



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Byers Gill Solar
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 Session 1 (ISH3)
Date:	15 October 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.

TRANSCRIPT_BYERSGILL_ISH3_SESSION1 _15102024

Wed, Oct 16, 2024 1:52PM • 1:29:53

00:05

Good afternoon. Can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly? Yes, thanks. Can I also confirm with Mr. Shrimpling that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced. Thank you for those people watching the live stream. Can I also advise that, should we at any point adjourn proceedings this afternoon, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result. At the point at which we recommend the meeting and restart the live stream, you will need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream. I will remind you of this again. Should we need to adjourn? It is now 2pm and it's time for this hearing to begin. I would like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing three on the traffic and transport plus flood risk assessment aspects of the proposed development in relation to an application made by RWE renewables UK, solar and storage limited, who we will refer to as the applicant for another granting development consent for bias, guild solar, the development proposal proposal consent consists of a solar farm with over 50 megawatt capacity, ground mounted solar photovoltaic models and associated mounting structures, inverters, transformers, switch gear and control equipment, a substation, energy storage equipment and underground on and off site cabling. Thank you all for attending this hearing. My name is Alex oyeade. I'm a charter transport planner employed by the planning inspectorate, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing, communities and local government as a member of the panel to examine this application, I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves.

02:34

Good afternoon. My name is Andre Pinto, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for local communities and government to look at the application and write a recommendation to the Secretary of State for net zero and energy efficiency as the lead member of the examining authority. Thank you.

02:56

Good afternoon. I'm Max wilch. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I work the planning inspectors and have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel to examine this application. Thank you.

03:10

Thank you, Mr. Weisha. Together, we constitute the examining authority, and we will be reporting to the Secretary of State for energy security and net zero with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. A case manager for this project is Jenny savage. Jenny is being supported here by Rebecca lockston. If you have any queries about the examination process or the technology we are using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. Their contact

details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us, or on the project page of the national infrastructure website. I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person. Can everyone please set all devices and phones to silence the closest inclusive and female toilets are just outside the room on this floor through the same doors you used to enter the room earlier. There are additional toilets just by the snack bar on the first floor. There are no fire evacuation tests planned for today. Should the fire alarm sound, please make your way to the nearest fire exit door using the fire doors marked in this room and head downstairs. Fire evacuation and assembly point is at the square outside the main entrance to this building. Today is a hybrid event, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue and some of you are joined. In us virtually, using Microsoft Teams for those people observing or participating through teams. Can you please make sure that you stay muted unless you are speaking, if you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at the relevant point in the proceedings, please use the handle function. Please be patient, as we may not get to get you to immediately speak, but we will invite you to speak at the appropriate time. We will make sure that how, whichever way you decided to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate. Any questions on that. Thank you. In addition to the live stream, a recording of today's hearing will be made available on the bios, gills solar section of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as practicable after the meeting has finished, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone, stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak for those at the table, you can do that by pressing the large button at the base of the microphone. If you are not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone, so please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak. If you are attending virtually and don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. For those in the room who don't want to be recorded. There is an area at the back, at the very back of the room out of the camera shot. Please use that area, because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies only in the rarest of circumstances. My way, ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us will prefer to keep private or confidential, therefore, to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, please try your best not to add information to the public record that you would wish to be kept private and or that is confidential. If you feel that personal information is necessary, please provide this in a written document that we can read that before publication, the planning inspector is practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision, a link to the planning inspectorates. Private notice was provided in the row six letter and also the notification for this hearing. I assume that everybody today has familiarized themselves with this document with which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to Jenny savage if you have any questions about this. This meeting will follow the agenda as set out in route 13 letter that was published on 17 September, 2024 it will be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you, I am going to speak to Ask the agenda to be displayed on screen now you

08:46

Okay, thank you. Does anyone not have access to the agenda? Okay, thanks. We will aim to finish the hearing today, by 530 at the latest 6pm with a break if needed, around 4pm please remember those who are participating virtually to turn their cameras and microphones off during the break. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked

and responded to. But if the discussions can be concluded, then it may be necessary for me to prioritize matters and defer other men other matters, to retain questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information requested, then please, can you just indicate that you need to respond in writing, and we will advise when. Submit your response or issue in writing. Thank you. Does anyone have any questions on what I have just set out? No. Thank you. I will now hand over to Mr. Weisha, who will do the introductions.

10:20

Thank you, Mr. Obadi, I'm now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to introduce yourselves. When I state your organisation's name, could you introduce yourself, stating your name and who you represent and which agenda item you wish to speak on? If you're not representing an organization, please confirm your name, summarize your interest in the application and the agenda item on which you wish to wish to speak. Please. Could every state how they wish to be addressed? IE, Mr. Mrs. MS, miss, so can we start with the applicant, please, and then any of their advisors.

11:03

So as Good afternoon, my name is Alex minnehinik. I'm a solicitor from Burges salmon, and I'm here representing the applicant. I'm joined on my right by Miss Laura Bing from Arup, who will be in control of displaying documents on screen as needs be. I am also joined to my left by Mrs. Nicola Hill, who is an associate at Arup. She is a chartered transport planner, and she will principally be speaking to agenda item three. To Mrs. Hill's left is Mr. Michael Baker, who is the DCO project manager at RWE. Mr. Baker may contribute on any of the agenda items to Mr. Baker's left is Mr. Paul Blackman, who is a civil engineer and an expert in flood risk assessment and drainage, and he will be speaking primarily to Agenda Item number four on water environment and flood risk. There are other members of the applicants team in the room with us, and to the extent that we need to introduce anyone else to contribute, I would propose to do so at the time.

12:24

Thank you very much. Mr. Mehta Nick, good afternoon to you all. Can we now move on to the organizations and individuals that have given notice of their intention to speak, starting with Darlington Borough Council? Please?

12:40

Thank you. I'm Lisa Hutchinson, development manager, manager at Darlington Borough Council. I can be referred to as Mrs. Hutchinson. To my left is Mr. Arthur houseon, highway engineer, and he will be here to answer any questions relating to Agenda Item number three. To my right is Mr. Stuart Edwards. He's the flood and drainage engineer for the council, and he will be here to answer questions relating to Agenda Item number four, thank you.

13:09

Thank you very much. Moving on to Stockton, please, Stockton Borough Council, good

13:16

afternoon. It's Helen Boston, principal planner at Stockton Borough Council. To my right, we have Stacey Moss, who's the principal sorry, can

13:23

you just pull the microphone a little bit closer? Thank you.

