



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Dogger Bank South Offshore Wind Farms
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 5
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 ON5_16012025

00:06

The time is now 1147 I'd like to welcome everyone back to this component, to this issue, specific hearing for the Dogger bank offshore wind farms. I'm just going to check during the adjournment, we looked at review the script and looked as to whether or not there's some issues, questions that we're going to ask this morning that can be rolled over to written action points. Just want to check with my colleague, Mr. Morrowski, whether she needs any additional time, or whether we're good to go.

00:34

No, I'm fine. Thank you. Thank you. So as I've mentioned, there will be some additional action points with the applicants agreement that we'll put into the action points that we published for today that we would have asked as oral questions, but to save time this morning, we've decided can be asked in a written format. Is that all right?

00:55

Jen asked both the applicants, yes, that's fine, madam, can I just check where we are on the agenda to make sure that we've got the correct people at the table, because we weren't sure whether we had done 9.6 or not. Yeah. Okay, I'll pass back now to Mr. Remske In any event, so that she can deal with the rest of the items and she can confirm that for you. Thank you.

01:17

Thank you, Mr. Arling. Just bear with me one moment. I

01:25

was going to move on to visual amenity next, which

01:31

is

01:37

I was 9.4 i

01:44

Okay, so at paragraph 7.84 of East Riding of Yorkshire Council's local impact report, the council states that there would be a negative impact on visual immunity from construction, but then goes on to say that, as these impacts are temporary and low level, the overall impact would be neutral. I just wanted to understand what the council meant when they said that the impacts were low level. Could you just explain that a little bit more? Please,

02:18

riding a future Council. Sorry. Can you remind me of the paragraph number

02:23

7.84, it

02:38

was regarding the low level did

02:42

is that in terms of the

02:44

the magnitude of impact, is that in terms of the actual height of the the elements, I just wanted to understand a little bit more around the sort of definition of what you consider low level to me, yeah, I believe it's in terms of the the impacts with mitigation, rather than the actual height of the building.

03:02

So the more the magnitude of the effect.

03:11

Okay, and within the local input report, this also describes the converter converter stations as being very prominent and overbearing on properties in Bentley from book farm, and that the impact would be negative in terms of visual amenity, but less into replanting becoming neutral. However, environmental statement, chapter 23 describes the residual effects on visual amenity

03:38

from book farm Bentley and the Beverly 20 walking route as moderate, averse, which is significant. Does the council therefore disagree with the applicants in terms of the residual effects on visual immunity?

03:50

Graham Fauci is riding the theoretic Council? No, I think in terms of the local impact report, what we tried to do was to follow the

04:00

government advice. Note about expressing things in terms of negative, neutral or positive impacts. So that was not specifically in reference to the Kildare assessments that have been done so in terms of the applicants conclusions. Yes, we, we agree with those.

04:18

Okay, thank you.

04:22

I'm going to

04:25

I will leave questions on tree, excuse me, on tree and hedgeway replacements and early replanting opportunities, which I was going to look at under the outline landscape management plan.

04:39

I did have a couple of questions on landscape enhancements.

04:43

So paragraph 4.32,

04:46

of the third edition of the guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessments state that whereas significant adverse landscape or visual effect cannot be avoided or markedly reduced, consideration should be given to a.

05:00

The opportunities to offset remedy or compensate for unavoidable effects

05:05

have. How have opportunities to offset remedy or compensate for unavoidable significant adverse landscape effects be considered for the proposed development

05:22

I

05:30

create for the applicants. So I would refer to the landscape mitigation plan, which which seeks to provide

05:40

screening as well as general enhancement of the landscape.

05:45

The we believe that the mitigation proposals are generous in nature and will serve as enhancement as well as mitigation of the landscape. And we would also refer again to the reference to working with the Humber forest on potential wider enhancement measures.

06:15

At present, the outline landscape management plan states that it seeks to secure enhancements where possible.

06:26

It doesn't commit to landscape enhancements.

06:37

We've got the subdivided statements, particularly with the hedgerows. We could replace single species hedges with species switch hedge rows, which could be deemed as an enhancement,

06:52

is that that's from that you'd say that's from an ecological perspective,

06:57

yeah, but I think it would would apply to landscape as well.

07:02

Okay.

07:06

Is there anything else that you could

07:10

say specifically, which is a landscape enhancement in terms of the landscape mitigation plan? I

07:38

on the Cray for the applicant, just as I say, the the landscape mitigation plan as presented, which

07:48

seeks to

07:51

introduce large areas of native woodland and hedgerow into an area which is Currently intensively farmed. And we believe that that will will introduce a level of landscape enhancement.

08:13

I understand what you're saying. I think there is a difference between what would be considered mitigation and what is enhancement, though, and I suppose what I'm trying to pin down is what you consider enhancements to be. And obviously your colleague gave an example of what he considered would be a very specific site level enhancement from an ecological and landscape a visual perspective,

08:40

it would be difficult, I think, when you're saying looking at the landscape plan as a whole, that

08:47

I'm struggling to understand where the mitigation ends and the enhancements begins. When we're talking about the landscape management plan as a

08:54

whole, Rosemary tingle with the applicant. And one other option that we're considering as part of our bng strategy is looking at potentially managing the ancient woodland depending on wood, in order to try and provide some enhancement measures there in terms of managing the woodland mix, and potentially looking at ash die.

