

ISH2 Weds 7 Dec_Part2

Created on: 2022-12-07 13:44:11

Project Length: 01:21:05

File Name: ISH2 Weds 7 Dec_Part2

File Length: 01:21:05

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:22 - 00:00:09:03

It's now 1145 and the hearings resumed.

00:00:17:04 - 00:00:40:26

If we move on to just considering viewpoints one, two and three. Natural Resource Wales disagrees with the applicant's assessment from these viewpoints, which are all located in the Anglesey Airbnb. You can use Usk Natural Resources Wales. If you're aware that Anglesey County Council has not raised any concerns in this regard.

00:00:42:23 - 00:00:56:16

And so we note that and aware of of that position. We respectfully disagree with that assessment and we having taken that position into account. We maintain a difference of opinion

00:00:58:19 - 00:01:10:06

when compared with the applicant on the significance of the impacts from those those viewpoints, which I can elaborate upon if helpful. But you have a detailed representations on that.

00:01:10:19 - 00:01:37:26

Yeah. So yeah, Natural Resource Wales suggests from these viewpoints the effects will be significant, noting that the proposed development would be a notable addition in sea views. The Solvay assessment acknowledges that the turbines would be visible, but concludes this would represent a low magnitude of change under budget. Minor significance effects of effect in each case. Setting out its reasons for this

00:01:40:17 - 00:01:50:23

natural resource. Wales. Please explain precisely why and where it disagrees with the applicant's assessment in order to arrive at a significant fact in its view.

00:01:51:19 - 00:02:30:18

So yes, of course. Context again here is important and explains the difference of in judgement. And as I mentioned this morning, more generally in relation to the Isle of Anglesey and Aonb Sea views and the coastline are the key focus, we say, of views in the predominantly coastal area and B and they are currently, as you might have observed from your many site visits. They are currently entirely undisturbed, we say, by development or human activity, apart from the occasional ship.

00:02:32:12 - 00:02:40:17

The existing wind farms to the east, including going to mod, are extremely hard to discern

00:02:42:25 - 00:03:01:27

based on our assessment, even in fine weather. And we've looked at this both in the summer and in the winter, and we remain of the view that they are extremely hard to discern. A Quinta More in particular, even when the weather is fine

00:03:03:17 - 00:03:25:25

and the built development, as we understand, one of the applicant's argument is to say, well look, there's some built development along the the coastline so surely that should have a bearing also on the judgement that's made that built development so far as it exists is simply not similar in nature or scale to the proposed wind farm.

00:03:27:27 - 00:04:05:14

And so far, as reliance is placed on the onshore wind farms, they are located inland, away from the coastline. One often has to turn one's back is to be able to see them. So they're not in the main part of the visual experience of looking out to sea. And they are, in any event, at a much smaller scale than what's proposed here. So it's because of that focus on the coastal landscape and the sea views that we that contextual difference that leads us to have a difference in judgement.

00:04:07:06 - 00:04:39:10

Yes, they are large scale sea views, but the scale and nature of this proposal within those views would make the development very noticeable, certainly more than visible, very noticeable. They would draw the eye, we say. And attention would be focused upon it. And if it's suggested, well, they only I think it was said this morning, well, the wind farm would only take up a very small part of that open view.

00:04:40:21 - 00:05:03:08

We don't accept that based on some of the visualisations in relation to viewpoints one, two and three, they clearly would be a prominent, certainly noticeable and quite striking element in that view. We say that leads us to assess the degree of impact differently. Thank you.

00:05:04:03 - 00:05:19:27

Okay. Thank you. So is it effectively. The magnitude of change which you disagree with of the applicant South Africans, just a low magnitude of change from these viewpoints. What is it that actually makes it? If you look at the LPA, what what is it you actually disagree with?

00:05:26:12 - 00:05:34:08

It might be worth actually pulling up if you're going to miss. Okay. Oh, Mr. Stevens has it also.

00:05:38:20 - 00:05:39:27

Yes, I think that would be helpful.

00:05:39:29 - 00:05:44:02

So that point to some points limits.

00:05:51:22 - 00:05:52:14

And yeah.

00:05:53:06 - 00:05:57:03

If you if you scroll down a bit, please, Mr. Stevens.

00:05:58:21 - 00:06:00:00

Yeah. Okay. That's good.

00:06:02:06 - 00:06:14:10

So. So effects are we looking at the from the viewpoint across the seascape. And you can see at the bottom, the way line is showing the existing and black and the proposed in red.

00:06:16:00 - 00:06:16:22

Thank you. Yeah.

00:06:16:24 - 00:06:51:05

And we our view is that this is a moderate significance and not that threshold is crossed because of the other being explained because of the high visibility that's extremely noticeable in the view and it draws the eye. So we think the combination of the magnitude with the very high sensitivity of the receptors along the coast path and enjoy in this part of Anglesey combine to get there for a moderate significance.

00:06:53:25 - 00:07:00:06

Yeah, it is. Sorry about the medium magnitude effect. So much.

00:07:00:22 - 00:07:01:29

Concern by.

00:07:02:06 - 00:07:13:15

Segment, but significant because moderate can be seen as the most significant according to the applicant. You're saying it's moderate significance with fact, but that is a significant fact.

00:07:13:17 - 00:07:28:26

And yeah, it's a combination of a high, very high sensitivity with, say, a lone magnitude or low medium, we would say magnitude of effect. And in part that results in moderate significant.

00:07:30:21 - 00:07:46:09

Okay. So are you saying it's in terms of magnitude of change, if you look if you're using satellite terminology, you're you're you're saying it's a low or medium or a low medium magnitude of change. Which which one of those.

00:07:47:10 - 00:07:50:05

Low, medium, low dashed medium. I think it was the media.

00:07:50:12 - 00:07:51:21

Right. Thank you.

00:07:54:08 - 00:08:00:02

And that then brings her out as a model as fact. And in your professional judgment, a significant one.

00:08:01:27 - 00:08:10:17

Yeah. Okay. And that's for all three of these viewpoints. One, two, three. Yeah. Yes. Okay. Thank you. Would you like to comment on that?

00:08:13:13 - 00:08:56:04

I think the gentleman has made the point that previously that these viewpoints need to be seen in the context of the wide open sea views, and they are a considerable distance. So to the degree of visibility in terms of the vertical scale is as reduced because of the distance and the the horizontal extent of visibility ranges between 12 and 14 degrees of the overall sea view that I saw that the because the development is not located within the open part of the sea view, but tends to be located closer to the coast, that it then retains a vast part of the open sea view.

00:08:56:15 - 00:09:12:00

And to that end, I consider that the effect would air on the side of being nonsignificant and a little magnitude of change. And that has driven that given and that is considered to be high sensitivity at those viewpoints.

00:09:12:02 - 00:09:21:19

Okay. And as low magnitude of change, where is that defined? What was the definition of a low magnitude of change compared to a low medium magnitude of change?

00:09:21:28 - 00:09:23:17

And I think I have that here.

00:09:36:27 - 00:09:43:14

Mr. Stevens, can you remove the image? Thanks. I'm sorry. Okay. Thank you.

00:09:45:01 - 00:10:17:12

It's considered that the level of magnitude of change falls within the definition of the definition of low magnitude asset itself. The IMF methodology. One, one, two. The development will result in a low level of alteration to the baseline view, providing a slightly apparent influence and or introducing elements or characteristic in the receiving view which we have established, is not the case in this instance. We concur that the influence of the existing offshore wind farms as is, is not generally perceived from these viewpoints.