13:29

To my right is Stacey Moss, Principal Engineer for the lead local flood authority, and to her right is Martin Parker, Principal Engineer for highways. And we're available to answer any questions. Should they be required?

13:41

Thank you. Thank you very much.

13:51

And next the Environment Agency, please

13:56

Good afternoon, sir. I am Lewis Pemberton, an Environmental Planning Specialist in the environment agency's national infrastructure team, and I lead on the EAS input into this DCO application. I can be referred to as Mr. Lewis Pemberton. I will be speaking on agenda item four, water, environment and flood risk. My colleagues, Phil sale and Claire hymns with also in attendance, who will now introduce themselves. Thank you.

14:26

Good afternoon. I'm Philip sale with the environment agencies, national infrastructure team. I'm a modeling specialist within that team. I can be addressed as Mr. Sale, and I may answer questions in relation to agenda writing. Thank

14:42

you very much. Good afternoon.

14:47

My name is Mrs. Claire hinsworth. I'm a flood risk advisor for Environment Agency, and I may answer questions if needed. Thank you.

14:59

So. Thank you all very much. So we will move on to the local councils, please, starting with bishopton parish council, please.

15:14

My name is Norm Mulaney, representing bishopton parish council, and I will be commenting on item four.

15:25

Thank you. Anybody else from bishopton parish council? No, the bishopton villages Action Group.

15:41

Good afternoon. My name is Mark Smith, representing bishops and Religious Action Group, not planning to speak on any specific item on the agenda, but happy to take any questions that are necessary.

15:52

Thank you and

15:58

good afternoon. My name is Sean Anderson, happy to be addressed to Sean Anderson, and I will be speaking on agenda items three and four, if appropriate.

16:11

Thank you very much. And great Stainton parish meeting, please

16:20

Good afternoon. My name is Colin Taylor. I'm representing great Stainton parish meeting. Happy to be addressed as Colin Taylor, and I'm not intending to speak on any specific item, but here to answer questions or to raise any issues that may be helpful to the examiners.

16:36

Thank you very much. And then moving on to others who intend to speak in the room, please, we'll have a oh, sorry, the gentleman on the right, on my right, good

16:53

afternoon. My name is Peter wood. I'm a bishopton resident and chair of the bishops and Village Hall Association. I would like to speak on item four.

17:05

Thank you, Mr. Wood.

17:14

And then moving on to any others in the room who wish to speak, we've got roving microphones, so if you can, put your hand up, please, if there's anybody else in the room, thank you.

17:32

I'm Stacey Gowin. I'm a bishop and village president, and I'd like to speak on Agenda four.

17:39

Thank you.

17:42

And my name is Christine Briscoe. I'm a resident of bishopton village, and I'd like to speak about traffic, transport.

17:51

Thank you.

17:54

Thank you very much.

18:02

Melanie, Turner, great. Stanton, I was going to read out a submission, but I'm going to send that in. Possibly might want to ask some questions today, though.

18:13

Thank you very much. So if you have a submission, if you could come for deadline four, that would be great.

18:26

Good afternoon. I'm Paul Brown. I'd like to be referred to as Paul. I'm a resident of Bishop and Village. I would like to be given the opportunity to respond to any matters which arise throughout the discussion this afternoon. Thank you.

18:40

Thank you. Mr. Brown.

18:46

Anybody else in the room? Thank you very much. Jen and online, anybody virtually who would like to speak please is that Mr. Somebody flashing, if you could put your hand up please. That would help. Mr. Anderson, do you need to unmute yourself,

19:16

right? Is that better? Yes, that

19:18

is thank you.

19:18

Yeah, thank you. My name is Andy Anderson, and I'm happy to be addressed as Andy. I'm representing the bishop villages Action Group. I didn't have a specific statement to read out. I wanted to be available for any questions from any of the submissions that we've made, and to have an opportunity to ask questions.

19:48

Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson, anybody else? Virtually, I can't see any more hands up, so I think I'm going to hand back to Mr. O. Bad day. Who will lead us through item two on the agenda?

20:09

Sorry, Thank you, Mister wisher. Let me briefly explain the purpose of issue. This issue specific hearing. The purposes of this issue, specific hearing are for the examination, examining authority to explore the staff travel plan for the development proposal and how it will minimize vehicular traffic and car parking demand while ensuring highway safety in this locality. The second purpose is for the examining authority to explore the applicant's intentions regarding the sections of the construction vehicle routes that are not suitable to heavy goods vehicles, particularly mailing for the third one is for the examining authority to understand outstanding issues from the flood risk assessment that was carried out by the applicant, particularly evaluation of the impact of climate change on flood levels using hydraulic Modeling, sequential test approach to flood risk assessment and concerns with flooding along mailing and towards Bishop Tim mill, as previously mentioned, the agenda for this meeting was set out in the route 13 letter that was published on 17 September 2024 Today's hearing will be a structured discussion led by the examining authority. Please be assured that I am familiar with what you have already submitted to us so you don't have to repeat in length anything that you've already put to us in writing. Submissions carry equal weight, regardless of the format in which they are put to us. If you do refer to any documents this afternoon, it will be helpful if you could give us the correct examination Library Reference number. Please do try to avoid using any acronyms as people might people who might be watching in the room might not be as familiar with those terms as you are. Are there any comments anyone would like to make on item two of the agenda? I thank you. I will now move us on to item three. Item three, which is the traffic and transport, a list of the keys. Written submission that will inform my questions has been included in the agenda published in anticipation of these hearings. As it is a long list. I do not propose going through it in detail now, but can I ask if anyone has any comments they would like to make on the list included in the agenda for this item. No, okay, thank you. I would now like us to turn to chapter 12 of the environmental statement, which is transport and traffic and transport. Paragraph 12, point 10.13, assumes that the 100 staff per site would travel in vehicles accommodating seven people, thereby equating to a requirement of 15 cars per site. Would the applicant provide us with an overview of how the construction workers vehicle trips were estimated.

