



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 4
Date:	16 January 2025

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

TRANSCRIPT_DOGGERBANK_ISH2_SESSI ON4_16012025

Fri, Jan 17, 2025 11:23AM • 1:38:05

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Dogger Bank, offshore wind farm, construction activities, environmental impact, landscape mitigation, visual amenity, decommissioning plan, landscape planting, construction lighting, converter stations, mitigation measures, landscape character, visual effects, landscape management, mitigation strategy

00:05

Good morning. The time is now 10am and I shall resume this issue, specific hearing on the scope of the proposed development, including construction activities in relation to the application made by RWE renewables UK, Dogger bank South West limited and RWE renewables, UK, Dogger bank South East limited for the proposed Dogger bank South offshore wind farm. Before I proceed any further, can I just check that everyone can see and hear me? If not, can you please raise your hand in teams? Can't see any hands raised so I assume that everyone can see and hear me. Can I also confirm with Mrs. Hopewell that the live stream and the recording of this event has commenced? Thank you. Please. Could all participants ensure that they are muted unless invited to speak, and please silence all electronic devices. My name is Joe Dowling. I'm an examining inspector and a chartered town planner. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of a panel of inspectors to examine this application. In this introduction, I will be going through the management of today's event and introduction, and one of my colleagues will be taking notes of any actions. I would now like my colleagues to introduce themselves. Good morning. My name is Claire bilo. I'm an examining inspector, chartered scientist and chartered Water and Environmental Manager.

01:29

Hello. My name is Helena robranski. I'm an examining inspector and chartered town planner. I'm attending this hearing virtually today, and for information, when I'm not directly participating in the hearing, I will switch off my camera.

01:43

Good morning. My name is Laura Shawnee. I'm an examining inspector and chartered town planner.

01:52

Good morning. My name is Matt Tandy. I'm an examining inspector, a chartered water environmental manager and also a civil engineer.

02:01

I can confirm that all members of the examining authority have made a formal declaration of interests and that there are no known conflicts of interest. With regard to us examine this application, together, we form the examining authority or exa for this application. There are other colleagues from the planning Inspectorate with us today. You would have spoken to Caroline Hopewell, our case manager in the joining conference together with Mr. Emil Burnie the case officer, they are the case team for this project. In addition, there are technicians from production 78 who are attending solely for the purpose of managing and recording the live streaming of this event. If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, could I ask that you please email a case team who will be happy to help. As this is the resumption of a hearing, I intend to keep my opening comments as brief as possible, as many of those attending today will have heard these yesterday, and as we have quite a lot to get through today, I'd like to minimize the time taken with reopening this hearing. The meeting is being held on Microsoft team platform and is being live streamed. Participants should not use chat function, as it's not being monitored. Today. Should you wish to make a comment, please switch your camera on and use the Microsoft team handout function, and please wait to be invited to speak. If you participate in the meeting, it's important that you understand that you will be recorded and live streamed, and the digital recording will be published. If you do not want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera. The planning inspections practice is to retain recordings for five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order, if at any point in the meeting you can't hear us or wish to speak, can I ask you turn your camera on if it's turned off, and use the raised hand function in teams, there may sometimes be a delay before we acknowledge this. This is Hopewell will have explained what to do if you lose your connection and we are able to adjourn for short period of time. If there are any more significant connection problems, we will adjourn for short breaks at convenient points, usually no more than every hour and a half or so. If medical or other reasons, anyone requires a break at a specific time? Could you please let the Capes team know, and we will hopefully adjust the program to meet your needs for the purpose of identification of the benefit of those who may listen to the digital recording later. Could I ask that every point in which you speak please give your name, and if you're representing an organization or individual, who it is you represent. Does anyone have any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event? Can't see any hands up, so I'm going to move on. The case. Team have provided me with a list of those interested in other parties who have expressed or wish to be heard today. Those persons are people representing the following organization, the applicant and their representatives, the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. Before I ask these organizations and people to introduce themselves, can I just check that I haven't inadvertently missed anyone off the list of participants, again, I can't see any hands raised, I'm now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's hearing to introduce your. To the examining authority and the people who are watching the live stream of this event. When I ask your the organization to introduce yourself, please switch on your camera and microphones, including yourself. Introduce yourself, including how you'd like to be referred to. For example, dr, Mrs. Mus, Mr. Miss, etc. And if you're representing someone who it is that you represent, could I just now ask the applicants to introduce themselves?

05:28

Good morning, madam. My name is Julian Boswell. Mr. Julian Boswell, I'm a solicitor and partner with Burgess salmon, and we are representing the applicants. I will ask the other members sitting up at the front table who are likely to speak in the first slot to introduce themselves.

05:49

Good morning. Anthony Pearson, I'm a charter civil engineer, and I'm a lead civil engineer for the DoD myself project. So yeah,

05:58

Jen as well. I'm a director at Burger salmon, representing the applicants.

06:04

Paul McCray, I'm a landscape architect at Luc and I read the I was lead author on the landscape and visual impact assessment. I'm raised. Me and self application.

06:22

I'm Rosemary tingle. I'm the onshore consents manager for RWE and the applicant.

06:30

Thank you. If I can now ask the East Riding of Yorkshire council to introduce the people that they want to speak today

06:41

morning. My name is Graham Farley, a principal Planning Officer representing the East Riding of Yorkshire Council in respect of the local planning authority. If preferred, I can allow them to introduce themselves. But we also have online Jennifer woolin In terms of ecology and trees and then representing the council in respect of the landscape and visual aspects, Bill Black ledge and Amanda McDermott from B to B consultancy, and in respect of item 13, ground contamination, Jonathan Tate, later in the proceedings, we are also expecting Jason Shakespeare, who will be representing the council as local highway authority in respect of item 14. Jonathan Smith, in terms of item 15, specifically noise and vibration.

07:35

Thank you. Mr. Valli, I don't think the rest of the team needs to be introduced myself, given that you've introduced them. I reckon that both the applicants and the Council have a significant number of people with them today, and we also have quite a lot of matters to go through today in terms of managing the event. I just want to check if there are any time constraints on people's attendance that would need us to reorder the agenda, reorder the item, reorder the items on the agenda and the way that we deal with them, I believe. Mr. Vale, you've got people coming in later this afternoon for the later items. But is there anything that anyone needs me to deal with first thing? Mr. Tate,

08:12

yes, hello. I have another meeting between one o'clock and two o'clock. So if a land contamination matter can be held outside at that time, that'd be useful. Mickey,

08:21

thank you. That's noted. And I just have a very question for East Riding of Yorkshire Council, in your local impact report, which is PDC 07 it states that comments from the coastal change management team are currently awaited. I don't think they're coming today, but could you just confirm when those comments would be provided?