00:10:17:28 - 00:10:23:03

The addition of the development will result in a low incremental change, loss or addition to the baseline view.

00:10:30:22 - 00:10:33:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:10:34:18 - 00:10:52:26

I mean, it is quite I mean, you would notice that, wouldn't you? Because he has a lot of he said he didn't necessarily see the existing turbines off off the coast unless it's an extremely. Yes. Good visibility and just looking at the montages.

00:10:54:27 - 00:10:59:09

For a while, more would be noticed that.

00:10:59:19 - 00:11:39:08

You would notice it. But. And seeing that any any one offshore wind farm that you put in the seascape, you would notice. I think it's getting that that threshold of of where we we tap into significance. You need to consider the whole of the the view from that viewpoint, the degree to which it affects the open seascape. And as I suggest that it there is a vast area of open seascape, particularly from point lightness, where we have probably 270 degree views of open sea with the wind farm being a part of that, but retaining a vast open seascape.

00:11:39:18 - 00:11:49:04

I think that's where being at the viewpoint is really essential. And I know you've undertaken a lot, a large amount of site visits, and you will have seen that yourself. Yeah.

00:11:49:06 - 00:11:59:04

Okay. So in terms of if you insert a low medium magnitude of change into your table, does that come out? As a matter of fact.

00:11:59:09 - 00:12:01:24

It comes out as either being moderate or.

00:12:01:26 - 00:12:02:18

So it's moderate and.

00:12:02:25 - 00:12:09:23

Moderate and then adjusting to professional judgement so it wouldn't automatically to into being a significant effect.

00:12:10:14 - 00:12:12:11

Okay. So I'd raise it, but not necessarily.

00:12:12:23 - 00:12:15:14

Yeah. It wouldn't necessarily be put into significant.

00:12:17:00 - 00:12:17:27

Okay. Thank you.

00:12:20:17 - 00:12:25:24

If I move on to view point 23 in that case and real settlement.

00:12:28:24 - 00:12:52:25

So in the land use consultant review, which is that 1091 the page 29 to 38 states of the effects regarding real settlement are likely to fall below the threshold of significance. Temporary Accounts Council appears to suggest otherwise. I'm content, so please clarify that is still your position.

00:12:56:20 - 00:13:10:03

Yeah. Okay. So, um, I think we would rather defer to the agency review. I think that was a mistake. Translation And we both have learned from the law, so the healthy review.

00:13:10:06 - 00:13:11:11

Would represent our.

00:13:11:15 - 00:13:13:22

Stance on the impact on the rail viewpoint.

00:13:13:24 - 00:13:15:03

On the rail is absolute.

00:13:17:15 - 00:13:19:10

Okay, so you'll say that.

00:13:24:26 - 00:13:39:18

Yeah, there was some disagreement about how the assessment of effects was assessed in the submission that that was addressed in the Alessi review. But yeah, we don't think that significantly alters the effect of the real settlement.

00:13:40:17 - 00:13:41:14

Okay. So just.

00:13:41:24 - 00:13:47:18

Yeah, the LC review is. Is correct assessment of impact.

00:13:48:01 - 00:13:59:12

Okay. So just looking at the I u C review it, say it states that the effects regarding real settlement are likely to fall below the threshold of significance. So you agree with that?

00:13:59:23 - 00:14:00:08

Yes.

00:14:00:18 - 00:14:03:11

Okay. So. And.

00:14:05:06 - 00:14:20:15

On page 29 of the of the Land Use Consortium report. It says that we accept the authors have reviewed their assessment for Viewpoint 23 and confirm their finding suggesting that that saying no significant fact from that viewpoint

00:14:22:14 - 00:14:34:12

but that now you see on page 13 suggests that it's borderline whether there is a significant effect from 3.23. So I'm I'm not actually too clear what Lucy is saying about it.

00:14:35:10 - 00:14:44:01

Would it be helpful if I and if Paul McCrea possibly comes in at this point just to explain that kind of assessment of, say, the Olivia.

00:14:45:01 - 00:14:45:20

Yes, please.

00:14:50:02 - 00:15:13:00

By Paul Macrae for the North Wales planning authorities. And I think this there's two. Two separate things here. There's there's the assessment of the facts on Viewpoint 23 and the assessment of effects on the settlement of rail more generally. Is that is that what you're. Yes, that's what you're getting into.

00:15:13:07 - 00:15:26:28

That's what I understand. But I think you're saying in terms of settlement, there would not be a significant fact. But in terms of the viewpoints, there's a couple of inconsistencies in the report, which I'm just asking what your view is on that.

00:15:29:01 - 00:15:50:00

We. I think in terms of. The settlement. We we have a slight, I suppose, different approach to how the the effects on settlements are assessed generally. And that's that's a comment that we've made within our remarks on, on

00:15:51:24 - 00:15:53:13

sorry I'm getting so I go back.

00:15:55:16 - 00:16:08:19

And that's in terms of real settlement, I think you're. Well the report states that it effects would fall below the threshold of significant. So I think we can yes.

00:16:09:02 - 00:16:25:09

So what we say is that we take this slightly different approach, but we accept that what they're saying is that the the developed seafront is is a sort of separate almost receptor to that the the settlement where the where people live.

00:16:28:11 - 00:16:35:17

We Yeah we we accept that is that is not a significant effect in that instance in relation to the settlement as a whole.

00:16:36:03 - 00:16:45:02

Okay. Thank you. And then Mr. just has just confirmed that they now concur with us. So if we now just focused on the viewpoint 23 instead.

00:16:45:23 - 00:16:46:14

Yeah. Yeah.

00:16:48:08 - 00:16:58:14

What was he saying about few points and three exits? There's there's one place you suggest it may be significant. In other places it may not be. So what's your view on that?

00:17:00:01 - 00:17:02:27

So we've said. That the.

00:17:05:25 - 00:17:16:16

In relation to 4.23. So the we've acknowledged that that the applicant has gone back and had had a look at that and they've confirmed what they're finding is.

00:17:19:01 - 00:17:40:08

We felt that there's maybe a bit more contrast between the that the turbines and the existing turbines that would that was not necessarily addressed in detail, but we didn't think that there would be enough to raise that to a significant effect.

00:17:44:00 - 00:17:53:01

Okay. Thank you. So just to confirm, you're saying there's no significant effect from 3.23 temperatures agreeing with you. So we can move on?

00:17:54:21 - 00:18:01:15

Yeah, I'm saying the difference between ourselves and the applicants is is a very minor one on this matter. Yes.

00:18:04:10 - 00:18:06:11

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:18:10:25 - 00:18:16:26

So just so when you say it's borderline, are you now saying it's not borderline? It's definitely not significant fact.

00:18:18:28 - 00:18:58:14

Well, if I can just clarify what our role is. We've undertaken a review of the applicant's assessment. We haven't undertaken an assessment of our own. We haven't been to the site. The the nature of our review as it's as it's set out and in the introductory sections is a by means of a cross-check or a sort of peer review of the applicant's work. So it's not for me to say that an assessment is significant or not significant because we haven't undertaken that detailed assessment.

00:18:59:21 - 00:19:13:05

We've we've raised our queries with the applicant's assessment, and I think their responses are responses. We don't we can see that the difference in opinion is is significant in this case.

00:19:13:19 - 00:19:18:00

Okay. Thank you for that. Will the applicant just like to comment on any of those points?

00:19:21:02 - 00:19:46:05

I think we had noticed ourselves that there was some discord between the some of the comment on how you see this report compared to the table. I think that's what you're you're referring to. And they they have suggested that the effect would the magnitude of change would be low. And that to me would suggest that they agree with our assessment that the effects are non-significant.

