



Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN010139 - Byers Gill Solar
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing
Date:	23 July 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

BYERSGILL_ISH1_SESSION2_230724

00:06

Hello, good afternoon. It's now half past three in the afternoon. And Tobias Gill Soler hearing is which one is resumed.

00:18

Thank you very much. May I remind those watching us online that you might need to refresh your browser? If you are watching on them on on the

00:28

live stream? Can I ask if the live stream is operational at the moment if I can get some confirmation on that? Thank you.

00:41

Right, so before we went on a break, we finished item three. And I was moving us to item four.

00:54

Item four, before I move on, are there any questions on Item three

00:59

stood? Yes, please, I'd like to make an observation about the mitigation.

01:08

bishopton village lies in a hollow and is about 130 feet above sea level. And so therefore the land all around, it falls down to the village which is in the base of the hollow. There are five roads into and out of our village. And as a resident been living there for many decades, three of those access roads regularly and I mean regularly flooded to become impassable by vehicles, to the point that local farmer's sons make pocket money pulling vehicles out with their tractors, when people who don't know how deep they are, get get stuck. Now to take those three roads in turn. One is adjacent to site F, which goes along the side of bishop to school, that middle lane, and that site that floods regularly, I'm not exaggerating regularly, I mean, often, and it's impossible. Now that is the very road where they're proposing to put the mitigation of a car park entrance. Now, schools work through all winter. There have been many, many days that car park will be inaccessible due to the entrance on the floodwater. So that is one point to consider. Secondly, another road is the road that sounds that we should be leading to read Marshall, which will have some of the cabling underneath him. The local authority have attempted to release the flood problem. And now over many, many years without success, it's because of the land the lay of the land that just can't move water uphill. And that regularly floods to become impassable. Now we're going to dig it up and create more problems by putting the cabling under the third one is the road that leads adjacent to site E. We call it locally ashes bank, and it's to the west of bishopton that again becomes regularly impassable in the land of site a naturally falls in a slope down to that road to the village.

03:23

With if you gotta cover citee in class, that will clearly exacerbate the drainage problems. And even more rain and water will flood those roads. So we the journeys into and out of the village will become even more difficult. And it doesn't appear that our severe flood problems have been considered. Thank you. Thank you for that. Mr. Ward. As you have now mentioned at the end of your of your participation, the issues that you have raised are very much linked with water environment and flooding.

04:00

We are likely to actually have specific hearings on that specific point further on in the examination. So we'll draw your attention to details where it might, it might be particularly relevant for you to actually have a look at the discussion in the agenda for those hearings. In the interest of time. And considering the purpose of today's meeting. I am going to take that specific item away and ask you Mr. Wood, if you wouldn't mind submitting that specific question in writing. And then the applicant can reply to that specific question that deadline one, which is I have mentioned before it's on the eighth of August, please. Thank you very much. Now, I would like us to move on then to Item four need for the proposed development. And similarly to the previous item it might be helpful for me to start by setting out two key documents that have informed my questioning on this specific topic.

05:00

So, mostly, I'm going to be drawing on the information from the planning statements. So that is a pp 163.

05:09

Long list of committee developments. That is a p 161 shortlist of committees development. That's a PP 162 policy compliance document that's 168, pp 164. And then the applicant submission of new and revised information, particularly as 01 for streetworks rights of way in excess plans, length plans, which is ASC or 15. And then the environmental master plan as 016.

05:41

So,

05:44

on our agenda for this specific item that we have published with our roll six letter, we have mentioned that we would like the applicant to provide us with some information in terms of how it actually assessed needs. So if I could actually hand over to the applicant, to please, in very general broad terms.

06:09

Explain how you have evaluated the need for the proposed development in how that needs

06:18

matches the government's journey to net zero?

06:22

Or assists the government's journey to net zero? I should have said, sir, thank you, Alex 100, for the applicant.

06:30

Thanks. I'm actually going to start with that policy, if I may. So the obviously the the key relevant policy in this situation is, are the national policy statements, the relevant national policy statements, which for the purposes of this application, are the energy national policy statements which were designated in January of this year, and it's particularly en one, which is the overarching renewables, sorry, overarching energy statement en three, which is the renewable energy statement, and N five, which relates to grid connection infrastructure.

07:10

This application will, of course, actually be one of the first solar DTOs, which is going to be decided under Section 104 of the Planning Act. Under those newly designated national policy statements. It's of course, the case that the the previous decisions which have been taken, have had regard to national policy statements that have been in place but thinking in particular of the three DCO decisions, which were development consent order decisions, which were issued by the new Secretary of State around 10 days ago, those were decisions which were taken under Section 105 of the Planning Act on account of a relevant national policy statement aimed specifically at solar generation, technology not been in place. So we are in a slightly different position. Now, we obviously have those new national policy statements in place. And it's worth, sir, touching very quickly on some of the key paragraphs of particularly en one, which is the overarching national policy statement on energy.

08:17

And so the paragraph references that I wanted to take you to there are, there are several of them. The first is the three paragraphs that start to 3.2 point six, and three, point 2.67 and eight. And it's worth I think, just reading these for the room, so the Secretary State should assess all applications for development concern for the types of infrastructure covered by this MPs, on the basis that the government has demonstrated that there is a need for those types of infrastructure which is urgent, as described for each of them in this part. In addition, the Secretary of State has determined that substantial weight should be given to this need when considering applications for development consent. Under the Planning Act 2008. The Secretary of State is not required to consider separately the specific contribution of any individual project to satisfying the need established in this MPs. If we then move down to paragraph 3.3 point 20, which is the role of wind and solar.

09:28

It provides that wind and solar are the lowest cost ways of generating electricity, helping reduce costs and providing a clean and secure source of electricity supply, as they are not reliant on fuel for generation. Our analysis shows that a secure reliable, affordable netzero consistent system and 2050 is likely to be completely composed predominantly of wind and solar.

09:54

And where that takes us to sir is paragraph 4.1 point two

10:00

worry,

10:01

which states that given the level and urgency of need for infrastructure of the types covered by the energy MPs as set out in part three of this MPs, the Secretary of State will start with a presumption in favor of granting consent to applications for energy and SERPs nationally significant infrastructure projects. That presumption applies and less any more specific and relevant policy set out in the relevant MPs is clearly indicate that consent should be refused.

10:35

The final area then sir of en one that I wanted to focus on, was the definition of critical national priority. So what four point 2.4 of en one provides is taking account what was said before, obviously only small parts of which I've read, government has therefore concluded that there is a critical national priority for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. And then reading the first bullet points of four point 2.5 Low Carbon infrastructure for the purposes of this policy means for electricity generation, all onshore and offshore generation that does not involve fossil fuel combustion. And then there is more to that definition, but I don't think we we need to go further.