08:44

Graham Valley is riding at the auditor Council. We haven't received any comments to date. Now, if the panel would still like those, then we can, we can go back and chase those and try and provide them for deadline one. That

08:57

would be helpful. So if you can take that as an action point, and if they could be provided at deadline one, we would be grateful to receive them in preparation for this hearing, the examining authority has a number of questions that it considered either require relatively straightforward responses, clarification or submission of additional information, or potentially require a more detailed technical response that we better provided in writing. Furthermore, the examining authority was aware that several interested parties, such as Natural England and the marine management organization have indicated that they will not be attending this hearing. The XA had a number of questions where, if they were attending the hearing, they would have sought a response from those IPs to use the examination time efficiently. These questions were published in a supplementary agenda, which can be found in the examination library at EV 5002, on the 10th of January, 2025 and we asked for responses to be submitted at deadline one, which is the 29th of January, 2025 as set out in that supplementary agenda and following discussion at the preliminary meeting. I just want to take the opportunity to ask now whether anyone considers that any of those questions requests need to be explored orally at today's hearing, or whether the parties need clarification, or any of the questions raised

10:17

June impossible for the applicant. No, we don't have anything to raise on those topics.

10:23

Thank you. As I can see, no other hands. I'm assuming that's the same for everyone else. I just very briefly want to touch for the benefit of those people who weren't here yesterday, on the fact we have a change request. So on the 10th of January, 2025 the applicant submitted a change the application. Due to the timing of this submission, the examining authority had been unable to undertake a comprehensive review of the information submitted prior to this hearing. As a result, the agendas and questions we have prepared for this hearing are based on the information submitted by the applicant, up to and including pre examination deadline C the examining authority at this stage are therefore not proposing to ask any detailed questions in relation to this proposed change however, we recognize that the applicants may need to refer to the change request in response to some of the questions we are about to ask the examining authority would like to make it clear that any discussions on the change requests are on or without prejudice basis, and do not indicate that the examining authority have agreed to accept the changes into the examination. Can I just check that the applicants are clear on this?

11:29

Yes, madam, thank you. So

11:32

if nothing else, if no one has anything else to raise with the first with the management meeting, I'm now going to pass over to Mr. Bremsky to lead on Item nine of the agenda, which is seascape, landscape and visual. Thank you.

11:48

Thank you. I won't be asking any questions today on the effects of offshore platforms outside the array areas or the Flamborough heritage coast. For information, I will be asking some questions on good design at the end of this agenda item. So we'll make a start with light pollution and effects on dark skies. Firstly, a question for the applicants, please. Es, chapter 23 A, P, p1 92 does not appear to assess the effects from lighting, either during construction or operation on dark skies. Can the applicants explain why this is please?

12:36

Paul McCrae, for the applicant, the landscape and visual impact assessment chapter assesses the effects on lighting. It doesn't specifically assess effects on dark skies. It was not thought that there were areas of particular dark sky value in this part of East York East riding in Yorkshire. So that's why the term dark skies has not been used in the assessment.

13:12

I mean, it will, it would introduce converter stations into a rural setting, and the ES does note that security and operational lighting would be required. I also know that East Riding of Yorkshire council have expressed within their local impact report, with reference PDC seven, that effects from lighting should be considered given that MPs en one requires that the landscape, landscape of visual impact assessment should assess the effect on dark skies. How? How could the examining authority report that this had been complied with at present? I

14:10

Paul McCray for the applicant, so the the onshore substation will not be manned and lighting will only be required during certain operation and maintenance activities. This this lighting will be designed to be directional, and it will only be used for safety and security purposes on a very infrequent basis. The likelihood is that that most of those activities will be undertaken during daylight hours. Therefore, there's not expected to be any significant effects or lighting during the operational phase

14:54

and during construction,

14:59

there would. Be lighting during construction. The construction works may extend into the hours of darkness.

15:13

However, this would be controlled by the code of construction practice.

15:25

Thank you. I think I'm just a little bit unsure that we could say that at the moment, it's within the ES that that's it been demonstrated that effects on dark skies had been considered. I appreciate what you're saying. In terms of you've come to the conclusion that there would be no significant effects, but at the moment, because there is no reference within the environmental statement to that, it's difficult to say that it has been considered. So perhaps I could ask as an action point that that could be looked at and it could be reported on. I

16:05

and we can, we can address that. I'm not, I know. I don't think we're proposing to alter the environmental statement. As you know, the definition of environmental information under the EIA regs includes information that emerges from this process. So you can explain slightly more clearly the point that Mr. Mcraely may neither this doesn't appear to be an area of dark sky value. And in any event, the lighting involved is is extremely minimal during operation, and the lighting during construction is obviously for a limited period.

16:41

Okay. Thank you. And do you intend to prepare night time visualizations during construction as East Riding of Yorkshire council have requested in their local impact report,

16:55

Al McRae for the applicants? No, we don't propose to do that on the basis that we don't know where that construction lighting will be placed, nor do we have any details on which to base a visualization the lighting would the Construction lighting would comprise temporary and often mobile light sources, and that's details of that won't be available until a contractor is appointed. The construction lighting will be controlled through the code of construction practice. We don't believe it's it's proportionate to provide a reasonable or provide a meaningful visualization of temporary construction lighting.

17:55

Okay, thank you. I suppose the question that I would draw from that then is, if you don't know the extent of the lighting, how can you be sure that there wouldn't be a significant effect during construction?

18:13

Rosemary tingle for the applicant, I think there are a number of measures in the code of construction practice which will control the construction lighting, including ensuring that it's directional and it's kept to a minimal at minimum. There's also some federal access state, which I agree saying is operational, but would also be considered in relation to dark corridors around the site. And we've also got requirements part of the code construction practice to a career construction lighting management plan with East riding that would, you know, kind of ensure that those measures were proportionate. So we do feel that the construction lighting will be sort of adequately controlled by the COVID construction practice. So the mitigation really is those, those measures to keep that lighting directional proportionate and not high

levels. And then the fact that when we do know the design, the design details in more detail, as Paul said there, maybe we'll have to confirm that I agree that with the council in the plan.

19:06

Jen ash, well for the applicants, just to add to that, I understand that a construction lighting plan will be appended to the final code of construction practice. And in terms of operational lighting, we have requirement 22 in the draft DCA in relation to the control of artificial light emissions, or the substation works okay.

19:28

Thank you very much. And could ask, would there be any permanent lighting along the access road to the converter stations? Do um,

19:45

there's currently no intention for having the access road lit. Thank you, as use would be infrequent.

