

# TRANSCRIPT\_GATEBURTON\_ISH3\_SESSION1\_1\_23082023

00:00

Good

00:04

afternoon, two o'clock.

00:08

We'll move on to

00:10

issue specific hearing number three.

00:16

Here we go any further, can I just confirm back of the room that you can hear me?

00:22

The good thank you very much can also confirm with Mr. Cook that the live streaming recording of the event has commenced.

00:29

Thank you very much.

00:32

I'd like to welcome you all to this

00:35

first session of the issue specific hearing three, on environmental matters in relation to the application made that get Burton energy Park limited for an order to grant development consent for the good burden energy Park project.

00:52

My name is Ken stone, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the single examining inspector to examine this application.

01:03

Many of you will have heard many of these comments before because you were here this morning or another event, but there are other people engaged online and here in the room who may not have heard them. So I do have to go through all this again. Please bear with me for that.

01:19

My role is to examine the application and to report to the Secretary of State for energy security and net zero with a recommendation as to whether or not the development consent order should be made.

01:31

Public application seeks consent to construct operate, maintain and Decommission ground mounted solar virtual photovoltaic panel arrays on site battery storage and associated infrastructure. The associated infrastructure includes but is not limited to access provision and an underground 400 kilovolt electrical connection of approximately 7.5 kilometers to the caught on National Grid substation.

01:58

Planning Inspectorate case manager for this application is Robert Cook, and he is supported by Spencer Barrowman. Please don't hesitate to talk to a member of the case team should you need any help at today's event, or with the technology?

02:16

Before I go any further, I will no deal with a few housekeeping matters.

02:22

Firstly, mobile phones, please could you turn them off turn them to Silent

02:29

toilets and other essentials. You may have seen them if you've been here before, but they're both through the double doors back in the lobby and on the left. Again, we're not expecting any fire alarm or anything this afternoon. So if one goes off, that's for real. The evacuation route is out into the corridor to the end here at the store down the stairs and into the carpark and the assembly point is in the carpark.

02:57

I'll make a few preliminary marks again. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some participants are present with us at the hearing venue and some are joining us virtually using Microsoft Teams.

03:12

I will make sure that however you've decided to attend today you will be given a fair opportunity to participate.

03:19

If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at any point in the proceedings, please use the raise hand function and I will invite you to speak at an appropriate time. Alternatively, please turn on your camera so that I can see that you wish to speak the

03:35

hearing was being both live streamed and recorded and the recording will be available on the good Burton energy Park page of the national infrastructure website shortly after this hearing. For the benefit of the recording, please canoes present ensure that they speak clearly into a microphone stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak.

03:57

For those people observing or participating remotely, in order to minimize background noise, can you please make sure that you stay muted unless you're speaking?

04:10

I think to the planning inspector, its privacy notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. And I assume that everybody here today has familiarized themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out and data protection laws. Please speak to the case team. If you have any queries about this.

04:32

I it's unlikely that I will ask you to put any sensitive personal information into the public domain and I would encourage you not to do that. However, if you feel it is necessary to refer to information that you would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential. It should be in a written form which can then be redacted before being published. Again, please talk to the case team about the best way to do this

05:01

In this video, I would mention that if you would want to tell me something about where you live today, because it's relevant to what you have to say, please just give me a general location without mentioning a specific address.

05:18

Examination of this application commenced after the closing plenary meeting on the Fourth of July, and I held an open floor hearing on the afternoon of the Fourth of July.

05:28

1 issue specific hearing on the draft development consent order was held on the fifth of July.

05:35

And I held the first compulsory acquisition hearing on a second open floor hearing yesterday, and then this morning, I held a further

05:46

issue specific hearing on the draft development consent order.

05:54

The recordings of these earlier events have either not been published or will be published shortly.

06:01

On the website.

06:05

terms of this today's meeting and this session, we have an agenda that is published on the examination library, that's e v 008.

06:19

Can you just display that on the screen please for me.

06:26

And then just scroll to the

06:30

again, we just need the first page. We'll just be doing session one today in

06:37

terms of the substantive matters the agenda is split into three main parts to intend to hold three separate sessions.

06:45

So we've got one this afternoon, and we've got two tomorrow. Session One this afternoon will focus on landscape and land use matters. Session two. Tomorrow morning we'll focus on carbon savings from the proposed development. And then session three tomorrow afternoon, we'll focus on a series of other environmental topics.

07:06

The agenda is for guidance only. And I may add other considerations or issues as we progress and as matters unfold during the discussions.

07:17

I will most likely take a mid afternoon break at some stage. And that depends on where in the agenda we are and how things are progressing.

07:28

I will conclude the session as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all question to ask them responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for me to prioritize matters or even to defer matters to other written questions. And likewise, if you cannot answer the question being asked or require time to get the information to provide a full and fully informed information, then please indicate that you need to respond in writing to me.

08:01

If I do take a break later, or when I do take a break later those of you who are participating virtually, you need to ensure that your cameras and microphones are turned off during the break.

08:15

I will now move to introductions I will ask you to those of you who are going to participate in this hearing to introduce yourselves. Could you introduce yourself stating your name and who you represent and letting me know on which agenda item you wish to speak.

08:36

If you're not representing an organization, or other party, please confirm your name, summarize your interest in the application. And again confirm the agenda item on which you wish to speak.

08:49

I'll start with the applicant.

08:53

Thank you. Good afternoon, sir. My name is Amy Sterling. I'm a Senior Associate Solicitor at Pinsent Masons. I'm joined today

09:02

through to my left by Mr. James Hartley bond as a product development director at blue carbon. I'm joined today to my left by Mr. Will Barrett who is an elite and technical director at a calm. I'm joined to my right sorry, Miss alley leader has a DCO and planning lead at ATAP. And then to my left, I have Mr. York shows who's a landscape and visual expert and an associate director at AECOM. In the back row, sir, I have a Mr. Kernan who's going to be speaking about the agricultural land and BMV. I propose that we, Mr. Kind of we can introduce him as and when those topics arise. We'll just somewhat limited in space at at the table. Nope, that's fine. Mr. Kernan is from Mr. Tony Curran and he's an agricultural and be in the land and he's a director at Kernan consulting.

09:57

Okay,

10:02

That's everybody. Thank you very much. Okay, then can we move on to the other organizations and individuals who have expressed the wish to speak? Again, please introduce yourselves and tell me on which items. I'll start firstly with the local authorities. So West Lindsey District Council.

10:20

Good afternoon, sir. My name is Samuel Shaikh. I'm of counsel representing West Lindsay District Council. I'm instructed by Martha Reeves who sits to to my left whose legal services Lincolnshire Mr. Russell Clarkson to my immediate left is the development manager at Westland District Council. And Mr. Alex Blake To my immediate right is the Associate Director Atkins.

10:46

Okay, thank you very much.

10:49

And then link to county council. Good afternoon sir. Miss Stephanie Hall Council instructed on behalf of Lincolnshire county council again by legal services, Lincolnshire and this receipt says to my right, so I'm joined at the table by Mr. McBride who is to to my left he's head of planning at Lincolnshire County Council and the Mr. Oliver Brown who is new to these hearings. So here's Oliver Brown, a landscape architect ah consultants, and his letters are dip la cm Li.

11:31

Okay, thank you very much.

11:34

Do I have nothing I'm sure county council

11:43

Yes, thank you, sir. Stephen pointer Nottinghamshire County Council you're on mute.

11:49

Can you hear me now? Yes, that's

11:54

Stephen pointer team manager planning policy, Nottinghamshire County Council

12:02

Okay, thank you very much.

12:06

And do I have anybody from Bassett law

12:19

Okay, thank you very much Nick case if I move along.

12:26

Just checking my list to see who we've got here.

12:33

20 statutory parties so parish councils.

12:39

Afternoon Sir, my name is Carol Gilbert. I'm representing Stoughton Barstow parish council.

12:45

Okay, thank you very much.

12:50

Do I have anybody from Morton and good Burton parish council?

13:02

Okay, I'm not seeing anything either virtually or in the room.

13:08

So if I now turn to interested parties, from whomever request to speak or wish to be heard, can I hear from 7000 acres who you have representing you today?

13:19

Hello, good afternoon, Liz Garbett 7000 acres on teams, Mr. Mark Pryor. And in the audience, Mr. Tony court who will be speaking on BMV

13:34

Thank you. Right. Okay.

13:43

Do I have any buddy out here who would wish to speak in the room?

13:49

Yes. Can I just take a note of your name? He just sort of stand up. Is there a roving microphone? Sorry.

14:04

All right, good afternoon. Margaret O'Grady filling in parish meeting.

14:14

I will move to the front when I say

14:22

yes, there there is written there for you to do that whenever you wish to come forward if you wish to do so.

14:31

No one else in the room. Okay. In that case, virtually Is there anybody else in the virtual room who would wish to speak?

14:41

Not seeing any hands at this point in time. But obviously if during the proceedings over the afternoon, anybody who wishes to try and

14:53

speak to me then that's fine. Just if you're in the virtual room, raise your hand. If you're in this room, then just raise your hand and

15:00

draw my attention to it and I shall draw you into the meeting at the appropriate point in time.

15:26

I will just mention that today is being live streamed and recorded, and will be available on the good Burton energy Park page of the inspected web page. Anyone watching on live stream or at a later date has the opportunity to make any comments about the matters covered at this hearing in writing by deadline three, which is Friday, the first of September.

15:51

I would also point out that it may be that further time is needed and some of the matters that we discussed today. And there are opportunities for either further issue specific hearings or written questions and parties will be given opportunities to respond to those if that happens.

16:10

I'll not briefly explained the purpose of this issue specific hearing.

16:15

nationally significant infrastructure project are considered through an examination process that process is primarily a written process, and information somebody submitted in writing is given similar weight to information provided orally. It is however helpful to provide for matters to be considered or really and when the evidence can be tested considered challenged and examined in greater detail. This is not like a public inquiry where that may be done in an adversarial process with legal representatives cross examining witnesses in an examination is conducted as an inquisitorial process, where if the examining Inspectorate will seek to test the evidence that has been put before me and give parties reasonable opportunity to prove their case to me.

17:04

For the purposes of is h3, I have identified three broad areas that I would like to hear further evidence on. As these are fundamental and important matters to my consideration of this application. I've therefore sought to divide the hearing into three distinct sessions, so that we can focus on those matters. Firstly, I will deal with the landscape effect and land use issues related to the application. Secondly, I will move on to examine matters related to the carbon savings proposed by the applicant. And then in the third session, I will look at a number of specific environmental topics on which I wish to hear further evidence. It is a controlled agenda, and I will run through the matters in the agenda that has been circulated. It is however, not an immovable feast. And if there are matters that arise, or that I wish to explore, I may deviate and do so the objective of the hearing is to develop my understanding of the issues and consider any further issues arising including any remaining concerns of IPs. It is not at a point where I am reaching conclusions or findings.

