

# TEXT\_EA1N&2\_ISH8\_Session2\_18022021

Thu, 2/18 1:05PM • 51:28

00:00

Okay, good afternoon, everybody, and welcome back. Just before we recommends, can I just check with the case team, please, that the recordings have restarted? And that you can see and hear me.

00:13

Okay, I can confirm that the recordings have started and the live stream is working. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

00:21

Okay, just before we move on to agenda item three, B.

00:27

Obviously, just just before the break, we were discussing an action for natural England and indeed the applicants. And I just want to

00:36

point natural England it assisted obviously, that there is quite quite a lot of information within the applicants deadline five submission concerning rampion. And indeed, navitus Bay. So if that assists, in the meantime, in terms of

00:53

dealing with that action, if you like,

00:56

I think that would be quite a good, quite a good place to start.

01:01

And, actually, brief briefly as well, if it helps, it would probably be useful to record the what we do not want from natural England, is what we would refer to as another report of biblical proportions. And the thinking that we have been having around this over the break as well has been around essentially, something of the nature of a matrix that essentially is comparative between the project at hand here, and the two projects have been referred to.

01:31

And to really digest, summarise and finalise positions, on the dimensions that we've referred to so so yes, this we're really very much hoping for this not to be a long document, but to be as best as it can be a clarifying document. So that's that's what we're asking for.

01:53

The Louise Berta, natural England understood, and we'll, we'll consider your request. And we'll make best endeavours to cover these off because we have obviously reviewed what's been submitted at deadline five, and we were providing points of clarity. Anyway.

02:11

However, I just wanted to make one point clear in relation to this is that

02:17

it's not appropriate to compare one project and one a one B with another A and B in the quality of the OMB.

02:27

So, in terms of that matrix, and

02:33

like I say, we will consider the response but just wanted to make that clear that

02:38

assessing one designated site against another designated site, and the qualities of that designated site and the impacts from

02:47

it from sustainable development is is is not really appropriate in this instance. So we will be considering your request and providing a suitable response.

03:02

Thank you, Isabel, are useful. The applicant? Mr. Ennis, do you want to raise anything? Yes, corresponds just to so of course, I recognise that all circumstances in relation to individual schemes have to be taken into account. My understanding is what you're looking for his other examples which may have been approved,

03:22

and naturing, or disapproved, not approved, to give you some examples of thresholds that have been used elsewhere in relation to that matter. So it's not really doing a comparison of of the whole schemes is trying to understand where those crunch matters occurred. I'm also quite surprised by natural means position here, given the material that we've already put in on the comparative basis, it seems somewhat consistent to now advanced the position that there is no merit in any form of comparison, having undertaken an exercise of extension reference to other schemes and materials. So we will do so and we know that no one does suggest that there can be a value in examining authority has been given additional examples, and will seek to work with this with you to give that critical information but also to understand that we're not seeking to do a broad comparison is to understand those critical aspects of the impacts on designation really, and how those were reflected and in the environmental statements

and the subsequent decision making to help understand a bit about a threshold. But equally, each threshold will be determined on the individual assessments relative to the particular applications and the particular special qualities of the particular A and B are designated site for except that, but I get to that it is an important point. And we will seek to give a focused response in relation to the smartphone, if I can indicate in response to that submission from Australia that that has set out I think in clear terms and the understanding that so

05:00

And me I've attempted to bring to this,

05:05

which again, takes me back to the matrix remarks I made before because it ought then be possible to establish the critical factors and work out what in each instance, they were, and set them out side by side, in a very summery and digested form with hyperlinks off to the primary documentation

05:29

that will assist us quite significantly, without

05:33

moving down in any direction or kind of misleading

05:38

path, which would be the path towards error. And that would be the path towards attempting to conflate a result in one protected landscape with one distinct unique and important set of

05:56

very varying relevant considerations that are not applicable in these landscapes. So so that that I hope describes what we do not wish to do, and sets it against

06:10

an outline, which I think I think Mr. Ennis has clearly grasped and articulated their of what we believe we ought to do.

