

Heckington Fen_22 NOV_ISH4_PT1

Created on: 2023-11-22 08:52:24

Project Length: 01:16:18

File Name: Heckington Fen_22 NOV_ISH4_PT1

File Length: 01:16:18

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:29 - 00:00:06:03

Take morning.

00:00:08:22 - 00:00:42:24

I'll just confirm everybody can hear me clearly, both in the room and online, and can confirm the case. Team that live streaming and recording has commenced. Okay, it's now 10:00, and it's time for this hearing to begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this second issue specific hearing. Third issue specific hearing relating to the application made by eco Tricity hedge fund solar, who I refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the Hankinson Fen Solar Park.

00:00:43:13 - 00:01:19:18

My name is Susan Hunt. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, housing, Communities as a single examining inspector. To examine this application, you will see and hear me referred to as the Examining Authority or the Exa. I'm a Charlestown planner and a planning inspector. I'll be reporting to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net-zero, with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. Case manager for this project is Noel McGowan, who has supported Here Today by Elliott Booth and online by Case Officer Core.

00:01:21:02 - 00:01:29:15

You can contact a member of the case team if you have any queries about the examination process, or if you need any help today at the event, or with the technology.

00:01:31:01 - 00:02:08:06

Just a couple of housekeeping matters. Just remind everyone to settle their devices to silent. And I'm not aware of any fire alarm or any other tests or drills today. So in the event of an alarm, the assembly point is, is at the Sea Cadets building on Bradford Wharf. It's. Just for today. There is an event taking place in the room next door so we can't use the main lift. You have to come up to the fourth floor and then up the stairs to access the fifth floor to the room today, so don't enter the room next door.

00:02:10:16 - 00:02:18:13

This hearing will follow the agenda as published on the 13th of November. It would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you.

00:02:20:08 - 00:02:26:01

And you'll find information about the application on the project page on the National Infrastructure website.

00:02:28:11 - 00:02:47:08

Today's hearing is blended events, and some of you were present with us at the hearing venue here in Lincoln, and others are joining us virtually on Microsoft Teams, and everyone will be given fair opportunity to participate. And if I don't see you immediately on the screen, just bear with me.

00:02:49:11 - 00:02:56:23

And if you don't manage to raise a point at the relevant point on the agenda, there'll be an opportunity to do so towards the end of the hearing.

00:02:58:19 - 00:02:59:14

The recording of.

00:02:59:16 - 00:03:13:25

The hearing will be made available on the National Infrastructure Planning website, and this will include a transcript. And that's why we ask you every time you speak, to speak clearly into the microphone, state your name, who you're representing. And that should be every time you speak.

00:03:15:22 - 00:03:52:15

And I need to make everyone aware. The recording will be retained by the Planning Inspectorate for five years, because it forms a public record that contain your personal information. Switch to general data protection regulations apply. The Planning Inspectorate Privacy Notice establishes how the personal data of customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. So if there's any personal information necessary making or submissions that's better, put in a written document that we can redact before publication to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings and play space.

00:03:52:17 - 00:03:55:05

The Case Manager. If you've got any questions about this.

00:03:57:01 - 00:04:06:23

The hearing is expected to continue for much of the day, and there will be an opportunity for a break in around 90 minutes, time and again for lunch at around 1 p.m. or earlier.

00:04:08:12 - 00:04:22:05

I'm now going to ask you to introduce yourselves. And when state organizations name you state your your name, who you represent and the agenda items that you'll be speaking on. And if you wish to be addressed in a certain way.

00:04:23:24 - 00:04:27:11

Can we start with the applicants and their advisors, please?

00:04:29:05 - 00:05:02:18

Thank you. Good morning madam. Um, if it's okay with you, I'll just rattle through our team attending today. My name is Neil Bromwich. I'm a partner at law firm Osborne Clark, and I'm appearing for the applicant. To my left is Josh Taylor, who is also at Osborne Clark. And the applicant as well. To his left is Laura White. Laura is the project manager for Eco Tricity.

00:05:05:09 - 00:05:26:17

And to her left is Isabel Holland. And she is from Pegasus Group. She will be speaking. No, she's not sorry. That's been corrected. So to Laura's left is Ruddock Charnas. He's from Pegasus Group, and he'll be speaking on Landscape Matters.

00:05:27:18 - 00:05:28:03

Um.

00:05:28:11 - 00:05:35:11

To his left is Elizabeth Pratt. She's from Pegasus Group. She'll be speaking on historic environment.

00:05:37:16 - 00:05:55:09

To her left is Mark Latham of Ecosystem Group and he will be speaking on ecology. And then finally at the end of the table is Isabel Holland's Pegasus Group. And who'll be assisting on environmental matters. That's.

00:05:57:26 - 00:05:59:15

The applicants team.

00:05:59:20 - 00:06:02:06

So anybody online that will be speaking for you today?

00:06:02:12 - 00:06:12:09

Yes, madam. Sorry. And there may be others online who will introduce themselves at the appropriate time. If that's if that's okay, I won't I won't go through the whole team.

00:06:13:03 - 00:06:14:06

Yeah okay. That's fine.

00:06:15:29 - 00:06:21:17

Okay can give the relevant planning authorities, starting with Lincolnshire County Council, please.

00:06:22:25 - 00:06:24:27

Good morning, mum Stephanie Hall.

00:06:26:15 - 00:06:55:06

Happy to be Ms. Hall or Ms. Hall or whatever comes out of council. Sitting to my immediate right is Mr. Willis of Lancashire County Council. Sitting to his immediate right is Mr. Kevin Gillespie of Landscape dealing with unsurprisingly, landscape matters and on line we have Mr. Matt Adams, who's from Lincolnshire County Council, will be addressing the hearing on archaeology.

00:07:01:01 - 00:07:04:11

Account for it, not North Kesteven District Council, please.

00:07:05:11 - 00:07:37:03

My name is Shmuel Sheikh. I'm of council. I'm instructed by Miss Martha Reeves, who sits two to my right of legal services. Lincolnshire. To my immediate right is Mr. Nick Feltham, who's assistant development manager at North Stevens District Council. To my immediate left is Denise Drury, who's a senior historic environment officer at Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire and who will be dealing with archaeology. To her left is Matthew Bentley, who's a conservation officer at North Kesteven District Council and who will be dealing with aboveground heritage assets.

00:07:37:05 - 00:07:42:23

And then online we have David Broughton, who's from A.com and who will be dealing with ecology.

00:07:45:14 - 00:07:51:25

Hi. Thank you very much and welcome. And is there anyone here from Boston Borough Council today? They online.

00:08:00:21 - 00:08:05:05

Not. And watch this internal drainage board.

