



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Byers Gill Solar
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 6 Session 2 (ISH6)
<b>Date:</b>	27 November 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\_BYERSGILLSOLAR\_ISH6\_SESSION1\_27112024

Wed, Nov 27, 2024 1:20PM • 1:10:10

I would like to the time is now 1142 and I would like to resume the meeting you.

Um, my

next question to the applicant,

I would refer the applicant's response to Esq 1.8

which says that the applicant would also welcome opportunities to provide appropriate educational and learning opportunities during construction and operation of the proposed development. Would the applicant then explain how this will be managed and enforced without a definitive employment and skills plan,

fundamentally, such plan would have would have detail. Would have detailed the arrangements to promote local employment and skills development opportunities, including apprenticeship education, engagement with local authorities, schools and colleges and training programs, so I just like you to explain how this will be enforced.

Thank you, sir. Michael Baker for the applicant. RGB has several programs relating to STEM education and apprenticeships. We would ensure that the contract includes provision for

STEM activities during the during the construction process and our apprenticeship program would be open to local applicants related to the scheme. I don't have further details of that, but it is something which we would deliver as part of the contracts of the project. And also, RGB has an extensive has extensive programs covering this that would be rolled out as part of the delivery of the project.

I think Thanks, Mr. Bet. But is this something that could form like a stand alone? Well, supplementary document to

the management plan,

Sir Alex minhinik for the applicant, Mr. Baker has explained the

wider opportunities and the wider processes and opportunities that are available via our W ease existing programs, but so there isn't any proposal for a Bespoke

Skills plan or anything of that nature for this particular project, and the benefits that would emerge from a bespoke program or plan of that nature are

not benefits that the applicant is relying or seeking to rely on in the planning balance. Does that help address the question, sir, yeah, just because the just looking at your response, it just, we would welcome opportunities, just thinking this sort of actions should be spelled out in terms of actions on the part of the applicant, where to promote

education and learning opportunities. And then,

you know, in the form of

a skills plan, really employment and skills plan, I thought that should, one should be able to pinpoint all these actions within a specific document, without it scattered all over the place. That's all I'm thinking,

sir, thank you. And no absolutely Alex. And Alex the applicant, absolutely understand

where the where the questions are coming from, sir, I think to

go back to my response to the to the

my previous response a moment ago.

This isn't a situation where the applicant is pointing to a Bespoke Skills plan and saying that it will implement that, and it would like the benefits of that plan to be weighed into the planning balance.

It's not something that has emerged during the development of the project to date,

the situation that the applicant is proposing and the basis on which the applicant is asking the examining authority to take into account the application is the situation that Mr. Baker.

Was described. So there are these opportunities available. And RW RWE

will also look to ensure that its contractor has regard to these matters when it comes to the point of appointing the contractor for the scheme. But this isn't a case where a Bespoke Skills plan is being proposed by the applicant.

Thanks, Mr. Mahini, could that be part of

the agreement with the contractors?

Employed contractors?

Thanks. I think we probably have the applicant. So we do have commitments within the existing outline construction environmental management plan to explore those employment and supply chain opportunities with the contractor, and also working with the local planning authority as well in their role within the local economy. So the commitments are within the documents, and yeah, as a commitment will seek to follow through with the contractor. Thank you, Mister Brown,

now having established during the issue specific hearing three, that was conducted on 15, October 2024 that the applicant is amenable to increase in the community benefit fund some I will now ask the applicant to explain how the community benefit fund provisions would be expanded to cater for employment and skills development in renewables and supply chains, including apprenticeships, Education and young people, plus rural business and farming support.

Thank you, sir. I understand this is known to the examining authority, but I would like to stress that the community benefit fund isn't relevant to the planning decision and shouldn't be taken into account in the decision whether or not to grant consent.

It's a Voluntary Arrangement offered by RWE to provide direct benefits to communities in the vicinity of renewable energy projects, and it's been a standard practice for wind and solar over a number of years.

The community benefit fund statement R E, p2,

zero, 11 states that the fund will be managed by a third party, independent administrator on behalf of RWE, and lists relevant organizations who can apply to the fund. So this includes voluntary and community groups, parish councils, schools and educational establishments, social enterprises and community interest companies, and in certain cases, individuals are also eligible to apply. The fund is intended to provide benefits from projects identified and led for projects identified and led by the relevant community organizations have listed, and it's not aimed at redressing

the any planning related matters, such as the impacts of the proposed development on the local economy.

As I've said, the community benefit fund isn't related to planning.

So in terms of those areas that you've listed, in terms of employment and skills and other areas that would be a matter for communities to bring forward and apply for, rather than something that we would use the fund to directly ameliorate any effects from the project. Thank you, Mr. Baker,

I'm just wondering that

there's no reason why this sort of initiatives cannot be incorporated, because you got a good document, and I read it through and I saw few of the

initiatives that you've with the document was targeting. So there's no reason why you shouldn't be able to include this statement about employment and skills development in apprenticeship, especially education and young people

within the document that we can read that this is an area that this fund will target, so that when local communities come along, they'll be able to say, yes, you know, it will attract even the local authority as well. Because in one of the representation by Dalit in Borough Council, I think I picked up something to do with education and young people. So if this, if this, these initiatives, are included, then that will encourage the local authorities as well to participate. So that's why I'm getting out.