06:23

Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. And thank you, Miss Burton, and Mr. Ennis. So now if we move on to agenda item three, B, which concerns East Anglia, one North? And as I flagged earlier, it seems to me that clearly there are less potential issues relating to seascapes caused by East Anglia, one north and by East Anglia. Two. So my intention is to take all this agenda item. At the same time, that's all a freebie, one, two and three.

06:49

Obviously, it'd be an opportunity for all to contribute on this agenda item as a whole, if you wish to do so.

06:56

And my first question is to the applicant

06:59

on East Anglia, well north, and relates to nighttime effects.

07:04

And as I understand it, this issue is now an area of agreement between the applicant and natural England for both for both East Anglia, one North and East Anglia. Two. So this question in effect relates to e to agenda item three, B two and three, C. Three.

07:20

And this question is also asked in our second written questions, and relates to the applicants commitment to reduce the intensity of the aviation lighting to 200 Candela whenever atmospheric conditions permit. So it may be that the right people aren't in the room, if you like. But I thought I'd raise a question now, whether that

07:40

that had been agreed with the relevant aviation authorities.

07:47

I'll do

07:50

this calling some of the upcoming, it's actually a relatively standard provision that the question of the lesser lighting, it's a permission, a permissive approach within the actual regulation. So

08:03

insofar as this particular issue is concerned, it is now accepted and is, I suppose over the last 24 months, has become a standard not only offshore, but onshore in relation to those that are over 150 metres on shore. And it is essentially that it's been accepted by the CAA, that we have sufficiently good quality equipment to measure visibility, and thereby operate in a manner which reduces the visibility reduces the extent of the visibility of lightning, when it's it's not required to be at that intensity. So in terms of a position, it is accepted, and it's it is part of the the regulatory framework that we're allowed to do this. And it is part of what can be generally described as a genuine emerging technologies to reduce some aviation lighting at night. And this is one of a major step forward and not having to have the brightness of the lights in circumstances, whether it's good visibility, and that's the basis on which we've been able to proceed and make that commitment in the DCA to early operating

09:17

licence when the we're able to do so.

09:20

Thank you very much for doing this. That's very clear. Okay, my next question is to natural England.

09:27

And it's just a general question. Really.

09:29

Are there any issue

09:34

raised today concerning any effects of East Anglia what north in isolation further to your written representations? No does nothing sorry, Louise better natural and good, nothing further to add? Thank you very much.

09:46

Just before we move on, then I'll just I'll just check if anyone else wishes to raise any issues relating to East Anglia, one north.

09:56

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands or cameras on

10:00

So on that basis, we'll move on to agenda item free c ganglia to justly. We've discussed various aspects and issues in the round already on this one, but we go through the agenda items.

10:15

And my first question and see one good design is to the applicant.

10:21

And the turbine heights have come down to 282 metres now, as a result, I believe of discussion through your supply chain.

10:28

And my question really was, are there to your knowledge any further changes likely as any result as a result of any further discussions? Is this an ongoing process? Or do you consider children at two metres will be the final height for the East Anglia to winter

10:46

corners and half the applicants, obviously, we've, our current position is that we've been able to engage further with supply chain, we understand the latest turbine dimensions

10:58

that we can build effective and viable schemes with or for the duration of the consent.

11:08

And that is the position which we have adopted. And that's the basis of the engagement that we've had today with the supply chain. And that is the basis on which we these these these applications will be proceeded with bank, understand that others have got a view that they should be lower, and have expressed the view how much lower that should be that the difficulty with those and the compliance with the end. One is that they do and will compromise the ability to adopt the most efficient and optimum technologies of exploiting the wind resource effectively and efficiently. And so the applicants have done that engagement. It has enabled us to take that commitment for a reduction and commit to that again in the DCA.

11:57

And as it currently stands, there's no intention for us to make any further adjustments during the examination. But that's the applicants position. Thank you, Mr. Ennis, clear.

12:11

To natural England. Is there anything you wish to come back on that? And indeed, are there any further comments you want to make further to your written representations on the issue of good design relating to East Anglia to

12:26

Louise better natural England note we, we refer you back to our written representations. Okay. Thank you.

