

File Name: ISH5 13th March 2024 Part 3.mp3
File Length: 01:38:40

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:06:23

Welcome back everybody.

00:00:11:02 - 00:00:19:10

And the time is 230. So we'll resume this issue specific here in five. And, uh, we are.

00:00:21:08 - 00:00:23:26

Uh, most of the way through item.

00:00:26:03 - 00:00:31:24

Three, particularly in terms of. Substantive elements. Um.

00:00:34:07 - 00:00:48:23

That we're on. We're on item three, which is I'm cumulative impacts on the wider landscape, heritage assets with specific settings with a specific reference to the effects on the Roman villa at Scampton.

00:00:52:17 - 00:00:53:26

So, um.

00:00:58:00 - 00:01:03:06

In relation to this written question. Um. 1.7. 15.

00:01:04:21 - 00:01:51:21

Referred for the potential for up to. Moderate adverse cumulative impacts on the round at Scampton when considered cumulatively with the Cottam Solar project. And this is set out in the Joint Report on Interrelationships. Um, so but in response to that um, written question, the applicant has clarified their view that following a winter site visit, um. When the foliage coverage coverage was lower at its lowest, um and with considerations of design proposals of the scheme and Cottam solar project, including landscape mitigation, there would actually be a slight a slight adverse cumulative impact.

00:01:53:14 - 00:02:26:15

Um, and the particular point I just wanted to, to clarify was that I note in response to this written question, Historic England has suggested that the conclusions of the joint report, um, appear reasonable. And that's I'm assuming that's in in terms of the conclusion of up to moderate adverse cumulative impacts. So, um, as I say, the applicant has updated their position in response to that written question and have set out that that would actually be a slight there would actually be slight adverse cumulative impacts.

00:02:26:17 - 00:02:37:03

So I wondered whether, um, Historic England, um, uh, Mr. Allen, whether you have any comments on the applicant's updated position, please.

00:02:38:04 - 00:02:49:03

Uh, thank you, ma'am. Uh, Tim Allen, Stoke, England. So, Southampton, Roman Villa, um, one of the earliest excavations. Um,

00:02:50:20 - 00:03:18:21

from the slightly challenging, um, late 18th century description of what was excavated, it appears the range of buildings was oriented westwards from the high ground looking towards the Trent. And, um, so there's an architectural component to how it sits in the landscape and to those big views. Westwood um, as it sits on the.

00:03:20:13 - 00:03:31:12

To the just to the north of A on the middle street where near the junction with the Roman road going off towards the caster. Yeah. To talk it um,

00:03:33:08 - 00:03:47:12

it's a big view. These are and this is about sound and try to hope. It's a big view of a lot of landscape. These are large scale changes within that landscape. It.

00:03:50:00 - 00:04:11:06

There is. There's intentionality in how it sits in relationship to those views. Obviously, those views contain many things that weren't there in the Roman era, but this is a large scale introduction into that. We were content that the moderate level of cumulative impact seemed to be in about the right place. It's.

00:04:18:15 - 00:04:31:11

I think. I don't know if we have more to add to our written. Answer on that. The applicants have come to a slightly different place in their assessment from what you were saying, ma'am. Yes.

00:04:33:00 - 00:04:33:25

I don't know whether it'll be helpful.

00:04:33:27 - 00:05:05:02

We may be getting into the differences, into narrow differences of professional judgment. Yes. I think for us, and as we alluded to in it, and this wasn't as trying to sort of evade a role as governments advise on the historic environment. But there is a point at which if in policy terms, we're going to have very large solar schemes in the landscape, they are going to have landscape scale impacts, and therefore those are going to weigh against multiple issues as well as the setting, the scheduled monument.

00:05:05:04 - 00:05:27:04

And and therefore for sort of in the general scope of things that yourselves as the essays are going to have to consider. But yeah, I think, I think in terms of the scheduled monument given given the intentionality of it, the apparent intentionality of its placing and, and and the drama of that piece of landscape, I think moderates probably about the right place.

00:05:27:24 - 00:05:57:14

All right. Thank you. And in your experience, um, in relation to to to um, uh, an asset of this nature and, um, its position, as you said, the positionality issue or, or consideration, should I say the fact that a winter view, um, has altered the degree of effect? Um, is that something that's, that's that's a reasonable position to today.

00:05:57:16 - 00:06:28:00

Yeah. That that that's that's normal, that, um, visualisations, visualisations work that's done in summer tends to produce lower impact assessments. And often one will say, we think that piece of work needs to be redone in winter or to take account of loss of foliage because, uh, not just at the most crude level where you're got a deciduous tree in between the viewpoint and the and the object.

00:06:28:02 - 00:06:41:13

But at this larger landscape scale, the cumulative effect of all that deciduous vegetation will tend to make make the panels erase less, less visible at that scale. But.

00:06:43:02 - 00:06:46:09

It is a big swathe of landscape and.

00:06:47:29 - 00:06:54:27

Does not much, does not a lot of hiding things the size of these arrays in that landscape, I think at this scale.

00:06:55:26 - 00:07:22:09

Thank you. And along a similar vein, and the applicants also clarified that the possibility of further cumulative impacts with the gate, Bourton Energy Park and the tillage solar scheme are considered negligible as um direct visibility from the asset is again filtered by hedgerows um to the west and the features in the landscape which help provide screening. Do you have any observations on on that conclusion?

00:07:23:06 - 00:07:39:21

We haven't drilled into that, but the schemes I my suspicion is that in your experience of that landscape, if all the schemes are consented, they'll tend to run together in your experience of the landscape, particularly once you start moving around in it. But

00:07:41:06 - 00:07:43:11

but we haven't tested those points.

00:07:43:13 - 00:07:46:13

Okay. All right. Thank you.

00:07:50:00 - 00:08:01:07

Um, a particular point, um, in the heritage statement makes reference to the fact that um as the scheme. Sorry this Mr.. Mr.. Did you want to come back on?

00:08:02:25 - 00:08:04:04

Oh, yes. Emily.

00:08:06:13 - 00:08:36:15

Um, I just wanted to clarify that, uh, originally in the heritage statement, which is app 1172, app 1-119, um, and the um, the environmental statement, which was app Dash 051. Um, originally we were looking at, um, the kind of cumulative impact with gate, Burton, um, Teignbridge, Cottam and West Burton. Um, and that's where we said on a kind of worst case scenario, it was moderate adverse.

00:08:36:21 - 00:09:07:17

Uh, then in the relationship report that was subsequently, uh, produced, which is um rep 2-010. Um, the, the the cumulative impact was then reduced to just, uh, the customer in West Burton schemes due to the fact that the direct visibility within the landscape, um, it was filtered out by existing hedgerows and landscape features and the kind of diminishing effects. Um, so we what? We've, um.

00:09:07:19 - 00:09:23:03

We. Yeah. We're not looking at the whole of them. Um, following the interrelationship report, we're just looking at, uh, the cumulative for, uh, West, Burton and Cotter and primarily West Burton one. So just wanted to clarify.

00:09:24:20 - 00:09:25:13

On that point.

00:09:29:00 - 00:09:35:06

So in terms I'm not sure I quite understood. If you just, just help me a little.

00:09:35:18 - 00:10:09:22

So you were discussing before about the moderate adverse impact? Um, that was our worst case scenario. Uh, since we produced the heritage statements and the environmental statements. Um, and, you know, we've had discussions with Historic England and we've had the kind of interrelationship report also, um, you know, that just that iterative process and through going through the examination process as well. Um, and that's why we, uh, we then revisited the site in the, uh, you know, the kind of the depths of the winter period as well.

00:10:10:01 - 00:10:43:14

Um, to clarify, following the interrelationships report, um, which, uh, basically reduced the cumulative impact to just West, Burton and Cottam. Um, that's that's where we are now. So, uh, the moderate adverse was looking at all encapsulating all of the, um. The schemes, but we were able to actually, uh, just look at West Berlin and all that. So the moderate adverse was the kind of worst case scenario.

00:10:43:22 - 00:11:06:10

Um, and we were able to reduce that down. What we're looking at more, we're looking more like slight adverse. But that was with the mitigation in, uh, the landscape mitigation in the, in the running as well. Okay. So we've got hedgerows in the, in the foreground, in the foreground. But that's, that's something we'll come on to later with the landscape.

00:11:06:16 - 00:11:18:02

Yeah. Yeah. Okay. So in terms of that assessment then as I understand it, and the more detailed review has um indicated that it's appropriate to exclude gate, Burton and Tilbrook. Yes.

00:11:18:04 - 00:11:19:22

From the interrelationship because.

00:11:19:29 - 00:11:24:00

It's because of the lack of visibility. Um, the lack of.

00:11:24:02 - 00:11:31:14

Direct visibility resulting from the existing landscape features in the hedgerows, which are, uh, in the in the mix.

00:11:31:22 - 00:11:37:03

Okay, I understand that. Thank you. Um, yes, Miss Broderick.

00:11:38:24 - 00:12:14:00

Uh, and that's just to reiterate, because further information became available in relation to those schemes after the initial work being undertaken. So once gate Burton had been, um, accepted into examination, obviously all of the information about that scheme was available. Similarly in relation to statutory consultation on Teignbridge. So the purpose of the interrelationship report, as I'm sure you've noted from the description is, was to reevaluate or, uh, to confirm that the conclusions that had been included in the environmental statements for each of the topic chapters remained the same.