09:16

Bad

09:18

is that? Is that referenced in in the ES At present,

09:23

the biodiversity net gain strategy and what are the options that we're looking at we can take away and have a look, if that's something to include defaults On the outline once game management plan. Thank you. Applause.

09:44

Okay,

09:49

I'm going to move now straight on to the agricultural survey report, preliminary agricultural impact assessment, and outline agricultural method statement with reference.

10:00

AAAs 036,

10:02

so a question for the council. Please within East Riding of Yorkshire Council's local impact report, the council states that no tree survey or agricultural impact assessment is being provided. However, the applicants have provided this information under reference as 36 I just wanted it has the council been able to review this information, and do they have any comments to make on it? Good

10:26

morning.

10:29

Jennifer William for the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, we have now subsequently seen the submitted true information that was

10:38

submitted in November, and had we have had chance to read through it, I believe that it's consistent with the outline measures, the avoidance measures follow best practice.

10:56

Obviously, it's regrettable the loss of some category A trees that appear quite prominent on the landscape.

11:07

So a little bit more detail about why those impacts can be avoided, but otherwise understand the nature of the

11:18

proposal. And

11:22

yeah, happy with how it goes in terms of avoiding impacts on ancient trees, and particularly the woodlands around the converter station.

11:36

Okay, so you have no concerns regarding veteran trees or effects on ancient woodland.

11:45

At first reading, you think, my goodness, what's going on. But when you come down to the mitigation section, it does feel that they've, they've done enough in terms of those impacts around the temporary construction compounds and the whole routes through those areas,

12:08

they're not fully avoided,

12:11

but

12:14

it's very tight around the converter Station, isn't it?

12:19

I think micro siting will be key on site and the kind of arbor or cultural supervision,

12:32

okay, is there anything in your view

12:35

that needs to be amended in regards to any of the protection measures moving forward? Uh,

12:43

given that question, I would appreciate if we could come back with that with a written response so we can fully assess in bit of your questions. Please. Yes, of course. Um, if we could provide that for deadline, one would that be feasible? No problem. Thank you very much. Applause.

13:08

Um,

13:10

so moving on to works number 29 A of the draft development consent order. Um, yesterday at issue specific hearing. At the issue specific hearing, we asked the applicants about the wording of schedule one of the draft eco regarding works, number 29 a which refers to permanent landscaping for the screening of the converter stations, comprising enhancement and management of ancient woodland and the local wildlife site. And the applicants request requested to respond at today's hearing.

13:44

As regards to this, can you just clarify what you meant by enhancement of ancient woodland? In regards to works number 29 A,

13:59

we considered enhancing the woodland with a simple kind of a management of woodland management measures

14:07

as well as the expansion of the woodland that we mentioned earlier through natural regeneration and perhaps some

14:15

complementary plotting as well.

14:20

So this was a way to

14:25

boost biodiversity within the ocean woodland.

14:30

And just to clarify the point earlier, the

14:35

greenery agricultural Impact Assessment did not identify any oceans veteran or ocean woodland trees that will be directly impacted by the project,

14:48

but there are quite a few instances where mitigation will be required to avoid impact on the veteran trees. So this is being seen as a priority, and it

14:59
will be.

15:00
Implemented on site.

15:03
This is quite high on our priority list is to

15:12
thank you.

15:17
So have a few questions on good design that I would like to ask. Just before I do that, I just wanted to give

15:27
East riding of Bucha Council one final chance to comment on anything in terms of the landscape and visual effects for the proposed development I

15:42
um,

15:44
so I'm, I'm, there is a point, sorry, Bill Black History riding Council, there is a point that we have been discussing in previous meetings with the applicant,

15:57
which I think relates To the landscape enhancement point that you raised previously, and it may be something that we come on to in the next section. So apologies if that's the case, but the suds design, the sustainable drainage design,

16:13
is something that we consider thus far has been engineer led, and we have stressed and suggested, and we believe the applicant has taken on board the principle that it should be landscape LED. And I think if that were the case, or

16:35
if that is the case, that there would be notable landscape and ecological enhancement resulting from that. So just if we in case, we didn't touch it anywhere else, I just wanted to mention that now, thank you. Thank you.

16:52

And just quickly for the applicants, Mr. Blackledge said that you were looking at taking on board. How are you intending on responding to those requests?