12:34

And just before we move on to item two, is there anyone? Does anyone else wish to raise anything regarding good design?

12:46

Okay, thank you. So we'll move on to agenda item three, C two.

12:51

And this is a question initially to the African on the matter of visibility of East Anglia to wear out naturally, between 13 and 26% of the array will be the primary source of significant adverse effects if 16 turbines

13:08

and I note that in response to state that significant effects should not be defined in terms of percentage or proportion decide given of a multiple factors. And could you expand on those multiple factors for me?

13:25

So you're on mute Mr. Ennis.

13:31

Yes, you're good to hang out with Simon Martin, please. Thank you. Mr. Martin. Yes, I know, Martin on behalf of the applicant.

13:40

Yes, our view on that is really the the those multiple factors extend to all of the parameters that we would typically assess in a in a landscape visual impact assessment and not just a

13:55

start suppose a mathematical or proportion based assessment.

14:02

So, those factors range from all of the sensitivity factors that we assess for the the landscaping question, the magnitude of change, arising as a result of the as a as a result of the development, which can include distance,

14:22

lateral spread, extent of the development on the horizon, and, and so on. So I think it was really making point it's, it's all of those matters in the round that we, we consider when we're, we're making a judgement on the magnitude and significance of the of the effect.

14:43

Okay, thank you, Mr. Martin. And Mr. Barton, was there anything you wish to respond on that subject?

14:52

Louise better natural England. No, sir. Okay, thank you very much. I know that any other issues related to visibility that you wish to raise now?

15:00

already covered,

15:05

at least better natural England. Now I think we've covered that in our written reps. Thank you. Thank you very much.

15:11

Okay, if we now move on to dodging free c free, which is nighttime effects on which I have no comments about to the general question that I raised earlier on. But before we move on, I just

15:25

I need duty to check whether anyone else wish to comment on the nighttime effects of East Anglia to

15:35

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised. So we'll move on that basis. Thank you. So next agenda item three, c four concerns the effect of East Anglia to on landscape receptors within the

15:49

flag, gender, areas B and D of LC to six and LCT 29. But obviously, if interested parties wish to raise a landscape character areas, then this is the place to do it. So if we can look at LCT Oh, six areas B and D first, this is a question to the applicant.

16:08

Is it fair to say that the the GST, if you like, of your view of the magnitude of change on this area, being medium low, as opposed to medium is due to the majority of deer and not having a seascape setting? Or in the case of area d having no car at all? And could you expand on your point that this is not a material that there is limited access to perceive changes to the character of this area?

16:36

Yes, Simon Martin on behalf of the oxygen.

16:40

Yeah, thank you, sir. The two areas in question that he raised.

16:46

Were both part of the the coastal levels, landscape types of areas areas B and D.

16:53

area B is the is the the marshland effectively flanking the the river blys. So it's just just inside the south wall between between Southwold and Walberswick.

17:04

And,

17:06

essentially, yes, in terms of the sort of seascape setting element of your question, a six B in particular is

17:18

it covers the landscape to mainly sort of to the inland side of size world.

17:28

So there are there are large areas within this landscape type that don't actually have visibility of the car search on a seascape setting.

17:38

There are intervening either intervening urban areas that Southwold or intervene in coastal beaches, particularly this sort of shingle and dunes system

17:51

to the to the south of Southwold, which it provides a lot, you know, quite a bit of screening really between the sea itself and, and the marshland on the inland side of the, on the land side of the the shingle, the shingle landscape. So



18:10

yes, that that's the key issue really, there, there's our view is that,

18:18

you know, that the, the aesthetic and the sort of perceptual aspects of the character of that landscape that essentially martland landscape

18:28

would, would remain fundamental and continue to be, you know, its definitive character regardless of an offshore wind farm development. At such long distance off off offshore from from from this landscape type. And you very much, I think, get the feeling when you're, you're that you're down in the landscape, I think when you're when you're within this area

18:56

that includes the the route of the Suffolk coast path as it as it passes through this landscape.