00:12:14:02 - 00:12:28:16

Now that detailed information was available about each of those projects. So it was part of that review exercise. Um, generally, as well as, um, the more specific discussions that are taking place with Historic England. Next topic.

00:12:28:28 - 00:13:08:14

All right. Thank you. Um, I just wanted to pick up a particular point, um, about the within the heritage statement, there's a suggestion that, um, the the scheme would prevent any further developments from coming forward within the order limits, for example, for residential development, um, during the operational period. Um. And that in itself could be considered as a beneficial effect on the setting of heritage assets such as this, and so historically have indicated that no weight should be given to this point, noting that any future development would be assessed on its own merits.

00:13:08:16 - 00:13:21:17

Um, anyway, so I suggest to the applicant that Historic England's position seems to be a more reasonable position to take. Um, is there any comment on that particular point?

00:13:23:10 - 00:13:44:11

Emily Mercer for the applicant. I'm sorry. Um, it was more of a, uh, recognition of the reversibility of the scheme. Um, following the the. Once it's decommissioned, um, the scheme will be removed as opposed to something which is more permanent, such as, um, residential development. It was. It was a comparison or not.

00:13:46:06 - 00:13:46:21

Um.

00:13:48:04 - 00:14:00:17

And and is the applicant's position still that that sort of consideration should be given weight? Um, uh, in uh, in terms of it being that being a beneficial effect.

00:14:00:19 - 00:14:02:23

In terms of the reversibility. Yes.

00:14:03:23 - 00:14:05:14

Okay. Thank you.

00:14:12:20 - 00:14:26:29

Okay. I was going to move on. Um, I wanted to to look at at wider effects on historic landscape character before I do. So are there any other comments? Um, in relation to the the setting of the Roman villa?

00:14:30:12 - 00:14:31:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:14:34:02 - 00:15:11:16

So just on, just finally on the cultural heritage section, then I wanted to clarify that the applicant's position in relation to the suggestion that the scheme overall would have, in combination, beneficial effects on the historic landscape character. Um, and in response to written question 1.7. 13, the applicant set out that this is due to the reinforcement of existing woodland, scrub and hedgerows and the addition of new hedgerows trees which would help reinforce the historic landscape character of the wider rural area and within which designated heritage assets are experienced.

00:15:12:09 - 00:15:12:24

Um.

00:15:14:18 - 00:15:45:22

So uh, then looking at, um, appendix 13.8, the Cultural Heritage Impact assessment tables. Um, the in in there, the significance of various effects on um landscape elements are set out and they range from um moderate adverse to neutral at best. So I'm just wondering where the conclusion of of a beneficial effect during the operational phase on the historic landscape character.

00:15:46:01 - 00:15:54:13

Um, where where that's where that's come from. Um, I don't know who wants to. To help with that particular question.

00:16:02:24 - 00:16:35:03

Emily Mercer on behalf of the applicant. Um, the, um, the obviously the the landscape character. It it broaches both the landscape and visual and, uh, cultural heritage. Um, there'll be discussion about this later as well. Um, but since the, um, the environmental statements, there has been that, as I was saying before, you know, the the going through the examination process and the iterative process. Uh, this is one, you know, the the discussions that have been ongoing.

00:16:35:12 - 00:16:43:01

Um, the, uh, I suppose the conclusions have moved on slightly from, um, the environmental statements.

00:16:45:16 - 00:17:17:13

Okay. As I say, there's a there's a particular point there about that in the tables in the environmental statement, appendix 13.8, which looks at the operational phase impact on Non-designated, on the on the Non-designated historic landscape. And I say it's hard to see from from those analytical those tables analyzing the various impacts where the conclusion of a beneficial effect comes from. So maybe if the applicant could take that point away and, and have a look at it, um, and just clarify that that would be that would be helpful.

00:17:17:15 - 00:17:20:18

It would be something we need to look at. Thank you. Thank you.

00:17:20:20 - 00:17:34:18

Thank you. All right. So we're just just coming to an end of agenda item three on cultural heritage. Before we move on to look at landscape and visual matters, is there anything that anybody wanted to to raise?

00:17:37:21 - 00:17:38:28

Yes, Miss Broderick.

00:17:40:28 - 00:17:56:23

I wish I was. Just wanted to clarify, um, that, um, you didn't need the, um, applicants cultural heritage, um, experts to stay for agenda item five. Whether we've covered everything.

00:17:58:10 - 00:18:11:03

Cumulative in terms of cumulative assessment with topic. Topic. Chapter two. So I can let Miss Mirza leave the leave there, but no further questions to double check.

00:18:16:18 - 00:18:25:03

Then I am sure the lincolnshire's. Nottingham's officers would. Would appreciate what would be being allowed to leave if they.

00:18:25:07 - 00:18:44:08

Indeed, yes. I'm just. Yes. Uh uh. No. This this just a minor point, but I can pick that up in a written question, so that's fine. Yes. I'm happy that, um, the, the, uh, Heritage Advisors escape at this point. And thank you very much to. Oh, miss. Miss Allen, did you want to say something before you disappear?

00:18:47:09 - 00:18:52:17

Now. I think we'll we'll submit for him. Oh, miss.

00:18:53:03 - 00:18:53:18

Miss Allen.

00:18:53:26 - 00:18:54:11

Mr..

00:18:56:01 - 00:18:59:21

I always feel the urge to say we're not related that we know of. Um.

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

Uh, thank you, ma'am, it's Jan Allen.

00:19:02:05 - 00:19:02:28

From Lincolnshire.

00:19:03:00 - 00:19:05:06

County Council. Um, I just wanted to.

00:19:05:08 - 00:19:12:17

Chat before we sign off. Um, that what we are producing for you for deadline five is, um.

00:19:12:25 - 00:19:19:13

Clarification. Short document for the applicant to just say again what we've said we want.

00:19:19:15 - 00:19:21:07

And, uh, what is expected.

00:19:21:09 - 00:19:27:14

In terms of standard practice. Uh, we will do the written submission. Uh, summary.

00:19:27:21 - 00:19:29:24

Um, and, um, will attach a.

00:19:29:26 - 00:19:31:18

Few, um, actually Historic.

00:19:31:20 - 00:19:32:05

England.

00:19:32:07 - 00:19:35:06

Documents, which, uh, may be helpful in terms of.

00:19:35:08 - 00:19:38:16

Um, piling impact and, uh, public benefit.

00:19:39:12 - 00:19:40:17

Um, was there.

00:19:40:19 - 00:19:42:23

Anything else that we can do for you or that you would.

00:19:42:25 - 00:19:55:15

Need? I did I did ask for, um, a bit of a bit of clarity around the particular sensitivity, um, archaeological sensitivity of of of the, the, the areas that we're looking at. Um, okay. Okay.

00:19:55:25 - 00:19:56:10

That's good.

00:19:57:21 - 00:20:01:18

Due to the sensitivity. That's gorgeous. Thank you very much, ma'am.

00:20:01:24 - 00:20:13:25

You're welcome. Thank you. Thank you for your attendance. And Mr. Allen and Mr. Spencer, too. And and, um, the other advisors and everyone else who's been contributing. I may have missed off. Sorry.

00:20:14:23 - 00:20:24:26

Just to add that there was the action to comment on monitoring any ongoing operational monitoring to provide the wording, um, that they would like to go in on that particular.

00:20:25:02 - 00:20:25:17

Right.

00:20:25:19 - 00:20:26:24

Yeah. Sorry.

00:20:28:01 - 00:20:33:06

Um, monitoring is not, uh, is not acceptable.

00:20:34:10 - 00:20:52:25

No, no, it was, it was. It was reference to. It was reference that to Mr.. That. Mr. Adams made I believe to future monitoring and and clarity about what um, the local authorities would, would be seeking um in terms of, of, of the particular point that was made about there being insufficient provision for future monetary.

00:20:54:02 - 00:20:57:14

Okay. Oh my apologies. Yes. For the preservation.

00:20:57:16 - 00:20:58:01

In situ.

00:20:58:03 - 00:20:59:06

Areas. Sorry.

00:20:59:08 - 00:21:03:11

I thought you were talking about monitoring as an archaeological watching briefing.

00:21:03:13 - 00:21:04:18

Okay, lovely.

00:21:04:20 - 00:21:17:07

So, um, yes. So the details on what would be expected in terms of, uh, ensuring the, the, um, the continuity of the preservation in situ areas throughout the lifetime.

00:21:17:09 - 00:21:18:27

Of the team. Thanks very much.

00:21:19:10 - 00:21:21:27

Thank you. Uh, yes, Mr. Allen.

00:21:22:29 - 00:21:30:13

Um, so if you've. Have you anything else for us, ma'am? Under. No, I happen to be free in that case. Thank you very much. We'll go.

00:21:30:16 - 00:21:34:12

Thank you. Thank you very much for your your your participation today.

00:21:34:19 - 00:21:35:08

Thank you.

00:21:38:08 - 00:21:46:26

All right. So. Moving on then to, um, landscape and visual matters. Um.

00:21:48:28 - 00:21:53:28

And the first element of that is, uh.

00:21:55:22 - 00:22:23:19

Reviewing design coherence and the assessment of landscape and visual effects. So, um. In response to the previous suggestions that the landscape and visual effects assessments were difficult to navigate, the applicant has produced summary tables and of landscape and visual effects. Um, and this helpfully. Um. Places the detail of of those assessments in one place. So so thank you for that. Um.

