in our report.

00:19:46:20 - 00:19:49:09

For the Secretary of State if they wish to do that.

00:19:50:29 - 00:19:52:18

Yes. I'll take that away as an action. Thank you.

00:19:52:20 - 00:19:53:10

Thank you very much.

00:19:55:14 - 00:20:00:21

And in that case. Oh, sorry. Can see Mr. Shake is wanting to come in there, Mr. Shaikh.

00:20:00:23 - 00:20:37:00

Thank you sir. Westlands District council. Yes, it's one one. Just general point of clarification about the interrelationship report. And we noticed in the introduction of the interrelationship report that it is provided on behalf of a number of projects, not just this one, to include in Gate Burton on West Burton. We're conscious that Gate Burton examination closes on the 4th of January, 2024. So the point of clarification is the extent to which gate Burton will be aware of and sign off on any updates to this relation, interrelationship report, or whether essentially their involvement in this report stops at that stage because.

00:20:37:25 - 00:20:55:14

Procedural point is that the interrelationship report is an evolving document, but obviously that examination will conclude, despite the fact that this interrelationship report will continue to evolve. So whether or not they will continue to be involved in that or their involvement completely stops at that stage.

00:20:56:14 - 00:20:56:29

Um,

00:20:58:11 - 00:21:02:09

would I'll let Ms.. Broderick answer that before comment.

00:21:02:12 - 00:21:02:27

Comment

00:21:04:17 - 00:21:38:18

for the applicant? Yes. So the intention is that it will remain a joint document that will be approved by all of the projects. However, obviously, after the close of the examination, the examining authority are unable to accept any further information. However, the Gate Burden project will be able to submit a copy of the most recent version of that report to the Secretary of State once the decision. Once the process moves from recommendation into the decision making so similar, um, what Mr.

00:21:38:20 - 00:21:54:28



Clinton said in terms of providing an update at the end, the gate burden examination, they'll obviously be stating what the position is then, but the Secretary of State will be able to request the most up to date version as part of their decision making process.

00:21:57:13 - 00:21:57:29

Mr. Sheikh.

00:21:58:22 - 00:22:08:06

Shall we say, Westminster Council? Yes, that's very helpful. Thank you. The point of clarification was the extent to which Great Britain will still continue to be involved. And if they will, we're content. So I'm grateful.

00:22:08:08 - 00:22:21:16

Thank you. I think the position is the same for all of the projects as they move through. The statutory deadline will come down on one of them. Then the Secretary state will be able to request the most recent up to date position at the point of the decision making process.

00:22:23:15 - 00:22:28:18

Thank you. Well, then, starting on some of the main agenda items, the first one we have is climate change.

00:22:31:00 - 00:23:02:28

So I'm going to direct it to Mr.. But it might be Ms.. Broderick that answers. So I'll leave you to determine who's best placed to answer my question. I see from the interracial relationship report that both gate, Burton and the bridge team have identified no significant cumulative effects in terms of climate change. And why is it that the applicant has reached a different conclusion and concludes that there's a major beneficial cumulative effect in terms of climate change? The reason I ask is that surely all the schemes are looking at the same or similar information.

00:23:03:05 - 00:23:05:00

And so is it a methodology point?

00:23:07:06 - 00:23:11:20

The applicant will hand over to Mr. Clampett to respond to this question. Thank you.

00:23:11:27 - 00:23:15:00

Chosen the wrong person to apologize for them?

00:23:15:04 - 00:23:15:19

Yeah. Daniel.

00:23:16:01 - 00:23:51:29

For the applicant. Um, so to determine the, um, the significance of the cumulative effect, we use the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment or Guidance document, um, assessing greenhouse gas emissions and evaluating their significance. Um, so this guidance doesn't really give a prescriptive, quantitative methodology, but encourages the significance of any development with regards to climate change to be considered within an appropriate contextual framework. Um, and states, it's down to the practitioners professional judgment on how best to contextualize the project's greenhouse gas impact.

00:23:53:13 - 00:24:14:28

Uh, guidance also states a project that causes greenhouse gas emissions to be avoided or removed from the atmosphere has a beneficial effect that is significant. Um, and it's specifically used as an

example of a greenhouse gas benefit displacing a legacy source. So gives the example of renewable energy displacing gas fired baseload.

00:24:16:22 - 00:24:24:14

So this was considered applicable to both the Gotham scheme and the cumulative solar schemes that were that are being considered as part of our cumulative assessment.

00:24:26:03 - 00:24:35:19

To determine that the effect would be significantly beneficial and within the kind of context typically.

00:24:37:22 - 00:25:04:07

Environmental statement chapters will be looking at the kind of local impact and when considering when considering that that cumulative effects. But with greenhouse gas emissions and the effect is kind of on a national and international scale. So it's a bit harder to provide that that kind of immediate local context.

00:25:05:28 - 00:25:07:17

When assigning significance.

00:25:14:09 - 00:25:34:18

But the guidance again gives the following advice on considering cumulative greenhouse gas emissions around the contextualization of greenhouse gas emissions it should incorporate and. Other greenhouse gas sources which make up the context of the specific development, either geographically or sector bounded.

00:25:36:11 - 00:25:44:08

So in this occasion we considered the within the context of the scheme, the other solar farms and.

00:25:46:19 - 00:26:01:02

As there's that cumulative assessment of multiple solar farms, we've concluded that it would be have a significant beneficial effect as a result of the displacement of legacy sources with renewable.

00:26:02:05 - 00:26:23:22

Yes, yes. Understand all of that. Think. What I'm trying to get at is why one project using the same information has found no significant effects, and another project using the same information has found significant beneficial effects. And there is quite a large gap between the two conclusions, and I'm trying to understand, is that about professional judgment, or is that about the methodology used or some other reason?

00:26:24:12 - 00:26:44:19

I think it would be down to professional judgment against that guidance, which yeah, is not is kind of not prescriptive quantitatively. It is kind of based on a multiple contexts within which the scheme is to be considered.

00:26:48:10 - 00:27:14:09

If can just add that there are discussions ongoing between the topic lead for each of the environmental topics as part of the development of the interrelationship report. My understanding is that where there are differences, discussions are ongoing as to whether the positions where it's a matter of professional judgment, whether there can be any further alignment.

00:27:16:24 - 00:27:36:16

Between between the conclusions that have been reached. So it is something that is ongoing and where perhaps a precautionary approach has been, has been taken by one set of consultants that that's

being explored, explored further as part of the ongoing discussions in relation to the interrelationship report.

00:27:36:25 - 00:27:46:20

And then presumably, any changes to those positions will be will trigger an update to the climate change chapters of the. As well as the interrelationship report.

00:27:49:00 - 00:28:21:02

Subject the applicant. Mean. Think. Guess. That's sort of a a more. General point in terms of sort of document management. To date, we have been primarily using the interrelationship reports to provide updates where they're where they're necessary rather than necessarily updating the chapters. Themselves. Obviously the chapters were drafted on the basis or refer to information that was available at the time the application was submitted.

00:28:21:04 - 00:28:51:21

And so we we hadn't to date been updating that those sections to refer to the actual application documents. That's all been contained in the interrelationships report, just as a general position across the chapters. And we're sort of flexible, I suppose, in terms of how you would like any changes to conclusions of cumulative effects to be documented, as in, we can update the chapters as well as the interrelationship report, or we can keep it solely in the interrelationship report.

00:28:51:23 - 00:28:53:27

It's entirely up to you. Yeah, exactly.

00:28:54:02 - 00:29:08:23

Yeah. Significance of effect. And the basis for reaching those conclusions differs. Then it probably touches on the chapter. Whereas if it's more a case of West saying sorry burden taking the similar, then you wouldn't need to update the chapters.

