

File Name: ISH1 9th November 2023 Part 3.mp3
File Length: 01:20:59

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:17 - 00:00:23:24

Good afternoon everybody. And. Welcome back. It's now 231 and time to resume this afternoon session. Can I confirm that everybody in the room can hear me?

00:00:26:07 - 00:00:29:20

And that the live streaming has gone on. Great.

00:00:31:10 - 00:00:31:27

Okay.

00:00:33:29 - 00:00:40:12

I will ask. For the agenda to be reshared. But you'll remember we were at item C.

00:00:42:14 - 00:00:44:01

Of 0.4 of the agenda.

00:00:46:25 - 00:01:09:16

Noting that some of this information has already been strained into. Probably rightly so through earlier sections of the agenda, and therefore it ought to be slightly shortened, and we should be able to go through reasonably swiftly. Item C is the approach to site selection and order limits. So.

00:01:11:20 - 00:01:30:19

Without repeating anything. I'm just going to start by asking the applicant to outline the approach to site selection we have heard. And in some detail earlier this morning. Is there anything else you'd like to state that you haven't already said? Let's recap those items on site selection that you feel necessary to state now.

00:01:32:15 - 00:01:43:26

The club of the applicant. Now, I set out the process that was undertaken earlier in that set out in chapter five, which was 043, in the relevant appendices.

00:01:45:26 - 00:01:56:01

Thank you. So just a couple of questions really from me that. Maybe you didn't didn't come through early. Today is.

00:01:58:26 - 00:02:04:06

The extent to which land is necessary within the site. Selection. And.

00:02:05:22 - 00:02:19:21

Unless you feel that that's already been addressed. The other question really is how have the cumulative effects of the number of solar development proposals, each in close proximity, being assessed in terms of the land take?

00:02:23:13 - 00:03:02:15

But clever in respect of the first point when describe the site selection process. I mentioned that the initial stage and in accordance with the policy, the applicant was looking at sites that were non-agricultural land, so brownfield sites and land that was agricultural but of a lower quality. So grades four five or non classified as part of that site selection process, no available or suitable sites were identified and therefore the applicant looked at grade three land within the study area.

00:03:02:17 - 00:03:17:19

So that's that was the site selection process that led to the identification of a need to include agricultural land within the scheme. In terms of your second question, I'm conscious that we've obviously got.

00:03:19:07 - 00:03:34:16

Swale is a separate agenda item laid down. And we have Mr. Byrd, who wrote the relevant chapter in the in the room and wonder if we can either obviously deal with it now, or whether it's maybe better to wait and deal with cumulative impacts under that topic heading.

00:03:34:26 - 00:04:02:12

Thank you. Yes, yes, there is some slight duplication there, in which case we'll leave it for relevant section on the agenda. Thank you. Oh. Thank you for saying that out succinctly as say, we've cut a number of these items. Is there any additional points parties wish to make in terms of? And. Yeah. The item C, which is the site selection process that haven't already been made earlier.

00:04:07:16 - 00:04:38:20

87,000 acres. I think the point that probably. Uh, it's not quite being met. I think it was mentioned last night by Sir Edward Lee that the government is looking to produce a land use framework. Um, this hasn't been mentioned explicitly today, but I think that's an important point because it's absolutely recognised the pressure that land is under. Um, and of course, schemes like this consume land at a voracious rate.

00:04:39:15 - 00:05:03:04

So that land use strategy is important to, to, to be able to decarbonise. And the other point just I'd just reiterate, is it feels like we're getting sucked into the, um. Is it three A, is it three B debate? Whereas in reality all the land is productive and all the land is useful and precious and that.

00:05:04:24 - 00:05:20:07

Yeah, we're kind of missing the point. If we're just talking about three A, three B, the applicant kind of will be quite rightly thrilled to bits. That's where the debate is. Rather than is the land use actually efficient and effective in the first place? Thank you.

00:05:22:29 - 00:05:24:16

Thank you for that. And.

00:05:27:08 - 00:05:31:20

Just see if there's any response to that from the applicant.

00:05:32:29 - 00:06:07:26

Collaborate with the applicant, obviously. Any future policy statements on land use or any land use strategies. They're published during the examination period. Then we would provide comments and we would have to look to see how these might have an impact on the scheme as when they're published. Think it's incorrect to assume that any sort of strategy is going to say that solar is not an appropriate use of land? We don't know. Nobody has any information on what that might say so, but we will deal with it as and when it comes forward.

00:06:08:06 - 00:06:42:29

I think we're slightly obviously we have fully assessed the impacts on land use and that think will be covered in the later agenda item. But in terms of site selection, obviously it is relevant in terms of your site selection process in light of the policy, whether the land is or is not BMV land. So grade three is BMV land and there is a policy requirement to try, you know, try and avoid using BMV land if possible to do so. So the distinction between grade three A and grade three B is relevant for the purposes of site selection.

00:06:43:01 - 00:07:02:03

It is a separate point. Whether the impact of the scheme on land use generally is a separate point. And we have considered that. And we can talk about that maybe in terms of the later agenda item on the impacts of the scheme on agricultural land, but it is a relevant distinction for the purposes of site selection.

00:07:04:11 - 00:07:21:17

Thank you. Yes. Okay. We will hold some of that discussion for the relevant item a bit later. In which case having. Discussed site selection at some length earlier on. I'm going to move on to. Item D.

00:07:23:26 - 00:07:54:06

Which is the use of alternative technologies, and commence this with asking the applicant to respond, to respond to any points that have been raised in relevant reps regarding alternative approaches to renewable energy generation, and noting particular references to the relative efficiency of other approaches. Again, some of this has been raised earlier today. So a succinct response, not repeating those items that have previously been made would be very helpful. Thank you.

00:07:55:13 - 00:08:31:04

Collaborate with the applicant. And yes, as you've mentioned, Mr. mentioned in quite some detail earlier on in the hearing before lunch about the different types of renewable energy and how solar fits into the energy mix going forward in terms of this particular scheme and alternative technologies. And section 5.6 of chapter five of the chapter, which is Dash 043, sets out the applicant's approach to alternative technologies.

00:08:32:04 - 00:08:53:03

And. That gives some detail in terms of think as other points we've mentioned, in terms of the type of panels that might be used, for example, the difference between fixed panels and tracker panels. We'll be responding in detail to the relevant representations that were made at that deadline, one which deals with

00:08:54:18 - 00:09:16:13

sort of nuclear tidal wave and wind being as a suitable alternative. But Mr. Phillips already mentioned why solar is needed in that mix as well, and how solar can deliver within the time frame available. So that's delivering renewable energy by pre 2030.

00:09:19:03 - 00:09:55:00

Thank you. And mindful, also working through relevant representations and having regard to those number of these refer to. We've heard also the open floor hearing yesterday and this morning, suggestions of inefficiency in solar generation in terms of being produced largely in the summer months when it isn't required. I'd just like to invite your response, the applicant, to that point, and before maybe just seeing if there were any further comments on.

00:09:55:28 - 00:09:59:13

Alternative technologies from other the representatives.

00:10:02:28 - 00:10:07:00

So it's like the applicant. A lot of this is covered in the statements of need.