00:19:47:02 - 00:19:54:00

Okay. Thank you. In that case, I'll move on to viewpoint 36, and it might be worth pulling this up on the screen as well.

00:19:55:21 - 00:20:26:19

So Natural Resource Wales and state owned National Park both raised concerns with the applicant's assessments of this viewpoint, which is Taliban, noting similarities with viewpoint 38, which is from far over another peak where a significant fact had been reported and the applicant respond to the deadline to identify that as with viewpoint 38 Viewpoint 36 should have had a sensitivity rating of high rather medium high as reported.

00:20:28:04 - 00:20:31:25

But despite this, still considers the facts to be moderate and not significant.

00:20:33:18 - 00:21:04:05

Can the applicant please justify this conclusion, further pointing out what it considers to be the key differences in its findings between Viewpoint 36 and Viewpoint 38 and noting that significant effects have been reported for all other representative viewpoints in the northern uplands area of the National Park, including Viewpoints 1238 and 40. All represented viewpoints in that area which have been where significant significant effects have been found.

00:21:04:07 - 00:21:09:03

But Viewpoint 36 has not. Could you please explain the reasoning for that?

00:21:10:03 - 00:21:48:08

Yes, of course. Linda Thompson for the applicant. I think the key difference there is that from telephone, the the and the visual impression of the seascape to the east of the ORME is very much influenced by the existing wind farms. Our assessment takes into account the and the assessment of only more in a context of good excellent visibility. And on my visit to Tal Afar and in particular, the visibility was such that the existing offshore wind farms were a key component in the view of that in that direction.

00:21:48:18 - 00:22:26:14

In addition and over over the highly developed of course there and I think that's where the views from the other parts of the national park we have identified significant effects differs. I think it's the contrast then becomes different. You're you're closer to the existing development. So it is a more pronounced part of your baseline view, a telephone or it's a changing angle, I think as well that makes the existing seascape with the offshore wind farms more clear.

00:22:26:18 - 00:22:34:06

I think in that view, so the contrast and then with the addition of only more to that view is not so marked.

00:22:34:12 - 00:22:37:23

Is it possible to bring up 3.38 and compare the two?

00:22:50:11 - 00:23:20:11

See. You can see the developed coast from Paul for us as well. But it is such a notable part of the content context there. I think from that viewpoint as well, you're you have much more of a sense of being further back into that world, this sort of core area of the national park. So your sense of remoteness perhaps, and tranquillity is heightened there.

00:23:20:14 - 00:23:53:21

I am aware from Tollefson there is more of a sense of being set back a bit from that coastline, but I think it's that differentiation of that baseline and that context. But I think it's not just about the view and the direction of of the wind farm that offers a totally fun as well. You just get that sort of sense that you are much more in the part of the upland area where I'm from, sorry, from Paul for us, but entirely fine.

00:23:53:23 - 00:24:11:14

You sort of feel like you're still on the edge of because you've got that that open area of the Maryland and then you've got the sort of edge hills that separate you from that, that you your impression of being within that upland is slightly different between the two viewpoints.

00:24:12:12 - 00:24:21:06

Right? So in Taliban you're seeing more development closer by. Yes. There's that makes any change. It's sort of less less with us.

00:24:21:27 - 00:24:30:19

It's more to do with. Yes. The incremental changes is is less from Taliban than it is from for us.

00:24:31:11 - 00:24:32:06

Okay. And.

00:24:37:06 - 00:24:40:25

Close US Natural Resources Wales for their views on that topic.

00:24:40:28 - 00:25:14:28

Yes, I'm afraid we respectfully disagree with that assessment and we don't see a basis for that distinction drawn between 36 and 38. Our judgment we maintain that the effects at this viewpoint have been underestimated. They are, we say, likely to be significantly adverse. The applicant's argument in writing and we've heard it again rehearse this morning, is that the experience in Viewpoint 36 is already modified by existing wind farms and pylons.

00:25:15:15 - 00:26:00:29

Well, we disagree and we say that that's borne out by the images that we can see this morning on the screen. In our judgment, at this viewpoint, the existing onshore wind farms and pylons are hard to discern and go into more. And other offshore wind farms, which are visible at a distance, appear small scale and not prominent in those views. And a reminder here, of course, that the proposal involves the construction of between th4 MDC and 50 MD SB turbines of height between 282 and 332 metres.

00:26:01:12 - 00:26:28:24

The reason why that's an important reminder in this context that is roughly twice the size of course of the existing winter, more turbines being 150 metres. So we say that that viewpoint 36 the sensitivity here is high. The magnitude of change again, low, medium. And that results again in a moderate effect that in our professional judgment is significant.

00:26:29:23 - 00:26:37:16

Okay. And they don't need National Park Authority. Do you concur with Natural Resources Wales on that? Would you like to add anything else?

00:26:39:06 - 00:26:41:05

Yes, I completely agree with that.

00:26:41:18 - 00:26:42:12

Those games, really?

00:26:45:15 - 00:27:10:17

Okay. Thank you. So Natural Resources Wales. And slow down the National Park. Both suggest that the effects of the national park floods a character area in one northern uplands would be significant, whereas applicant finds otherwise had the applicant found a significant effect from from 5.6 5.36. Will this have altered your findings in relation to LCA? Well.

00:27:11:18 - 00:27:12:06

No, it would not.

00:27:13:15 - 00:27:14:02

And why not?

00:27:15:11 - 00:27:41:09

We have already identified some significant effects within the the northern uplands LCA, and that hasn't driven us to make the distinction that there would also be a significant effect on landscape character for the reasons I have explained. Landscape culture effects and visual effects are not the same and we need to avoid double counting the visual aspect of the effects on LCA one.

00:27:42:28 - 00:27:49:15

Okay, thank you. Would you like to say anything else on LCA? Well, in terms of the effects on that particular character area.

00:27:50:24 - 00:27:51:13

I think

00:27:53:25 - 00:28:04:18

yes, we, we disagree. We think that the impacts on LCA one are significant. And, and the reason we say that is, is

00:28:06:03 - 00:28:50:20

the result of the sort of widespread disability across the whole. Yeah. So it's not just about the individual viewpoint, but it's about the spread of views and that influences the visual character and the scenic quality of the area. So in terms of the differences between the landscape character and the visual amenity in landscape character, it's it's more about the overall visual impression and your appreciation of the scenic quality, which in this case is very much there's this combination of this juxtaposition of the sea and the land views across Colwyn Bay through all to graceful.

00:28:51:29 - 00:29:16:00

So we feel that over that that area there will be a lot of views and it will affect the character and it will also impact on the tranquillity and remoteness to some extent from the uplands. So there are lots of views from ridges and high ground. And again, as I say, it's just a sort of combination of the coast and the sea that make this area particularly special.

00:29:17:09 - 00:29:31:03

Okay, thank you very much. That I'm the land use consultant. Documents said that they'd only be impacts on the northern parts of the LCA. I know that's not your that wasn't your part of your submission but is that is that your view as well?

00:29:31:11 - 00:29:38:18

Sorry I missed the adjective on the non on the something parts. I missed the word before parts. Northern parts of the northern parts.

00:29:38:24 - 00:29:48:06

LCA is only the northern parts which would be affected according to the land use consultants. I know that's not your submission, but is that your view as well?

00:29:50:05 - 00:30:02:10

So we're not we're not exclusively focused on the northern areas, but it's fair to say that the northern the the impact on the experience in that northern area is a particular concern. It's certainly a point of emphasis in our advice to you.