19:58

Thank you and I. Just wanted to give East riding, the Yorkshire Council, chance to respond to the applicant's comments that they don't intend to provide those visualizations and the applicants reasons for that. Could I ask for a response from the council? Please?

20:17

Hello, yes. This is a point that that we raised

20:25

it. It's

20:27

frustrating that there is no sufficient detail, but we, we have accepted already that the the applicant's suggestion that this will be considered in more detail as the design and planning process proceeds. So although we're not entirely happy with it, we accept that they're not really in a position to provide us with substantive information. But it is, it remains a matter of concern and one that needs to be monitored. Okay?

21:00

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mrs. Sean, I understand that you've got a question. Did you want to come in here?

21:12

Yes, thank you. Just a quick follow up question. Really, I know you just mentioned that the construction lighting plan would be appended to the outline code of construction practice. I'm just trying to understand the detail of information that will be provided. Would that include luminance levels for the construction period? What detail will be part of that plan?

21:40

I think for my I'm just probably coming a bit more from ecology. I had a few questions in terms of impact of light construction lighting on wildlife, which is probably more appropriate to be covered in ecology. But it was just mentioned. I just thought I'll double check and obviously in terms of what I note in the obviously in the code of construction, or the outline code of construction practice, that the detailed information would then be confirmed with the ecological clerk of works in terms of the Lighting. But is that then also part of the construction lighting plan. So will that all be covered as one, or will that be separate?

22:30

Raise my meeting or for the applicant? I think we'll take it away and just take your comment on board and decide the best way to kind of respond to that one. I don't think we would plan on producing a lux level plan for contemporary construction lighting. But we appreciate your point in terms of operational construction planning, and it will take the way to discuss with the engineering team to make sure that that's coming up.

22:54

Sorry, I couldn't hear you the last sentence. Apologies. I think

22:58

if we review the text and the outline code of construction practice and just check if there's any further detail, if there's any further detail we need to add. Just to be clear about that, because I appreciate we haven't mentioned lux levels anywhere. So I'll take that way and just we'll discuss with engineering as to what been most appropriate to include, but my understanding would be more appropriate for operational than temporary, unless Anthony wants to add anything. We could also discuss with each riding as well. Then, yeah,

23:23

if we could take that as an action point, then that would be appreciated. Thank you. That's all my questions. Mr. Brensky, thank you. Thank you. Mr. Giorni,

23:35

so I've removed the candidate Yorkshire world's national landscape and residential visual immunity assessment from today's agenda, so I'm going to move on to design details. So just looking at lighting of the turbines. Could ask the applicants, would lighting from the turbines or any offshore structures associated with the proposed development likely be visible at night from the coastline?

24:06

Paul McCrea, for the applicant, no, there would be no visibility of the turbines from the coast, and that would include any lighting at night, and that would include any other offshore structures. Thank you.

24:22

I'm just going to move straight on to the lightning masks. Now. Is there a maximum number of lightning mask masts to be controlled through the draft DCO or any of its supporting documents? I

24:43

and rosemary. For the academic onshore development manager, there are up to 10 library maps that are depicted in the visuals and are considered as part of the design. However, we know that we haven't actually included that detail in the project description. It so we can take that away and provide an update, but usually would be up to 1027, meter high mass throughout the site. And a number of maths are identified on the visuals.

25:12

So 1010, lightning masks are shown in the visualizations, and that is the maximum that you would envisage there being.

25:19

Yeah. So we subject to a lightning study. But that's based on other projects. That's, I

25:25

think, because we're just looking at making sure that we've we've looked at the worst case scenario. So for example, if the if the study showed that there were 20 that obviously is not what's been assessed here. So I think that there isn't, there needs to be some sort of limitation in terms of a maximum number captured somewhere within the supporting documents.

25:46

So Grace meeting will be applicant, and I think we appreciate that we haven't written that down anywhere. So we'll add that in the design either chapter bike or we'll discuss when Patrick,

25:58

thank you. Applause.

26:03

Um, so looking at the gas and air insulated switch gear design of the converter stations, paragraph 342, of the project description, which is a PP 71 suggests that the air insulated switch gear design represents a worst case scenario. However, at table 529 refers to a gas insulated switch gear design. Can you confirm which gear design, in your view, represents the worst case scenario? Please?

26:39

I think it's the applicant in terms of design, the air insulated switch here is considered the worst case scenario, which has been used in our visualizations, due to the larger footprint it takes across the site. And so gas insulated switch gear is more suitable in terms of kind of environments or space restrictions because it has a smaller footprint, but then also might require buildings associated with the gas insulated maintenance and what is the edge later, such. Here is external things. It's what's commonly found on external subs within UK. So I just

27:19

wanted to check then why does the Why does table 529, refer to gas insulated

27:28

sign the final design decision on exactly what type of switch gear is not being made, and we can't make that at this time. It depends on what's available in the market and the systems provided we believe that air in shaders, which here is most likely solution for the site, but we can't think of equipment availability and what comes from our supply chain. There might be situations where gas switch here might be

27:57

okay. I think I just want to make sure that obviously the environmental statement represents the worst case design scenario. And obviously, if you're telling us here that it should be air insulated, but the table in there refers to gas insulated. I just want to make sure that that aligns.

28:14

Very interesting. I think we'll just check chapter five to make sure that's really clear. We want to make sure that there is the option for either AIS or GIS in the final design. However, we probably just need to make clear in chapter five that for the purposes of the environmental statement, we've selected the AIS footprint that represents the worst case, I think, with that kind of resolve this query, just to make clear that that that is what we've taken forward, although both designs would be considered at the end, yeah, I think clarified in that section of chapter five, if it's if it's

28:42

not clear, yeah, okay, thank you. And you have just touched upon this, but I just wanted a brief explanation of what are the material differences in terms of design between the two different types of switch gear. Design,

28:56

active business applicant. So air insulated. Switch gear uses the air surrounding the structure as medium to insulate, to prevent arcing electrical currents. So if there's fault, or when opening and closing breakers, it arcs across the air. So it involves designing air gaps between structures, whereas gas insulated switch gear, the switch. Gear itself is contained within a pipe or containment system, and it's surrounded by gas, which reduces the distances because it's a better insulating medium, but you need a containment system for that gas, so it introduces SF six is the commonly used gas for it, but that has issues in terms of recent as a greenhouse gas itself. So there's a lot more engineering involved in actually managing that gas. But the belief is that gas in those certificate can be a better long term solution, or better in certain situations. Which one did you say was a better one? Because it depends on the situation. So gas can be better. But in some situations where you've got a polluted environment, or things like offshore, where you're constrained for space, but it is a more complicated system to engineer. So commonly, most substations operate on area state to switch gear unless there is a significant size constraint. But in case of this plot, that as it's not within an urban area, gas in place which get is generally more appropriate when you put inside a building or something like that. But for rural site, air changes which gets preferred,