00:10:08:23 - 00:10:15:01

Clearly solar doesn't generate at night. And clearly solar generates less in the winter than the summer.

00:10:15:22 - 00:10:16:07

Um.

00:10:17:26 - 00:10:18:22

That those were.

00:10:18:24 - 00:10:56:18

Them here to the to the ground on the electricity market will also know that wind is the opposite of that, not a perfect successor lighting opposites to that. But the trends are opposite to that and therefore an element of the statement of need, particularly around figure 8.2, describes that without solar filling a gap in summer months and a much larger amount of offshore wind, which is already at risk of not being delivered at the rates needed, would be needed in order to cover generation in the summer.

00:10:56:20 - 00:11:04:29

So think it's a very insular view to to look purely at. Um,

00:11:06:19 - 00:11:17:11

what aspects of solar generation without looking at the energy market in the round? Um, in terms of efficiency, I think we've. Covet that.

00:11:19:09 - 00:11:44:06

And in relation to alternate technologies at the site. If I could draw back to table 7.1 of the statements of Mead, where we illustrate that in terms of gigawatt hours per hectare for range of solar and a range of onshore wind technologies which think, you know, both could connect at

00:11:45:22 - 00:11:57:25

a substation, the amount of renewable energy that those would generate per hectare per year are not saying they're the same. They're similar. They're of a similar order of magnitude.

00:12:03:18 - 00:12:07:24

Thank you, Mr. Gillet. Okay. We have heard about.

00:12:10:05 - 00:12:39:17

Inefficiencies there and those relative to other alternatives. We've discussed this morning about the use of brownfield sites and rooftop as a prime. I'm going to see if there's anything other than those points again that we've already raised and that have been put forward by the applicant that any. Interested parties would like to make now, Mr. O'Grady, which.

00:12:39:19 - 00:12:40:24

Already 7000 acres.

00:12:42:25 - 00:13:18:00

Think this this point about the about alternatives. And we're not saying that we don't need 7080 whatever gig of solar and. But it is this point about how you deploy it and how you minimize the harm. Um, so offshore wind. We've talked about, uh, offshore wind. Is expected to produce around 70% of the UK's power, from around 130,000MW of installed capacity.

00:13:18:29 - 00:13:36:04

Uh, solar or 70 or 80GW of installed capacity will produce less than 10%. So the the contribution from offshore wind is massively more. And.

00:13:37:25 - 00:14:01:26

So, given the fact that there is such a low yield, such a low contribution from solar in this country, we need to be really mindful that when we deploy it, we minimize the harms. And that, I think, is where. The applicant is is missing the point by having such an extensive area that such a significant height.

00:14:05:17 - 00:14:06:29

Thank you, Mr. O'Grady.

00:14:09:04 - 00:14:13:21

But the other night to come back on any of those points before moving on.

00:14:16:23 - 00:14:50:22

A collaborative napkin. I'm just to say that that's obviously the purpose of the environmental statement, to assess the impacts or harms of the scheme, to see where they can be mitigated and where significant adverse effects remain, whether those are justifiable in the planning balance, taking into account the contribution of the scheme. So that's the purpose of the environmental statement to to undertake that exercise and think it. And then a very similar exercise is undertaken in respect of offshore wind project.

00:14:51:03 - 00:15:21:21

An environmental statement will be undertaken in the same way to assess the harm of those particular developments. And we were talking about different types of environmental harm in an offshore environment than we are onshore, but they are still environmental harms. And so the the suggestion was that there weren't any impacts associated with offshore wind. That's perhaps a generalisation. It's just a different type of harm that would need to be assessed.

00:15:21:23 - 00:15:42:01

And obviously you have all of the onshore connection elements of offshore wind as well. So think it would be incorrect to say that there are no. Issues or adverse effects associated with other types of electrical generation. And it's only solar that has these types of impacts. Be over there. Different in nature. Thank you.

00:15:43:09 - 00:15:44:13

Thank you, Mr. Broderick.

00:15:47:10 - 00:15:49:06

I think.

00:15:49:13 - 00:15:52:16

Excuse me if I can make the misconception there.

00:15:52:18 - 00:15:54:28

One second, Mr. Grady. Okay.

00:15:56:21 - 00:16:00:22

Like. Scroll through my notes. Okay.

00:16:04:14 - 00:16:07:20

You could make your point. Mr.. Really, very, very briefly, please.

00:16:08:11 - 00:16:44:10

Peter O'Grady, 7000 acres. So there was no implication to suggest that any form of generation would have no impact. And the point was that I was trying to illustrate is the relative benefit for the relative harm is significantly different because for, for instance, twice the assets are almost twice the capacity of wind generation, you will get seven times the, the energy benefit for from from so than solar okay.

00:16:44:24 - 00:16:56:15

That's the difference is not that one doesn't have any harms at all. It's when you're assessing the benefit versus the harm benefit one is massively higher than the other. Thank you.

00:16:57:06 - 00:17:10:01

Thank you. Think okay. Think these these points are needed. It would be very useful to reiterate some of those points in 7000 acres. Written submission for deadline one. Thank you. And.

00:17:11:21 - 00:17:18:25

And will just take one further item then on this Mr. Gilet. Thank you.

00:17:18:27 - 00:17:20:27

Sir. We're very brief. I just wanted to.

00:17:23:06 - 00:17:43:15

Note on record that we're not saying that solar is a substitute for offshore wind or for onshore wind. It's needed within the mix, and it's an important part of the mix. Wherever you have a mix, you have a more, more a larger part of that mix and a smaller part of that mix. But the mix is the important part. And so solar therefore has its need in the future.

00:17:44:05 - 00:17:46:03

Thank you for confirming. Okay.

00:17:47:12 - 00:17:47:27

And.

00:17:51:02 - 00:17:54:17

Okay. That concludes item four and five.

00:17:55:15 - 00:18:14:23

Indeed. Item five environmental matters. Would you mind if we just switched? Give us a moment to just switch the people at the table because we have different experts? Yes. No problem. Thank you. And is Mr. Gilet needed for any further questions on the agenda? I don't believe.

00:18:18:16 - 00:18:20:24

That's really simple. Thank you very much. That's appreciated.

00:18:46:19 - 00:18:55:23

Okay? Just just while you're getting yourselves settled. Say a few words by way of. Introduction. So and as we've said at the outset.

00:18:56:27 - 00:19:26:27

We've identified a number of matters that at this early stage in the examination. We thought it would be helpful to spend a little bit of time looking at. These are largely in relation to matters that have arisen during acceptance and pre examination. And. Look, we did have quite a number of questions, but we have reviewed those over the lunch break. And on the basis of the time that we have available

this afternoon, and a number of them are are ones that we think could could be well suited to, to questions.

00:19:26:29 - 00:19:48:29

So so we've tried to trim things a little bit. Um, and also to note at this stage that as I say, this will be fairly high level. And we anticipate that some of these matters are ones we will want to look at in more detail at future issues, specific hearings. So just we will settle.

00:19:51:17 - 00:20:01:17

And. We can do the relevant introductions when your speakers do introduce themselves. So in terms of landscape and visual impacts, first of all. And.