19:05

And you make mention the point about access,

19:10

and that that's a consideration really, in in, in GL VI, a three, the guidance that we that we use as part of our methodology that,

19:23

you know, in order to perceive landscape, character effects, and, you know, one, one would need to have access to that area and be able to experience those changes in character. And I think our point there was that they're in some of these land in some of these areas, because they are in fact marshland it is it is difficult to access these areas to actually experience the change

19:53

other than from, you know, the defined the defined route through on the Suffolk coast path which is

20:00

Which is largely kind of screen down behind the, the intervening shingle landscape that I referred to.

20:10

So that that that was the basis really of our,

20:13

of our lower magnitude of change assessments or for for LC TB. And it's similar for lctd as well, really, in terms of findings there. The there isn't a direct, there isn't a direct coastal edge to that landscape type. It's separated from the sea by by the intervening LCT. Five.

20:44

And as a result, there are lower levels of effects and low levels of change within those landscapes that have a fairly, you know, strong, definitive character in their own right.

20:57

Okay, thank you, Mr. Martin. That was useful, natural England. Was there anything you wish to respond on there or any other comments you wish to make about LCT overtakes

21:11

Louise Burton, natural England. Now, again, it's in our written representations.

21:16

Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Martin, I have a quick question for you now on LCT 2905 and Eastern broad.

21:26

And I know that natural England raise awareness, these areas will be closer to East Anglia to then LC to five, which the environmental statement concluded in a proposal would have significant effects on and I just wanted your your view on that, please.

21:41

Yes, Simon Martin for the applicant. Our view on that is that the the majority of LCA 29, the wooded fence landscape, extends 10 extends inland at low level. So it consists of sort of low lying valley floor marshland areas of open water covering the broads at Koko Hydro and Eastern broad and then there's gradually rising landform around that that landscape type and the land that coface clis provides quite a bit of intervening screening from most of the most of the landscape within this landscape type and and more visual containment is provided by the the the sort of habitats I suppose within it so when once you go down into that landscape, it's it's martial and extensive reedbeds.

22:38

There are there are areas I mean that wooded fence so there are areas where there's quite extensive areas of woodland that that also provide screening

22:49

and prevent the use of the sea. And the the general perception really in that area is that it's quite contained in your within the landscape. And it's it's really just with the exception of two short sections of coast where the

23:06

the the coastal the edge of the broads

23:11

joins the coast that, you know, we when we've acknowledged I think in our in our dialogue in the commentary on natural England's relevant representations that refer to short sections which

23:27

I mean they're almost part of the the shingle dunes landscape tight really because they sit at the very coastal edge. And that's really the only area where we think there would be any any

23:40

effect on on the perceived perceived qualities and character of this of this landscape type.

23:48

Okay, thank you Mr. Martin.

23:51

That's clear.

23:55

natural energy Do you have any comments you wish to make? On Isvt 29 or, indeed any other comments on landscape receptors within the AONB?

24:04

Louise better natural England? No, we refer you back to our written representations. Okay, thank you. Before we move on, does anyone else wish to raise any comments relating to this agenda item that's free see for

24:22

not seeing any hands. So thank you for that. We'll now move on to free c five, which is the special qualities of the OMB. And I just wish to focus in the section on the six special qualities of the OMB where there's disagreement between the applicant and natural England on the magnitude of effective proposals.

24:41

I've got one question for the applicant on these six special qualities and then I'll have some questions for natural England.

24:46

And then I will come to have a party for any wish issues they wish to raise on these qualities. I know Mr. misters you flagged earlier on that you wish to speak on this matter.

24:57

My first question to the African relates to the special quality

25:00

You've landscape quality influencing Congress features. And your view on the divergence noted by natural England between the assessment of landscape types and viewpoint locations along the coastline. And the assessment of this special quality. In your expectations, you refer to a reference from Libya freedom, this divergence, which states this is possible, but less common.

25:24

I just like to know, from your experience, how common would such a divergence be?

25:37

Just say I think probably both my parties present may have a view on this bill asked Mr. Martin to to speak first. And if Mr. Denny has an ad, I'll ask him just to instantly come in at the end, rather than than being a gap. So that's how we propose to answer this.