30:33

okay, and just in terms of the physical design. So for example, it was my understanding that air insulated is lower in height, but larger in footprint. But then gas insulated is taller but smaller in footprint. Have I got that correct? Yes, generally, that's okay. So sorry. Carry

30:57

on. I think the important thing to note is that in both the AIS and the GIS, because I think this is still the maximum building height. Would still be the 24 meters that we've got in our design. I think for me, not being an engineer, but slightly understanding your point the difference between the two, I think there would be an additional building with the GIs that would be smaller than the 24 meters, but to cover that externally, that for me, it's like the not being an engineer, the biggest differences,

31:23

yeah,

31:24

I'm sorry, Mr. Tingle, I'm struggling. You're just a little bit broken. So you were saying that there was a another building that there could if it was the gas insulated, insulated

31:34

system, then the external equipment that you can see in the AIS design is then covered by a secondary building to allow that gas insulated system to work so you would have a secondary, but slightly smaller building than the main one.

32:00

Okay, thank you.

32:02

And I think you've answered my next question. You said that the visualizations were based on the air insulated design. And can you confirm that the Indicative landscaping plans have been based on the air insulated design as well, or not?

32:20

Yes, a model that was used for the visualizations based on air insulated such here, yeah, and that includes Paul MC applicant, so the visualizations and the landscape plans all show the the air insulated option as rosemary, as has said, the key visual and landscape impacts arise from the large converter Hall, rather than from the air insulated or gas insulated part of the proposed development. So the landscape mitigation measures would be applicable to either scenario

33:06

you've predicted. My next question, what would be the differences between landscape mitigation for each so you're saying that they would be similar?

33:17

Yeah, we don't Paul McCray for the applicant, we don't expect there to be any significant difference between the two scenarios that would in terms of their impact, That would require a different approach to landscape mitigation. I

33:43

Okay, thank you. Does

33:52

the just one of the different types of the switch go design have more external paraphernalia than the other? I i

34:03

believe there should be the same number of items, but the GIS ones would be just more compact, so you'd usually have the same number of breakers and bits of equipment. The additional item for the gas invasive switch gear would be the kind of that extra building space involved with managing that gas. You have to recharge the gas system and circulate the gas, which once you don't need with air into switch gear. Can see the air zone for free.

34:36

Okay, thank you. Did East Riding of Yorkshire council have any comments on what the applicants the comments the applicants have just made? No, I can't see any hands. Okay, okay, I'll move on to visualizations. East Riding of Yorkshire Council's local impact report has identified a. Some concerns regarding the submitted photo montages and made requests for amended photo montages. Can the applicants? Applicants confirm if they intend to update or provide any new photo montages to address these concerns?

35:15

Alma Gray, for the applicants, yes, we are aware of these comments, we've taken those on board. We have proposed two additional viewpoints to address the comments made by the examiner authority as well as council. There will be two additional viewpoints. Well, two additional viewpoints have been visited and photography has been taken. We are in the process of preparing visualizations from those two locations. One is on Duncan black road to the south west of the site, and one is on the A, 164, to the south east, and those locations have been advised to East riding Council. We intend to prepare the photo montages for those and submit them at deadline one.

36:19

Thank you. So East Riding of Yorkshire council have asked for photo photo montages of effects from construction and appreciate you said you wouldn't be looking at providing night time construction photography. But do you intend to provide any visualization showing construction effects,

36:50

all macrate for the applicant? Again, we don't consider it's it's possible to provide a meaningful visualization of of construction works, given that those would be temporary and also would be the would change during the construction phase, we have produced a visualization from viewpoint three, which

shows the Indicative extent of the temporary construction compounds which would be within the foreground of that viewpoint. That's just in terms of a horizontal extent, overlaid onto the photograph that has been provided to East riding Council, and we can submit it at deadline one.

37:37

Yes, please. Thank you. Do?

37:46

Okay and

37:48

East riding Bucha Council identified a concern regarding some of the landscaping shown on the Indicative landscape plan, and that they didn't align with the actual visualization. So is that something that you're in the process or planning on addressing?

38:08

Paul McRae for the applicant, I think you're referring to view point three,

38:14

the sorry, yes, yeah,

38:17

the mitigation planting, which appears on the plan is shown in the visualization. We've We've checked this. We believe it, it is in there, but because of the the topography, which is slightly it's difficult to see in the photograph. It appears that the there's a there's a sort of dip in the landscape, which is not really visible in the photograph. And we believe that the landscape planting is is actually shown, but it's within that dip that from that particular location, it wouldn't be particularly visible, and the upper part of the proposed development would still be visible.

39:05

Okay? Noted, thank you. Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Did East wedding Bucha council had have any further comments that they wish to make? Yes, Mr. Black ledge,

39:22

yeah. Bill Black ledge for East riding Council, the two things that we've noted about the latest position on the viewpoints, the viewpoint to the south west from dunflat road. It wasn't one that we we requested, I assume that's come from the examining authority. We are wondering how useful that will be. It remains to be seen. And in particular, I know we're not currently considering the reduced size of. Of the converter station. But when it is reduced, it will effectively result in the easterly section being removed. That is likely to be the section that is visible from that viewpoint. So I guess I'm just thinking ahead a little bit. We also looked at that section of dunflat Road, and there is a very open area further to the east that has no hedge, and we wondered whether that would give a clearer view. It is admittedly closer to the A 164 so it might be argued to be duplicating that. But I think we should just be aware that viewpoint of the Southwest. The other thing to say is about the efforts to communicate the construction

effects through the visualizations and visualization of viewpoint number three, as Mr. McRae has just described, we now have a footprint, I suppose, would be the best way to describe it. Of the construction compounds, there are two of them in viewpoint three that is better than nothing, but it still requires a very hefty degree of imagination to understand what the visual effects of the construction compounds might be. And I, I'm, I think I recall that the applicants offered to provide some photographs of similar construction compounds, so that there would be less imagination involved. But the other thing that I do wonder is whether it is possible to provide some kind of vertical extension to that boundary line so that we get a sense of, for example, there will be a temporary boundary fence, and there will be some compounds and buildings within the construction compound. So I would like to see something that leaves us less likely to have to guess, and more likely to be informed, because that, after all, is the purpose of visualizations. I appreciate that these are forward details that are difficult to assess, but I think an impression would be very helpful at this stage. Thank you. Thank you. Mr.

42:41

Black ledge, can I ask the applicants to respond? Please?