00:20:05:17 - 00:20:39:21

Comments and observations about landscape and visual impacts have been raised by a range of parties. So, as I say, it's helpful to spend a little bit of time looking at this and, and, and being clear about how this is set out in documentation. And I say that because there's a lot of information in the documentation. And it's I think it's probably fair to say that it is it's unwieldy, a little bit tricky to navigate. And so this is something that I want to address to help all parties to the examination.

00:20:39:23 - 00:20:48:12

I'll come back to that specific point a little bit later. And. I just wonder if it's helpful for the applicants

00:20:49:29 - 00:20:56:26

expert to spend a little bit of time explaining how the landscape visual impact assessment has been put together. Just as a star, just to start us off.

00:20:59:12 - 00:21:31:17

Check for the applicant. Yes. Hand over to Mr. Jackson in a moment. Just to say that we are going to prepare some summary tables for submission at deadline one, which will bring together the conclusions of the environmental statements and the various appendices all together in one place. We've done a similar exercise on cotton solar project, which was submitted at their deadline one and that been requested by the local authorities to try and as you say.

00:21:32:25 - 00:21:50:19

Bring together in a helpful way, which is quite a vast amount of information as a result of the the makeup of the sites, the number of viewpoints that we are asked to look at it better. So I'll hand over to Mr. Jackson, but it was just to let you know that that summary is being provided at demo one. Thank you.

00:21:54:27 - 00:21:59:26

And Christopher Jackson, landscape architect, and prepared the landscaping visual impact assessment.

00:22:01:29 - 00:22:02:19

Mr. Jackson.

00:22:05:08 - 00:22:06:21

Okay. Sorry. Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

00:22:10:25 - 00:22:15:22

I suppose in response to your. Your how we went about the perennial the.

00:22:18:28 - 00:22:52:27

It's. A methodology that was prepared in line with the Landscape Institute guidance on Skin Visual Impact Assessment, volume three. And it was something that was originally prepared in-house with ourselves. And then it was agreed for a consultation with local authority. And at various points, the assessment reviews impact on landscape, character and fabric and visual receptors independently.

00:22:53:11 - 00:23:22:09

And whilst they are intrinsically connected, they are two separate considerations that need to be undertaken throughout the impact assessment. For example, impact on visual receptors to people and impacts on the intrinsic landscape, character and fabric landscape as a result of the development. And obviously we've got a, a a disparate site, we've got the West, but one was built in to us, but in three in the cable corridor and the.

00:23:24:09 - 00:23:44:17

Assesses the landscape impacts of three sites in the cable corridor. It then also assesses the cumulative impact of the what we referred to as the site. So the combination of all of the sites and the cable corridor and then Kimberly with the additional.

00:23:46:27 - 00:23:52:19

And CIPs locally to the scheme. So Tilbrook and Cottam the.

00:23:54:12 - 00:24:28:05

The report is split into a series of technical appendices, which is where the detail of the assessment essentially takes place, and then the identified significant effects on the landscape or visual, and then carried through into the main document being the focus of the report to address the significant, likely significant effects, adverse or beneficial. And that's then the report is structured through a series of individual points of assessment regarding the individual sites.

00:24:30:09 - 00:24:33:27

So again it's structured to look at landscape impacts.

00:24:35:28 - 00:25:22:16

Or visual impacts once the assessment takes place for time periods. So the the construction of effects the effects at year one, the effects at year 15 and the effects of decommissioning. And so that's the sort of different approach that we look at year 15 is is common practice to look at. But it's on the landscape. Mitigation has had a chance to begin maturity and start providing the mitigation requirements of the intention of why it's potentially been, um, the landscape mitigation in this instance, with this sort of scheme that we're looking at, is set to reduce the visual impacts, enhance the landscape character.

00:25:22:23 - 00:26:02:13

That is also the wider biodiversity, ecology, habitat enhancements that are associated with that, that landscape scheme that was prepared. Um, that mitigation is what we rely on to establish and provide the mitigation. So when we're talking about mitigation within the scheme, it's that changing landscape management that might be associated with the, with the and as well as the new planting or changes associated with land use, for example, from agriculture or sorry, into a

00:26:04:04 - 00:26:48:09

meadow planting or woodlands or new sections of for example. So that is being applied at year 15. So you've got a year one um, assessment, a construction effects assessment, which are very similar given the short up to 24 month construction timeframe. So the effects that year one are considered to be very similar because we haven't had time for that. Whilst there may be some changes in landscape management that started to take place, you know, growing green hedgerows to add to the height or

growing out, the new planting at that point is still very immature in its infancy, so it hasn't started happening of that sort of landscape or visual mitigation that might be behind it.

00:26:48:11 - 00:27:33:12

Some of the landscape enhancements might be taking place at that point as such as the changes. But we look at the year 15, for example, by the time that trees or woodlands or have reached a point where they're starting to provide enclosure and screening. So the the visual effects, that's why the 15 assessment notes drop back down. Um, would like at this point as well, to raise, um, a number of inconsistencies that have been highlighted, but in the other, um, so identified by both ourselves and through the Accounts Council local impact reports, there's a small number of inconsistencies when the West is contained in the residual visual effects section of the

00:27:35:06 - 00:28:05:10

tables 874, 8.75, 8.76, 8.77, 8.78 and a relevant to West Burton 1.8007. West Burton 218, 24, 26 2728 20092010 and West Burton three zero 38. In each of these, nature defects is incorrectly identified as beneficial.

00:28:05:23 - 00:28:29:01

This is also repeated within the NTS in both of these instances. This is unfortunately a typo to be consistent with all other locations of the technical appendices. The summary of significant effects. This should read as adverse. The corrections. Nature effects results in no changes to the findings of the remainder of the technical appendices, and some recent significant effects are all correct.

00:28:32:04 - 00:28:42:07

Right. Okay. Sorry. Sorry. That has a bearing on some of my questions. And must admit from the list you're just giving me, I'm not able to.

00:28:43:05 - 00:28:44:15

Exactly. Forum.

00:28:44:24 - 00:28:48:04

Well, we'll have to go through my questions and just see whether or not there's any.

00:28:48:10 - 00:28:48:25

That's fine.

00:28:49:11 - 00:28:54:14

I've picked up on some inconsistencies, so you may want to answer those. But obviously in terms of.

00:28:56:14 - 00:29:04:18

That clarification. It would be helpful to have that as soon as possible before before deadline. So we've got we know what we're working collaboratively at.

00:29:04:23 - 00:29:24:29

Yes we can we can provide that. But yeah, just to reiterate, Mr. Jackson said the information contained in the appendices and the overall conclusions that are set out in 2023 are correct. It's just how that information was copied across into the summary tables. Yes, that was unfortunately incorrect. But final conclusions and the technical appendices.

00:29:26:11 - 00:29:30:24

So the table in chapter 23, which is that. Yes that's correct. All right. That's that's helpful to know.

00:29:32:25 - 00:29:36:24

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jackson. So just in terms of.

00:29:41:24 - 00:30:05:18

So think. Think this is right because I'm looking at 2023. So suggested that there would be no residual adverse significant effects to any landscape receptors. And the assessment is that any residual effects would be beneficial. And this appears to be on the basis of mitigation planting. Is that right? Is that correct?