11:26

In terms of how

11:28

that critical national priority and the need that has separately been identified 4.2 point six and four point 2.7 provide a brief explanation of how those matters should be taken into account how that applies. So 4.2 point six provides the overarching need case for each type of energy infrastructure and the substantial weight which should be given to this need in assessing applications, as set out in previous paragraphs is the starting point for all assessments of energy infrastructure applications.

12:05

Four point 2.7 then provides that the CMP policy does not create any additional or cumulative need case. It doesn't need to.

12:17

But it applies following the normal consideration of the need case. And it takes into account the impact of the project and the application of the mitigation hierarchy. And therefore, as such, it is relevant during the Secretary of State's decision making, and specifically in reference to any residual matters, any residual impacts Forgive me that have been identified. Now, the final piece of this policy document that I wanted to take your attention to sir is how those residual impacts should be considered in the decision making process. And for that, we go to 4.2 point 15 which relates to and forgive me there are acronyms in the text, non HRA, which means non habitats regulations assessment, and non MCs EAD, which relates to non marine conservation zone, reserves, residual impacts of critical national priority infrastructure. So, residual impacts in those categories. So the one the ones that aren't subject to the

habitats regulations, and don't affect marine conservation zones, which obviously aren't relevant to this project,

13:33

what 4.2 point 15 says these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but most exceptional circumstances, it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. The exception to this presumption of consent or residual impacts onshore and offshore which present an unacceptable risk to or unacceptable interference with human health and public safety, defense irreplaceable habitats, or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero. And then 4.2 point 16 provides as a result the Secretary of State will take as the starting point for decision making that such infrastructure is to be treated as if it had met any tests which are set out within the MPs his or other planning policy, which requires a clear outline of harm exceptionality or very special circumstances. And so the reason why I've taken you through that policy in a very high level way.

14:40

It's clearly explained in more detail in the planning statement that you've referred to and also the planet the policy compliance document, which has been prepared, prepared through the early adopters program that the scheme was was part of the function of those documents is

15:00

To identify the impacts of the proposed development in relation to relevant policy topics, and in doing so, what those documents between them also do is they evidence how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied by the applicant to avoid or reduce adverse effects wherever that has been feasible.

15:26

The

15:29

as as those documents conclude, there are a limited number of residual effects which occur from the proposed development. That's acknowledged in chapter six for example of the planning and statement. Those are summarized and relate to soil resources during construction landscape and visual receptors largely during operation and noise during construction and decommissioning.

15:57

It is worth noting that there are no significant adverse effects on designated landscapes designated ecological sites, protected species or designated and and designated heritage assets. It wouldn't, the scheme wouldn't have significant adverse effects on transport waste, air quality aviation health, or in accumulation with other developments. So

16:29

the conclusion that the planning statement reaches is the limited residual effects of the proposed development do not outweigh its urgent need and light with the context that I've just explained. And do

not represent an unacceptable risk that would negate that presumption in favor of consent, which is the starting point of the policy documents.

16:56

And

16:59

critical national priority to the extent that that needs to be taken into account would also factor into the weighing of any impacts and benefits which arise. So finally, the proposed development would deliver greater benefit and adverse effects and would contribute to an urgent national need for low carbon infrastructure.

17:22

Thank you very much. Thank you for taking us through that. Mr. Mechanic. If I may, I would ask, I would like to ask a couple of questions. Obviously, you have highlighted very much the need case, as you see it very much based on the national policy statement, which obviously, is one of the key documents that you need to take into consideration as well as the policies and direction that the that you have just outlined.

17:54

However, can I ask if you have looked at the neat case from a more local or regional perspective?

18:06

And if you have,

18:09

what were the key messages in terms of needs, locally? And perhaps provide a little bit of context to this specific question? The excise obviously very aware of points that were raised actually earlier today in throughout several relevant representations in relation to the cumulative effects of this project alongside several other solar energy generating projects, which might have been approved through this a different planning system, but nevertheless, are within the vicinity of by skill. So could you please talk us through in terms of how you have taken that need into consideration from a regional and local perspective?

18:57

And also, how you have taken into consideration this part of the overall

19:05

the location of other facilities in the cumulative effect of other general energy generating facilities within the area?

19:16

Thank you. So Alex, Minh Henyk for the applicant.

19:20

I think perhaps it's easiest if we start with the cumulative effects first. And we've we've seen the representations that have been made, for example, at procedural deadline a and as part of relevant representations as well in relation to the cumulative effects of the buyers guild scheme alongside other schemes that may already have been developed or are in the planning process, or are expected to come into construction in the short term future. There is a tried and tested methodology for the assessment of cumulative effects from the scheme being promoted together with others

20:00

games of that sort. That methodology has very clearly been followed in consultation with relevant technical stakeholders such as the local authorities, but also other statutory advisors who contributed to the scoping process, which led to the eventual environmental assessment work, which I'm referring to that scoping process is obviously one that is run by the planning Inspectorate who are familiar with the methodologies that are applied to cumulative assessments. And I think that the core point from the applicants perspective is all of these schemes which are being referred to have been assessed from a cumulative perspective, together with the buyers guild development now that will either have taken place as part of the baseline for the existing environment to the extent that those other schemes are already built and in place, or to the extent that they're coming forward in the future are expected to come forward in the future. Those are taken into account through the environmental assessment work in the conventional. Right. Right. Thank you for that. Mr. minich. I suspect judging from the number of relevant representations and interest that has been demonstrated today on this specific issue, we might have to drill further in terms of the cumulative effects. But for the time being, and in the context of the item is agenda of needs.

21:38

I think that probably that explanation for now will be sufficient. But I would ask if anyone around the room has any specific questions in terms of what the applicant has just explained.

21:53

Anderson, Sean Anderson for the Washington Action Group, can you confirm the dates when buyers guild would be connected and fully operational? If your application was successful?

22:07

Mr. Anderson, that is a very, very, very specific question. I will just I am just going to turn to the applicant safe, you'll have that date with you, or at least an indication then I will allow that question, but because it is very specific, I think that that's the type of question that might be best dealt with in writing. So if I could ask you to submit that question in writing as well as part of a deadline, one submission, that would be really useful. Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson.

22:37

Would the applicant like to reply or prefer to defer to

22:43

the for the deadline? So it may be easiest if we come back on that question on rotation? I think the information is in the application documents that simply finding that precise reference points to a very specific question. Yes. Live as it were, which is totally, yes. Okay, thank you very much. Any further questions from anyone else in the room online? Joining us in relation to need?

23:10

I don't see any hands raised.

