

### ISH2 Weds 7 Dec\_Part3

Created on: 2022-12-07 16:07:27

Project Length: 01:36:38

File Name: ISH2 Weds 7 Dec\_Part3

File Length: 01:36:38

#### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:24 - 00:00:10:18

Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. Now 2:00. And time to reinvent.

00:00:15:07 - 00:00:19:20

Can I just check with Mr. Stephens if the live stream is recommence later?

00:00:22:19 - 00:00:24:05

Mr. Stevens? Yes.

00:00:31:06 - 00:00:38:11

Yep. Great. Thank you. Okay, so what now? To section four of the agenda, which is cultural heritage.

00:00:39:27 - 00:01:09:17

And I'd like to start off, if I may, with the first bullet point agenda, which is policy and identification of half an hour. The examining authority is first written questions. That's 8q1 .8.89, which is one seven, considered the equivalent of the findings of the environmental statement to planning policy. In terms of how so, namely in planning policy notes, the M one and the draft and what

00:01:12:02 - 00:01:57:00

you stated in your op ed to sorry to the applicant, you stated in your answer to that question that the in your view, the assessment of heritage effect was in effect major was substantial harm moderate was less of substantial harm at the top end of the scale or higher end of the scale, should I say minor was less than substantial harm at the lower end of scale and negligible was no harm. So I understand your answer there, if you like. I just what the question why negligible harm equates to no harm when some heritage assets have no effect predicted which would potentially quite deny may potentially to a layperson, no effect predicted would be no harm as opposed to negligible, which may presuppose that there is some effect there.

00:02:01:29 - 00:02:11:25

Mark TONER on behalf of the applicant. I think that's just in the main culture thing. When we say negligible, we mean there is no effect or no discernable effect.

00:02:14:14 - 00:02:30:15

Okay. Thank you. So for all the various heritage assets that you've listed as negligible in your view, there's quite a few of them, about nine or ten, I think they are all in effect, no effect from your point of view. That's correct. Okay. Thank you,

00:02:33:11 - 00:02:36:07

Mrs. Emmett. Did you have any views on this matter?

00:02:38:03 - 00:02:42:21

No, that's okay. Sense. Thank you. Thank you. And

00:02:45:12 - 00:02:53:00

so if we can move on to individual sites, then please. So the first one we have on there is Penryn Castle and the Penryn Castle registered historic park and garden.

00:02:55:11 - 00:03:13:27

And again, to the applicant in your response to xq1 .8. 13 you stated to the availability of use for the castle is what's important, not necessarily what's in those views, and that landward views are arguably more important than see what views as a contributors to Castle significance.

00:03:16:11 - 00:03:36:00

I was just I noted in the end that a listing for the rest of Park and Garden states that significant views include views for the main entrance of the house and the Barbican Terrace, which obviously we have a visualisation from on the east side, offer the best views towards Penmaenmawr and comedy, The view and the quotes. A view of the park, coast and hills is spectacular.

00:03:37:17 - 00:03:49:16

So my question is, would the construction of the project have an effect on those views? Introducing a new element into the largely countryside and seaside based views that are presently recognised in the listing?

00:03:52:06 - 00:04:22:09

Mark TONER on behalf of the applicant. It will certainly introduce something new in view. But it's the question I need to consider is to a degree, the view and what's in the view contributes to your ability to understand the Council's significance in terms of its other interests in the round and what part that plays in terms of the role of the park surrounding it as an appropriate setting for the castle and whether that's an armed.

00:04:22:20 - 00:04:38:27

In my view, whilst there is an addition in the view it does not so materially change the contribution made by the setting in the round to how you appreciate the castle when you circulate within its setting.

00:04:41:01 - 00:04:47:10

Thank you. And would that answer be the same in your view for the other parts of the bridge to park and go?

00:04:49:19 - 00:05:12:04

Mark Turner for the applicant. Effectively, yes. The park can be set up a wider setting because it certainly borrows elements of the wider landscape. And in particular, I think it is important here was to seize a part of that in some views to the north. It is equally important in terms of views to the south with the Snowdonia range behind it as a backdrop for it.

00:05:13:20 - 00:05:40:03

I think the park has slightly separate concerns in that as you circulate and move around the park and the various elements within it, the walled garden, the terrace gardens, the open farmland, parkland to the south side, that you don't get that interaction with the sea view. In any case, we've you've got your back to it and that it is important in this case that you see it in the ground and as an experience within which you appreciate the castle as the focus of that park.

00:05:42:06 - 00:05:48:08

Thank you. The rest of park garden just runs down to the sea as well as include a clue, the old port as well.

00:05:50:07 - 00:06:27:15

There's certainly an historic association between the two, and I think it's important to an understanding of how the estate developed, how we used the money and the wealth generated by the slave industry and all other business interests around the globe. And that's all part of it. But again, the ability to understand and appreciate those linkages is, in my view, not affected adversely by the fact that you may see in some views the addition of some turbines and distance. I think those historic associations and the ability to to appreciate how those relate back to the the castle as the seat of the estate are unaffected, in my view.

00:06:28:22 - 00:06:33:16

Okay. Thank you. Must have it to do. Did you want to make any comments on Penrhyn Castle?

00:06:34:21 - 00:06:53:09

Yeah. This is just a point of disagreement, I think. And I agree in terms of the impact on Penrhyn Castle itself and the role of the park and garden as the setting for the castle. And it's a valid point to make about considering the whole thing in the round. But as was made this morning,

00:06:56:00 - 00:07:31:29

you can't just focus on what is not affected. You need to acknowledge what is affected and give that due weight. Is the view from the terrace. Looking out towards the sea is important. It's an intentional view design view and the beauty and scenic quality of that view is important and it looks, it leads the eye to the horizon and as such towards the overseas estates, the plantations and the problematic slavery connection that was the source of the and state.

00:07:32:01 - 00:07:32:16

Well,

00:07:34:12 - 00:07:35:02

and

00:07:36:20 - 00:08:10:06

the new development that the turbines would fill that framed view. It would have me say it would foreshorten the view and detract from the and the experience. I guess that the intended aesthetics of that view. And so in that particular view, I would argue that the the impact is of some significance. It doesn't disrupt the relationship between the estates and seeing it, you know, moving.

00:08:10:08 - 00:08:21:19

And the thing is there's nothing immediately blocking in the in the in the foreground, but it is a conspicuous impact on that one setting and reduces the contribution of that view

00:08:23:12 - 00:08:37:00

to appreciation of the setting of the park and garden. And so, yes, it is true that the remainder of the estate and its landward surroundings aren't affected. But if you apply blinkers in that way, you certainly this could be respected.

00:08:38:22 - 00:08:41:11

Thank you. Mr. Turner, did you wish to respond on.

00:08:43:03 - 00:08:44:13

Mark Turner for the applicant,

00:08:46:11 - 00:08:54:09

except that there is something new in The View? Well, I don't think that the ability to appreciate either the park or the castle again.

00:08:56:27 - 00:09:10:10

That the significance doesn't rely solely on that view. And in my view, you can still experience the intended relationship with the C, and I accept there are some design views throughout that landscape in different directions.

00:09:12:04 - 00:09:13:29

This isn't the only one that's available.

00:09:15:18 - 00:09:26:28

I don't believe that having the turbines in my view, prevents your association or understanding of the intentionality of the landscape in the design planting either in the case of that individual view or in the round.

00:09:29:11 - 00:09:33:18

Thank you. As I met with you. Did you want to respond any further?

00:09:33:28 - 00:09:36:04

I think we just agree to disagree on this one.

00:09:38:01 - 00:09:38:16

No.

00:09:39:11 - 00:09:44:28

Thank you. Is there anyone with us virtually, who wish to make any comments today about Penrhyn Castle?

00:09:50:15 - 00:09:51:18

I would say, Joe.

00:09:52:11 - 00:09:53:13

Mr. Pearson. Yeah.

00:09:53:15 - 00:10:07:21

Malcolm I think we would like to do is just reemphasize the, the element of the spectacular view within the registered park and garden and also.

00:10:08:03 - 00:10:09:15

I would add.

00:10:10:25 - 00:10:21:11

Response to the issue raised that the trust has historically used the picture frame within the park and garden to illustrate the.

00:10:21:13 - 00:10:22:00

Outstanding.

00:10:22:02 - 00:10:26:10

Landscape. So it's really just to to reemphasize that point.

00:10:26:12 - 00:10:27:04

So thank you.

00:10:28:04 - 00:10:33:02

Thank you, Mr. Pearson. And there's one more hand up as well, I believe. Quite possibly.

00:10:36:08 - 00:10:56:28

Hello. Well, hello, Gwynedd Council. I'd like to allude to the comments made and that Cotu has formally given comments. I think they were in July. We would like to receive further comments from K2 on this point as well.

00:10:59:00 - 00:10:59:25

Okay. Thank you. So

00:11:02:11 - 00:11:07:29

did. So you'll be awaiting for further comments. Ricardo, are you asking for. For further comment?

00:11:10:21 - 00:11:20:12

I, I believe Carter was involved in the consultation process that that that that they will comment so we were to wait for their comments and and

00:11:22:03 - 00:11:25:00

on this point and we probably with.