Yes sir. Michael Bucha for the.

Applicant, I think the

there are some of those things that could be included in the terms of reference for the funder as part of the objectives of the fund, and that would come out of

discussion with those relevant organizations, including parish parish councils, following the grant of consent if it's granted.

And we would consider those sorts of things, I would say, specifically on apprenticeships, that's something that RWE would do separate to any fund. It's something that's part of our operation, of our firm, and wouldn't be related to the fund.

So some of those things could be included in the objectives of the fund, and we can get to that once we have a chance to speak to the organizations, but it's really for the community to define how they wish those funds to be to be spent

and on their projects.

Okay? Thank you, Mr. Bucha.

I will now ask my fellow panel members if they have any questions they would like to ask?

Thank you, Mr. Obadi, I do have a question, if I may.

I have a question for the applicant. I would like us to

go back to chapter nine, land use in socio economics

and my question is broadly related with information included by the applicant in Table 9.4

community facilities and services that is

page 15 of 52 of the document.

And my question is, is linked with cumulative effects, but cumulative effects merely from a perspective of land use and socio economic effects, not

cross topics, which we will be looking into later on today,

but merely from a lens, from a land in socio economics perspective, if we take

the number of receptors identified as having some sort of effect from the proposal, even though the majority of them are is identified as low in terms of sensitivity.

Nevertheless,

on some of some locations, such as for example, Brefferton or Stillington, there are several Bishop turn red Marshall, Great Stanton, there are several identified receptors that will have a low impact. So has the applicant considered the cumulative impact of all of those significant, of all of those low impact significant,

cumulatively within that specific location and within that specific area for each and every topic, particularly this one.

Thank you. So David Brown on behalf of the applicant, so that it does come into consideration of the overall conclusion as part of the assessment work in terms of the number of receptors and the potential impact, I think what we have with the proposed development in front of us, sir, is that those recreational

community facilities, as we've described, access, will be maintained, and that is committed as part of the embedded mitigation measures. It is really access to and continued use of those facilities, which is the key potential impact, which might lead to loss as part of the construction process. And because of those mitigation measures, we've got a low magnitude of impact across all of those receptors, and that's what's driving the negligible, not significant effect during construction. So so it would have come into account if those the magnitude of impact would have been higher. So if there were a number of impacts across a number of receptors, it may have driven a higher overall conclusion. So, but in this case, it hasn't, because of that low magnitude of impact.

Thank you for that clarification. I accept that. However, if you are a resident of say brefound in actually 346,

community facilities and assets within the village have been affected. Then, how has that assessment been carried out by the applicant in terms of the overall effect, even though it's slow in magnitude, but it's an overall effect on several different resources that are continuously used by the local community? Do.

So David Brown on behalf of the applicant. So I think what the position of the applicant is that there won't be that effect because of the mitigation measures in place. So the community shouldn't feel an effect on those receptors, because access is maintained as it currently is, and construction routine, for example, and he movements are limited where they may have an effect on those receptors. So the mitigation should mean that that impact isn't felt, and therefore that cumulative effect is also not felt across the community.

I'm going to have to press you on that specific point, because I'm not really quite understanding why say

a low magnitude effect on five significant social and community facilities has the same effect as one low it seems to me that if five different community facilities within a small village are going is going to be affected, then surely there must be a consideration of the cumulative effects that proposal is going to have on all of those assets.

Yeah, so Doug Baron pay off the applicant. I do take the point so but again, I'd stress that it's not a significant effect from a social perspective, and that is because of the mitigation measures that are put in place within the management plans, which will mean that those receptors will continue to operate as they currently are. So as per the baseline situation, if there was a situation where the effects of the development were going to mean that those facilities couldn't be used for certain times of the day, and that was across five facilities, we would be recording a higher magnitude of impact, and therefore a



higher overall significance. That's not the situation we're in here. So we're we're saying that those receptors will continue to operate as the baseline situation, hence the negligible effect. Okay, thank you. Thank you, sir.

That's all from me at this point. Thank you. Mr. Very much. Mr. Abadi, thanks. Mr. Pinto,

None for me. Thank you. Mr. Abadi,

yeah, None for me. Thank you. Okay, thank you, Mr. Oisheo.

Now that we are finished the

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, please.

Thank Thank you. Lisa Hutchinson, Darlington Borough Council. I do have a couple of questions or points of clarification today, just to say that much of what we've heard today, our response is set out in our local impact report and obviously in the statement of common ground that we're working towards. And I working towards. And I'll be brief, because obviously, there's a number of people that do want to speak today, but the first matter relates to best and most versatile land,

as I set out, we don't have the technical expertise in Darlington to

fully assess the impacts of the agricultural land classification report or the soil resources report, and would defer to Natural England as statutory consulting on those matters. We do note that they do not consider the permanent loss of BMV land in this instance, be significant subject to soil management techniques, which will be secured by requirement 10. And I would ask whether Natural England could hold that requirement 10 could be amended to include Natural England as a consultee, so that Darlington Borough Council, in considering matters relating to requirement 10, should the order be granted, can

consult with Natural England As an expert or statutory consultee on those matters.