00:29:11:14 - 00:29:20:12

Thank you. Well, that gives us some some further information on that point. Would anyone else like to come in at this point? We have any comment from the local authorities to shake?

00:29:20:21 - 00:29:51:23

Let me say West Lindsey District Council. Yes. Our only concern in relation to that is essentially we don't know what we're working on as far as the conclusions are concerned in the cumulative assessments, because a key consideration and a point that we have made in written representations is that the is for each of the projects do not align with each other and in some instances are quite far apart from each other. And that's a point that I'll come to further down the agenda. But at this stage it is somewhat unhelpful to not know what we're talking about as far as the conclusions cumulatively.

00:29:51:25 - 00:30:13:08

And if they're going to be updated, then again, we don't know the extent to which they're going to be updated or which ones, which topic specific areas or chapter. The yes may need to be updated. And so we're in a slightly difficult position in that respect, because it means it's difficult for us to assess the and the cumulative effects if the conclusions still haven't actually been confirmed.

00:30:14:05 - 00:30:27:16

Yes, they take the point, Mr. Shaiken. It's very much the point I'm getting to Ms.. Broderick. How do we how do interested parties and myself and Mr. Henry, as the examining authority, examine the application of the information that is based on is changing and discussions are ongoing.

00:30:32:10 - 00:30:36:19

And I suppose a follow up to that is when would we expect those updates to come in?

00:30:56:09 - 00:31:33:02

A clever trick for Atkin, just in terms of the order of. Admissions the next. As said, the next version of the interrelationship report will be deadline three for the Cotton Project, which is a couple of days before the main last deadline for the Gate Burton project. So our anticipation is that the extent that there are any discussions that just mentioned that that would be included within what is essentially the last version of the report for the Gate Burton project in terms of the more general point.

00:31:34:27 - 00:31:38:14

Each of the environmental statements have been.

00:31:40:22 - 00:32:13:10

Undertaken separately, and the professional judgment of the various topic chapter authors has been applied. And sort of in isolation, as it were. There's no requirement for that to be an alignment. And responding to West London district councils point they will need to read each of the environmental statements separately to understand the impacts for those projects and where different professional judgment has been taken.

00:32:13:21 - 00:32:33:14

And they will just need to consider the professional judgment that's been applied for each of the schemes. Don't believe there's no requirement for there to be alignment in terms of the conclusions of each of the projects, and we don't think that that undermines the adequacy. The environmental impact assessment, just because the various experts have come to a different conclusion.

00:32:34:03 - 00:32:35:05

Just on that point.

00:32:36:23 - 00:32:46:20

Obviously you're talking in terms of standalone projects, but in terms of the cumulative effects, does that have any bearing in terms of what you've just said, that in terms of these individual judgments which have been taken place?

00:32:49:13 - 00:33:05:05

For the applicant. No. Think you have to read the conclusions on cumulative for each that each of the schemes provided. Um, and there doesn't need to be alignment on those conclusions for the cumulative effects assessment to still be adequate.

00:33:07:06 - 00:33:39:01

Miss Broadrick, take your point in alignment. This is a separate examination. Think it's important that everyone recognizes that we are a separate examining authority, and we are not looking into the detail of Gate and Tilbrook or any of the other large solar schemes. Having said that, I think the applicant has put forward on a number of occasions the point that they are in discussions with these other. And Applicants and. It seems to me that on that basis, one would expect some sort of either alignment or.

00:33:39:29 - 00:34:16:23

Explanation as to why there is such a significant difference in the professional judgments being applied on what is essentially a similar point. We are looking at different applicants taking similar information, using a similar methodology, but reaching what can appear to be significantly different conclusions on it. And. While I take the punt on. There is no requirement for alignment. Think in terms of an explanation as to why that position has been reached. Would be useful for both us and the Secretary of State, because they will clearly see a similar point that we are that there are differences in in the conclusions being reached.

00:34:16:25 - 00:34:17:13

And so it.

00:34:18:09 - 00:34:18:27

I suppose.

00:34:20:23 - 00:34:23:21

Raises the question of is one of them incorrect?

00:34:25:19 - 00:34:49:13

A clairvoyant for the applicant. I don't. Obviously, we're dealing with a wide range of different topics in the interrelationship reports, and because they're looking at the cumulative effects of all four projects, they won't necessarily be the same. Climate change aside, for some of the other projects, obviously, what what the impacts are different.

00:34:49:29 - 00:35:02:15

Yeah. The point on other topic areas. Yes, definitely think in terms of climate change in particular, trying to understand how two different professionals can reach vastly different conclusions based on the same information.

00:35:15:03 - 00:35:47:15

I think in respect of climate change, I think we will take that away as an action, if that's okay, and have a further discussion with who are the environmental consultants for both the Gate Burton and the bridge projects and provide an explanation in the next iteration of the interrelationship reports. In terms of the what has led to the difference in professional judgment, in terms of the things that have been taken into account, in terms of each of those projects.

00:35:47:17 - 00:35:48:23

That would be very helpful. Thank you. Mr..

00:35:50:24 - 00:35:58:09

To anyone else like to come in at this point on. From the local authorities. Any any other comments from the local authorities before move on to others?

00:36:00:10 - 00:36:11:24

Stephanie holding a chair. County council. Thank you sir. Think we appreciate and look forward to the applicant's explanation of the differences and judgments. That would be very helpful and we'll review that when we get it.

00:36:12:03 - 00:36:32:03

Thank you very much. This project can also ask that if this general point crosses over, because, you know, I just said that it's climate change that was interested in in terms of this discussion. But there may be other topic areas where a similar point applies. It doesn't apply to all of them, and I accept that point. But if it does apply to any of the others, then I'd be grateful if you could include that in the update as well.

00:36:33:20 - 00:36:34:24

7000 acres.

00:36:36:10 - 00:37:08:12

Thank you, sir. Mark Prize of 1000 acres. We agree with the West Lindsey Point. It's very, very hard for us to actually assess these schemes when everything keeps, keeps moving. Because really, an

insight should be a front loaded process. They should come with a coherent plan. But every meeting we have the goalposts move just we've put in written submissions and.

00:37:09:14 - 00:37:40:06

We see issues with the way that the applicant has come to its greenhouse gas emission can come flue occlusions, for instance, it did assume that 50% of the goods will come from China and 50% from Europe. If you look at the current market, most batteries and solar farms come from China, so that is out of date. Of course, the current greenhouse gas emission.

00:37:42:11 - 00:38:15:19

And calc and collections are based on on the and the 40 year scheme. Now it's gone to 60 years. They will need to change out the batteries and the solar panels more. Um. So there are various points like that that we will put in writing. Mr. O'Grady, who could not be here today, has left me a note. Now, of course, he is a chartered engineer working in the power industry.

00:38:15:23 - 00:38:18:17

He has gone through the applicants.

00:38:21:03 - 00:38:25:23

Work, and they claim that they will

00:38:27:17 - 00:38:59:12

generate 945,000 megawatt hours of power per year. But if you look at an average 11% load factor, that would mean that they would need about 980MW of solar panels. And as we know, this will be for about a 600 megawatt scheme. So they seem to be claiming credit for about 30% more power than their scheme can actually create.

00:38:59:25 - 00:39:09:06

So there are various things like that that might account for why they make a very different claim to the two other schemes.

00:39:10:25 - 00:39:38:22

But we will will back up this in writing. But we do have concerns. And again, we think this should be nailed down quite quickly because otherwise the goalposts move and it makes us makes it very hard for all of the parties to assess. And yourselves, of course, what the applicant actually plans to do. And if there are in fact any greenhouse gains.