18:12

For I move on and into the substance of the agenda, has anybody any questions on those points?

18:23

Nothing in the room, and I'm seeing no hands virtually. So I shall move on.



18:28

So we're at item three, and we're moving into the substance of session one.

18:39

Going to talk about landscape and land use matters under this is very significant matter within this, which has been raised in most of the representations to me, visual amenities of their character there cetera, et cetera, et ne agenda, various matters that I would like to explore with the parties. And I'll take each of those in turn. This does not mean that these are the only matters that are relevant to these considerations. But rather, they are specific points that I would like to explore in a little bit further detail. So there is a lot of information already in there in terms of the environmental statement in terms of the representations that have been submitted to me the relevant reps, the layers, etc.

19:27

Because I've got a series of bullet points here, that's not the only points that are before me, or that I'm considering. It's just that these are matters that I would like. And certainly if, within the context of the discussion, we stray a little bit further because of comments and other parties wish to make them feel free to do so. I'm not going to constrain matters not far.

19:50

So the first message that I want to pick up is really a combination of the first two bullet points on the agenda which relates to certain things.

20:00

and components of the scheme, me and buildings and the location of the BSS, and Bo SS and the substation and building. So it's around those sorts of areas that I want to just get a little bit of clarity on.

20:16

And a bit of understanding around to the location of the main buildings, including the boss. So we've got the office warehouse, the plant storage buildings, we've got the BSS, we've got the water supply, etc. And they've been cited to the west of the railway line.

20:35

It's described as taking advantage of screening provided by surrounding woodlands, and the very low flood risk. So there's a particular justification for identifying it in that location. Yes, provides

20:50

what's a reasonably detailed explanation of that sighting,

20:55

on identified sort of three or four examples of locations where you almost went into micro setting of that, to identify it.

21:05

I have in the latest version of the outline design principles, which included parameters plan, that specific location is not identified as the location for these matters, given that it's such a justified specific location, why aren't you confirming that that's the location where this will be other than in what would be the

21:29

outline design that not even the outline design principles, but in the schematic scheme? So should we not have this area identified as this is where all these parts will be?

21:43

Me standing on behalf of the applicant? Yes, sir, we can certainly update the environmental parameters plan and outline design principles to reflect the location of the infrastructure. However, the location of the infrastructure is secured via the works plans. And in particular, Article Three, two of the draft DCO, which states that each numbered work must be situated within the corresponding numbered work area shown on the works plans. So the DCO will only grant consent for those works and those areas. But I take your point that the purpose of the environmental parameters plan was to bring all of those

22:23

constraints together in a single plan. So we will update that plan. Thank you very much, that's very helpful.

22:34

In relation to certain dimensions of certain components within

22:42

the design, it's a question of the necessity of those new justification for the reason, the substation, in the outline design principles, state components of the onsite substation will be a maximum of 13 meters in height above AGL. The design natural statement at four

22:59

point 5.17 simply states, the substation would have up to four transformers, and would have a maximum footprint of up to 220 meters by 130 meters, and up to 13 meters in height. And then there's illustrative plans

23:16

of those features and cross sections across this, but there's no explanation as to why those dimensions are necessary, the technical constraint, and whether there's an opportunity to reduce those heights. So for instance, you've got the bus bars and 13 meters, but within the same section, there's a lower section of bars bars, which are eight meters or something of that nature. Why, what's the justification for the dimensions and heights of those matters? And should that be set out somewhere? Maybe that there's a technical constraint that needs to be there, but that's not stated anywhere in the papers?

23:54

Any standing on behalf of the applicant? Yes, I think you've hit the nail on the head there with your last comment, things are reasonable worst case scenario based on the technical parameters that the applicant is aware of at this stage and design and with sufficient flexibility added for detailed design.

24:11

I can get your point that is perhaps not explained as well as it could be maybe within the topic chapter or perhaps in the selection and consideration of alternative chapter we can provide more detail as to how the parameters have been identified.

24:28

I'll just hand over to Mr. Robot it who may have some more information to add.

24:33

William Barrett for the applicant? Yeah, the only thing I would add would be there is an appendix to chapter two of the environmental statement. So that's appendix two a, which provides a full description of the best and the substation, and that document is a PP. 113.

24:57

Thank you

25:05

Yeah, I mean, if what you're saying is that those are the worst case scenarios, and that's fine. And it's just sort of telling me what that that

25:14

technical requirement of that would be, it may be that you've got potentially the opportunity to reduce that or lower that. But as long as I understand what that technical concerns is, then that would be helpful.

25:27

Me standing for the applicant noted. So we'll take that away and see where as an appropriate place to provide that clarification, thank you.

25:42

You will be aware that en one

25:48

and draft, en one draftee and three

25:53

a whole different words, but for the purposes of the comment,

25:57

material as such, they advocate that materials design of buildings should always be given very careful consideration. And

26:07

in terms of the nature of the information that's before me.

26:13

And we've got various requirements for detailed design work that start

26:19

to demonstrate that there is a

26:23

an attention to detail around those matters. I'm wondering whether or not it would be appropriate or helpful to provide for a design code for the buildings that would then give the local authorities some parameters around which they can then consider those matters.

26:44

In your standing on behalf of the applicant? I think as we've responded to in our frustrating questions, we feel that this scheme has been subject to good design. And we'll continue to do so via the mechanisms that we have in place. This is explained in the planning, design and access dmn which accompany the application and which has been subject of updates so far, and examination, we don't feel at further requirements in relation to design or design called is necessary for the reasons that have and are frustrating questions.

27:24

Okay,

27:26

I mean, I'll lay out a little bit is that my view of some of the buildings that are indicated in the industry in the Indicative illustrations are very industrial and form with little attention to detail around them.

27:46

William Barrett for the applicant?

27:48

Yes, sir. The the information that the environmental statement is based on is very much a concept design.

27:59

The intention has been very much focused on setting the maximum parameters in terms of dimensions. So the footprint and then the maximum height to form effectively an envelope,

28:12

and then would allow assessment for each of the individual technical studies.

28:21

We would agree that there is plenty of opportunity to develop further the detail around the design. So in terms of final finishing, rendering color,

28:35

the process for that is set out within the requirements. So the design development approval

28:45

requirement, which I believe is number five,

28:51

would provide the opportunity to follow that process and work in consultation with Lincolnshire and others to incorporate those levels of detail within the design. Yeah.

29:02

I hear what you're saying.

29:04

And I'll leave it to West Lindsey and Lincolnshire under local authorities who may have a view on this. But I suppose the view that I have is what those provide a format for the approval of the details. Without having certain

29:28

other parameters in there or other matters in there.

29:33

It sometimes becomes difficult for a local authority to

29:38

engage in design discussions where the applicant then says, Well, this is approved and you've got an envelope and you've got that what's what's the issue here and we're talking about when it comes down to the detailed design measures, and sometimes that can get lost a little bit on larger schemes. And I think the whole purpose of en one and the commentary within that

30:00

is to try and ensure that that doesn't get lost. And I suppose I'm just looking for a mechanism or a manner in which that final green detail can be drawn out a little bit.

30:17

William Barrett for the applicant, and I'll hand over to my colleagues, if they have more items that Yes, sir, we

30:26

we take that point on

30:29

elaborating, I would say on some of the principles of the design around the buildings that are associated with the substation and the base.

30:42

I take the point that at the moment, we we effectively have a concept of design that has informed the environmental assessment and the studies and allowed us to draw conclusions in terms of the levels of environmental effects, which is the primary purpose of the studies that have been undertaken. All of that said, Yes, we would agree would take, we can take that one away, because we would agree that there could be some elements of principles and a next step of detail

31:08

that we could make reference to that would then further inform that process of the development of the other detail on the design.

31:16

That's helpful. Thank you.

31:20

Okay, those are the matters that I just wanted to sort of kick off with. But then, can I just draw in the local authorities to hear whether or not they've got any opinions on those specific points at this point in time? So where's Lindsay, first of all?

31:40

Alex Blake from West Lindsey,

31:42

as expressed in our responses to the first round of questions,

31:47

around design coding, for us is a principle that should be embedded at the start of a project if it were to be embedded.

31:54

It's certainly a toolkit that should be produced in collaboration with key stakeholders, and consulted upon.

32:04

So opposition is simple in this stage to impose the design code we don't feel is too helpful in some is too late to put it simply

32:14

on the scheme, if there are components of the design of the project,

32:19

that concern decision maker, then the scheme should stand on for as it stands at the moment. Thank you.

32:27

I think that's taking the design coding slightly differently, where we're looking at the nuance of

32:34

individual components of the building rather than the overall scheme where a rationale and an approach and a design statement has been provided, which underpins that. But it's then getting down to that level of detail. I mean, as a local authority, if you're happy that requirement five gives you sufficient armory to have a discussion on the detail of the buildings that are there, they're not a matter for yourselves. I'm trying to create a

33:08

other

33:10

areas or other matters, which provide for

33:16

areas for you to have a discussion with the applicant with.

33:23

Explain for West Lindsey,

33:25

I respect that certain sense of trying to give

33:29

has said he will use the word detail but to give us a more a framework to assess that the details that come in under requirement five.

33:40

However, the approach taken this is fairly common from our point of view, in fact that the parameters are clear on this particular project, we understand those parameters.

33:50

Within those envelopes, it'd be fairly normal for authority to consider those details as they come forward.

33:58

As always, from a local authority perspective, more details will be welcomed. So, you know, you can inform a viewpoint at this stage. But we're trying to strike the balance at this point between

34:09

the scope and purpose of a DCO in terms of allowing the developer to consent an envelope and then establish those details through Value Engineering at a later stage.

34:21

The local authority having enough of that calibration to say well, that's outside of what was considered or or we're happy with it.

34:28

I mean, from our perspective, we are it's an open we are open minded to it clearly more detail would be helpful. But at this stage, we just don't see what that would be and how it would help. You know, calibrate requirement five, in a way that's helpful.

34:44

Here, would you say okay

34:49

delinking to heaven any views? Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. Thank you. So yes, I think it looks to us just to sort of orientate ourselves where we've got to with this debate

35:00

So the applicants response to first written questions when they were asked about this, their response and design code was that in the applicants view the outline design principles provide what is required. We seem to have moved on slightly from that with a sorry, is it Mr. Burton?

35:17

Mr. Burns comments just now about agreeing and opportunity use my notes to develop further the details around design. And obviously, we would welcome that. We would encourage it. It's a direction of travel, we would like obviously, the more we have up front, the less pressure there is on the the six weeks, eight weeks or 10 weeks to deadline that we're going to have for determining

35:40

requirement five discharge. So any opportunity to develop more design now it is welcomed, whether that is it as part of a different design or new design code document? Or is an evolution of the existing outline Design Principles Document? I think it's more a matter of form than substance. But any further detail is obviously welcomed. Thank you. Thank you very much. I'll turn to the applicant in a second. But can I just finish with the the local authorities and turn to NCC?