00:30:03:09 - 00:30:06:27

Okay. Thank you. With that and let's just respond on that.

00:30:08:02 - 00:30:36:15

Linda Thompson for the applicant. I think it's fair to say that following the Section 42 consultation Footwear and RW provided the same advice and that they considered the areas within LC one, which does have some visibility. I wonder if it'd be useful if we could just draw up a figure of 16, which is the Z TV LCA Part one please.

00:30:42:27 - 00:30:45:09

So B the second cheat is.

00:30:49:12 - 00:30:52:15

So can we zoom in slightly onto LC one?

00:30:56:00 - 00:31:31:10

So with SLV as a component of the environmental statement, we we looked at all parts of LC one where there was the potential for visibility, and I think we provided further justification for why we didn't consider the visibility from within. What you can see there is not widespread visibility across LC one, but it is predominantly from some high points and bridges. For example, the western areas we felt were very much and also influenced by views out to sea up towards Anglesey.

00:31:32:08 - 00:32:11:24

And there are many parts of the of the bridges in the eastern part of the area where there is further visibility into the valleys to the east and also further visibility of the high ground to the not. The south is also very much a component of the character of of the landscape within LC. One is when you come to the northern parts there where there is the visibility and we've discussed previously the the characteristics are more definitively defined by having some views of existing development from those northern parts.

00:32:12:02 - 00:32:32:20

And for those reasons there are different reasons and rationale for why those areas of theoretical visibility have different reasons for that. I've set out in their self for why I don't think that visibility combines to meet a significant effect on landscape character.

00:32:33:15 - 00:32:34:26

Okay, thank you for that.

00:32:36:27 - 00:32:59:10

That keeps moving on to the 5.44, the Isle of Anglesey County Council. The l g c review suggested moderate significant rather moderate non-significant effects from 3.44. But neither Anglesey County Council nor the l u c review materially expand on this. Could you please briefly just explain your reasoning

00:33:01:28 - 00:33:07:22

here? You one chance I will. Anglesey County Council. Can I refer to at least three? You might think you.

00:33:11:25 - 00:33:23:04

Paul McRae, North Wales planning authorities. Just to reiterate about our report, we're you know, we're we're providing a review rather than a.

00:33:24:21 - 00:33:29:16

A separate assessment in relation to 2.44.

00:33:31:09 - 00:33:32:21

We understand this is.

00:33:34:14 - 00:33:48:17

At a sensitive location. It's obviously within the castle. But I think it's I think it was suggested that it was not somewhere taken from not somewhere that was publicly accessible within the castle.

00:33:50:05 - 00:33:55:02

So I can't comment on how representative it is. As a few points

00:33:56:17 - 00:33:57:15

I am.

00:33:59:26 - 00:34:21:06

In terms of of the the effects. I think, you know, we've queried the the way that moderate effects can sometimes be significant and sometimes non-significant. So our approach would tend to be to. Take a precautionary stance and suggest that the moderate effects are significant.

00:34:22:22 - 00:34:46:12

And it was just in our. Finding in relation to that was. To just flag that up as something that could potentially be queried. And we're noting that that the other moderate effects on Anglesea are all considered significant within the self I am and that there is.

00:34:48:12 - 00:34:56:23

There is perhaps a slightly lower magnitude of change at this location due to the different focus of the views from the castle.

00:34:59:15 - 00:35:04:19

Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCray, for that. I'd like to say anything about that.

00:35:05:24 - 00:35:47:25

Well, yes. Mr. McCrea is correctly pointed out that this a few pointers from an accessible area for the public. It was originally requested as a cultural heritage viewpoint, but we were asked to also assess it as from as a visual viewpoint. And the accessible areas by the public are actually sited farther to the south. So they have to see over the section of wall to be able to obtain any views, which then adds and further and screening and other parts of the view that mean that you wouldn't get such visibility of only more from those publicly accessible locations.

00:35:48:06 - 00:36:24:21

Putting that aside, our our threshold for moderate effects being significant or difficult. As pointed out by LGC has actually not changed the combinations of of magnitude of change and sensitivity have not changed since the air the so the threshold hasn't altered. We maintain that there has to be a degree of professional judgment and the assessments of the medium area of those combinations, which has long been unchanged since air.

00:36:25:09 - 00:36:35:06

And so coming back to the effect and this view and the magnitude of change, I think you can see there and the degree of magnitude of change,

00:36:37:01 - 00:36:42:26

you're looking over a view that has been extensively modified by modern

00:36:44:17 - 00:37:15:25

aspects of development so that the views that are in other directions across the streets and to the Snowdonia and indeed in the other direction across the settlement of Wattle and sorry Beaumaris are much more likely to attract your attention because that is just not a key direction of the view. And from this viewpoint because of those what is essentially poor ground and ground clutter with a view.

00:37:16:03 - 00:37:19:15

And that's why I determined that the effect would be non-significant.

00:37:20:08 - 00:37:21:16

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:37:23:17 - 00:37:34:09

Okay. If you move on to the next bullet point, which was artificial lighting and night time effects, can you please briefly explain about directional intensity?

00:37:36:14 - 00:37:42:15

And you say that as a result of directional intensity, there would be a lower light intensity than assessed within the salvia.

00:37:44:09 - 00:37:51:11

I wonder if that applies to all areas of land over there. Also the significant factor reported in respect of the great old.

00:37:53:23 - 00:38:24:19

So this is quite a complicated subject. So the Civil Aviation Authority, I set out the requirements for the aviation lighting. And one of the requirements is that the the the vertical extent of the light emitted does not go too far below the horizontal. And I understand the reason for that is so that it doesn't avoid a confusion with marine navigation.

00:38:25:12 - 00:38:31:06

So that's a reason it's that that is not a mitigation. It's actually a requirement. Above the

00:38:32:21 - 00:39:03:00

above the horizontal. There's also requirements of where the light is most intense, but they suggest that it has to be of an intensity within and to a number of degrees above and below the horizontal. But it also reduces above the horizontal an angle. But it's very difficult to determine from the different lighting manufacturers to what degree that light falls off, if you like, above the horizontal. But we know that it would.

00:39:03:08 - 00:39:40:11

So we know that the highest intensity of lighting has to be within three degrees either side of the horizontal I am. And that that would mean the areas that are sitting at lower lying would be lower. There would be no possibility of it being higher than what's been assessed because those light parameters that are set by the sea and would arise in relation to the 200 or the 2000 Candela, whichever light source was being used at the time, depending on the visibility conditions.

00:39:40:21 - 00:39:48:28

I see. So there's no effect on the of the effects from the great on in terms of in terms of lights I'm lighting effects. So it would be.

00:39:49:00 - 00:39:55:03

To reduce to reduce that it would reduce the effect rather than making it any worse.

00:39:56:14 - 00:39:58:12

Yet there still be a significant effect though.

00:39:58:29 - 00:40:00:24

From the base of the great. Yeah.

00:40:01:02 - 00:40:24:24

Okay. Thank you. And we observed some the nighttime lighting of these of the existing offshore wind farms earlier this week from relevant viewpoints. Do you know the intensity of the lights on those on the wind farms? They also operating at the minimum. So it was fairly clear night. Would they be operating at 200 Candela?

00:40:25:25 - 00:40:44:08

I believe that would be right. Light operating at 2000 Candela. So the mitigation and the outs allowed the c. E to permit the reduction in the Candela, they're noting, has only come in recently to try and reduce the potential for nighttime effects.