17:06

Raise me a tingle for the applicant. We've been discussing this one with East Riding for a while as part of our environmental technical groups. The design that's on the landscape management plan is very oval and uniform, and that's very much to make sure that we've got the maximum surface area for the sustainable drainage pond. However, we've spoken with Bill on this, and we've Mr. Blackburn, sorry, and we've, we've sort of discussed options that we could take forward. The design and access statement has a number of sort of illustrative options in there, and then we're looking to how we could incorporate those on site. This is something that we would, I think I'd stress something we normally do at the deep Health Design The DV health design stage. So we'd ideally like to take that next level of detail at that stage. But we have added a wording to the landscape management plan and the drainage strategy and COVID sort of practice multiple check just to add it would be a landscape led approach. We appreciate that we might need to strengthen that wording further, following sort of comments back from East Riding and Council, just to make sure that that is 100% clear. But it is our intention,

18:16

diverse and then landscape features

18:19

that's there. But if that word is still not clear enough, we could seek to make it clearer. And we'll, we'll continue those discussions with East Riding. Okay, I'll leave you to discuss that with East Riding, Yorkshire Council. We you said the outline, landscape management plan, and you thought there was another document where that in the draining strategy? Did you say

18:38

drain strategy? And

18:41

I think we will be adding it to the design access statement if we haven't already.

18:47

Okay, thank you.

18:51

Okay, so looking at good design. The planning Inspectorate published guidance on good design for nationally significant infrastructure projects in October 2024

19:02

I intend to ask queries in relation to this guidance, which I will refer to as the guidance, and also in relation to the design and access statement submitted with reference a, PP, 233,

19:14

the guidance states that achieving good design requires a holistic approach to deliver high quality, sustainable infrastructure that responds to place and takes account of complex environments. The design and access statement sets out design parameters for individual parts of the onshore elements of the proposed development, such as the landfall onshore export cable corridor and converter stations. However, it does not appear to provide design parameters for the onward cable connection to the proposed Burke Hill wood National Grid substation.

19:44

The design access statement also provides some information on individual design elements for the converted stations, such as materials, access, lighting, noise, etc. However, the design and access statement appears to lack a holistic approach, which the guidance of.

20:00

Good design advocates for can the applicants explain if and how a holistic approach to good design was taken for the proposed development as a whole? I

20:30

rose meeting of the applicant. I did not draft the sign access statement myself, but I've been heavily involved in it. Given the last minute nature of the addition, we haven't got the author himself here today, but I'll cover the points. Along with along with Paul, we felt we did take a holistic approach to it. And obviously one of the key components for, I think you mentioned, the onward cable route, but for the cable route, including considerations of the onward cable and if that's not clear, we can, we can look at that related around the auctioneering approach that we took. I think one of the key elements was considering the avoidance of sensitive features, which was a key element of our optioneering and design process, when considering the land for the cable route and the onward cable route, and also the selection of the converter station. And so we considered all elements of design, including sort of a landscape led approach topology containing our key elements, such as flood risk, historic environment, to make our design decisions, to select our route and to select our final decision. There's a number of sort of overarching design principles and sort of table 4.1 of the document that kind of puts their design principles, but they were considered in quite a holistic way, in terms of the way we applied them to the whole development. I don't know if that sort of helps in response, yeah, thank you.

21:52

I think it would be helpful if the design access statement could be more

21:58

specific. As you just noted, there are some elements where I feel like it is quite segregated in terms of, as I said, it doesn't look at the onward cable route, and the design parameters are obviously just focused on the

22:12

well, the design information is focused quite heavily on the converter station. So I would ask if you can have a look at the design access statement in light of the guidance, which has been published in October 2024 that would be helpful.

22:33

Sorry, just a note on that one. We were aware that new guidance had come out since we published the document and drafted the document, we've had a look at that, and we note that your additional questions are quite heavily related around that. So the authors going to provide written comments into any area that we may not have COVID in light of new guidance. So that's fine, yeah, okay.

22:57

I note that on the Hornsey four development consent order. Part of requirement eight requires the details of the substation are subject to a design review process carried out by an independent design review panel to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, given similarity in the locations and the concerns stated by the local planning authority in their local impact report. Why is there no such requirement for the proposed development?

23:27

I'm looking from the design and access statement. So at the end of the document, there's a section on design champion and design panel. So we'll propose to have a similar panel to 124, proposed

23:41

which would review the design and provide sort of expert advice in terms of their landscape knowledge and their design, and the design champion would sit on that panel. And so we proposed similar measures.

23:52

Yes, I see that there would be design panel, and I think that there's a slight nuance in the difference that with the Hornsey fall project, it would be to the satisfaction of the local planning authority. And it wasn't clear to me from the design and access statement, what extent the local or planning authority would

24:11

have on, you know, the impact they would have on being able to

24:17

determine the the review panel, so that there is a bit of a difference there. I suppose. If I could ask East Riding of Yorkshire Council, what, what would they seek to see in terms of consultation with yourselves, in terms of the design panel, and if that could be incorporated into the design and access statement, for example,

24:42

Brent Grand Valley is riding a future Council. Yes, it is something we raised, and it was also something which our members, when the local impact report went to committee, were quite

24:53

strong in terms of what they would like to see. I

24:56

think the design and access state, design and access statement, we.