25:54

Mr. Martin,

25:57

Simon Martin on behalf of the applicant, as I understand the question, so that is that your question is really about professional judgement and differences in professional judgement. Is that is that right? I just want to check, question, a natural thing that I believe raised the point about the divergence between the assessment of landscape types and viewpoint locations. Yeah, a long coastline and the coastline and the assessment of the spatial quality.

26:23

And in your response to that, you refer to a reference from Libya three, which I believe and obviously, correct me if I'm wrong, that is possible. But less common, I think, is a phrasing. So it was a question really about your experience, how common would would such a divergence be?

26:41

I think the divergence come comes around between visual and landscape effects. It comes in, I suppose, the consideration of

26:52

visual effects, which is a direct. So it's a direct effect that we're assessing as a as a particular view,

27:01

orientation towards the project.

27:07

And

27:09

often,

27:11

the case can be that you may have a significant visual effect of other development as a direct effect on that particular viewpoint oriented to the scene, the development

27:24

when the landscape character effect, when we're considering something slightly different, and something broader in terms of the the overall experience of the landscape.

27:37

And all of the qualities that might be experienced that that location could be affected. And

27:46

it's a it's, it's an almost an indirect effect in this case, because the development isn't isn't located within, you know, within this landscape, types of it doesn't have any

27:59

effects on the physical fabric of the of the landscape and how that they are experience. So I think it's, um, it does happen. And I've noted it on other assessments where we had differences between

28:13

visual effects assessed at a viewpoint within the landscape type compared to the overall act on that that particular landscape type in terms of its character effects.

28:23

Okay, maybe pass on to her to Mr. Danny to the wanted to elaborate on that. Thank you. Yes. And where this confusion sometimes lies here is that GTA three is, is very strict on the fact that visual effects and character effects must be assessed separately, and other than the two, not confused conflated. And that is, because as Mr. Martinez said, that can be a significant difference between the impact on a view or the change to a view, which may not impact to the same degree on the character of an area, character, and is largely made up which is why they're separated separately, by the physical features of the landscape, the landform, land pattern of vegetation and the interrelationships of those things. And so the other three is asking you to separate out changes to character, and changes to views as to separate items. So it can be the case that

29:18

a series of significant views can impact upon character, but that that is not the primary purpose of what the assessment is trying to do. And it is the case as Mr. Martin has said, that you can have a significant significant effect on the view without having significant effect on character.

29:37

Thank you, Mr. Denny.

29:39

It's very clear. Thank you, Mr. Martin. I'm naturally good respond. Was there anything you wish to respond on the question of that special quality?

29:49

Louise Burton, natural England. We've obviously covered this at length in our written response is but we just wanted to flag that as part of that written response. we've highlighted as

30:00

designating authority for the LMB and also as government's statutory advisors of what the impacts mean for the purposes of the OMB and and it's really a matter for yourself to decide whether or not and this sort of crossing into policy here as to whether or not the design of the scheme has avoided that compromising the purpose of the ESA and sorry, the AONB. So just wanted to flag that.

30:28

That divergence is going to remain and this is one of the issues that we believe we're going to agree to disagree on. Of course, yeah. And thank you for that. I understand that it was more about I'm just just trying to advance my own understanding of the the agreements, the agreements is wrong, the areas of disagreement between the parties. This is the fundamental one. Yeah, I understand. While I have you miss Burton, I haven't next question on scenic quality appeal to the senses, sensory stimuli and big Suffolk skies, especially quality.

31:02

And in your response, you know, a few agreements with the applicant to position

31:07

such as the agreed at the turbines of East Anglia to will occupy a small vertical portion of the big southern skies. The aviation lighting, now proposed will assist and shipping traffic will also influence seascape settings.

31:22

I just wanted to check almost, you still have the view that the magnitude of effect for that special quality is incorrect.

31:30

I'm not the technical specialist for this, but we can confirm in our or our our reps written or oral reps as it were. Okay, thank you.

31:42

You may not be technical specialist for the next question, as well. Okay.

