

Issue Specific Hearing 2

Supplementary Agenda Additional Questions – ERYC Response

Number	Question	Response
ISH2.9.3	Would there be views of any elements of the Proposed Development during construction or operation from the candidate Yorkshire Wolds National Landscape?	From the candidate area map the closest point appears to be 12-14km to the north-west close to Market Weighton. It is highly unlikely that there would be any intervisibility between the candidate AONB and the proposal given the distance and intervening land form and vegetation. If there are any views these would be barely noticeable.
ISH2.9.4	Do you agree with the Applicants conclusion that the candidate Yorkshire Wolds National Park Landscape would not be affected by the Proposed Development and, if not, what would you consider the effect to be and what leads you to that conclusion?	The applicant's conclusion is supported.
ISH2.9.5	Do you consider that a RVAA should have been carried out and, if so, why?	A RVAA was not requested by ERYC. However it would be helpful for the Applicant to establish whether there is any likelihood of living conditions or residential amenity being significantly affected, in order to determine whether a further study is required.
ISH2.9.12	Are there any policies in the ERYC Local Plan that are relevant to the assessment of this application that require landscape enhancements, and if so, would the Proposed Development comply with them?	Policy ENV2: Promoting a High Quality Landscape states: Development proposals should be sensitively integrated into the existing landscape, demonstrate an understanding of the intrinsic qualities of the landscape setting and, where possible, seek to make the most of the opportunities to protect and enhance landscape characteristics and features. To achieve this, development should: 1. Protect the character and individual identity of settlements by maintaining their physical separation, including through the maintenance of the Key Open Areas identified in Policies A1-A6, where there is a risk of settlement coalescence.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Protect and enhance important open spaces within settlements which contribute to their character.3. Ensure important hedgerows and trees are retained unless their removal can be justified in the wider public interest. Where important hedgerows and trees are lost replacements will usually be required.4. Maintain or enhance the character and management of woodland where appropriate.5. Retain, not detract from, and enhance wetland and water feature characteristics.6. Protect and enhance views across valued landscape features, including flood meadows, chalk grassland, lowland heath, mudflats and salt marsh, sand dunes and chalk cliffs.7. Protect and enhance the undeveloped coast. <p>Of relevance to the Proposed Development are:</p> <p><i>A3. Ensure important hedgerows and trees are retained unless their removal can be justified in the wider public interest.</i></p> <p>Unavoidable loss of important hedgerows is outlined in APP-024. We would encourage minimisation of loss of H0001 and H0003 in association with the works compound. It is noted that Hedgerows that intersect with TCCs will only be removed where it is not possible to protect the hedgerow during the construction works. There is a commitment to replanting hedgerows. Constraints in relation to replanting hedgerow trees in the cable easement are fully outlined. APP-235 (paragraph 13) states “Where removal of trees and hedgerows is necessary to facilitate construction, these will be replaced. Replacement will take place as soon as is practicable after installation of the cables.” (paragraph 14) states Hedgerows will be replaced in-situ. Replacement planting will comprise native shallow-rooting hedgerow species typical of the local area and existing landscape, planted as 40 – 60 cm high whips (or larger), with suitable protection from grazing. 18 Removed hedgerows and trees</p>
--	--	---