00:11:25:09 - 00:11:43:19

Thank you. Just they might be worth as. I don't know if you've had a chance to say it yet but just draw your attention to recently made a statement of Common Ground published by the on the website. It was only within the last week or so, so you might not have a chance to say. And that was between the applicant and Cato as well. So that that may aid you further.

00:11:43:24 - 00:11:52:01

Yeah, and certainly is done on behalf of the applicant. It's certainly your understanding from that statement of common ground that do agree with our position in respect of.

00:11:53:18 - 00:11:57:02

Penrhyn Castle in the park and garden. Thank you.

00:11:58:08 - 00:11:58:23

Thank you.

00:12:02:15 - 00:12:03:01

Okay.

00:12:04:25 - 00:12:08:13

Did you wish to respond to comments on National Trust, or should we be assuming we all.

00:12:10:01 - 00:12:18:03

Marked only for the applicant? I think we can probably move on. I think we know where the disagreements are will clear between us much of anything in within the realm of professional judgment.

00:12:18:24 - 00:12:24:03

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. So if we move on then to Beaumaris Castle.

00:12:26:05 - 00:12:47:15

DEADLINE to me, so it made the point that it would have been helpful for the assessment effects upon the castle to have included an analysis of the part of you from where the more turbines would be seen to contribute to the castle significance. And I noticed in your deadline to response that you consider the importance is the availability of near all round views from the castle.

00:12:49:08 - 00:13:12:25

I'm not wrong that, but obviously feel free to correct me in a second if I am. But my question is that the main entrance to the castle, which I is the south gate of the castle, is the gate next to the sea. And presumably the castle was partly built to control them. And I. So given this, would the view or views of to see. Not contribute more to the significance of the castle than of a landward views.

00:13:15:15 - 00:13:16:27

Mark TONER for the applicant.

00:13:18:15 - 00:14:06:18

Certainly a large part of the importance of the castle, both in and of itself. And as one of the component parts of the World Heritage site is how it is located on the main high streets, perhaps as a control, but also logistics supply by sea in routes that the Welsh couldn't interdict, if you like. In that connection, whilst the sea is an important component of it, of its setting. One can argue that the more important part of that is the focus directly to the many straits and how the castle would have been accessed via, you know, the dock by the Gunners wharf that's no longer physically available due to the build up of the coast around it and the separation of the castle from the coast currently.

00:14:07:03 - 00:14:37:21

However, it seems to me the understanding that function and the placement of the castle and its architectural arrangement relates directly to the strait in front of you by the by the main gate. So the southern side of the castle, rather than the full extent of the main, I think that's important to understand a strategic access view. It's not the only thing and the more important, if you like, tactical element of it. I understand the alteration built as it is, relates directly to that frontage, in my view.

00:14:38:18 - 00:14:54:14

In any case, whether you can see the turbines or not does not prevent your ability to understand the strategic location of a castle. With respect to the North Wales coast, the Anglesey coast, and the many straight as a strategic railway in that regard.

00:14:56:24 - 00:15:00:25

Okay, Thank you for that. Ms.. Emmett, was it, if you'd like to say, on Beaumaris?

00:15:02:01 - 00:15:34:04

Yeah, I tell you, I'm at full service. I actually agree with the revised assessment of the revised scheme that the only stages of the scheme that would that our law would have been highly intrusive in the setting of the World Heritage site such that we would well, we did raise significant concerns and it really would have impeded understanding of that strategic position, that dominance of the castle and the control of the

00:15:36:12 - 00:15:57:06

of its marine and terrestrial surroundings. But here it is. Yes, the turbines were visible, but it doesn't detract from that sense of dominance. It doesn't impede them. Some of those relationships and the other aspects, the outstanding universal value all affected any material degree.

00:15:58:25 - 00:15:59:28

Thank you. Okay.

00:16:01:17 - 00:16:06:12

Would anyone else wish to make any comments about Beaumaris Castle before we move on?

00:16:11:18 - 00:16:18:16

I'm not seeing any. And so if we can move on to Conway Castle place and this is a question to Ms.. Emma, if I may.

00:16:20:01 - 00:16:49:08

Your deadline one submission seem to state that you agree that the effect on the castle for an escape would be negligible, but that the assessment should have taken account of the fact that two of the four components in a World Heritage site would be affected. A scheme which may equate to a combined impact of high significance. Obviously, please feel free to correct me if I'm wrong when I say I was just looking for clarification. Napoli's did consider that effect would be negligible or would it tip the balance into minor

00:16:53:01 - 00:16:53:26

planning service?

00:16:54:12 - 00:17:09:21

And now I think it is still making shovel on concrete. Castle I wondered whether in combination with the effects on commerce, whether it might creep up to minor, to something greater than

00:17:11:15 - 00:17:18:02

the individual parts. You know, it's borderline. It's still non significant in English terms. It's

00:17:19:17 - 00:17:20:10

I'm not going to make.

00:17:21:02 - 00:17:26:19

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Turner, did you want to raise and if you don't call my castle.

00:17:27:27 - 00:17:54:21

Just to repeat, I think we're in agreement that there are. The effect is not non-significant for the items that are. And I think that the the viewpoint we used from the the high tower does reflect a similar viewpoint that might have been obtained from the town walls. But in my view, the effect would be the same, namely negligible in that regard. But I think we're in agreement on this point.

00:17:56:14 - 00:18:01:14

Okay, thank you for that useful. Any other comments for anyone on Common Castle?

00:18:03:08 - 00:18:06:13

Okay, thank you to me or to Puffin Island.

00:18:08:09 - 00:18:30:01

And my question on Puffin Island, by which I'll refer to the heritage assets on the island. The towering remains of a church in a monastic settlement relates to the statement in the environment. In the environmental statement, it notes that the selection of the location for the monastic settlement may well have been chosen deliberately for the sense of isolation and being physically cut off from the world.

00:18:32:03 - 00:18:42:08

Another noted in your answer to Q 1.8. 14 and a deadline for that. You stated effectively the separation of the island from the mainland is what is important in that respect.

00:18:45:05 - 00:18:59:21

My question really was with the siting of the proposed outlines create a backdrop of modern development to the island, both from the island itself and from the assets on the island, but also from viewpoints on Anglesey.

00:19:01:07 - 00:19:11:01

I borrow a phrase here from Mohammed's representation about to appreciably reduce their sense of removal for the secular world. Do you think you'd have any influence in that respect?

00:19:14:20 - 00:19:25:13

Mark Turner for the applicant. Certainly the introduction, the turbines will be a new and notable addition to the seascape when we look at.

00:19:27:02 - 00:19:58:05

I think I maintain my position with regard to the monastic settlement itself, that your ability to understand its island position in counterpoint to the mainland, both of Anglesey itself and North Wales, is important in my view, and I think more important than that, the seaward aspect in of itself, although that contributes to it, I don't think it materially affects your ability to withstand. Understand some of the key interests in the monument, namely is architectural archaeological value that they are effectively unharmed.

00:19:58:29 - 00:20:05:02

I know further that in the view from that we've got from penman point which incorporates trend do

00:20:06:18 - 00:20:37:00

the tower itself is not visible in that it's not a prominent landmark for most positions on the on the Anglesey coast. We cannot see it from some points. So what you're seeing is more of a land mass rather than an archaeological site, if you like, from from most views in most views. So in the sense that the turbines are visible, I don't think it affects your ability to appreciate that or the chosen location. Clearly, the turbines will be visible in some views around that.

00:20:37:16 - 00:21:09:24

On good weather, there are already some turbines in those views and you're not seeing it again in isolation. You're seeing it in relation to the whole of the coast and all the things that are going on around the coast. So taking those elements into concern, into my consideration, I felt that on balance there wasn't a significant effect. The ability to understand why it's located there and that visibility or otherwise of the turbines is largely immaterial in that at least understanding those key aspects of it.

00:21:11:21 - 00:21:40:25

Okay. Thank you. So I'm speaking a little bit hypothetically here, and it's a similar question, but if the monastic settlement was cited on Puffin Island for separation from the island for the purposes of isolation. So you've got an island effectively on free site, as I can see. And then you have obviously Anglesey on the other side. What the presence of the wind farm reduce the scope of the open sea from that settlement and within the setting of those heritage assets.

00:21:45:19 - 00:21:46:29

Mark Turner for the applicant,

00:21:48:22 - 00:22:19:28



the clearly visible. So there's clearly going to be an imposition. It's whether we think the imposition is sufficient to affect your ability to understand the significance of the asset, whether or not turbines are within the setting, because it's a sort of a permeable form of development. You can see through it, you know, blocking or severing key relationships with other contemporary or non contemporary assets. I don't believe that is the case. You can still appreciate there's a large expanse of city, albeit is now got some modern developments in it.

00:22:20:08 - 00:22:29:19

Does that affect your ability to understand the the placement of the of the monastic settlement or what would have occurred that why it was chosen? I don't believe that's the case.

00:22:31:19 - 00:22:33:18

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schmidt.