25:00

About it in terms of it does say that there will be a design review panel in there, but it would benefit ourselves as the council, if there was more clarification as to what that involves and the timings of when that's done as well, to ensure that there is sufficient time before the

25:17

the final detail is submitted to us for for agreements in terms of consultees and who should be on there,

25:24

I think I can really speak in terms of who we would like to see from the council. We do believe that that should, as a minimum, include

25:33

a council representative from the design

25:38

team. The local councilors have also asked that at least one local member is included within that as well. Other than that, I think it needs to be

25:48

independent architects or independent groups who can provide that design review, excuse me, can provide that design review panel expertise

26:02

and the cast for the applicant's response to that,

26:05

please raise my tingle for the applicant. Yeah, we're happy to discuss this further with them, East riding of York council about how they could work and timings, I think in relation to who would sit on the council. I know we haven't included a lot of detail in the application, but we'll be discussing this further, I think in terms of the level of expertise we'd like to sit on the group, we prefer to keep that professional level of expertise. In terms of it being an internal panel of people from RW or project who understand design, process, engineering and but we completely take off all the external side of things. So having an external landscape architect would be part of that, in terms of having East riding and the parish council sat on the design panel itself. It's something that we'd we'd seek to

26:49

not implement at this stage. However, we do take away your comments just due to the professional nature of this, and at the end of the team, what we'd like to do is have the panel review and provide their their expert knowledge, and then I think we'd seek to discuss with East riding how we could then involve the local parish councils and themselves and the outputs of that to feed back into sort of future meetings. So I do want to take your comments on board and discuss further, but we just want to take away and sort of highlight the appropriateness of the right level of expertise being sat on the design panel. So we'll, we can come back further writing on that one, but that would be my initial sense. Okay, thank you. I think so, a couple of things there. So looking at, perhaps the way in which the Hornsey four requirements worded in terms of

27:36

potentially the design review panel to the satisfaction of the relevant local planning authority. So I would encourage you to have a look. Encourage you to have a look at the wording of that, I think, in terms of the requests from Mr. Barley, looking at the way in which the council representatives or any local members can be involved in that process in some way. I think that would be, that would be really useful. I mean it perhaps you could look at some sort of framework for engagement, and that could be incorporated within the design and access statement, and just looking at some indicative,

28:10

not even necessarily a time frame, but a timeline of how, how the consultation process would work, for example, that would that would be quite helpful.

28:19

Obviously, we've any recently received a local impact before comment on that, but it's one that we want to work up and talk through with each riding to so we had anticipated your comments and are sort of working on it and on a potential solution to that. Okay, appreciate that. Thank you.

28:35

Okay, those are all the questions that I had in regards to the landscape and visual effects. Does anybody have any comments regarding any of the matters we have discussed under this agenda item?

28:52

I can't see any hands up in one

29:01

moment.

29:06

Mr. Blackburn, yes, sorry, late, a late thought

29:12

we raised with the applicant

29:16

on fairly general point on design, but the use of color, and in particular environmental color assessment, because there is a tendency to default to whichever row, gull wing, gray, whatever it may be.

29:32

And color could be particularly useful. And to be honest, I can't remember now what their response was, I believe they did take it on board, but it might be worth, worth just seeking clarification at this point, and that, sorry, that's color, color for the for the converter station, the converter stations, yes. Did the applicants have anything they wanted to say on on the point of color?

29:59

And.

30:00

Yeah, Rose meeting will be, I think that wedding is inside an access statement. I haven't got to open right now in front of me, but I can,

30:07

I can provide the reference

30:09

we took that was following discussion with East riding and Bill's recommendations. So we, we haven't got that specific reference, but I will find the relevant section.

30:20

Okay, thank you.

30:23

So we will now move back on to agenda item 10. I don't know if you need to have a change of seats at the applicant's end.

30:35

Yes, please, Madam, if we could just have a moment to sort of keep their own Thank you. Yeah. Yeah, so

31:50

thank you, Madam, we've now moved people to see appropriate seats. Would appreciate it. Thank you. I'm just conscious of time, and in terms of expediency, I am going to defer some of the items on this agenda as well to the action points

32:07

I did want to ask.

32:13

I understand that the council's archeological advisor is not available today, if I only just had that correctly. Mr. Barley,

32:25

Graham Farley is riding a few orchard Council. That is correct. It's given me a shortish three paragraphs in terms of the current situation in terms of ongoing work between our archeologist and the applicants, archeology, archeology scene. So

32:41

I can always go through that if necessary. But otherwise, no, we don't have the actual

32:47

specialist officer available. No, okay, that's fine. It would be helpful. I think, just in terms of expediency and time, would you be able to submit that at deadline one, and that will give that as a useful update in terms of where you where matters are standing? Yes, I can do that. Thank you. Appreciate that.

33:09

I'm going to focus today on the effects on

33:14

on heritage assets and notably but farm heavy anti aircraft gun site,

33:21

so in the just to start with, if we can just have a look at the historical context of the Heritage asset in the infrastructure settings assessment, a PP 178 is acknowledged that the raw character of the site contributes to its character. Does the rural, open nature of the wider area contributes the setting of this to heritage asset, in your view.

33:51

Dr John Abbott, for the applicant I led on the Historic Environment assessment,

34:00

yes. In short, the wider landscape does contribute.

34:06

It contributes differently in different areas. So the views to the north and to the west

34:14

are more significant because that's the planned field of fire of the gun battery is the views to the south and the

34:22

views to the south and south east are less significant to that

34:27

terms of understanding how the how the gun battery function was designed.