00:40:44:10 - 00:40:53:29

So what we were seeing, what would be seen with the well, a more would be a reduced lighting intensity. Well. Yes. The other wind farms display it.

00:40:54:02 - 00:40:54:17

Yes.

00:40:55:29 - 00:40:58:00

By some tenfold.

00:40:58:04 - 00:40:58:27

Yeah. Yeah.

00:40:59:04 - 00:41:03:17

Okay. Thank you. And in terms of requirement three to

00:41:05:13 - 00:41:34:22

my question was going to be is the lowest lighting intensity, 200 Candela. But it does it depends on weather conditions. So you can't specify in the figure because it changes dependent. The actual light emitted from the source is different changes because of different lighting or different color conditions or fog. So I can't specify 200 Candela in the DCA because it will necessarily be that from land. That's the maximum that you would experience.

00:41:37:09 - 00:41:56:15

I think I think what we've said is that during low visibility conditions, the 2000 Candela light would be switched on, but there would be an understanding that those low visibility conditions would also affect the degree to which the 2000 Candela was visible from the coast.

00:41:56:29 - 00:42:01:16

And so we don't specify a figure in the DCA because it would change effectively.

00:42:01:18 - 00:42:02:03

But yes.

00:42:02:09 - 00:42:05:06

From land you'd only ever see 200 Candela.

00:42:05:24 - 00:42:46:14

Well, I didn't quite see that because you we are assuming that the 2000 Candela would be reduced to some degree by the time you got to the land. But we're also understanding that the 2000 Candela will only be worn infrequently and due to climatic conditions. So that if there was over 200 candela to be visible and which is possible given that we don't understand completely what the the reduction and visibility is going to be caused by climatic conditions, then that would be an infrequent occurrence by the time we got to the coast.

00:42:46:16 - 00:42:47:20

Okay. I understand.

00:42:47:26 - 00:42:55:14

And the process that has been agreed by what you see as a as a reasonable way to deal with that mitigation.

00:42:56:06 - 00:43:05:08

Classic within our W and any other North Wales local authorities, they're satisfied with that condition which was amended at deadline to, I think.

00:43:07:19 - 00:43:10:01

We have no concerns to express about that condition.

00:43:10:03 - 00:43:17:26

I met requirements or requirements idea. Okay. Is there any other North Wales local authorities would like to comment on that?

00:43:20:07 - 00:43:24:00

Okay. I'm saying that with the hands up. So I'm sorry.

00:43:26:06 - 00:43:27:27

Thanks. Yes. Sorry.

00:43:28:14 - 00:43:41:19

Thank you. Just a quick question. So the 2000 candidates, what if it comes on in these foggy conditions or what have you? How is that controlled? Is that an automatic thing based on light sensors or is it done manually?

00:43:42:05 - 00:43:42:20

Just

00:43:44:12 - 00:44:00:01

I understand that sensors are fixed to pre determined turbines. That would be an array and that would then switch the the lights to 2000. Candela, I can see nodding again. Okay.

00:44:00:14 - 00:44:31:24

Okay. Thank you. Thanks. Okay. Thank you. So moving on to the next bullet point, which was the draft of a development consent order and parameters for this virus in question questions this issue specific what around the array parameters set out in requirement two of the draft DCO on the concerns of interested parties, the applicant made some changes to requirements, so including specifying that the parameters must accord with those assessed in the Yes.

00:44:32:20 - 00:44:54:18

And the applicant also highlighted that it's the maximum total swept area which would control the number and size of turbines. Is that correct? Yep. Yes. So I just want to ask about W and any other parties, whether they have any concerns with the applicant's view on that particular matter.

00:44:55:20 - 00:44:58:12

We've nothing to raise on this, so we're content. Thank you.

00:44:59:12 - 00:45:00:19

Okay. Is there anybody

00:45:02:05 - 00:45:04:20

virtually who has any concerns about that?

00:45:08:06 - 00:45:09:20

Okay. I'm seeing their hands raised.

00:45:11:05 - 00:45:21:09

So if Mr. Stevens. Or could you pull up appendix Q of your responses to our written questions, please?

00:45:23:26 - 00:45:36:00

So Appendix Q to Rep 1-007 provides a table to show the different design scenarios which have the same total windswept area.

00:45:38:08 - 00:46:08:08

I'm like, I just like to ask the parties present whether they're satisfied that the. Of these scenarios. It is a maximum design design scenario A and maximum design scenario B, which represents a worst case,

i.e. those which have been considered within the seascape landscape. Visual impact Assessment. It's quite low, though. I don't think we have it just on one slide if it's easier.

00:46:12:02 - 00:46:31:14

So while the other parties are discussing this issue on behalf of the applicant and that the as I understand it, the establishment of the MDR A and B scenario is for the purpose of the assessment was something that was discussed in quite a lot of detail in the evidence. The evidence topic groups for the application.

00:46:31:16 - 00:46:41:08

That was before this tape was produced though. So I'm just wanting to clarify whether policies satisfy that and say under this they would represent the worst case within this table.

00:46:41:21 - 00:46:43:03

We are indeed dep.

00:46:43:15 - 00:46:46:12

Okay, and any other parties wish to comment.

00:46:49:01 - 00:46:49:16

Okay.

00:46:51:05 - 00:46:58:02

All right. Is there any reason this table can't be included within the draft development consent order?

00:46:59:21 - 00:47:34:21

So let's start on a half napkin, and I think I'm not sure it's very helpful in that respect. If it was provided to demonstrate, I think, how the total swept area operates in terms of the kind of using it as a if you've got 43 turbines, there'll be 272.1 metres maximum to tip. It isn't necessarily going to work in that way because the turbines that are available within those parameters,

00:47:36:18 - 00:48:02:21

there'll be a range in terms of, of which they are and they won't directly correlate to each of those numbers. Say that you've got the total swept area there. So I think we would say that the parameters that are in the DCO at the moment in table three in requirement two are sufficient to to place that control without that being need needing to be there as a as a sort of certified document.

00:48:04:09 - 00:48:17:02

Okay. But. So that might that might represent what's happened now. But in three years time, when it's if his belt there might be 42 at a different size 2275.

00:48:17:25 - 00:48:20:13

Which would still fall within that total swept area.

00:48:21:25 - 00:48:26:27

But it wasn't. The number of turbines directly relates to the. So it could only be

00:48:28:13 - 00:48:29:18

those are the numbers and it.

00:48:31:13 - 00:48:33:29

So you would definitely not be more.

00:48:37:06 - 00:48:38:14

To attend the speech.

00:48:42:00 - 00:48:49:08

Charles Williams on behalf of the applicant. So in your example, if there are 42 turbines, then the.

00:48:49:16 - 00:48:50:12

Maximum.

00:48:50:14 - 00:48:51:27

Rotor diameter will.

00:48:51:29 - 00:48:52:21

Not be more than.

00:48:52:23 - 00:49:04:11

275.3 meters. And the point my colleague is making is that the individual size that might be available at the time might not be exactly those numbers.

00:49:05:05 - 00:49:07:17

But will be less than that maximum number.

00:49:08:22 - 00:49:19:12

Yeah, so it's a maximum. So why can't this type be included in the DCI? Because it will only be one of those effectively one of those scenarios. I suppose one of the points on this is

00:49:21:08 - 00:49:31:11

might there be a situation where there's a variety of turbine sizes so you may have 20 at one size of it? Where does the DCI control that

00:49:32:26 - 00:49:39:07

and might that have additional visual effects if, you know, ethanol, constant consistent sizes?