00:08:09:02 - 00:08:15:27

Morning, mom. Andrew. Internal drainage board observing and for responses as required.

00:08:17:01 - 00:08:18:02

Thank you. Welcome.

00:08:20:29 - 00:08:27:05

Is there anybody else that hasn't introduced themselves that wishes to speak today, either in the room or virtually?

00:08:30:02 - 00:08:31:21

Right. That's fine. I'll move on.

00:08:40:17 - 00:09:12:08

Okay, moving on to agenda item two. I'll briefly explain the purpose of today's issue specific hearing, which is being held because I wish to explore a number of matters orally in respect for a range of environmental issues. And you have already seen and replied to my first written questions, and they were issued on the 17th of October, and most of you were present at the first set of hearings at the start of the examination and at issue specific hearing three yesterday.

00:09:12:28 - 00:09:28:23

And you'll be aware that there was item number nine. And in relation to landscape, visual and residential visual matters that have been carried over to today. So we'll start on agenda item three on that matter.

00:09:30:19 - 00:09:41:08

There are no additional hearings scheduled in the examination timetable. So it's your specific hearing for. It's the last opportunity for verbal submissions.

00:09:43:06 - 00:10:05:27

And you'll see from the examination timetable, there's an opportunity for a second set of written questions, which is scheduled for the 19th of December. And that's likely to be sure to list of questions than the one issued previously, just to mop up any outstanding queries that I've got on environmental matters before an early close of the examination in February.

00:10:08:19 - 00:10:29:25

And as in the previous environmental hearings, I won't be covering every aspect of the environmental statements. And it doesn't mean I'm not giving those matters any less weight or that I'm not covering them, but either have the information I need and I don't have any further questions, or I may be asking written questions on those matters instead.

00:10:31:21 - 00:10:52:02

I will be examining information submitted by the applicant, and would also like to hear from interested parties. And just to remind you to keep presentations relatively brief, don't need to repeat at length something you've already submitted in writing. And if you wish to refer to a document, if you could give the examination library reference.

00:10:53:21 - 00:11:03:12

And for the benefit of parties here today, or watching the live stream that might not be familiar with the documents or the process, just to avoid using acronyms and abbreviations.

00:11:05:14 - 00:11:19:17

So in summary, the purpose of the hearing today is to enable the applicant and the interested parties to answer any questions I may have to ensure have all the information I need to make my recommendations to Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net zero.

00:11:22:00 - 00:11:29:25

Okay. There are any questions on procedure before I move on to agenda item three environmental matters. Yep.

00:11:33:29 - 00:11:59:06

Okay. Item three. Landscape, visual amenity and residential. Visual amenity. So I'd like firstly for the applicant to provide a summary of their case. And that's in relation to landscape visual effects in particular. And I'm responding to Lincolnshire County Council's Local impact report which is rep 1028. Thank you.

00:12:00:00 - 00:12:03:17

Thank you madam. Janice, just to respond on that matter.

00:12:05:21 - 00:12:36:07

Public chance on behalf of the applicant. Thank you madam. And having reviewed the local impact report, know there are a number of items raised by El-Sisi and would like to itemize them first. And then I'll come back to them in turn to respond to them. But there's only five of them, and I'm hoping to maybe take 1 or 2 minutes per item. So first of all, there's the position on the significant facts with regards to the methodology, assessment approach and viewpoint selection.

00:12:36:16 - 00:13:23:05

These have been agreed with the relevant planning authorities. So I understand there are no dispute there. And the only point of disagreement, if you like, is the it's not the methodology, it's the level of significance or how we interpret that definition and the value of that significance we assign to certain effects. And this is clarified in .13 of our response. And I don't want to repeat that. But in essence the three states, that is for the assessor to determine that a level of significance, the guidelines are just guidelines, is for each assessor to determine their own criteria and apply them in simple and transparent manner.

00:13:24:02 - 00:13:38:19

And methodology is quite simple. Think the three tier scale is very. What enables you to apply that assessment in a very transparent and simple way, and there's no room for any ambiguity. And also.

00:13:41:29 - 00:13:54:08

Any likely significant effects are dependent on all the factors in relation to the magnitude of change in sensitivity, and we look at them collectively and determine that level of significance. And

00:13:55:25 - 00:14:10:19

to put it simply, our position is that the significant landscape effects and visual effects are then would only occur where the key characteristics of that landscape or that view would be completely changed and redefined or removed.

00:14:12:22 - 00:14:31:19

One problem I suppose with is that they did not present their own methodology, so I'm quite unable to respond in detail to that. But should the examining authority accept that approach, that moderate effects are significant, then our assessment in chapter six

00:14:33:04 - 00:14:55:11

identifies that any significant effects would occur within the same geographical extent. In other words, major effects and moderate effects still occur within the same geographical extent. So there's an overlap. And beyond that then distance geographical distance of let's say one kilometre. To put it simply, none of those effects will be significant.

00:14:58:27 - 00:15:05:25

Some can refer to a number of viewpoints, if that's helpful, but I'm mindful of time. Shame on.

00:15:07:20 - 00:15:41:26

Thank you. So, for example, the effects of viewpoints 23.3, 3.5, 3.23 and 3.8 were all judged to be minor adverse. Um viewpoint eight at Clydebank Underhill. Some 1.6km away, was judged to be minor adverse, therefore not significant. And that proves our point, and been clarified in chapter six that the actual visual envelope of the park is very limited.

00:15:42:05 - 00:16:16:03

Any effects that we deemed to be significant are effectively limited to sidebar lane to the A17 to the south and closest viewpoint. The convention 3.8 is not judged to be significant. That's viewpoint eight is located, broadly speaking, to the East and viewpoint 22, which was started at the latest stage, which is located to the northeast, was also judged to be not significantly affected. And effectively, we end up with this visual envelope of the scheme where the significant effects are highly localised.

00:16:17:08 - 00:16:17:23

I'm.

00:16:20:17 - 00:16:50:20

I'm happy to dwell on that a bit more. But yeah, like I said, I'm mindful of time, so perhaps move on to the next item. So the three kilometre study area and effects beyond that study area. That's paragraph 7.1. 19 of the local impact report. Um, I think it's fair to say that LCC agrees with our assessment and approach. Broadly speaking, there's no dispute about the viewpoint selection or the extent of the study area.

00:16:50:22 - 00:17:17:19

That's been clarified again in chapter six quite plainly. Um, the viewpoint selection was coordinated and agreed. The forward follows that the consultees did not have any concerns in terms of the geographical extent of those viewpoints or selection in terms of receptors presented, and they did not consider any more distant viewpoints to be informative to the debate. And again, chapter six aims to focus on the most significant effects.