34:32

And would you say that the views to the south

34:37

still contribute, albeit a lesser in in terms of setting it in a general context, yes, but not specifically in terms of that historical value. In the same way I.

35:02

Could, could aircraft have approached from the south? Is that? Is that likely to have happened at all?

35:13

It's

35:15

John Abbott for the applicant, that is entirely possible. I think the gun battery is part of a much wider designed and planned scheme which provides, effectively an encirclement of hull and the strategic port facilities at hull Grimsby in England, on on that timber area. So as a result,

35:39

you that that would be mainly dealt with by gun batteries further to the east and to the south, which would be firing away from the city, and so as to not Buy collateral damage to that to the city itself. I

36:05

and could the applicants confirm if the original brick and clinker track serve in the scheduled one would be affected in any way by the proposed development

36:15

for the applicant, there would be no physical effect on the scheduled area, no

36:26

thank you.

36:30

What would you describe as the most defining form of development viewed from public vantage points when observing the heritage asset?

36:41

I um,

36:43

John, John Abbott, for the applicant, I think it is probably into in terms of viewing, in terms of viewing the aspect, in terms of experience. It is probably that approach from butt farm, as you approach the asset and as you see the gun batteries themselves, and as you are quite close in it, looking at the gun batteries, it's primarily scheduled for it evidential value, and it's historical value, and those are mostly manifest in its structure, which can really only be appreciated in those quite close to use. So it is quite in order to understand that you do need to be quite tied into it. And it is quite well screened in use from north because because of the modern hedge there. And it's also designed to be quite low in the landscape for protective purposes. So it's not one that extensive views of it from far away are particularly significant.

37:54

And what would you say is the most divining form of development when viewed from the Heritage asset itself. So looking out from the asset,

38:05

the applicant, I would say that is again, looking to the north and west,

38:13

which is sort of direction away from the I mean,

38:17

actually from the asset itself, looking north and west in that plan feel defined.

38:23

That's where you have that that open sky and that open countryside that it's aimed to work over.

38:39

And how would you describe the experience of this asset and its setting to be affected by the proposed development?

38:50

John Abbott, for the applicant, I think it is.

38:56

This is something we covered in the settings assessment.

39:01

It is the I mean, the price would would be very would be visible from the asset, and in some use of the asset, it would be quite prominently visible. But that

39:13

that visibility itself is not the determinant of the effect. Effect is determined by how that visibility interacts with

39:22

the significance and how and how it would change that view. And effectively, it is not located in those areas that are most significant to understanding. It would not affect how you would it does not affect the sort of evidential value of the site at all and those features that contribute to its historical value, it doesn't affect that understanding of how it was designed and functioned. So

39:52

that that's that's where we we thought certain words effectively, was quite promptly visible. It wouldn't interact particularly with those.

40:00

And those values and those interests.

40:05

Okay? Thank you.

40:12

So the examining authority notes that es chapter 22 has been updated to provide consideration of the effects from lighting on heritage assets, which refers to table 22, one, and that presents the realistic worst case design parameters regarding lighting. However, this table provides very limited information regarding the potential extent of any lighting. How can the examining authority be confident that any lighting used at the converter stations would not have a harmful effect on the nearby heavy and anti aircraft gun site.

40:46

John mabbit, for the applicant, that table effectively summarizes the elements that have been taken from the design or the project description. So it's not there to set that up in great detail. It's there to reference which elements of that wider project description we've looked at. And I think, as with the operational lighting is very limited. And

41:18

Lauren Thompson, I'm sure, consent manager for the applicant, just on the subject of lighting, we did clarify that during operation, there would be no continuous or night time lighting of the onshore converter station, and

41:33

lighting during any operation maintenance activities is very minimal, with visits mainly taking place in daylight hours. So that's the basis on which the assessment has been made.

41:44

I think at the moment, I'm in a situation where I've heard what you're saying in terms of it's minimal that it would be that any sort of operational activity is generally taken during daylight hours. However, we've got next to no detail on in terms of what actually the levels of lighting would be on the site,

42:05

in terms of the requirement, which we did mention yesterday, there's no maximum parameters which are secure in terms of lighting on the site. It's just difficult for me to sort of understand what the actual effects were going to or could be, given the sort of lack of any details parameters that we've got on lighting. I know that you are going to take away and have a look at the requirement that I referred to yesterday, so I welcome that. But it's just a point that I wanted to make that it's, it's, it's difficult to

42:37

understand at the moment, in terms of the details and lighting presented, what the effects are going to be.

42:55

Sorry. Rosemary, single manager, just in relation to the DAs and

43:00

construction lighting. We've also got a requirement. It's more related to ecology, but we have the same purpose about providing a dark corridor around the outside the site. So again, there's further descriptions of construction lighting in there, in terms of being directional and and the height and the way it could go. So although that does relate more to ecological and dark corridors, I just wanted to draw your attention to that element as well. Thank you.