00:22:26:03 - 00:22:48:25

Like looking in greater detail at the elements of those assessments and firstly looking at visual effects. Um, I understand that no beneficial visual effects are identified. Um, uh, I said it's it's it's it's certainly helpful to be able to see that in one place with the, um, the visual effects tables. Um.

00:22:50:18 - 00:23:24:08

Just in response to the request for a comparative assessment of the landscape and visual effects of the fixed and tracker panels, the applicant produced a document which is attached to um appendix D of the applicant's written summary of oral submissions and responses to issue specific hearing one and that's document rep one and 052. So this this document sets out in summary that there'd be no differences in effects, um, in landscape or visual effects.

00:23:24:19 - 00:23:41:06

Um, and we're presuming that that assessment was undertaken on the basis of, um, tracking panels having a maximum height of 4.5m above ground. Um, when it's when the panels are at its greatest rotation. And similarly, um, fixed panels having a maximum height of 33.5.

00:23:43:08 - 00:23:43:23

Um.

00:23:45:09 - 00:23:46:03

So.

00:23:47:19 - 00:24:09:24

My assumption is that, um, that that that conclusion. Um. Of the effects being the same is based on the conclusions of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility assessment, meaning that there would be no difference in the way that, um, these different sized panels would be experienced in the landscape when seen from visual receptors. Is that right?

00:24:12:10 - 00:24:51:24

A clever trick for the applicant. I would just let, um, the applicants, um, landscape and visual, um, experts introduce themselves. Um, just to note that, um, uh, Mr. Jackson, who's the author of the Elvia chapter, is unable to attend today's hearing, but his colleagues, who are Mr. Right and topical introduce themselves, are familiar with the the documentation and also, um, were involved in the production of the Elvia assessment um for cotton solar project. And therefore I've been involved in all of the discussions with Lincolnshire County Council in relation to, um, matters that are outstanding and the production of those sorts of things that they're very familiar with the projects.

00:24:51:26 - 00:25:06:11

But I just would, um, just wanted to note at that point, um, for your why why is somebody different than who is it is um, one and three. So, um, I will just let them introduce themselves and then they can answer your question.

00:25:06:13 - 00:25:11:25

Sorry, I should have I should have asked for that to happen first. But but, um, by all means, introduce yourselves now. Thank you.

00:25:13:22 - 00:25:17:04

Good afternoon. Um, I'm Wendy Wright for the applicant.

00:25:17:06 - 00:25:18:26

Landscape and visual associate.

00:25:18:28 - 00:25:20:10

Director at Lambeau.

00:25:22:07 - 00:25:26:19

My name is Mark topping. I'm director of design at lamprey, covering landscape visualizer.

00:25:27:11 - 00:25:28:10

Thank you very much.

00:25:30:04 - 00:25:34:12

So if you if you're able to assist me with that, that question that will be that will be helpful.

00:25:34:14 - 00:25:42:14

Yes, yes yes, ma'am. I can, um, I can direct you, um, I think what would assist the, um, explaining how we derived.

00:25:42:17 - 00:25:43:12

The findings.

00:25:43:14 - 00:25:45:06

Of the fixed versus tracker.

00:25:45:17 - 00:25:46:10

Is just looking.

00:25:46:12 - 00:25:51:12

At table 8.49 in the Elvia. Um, you could just.

00:25:51:14 - 00:25:54:14

Bear with me a moment when I bring that up. Um.

00:25:57:13 - 00:25:58:02

Ambev stock.

00:26:00:04 - 00:26:05:00

App 046. Page 138.

00:26:16:03 - 00:26:17:13

Sorry. It was app.

00:26:19:14 - 00:26:21:02

I have to share that.

00:26:21:19 - 00:26:25:12

Okay, there we have it. You've shared it. There we are. Right. Okay. Thank you.

00:26:25:21 - 00:26:26:06

Okay.

00:26:26:09 - 00:26:30:18

Um, so in terms of the comparison between the 4.5m.

00:26:30:20 - 00:26:36:05

And, um, tracker and 3.5m fixed panels, we.

00:26:36:07 - 00:26:37:25

Are looking at first of.

00:26:37:27 - 00:26:38:14

All the skiing.

00:26:38:16 - 00:26:40:25

Context. So we felt that the context of.

00:26:40:27 - 00:26:43:18

The scheme, the fact that the panels.

00:26:43:22 - 00:26:44:16

Were still.

00:26:44:18 - 00:27:16:21

Sitting in a large scale landscape with wide views, um, and appearing in mid-ground in most of the views from the ridgeline that the, the, the scale of the scheme, uh, wouldn't alter significantly between whether it's between 3.5 or 4.5 meters. In the wider context, you would still, um, have a similar, um, position with the panels. You wouldn't notice any significant change in that position.

00:27:17:20 - 00:27:42:22

Um, and then moving on to the existing vegetation. And this is present in the landscape, we have layering which is provided by woodlands, trees and hedgerows and copses. Um, and a lot of this vegetation, um, is, you know, reaching heights and especially the existing hedgerows are reaching heights of three metres, 3.5 and eventually we will be allowing them to grow.

00:27:42:24 - 00:27:44:10

Out to five metres.

00:27:44:12 - 00:28:20:18

Which in effect would then provide the mitigation for the 4.5m high panels. So therefore the distance between 3.5 and 4.5 um would be barely noticeable because by virtue of the screening provided by the existing vegetation along route, with the reinforcement of this vegetation as part of the new mitigation. And committed by the scheme in terms of the features that the color of the panels and palette of materials.

00:28:20:24 - 00:28:55:01

Again, this would be inconsistent. Um, between the two options, 3.5 and 4.5m, and the backdrops um afforded to these panels by the woodlands and the dark vegetation would still give that same level of integration. Um, in terms of, of lighting for both options, that there wouldn't be any, uh, any. And material differences and then the location of the panels, and again where we're swapping the light for like.

00:28:55:03 - 00:29:27:28

So that wouldn't change the assessment in terms of how they're located physically in the landscape. So this is relating to landscape character and coming back to me, planting the green infrastructure again, whether they're 3.5 or 4.5 million panels we would escape would be bringing forward that mitigation in the same manner as if it was, um, 4.5 or the 3.5. So therefore that that that position wouldn't change.

00:29:28:18 - 00:30:17:07

Um, and likewise with the landscape character, although you're not perceiving the planting visually, the physical implementation of the new planting within the framework of existing hedgerows can still be realized, uh, with, with both options. Um, and then in terms of the, uh, the recreational users. So this is referring specifically to public rights of way. And again, where the panels are set, um, behind the field boundaries, behind hedgerows, the proximity between the the viewer, the person and the users, the public rights of way, the angle of the view would be that you would, um, that they would reach above the hedgerow of the view line, and therefore the panels would be, um, disclosed in the same manner as the 3.504.5.

00:30:17:09 - 00:30:42:21

They would appear, um, set behind the road. So therefore, um, I think, um, that sort of sums up broadly how we felt that the difference between the tracker and the fixed, uh, we had arrived at the same findings, uh, based on those, um, criteria set out in table 8.49 months.

00:30:44:19 - 00:31:15:19

Okay. Thank you. And that's helping. And, um, I suppose what I wanted to explore particularly was, was, um, that the closer to visual impacts, if you like. So for example, viewpoint nine, which is, is just north of um, Broxtowe and, um, close to public rights of way and a reasonably well-used area. And I note there that, um, uh, views would be relatively, um, uh, close at hand.

00:31:15:21 - 00:31:25:24

And the assessment of, um, where are we now? Um, moderate adverse effects are, are the same for both. And, uh.

00:31:29:04 - 00:31:51:16

At. Yes, it's, it's construction and, um, operational phases when, where vegetation would, wouldn't necessarily have grown to the degree that it would, um, mask the, the um, the height of particularly the higher the higher panel. So just, I was just curious about I just wanted to explore that in a little bit more detail and understand how that conclusion could be reached.

00:31:52:19 - 00:32:23:22

I guess Wendy Ryan for the applicants. Um, so viewpoint nine, uh, is situated, uh, one field, um, way from the, um, West Burton, one, um, and the southwest to the south of the, the watercourse there, and obviously looking across an open field towards the site. Um, along that site boundary, uh, we would be proposing, uh, some mitigation there to, to ameliorate those views.

00:32:23:29 - 00:32:43:08

And we anticipate that that mitigation would reach, um, five metres, um, to impede views towards the, the panels. And so we felt that that mitigation would contribute to mitigating those views, whether they were 3.5 or 4.5 metres.

00:32:44:20 - 00:33:01:01

I suppose my point is that that mitigation wouldn't be in place. Um, during construction, it would. Well, it may be in place, but it certainly wouldn't have reached a height where it would make a significant difference. Um, at that early point in the delivery of the scheme. So, um.

00:33:01:09 - 00:33:31:29

Not not something for the, um. Um, essentially because of the the size of the existing hedgerows, I think, um, Miss Wright mentioned there was between two, 2 to 3m generally. So the fact that you can see the panels above those existing hedgerows, be they 3.5m or the the larger track panels, albeit that they, they tilt that those the construction and operation, you are still able to see those panels at that point and mitigated by secondary mitigation planting essentially.