00:17:20:08 - 00:17:28:14

And even if those views are gained, they are unlikely to be significant, certainly beyond the one and a half to km study area.

00:17:30:27 - 00:18:02:10

Table 6.6, page 41 and 42 of chapter six and Associate Appendix 6.8, reference one, two, three and appendix 6.9, reference 125 and are quite informative and provide our detailed analysis of those viewpoints. And again, we refer to those viewpoints in terms of distances as well, which is quite useful. And again reiterates that my my point that those significant effects are highly localized.

00:18:03:11 - 00:18:15:01

Another point raised by El-Sisi is the construction and operational landscape and visual impact. The proposed development will be negative. That's in paragraph 7.1. 20.

00:18:17:23 - 00:18:58:09

Again, those effects are qualified but not quantified. We know there are adverse and and this is something we acknowledge and are transparent about in chapter six. But again, those viewpoints and those effects will be highly localized. And most importantly, the residual effects will not be significant. To introduce mitigation measures, have the ability to screen the proposed energy park

sufficiently to reduce those significant effects. Another point is the cumulative landscape and visual effects, and overlaps with other comments from in terms of cumulative developments scoped out beyond three kilometres study area.

00:18:58:27 - 00:19:06:29

And we've provided cumulative assessment at deadline too, and don't want to repeat that. I'm happy to to expand a bit more.

00:19:09:01 - 00:19:51:01

And. Chapter six, reference 59, paragraphs 6.3. 9 to 6.3 17, and paragraphs 6.4 43 to 6.4 0.51 provide a detailed and robust analysis of how we arrived at the extent of our study area, and why certain parts of that wider preliminary five kilometre study area have been omitted from further analysis. And that is quietly quite detailed, explained in terms of the northeastern and northwestern quadrant of the study area, where the level landform allows for theoretically long range views.

00:19:51:03 - 00:20:41:02

But in reality the intervening hedgerows and trees and build form the large scale of the landscape diminish any change of of perceptual change. And lastly residential visual amenity negative effects during the construction and operational phase, which is on page 44 of the layout and table 7.4 of chapter seven, reference 61 identifies collectively 22 receptors which would be affected to the significant significantly affected at year one and again, the introduced mitigation measures, in this case largely hedgerows between three, three and a half and sections of five metre high hedgerows, and would assist in reducing those effects to moderate adverse visual effects.

00:20:41:04 - 00:21:02:08

And those effects are not significant. And I think it's important to recognize that the main purpose of the residential visual amenity assessment was not necessarily to identify major effects, but to identify whether any of those effects are overbearing. And in the case of Harrington, Fan and Park, those effects would not be overbearing.

00:21:03:27 - 00:21:04:12

Thank you.

00:21:06:04 - 00:21:07:13

Okay. Thank you very much.

00:21:26:14 - 00:21:54:05

Yeah. In terms of viewpoints. Don't wish to ask any further questions, because I see that the relevant planning authorities have confirmed in both in their local impact reports and their answers to first written questions, that the selection of viewpoints are appropriate. So don't wish to ask any further questions on points. Um, so in this comprehensive summary from yourself, um.

00:21:55:24 - 00:22:01:04

This is a couple of questions for Lancashire County Council, Miss Mr. Gillespie.

00:22:06:01 - 00:22:07:01

So.

00:22:08:18 - 00:22:31:03

The answer to 1.3 in the first written questions, which is about the justification for the classification of significance of the facts. And Lincolnshire County Council consider that it's downplayed and. The applicant provided a response to that and. Their answer to

00:22:32:27 - 00:22:47:27

be LV 1.3. And in their answers to written questions. Rep 2077. And just wanted Lincolnshire's response to the applicant's response basically on the significance place.

00:22:49:09 - 00:22:49:24

Thank you.

00:22:49:29 - 00:22:50:22

Kevin Gillespie.

00:22:50:24 - 00:23:12:07

For. Um, I agree with the comments that it is guidelines under the um. However, we retain the stance that moderate and above is significant, particularly given the open nature of the landscape and that there can be some long distance views in the site. Um.

00:23:14:17 - 00:23:20:00

I agree with. As we've stated, I agree with some of the with the viewpoint selection as well.

00:23:28:20 - 00:23:37:01

If you got any comments to make about what the applicants are just said regarding your methodology in terms of significance.

00:23:38:00 - 00:24:00:07

Well, we've we've applied the same interpretation, but we've we've applied that moderate and above is significant. That is a stance that I've used for all of the all of the solar panels, stations that I've done in Lincolnshire and across other projects as well.

00:24:10:07 - 00:24:23:11

So the other projects that are in examination in Lincolnshire at the moment, you've also provided responses for and taking the same stance on significance. Correct.

00:24:25:17 - 00:24:49:23

Yeah. Mean the key thing as well that should have mentioned is that it's just the fact that they've, they've not assessed the moderate and. Significance. They've just they've just accepted that moderate is not significant and therefore sort of downplayed it. Whereas I would have assessed moderate as significant and therefore considered in more detail.

00:25:06:03 - 00:25:07:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:25:12:00 - 00:25:21:00

So Lincolnshire County Council's local impact report. Paragraph 7.1. 20.

00:25:22:17 - 00:25:47:24

Let's rep 1028. Notes that the solar part would lead to significant adverse effects on landscape, character and visual amenity, transforming the local landscape, effecting the current openness, tranquillity and agricultural character. Could you just provide some further justification for those comments, in particular how the proposed amendment would affect tranquillity?

00:25:49:22 - 00:26:22:04

Yeah. Kevin Gillespie CC um, one of the significant changes is that, um, there's there seems to be an overbearing on hedgerow planting. Um, it's my opinion that hedgerow planting, while is present in the area, is not as significant as what it would be given the proposals. You're talking about extensive

amounts of three three meter tall or five meter tall hedgerows, which will completely check, will change the character of the the open landscape.

00:26:22:06 - 00:27:01:06

Um, and instead of enjoying as, as the the national character area and state, instead of enjoying open views, you will actually be confronted with hedgerows and which will diminish the long range views afforded by users who on those sort of country lanes are going relatively slow and are enjoying the the view and. Obviously from the A17 they set back, but it's the same sort of change from open to semi-enclosed back to open, which I think is a tranquillity change.

00:27:02:22 - 00:27:04:28

Also out of character to the area.

00:27:12:03 - 00:27:19:03

So there's conflict there between the hedgerow screening? Yeah. Development? Yeah.

00:27:19:05 - 00:27:22:03

Think, think in themselves.

00:27:23:07 - 00:27:25:07

Affecting the character of the landscape.