00:30:05:24 - 00:30:22:02

Chris Jackson for the applicant. And it's the difference between the mitigation and the landscape enhancement. So as discussed, there's a significant amounts of landscape and enhancement associated with. So not just mitigation. So for example the.

00:30:23:27 - 00:30:38:12

So like a 7.1km native hedgerow. 13.7 hectares of shelter belt, woodland planting and a total of 570 hectares of new diverse grassland habitats across the scheme, resulting in significant

00:30:40:00 - 00:31:19:16

gains. And that's the predominantly the driver. So the when we were establishing how to address the landscape scheme, it's been produced in line and to enhance with the characteristics and guidelines of the local landscape character assessments. So, for example, while it's not a significant feature of this landscape to have large scale woodland blocks. So we've intended within the landscape scheme not to just put large blocks of woodland or create new large scale mass woodlands as a, as a as a new feature, recognising that those in themselves can be in Congress to the accounts of the landscape.

00:31:19:25 - 00:32:02:19

So the landscape scheme has focused on reinforcing and enhancing existing accounts of landscape through the reinforcement or recreation of existing features within it. So, for example, reinforcing hedgerows, the large scale meadow, planting individual trees within hedgerows rather than just significantly planting large blocks of woodland. And the idea being that through sensitive design, we can provide mitigation and screening without the need of just hiding it behind large blocks of incongruous woodland, as it were.

00:32:03:13 - 00:32:19:21

And and they'll see that so that building upon the existing strength of character or in some places lack of character and reinforcing and trying to re-establish that, that's the driver behind the landscape improvements, which is what's led to the beneficial landscape counter effects that identified many of your.

00:32:20:27 - 00:32:23:02

Okay. Thank you. Yeah.

00:32:25:04 - 00:32:27:07

It's just on on that point. Um,

00:32:28:22 - 00:32:56:05

comments made in the evening, comments made in written representations about the the change to landscape character that may result from litigation stroke planting. However, we turn to the present time and at particular reference to changing character through sort of foreshortening views and enclosing views. And how would you respond to those comments?

00:32:58:24 - 00:33:32:05

As I sort of set out, the the identification effects on views and visual receptors whilst connected, is identified and assessed separately. So whilst landscape character one where you are aware of it is visually, that's not the sole sort of driver behind what sets the character of an area. And there may be opportunities for views. Notable potentially specifically reference viewpoints where you can stand and absorb the character of an area.

00:33:32:18 - 00:34:03:25

Um, but that is your visual interpretation of that landscape and the impacts and the change to that is assessed to that as a receptor also uses the receptor. Obviously, in this case it's referring to people at specific locations. That is a separate form of the assessment. Um, and so whilst we've got the obviously following my correction that have got the beneficial landscape effects that we identified, visual effects are identified as being adverse.

00:34:04:14 - 00:34:33:03

Okay. So sorry, I do understand I suppose what was trying to to to get to as the that aspect of landscape character that is perhaps characterised by long range views or or short ranges. So, so I realise that there are two separate aspects of the assessment. So and just so, just in terms of landscape, character. Before we move on to look specifically the visual assessment, does anybody want to raise any points about landscape character?

00:34:37:26 - 00:35:14:05

Thank you, ma'am. Lancashire County council. Um, suppose I just want to sort of put in some sort of context, really. Not necessarily on landscape character, but what's what we have done as part of our local impact report, we have attached to that a quite comprehensive review of the applicant's landscape and visual impact assessment. And the applicant has had benefits of seeing that before today, because it was the public domain and released in time for our planning committee on Monday.

00:35:14:07 - 00:35:53:18

I appreciate you haven't seen that and think it'd be quite difficult for me, perhaps, to communicate the sort of information that's in that report, you know, before you've actually seen it. I would say that we have got some tensions. There are some issues that we have. Um, and I think throughout the assessment that's been done, maybe not so much with the methodology, but I think certainly some of the weightings and conclusions that have been reached. But I don't think it's probably sort of within my expertise to communicate all those to you now, especially if you've not seen that document before.

00:35:53:20 - 00:36:13:01

And so what I want to say is that we have got issues, and I think that it's probably best that you see those via our local impact report and the accompanying review of that. Environmental statement chapter. And then perhaps after that, then that's maybe when the appropriate to go into a bit more detail.

00:36:13:23 - 00:36:36:04

That's that's absolutely fine, Mr. McBride. And yes, I'm sure this is something that we will come back to to look at in more detail. Any other comments at this stage on on landscape character specifically? Yes. And, uh. He's got that start with with you, Mr. Summers. Thank you, ma'am. Let's go. 7000 acres.

00:36:36:07 - 00:36:59:01

And I understand that the draft DCO states that all trees and hedgerows are in the red line. The order limits are to be removed and associated highways. I imagine to allow construction traffic to get to a site also affected outside the order limits. Therefore.

00:37:01:05 - 00:37:05:12

On that basis. If that's the case. To actually then

00:37:07:05 - 00:37:36:24

remove all these hedgerows and trees which are mature and existing, have a benefit not only in terms of landscape character, in terms of biodiversity, then to replant after construction, after the soil damage, and many years hence, potentially with the exceptionally smaller and established planting, which then takes many years to establish. The impact on character is.

00:37:38:13 - 00:37:49:29

Negative in the first instance and will be many years hence before anything gets back to anything. What it is like now. So if it ever will, because there may be failures and.

00:37:51:24 - 00:38:24:22

You know with that, with that mitigation. So. We really do feel that. The landscape and ourselves as receptors will suffer for many years. If all these trees and hedgerows are to be removed, as a draft eco suggests, and this obviously isn't reflected at all in the submitted by the applicant, that obviously assumes, imagine that, that that's not occurring and therefore their findings and their mitigation is based on that happening. Therefore, the two documents conflict their findings.

00:38:24:24 - 00:38:25:14

Thank you.

00:38:28:18 - 00:38:34:18

We have not also from Mr. Summers, before we go back to the applicant for for any for comments on on matters that been raised.

00:38:37:24 - 00:38:40:25

Thank you, ma'am. Jefferson has 7000 acres.

00:38:44:16 - 00:38:46:07

Yeah, the LinkedIn and LinkedIn reg.

00:38:46:29 - 00:38:47:14

Um.

00:38:48:27 - 00:39:06:25

The drive from Lincoln to Lindsay is an extremely important route for all locals and visitors, especially anyone coming to Lincolnshire for holidays, etcetera. Tourism is a significant part of the district's economy.

00:39:08:15 - 00:39:18:09

And it is a wonderful view as you ride along that road. Very clear, open, beautiful aspect running over into South Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire beyond.

00:39:19:21 - 00:39:20:06

Well.

00:39:22:27 - 00:39:23:12

Um.

00:39:24:08 - 00:39:48:12

The Trent Valley is flat. Not. My concern is. What we will actually see. Obviously, everything that's there once is constructed at that point of being. But then you talk about landscape enhancement. Um, I'm just wonder what you have in mind in terms of landscape enhancement and.

00:39:51:24 - 00:39:58:21

Avoiding the unnecessary constant view of the panels from that higher ridge road.

00:40:01:06 - 00:40:01:23

And.