24:07

Thank you. Nicola Hill, for the applicant, the travel arrangements for the site have been informed from information from other solar farm developments in the UK and our experience from other construction sites, it's expected that many of the construction workforce will travel to and from the site in group vehicles such as minibusses. As I said, the use of the large vehicles or minibusses, to travel to and from the site has been informed by the methods used to construct other solar farm developments. Whilst this is based on our experience and research from other solar farm sites, the use of group travel is also likely due to the rural nature and lack of public transport, and also the start time, the working times, the applicants happy to confirm that all parking demand associated with with travel to and from the site would be accommodated. Within each site, and no car parking or parking minibusses would be permitted outside the boundary of the panel area. The principle of providing this car parking within each compound is outlined in the outline construction traffic management plan, which is reference number 112 the detail of this parking area within that compound would need to be confirmed by the principal

contractor, and that would be in the detailed ctmp, which would need to be submitted and approved by the planning authority prior to each phase of development. So it's that there are view that there is this commitment that would be secured by that ctmp to ensure that all parking demand associated with staff movements could be accommodated and provided for within the site compound.

25:52

Thank you. Now the next question I've got, again relates to the first one. I will now turn to environmental statement, Appendix 2.8, outline construction traffic management plan, which gives the proposed number of car parking spaces. Would the applicant explain how these numbers were calculated and if any car occupancy survey data obtained from similar size had been used to support the assumed average of seven construction staff per car.

26:38

Yeah, for each of the panel areas, we were estimating up to 100 employees for each panel area. And assuming that the 100 employees would be divided by the seven seater vehicles, it was the 30 trips. So 1515, minibus trips to each site. Hence, the parking provided within each compound was at least for the 15 minibusses. It's likely that some of those won't stay on the site all day. They may, you know, the minibusses, they may be there, traveling in and out on the morning and coming back on the evening, or they may need to be accommodated within the site. Either way, the assurance by the applicant would be that that demand can be accommodated within the compound. It may be that in some compounds, there's less than that needed, and others there's more. And that would be in the detail ctmp that would need to be submitted prior to each phase of development.

27:39

Yes, what I'm trying to establish here is, without a bona fide survey, let's say car occupancy survey, that had been carried out, that there is a possibility that the number might have been underestimated, because if it's car occupancy survey, maybe there might be three in one car, there might be four in one car, there might be two, and it spread out my dad. So this is my concern. Is, without that survey, how would How can you explain to the examiner authority to believe that figure of seven? Yeah. Nicola

28:29

Hill, from the applicant, I think it would be quite difficult at this stage to know exactly how people will travel. As you know, it would be something that would need to be agreed with the principal contractor once appointed so we knew where people were traveling to and from. We've just based the assumption that there would be the group travel based on other solar farm developments and construction sites. It may, in some instances, to some of the panel areas be slightly less, and others, it might be more. But I think at this stage, we're fairly comfortable with the estimate is around the ballpark of what we're seeing at the construction sites that the experiences that they generally do travel in larger vehicles that this group travel, and that any demand for the car parking can be accommodated within the site compound.

29:19

As a quick follow up to that, will it then be possible for the applicant to look at into this and possibly provide some form of survey that we can rely on to substantiate this figure so that the number of vehicles are indeed the car parking number of car parking spaces can be relied upon.

29:51

Sir, Alex, for the applicant, I'm very happy to take that point away. I'm. I wonder if you could clarify. Perhaps I'm it may be that I'm not following the conversation closely enough, but um, are we are we talking about, when we talk about a survey? Are we talking about a prospective use, a prospective survey of the the workers who would be delivering this scheme, or are we talking about surveys of some, some other scheme, perhaps. Okay, thanks,

30:22

Mister mayhem. Is if you take, if you use a figure to calculate, say, like the number of car parking spaces, that figure should have come from a bona fide they serve a car occupancy. Say, for instance, someone was there at the entrance gate of the development and say, these are number of people that come to this site traveling in twos, number of people traveling in threes and four and so on. And that will be used at the end of the day. You might use the average to provide a figure. So that's what I'm getting now. So without that sort of survey that has been carried out, this seven figure might not be reliable. It's difficult to rely on that average figure of seven,

31:16

sir, thank you for that clarification. I agree. Certainly we can. We can take the point away, and perhaps we can come back on it in writing. I think the one thing that I would point to as an interim measure is that there are management and monitoring measures written into the draft construction traffic management plan as drafted. So I think in the first instance, I'd be suggesting that they're capable of insurance. So so the ctmp is to be approved by the local planning authority for each phase prior to prior to construction commencing. There is then management and monitoring of compliance with with the CCMP in the approved form. We can perhaps take those points away and provide a short summary of how we see that working in practice, and consider whether surveys are an appropriate thing to supplement that monitoring process.

32:17

Thanks, Mr. Mahinik, I will now ask the applicant to clarify if any thoughts had been given to the potential for overspeed parking consequential to underestimation of the number of car parking spaces per site based on the adopted forecasting method that we just discussed on did you sort of think about whether there be underestimation of those figures? Because, like I've explained, yeah.

32:50

Nicola Hill, for the applicant, we haven't identified any overspill car parking areas. The information I've been given is that the compounds will be sufficient to accommodate our parking demand within the site based on the number of construction workforce, based on each site. We can certainly take away the point and have a look at the if there's any other examples. But in terms of solar farm developments in the UK, we've had a look at other examples, and this is the method, the group kind of travel assumptions as what they have used. I know for other developments, sometimes you use things like the tricks database that will give you kind of average vehicle occupancies. I haven't found any as yet on the solar farm sites that have done these kind of construction surveys, but we can have a look. But no,

we haven't identified because we don't feel there's a need for any overspill car parking, the assurance I've been given is that it would be accommodated within the compound of the site.

33:47

Okay, thank you. I will now ask the applicant to present the travel plan initiatives for the proposed development and how it will minimize vehicular movements and car parking this demand and at the same time ensure highway safety in the vicinity of the proposed development, bearing in mind the nature of the rural roads surrounding the proposed development, and the challenges they present in terms of car parking opportunities constrained passing places for vehicles alongside the additional traffic ensuing from this proposed development.

34:32

Nicola Hill, for the applicant, as noted, we are expecting that the main travel planning measure will be to encourage the construction workforce to travel in group vehicles. So we said this is in the draft outline construction traffic management plan as a measure, and there are elements in the construction traffic management plan to monitor and enforce that form of travel. Other than that, obviously, people are welcomed. Cycle to the site, and we can check that there's provisions for that within the compound. It's been raised previously about the teas flex service, but that the on demand service requires a bit of flexibility. And of course, a construction staff would be welcome to use it, but we expect very few to use that just because of the need for the flexibility against the need to be on site for the start of construction eight. So there isn't, you know, the group travel is the main one for the construction workforce. And as noted, there's no, no measure as such, for any overspill parking, because we'll make sure, as outlined in the ctmp, that all car parking demand would be in would be accommodated within the site. Certainly don't want any kind of oversold car parking on the rural roads or the villages.