00:27:25:10 - 00:27:48:07

Think so? Yes. And sort of more more in character is sort of groups. Groups of trees. So there's two aspects. There's the quantity of hedgerows. And there's also the overreliance on hydro screen in the solar panels, but there's also the height of the height of the hedgerows. It's for me, it's not a normal hedgerow height that you would have a five meter tall hedgerow.

00:27:59:15 - 00:28:03:05

So if the hedgerows were lower. Would that make a difference?

00:28:05:01 - 00:28:21:22

Think if the hedgerows were used strategically and were lower. It would make sense. But if they were combined with different approaches, so as say groupings of trees as strategic points, given that there's not many receptors, there probably could be a more.

00:28:23:21 - 00:28:52:09

Detailed design, rather than rather than a single strategy approach to across the whole of the site, and think that would just be a little bit less overbearing and more in character with the area, and would retain strategic key views of the open landscape. It's just it just potentially has such a. Change in a short period of time as you're traveling along, and that it would look out of character.

00:28:59:06 - 00:29:12:18

So you've mentioned the receptors as being users of the country, lanes that are travelling at a slower speed rather than the A17. And there are any other receptors you particularly concerned about?

00:29:13:13 - 00:29:13:28

Um.

00:29:14:27 - 00:29:35:16

Think this residential of some kind. Um. That their particular mean recently looked at the that area and for the cumulative with beacon fan as well. And there's clear open views to that and. So think they would, they would notice quite a difference with the hedgerows.

00:29:37:23 - 00:29:52:03

And then obviously the road for two kind. While it's a relatively busy road and high speed, it is an open. It is an open road, and to see that sort of change would be quite a dramatic change.

00:30:01:01 - 00:30:06:00

So is that just residents of South Clime? Any other settlements or nearby residents.

00:30:06:26 - 00:30:12:14

Think they isolated the isolated residents? Some some residents along the the A17 as well.

00:30:14:08 - 00:30:24:05

But I mean, as the applicant stated, there is relatively few receptors that live in the area. It's sort of the transient uses of the road network.

00:30:40:22 - 00:30:42:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:30:44:21 - 00:30:52:12

Do any of the other relevant planning authorities want to make any points on those issues? If I get the applicant's response.

00:30:53:25 - 00:30:54:10

No thank you.

00:30:56:16 - 00:31:00:01

Okay with the applicant. Let's respond to what Mr. Gillespie has just said.

00:31:02:02 - 00:31:20:03

On behalf of the applicant. So understand there are three issues. Is the relative level of tranquillity. Is the proposed hedgerows being overbearing or not in character, and also views from Sidebar Lane being the main road receptor and the A17.

00:31:21:23 - 00:31:55:03

So if you start with the tranquility, the relative level of tranquility is greatly reduced by the presence of the motto of the A17 road and fast moving traffic, noise and light spill during hours of darkness. Also, looking into the landscape south of the road, we have a number of large scale energy related infrastructure, such as the wind farm being highly visible and prominent from close to medium range views.

00:31:55:12 - 00:32:16:14

And indeed it's visible from Sidebar Lane and the A17 and. Don't wish to analyze that part of the landscape, but simply saying those elements are highly visible and affect the character of the landscape and the relative level of tranquility, and in terms of hedgerows being out of character.

00:32:18:00 - 00:32:49:00

The family would like to quote from chapter six for simplicity. It's paragraph 6.5. 61. Page 51 of 78. And in terms of landscape pattern, the image of park would be still present, although hedgerows and tree planting across Harrington Fen are currently limited, as discussed before and suggested by landscape advisor. Historically, this area included a high proportion of structural planting, including vegetation along field ditches.

00:32:49:12 - 00:33:27:29

Therefore, it is considered that such mitigation planting would be in keeping with the local landscape. End of quote. And so, in short, I think that mitigation measures are highly appropriate and in keeping with the local landscape character. And we spend quite a lot of effort trying to devise those mitigation measures in order to a screen. The proposed scheme, which would respond to the draft in three, which is very clear about mitigation measures, can successfully screen low lying, ground mounted solar farms, but also to preserve that sense of openness and views towards the distant horizon.

00:33:28:06 - 00:34:02:21

And in my view, the perception of the of the landscape is it's obviously large scale. Which in my mind has a higher degree of capacity to accommodate large scale development. Jews are indeed distant, but nevertheless they are interrupted by isolated dwellings, farmsteads and clusters of tree vegetation around those farmsteads and dispersed through surrounding fields. Um, but in summary. If we look towards the horizon, it's distant and appears very well wooded.

00:34:02:23 - 00:34:39:14

Whether it's the layering effect of intervening hedgerows, trees, it's heavily, it appears very well wooded. And we aim to replicate that appreciation that although you your views might end up being foreshortened from certain viewpoints, certainly from from very close range views and from sidebar lane, you will see eventually a well developed hedgerow. And our aim was to replicate that perception of green horizon. If you like vegetated horizon, where the elements of introduced infrastructure would be screened or would not form an evident feature in that view.

00:34:40:00 - 00:35:17:16

Hence, the proposed hedgerow is varied in height between three 3.5m to reflect the height of the panels and the introduced five meter sections. Approximately five metre high sections enable that hedgerow to embed the scheme into the receiving landscape better, whereby the hedgerow is not simply a neatly trimmed linear feature on the horizon, which would be probably more incongruous. That's. Diversity in hedgerow heightened and its width, and the way it appears almost taking the form of an overgrown hedgerow field is much more suited to that landscape.

00:35:18:29 - 00:35:54:01

So that's on the hedgerow. And the third point was views from the highways. So obviously sidebar Lane is the closest highway. Again receptors travel at speed. Views are gained in different directions. And as analyzed in our assessment and agreed with landscape Advisor, we we concluded that only certain part of sidebar lane would gain views towards the energy scheme. The northern part, past headache would be more segregated visually through a combination of.

00:35:56:27 - 00:36:30:18

Tree vegetation build from and the embankment associated with the dyke itself, which in different sections obviously. So it's not uniform in height, but it's about 2.7 3.5m high above Ordnance date. And the site at that point is about one meter. So we have a difference of about 1.7m difference in height minimum. And throughout that introduce infrastructure will be better screened. And again, with the combination of the hedgerows and trees which are introduced along the northern edge of the energy park.

00:36:30:27 - 00:37:15:03

And that mitigation measure would be very successful. And again responding to the draft three and. Some short effects upon the road. Receptors associated with sidebar lane will be highly localized, and we do recognize that viewpoint for an analysis in our report is is quite transparent about a degree of change. And this is supported by a photo montage in terms of road users along the A17. Viewpoint five is one of the first locations along the road traveling eastbound where receptors would gain views towards the site, but did not believe one would be able to identify the sites simply because of the combination again of hedgerows.