00:22:35:11 - 00:22:38:11

Jamie. I met with the Bartlett Planning Service, and

00:22:42:00 - 00:23:01:26

obviously the intrinsic evidential value of the monument is unaffected, I think, between quite large outcry. I think that it's just the nature of the development and the topographic character of the site of the monastery. And associated rains is a key attribute. And

00:23:03:23 - 00:23:38:04

I think point eight. I have most concerns about where you're looking towards Popham Island and Penguin Point and those turbines between and between the two and flanking Baffin Island on the other side. And I think they're more than the view from point seven towards where you have the backdrop of the turbines is where its identity is and sense of place as a remote, detached, non-secular location is really compromised.

00:23:38:20 - 00:23:56:15

And I think that being able to appreciate that island location, that sense of remoteness is so important to understanding the significance of that monument that it has a detrimental effect on on significance. Like.

00:23:59:01 - 00:23:59:29

Okay, Mr. Sun.

00:24:00:09 - 00:24:04:01

Your alternative for the applicant, would it be helpful to put that up?

00:24:04:29 - 00:24:07:12

I think it would, yes. Thank you. That 3.8.

00:24:26:12 - 00:24:28:09

AP two, three, seven, I think.

00:24:36:15 - 00:24:39:03

Long tunnel for the applicant. Sorry. Two, three, six. Even.

00:24:47:17 - 00:24:48:05

One second.

00:24:59:00 - 00:25:02:03

I have not heard of the applicant. So this is viewpoint eight.

00:25:05:11 - 00:25:24:21

Clearly there's a small piece of separation between the island and the island point and the rest of Anglesey in which turbines are visible in this iteration of a putative layout. Notwithstanding the comments we had earlier today about the final form of what an array might look like,

00:25:28:20 - 00:25:56:26

in my view here, there is there is separation. Do you see that as a as a land form? You don't see it as a historic asset other than if you recall the island itself as a historic asset. So again, in my view, that's not harmful to you understanding necessarily the monastic side of being chosen for a point of isolation because it is not apparent here. So the historic interest, one could argue, other than the landform it is, is not apparent in this view.

00:25:58:20 - 00:26:08:13

So I don't think there's any harm in this view that this certainly isn't an addition to the view clearly, But I don't think it affects those interests that we we alluded to earlier.

00:26:10:09 - 00:26:10:24

Thank you.

00:26:11:25 - 00:26:15:17

Mr. Jekielek Green explains that this

00:26:17:11 - 00:26:19:12

I think, as I said, the

00:26:20:27 - 00:26:28:04

the nature of the site as an island is just an important aspect of its setting. It's a key attribute and

00:26:30:02 - 00:27:03:09

the current configuration as presented but unlikely to change significantly does involve a huge extension of wind turbines almost extending right across that that horizon towards the great Orme. So it's almost becomes an enclosed rather than a part of an enclosed continuous line of horizon features, rather than just going to an island, an offshore island from Anglesey. You know, in fact, some perception of its isolation.

00:27:05:00 - 00:27:08:16

Thank you, Senator. So you want to add on that, Mr. Turner?

00:27:09:26 - 00:27:22:11

Mark Turner for the applicant? I think I'll just repeat that. It's in this the sense of separation is pretty minimal in this one image. Obviously, it will change as you move up and down the coast.

00:27:24:10 - 00:27:30:29

And this this becomes more of a landscape scale issue rather than, in my mind, a historic issue.

00:27:32:16 - 00:27:36:17

And in so in that regard, I stand by my original assessment. Thank you.

00:27:38:29 - 00:27:46:21

Okay. If we can move on then to COVID and Conway British Landscape of outstanding Historic interest.

00:27:49:21 - 00:28:01:04

And your response that long for this to the applicant. Apologies to Miss Emmett states that you agree that the effect of the proposal on this historic landscape would be would not be significant in terms.

00:28:03:00 - 00:28:08:27

I wasn't quite sure. Just looking for clarification, really. If you considered that that would be negligible or minor.

00:28:10:28 - 00:28:16:19

Marked Turner for the applicant, I consider it to be negligible in terms of its historic value.

00:28:19:19 - 00:28:20:04

Thank you.

00:28:22:12 - 00:28:27:06

But, Emmett, did you want to say anything about the Crowfoot and company Registered landscape.

00:28:29:08 - 00:28:37:16

Permits from that? No, I don't have anything to expand on my written representation. It's still significant, but it's. It's there. All right.

00:28:38:23 - 00:28:46:13

Thank you. Yeah. Okay. So finally, in terms of heritage assets, we have on the agenda that land that no

00:28:48:15 - 00:28:52:27

conservation area. So my question on this is directed to common council, if I may.

00:28:54:12 - 00:29:15:16

And now I know your views of the impact on the conservation area should be the same as it is for what building that is appear, which is assessed as moderate harm. So at the higher end of lessons of statute, the applicants reasoning. But the conservation area obviously covers a fairly large area of the town and extends inland a reasonable distance. Could you elaborate on your reasons for your view?

00:29:17:01 - 00:29:17:16

Thank you.

00:29:17:29 - 00:29:19:24

Kerry Thomas from Conway Council.

00:29:20:23 - 00:29:22:18

Yes, the concerns.

00:29:22:20 - 00:29:48:19

Relate to the importance of Sea World views towards the setting of the conservation area. The conservation area extends along the entire North shore, as you say. It does include it does extend inland as well. But it's known as the Sentinel Sea. France in some sense a conservation area. So it extends basically from the pier right to the end of the Craig, the Don area

00:29:50:18 - 00:30:24:21

of the town east of where we are sitting. So it's our view that because the seascape is so integral to the character of the conservation area and it's basically the reason why it no exists as a tourism resort, as entertainment destination, it's it forms an important role in the history and the economic character of the town that we feel that it is a matter of such fundamental importance that the impact it we shouldn't just look at the impact on the setting of the pier that's on there.

00:30:25:09 - 00:30:36:13

But we should also be assessing on the similar basis the impact on the setting of the sea front, which forms an important component of the conservation area.

00:30:38:11 - 00:30:45:04

Thank you. That's useful. Mr. Turner. Have any comments on the conservation area?

00:30:46:09 - 00:31:00:26

Mark on for the applicant. I think first I'd like to clarify why I have a difference in scale between the moderate effect I assessed at the pier and the conservation area where I recognized a minor effect.

00:31:03:05 - 00:31:33:17

So with the pair, I felt the hope became clear in the yes, that there was a clear juxtaposition of the turbines and some views on the relatively limited part of the view. Well, it's a really awkward juxtaposition of the turbines effectively springing from the pier deck in such a way that you it compromises the ability to understand the original engineering intent of the pier as an architectural form, as an engineering piece, and affects your ability to appreciate in those views.

00:31:35:04 - 00:31:49:08

I thought that was sufficient to justify a motor home or be ignored as it doesn't affect your ability to understand the pier and its function. And obviously that changes as you get closer and under the award and look the other way when you're on the pier.

00:31:51:08 - 00:32:25:04

The conservation area. By contrast, I had in mind the whole of the designated area, and I recognise certainly that it is extensive and the seaward angle is an important part of it. I recognise again the fundamentally the designed and planned settlement that we enjoy today depends on that aspect. But travelling up and down both the Promenade, Mostyn Street and the streets in the interior that are still within the conservation area, it's quite clear that there is, there is a difference.

00:32:25:06 - 00:32:32:06

Whilst the town relies on this seaward setting and its topographical relationship to the bay and how it sits under the.

00:32:33:21 - 00:33:04:27

There is a landward element to that that we can't ignore. Now there are linkages of some of the streets that join onto the, you know, the take you from the interior to the sea in which you will then see the bays spread between you. But it's it's clear when you when you access those, you start to see the sea. The sea would end. It doesn't extend all the way from town. You can't see from Mostyn Street, the Sea particularly. And in those access views towards the promenade, you'll see the existing turbines in any case.

00:33:06:00 - 00:33:14:15

So my view the the addition of outdoor to that would not be of such

00:33:16:06 - 00:33:22:15

a type. It's not an entirely new development type. It's not unexpected as you move up and down the coast

00:33:24:00 - 00:33:48:27

that it doesn't constitute substantial harm in my view. The reason I put it towards the lower end was the one recognising the extent of the conservation area recognised the interior and the different sorts of buildings and forms, how you circulate around it or when you're on the the upward bit's on the slope of the wall. Looking back along the bay, the your ability to appreciate the interest wasn't, I wasn't affected

00:33:50:17 - 00:34:25:02

taking that one stage further. When you look at some of the spaces and the buildings and their architectural interest within the conservation area and which lended its character and appearance, your ability to appreciate the individual form, an architectural interest in those buildings isn't affected. Whether or not you can see the turbines, particularly taking into account the existing turbines, there's no additional effect there. The causes harm, in my view, and in many cases if view in some of the shelters on the promenade looking towards the buildings, you have your back to the turbines in many cases anyway to appreciate that detail.

00:34:25:14 - 00:34:53:00

So consequently I recognised there was an effect and recognising the sensitivity of the conservation area and its historic function as a as a resort and a planned address as a resort. I didn't feel that that home was was approaching substantial and was certainly less obvious in a particular connection than was the case with the pier. So I consequently assessed them differently. But, but I do recognise there is an effect.

00:34:54:14 - 00:34:59:00

Okay, thank you for that. Mr. Thomas, did you wish to come back on anything now?

00:35:00:28 - 00:35:01:13

Thank you.