That was the first point I wanted to make. The second related to

the classification report itself, and the assumptions made around this, the

those areas of the off road cable route that couldn't be

tested, and the assumptions made around that, clearly, that is a significant amount of land at 21.2 hectares out of a third a total of 35 which weren't available or accessible for surveying.

And I suppose the question is,

how are these assumptions that are set out in the report to be validated to ensure that

the land in those areas which would be disturbed during the construction is then reinstated to an appropriate

original condition, which again would feed back into requirement 10. So whether is that something that's going to be given further consideration as part of your

assessment of the proposals and the impact on agricultural land? BNB, in particular, I do have another question, but I think it's probably something that's better off looked at in this afternoon's session on cumulative impacts, but they were the main points on best and most versatile land, and it was just that the final point was relating to the community benefits fund, accepting the position that it's not.

Part of the planning balance, but just to support, I mean, our position is set out in the local impact report. But just to

emphasize that, Dieter would expect a full package of measures fully funded to be

offered as part of the development should it proceed and support the local community in developing an appropriate range of

topics or measures to be funded through that, and that was it. Thank you.

Thank you, Mrs. Hodgkinson.

I will now ask the applicant to respond to Mrs. Hodgkinson presentation.

Alex,

excuse me. Alex menick, for the applicant, so in response

to the points that have been raised by the Council for which we're grateful, there's no objection on the part of the applicant to including Natural England under requirement 10, if that's going to be of assistance to the council,

ensuring that they're involved in that consultation exercise and the discharge of that requirement.

When it comes then to the assumption, assumptions which have been made about part of the off road

cabling corridor. We've heard Mr. Baker talking earlier about the construction methods which would be used to deliver those cables, and acknowledging that it's not It's not yet known precisely the proportions of which construction method would be used, obviously, the clown method would have a a much shorter term and a much less significant impact on the continuing use of the land, but in either case, once the cables have been laid, my understanding is that there's no impacts on The continued use of the land for agricultural purposes.

And the precise methodology and the details of all of those works are obviously something that would be subject to the controls of the construction environmental management plan, so that would be the control mechanism within the development consent order. So

thank you, Mister mahini, the bit you then you haven't spoken about the community benefit issue. I think we spoke about it earlier on. And Darlington council wants certain Action List of

initiatives to be included. Uh, concluded.

Sir, thank you,

Mrs. Hutchinson, we're grateful for the qualification which has been placed on any discussion of the community benefit fund, which is obviously that this is something that sits very squarely outside of the planning regime, and it isn't a consideration which the examining authority or the sector of state should ultimately be taking account of in their decision making. That said, there has been obviously discussion of it as part of the hearing, because it was part of the applicant's wider proposal, and we've obviously heard what the council have had to say about that.

And I think the applicant's position is that there is a fully funded and committed community benefit fund which has been put forward as part of this proposal. Mr. Baker has explained to the process by which the details of the delivery of that fund will be shaped by the community, the groups that will come forward and will be involved in that fund. And I'm not sure there's much more that there is to be said about that fund at this stage. So

sorry, Mr. Mehn,

the sort of action I would like on that is to say, Okay, this document will be amended to take into consideration the aspirations of the local authority, and in terms of few initiatives that has been mentioned to incorporate it into that. Is that something the applicant can do

please.

So yes, to the extent that the local authority come forward with specific proposals for the community fund,

I'm sure they would be taken into account by RWE and the establishment of that fund, alongside the views of other groups that they would be involved in in that process. So can we document this within the doc, the community benefit fund document, or indeed, any other document you can think about? Please. Thank you, sir. Um. Michael Baker, for the applicant, we haven't uh.

Earlier in the process, after consultation, we were asked not to talk about the fund with the parishes. They wanted to concentrate on the planning. And we've honored that promise, and we don't intend to push them into those discussions. So we wouldn't really be able to have that conversation about those initiatives and speak to them, and commit to them join in this, in the document that you've outlined until we have those discussions. And I don't want to preempt the parish or put them into a position that they don't want to engage with. And I think while we can take into account any submissions of the local authority on the matter, there are the other list of organizations that I set out, which are the fund is more directed towards

Thank you, Mr. Baker.

And if I can clarify that this

statement of common ground with say, Darlington Borough Council, for instance, will be able to cater for that that

does seem to be we can discuss with Darlington Council, if they would like to see that in the statement of common ground. Yes. Okay, thank you.

I will now ask the interested parties with us today who have elected to speak to come forward as their names are announced.

Mr. Taylor, please.