43:24

I was going to ask the applicants to display figure 2315,

43:29

a however, I think that our case team have got that to hand. If the applicants are still struggling with displaying the document, would the applicants prefer if we try to do that? I

43:43

Yes, please remember if that's okay.

43:56

Thank you.

43:58

So

44:00

if we just, obviously, we're looking at the effects on but farm here, so in terms of, can I just check that my understanding is correct here, that as regards to the heritage asset, the two forms of proposed mitigation would be screening, planting and the adoption of An appropriate surface finish cover for the converter station? Do

44:23

from Thompson for the applicant. Yeah, the full details are within the design and access statement, but it's primarily as adding and treatment of the entrepreneur stations and the landscaping planting proposals.

44:37

So is there anything else on top of that in terms of mitigation that you're proposing to mitigate the effects on the heritage asset,

44:48

the ones we've described are the key sort of mitigation.

44:54

Okay, thank you. Applause.

45:01

So looking at the image that we've got here, would you say that despite the screening, the majority of the converter station, including an appreciation of its bulk and mass, would still be visible from the Heritage asset?

45:19

I'll have it for the applicant. I mean, yes, I think, as we have said, it would, it would still be visible, and quite prominently visible.

45:27

I think what we are needing to assess, however, I think before, is we need to understand how that interacts with significance, rather than just understanding mere visibility.

45:45

And can you describe what an appropriate surface finish could be and how this would mitigate the effects on the heritage asset?

45:56

Tom Abbott, for the applicant, I think again, as we heard earlier in the landscape and visual what, what we are looking at is a mitigation scheme that effectively creates a separation between the asset and proposed development by removed by screening at lower level visual clutter. I think one of a better word so to screen things like vehicle movement, signage, low level lighting, staffing, so we only have those, the more architectural forms visible, and then managing that effect with the use of surface finishes to create that distance. So effectively, the closest elements of that development would be screened, which are the lower level parts of the switch gear, leaving the things

46:50

visible. And I think again, it's worth noting that these views are of the of both converter stations. So following the change request, the one of those would be would be going so that would reduce that that period quite substantially.

47:12

Okay, thank you. How can you be sure that the surface finish would assist in mitigating the effect? Given that the details would not be agreed until after consent was given,

47:35

as well as the applicants, apologies, madam, was that question?

47:39

Yes? How can you be sure that the surface finish would assist in mitigating the effects, given the details would not be agreed until after consent.

47:49

Got John Abbott for the applicant, because that would be one of the aims of that

47:55

review process in design.

47:58

That would be one of those objectives of that design process.

48:06

Okay, thank you.

48:09

This actually goes back to a point that you made a moment ago. So

48:14

you suggested that the use of planting the screen, the, excuse me, the closest low level elements of the converter station would assist in mitigating the effects. However, the heights of these lower level objects aren't controlled through the draft development consent order. So how can we be sure that the lowest elements would definitely be screened you?

49:00

Jen as well, for the applicants, we are considering whether we could include more parameters within the DCO itself in order to ensure that the maximum heights that have been assessed are properly secured. So if we could take that away and look at whether we could update the DCO just to provide that reassurance. Thank you.

49:23

I think it would have to

49:26

link back to planting, not necessarily through the DCO itself, but I think you'd need to have a think about what type of planting would be going there, and making sure that that was captured within the,

49:39

possibly the outside landscape management plan to make sure that

49:43

there was consistency between the planting and what that was designed to screen in terms of the lower level objects and what sort of height that would need to be possibly,

49:57

right? Yes, that's fine. We'll consider that. Thank.

50:00

Thank you.

50:02

And to what extent have views from the Heritage asset been taken account of, and what mitigation is proposed to reduce any effects on views from the Heritage asset?

50:17

John Levitt, for the applicant, I think yes, we have considered views from the Heritage asset.

50:25

Again, we have weighted those in terms of their contribution of significance. As you can see, this visualization is a view from the Heritage asset,

50:37

and that that mitigation in these views would be what we have just been discussing.

50:49

Okay, thank you.

50:52

Obviously we spoke earlier about this, the sense of openness and the rural nature of the wider area, and the contribution that makes to its setting and in terms of views from the site,

51:06

is there any way that the introduction of landscaping could actually to, could actually reduce views out of the site, ie containing those and causing harm To to the heritage asset?

51:21

Um John Abbott for the for the applicant,

51:25

I think that the intent has always been to try and use that planting to work with the

51:36

to work with the existing historic landscape character and to reflect that network of

51:43

actually woodland that is visible,

51:46

there is also, I think we need to remember that there is no further development going on in the rest of that arc of view, which is actually the designed arc of fire. So if you were to turn round and look in the direction that the gun battery is designed to face, then there would be no change to that. And I think that's one of the things we want to highlight. Because one of the concerns is, as soon as there is a viewpoint produced discussions about that viewpoint, not about the contribution, the significance of the areas which are not shown and which would not be affected.

52:25

So want to make sure that

52:28

that openness would that openness will remain, because it will still be there. I'd have changed it's only this area where there is an existing hedge, an existing woodland. So it that and that makes less of a difference.

52:46

Thank you.

52:47

When you say it makes less of a difference, are you suggesting that it makes no difference or less of a difference?