31:50

The question about relative wildness, sense of remoteness, pockets of relative wildness

31:55

where the advocate noted that the distance of East Anglia to from the coastline referred to as remote and the difference between the wildness of the sea and the land. And it was question if there was anything you wish to add here on effects of this special quality?

32:09

Now, I believe we've covered that in our written reps as part of that, and have nothing further to say. Okay, thank you. And then finally, for relative wildness, sense of remoteness, relative lack of human influence.

32:25

Your representation at four locations, minsmere dunnage, co five, and Orford Ness, access to the coastline is not easy. And the character of these areas is generally free of intrusive man made structures. However, from our site visit, too often. So we mentioned earlier, there was a number of man made structures, which although obviously maybe derelict show human influence in a remote area of the coast.

32:50

Did you have anything to add on your reputation written representations to that?

32:57

And I believe we covered that off, but I will take that away as as something that we may want to

33:05

bolster as part of our advice if it's not being clear.

33:10

Okay, thank you. And just, I said finally before, so apologies for that. But finally Now, are there any other issues on effects of East Anglia to on the special quality of the IOM wish to raise today?

33:22

Not today. Thank you, sir.

33:24

Thank you. Before I report written, response, go back to the applicant. I can just gonna ask if anybody else wish to raise any issues, and I can see that Suffolk County Council have their hand up. So I'll go to Suffolk County Council first and then to sunlamps afterwards. Thank you.

33:45

Thank you, Richard berry for Suffolk County Council. From the county Council's perspective, this is really the key issue. And why we of course, as I said fully endorse and support the advice and conclusions of natural England, I think it is important to highlight that there's two separate things that that that we need to think about. And one is that, you know, individually, the effects on the individual special qualities of the LNB have not been accurately assessed. And then the second aspect, which is the approach in assessing overall impact on the special qualities and on the AONB and the statutory purpose and that has to be, you know, an overall assessment. So I think, on both of these issues, you know, this is something that the county council is concerned about, and ultimately, of course, we just, we support everything that naturally been said, and then just searing down to in terms of special

qualities if I may just bring in Phil Watson to add a couple of points on that, please. Close. Yes, thank you.

34:51

Sorry, Mr. Watson. I can't I can't hear you.

34:55

I can hear you very, very faintly, but

34:58

I apologise

35:00

I'm

35:03

Phil Watson for Suffolk County Council, I just like to draw the panel's attention in terms of the special qualities and how they were part of the background to that.

35:16

Part of the background was to review a document

35:22

published in 1999 by the country's art commission called the designation history series, in which the author sets out how the in broad terms sketch of how the OMB was designated,

35:37

which we intend to submit the next deadline just to provide useful background information.

35:44

There's a couple of points from that, which I'd like to draw to your attention.

35:50

Firstly, it should be noted in terms of structures. And I think it's possibly instructive

35:59

that the aim boundary was drawn to include the sizewell side.

36:06

Indeed, the author points out that the emergence of the proposal for the nuclear power station in 1958 brought forward plans for designation of the OMB.

36:18

And they OMB was finally signed in ordered by the Secretary of State in 1970. And



36:28

size while they had been complete construction had been completed in 1966. That's a kind of an aside, but it is useful to refer to it in this document. My principal point was that looking at this document, what we see is although Unfortunately, it doesn't provide detailed indications of how the boundary was drawn up in terms of what that what was in the minds of the assessors at that time. Looking at it, you can I believe it is possible to identify broadly and I'll leave the panel to look at it themselves and come see whether they agree that the principal things that bring the panels in the in the mind of the assessors at the time were as follows.

37:17

In terms of the landscape, it was about the Suffolk coast including low lying cliffs, gravels and sands. Low drowned valleys deepen old or implied the extensive salting marshes and swingle including features such as the splitter off of NES, standard heathland, associated woodland, scenic the quiet and unspoiled remote quality and character of the countryside, river estuaries, marshland heathland and woodland, and the small, attractive rural settlements of the coast. And taken together. Those were, I would suggest, looking at this short precis of designation history, the principal drivers and I think I just wanted to kind of provide that context, because it is from that and

38:11

the work that the actual on site work that the special qualities were drawn together. And that's all I really wanted to say at this point. Thank you. Mr. Watson, you mentioned ended you were to submit your document by deadline six, is that correct?