Thank you. Colin Taylor, for great stains and parish meeting,

I find myself in a strange position of actually agreeing with the applicant in relation to the community funding and and

and the difficulty that the parish meeting would have in including the local authority as one of the benefits of the community funding.

Thank

you.

Thank you, Mr. Taylor, I think I've got Mr. Peter wood. He has for

Peter wood, bishopton, I've just got a few comments on some of the things Mr. Brown said earlier. Firstly, on food security.

It's interesting to see that he said that the income from solar farms would assist farmers in achieving food security.

I can't agree with that, because if you take land out of food production, no matter where an income stream may go, That land is out of food production. It's got nothing to do with farm food security, perhaps farm financial security for some of the farmers who have joined into the scheme, but locally, we're losing an accumulative effect, and I know that's this afternoon's subject, substantial proportions of the land is going to be taken out of food production in the area between Darlington and Stockton. So that is a cross naive statement to say. The other naive statement is that they did not assess sheep grazing to be

an opportunity, but it was an aspiration after construction under the glass and glazed areas, and I think apparently, hair production. I know I've mentioned this in the past, but I'm a farmer's son, I would have thought that

the idea the purpose of solar panels is to harvest and absorb as much of the sunlight as possible to generate electricity that then would leave vast areas of the ground in shade plants grass cannot force photosynthesize and thrive underneath grass, so therefore the Whatever grows underneath there will be weedy and have poor quality. So to say that it can be used for sheep grazing is silly. To say that part of the areas could be used for haymaking. Well, again, they will cluster the avenues of glass very close together, leaving small grassy avenues, I would imagine between them. I'm sure many of you have seen the size of agricultural machinery these days, there's not a chance you'll ever get any of those down those narrow areas. So we've just been led down a song and dance on these aspirations.

There was something said about the impact on recreational assets and the impact on receptors. And I know that you were taught you were speaking about.

The socio economic issues on pubs and restaurants and village halls. But there's another asset facet that hasn't been turned into account today. I've just done a quick mental count up. I believe there are eight livery horse livery installations

within a two mile radius of great Stanton and bishopton. And a quick headcount talking to the owners last night, there's over 200 horses liveried within a two mile radius of great Stanton and bishopton. They are used daily by people on the public bridal ways, on the public roads. So this is going to be, you know, a massive impact. I know from a remote location, they've assessed it remotely as a low impact, but that is not the actuality of it. Horses have a flight of fright response to noise, and this is going to be a dramatic thing matter. So there are eight, at least livery locations that have an economic

dependency in their own right, and then 200 customers with hosters who are going to be dramatically affected. That's all. Thank you.

Thank you Mr. Wood.

I think I've got Mr. Melanie here as well. Yeah.

Thank you.

My comments on this morning's

Question and Answer series largely

mirror Mr. Woods, generally, the effects on receptors have not been determined or investigated. The potential for interaction with effect and combined effects have not been made.

Adverse residual effects have not been identified or addressed.

The effects on the health and well being of residents,

without including horses and pets, dogs and cats, and is a serious concern to the parish council Darwin Bucha Council and the action

group we in their EIA should have predicted negligible,

minor, moderate and major, adverse or beneficial effects. This isn't being done. What's been produced in Table 9.4

addresses

premises and buildings and businesses that are well outside the effect the area that's affected by this. They won't actually see it. They won't drive past it on the way to work.

It's I just find it amazing that the field to do this,

the proposed project will have an effect in several ways, on the community, facilities, socio economic resources and receptors

are not being properly identified and monitored.

It's a real concern. Another one again, going back to Mr. Wood, is the removal of the topsoil from BM BMV land will create a situation in 40 years time regarding recovery of the farmland, and it could take 1015, years for it to be usable, really usable. Again,

there's nothing in any of the documents about how they're going to do this when they do decommissioning. There's nothing that explains what they would do to accelerate this. Because what we're talking about is land that land not being usable for 50 years, maybe 60 years.

It's important that the applicant starts to address some of the major concerns,

and that's all I've got to say at the moment.

Thank you. Mr. Millennia.



Of course, with millennia here

as well

to speak.

Hello, hello. Um, I'm unable to speak on this just at this moment, but I will submit something in writing. Thank you.

Thank you. Mrs. Melanie.

Is

Myra McKeon,

here to speak.

No, okay,

and I don't think Melanie Turner, no.

And with Mr. Anderson has spoken. So is there any one

day? Okay, thank you.

Hello. Yes. Mark Smith, on behalf of Bishop and village Action Group, just to pick up on the point that Mr. Pinto has already raised due to the sensitivity of the receptors. I'd like to highlight at least one business that will no longer be able to operate

and will have to close. And how could that be designated as a low sensitivity on that particular business? And the reason they'll have to close is during the construction phase, the welfare of the animals concerned that they can't operate their business during that construction phase. So that's a question I'd like to ask the examining authority.

Thank you for that. Mr. Smith, can I just clarify

what sort of business it is? So is there something else that you can provide us some information regarding the business so that the applicant and dx, I can actually consider it in more detail, please. Yes, of course, it's the business concerned is a boarding kennels for dogs, and

you said it's located within the proximity, of course, development?