00:37:15:05 - 00:37:54:15

Trees build form and viewpoint has been actually scoped out from detailed assessment, and that's explained in appendix 6.8. And further east views become interrupted by built form vegetation, including hedgerows and again roadside hedgerows. Hence our idea that hedgerows are actually characteristics of that landscape. We have a gap in the vegetation and built form where the proposed access track is going to connect to the road and agree that section of the road would receptors along that section of the road would be able to induce towards the site.

00:37:55:12 - 00:38:21:27

Solar panels are separated from that road by, if I'm correct, by two fields apart. And again the introduce hedgerow planting would help reduce any residual effects. And further east we end up looking at viewpoint six, which is a heavily glimpsed short range view and gained between two classes of properties. So it's a short duration viewpoint gained in transition, and those views will be oblique to very oblique.

00:38:23:27 - 00:38:29:07

And beyond that one is looking to the open countryside, not the energy park.

00:38:31:03 - 00:38:31:18

Thank you ma'am.

00:38:35:01 - 00:38:41:02

About what Mr. Gillespie mentioned about self coin. Response to that.

00:38:42:26 - 00:39:13:09

Righteousness on behalf of the applicant. And. In short, our viewpoint 19 has been selected purposely to illustrate that indivisibility, or rather lack of that indivisibility. And again, that was something that was discussed during the preliminary stage of the of the work on the. So we have viewpoint 19, which is just south of the of the settlement, and also viewpoint 18, which is further further south. And in both cases those views are inconsequential.

00:39:14:12 - 00:39:15:18

And not significant.

00:39:20:09 - 00:39:22:20

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

00:39:33:20 - 00:39:39:01

Terms of cumulative landscape visual effects. I'm.

00:39:41:21 - 00:39:48:20

What's referred to in Lincolnshire County Council's Local Impact Report. Paragraph 7.1.21.

00:39:50:09 - 00:39:59:07

And concerned about cumulative effects when assessed alongside beacon in particular and.

00:40:01:07 - 00:40:19:24

You see that that's now in the cumulative assessment and the interrelationship reports. Understand that the final details are as yet unknown and that consultation is not yet commenced. Is that correct? Anybody tell me.

00:40:22:01 - 00:40:55:12

Isabel Holland to Pegasus on that one. So the situation would be confirmed at the moment, is there? They haven't yet started any consultation. They've got their own website, which is very limited information. There's nothing there at all on a design within the scoping that was submitted to Pins. There's details of the maximum height of panels being 4.5m and potential number of inverters, etcetera. And they say that they will also have battery storage, but no dimensions or locations or any of that equipment is shown on any of the plans that were submitted to Pins.

00:40:55:14 - 00:41:17:06

Nor is any of information to date available on any of their published materials. We have had ongoing conversations with them to see if we can obtain any information from them, but to date, they're not willing or at a position where yet within their design process, where they're comfortable with having that presented in the public domain, because the the ongoing assessment work that they're doing for their site.

00:41:18:15 - 00:41:21:08

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

00:41:27:13 - 00:41:38:25

Just like share counts. Council. Do you have anything further to add regarding cumulative effects and. Take away from Bacon Fan or any any other developments in the area.

00:41:39:17 - 00:42:13:24

Kevin Gillespie for the applicant for the, um. Yeah, I'm actually working on the beacon side of the project and recently went on a site visit to check on cumulative viewpoints. Um, to advise beacon. And we believe that, um, the South Kane area does have merits of a viewpoint that assesses the cumulative effect. And also, um. But the junction on the A17 to the road that goes to South Cheam.

00:42:14:18 - 00:42:24:00

I think there's indivisibility there. Um, we're just about to advise and be concerned applicant on those findings.

00:42:28:23 - 00:42:32:23

She's that she's working for Bacon Fen rather than for the council.

00:42:37:09 - 00:42:39:26

The county counsel advising the county.

00:42:40:00 - 00:42:41:03

Advising the council.

00:42:42:15 - 00:43:00:19

It's definitely because. Yes. Just asked me. So that was the frantic whispering on the side of the table. I said, could you just make it clear that you're not advising Beacon Fen when he's. When Mr. Gillespie, speaking about advising Beacon Verney means relaying Lincolnshire County Council's comments to the Beacon Fen applicant team. Okay.

00:43:00:21 - 00:43:10:15

Yeah, yeah. And in respect of selection of viewpoints and the initial pre app type discussions. Yeah. Okay. That's understood. Thank you.

00:43:14:22 - 00:43:31:02

The link and share. Have any comments to make about smaller solar parks in the area that have been approved by Boston Borough Council, Vicarage Grove, Cowbridge Road and then there's little health now as well. How many comments to make about those?

00:43:32:21 - 00:43:35:02

Kevin Gillespie. Also see no no comments on that.

00:43:35:25 - 00:43:36:21

Okay. Thank you.

00:44:02:03 - 00:44:16:20

Now don't have any further questions in in respect of landscape visual impact and move on to residential visual impacts unless anyone's got any further points to make. Landscape and visual.

00:44:19:07 - 00:44:19:22

No.

00:44:23:05 - 00:44:29:22

In terms of visual impact assessment, residential visual impact assessment. Um,

00:44:31:20 - 00:44:32:27

from the.

00:44:34:24 - 00:44:49:01

Yes states that only nine out of 105 responded to attempts to access this. Wonder whether any further attempts had been made to access any properties.

00:44:50:20 - 00:45:25:27

Radack channels on behalf of the applicant. Not from, you know, not. But we approach the assessment in such a way that those residents who responded, they were visited, photographs were taken. And then we identified a number of viewpoints which served as proxy views from publicly accessible locations, including Sidebar Lane and the A17 and nearby footways, which means that the coverage is quite good and representative of views potentially gained by those residents.

00:45:26:02 - 00:45:36:29

Therefore, there's limited, limited conflict or we try to remove that ambiguity as much as we can, but obviously agreed certain properties have not been visited simply because of the lack of response.

00:45:38:20 - 00:45:47:29

Okay. Thank you. And to the relevant planning authorities, consider that the proxy view points and they are sufficient.

00:45:59:09 - 00:46:01:26

Kevin Gillespie. Yeah. Think they're sufficient?

00:46:04:28 - 00:46:08:17

Okay and North Kesteven District Council.

00:46:08:19 - 00:46:09:29

Yes, ma'am. We haven't raise any issues.

00:46:10:15 - 00:46:11:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:46:27:26 - 00:46:51:29

And in terms of mitigation for the residential properties, both built in and secured by requirements. We've talked about hedges just now in terms of the landscape impact, in terms of screening views for local residents and the the distance that's built in from those properties. Are you agreeable with the mitigation?