00:35:01:26 - 00:35:11:27

Nothing in particular other than to reiterate the importance of the seafront to the rest of the town. So I don't think it's I think you have to

00:35:14:00 - 00:35:15:03

understand the.

00:35:15:05 - 00:35:19:18

Context of the historic and architectural context of the town as a whole.

00:35:19:20 - 00:35:21:16

In the context of the seafront. So

00:35:24:18 - 00:35:28:10

that's the reason why we feel we feel it should be assessed as being a moderate effect.

00:35:29:19 - 00:35:30:18

So thank you.

00:35:33:05 - 00:35:36:00

Samit, was there anything do you wish to write about? I don't know.

00:35:37:14 - 00:35:52:06

Any of it from Gaps, and I'll just echo Gary Thomas's comments really, because the seafront and the seaside resort aspect is the *raison d'être* for shouted no.

00:35:53:26 - 00:36:08:25

Perhaps the sea view should be afforded a sort of awaited significance. It is only one element. And there. The architectural significance as well. But it is so important that perhaps it merits a high weighting. That's why I reached conclusions like did.

00:36:09:28 - 00:36:12:19

Thank you. As you saw astern, of course.

00:36:13:10 - 00:36:26:10

My turn for the applicant. Just to clarify, in my previous section where I mentioned substantial, I'm referring to significant facts in the terms. Just just to be clear, and just finally,

00:36:27:26 - 00:36:35:00

I think I had to have regard to the whole of the the conservation area, because that's the designation of which we're talking

00:36:36:20 - 00:36:38:03

in in the round again.

00:36:39:01 - 00:36:51:12

Q Thank you for that. Okay. If we could move on then to mitigation, I'll just check if no one else has any further comments about specific heritage assets before we move on.

00:36:54:15 - 00:37:15:17

Okay. I said, any more hands up. So we'll move on to mitigation. It's just a brief question really on here whether any mitigation measures have been or could be considered and whether any heritage mitigation was or is being considered as part of the proposals we heard out here in terms of landscape mitigation.

00:37:27:03 - 00:37:30:17

Mark turning for the applicant. Firstly,

00:37:32:03 - 00:37:36:23

when we've been discussing the landscape enhancement package

00:37:38:13 - 00:38:00:15

and we noted the comments, we've seen the draft and the comments made by the North Wales local authorities, you know, as referred to by and I'll tell you earlier. There are certainly opportunities within that to incorporate some enhancements in respect to the cultural heritage. We will certainly be actively exploring that as we go forward in terms of specific mitigation.

00:38:02:23 - 00:38:27:09

Bear in mind that with one exception I don't recall there are any significant facts. In most cases, I don't believe mitigation is required, specific mitigation in terms of turbine placement or location. Having said that, I don't think that even where there were effects that required mitigation, that you could deliver that mitigation in such a way that would enable you to have a scheme.

00:38:30:23 - 00:38:32:20

I understand. I guess

00:38:34:15 - 00:38:36:20

other schemes have considered measures

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

which potentially allow, say, for instance, residents or visitors to appreciate a significant heritage asset more than they may be able to already. If that makes sense. I just example things like interpretation, bolts and wayfinding and things.

00:38:58:28 - 00:39:01:15

Whether or not those kind of measures are being considered. So.

00:39:02:21 - 00:39:22:07

Mark Turner, for the article that we will certainly have discussions regarding those sorts of things. Exactly. Those sorts of things. When we discuss the landscape enhancement package in detail, we welcome, you know, discussions with with our colleagues to see what's most appropriate in that regard or how we can address that.

00:39:24:13 - 00:39:25:09

Okay. Mr..

00:39:25:19 - 00:39:35:05

So it's done on behalf of the applicant. I think it's also probably relevant to our discussions on tours and in the next section as well, because there is clearly an overlap there. Thank you.

00:39:35:14 - 00:39:35:29

Thank you.

00:39:37:17 - 00:39:40:26

Anyone else wish to have any comments on mitigation? On.

00:39:43:14 - 00:40:03:28

It's about changing that from gaps. Yes. I need to say that I've just spoken to Mr. Jones that and see just requests to be included in that discussion about landscape enhancement measures that have input into that. Yeah, yeah. We agree there's ample scope for his strong involvement to be included in that.

00:40:06:17 - 00:40:32:27

And in terms of general scheme mitigation, this is a bigger discussion, not just related to. Compared to assessing impacts, the fixed term operation of the development is a mitigating factor. Usually in this type of indirect impact, I'm not sure. Whereas in sort of securing or putting any sort of limits on the period of operation or whether that's an.

00:40:35:00 - 00:40:35:19

Open ended.

00:40:37:26 - 00:40:49:17

Thank you. We will discuss these measures in previous hearings in terms of the life lifespan of the development. But I don't know whether the applicant wish to come back at all or make any further comment.

00:40:50:13 - 00:40:53:21

So now it is done on behalf of the applicant. We don't have anything further to add.

00:40:54:15 - 00:41:03:11

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Before we move on, is there any one else wish to make any comments on cultural, cultural heritage?

00:41:07:29 - 00:41:15:26

Nope. I'm not seeing any hands here on the room, so we'll move on to and I'll pass on to Ms.. Cassini for item five, please.

00:41:16:00 - 00:41:19:09

Thank you. Could we have a moment just to swap people? Of course. Yeah. Thank you.

00:41:51:16 - 00:41:52:01

Thank you.

00:41:53:18 - 00:42:07:09

So before you start, can I just perhaps suggest that we deal with the heritage before the community fund in that those things sort of feed into each other in terms of. Sorry. And so we look.

00:42:08:26 - 00:42:14:19

But before we look at the tourism fund. Yes. Yes. Okay, That's fine. If everything was okay.

00:42:14:25 - 00:42:15:15

You too?

00:42:16:08 - 00:42:20:18

Yes. So we're now moved on to agenda item number five.

00:42:23:08 - 00:42:30:07

Which concerns socioeconomic, tourism and recreation matters. So we're going to skip a little bit

00:42:32:03 - 00:43:02:08

with me while I go to tourism and built Heritage. And Conway County Borough Council raised concern in their written representation and in answers to Key one references at 154 and 55 that any reduction in visitor numbers or expenditure could have a detrimental impact on the ability to undertake the maintenance of hotels and guesthouses in the. Know town center and see for a conservation area, particularly those that face the promenade.

00:43:03:03 - 00:43:35:12

It's further stated that such a lack of maintenance could over time result in a gradual deterioration of the built fabric and therefore the character and appearance the conservation area and its associated buildings. This is also a deadline to at to 53 who agree with Conway Council that should there be a decline in tourism as a result of the proposed development and which in turn would lead potentially to a loss in investment, there could be an indirect impact on the local historic environment.

00:43:35:22 - 00:44:11:10

I am aware of the applicant's response to this at 3002, insofar as the applicant states that there's limited evidence that the wind farm development, that wind farm developments have a negative impact on local tourism economy and that that a long term decline in tourist numbers would not occur as a result of the construction and operation of the wind farm. Furthermore, that the applicant considers that there is no likelihood of any such. Commercial effects on the long term ability of businesses to maintain the assets in the conservation area.



00:44:11:13 - 00:44:42:20

Notice that any evidence of this occurring in relation to other similar offshore energy developments. Before turning to other interested parties, have I correctly summarized your position? Yes. You have correctly summarized our position. Thank you. Turning to Conway County Borough Council. I accept that we are in a different economic climate to that of one winter more was constructed and operation commenced. But do you have any evidence

00:44:44:05 - 00:44:50:11

to suggest that construction of the existing wind farms along that stretch of.

00:44:51:17 - 00:44:52:02

That.

00:44:52:04 - 00:44:59:25

Area has resulted in a direct effect on the ability of hotel and guest house owners to maintain their properties.

00:45:00:19 - 00:45:10:21

And carry time as communicated by the council? No, we don't have any direct evidence of impact. I don't believe that any studies were undertaken in relation to the winter. More development.

00:45:12:16 - 00:45:26:11

Thank you. Do you have any sort of anecdotal evidence from any owners of the hotels or guesthouses? Or is this just an overall view of the concerns for this particular development?

00:45:26:29 - 00:45:33:14

I think it relates to the latter really, and it arises from the

00:45:36:02 - 00:45:39:06

position, the assessment in the yes, the US.

00:45:39:29 - 00:45:41:14

Assesses the impact.

00:45:41:16 - 00:46:14:16

Of the tourism impact on the visitor economy for some didn't know and the great storm as being low in the short term and negligible in the longer term. I'm not quite certain why it would decrease from being low to being naturally negligible in the period of, say, two years because the physical presence of the turbines is going to be there for much longer. And presumably any detrimental impact on the tourism economy could therefore last for longer than two years.

00:46:15:04 - 00:46:21:15

But leaving that matter aside, the Yes does acknowledge that there is an element of uncertainty in the proposals.

00:46:23:08 - 00:46:50:08

It's difficult for us as an authority to prove that there will be a detrimental impact, but equally a detrimental impact cannot be ruled out. And therefore, I would approach as a precautionary approach which understands that there could be detrimental impacts. And we say if that if those detrimental impacts are going to occur within the first two years, then there's no reason to believe that they wouldn't continue for a longer period.