52:56

It

52:57

I mean,

52:59

there is arguably a change to the

53:04

slight reduction to openness, but there are existing woodlands in there, so that view to this to the south is not as open As the views in other directions, necessarily.

53:21

Thank you.

53:24

So if we can have a look at ms Hopewell, if you can just scroll up a little bit, just so that we can see the chief the year one and the year 10, that's great. Thank you.

53:36

Can you explain, with reference to these figures,

53:40

why you consider the magnitude of impact to be low adverse prior to mitigation?

53:49

John Abbott, for the applicant, we considered the that magnitude of effect looking at the contribution of those various views to significance. And I think as we, as we've said,

54:04

that significance is primarily intrinsic to those to those structures. It's contributed to by views in the direction or views from the asset in the direction of that design, Field of Fire, and views from the remainder of the

54:24

of the AA game battery site, which is that field between the between the scheduled area and the

54:33

and the converter station, where was a radar mat and various hunted accommodation. So it's those primary those primary contributions are views from the south and the south east and looking Northwest, also in and up through north, north to West from the gun battery itself. So those principal contributions to.

55:00

The significance in those views weren't going to be affected.

55:04

So as a result,

55:08

while there is visibility post development, it doesn't impinge on those key elements of that, of that setting, which is, which is why we assessed it is low in the absence of mitigation.

55:20

Okay, thank you.

55:24

Do you know how many meters away the converter station and its infrastructure would be from the Heritage asset as a worst case scenario? You may not be able to tell me that off the top of your head, but I just wondered if you had that information.

55:38

We don't have that measurement, exact measurement, I'm afraid. Okay.

55:50

Would you say that they appear in in terms of views from the heritage? Would you say that they the converter stations appear in close proximity, or is there

56:04

more, more sort of separation than that?

56:11

I think this is another issue around the Mitigation Scheme, and I think illustrates how that mitigation works in that that screening of the lower the lower level,

56:28

it does perceptually increase that separation. I think close proximity

56:34

is probably

56:39

it's very difficult term. I would say it's probably an overstatement, but I think it certainly is

56:47

clearly and prominently visible in the absence of mitigation, and that mitigation increases that perception, increases that sense of perceptual separation.

57:00

Okay, thank you.

57:04

A question for the council, if I may please, within the within the local impact report that paragraph 7.91

57:12

the council states that there would be substantial harm to the setting of the scheduled monument,

57:18

could the council confirm if they consider this to be during construction and OR operation, and why they consider the level of harm to be substantial.

57:32

Grand Valley is riding a future Council.

57:36

Yes, it's something I we don't have a archeology, sorry. We don't have our conservation officer officers available today. I did have a discussion with the conservation manager yesterday, so I'll try and explain his particular comments in relation to that, in terms of what we described as substantial firm and what we didn't what he wanted to clarify was in terms, and I think this is probably following discussions you've already been having, but in terms of the the impacts on the building remains themselves, then there is no specific because those built, those remains not been been attached. But what he was keen to stress was, as you been

58:19

clearly discussing earlier is that the historical context of the gun battery is about the visibility around the gun battery in terms of having visible skies and visible views around it.

58:32

And the conclusion that he has come to on that is that there would still be substantial harm in terms of the setting of the of the

58:44

scheduled monuments because of the building which would have the construction period. Haven't actually discussed whether it's construction and operational, but clearly,

58:55

as it gets built, there will be greater

58:58

what he also felt that was the mitigation. Even though it helps to screen the building, there is some benefit to that. It doesn't overcome the harm that's caused by the

59:11

what's the right word, but enclosure of the of the site.

59:21

Okay, thank you for that clarification. Mr. Farley,

59:25

I think

59:26

the applicant set out their position in terms of what they consider the effects to be. Did you want to make any response to Mr. Valley's comments? I

59:58

we're just dividing by that.

1:00:00

Yes, that's fine. John Abbott, for the applicant, I think at this stage we would want to note that we do disagree quite strongly that assessment of the magnitude of harm, and I think that relates to both the

1:00:19

in effect for a development to cause central harm through change setting that harm has to affect and remove almost all, or approaching all of the significance of that asset. So really, all, almost all of the significant asset must come from its setting, if the asset itself is physically unharmed. And I think, as we've pointed out, there are, there is a contribution of that setting would be, even without mitigation, would be largely unchanged. So I think that's that's why we disagree with that. And to note that

1:01:00

I've also been advised that the made the distance to the Convert station is approximately 140 meters to the between the schedule monument and the red line. That's

1:01:15

helpful. Thank you. Applause.

1:01:25

So in terms of potential public benefits suggested by the council within its local impact report, East Riding of Yorkshire Council suggested implementing mechanisms to facilitate an improved visitor experience or greater public benefits to be derived from the monument. Can I just ask either the applicants or East riding of the orchard council to confirm if they know who owns the land on which the scheduled monument is located, and would they need to be party to any agreement for an improved visitor experience?