00:39:40:05 - 00:40:13:18

Thank you, Mr. Pryor. Think two. Two points. I'd just like to mention that. Think, firstly, the applicant is now made commitment to resolve this issue. Think by deadline for the latest would say, if not by deadline. Three. On the basis that the gate Burton examination will close in early January and so any discussions with them will have taken place by that point in terms of the significance of effect. The second point, and it's for both yourself and for Mr. West Lindsey, as I currently see it, in terms of the difficulties that you may experience with the goalposts changing.

00:40:15:06 - 00:40:36:27

The applicant is putting forward a case of significant beneficial effect that's unlikely to get any better. In my view, it's if anything, they would be bringing it further back. So that would align more closely with the positions you're putting forward. But it's not. So how does it impact on on your ability to respond to the general point around climate change? Mr. Shaikh?

00:40:41:03 - 00:40:41:18

Back normal.

00:40:50:03 - 00:41:41:13

You say West Lindsey District Council. So think think. There's two points to this. The first is the substantive point. But the other point is the explanation for any distinction or difference in professional judgment between the is at the moment, we we struggle with both, but perhaps more with the fact that there is no explanation as to why the S is a different relation to cumulative effect of climate change. And the reason that's important is for the same reasons we've set out in our written representations in relation to the cumulative assessment overall, and the extent to which we say there hasn't been a combination analysis carried out, which will assist you in determining exactly to what extent the trigger point may set, or the the extent to which this project may go beyond the acceptable cumulative effects in relation to a combination of other projects.

00:41:41:17 - 00:41:52:23

And it's for those reasons that the disparity between the s that doesn't assist you in making that decision, especially without any explanation as to why different professional judgments have been reached.

00:41:53:03 - 00:42:13:05

So if understand correctly, Mr. Shaker point is around this in combination point, which we've got listed on the agenda and we will come on to. So I'm not going to get into detail on now as opposed to whether or not the significance of effect changes between what the applicant is currently predicting in terms of climate change and what they may follow in further discussions with Putin team. Change it to.

00:42:13:23 - 00:42:30:20

Lindsey District Council. Yes, sir. That's correct. Thank you. In part because if it is reduced to a line with gate Burton, obviously that's in line with what we're saying already. So it's accepted that that's more aligned with our position. And so yes, and I'll come on to that point in due course in later in the agenda as it's listed.

00:42:31:05 - 00:42:33:00

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Prior.

00:42:34:15 - 00:43:10:21

Um, Mark 7000 acres. Yes, I agree with the West Lindsey Point. This tends to draw into doubt the whole. Yes, because we've seen this where there is a big difference between this scheme and gate burden. And as well we've seen the same with the idea as well. So there are several fields where this scheme seems to come to conclusions which other schemes don't.

00:43:11:04 - 00:43:19:10

So I think that cast into doubt the use of of professional judgment in this case.

00:43:20:06 - 00:43:33:09

Thank you. Mr.. Well, we'll wait to see what the applicant has to say when they come back on this point at future deadlines. And we will be picking up on that point in a moment, and hopefully that will give some further clarity. Ms.. Broderick.

00:43:33:18 - 00:44:10:05

Okay. Yeah. I mean, obviously we reject, um, the assertions that have just been made in terms of calling into question the validity and the acceptability of the environmental impact assessment just because there is a difference in professional judgement. Just want to make clear that the gate we're talking about cumulative effects here. The Gate Burton project for its project alone on climate change, concludes that there will be beneficial, significant effects in relation to its scheme. What they are

saying is they don't believe there are any additional beneficial cumulative effects as a result of all the schemes together.

00:44:10:07 - 00:44:52:21

So this table purely sets out the conclusions on cumulative and that gate Burton, as with the Cottam scheme and as with the other two schemes, each of those projects concluded beneficial significant effects for their schemes alone. The question where professional judgement differs is whether there is an effectively an additional beneficial cumulative effect. So we're not talking about a very wide difference in opinion in terms of what underlines the whole assessment, which seemed to be the impression that was being given, that there was a marked difference in the approach to consideration of climate change across the board.

00:44:52:23 - 00:45:27:29

That's not the case. Um, think the applicant would also add that, um, in response to requests from the examining authority, but the developers here have have made a an effort to try and provide as much information as is helpful to those who are affected by all of these projects. It's no different than any other type of development that interacts with other types of developments, which don't typically provide this level of detail in terms of how the projects and the assessments interact.

00:45:28:01 - 00:45:42:11

So we would we would argue that this is, um, extra information that's being provided rather than information that's actually required as part of the environmental impact assessment regulations and what is necessary for a valid EIA.

00:45:43:11 - 00:46:17:22

Thank you Ms.. Project. If understand your point correctly, what your what your what you're getting at is that the when considering cumulative effects, each individual project has included itself in the baseline. And then what it's looking at is whether the other projects. Increase or decrease, whether it's adverse or beneficial from that baseline that's already included. So in terms of your gait burden example, that statement of no significant cumulative effects is based on. Them, including themselves in the baseline, and then looking at the other projects to see if there is an additional uplift as a result.

00:46:18:06 - 00:46:19:16

Is that correct understanding?

00:46:21:01 - 00:46:54:24

Yes, and that applies across the topics. It's pure. The table in the interrelationship report is purely looking at additional cumulative effects. It doesn't reflect the conclusions individually of that. You know, it's not setting out the individual conclusions for each topic. For that particular scheme, you each of the you would need to go back. To the Or. The examining authority for each project obviously needs to look at the conclusions of the environmental statement for that particular project alone, and then they're looking at the cumulative effects.

00:46:54:26 - 00:47:02:03

You're not looking at what gate Burton concluded for their own project alone, because that's not relevant to this particular examination.

00:47:02:05 - 00:47:13:11

In conjunction with their project, these other projects are having significant effects cumulatively with what they've already included in in their own assessment. Yes.

00:47:13:13 - 00:47:13:28

That's correct.



00:47:17:11 - 00:47:20:16

Would anyone else like to come in on this point before we move on?

00:47:22:12 - 00:47:23:10

Nope. Okay.

00:47:23:12 - 00:47:41:13

Thank you all very much. Very useful. Moving on then, to landscape and visual impact. This isn't on the agenda. Just to let everyone know. In case you're wondering, for those of you viewing on the live stream, this is a slight addition and it comes out of the discussion that we had in stage two. It is really a project.

00:47:41:15 - 00:47:47:17

We're just going to swap over our experts, if that's okay. Just have a chance to listen to the questions.

00:47:47:19 - 00:47:50:28

Might not be that they need to come in at this point anyway, but but certainly do.

00:48:35:09 - 00:48:56:18

Now was was a little bit unclear initially when saw the interrelationship report on the position on. As we've moved through the week, I think I've got a bit more clarity. So just wanted to confirm the point really that as understand it, the applicant's assessment has identified significant cumulative effects on the landscape and visual side of things.

00:48:58:06 - 00:49:07:25

Updates for them made to chapter eight. A deadline to think where those there was a bit of, whether they were errors.

00:49:07:27 - 00:49:08:12

Or whether.

00:49:08:14 - 00:49:24:13

Whether the information hadn't been carried through from the tables correctly. There was an explanation of it, but updates were made to chapter eight, and that now aligns with what I understand to be the position of significant cumulative landscape and visual effects being predicted across the schemes. Is that correct?

00:49:27:10 - 00:49:59:24

When you write for the applicant. Yes, sir. The original assessment on the cumulative effects relating to the scheme was undertaken. This was looked at two aspects of the cumulative effects. It looked at the cumulative development. So that is the sites in the context of the other cumulative solar schemes and the and then the cumulative sites which is essentially cotton one, two and three in combination with each other.

00:50:04:13 - 00:50:06:03

One. Hear me? Okay.