35:55

Sorry, how would you like to be addressed? I'm not sure, without Mrs. Or Miss hills. Mrs. Hill, Thanks, Mrs. Hill, without specific action on the part of the applicant, beginning to struggle, how this travel plan arrangement will work. Say, for instance, there isn't a talk about dedicated shuttle bus, for instance, that will transport workers, construction workers to this site. There isn't anything like that that the applicant has proposed. And that's a really big concern, because without this travel plan Element Bearing in mind in the question we talk about the need to minimize car parking demand, and again, that has an impact on another topic we discussing in terms of the overall requirement for land, so at a later stage anyway, so without that sort of action is quite difficult. So would the applicant then explain if any thoughts has been given to providing dedicated transport for the construction workers. Nicola

37:26

Hill, for the applicant, at this stage, it's to be agreed as part of that detailed construction traffic management plan, which must be developed in accordance with the outline construction traffic management plan, which just state that they will be that group travel the construction workforce to and from the site. So at the moment, the commitment is really in the construction traffic management plan, and the need to ensure that's enforced at each phase of the development.

37:55

Yes. Thank you. Mrs. Hill, the what would be useful to us is for the applicant to actually have a specific initiative within the construction traffic management plan to say, you know, before the start of the development, maybe a negotiation with a transport provider so that people can travel in groups of it could be seven, it could be 10. So so as to minimize the car parking demand at the same time, the highway safety and demand of it as well needs to be taken into consideration. Because when we had the site visit, I think July 23 we struggle to find any space to park along the rural roads, and that's a big concern. So that's why I'm saying that you should stay at that point seriously. My next question is, I will now refer to paragraph five, 3.13, of a PP, 112, which states that car sharing and the use of mini busses will be encouraged for local construction workers and the employee trip demand has therefore been based on an average cap occupancy rate of seven persons per vehicle, given that there is no information regarding the applicant's commitment to provide dedicated transport, or indeed any enforcement action built into a contractual agreement, would the applicant explain how this forecast will give a reasonable assurance to the examining authority,

39:46

Nicola hills, the applicant. I think again, this goes back to the commitment of the initiative within the ctmp to ensure the shared transport to and from the site, and the estimate in the ctmp. Is based on a conservative estimate of the number of people working on the site. And it may be that, once we get to the detail, CTM, CT MP stage, that we can understand exactly the construction workforce, and once the contractors appointment understand the origins of the construction workforce, I think at this stage, our initiative really is just to say that the shared travel is based on previous solar farm developments from other construction sites were fairly comfortable that the shared travel Initiative is a reasonable assumption to make, and that detail will come as part of the detailed ctmp as and when we get to that phase of development.

40:38

Thanks. Mrs. Hill would can we then, I mean, assume that before the end of this development control order, before the hearing, end of the hearing anyway, can we then be assured that you will provide this information that will give the reassurance to the examining authority that a clear court action will in terms of mini bus provision or joint transport provision will be provided.

41:18

Sir Alex minhinik, for the applicant. You, you asked, sir for reassurance before the end of the hearing, I think you mean so before the end of the examination process, and as quickly as possible. And yes, we will, obviously, we're, we're hearing the concerns that you're raising, and we will absolutely take these points away and reflect on what we have and what more can be done and can be said to provide that reassurance. I think the there were two points of process that I just wanted to stress if I could at this stage. The first is that the provisions of the construction management plan will be incorporated into the contractual relationship between RWE and the contractor that it appoints to deliver this development. So the things that are in the construction traffic management plan, the contractor will be held to account, not just by planning controls, but also through that contractual relationship. The second control mechanism. Then that I wanted to point to was that there is a specific requirement which deals with the need for approval and then compliance with the construction traffic management plan. That's requirement number four, which is in the draft development consent order as submitted. The reference

number for that for the initial draft was at 031, that requirement is there. The ctmp has enforcement mechanisms within it, which would be overseen by the local highway authority, which is also the local planning authority in this case, so that contractual, that enforcement framework is certainly there in the applicant's view, in the documents which have been submitted. We We thought, prior to coming to this hearing that that was an appropriate mechanism to use, and that provided the necessary reassurance. We weren't aware that the local highway authority had particular concerns with that approach, but we have certainly heard what you said, and we take the point away and see what more we can do to offer reassurance.

43:36

Thanks, Mr. Hinik, if I can just remind you for is a travel plan to work, there has to be clear cut initiatives listed within the travel plan that we can rely on. It could be an outline form the construction Traffic Manager plan will then enforce it at a later stage, then we can read and say, Yes, you've provided all this information. You see it's taken by what you put originally. So but without having a put forward in first instance, we don't know that staff travel plan cannot be relied upon. So we need to see all these clear cut initiatives that we can rely on. Then we say, Yes, we take that off. The applicant has intended to do that. The next step then will be the enforcement action. Are they actually carrying out what they say they're going to do? If you understand what I'm getting now, so we need those clear cut actions,

44:35

sir Mr. Menick, for the applicant, thank you for that explanation that is helpful. Like say we're taken away and we're we're coming back with something in writing, if we can.

44:43

Okay, thank you, Mr. Mahinik. Now would the applicant explain, if any school for okay, we've covered that, in a sense. If any score for alternative short shuttle bus provision for Star had been considered. And if I remember correctly, Mr. Mehnik, you've taken that way to look into that. Yeah. Is that correct, sir?

45:12

Mr. Manhini, for the applicant? Yes, absolutely. I think Mrs. Had already explained that the applicant doesn't think the shuttle bus service that has been identified in the question, the tslex service, we

45:25

go into that. The next question then is, sorry you that's the next question is whether any negotiations with TS flex bus operator or any transport provider with a view to organize a shuttle bus for the construction workers of the proposed development have taken place, if any negotiations,

45:47

Mrs. Hull for the applicant, no, as we've mentioned, the T flex service does require that amount of flexibility travel from those living within the zone is permitted to the to the other locations within the zone, which includes some of the villages near the panel area, so people will be welcome to use it, but it does require that element of flexibility which might not be suitable to the workforce. We also know that funding for the TS Flex is likely to run out in March next year, so it can't be relied upon at this stage. We

feel as a proposed measure to transport construction workers. We've also spoken to Darlington Borough Council, and they've kind of agreed that they don't know if the service will still be operating. You know, from next March, it's subject to funding, so at this stage, we think it's not really the most appropriate form of transport whilst it's there at the moment, and they would be welcome to use it. It's not something we relied upon in our assessment.