00:33:32:01 - 00:33:50:13

And that's where the effects come into play. So there's a balance of the panels that their worst case scenario, 4.5m, um, balanced against and obviously then tilting down to two metres balanced with the fixed at 3.5m being constantly made. So essentially that's how we've we've come to that conclusion that makes sense.

00:33:55:21 - 00:34:16:05

So I think so it's. So it's it's how they would be experienced and to those, those local users and to my mind there would be a difference, a visible difference between the two heights of panels, which

wouldn't necessarily, certainly not immediately anyway, be mitigated by the presence of intervening vegetation. Um.

00:34:18:18 - 00:34:19:03

Uh.

00:34:20:28 - 00:34:54:20

When do you write the output? Um. Um. Yeah. In the context of that view. And you're looking across, um, open arable fields and then you, um, there is a backdrop there. You have the, the raised level of the watercourse, and then you have vegetation beyond that. So your skyline is defined by this sort of dark band of vegetation. And the panels are set in that context of that, that skyline. This is because of the flat landscape that gives you this elevated skyline.

00:34:55:03 - 00:35:19:10

So therefore we felt that the panels where the, you know, they were 3.5 or 4.5 meters would still sit in this dark backdrop. And because of that distance, um, to the viewpoint, it would wouldn't be a significant material change to, um, the view for for users at that, at that location and that distance. Yeah.

00:35:19:12 - 00:35:58:03

So talking to the applicant, see, essentially what we're saying is certainly in terms of the comparison of that distance is an important component. If you imagine sort of the comparison between 3.5 and 4.5, that's that's a whole meter difference. If you were a place to that panels, you would be able to perceive a significant level difference of a meter at the distance of this viewpoint. In particular, that because of the angle of the view that will meter is compressed within the landscape, and the fact that it's it's backdropped against existing vegetation and the ridgeline in the background grazing as the backlighting effects that that makes the difference is barely perceptible in that view.

00:35:58:12 - 00:36:01:27

And from that distance. And that's sort of similar across the the assessment.

00:36:02:29 - 00:36:03:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:36:05:25 - 00:36:41:15

All right. Um, thank you for that. Uh. Moving on. Um, uh, another point that was picked up in, in written questions was in relation to the substation at um West Burton three. Um, which is a particular high point in terms of, in terms of the infrastructure that's, that is proposed. Um, uh, we asked about the visual effects of, of this, um, in written questions, particularly, uh, question 1.8. 15. Um, and we also reviewed, um, the, the relevant, uh, viewpoints on site.

00:36:41:17 - 00:37:17:08

So in response to that question, the applicant has set out that the the location of the substation was identified to allow it to sit within within some of the lower lying landform of the West Burton three site. Um, and it would be suitably offset from visual receptors and benefit from some immediate softening provided by existing field boundaries. And I just it would be helpful if, um, the applicant's advisors could explain a little bit more detail how how that landform has informed siting and particularly with reference to the submitted documentation.

00:37:17:10 - 00:37:18:27

Documentation, please.

00:37:33:12 - 00:37:48:19

I'm happy that if you have, if you haven't got that information immediately to hand, this is something that I'm happy we could put in as a as a written question, because I'm just asking for assistance with navigating the documentation in that in that sense, because I'm sure the information is there. It's just it just wasn't immediately apparent.

00:37:54:16 - 00:37:55:21

Would that make sense?

00:37:57:23 - 00:38:03:26

I can. I'm not sure if Miss Wright is speaking, but it's muted at the moment. So it's just, uh, if you were.

00:38:04:06 - 00:38:05:12

Yes. I can't question.

00:38:05:14 - 00:38:53:13

That. Haha. I wasn't sure if you if the liaising or whether she was attempting to answer the question, so I thought I'd just back that. Thank you Wendy. Right. For the applicant. Yes. Um, but in reference to 1.8. 15. Um, yes. We I think it may be, um, beneficial to come back. Um, as with more information on that particular question, and we can. Okay. Due to the, um, the topography, um, and landform plans, which form part of the yes drawings, um, package and put in the written explanation there in terms of how we felt, um, that there's the substation, um, sat in that context of, um, West Burton through presumably you're needing to understand more about how what the impacts would be and to what the bring.

00:38:54:16 - 00:39:17:04

I suppose it's more about the design process and how and how that's been informed by the particular topography and configuration of, of that, that area to, to, to enable, as the applicant has said, um, uh, that that substation to sit within, within that landscape. So it's understanding how that's the nature of the landscape and, and how that's happened.

00:39:17:16 - 00:39:53:25

Yes, yes, yes, ma'am. You missed earlier, but I was obviously not on I was on mute. But it's also about how the, the receptors are placed quite um, some distance from the substation. So you have the, the public West Park Road to the north, and then you've got a few point 52 to the west. So, so the appreciation of the substation and the landscape is, is often um, at, at that sort of distance. So um, again, that's, that's assisting with how it's read in the landscape and it's not a close range perception, um, of that future.

00:39:56:00 - 00:40:36:06

Okay. All right. Thank you. That's helpful. So I will put that, um, in as a more detailed and, uh, question as well into the next round of questions. Um, so I'd like to turn to the effects on landscape character. And this is, this is a concern that has been raised by a wide range of interested parties. And it's something that we did, um, start to explore in issue specific here in one, um, particularly the, the, the concern and the suggestion that's been made by a wide range of parties that the scheme would change visual perceptions of this being an agricultural or rural landscape into it being an industrial landscape containing extensive areas of large solar panels.

00:40:37:07 - 00:41:08:19

So so we're very conscious of that. And I don't want to open up that, that particular line again. But I do want to look specifically at the effects of the scheme on, um, various landscape character areas and particularly pick up, um, the effects on landscape character on the regional landscape character area

called the on Wooded Dales, which covers most of the site area. Um, and similar points can be made in relation to the local landscape character area of the Till Vale.

00:41:08:21 - 00:41:42:24

So, um, looking at the potential landscape effects and key features of this um, landscape character area relate to it being a low lying rural landscape, um, uh, expansive long distance and panoramic views from higher ground, limited woodland cover, um uh, shelter belts and hedgerow trees growing, gaining greater visual significance and as a result, um, it's productive arable and pastoral farmland with um and it's sparsely settled, with small villages and dispersed farmlands linked by quiet lanes.

00:41:43:10 - 00:41:44:10

So, um.

00:41:47:15 - 00:42:23:09

I say the reference to the character there. Um, and again, looking at the assessment of potential landscape effects, this describes the low levels of woodland cover creating a relatively open and expansive landscape. Um, it's described overall as being moderately susceptible to to change because the relevant character characteristics of the landscape have some ability to accommodate, um, change without undue adverse effects. And so I might. Question to the applicant is really to, to to explain that the reasoning there.

00:42:23:12 - 00:42:41:24

Um, uh. Ask the applicant to to start in terms of how that conclusion of moderate to susceptibility has been reached. Before I can see Mr. Shakes got his hand up and I'll, I'll come I'll come back to Mr. Sheikh in a moment. I don't know whether the applicant wants to to start, please.

00:42:48:22 - 00:43:08:17

Thank you, Mike, for the applicant. And, um, so, um, just to recap, uh, the question that you're asking me first, um, you would you'd like to understand the how we arrived at the sensitivity of Eric's area for a on wooden burials, is that correct?

00:43:09:02 - 00:43:10:25

Yes, yes, yes, yes.

00:43:11:15 - 00:43:46:19

Um, so the the approach to, um, looking at the sensitivity of, of this landscape character area was that we based that on the landscape character assessment. Um, and we, we looked at the, the features within the landscape that would that are still present, um, uh, as part of that character. And again, where the where there have been forced change, meaning where, where the landscape has changed as a result of activity from either agriculture or other other influences.

00:43:46:26 - 00:44:33:06

Um, and we um, we felt that while the landscape character, um, was, um, intact, uh, faithfully in terms of it forming, um, visual coherence across the, um, the till veiled, we felt that, uh, individually that parts of that landscape had become, um, changed by agricultural influences. So that's mainly relating to the, uh, the condition of the hedgerows, the fact that some of the hedgerows have become gappy, the management of some of those hedgerows and, and the loss of um hedgerow trees through um, the, the trimming and um intensive management hedgerows.

00:44:33:16 - 00:45:07:15

Um and then also referring to the pattern of the landscape, uh it was noted that it was noted that the um, that that has changed the scale of the landscape has changed, and we've lost those intermediary hedgerows, um, in parts so that we now have amalgamation of various fields, um, to, to um, provide

more intensive agricultural practices. Um, in, in this part of the character area. So it was felt that those two aspects change that character.

00:45:07:20 - 00:45:47:22

Um, and likewise um the. The lack of woodlands in the area. Did, um. Uh. Because they rely on the tree cover to provide some intimacy to that landscape. But again, that that was that is missing in parts. Uh, so we felt that that's, um, how we assigned the moderate sensitivity to the, to the, to the to the landscape. Um, and we felt that, um, normally high sensitivity is assigned to, um, uh, areas, um, of naturally designated landscapes or high value landscapes.

00:45:47:24 - 00:46:15:04

But we felt that the moderate, um, sensitivity was applicable to this particular character area for the reasons that I mentioned earlier, um, that the, um, the landscape had become changed by the agriculture that has taken place, um, over the um, over the last, um, 20 to 30 years, particularly with, with the intensification of agriculture. I don't know whether they, uh.