36:15

Thank you. Seven points, Nottingham? Sure.



36:18

We haven't made specific comments on landscape, in particular, but and design, but I would endorse what Bassett law have said in their response to two questions regarding the importance of design to the local area and in particular in terms of adopted neighborhood plans in basket law. So I would share their view that any initiative to support design coding

36:50

and

36:54

have a common approach. And this potentially goes into other areas of

37:00

having commonalities between various ENSET proposals in the area that we do we do put this in place, because we're talking about more than one more than one project here. Thank you.

37:16

Thank you very much.

37:19

Okay, I'll open this out to other parties in a moment. But let's just hear the applicants response to some of those points.

37:27

Thank you, sir, and the leader for the applicant. And I really welcome this discussion. Because I think I think it is worth having us sitting down having a conversation about the design of the buildings, the development. Obviously, the majority of the author development in this case isn't buildings. So I would tend to agree with Westlands either. In general, you would have a design code for a development such as a large residential development, why you might have lots of different areas. And you might be setting design codes for different types of buildings. Were in this case, in reality, from the building's point of view, the largest building is a warehouse, which is situated between the battery storage compound, and the substation, which are relatively large developments. And then you have the woodlands to the north and south. So the visibility of that building is actually relatively limited. But that said, we were very happy to discuss the the appearance of that building. And in terms of the rest of the infrastructure, it is relatively utilitarian, because it solar panels and a substation, which unfortunately, there's not a great deal of flexibility in appearance, but we can look to those those elements that we can influence. So for example, there may be flexibility in colors of containers and that type of thing. But I guess part of it is the nature of this type of insert, there being actually a relatively limited amount of design to the project components.

39:02

Yes, exactly. And I think it's just sort of setting in some of those details and giving some indication of those. It's

39:12

by the nature of the development itself, there are certain constraints and there's not going to be the same sort of thing is in large buildings or in terms of, as you say, residential schemes or anything of that nature. It would be a very different scale or nature of document. But there is still opportunities for identifying some of those matters.

39:37

Thank you, sir. Yes, we'll take that away and discuss with local authorities.

39:42

Thank you very much.

39:52

Okay, can I just

39:55

turn to the room to see if anybody else has any other issues on that

40:00

ticular discussion? Yes, 7000 acres. Thank you. Let's go up at 7000 acres. Yes, thank you, whilst, obviously they're looking at the PVS, as beautifully mentioned, and they're not buildings within the landscape, but they are structures within the open countryside, the mount to a vast mass collectively. So, therefore, the area they cover is beyond any building or singular building or collective of those buildings.

40:36

Secondly,

40:38

whilst obviously you can appreciate the detail needs to be added, obviously, we've gone a long way already down this design process. And as a group, we would have preferred that obviously, the design

40:52

could have taken into account, the landscape and land form and been be more accommodating in that regard, in terms of appearance of the buildings of just looking at those that none of those represent any sort of local vernacular. As such, they seem to be totally inappropriate to as in the countryside setting, you could have a barn like structures for instance monopitch, the monopitch the buildings at the moment, we could have geo pitch with clay pantiles, redbrick bond like structures, which I'm sure obviously the council's will be looking into those details. But this is these are sort of details that has IPS interested parties and local residents. We see that there are those details. And it's very concerning to us to see very,

41:43

very ugly buildings going in the open landscape along with all the mass of the PVS, which adds to the industrial character of these buildings. Thank you. Yeah. I mean, just in the context of the discussion that we've been having, that's what the discussion is about, is that the parameters plans and the nature of the information in the environmental statement is simply setting a shape and form or overall dimensions against which they can then assess the assessment. So it's, it's getting into the detail that will then be submitted to the council to get approval of those details, which is at that stage that, you know, you may, if it does get approval, that you would then be engaged at that point in determining whether or not the design and the appearance of those buildings, and its what the nature of the levels of control of those are that we're talking about here and how you how you can put parameters in around those rather than just the requirement five, which is your submit the details, it's giving some indication as to what or how those details will be considered. So that's, that's the purpose of what we're trying to get to the bottom or

42:56

as to the nature of the

42:59

amount of PVS in the landscape. That's something we'll we'll move on to in a minute. But that is sort of, yes, very much part of the wider consideration.

43:11

Sorry, does anybody else have any other

43:14

matters, I've got nothing else in the room and needs to first bullet point, I'm not seeing any hands up.

43:20

Okay, thank you very much.

43:22

So if we move on to basically that point, I suppose, in terms of the the

43:31

scheme in the landscape and cumulative assessments, sequential kinetic effects, one views, or experiences, these schemes, this scheme and potentially other schemes, so many of the representations and indeed, the criticism from the host authorities is that the scheme will significantly alter the wider landscape to a more industrial and energy based landscape has been compounded by the cumulative effects when associated with other end CIP projects, particularly taking kind of, as I say, sequential or kinetic views, and the experiences of users in the area.

44:19

Firstly, I'd like to just jump in with the applicant and sort of go,

44:24

what's your view of that general characterization?

44:30

I assume that you don't necessarily agree with that. Industrialization, that

44:36

energy character.

44:39

Why would you not disagree? Why would you disagree with that characterization, given the scale of the amount of schemes in the area and the size of this scheme?

44:56

Me speaking on behalf of the applicant, I think to respond to these questions are

45:00

and I'll pass on to Mr. Joe's, he can explain to you what our view of the characterization of landscape will be on a cumulative basis. And yes, I suspect we also do disagree.

45:14

Your shorts on behalf of the applicant.

45:18

The if you look at the overall landscape character, we go back to the baseline and look at what's there at the moment and we have a largely agricultural landscape.

45:31

Within the application site, we are adjacent to the Trent River and Trent River Valley, which has a significant amount of large coal fired power stations, which contribute an industrial character to the overall landscape. And the development is acknowledged in the landscape visual impact assessment, we'll add an extended large scale solar farm component to that landscape.

46:00

However, we have then

46:03

assessed the gate board and energy Park with the adjoining

46:09

applications best Burton kottam and tilbage solar farms, individually and jointly.

46:17

And you have found that the overall pattern and set out of the landscape in terms of existing screening,

46:30

topographical changes, lends itself to very limited into visibility. In fact, the visibility between gait Burton energy Park and vest Burton is hardly noticeable. It's there's no inter visibility, the same as cotton, and the same material bridge. And I think we come back to a little bit later when it comes to sequential views. The the overall landscape character if one looks at the map, and we have done that, as well, we have done not together with land pro last year with the applicant for best Burton and kottam

47:11

DBT landscape architects who sat together and you looked at that and if you look at the map, you think, yes, of course, this is becoming a solar farm landscape. But on the ground, where the human eye is where we can see things like the observers, you cannot find evidence that visually, the overall landscape becomes a solar farm landscape. Because we have intermittent screening, we have screening by hatches, we have screening by topography, screening by advance of trees along roads, along

47:41

public roads, public

47:45

walkways.

47:46

And

47:49

we therefore have concluded that the cumulative impact of the scheme in conjunction with the adjoining schemes around it is moderate. It is significant, but it's moderate.

48:04

And visually, we could not find significant effects because there is no intro visibility.

48:29

So as part of that,

48:32

there's comments that once there's no significant cumulative views that have been identified in the LDA

48:40

views do not have to be extensive and open to create the perception of substantial change.

48:48

But regular sequential glimpsed views. So when you're shooting, you said, there's no end to visibility, there's lots of screening

48:58

it's fine. But if I'm traveling through that landscape,

49:03

and every so often, all I see through a hedge or an opening or solar panels, and then I come along the next bit know deceased or I feel like I'm traveling through a landscape which is simply just on solar panels.

49:19

I did address that.

49:23

So as an example, if you go to the southern border limits boundary along Martin Road, for example, or Billingham road, if you look north, but the overall scheme as a landscape mitigation proposal, and that is aimed to screen your solar farms and as as much as possible, while retaining also open views in certain locations. The video open views venue as you see come to gaps in hedgerows, access gates or

49:55

other openings and but the majority will be screened and

50:00

If you travel along mountain road, and you get to a gap

50:05

and you see the solar farm, you can look actually north and you see a large extent of the solar panels right towards Caspi lane, and you turn south, and you see agricultural landscape. And further south is actually West Burton, solar farm would be potentially best broken solar farm located, but you will not see because intervening vegetation was screen it. So if you're in a car you travel on, and the next possible location to see

50:37

the car caught him solar farm would be about three to four minutes later when you get towards

50:44

DB 1241. And

50:48

cotton, again, has mitigation. So if there is a gap on that spot where you get closest to the boundary of cotton, you might see it there. And then you need to travel on. And there is no solar farm for quite a while because you have to get to Vestberg in solar farm. And that might take another 10 to 15 minutes to get there

51:11

was a 10 minutes in the car. If you walk,

51:16

the sequential effects might be taking between 20 or 30 minutes until you get the next chance to look actually at another solar farm development. And I'm not talking to us about Caperton about that talk about Cottam and Vestberg. So the sequential effects are

51:35

the time until you experience sequential effects can be quite long.

51:41

So an in between those moments where you can see potentially solar farms, you see a lot of agricultural landscape and you see the landscape which is there now. And there is no change to it. And I understand the concern that as I said earlier, when you look at a map or at an aerial photography, and you see the location of the solar farms, you will think, gosh, we see nothing else but solar panels.

52:08

But as I said during our site surveys, doing beach informed in landscape mitigation, we cannot find evidence that this is going to be a significant effect

52:21

on your mitigation schemes

52:26

resulting

52:29

where possible, retaining screening, hedging, tree planting, whatever. And then adding additional screening wherever it is. So predominantly, your mitigation is through screening. Is that correct? That's correct. Yeah.

52:51

But that is one that is a main component from a landscape point of view. Now mitigation has

52:59

started at the outset of the development, and that is about the location of panels. It's about setbacks from

53:09

roads from residences, we have had meetings with with local residents who are adjacent to the solar farm development, and we discussed and agreed exclusion zones around properties. We have

53:25

excluded solar panels between gate Burton estate and Burton board.

53:31

We have

53:33

not opted for tracker panels, which would be higher.