00:50:06:05 - 00:50:11:21

I could hear you and think you would be picked up sometimes if it's not close. That doesn't really quite capture it.

00:50:11:23 - 00:50:57:00

But moving on from that, the act within the report, it was picked up. This was Lincolnshire County Council, it was picked up and there were some inconsistencies at 4.9 and 5.9 of the Elvia review, which was undertaken as part of that process in the context of putting those anomalies. Right. Um, so it was also requested as an examiner's question, that we review the whole report and ensure that all anomalies or carry forward from the assessment appendices are corrected or put right within the chapter eight.

00:50:57:09 - 00:51:34:07

And that is the work that we undertook and submitted at deadline to. In the process of undertaking that work. It was set out within the explanatory note, which was also submitted at deadline to, and the explanatory note set out where there may be a departure from the original assessment, where there may be significant effects now identified that weren't originally within the assessment that was picked up in the explanatory note, and that related to.

00:51:35:22 - 00:52:01:07

Four receptors. Where the effects had changed for various reasons, one of them being that there had been panels within field 20 and 21 that were no longer within the assessment, and then the other reassessment of the receptor was relating to viewpoint 29, which was

00:52:02:24 - 00:52:40:10

a reread judgment on the effect from that particular receptor. Which has taken away a significant effect from the scheme. So that sets the position in terms of the assessment of the effects of the scheme in its own right. Then turning to the cumulative effects. We haven't changed our position on the cumulative effects since the assessment was submitted. Those effects haven't been changed as a result of updating the Elvia, which is now revision A.

00:52:41:17 - 00:53:17:19

You say that they haven't changed, but in terms of yes, chapter eight, they have changed, haven't they? Because in chapter eight, in the original original draft, if I understand, or if I recall correctly, it was saying that there weren't any significant effects. And as I look at the interrelationship report, that point has carried through into the interrelationship report and under the point court and predicts no significant cumulative effects. And what I've assumed, perhaps incorrectly. Right. You can correct me if I'm wrong, is that those those errors in the original chapter eight have carried through to the to the interrelationship report, the amended chapter eight.

00:53:17:21 - 00:53:32:08

Now we're in a position where they haven't carried through and it's still seeing no significant effects. So it's an alignment point if I understand correctly. But if I go back to the the raw data sheets. In terms of cumulative effects. Those are the things that haven't changed.

00:53:32:26 - 00:53:47:08

Yes, the original data sheets haven't changed, and the assessment of that as significant effects still stands. And we identify that there are significant cumulative effects.

00:53:48:12 - 00:53:51:21

Yes, that was my understanding of this project. You can see.

00:53:52:09 - 00:54:26:08

Yes. Collaborative for the applicant. Yes. It's a result of the version of the latest version of the interrelationship report. Was the version that was agreed for the prior Burton deadline, which was published the gate Burton prior to the deadline, two updates being made to the landscape and visual impact assessment. So it's it's out of date because we we submitted a deadline to the version that had

already been submitted into the gate Burton examination, because that was the latest version that was agreed by all of the parties.

00:54:26:10 - 00:54:48:24

The same version went into the West Burton examination deadline. That was also that week. However, my understanding is, is that the the next deadline is Cottam deadline, which is for all of the projects, which is the deadline three and the updated version of the interrelationship report will pick up any changes that are required as a result of the deadline to submissions made by the applicant.

00:54:49:11 - 00:55:23:28

That's correct in thinking that without a position on cumulative effect hasn't changed, it's just the chapter eight has been updated to align with the tables, and then that just needs to be pulled through. Now to the interrelationship. It just needs to. That's how I read the interrelationship. I have to say it was a bit confusing, and it was probably quite difficult for interested parties to follow that point because it took me a while to get there as well. Can ask in future if these updates are happening, that even if you can't get the changes in time, that we have a note just to let us know so that other parties are able to follow because think it might be difficult for them to.

00:55:24:24 - 00:55:30:13

To keep up otherwise. Does anyone else wish to comment on that point before we move on in terms of.

00:55:35:22 - 00:55:43:19

Mr. Shaikh, I'll come to you first. As you can see the discussion in Lincolnshire County Council at the moment, and they may wish to come in. Do you have anything at Westminster?

00:55:44:04 - 00:55:45:06

No. No, sir. Thank you.

00:55:45:10 - 00:55:46:02

That's all.

00:55:47:01 - 00:56:00:17

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council thank you sir. Think because of the updates and the number of updates, we need to probably comment in writing rather than now if we can just once we've got all of the documents all updated. If we're able to comment in writing, that would be appreciated.

00:56:00:19 - 00:56:08:13

Yes. That's fine. I assume you follow the point of what's happened, that it's not a change in the data, it's just the way it's been presented.

00:56:09:10 - 00:56:16:05

Yes. Think even say, we probably just need to take stock of where we are and and work out whether we've got any additional comments to make or not.

00:56:16:15 - 00:56:21:09

Thank you very much. 7000 acres. Do you have anything with surprise? No, thank you very much.

00:56:24:16 - 00:56:28:10

I mean, case, I'm going to hand off to Mr. Henry now to take us through the next few agenda items.

00:56:29:04 - 00:56:37:20

The thank you. And I'm not going to turn to the historic environment. So again, I don't know whether there's a need to change in the applicants team.

00:57:10:16 - 00:57:42:27

Okay. Thank you. Um, as these gender asset sales. Um, I'd be interested in applicant's most up to date position as regards cumulative effects on designated assets as viewed from Lincoln Edge. Um, in that regard, in particular, I note that the the chapter on cultural heritage um on page 86, if it's a hand first the potential for moderate adverse effects or above, but then goes on to say this would require, amongst other things, the assessment or the steps to confirm. Um, so now have these other assets now being considered in this regard.

00:57:46:25 - 00:57:52:00

Mr. Wilson on behalf of the applicant. And so firstly on.

00:57:52:02 - 00:57:52:19

Your.

00:57:52:21 - 00:58:27:00

Your point regarding the. Explaining position and or designated heritage assets were identified within the heritage statement. Where views out from Lincoln Cliff made a contribution to their significance. Um, these assets, as you will have seen, were identified within that environmental statement and it was concluded that during the operational phase, there was potential for these assets to experience cumulative visual effects. Uh, no other assets were identified to have the potential to experience cumulative effects.

00:58:27:24 - 00:59:00:26

The cumulative effects were, um, were reviewed in September 2023 as part of the joint report into relationships between nationally significant infrastructure projects, in line with the assessment, um, approach taken within the heritage statement and environmental chapter. Um, it was assessed within this document that there was the potential for up to moderate adverse effects, cumulative impacts at the worst case. And that was with West Burton in mind on the Roman villa west of Scampton.

00:59:01:09 - 00:59:41:17

This was depending on the dependent upon the effectiveness of the landscape mitigation. Um, any additional cumulative impacts with the till bridge solar schemes would be likely to be negligible and no significant cumulative impacts were identified for other heritage assets. And I would add that in relation to that, no objections were raised by Historic England to this approach. So the cumulative effects were reviewed in September, as said in relation within the Joint Report on Interrelationships and taking into account the the schemes included in that joint report.

00:59:43:13 - 00:59:46:21

And is is that position likely to change? Obviously.

00:59:48:16 - 01:00:06:27

The colleague spoke in relation to deadline three. There'll be updates in terms of the cumulative sites and the various other sites were referred to. So is it likely that that will change again in terms of or at least will be looked at again in relation to that stage when you know the sites like One Earth, etc. are looked at as well.

01:00:08:01 - 01:00:21:29

Tristan Willson, on behalf of the applicant. It is our intention to review the cumulative effects again as part of the update to the interrelationship report that will be submitted at deadline three.