00:46:15:23 - 00:46:17:08

Um, while solving.

00:46:17:10 - 00:46:47:10

For the applicant, they just simply that the, um, part of the characteristics of the openness is interrelated to the degradation of some of their cultural landscapes. Hedgerow removal. Um, as my colleague said, um, and, um, sparse, you know, um. Sparse hedgerows with with large gaps in them, etc. so, so part of the characteristics of the landscape is symptomatic of partly the degradation of the landscape. So we balance this, um, in the round on that basis.

00:46:48:21 - 00:47:21:24

Okay. All right. And then in terms of the, um, uh, the mitigation measures proposed, um, uh, which, which a significant element of that is, is reinforcement. It's noted as reinforcement of existing planting and introduction of new shelter belt planting. Um, I'm assuming that that that then from follows on from what you've set out in terms of, um, explaining the rationale for that, although that that there is a tension between that and obviously the limited woodland cover that is identified as a defining feature of the landscape character area.

00:47:22:05 - 00:47:31:03

Um, uh, I don't know if they want to say anything more about, uh, about how that, that mitigation planting works with existing landscape character.

00:47:32:17 - 00:48:22:21

Um, not something for the applicant. Yes. Essentially the um, in terms of. The the process that we've gone through, we've in terms of the the embedded designer space is retention of all existing vegetation. I think it is. We've got about 25 linear meters of hedgerow loss across the entire scheme, balanced with retention of existing woodland, existing hedgerows, um, those sort of components. Then I think in terms of primary, um mitigation, looking at the site layout in particular, in particular, so allowing those existing assets to, um, to function as they currently do and to function in an enhanced way through management changes controlled through the Olam um, and also the introduction of new mitigation planting associated with secondary mitigation.

00:48:22:23 - 00:48:55:26

So and again allowing space for that mitigation to to grow and mature over time. So the the quantum of what's actually been put back into the landscape aligns to character. So gapping up existing hedgerows, planting of new hedgerows I think there's over seven kilometres of new hedgerows proposed within the scheme. Um shelter belt planting as opposed to sort of large scale woodland

creation. I still think there's still about nine hectares of, um, woodland creation, but that tends to be quite linear. Shelter belt, sort of associated with the current agricultural landscape.

00:48:56:06 - 00:49:27:06

Um, I think just to put it in, I won't go through the sort of the full list of sort of, um, landscape improvements. Um, they sort of set out in the bag calculations and the land itself. But to, to quantify it in biodiversity net gain terms, um, we've got 86.8% net gain in habitat units, um, 54.71% net gain in linear units and 33.25% net gain in river units through changes in management.

00:49:27:08 - 00:49:46:10

So cumulatively are, you know, looking at that as a whole in terms of retention and the introduction of new, um, planting aligns to landscape character across that large scale. All of the sites, um, as a whole, um, we feel is significant. And that's really what's, what's tipped that balance.

00:49:47:18 - 00:49:51:11

Okay? Yes, ma'am. Mr. McBride, would you like to come in?

00:49:54:28 - 00:50:00:13

Thank you, ma'am. Yeah, I just wanted to. It's Neil MacBride, Lancashire County Council. Just wanted to, uh.

00:50:00:15 - 00:50:16:20

Give an opportunity for Mr. Brown, who's our landscape, uh, advisor who hasn't been introduced yet to the, uh, to the hearing to perhaps comment on this point or the previous point, just to see, you know, if he if he has anything that he wants to add to what's being said.

00:50:18:02 - 00:50:23:03

Yes, but very happy to. To hear from from Mr. Brown, Mr. Brown. You're there now. What would you say I am?

00:50:23:05 - 00:50:23:20

I actually.

00:50:23:22 - 00:50:27:03

Suit yourself. Yes. Would you like my name and say what you say?

00:50:27:14 - 00:50:35:12

Of course. Uh, my name is Oliver Brown. I'm a landscape architect with RH consultants, and we're representing Lincolnshire County Council.

00:50:37:03 - 00:51:08:27

Um, yeah. Just just in such a touching on the landscape character, I think your summary was, was was accurate. And I think the, the, the applicant's assessment of sensitivity is, is fair. Uh, I would agree. It's a, you know, it's a, it's a landscape of medium sensitivity. Uh, I think where we have, uh, the disagreements in a difference of professional judgment is in terms of the magnitude of change and then the subsequent, uh, significance of effects on the landscape, uh, in this area.

00:51:09:16 - 00:51:40:27

Um, we acknowledge the, the, the establishment of the new areas of planting is going to introduce, uh, positive elements to the landscape. Um, and I think the, the mitigation planting scheme that's been put in place is, is, uh, well, it's, you know, a sort of. Quite high level and broad brush at this stage is well considered, and I think it looks, you know, well at the things like the landscape character. Um, what

we have the concern about is the extensive change to land use, uh, which is defined essentially what the land is used for.

00:51:40:29 - 00:52:05:01

So it's changing from, you know, an open, uh, rural agricultural landscape where the land use will be of a soil development. And we've looked at how, um, the, the mitigation, uh, how far that goes to offset, to mitigate that. Um, and obviously that does have a benefits to that. But, you know, we may maintain the position that there will still be, um, adverse, uh, landscape effects.

00:52:07:24 - 00:52:15:22

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Brown. Um, and I want to come on to that that particular point about about land use in a moment. Um, Mr. Sheikh, what did you want to say?

00:52:16:11 - 00:52:17:18

West Lindsey district council.

00:52:17:20 - 00:52:18:05

Yes, ma'am.

00:52:18:07 - 00:52:52:21

It's a point of clarification. It follows similar to that of, uh, Mr. Brown for the county. Um, I understand from the conclusions reach that the beneficial impact conclusions are primarily based on the mitigation planting. We're not entirely clear. And that's why it's a point of clarification, how that mitigation has been balanced with the change to the character of the land itself, which will be from agricultural to solar or industrial. However, it's explained so quite how the conclusion has been reached that there will be a beneficial impact because of the imitation planting.

00:52:52:23 - 00:53:02:22

But irrespective of and despite the change in the character of the land itself. So it's a point of clarification as to how that's been assessed and taken into account and balanced.

00:53:04:11 - 00:54:00:12

Thank you, Mr. Shaker. Yes. You led neatly onto my next point, which was around, um, uh, the fact that the landscape summary table, in terms of the, the the effects and summary tables clearly set out, um, they that beneficial landscape effects have been identified in relation to the regional landscape character area or wooded Wales and the local Trent um Valley landscape character area and the local Tilt Valley um landscape character area. In fact, these are the only landscape effects identified of of of any significance and and noting the points that have been made about the change from what's described as a um, uh, very now, um, low lying rural landscape, um, an area characterised by productive arable and pastoral farmland and the change in that land use from um, from, from, from that to, to, uh, large scale solar.

00:54:00:14 - 00:54:06:16

Um, how has that been? Um, uh, considered in those, uh, landscape effects assessments?

00:54:09:05 - 00:54:46:01

I'm not stopping for the afternoon. Um, so when when the landscapes view, there's obviously there's, there's long distance versus there's close range views. Um, and that's, that's demonstrated in the sweet of those montages. So I think when you're viewing the landscape generally, obviously you're driving through openness where there's clear views of agricultural fields. Generally the long distance views are, um, are looking at less so across the landscape in terms of hedgerows, woodlands. So it is a sort of hierarchy of, of, um, green infrastructure within the landscape that forms a significant part of that character.

00:54:46:06 - 00:55:16:16

What we've tried to do very carefully, um, is to maintain elements of openness, um, as well. So sometimes the closure of, um, open views can be more incongruous than the natural mitigation itself. So we have worked very hard. I think an example of that would be, um, possibly looking at, um, at one nine, eight, um, viewpoint five. And also in terms of close range views 8 to 1 9.26.

00:55:16:18 - 00:55:47:02

So one and this, this is partially looking at visual receptors as well. So just to be clear on that. But one of the views um is is when we we looked at sort of fairly early on in, in your um, questioning showed that sort of, um, that middle distance view where the panels were just visible above existing hedgerow vegetation. So as part of the mitigation, it's been to ground the hedgerows. It's been to put in sort of relatively low level planting to to screen, but not to close off the views of the ridgeline.

00:55:47:14 - 00:56:26:21

Um, in contrast to um at 219 viewpoint 26 um, there is a sort of closure of some of the longer distance views. Um, we maintain that part of that, um, closure is justified because, um, part of the openness, as I said before, is symptomatic of removal of hedgerows or poor quality hedgerows, but where there's where that, um, takes place. Um, certainly in the visual assessment, we've, we've assessed that accordingly. We've given that sort of change, albeit the creation of a natural foregrounds view replacing the views of the panel we have assessed that has been moderate adverse.

00:56:26:23 - 00:56:58:21

So in terms of the landscape fabric, the character of what we're putting back, we believe that that ties very strongly into the forces for changing the the landscape, character, opportunities within this landscape to create significant enhancement. The approach is also very similar to, um, that taken by the Defra 25 year Environmental Plan, which looking at the establishment of hedgerow creation, woodland belts all aligned to landscape character. Um, the land use um question.