23:13

I would just like to actually touch as well then, in terms of obviously, as part of the applicants overall case for need. You have also identified a series of additional project benefits that are set out within the planning statement.

23:33

Could you talk us through these benefits and I think that Mrs. Fisher has actually touched on some of that earlier today in relation to community projects and community benefits.

24:06

So we touched on some of these matters during the previous presentation, Mrs. Fisher, certainly pointed to a number of these in her slides.

24:17

They are also set out in the planning statement.

24:21

You will have to forgive us we don't have a presentation as such ready to deliver to you as to exactly what those benefits are.

24:29

I wonder if there were particular questions about them. Roads benefits benefits as stated within your planning segment. I am trying to actually find specific reference to those paragraphs. Bear with me for one second. And I will try and assist you with that as well.

25:00

Okay.

25:17

So I believe that the key benefits is our pick them up from the planning statement are linked with biodiversity, enhanced access and interpretation to public right of way. And then community benefit fund. And

25:35

I was just, I was just wondering if you could talk us through sort of the overall package from a neat perspective. So I don't want to get into any detail of what is proposed through those specific benefits. I

just wanted you to confirm and give us a little bit of a sense for the benefits in additional to the energy production that you are proposing through the application.

26:01

Of course, thank you, Alex, Minh annex and the applicant the the relevant reference to go back into the application documents is it's part 3.3 of the planning statement, which we could share on screen if that would be helpful, we have it available. That is document 163. And yes, sir, as you know, there are a series of

26:31

benefits enhancements which are identified. And then in addition, there are community benefits, which we'll come to in a second, because they certainly fall in a separate category.

26:41

The key benefits are identified as being those relating to biodiversity. So for example, there is a significant delivery of bio the biodiversity net gain as a result of the development as a result of the biodiversity improvements that will be delivered and secured within the order limits for the scheme. There are a number of specific examples of improvements which are identified within the statement including, for example, the allocation of two large fields expressly for Habitat enhancements,

27:18

amongst other features, there is

27:24

in addition, a biodiversity net gain calculation, which has been carried out, which identifies that the proposed development is is anticipated to provide an 88% net gain

27:40

in area habitat biodiversity units under 108%. net gain of hetero biodiversity units, which is significantly above the future mandatory requirements for developments to deliver biodiversity net gain, which is expected to be in the amount of potential percent increase or net gain.

28:06

In addition, then the second category of benefits above and beyond the need

28:11

relate to enhanced access and interpretation. So, for example, three through over three and a half 1000 meters of permissive paths will be implemented during the construction stage of the proposed development, which will considerably improve access arrangements in the local area. Interpretation is also to be provided at points of interest throughout the network. And again, all of these matters will be controlled and delivered through the management plans attaching to the proposed development consent order. The third and final category then of benefits above and beyond need is the community benefit fund. Now, the panel will be very familiar with the rules that relate to consideration of community benefit. And the applicant is not proposing that this is something that is relevant to the planning

decision making, which has to be taken it sits outside of the planning regime. But equally, it is thought that it is helpful to the public to understand that the applicant has committed to provide a community benefit fund of approximately one and a half million pounds across the lifecycle of the proposed development.

29:33

I accept that Mr. mechanic but you do mention that within obviously, the planning statements and the benefits for the proposal. So I think it is pertinent for us to question, that specific proposal. And I just wanted to actually check as well what sort of consultation was there on this community benefit fund, if any

30:02

Michael Baker for the applicant so it was made the the fundament was part of the statutory consultation. And I believe that we asked the question and the statutory consultation around how we'd like to be spent. And we engaged with the parishes prior to quit prior to and just after Christmas regarding

30:22

the changes to the project following consultation, and we wanted to talk about the community benefit fund at that time, but we were asked to leave it to the later time because we wanted to talk about more pertinent issues.

30:36

So that's where we have consulted on it, I don't think there's a particular requirement to consult on community benefit funds, but just to provide wider information about it that the RGB runs a number of community benefit funds, and it tends to be a third party provider where people can apply to that fund for

30:59

for the funds, and it's administrated independent of beauty. Right.

31:05

I think that for the purpose of this hearing today, I think I would like to leave that specific topic there. But if I could ask for an action to be taken for the applicant to actually provide a little bit more information regarding the community benefit funds,

31:23

that would be useful particularly terms of consultation and management, and what are those rearrangements?

31:33

So,

31:35

so that we can actually assess as part of the additional benefits of the proposed development that the applicant has highlighted as well to us.

31:45

Thank you.

31:52

Moment please Sabri?

32:00

What I think that those were probably all the questions that I want to ask considering time today.

32:09

Can I ask them suppose I believe that you would like to ask a question. First of all, I'd like to confirm what Mr. Baker just said it is the public position of bishops and parish council to oppose this proposal and to not start discussing any community funds or any financial benefit in that regard. And he did actually offered to have that discussion around Christmas time, and we declined the offer. So just confirm that. That's correct. Secondly, I will put this into the written question about the biodiversity and those benefits. Great, we are still wanting to see where those those benefits have accrued in other developments elsewhere in the country. And we still haven't seen that. So we'd be interested to know what what examples of those benefits exist elsewhere.

32:57

Thank you, Mr. Wells, as you have suggested, on your oral submission to us now, it might be beneficial for you to actually submit that that request in writing, please. And if I may suggest that perhaps if you could be a little bit more specific in terms of biodiversity gains that you would like to see in what you were expecting, because obviously, the applicant will have only control over the application itself that they are proposing in this development proposal. So just be mindful of that in terms of your submission. If I may suggest that Mr. Rouse. Anyone else, Mr. Anderson, Sean Anderson from bishopton Action Group.

33:41

He made reference to community benefits in access routes,

33:48

the overwhelming feeling of residents, which which was highlighted during the consultation process, that middle lane is considered as the village's most valuable asset for access for exercise for amenity. How is it possible that some other routes that offset that are of a benefit? Who decided that we're a benefit of the residents of the village those people who are affected have their decided that's a benefit?

34:20

I would like to know who thinks it's a benefit and who decided it was a benefit and HAVE and HAS do recognition being taken or the residents concern? Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for that.

34:34

Can I ask if the applicant feels that they can provide an answer to Mr. Anderson now but Mr. Anderson, as per the previous interventions, yes, please, if you could, deadline one have have a written submission that will be helpful. Thank you. So yes, Alex Montana for the applicant in headline terms, the

34:57

applicant has submitted a

35:00

A wide range of information about impacts on the public right of way network and access to recreational space for local residents. That has all been assessed as part of the environmental statement. I believe it's in chapter nine that I might need to check that point and come back and confirm. But certainly those impacts have been explained the information around a permissive pass which is, which is, which was been referred to in the context of access arrangements is included within various management plans that exist within the application documents. There is there are both plans, which show where these permissive paths will be there is also a management plan, which describes how they would be brought into being and thereafter maintained. That information is within the application documents and to I don't know what the best means of providing a summary of that information would be if, if the intention is that interested parties will be asking questions of the examining authority, and you will then be collating those into your written questions, we can certainly provide a response to it in that way.