01:00:22:28 - 01:00:23:20

And thank you.

01:00:26:28 - 01:00:35:15

Um, do any of the parties have any points to make on this specific historic environment? Parts West Lindsey, Lincolnshire. Nottinghamshire.

01:00:38:06 - 01:00:39:12

7000 acres.

01:00:41:05 - 01:00:52:28

And then more broadly, in terms of historic environment, cumulative effects. Um, any other points that any other parties wish to raise before I move on to culture and soils?

01:00:56:11 - 01:00:56:26

Thank you.

01:00:58:21 - 01:01:02:06

So turning to that now again, I don't know whether you need another change in the lineup.

01:01:40:18 - 01:02:11:24

Um. Okay. Obviously, we've already had one revision of the Culture and Soils chapter. Um, but when this was revised, it did not appear to be revised in relation to the agricultural land classification grades, soil resource and farming circumstances. In relation to the cumulative effects. And I'm wonder why that was the case. Because when the the chapter is is read on page 28, it still states that there is an absence of such assessment results in the public domain.

01:02:12:17 - 01:02:27:07

There are no meaningful data is available to praise farming circumstances for these six cumulative sites, but presumably now some information would be available. So let's get back to my question. Why? Why hasn't the chapter been updated in that regard?

01:02:29:23 - 01:03:11:29

Daniel Byrd for the applicant. Yes. Chapter 19 Soils and Agricultural Revision a, um, note that all six cumulative sites will be temporary without loss of the agricultural land resource. The residual effect of each of these six sites on the agricultural land resource is therefore predicted to be negligible. As for cotton, the impact assessment will not be changed by the release of site survey data. The update for the chapter did not include updates to the cumulative chapter for sites in now in the public domain, as these will be addressed in the interrelationship report as the data on the cumulative sites is progressively released.

01:03:12:10 - 01:03:18:12

The purpose of the update to chapter 19 was to address Natural England comments on grades.

01:03:19:18 - 01:03:29:16

So is that paragraph still correct me when it talks about there's no meaningful data available to appraise this issue in terms of the cumulative sites. That's that's what the provision of the chapter still say is.

01:03:30:28 - 01:04:09:19

The not that paragraph has a. Become out of date because of us. All of the chapters will have because of their progressive release of information on new cumulative sites. But that update was to address a technical issue, and the updates for cumulative impact were to be addressed in the interrelationship

report, rather than multiple updates of every chapter every time new information is released on cumulative sites.

01:04:10:15 - 01:04:20:11

So the most updated version of the joint report. Does that present the most up to date position in relation to our culture and soils, and in terms of the cumulative effects across the sites?

01:04:23:08 - 01:04:23:23

Sorry.

01:04:24:26 - 01:04:41:19

The joint reports. That's simply saying. That's what you're relying on rather than the chapter in relation to now providing the most up to date information as regards the cumulative effects. So it is the most update version of the joint report we have. Is that up to date in that regard?

01:04:43:06 - 01:05:23:17

Yes. That's that's the approach. As mentioned earlier, it was decided to not update all of the chapters to reflect the moving position on cumulative effects, but to have that information contained in the interrelationship report. Some errors had been noted in the soils chapter, and so a revision was included to correct those errors. But to avoid some chapters being up to date on, you know, having up to date text in relation to the progress of other schemes on cumulative and others not being updated to include that text.

01:05:23:25 - 01:05:49:19

It was felt appropriate to have everything in the interrelationship report on that. However, obviously if you would prefer. Revise chapters to include updated text, and we can obviously arrange for that to be done. But we didn't feel there was a need to update all of the chapters, and we didn't want to have individual chapters having taken a different. Different approach where they were being updated to correct other.

01:05:50:01 - 01:05:57:28

So in terms of the joint reports, is that today, though, in terms of our cultural and classification grade, school resource and farming circumstances.

01:05:58:00 - 01:06:29:29

Yes, based on the information available, obviously once the till bridge application submitted, if that is done during this examination period, then that would be updated. To reflect that. And as we were saying before. We're currently reviewing the scoping reports for the other two projects that have recently been published, so it will be updated further. The interrelationship report as a result of that new information. And the live document as we've been discussing.

01:06:32:23 - 01:07:05:02

Paraphrase, Mr. Baird said there were no changes to the conclusions on cumulative effects as a result of. And. The review of the information and interrelationship reports. We mentioned before that where chapters were being updated, if there was a change to the conclusions on cumulative, then it would be useful for you to have that section of that chapter updated as a result to reflect any changes to the conclusions on cumulative. So there wasn't a disparity between.

01:07:06:08 - 01:07:23:04

Conclusions on significance of cumulative effects in the individual chapters versus the interrelationship report. But as you see, for the majority of the documents, it's been a case of confirming that the up to date information has been reviewed, but there are no changes to the conclusions.

01:07:23:29 - 01:07:51:21

To understand correctly. Ms. project. When we and we present this in our report to the Secretary of State position, is that the Secretary of State can go to the individual topic chapters. But in terms of cumulative effects, he needs to read across from those chapters to the cumulative report to find the most up to date position on them. So you can't rely on the topic chapters for the most up to date position, can't necessarily rely on them for the most up to date position in terms of cumulative effects.

01:07:53:03 - 01:08:30:18

Collaborate with the applicant. That's correct. However, as we discussed, if there was a if the interrelationship report identifies a change to the conclusions, then we will consider providing an update. To the chapter. So for example, if you have a chapter which says there's no there is a limited information available, but our conclusions are no significant cumulative effects. And the interrelationship report concludes that there are no significant cumulative effects. We wouldn't go about updating that chapter, but if we'd if the chapter had said there were no significant cumulative effects.

01:08:30:20 - 01:08:42:04

But as a result of the interrelationship report, we've now moved to having significant cumulative effects. Then we would update the chapter in that circumstance so that the chapter is not misleading in that sense.

01:08:42:22 - 01:09:24:23

Just wondering that regard. It's also worth if any paragraphs are no longer applicable in the chapters in terms of stating that because I can see if someone's reading the chapter and reading the joint report, if the paragraphs which are no longer relevant, that could that could lead to some confusion in terms of how the two documents are read together. So obviously in this regard, for example, we have a paragraph saying that without knowing, no meaningful data now been available, obviously it is, and it's reflected in the joint report, but the chapters also something else. Just wonder whether it's in terms of purposes of clarification or it's worth that being listed in terms of there are paragraphs within the environmental statement which are of no longer relevance because of what the joints, you know, the joint report says.

01:09:24:25 - 01:09:34:22

So it's clear it's almost signposted what what the most, where the position is and what signposted, what environmental statements, you know, is of no longer of relevance.

01:09:35:21 - 01:10:08:05

Can mean don't wear. There haven't been any changes to the conclusions. Would. It wouldn't be normal practice to update the environmental chapters as they were submitted, because they obviously represent the situation as per when the application was submitted. So don't believe there's a need to update all of the chapters to confirm that information is available. However, we talked about providing effectively a concluding statement at the final deadline.

01:10:08:07 - 01:10:31:26

Perhaps in that document, when we state where we've got to in terms of the relationship report, we can provide a summary that applies to all of the chapters, so that the Secretary of State then has that overriding summary of the position and the approach we've taken. So it's very clear. But I would call her to avoid having to resubmit every single document in the environmental statement. Would caution.

01:10:31:28 - 01:10:32:14

Against that.

01:10:33:06 - 01:10:39:27

Can take the point and think a summary would be quite useful in that respect. Mr. Sheikh can see what's come in there.