00:49:59:09 - 00:50:04:15

John Sims Williams on behalf of the applicant. So all of the turbines within the wind farm will.

00:50:04:17 - 00:50:05:19

Have the same.

00:50:05:21 - 00:50:06:10

Rotor times.

00:50:07:00 - 00:50:08:26

Doesn't say that anywhere in the DCI.

00:50:14:02 - 00:50:51:08

So I don't know how that can. It does, however, say that the that the parameters must be in accordance with the environmental statement undertaken. And in no place have we assessed different maximum turbine heights. So we haven't in any place said what would happen if we. The s is predicated on there being a single hub height for those turbines. And what we've done through the MDC and MDC space scenarios is to say in agreement with with the parties, this is what the maximum this is what the.

00:50:51:19 - 00:51:11:19

The smallest number of the biggest number of smallest turbines would be. And this is what the. This is what the smallest number of largest turbines would be. But in no place do we assess different heights. And therefore I would suggest we wouldn't be able to install different pipe turbines because that hasn't been assessed within the environmental statement.

00:51:11:21 - 00:51:20:17

Okay. So could you include something in the d C I said something like. And all when w t G's would be of a consistent height or something.

00:51:22:23 - 00:51:46:12

So we could do. It's not something that's been raised by any of the parties apart from yourself so far. And it's not something we would typically say. If it if it's a key issue, then we can certainly look at adding something in. But I think I would again say that within the environmental statement, it's quite clear that we are assessing. A single turbine type across the wind farm.

00:51:46:19 - 00:51:50:28

Okay. And just one last question on that was, should there be a minimum site if you're

00:51:52:17 - 00:51:55:06

you've got maximum size in the DCO.

00:51:57:25 - 00:51:59:21

What prevents there being

00:52:01:08 - 00:52:03:15

more turbines of even a less life?

00:52:04:23 - 00:52:10:17

So because we haven't assessed that in the environmental statement either, and therefore we'd say it will fall within a.

00:52:13:24 - 00:52:19:16

The question was what would stop us doing more than 50 small turbines?

00:52:19:29 - 00:52:30:04

So I, I know what you're assessing. The end of the day, the CEO should have his own controls over what could actually be built. So I'm just maybe something for you to to think about

00:52:31:24 - 00:52:32:09

with

00:52:34:21 - 00:52:35:06

policy.

00:52:35:08 - 00:52:50:11

So we do have a maximum number. We do have a maximum number of wind turbine generators as parameters, which is 50, and therefore we can't go below that. So we can't go above that. I'm getting confused now.

00:52:52:02 - 00:52:53:29

Yeah. Okay, fine. Thank you.

00:52:57:14 - 00:53:17:03

So maybe go down to the gray area and mitigation matters. We also sequester one point 17.19, which was around the potential to relocate some of the turbines, such as the westernmost ones, into other parts of the Ouray area, such as eastern parts. It might be worth bringing up figure 8pp191,

00:53:21:00 - 00:53:53:15

which seems to indicate there's some space on the sort of eastern part of the array. You, the applicant respondents say that the gray area could not be reduced further to mitigate effects without a significant reduction in the project's outputs. And to relocate the westernmost turbines would reduce the size of the gray area and energy outputs. Well, we weren't saying reduce the number of turbines in this figure. We're saying if you look at the western parts, we can go into more and a well or more.

00:53:53:18 - 00:53:55:18

There's there seems to be a gap.

00:53:57:06 - 00:54:30:01

So the four westernmost turbines, the question was. Can they be? Why can they not be relocated where those where that kind of gap is? Is there is there a reason for that? Paul KARLSTROM Behalf of the applicant. Yes, there is a reason. I mean, one of the reasons is that the agreeing for this boundary or the blue or purple boundary you can see here in the figure is right up against the existing green to more boundary. Now, clearly we can't put turbines on the edge of our boundary, right.

00:54:30:03 - 00:54:32:17

The consequence more that has to be a natural separation between

00:54:34:04 - 00:55:07:20

the two wind farms in order to include the requisite distance from from road to turbines, as you can see in the green small layout. And as you can see in the Alamo now, there's quite a separation between the turbines and the larger turbines getting agreed to. That separation is if you were to relocate those Western turbines, you'd be putting them right adjacent to the Winton Autobahn and you wouldn't have the requisite separation distance. I think it's also worth saying, and I think we made this point in our response that the layouts that we've included are indicative layouts.

00:55:07:22 - 00:55:29:15

They are not to be as built layouts and perhaps in the final layout there might be a turbine that fills some of that area with requisite set back from when to move. And nothing in this precludes that. So that's the top on the top border on the Far East, the yellow is yellow. Know just to the east of that, there seems to be

00:55:31:02 - 00:56:02:12

a gap between that turbine and winter more so. So I'm just trying to find out what there must be a reason why you haven't suggested putting a turbine in that spot. So if if we were to change this layouts and put it on there, it would just spread the write out layout slightly more. It would decrease the density of the turbines. We wouldn't just relocate the turbine from that. We would use the whole consented area in order to spread the turbines out to decrease the density of the array.

00:56:02:19 - 00:56:04:18

One of the points we made in our response is that

00:56:06:14 - 00:56:45:15

the array that we have got here and that we're looking to bring forward for consent is already relatively small relative to other wind farms that are being developed at the moment and that we need to compete against in order to be able to bring this project forward, to win a contract for difference and to be able to develop it. So and reducing the area would have a significant effect, increasing the density of the array, placing the turbines in a in an F a smaller area and would have a detrimental effect on the levelized cost of energy, on the energy yield, on the benefits of the project effectively, and on our ability to to bring it forward through a contract for difference.

00:56:45:17 - 00:56:50:13

So it has an impact on the viability of the project. Right. Okay. Thank you.

00:56:55:01 - 00:57:13:27

So you you gave us a reason why you couldn't say you gave the reason why you couldn't reduce the scope. So there's no scope to reduce the scope of the proposed development to mitigate seascape landscape visual effects to the to the scale. Let's say Snowdonia National Park and Natural Resource Wales are suggesting

00:57:16:13 - 00:57:34:08

because check with Natural Resources Wales, that you were satisfied with the response from the applicants on that in terms of that sort of effectively to reduce it, basically what would need to be reduced by such significant scale, it would affect the viability of the project in order to reduce the significant effects that are being recorded.

00:57:35:12 - 00:58:08:24

And we're not, I'm afraid, satisfied with that answer. I say at the outset we've had a highly constructive relationship with the with the applicant, but on this matter we do, I'm afraid, respectfully disagree. And the it is not within the remit of any of you to comment on matters of economic viability. So I won't venture into that territory other than to say, and I hope it's fair to say this, that the evidence that has been provided in relation to economic viability does appear somewhat limited.

00:58:09:09 - 00:58:15:07

Now you will have to reach your own judgment, of course, on that. And

00:58:17:06 - 00:58:55:13

our role in this process is to advise you on whether in relation to the seascape landscape and visual effects there has been do you regard had to rather than policy and guidance we have highlighted to you where there is a difference of opinion between us about the assessment of effects. It is certainly our view and our judgments that sufficient efforts have not been made to minimise the harm in the context of the highly protective landscape designations that we're dealing with.

00:58:55:15 - 00:59:08:08

In this case, we acknowledge that the Western extent of the array has been reduced and that there's been a reduction in the number of turbines when compared with what was originally

00:59:10:08 - 00:59:44:13

proposed for the site. But we don't consider that sufficient to reduce to an appropriate level the likely significant effects that the numerous viewpoints that we have identified within the Isle of Anglesey and B and the Snowdonia National Park. And indeed, in fairness to the applicant, the environmental statement acknowledges that the likely significant effects on those landscapes haven't materially diminished because of the reduction in the extent and number of those turbines.