00:40:03:18 - 00:40:34:04

I'd like to know a bit more detail. If you just explained to me what an enhancement would incur if it was a mixture of trees, then one would expect them hopefully to be a mixture of deciduous and evergreen. But once they're established, if it's assumed that this site does run for 60 years. Even 40 years. So 60 years and trees will be of a significant size.

00:40:38:02 - 00:40:56:00

And those screening attempts. Would they be protected at that point? Or would the land owner, following decommissioning, be able to pull them out and clear the soils again?

00:40:57:07 - 00:40:57:22

Um.

00:40:58:09 - 00:41:04:00

And this, I think, is a critical part as far as the aesthetic appearance of that Trent Valley.

00:41:07:01 - 00:41:21:22

Because if the right materials are planted in the first instance, it could show a benefit to the district. But afterwards, if certain species are not protected, then they will be cleared away again and that would just be a complete waste.

00:41:23:15 - 00:41:26:24

And so I think that's an important question. I'd like answering please.

00:41:27:21 - 00:41:49:02

All right. So a series of points they raised there and Mr. Jackson. And so, so starting with and what point about the contradiction between the what's in the in terms of the extent of existing landscape retention? And and then Mr. Somers points, please about.

00:41:51:16 - 00:42:00:28

The extent to which the existing landscape character has been factored in in terms of the landscaping that would be provided and how that would be protected long term. So a few things to go out there.

00:42:03:03 - 00:42:49:00

For the applicant will just respond to the first point relating to powers, as Ms. Garbutt will recall, when was pointed to the same question that she raised at the Cottam hearing a few weeks ago and the draft, the powers and the draft have to be read in conjunction with the requirements set out in schedule two to the DCA. So whilst there is a power to remove hedgerows, for example within the order limits, and that power is limited by a requirement to comply with the measures set out in the requirements, including the measures that will be set out in the final Landscape and Ecological management Plan.

00:42:49:05 - 00:43:22:02

So it is not an unknown limited power, and there is definitely no intention to remove all of the trees and hedgerows within the order limits. The reason why the power is wide is because, as we described earlier this morning, a degree of flexibility is required as the detailed design for this scheme is not

known. So, for example, hedgerows may need to be removed to enable access between fields for construction and for cable construction.

00:43:22:04 - 00:43:53:12

And we have a corridor for cable construction. But the exact location of the cabling within that corridor is not currently known. So we need to allow the ability to microsite cabling within the order limits. And because we need to do that micro siting, the general power has to be a wide one that applies to hedgerows. But that power, as I said, has to be exercised in accordance with the controls set out in the management plan.

00:43:54:05 - 00:43:54:20

And.

00:43:55:17 - 00:43:56:15

Mr. Fox can provide.

00:43:56:17 - 00:44:00:05

Some more detail if required, but we have identified.

00:44:01:28 - 00:44:35:12

The amount of hedgerows that we think might need to be removed from the scheme that's been fully assessed in terms of the number of gaps. So, for example, with respect to the cable corridor, it's estimated that between 82m and 142m of hedgerows might be affected, which is approximately 20 gaps of up to 7.1m wide. Um. Similarly, there will be new gaps required within the solar arrays.

00:44:36:00 - 00:45:09:18

Um, and we're looking at um. Approximately seven Petro gaps and nine associated ditch crossings. And so we've got a total amount of between 24m and 52m of hedgerow anticipated to be removed as part of those works. So the amount of hedgerow to be removed is not all of the hedgerow listed is a very small amount of hedgerow. We just need that power to apply across the whole order limits, so that we can microsite where those access points are going to be located.

00:45:11:07 - 00:45:18:23

And I will hand over to Mr. Jackson just to pick up the camera, which.

00:45:21:24 - 00:45:45:10

Mr. Johnson, I'm having the applicant. The Lincolnshire Ridge, as a as a landscape resource is assessed within the landscape character assessment. So particularly as a landscape character area. Um, there's also two viewpoints located upon that ridge. Viewpoint 15 and viewpoint. See, I believe it's been.

00:45:48:16 - 00:46:10:04

Yes. Viewpoint 15 and sorry Lincolnshire viewpoint LCC a and both of which have a verified photo montage associated with that that sets out the and the development at year one and year 15 with the mitigation established in regards.

00:46:13:11 - 00:46:14:16

In regards to the.

00:46:16:20 - 00:46:17:19

Excuse me for just.

00:46:23:21 - 00:46:59:28

In regards to the species selection for the landscape planting and landscape scheme, of course, that would be a choice of native species in line with local provenance and set out within the limits of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, which is specific about what species would make up various parts of the landscape scheme. So whether that's the species rich grasslands, the woodland shelter belts, hedgerows, for example, it's all contained and set up in that document.

00:47:05:21 - 00:47:20:15

Consultant. Mr.. Raised a specific point about the protection of those landscape features at decommissioning. I don't know that you've got anything you can add in terms of that particular query. Connect project with the applicant.

00:47:21:03 - 00:47:36:01

So yes, there is a commitment to decommission the scheme, which is to remove the apparatus above ground associated with the with the scheme and return the land to agricultural usage. So that's.

00:47:37:27 - 00:48:00:07

The basis of the environmental statement. That it would be returned to agricultural use. And hand it back to the landowner to use as they see fit going forward in terms of the enhancements that are made there. There isn't a specific obligation for that to be retained because the.

00:48:02:02 - 00:48:35:18

Commitment is to return the land to agricultural usage. However, the applicant considers that it is highly likely that there will be benefits to the landowner to retaining those features in place, and at that point in time, those features may well be protected in any event, and so they'd have to comply with any hedgerow or tree related protections that apply to them. But we think it's highly likely because of the benefits associated with agriculture of having sort of species rich hedgerows, etcetera, that they're likely to retain it.

00:48:35:20 - 00:48:37:13

But there is no commitment. That is correct.

00:48:39:29 - 00:48:42:24

Thank you. So. Yes, Miss Gabbard.

00:48:43:11 - 00:49:14:18

Thank you ma'am. Just this car, about 7000 acres. Just coming back to Ms.. Brooke's point in terms of the draft DCO. Um, and that in terms of the removal of potentially all trees and hedgerows within the draft DCO and the need, the applicant states, for flexibility, this flexibility should not be unlimited. Um, and that's how it's currently I understand drafted. And so therefore it causes a great deal of confusion.

00:49:14:20 - 00:49:39:04

What are the parameters we are working to. We just don't know. So therefore we have to take the worst case scenario. And that's obviously what we're doing that potentially all the trees and hedgerows will be removed. And therefore in this instance the EIA has it is in conflict with the Elvia and going. So I don't know the point there, but I think I've lost my thread. So that was my main point. Thank you.

00:49:41:18 - 00:49:58:13

I think Miss Brodrick did explain how the powers themselves wouldn't be unlimited. They will be constrained by the relevant documents in terms of the landscape retention and enhancement, but I don't know whether there's anything more you wanted to add in terms of giving some reassurance on that point. Ms..

00:49:58:15 - 00:50:29:08

Broderick for the applicant? Yes. So on. We made some amendments to the. In light of the concerns that have been raised, we've made some amendments to the drafting in the draft for Cottam, which will propose to make for this, which is just to make reference in that in the relevant power, that the power needs to be exercised in accordance with the landscape and ecological management plan that's approved. Pursuant to the requirements.