38:28

Well, I can be, it will probably be submitted at the as part of our oral summary of oral Of course, yeah, if that's okay. Of course. Yeah. That's great. Thank you very much, Mr. Watson.

38:41

Mr. Amstutz, you wish to raise an issue on special qualities?

38:48

Yeah, thanks very much. Simon Amstutz, a OMB manager comments on behalf of the Suffolk coast in his area of outstanding natural beauty partnership.

39:00

It is very much

39:04

it is of course for the panel to decide on

39:08

on how much impact East Anglia two is on nationally designated landscape. But of course, just want to draw your attention to a couple of bits of those defined qualities. If we look at landscape quality that talks about the intactness of the AONB. And I think that bringing this

39:32

proposal forward, we would see

39:35

an introduction of a feature is is not part of the natural beauty it is in in Congress to the purposes of the AONB. And likewise with the scenic quality seed quality talks about a sense of place, and again, bringing that industrial element into the experience of the AONB. You're losing

40:00

Some of the purposes of the AONB and likewise with the relative wildness as a as a defining feature. Again, we can see the introduction of an industrial element into the experience and also an increase in the Yeah, the the human influence on to that to that landscape. And, again, perhaps the final point I want to make on the defined qualities is that, that the cultural heritage, we're seeing modern day infrastructure, industrialised infrastructure, being experienced from from the AONB. And also we shouldn't underestimate the value of some of the artistic associations with with the AONB, which include images of the seascape and you know, those, those will be changed. Should this proposal go ahead? So last few things I want to say is that, you know, the IRB maintains its position has made in previous submissions. It supports the submissions of natural England and what we've heard from the county council today. And the last last feature of comments wanted to say that, yeah, turbines are not a feature that contribute to the purposes of the AONB. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. emphasise very clear. Thank you.

41:34

Okay, so just, if I shall just now return to the applicants. If there's anything they wish to come back on their on the comments that they've heard from the county council and the AONB partnership,

41:48

Mr. Martin,

41:57

Mr. Denny to come and first of the big general MB purposes. And if there's any matters that Mr. Martin wants to add a tonne of assessment can come in at the end, but I think primarily, Mr. Danny responded to those matters. Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Danny. Thank you. Yes, I just want to clock slightly back to the first few questions in relation to the

42:22

the special purposes and the and the indicators, I think the first thing that we would say is that the majority of the

42:31

indicators of natural beauty in terms of the factors which make up that natural beauty, are not impacted upon by this development.

42:41

Those that are, which is

42:45

landscape quality, relative wildness, and scenic quality, it is only some aspects of some of the indicators, which are impacted upon. So I think in our written representations, I won't go into it now. We've set out for you how we feel that that goes to the matter of wait.

43:03

I was heartened to hear what the county council said about the reasons why the OMB was designated and what made up its natural beauty isn't effect what the actual beauty indicators are underpinning. And that list which included the coast gravel, sand shingles, Heath marshes and woodland countryside character, pretty much mirrored the list that I gave to you earlier in this session.

43:29

And I agree that they're very important. They're very strong features of this lamb.

43:37

I can't see and our case has been in it's set out in our representations, that a wind farm with some visual impacts on some aspects of sexual qualities 30 kilometres offshore, which is beyond the visible horizon. And it's interesting that it's, it's more than twice the distance off our shore that our

44:00

national waters extend to, which is a considerable distance,

44:06

how that would compromise the purposes of designation, which is to test

44:13

those elements that have special qualities which remain and would remain so strong.

44:19

And so indicative, and underpinning the natural beauty of this landscape would remain unchanged by this wind farm, with some perceptual College's changing, that the end will not be compromised by this effect.

44:35

Thank you, Mr. Denny.

44:39

Mr. Martin, did you wish to add anything?

44:47

Nothing further to add, sir, on that point, I think that that covers that and covers opposition really clearly. Thank you, Mr. Martin.