42:54

Paul McCrea, for the applicants, yes, we we've had the Mr. Black ledges, comment about the Duncan black road location, and we're aware of that, so we'll, we'll follow that up, and we will also look at the potential to to show some kind of vertical extension on the view from 3.3 and we'll confirm our approach to that, okay,

43:21

I think that I would find that helpful if that was added to the viewpoint. So if that could be done, that would be welcomed.

43:32

So

43:36

in terms of the location of the additional viewpoint that should be provided, is that directly south, or is that south westerly of the converter stations?

43:52

Paul mccritt for the applicant. So the two locations which I referred to earlier, one is, one is to the south west from dunflat Road, and one is to the south east from the A, 164, I believe the the location that Mr. Blacklich referred to is somewhere between the two along Dunc road to the south of the site.

44:20

Okay, thank you.

44:23

That's fine. So moving on. Es chapter 23 recognizes that the Yorkshire world's important landscape area has gently rolling hills, exposed slopes and a very raw character. Should more visualizations from

the West have been provided to assess the effects on the important landscape area given its elevated and open position in proximity to the proposed converter stations.

44:55

On the great for the applicants, we have still. Accepted the view, the visualization viewpoints based on the zone of theoretical visibility, which is shown within the biggest or the landscape impact assessments, which will be in a PP, 193, I'm not sure the exact bigger reference, but though there are zdb figures for the substation, we didn't identify further locations to the West as part of that exercise, and the visualization locations were agreed with with the stakeholders, including East riding Council, whole city council and art Historic England at the time.

45:58

Okay, thank you. I mean, this obviously is an important landscape character area, and it is in the zone of theoretical visibility. I'm just unsure why a viewpoint wasn't chosen from there.

46:20

Only great for the applicants, there was not considered to be locations where there would be a clear view that would be helpful to show, I think, is the is the answer to that question, and again, it wasn't something that was raised by the council.

46:47

Okay, thank you.

46:52

Table 23 one of ES chapter 23 presents realistic worst case design parameters, including those for the converter stations. It confirms that the Eastern plot finished ground level would be 30.4 meters, and the Western plot finished ground level would be 33.445 meters. There would therefore be a three meter difference between the finished ground floor levels for each of the converter stations. Could you tell me why is this, and that would presumably would result in a finished maximum height of each building being three meters different. And has this been reflected in the visualizations i

47:47

The levels are there to allow a fall across the site for drainage. So in the platform modeling of platforms provided so the ground level varies across the site, and so it falls site to allow for drainage and connection to the drainage system. So it's not a step platform, it's a continuous sleep platform. And

48:13

is that reflected in the visualizations? Paul McCrea

48:17

for the applicant, yes, that's correct. I

48:28

thank you.

48:31

How would the change request request affect this? I

48:45

Anthony Pearson for the applicant the change request, the levels have been remodeled for the location, because it's the use of the landscape for the cut and fill balancing. So the levels are actually slightly lower than the existing level for the platform and that ground works models being provided, these in the visualization.

49:09

Okay, thank you.

49:14

The design and access statement, A, P, P, 233, states that evergreen tree species would be minimized and kept the outer edges of the Woodman blocks. To what extent is this reflected in the visualizations? And how would this ensure adequate visual mitigation during the winter months?

49:38

Paul McCart, for the applicant, the visualizations indicate the landscape mitigation planting during summer conditions so they they don't show the difference between evergreen and. Deciduous species. The intention would be, as part of the detailed landscape mitigation plan, which would be agreed with the council post consent that the detail of that would include more evergreen species towards the the edges of the of the outer edges of the screening plantations, so that the benefit of that can be the benefit extends year round.

50:40

I have asked for winter visualization. So are you intending on providing those with your suite of new visualizations?

50:48

Alma gray for the applicant? Yes, we are. We have done winter vision, winter photography in the past few weeks, and that's in progress for submission and deadline one. Thank you.

51:06

Do the visualizations include other development not yet constructed, which is identified in the cumulative effects assessment

51:19

on the great the applicants? No, they do not.

51:25

Would you prepared be prepared to provide visualizations which do show that?

51:35

Paul McCray for the applicants? I think we would need to understand what cumulative developments were, were needing to be illustrated, and what parameters we would need to be showing in that in those visuals, it's something we could take away and consider

51:59

yes please. And you could take that as an action point to go away and consider that, and I would find that useful in assisting to assess the cumulative effects in terms of visual and landscape.

52:22

And before I move on from the from visualizations, did any of the interested parties such as the council have any further comments they wish to make?

52:37

Okay,

52:38

so I'm going to move now on to the significance of effects, and just first looking at the assessment methodology. Es, chapter 23 identifies the residual effects on landscape character and visual amenity as negligible, negligible during construction following reinstatement planting, however, as I understand it, as a worst case scenario, replacement planting may not be reinstated until potentially two years after construction works finished, parts of the development whilst noting that construction would be temporary if the proposed mitigation to reduce the significance of effects would not be in place until after construction finishes. How can this be considered as reducing the effects during construction? The

53:30

Paul McCray for the applicant, no, I don't believe that the reinstatement would reduce the effects during construction. The effects during the construction works are reported separately within the Ibia chapter, and where those are significant that is noted within the assessment

54:00

are the residual effects are reported as negligible.

54:06

So what the way Paul mccread, for the applicants, the assessment reports on the effects during the construction stage and then again, following the reinstatement of the works, which is taken to be the residual effect of the construction, but

54:28

that wouldn't actually happen until construction is finished. And is that arguably, within the operation period, if we're talking about after construction is finished, you would then move to operation and the effects from operation are reported as they are, but in terms of construction, if they are not reducing the effects during that construction period, how can they be said in within the ES to reduce the effects to negligible,

54:57

the effects are considered. And, as I say, during the during the construction works, and then again, as the long term residual effect, which would be following the mitigation and the reinstatement. Okay, so

55:28

So

55:30

in terms of construction and the actual effects during that construction period, the environmental statement identifies major, moderate and minor, significant effects. So during the construction period, you're saying that those, those are the significance of effects that are reported

55:48

on the great for the applicant. Yes, that's correct. Okay.

55:56

And in your view, would any significant effects identified during the construction period apply to the decommissioning phase. Given the conclusions that in the ES that effects would be no worse. I

56:25

on the great for the applicant, in the absence of any detailed decommissioning plan or any assumptions that we can we can base an assessment on we have to assume that there would be a level of disturbance which would be similar to that arising from the construction works, and which therefore could be significant, but would be no greater than what is assessed for the construction phase.

56:52

Okay, thank you.