00:46:52:19 - 00:47:03:03

Thank you. That's useful. A similar type of lesson question to you. Have you any evidence to support the comments that you've made?

00:47:04:23 - 00:47:37:16

Any gaps? No. I mean, I really just wanted to raise that it's part of any accurate assessment to identify the direct impacts. The indirect impacts, both things like setting and knock on consequences that may arise. And I think this is a valid concern. And I appreciate it's quite a subtle thing to monitor, to measure and to assess. It's quite unpredictable and with no evidence to suggest either way. At the moment it's really useful observation from my perspective that your diligence really.

00:47:38:24 - 00:47:45:26

Thank you. Before I turn back to that, is there anybody else either in the room or virtually that would like to comment on this issue?

00:47:49:01 - 00:48:22:08

No, I don't think so. Thank you, ma'am. Liston, on behalf of the applicant. And I will hand over to Mr. Evans to talk about the sort of duration of the the risk of an impact that we've we've identified. But I think there is something that it's worth saying in this context. There are no representations to this examination from tourism businesses. None of the tourism businesses in London. No. Have registered as interested parties or sought to participate in this examination, which is quite unusual.

00:48:22:10 - 00:49:12:15

I think if there was a concern around tourism impacts as a result of this project and from speaking to to the hourly more team and and clearly going to more was a project that was brought forward by out to be there were concerns raised when that project was developed and there were representations made by tourism businesses about the impact of going to more on on the tourism economy in this area. The evidence is that those impacts have not materialised in any way and actually tourism in the area is flourishing and I think it is important for us to recognise that that were those concerns shared by the tourism industry, I suspect we would be seeing quite significant representations in that respect which are noticeably absent.

00:49:13:05 - 00:49:45:22

So the assessment that's been undertaken has been done on a very precautionary basis and it, as you'll have seen from our representations, it has there is it's difficult this one because it's effectively trying to put in evidence that proves a negative as opposed to proving a positive effect. And and you'll have seen from the material that we've submitted that there is no evidence that offshore wind farms have an adverse impact on the tourism economy.

00:49:45:24 - 00:50:39:05

It simply isn't there. And I'd suggest if it was there, we would certainly be hearing about it. The the assessment that's been undertaken has identified a small risk of an impact in that sort of last stage of construction. And as I said, I'll hand over to and to Mr. Evans to explain why that's the case in terms of us identifying that risk. But I think it I think that the conclusion is that it's a very small risk and it's a very small risk because of the nature of the tourism offer that the strength of the tourism economy at the moment, which I appreciate in a in the current challenging economic circumstances, may be difficult, but equally my flourish because actually people won't be travelling abroad, they'll be travelling, they'll be staying in the UK and this type of destination becomes even more interesting.

00:50:40:11 - 00:50:48:14

I'll pass over to Mr. Evans to tell you a bit more about the detail, but I think it is really important that we see this in context. Thank you. Thank you.

00:50:49:10 - 00:51:36:07

Neil Evans for the applicant. I think my colleague is given sort of a very good explanation of why we think that there's a likelihood, albeit a relatively low risk, of a low impact, which would be sort of moderate significance. And I think to most of that argument, I don't have a great deal to tell. And I will pick up on the point about the timing of the impacts. And I think given what Conway said about uncertainty around that, the logic behind our conclusion about the timing of an impact is really driven by the construction of the wind farms and really the timing when they become visible to visitors.

00:51:39:05 - 00:52:12:17

Within that assessment, we conclude that it would be a short term impact for a couple of reasons. The one is that any potential discouragement of visitors, albeit a low risk, would probably decay over time. And we expect that that to happen over a period of a couple of couple of years. I think the evidence from elsewhere suggests that as visitors become aware of the change in the views and how it impacts on their experience, then they alter their behaviour accordingly.

00:52:13:05 - 00:52:48:03

And I think in this instance people will see that it doesn't impact in a detrimental way on their experience if one doesn't even grant them. So we have more of that decay in the discouragement of visitors over the period of 2 to 3 years. But there's also another consideration, which is the potential for replacement of any discourage visitors. And the logic here really comes from the evidence about the impact of offshore wind farms on visitor economies and the opportunity for visitors.

00:52:48:06 - 00:53:11:28

To actually be attracted to a particular location because of the construction of an offshore wind farm. And finally, in addition to that, if visitors are discouraged and it frees up capacity, especially for a popular resort like wanted. No. It gives other businesses the opportunity to occupy that freed up capacity. So really, that's the reason for the timing of a short term effect.

00:53:14:02 - 00:53:14:29

Thank you. Thank you.

00:53:16:17 - 00:53:19:27

Call me. Do you have anything you wish to add to that?

00:53:21:23 - 00:53:23:12

No, I don't think I've got very.

00:53:23:14 - 00:53:40:14

Much to add, really, other than, of course, the nature of the tourism industry is very unpredictable. Since the pandemic, there has been generally and I don't have any specific evidence related and did movements generally arise in staycation ing?

00:53:42:17 - 00:54:11:09

And that has effectively managed to support the local tourism sector. But the question remains as to how long that will last as people as travelling abroad becomes easier, people may may decide in future that they would prefer to go on holiday abroad rather than the UK. So there's still a significant element of uncertainty to say in assessing how the tourism sector will fare in the longer term.

00:54:12:29 - 00:54:46:26

Thank you. Miss Emma, is there anything and Mrs. done anything? I'll go back to the beginning of the agenda. That's alright. So starting a community fund benefit. Actually it is to the applicant. So in response to xq1 18.1, which is reference 1007, I note that you stated that you have a long history of offering skills and investment within the region, notably through Quinta More Wind Farm Community Benefit Fund.

00:54:47:13 - 00:55:06:19

And in response to the same question, you also state that you're undertaking community consultation with a view to providing a community benefit fund that will offer the opportunity for community to continue to benefit. And the reference to your community benefit funds are also made in the Equalities Impact report, which is reference 310

00:55:08:12 - 00:55:27:26

And in that report it's noted that such a fund will be different to that of going to wind farm and will not form part of the planning process. With that in mind, can you give me some further information as to the likely purpose and contents of the community fund at this stage, please?

00:55:29:25 - 00:55:32:25

Thank you. Ron Paul Carter On behalf of the applicant.

00:55:35:14 - 00:55:37:06

So we don't I think we've got some.

00:55:37:15 - 00:55:38:05

Ideas or something.

00:55:39:12 - 00:56:13:24

And we've conducted an initial consultation with a number of parties, local authorities, local third sector organisations. Members of the public had about 400 representations to a consultation that we ran on the Community Benefit Fund. The initial consultation has been to understand organisations and people's views on what they would like the fund to cover. So we have set out without any real preconceptions of what that fund would cover in terms of its wider scope.

00:56:14:07 - 00:56:16:15

We've had some initial framework ideas

00:56:18:23 - 00:56:50:21

form part of that consultation, but they're very broad brush ideas and really we want to be led by the community in terms of what that fund would ultimately look like, both in terms of the types of projects and themes it would address and cover, but also the way it's structured, the way it's run. And that's very much because we consider that the community benefit funds that we put in place to be community led. And that brings together quite a wide range of different views and opinions and different organisations that would be interacting within the steering groups and decision making panels.

00:56:51:09 - 00:57:01:17

And as an applicant, once we've set that fund up and got it running, we don't tend to be involved in any of the day to day management of it. That's for the community to manage on its own.

00:57:03:17 - 00:57:40:10

So at this time, having done that initial consultation and having quite a range of different views on what the funding should cover, there is no or no set piece at the moment. So a set framework on what the Community Benefit Fund will cover. There's been a whole range of ideas from and to give a flavour of examples, the sorts of things and electrical infrastructure for car charging, improvements in community, renewable energy, all the way to more traditional things such as money for, you know, rooves of parish halls and that sort of thing.

00:57:40:12 - 00:58:01:28

That more traditional community benefit funds from Shell wind farms have covered. It's a wide range of ideas and we need to sort of. You over all of that puts out the information that we've received and probably run more consultations through the next year and further years up to the. The point to which we put the Community Benefit Fund in place. I'd say it's very early days to be able to say what action the fund will cover.

00:58:03:22 - 00:58:36:20

Mark, Just it's worth adding. The reason it's considered outside of the planning sphere is because it isn't something that is directly necessary to mitigate effects of the scheme. And therefore and it isn't something that we would suggest or ask that you take into account in terms of your sort of consideration of of the scheme and the benefits of the proposal. So it isn't something that should weigh in. The balance is that is the provision of the of the fund.

00:58:37:03 - 00:59:13:14

It's it's easier to keep it outside of that process. So so that's entirely clear. And I'd just sort of reiterate what Mr. Carter said ought to be. We have delivered community benefit schemes across a number of their projects going to always one, the Triton, no offshore wind farm, which is just now into operation. And they've all been done separately outside of the process with that engagement with the community taking place alongside consideration of the application and the fund being put into place post decision effectively.

00:59:15:08 - 00:59:31:26

Thank you. You've actually kindly answered all of the questions that had on it in terms of what weight, whether it was an enhancement mitigation. So I don't have any more questions for the applicant. I'll just open the floor to any of the councils in attendance, either in the room or virtually whether they have any comments to make.