		<p>will be replaced with hedgerows of a more diverse and locally native species composition than that which was removed.</p> <p><i>4. Maintain or enhance the character and management of woodland where appropriate.</i></p> <p>APP-235(38). Landscape treatments around the Onshore Substation Zone boundaries will be designed to provide visual mitigation and integration of the structures into the landscape as well as contributing towards the biodiversity net gain opportunities. New woodland planting to the north and south of the Onshore Converter Stations, and the expansion of existing woodland to the east will involve an organic layout which mimics canopy layers found in the wider countryside. This will help integrate the planting into the wider landscape and contribute towards improving the ecological quality of the area. Although evergreen species are required for screening purposes, such species (e.g., Scots pine) will be minimised and focussed along the outer edges of the woodland, with native species forming the majority of the interior woodland.</p> <p><i>5. Retain, not detract from, and enhance wetland and water feature characteristics.</i></p> <p>The project has prioritised avoidance of impacts on high distinctiveness wetland and waterbodies.</p> <p><i>7. Protect and enhance the undeveloped coast.</i></p> <p>The project has included design stage avoidance of most sensitive coastal areas and seeks to minimise impacts from the cliff cut for emergency beach access.</p>
ISH2.9.18	Do you have any comments or concerns regarding ash die-back and the potential effects it would have on landscape character or visual amenity	Ash die-back is prevalent in East Yorkshire and significant declines in seemingly healthy trees can occur within 12 months. Trees in woodland are most severely impacted on a County level due to the close proximity of trees and the build-up of fungal spores within the leaf litter.

	<p>in relation to the Proposed Development?</p>	<p>Without baseline information on the composition of these blocks of woodland it is not possible to accurately comment on the impact of ash die-back. Johnson's Pit benefit from a public right of way and local knowledge recalls that this is predominantly sycamore, birch and oak so will not be significantly impacted by die-back. The Local Wildlife citation has been sought for Bentley Moor Wood, dating from 2009 which details frequent mature ash. Impacts are therefore likely but we are unable to provide an assessment of the magnitude of effect. The Local Planning Authority hold no data for Eleven Acre Plantation.</p>
<p>ISH2.10.1</p>	<p>Your Local Impact Report suggests that there would be less than substantial harm to conservation areas and listed buildings from the route of the pipeline, the landfall zone and substation zone. The ExA requests the following clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm what you mean by pipeline. - Set out each conservation area and listed building the Proposed Development would cause less than substantial harm to, and why. - Detail whether this harm would be as a result of construction or operation of the Proposed Development. - Confirm whether any pre-mitigation or residual effects would be significant in Environmental Impact Assessment terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Pipeline" was inserted in error and should read cable corridor route. - While the development runs in close proximity to a number of designated heritage assets, it will only have the potential to affect the significance of a small number of them. Those that it will not affect include all the conservation areas and the majority of the listed buildings in close proximity. The exception to these would potentially be: <p>Catfoss Hall - Late eighteenth century house with later alterations, listed at grade II. Its setting is strongly defined by its relationship to its associated complex of buildings, but its setting is also characterised by its open and agricultural nature, and by its sense of separation and isolation. The construction phase of the development has the potential to adversely affect the contribution that this element of its setting makes to its significance, through audial and visual interaction. However, this impact will be diminished by the fact that there will be some separation between the development and the listed building, that it will affect one of a number of elements that contribute to its significance, and would be transitory in that it would only have an impact during the construction phase. Harm would be less than</p>

		<p>substantial, with the overall impact on significance being low and limited to the construction period.</p> <p>The Black Mill- Surviving section of an early nineteenth century mill, tarred and now crenelated. Listed at grade II. It is a prominent landmark feature in views looking across the Westwood, particularly in views approaching from the south and west. While not inherently contributing to understanding its historic use and function, it does contribute to its communal value and its value to more recent generations. The proposed route of the development is likely to result in the introduction of distracting works associated with construction, within these longer views of the mill, which would have a potential impact on how the asset is viewed and experienced during the construction phase of the works. However, this is not considered to impinge on the ability to appreciate the significance of the asset post-construction, and nor will it have a major impact on the contribution that the setting makes to the significance of the listed building. The impact will therefore be low, and the harm less than substantial, limited to the construction period.</p> <p>Beverley Minster- Hugely significant ecclesiastical building of multiple phases of medieval construction. Exceptional architectural merit both internally and externally, strengthened by the high quality of its decorative detailing. Hugely significance also in understanding the evolution of high-status ecclesiastical architecture and in determining the trajectory of the history of both Beverley and the surrounding area. Listed at grade I. The building's setting is in part defined by its placement within the medieval settlement plan of Beverley, which illustrates both its importance to the history of the town, but also remains comparatively unchanged from how it would have been experienced historically. However, its setting is also defined by the ability</p>
--	--	--