01:10:40:12 - 01:11:20:10

West Lindsey District council, yes. We appreciate the purpose of the interrelationship document, in the sense that it is going to provide updates through an external document to the Is. The only concern we have is that the interrelationship report. Well, the point of clarification is that we're not entirely sure what its status is because it is not in the document. So if there are discrepancies between the interrelationship report and the chapters, aside from obviously the conclusions which would be potentially updated if there are discrepancies in the actual information or positions in the chapters, arguably they actually ought to be updated to rather than relying on an external interrelationship report document.

01:11:21:00 - 01:11:54:05

As much as it depends on the nature of the issue, doesn't it? Because think what Ms. Broderick is saying is if it goes to the significance of effects, then that clearly requires an update. But if it's more of a signposting point or a general point, then they don't. If I've understood you correctly, which project you're saying that if we go through a process where all of these documents are continually updated throughout the examination, then very quickly we end up with vast numbers of versions of documents that becomes quite unwieldy and think what Ms. Project is trying to avoid is that we all end up in a situation where we have.

01:11:56:00 - 01:11:56:27

Number of documents.

01:12:00:03 - 01:12:08:13

And yes, just to reiterate that, obviously, chapter 23, which provides the conclusions on residual effects, would be up to date. And.

01:12:13:12 - 01:12:31:24

Complications on cumulative effects, which obviously forms part of the environmental statement. So it's the interrelationship report is providing a summary of the conclusions. On cumulative effects that are included in each of those environmental statements. So it necessarily has to reflect the chapter 23.

01:12:32:02 - 01:12:59:29

As we move through the examination, it will be clear to everyone what these updates are, because at each deadline, the applicant does provide a summary of the changes and the issues that are being altered in or the issues that have come to light. And so I don't think anyone would be prejudiced by this point as we move through the examination, because you will be aware of it as we go through. And obviously we'll include that in our recommendation report to the Secretary of State to highlight any issues as we go ahead, Mr. Shaikh.

01:13:01:01 - 01:13:09:00

Counsel. Yes. So just to say that if that's the case and the interrelationship report is going to work in that way, it just ought to be certified. So it does fall part of the recommendation. And.

01:13:10:12 - 01:13:24:23

Thank. Thank you, Mr. Sheikh. That is a good point, Ms. Broderick. Is that something that you can add into the development consent order as a certified? Actually, as I'm saying that it makes me that that report will change, presumably after the close of the examination. And that becomes problematic then, doesn't it, in terms of notification.



01:13:25:27 - 01:13:57:24

To the applicant? Yes. Think we'd need to consider the because the purpose of the environmental statement being both the documents that were submitted as part of the environmental statement at the application and additional information that's clarifications that have been provided as part of the environmental statement, obviously captured for the purposes of the definition of environmental statement in in the draft, where there are references to there not being any materially new or different effects in the in the environmental statement.

01:13:58:11 - 01:14:31:15

So don't necessarily think it would be appropriate to refer to the interrelationship report as being part of the environmental statement on the basis that that's an evolving document. However, the as I said, to the extent that there are any changes to the conclusions on cumulative for this project alone, the environmental statement will have been updated either through revision to the individual, to the individual chapter itself, and also to chapter 23, which provides the conclusions on cumulative and residual effects as well.

01:14:31:17 - 01:14:51:01

So for purposes of the Cotton Project, the environmental statement and its updates to the various chapters will be will be comprehensive. The interrelationship report obviously does provides what the conclusions are for other projects, which isn't obviously relevant to.

01:14:53:02 - 01:15:00:05

Compliance with the environmental statement in as firm as used in the draft development Consent order.

01:15:00:19 - 01:15:31:29

But think Mr. Sheikh's point is that you end up with erroneous information in the environmental statement. If they're not updated and you don't have a certified interrelationship report. So there could be information that you can't unless you go through all of the examination documents and pull that information out individually. The Secretary of State will find it quite difficult to to follow which bits of the environmental statement are currently up to date, and which bits of the environmental statement have been superseded, unless there's a mechanism in place by way of update, presumably, is your point? Mr..

01:15:33:24 - 01:16:05:12

But the purpose of that is the conclusions of the environmental. How the wording of environmental statement is used in the draft development Consent order, not for the purposes of c, the Secretary of State's decision or your recommendation, but how it is used is only to determine whether there are any materially new or different effects compared to those reported in the environmental statement. So the conclusions are up to date in the environmental statement, then that's sufficient.

01:16:05:14 - 01:16:06:11

It doesn't matter that.

01:16:11:02 - 01:16:24:06

They're waiting. Further information at that point in time. What we're saying is the conclusion was no significant effects and the environmental the interrelationship report is confirming that that no significant effects conclusion remains the same.

01:16:26:25 - 01:16:35:22

Thank you, Mr. Broderick. Think we might need to give that a bit further thought. Mr. Scheck, is there anything else you want to point out there? Mr. Hall, do you have a view on this?

01:16:38:06 - 01:17:16:02

Every hole. Lancashire County Council say. Think if there are any substantive amendments to be made to the conclusions of the environmental information, then they're going to need to be reflected in the updates to the chapters of the yes, which I understand is what the applicant's actually proposing to do. So it was the only thing that falls outside that category is something that wouldn't be significant. They don't have a problem with that being in a different document, as long as the as long as the environment the certified document is, the environmental statement is updated to a point where it identifies all of the likely significant environmental effects, which I understand is what I'm getting.

01:17:16:04 - 01:17:21:02

Nods on the other side of the room. That's what is proposed, so I don't have a problem with that.

01:17:21:07 - 01:17:33:26

Yes. And take that point that the environmental statement is concerned with the significant effects rather than all of the effects. Okay. Thank you very much. I'm not sure we can take that conversation any further unless anyone else wishes to come in at this point.

01:17:34:20 - 01:17:35:07

Don't you have any?

01:17:37:25 - 01:17:44:14

Does anyone have any further points in relation to our culture and soils and community effects before move on to transport?

01:17:46:21 - 01:17:58:27

Thank you. Okay, so turning to transport then my first question actually is to West Lindsey District Council. Um. So in relation to the the Local Impact Report, it was submitted.

01:18:06:12 - 01:18:07:10

Think on page.

01:18:12:07 - 01:18:14:04

And page 54 of that report.

01:18:17:01 - 01:18:17:16

And.

01:18:19:04 - 01:18:43:05

There's a paragraph 10.1 bullet points under that paragraph. We got one of the last two bullet points and I think it's six and seven. Um, talks obviously about the potential consideration of the routes used by community of schemes. Just wondered whether that has any why you consider that has a bearing relation to the to the assessment which has taken place.

01:18:51:10 - 01:18:57:11

West Lindsey District Council. Thank you. I'm going to pass this one over to Mr. Blake when he's also at the right part of the document.

01:19:02:23 - 01:19:04:10

I'll explain. West Lindsey District.

01:19:04:12 - 01:19:05:00

Council.

01:19:06:16 - 01:19:08:20

With regard to the, um.

01:19:10:02 - 01:19:11:01

Construction, traffic.

01:19:11:03 - 01:19:11:18

And the cumulative.

01:19:11:20 - 01:19:12:10

Impact.

01:19:13:04 - 01:19:47:15

To be clear from the start, the Westlands position isn't raising a concern on a technical point around the highway capacity or safety. Obviously that would be a matter for the county Highways Authority. Our issue here cumulatively, is about how this is going to be managed in the event that two or more schemes come forward. And constructed. At the same time, or in an overlapping nature. Um, the current construction, outline, construction, traffic management plans all work in extensive.

01:19:48:09 - 01:20:24:09

Dealing with mitigating those impacts as far as possible for the projects in Solis. Speak about the other applications that are examination as well what the county are looking to safeguard. So come to the district looking to safeguard, uh. Um. The coordination. Of how those construction activity will occur. Obviously this particular topic is transport but construction around. So we'll have multiple vehicle trips linked to multiple projects occurring at the same time on the highway network causing amenity.