53:37

So there are a lot of components, which you know, are part of the overall mitigation. And landscape mitigation is one of them. And

53:48

so the

53:52

I think landscape mitigation, there is concern potentially that all we just screen everything and we create unnatural screens and hedges. And now if you traveled to the area,

54:06

we are very in a very lucky situation that there is actually a dense band of hedgerows of trees. And the chairs change as opposed to over the last few decades as fields got bigger. hedgerows disappeared in order to make it easier for aquaculture to function and that their machines if you traveled from, say filling him to wheeling him by so you see considerably tall hedgerows

54:32

in along the roadside. And you have a lawn clean. You have hedgerows in bounds of trees to either side, which great tunnel effect. We have that as well along Willingham road when you go towards the railway bridge on the southern or the limits of the Cape Breton energy park, you have

54:56

tall bands of trees and buildings

55:00

hedgerows and overgrowth in general along several locations. So the landscape mitigation looked at that and say, Well, how can we work with that? What's there actually, certain areas that we can let hedgerows grow taller to achieve screening. How can we enforce existing hedgerows reinforce existing hedgerows or indeed plant new hedgerows which have a screening effect but also reconnect, truncate detect hedgerows which have been removed over time. And so that basically has informed the landscape mitigation and screening proposals.

55:36

Thank you very much.

55:40

terms of that connection to the control centers to



55:44

get your view on what you've heard on those matters, and particularly to focus on the issues of this characterization of the landscape and the impact on the landscape and sort of sequential kinetic views and effects and what you've heard from the applicant in terms of their mitigation and design assessments. So if I can turn to Lincolnshire first, I think he says definitely holding on to county council, I'm actually going to hand over to Mr. Brown.

56:16

Thank you, sir. Oliver Brown, Lincolnshire county council.

56:20

Microphones drooping slightly. Yeah, obviously, we have concerns regarding the cumulative landscape and visual effects. And I think just as a starting point we do you need to remember that landscape and visual well interrelated, are considered separately also. So I don't think we can get away from the fact that in landscape terms, we are replacing considerable areas in terms of land use, from a cultural arable land into solar. And obviously, this has an impact on on openness and the perception of solar as well. In terms of visually, yeah, I think, you know, the

57:01

combined as in the same view, cumulative effect, it probably quite limited. The main concern on this is the sequential views through the landscape as we're moving through the landscape. And the guidelines for Alaska visual impact assessment actually define these two different so the combined will be in the same view, and the sequential will be obviously moving through that landscape. And that's in table 7.1. So, in terms of the sequential views, so this is basically when when you are moving through to a different viewpoint to see either the same development or another development that is either similar or of a scale that will be

57:38

considered to be a significant. So rather, frequency sequential or occasional sequential act depends how quickly you're moving through the landscape. And obviously, the type of receptor as well. Obviously, users, the rights of way, are going to be moving much slower. However, they have more time to perceive the landscape as they're moving through it, motorists, obviously moving quicker through it through the landscape as well.

58:00

So I think it's just important to remember the scale of these and identifying that the mitigation is in place to screening in certain areas, but we're talking up to 15 years time for that as well. We have the construction period and obviously have the establishment period as well as we're moving through that landscape.

58:30

Okay.

58:34

In terms of the nature of the mitigation,

58:39

in terms of what you've heard that they've said, either in terms of design of the scheme, placement of the solar panels within that offsets, etc, and focusing the actual landscape mitigation in terms of hedgerows and other matters. How successful do you think that that has been?

59:03

Oh, the brown Lincolnshire county council? Yeah, there's obviously a balance here. And I think it's a similar item that's some further down the agenda in terms of the concerns and mitigation planting, potentially changing the view changing the character of views. The landscape to the to the west of the railway line is much more vegetated, more intimate, there's a lot more planting in that area. However, when you cross over to the eastern area, beyond the railway line, that's obviously much more open.

59:31

And we do have concerns that, you know, the mitigation plans would shorten those views, it would change the experience for the user, you know, out enjoying the open views of the countryside. I think a good example from the LVA is viewpoint four which is taken from the railway bridge at the south of the site. Very sort of open panoramic view, obviously with hydro planting to screen and proposals. That is going to change the

1:00:00

territory without view from the baseline

1:00:09

Thank you very much.

1:00:13

Lindy

1:00:16

West Lindsey District Council. I'm equally going to pass over sir to Mr.

1:00:23

Alex Blake West Lindsey District Council. I will repeat

1:00:29

the comments put forward by Lincolnshire county council that that align with those of West Lindsay.

1:00:38

Terms of the cumulative effects Taken as a whole. It is those glimpses it is that experience of recognizing

1:00:46

and identifying with the solar scheme projects as you move through the landscape that is significant and adverse both in EIA and planning terms.

1:00:55

You know, the range of projects together, circuit 30 Miles half an hour driving time on a good day.

1:01:03

This these are significant geographical impacts that the residents will and visitors will experience as a significant change and change in terms of the nature of the visual effect of the infrastructure being not be in place.

1:01:21

Says recalibrating, again, that, you know, the impacts, we spoken a lot about visual effects and glimpses and screening

1:01:29

is also the character affects without wishing to be abstract it, it will change

1:01:36

materially and adversely the character, the Lincolnshire landscape over broad area from big open agricultural fields.

1:01:45

Just erase, we're inviting clearly the decision maker to weigh those heavily, negatively in the balance finding balance.

1:01:56

One little point around that balance as well, that we just add, like to add

1:02:01

is the issue of temporal effects and the extent to which that should be considered.

1:02:07

When judging the extent of those impacts,

1:02:12

from which lenses perspective, the 60 year period is an effect of a full permission, those experiences will also those landscape changes will be experienced by several generations of people living in visits in West Lindsey. And any reduction in weight on the basis of temporal effects is something we would resist, we'd encourage you to, to weigh that as if we're yeah, I've got I've got an item at the very end, we're gonna pull everything together, we're linked to that impact yet, but I'm going to ask about weird to be given to landscape effects and what balance is in that so we're gonna we're gonna have a bit more of that discussion later on. But it's not myself that I said it's it's a point that's not missed.

1:02:57

Okay, thank you very much. NCC Do you have any thing to add to this matter?

1:03:05

has even pointed to the manager Planning and Policy? Nothing specific related to the solar arrays? Clearly that's in Lincolnshire.

1:03:14

We don't really have obviously, the substation, we recognize the industrial nature of parts of the Trent Valley and accept

1:03:26

and support in a regeneration of those of those sites.

1:03:42

Thank you very much. Can I just then turn to other parties? So I'll turn to 7000 acres first of all?

1:03:49

Thank you, sir. Yes, the applicant said they felt the development will be screened. Obviously, we completely disagree with this. Partly because the we believe the mitigation in our opinion will fail. Part We have obviously on the ground experience of trying to establish landscaping within this area. And it's very difficult with grazing, browsing.

1:04:16

And obviously, the Africans are talking about a 15 year period, but it obviously they have to start first of all by removing vast swathes of established mature hedgerows and trees, then which opens the character of the landscape radically changed it in the first instance to then put back

1:04:35

minor planting in

1:04:38

whips or what have you small planting to establish over a long period of time, so they'll be much more open landscape over that 15 year period. And then indeed, if they do, establish these are our suggestion that they a large portion will not so therefore, in our opinion, the character will change radically

1:05:00

straight away. And obviously,

1:05:03

we feel this is something that will not be successful. And we agree with both links county council and West Lindsey county council in terms of the characterization of a landscape changing from an agricultural landscape

1:05:17

to an industrial. Thank you.

1:05:26

Okay, thank you very much is there anybody else, I've got one hand in the room to hand in the room.

1:05:36

And I shall come to you in a moment. I'm just going to

1:05:39

start in base to Paris Council. First of all, Carol Gilbert stone bisogno. parish council. First point, the coal fired power stations, they are in currently in decommissioned.

1:05:53

So that will actually change that particular industrialization of that particular landscape for a start.

1:06:05

The A 1500 runs from the a 156, all the way up to the A 50. And this road, you have presumably the thinking about it will be screened and tunneled with hedging and trees. That's a very, very long way. And from the a 15, down to the A 156, you're coming off a hill. So you will actually see the full scale of all of the solar panels.

1:06:51

Thank you very much.

1:06:53

Yes, sir. There should be a roving mic coming to you. And if you can just confirm your name and your interest in the application. Good afternoon. It's Andy Johnson, and I'm a local resident.

1:07:05

During the applicants, defense of the screening, it was it was all about eye level, in your car or walking, there was there was no consideration given to the Jurassic Hill, the hill looks all the way across the Trent Valley, and you have a view of in excess of seven miles from the hill, you'll be able to see all these solar panels unless you build extremely large hedgerows and trees in front of it, which obviously takes many, many years to actually obscure the view.

1:07:38

I would ask that that reconsidered. Yeah, and the applicant knocks out the hill. And also part of the planning process, visits the hill, and actually digests the actual view, you get the views of that good that it actually has visitors parking for the views that actually highlighted on that road. Okay.

1:08:00

Yes, as part of my on accompany site inspection, I went to the viewpoint parked up there and viewed from there.

1:08:11

Okay, again, could you just confirm your name and your interest? I'm Katrina Morton. I'm just resident in and around the area.

1:08:22

I'd obviously make slightly the sentimental point that I do travel on foot. And in cycling around the villages along the 1500. I'm swapping intermittent views through screening

1:08:40

of feel breaking up.

1:08:46

But the intimate use you do path of actually D is crossing the field? You know?

1:08:53

Sorry. Sorry, I'm having gripping, difficulty with that. If that doesn't work. Do you want to come up to one of the seats here where one of the microphones is and just sort of?

1:09:06

Yeah, just just there's a spare seat there. Just come up and sit at that season.

1:09:17

Just just straight in front of any microphone, just press the button. Yes, thank you. So it was obviously the observation which has been made about the intimate views and actually moving through. And what you might get this time is a little bit of the solar. Well, I don't think that's a good swap, potentially for what we're going to have to do, or we're having to put up with

1:09:39

reference has been made, again, about baseline the eye level. And obviously, you know, the gentleman there has touched on the height. Can I ask? I don't I haven't seen it. You may have got it but obviously work has been done collaborative ly with other projects. Can we have an area

1:10:00

he'll view showing I don't mean, you've already got one diagram with yellow and pink spots. But can we have an aerial view? Showing the panels, the buildings, you said you only got the dimensions. I'm not bothered about what the look like, but what they would look like, from a higher level because that is what you do see. And forgive me, I mentioned it yesterday, you genuinely do get a lift of the heart as you travel along the 1398. Looking down into the valley, we are a big sky.

1:10:35

County, and this is the industrialization of the landscape. Thank you.

1:10:43

Thank you very much.

1:10:47

Okay, if I look around the room, is there anybody

1:10:52

in the virtual room who would like to contribute to this part of the discussion?

1:10:59

Not doing any hands up. Okay. So in that case, I'll turn back to the applicant to ask for the comments. On any of the comments, you've just heard me standing on behalf of the applicant. And yes, sir, I'll pass familiar Mr. William Ballard, who wants to just make a few clarifications in relation to hedgerows and overall effects.