00:50:29:10 - 00:50:55:26

So we thought it might be helpful to allay concerns to include a specific reference to that management plan, which will set out the actual when its the final version is submitted for approval. That will include details of the actual extent of hedgerows to be removed at that point in time. And there's a number of other sort of small amendments we've made to relation to refer to part of the hedgerow, for example, rather than

00:50:57:12 - 00:51:21:11

at the moment. It just sort of lists the various hedgerows. And so we've made a few main amendments to say it will be part of that hedgerow in accordance with the management plan. So we've tried to give some comfort in the drafting to support the approach that's being taken. But but it's not correct to assume a worst case of all planting being removed, because that is not what is being proposed to the scheme and not is what is being committed.

00:51:22:07 - 00:51:33:14

All right. Thank you. And obviously it will be helpful to see that. And before we have further hearings and specifically hearings relating to the ACA, so we can come back to that, that at that time. Thank you.

00:51:37:00 - 00:52:01:03

But what types of things to right are rearranging your deck? That's fine. Doing that as well. Okay. No problem. So moving on to an. Townscape character to think about visual effects. And again, this is a point that's been raised in a number of visual representations. And again yesterday

00:52:02:18 - 00:52:26:10

noting particularly that the height of the the tracker panels they use being around 4.5m. The concern is the change in the quality of the landscape, from it being a agricultural or rural landscape, to other suggestions that it would appear as an industrial landscape dominated by.

00:52:27:07 - 00:52:28:07

Large scale solar.

00:52:28:09 - 00:52:32:26

So how would. How would you respond to that that concern. Jackson.

00:52:33:17 - 00:53:23:09

Ms.. Jackson. For the applicant. Um, the the address addresses visual effects. Um, the unidentified significant visual home to users of visual receptors, locally to the sites, predominantly when they're immediately alongside where there is a direct and open view of the infrastructure within the site. So the recognizes that there is a visual change associated with the development and proposals, um, where that has been identified at construction or year one, the landscape mitigation landscape, the landscape enhancements as aimed to provide mitigation to remove that adverse significant effects, whether through gapping a section hedgerow providing offsets.

00:53:23:11 - 00:53:56:14

So through the design process, perhaps we installed the the infrastructure offset with a number of offsets that have been provided across the scheme to offset from public rights of way, residential properties, highways, etcetera. And as they run through the scheme, um, and typically that's then been buffered with some form of landscape that is in keeping with the character of the the area. As said previously, in regards to trying to build and enhance the existing character rather than trying to bring something in presenting itself would be in Congress, and we'll see.

00:53:56:16 - 00:54:52:17

We're in a predominantly flat landscape. We have some points of elevation to the east in regards to the ridge, which I was aware of, and we discussed that we've got viewpoints up on the on the ridge, looking down across across the site and the security of developments locally. And we've also got viewpoints alongside the site on receptors and spread out across the wider landscape to to look at that and think we've got in the region of think a number, but think it's 57 viewpoints that are identified from us, plus an additional 15 or 25 from consultation with the local authority, and which the viewpoints of which a significant number were taken forward to photo montage, um, which again sets out the potential change to that location, to that viewpoint as a consequence of the development.

00:54:53:02 - 00:54:56:15

Um, and obviously we've also got the the year 15.

00:54:58:12 - 00:55:37:10

Built into that so that you can see the effect of the mitigation once it's established, and how that would potentially change that view. We've got a fundamentally flat landscape, as I said, which allows for development to be quite well screened and accommodated within it, and the strengthening of the character of the hedgerows, the small sort of woodland blocks and shelter belts that we do have and building upon that character, allows for additional enclosure across this landscape and provides adequate screening and accommodation of the development locally.

00:55:37:20 - 00:56:14:04

And we've got a desperate site said at the beginning. So rather than being one large essentially scheme, we've got broken down into one, two and three, which allows for us to provide mitigation. Bespoke to each individual site within the wider scheme and also to. Break it and accommodate it within the landscape by adding additional layering or containment through the landscape mitigation. And that is again set out within the appendices in the rather more complete assessment.

00:56:18:12 - 00:56:20:15

Did you want to say to add to that this project.

00:56:21:02 - 00:56:57:14

For the applicant? Yes. Just I was just going to add and it is set out in the material, but obviously National Policy Statement one has a section on landscape and visual impacts. And paragraph five point 10.12 does acknowledge that all those energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects or receptors around the proposed sites, and that's recognized as a nature of these types of developments, and that the Secretary of State will have to make a decision as to whether the visual effects on sensitive receptors, such as local residents and other receptors, such as visitors to the area.

00:56:57:16 - 00:57:25:13

So taking into account tourism that has been mentioned and whether those impacts outweigh the benefits. So that's part of the decision making process that will be undertaken. And so obviously, the applicant has sought in its materials to demonstrate how it's tried to minimize, through the use of mitigation measures and the amount of visual impact, but it is recognized at a policy level that there will be sufficient impacts. Yeah.

00:57:25:15 - 00:57:38:17

And I think we all appreciate they'll they'll about the visual effects. It's about really understanding those and and how they would be managed just just specifically in relation to and the photo montages and.

00:57:40:16 - 00:58:01:22

Obviously they're not produced for every single viewpoint, and particular point is they're not produced for every single viewpoint where significant effects are anticipating. That was one thing that we did want to to see if that could be looked at, because I think that's that's quite an important point. If we can have that additional assessment. So we were able to we've got a fuller, fuller picture of what those impacts might be. And.

00:58:03:22 - 00:58:25:19

We'll also need to also come on a little bit later to think about cumulative impact, not in terms of the scheme which you described as being being looked at cumulatively, but in terms of the other solar projects will come onto onto that and as well. And. Sorry. Is there anything more you want to add to this? Look like you're poised, Mr. Jackson, to jump in.

00:58:26:22 - 00:59:01:12

It's just in regards to the production of photo montages, the photo montages and the locations for agreed with the local authority through consultation and the decision of whether to. So first, montages are quite a complex beast. The they were produced by actually by the author of the Landscape Institute guidance technical advice. No 619. Um so the the have a specific methodology that sets out how these images need to be produced.

00:59:01:21 - 00:59:31:26

And so we essentially went straight to source and use the author of that guidance to, to assist us in producing the photo montages. And they are all what we call false a fully verified survey, verified photo montages, which involves being out in the site with surveying equipment to understand and accurately georeferenced the viewpoint, but also the the scheme within it. And they are then produced at a series of what we call levels.

00:59:31:28 - 01:00:14:00

So that's the visual representation. So the the type and in the guidance that's between type one and type four is, is how um. Technically accurate, the photography has been undertaken and the methodology for inserting the 3D model, which is ultimately what is displayed in the photo and the level. This is the level of illustration, as it were, for level one would be what we call a line. Level three is a fully rendered photo montage, and the decision was also the consultation and decision on which viewpoints would be taken forward to a fully rendered type four.

01:00:14:09 - 01:00:31:28

Level three photo montage was also made in consultation with the local authority. So we sat down with time and went through one by one which viewpoint they would like to be seen forward, and to what points of level they would like to see that produced.