44:58

We move on. I just

45:00

I'll find opportunities for anybody else if they wish to

45:03

raise come back on those issues but related to special qualities at all.

45:10

not seeing any hands up. So thank you for that. We'll now move on to items free six.

45:19

And in terms of free six and free seven, the effect which is the effects of the proposed on viewpoints and visual receptors within the AONB, and upon the stuff at coastal path.

45:30

I don't have any more specific questions

45:34

that I need to ask in this hearing. Other than you know, I've heard already today. So first natural England are no more points that you wish to raise on these items at the hearing further to your written representations.

45:46

Do we use Berta natural England? No, sir. There's nothing further for us to raise your awareness to thank you. And do any other parties wish to make representations on these agenda items? So that's free c six and seven, coastal path and viewpoints.

46:08

Okay, thank you. I shall we shall move on then. To item free D, which is Kim to the facts. And this is a simple, very simple question for me on this issue. Very similar to the last one, in fact,

46:24

naturally, is there anything more that you wish to add to your written reps in terms of q to the effect?

46:32

always better not to invent? No, sir.

46:36

Thank you. And for the same question, to Suffolk County Council, please.

46:47

Would you park this up a county council? Thank you. So um, so I think we will just reiterate what we've already said in our statement of common ground. And and really the council's position is that the applicants should provide an update to the cumulative impact assessment, taking into account the size well, CDC or submission materials. And, you know, we just re emphasise that we are talking about, you know, nationally designated landscape, we have all this new information that's now available. And you know, given the sensitivity of the receiving environment, a degree of robustness is required. And in the circumstances, we don't consider this to be an unreasonable request.

47:25

Thank you.

47:28

Very useful.

47:31

Anyone else wish to raise any comments related to QB to the facts?

47:38

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands. So

47:40

was there anything you heard there? Then the applicants question?

47:46

Anything you heard from South County Council you wish to come back on?

48:00

constable for the applicant? I think I might ask Mr. persona to come back to your cumulative assessments because

48:12

I'll be solid for the applicant. Sorry, I'm wearing

48:15

a bit cold. I'm

48:18

not expecting that.

48:20

I think that we've we stated the position in the in the deadline five response on this that we submitted these applications in 2019.

48:31

And there have been there were various parts of our cumulative assessment, which prior to application we committed to updating with regard to size, well see on the basis that we understood that there were things coming and there were particularly sensitive issues such as the traffic and transport and the socio economics where we had agreed that those elements would be updated within the assessment. That was 2019. It is the it's a year after that, that the sizewell c jetty applications and considerations have come forward as a material change to that project, not to this project. And I think, really, the position of the applicants is that there has to be an end point within which our assessment is closed. And it falls to the other project, which is making the material change, not this project, to actually undertake that cumulative assessment, we feel it's an extension, an unreasonable extension of what we're being asked to do, particularly given

49:37

as we've heard from Suffolk County Council, the sensitivities around this and the level of detail that we would need to go into to ensure that it was seemed to be a rather robust extension to our cognitive assessment.

49:52

Thank you. It's useful and what I'm going to suggest now is

49:58

we do have

50:00

Some issues discuss later on in AONB. And we're rapidly approaching lunchtime.

50:07

or indeed in a debate, I do apologise, yeah, the slip of the tongue.

50:12

But what I would like to point to post some questions natural England

50:19

that if you could think about over the lunch break, and then come back to us afterwards that would be very useful. So Miss Burton, the questions really are, do you fundamentally object to the application for East Anglia to on seascapes grounds?

50:36

And if so, what might the applicant do to address your curb your concerns?

50:41

And have you in terms recommended this action to the applicant?

50:46

And if you cannot see any action that can reasonably be taken, is it your view that development consent should not on balance be recommended?

50:56

Okay, noted, sir. Thank you very much. So what I realised is there's quite a lot to think about there. So what I suggest if we did take an hour and 10 minutes for lunch now, and if we break and reconvene for those questions, then on a ob not a human being in at two o'clock. Thank you very much. Thank you.