1:11:21

William Barrett for the applicant? Yeah, just a couple of clarifications worth making first one, on hedgerows

1:11:32

the hedgerow removal plan, which is figure 1021. And it's rep 2017. This is a very useful document because it shows the hedgerow removal at the main site.

1:11:49

The hedgerow removal comprises a very small and discreet and defined limited locations, which are shown in purple hatching. And they're there primarily for the purposes of access tracks. So they're theirs, they're very limited in scale. And it's worth making sure that when that plan is read, then it needs to be read alongside the landscape and ecology management plan.

1:12:21

That management plan is very important, because then makes the commitments around the reinstatement following any removal of hedgerows for the purposes of access. And so that document is rep 2038.

1:12:38

And the other clarification, I think just looking at the layout plan, and building on what your was communicating, we're talking here about landscaping visual. But there are many, many other elements environmentally that have fed in to particularly the no panel areas, the areas where there are zero panels. So when we think about the offsets, so the 15 meter offsets from existing woodland, the 10 meter offsets from headrow

1:13:08

and the 10 meter offsets from water.

1:13:12

And it's worth

1:13:14

referencing the other studies. So there's a lot that's gone into this in terms of the water and the ecology, work to identify and set out those panel removal areas. We wouldn't accept that there are material adverse effects.

1:13:31

And I would point to chapter 17, of the environmental statement

1:13:36

as the reference document for that. So we know that we have no overall likely significant effects. And for each of the topics, and there are two moderate effects that York has referred to from the perspective of landscape and visual.

1:14:01

Think it's something that sorry, we couldn't contribute or add to that.

1:14:07

Something I just wanted to pick up. But I think I have got cigs on to pick up and in a different session, in terms of construction matters. But you just mentioned there the hedgerows removal plan for at the same time as the hedgerows removal plan, there was an access

1:14:27

alteration scheme that was put in, which includes looked at ways in which you would reduce the amount of hedge row removal.

1:14:40

I wasn't quite sure whether or not those two had been aligned yet or whether there was going to get another iteration. So as the hedge removal plan, the removal of hedgerows up to the consideration of those changes to the access or does it already incorporate that or is that another iteration that

1:15:00

I am going to receive

1:15:04

there will be another iteration of the detailed design drawings that accompany the hedgerow removal for the purposes of those access locations that I know James Hemingway's talking to Lincolnshire county council about



1:15:20

to answer the other point, the hedgerow removal plan is very much it shows the maximum maximum extents for which powers under the DCO are required.

1:15:31

The hatched areas are not the won't be the final extent because they will all be within will be smaller when we come to detail to design. The actual removal plan accompanies the DCO. So it's the big area within within which powers are required. But in detailed design, the areas will be more limited. And one example is the one that said that you've referred to where we know with more detailed work on safety and visibility lines on those access locations, we know that we can reduce the overall amount of facial removal right.

1:16:32

One correction, so the vegetation removal plan has been a version that's been submitted at deadline to Yes, yeah.

1:16:42

Yeah, you quoted that as rep. 227.

1:16:50

Yep, thank you. That's great. Yep.

1:16:59

Okay,

1:17:01

not seeing any of their hands or any other parties here. I'll just go around and see whether or not the consoles have got anything that further they wish to raise. And this issue, Lincolnshire note was Lindsay Nope. 7000 acres. Nope. Mr. Johnson.

1:17:31

Andy Johnson, local resident just a very quick one. Listening to the applicant's response. There was absolutely no mention of a potential solution for the view from the cliff. Everything is all about eyesight and ilevel driving your car or walking the dog. Okay, there are 1000s of people that go across that cliff every day 1000s and 1000s. And it is well known as a view viewpoint across the Trent Valley, and you offer no solution. Thank you

1:18:09

Do you want to respond to that and then I'll move on. But yes, your shorts on behalf of the applicant.

1:18:17

The use on the cliff have been illustrated in photo montage seven, C four and C five

1:18:26

foot 107 is looking at Miss Burton energy pack alone. And it's no view from tilbage Lane viewpoint visible of development because it's screens by intervening vegetation.

1:18:40

That is confirmed by sea five as well which is at the top of the cliff near Park farm. AND

1:18:50

gate bird management will be screened, what isn't screened and is cotton solar farm that will be visible.

1:18:57

But I do have to say as well that the existing power stations are also visible from those clips and they have been for the last 60 years or 50 years. And I know that they are in the process of being decommissioned. But when they were built and for decades were active together with our balloons which aren't visible at the moment, they would have been a major component of the visual amenity of the overall area. And that is not just the study area we have but it's in the wider area. You can see them they have been in the Lincolnshire bowls. You can see them on the horizon. You can see them from Lincolnshire cathedral. You can see them everywhere. And you see them on train journeys between Redford and Saxelby. Drive by them literally less burden. And so there is always and has been an industrial component in the landscape. And the proposal you have

1:19:52

is different. It's very different scale. It's not as punctual as the power stations. It's most

1:20:00

About out. And that's what we have said in the Yes, in the assessment, that this is basically what contributes to the significant

1:20:08

landscape character change. But it is only a layer. It's not an all defining

1:20:16

impact, because of the nature of the landscape and the screening effects already there.

1:20:30

Thank you very much.

1:20:40

Yes, thank you just one comment.

1:20:43

The gentleman alludes to the power stations, they are landmarks points on the landscape, they do not cover the landscape, there is a vast difference to this. And the design that you that you're

1:21:00

putting forward

1:21:02

will define the landscape for 60 plus years. So it's not

1:21:09

something that can be so easily dismissed, obviously. But they those power stations were very valuable power stations, obviously, in terms of energy for the nation, and and very reliable. But they were land marks, they said this is a very different scenario, which you're proposing to develop thinking.

1:21:34

Just confirm that there's no other comments.

1:21:40

Sorry, still, Carol Gilbert stone by stone, just to point, the screening. Is this to be

1:21:50

it just assessed during the summer time? Or do you actually think that during the winter time, when there are no leaves on the trees, and the hatchet that they will still screen adequately.

1:22:06

Your assessment does include Summer and Winter views.

1:22:12

I will give the applicant the final view before I move on as a final point of reply if they would wish to do so. And the nominee from me standing on behalf of the applicant and no so nothing major sponsor at this moment. We obviously did receive the deadline to submissions, and we'll be responding to those at deadline three. And that includes comments on landscape and visual impact as well. Thank you very much.

1:22:34

Okay, in that case, I'll move on to the next couple of bullet points, which relate to the area of grit landscape value. So we've got an

1:22:46

area of great landscape value, and we've got local landscape character areas that have been defined within the years and comment made and knows

1:22:57

I wanted to have an understanding of the AGL V, including the elements that contribute to its distinctive value. Also wanted a general understanding in terms of skill around the local character areas that have been identified to understand rough areas and comparatively the areas of each of the affected LTAs that will be covered by the scheme. So turning to the AGL v have a number of matters. I would wish to hear comments from West Lindsey, then LCC and CC, and then we'll come back to the applicant.

1:23:37

And then I'll go to other parties, but firstly,

1:23:42

the applicants identified that they've been unable to see or identify the evidence base on which the AGL V has been designated on deed that's acknowledged in LCCs comments.

1:24:02

Canwest, Lindsay assist at all by identifying any landscape character assessment and committee report any document that's in the public domain that actually sets out the justification for the AGL, the

1:24:21

unexplained West Lindsey District Council

1:24:25

the core evidence base documents for the landscape character area is the landscape character assessment of August 1999, which the applicant reflects in the environmental statement. So there isn't a

1:24:39

question from West Lindsey about a the missing piece of evidence base that's all been captured. This is what happens next that that the

1:24:47

West Lindsey have an issue with no I was more asking you whether or not you as an authority have the document that specified what the AGL V, what the specific characteristics of that

1:25:00

that were that led you to protected in the development period be that character assessment that fed into the local plan Examination, or pause that.

1:25:11

Mr. Clarkson's you have anything to add on that information on the local plan?

1:25:18

Okay, yeah, sorry, Mr. Clarkson just confirmed that it's that character assessment from 1999. That's been rolled forward and considered for the local plan evidence basis, consecutively leading to the one that was adopted in April this year.

1:25:40

So has that been produced and provided to the applicant for

1:25:45

I'm sorry, Alex Blake, West Lindsey, as his normal practice on the applicant would have sourced that information readily from the council website, evidence based page for local plan, if the council didn't provide it themselves, early scoping activity, possibly.

1:26:08

An early leader for the applicant. And We have indeed received that document, we have reviewed it in the landscape and visual impact assessment. I think, perhaps, the conversation that's coming here is in that document, whilst it describes the landscape character, it doesn't set out reasons why some areas are designated as areas of great landscape value, what the most valuable elements are of those areas, why those areas have been curtailed, where they have or went wider. And it doesn't separate out the different the different areas of great landscape value in that way. So when we're looking at assessing the impacts are in an area of great landscape Valley, we can't point to a document that says the most valuable parts of this area or this or it's because of the woodlands, or it's because of the heritage or anything like that, because that's not provided in in that character assessment. But the information that has been available has been taken into account in our assessment. And we have made our own assessment of what we think are the most valuable elements of that area of great landscape value and sought to avoid impacts on those wherever possible.

1:27:28

So in that context, and I suppose the question is whether or not what are what does West Lindsey identify as the principal characteristics of the AGL V that it seeks to protect? Okay.

1:27:44

I'll explain as Lindsay District Council.

1:27:49

That helpful explanation from the applicant does emphasize the point that all the objections that Western has you're making

1:27:59

in it, firstly, the policy, the statutory policy is 62. And the adopted development plan

1:28:05

is not for disaggregation, just as a starting position, it's a policy that defines designates the AGL V. There is no provision within that policy to disaggregate it and waits those areas. The policy test is to determine harm

1:28:25

and change that the existing character in that designation.

1:28:31

But if you don't understand what the contributors are, that underpin that designation, I can do then with

1:28:44

or using the character assessment that describes the Trent Valley, for example, its key characteristics along that ridge, that's your evidence base for an assessor who would then be through their experience on site to identify what impacts and what characteristics are impacted. What was lenses cases, they are equal, there's there's no desensitizing or attributing a lower sensitivity to parts of one part of the story the AgRP to another, which said out west Lindsey appears to have happened in in the ES

1:29:19

where the upcoming seems to I think it's in 10, paragraph 10 915 and 10 957 of chapter 10 of the s.

1:29:31

IR appears the assessor has attributed a sensitivity within a matrix. But then in description in that paragraph says well actually this part of the AGL V, where the project is located is of less value. So we can desensitize that further got attribute a lower sensitivity. So that's why we, in objecting to the impacts, we are questioning whether that's happened really it's a question is that the approach has been taken as the assessor Unilad

1:30:00

really made a decision that this part of the ARV is of a lower sensitivity than the rest of it? That's the question. If so, we object to that approach, we think it's that is not an appropriate way to deal with it with with the designation.