36:20

In terms of depth process, I believe that we have set out in the timetable, subject to any changes on the specific dates as we have discussed this morning. But

36:32

in terms of the items, we have actually set out deadline, we have actually set out at line one for post hearing submissions, including written submissions of oral cases, as heard today on a sh one,

36:47

and then deadline to to risk responses to those submissions. So I would actually expect those responses to be submitted towards the deadline to

37:03

thank you, sir, for explaining that process. Yes, I'm sure on those points that have been raised so far. We can provide a response on that time. Thank you.

37:17

Can I ask if there is anyone online that would like to ask questions on this item item for needs. Before we move on to Item five alternatives?

37:33

I can't see any hands raised online. So I'll move on to Item five then alternatives.

37:41

For this specific topic, the key documents are chapter three alternatives in design iteration, that's AP p 026. Figure 2.2 general arrangement scheme wide a PP 040 figure two point 19 environmental constraints Plan A pp 057. Figure 3.1 sequential analysis assessment plan a PP 060 design approach document a s 004. In then the applicant submission of new and revised information particularly in terms of streetworks rights of way annexes plans, that's a s 014. And then the underground cable routes except it takes me some thought it's question that's a 019. So as per

38:30

what was advanced in our agenda, can I ask the applicant to please talk, talk dxc through the reasonable alternatives considered by the applicant to the existing proposal, and the reasons for the selection informed by environmental considerations, particularly in relation to site selection process? I would like to divide this first of all on site selection process, and then we'll cover design if that's okay.

38:57

Sir Alex Vanek for the applicant. Yes, absolutely. We can

39:01

provide a broad overview, which is what we intend to do to the extent so other than our fine grained questions, we will obviously answer them to the extent that we're able to here today, but we may need to ask to take some things away. But when separately, first of all, thank you, if that's acceptable, thank you.

39:21

So you've referred to Chapter Three on alternatives and design iteration, which is a PP zero to six and serve that is the account that has been provided by the applicant of the alternatives, which have been studied in developing and citing the design of the proposed development in accordance with the EIA, the environmental impact assessment regulations, and looking at part 3.2 of that document and in particular 3.22 and 3.23. We see the the requirements of

40:00

relevant regulations for a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the applicant which are relevant to the proposed development and specific characteristics. And an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen taking into account the effects of the development on the environment.

40:17

So that broadly is provided in

40:24

chapter three of the environmental statement. And coming to your point in relation to site selection, that is expressly addressed at 3.6 of Chapter Three were the four stage process, which was taken to site selection by our web as the applicant is explained. And I was just going to very quickly run through what each of those four stages were. So stage one was identifying the search corridor and the two key

factors which were taken into account at that stage were irradiance and yield for delivering a solar scheme in the Northeast region. And it was that was taken into account and concluded by the development team or our web that it was a suitable location.

41:17

And then the grid connection capacity, the points of connection to the grid was a secondary key factor which was taken into account in identifying that broad search corridor, as I believe has been mentioned in previous presentations during this hearing, there is a an agreement with the relevant distribution network operator to connect generation capacity at the existing north and the substation, which is located to the northwest of Stockton. And a connection agreement has been secured with North power grid, which is the district network operator for the generation and export of 180 megawatts of electricity.

42:04

taken into account to radiant and grid connection, location search areas were then derived from that point of connection at the Norton substation, initially within six kilometers, but then subsequently within 12 kilometers of that point of connection.

42:22

That takes us through to stage two.

42:26

During stage two of this four stage, site selection process, a very wide range of environmental and planning constraints were factored into

42:39

that previously selected search corridor. So the full list of these constraints is provided at 3.61 Turn of the environmental statement, but it included things such as the Brownfield land register, agricultural land classifications, ecological designations, flood zones, cultural heritage assets, landscaped designations, and existing public rights of way. And all of those factors were

43:11

computed and taken into account and helped inform the next stages of that four stage process.

43:20

At stage three, taking account of the search area, the search corridor, and also taking accounts of those environmental constraints within that corridor which had been identified, the applicant started to engage with relevant landowners with a view to forming carrying out land assembly for the project. Now, it's worth noting at this stage that

43:47

powers of compulsory acquisition wouldn't be available to an applicant to deliver a generation project of this sort. However, in keeping with much of the solar industry at large, RW as an applicant has sought to assemble land on a voluntary basis so that it has dealt with willing voluntary landowners who have

entered into option agreements for the delivery of solar infrastructure on their land, and identifying who those willing landowners were.

44:19

And how that how the availability of their land parcel was factored into those existing constraints that we've identified, formed an important part of that site selection process. So that's stages one to three, stage four was then the initial identification of panel areas within the land that was available. And I think sir, and one of your questions earlier during Mr. Baker's presentation, you started to

44:49

delve into how that process works, but broadly speaking, there are a series of factors which are taken into account in the layout of the scheme.

45:00

For those include, for example, those major environmental and planning constraints that we've previously identified in forming site selection, they continue to inform the detailed layout of the scheme when you get to this stage for

45:15

and at that stage, Sarah was going to pause because that's that's probably the end of the headline of the site selection process. Okay.

45:24

You mentioned in paragraph 3.6 point nine if I'm not mistaken off chapter three alternatives in design a PP zero to six, that the original search corridor of six kilometres was defined by the extent to which a solar farm of the proposed scale could be viable, but after further considering scale of the project, this area was extended to 12 kilometres, which is obviously twice the radius.

45:51

Can you please explain why and provide some further reasoning why that was appropriate to expand the search area

46:03

to that extent?

46:20

So we're not in a position at this stage to provide a detailed response to that right question in the hearing, partly because it involved things that happened prior to Mr. Baker's involvement with the project. But there was consideration of the the, I suppose the crucial factor and how long well there are two crucial factors with how long the grid connection for a project of this sort are one of them is cost and the other is the environmental impacts of delivering that grid connect. Thank you, Mr. Mechanic, I will then

46:55

I will then probably deprioritize the specific questions because there are some couple of questions following up from this one as part of our written questions. So, you will get those questions in writing and perhaps it will be an easier way of dealing with this specific situation. But could you talk us then quickly through your approach to design generally speaking in terms of your alternatives?