00:46:56:07 - 00:47:10:00

Kevin Gillespie fell and. Yeah. Again, it's just the, the height issue of the hedgerows and, and and the impact on on the open character of the, the area.

00:47:18:11 - 00:47:23:07

Then some residential visual viewpoint and living conditions. Viewpoint.

00:47:24:00 - 00:47:32:09

No. In principle we agree with the idea of screening where it's where it's been placed. It's just it's just the height.

00:47:32:25 - 00:47:36:17

Okay, okay. Anything from North Kesteven on that?

00:47:38:04 - 00:47:39:04

Nothing to add. Thank you all.

00:47:50:08 - 00:48:21:10

To Lancashire County Council. Local impact reports wrap 1028, paragraph 7.2. ten. Concludes that even with mitigation, the effects would be negative. And the the lavender test is mentioned. And it just wanted some further thoughts on how how would the proposed development be overbearing? Is it the hedges that will be overbearing or the proposed development itself?

00:48:23:06 - 00:48:57:20

Kevin Gillespie for El-Sisi. Yes. Stated. And the area just doesn't, in my opinion, have that character on that scale. And so it's it's the quantity of hedgerows. It's a change because of the hedgerows, but it's also the height of the hedgerows. Um, and if you look at Google, Google Earth, you can see just how open it is. If you go on Street View on any location, you can see the, the openness of it.

00:48:57:22 - 00:49:17:16

And that would just be a change. Um. And I do believe that sort of a more strategic positioning of of planting a mix of hedgerows. At a lower height, perhaps, but also groupings of trees would work better than just blanket hedgerow in.

00:49:18:27 - 00:49:25:24

But how would they be overbearing to local residents? Well, in terms of the so-called lavender test, I.

00:49:26:16 - 00:49:28:14

Think it's I think just as your.

00:49:30:05 - 00:49:41:19

As you're going mean. Even if you go along any roads, you'll see the hedgerows and it just completely will block up the view that you currently have.

00:49:46:20 - 00:50:30:05

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. Just just add a code about the lavender test. And that's obviously firstly is an informal it's become a point of practice, but it obviously arose in the context of wind decisions where one can imagine the word overbearing applies quite readily. I quite appreciate the query in terms of well, how is solar overbearing? So I'd encourage really focus on the latter part of that test in terms of whether a residence becomes an unattractive place to live in a broader sense, rather than focusing exclusively upon the words overbearing, which maybe doesn't have such a natural application in relation to solar as it does to wind.

00:50:30:18 - 00:50:50:05

But obviously the point is whether there is such a negative effect in terms of visual effect on amenity of any one resident, that that that place just becomes not a very nice place to live. And obviously, Mr. Gillespie's view is that that that threshold is met just from the scale of change.

00:50:52:04 - 00:50:55:08

Okay. Thank you. Stephen, have anything to add on that?

00:50:57:07 - 00:50:57:22

Thank you all.

00:50:58:04 - 00:51:02:11

Okay. Thank you. And with the applicant, let's come back on any of that.

00:51:08:00 - 00:51:43:25

I'm Neil Branch and the applicant. Madam, just to just to state, I'm very familiar with the lab and test, and it's an extremely high bar and we would, we would just suggest that the planting of hedgerows to between three and a half from five meters to screen a solar park. Um. Would not. Create a position where the residents around the solar farm would be.

00:51:43:27 - 00:52:04:12

It would be so overbearing that the living conditions of that property would be affected to such an extent that it would no longer be somewhere where somebody could find it attractive to live. That's an extremely high bar, and we disagree strongly that that would be met in this case.

00:52:06:22 - 00:52:14:22

Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else anyone wants to add before I move on to agenda item four? Yeah.

00:52:16:16 - 00:52:50:20

On behalf of the applicant. Thank you. Just 1.3. Completely disagree with the suggestion that hedgerows would be overbearing from a landscape or visual point of view. And our chapter seven. At the beginning of that chapter, we refer to residential visual assessments. And it is correct to say that they are more mostly associated with windfarm developments. But for example, the approved Cliffe Hills Solar Park, first solar farm in England did include residential visual amenity assessment.

00:52:52:17 - 00:53:30:11

They are being used by Pegasus on other schemes as well. And it's not about major or significant effects, it's about whether those properties will be subject to overbearing effects. And. And think it's, um. It's also informative to refer to the technical guidance note to Forward Slash 19, published by the Landscape Institute, which did inform our methodology. And if I may quote paragraph 1.6, it's not uncommon for significant adverse effects on views and immunity to be experienced by people at the place of residence as a result of introducing new development in the landscape.

00:53:30:19 - 00:54:03:00

In itself, this does not necessarily cause a planning concern. However, there are situations where the effects on the outlook visual amenity of a residential property is so great, but it is not generally considered to be in the public interest to permit such conditions. But they did not exist before, and the suggestion that hedgerows would cause that overbearing facts is simply wrong. On that basis, most of the landscape planting around the settlement of East Haddington could be judged to be overbearing, including vegetation around private gardens.

00:54:03:18 - 00:54:04:07

Thank you.

00:54:05:20 - 00:54:06:19

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:13:05 - 00:54:17:10

Okay. Anything else for? Move on. Yep.

00:54:19:24 - 00:54:35:21

Okay. Um, gender item four for shoes Historic environment. We'll start with the listed setting of heritage assets and in particular the setting of grade one listed coin tower.

00:54:44:14 - 00:55:18:23

So. This put, the tower was pointed out to me at the company's site inspection on Monday. Numerous views of it throughout the solar park site. Um. And asked a question relating to Coin Tower in first written questions at 1.2 and responses were received by both Historic England. She's rep 2091 and Norfolk State District Council, which is rep to 101.

00:55:20:03 - 00:55:30:20

Um, and just further to those responses. Does the applicant have anything further to add in regard of their approach to the setting of Climb Tower?

00:55:32:09 - 00:55:37:18

Elizabeth Pratt for the applicant. We maintain that.

00:55:38:02 - 00:55:55:06

Visibility of the energy park in certain views to and from climb tower are largely incidental. That the energy park does not contribute through setting to the significance of climate tower, and that accordingly, the proposed development will cause no harm to the significance.

00:55:55:08 - 00:55:55:27

Of the asset.

00:55:55:29 - 00:56:26:12

Through change to setting in terms of Historic England's response. We were encouraged that they do not identify the energy park among those elements of setting that they consider do contribute. So those elements, the identify the immediate surrounds of the asset, namely parts of the scheduled monument in which the tower sits, the village and the immediately outlying fenland, which stopped short north of the energy park.