00:59:34:26 - 00:59:38:03

No, I don't see any other interested parties.

00:59:41:08 - 01:00:13:13

No. I'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is Tourism Fund. Paragraph 257 of the Tourism and Recreation Environmental Statement chapter, which is reference AP 65. It states that there are opportunities for the proposed development to support and engage with local stakeholders to promote and realise potential positive benefits to the tourism sector within Consett and the Great Orme area during the construction phase.

01:00:13:28 - 01:00:50:03

Paragraph 301 of the same chapter further states the potential tourism benefits also during the operational phase of the wind farm. Turning to the applicant in response to one 19.7, you further expand on what is said in the East and confirm that ongoing discussions are underway with stakeholders in respect of the opportunities to deliver a positive benefit to the tourism sector and that separate discussions have been held in respect of the package of contributions to support the tourist industry, which would again sit outside of the planning process.

01:00:51:06 - 01:01:24:02

Conway County Borough Council in no written rep, which is reference 155, Paragraph 5.4 states are willing to enter into discussions in relation to such a fund and also where the representations made in respect of tourism by other interested parties, including National Trust and the Isle of Anglesey County Council in respect of the parties requesting additional mitigation very much similar lines to the Community Fund benefit. Can you give me an overview of the discussions?

01:01:26:12 - 01:01:50:28

What measures discussed are proposed will be considered mitigation in contrast to enhancements, if relevant and if any measures are considered to be mitigation? How are they to be secured? And finally, are you planning on submitting any of this information into examination, and what weight should we give to it? Okay.

01:01:53:01 - 01:02:37:05

Thank you. Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant. I'm sorry. As part of the conversations we had on the Landscape Enhancement Fund with the local authorities on the 17th of November, we did touch upon how we would take discussions forward around any tourism fund. And the agreement that was reached on that call was that we would have direct discussions with Conwy alone on that issue. We had a subsequent call with Gary Thomas from from Conwy on the afternoon of the 17th of November, where we opened those discussions and there's further discussions to be had.

01:02:38:09 - 01:02:59:00

Mr. Thomas suggested he would talk to colleagues who are in the Tourism Department and may come forward with some thoughts on the sorts of mitigation that that they might see as being relevant. I think our position is that and this has been outlined by my colleague, we see the

01:03:00:16 - 01:03:06:26

the possible tourism impact as being geographically quite small in terms of

01:03:08:11 - 01:03:44:11

what Mr. Evans was was indicating it's temporarily quite short and and low risk. And even if those were to come forward and therefore the fund would be focused on mitigations that might look towards those potential yet low risk impacts. And those discussions would be happening with Mr. with Mr. Thomas about how we could how we could bring forward a fund that that may be able to talk to some of those impacts. In terms of the securing that we haven't got into the detail of those discussions yet.

01:03:44:24 - 01:03:56:27

The discussions on the morning of the 17th on landscape enhancement, there was a clear agreement that any tourism fund would sit separately from whatever agreement was put in place. With regards to the landscape enhancements

01:03:58:12 - 01:04:18:18

we have done in the past and go into more as an example of that direct contract with local authorities to put in place funds for this of this nature. We could explore that. I don't think we've got to the point where we have settled on the way to to secure this, and we'd have to have further discussions with with Conwy in order to and to seek agreement on that.

01:04:20:23 - 01:04:54:26

And long list done on behalf of the applicants in terms of the weight to be given to that in the decision. And we may need to come back to you on that one. I think it's it's somewhere between the landscape enhancement and the community fund. The community fund is clearly outside of the of the process. Our position is that this fund is not needed in order to to address the short term impact that we're looking at. For the purposes of the risk of a short term impact on tourism.

01:04:55:10 - 01:05:29:02

But it could be beneficial and we are happy to be discussing that with with the with the council. So I think the best thing at this stage, I think, is for us to keep you informed as to where that's going. Presumably, if we're if we're able, I hope we can reach agreement on what that looks like and what it is. We will put that information into the examination. So you are aware of it. And then I guess it's a it it may be a matter for you as to as to what weight you give to that in the balance. But clearly, there's an impact there or there's a risk of an impact.

01:05:29:06 - 01:05:59:10

So rather than there being an impact. So it may well be that you consider it to be material. Thank you that to. So just as a probably a wider issue as well. It would be really useful for us for factors that are considered to be mitigation are clearly defined as mitigation and those that fall into enhancement of whichever term you prefer, I'll very clearly label. It is it is an important distinction for us.

01:05:59:18 - 01:06:25:08

So moving forward across the project as a whole examination as a whole, could I ask that those those issues, those particular that fall into the two categories are very clearly identified for us? Yes, ma'am. We've sought to do that so far. But I think as this is evolving, it's becoming clearer where things are going to sit. So, yes. No, I appreciate that. I'm grateful. Thank you. Mr. Thomas, would you like to add anything?

01:06:25:21 - 01:06:26:08

Yes, thank.

01:06:26:10 - 01:06:57:22

You. I'd just like to reiterate reiterate what Mr. Carter said in terms of discussions having taken place between the local authority and the applicants. And I have asked my colleagues in tourism and regeneration to come forward with a draft proposal which we can put forward to the applicants as a basis for further discussion. No freak or anything like that has been being suggested yet. So we're still in the early days in terms of the distinction.

01:06:57:24 - 01:06:59:20

Between mitigation and enhancement. That's a.

01:06:59:22 - 01:07:00:13

Difficult one

01:07:02:13 - 01:07:09:08

because it it's our view that if there is a detriment to the tourism industry, then any

01:07:11:00 - 01:07:11:23

campaign to.

01:07:11:25 - 01:07:12:11

Attract more.

01:07:12:13 - 01:07:21:09

Tourists into the area would count as mitigation in terms of replacing a loss rather than net enhancement. That's I appreciate that is subject to further discussion.

01:07:22:28 - 01:07:28:28

Thank you. Are there any other councils or parties wishing to comment on this particular topic?

01:07:31:23 - 01:08:05:19

So I'll move on to the next topic, which is the outline Skills and Employment Strategy update In the Socioeconomics chapter, which is referenced as 34, the applicant stated that opportunities to maximize local socio economic benefits would be presented in more detail post consent Following consent, a skills and employment strategy was to be used for approval and would be produced in accordance with the supply chain plan required under the contracts for different supply chain process.

01:08:05:25 - 01:08:42:27

However, as we discussed issue specific hearing on the draft DCO, this has been amended to include requirement 20, which would secure a skills and employment strategy to be approved by Denbighshire County Council in accordance with the outline Skills and employment strategy. If consent is granted. And again to the applicant. First, please. I note that you've stated that you're engaging with relevant, interested parties and other bodies on the content of this strategy, and it's your aim to submit the outline strategy and to examination once suitably advanced.

01:08:43:08 - 01:08:55:02

Can you just give me an update in terms of engagement regarding this and what progress is being made? And if possible, provide an overview of the likely content of the strategy.

01:08:58:12 - 01:09:30:00

Thank you, Paul. Costs from behalf of the applicant. So yes, we have conducted a number of meetings with interested parties and other bodies. I can give you a flavour of some of those. It includes all of the North Wales local authorities. It includes Welsh Government and some underlying agencies and the North West Economic and Vision Board. It includes other existing offshore wind farms that are operational and unemployed people.

01:09:30:02 - 01:10:02:08

It includes possible future offshore wind farms in the area to look at interactions and the way that skills and employment strategies might be brought forward collaboratively in the future. It includes the likes of SPARK, Bangor University, a lot of the or a number of the skills providers in the area, such as college Candice Lomeli, who are the provider of the the apprenticeship scheme that we operate.

01:10:03:29 - 01:10:44:27

And I could go on, but a number of other organisations along this, a lot of which we are gratefully received from Mr. Jones at Anglesey as a starting point. And we've been talking to all of the agencies which were highlighted as well as as well as others, and we're in the phase now of of collating all of that information from those stakeholder engagement meetings and drafting a plan which we would look to circulate to the bodies that we've engaged with to have some initial comments from them on the suitability of the of the outline plan against their main areas of interest and concern.

01:10:46:09 - 01:10:59:07

We may then do a further iteration of that outline plan and then at that point we would put it into the examination with a hopeful understanding that we've got an agreement on the contents of the outline plan with the organisations that we've been consulting with.

01:11:01:12 - 01:11:02:00

Thank you.

01:11:03:23 - 01:11:06:03

Mr. Thomas, do you have any of clients?

01:11:06:21 - 01:11:07:09

No, thank you.

01:11:08:21 - 01:11:11:16

Is there anybody else in the room or virtually who'd like to comment?

01:11:14:10 - 01:11:27:07



No, that is the end of my questions regarding socioeconomics, tourism, recreation and thank you for all your input into these matters. I'm not going to hand over to my colleague, Mr. Roland, for agenda item six.

01:11:29:04 - 01:11:29:19

So

01:11:31:09 - 01:11:32:29

thank you very much. To hold,

01:11:34:19 - 01:12:07:03

I'd like to remind parties that the aim of the statements of common ground at an early stage is to recall the areas of agreement and identify the points of differences. It's important at an early stage in the examination for parties to communicate and highlight the point of differences to us. Well, I will now ask Mr. Stevens if you could share a statement of common ground of risk.