Yes, that's correct, yes, okay, thank you.

Would you be able to say, in terms of walking distance, how far you would be from the proposed development? It's immediately adjacent to the to the development immediately adjacent? Okay? Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Pinto, I will now ask the applicant to respond. Obviously, I had a couple of other questions, if that's okay, regarding specific points from this morning, so that the agricultural land section in that document, it specifically says that 13 samples were taken and submitted for laboratory analysis. It doesn't clarify very well how those 13 samples were selected, and if they were selected to give a broad coverage of all of the areas within the development so just wondered, if that could be clarified,

would the applicant now respond to all this?

Sir? Alex minhini, for the applicant, I think

just taking them in order is probably easiest, if we could come to Mr. Field first online to deal with that question. Of the

samples which were taken for analysis purposes as

part of the agricultural land classification surveys. Mr. Field, would you be able to answer that question? Please? Yes. I can do that. Alistair field on behalf of the applicant. The samples that are taken for laboratory analysis are effectively a check on our on our observations during the field survey. So we, we to to analyze soil texture.

It's it's a matter of an experience of air, having to judge the the relative proportions of the sand, silt and clay fractions. And you do this by just taking a small a small ball of soil, rubbing it into a ball, trying to roll it into a thread, seeing how it fits, and just sort of the feel of the soil. And an experience survey will be able to tell you if that's a medium clay loam, a head, a heavy clay loam, a clay, a sandy so then you know whichever texture the the purpose of taking representative samples then for laboratory analysis is that those are then a check on our hand texturing in the field, so that we take representative samples that we've identified within the field, send those to laboratory, and those will give us a precise breakdown to, you know, point one of a decimal, point a decimal place

for the relative proportions of the sand, silt and clay fractions. So it's a it's a check and a confirmation of our

of our fields, field survey techniques. You can't take samples for every single observation point. It would just become blue, disproportionately expensive. So that's why we've chosen 13, and those 13 are representative of the panel areas and and the soil types that we've found within the within the panel areas.

Mr. Fee, field Andre Pinto from DXi, if I may ask you to clarify please, if there is any relationship between what you have just explained in terms of the quality of the soil in productivity, and briefly explain what that relationship is, and how do you assess that?

And if that comes into consideration with spotter assessment, not in terms of this grade, in terms of the agricultural land classification. So agricultural land classification considers the physical, physical characteristics of the soil and the interaction of those with the local climate and with various site conditions, such as slopes and and that sort of thing. The actual yield achieved by farmers is not one of the parameters that's that's used within the agricultural land classification, because it's too variable, because it depends on, it depends on the farmers particular ability or the amount of inputs, in terms of fertilizer, etc, that any one farmer might apply. So to be consistent and to be to be a standard

system of classifying land, the agricultural classification system doesn't look at management or use. It just looks at the inherent physical characteristics. Thank you. Mr. Fields, thank you.

Thanks. Mr. Field,

would the applicant continue to respond to the remaining questions, please? So thank you. David Bell, on behalf of the applicant, so I'll just respond to a couple of the questions that were raised in relation to delivery. So we are aware of those businesses and operations in proximity. And I think during the course of examination, concern has been raised, and we've not we've acknowledged that concern,

primary concern is noise and vibration impacts during construction. So we did submit a noise and vibration addendum, a deadline for which was R, E, p4, 012,

and that provided a more granular assessment of construction, noise sensitive, sensitive receptors across the study area, not just deliveries, but it does have a section in there on on delivery specifically. And we've proposed some further mitigation in the outline, Kemp, through commitment. NV four, to engage further with those businesses once the final construction methods, final piling method is known. That assessment I've mentioned has been done on a worst case piling method, but it might be that we can employ quieter methods, for example, or work with the businesses to relocate horses during the noisiest periods of work. So that's the commitment we've made in the camp in relation to health and well

being, to a specific health and well being chapter or assessment was scoped out a scoping stage of the environmental statement, and that was because the planning inspector agreed with us that impacts or potential impacts were to be considered through individual assessment chapters, including noise, air quality and transport. So that was scoped out.

And then a broader point, I think, just make that in relation to socio economic assessment, community receptors, facilities and recreational receptors and the crossroads, to a certain extent, none of the technical stakeholders have raised any concerns with the assessment findings. The final point on the kennel business, which I believe is hotel farm,

we have acknowledged the potential impact there through further conversations. I know Mr. Baker is engaging with them about potential mitigation measures at this point in time.

Thank you, Mr. Brown, the bit I picked up from mister mileni

deposition is,

I think I was going to ask this question before, because of the time, I just left it out so as it is unclear from the same from the

relevant document, I think it's materials management plan,

how the install cables will be treated during the commissioning of the proposed development. Because Mr. Amelia was saying that I don't know what's going to happen once this development so

the finalized

so the decommissioning one.