00:56:27:09 - 00:56:58:29

And Historic England say that views within across the Energy Park quote still have the capacity to contribute to significance, but arguably to a much lesser degree. And they concluded by suggesting that a low level of less than substantial harm might still be identified, but in their view that would not constitute a significant effect. So whilst we still maintain this, there's no harm really.

00:56:59:01 - 00:57:04:18

The point of difference is whether paragraph 202 of the is engaged.

00:57:08:03 - 00:57:09:02

Okay. Thank you.

00:57:25:11 - 00:57:32:02

So you saying that that's up to the decision maker? Correct, ma'am. Yeah.

00:57:34:06 - 00:57:40:22

Do North Kesteven and they the heritage advisors here today have anything to add to that?

00:57:41:09 - 00:57:44:14

Somerset North District Council. Yes, ma'am. Pass over to Mr. Bentley.

00:57:48:05 - 00:58:19:05

I'm. Thank you, ma'am. Matthew Bentley North. On behalf of North Kesteven District Council. Um, yes. Sort of. Similarly, um, agree, you know, with the historic England position that it would be a factor of probably almost certainly less than substantial harm. Um, the key point that I think is sort of probably missing is this idea of incidental views from the fortified tower. It as a fortified tower.

00:58:20:00 - 00:58:55:19

The idea of it would be to provide and maintain 360 degree views of the surrounding landscape, and the fact that the tower is visible from the site shows that there are views from the site towards the tower and vice versa, and no view from or towards tower should be classed as incidental because it is supposed to be. The landscape is supposed to be viewed from the tower, and it is, and the tower is supposed to be a conspicuous sort of monumental piece of architecture within the landscape as well.

00:58:56:04 - 00:59:31:24

Um, it. Don't don't feel that the fact that it was classed as incidental and then as such, wasn't thoroughly assessed enough as to what that impact was or could be on the tower, is something that ideally would still need to be addressed to complete the ascertain that level of harm of of the tower. There will be a hierarchy of significance, as the applicant has stated, with regards to the immediate scheduled monument surrounding the tower, forming more significance and probably than probably the views.

00:59:31:26 - 00:59:44:18

But again, that sort of wide ranging views of the tower are still of significance. I do believe, still contribute to the setting of the heritage asset and so need to be assessed in more detail, ideally.

00:59:47:07 - 00:59:57:21

Somerset North District Council. Yes. I might also just add that our position aligns with that of Historic England. Ensure that paragraph two of the is engaged for the reasons that given.

01:00:09:03 - 01:00:13:18

Okay. Thank you. I'm just. The applicant wants to come back on that at all.

01:00:16:16 - 01:00:22:18

Elizabeth Pratt on behalf of the applicant. Um. I would just argue that.

01:00:24:04 - 01:00:27:19

Kind of in support of our previous assessment. Um.

01:00:29:10 - 01:01:00:01

Stating that the views are largely incidental. There is nothing to suggest that visibility specifically from across of the energy park was ever of particular defensive significance. The height of the tower and the flat, low lying landscape character creates long ranging 360 panoramic views. Um, it's important to remember that visibility does not equate to a contribution of heritage significance. Not all views are significant.

01:01:00:03 - 01:01:33:03

And I note Mr. Bentley's point about hierarchy of significance. So, um, I'd also like to emphasize that the energy park is not visible at ground level. So the key views, we argue, of the tower where its significance is best appreciated. The energy park could be visible from the top of the tower, but I'd also like to make just two points here. Firstly, when the tower was built and in use, there was an attached house to the southern elevation.

01:01:33:13 - 01:02:05:09

Um, so it isn't entirely clear at what levels. Um, there would have been south facing views of the energy park. The house is attached to the southern elevation, which is the elevation towards the site. Um, also, the energy park is now part of a landscape whose characters derived mostly from post-medieval and modern drainage and agriculture, so its current character is already not representative of when the tower was built and used.

01:02:05:11 - 01:02:14:06

And that's why we came to the conclusion that the visibility specifically of the energy park, um, is not significant.

01:02:16:29 - 01:02:21:22

Okay. Thank you. Um, I assume the towers are not publicly accessible.

01:02:22:21 - 01:02:37:12

Um. It's not. No. All of the floors within the tower have been removed. There is a stair tower attached to the tower itself with the surviving staircase, but there's no, um, no public access.

01:02:44:01 - 01:02:54:15

Um. So, North Kesteven, are you saying you want further assessment? From the tower of the tower. Do you want additional visuals?

01:03:04:06 - 01:03:14:01

Somerset North Devon District Council. Yes, ma'am. Our position would be that we are asking for further visual impact assessment. In relation to that tower specifically.

01:03:24:06 - 01:03:27:15

So that is that both from the tower and of the tower.

01:03:29:02 - 01:03:29:20

Yes.

01:03:42:27 - 01:03:58:15

I'm just thinking aloud, but it is their benefit in me. Going for a further sight. Inspection would have to be unaccompanied from the area around the tower. Is there any public access near to the tower that could get to?

01:04:02:11 - 01:04:15:15

Somerset North District Council, ma'am. Yes, there is benefit in an unaccompanied site visit and we would have to go away and just find out to what extent there's public accessibility. So we might need to come back to you on that one.

01:04:28:15 - 01:04:31:27

Okay. Thank you. The applicant lights come back on that place.

01:04:37:02 - 01:04:42:28

And I think pending securing access, we could perhaps look into some visualizations.

01:04:45:18 - 01:04:46:03

How?

01:04:49:28 - 01:05:29:25

Not the applicant. And think, as Mr. Pratt says, we're more than happy to provide further information and assist you in coming to a conclusion on this matter, whether paragraph 202 would then subsequently be engaged or not, I think might be a matter for you, mainly because Miss Pratt's come to her conclusion. Um, some additional visuals from the tower and to the tower may assist you in doing that, but I expect our conclusion will be our conclusion.

01:05:32:06 - 01:05:38:11

Yeah, yeah. Understand? It's up to the decision maker. My recommendation for the decision maker and.

01:05:39:26 - 01:06:12:26

In the paragraph 202 and obviously against public benefits, um, which which we've already talked about and do think there is benefit in me visiting South Pine don't need to go up the tower. Don't think there's the health and safety reasons for that. But if there's any where if there's publicly accessible footpaths or street, if you could just let me know at deadline three, where would it be? Good viewpoint for me to view from that would be useful.

01:06:12:28 - 01:06:13:16

Thank you.

01:06:15:02 - 01:06:22:29

Commercial District Council. Yes, ma'am. There are two public rights of way around the town, so perhaps will provide that map to you. Just. Just for assistance.

01:06:24:17 - 01:06:26:02

Yeah, that'll be useful. Thank you.

01:06:31:29 - 01:06:40:12

Okay. I don't have anything else on Crime Tower or any other listed buildings, unless anybody else would like to raise anything.