46:42

Thank you. Mrs. Hill, I will now ask the applicant to set out its approach to arriving at the community benefit fund some the sum within the community benefit fund, yeah, explaining whether it has considered the noted deficiencies in the road and transport infrastructure in the local area.

47:12

Sir, good afternoon. Alex mhinick, for the applicant, the applicant submitted a community benefits fund statement, which I'm sure you are aware of as part of its deadline to responses, and so that that statement includes the detail that the applicant is able to provide about the proposed community benefit fund, I'm not sure we have anything to add to the information that's in that written statement which has been submitted. The two particular points, sir, that I would add to that written information are, firstly, I'm absolutely sure that the panel is alive to this, but clearly the question of community benefit and the provision of community benefit funds are things that sit squarely outside of the planning regime. They're not to be taken account of during the consideration and determination of planning matters, and that is very squarely how the applicant sees the community benefit funds that has been offered clearly it's communicated the presence of that fund as part of the consultation on the scheme, and that's one of the reasons why there have been references to it elsewhere. But we just want to be absolutely clear that we don't see it performing a traditional planning function of offsetting direct impacts of the project that fall to be compensated for through traditional section 106 agreements, for example. So we're not seeing it performing that function. It's something that sits outside of the planning regime and shouldn't be taken account of when it then comes to whether consideration has been given to the use of that funds for highway purposes. The short answer, Sarah, I think, is that it wouldn't be appropriate to use a fund of that purpose. Well, put it this way around, the applicant hasn't identified any particular deficit in the existing highway infrastructure that it would be appropriate to fund highway improvements for all highway improvements that are required to be funded in order to facilitate the delivery of the development so those two categories of improvement works being Things that would normally fall within the consideration of the highway transport impacts of a planning proposal, the applicant hasn't considered anything that sits within that category. As far as I'm aware, neither of the local highway authorities have identified anything that would sit within either of those categories. So. So the applicant has not directly considered using what you could call section 106 funds to deal with highway matters, because it's not apparent that there is anything that requires the application of those funds to matters which have that necessary connection with the development proposal which is coming forward equally the to answer the question directly, the nature of the things that community benefit the community benefit fund, would be made available for are explained in that community benefit statement. And I don't think General highway improvements in the local area are one of the things that would naturally fit within any of those category of things that are intended to be funded through the community benefit fund. I hope that's helpful. So

50:58

thanks, Mr. Mehnen, would you then think that? Would you not think that this T flex boss, that the council, the joint councils, funding up till March 2025, would you then not think that the longevity, or indeed the extension of that bus service would actually benefit the local community.

51:35

Sir Arlo, I steer clear from answering whether it would or wouldn't benefit the local community, because I'm not a transport planner, so I'll ask Mrs. Hill to comment on that in a moment. I think the the the applicant's perspective on that bus services, that it's probably not the right mechanism, the right vehicle to use to address any transport needs that the scheme has. Mrs. Hill was talking about its suitability a moment ago. It's it's not thought that that's the appropriate means by which ensuring construction workers can access the site is best delivered, as we've explained, and we've had a conversation about more information on this, but the applicant's position is that multi occupancy vehicles would be the best means of delivering construction workers to the site. We don't think the T select Service would be necessarily make any meaningful contribution towards that process. I don't know if Mrs. Hill, you have anything to

52:38

add for the applicant we did ask Darlington Borough Council, they're not aware of any of the developers that have contributed to the bus service. So it would be quite unusual for a development to contribute towards that service. And as Mr. Mohinik said, it's really the very low demand that we would expect, given the timing of the construction workforce needing to be on site, that our view would be any funding towards that service would likely be disproportionate to the scale of use from the construction workforce, so it's not something that we would consider. We think the more appropriate use would actually be shared transport organized by the principal contractor, rather than using the public bus service.

53:16

Thanks, Mrs. Hill. Moving on. Also looking at paragraph two point 2.4 of the community benefit fund, would the applicant explain what action it has taken to address the perceived insufficiency of the fund, resulting from the related consultation with the stakeholders, because some of the consultees said that the fund was insufficient. If I

54:00

the fund is proposed based on a proportion per megawatt that we contribute, and we would like to discuss that level with the parishes, but we haven't discussed it to date, following the parishes wish not to discuss it during the planning process. It's something that we will discuss following the planning process, or when the parishes would like to do that, or any other stakeholder, just to clarify, it's also the fund itself is administrated by a third party from RWE, so grandscape And people would apply to it for projects independent to RWE, but we are open to discussions about the level of the level of

54:44

defend. Thanks, Mr. Baker, looking at paragraph 2.26, of the same paper, would the applicant confirm whether its willingness to discuss the size of the contribution? With the stakeholders, gives certain level of flexibility in the ultimate so there is, I think it's the last sentence there in that paragraph, that's a book.

55:15

It's 210 megawatts, and there's emerging at 210 pounds per megawatt, and we can review that in line with discussions and based on the viability of the project and what we can contribute. Yeah, that's that's the discussions that we're happy to have at some point.

55:36

So follow up from there, Mr. Baker, does that mean the sum is likely can go up or can remain the same. If you can clarify Please, yeah,

55:47

it could either remain the same or go up. Yeah, that's that's the nature of the discussions that we'll have, and we'll have to take that into account in the context of the project that we're putting that we get consent for. Again, repeating that it's not relevant to

56:01

planning. Thank you. Mister Baker, also, I would now refer the applicant to paragraph two, point 3.2 of the community benefit fund and ask the applicant to clarify why local councils are not included in the in the list of organizations that can apply for a share of the fund of this form. Is there some certain

56:27

the fund is administered by an outfit called grandscape, which would take funding applications from relevant organizations that we define closer to the time or groups or within a certain meter of the thing. So it's not it's not necessarily for the local authorities or matters related to planning. It's not related to planning. It's a community benefits fund for community groups.

56:53

Okay? Thank you, Mr. Baker, I would now ask Darlington Borough Council for explanation about any plan for the TS flex bus following its initial funding period ending March 2025, and whether any source of funding had been identified, including potential for that developer contribution in this area area to enable the this bus service to continue to operate beyond March 2025

57:25

please. Arthur house in Darlington Borough Council funding for the tees flex service. It's funded through the tees Valley Combined Authority. Funding is currently under review. There's no commitment for funding beyond March 2025 at this time, it's subject to review, so there's no certainty that it will be available for use by the developer by the time hit site. We've not asked any development contributions through one or six or other means thus far, essentially because it is fully funded, that's the reason why it's fully funded. Essentially, until such a time it isn't

58:07

okay. Thank you very much.