It wasn't apparent from any of the document how the install cables will be treated once this development proposal is decommissioned. Would the applicant clarify this. Thank

you, sir. Michael Baker, for the applicant, the cables, as is usual for underground type of cables, are usually left in the ground as they're under plowing that they're below where a plow would affect them, and unless there's a particular part of an agreement with a landowner or a particular reason, they're usually left in the ground, and that's the case with all underground cables, historically.

Thank you, Mr. Bucha, you.

Is there any other person in the room who would like to speak please? Okay,

Mr. Anderson first, please.

Thank you. Sean Anderson, Bishop, President, I do want to speak about the socio economics, but I've got a couple of questions in response to what was said this morning, and not what notwithstanding what was said by Mr. Field about the number of soil samples that were tested in the laboratory. The

analysis of soil samples is very much a visual and a touch feel. It's not a scientific analysis, and it's open to interpretation. So I would suggest that, you know, it's possible that another consultant could assess those samples very differently. In light of that 13 number samples over an area of this size is very, very small, and possibly should be revisited because it's not representative of the whole site. That's my first point. The second point I would like to make is in relation to the cables. It would be useful to know how deep the cables are going to be

because it's been suggested that the cables will be installed using a more plow. Well, my understanding is cables of this nature will meet, of this nature will be need to be buried about a meter deep.

A mole ply was used to install land drainage, and it goes in between 406 100 millimeter deep, and that's dependent on the wetness of the soil. If that's the case, then the suggestion that you got that the applicant is going to use a mole pile is wholly misleading.

The third point I would like to make in relation to the points that were raised this morning. A lot of emphasis is being put on apprenticeships. It

would be useful if the applicant could give us an idea of the kind of apprenticeships they're referring to, because it's very difficult to see what kind of apprenticeships could be offered on a scheme like this.

So they're my points in relation to what was said this morning, I would like now to go on to some points I would like to make up on the the socio economics of the development

in respect of the social socio economic impact. Let us consider the benefits of the bio bioskell proposal, from what the community from what the community can determine,

will there be an enhanced landscape and visual amenity? No, it will be detrimental. Will there be improvements to physical health? No, there will be detrimental effects. Will there be improvements to mental health? No, there will be detrimental effects. Will there be job creation and employment project prospects? No. It is generally acknowledged already that there's a skill labor shortage for the construction phase, and there will be no long term employment opportunities.

Property values. Will these be protected? No. These will reduce. The villages will be undesirable locations in which to live.

Your focus specifically on land use and social economics issue, because you sort of deviate to other areas there, landscaping and so on this

specific on land use and socio economics. These are, with respect to Mr. Deo, these are socio economic aspects.

We're talking about the impact upon the village and the social impact and the economic impact. And I'm going through some of those impacts now, which are huge and are not being addressed.

Mr. Anderson, if I may, I understand your position. I would probably say that

what you are asking the xi at moment is more in line with cumulative effects session, which will be later on today, because you are looking at the effects of the proposal in the round and across a series of different issues within the village. So I think that my colleague Mr. Obadi was just trying to encourage you to speak more about land, using socio economic issues as the ones that we have been discussing this morning. But please do continue. Thank you. Okay,

just to continue. Then Will

there be enhanced local infrastructure? No, the existing infrastructure will be overwhelmed. Will there be enhanced education prospects? No, with a lack of new residents, the local school will face an existence, existence of threat to.

Will there be opportunities for local businesses? No, because if you consider the profile of the local businesses that we already have, there will be no businesses opportunities provided. On the contrary, RWA is a German energy company. GENCO panels are manufactured in China. The labor will probably have to be sourced from Eastern Europe. The business rates won't go to our local authority. They'll go to Stockton Council. Will there be an enhanced lifestyle? No, there'll be an overall detrimental effect. Will there be enhanced land quality? No, there'll be a degradation of land quality. Will there be enhanced farming opportunities and food production? No, an overall reduction in food production is likely.

Only last week, Jurgen Maier, the chairman of great British energy, he stated that renewable energy developers must demonstrate clear, tangible and demonstrable benefits to local communities where renewable where

renewable developments are proposed.

It's also internationally recognized that the socio economic impact of renewable energy projects must be identified, considered and more importantly, measured. In effect, they must be tangible, demonstrable, and more importantly,

genuine. RWE have not adequately considered the socio economic impact of this scheme and offered no support of data that can be measured, all in contravention of recognized good practice.

They during the course of today, they've referred to on a number of occasions,

I think, commitments in management plans that's kicking the can down the road. It's it's not giving you the information as the examiners that you need to assess the scheme appropriately, and I think it's appropriate that they should provide more information to allow you to make that assessment.

Therefore request that RW, we are tasked with providing that detailed and accurate and measurable information that sets out the socio economic impact of this proposed scheme, which will, in turn, will inform the community to allow the and allow the application to be properly assessed. Thank you.

Thank you. Mr. Anderson, would the applicant.