01:06:43:09 - 01:06:44:25

You move on to archaeology.

01:06:51:18 - 01:06:52:03

Good morning.

01:06:52:05 - 01:07:34:11

I'm Nick Feltham for North Kesteven District Council. One of the first questions that we responded to was in relation to a schedule of Non-designated heritage assets, and our written response set out that, on the whole, we agree with those local listed Non-designated heritage assets, with the exception of one remnant of wall at Elm Grange and North Kesteven position is that we think that there does need to be a degree of building recording captured, possibly by requirements which we might need to discuss with the applicant just of some or all of those non-designated heritage assets.

01:07:34:22 - 01:07:46:03

But in principle, we're confident that if needs be, that could be captured through an extension to the. That the heritage requirement, which could deal with that above ground building record.

01:07:50:17 - 01:07:52:25

So part of the archaeology requirement.

01:07:54:11 - 01:08:00:26

Possibly is an additional bullet point to the archaeology requirement. Yes. Rather than a new freestanding. Okay. Yes.

01:08:10:21 - 01:08:21:18

In terms of the list of Non-designated heritage asset and what's been assessed in that chapter of the satisfied with no no additions to it that are needed.

01:08:21:27 - 01:08:27:25

Correct? Yes. It's comprehensive. There's no additions. On the whole, we agree with the inclusions with with that one exception. Yes.

01:08:39:14 - 01:08:43:24

So the the applicant are willing to discuss that with with the council.

01:08:44:27 - 01:09:22:12

Um, yes, I believe so. I'd just like to highlight as well that, um, protection measures for both assets, the 600 form buildings and the former drainage pump at her dyke. Um, protection measures secured for both in paragraph 7.70 and 7.71 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, which is ref um rep 2071, is the clean copy. So these protection measures will comprise the assets being fenced off to prevent access by plant and machinery, which obviously could cause damage.

01:09:22:22 - 01:09:30:06

And they'll be regularly inspected and monitored to ensure those protection measures are remain in force during the construction phase.

01:09:32:24 - 01:09:38:11

Yes. So that's embedded in the camp, which is a different requirement to the archaeology requirement.

01:09:38:15 - 01:09:41:00

Yes. Just thought it was worth noting at the same time.

01:09:42:00 - 01:09:43:15

Yeah. Is there anything?

01:09:45:00 - 01:09:49:24

Expect to get something on deadline three. Yeah. Okay.

01:10:02:11 - 01:10:16:13

Okay. Archaeology. Just like an update from the applicant in respect of archaeology matters and reporting on the latest investigations on the cable corridor, please.

01:10:17:22 - 01:10:49:16

Elizabeth Pratt for the applicant. It hasn't been possible to undertake any additional field work for the trial trenching on the cable route since the preliminary hearings, but an interim report is now available for the work carried out in August and September, and the reference for that report is rep to 048. A reminder that this work took place at Royalty Farm, which was the part of the cable route corridor with the greatest archaeological potential.

01:10:50:07 - 01:11:06:16

As indicated by the desk based assessment and the geophysical survey, so total of 67 trenches have been excavated. 24 of those contained archaeology, namely the remains of and British enclosure complex or field systems.

01:11:08:12 - 01:11:32:02

The completion of the remainder of the trial. Trenching is secured by requirement 12, and the outline written scheme of investigation for that evaluation has also been updated. That's reference rep 2055. And also since the preliminary hearings, the outline written scheme of investigation for mitigation.

01:11:34:04 - 01:12:04:24

Which is reference rep to 057 is chapter ten and it's supporting figure 10.4 have been updated to resolve previous discrepancies or picked up by Heritage Lincolnshire. And regarding the mitigation proposed within the energy park, and also to provide additional detail for the mitigation strategy for the cable route, which has been led by those initial trial trenching results.

01:12:05:24 - 01:12:08:19

I can run through that in greater detail, but, um.

01:12:10:13 - 01:12:14:15

Or if you if you wish. What the mitigation strategy is to comprise.

01:12:17:11 - 01:12:37:01

No. That's okay. That's that's all in the documents that I've got a deadline to. I'm. It's just an update, really, about what's been submitted. Um, so in the remainder of the examinations, they expect it to be for now for archaeology.

01:12:38:08 - 01:12:39:16

In all likelihood, yes.

01:12:40:27 - 01:12:48:25

Okay, so can I have a response from the North Kesteven representative face.

01:12:49:17 - 01:12:52:28

North District Council? Yes, ma'am. And pass over to Miss Drury of the state.

01:12:56:01 - 01:13:33:28

Denise Drury on behalf of North Steven District Council, as the applicant stated, some of the trial trenching on the cable route corridor, which was the outstanding piece of archaeological field work, has been carried out and that information has been reported and incorporated into the outline mitigation document. So, apart from the excavation of the remaining trial trenches for which there is an agreed outline written scheme of investigation, I think that work is the.

01:13:34:27 - 01:13:49:29

The work that has been undertaken has produced a robust level of baseline information which supports which is informed, which has informed the mitigation strategy, the outline mitigation strategy.

01:13:54:06 - 01:14:03:20

Okay, so is satisfied for the time being. That was what's been submitted today is is is enough. Yes. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

01:14:18:21 - 01:14:20:03

Okay? Okay.

01:14:28:01 - 01:14:40:18

Now I've got nothing further to raise on heritage matters. Is there any other heritage matters designated Non-designated? Before we move on, have a break. No.

01:14:42:00 - 01:14:58:04

Please. I'm Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council. Just for your note, ma'am. Just that we agree with the position of North Kesteven District Council. We don't have anything to add there. We're happy that the small bit that's left to be done and will be will progress as it should. And we're happy with progress to date.

01:14:59:00 - 01:15:06:21

Okay. Thank you. Um, I understand Boston Borough Council are now present. Is that correct? Online.

01:15:08:06 - 01:15:13:05

Come on, come on. Yes, Abby. Council apologies for earlier. We had some. That's okay.

01:15:13:16 - 01:15:20:09

I just want to check that you're okay with the heritage matters as well. In terms of your your area of the site.

01:15:20:19 - 01:15:28:16

Yeah. From our point of view. In agreement with heritage Lincolnshire's views. No further comments to add on archaeology from our side of things.

01:15:29:05 - 01:15:30:18

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:15:38:27 - 01:15:51:24

Okay, well, we'll move to a break before we go on to agenda item five, which is ecology natural environment. And time is 1116.

01:15:53:13 - 01:15:55:14

I think we can put.

01:15:57:16 - 01:16:08:01

Yeah, we'll make that. Nearly 20 minutes. We meet back here at 1135, so the hearing is adjourned until 1135. Thank you.