58:15

I will now refer to the refer the applicant to table 3.1 of construction and traffic management plan, Mr.

58:23

Brothers, before we move on to the next topic, can I just ask another question? Thank you, Council, please.

58:31

Thank you.

58:32

I would just like to ask if the Downton Borough Council would like to comment on some of the assumptions that we have just heard from the applicant in relation to traffic management and the use of the busses, and if you actually agree with the methodology that has been used for that. And I would also like to ask if the local authority like to come in terms of status road, and how the local authorities see those uses being used on those roads, and if they are suitable for the type of busses that will likely be used by the applicant

59:16

other house and on some Council. I think we've made similar conclusions and observations as you've discussed previously, the evidence around the the occupancy rates feels a bit lacking, so we've raised that with the applicants, and like yourselves, we look for a bit more robust evidence. Based on that, I would agree that the probably the best way is, again, some survey methodology from some of the sites. In terms of the travel plan, I think to use mini busses specifically for construction workers is probably the last. Forward. Yes, I can see no reason why the local highway network isn't suitable for using that type of transport. Thank

1:00:09

you. Mr. Hudson, over to you. Mr. Oiba, there. Thank you.

1:00:15

Thank you. I will now move you.

1:00:25

To the next Yeah, the question I was going to ask, thanks, Mr. Pinto. The question I was going to ask is for the applicant to confirm if all the row sections in that table are presently in a state that will withstand the weight of heavy goods vehicles serving the proposed development and if not what measures will be put into place to ensure that these roads will continue to be safe for all road users.

1:01:00

Nicole for the applicant table 3.1 in the construction traffic management plan will be updated. It's within the list of documents to be updated as the consultation report, application reference number 21 notes

that following the consultation the panel area and area ref was moved back away from the boundary with mill lane and the construction access routes were altered to remove the use of mill lane as a construction access route. So that has been reflected in figure two, point 2.1 which shows the construction compounds and access routes. So just to confirm that in area f, it's just the road along the western boundary of panel area f and mill Lane has been removed. I think all of the I'm trying to see if there was any of this that were removed following the consultation, but certainly all the routes shown in figure two, point 2.1, which is the latest construction access route diagram. They're all public highway. There's no weight limit restrictions on those routes. So we drove them all, and we're happy that they're all suitable for the use by all vehicles.

1:02:18

Thank you, Mrs. Hill. As you are aware, most of these roads are narrow, even though they are suitable for heavy goods vehicles. And what I'm sort of thinking about as well is the need for passing places, because when we went out on site, there were many opportunities for vehicles to pass in the on this narrow, narrow road. Have you? Has the applicant actually looked into that to see if there's opportunity, where there is opportunity, and there's no restriction to creating passing place, a couple of passing places.

1:03:00

Nicola Hill, for the applicant, we haven't looked at passing places, I think, largely based on the forecast number of heavy goods vehicles that we're expecting, which is on average, about six per day to each panel area. Looking at the existing we did traffic surveys in March 2023, admittedly, the roads are likely trafficked, but there are some goods vehicles using these roads where goods vehicles are allowed to so I think the addition of about six vehicles per day, we haven't felt necessitated any kind of infrastructure works, because they would be within the daily traffic and deliveries that currently occur on the local road network.

1:03:42

Okay? Thank you. Mrs. Hill didn't ask.

1:04:00

Okay. Now the if I can ask you the applicant this question is to do with the precondition survey, would the applicant agree that the idea of a precondition survey, apart from establishing the current state of the road, is to make sure that the construction works do not compromise the free and safe use of the highway, and following completion of the proposed development, repair unconditionally any further deterioration in the highway. My reference there is to the applicant's response to the Darlington Borough Council. Durham County Council has talked in Borough Council local impact reports, rep, 2008, so I think the council was concerned about the possible deterioration. Are relating to the highway there. So the response we get there are not quite comfortable with the response.

1:05:13

Nicola hillth, the applicant, yes, the applicant is willing to commit to undertaking pre commencement condition surveys and regular inspections of the routes to the site. This the outline ctmp will be updated to include this requirement alongside a commitment from the principal contractor to let Durham County

Council know of any Darlington Borough Council, sorry, know of any deterioration of the routes to the site, and resolve any of that through reasonable routes and proportionate compensation. We have discussed this with Darlington Borough Council, and I think they were satisfied that as long as those pre commencement condition surveys were carried out, and there was a commitment within this, the detailed ctmp, that that would be satisfactory.

1:05:57

Thanks, Mrs. Here can I just confirm that assuming the preconditions of A trigger certain level of repair, say, for instance, even though the road is suitable for heavy goods vehicle and there is a section that is severely damaged that heavy goods vehicle cannot use, it, is it something that the applicant is prepared to rectify before the the implementation of the development. It'll

1:06:28

help the applicant. I might defer this one, but my assumption is, if the road's damaged already, it wouldn't be liable to the applicant. I

1:06:47

The precondition service labor would be carried out, and as I understand, we'd have to review the roads after construction and ensure that it's remains suitable for traffic, and those repairs would be covered by the applicant if they were to occur. But we might want to clarify that exact mechanism in writing following the hearing at deadline four.

1:07:10

Sorry, Mr. Baker, I didn't quite get the response there, because, if I use a simple example, a precondition survey has been carried out, and there's a large pothole, for instance, that will create ponding. Ponding that, say, for instance, pedestrian passing, it will trigger water spilling everywhere. Is it something that the applicant would do to repair that, to make sure it's okay for the for the heavy goods vehicle, in the meantime, prior to repairing other necessary repairs.

1:07:56

Yeah, we would also review it prior to construction to make sure it's suitable for the construction period. And so if there was that instance, then that's something we'd want to repair prior to construction.