47:20

Thank you. So yes, absolutely. So,

47:24

the the the design of the project has been under review and has been an iterative approach to design from the start, and that has taken into account feedback, from consultation from engagement from technical stakeholders. And also the technical assessment work has been carried out by the applicant and their team throughout the life of the project.

47:51

So, there are a few for instances of where this iterative design approach has

47:59

led to changes to the scheme. So for example, one of those is the alternative types of solar PV panels which had been considered and whether those would be fixed or tracking panels. And after

48:15

consideration of the point, it was concluded that fixed panels should be used. And one of the benefits of taking that approach was the maximum height of the panels and therefore the consequent

48:25

effects associated with them was reduced from three and a half meter to three and a half meters from

48:33

4.35 meters of tracking panels, which is their height.

48:39

Another example, relates to the siting of the substation. And again, this is, so this is the onsite substation which is currently located in a corner of Pamela area see, and again, as as Mr. Baker explained, during his presentation, there were a number of locations which were looked at for the siting of that substation, as part of this scheme, and that location was selected primarily because it minimizes impacts on nearby residential receptors.

49:10

The final,

49:14

detailed design alternative that is worth referring to is a point that I've mentioned before which is the consideration of on road and off road cable routes. So this is both for the Internet res 33 kilovolt cables

and the export 132 kilovolt cable going out to the northern substation. Again, the applicant acknowledges that there are different environmental impacts associated with each of those options, and on balance feel that it would be preferable to deliver those cable routes off road wherever possible.

49:52

That of course is contingent on the availability of land rights. So either having an option with the relevant landowner to delay

50:00

Have those off road cable routes? Or if those land rights aren't forthcoming, the availability of compulsory acquisition powers?

50:09

Thank you very much for that explanation as to mean, Hey, Nick, can I ask in hopefully, this is not too much detail. But can I ask if the applicant has

50:20

any intention or have engaged in perhaps the possibility of employing or getting the input from a design review panel as part of the proposal, particularly considering that some elements of proposal are still to be decided and are still to be designed? And the applicant has said on several different documents that wants that flexibility? So how will that flexibility be used in order to maximize the opportunity to really improve the design of the application?

51:01

Sir, it's not an opportunity, Alex banana for the African engagement with the design review panel has not been something that the applicant has carried out by to date,

51:12

noting the comments that you're making in this area, and it's certainly something that we will be considering and potentially looking to do as we move forward. It is so worth noting that there has been, despite the Design Review Panel not haven't been consulted, there has been considerable consideration, which has been given to design generally to minimize impacts with whether that's through location or design itself. And the design approach document is a an application document which I don't immediately have the reference to,

51:49

but it's one that I can find and provide before the end of the hearing. But that is the primary document that I would point the panel to in terms of how design is intended to influence those future stages and it is written into the requirements of the development consent order to ensure that regard is had to hit and miss fingers hopefully found the reference which is AP p 165. For the design approach document.

52:19

Forgive me, it has been updated it is now as 004.

52:28

Yes, as 00 fall

52:32

right into Yes. So in answer to your question.

52:37

In your point, just complete that we will certainly be drilling in more detail on this specific point during our written questions. So there'll be an opportunity for you to provide a full answer to the specific point. At that stage. I just felt that it would be good for us to have an understanding of where you stand at the moment

52:59

on that specific issue in order to be able to really have this conversation about alternatives in relation to design.

53:07

Can I ask if the panel would like to ask any specific questions on this

53:14

item?

53:17

No,

53:19

no

53:23

question the mystery of other

53:27

assets mix up into

53:29

the question I like to ask relates to the storage system in terms of alternatives have you considered because when I was reading some of the document is about storage of spare like maintenance equipment that you go spare storage

53:50

boxes and because of the size I'm just thinking Have you considered alternative of site off site as a storage system where you can say for instance, contractors turn up somewhere at your home for instance, they have their maintenance equipment in in their van that is transportable, do you think any of those maintenance equipment is to transport easily transportable from off site location to this location

where maintenance is being carried out rather than having it stay there even though those maintenance equipment might not be utilized?

54:40

Sir, thank you for the question.

54:44

The the general approach which is taken to the maintenance of schemes of this sort is relatively limited in terms of frequency of vehicle movements and application of personnel as to maintenance. It's

55:00

Not

55:02

it's a much less intensive maintenance regime than that perhaps might be associated with other projects, or other generating types. Now, I don't have specific details to answer your question here, it's certainly something that we could come back on with a written question. But my understanding is that the proportion of space which is given over to those maintenance operations and storage and maintenance equipment, is relatively limited and modest.

55:35

So we it's, we have not considered the prospect of storing our off site

55:42

that hasn't formed part of the consideration of the scheme to date. It's not something that is generally done in the design of schemes of this sort. And I expect the answer lies in the relatively modest volume of equipment and the relatively modest extent of maintenance operations, but we can hopefully provide a more detailed and fleshed out response in writing and due course.

56:12

Yes, can I just follow up with additional question in terms of,

56:19

you know, when I look at the individual sites, each of them has got these maintenance boxes, is there a way you can consolidate, say, for instance, three sites are so close together, that you can have one maintenance box or a couple maintenance boxes, serving those three, and another one, but individually, they've got these additional boxes. So it's something that we want you to look into, to see how you can minimize or consolidate those sort of boxes and that will minimize the Atlantic.

57:00

Sir, thank you, that is certainly something that we can have a look into.

57:10

Thank you, Mr. Pinto. Thank you, Mr.

57:14

White is are there any further questions on this specific item alternatives that we have? Okay, we have some hence above raised in drawn Mr. Melanie, I normally bishopton.

57:30

parish council.

57:34

The document that we that we were handed chose the 132 substation has been a 70 meter by 70 meter concrete part.

57:46

The very, very early drawings that were put out, short in front of that there was a 70 meter by 30 meter, hard standing area for lorries delivering equipment to be able to turn round. Has that been removed? Or is it just been ignored for the purposes of this discussion?

58:11

And elsewhere?

58:14

Thank you. Mr. Melnick. Can I ask the applicant to reply to this? I'm assuming that this is something that's linked with the evolution of the design proposal and the alternatives considered? I think it's probably just related to the microbiome for the applicant. It's related to just the presentation itself, which just included the basic dimensions of the

58:39

of the substation, and not the wider access proposals as well. So

58:45

in this initial following this will clarify that in the presentation as to what the other dimensions are. So Mr. Becker, I'm not very clear. So

58:56

are you saying that it was reduced

58:59

following further refinement of the design proposal, or it was actually the area was increased? The area hasn't changed since attached to consultation. It's just how I've referred to the measurements in the presentation given today, compared to what's in the documents. So we'll clarify that in writing afterwards, because I think there's some dimensions missing from the presentation that I gave. Right. Okay. Mr. Melanie, I hope that that was

59:25

that was

59:27

well clarified for you in terms of the process and the process will be, again, as per other questions today, if you submit that question in writing, that will give the applicant an opportunity to actually review the documents and come back with a clear explanation in terms of the dimensions of specific units that you have mentioned. Thank you, Mr. Melanie. Anyone else? Mr. Anderson, Sean Anderson for bishops in Action Group. The applicants gave a good decision

1:00:00

friction of the design development process from concept design to where they are now.