1:30:18

And therefore, that, you know, the impacts could be higher subject to how that sensitivity works in the matrix.

1:30:27

So I'll pause there is not my understanding of the approach. And it's not for me to put the applicant case, but I'm trying to get to an understanding of how you're making that assessment is that what they're trying to understand is, what are those features are matters which contribute to give this

1:30:50

locality, its particular value that lifted above other areas, such that it is an area of great land to get value,

1:31:01

they are unable to identify a

1:31:05

document which lists those contributors. In doing so they have identified their own. And in doing that, they have then sought to say, well, if these are the matters, or these are the factors that contribute to this area being of great land to give value,

1:31:28

then if we don't harm those factors, then we are not harming the value of the area, because we're not harming those matters, which contribute to its designation as a value. And therefore they're saying, we don't contribute to them. So it's not that they're sort of going, we'll take this little area out of it, or we'll take that little area, but what they're saying is, you have to have a series of factors which contribute to reduce to produce this locality being of a particular value. And those areas are not being affected in that way. So therefore, it's not having an advantage or an impact on me AGL V overall, that's what I understand where they're coming from. And I think that that's

1:32:24

a little bit Miss characterized, by the way that you're saying they're trying to deconstruct the area, what they're trying to do is say, you've got this area, what contributes to it? What are the main factors that contribute to it? And if we can identify that our scheme doesn't adversely impact on those, then are you assessing it that there is harm or significant harm to that area?

1:32:53

Under understood, but the, the point of the Council

1:32:59

makes in relation to the designation is that change in itself would be harmful.

1:33:07

It would change that character. So if we were to sit here and describe that baseline, so we go out and we assess the baseline of that character, and the key features in a particular area, you are still having that adverse impacts, even if you avoid the ones that you unilaterally think are the most important characteristics.

1:33:30

So this, the characterizing effect that this proposal has around circuit 10% of this AGL V is significant.

1:33:41

Whether you go into then the finer more granular as you would expect, not criticism, because you have to you have to identify something, you have to identify what you feel as an assessor is important. But once you've done that, then everything underneath that doesn't become insignificant.

1:33:59

Yeah, yeah. So that's our point is that's where we come from. So it's that that change

1:34:05

and even taking the

1:34:09

conclusion of the Yes, face value.

1:34:14

That level of impact assessed does not make acceptable when you apply its policy.

1:34:21

So you could have a minor impact. But that minor impact could be unacceptable when you apply to a policy that in effect says this areas should be protected and conserved.

1:34:34

Okay, I'll give the applicant a chance to come back on that in a minute but let's just explore whether or not what

1:34:42

Lincoln choose you on these matters on

1:34:49

Brown County Council

1:34:52

Yeah, with the HIV.

1:34:54

It's, it's it's not been identified as a receptor in its own right and the baseline however, it is

1:35:00

Obviously mentioned within the main body of the text. However, this designation has been taken into account in terms of the finer grain, local market landscape. Character areas have a look at

1:35:15

character area one and character 82 which are located in the AGL v. And again, this is the area that is the west of the railway line.

1:35:25

And based on that, you know, the evidence on sight and what's presented within the AIA, it clearly has a more intimate character it clearly has more woodland cover vegetation cover is in better condition,

1:35:40

which we would expect to be reflected in the sensitivity of that as receptor.

1:35:46

And looking at, you know, the effects that have been assessed within the local landscape character area to

1:35:55

even 15 years, they've been, you know, still got significant effects within that character area.



1:36:08

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council if I could just summarize that as we don't dispute methodology, we agree significant adverse effects.

1:36:21

Okay, I'll come to the applicant in a second NCC, do you have anything I know, we're talking about areas that are more in Lincolnshire and in relation to

1:36:33

the solar farm rather than in the grid connection corridor. But just to complete matters in terms of the consoles? Do you have anything that you wish to add?

1:36:45

Okay, Stephen pointer, Nottinghamshire County Council. Nothing specific. It's just a note that bass Lord don't have any landscape designations in the area's local planning authority. They reference the Natural England national landscape character areas of which this falls in the trends and beaver veils. So, you know, I think that's who will just want to make sure that,

1:37:16

you know, appropriate recognition is given to that. Yeah. Thank you. Okay, can I turn to the applicant, first of all, and then we'll come back out to everybody else, but can I go to the applicant? Yes, thank you, sir. I've got clarification on my right and my left, so I'll pass first misleader.

1:37:35

Thank you, sir. I'm Ally leader for the applicant and mines to stay a clarification I think more for the public and people watching but by Mr. Blake was speaking earlier, we were talking about AGL vs and MyLincoln cliff in the same sentence. So just to clarify, there are two areas of great landscape value that we're looking at in the this area, which is area two and area for one of which is the cliff, which we're not experiencing the which we're not affecting due to the limited visibility. The other is the one south of gains for where we have the minor effects. So just to clarify that the there are differences between those two.

1:38:15

Thank you. That's helpful.

1:38:21

Europe shoots on behalf of the applicant. I think a lot has been said about that area and the conundrum we have actually faced of having a policy which identifies these areas, a map which shows the location of these areas, and gives general

1:38:41

policies about what is important about these areas in terms of the overall so like what should be protected in terms of the overall scale, but nothing is in detail there. We don't know what makes that

1:38:59

area of landscape character special. We have to remember that the area where the proposed development is located in the southern end of the area of wetlands K value, which stretches from Martin pass Gainsborough and further north so it's quite a large veg of an area and because we didn't have clear information on what makes that character special, what makes that lands Cape Great.

1:39:29

We have established local landscape areas which have been referred to earlier

1:39:36

and the three in particular, which did development would be located in and that is as the a one gate Bergner state Isca to the ancient woodland ridge, and then Isca, five Somerby and Nathe woodlands,

1:39:55

the

1:39:57

landscape and visual impact assessment

1:40:01

provides a baseline for this. For these landscape character areas which include sections of the area of a landscape value. We provide key characteristics for those local landscape character areas. And we also apply value.

1:40:17

And we acknowledge in the area west of the railroad, which Oliver Brown has referred to earlier, that there is indeed, a change in landscape. We do state that are predominantly small size, medium deciduous woodlands scattered across the area. Some of them include ancient woodlands, like Birkin board itself. And then,

1:40:43

because of that, the diversity of the overall

1:40:47

arable landscape changes there, although it's enhanced diversity, it's not just open fields with agriculture, it actually has a

1:40:56

greater diversity because of these Bookland pockets. And those woodland pockets are not affected by the proposed development.

1:41:03

So that has been

1:41:05

identified as

1:41:08

precious and contributing to the value and for gate bergna. State for that landscape character area, we have in fact, sensitivity applied or value applied, which is high, which is the highest level of of value. And for the ancient woodland Ridge, we have applied medium.

1:41:27

And that is because there is a change already in your wall, setting the other residential properties in there. So there is a change in landscape and landscape slightly. And that is the same for clay farmlands, which then,

1:41:44

again, changes in a more ordinary landscape where we have to unapplied a low value, low means not that it's not

1:41:53

that it's not a great or a nice value landscape, it's just that it's more ordinary features in there, which are more common. And that has affected the value rating. And then the landscape character assessment has assessed this and has applied a rating in terms of the changes to the landscape character. So that's how we have dealt with the area of great landscape value, we have also assessed the area of good landscape value in the overall assessment as to what impact it would have based on our own findings and as what the characters consisting of

1:42:36

Thank you very much.

1:42:44

Have you got any rough indication of those LRTA as to the amount of coverage of the areas and the coverage of the scheme within those areas?

1:43:05

Your shots on behalf of the applicant?

1:43:08

So the multiple levels of landscape character areas. As you know, we have the national level, which is the trend and bevel. I was more looking at local local ones. Okay. So the local ones. So for the LLC, one vapordna state. Now this is an approximate figure. Yes. And it's not going to hold you to

1:43:33

30%.

1:43:36

And for the ancient woodland Ridge is about 80%. So this is where the majority of the development is located. I'm sorry, that's LLC. It's but that's the Isca to ancient Portland ridge.

1:43:51

And that is about 80%. Yeah. And then you have the LLC a six.

1:44:00

Second, make sure that find nothing right early on.

1:44:05

Yes, the clay farmlands that's about 40%.

1:44:11

And then we have LLC, a oh five, which is a much bigger landscape character area.

1:44:17

Some of the neath woodlands, and that is about 15% around that figure about 15. Okay, it's a rough indication. Now. I think it's worth mentioning for the general for the for the listeners as well that

1:44:35

the landscape character local landscape character areas were created because the national and regional landscape character areas are very, very large. So the national landscape character AR, which is the NLC a 48 trend, embeddable Rails

1:44:54

is so large that the proposed development would possibly take 1%

1:45:00

To probably less of the entire landscape character area, and the regional landscape character areas,

1:45:07

which include the East Midlands regional landscape character areas, is include the wooded veils, and that is including actually the area of great landscape value. And that is probably the development takes about 15%, potentially less. And for the onboarded veils, it's less than 3% and floodplain Valley landscape character area, which only contains a great connection, it's probably less than 3%.

1:45:36

And add County and district landscape character level, we have the best Lindsay landscape character area to Trent Valley.

1:45:45

And that's again a very large character area where the development would probably take up less than 55%. And that is the same for the Notting Hampshire County Landscape character area, which is the trend wash lens, which again, contains the grid connection only. And that has about 3%, probably less

than 3%. So now those figures are approximate you I just took the on the screen and look well, what would it be awfully be, but I think it gives the reason as to why we define these local landscape character areas to provide a better meaning to the assessment to in fact drill down into the local character area. And that has addressed obviously the lack of information for the area for quite landscape value, and has helped us to

1:46:37

miss the assessment.

1:46:39

Thank you.

1:46:52

Okay, I think

1:46:54

understood where we're at with that.

1:46:57

Just wanted to make sure in terms of the policy side of things

1:47:02

we're dealing with, and such, but the framework still is an important and relevant matter. So in terms of that, is this where would the council view this as a value landscape in terms of the NPPF 174? A?

1:47:28

I direct that towards West Lindsey.

1:47:38

And the short answer from Wesleyan. So Alex Blake, West Lindsey, District Council, the short answer is yes, sir. We think it falls within that definition framework.

1:47:47

In terms of the applicant, do you view it as a valid landscape to which I should apply one seven for

1:48:00

an ally leader for the applicant? Can we take that one away? As we might want to have a discussion between myself and your gun that please? Yeah, surely

1:48:10

you can add that into your

1:48:13

written response to the oral submissions today.

1:48:18

Thank you.