Reply,

please, sir. Thank you. Alex menick, for the applicant. So I'm not intending to go through each of Mr. Anderson's points in detail, so I think many of them are addressed by the generic or sorry, general statement, which would

a role of the points that Mr. Anderson has been making towards the end of his commentary, which is that the applicant has assessed the likely significant effects of this scheme

on a variety of receptors, the vast majority of which are local receptors through its environmental statement, the environmental statement, the scope and the methodology have been



have been worked up in agreement through the scoping process with

Local and national technical stakeholders, including the relevant statutory advisory bodies, and it's also, of course, a process that the planning Inspectorate

manages on behalf of the Secretary of State. So the Inspectorate has also been involved.

So the applicants also provided as part of its application a detailed planning statement,

the reference number for which is at

163

and there is supporting that planning statement, a table of compliance with relevant national Planning Policy, the reference number for which is at 164

and each of those documents, together with the environmental statement, takes in turn all of the relevant policy considerations which need to be considered by the examining authority and the Secretary of State in the determination of the scheme. And the applicant would say that that assessment remains adequate and sufficient, and considers all of the effects of the scheme and applies them against national policy.

There were then three points of detail on earlier answers, which were provided

by Mr. Anderson during the beginning of his commentary. And I'll come to Mr. Baker first, if I may, on the cable laying questions and the apprentices, and then we're going to Mr. Field on the question of soil sampling methodology.

Thank you.

It's Michael Baker for the applicant, just on the cables. So they are Bucha depth of 1.2 meters.

The Mole plow referred to,

we use a cable plow. National Grid used them to bury 132 KV cables. So it's a different type of plow to the one referred to. I think that was all that there was to respond on that. Thank you, Mr. Bucha, Mr. Mahinik,

something that crop up the statistical element of the soil sampling that I picked up from Mr. Smith and Mr. Anderson. Statistically,

the higher the sample size, the less the margin of error, and the smaller the sample size, the more the margin of error. So what I like to ask the applicant is to clarify whether that 13 sample size is the going rate or the average rate that you use

in this type of industry to assess the soil quality.

Sir. Thank you. I'd ask Mr. Field to come in and provide a response to this question, if he could please? Yes. Alistair field on behalf of the applicant, the relevant the relevant sampling density is one soil profile observation per hectare, which is set out in natural England's technical information. Note, 049,

and this survey was was carried out at that density.

The point about the checking the sample, the samples, is a matter of good practice. It's not actually set up. There's no prescribed

proportion of samples which need to be centrally laboratory for double checking for confirmation of soil texture.

We didn't identify too many different soil textures. The top soils mostly heavy clay loams and clays.

Those are relatively easy to identify in the field anyway, but we took 13 samples, which is one in 30 hectares

as as a double check. But that's a matter of good practice, the results didn't come back with anything that we hadn't already anticipated from our field observations, so there were no surprises from the laboratory analysis, and we didn't have to make any amendments as a result of the laboratory analysis. It was purely a matter of crossing the T's and dotting the I's and making sure that we hadn't made any errors in our field observations. So no, I don't accept that that 13 laboratory samples is inadequate. I think it's more than adequate, given the limited number of soil types that we identified within the within the panel areas.

Thank you, Mr. Field, I think that clarified that. Thank you.

Is there any other person, whether, online? Oh, sorry, okay. Can I just ask?

And we we're running out of time. So after this we might close, we're likely to close the hearing. So if you can,

if I may, Mr. Everybody, I think that there are two people that raised their hands now that have not spoken before. Can I just confirm? So I believe that, Mrs. Tinkler, you have raised your hand just now. Is there anyone else that would like to speak

now? Just miss Tinkler, okay, in that case, we will. We will let you speak now and then. After that, we will close the hearing because we are running out of time. We are ready at 20 minutes to one, and we are aimed to close at half past, but we will ask Mrs. Tinkler to speak. Thank you very much. Thank you. Over to Mr. Everybody. Thank you all right, Mr. Tinkler, Mrs. Tinkler, sorry. Carly Tinkler, advising bishopton villages Action Group. I will be brief, because I can wrap these up for the next deadline,

I wondered whether the examiners could possibly ask the applicant to provide examples of where currently sheep are being grazed at solar farms in the UK, because we have been unable to find any.

Okay. My second point relates to ES chapter nine, which is document a, p, p 029,

where, in paragraph nine, point 10.55,

the applicant says there is the potential for the soil resources to benefit from a less intensive management than under agricultural use. I wondered whether that means that the applicant accepts that agricultural use would not be continuing on this site.