1:01:59

I believe Lauren Thompson, the applicant, sorry, on the question of the ownership, I understand it's a buck farm

1:02:07

land owner who is located on private land,

1:02:12

yeah, okay,

1:02:14

so presumably they would need to be party. So any,

1:02:18

any, any agreement for improving visitor experience. Yes,

1:02:24

sorry, Lauren. Talked some of the applicant on this subject. We have been in dialog with Hamburg theological partnership so East ridings advisors and Historic England on this matter, about looking at ways where we could potentially provide potential enhancement options, including these visitor experiences you just mentioned, and we have put forward some options, and we are awaiting feedback from Historic England as to what what would be a sort of preferable approach that we could then investigate. But as you mentioned there would be potentially issues with arranging land access and that kind of thing. But we're, we're waiting for sort of direction as to which enhancement options might be

1:03:12

preferable. So it's something that we're actively engaging in, and we're moving those conversations forward.

1:03:19

Okay, I welcome. I welcome that. Thank you.

1:03:23

How are you

1:03:27

proposing capturing something like that? Have you got as far as thinking about that yet?

1:03:36

Yes. Lauren Thompson, the applicant, so we would envisage that would be part of the public engagement and outreach strategy that's within the outline, WSI, Britain, scheme of investigation, which, at the moment, outlines a suite of potential options, and it's proposed they will be developed for the final details. WSI, so we've started a program of engagement in terms of talks of parish councils, archeological websites, and those sort further stages around Buck farm are,

1:04:10

are something that we will be looking to develop in the future and secure through the written scheme of investigation, which is a DCA requirement. Yeah, I'm just it's, and we did briefly mention this yesterday, whether it would trigger the need for a section 106, agreement at all, whether you were looking to sort of approach it in that way. But

1:04:32

okay, so I think it's too early for us to say, at the moment, without any clearer direction as to sort of one just might be preferable if we were to go down the road of needing to have access to butt farm, because obviously the site is on private land, that would possibly be a private arrangement. But we're not at the stage say at this point.

1:04:55

We obviously also need to ensure that the relevant tests for legal obligations.

1:05:00

Into a met in relation to that particular matter, in terms of whether or not section 106 would be appropriate. Yes, of course. Yeah, absolutely. Okay. Well, I'll just encourage you to progress that as as quickly as you can. Thank you. And

1:05:16

I think if you can provide an update at the next deadline that would be helpful as to where you where you are with that,

1:05:30

I was going to ask the Council on some comments and a request for, excuse

1:05:36

me,

1:05:38

madam, yes, yeah, England has

1:05:42

advised us they were going to respond to our proposals for enhancement measures in their written representation. So that would give you the time scale for power.

1:05:53

Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Yeah, no, that's, that's great. Thank you. So I was, I was going to ask the council some queries as regards to some comments that had been made

1:06:06

in the in their local impact report. But I think,

1:06:11

well, I'll see. I wonder if how you're intending on responding to the So,

1:06:19

sorry, I was asked. I was wondering if the council had their representative there, so we could comment on some comments from Historic England, but we'll leave it there, I think for today on that one, because it's as the council's historic advisor hasn't, isn't able to to be here today. Okay, I think on that, has anybody got any other comments as regards to

1:06:42

the effects on Buck farm or anything that we've discussed so far today. Do the applicants have anything further that they wanted to add?

1:06:58

Yes. John Lavitt for the applicant. During our discussions with Humber archeological partnership, their archeological

1:07:08

advise that they would defer to Historic England on matters relating to Butt Farm so that would be captured in the state of the common ground with H, A, P, I, okay,

1:07:31

thank you.

1:07:36

And does anybody else have any comments that they wanted to raise?

1:07:42

Nope, okay, I can't see any hands. In that case, I'll pass back to Ms Dowling.

1:07:49

Thank you very much. Just quick question for Mr. Vari one of your

1:07:55

colleagues said that they weren't available between one and two. Next item on the agenda is onshore water environment. Was that something that they were wanting to talk to? Just trying to calculate whether we break for lunch now, or maybe we deal with that and then break for lunch.

1:08:15

I've got a hand up from Jonathan Tate, Yes, Grand Valley is right in New York City Council. I don't believe it is, but it's probably better if Mr. Taker, Mr. Tate, can answer that.

1:08:27

Hello, madam, yes. John Tate, I cover the environmental control for contaminated land. I'll be unavailable between one and two so

1:08:36

yes, later. Okay, let me just check with my colleague, Mr. Sandy, whether he was expecting to ask you some questions on the next

1:08:47

matter. Okay, thank you. I think actually, given the time, it's 12:55, I think if we break now for lunch and then come back to item 11 the agenda, which is onshore water environment. So

1:08:59

if

1:09:01

we can. So I'm just trying to do the maths. So we'll come back at

1:09:09

if it's 1256 now if I run up to, if I'm going to, I'm going to round up to one o'clock. So if you come back at 145 if that's all right with everyone is 45 minutes financial, right with the applicant and with the

1:09:24

council? Yes, madam, fabulous. Okay, so whilst we're adjourned again, can I just ask that all participants turn off the cameras and mute their microphones. Those people watching the live stream again will need to refresh their browser, and so this meeting is now adjourned and will be resumed at 145 Thank you. Applause.