01:20:25:04 - 01:20:36:04

Impacts upon local residents in terms of temporary highway works, temporary traffic controls, etcetera. So in order to control and minimize that further.

01:20:37:28 - 01:21:13:22

Well, the districts are looking for a mechanism within the control documents to say, okay, in the event you come forward, we will have, for example, a single point of control, a project coordinator that will be that central source of information for residents, for the council, from an enforcement perspective, whatever it may be. But to have multiple projects, having multiple construction activities makes it very, very difficult for the council to seek what the harm is being caused in the event of an enforcement complaint and how to resolve that to secure remedy for any particular impacts.

01:21:13:24 - 01:21:26:00

So it really is about, you know, finding what what the fault is in the event of multiple activities happening at once. That's where the, the crux of the of the Westminster's issues are, if that helps. Okay.

01:21:26:03 - 01:21:38:14

So in terms of my understanding of what you've just said, and it's another item, it's listed on the agenda. Are you looking for something like a joint traffic construction management that is that what. Yeah, a suggestion sorry.

01:21:38:16 - 01:22:10:15

I'll explain. West Lindsey District council. Yes. It's not. We're not looking for. Um, it's almost like a framework or skeleton approach in the event if, you know, secured as an appendix to the current control documents to, say, an event, this happens. These projects won't just plow their own furrow and deliver the projects in isolation. There will be something in those control ducts to compel the developers to work together. In a spirit of collaboration that we've heard throughout the examinations so far, for the applicant to say no, we will.

01:22:10:19 - 01:22:48:10

Clearly, there will be construction activities that will be regulated in solar. So understand all that. But in terms of the overarching control of to give you a practical example, journeys, there's going to be several trips, abnormal loads we can find through websites, through contact about what's going to happen and when in a coordinated approach. Um. That's the sort of mitigation remedy that the council is looking for to be secured through the management plans that will then be fleshed out in the event that two or more schemes come forward and those conjoined activities occur on the ground.

01:22:49:06 - 01:23:02:25

Okay. Thank you. Obviously we'll come to the applicants for that, but I think firstly, I'll just ask the same question to the what's been said to the two high authorities first and then we'll go back to the applicant. So Lincolnshire do you have any, any any comments on that.

01:23:06:04 - 01:23:15:18

It, says Stephanie Hall, linked to county council from a highway safety point of view. Um, at our highways office didn't have any additional comments to make. Thank you very much.

01:23:15:28 - 01:23:17:03

And Nottinghamshire.

01:23:22:04 - 01:23:29:11

So, you know, I recognize the issues with cumulative. But our highway

01:23:31:00 - 01:23:41:21

highway officers are broadly content. Certainly with the aligned and fully agree obviously the aligned construction pipeline corridor being proposed in Nottinghamshire.

01:23:43:03 - 01:23:43:19

Thank you.

01:23:44:21 - 01:23:58:17

Um, so in terms of what West Lindsey have said, obviously be interested in applicants views on that and particularly relation to whether there will be some sort of joint document possibly appended to the the construction traffic management plan to to essentially deal with this issue.

01:24:00:24 - 01:24:12:25

The applicant, and in section 5.4 of the interrelationship report, which was rapid 2-037. And there is.

01:24:14:19 - 01:24:44:09

A number of paragraphs relating to mitigation that would be put in place in the event that the projects are constructed at the same time as it states in there, there isn't any certainty at this point in time whether there will be any overlap or, in fact, which projects may overlap. So there could be overlap of all all of the projects, or only 1 or 2 of them. So and it was not considered therefore appropriate to.

01:24:45:27 - 01:24:48:18

Set out the detail of any joint.

01:24:50:14 - 01:25:27:10

Construction traffic management plan at this stage in the process, because of the number of variables there could be. However, in the outline for the gate, Burton scheme says out in 5.4.4, some text was added to refer to the possibility of a joint, and similar wording is going to be added to the next version of the outline for the cotton project, which provides the types of measures that could be included in that joint if it were to be required, and obviously the.

01:25:28:28 - 01:25:59:02

That plan will need to be approved by the relevant planning authorities prior to construction. So at that point in time, there will be a much better understanding of the nature and extent of any joint ways of working that may be required. And so we envisage that discussion being had at that point in time. How have we are going to update the outline to provide that kind of hook, as it were, so that those discussions can take place as a result of the discharge of the final.

01:25:59:05 - 01:26:00:04

So just to.

01:26:00:06 - 01:26:09:28

Summarize, and so we'll deal with the issue then. Or is it kind of be less slightly open in terms of whether it will or not dependent on what the you know, how these construction programs work out in practice.

01:26:11:11 - 01:26:47:03

The applicant. So there will be reference to the need for a joint TMP in certain circumstances. But it's we don't consider it's appropriate to provide an outline for that plan at this stage because of the number of variables, but we would expect that to be done at the detailed design stage once the individual programs for each of the projects are known and the contractors are appointed. So that kind of level of coordination can be discussed, but it will all need to be approved by the relevant planning authorities. So they will need to be the applicant for this scheme and the undertakers for the other projects will need to.

01:26:49:19 - 01:27:02:18

Provide evidence to assure the discharging authorities that there are appropriate mitigation measures in place in order to minimise impacts, as have been reported in the environmental statements for each of the projects.

01:27:03:06 - 01:27:06:12

Thank you. Probably want to have any comments on that.

01:27:07:03 - 01:27:41:15

Yeah I'll explain. West Lindsey District Council. Without repeating the discussion we just had around the interrelationship document. It's clearly not the mechanism upon which we can rely upon for secure and mitigation. Okay, we can refer to it as a useful signpost and document, but it doesn't deliver that mitigation. So I was pleased to hear the commitment to update the set. We're not asking for anything more than that. Um, and we welcome. See that word and see, um, uh, the extent to which that meets our concerns.

01:27:41:17 - 01:28:06:21

What I will say, though, is a commitment. It's one thing clearly from opposition, the more of a framework we can secure from heads of terms, whatever it might look like, the more security and assurance we have. But we. Seek to consider the requirements. Um. You know, which will be broadly

in accordance with that document, the most kind of framework detail we have in there, the most, you know, assurance we have as an authority that that those commitments will be driven through.

01:28:09:05 - 01:28:25:01

This isn't the assurance, though, that you approve the final document. To some extent. So think, Ms.. Blake. Sorry. Ms.. Broderick's point, Mr. Blake. That point is that they will include the update, presumably at deadline three, as the wording seems to have already been included in.

01:28:27:03 - 01:28:59:21

The applicant. Yes, that's correct. It'll go in the deadline three version. We're not aware, but we will double check that. West Lindsey District Council has provided any comments or additional wording that it wanted to see in the gate Burton version, but obviously if there is specific wording West Lindsey would like to be included, then the applicant is happy to consider that. And we'll speak to Kate Burton about ensuring some sort of consistency. But as I understand it, we haven't I don't think there's been any comment on the specific wording of the or the framework as it's called in the Gate Burton scheme, the framework.

01:29:00:15 - 01:29:02:21

But we will check that position.

01:29:02:23 - 01:29:03:10

And no doubt, Mr..

01:29:03:12 - 01:29:08:16

Blake, then once you've seen the wording, you can come back and comment on whether or not you you consider it to be acceptable.

01:29:09:00 - 01:29:32:25

Yeah. Alex Blake, West Lindsey District Council yeah, absolutely. It'd be all down to the wording. Um, a lot of them just open up discussions we've had on other projects, but we're more than happy to, to discuss that, you know, particularly in the context of this, you know, substantially in accordance with, you know, test within the requirement that's quite highly assessed in terms of that substantiality. So, um, yeah, we look forward to seeing the wording we're responding. Right. It.