00:56:58:23 - 00:58:00:08

Clearly there is a change, a significant change to the the land use itself that's balanced by the under planting, the separation of panels and the reversion of arable through to generally grassland and wildflowers. So again, that's taken the balance. Whilst the land use has changed, it still remains in, in an element of agricultural land use and beneath the panels. So although it's a just in summary, as we're adding those components in and in reference to the before and afters, if you like it year zero and year 15 in the first montages, that shows the the change that that's been implemented as part of the development proposals, um, which tends to remove visibility of the panels themselves, um, and introduces significant change to the landscape character which which we affirm is is positive change because it's a reconnection of that existing green infrastructure which, um, has, has been eroded and opened up the landscape.

00:58:00:10 - 00:58:07:16

But also it has the mitigation proposals have respected that openness as well, where we've we've been able to do so.

00:58:08:11 - 00:58:50:24

And respect the Wendy Wright, the applicant, in respect to the to the land use. I just bring bring us back to the public landscape, character assessments and other guidance that we've taken these into account. Um, in particular, uh, with respect to green infrastructure planning and biodiversity net gain. And we've also taking account of the Trent Vale Landscape Partnership character assessment. And I'd just like to, uh, just referred to a point in that particular character assessment under TVP three industrial restored Vale, and that mineral extraction fundamentally changes the nature of the landscape in which it operates.

00:58:50:26 - 00:59:24:02

And whereas power production, with the exception of the footprint of the buildings and the cooling towers, is overlaid on the landscape. So for from a landscape perspective, in terms of the land use, we have seen that the the project is overlaying. The nature of it is overlaying onto the landscape, and that it is reversible and that it does not affect the structure, the framework, and where it's being laid into the hedgerows, the woodlands and the tree cover and.

00:59:25:10 - 00:59:25:25

Thank you.

00:59:27:09 - 00:59:28:06

Thank you very much.

00:59:30:08 - 00:59:31:11

All right. Um.

00:59:33:11 - 01:00:05:24

Yes. I'll contain a moment. Mr.. Just just, Mr. Shaikh. Sorry. Just just, um. Yeah I appreciate that this there's an overlay in terms of in terms of this use. But that's not how it would seem to to those people living and working in, in these areas. They would experience very this very much as a sort of a dramatic change to the, the character of the landscape that they, they, they live in and they and they, they experience. And that's obviously something that's, that's been, um, uh, referred to us on numerous occasions. But, Mr. Sheikh, what would you like to what would you like to say?

01:00:06:09 - 01:00:45:00

Somerset West Lindsey District Council, ma'am, I wonder whether it might be of assistance to have this, um, written as a response, because it's something I think we we would like to respond to and see if it's going to be to that extent of detail that we'd like to potentially take it away. The other point is, we're not entirely clear on the distinction and the approach to the distinction between visual impact and impact on landscape character. I understand that there's an overlap between them, but we're not entirely clear from the explanation there, how they have been assessed separately, and how the balance has been approached in relation to change in the use of the land solely in terms of landscape, character and putting aside visual impact.

01:00:45:10 - 01:00:56:29

Um, so so it's a point of approach and explanation which rather than trying to do orally, it might be beneficial that we consider a response in writing once we've seen a detailed explanation.

01:00:58:21 - 01:01:01:01

I think that was that. That would be helpful. Um.

01:01:02:19 - 01:01:27:03

Uh, yes, certainly. In terms of the, um, the change to landscape character. Um, I think the applicant has responded in a number of ways, but particularly by emphasizing, um, uh, the, the visual nature of the, the mitigation proposed. Whereas with the landscape character itself, it's much, much, much broader than that. Um, Miss Broderick, what would you like to say?

01:01:28:24 - 01:02:10:04

And the applicant. And it was just to clarify, I suppose when we when we write, we will obviously do a written summary of of the comments that have been made so that there will be the opportunity, obviously, for West Lindsey District Council to comment on that. On that written summary, the. See, it's important to note that obviously they are two distinct types of assessments, the visual assessment

and the landscape assessment. And so what it seems to me is what's being requested here is clarification of the approach to change, as it were, of land use in a landscape assessment context and then separately, how change of land use has been considered as part of the visual assessment.

01:02:10:10 - 01:02:21:00

Um, is that I just wanted to clarify that that's actually what's being asked for here, because there obviously are two distinct types of assessment process with different guidance. And I.

01:02:21:02 - 01:02:21:17

Do want to.

01:02:21:28 - 01:02:46:09

Share that. Western District Council. Yes, that's entirely correct. And the the more important of the two being the landscape character assessment and the conclusions or the assessment and approach to reaching the conclusions of beneficial impact in terms of landscape character. That's that's the primary, uh, approach. But we would also welcome and be, um, what we would we benefit from an explanation in terms of the visual impact as well.

01:02:54:06 - 01:03:01:04

Is that. Is that clear now, miss? Miss Broderick. Are you happy to take that forward as an action for the applicant?

01:03:02:19 - 01:03:23:10

And yes, that's correct. I think we were just a bit concerned that there was a conflation of the experience of individuals from a visual perspective versus the assessment that's being carried out on landscape character. And so I think we were just a bit concerned that perhaps the two points were being conflated, but it appears not so, and that that's fine. Okay. Thank you.

01:03:24:24 - 01:03:25:09

Thank you.

01:03:34:08 - 01:04:10:03

I just wanted to pick up on a particular point that's been raised by 7000 acres in the, um, uh, deadline for representation, which this refers to, um, a point that's in chapter 18 of the environmental state statement. Um, it's paragraph 18.7 .116. Uh, so sorry, this sets out that, um, there's a reference to the scheme having a long term impact on the landscape character of some tourism and recreation receptors that are reliant on landscape context for their value.

01:04:10:16 - 01:04:37:08

Um, so this this does suggest that there's been a recognition of adverse effects on landscape character. Um, and I actually think this is probably quite a specific point that that may be best dealt with, um, in writing rather than given the conversation that we've just had. Um, so I will put that rather than ask for a response. Now, I'll just I'll put that down as something to pick up in in written questions. Um.

01:04:39:15 - 01:05:17:27

I would like now to, um, talk about the, um, the landscape effects or the landscape impacts of the configuration of the scheme. So this is this is something that's been referred to previously, um, and the fact that the scheme has three main elements, um, and this is something that Westlands District Council have have referenced in their representations with particular regard to, to good design and the suggestion that, um, good design will be represented by a single coherent scheme that minimizes the spread of impacts.

01:05:18:14 - 01:05:56:02

Um, so in contrast to that, the applicant has set out their position that, um, the discrete elements of the scheme would assist with this integration. So um, noting the the features of the on wooded Vale landscape character area. As we we have this relatively open and expansive landscape comprising arable land with a scattering of settlements. Um, I'd like to hear from, um, from both parties, if possible, on in terms of how landscape character, um informs their cases in terms of the as I say that the configuration of the scheme.

01:05:56:24 - 01:05:59:19

So I don't know whether the applicant would like to start first.

01:06:10:17 - 01:06:41:19

Yes, ma'am. When do you write for the applicant? Uh, so just turning to how the, um, the the mom you're asking, um, just to clarify, um, this is referring to the fact that we have, uh, the sites as, um, uh, parcels of land and to set them apart as opposed to one contiguous site. And why that, yes, is more beneficial. Um, okay.

01:06:41:25 - 01:07:15:28

Um, so just in terms of, um, the first point, uh, the boundaries of the site, um, you see the there, the, there to reinforce, um, the, the views towards the scheme and to set the context and of the future within the scheme. Um, and the features of the proposal and the fact that the sites are set further apart. This allows for land between them to provide some elements of mitigation.

01:07:16:00 - 01:07:56:25

So therefore this this open parcel of land between each of the sites has features within it, such as hedgerows and tree and cover. That therefore gives that element of um visual um uh mitigation between the sites. And so, so that's a sort of a physical, um, this element of separation. But then it also provides an open element of separation by providing an open parcel of land between twin the sites as well, so that the fact that the sites are pulled apart just gives that, um, aspect of openness between.

01:07:57:24 - 01:08:32:24

In terms of, um, experiencing, uh, sequentially the, the development, the scheme, um, the open areas between the sites again, allow for some sort of breathing space and therefore so you don't appreciate one if you're travelling through one large contiguous site. Um, then appreciate and experience that, um, in one, um, in one particular passing of that site. But the fact that you're passing between several independent sites with parcels between that are not, um, subject.

01:08:32:26 - 01:09:05:16

So the panels then that gives an element of um, uh, separation between the travelling between them. The um, the other aspect is the fact that the sites are set in a flat landscape, um, and therefore it is difficult to experience the, the fact that they are separated because you don't see them. Um, on that, um, open plane. It's very difficult to see them at close range. And the only way that you experience them is from the ridgeline.

01:09:06:01 - 01:10:00:29

Um. The, um, to the east. And there and there you experience the sights set apart, but you experience them at mid range. Um, so it is very difficult to peak out in the landscape. They are prised apart and, uh, and not one contiguous landform because they divide by tree and woodland cover. The the the, um, appreciation, um, the the benefit of having the sites um, uh, more separated is, is from the aspects of green infrastructure, biodiversity and trans trans uh, the passing of um, of, uh, ecology networks between the sites so that you have these open parcels of land between the sites that then allows for this freer passage, uh, for ecology and nature conservation benefits.

01:10:01:19 - 01:10:19:05

Uh, so therefore you have you you have both physical, um, benefits from having separate parcels of land and, and visual benefits. And then also, um, adding to that, you have the, the ecology, major conservation benefits derived from green infrastructure.