57:01

And can I just ask East Riding of Yorkshire Council you've reported that the you consider the significance of effects would be neutral within your local impact report, just in an EIA terms, can you just explain a little bit more about that? Please?

57:33

Graham Valley is writing the Future Council. The neutral impact is based on the the effects of the mitigation. So in terms of the mitigation going in and reaching its 10 year maturity, we've then assumed that at that stage there will be a neutral, a neutral impact on landscape. But if I can defer to Bill Black ledge as well, if he has any further comments on that,

58:08

that's that's not an assessment that we've specifically made, Graham, we haven't, we haven't been requested to provide that kind of assessment, so I'm not quite sure where, where the statement has come from.

58:33

Okay? Thank you.

58:36

So during

58:37

moving on to operation, the significance of effects on landscape, character and visual immunity during operation are assessed at year one post construction. However, could it be the case that landscaping wouldn't be installed by this point, and therefore the significance of effects could be worse, and is set out within the environmental statement.

58:59

Paul McRae for the applicant, the intention of the mitigation strategy as it's presented within the lbia and within the outline landscape management plan proposes that advanced planting would be established at the outset of the construction stage. The detail of this would be confirmed through the detailed landscape management plan, which would be agreed with East Riding of Yorkshire Council. But the the applicant believes that a substantial amount of the screening plantations could be established at the construction outset. Which would that would be at the start of the multi year construction stage, so that, in fact, the screening benefit. Would already be be advanced or be the planting would be maturing. The screening effect would be becoming more effective by the conclusion of the construction stage.

1:00:17

Does it commit? Are you secure advanced planting

1:00:30

applicants? I believe that is within the commitments register, and we could get the reference of that for you.

1:00:41

Yes, please.

1:00:44

Just for example, the outline landscape management plan states that paragraph 13, where removal of trees and hedge rows is necessary to facilitate, facilitate construction, these will be replaced. Placement will take place as soon as it's practical, after installation of the cables and the projects commit to reinstatement, reinstate the landscape along the onshore export cable corridor within two years. I think just in terms of my previous question, whilst you're saying that there would be advanced planting, it's not committed to across the development. And certainly there are instances where, as I've said, it could be two years after if we're looking at this on a worst case scenario basis. So I'm just, I just want to be certain that in terms of the effects which have been presented within the environment environmental statement, that if, if there is no commitment, for example, to this advanced planting and

looking on a worst case scenario basis, that those effects are presented in the right way, because it was my understanding that whilst advanced planting would be considered that it wouldn't, it wasn't necessarily committed to. But if it's in the commitments register, then I will obviously take that away and have a look at it. But as I've just read out for in that case, it could be two years post construction when there is reinstatement landscaping.

1:02:16

Paul McCrea for the applicants, just to clarify, then the advanced planting would be relevant to the landscape mitigation plan at the onshore converter station. The same would not apply to the cable corridor, as it wouldn't be possible to install the planting until the cables have been installed and the ground restored. Okay,

1:02:51

in terms of the magnitude of effect from the converter stations, environmental statement, chapter 23 suggests that the development is reversible, as the converter stations would be decommissioned after 32 years. However, as far as I'm aware, there is nothing in the draft development consent order to secure the decommissioning, to compel the converter stations to be decommissioned after 32 years. Should the effects therefore be considered as permanent? Do

1:03:29

Paul McCray for the applicants, I'm not able to answer the specific question about whether it's should be considered a permanent development, but in terms of the magnitude of change. I don't anticipate that that would whether it's whether it's present, whether it's considered a reversible or non reversible impact. I don't think that would change the overall magnitude of impact, which is based on on the installation of a large building in a in the location where it is it would obviously extend the duration of that impact, but I don't think the overall magnitude, And therefore the level of significance would not change. So okay,

1:04:32

just whilst we're on decommissioning, obviously, I note that there is requirement 27 which requires within six months of decommissioning for a plan to be submitted. I did wonder, in terms of the wording of that requirement, does it need to be amended to ensure that the local planning authority actually grants the decommissioning plan? Otherwise, the requirement simply requires that a plan is submitted to the local planning authority, as I read it, do?

1:05:01

The National of the applicants. 27 three requires development planning authority to provide a decision on any onshore decommissioning plan within three months of the submission of each plan. And then 27 four requires the decommissioning plan approved to be to be implemented as approved. So if

1:05:23

the local planning authority determined that it's not acceptable and issue a decision on that, you've still complied with the requirement,

1:05:34

well, we wouldn't be able to discharge that requirement until we'd submitted a plan that was sufficient to receive approval from the relevant planning authority,

1:05:44

no, but I'm still not convinced that the wording is quite right with that.

1:05:51

Yeah. I mean, I'm happy. I'm happy to revisit the wording. I didn't think it was anything unusual, but I'm very happy to revisit that after another ACA some check whether they've done that any differently.

1:06:05

Thank you. So moving on to mitigation, given that the landscape and visual effects are considered at year 10 as part of the landscape and visual assessment. Can, could the applicants confirm please, is the five years monitoring set out in as 96 efficient and how? How would it be identified and secured? If this needed to be extended? I

1:07:00

I'll create for the applicant. The five year period is intended to ensure the establishment of landscape planting. So that is the period within which any plants which do not establish successfully would be replaced to ensure that the screening or to ensure that the planting gets off to a good start. Essentially, in the longer term, the landscape planting would be maintained, or as long as the applicant has has the as part of the substation and as it forms part of the development so it would be maintained as part of that.

1:07:52

Jen as well for the applicants. Just to clarify as well, we did agree at the DCO hearing that we would update requirement 11 just to cover that long term management for the planting at the substation, that change will be made to the next version of the DCO,

1:08:14

and how would any necessary maintenance and replacement planting be ensured once land is handed back to landowners. Is there any areas which which would require maintenance, which would be outside of the the applicants control,

1:08:35

Rosemary tingle onshore consents manager, I mean, after the initial five year establishment process to make sure that here is established only, however established. And we do intend to hand that back to the map owner for maintenance going on ongoing. We also have to consider, as part of this project, that the cable route will be handed over to an October to manage, as well relations in relation to October maintenance law of the Capitol route, as opposed to the substation zone. But in terms of the substation zone and any mitigation associated with that is that within the gift of the applicant to ensure maintenance of it, in terms of substations over planting, especially the planting that's associated with the screening for the advanced visual impact assessments, we'll be maintaining that for the Lyman

project. And I know we're coming on to ecology later, sort of pick up BMG there, but also there is, although we haven't added any landscaping specifically for BMG purposes of that area there, it does serve dual purposes as part of the energy strategy. Thank you.