1:00:06

But I understood the question that you asked was for them to give an overview, an overview of how reasonable alternatives, including locations have been considered a bearing in mind, the view of local residents about particular sites and the closeness to residential areas has adequate consideration given to alternatives and removing moving sites away from residential areas.

1:00:37

Mr. Anderson, I would pick up on this point in my written questions in I think that perhaps I'll give the opportunity to the applicant to then reply to this question in writing. And then both the XA and yourself Mr. Anderson will have access to that reply. In follow up if there are any subsequent questions. But as you have mentioned, that is something that I would actually like, quite like to drill into a little bit more detail on. So I am mindful of that specific issue. I think that in light of the applicants questions and

1:01:11

the team that we have with us today, it might be best to actually put that in writing, and revisit that issue at a later stage, if that's alright with you as well. But please, if I could ask you, Mr. Anderson to submit that in writing as well, that might be useful. Thank you.

1:01:29

Any further questions?

1:01:32

Can ask if anyone online would like to ask any question in relation to alternatives? Please?

1:01:47

I don't see any hands raised. So assume that there are no questions.

1:01:52

Mr. Smith, is it? Would you like to ask a question now? Sorry, yes, if that's okay, just to clarify a point. So you spoke about the grid connection capacity was that grid connection capacity, looked at in conjunction with the already granted? Well, in excess of 300 megawatts generating capacity from the

other sites, most of which are feeding into the same substation was that looked at in conjunction to say that the

1:02:20

the overall capacity of the substation was sufficient to take that 300 plus another 180 that that you'll be generating?

1:02:28

If I could ask the applicant to reply, so yes, absolutely. The

1:02:36

the question of connection to the grid is managed by the parties who are responsible for

1:02:44

the operation of the network. Now in broad terms, that's National Grid transmission level, and then a series of district distribution network operators at a more local level.

1:02:58

The applicant has submitted a grid connection statement, which explains the nature of its relationship with the distribution network operator and the grid connection agreement that it has.

1:03:12

It's for the distribution network operator and others responsible for different elements of the national grid to ensure that they can deliver the capacity at the substations that they have entered into grid connection agreements with developers for however, as a general proposition, they don't enter into grid connection agreements, if there is an existing capacity or there isn't expected to be capacity for those grid connection arrangements in the future. So the applicant has not considered

1:03:48

the cumulative effects, but that is because it has a grid connection, sorry, not the cumulative effects. It hasn't considered

1:03:55

the impacts on connection at that substation of these other schemes because that is the role of the distribution network operator who has entered into the grid connection agreement with the applicant.

1:04:08

I don't know immediately offhand whether all of these other schemes are connecting at the same substation, it's possible that they connect to other nearby substations. That is something that would have to be looked at but from our web perspective as the applicant for the scheme that has a grid connection agreement to connect up to a certain generating capacity at Norton substation, which is the basis on which this application is submitted.

1:04:36

Thank you, but if I may, there are ways

1:04:41

in order to actually assess the benefits and the overall impact of scheme, obviously, a useful and usable connection to the grades will be absolutely underpinning of the benefits of the proposed developments. In considering

1:05:00

and get I believe that we have asked for a statement of common ground to actually be developed with the northern grid connection, who I think are responsible for North and sub session. I do want to picking up on this point, if it would be possible to actually add that as one of the issues that you would report back to us

1:05:22

in terms of what is the position

1:05:27

in relation to capacity of the Norton substation overall, considering the cumulative effects?

1:05:35

Sir Alex 100, for the African? Yes, absolutely, we can look to pick that up with Northern Powergrid. The book but just to the risk of repetition, the position at the moment is that that grid connection agreement exists the connection situation as explained in the grid connection agreement, and there is no reason to think that that is not going to deliver the grid connection that is required, because I agree that grid connection is relevant to the benefits of the scheme. We will engage with Northern power grid, and hopefully we can get them to engage and confirm that position on the statement of common ground. I accept that it obviously from your perspective, in terms of the applicant, what the evidence that you have is that you have actually made that agreement, but for us in terms of the exci would really benefit for us to be able to actually assess that if we would have some confirmation on that specific fraud point from the organization responsible for fraud connection. So if we could thank you. Yes, sir. Sir, of course, recognizing that it's not within our control, but we will step down to provide that. Thank you. Is that acceptable? Mr. Smith? Yes, thank you very much.

1:06:50

I don't think that we have any other questions then, under alternative. So I would suggest that we move on to order land entity co item six, if I may.

1:07:02

So in the interest of time, and considering that we are approaching five o'clock, can I please ask the applicant to briefly explain their approach to identification of land. And

1:07:19

as mentioned, within the agenda, I am particularly looking for information regarding land identified as needed for the proposed development, particularly linked with the powers of acquisition and possession

of land included into dcl. And obviously, the ESA is mindful of the response to the rule nine request that the applicant has already submitted to the initial access request. But if I could ask the applicant, then to actually talk us through that response, particularly focusing on ca on compulsory acquisition, into your approach to the identification of that lens. That would be really useful, please, thank you.

1:08:09

So yes, of course, very happy to do that and

1:08:15

come to that role not in response at the end, if I may.

1:08:19

Having taught through the approach to compulsory acquisition of land more generally.

1:08:25

So, broadly speaking, and briefly, please, Mr. Milliken, if we could get to that point, then of indulgence of time, please open Of course, yes, I will be as

1:08:37

short as I can, sir.

1:08:39

So, and I think actually, this explanation will help with that rule nine context. So hopefully that will get us there. So broadly speaking, there's 490 hectares of land which is required for the proposed development. And that covers the key components that we've had described to us during previous presentations today, key areas been the panels, the on site, battery, energy storage systems, the substation, and then associated infrastructure which includes into array 33 kilovolt cables and export 132 kilovolt cables to the northern substation,

1:09:16

it may be helpful to categorize the areas of land that have been identified has been needed for the scheme into five separate categories. So on the one hand, we have the panel areas A to F, there are six of them. In respect of all of those areas, the applicant has obtained an option for lease over those areas. So there is no proposal for compulsory acquisition powers to be used in relation to those panel areas.