01:00:33:03 - 01:00:48:18

This must be specific. Point is, is that in relation to those viewpoints where significant effects have been identified, are not all of those. And in fact, there's quite a number of them where we don't have photo montages to be able to visualize that. So it is something we would like the applicant to look at.

01:00:50:24 - 01:01:00:00

As part of the examination going forward, just in terms of being able to really appreciate what those visual effects would be in relation to, where there are significant effects.

01:01:02:13 - 01:01:11:28

That was it for the applicant. Think we'll need to take that away and go through by one by one? Do. You can't. No. Mr. Jackson has said the work that's involved in producing photo montages. It's not something you can.

01:01:12:12 - 01:01:15:04

No, no, I'm just saying that I'm just flagging it at this stage.

01:01:15:06 - 01:01:21:00

Yeah. We'll perhaps look at those individually and maybe discuss with the local authorities whether they.

01:01:23:04 - 01:01:26:29

What's been agreed to so far as being representative of the visual receptors.

01:01:27:01 - 01:01:29:15

Understand that. Yes. Sorry.

01:01:30:00 - 01:02:05:28

Chris Jackson filling up the just again, a bit more background context on the consultation. It's that consultation took place before the final assessment had taken place. So they were there was no identification of significance at the point in the consultation had taken place with. So it was it was a case of the individual is also a chartered landscape architect with experience. So it was a case of sitting down with with us and them and identifying where we at the time believe significant adverse effects would be identified and then moving forward from that.

01:02:06:13 - 01:02:20:06

And I would also stress that photo montage is only a tool to identifying potential significant effects and to aid with an understanding of visibility. And there are there is photography for all of our viewpoints. And.

01:02:22:15 - 01:02:30:27

Perhaps, you know, some of them have not been taken forward. We'll have to check and identify that. And but I'll certainly take that away. And one action clarification for me.

01:02:31:03 - 01:03:03:00

That's great. Thank you very much. And just another very specific point before we have a sort of a more general discussion. And so. In terms of visual effects and the effects of substations and the battery storage facility haven't been assessed within the five kilometre area, as effects aren't anticipated beyond two kilometres, and the particular point is noting that the highest part of the three. Substation could be up to 13.2m.

01:03:03:02 - 01:03:09:04

We're just wondering whether that's a sort of a reasonable position to take, given the nature of the landscape in that area.

01:03:11:12 - 01:03:13:21

Christiansen on behalf of the applicant and.

01:03:15:10 - 01:03:53:17

The study areas were again agreed for consultation with the local authority. And when we looked at the location for the best the substation site, we went through an iterative design process that looked at

trying to identify a location within the West Burton three site that would best accommodate the infrastructure. And so we were we were looking at topography, for example, existing containment provided by the topography, existing landscape features within it, not just within the site, but within the wider area to try to best accommodate that infrastructure.

01:03:53:27 - 01:04:14:20

And the assessment of visual effects does include reference to those. So when we are looking at a viewpoint that may be beyond that point, it is not removed from the assessment. It's just not expected that there would be any significant effects identified with that particular infrastructure beyond a certain given distance.

01:04:17:05 - 01:04:35:14

It was included in the questions as well, because it was at a very specific point that we'd like a more detailed response to, but just just leaving that there for now, I'd like to sort of see there any other other questions in the room about or online, but in relation to visual impacts specifically?

01:04:38:00 - 01:04:39:02

Yes, Mr. Thomas.

01:04:41:04 - 01:05:07:29

Thank you, ma'am. Jefferson has 7000 acres. There's been mentioned about the removal of hedgerows. Now, whether it's a ten, 20, 50 acre field or whatever it might be, you remove a hedgerow and you multiply double the size of that field in its initial state. In doing so.

01:05:09:15 - 01:05:11:12

As an example from the.

01:05:11:14 - 01:05:43:11

Lincoln Road on the cliff edge that would increase the visual impact. Because you haven't got the hedgerow splitting the fields. And I'm just wondering if there's been a true assessment of the adverse impact that that may create. An off hand, not not knowing which hedgerows are being referred to, but can see that would cause an extra impact if any information is coming forward on it.

01:05:43:13 - 01:05:44:29

I'd be interested. Thank you.

01:05:46:26 - 01:06:05:15

Thank you, Mr. Sumner. So we have heard how there is there isn't the certainty that would perhaps be desirable at this stage given the, the, the flexibility that's required in terms of scheme design parameters. And so I guess the question is how has. The removal of a degree of hedgerow being factored into the landscape. Assessment.

01:06:06:15 - 01:06:24:25

Request from the applicant and as my colleague identified before, the hedgerow loss is associated with this project that is associated with the potential locations of access tracks within the sites. So hedgerow loss is restricted to.

01:06:26:22 - 01:06:51:09

Gaps are between 3 and 6.5 or 7.1m, depending on whether it's a cable corridor or internally in the sites. So there's no intention to remove entire lengths of hedgerows to widen or to conjoin to adjacent fields. It would be to provide access for the internal access tracks between one field and another, and that has been assessed and included within the landscape division, but not.

01:06:55:22 - 01:06:58:18

Okay. Yes. It's copied.

01:06:59:15 - 01:07:35:09

Thank you. And this guy about 7000 acres just in terms of visual impact. And we're talking about here panels that are 4.5m high and red over obviously, three very large sites that are sort of desperately spread across the landscape, which has a wider impact. Um, and therefore the visual impact of these panels from up close or from a long distance is of panels alone.

01:07:35:11 - 01:07:58:08

Is highly significant. And then obviously in terms of the infrastructure as well, which can be a lot higher in terms of metrics, you alluded to mum and their visual impact would be excessive and a high degree of harm also on visual receptors and landscape receptors. So really the scheme.

01:07:59:24 - 01:08:18:21

Will be changing the character of the landscape from an agricultural area to a solar landscape, an energy landscape. And that for ourselves is a highly significant major change, almost a regional change that is hard to

01:08:20:07 - 01:08:28:29

square if you like. But the impact, the height of these panels is significant. And to mitigate that with some.

01:08:31:01 - 01:08:34:13

Planting that will take many, many years to establish

01:08:36:05 - 01:08:42:27

in the first instance will not be mitigation in the first instance, if you see what I mean. Okay. Thank you.

01:08:44:09 - 01:08:53:26

Thank you. And I think the request for further visual information is really to try and understand the nature of these, these visual impacts that you're describing. Mr. O'Grady, what would you.

01:08:55:03 - 01:09:25:25

Yeah. Already 7000 acres. Guess one of the key design trade offs here is, is is what's the the height of the panel versus the visual impact that the scheme leaves. Um, and I wonder whether the applicant has considered the, the the guess, the output impact, the benefit impact of reducing the height to say, two meters or thereabouts.

01:09:25:27 - 01:10:09:04

Now, I believe in the morning the the applicant talked about typical solar output being on average around 10.3%. And then by using the tracking panels, which are a lot higher, would therefore take it to around 10.7 to 11 or thereabouts. Um, so it would be relatively I would imagine. I mean, I've done a rough thing, but in terms of for the applicant to consider actually and demonstrate what is the what is the visual benefit difference and the energy difference between the tracking panel and the non tracking panel.