1:09:39

So we'll now be discussing the effects on viewpoints 123, and four from PDA 10, could ask if the applicants could display figure 23, seven, showing the photo montage at view viewpoint one from year one, i.

1:10:06

We're just bringing that up. Thank you. Apologies.

1:10:20

We're just having a couple of technical issues our end.

1:10:22

No problem. You.

1:10:40

I think it's due to the size of the document. It's just taking a while. No

1:10:58

problem. There we go. If

1:11:00

we

1:11:13

can have a look at the photo montage view point One at year one, I

1:12:06

apologies. We're really struggling to open this document, but no if that's okay, basis that people can hopefully view it on their own personal screens. If that's okay with you, madam, yeah,

1:12:17

worst case scenario, we can do that. I understand that. Case team have got a backup to hand. So we'll ask case team to try and do that. But if not, hopefully people will have those tan Mr. Blackburg, you've got your hand raised.

1:12:32

Yes, sorry, just if it's helpful, I've got that viewpoint on a screen here. I should be able to share.

1:12:39

Oh, it's very fine. We'll let the case team have a try first, but if perhaps we'll come back to you. Thank you, though, thank you.

1:12:58

Is that showing you on your screen? Though. Liz Prensky, it is, it is showing it's we're going to need it a little bit wider, if that's okay, and perhaps a bit more zoomed out.

1:13:15

Be okay to zoom out a few a little bit. Okay, great, fine.

1:13:28

If we just have, if you go, Mr. Hopewell, if you go down a little bit, we'll just have a look at the year one. So after the That's great. Thank you very much. Brilliant. Thank you. So if I could ask the applicants Please, could you set out how the proposed landscape mitigation reduces the significance of effect during operation from major adverse to moderate adverse, using the photo montages at year one and year 10 to highlight the explanation. I information

1:14:09

on the Craig for the applicant. So the mitigation is is shown in the following image, which is at the bottom of the screen there. So I think if we can scroll down a little bit, we should be able to see both on screen. Thank you. So I think this, this image shows the year one without the landscape screening at the top, and it's clear that the buildings are visible, and it's parts of the air insulate equipment, but also visible and some fencing to the left hand side there in the the year 10 image, the landscape mitigation has established and is screening parts of those in. A lower level infrastructure, although the tops of the buildings and the lightning masks would still be visible, we've we've assessed that that would be a reduction in the level of significance of effects because of that screening potential.

1:15:20

Okay. Thank you. If we can have a look at the same for viewpoint two, please. So Mrs. Hopewell, if you can scroll down to the same, should be just the next ones. Yeah, if you scroll down, great, that's year one and 10. Thank you. And if we could just do the same please for this one. So this is reducing from moderate adverse to minor adverse.

1:15:53

So again, the same the same principles, really the the upper image shows the visualization with no landscape screening and how visible the development would be in that situation, and comparing that with the lower image, which shows that the land gate screening plantation to the south of the site becoming more established. I would add, as we touched on earlier, in terms of advanced planting, much of that plantation that's visible in the lower image would be established at the outset of the construction period. Therefore, the image that's shown in the the upper the year one image is is not a realistic scenario, in that that there would never be a view of the completed substation buildings with no landscape mitigation at all in the foreground.

1:17:11

Okay, thank you. And if we can have a look at viewpoint three now, please do

1:17:23

Thank you. So just in terms of this viewpoint, we're looking at the year one, year 10, and there's not a huge amount of difference, I would say, between the two images. And with this one, there is a reduction from moderate adverse to a minor adverse, significant effect. So I just wanted to understand how that had been derived. Please. I

1:18:06

Oh, sorry, sorry, sorry, I'll mute. Just been unmuted, apparently, for the applicant. So this is the same situation. So we have the landscape mitigation, which is, as we've discussed, partly out of sight in the in the kind of middle distance we do have the the access road in the foreground, which would be visible, and there's there's mitigation proposed along that this would Be a view taken from this book path, which which rises and falls with the landscape. So overall, the views on this book path would benefit from some mitigation from this angle.

1:18:56

So sorry, I'm just trying to understand. I mean, the previous photos, there was clearly quite a difference between year one and year 10 in terms of the landscape mitigation and how that was aiding reducing the effects of the converter stations between these two photos, it is difficult to see a huge amount of difference. I just wanted to understand how that had been assessed, really, because it's, if you look at the two, there really isn't much difference other than really the the hedgerow serving the the access road, I think, but the bulk and the maths and the visual extent the converter station remains the same between the two.

1:19:47

Paul mccread, for the applicant, yes, that's correct in terms of the actual viewpoint here. But as I say, I think as you move along this foot path, which is the viewpoint. Representative of people using this footpath, it would not necessarily be standing in one place, but would would be walking along the footpath. And the level of mitigation that's visible would would vary along the footpath. So I think that's it's recognizing that as part of the assessment. Okay?

1:20:27

And then just finally, can we have a look at viewpoint four, please?

1:20:41

I had similar questions here, really, in terms of the extent of the landscaping and the differences between year one and year 10, and how the how the conclusion that the effect is reduced from moderate to minor adverse had been derived from using these please

1:21:05

landscape planting visible in this montage, in the lower montage, if it's seen it doesn't. So again, the in the in the year one view the low level infrastructure, fencing and so on is partly visible in the foreground of the converter holes in the lower image, some of the mitigation Planting has started to screen that

lower level equipment and and although the the upper part of the converter hole remains visible, we considered that the screening of the low level the word clutter is sometimes used to describe the sort of smaller scale fencing and equipment that that's visible in that area, and that would that would improve the or that would reduce the significance of effect from this location, and just just to point out as Well, in relation to to all of the views, these would be further aided by the change request, assuming that goes ahead, then the bulk of the substation would be greatly reduced in comparison to the extent of the landscape mitigation which have remained largely the same. Thank you.

1:22:49

I think say particularly in regards to viewpoint three, is there any think further? Or could anything else be done in terms of mitigating the effects?

1:23:09

Al McRae, for the applicant, we consider that the landscape mitigation plan, or the outline landscape mitigation plan, I should say, has considered the potential for impacts in the round and provided a an approach that seeks to mitigate all of those effects. There are limitations around the quantity of screening that can be delivered on the north side of the converter station, and that's related to the cultural heritage receptor, which which will be discussed later, I'm sure, at the anti aircraft battery. So I don't believe that there is additional landscape mitigation which would would further reduce those effects, and what's been put forward in the application.

1:24:20

Thanks,

1:24:24

Ms, Hopewell, could you display figure 23, six of the document that you're in, please, and that will show the Indicative landscaping plan.

1:24:41

You go back up to the start. Must be easiest, and go down

1:24:56

there's the one okay. Do.