1:09:45

The second category of land can be referred to as off road cabling. And

1:09:56

that is that covers both 33 kilovolt and 132

1:10:00

Do kilovolt cabling, and the applicant is engaging with the landowners over which those off road routes would run. It is making good progress today from 16 landowners. Three easement options have been agreed and 11 landowners are advanced stages of negotiation to agree those easement options. We've already talked through the effect of those agreed options on the on road route through bishopton, which is now proposed to be removed from the scope of the development consent order. The onroad options which we will come back to in the context of the rule nine submission relate to the cable connection as for the project, so both 33 and 132 kilovolt cabling, which would rather than following the off road routes, follow the alternative on road routes. And it is worth noting at this stage there there are

1:11:05

the the on road and the off road road routes are not.

1:11:11

It's not as simple as a case of A or B, there are elements of the scheme where parts of on road works will be required, for example, where there is the crossing of a highway. So even if all off road easements were obtained and agreed, and as much of the off road cables were cable options were used as possible, there would still still be small areas where the cable would cross the perfectly adopted highway.

1:11:45

The fourth category of land then can be looked at as being the Norton substation itself, which is obviously land, which is in the ownership of national grid. And we've spoken about the relationship and the connection agreement which exists between the applicant and the distribution network operator and then the transmission network operator. And how that is regulated under that grid connection agreement. There are powers included in the DCR to carry out works, but there are no powers of compulsory acquisition which are proposed in relation to that land.

1:12:21

And then the final category of land that I thought useful to refer to is areas over which temporary possession, powers are required. Now there are only three parcels and they are very small, where temporary possession is required. They relate to an access

1:12:42

point in the west of the development to the south of Ramadan.

1:12:50

So I wasn't intending to go into the powers in the DCO. itself.

1:12:58

to any great extent I will be two or three minutes, I hope at most. But I thought it was worth making the point that the land, which is

1:13:08

subject to compulsory acquisition powers in the way that I've just described in very headline terms, is all needed for the development to be delivered. Obviously, with the on road and off road routes, there is an element of optionality in there, which affects that need. But if the position that the applicant has put forward in the statement of reasons that the benefits of delivering the cable routes off road outweigh the associated impacts, which would occur through the delivery of on road cables, the Africans cases that the compelling case in the public interest for compulsory acquisition rights is made out in that regard. It's going to pause there for a moment Serbs.

1:13:51

Thank you very much for that explanation. Mr. Min Hey, Nick, can I ask them because obviously, you quote, other DCLs that have been granted is the basis for your approach to Ci and the articles that you are asking us to consider as part of the order.

1:14:15

However,

1:14:17

dos, other development proposals in those other DCO that have been granted already do differ in the way that they approach land and identify lands from the proposal that you have put forwards,

1:14:37

particularly in real in relation to

1:14:41

particularly in relation to compulsory acquisition.

1:14:46

So can I ask

1:14:50

how has the applicant approach that from that specific point IE, comparing

1:14:59

their approach to land

1:15:00

plants and the identification of land within the order. And then the articles particularly linked with the preposition and compulsory acquisition that go with that land.

1:15:11

Because the approach does not seem to be consistent, and therefore the exci would like to understand a little bit more, if the justice if part of the justification included within the explanatory memorandum is linked with other previous orders, then surely, the approach to language invocation should have been slightly similar.

1:15:41

Sir Alex minich for the applicant? I'm

1:15:49

I'm not 100% Sure, sir, that I'm following

1:15:53

the question. But if perhaps I start explaining and to the extent that that explanation isn't immediately on point, if you could perhaps step in and correct me.

1:16:04

The, the, the applicant has thought very carefully about the approach to compulsory acquisition for this scheme, and in particular has been mindful of the guidance, which is out there about the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers and the need to minimize

1:16:21

land intake and to ensure that the use of compulsory acquisition powers is no more than as needed to deliver the scheme.

1:16:31

The particular area that I understand the questions to be aimed at relate to the potential acquisition of subsoil land plots by which we refer to the land that exists beneath existing publicly adopted highways, which it's the applicant's position, that it is not necessary to exercise compulsory acquisition powers against those subsoil land parcels beneath the highway.

1:17:11

And the reason why its position is that it doesn't need to exercise compulsory acquisition powers against those subsoil plots is because it isn't intended to carry out any works within those subsoil plots. The intention is that the cables to the extent they're provided in the onroad option would be laid within the strata of land, which by virtue of these areas of land been publicly adopted highways, the highway strata, the top, the top structure of land, which rests on the highway authority, it's within that land that the applicant is intending to locate its

1:18:00

cables to the extent that they exist in the on road option.

1:18:07

We pointed you, sir, in the submission to the discussion that had taken place in relation to the high net

1:18:14

application and the high net development consent order, which was granted recently by the Secretary of State where a debate had taken place and opinions from King's council have been submitted, I think on behalf of both parties. And the the facts are there were different to the facts as we have them here

and the sense that the applicant wasn't saying, We will lay in that case it was a pipeline rather than cables. But the applicant was not saying we will lay our pipeline in the highway strata, they were expressly saying we will lay it in the subsoil below the highway. And the reason why we refer to that in those submissions is because it provides a useful counterpoint. Right. Okay. But why does the applicant believe that it's already has provides for all of the highway

1:19:08

soil that it needs or under the highway

1:19:15

when we did not have that reflected within the book of reference,

1:19:21

so normally we would expect all rights to be reflected within the book of reference correct for the different points that have been identified as needed for the development.

1:19:33

Sir Alex banana for the applicant, yes. The the reason why

1:19:38

there is no reference to an existing right for the applicant to lay cables under the

1:19:47

adopted highway parcels of the book are references because that right would arise by virtue of

1:19:56

the statutory right that we are suggesting is granted

1:20:00

it through the DCO through the incorporation of what's known as the streetworks code. Right? I think that it might be useful for us to actually take this specific discussion offline, and perhaps do this in writing as well in the all and then revisit at a later point. But I think that that's exactly the issue that I'm trying to clarify. Because the experience that we have had in terms of similar projects, has been that such land has rights for the subsoil of the clan have been identified is needed.

1:20:36

In they are not in the applicant is not asking for, though. So obviously, we need to clarify that position and have a clear understanding of that approach in order to be secure of the deliverability of the proposal, obviously. So it is within that sense, and we did with that understanding that I'm asking the question,

1:20:57

because

1:20:59

on previous and schemes that the applicant has referred to,

1:21:06

with similar articles, the approach to land has been different in terms of et Cie approach in the fall, this will lead to if we would like to disconnect between the dcl and glandt plans that the applicant has, alongside with the DCO Interland plans of similar applications that the applicant has referred to in its justification.