01:12:09:11 - 01:12:09:27

Disclosure.

01:12:10:06 - 01:12:11:11

And say,

01:12:13:04 - 01:12:13:20

okay.

01:12:14:07 - 01:12:16:29

There is a folder in place so

01:12:18:17 - 01:12:25:07

we could possibly just cover adjourn for a few minutes. Yeah. Just so that we could sort this out.

01:12:26:28 - 01:12:35:28

Okay. So if we could maybe adjourn for 5 minutes. It is a document that you unfortunately haven't got. You have a technical a five minute break.

01:12:36:09 - 01:12:40:15

If there is a problem with that, we do have a statement of commonality that we know.

01:12:41:03 - 01:12:42:02

It's slightly different.

01:12:42:15 - 01:12:43:02

Thank you, sir.

01:12:43:05 - 01:12:51:23

Okay, so the time is 16. 12. So shall we recommence at 15? 17, Hopefully. Thank you.

01:13:02:05 - 01:13:20:22

Okay. Thank you very much for being with us. Hopefully, we've been able to sort out the gremlins and yeah, so, yeah, on the screen you should be able to see an update regarding the statements of common ground.

01:13:23:04 - 01:13:29:04

The first part of the table shows local planning authorities

01:13:30:22 - 01:14:05:29

that we've had the standalone statement to cover the ground on known seascape landscape and visual impact assessment matters which have been placed in the Examination Library for Denbighshire County Council. And I'd say yes, 47. I would be grateful if I could ask the applicant just to summarize, regarding the updates for statements of common ground with Conway County Borough Council and the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

01:14:06:01 - 01:14:14:02

Before we then ask respective councils if they don't want to respond. So if I can hand over to Mr. Stone.

01:14:14:04 - 01:14:19:21

Thank you, sir. I'm going to hand over to Mr. McManus, who is going to take you through this. Okay.

01:14:20:09 - 01:14:51:03

Okay. So, yeah, Brian McManus, on behalf of the applicant. And yes, so the statement of Common Ground with Conwy County Borough Council covers the topics the non seascape related topics of tourism, heritage assets within the town, and the effects of offshore construction noise on onshore receptors. And as you say, it's not yet been submitted to examination, but we have recently received a completed draft from Mr.

01:14:51:05 - 01:15:06:29

Thomas that was received on the 29th of November. And we're currently reviewing that and hope to have a discussion in the near future on that. And so that draft, an agreed draft, can be submitted to yourselves at a subsequent deadline.

01:15:09:23 - 01:15:16:14

In terms of the subsequent deadline. Have you got a particular deadline in mind that you're aiming for?

01:15:17:18 - 01:15:25:03

I think that would depend on when we're able to have those discussions with Mr. Thomas and actually able to do that next week.

01:15:26:26 - 01:15:34:08

I'm not sure when we'd be able to submit it. I think we probably would be looking at deadline for in the new year if we can't make a deadline for you.

01:15:34:24 - 01:15:37:09

Okay. Thank you very much. So as.

01:15:39:05 - 01:15:43:25

Thank you. I would just like to confirm that we have sent draft comments

01:15:46:10 - 01:15:49:01

and we look forward to having further.

01:15:49:03 - 01:15:49:21

Discussions.

01:15:54:02 - 01:15:59:12

On that. In terms of because I see it as a small island, Anglesey County Council.

01:15:59:22 - 01:16:08:04

Yeah. To run on us on behalf of the applicant to the state and common ground with Anglesey County Council.

01:16:11:02 - 01:16:13:01

Sorry that has been submitted.

01:16:13:09 - 01:16:14:18

I see. Yes.

01:16:15:20 - 01:16:23:22

I would say so. So yeah, we we provided that deadline three. That's Rep 3018. Yeah. Okay.

01:16:26:16 - 01:16:47:21

The second part of the table notes joint statements of common Ground with the North Wales local planning authorities on seascape landscape and visual impact assessments. Please could the applicant provide an update on this before we invite respective councils to respond?

01:16:49:03 - 01:17:19:24

Ryan McManus On behalf of the applicant. And yes, as you said, this statement of Common Ground covers seascape, landscape and visual matters and is a joint state of common ground between the applicant and the parties listed there. I do know actually, that Flintshire County Council made a submission and withdrew from the examination, so it no longer includes them. But but it does include and to share Comrie County Borough Council, Gwyneth, Isle of Anglesey and Ari National Park.

01:17:20:21 - 01:17:44:16

And so that drive Statement of Common Ground was originally shared with North Wales, North Wales local planning authorities on the 18th of October. And since then the applicant has met with the group that was at the same meeting that Mr. Carter mentioned earlier on the 17th of November to discuss landscape enhancement. So that meeting also covered statements of common ground as an agenda item,

01:17:46:16 - 01:18:27:18

and since then it was agreed or at the meeting rather, it was agreed that the applicant would provide a draft, a revised draft to the group based on the applicant's understanding of the position of the North Wales local authorities, based on the representations made to date that was provided to them fairly recently on the 5th of December this week. So it's currently with the group for their consideration and they are happy to continue ongoing discussions with with the group and work to get a draft that can be submitted at a subsequent deadline.

01:18:27:28 - 01:18:31:27

And I think again, we'll probably be looking at deadline for in the new year.

01:18:32:29 - 01:18:43:04

Thank you very much for the update. And if I can maybe ask the local councils, shall we start off with Denbighshire County Council, please?

01:18:45:22 - 01:18:48:27

If you have any further. That.

01:18:51:15 - 01:18:52:00

No.

01:18:54:06 - 01:18:56:11

Okay. Conrad.

01:18:57:28 - 01:19:00:12

Thank you. Conrad has nothing further to add.

01:19:01:28 - 01:19:09:27

I have Anglesey, please. Thank you. Nothing further. Okay. Gwynedd Council. Have you got anything else to add?

01:19:14:08 - 01:19:15:05

And the theme song.

01:19:18:00 - 01:19:19:03

Is finally a very.

01:19:24:04 - 01:19:33:21

Yeah. Okay. So, thank you. We'll move on then. If we can go to the second page, Mr. Stevens.

01:19:36:03 - 01:19:38:28

So the second part of the table notes.

01:19:41:15 - 01:20:02:26

Sorry. A second page shows the Consultees table. I would be grateful if the applicant could summarize its position regarding statements of common ground with some did not town council that Susan Rice on Sunday, the host Community Council on Sunday was untreated a viable community council.

01:20:05:17 - 01:20:18:12

Loan amounts on behalf of the applicant. And so with regard to those those local town and community councils, it's set out in table one of the statement of commonality, which is

01:20:20:17 - 01:20:50:04

Application Examination Library Reference App sorry ref 3011 And it's noted in table one of that documents that the applicant has noted the requests from the examining authority for statements of common ground with those parties, and that since they have not submitted substantive responses historically, it has not been considered necessary to develop statements of common ground with those parties.

01:20:51:05 - 01:21:04:19

Okay, Thank you. Can I just check to see if we have some legal summary that the Voile community presents and if they want to maybe add anything to that?

01:21:06:27 - 01:21:09:25

I think there were a list of attendees virtually.

01:21:11:15 - 01:21:25:23

No, I'm not saying show of hands. So I'll presume that the content with the comments or otherwise they couldn't write. And if they're viewing the live, okay,

01:21:29:02 - 01:21:49:06

I would be grateful. Now if the applicants just provide high level summary updates regarding the three statements of common ground with natural resource soils and if you could highlight any significant areas of differences. Before I don't ask Natural Resource Wales to respond.

01:21:51:25 - 01:22:48:27

Yes. Ryan McManus on behalf of the applicant. So the as you said, that there are three statements of common ground between the applicant and Natural Resources Wales and they cover the topics of offshore matters, onshore matters and seascape landscape matters as a standalone topic, and those have all been submitted to the examination at deadline three, which are read 3019320 and 021 respectively, and that approach was taken in agreement with Natural Resources Wales and firstly in recognition of seascape landscape matters as a as a, as a principle area of concern and also reflecting the divide between the offshore and onshore advisory teams and also in recognition of the separate marine licensing process that is running broadly in parallel to this process focused on offshore topics.

01:22:49:19 - 01:23:23:18

And we're happy to report that the majority of matters are now agreed. And those statements of common ground and in the main areas of ongoing discussion relate to seascape, landscape and visual. And in terms of other minor points of ongoing discussion or disagreement. And there are some areas of non-material and disagreements in the offshore statements of common ground. Question two on authority, offshore authority principally.

01:23:23:25 - 01:23:47:17

So those are areas where there are there may be disagreements and how we've got to a conclusion, but not a disagreement in the conclusion itself. And and then in relation to onshore matters and the principal area of disagreement there relates to just application of flood risk activity permits. So the DCI.

01:23:51:04 - 01:23:53:06

Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

01:23:54:09 - 01:24:04:29

The Oscar will never come back. That cereal company. That is a fair, high level summary of where we are in relation to matters of agreement and disagreement. I have nothing to add to that. Thank you.