1:08:05

Okay, thank you. I mean, if I can ask for a statement along that line, because the precondition survey that was mentioned, it doesn't really include a statement to that effect. And looking at the response to the local impact report, it seems it appears as if the applicant is just saying, we do precondition survey, and that's it, and the vehicles will continue to use this so following that, if we do any damage, then we repair it. So that was the impression. Will it be possible then to sort of firm up this preconditions of area to include that sort of activity, action,

1:08:52

sir? Alex menick, from the applicant, we are intending to update the construction traffic management plan, there was a note to that effect, I think in the ESR Rata document. I think it's probably sensible that

we look to bring that together and some better Revised Version dealing with this issue together with the points we were talking about previously in terms of multi occupancy initiatives. I think, sir, the additional points that I would just add to this conversation about pre existing damage prior to any development where it's been carried out are, firstly, I don't think anyone's identified anything yet, and I appreciate precondition surveys haven't been carried out, but there has been an awful lot of informal surveying of the highway network. I'm not aware the local authorities identifying any particular areas of damage at this stage, if there were. And we came to the position where RWE had consent and it was looking to deliver the scheme and there was pre existing damage to the highway. Have to take the point away and consider how we put it in the construction traffic management plan, but the local highway authorities are obviously responsible for maintaining the existing public highway network, so I think primary responsibility for ensuring that that network is fit for purpose, for one of a more precise term, would sit with the local highway authorities, but would certainly look and see what proposals we can put forward.

1:10:32

Thanks, Mr. An important issue, because if the highway is unsuitable, we would expect the applicant to sort of rectify that. It might not be more, there might not be any, there could be couple to maintain, to put that into a state that will be fit for purpose. So that's why I'm getting out. So if you can just sort of improve that. And that leads on to the next question I was going to ask, because the response that was given there as well to the NRL, the next question will be for the applicant to clarify how the deterioration of the HGV routes that is unsuitable to the actions of the undertaker will be identified, because it was saying that any action that is attributable to the undertaker will be will be corrected. So I don't quite get is how you can differentiate between the vehicles heavy goes, vehicle associated with an undertaker, or indeed the odd heavy goods vehicle that passed the same route. So it seems to me like that sort of precondition, the action that is required, primary, primarily, primarily, the applicant is trying to sort of play that down by this sort of statement that, oh, if it's the action of Undertaker, will correct that. So that's the point that I'm trying to get at there. So if you can sort of maybe make corrections.

1:12:22

So yes, we'll, um, we'll certainly take the points away, and we will talk to the local highway authorities about things to try and make sure that when we submit something we're doing so on and we're all on the same page about what the proposal is and exactly how it will work in practice.

1:12:38

Okay, thanks, Mr. A

1:12:45

so now, having established that certain parts of the construction traffic traffic route might be, you know, there could be a damage, there could be anything, and you're going to correct it, the applicant will be correcting those prior to the implementation of the development so would the applicant then confirm how the draft DC or outline ctmp will be updated to include the necessary actions and related requirement That will make certain that the rules of the construction traffic are safe prior to the commencement of the proposed development. So would you include all those actions within the ctmp? How will it be done?

1:13:37

Sir alexman hanek, for the applicant. I mean, I think we will. We will certainly take the ctmp away and look at it and talk to the local authorities about it and come back with a proposal. I think, just to be absolutely clear, the applicant's position at the moment is that the local highway network is suitable to enable the delivery of the development. It's I'm not aware that the local highway authority has identified particular constraints on the existing highway network that mean that that's not the case, nor has the applicant's investigations to date and its assessment work to date, we will certainly consider how what the mechanism would be to deal with any pre existing damage that there might be when a precondition survey is carried out and the construction traffic management plan would I expect to be the natural place for that commitment To sit? But it is certainly something that the applicant is committing to take away and consider and reflect on and talk to local highway authorities about, and we will update the examining authority as quickly as we're able to once we've advanced those conversations.

1:14:57

So Mr. The C. CMP will be updated accordingly, with a correct statement within Yes,

1:15:04

absolutely the CCN. So the CCMP will certainly be updated to address a variety of matters that have come up during the course of this hearing, and that will certainly be one of the points that we will look at.

1:15:19

Thank you, Mister mahinik, I will now ask my fellow panel members if they have any questions they would like to ask

1:15:28

no questions from me. Thank you, Mister. Yeah.

1:15:31

None for me. Thank you.

1:15:33

Thank you.

1:15:41

Now that we have finished the examination examining authorities questions on this item, I will now ask if any of the local authorities present today would like to ask questions or clarify any issues on this item.

1:15:59

Thank you. Lisa Hutchinson, Darlington, Borough Council, no following. Mr. Houses, contribution. You've got nothing further to say. Thank you.

1:16:05

Thank you. Mr. Hochins, Mrs. Houghton, I will that is one. I will now ask the IPS with us, who have elected to speak today, to come forward as their names are. I

1:16:27

was talking, oh, sorry, sorry, I apologize to Stockton Borough Council comments from Stockton, I apologize, sorry.

1:16:37

No problem. No, we got nothing further to Raj.

1:16:40

Thank you very much.

1:16:43

Thank you. So I will now ask the interested parties with us who have elected to speak today to come forward as their names are announced, starting with Councilor Philip Watson, Bishop and parish council.

1:17:05

Norman Mullaney, Bishop and parish council, I'm not going to speak on this matter. I'm going to just send my comments in.

1:17:15

Okay, thank you, Mr. Mullaney, okay.

1:17:27

Thank you, sir. Mark Smith, speaking on behalf of bishopton villages action group in the Construction Management Plan section four, it highlights that there are developments of a similar nature within close proximity of the proposed development, they've been identified, but there doesn't seem to be any any mitigation built into the traffic management plan for the increased levels of traffic from the other multiple developments that are likely to be taking place at the same time.

1:17:58

Thank you. I will now ask the applicants will comment on there.

1:18:02

Yeah. Nicola Hill, for the applicant, we did look at all the committed developments within the local area and extract where they were available their traffic flow information, and then that was put into a future baseline traffic flow diagram. We looked at where they were routing traffic as well the main kind of committed development. Developments were to the west of the area, nearer to the A one. And there were some other solar farm developments around the red Marshall area. We have added that onto the future baseline, so that is considered within the assessment in terms of mitigation, within the construction traffic management plan, there is the site manager and the community liaison officer, and

they would be responsible for listening to residents concerns and and liaising with the other construction sites as well.

1:18:52

Thank you. Mrs. Hill, next,

1:18:57

hello, kind Taylor, great stains and parish meeting. The applicant, used the term for L Stob lane as been likely trafficked. I did a download from the speed monitor sign at the top of the village on Sunday, and it covered the period from the 15th of May to the 13th of October. And there were 461,199 vehicle movements during that period, which equated to 2975 vehicle movements a day. And whilst I respect the term likely traffic might be a relative term, it certainly doesn't feel likely trafficked.

1:19:41

Thank you. Mr. Taylor, would the applicant comment on that? Please?