1:21:33

Sir, thank you. And yes, very happy to provide further written submissions on the point. To the extent that you have particular schemes in mind and particular examples in mind, it would be incredibly useful if you could point us to that it wouldn't be the schemes that you have relied upon as justification. So those a bit schemes that we would check as well.

1:21:53

Yes, salutely?

1:21:57

I think the the

1:22:00

so there are probably a couple of points, which are worth making in general terms before perhaps leaving the discussion and taking it towards

1:22:09

written responses. I think the the first of those is that I am aware that as a practice, other developers of other types of infrastructure have on occasion sought to use the development consent order process to acquire sub sort of land, beneath existing highways,

1:22:33

on the expectation that they may need it to carry out their works. So they may so for example, if they were roadworks, it may be that the worst of the road would necessitate the use of the subsoil. And it has been something which has been the subject of examination and discussion in different

1:22:53

development, consent order examinations,

1:22:57

from our perspective, from the applicants perspective, where we entirely understand why you're testing this matter, and why you're asking these questions because we appreciate that worthy on road you route to be used, you need to be satisfied that the applicant has all of the necessary land rights in this instance, to carry out the works as they crossed the public highway entirely understand why why the questions have been asked. We

1:23:26

think we have explained that, like I said, the statutory license the statutory right, which would exist under the streetworks code, in the event, the DCA were granted within that tarp highway strata, which means that if we're not carrying out works in the subsoil, we don't need to compulsorily acquire that subsoil. And it's probably worth just so providing a bit more context in the sense of

1:23:56

solar scheme. There are a large number of existing solar schemes across the country.

1:24:02

The vast majority of those have been delivered under Town and Country Planning Act, planning permissions, which don't bring with them powers of compulsory acquisition of any description, a separate compulsory acquisition order would be needed. And as a general rule, they're not promoted for soulless games.

1:24:26

A significant proportion of those solar schemes are connected to the grid, through sub soil highway sorry, not sub soil through cables which are laid within the highway strata.

1:24:40

I accept that but obviously this is a different process and has a different test that the applicant needs to pass. And obviously we as an exile need to have be satisfied that you do have all of the powers that you actually need in order to deliver that so I appreciate that.

1:25:00

There are approaches within other parts of the planning system that have been taken. But for the purpose of this application, we would need to look at tests within

1:25:17

within the requirements of an end step and end within define work of national infrastructure projects, which is obviously, as you know, different from the ones that go through a local authority system.

1:25:33

Thank you, sir. And yes, and we,

1:25:37

again, to the extent that further written submissions would help, we're very happy to provide them just to have an eye on the, I suppose, the potential endgame and perhaps to bring this conversation to a close to the extent that the panel is not satisfied, the development consent order in the form provided would provide all of those necessary land rights, there is a relatively simple fix, which obviously would involve the addition of proposed provisions, additional proposed compulsory acquisition rights into the development consent order in respect of that highway subsoil, that change would be something that would fall to be consulted on under the compulsory acquisition regulations. And we're very mindful of

the process and the planning Inspectorate guidance on how change application is of that sorted to be made. It is a process that we could follow, if needed. And we made this point, in quite brief terms in our rule nine response. But I just wanted to,

1:26:40

to explain that that is an alternative process that can be followed within the existing examination framework, obviously, there will, there will be a point in time, there'll be quite some implications in terms of consultation and timetable for for us to have that approach.

1:26:59

I, I agree with you that if we're going to change that approach, then it is likely that the exci would be

1:27:09

minded to look into the need or not for consultation on that specific change. According to the CEO regulations. However, I would like to actually understand a little bit better to position and reasoning that the applicant has already put forward and has actually been working on and presented to us for this examination. I think it might be useful, as we have discussed previously, to take this conversation into perhaps, written questions, and we'll give the opportunity for the applicant to provide us with a little bit more detail.

1:27:51

Bearing in mind, and obviously acknowledging that some of your thinking has already been set out in your response to Drupal nine request, particularly along consistency with other schemes, which was item seven of your response. So you would be just provide a little bit of context in terms of my initial question, it would be

1:28:18

consistency, not just in terms of the DCO articles, but in terms of the land plans through those are the schemes that we will be looking at.

1:28:32

Thank you. So yes, and I think the the Africans position would be that the

1:28:38

the approach to the articles and the land plans is consistent to the extent that

1:28:45

of course, all land plans and articles will differ between the DCIS and different projects, but to the extent they are comparable, the approach to delivering compulsory acquisition powers which is provided by the development consent order and the land plant and the book reference is the same. It's simply that in this instance, the applicants position is that it's not necessary to acquire subsoil rights to deliver the scheme. So we have not included those absorb rights within the book of reference or or has rights which we are seeking to acquire. Okay, thank you very much for this clarification.

1:29:28

Can I ask if anyone else has any further questions relating to the order land and development consent order?

1:29:39

Online

1:29:43

I see no hands raised online or in the room. In that case, then I will move us on to item seven, which is review of the issues and actions arising. So correct me.

1:29:57

Mr. Baker and Mr. Minear Nick, if I am

1:30:00

incorrect, but I believe that you have been taking notes in terms of the actions that have been requested. So can I ask if the applicant feels that it might be beneficial to go through those actions? Now to get confirmation? Or

1:30:17

just writing dosed up, and then we can check that with the case team following from our hearing?

1:30:25

So yes, we have been taking notes Alex phonetic for the applicant. And

1:30:33

I would suggest the easiest way to deal with it is for us to submit those as action points through the case team, provided you're happy with that approach. Yes, I'll be happy with that approach. Just to confirm then, in terms of just for the benefit of everyone else in the room.

1:30:51

I am expecting then deadline one to receive post hearing submissions of the oral cases that we have heard today. And it deadline to to actually have responses to those oral cases as they have been submitted, as well. We will aim to publish the action list that we have gone through today

1:31:20

as soon as possible following from this week's hearings as well, which will be published on our website.

1:31:29

But I'll move on to Item eight, then which is any other business. So I have not been notified of any other businesses that people would like to raise. But nevertheless, I would like to check if anyone else would rights to raise any other issue.

1:31:47

No. Okay, so item nine, then closing of the hearing. Thank you all very much for contributing usefully to these meetings. This to today's discussions. And also to those joining us virtually. We will consider our submissions made very carefully and obviously in detail. The next hearings are going to be the open floor hearings. One into open floor hearing one begins at 10am. Tomorrow, followed by open for hearing two which will begin at six in the afternoon tomorrow as well in this venue and it is from the time is now three minutes past five and issue specific hearing number one for bass skill, solar energy is now closed. Thank you very much