1:48:26

Okay, I think that probably covers the matters that I wanted to deal with on that. So I'll just go around the room to see if anybody else wants to

1:48:35

raise any other matters on that issue. Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council. Thank you. So just to

1:48:41

put it put a marker down, I suppose that all the discussion today is focused on the local landscape character areas, it's really our case, given the not that local landscape effects don't matter, because of course, value may differ, but that national policy obviously envisages that projects of this scale will have significant effects at a local level. So it makes sense to focus on the medium and wider range effects in terms of the regional and national character areas. And it's really at that scale that we say cumulatively these projects have an unacceptable effect. So that is where our case focuses, rather than the acceptability or otherwise to local level where I think that all parties acknowledge or there's a little bit of deviation, that there are significant effects at a local level, because how can there not be with a project or of the salaries? So thank you. Just just to that is where we'll be going in writing with it. Thank you. Do you want to

1:49:35

ask your consultant just haven't made it up? It did come from it.

1:49:42

But I think you just want to put a little bit of meat on because the applicant is aware of what you're actually coming from in terms of when you say you're, you're moving up a stage looking at the regional and national levels given they've just given me proportions of that.

1:50:00

national and regional levels that might be affected by this.

1:50:03

So just a little bit of meat on where, where your written comments might come sort of doesn't come as a surprise, and they've got an opportunity to make some comments. Because all of our ground Lincolnshire county council, so we would urge caution regarding larger landscape character areas, which often we see quite regularly having limited effects from development due to the scale of the character area or the receiving development.

1:50:32

What would be looking for and what what, how we're looking at this is that while these are obviously very large developments, we need to look at the baseline in terms of what are the characteristics that make up that character area? And how are those being affected? Because if we weren't doing that, every development in every regional or district character scale landscape character area would have minimal effects. So what we were looking at is, what are those characteristics within this character area? What are important, and how are those changing through the development? So obviously, the site

1:51:11

by itself, but also cumulatively, and I think, you know, you look at the scale of that, and

1:51:17

I have to be corrected, but you know, the scale and the square meters that's taken up by this development is probably unprecedented in the county, if not in the country. So the test that I would have is if I was writing, even the national character assessment,

1:51:32

would this development be part of that would that'd be one of the key components of the character of this area? And we're suggesting that it is.

1:51:45

And it would mentioned and it'd be very important in defining that character.

1:52:05

Show if you would then identify it as a key component in identifying that wider character of a regional or national.

1:52:12

Given the baseline presently, you would say that that's a significant change in though you would assume, be concluding that that's an adverse change to that character area and therefore, that is a matter that I should weigh against the scheme. Correct.

1:52:33

Me Sterling for the on behalf of the applicant. Can I just clarify, and with Veselin the District Council, are those comments in relation to Cape Breton alone? Okay, bottom cumulatively, I'm sorry, that was slow Lincolnshire. Yeah.

1:52:50

Definitely cumulative.

1:52:53

And then potentially at site level as well.

1:53:26

Okay, are you okay, without any further comment? No. Okay.

1:53:32

I'm just looking around the room. We're going to move on to the next part of the subject. I'll just go to the virtual room. Is anybody any points on any of those issues? Okay, no. So we're moving to the

1:53:48

penultimate bullet point of item three, which relates to screening mitigation effects. I think we touched a little bit on this earlier.

1:53:59

I wanted to explore some of the issues around the mitigation of the scheme. And the effect that this may have. much reliance is placed on retention enhancement and installation of screening to reduce the effect of the scheme

1:54:13

as this LCC note that there's a potential over reliance within the L BIA upon planting to mitigate the visual effect of the development character the area's relatively open to much planting without due care for location simply to screen could have potential impacts.

1:54:34

They also need to note that care needs to be taken to prevent the loss of long range views and open aspects which contribute to the character the area through an overbearing set of mitigation proposals.

1:54:50

En one and en three do not have effect

1:54:56

in relation to this as a designated NPS

1:55:00

but they provide general principles letter saying, which might be important and relevant matters.

1:55:09

They identify that scheme should seek to minimize the visual outlook from public rights of way. And they should consider the impact that this may have on other visual amenities. And they note that screening may impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscape.

1:55:28

Can I just understand how the applicant has sought to address that tension between training screening of the scheme and creating a much more enclosed landscape and character that would result from that screening and those wider views of open aspect?

1:55:55



In a stolen on behalf of the African first pastor, Mr. Robot it to make one point and then Mr. Shields will provide the technical response.

1:56:07

Well, bad for the applicant. Yeah, thank you. Just the first point I wanted to make is in relation to our first principles in regard to this matter. And one of those first principles has been avoidance as the first step. So in terms of mitigation, and the mitigation hierarchy, if we go back into scoping, and they go back into identification of the site, location and the boundaries, one of the first principles was

1:56:39

the point on avoidance. And I guess the best example is on on public rights of way, when we look at the boundaries, and the first action during scoping was to to minimize

1:56:53

the distance of public rights of way within the site boundary. And that principle of avoidance then goes forward into your cool handover to then following that stage of the project, then we would go into the development of the mitigation alongside the design development. And I'll hand over to York, we'll talk a little bit more about that balance of screening as reducing the overall impact on visual receptors.

1:57:24

balancing that with not implementing planting that's going to cause that overall impact on short term views.

1:57:41

You have shields on behalf of the applicant.

1:57:47

The landscape mitigation is

1:57:50

a multi fold

1:57:53

process. First of all, we had

1:57:57

a Glyndon glare assessment done which identified areas which do require screening to avoid glare and glint effects, which we have addressed with advanced screening.

1:58:09

The overall pattern of the landscape is of consists of hedgerows or bands of trees, certainly the publicly accessible areas along roads along public rights of way.

1:58:24

And the landscape mitigation is taking advantage of that. Quite a lot of what is proposed is to enhance existing hedgerows and trees.

1:58:37

We have quite a number of areas if I think of Willingham road at the southern boundary of the site, Martin road where we have existing hedgerows which need to be maintained differently to grow higher. And we have

1:58:54

areas where open use will be retained. We have Martin road south filling and by so when you look west, and it's a slightly elevated location and by we have Petros proposed along the eastern boundary of the site limits in that location these hedgerows won't grow tall enough and are not supposed to grow tall enough to screen the development we retain the open view across the land towards the west towards Gate Burton. At the corner of the southeastern corner for example, at Martin road there will be locations where views will be possible across the land again to the north and to the northwest.

1:59:35

Again at the junction corner where Billingham Road Becomes Martin road at nursery house and in Zanzibar cottage cheese and open a gap between them where you can look north and that will be retained. And we have other areas along can explain where hedgerows on the southern side will be grown, grown taller and new head

2:00:00

shows and bounds of trees will be located to a large extent set back from the road actually in the distance precisely for that reason to

2:00:10

avoid tunneling effect along explain and also to address concerns by residents who live explain and but would have looked at solar panels otherwise quite close to that door. So we moved those panels away. And it also allowed us to move with the mitigation planting away from the roadways, which is the main access point for anyone to see it along Patmore lane or opt in roads, I should say, there are existing hedgerows which again will be maintained taller. And so there will be a change in the landscape character. And it will be coming a little bit denser, a bit greener. But a lot of the areas where when you travel along the development, you have to development on one side only. The very few where you happen on both sides is just literally atom can explain but this is the case. And so you're not creating tunneling effects. There'll be an openness on the other side if there is a toilet on the on one side. And as I mentioned earlier, as an example, tall hedgerows are not a stranger to that area. And we have that in the area between Willingham by stone and filling him as early as well. We have a long clay lane and a large extent of it, we have a long Billingham road. So we looked at the pattern of the landscape and vegetation pattern and we have tried to use that to our advantage and to support the screening without changing entirely the landscape perception.

2:01:49

And I think that is the balance we can achieve to screen as much as we can while retaining open views. And I think the landscape mitigation proposal will allow for that.

2:02:06

Thank you.

2:02:13

Turn to the conference. Do you have any comments from what you've heard? Lindsey? Sure. Michelle. What Lindsay District Council. So I think comments that are made previously probably stand at this point. So don't lose anything further to add at this stage on mitigation. Okay.

2:02:29

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire County Council this same month really? Thank you.

2:02:35

Again, NCC, I don't expect that you've got much because this is around the mitigation for the solar panels. Nothing to add at this stage, sir. Okay. Thank you.

2:02:47

In terms of the room, is there anything?

2:02:51

I've got Mr. Johnson, and I've got 7000 acres of 7000 acres firstly, and then I'll come to you Mr. Johnson. Thank you, sir. Just the same we would obviously I think the comments we've made earlier in relation to this matter still stand. The gentleman mentioned that the the changing landscape will become denser and greener in terms of character. This will take a very long time to establish in the meantime, as mentioned 15 years plus, there'll be a significant detrimental change to the character that denser, greener elements won't be arriving for some time. Thank you. Thank you.

2:03:30

Mr. Johnson.

2:03:41

Thank you, Andy Johnson, local resident, you speak about the hedgerows and obviously

2:03:48

screening the panels, can you tell me which side of the hedges the security fence is going to be and also we have I believe CCT V points, where are they going to be located in the sketch

2:04:11

you're actually on behalf of the applicant. The

2:04:17

outline landscape Master Plan

2:04:21

indicates the proposed planting proposals and it also indicates the location of the fencing around the solar panels. So on a typical

2:04:34

cross section, you have see again Melinda, take the example mountain road. On the north side of mountain road, you have the head through an existing Metro, which will be maintained to taller height and reinforce and then behind that hedgerow, you have an offset of a couple of niches, and then you have a security fencing and then you have two solar panels. So the solar add security fencing will also be screened in the majority of locations where

2:05:00

possible. Now, the CCTV cameras will,

2:05:06

may become visible because they're on a higher

2:05:09

scale. And so let me just have a look what what that is.

2:05:14

So the proposed hedgerows are between up to 3.5 meters tall. And the security fencing is between two and a half to three meters in height and set back from the edge. So when you are on the road or on a cow on horse, you will not look across and you won't see the fencing. The CCTV

2:05:35

is

2:05:37

proud proximately five meters high on a pole. So I probably can have to propose to my colleagues what that looks like. It's a little ball on a pole basically. So they

2:05:50

can appear as a individual points along the perimeter of the of the site. Yes.

2:06:01

Thank you for your reply.

2:06:03

Thank you.

2:06:14

For a move on a bit. Lincolnshire. Did you want to introduce your matter about temporal issues

2:06:24

that you raised earlier, whatever. You talked about timing of mitigation proposals and things of that nature?

2:06:34

I think it links to 7000 acres as well, which is sort of the issue around timing.

2:06:45

I think it's looking like I pause you're looking blank yet. The rest of Mr. Brown.

2:06:52

It was just a comment that you said at the start.

2:06:59

In terms of passing through the landscape, and when the mitigation planning will established. Is that Yes, after that question. Yes. So you said you were going to bring that back in at mitigation time? Yeah. Well, I mean, to be honest, I've not got the most most of that in relation to that. Obviously, I think we're all aware that until the mitigation is established, it's going to have limited

2:07:19

effects in reducing any adverse effects.