01:24:06:27 - 01:24:08:06

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:24:11:23 - 01:24:46:00

The table notes that statements of common grounds have been placed into the examination library with K2. S 46 National Trust 322 and also the Joint Nature Conservation Committee report. 324 Please cook the applicant summarize Code of Status of its statements of common ground with the Isle of Man Government, the Territorial Sea Committee, and again highlight any significant differences.

01:24:47:23 - 01:24:56:26

Brian McManus On behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the sorry, we wanted me to provide an update on Katie, so it was.

01:24:56:28 - 01:24:58:09

Interesting. Okay.

01:24:59:00 - 01:25:29:14

Thank you. So, yes, in relation to old man government and that statement of common ground covers the areas of offshore wind ethology, fisheries and marine mammals, and that's being provided to the Isle of Man Government Territorial Seas Committee as a draft. And we held a meeting with them and in early November, where we agreed to provide a revised draft to them. And that was then provided to them on the 7th of November.

01:25:29:26 - 01:25:33:25

Following that meeting we had and we're awaiting comments.

01:25:37:17 - 01:25:50:07

If I was asking you for a target state. Well, what are you looking to provide into the examination? Is it feasible to look at a target to be design for?

01:25:51:11 - 01:25:55:01

I think that would be a reasonable target to enforce. Okay.

01:25:55:11 - 01:25:56:03

Thank you very much.

01:26:00:27 - 01:26:14:11

So if I can now move on to statements of common ground with the Royal Society Protection Birds, could you give me, please, an update on its current status? And again, tell me of any significant issues.

01:26:15:18 - 01:26:46:24

Ryan McManus on behalf of the applicant. So an initial draft has been provided to the RSPB, and we recently heard from them that due to staff absences, they've not been able to provide comment so far and they got in touch on the 15th of November to say that they they will review an update once they have availability to look at it. And, you know, once again, we're very happy to continue to engage with the RSPB and we'll provide an update of statements upon grounds and subsequent deadline.

01:26:47:06 - 01:27:01:13

I'm not sure if I could say when with that one. And considering that I'd have to go back to RSPB and ask when when they think they'll have the ability to review it and correct my comment.

01:27:01:27 - 01:27:16:05

Can I just check the scope of that statement of common ground? Yes. Offshore shotguns, solitary. But does a pick up on, say, the on the solitary near Clwyd title with it.

01:27:17:06 - 01:27:20:27

It's solely in relation to an.

01:27:22:24 - 01:27:31:14

Offshore at intertidal Christology. So the same scope that was assessed in the ornithology chapter of the environmental statement. Okay.

01:27:31:16 - 01:27:33:16

So it doesn't include the type of river.

01:27:35:24 - 01:27:39:24

Not specifically, but that was within the scope of the assessment in the.

01:27:44:23 - 01:27:54:17

So if we can move on to statement common ground with the North Wales Wildlife Trust, again, you could give us an update on that, please.

01:27:55:18 - 01:28:18:15

Yeah. So run Manus on behalf of the applicant and say a draft has recently been received from North Wales Wildlife Trust and which has been completed with their position statements. With the exception of the Onshore Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Section, which is still awaiting their inputs from the relevant adviser within the trust

01:28:20:11 - 01:28:39:23

and understands that most areas covered by that statement of common ground are agreed with and mine areas of ongoing clarification required and then continuing to engage positively and productively with the North Wales Wildlife Trust and hope to have an updated version submitted at a

01:28:41:10 - 01:28:43:21

near future deadline. Okay. Also a deadline for.

01:28:43:29 - 01:28:50:09

A could I ask if there are any significant differences that you might be aware of currently?

01:28:52:28 - 01:29:04:00

Not not that I can recall, no. There are some minor areas of of clarification requires an ongoing discussion, but most areas covered by that statement come our. Agreed.

01:29:04:19 - 01:29:07:07

Okay. Thank you. Now if we

01:29:08:25 - 01:29:34:23

can go on to shipping navigation. So stating common ground has been submitted into the examination library regarding Trinity House ref 323. Could the applicant advise the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and also the UK Chamber of Shipping statement common ground with be submitted?

01:29:36:00 - 01:30:06:18

Yeah. Run. It matters on behalf of the applicant. So with regard to the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and that was submitted a deadline to that's rep 2050 and the applicant please report that most matters covered by that statement common ground are agreed. And there were some noted areas of ongoing discussion related to the interface between the DCI and the Marine licence. We're engaging in ongoing discussions with the Maritime Coastguard Agency on those.

01:30:08:09 - 01:30:41:21

And then if I come on to the UK Chamber of Shipping and we have revised drafts as one initial draft of that was provided in October to the Chamber of Shipping and we recently held a meeting with them and provided an updated draft of that to Chamber of Shipping on the 18th of November and that's with them for their consideration. And we agreed a provisional date for them to provide that to come back to us so that it could be submitted to deadline three.

01:30:42:10 - 01:30:43:09

Okay. Thank you.

01:30:46:10 - 01:30:49:17

If we can go on to the third page, please. Mr. Stevens.

01:30:51:26 - 01:31:15:10

And this shows the list concerning statutory undertakers. So references has been made by the applicant. The statements of common ground is necessary in some cases due to reference to updates on negotiations with landowners, occupiers, statutory undertakers under the utilities

01:31:16:27 - 01:32:06:04

RAB 3005. So as an example, with National Grid electricity transmission, it is noted that within this document Rep three five the applicant anticipates that both parties will be able to agree the protective procedure provisions before the end of the examination. Please can I reiterate my opening comments about the importance to communicate and highlight points of differences into the examination at an early stage? So be grateful if you could just give us a progress update on National Grid Electricity Transmission Statement coming out of progress.

01:32:13:20 - 01:32:19:13

So it is done on behalf of the applicant. And discussions are ongoing with national grid,

01:32:20:28 - 01:32:53:04

electricity transmission and. And we are completely anticipating that those will be resolved, that the protective provisions will be agreed by the end of the examination in respect of ESP energy networks. You'll note that we put what we believe to be agreed protective provisions which been into the development consent order that was submitted at deadline three. So as far as we are aware, those are agreed to.

01:32:53:06 - 01:33:24:17

It's been discussions are ongoing with Network Rail. You'll be aware that as well as protective provisions, there are a number of agreements that are needed with network rail in respect of crossings. So those are ongoing. And again, we are working very hard to get those sorted as soon as possible. And in respect of Welsh water deal. Comrie With it, ongoing discussions which I think are progressing well so that we're in this good news is we are fully engaged with all of those parties.

01:33:25:09 - 01:33:30:03

They are aware of the deadlines and we are pushing as hard as we can to get those matters resolved.

01:33:33:05 - 01:33:41:15

Thank you for that update. Can I just check with you that you're not aware of any significant differences at this stage?

01:33:43:17 - 01:33:45:27

No, sir. No significant differences at this stage.

01:33:46:16 - 01:33:47:01

Thank you.

01:33:50:12 - 01:33:50:27

But

01:33:52:07 - 01:34:00:18

if I can move on to your approach with Phil Flats, Wind Farm Ltd, if you could, maybe just.

01:34:02:12 - 01:34:28:19

So in respect of real flats, Wind Farm, we have drafted protective provisions in respect of the interaction that the the, the hourly more cable goes into a buffer zone around the real flats wind farm. And therefore we are in the process of discussing protective provisions with row flats, Wind Farm Ltd



01:34:30:13 - 01:34:43:03

and I can go on to North Wales. So no soil. I think we've agreed that protective provisions are not needed because of the distance between the two schemes, but there does need to be a crossing agreement in place and that is also being progressed.

01:34:44:25 - 01:35:10:21

Okay, thank you. With regards to the rail flats, wind farm, can I just follow up on that? They've obviously put in a written submission at 329 and that particular threat about the wake effect and how has it been assessed or has it been assessed in this matter. If you'd like to comment on that.

01:35:11:11 - 01:35:17:03

Well, I haven't got anything to add to the submissions that we've already made in respect of that matter.

01:35:21:11 - 01:35:24:26

Would you? Would it be possible just to maybe summarize?

01:35:26:14 - 01:35:27:03

Particular.

01:35:27:11 - 01:35:38:18

If you can hold on a moment, I will. I wasn't anticipating this being on the agenda. So if you give me a moment, I'll just go back to to our previous submissions, if that's okay. Okay.

01:35:43:18 - 01:35:47:22

If you have any other questions on science of common ground or anything else, you could go.

01:35:47:26 - 01:35:48:11

Because I've.

01:35:49:04 - 01:35:49:24

Been waiting.

01:35:50:03 - 01:35:57:03

Though, after this. I was going to draw this section to a close and then hand over to my colleague, Ms.. Cassini.

01:35:58:24 - 01:36:00:27

Could we maybe take one more.

01:36:00:29 - 01:36:21:18

For we could possibly do is. I was going to ask just ask this because we've gone past the time we normally go for a bit afternoon break. There's not a lot left on the agenda, but we do have a couple of questions in the any other business related things that we discussed earlier today. So we could have a short adjournment and give you a chance, if you like. So so adjourn for 10 minutes.

01:36:22:12 - 01:36:23:26

I guess that's what's.

01:36:23:28 - 01:36:31:03

Acceptable to everybody. Yeah. Okay. So we'll recommence at 15, 1524. Thank you. Okay.