My third point relates to your questions. You asked the applicant to explain

how it arrived at its conclusions that

in terms of soil health and quality, there would be a direct, long term, moderate beneficial effect on agricultural land, which is significant. So you did ask for evidence of this. I'm not sure that any has been received. So I may be wrong that they may have submitted it, but I would very much like to see the justification for these claims, because the evidence that I have found is to the contrary, in that it is very important if you want to continue the fertility of arable land over the long term. You must rotate regularly resting actually reduces soil fertility. And so that is actually set out in my document,

my written response, which is document,

excuse me,

R, E, p2, dash 044,

paragraphs, 4.5,

point 12 to 15. And so we have also heard mentioned natural England's technical information. Note 066, which is arable reversion to species rich grassland, which explains that areas which are less profitable to cultivate provide the greatest environmental benefits when reverted to grassland. In other words, those which are more profitable to cultivate provide the least environmental benefits because of the problems of of putting in grassland. Says, I'm nearly there. Could you possibly I am? I wonder whether restoration to agriculture at decommissioning is actually a scheme benefit as claimed by the applicant. I'm not sure how they've arrived at that. And finally, on soils,

i My understanding is that at the end, at decommissioning, if the soil is reverted to grassland, and then is going to then revert back to agriculture that it may need an environmental impact assessment under the EIA agriculture regulations, which is where they must go to Natural England for a screening

decision if the land has not been cultivated for more than 15 years And is greater than two hectare in size,

very quickly moving on to Glint and glare. There are matters that I don't agree in the applicant's responses, and I will go on to those, but I have just realized a very important point, which is that we were talking about the effects of Glint and glare on horses and and recreational receptors. And I've just realized from the response that what the glint and glare assessment is doing it is focusing on safety. So it explains in the response that the reason why it has not considered recreational receptors, people using the lanes and roads and on horseback is because it doesn't consider that to be a safety matter. Now that contradicts the fact that they are assessing residential receptors. So I would like to understand why I would I still don't understand why effects on the amenity of recreational receptors was not considered in the glint and glare set assessment because it is not considered in the LVI a. There is no mention of visual effects arising from Glint and glare in the LVI A, and there is none in the glint and glare assessment. Thank you. Thank you. Mrs. St Clair. Would the applicant respond to Mrs. St clair's deposition? Please?

Mr.

Stinkler has raised a series of very detailed questions, five running through in the series of a minute,

if we may. So, I think my preference would be to consider those having the benefits.

In them, in writing and responding to them at that stage. So if that's acceptable to you, thanks. Mr. Mcinnich, I think that would be right. So if Yeah, we can have an action for you to respond to, Mrs. Tinklers representation, please.

I think we've run out of time actually, so I'll quickly ask

if there's very quickly Mr. Anderson online. So if we can just hear you, please,

hello. Thanks very much. I know I'll be very quick

on the agricultural land classification issue. The question is, has the applicant taken any steps to avoid the BMV? There could be some discussion over whether the 7% they've identified should be higher. I

doubt it should be lower. But the question is, there is a lot of subjectivity in sampling between three A and 3b and being everybody in the in the field knows that.

But regardless about arguing with the figure, the figure of 7% is a very large amount. It could be as much as 5060, hectares, which is the size of three farms. I mean, 50% of UK farms are under 20 hectares, so we're not talking about a few sort of edge of fields here. Got significant areas. Now, if you look at those where they are located, if they decided to avoid BMV, if they'd taken some steps to do that, they could also reduce the panel areas around several of the villages. So it's actually quite easy to achieve. And the question is, have they taken in steps to do that after the assessment? Because it seems another example of design first and assess later, as with the heritage and archeology,

that's the main point I want to make, just to say that the land is very good land. Three a and 3b are both perfectly excellent farmland. There's a slight difference in yield, but it depends how you farm it. And this land has been farmed for 2000 years, so we're taking good farmland here, and it needs to be considered carefully, not in a sort of gold brush blase manner.

That's the main point I want to make. Actually, because of time,

I think somebody, I think the applicant, did say that they were going to answer the question on supply chain. So that'd be interesting. Half a million solar panels coming from likely could to be coming from China and the steel, because I assume the steel will be imported.

So supply chains upstream, very important on the environmental impact assessment, and then, of course, downstream, after decommissioning, when we're looking at recycling,

everything in about decommiss over quite quickly, because it seems a long way away, but there'll be lots, a lot of half a million panels to disposal in an environmentally friendly manner, I think requires some thought.

That's it. So thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Anderson. Because we're running out of time, can I ask the applicant to respond to Mr. Anderson's queries in writing, one of the critical point, as well as the to do with the the commissioning, because that's mentioned again, what's going to happen within Mr. Anderson's

representation there. So if you can just compile the responses to Mrs. Tinkler and then Mr. Anderson together and submitted at the next data please. Sarah, could deal with them very quickly. Now, if that would help.

Sorry, I could deal with them very quickly. Now, oh, okay, okay, quickly. I mean, I don't think the applicant has anything more to say on best and most versatile. And taking account of Mr. Anderson's representations. We've been through those matters during the course of the hearing this morning, and there's a detailed assessment in front of you in respect to a supply chain and decommissioning. So the applicant's position is that both of those matters are already addressed in the environmental statement. Okay, thank you, Mr. Mahinik,

so thank you all for contributing so fully and usefully to this meeting,

and including people who are attending today version, we will consider all submissions made carefully a next hearing in this examination is the

issue specific hearing seven, which is due to begin at 2pm today in this room. The time now is 1251,

and the issue specific hearing six, for the bias Gail seven.

Energy is now closed. Thank you. Applause.