00:59:44:27 - 01:00:19:05

So it remains our advice within our remit and from our perspective that a further substantial reduction in the Ouray area and in the number of turbines would be needed to appropriately minimise adverse effects on the Isle of Anglesey, Aonb and the Snowdonia National Park. We have sought to assist in that effort by advising the applicant from an early stage to undertake the three stage approach in the so-called White Report that I'm sure we'll come on to discuss later.

01:00:20:08 - 01:00:28:23

It's fair to say we are disappointed. I think that there was not more by way of engagement with that technical guidance.

01:00:30:24 - 01:00:40:23

But equally, you know, also fair to say that matters of economic viability, we don't consider it to be within our remit to advise you on those.

01:00:41:01 - 01:00:57:03

Okay. Thank you. And the white trickle so that the turbines are located in the area of medium sensitivity. So they were taken out of the high sensitivity or medium high inputs within the medium low. Does that did that not allay any of your concerns at all?

01:00:57:27 - 01:01:34:00

And it doesn't allay concerns, given our judgments on the significant effects, the number of them and the extent of them. And there is a as you've seen from our most recent representations, there is a real concern on our side that there wasn't due engagement, we say with the technical advice in those reports. We note, of course, that there's been an attempt made recently to state a case in relation to that guidance and we were grateful for that and we note it.

01:01:35:05 - 01:01:52:09

But fair to say, I think that it comes rather late in the process when we would say that having flagged up this guidance from an early stage, that the proposal would have benefited from earlier engagement with that advice, which we say would have

01:01:54:03 - 01:02:07:00

and should have informed the approach taken and would we say very probably have led to a reduction or at least a reduction in the extent of the array of number of turbines?

01:02:07:08 - 01:02:15:12

Okay. Thank you. And just one last thing on the White report. What status does that have? The guidance documents reserve adopted policy document.

01:02:15:19 - 01:02:55:09

It is technical guidance published by A.W. on its website. So so it is entirely fair to say that it is not a guidance that's been adopted or endorsed by Welsh Government. We wouldn't call it a policy document as such. The appropriate description for it, I think would be technical guidance that in our W commissioned in order to inform and assist developers with judgments that need to be made, anticipating that there would be very probably a number of applications of this nature being brought forward in and around Wales in the years to come.

01:02:55:20 - 01:03:27:16

So it's technical guidance that we say should be given considerable weight because of the authority of the consultants that produced it, because of the extent to which the assessment drew upon existing work done on other projects in relation to seascape and landscape impact assessment issues. It's true to say that it has not been the subject of peer review directly. But we say that because it draws so extensively on

01:03:29:01 - 01:04:03:16

available evidence produced for other schemes, it is clearly not a document that's been produced in the abstract or in isolation. It is a document that has sought to draw learning from a considerable number of other projects. And indeed it is our experience that developers on other projects are finding this document to be helpful and are using it. And it is unfortunate perhaps that that that wasn't that that that has not occurred to the extent that we would have liked here.

01:04:04:12 - 01:04:08:19

Okay. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to respond to that briefly, please?

01:04:09:03 - 01:04:19:09

Briefly, sir, I think is it there are a few points to make, and I think there are some important points that we need to make about the white report in terms of the

01:04:21:06 - 01:05:01:03

noted that it is a guidance document from. And notably, I think it's also important to note that it wasn't consulted on. As far as we're aware, it was a guidance note that was commissioned and then put in place by a notably without consultation wider on it. And it is something that the applicants been aware of and it was raised by another it was discussed through the evidence working groups and clearly the changes that were made to the western extent of the array have very much reflected the sensitivity that's identified in the White report.

01:05:02:29 - 01:05:30:09

It is also it is it is addressed, albeit at a higher level in the environmental statement. And yes, we've only recently put the detailed note into the examination looking at that. But it's very certainly been something that the applicant has been aware of and has had regard to in terms of just where we need to draw out some of the perhaps issues about the the White report.

01:05:32:02 - 01:05:50:19

Ms.. Thompson was involved in some of the projects that clearly were part of that, and we can talk to that if it's helpful in terms of it being drawn on on other projects. I just I think there are some just very important points to to draw out about the light report. So

01:05:52:06 - 01:06:26:06

we've set this out in our response, which was our deadline three response. It's our document reference. 316 But clearly that's that's in there. There's just a few points I would want to to draw out it. The brief of the note was to research and map buffers for different types of turbines that would be required to avoid significant adverse effects on high sensitivity coastal receptors. So it is clearly working at that. And of how do we avoid any sensitive, sensitive effects.

01:06:27:17 - 01:07:22:06

And the conclusions of that report were that in order to avoid those significant effects on a home base and Snowdonia national park and turbines of the size that we are proposing here, the maximum height of three, three, two metres to tip would have to be 44 kilometres away from designated landscapes. And for those 282, which is the bottom end of the envelope, those would have to be more than 41.6 kilometres away. So to some extent further distance from obviously the Ouray area that has been granted by the Crown estate for this extension project and the distance range where they are really more site is significant effect within within the approach they take would arise even for turbines of 145 metres to tip.

01:07:23:05 - 01:07:53:17

And as we said in our in our note, the most recent offshore development on this North Wales coast is by boat bank extension and the turbines there are 187 metres to tip. So whilst we kind of understand and I'll double you seeking to commission this, it simply doesn't have regard to the size of turbines that are currently available on the market and the drive and, and movement that they'll be.

01:07:53:19 - 01:08:36:00

We've talked about that about actually the size of offshore wind turbines increasing. I think it's also really important to note that with the larger turbines you get a much greater power output. And for projects like this, actually one of the key considerations is maximising the power output from a scheme like this. It's it's you clearly have to balance the impacts on the environment against those. But where there is an opportunity to deliver significant outputs in terms of power, it is my view and I think shared by others that actually we're in a sense, given the current climate emergency, almost under an obligation to do that.

01:08:36:12 - 01:08:58:10

So what we've what the applicant has sought to do is to make those changes to the area where that where that is possible to draw that area back from the east of most stage where there is the greatest sensitivity. But with respect to A.W. and its advice, it simply doesn't reflect the size and scale of turbines that are coming onto the market.

01:08:59:28 - 01:09:01:27

Is there anything more than about the and.

01:09:02:08 - 01:09:03:00

The projects that we.

01:09:03:02 - 01:09:03:17

Used?

01:09:06:09 - 01:09:43:14

If there is a point within the White Report suggest that a small number of turbines may be appropriate course to go into more, suggesting also that they could be would be most beneficial to the north of Gwent and more than where we understand it to be extensive constraints and ensure in relation to the shipping line. And so that was not a possible area to be selected for the extension to go into more as it is through the native release process and and a small number of turbines.

01:09:43:16 - 01:10:30:06

I'm just not within the realms of economic viability and, and and we considered even the white report itself would suggest that there would still be significant effects at the range even with small number of turbines. And even if all the number of turbines were located as far away as possible from the coast, we did look at that within the response that we've most recently submitted. And within this the small site, the smaller turbine range would look like that we could maybe get 17 turbines with a not for this part of the array area and that the realms of that will just not be economically viable for the applicant to be even.

01:10:30:09 - 01:10:55:29

Considering that. And although that part of the site would be furthest away from the coast, you would still have the same horizontal extent that we've been trying to to reduce. So it's not really clear where or how many turbines. The substantial reduction would include, but it seems that that's a substantial reduction is just not a possibility.