01:10:21:21 - 01:10:52:24

Um. Okay. Thank you. Um, so, so in response to what the applicant said, I don't know whether, um, Mr. Shafer for West Lindsey or Mr. Brown for Lincolnshire. Want to comment on the, um, uh, the point that was made by West Lindsey about the fact that this scheme isn't a contiguous whole. And in terms of, of, of good design, um, uh. It doesn't represent good design from from in that perspective.

01:10:53:19 - 01:10:59:23

Mr. Shaker, you are you are you are you? Do you have any comment to offer in terms of this particular point?

01:11:00:21 - 01:11:27:26

West Lindsey District Council. Unfortunately, I think the technology is with us today because Mr. Blake, who I was going to defer to on this point, has lost connection. And I have only just become aware. And he was he hasn't been on the call for the last few minutes. So I don't think he's heard what has just been said. So at this stage it might be that I just suggest, rather than repeating everything we respond in writing to that particular point, and perhaps Mr. Brown can deal with it from Lincolnshire County Council's view for the time being.

01:11:28:26 - 01:11:35:26

That's that seems to be a sensible suggestion. Thank you, Mr. Shaikh. Yes. Mr. Brown, are you able to, uh, to comment on this particular point?

01:11:36:01 - 01:12:13:10

Yes, I can. I'm not sure how much use it will be. I mean, we've, we've experienced with working on two different types of, uh, of red lines with the NCP scale solar schemes, whether it's warm, large or the fragmented, um, and I think each has benefits and, um, constraints as well. Uh, I think the applicant has provided a thorough, um, explanation in terms of the benefits of the red line being set over several different parcels. Um, however, you know, there's there's there's what that does do is it potentially dilutes the agricultural character over a larger area.

01:12:13:16 - 01:12:44:16

Uh, it can also potentially extend that sequential experience of travelling through this landscape where your experience of development is, is, is extended. Um, and then also there's the potential to, to increase, um, receptors because of that. However, with one block, yes, there's you don't get that, um, sort of I suppose breathing space between the parcels. Everything is very much focused in, in one area. Uh, and those, those effects, um, can be a lot more, more focused, however, with having just one, um, larger red line.

01:12:44:27 - 01:13:07:26

Um, the there's more of a perception of a solar scheme set within an agricultural landscape as opposed to the agricultural landscape being, I suppose, influenced by solar throughout a wider area. And hopefully that provides some. So some idea of the sort of the pros and cons in terms of the different types of red line layout.

01:13:08:28 - 01:13:25:24

Okay. Thank you. Yes, it does seem to me that there are there are pros and cons with, with each. So it would be helpful. And, um, Mr. Blake is able to provide further detail when, when he's heard what

we've been talking about and is able to provide a more specific response that would be that will be useful.

01:13:27:11 - 01:13:37:07

Um. So does anybody else. Does anyone have any further comments to make in relation to, um, the assessment of landscape and visual effects?

01:13:41:02 - 01:13:52:13

If not, we'll move on to look at, um. At iteration. Identification and control of design parameters. Parameters including post consent. Yes. Mr. Sheikh.

01:13:53:03 - 01:14:16:26

Chairman, Western Judicial Council. The only other point I'm not entirely sure where it fits best in the agenda is the extension and the assessment of the effects. If the scheme is extended from 40 to 60 years in terms of landscape impacts, that is a point that that we wish to raise. I don't know whether it's worth doing so now or slightly later. And I'm also conscious Mr. Blake isn't on the call yet, um, in the hearing yet. So it may be better.

01:14:17:03 - 01:14:23:19

We can we can pause that until until until he's he's back. Yeah. Okay. I'll make a note of that.

01:14:29:28 - 01:14:35:09

All right. So moving on to identification and control design parameters. Um.

01:14:37:15 - 01:15:22:14

So in terms of design coherence and the control of design parameters. So overall the applicant set out that in accordance with guidance, a design champion has been involved in the evolution of the scheme. Um, the applicants described their role in um, um, enhanced design, delivering additional benefits, reducing environmental impacts. Um, responding to change requests for change um from landowners, residents, local authorities and consultees. Um, and I wanted to just to be clear about, um, about that role and whether it's, um, uh, still in place, noting that the scheme has and will continue to evolve, um, with, with flexibility embedded in it.

01:15:22:21 - 01:15:39:09

Um, and the fact that key elements of infrastructure aren't, aren't yet fixed, though they're obviously guided by, um, uh, management principles and parameters. So, um, in terms of that design champion role, has that, has that come to an end?

01:15:45:22 - 01:16:18:14

I'm not talking to the applicant. Um. No, it hasn't come to an end. I mean, it is an iterative process. Um, post DCO as well. Um, there's elements within the, um, the current outline management plan, um, which can be reviewed at a later date as well. So I think there's a, there's a mechanism within the parent to review the, the proposed current landscape restrictions, for instance, so that we can take account of changes in landscape, character changes in the type of mitigation, um, that would be considered successful in this landscape.

01:16:18:16 - 01:17:00:04

The, the overall approach, um, has been landscape led from the outset. So we have um, essentially set out a environmental masterplan approach whereby we combine all the components, not not simply landscape but ecological, um, heritage. Um. Flood risk drainage, just to make sure that from an environmental perspective and and a best practice approach in terms of the iterative design, it very much is landscape led. So all those, all those components that that make up the landscape are

undertaken in a holistic way, holistic fashion that then feeds through to a suite of parameters plans, um, early on in the process.

01:17:00:06 - 01:17:32:06

So that's, that's where we look at the appropriate buffers from existing vegetation, existing public rights of way, all those aspects that we assess. And it's important to consider. And the final result of that, um, is the landscape mitigation plans, which form part of the Elvia um, assessment process. So that's where you they're much more granular, much more detailed. But you'll notice on the, um, looking at the West Berlin two scheme, for instance, um, the ecological proposals for um scrapes um along the wetland areas.

01:17:32:12 - 01:18:03:11

Um, the very sort of different components put forward by other disciplines is very much borne out iterative process and the ultimate, um, current landscape mitigation plans, um, before you so those, those mitigation plans will continue to be updated through through the examination process, as it were. Um, in terms of our understanding of the site and mostly controlled through iterations to the Olympe, um, that's where we sort of tend to have more granular detail. Um, but it really is a sort of, um.

01:18:04:24 - 01:18:33:09

It's a landscape design led process all the way through. And as I said, sort of the DCO process and jumping ahead of myself here, but but in terms of the um, the DCO, um, conditions, discharge, etc., again, there's the mechanisms within that to look at detailed design components. Um, so it really is part of the process. It continues all the way through. And that the landscape mitigation plans embedded into the island are part of that iterative process too.

01:18:34:01 - 01:18:54:07

And so in terms specifically of the of the design champion role. And is that is that the suggestion is that that's perhaps not held by one person, but that it's, um, uh, something that's the sort of exists, uh, an oversight that exists alongside that, that that process that you described is is that right? Am I missing something.

01:18:55:03 - 01:19:21:04

For the applicant? No, I think you are right. Um, I think it's because it's, you know, it's not simply the landscape and visual elements that that that control the design process. We, we work, um, collaboratively with the, with our colleagues in culture, heritage, ecology, all the aspects to make sure that it's a, it's a holistic approach all the way through, but it is controlled through that ultimately. And the landscape mitigation plans that form part of the island.

01:19:22:02 - 01:19:24:26

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:19:26:22 - 01:19:27:27

Yes, Miss Broderick.

01:19:29:16 - 01:19:58:01

Uh, yeah. And and it was just to add, obviously, that the, um, the concept design parameters and principles document, uh, the last version of which was rep 4-053 contains a number of different measures. So it includes some sort of fixed parameters, um, that are being worked towards. And then it also has a number of design principles that go more to the, the nature and the type or the appearance of certain elements of the scheme, um, that have been factored into, um, how the how.

01:19:58:03 - 01:19:58:23

The scheme sits.

01:19:58:25 - 01:20:17:17

Within some of the landscape mitigation and other mitigation principles and the requirements in the DCA, obviously, um, uh, require the detailed design elements to be approved by the local, uh, the relevant planning authority at the detailed design stage. And those will need to accord both with the.

01:20:17:29 - 01:20:18:14

Um.

01:20:18:16 - 01:20:19:25

Parameters set within the concept design.

01:20:19:27 - 01:20:20:12

Parameters and.

01:20:20:14 - 01:20:29:17

Principles document, but then also taking into account, obviously, how that fits with the measures set out in the in the outline lamp, etc. and, and similarly.

01:20:29:19 - 01:20:30:04

When.

01:20:30:27 - 01:21:05:13

We've discussed it before at previous hearings, but as part of the process of discharging the requirements, the applicant has a duty to provide statements stating whether or not, um, the the detailed design or the matter of the application for discharge and whether that introduces any new or materially different environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement. So all of the elements that have been taken into account in terms of good design throughout the production of the application are still there and being considered at the detailed design stage when the when when things are being, um, discharged.

01:21:05:15 - 01:21:26:17

If I think the if the question is, is there a specific reference to there being that design champion in any of the management plans at the moment, then I think the answer is no, but we can take away the point as to whether we think that that would be helpful in terms of demonstrating the ongoing commitment from the applicant to good design in accordance with in one.