1:19:45

Yeah. Nicola Hill, for the applicant, in terms of the traffic survey data that we have was from March 2023, and that was the busiest route, actually, throughout the study area was El blame being a kind of connection point between those two strategic roads. We had four. Fairly similar for about 3000 vehicles each way in a day.

1:20:03

Apologies, Mrs. Hilbert, can I ask you to just speak a little bit closer to here? Thank

1:20:08

you. Yeah. So we from our traffic survey in March 2023, which was over seven days, we registered about 3000 vehicles per day on that road. And as I say, it is the busiest road within the study area that we were looking at. But in terms of kind of the lightly trafficked is, perhaps, as you say, it's all relative, I think it was in comparison to the actual link flow capacity of that carriageway, which is between 1018 100 vehicles per hour. So in terms of, you know, a daily flow of about 3000 in in theoretical terms, is quite light compared to what it could handle. Admit the it's not you know, in terms of the study area, that road is the busiest route within the study area.

1:20:55

Thank you, Mrs. Hill. Did you actually look at the the traffic generated by this development in relation to the peak traffic for that escort Road,

1:21:13

Nicola Hill, for the applicant, yeah, it is within one of the traffic flow diagrams in haste. I can't pull it up at the moment, but there is a percentage change diagram within the transport statement, showing the change in trips from the current baseline, as we had it from March 2023, plus what the development would add, and then also what the other committed developments would add to the traffic network.

1:21:32

So what did I show it, roughly in terms of impact, pull

1:21:37

it up on that road. The one I have here is about two or 3% in each direction. That's the percentage change of committed and construction traffic. We have got one with just the construction on it. But I can't, in haste, pull it up, but we there are diagrams within the transport statement.

1:21:56

Okay? Thank you. Mr. Seal,

1:22:02

yeah. I thank you. Sean Anderson from bishopton villages Action Group, I would like to make the point that the construction traffic management plan relies upon the concept of shared transport. Shared Transport's notoriously difficult to manage and enforce. The construction traffic management plan also states that there will be 15 trips on each end of the day to get 100 men to site and to do to achieve that in the first hour in advance of the site opening, would mean that each trip would be a four minute round trip. I would suggest that the premise upon which the traffic management plan is based is flawed and needs to be reviewed. Thank you.

1:22:48

Thank you. Ms Danese, would your comment on that

1:22:51

please? Nicola Hill, for the applicant, as you say, we'll take it away in terms of surveys of other construction sites, but our view was, the shared use of vehicles was an established practice for sites such as this. So, yeah, I think previous commitments to look at that occupancy data will be provided.

1:23:10

Thank you, Mrs. Hill, Miss Dan does say again, yeah, I would

1:23:16

just like to make the point that if the if the shared transport can't be enforced, then construction workers will migrate again to their own vehicles, and that will mean more traffic on the road and also parking in lanes, which will cause even more problems. Thank you.

1:23:34

Thanks, Mr. Anderson, I think we spent time on that particular issue. That is why we requested the applicant to provide a firm action in terms of provision of shared transport. And I believe that once that is done and we have clear cost statement within construction traffic management plan that can be enforced, that can easily be enforced. Hence why we ask the applicant to commit to that particular initiative? So I would ask that you wait until we get the further construction traffic management plan from the applicant to see whether indeed or this statement have been inserted into that document.

Thank you. I will now ask if anyone attending virtually has got any comments or any questions regarding this topic.

1:24:42

No. I can't see. Oh, that's on,

1:24:49

yeah, sorry, just one. Thank you. It's just one question. And I hear that you just said that the topic has been discussed. And I think it's important that a. New Construction transport management plan is provided. What I wanted to ask is, would you think it's appropriate in describing that management plan that there's some description of the the way that the construction will be organized, the number of contractors and the way subcontracting will work? Because I don't see, let me see in the current construction transfer management plan how that can translate into a contractual arrangement with contractors and subcontractors, particularly in terms of modal share and seven people in a car. So I think would be interesting not just to look at the transport and the trips in a, in a in a technical sense, but also look at how the applicant intends to organize that construction through the construction, subcontracting and contracting process, because I think that's critical to being able to control that plan and implement that plan and come up with a realistic plan, and in terms of comparables, about the solar farms? I mean, every site is different, as everybody knows. This is a solar farm on a massive scale. That's equivalent of about 10 solar farms in terms of size. So can they actually see which comparables they're using to see whether other people think they are comparable. If that's another question, thank

1:26:28

you. I'll ask the applicant to provide a brief response to that.

1:26:36

Sarah, Alex, the applicant, I think so. The short answer is that it is possible to include those commitments in the construction traffic management plan. They will be enforceable in the planning regime. There's a separate conversation about the contractual relationship between our W is scheme promoter and its principal contractor, how that principal contractor then flows things down to any subcontractors is obviously subject to that initial position, but the starting point is that there are planning controls there which would be enforced if they needed to be just, just a couple of points of clarification on things that the last couple of speakers have said. So you have to forgive me, I didn't catch the name of the person who asked that question a moment ago, but in in their question, they indicated that this scheme is around 10 times the size of an average solar farm.

1:27:32

So if I may, just to clarify, I think it was Mr. Andy Anderson that joined us online. Just clarify for the record, the person that asked the question that you're referring to.

1:27:42

Thank you, sir. I didn't clock that. It was an online contribution. I thought it was somebody else in the room. So thank you, Mr. Anderson mentioned that this was around 10 times the size of an average solar farm. I suppose it depends on what you call an average this scheme is has a general will have an

export capacity of around 180 megawatts. There is a significant threshold at around 50 megawatts generating capacity between other solar farms and solar farms that fall into the DCO regime. I'd just suggest that 10 times as perhaps not necessarily true depending on what your average solar farm size is. The other point of clarification that I was just going to mention very quickly was Mr. Anderson was talking about squeezing in 15 four minute trips into an hour at the beginning and end of the day, I think, as a premise. And Mr. Anderson's question that it's the same vehicle which has been used for every single trip, which I don't think is what the applicant is suggesting it would there would be a fleet of vehicles. There may not be 15 vehicles, but certainly it wouldn't be the case of a vehicle flying backwards and forwards, a single vehicle flying backwards and forwards that many times in an hour. Thank

1:29:08

you, Mr. Mahini, I'm conscious of the time, and I think it's appropriate time for us to break now for the next topic. So I'll suggest we come back at quarter to four for the next topic. Thank you.

1:29:37

They were adjourning them.

1:29:40

I joined the meeting till quarter to four. Thank you very much. Thank.