		<p>to appreciate it in the much wider landscape- as this is not only serves an important function for an ecclesiastical establishment that became rich on the back of pilgrims who travelled vast distances to visit the shrine of St. John of Beverley, but it also allows for the full scale and magnificence of its architecture to be appreciated in a manner that is different to experiencing this in close proximity. Its historical wide landowning, and association with surrounding settlement also gives a strong historic association between the wider landscape and the listed building. The introduction of the substation will be appreciable in longer views from the towers of the Minster. However, they would be read in the context of existing intervening development between the site and the asset, as well as across a considerable distance. While the substation would potentially be visible, it is not concluded that it will adversely affect the ability to appreciate the heritage asset within its wider setting, nor will it diminish its significance. The construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposals are therefore not considered to harm the significance of the Minster.</p> <p>Risby Hall Park and Garden- Concerns were initially raised in relation to this asset, as it is close proximity to the site of the substation and there was a potential that the development would impact on intended 'borrowed views' looking north and east from the park and garden. However, further analysis would seem to suggest that the boundary treatment around the park and garden is deliberately tight and enclosing, intended to create enclosed and terminated views within the boundary of the designed landscape. It is therefore not concluded that the development would result in harm to this asset.</p>
--	--	--

		Overall the pre-mitigation and residual effects wouldn't meet the level to be considered significant-
ISH2.10.2	Your Local Impact Report, paragraph 7.92 states that key views of Beverley Minster and those from its tower would not be substantially harmed by the proposal. Please confirm if you consider there would be less than substantial harm to Beverley Minster or its setting, what you consider the level of harm to be to this heritage asset in EIA terms and why you consider this to be the case.	Please see response above.
ISH2.10.4	Do you consider the proposed mitigation measures in the Outline Onshore Written Scheme of Investigation to be adequate? If not, please set out any recommended changes.	Please see response to Action Point 19 from ISH2
ISH2.10.14	Are there any current cross-project forums or meetings that take place and, if so, could public outreach and community engagement aims regarding the mitigation and enhancements of heritage assets be considered at these?	We are not aware of any cross-project forums or meetings.
ISH2.12.4	Your Local Impact Report would not appear to make reference to the appropriateness or information in relation to commuting and foraging bats. Please could you confirm your views on the assessment of commuting and foraging bats? Do you consider additional mitigation	An oversight led to the response on commuting and foraging bats being omitted from the ERYC Local Impact Report [PDC-007] and is provided below. Transect and static monitoring surveys have been undertaken, equipment failure is noted and it is agreed that this does not pose a significant constraint to interpretation of the data or understanding the use of the onshore cable corridor by bats. Common and widespread species typical of the region were recorded. Of note is the increased, activity recorded in October at locations T4, T5 and

	<p>measures should be considered and, if so, what should they be?</p>	<p>T8. Section 4 of the Bat Surveys: Transects and Static Monitoring, Issue 7(Peak Ecology, 2024) provides guidance on project design and methodology to avoid and mitigate impacts on bats and many of these are secured in para 99 – 106 of APP-235 which is welcomed, however, there is no further narrative on the potential swarming site where APP-146 recommends “Further survey would be required to determine the cause of the increased activity in October. It is recommended that works in these areas do not take place overnight and artificial light is minimised during the autumn months (September to November) to avoid disturbance or disruption of flight lines and foraging features.” Para 178 of APP-235 detailed restrictions on night lighting that would benefit bats and this could be extended to November as recommended in APP-146.</p> <p>This has subsequently been discussed at the Expert Topic Group and the Local Authority are satisfied that this embedded mitigation running to 31st October is a sufficiently precautionary approach to the potential construction impacts on foraging and commuting bats. Replacement of hedgerows as soon as possible following construction works is also welcomed.</p>
--	---	---