2:07:24

Yeah, so GSP tube that three meters 3.5 meters is going to take time, obviously, that's reliant upon the management plan, and making sure that everything's installed and maintained to the to the correct procedures. Yeah. I just wanted to make sure there was nothing in addition there that we were missing out on. Yeah, and then just just just just building on that. And we've mentioned previously about the design code, potentially, and additional detailed information. And we're talking specifically about buildings and structures. However, I think this probably highlights how important the detailed design in terms of the landscape is going to be, and also how that relates to the ancillary I anthems such as fencing CCTV posts. And I think the nuances and the small details in those things will make a big difference. Yeah. But they are already covered by requirements in terms of the submission of detailed and loose.

2:08:18

Okay.

2:08:21

Thank you very much. I just wanted to pick up one final point before we move off this point. And that's in public right of way.

2:08:32

And I just wondered, in terms of

2:08:35

the MPs.

2:08:38

Again, I appreciate the caveat that it may not be a designated MPLS, which is directly relevant, but it has indications of government positioned about enhancements to public right of way. And whether or not schemes should take advantage to enhance public rights of way.

2:09:02

Have you sought to enhance any public rights of way in any way? Or? Or have you considered whether or not you'd wish to propose any new right of way in your scheme to actually take kind of those sorts of

2:09:17

matters that the government has raised on those issues?

2:09:23

will bear it for the applicant? Yet, so just first point would be to reiterate the initial point I made at the beginning that one of our principles was to minimize that overall impact on both rights away yeah, I'm probably turning it round on itself because I understand the minimizing effect and reducing adverse effects and seeing what positive matters have you thought to introduce to enhance the rates of whey or have you considered adding any further right of way on I know it's, it's a matter whenever you're going

2:10:00

Define large tracts of areas that you give some consideration to whether or not actually there is an opportunity to create new or established new right of way across across areas. Yeah, well, so we don't have. So our socio economic team wrote the outline public rights of way management plan. So at this point, I'd make reference to the management plan. And we could take that question away in terms of enhancement. Ally's looking over at me, so I'll hand over to Ali leader for additional comments on that as well. Thank you. Thank you.

2:10:33

Thanks, sorry, leader for the applicant? I mean, the short answer to this is yes, we've considered it and that we've sat down and we've looked at the plans. And we have had, we've had comments at statutory consultation that requested further public rights of way. And we went back in response to those comments and said, Is there any particular connection you would like? Would you like to have a meeting to discuss those, it was one of the parish councils, and we didn't have any response to those requests. So it remains something that the applicant is willing to consider that at present, we have very few public rights of way that no loss in this area for

2:11:11

parliament is part of the part of the site selection. So it, it would be great if we had a contribution that suggested a particular route that might be beneficial that we could consider.

2:11:23

It would help me if you could be provider, a statement on the right to weigh in terms of the positive side of it. So are there any enhancements that you can identify that have been introduced? And if there are any additional public rights of way, even if that is default, so far as to say, we did consider it, but nothing came forward, at least then I can report to the effect that you give consideration to it. And I have good the evidence to say that. Understood, thanks. Thank you.

2:12:05

Okay, then I think what we'll do is we'll finish this bullet point, and therefore conclude item three, and then I'll take a short break, and then we'll come back for those other items four, and five.

2:12:20

And then conclude, for the afternoon. So I think we'll take a short break. But let's just finish off item three. And the final bullet point is the wit to be given to adverse landscape and visual effects.

2:12:34

I just wanted to gauge from each of the parties, where they would advise that I should place that balance and what Wait, I should give it. Obviously, I need to advise the Secretary of State? Well, I think he should do. So I think it's only reasonable and I ask that you tell me what you think I should do.

2:12:57

I wanted to basically hear your views on the way it should be ascribed to any adverse effects that are considered to arise in respect of the character and visual amenities the applicant has drawn my attention to en one, and the advice that local landscape designation should not be used in themselves to refuse consent.

2:13:19

LCC have sought to draw my attention to the policy protection for the AGL Vienna development plan, and therefore this should be given full development plan with

2:13:30

I'm also conscious that en one advisors that were development plan policies are based on landscape character assessments, we should be paid particular attention to

2:13:41

terms of the ATO VI and the matters earlier.

2:13:45

Given that

2:13:47

part of the comment may be that it is a valued landscape, its protection and enhancement is advised in the framework.

2:13:55

However, the weighting I should apply to the harm that is identified is still important. And I would be interested to hear from the parties where I should apply to that harm. I think all parties agree that there is some form of harm somewhere along the line and we're on a continuum with different parties saying what that level of harm is, but then what weight should I apply to that is a further consideration.

2:14:21

So if I can just ask for your views on that. So if I turn to West Lindsey, firstly

2:14:30

I explained West Lindsey District Council,

2:14:34

keeping it brief, so significant weights should be given in your planning balance to impacts on on the landscape.

2:14:43

The particular focus for West Lindsey, as we've discussed is around the ATL V.

2:14:49

This is a statutory development plan policy that is both Porton and relevant for the purposes of section 105.

2:14:57

With regard to MPs en one

2:15:00

On, which isn't a relevant MPs for the purposes of this project, West Lindsey submission is that

2:15:09

that benefit to draw down on

2:15:13

the overriding of local landscape designations in Power Five 914 does not apply for the permit for the reason that it is not a relevant MPs. There are other components within MPs where that would equally apply. But in terms of the landscape, no, we we strongly contend that that benefit should not be drawn down for projects in Section 105. The reason being they relate to developments that do benefit from that MPs as a relevant one as an a technology cited within it. If you're not such a technology, then then clearly there are components within that policy document that cannot be derived in decision making process. So that's opposition, sir. Thank you.

2:16:06

And LCC.



2:16:09

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council, I'm going to pass over to Mr. MacBride to address you on weight. But just to say that we agree with Western z in terms of obviously at the moment, there's no designated NPS that has effect with respect to solar arrays. So insofar as the en one applies, it's a bite by analogy. Thank you.

2:16:31

q&a on bride council. So yeah, obviously,

2:16:37

concur with the points that West Lindsey have made, I think just a couple of the ones in relation to the value landscape and paragraph one salon for we would say that is a valid landscape. So we would

2:16:51

ask you to give that to the appropriate weight in your consideration. And the other point, I think I would make, I think, just I suppose a more general point is that as a as a plan authority, clearly

2:17:06

non lethal autonomy, you plan out applications, you know, it's a plan lead process.

2:17:13

And that, when we assess planning applications, we can look at need from the development plan.

2:17:22

In this situation, we can't it's almost market LED. So the tools that we have in terms of being able to

2:17:32

give you advice and make comments to you related to environmental considerations like landscape. So given that is a

2:17:43

a significant and important consideration that we feel

2:17:50

needs to be taken into account in your recommendation to the Secretary of State, we would say that it needs to be given that appropriate amount of weight, because the things that we might normally want to take into account like knees and things like that, we're not able to do that. Because clearly, there's a number of these schemes that are coming forward at the moment. This is obviously one of the four in this area. And it might be that they came in under a different system, there would be a plan that approach and we could look at things in terms of need, we're not able to do that. So it's not so we can resist the developments on that basis. So I think for that reason, landscape does need to be given considerable weight in your recommendation to the Secretary State.

2:18:38

Thank you very much. NCC Do you have anything to contribute?

2:18:44

That's even point to Nottingham shirt. Nothing that really I just endorse the comments that Neil has just raised there in respect of the importance locally of of landscape in this is assessment to the local authorities.

2:19:01

Thank you.

2:19:03

Thank you.

2:19:08

applicant, you may wish to respond to that you may wish to pick up whether or not you need is an issue.

2:19:15

Thank you, sir Ali leader for the applicant. So a couple of different points there. First of all, I just emphasize that we would consider both the draft and the and the designated MPs is to be important and relevant in decision making. The drafter are very recent from March 2023. And these documents have been written to guide decision making on these types of applications. So just just to emphasize, emphasize that and we nevertheless also see the local plans as being important and relevant matters, especially given the recency of the adoption of the Lincolnshire Lok over central Lincolnshire local plan

2:19:57

in terms of the weight that should be given

2:20:00

To landscape and visual effects, I would, I would contend that we should be giving those moderate weight. And that is, because we don't see it as minor, and we don't see it as substantial. And the reason for that is we are having significant effects on

2:20:20

high receptors with high sensitivity, ie residents. But the number of those effects is very low for the scale of scheme. So we have three residential properties that are experiencing significant effects during the operational period. From a landscape perspective, we are impacting a local landscape designation. And that's acknowledged in the in the assessment, again, that impact, and we do consider it to be minor. But also more importantly, we do need to look at the text in how we protect different levels of designations. So in national policy statement, en one, there's discussion on how we need to give substantial weight to harm to aonbs. And to national parks, the text is quite different for harm to local landscape areas. And so I don't think we can say that we should be giving substantial weight to impacts to a local landscape designation in the same way we would to a national designation. And so for these reasons, I think I think it shouldn't be minor, because we're acknowledging it's an area of great

landscape value, and that there are impacts on highly sensitive receptors, but equally I don't see higher than higher than moderate, being applicable in this case.

2:21:40

Thank you very much.

2:21:47

Thank you, sir. Yes, in terms of just responding to the applicant there, let's cover some 1000 acres, local landscape is very important to local residents, regardless of any other criteria. That's obviously what they experience on a daily basis and enjoy. We agree with councils in terms of weight, that significant harm will be afforded to the great landscape of value and the surrounding landscape. And

2:22:18

basically, obviously, we view the landscape area as highly important and something we wish to enjoy for many years to come. Thank you.

2:22:38

Any other comments?

2:22:40

Just for me, so that's okay. Just like checking if your final final rate of return a minute,

2:22:48

nothing else in the room? Nothing else online. Okay. Turn to the applicant and for a final response, and then we shall close this matter on item three.

2:23:01

Thanks, sorry, I'll be brief me stone for the applicant. I just want to be absolutely clear there is the applicants position that the need for solar and for this scheme as established in the draft MPs, quote directly from the Secretary of State at paragraph 4.7 of the longfield solar farm order 2020 V, where the Secretary of State acknowledges that en one does not have effect, but that the need for solar is established and the draft MPs and as a matter he considers to be important and relevant to decision making. Thanks.

2:23:35

Thank you.

2:23:37

Okay, I think that draws me to a conclusion on Item three, two, we've got items four and five to pick up. But I'm going to take a short break now.

2:23:48

We've got 1624. So let's

2:23:54

come back at

2:23:57

22.

2:23:59

We've got just over 15 minutes.

2:24:02

Sure. We'll be back at 22. The hearing is adjourned and we shall return at 25 Thank you