01:29:32:27 - 01:29:33:12

Thank you. Mr..

01:29:35:05 - 01:29:51:12

Thank you. Um, in terms of the joint relationship reports, obviously, I'm aware the last version, there was some updates in relation to access contained within that cross accumulative scheme. So think be quite useful to explain what he said in those and why why that update was made.

01:29:56:22 - 01:30:05:12

Yeah, we can just obviously provide a couple of high level points before Mr.. And goes into the detail. Um.

01:30:09:15 - 01:30:49:18

It has discussions ongoing about trying to align access points between the projects, particularly for the specific relation to the cable route corridor. We mentioned in our notification of our intention to submit a change request and a particular access change that was going to be put forward for the for the scheme in order to ensure alignment with Gate Burton in relation to their access points. Also, some additional access points in relation to the change to the cable route to the south of Cotton Power Station and to see the the detail of that information isn't yet in.

01:30:50:14 - 01:31:10:09

The scheme change application hasn't been submitted yet, whereas obviously the change application for the Gate Burton scheme already is in. So there's at the moment there's a slight disparity between the information that's in the gate Burton scheme versus the information that's in um in this scheme. But obviously the um.

01:31:12:01 - 01:31:24:26

The. Interrelationship report provides sort of an update on the status, but just wanted to make it clear that obviously some of it is referring to the change request, which you haven't had yet.

01:31:25:02 - 01:31:43:16

Okay. So was that so? Was that the primary reason for the update in relation to that part of the report is that that's essentially, you know, just looking for explanation in terms of why it's a fairly large update being made at this stage. Just if that's explanation why then. Okay then guess at that explanation. Why? If you can just confirm whether that is the case or not.

01:31:53:15 - 01:32:15:03

Yes, there's a combination of things. There's some the moving of some access points or removal of some access points within the existing red line boundary, which is reported to to ensure alignment between the access points, both schemes, so that they're not two separate access points in the same location. And then there are some that are related to the change application.

01:32:18:09 - 01:32:22:00

But if you want more detail on the individual accesses themselves and obviously.

01:32:22:29 - 01:32:33:27

Don't need that level of detail, just just an explanation of why it was updated in that regard. Thank you. Does any of the parties have any points they want to raise on this specific matter? 7000 acres.

01:32:34:22 - 01:33:08:09

Thank you Mark. 7000 acres. Firstly, we agree with the concerns raised by West Lindsey District Council. Second point, have really perhaps links into the next point on human health. Just to make the point that, of course, if these schemes do go ahead, we could have locals subjected to about six years of very heavy traffic on minor roads, which are in quite a poor state.

01:33:10:09 - 01:33:12:17

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

01:33:19:08 - 01:33:19:23

And.

01:33:22:01 - 01:33:23:20

In relation to the killing.

01:33:33:28 - 01:33:39:02

Open for me. Want to ask questions? Miss product wish to come in on 7000 acres. Response or.

01:33:41:04 - 01:34:11:11

Clarity of the applicant and only to say that the as set out in chapter two, which is the process and methodology chapter the cumulative assessment in terms of the shared cable corridor where where we've got the overlap considers two different cumulative scenario, one where all the construction of

all three projects takes place at the same time, and then another scenario where the construction of the projects is sequential.

01:34:11:13 - 01:34:22:29

So we feel that the environmental impact assessment has covered the scenario whereby construction of the projects takes place over a number of years, so the effects of that have been fully considered within the environmental statement.

01:34:23:14 - 01:34:23:29

And.

01:34:24:03 - 01:34:52:12

So on. That point, yes, sets out that the effect will be low. Relation to that, I just wondered how that accounts for the give so much for the explanation in terms of the the cumulative effect figures. I think they're cited in section 14.9 of the the Transport and Access chapter. So they'd be quite useful to explain to me how that conclusion has been come to in relation to, to effect figures, how that translates to a low effects in relation to that.

01:34:55:19 - 01:35:01:24

Something extolled. If you want to reference, think it's pages 6869 of the of the chapter.

01:35:18:18 - 01:35:49:25

A good morning run for the applicants. So conclusions on chapter 14.1134. We're based on likely pedestrian cyclist flows and then construction traffic movements associated with the scheme. So many of the minor roads mean many of the roads being used are roads, such as the one 500 or the A 61, which he used to use to accommodate in HGVs of the level we're talking about.

01:35:50:11 - 01:36:24:29

Um, some of the minor roads which don't have walking cycling provision do not necessarily provide routes to key destinations and as such have have low pedestrian and cyclist movements. Um, we also undertook some public rights of way surveys to show where usage within the area, and these also showed low usage. Think the busiest one had 28 movements over a seven day period, and most of these movements came at the weekend when construction vehicle movements would be low. Um, so the conclusions were based on construction vehicle movements and observed construction movements.

01:36:25:08 - 01:36:40:11

Um, construction vehicle movements associated with the scheme, and then the lower levels of pedestrian and cyclist movements in the area at the moment. Um, and because of that, we considered that the impact would be would be minor and temporary.

01:36:40:25 - 01:37:02:07

And that's that's your conclusion in terms of the clearance of effects? Um, based on the figures at the time of the presume the chapter was put together again, is that something which, um. Well has been or will be updated in relation to as the schemes come along during the course of the examination that have been discussed. So for the.

01:37:02:09 - 01:37:35:23

Applicant, in terms of the crossover of routes for the different schemes. This there's actually quite little crossover in terms of specific roads. If the bridge scheme comes forward they'll say on the A63 one. And then there were the shared elements of the cable routes with Gate Burton. But apart from that, the routes for the different schemes are spread out throughout the network. So whilst we might



update some traffic numbers and associated with to bridge and our initial review of their scope and reports, actually their numbers are lower than what is presented within our chapter at the moment.

01:37:36:09 - 01:37:42:12

There won't be any change to the conclusions based based on that information. Thank you.

01:37:43:15 - 01:37:47:13

Any parties to raise any. Any comments on this specific matter?

01:37:50:00 - 01:38:05:17

Thank you. In terms of the Joint Traffic Construction management plan, I think we've already really touched on that. So don't feel we need to go there for further questions. But in terms of transport of any other points which any other parties wish to raise in terms of cumulative issues.

01:38:09:25 - 01:38:10:10

Thank you.

01:38:15:14 - 01:38:46:07

I think we're getting to the point where it's time to take a short break before we do so. Ms.. Broderick, you mentioned the change request. Think I'd probably be a bit remiss of me not to actually come back on that point and just just to say, clearly we haven't had a change application in we just had a notification of change request. We won't be looking at any of the changes that may or may not come in at this point, but would take the opportunity. I have looked at the timetable proposed by the applicant would have seen my response or our response to to that timetable.

01:38:46:12 - 01:38:51:14

I would just like to reiterate that timings are quite tight and if there is any.

01:38:53:00 - 01:39:05:18

Possibility that we won't have any change request were it to be made by the 12th of December. Think those timings would become very tight indeed. So I'd just like to make that point now just to reinforce that issue.

01:39:06:16 - 01:39:36:07

Okay. Clever. The applicant. Yes. The the response to the notification has been been noted and we are doing our best to get the change application ready for submission prior to the 12th, which was the latest deadline that we considered to be possible for achieving consideration of the application within the remaining examination timetable. We were very much trying to get that in beforehand, and we hope to be able to provide an update to you on progress at issue specific hearing five on Friday.

01:39:37:03 - 01:39:48:27

Thank you very much. In that case, it's now 1140. We'll take a short ten minute break and we will resume the hearing at 1150. Curing is now adjourned. Thank you.