01:10:09:23 - 01:10:42:12

By a rough calculation, think still 92% of the output is achieved with a regular panel without being a 4.5m high monster. Um, the difference on a on a year would be around 0.01% of national output. So it's kind of getting into the lands of triviality. But for the impact on the community and the area, it is radically different. Having panel size of four meters and half that is two meters.

01:10:43:24 - 01:11:07:20

Thank you, Mr. O'Grady. And if presented some very detailed information there, which wouldn't expect the applicant to respond to at this point. But again, if you could present that in writing, that will be helpful in terms of that general point about the comparative landscape effects of, for example, and the lower fixed panels in comparison with the higher tracker panels, has a sort of a comparative landscape and visual assessment being undertaken.

01:11:38:22 - 01:11:39:07

And.

01:11:40:20 - 01:11:53:16

Project for the applicant. Thank you for letting us just double check the position. Obviously, as we described earlier this morning, we've taken a Rochdale envelope approach to the actual presentation of the assessment. So for

01:11:55:01 - 01:12:13:07

for example, the higher height of the tracking panels has been used to assess the worst case scenario. So the information provided in the documentation is the same relating to the worst case. However, we do understand the point being made about whether the.

01:12:15:12 - 01:12:45:01

Whether the just, you know, whether there is a whether the change in height. So if you were to use fixed panels, whether that would change the the overall outcome of the conclusions. So with that one meter difference take you from a significant adverse effect to a minor and out of significance. So that's something that we could take away to consider how long that might take. Just to answer that point in whether there would be a difference in the overall conclusions.

01:12:47:21 - 01:12:48:28

I think it would be helpful. Thank you.

01:12:56:21 - 01:13:14:02

I'm just to say we're not sure necessarily how long that will, that might take. So we wouldn't commit to it for deadline one if that's okay. But we will provide a deadline, one an indication of if we aren't able to provide it when we think we would be able to provide it in the in the examination timetable. But how involved for the exercise?

01:13:21:11 - 01:13:52:09

Thank you. Just turning then to and to cumulative effects in relation to. Not in relation to the different. Elements within the West Burton Solar scheme in relation to other West. Alongside other solar projects. So in terms of the assessment undertaken and the assessment of potential landscape and visual effects, appendices, appendices, annexes or appendices and two point sorry 8.2 and 8.3.

01:13:52:22 - 01:14:12:05

And as far as I see it. The conclusion is set out that there will be no likely significant cumulative effects for either landscape or visual receptors in relation to that assessment. Alongside the other solar projects is is that is that is that right? And and if so, can can you explain how that conclusion has been reached?

01:14:13:21 - 01:14:25:00

To start something up and family and believe you're correct, ma'am. I just want to verify that before I commit something that I'm not entirely.

01:14:27:02 - 01:14:27:21

The

01:14:29:13 - 01:15:07:10

gist for Mr. Jackson's finding the information. It was just to reiterate that the interrelationship report that you have requested will be provided at deadline one, and has already been submitted in relation to gate, Burton and Cotton. So the same document will be submitted into the West Burton examination at deadline one which obviously compares or brings together the conclusions of the assessments undertaken for each project, individually and cumulatively. So there will be that additional document available for you to review from from deadline one, as it has already been submitted for the other two projects.

01:15:07:27 - 01:15:11:27

There isn't a reason why we couldn't submit it into examination earlier. If that would be of assistance.

01:15:11:29 - 01:15:16:15

That's absolutely fine. That would be helpful. Thank you. Yes. No need to wait for the deadlines.

01:15:20:22 - 01:15:43:00

The Navy looks at kingdom effects, as we discussed previously against the Committee of Science and Development's cumulative assessments, and is focused upon the likely identification of significant effects. And so there are adverse effects identified, but they are not considered a breach of the significant threshold.

01:15:44:24 - 01:15:59:18

So looking through and again, this is probably a very detailed point to take through and written questions, but can identify two of the key points that in which facts are identified. So in addition to.

01:16:01:23 - 01:16:03:11

April 15th and

01:16:05:09 - 01:16:09:06

17. But we'll think, think we're getting into a lot of detail there.

01:16:09:08 - 01:16:10:29

And every month.

01:16:11:09 - 01:16:15:09

We can come back to that and revisit that in any questions and future hearings if it needs been.

01:16:15:15 - 01:16:43:06

I would just take the opportunity to bring it to the committee. So there's only theoretical visibility that's also been undertaken. Yes. So that doesn't imply potential crossover between the West Burton and the other developments locally. And obviously with regards to visual effects, you are we're looking at locations where you can see more than just the West Burton scheme in isolation, so where you can pick up on the other schemes.

01:16:45:09 - 01:16:56:06

Curative visual effects are looked at in sequential as well as essentially static. So and again the assessment identifies that and reviews that.

01:17:05:13 - 01:17:11:14

Do any of the parties in the room have any points to raise about cumulative effects?

01:17:13:25 - 01:17:50:01

Thank you, ma'am. Lincoln County Council. I think will just sort of give you the sort of conclusions from our perspective in terms of cumulative impacts. And again, I appreciate you. I've seen the evidence that sits behind this statement, but our conclusion is that the massive scale of these projects. So that's Kate Burton, West Burton Hill Bridge together with cotton as well, and basically would lead to adverse effects on the landscape, character and visual amenity over an extensive area.

01:17:50:10 - 01:18:22:18

Landscape character of the area and potentially regional area may be changed completely to be experienced sequentially while traveling through the landscape. So I think the point we're trying to make there is that if you sort of started off at the north of the area around sort of Corringham, where the cotton project is all the way through that landscape, you'd probably be traveling 15, 20km and all you would experience is solar panels.

01:18:22:20 - 01:18:32:03

So I think that's the point we're making. And obviously the report that you'll see gives us will give you the the reason behind that judgment.

01:18:34:05 - 01:18:38:22

Sorry. Thank you. And. It's Covid. What would you like to say?

01:18:40:05 - 01:19:12:11

Thank you. Liz Garbutt, 7000 acres. Yes, we agree with Mr. McBride from Lancashire County Council. Travelling through the landscape, there will be a drastic and considerable change from an agricultural landscape to, we believe, a solar industrial landscape. And as such the cumulative effect will be highly significant and we don't quite understand how the applicants advise that be no significant adverse effects, if that's what I've heard that correctly.

01:19:12:23 - 01:19:20:05

Um, this is a major change. On the landscape, character and the over vast areas.

01:19:21:25 - 01:19:26:00

So yes, we consider it to be highly significant. Thank you.

01:19:28:13 - 01:20:00:09

Thank you, Miss Garbutt. Think this is something that we will revisit later on noting and comments about Lancashire county councils, and we can come back and have a look at that and just conscious of time and the need to move us on. And I just had a couple of final points in the one relating to and noted here. We'd like to ask the applicant if it possible for you to clear and more succinct summaries, which we've already referred to. So that's already in hand. And we've called the point about photo montages.

01:20:00:11 - 01:20:01:00

So.

01:20:03:07 - 01:20:11:05

That's all I wanted to raise for now in relation to landscape and visual. Are there any final points that anybody wanted to make?

01:20:15:17 - 01:20:32:22

So we're moving on to look at ecology and biodiversity. And just wondering whether it's worth having a short break now before we start that section. If we have a ten minute break now and come back just after 4:00, please. Thank you.