01:10:56:26 - 01:10:59:06

Okay. Thank you for your answer.

01:11:00:26 - 01:11:27:20

Forecast from the Upton. Could I just just that vaccinated. There was a comment from a notably that if we had engaged further with the technical evidence from the white report that we would have reduced the project size further. I think we just wanted to sort of say we were considering the white reports in the work that we did and the reductions that we made. And what has got us to the position of the at the boundary that we've included in the application

01:11:29:14 - 01:11:46:27

so that there wouldn't have been a further reduction if we had considered the white report in any greater detail. And of course we were considering it in the work that we that we did and as had been outlined by Mr. Thompson. And you know, we were Coggins is cognizant of that as we were as we were making the boundary cuts that we presented.

01:11:48:12 - 01:11:57:00

Okay. Thank you. I've got two more questions before we break for lunch. Is everyone happy to continue? So moving on to cumulative matters.

01:11:58:17 - 01:12:08:13

So from the responses from our written questions, we're aware that the mood and Morgan Wind farms have recently been provided with scoping opinions from the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State.

01:12:10:01 - 01:12:51:05

That's taken notes of. These are high level documents. And given this lack of detailed information, an able to undertake a meaningful coherence of assessments in respect of them. According to the planning inspectors advice Note 17 relating to cumulative effects, these projects fall into Tier two, where such an assessment should be provided where possible. Please explain why on the basis of information available, which may include potential numbers and sizes of turbines and cable roosting as was addressed in the scoping report and scoping opinion for one or more, Is it not possible for the applicant to provide some form of cumulative assessment in respect of these projects?

01:12:52:17 - 01:13:11:23

So this is done on behalf of the applicant and we are aware that the minor project has has been into scoping and that was 15th of June. So it was after this application was submitted and all were aware that in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate advice note

01:13:13:14 - 01:13:53:17

that would now fall into tier two. I think we have reviewed that and maintain the position that there's been no refinement to any of the boundaries or parameters that were used for effectively the bidding process. Those projects have scoped quite early In terms of what I'm sorry, man has got quite early in terms of the the shaping of of its development. And there isn't anything we can update at this stage. We are keeping it under review and we are very aware of of the issues that have arisen in terms of cumulative impact assessment on projects that are coming forward at the same time.

01:13:54:19 - 01:14:32:21

And if there is sufficient information provided for us to undertake a meaningful came into the assessment before the close of this examination or indeed before the decision, that that will be done. But at the moment we don't consider that there is sufficient information available to be able to do that in a meaningful way. We're also very aware, again, not it is that those projects will be assessing our Lismore in a high degree of detail as they come forward because that information is available about this project as it's as there's a clearly a defined application.

01:14:34:19 - 01:14:38:14

Okay. Thank you. Did any parties here want comments on that?

01:14:39:09 - 01:14:42:23

That's all the further coming from us at this stage, but.

01:14:44:02 - 01:14:46:09

Okay. And nobody virtually.

01:14:50:27 - 01:14:53:12

But. Okay. Thank you. And then finally,

01:14:55:12 - 01:15:21:06

the potential for off site enhancement matters. So can you please provide an update in respect to the position on potential off sites enhancements to Designated landscapes? Setting out what form these this may take, what it might involve, at what stage negotiations are at. And to what extent any agreement would be a material consideration for the examining authority. Starts with the applicant.

01:15:22:07 - 01:15:24:18

Thank you. So I think Mr. Carter is going to pick this up.

01:15:26:15 - 01:16:00:00

Carter on behalf of the applicant. So we've had some initial discussions with an RW and a number of the North Wales local authorities. We have a meeting on the 17th of November where we have an initial discussion around some scope, some principles that a landscape enhancement fund might look at the sorts of projects and areas that it might look at and some actions have been taken away from that for us to review and to refine some potential proposals.

01:16:00:12 - 01:16:32:18

I think our sort of headline position is that we are willing in principle to put in place a landscape enhancement fund or a fund that is able to bring forward enhancements to designated areas. But obviously that's subject to reaching agreement with the relevant parties on what it covers and what the size of that fund is. So we need to go through those discussions and get to the point where there's an agreeable solution for all parties before we can say that that will be something that will be coming forward.

01:16:32:24 - 01:16:55:29

But we are very much committed to having those discussions to go through that process and to hopefully finding an agreed position. Okay. I think if you got some of the meeting lined up with the North Wales local authorities, we haven't got a meeting date in place, but we have said we will try and meet here before Christmas already in the new Year. Okay. And we would therefore like to be able to update you at, I think, the deadline for at the end of January.

01:16:57:29 - 01:17:16:13

Okay. So in terms of the form, it would be a fund and negotiations, a fairly early stage, basically, is that that's that's what you're saying? Correct. Yes. Okay. And then if and if the parties like to comment on that.

01:17:17:05 - 01:17:36:00

So, yes, we welcome those discussions. We are somewhat concerned about the pace with which these negotiations are progressing because as we see it, this is a case in which the number extent and significance of the effects on the two designated

01:17:37:23 - 01:18:15:24

protected areas are such that this is clearly a case in which enhancement measures not only should, but really must be considered. That we say, is clear in the light of policy. s0c06 of the Welsh National Marine Plan. So we're very grateful to the applicant for its confirmation that it is committed to those discussions. We have had input ourselves into the process as to what that contribution could look like and what it could be spent upon.

01:18:16:12 - 01:18:21:24

By reference to the policies that flowed from what is that? If you have asked him what what is it you've suggested?

01:18:22:07 - 01:18:41:29

What is the nature of the input you say? So there's been there's been a document that's been led by the Isle of Anglesey Council into which we had input, into which we set out some suggestions as to proposals, measures that we say could be the subject of such a contribution.

01:18:42:10 - 01:18:43:15

They, for example.

01:18:43:23 - 01:19:14:02

So they include such things as measures for the restoration of traditional field boundaries, measures for the restoration and enhancement of important habitats, surveys of hedges, stone walls, etc. to identify the extent and condition of traditional field boundaries, measures to control non-native invasive species, drainage management measures for ditches, the management of car parks and points of access to conserve, tranquillity and avoid visual intrusion.

01:19:14:21 - 01:19:49:27

We have made a series, or rather, in fairness, I should say Anglesey has led the discussion, but with our input, a series of proposals has been or suggestions has been made to the applicant as to what that contribution could be spent on. Not suggesting, of course, that necessarily all of those things would need to be achieved, but we hope that that contribution has given the applicant a better sense of the type of things that we have in mind as being matters that if funded.

01:19:50:15 - 01:19:55:15

Would, in our judgment, support the purpose of conservation and enhancement of natural beauty.

01:19:55:24 - 01:19:59:25

Okay. Thank you. It's useful just to understand the kind of things that you're discussing.

01:20:00:02 - 01:20:00:17

Thank you.

01:20:01:18 - 01:20:05:22

And what I would Anglesey County Council like to comment on that is

01:20:07:10 - 01:20:34:09

you want your own standalone concerns. Council would like to echo these comments. Positive talks have been ongoing with the applicant. We have no further comment. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. And will the applicant like to respond to any of those points just made to cut somebody else? That's you know, I think I would just agree with, you know, the statements around the sorts of scope of the agreement, and that's part of the discussions that we're having.

01:20:36:06 - 01:20:54:10

Okay. Thank you. Well, thank you for all your contributions this morning. It's 6 minutes past. One will adjourn the hearing till 2:00. Yep. So until 2:00, the hearing is adjourned. Thank you.