1:25:10

This is the one before that. That's it, great. Thank you. So, if you could, that's brilliant. Thank you. Mr. So well. So there appears to be a pinch point in the proposed landscape into the north of the converter stations in the native woodland. So it sort of pinches into a fairly narrow strip in comparison to the rest of the particularly comparison to the native woodland proposed to the south of the site, is this sufficient mitigation to provide effective screening in the north, and what scope is there to provide any additional planting to the north of the converter stations

1:25:59

or McRae for the applicant, the landscape mitigation to the north of the substation relies in part on retention of the existing hedgerow, which is the darker green line shown within the screening but the screening plantation to the north, and that's the reason for the sort of kink in the width of that plantation. The area to the south of that hedgerow has been identified as as potentially forming parts of the cable corridor, and would therefore not be available to be planted over with Woodland at the detailed landscape plan stage, at the detailed design stage, that cable corridor could be rationalized and the extent of that northern planting could be reviewed at that time.

1:27:15

Okay, thank you, and there's no way to for that part of the cable corridor for any investigative work to be done up front to be able to reduce it for the purposes of the development consent order, just to give us that that benefit, or that reassurance that there could be potential for additional screening to the north so

1:27:55

Oh, great for the applicant. So just just to go back a step and to confirm that we believe that the mitigation planting, as shown on the plan that's in front of in front of us now is sufficient to provide the level of mitigation which is set out Within the LVI, okay.

1:28:19

Mr. Black ledge, yes.

1:28:22

Thank you. Bill Black ledge for East riding Council,

1:28:27

we did question

1:28:29

previously in meetings with the applicant, the fact that the mitigation planting to the north side of the converter station effectively doesn't appear in viewpoint three. And they reviewed it and said, effectively, No, it wouldn't because of the topography. As we don't have any 3d model. We don't have any 3d model of the site. It's very difficult for us to to verify that. And I must admit, I'm still a little confused that trees and the maturity of 10 years, I think the think the figure was seven meters height would not be more visible in viewpoint three. So I would perhaps ask the applicant to just review that one more time, because it's clearly a point of concern for the examining authority as well. And the other thing that would help independent assessment would be a very simple 3d model, for example, in Google Earth. This is a suggestion that we've made previously that hasn't been taken up by the applicant, because then we could all verify from these viewpoint locations and and indeed, anywhere else within the site. And. Within the area, what the effects of the buildings and the mitigation would be.

1:30:09

Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to respond? Please?

1:30:15

Paul McCray, for the applicants, yes, I, I we can take that point about viewpoint three away and just review that again. I would also highlight that the effect, the likely impact of the converter station on that viewpoint, would reduce further as a result of the change request.

1:30:42

Okay, thank you.

1:30:50

Thank so just on for a question for East riding Yorkshire Council, so within their local impact report, they state that the conversations, impacts of the conversations on the landscape joint operation could be significant, but with appropriate mitigation enhancements, impacts could be neutral. The applicants, however, state in ES chapter 23 that there would be residual, moderate adverse effects on landscape character and the Yorkshire world's important landscape area, which are significant effects. Does the East Riding of Yorkshire Council therefore disagree with the applicants, and consider that there would not be residual, significant adverse effects on landscape character during the operation of the proposed development?

1:32:02

That's Graham Valley, East York is riding at Yorkshire Council. We don't disagree in terms of the local impacts report. We tried to address that and write that in terms of the neutral and positive effects, which are recommended to do, rather than specifying it or referring it back to the actual environmental impact assessment assessments. So yes, we're okay. We agree with the responses of the applicant.

1:32:35

Sorry, just so I understand Mr. Riley. So I mean, at present, the local impact report says that there would be a neutral which I would consider to be no effect, for example, or certainly not significant. But the applicants have said that there would be a significant adverse effect on landscape character, and the warship Yorkshire world's important landscape character area, you're saying that you do agree with the applicant's conclusions on those

1:33:06

in that wider respect, yes, I think we will do yes,

1:33:10

okay, thank you.

1:33:20

Just before we move on.

1:33:32

So in terms of anything that the applicants have commented on to date, so effects on the Yorkshire world's important landscape area and the visualizations we've talked about, did East Riding of Yorkshire council have any additional comments which they would like to make on

the applicants comments that they've made today from a landscape character and visual immunity perspective? Yes. Mr. Blackledge, hello. Yes,

1:34:04

we would

1:34:06

concur with the comments the point was raised earlier about views from the west and the important landscape area. We did go out on site, particularly to look at views from the west and the walkington area. And we felt that it was appropriate to concur with the applicants that there were no particularly useful viewpoints in that direction. So just wanted to confirm that the only other observation I would make with regard to mitigation potential, and I'm conscious that that is questionable how how this can be. I. So it's questionable how this can be enforced, but we have recommended that, because the effect of the converter station is upon quite a wide area of landscape, and there is only so much that can be done with mitigation planting within the footprint of the proposed development. It is worth the applicant looking beyond the site, and, for example, working with Humber forest, which is the local community forest, to consider what can be done to reinforce or enhance landscape quality in terms of tree planting beyond the site boundary? I appreciate that that does raise issues of control and enforcement, but it is nonetheless an opportunity. I think that's all I would want to say on that point. Thank

1:36:05

you, Mr. Blackburn, I appreciate those comments. If I could just ask and sorry, Mr. Blackburn, was it Humber forest that you that you recommend a voice that the app of is? Yeah, I guess

1:36:15

Humber forest is the community forest, part of the northern forest.

1:36:20

Thank you. And if I could ask for any response on that from the applicants,

1:36:32

Rosemary tinkle onshore manager. We discussed this point with each riding at various etgs, and we added a reference to it. I think it's in the landscape management plan that so I think we find reference to the forest that possibly the ego command plan will check. And we also appreciate we can't. We have not included this in our red line boundary because it could be a number of different areas outside of our order limits, but we've made the commitment to look into this as part of our ongoing sort of mitigation outside of the red light boundary and implement where we can

1:37:06

Okay, thank you.

1:37:08

Paul McCray, for the applicant, just to confirm, the reference to Humber forest is in the outline landscape management plan at paragraph 29 Thank you.

1:37:20

Okay. Thank you very much. I'll now hand back to Mr. Ling.

1:37:26

Thank you very much. We've been going for an hour and a half, so I think this would be an appropriate point to take a short comfort break. The time is now 1137 and I suggest that we take a break for 10 minutes and come back at 1147 is that all right with everyone? Yes, madam, while we adjourn, can I ask that all the participants turn off the cameras and meet their microphones, the people watching the live stream will need to refresh their browser. This meeting is now adjourned, and we will be resumed at 1147 I