01:21:27:22 - 01:22:06:14

I suppose. I suppose the point is whether or not that that role exists. Um, and and there is a, there is, um, a person, a number of people with that, that design oversight. Um, and I suppose this like this brings me on to the next question, really, which is, um, so, uh, question 1.8.4, um, was looking at the question of whether local planning authorities have sufficient design experience and expertise to take on, um, design approval, approval, post consent, and whether an external um, or whether external design review would be necessary.

01:22:06:16 - 01:22:37:27

And it does appear from the response um, from Lincolnshire um County Council to that written question that external expertise may be required. So it's looking at how all of these things, these things come together, um, and understanding from the applicant, um, how that process of, of um, um, monitoring design, um, good design through these various stages, um, including at, at the post consent stage. How that's all all managed to best effect.

01:22:39:17 - 01:22:43:23

I concede that. And this writer, Mr. Topping, have got their hand up.

01:22:48:03 - 01:22:48:28

Do you want to come in?

01:22:53:15 - 01:23:27:03

Um, something called the applicant. Um, it was just to add to, um, to that process for him. Um, in terms of the, the consultation processes that we've gone through as part of this process, and I think the the design workshops that we've undertaken with the local authority, um, representatives to date have been influential in this process, too. Um, so just just to set that out. So I suppose in my response, um, the authority we have welcomed that engagement, um, and it has formed a significant part of the process as well.

01:23:27:12 - 01:23:36:13

Um, so again, if there's a mechanism for that to continue, as I'm sure that there would be, as there always is, as part of that detail process then. So you welcome that.

01:23:37:16 - 01:24:16:15

And ma'am. Wendy Wright for the applicant. As part of that process, we've actively engaged with heritage topics and ecology topics, um, in bringing forward proposals for mitigation. And we appreciate that that that has to be taken into the round in terms of, uh, the, the independent, um, impacts between the topic areas. Um, and obviously then we also are cognizant of the fact that we need to refer to the various character assessments that underpin the Elvia to understand that the, um, the nature of planting the species types.

01:24:16:17 - 01:24:32:04

And and again, we'll be guided by that through the local authority, um consultation process in, in putting together detailed, uh, planting plans and the detailed design for the scheme, um, at those detailed stages.

01:24:33:14 - 01:24:54:08

Okay. Thank you. I think the broader question does remain about, um, supporting that process and working with the local authorities post consent. Um, and I don't know whether Miss Broderick or anyone else is able to assist with with that that particular point. Yes, Miss Broderick.

01:24:55:22 - 01:25:33:10

Uh, the applicant, I think it's one will take away to have a look at whether there are any additional wording that could be added to any of the the management plans. Obviously we are when you're looking at good design and what more can be achieved. Um, you are that is constrained by the nature of the development that is being undertaken. So obviously there are technical elements to obviously the configuration of the solar panels, the substation, the energy storage, etc.. So obviously E-m1 acknowledges that there is a limit to the extent to which, um, design, good design can be achieved when balanced with the technical requirements that you're working within.

01:25:33:12 - 01:26:00:15

We've obviously sought to include a number of principles within the concept design parameters, uh, document in terms of, you know, the color of certain aspects, um, and those sorts of external elements of the scheme. But we'll have a look and see whether there is a whether there is opportunity for and the extent to which there are opportunities to further inform good design as, as the detailed design comes forward over and above what we've already committed to do.

01:26:00:27 - 01:26:02:11

All right. Thank you.

01:26:04:07 - 01:26:14:24

I don't know whether either of the local authorities want to to add anything further on on, uh, design issues or the management of design matters post consent.

01:26:21:10 - 01:26:24:16

Okay. Um, yes. Mr. McBride.

01:26:27:15 - 01:26:54:24

You know, Liam. Uprisings kind of council. Yeah. I mean, I think that's something we would, um, you know, welcome and involvement in, uh, I think at the moment, the way the, um, discharge of the requirement is, is set out that would be undertaken by, um, West Lindsey District Council. But, uh, obviously, if we can, uh, contribute to that, then we do, we'll do where we're able to in terms of what expertise we have or, you know, but we can maybe bring in to to assist in that process.

01:26:56:00 - 01:26:56:19

Thank you.

01:26:59:13 - 01:27:03:00

And I just got one more point to pick up on. Um.

01:27:04:19 - 01:27:42:08

For B, and that's in relation to, um, a point made by the applicant and their cover letter for the deadline for submissions. And this relates to the separation of the cables connecting, um, work number three C and work number four. Um, so this sets out that this is page five of the applicant's cover letter for the deadline for submissions. And it sets out that the separation of the cables can be reduced, um, resulting in minimization of impacts during construction and land and landowner easement widths.

01:27:42:10 - 01:28:02:00

And I just wondered what the implications of that were for, um, for scheme design and also land requirements. Um, and this, this, this may be something that the applicant would like to clarify in a written response, but I just wanted to raise it here.

01:28:06:15 - 01:28:21:15

I'm not talking to the applicant. I think it's something I'd like to take away, ma'am. Um, provide a detailed response to that. I'm not sure. I'm not sure it's specifically landscape related, although it does affect sites. I'll let Mr. Roderick come in, but this might be.

01:28:24:21 - 01:28:27:16

Yes, Miss Broderick, what do you like to say?

01:28:36:05 - 01:29:13:27

Uh, the applicant. Um, I think that we had relooked at the separation distances required for the HDD elements of the scheme. Um, and however, whilst the separation, whilst it's possible to reduce the separation distances from a land, uh, sort of an order land perspective, which I think is what you're asking in terms of, um, whether the order limits should therefore be reduced in some way as a result of the ability to narrow the separation distances, we still require that ability to microsite the location of the HDD within the cable route corridor.

01:29:14:07 - 01:29:43:05

And that we've selected and we've stated in the statement of reasons that we'd only be seeking compulsory acquisition powers over the actual um, as built area for the for the cable. So obviously, if it's a narrower corridor because we've been able to do that HDD, um, with smaller separation distances, then we would only be seeking to exercise the powers over that smaller area. However, we need to retain the ability to microsite it. That's fine. Extent of the um.

01:29:43:27 - 01:30:10:00

Okay. Thank you. Yes, I raised it here just because it was it was under the concept design parameters. Um, part of of of that um, the cover letter. Um. I understand the point that this Broderick's making, but if there are any wider implications for, um, uh, any other implications, should I say then then it will be helpful to understand that, but I will include that as a, as a written question. So to, to allow exploration of that. Um.

01:30:13:09 - 01:30:20:12

I'm just going to ask if there are any other, um, points to raise under item. Um, for B.

01:30:25:24 - 01:30:32:21

Okay. I think Mr. Blake is is back with us. Um. Now.

01:30:34:19 - 01:31:03:27

I'm aware from Mr. Sheikh's comments earlier on that Mr. Baker may have some observations to make in terms of the, um, uh, the comments that were made around landscape character assessment, but he perhaps hasn't heard, um, what was said earlier on. So I'm hesitant to say, should we, should we have a break now, bearing in mind that Mr. Blake has already sort of just arrived? Um. Mr.. What do you think the best thing to do is in these circumstances?

01:31:04:06 - 01:31:34:06

Somerset West, Lindsay district. Ma'am, I think we're content to respond to that particular point in writing. Um, but it might be that I can raise the other point that I was waiting for him to be in the room in case he wanted to respond to the applicant response. Um, the other point that we wish to raise was about the, uh, methodology in reaching the conclusions that there would be no change in relation to landscape impacts between 40 and 60 years if the project were extended temporally.

01:31:34:08 - 01:31:45:04

And the question about methodology relates to the application in terms of magnitude of change in taking into account the increased duration.

01:31:47:21 - 01:31:55:13

And it's firstly a question of clarification because the. Summary of Significant Effects document.

01:31:57:24 - 01:32:39:18

It doesn't explain the methodology that was adopted, or the professional judgment that was applied in reaching the conclusion that there was no change. So the first question is, is how that, um, duration, extended duration was actually applied methodologically. And secondly. And probably contingent on the response to that. It's our view is that the duration, albeit we accept that professional judgment has to be applied in in considering whether a scheme is short, medium or long term, the extended duration of another 20 years to this project is equivalent to in three terms, another long project.

01:32:39:20 - 01:33:03:00

So in and of itself, 20 years would be classified as long on the guidelines for Elvia assessments. And so on that basis, um, how that is incorporated into the judgment, if the judgment is that it's still classified as long, whether it be 40 or 60 years, how that duration affects the magnitude of change and how that's been adopted in the methodology.

01:33:08:00 - 01:33:08:15

It's.

01:33:09:13 - 01:33:18:23

Um, locked up in for the applicant. Um, ma'am, this may be one that, again, we take away and come back to you with a definitive response. Um.

01:33:20:12 - 01:33:21:13

Bailey. Um.

01:33:21:15 - 01:33:33:25

I think that makes sense. It's quite an involved question, and, um, and a thorough response would be, um, would be helpful, I think. Um, miss Broderick, you've got your hand up also.

01:33:35:15 - 01:34:05:16

Uh, Atkins. Um. I believe we've maybe dealt with this point before, but it was just to say that obviously the methodology that was used when when carrying out that review was the same methodology that set out in, um, chapter two of the environmental statement, and then any subsequent further information on methodology that is set out in for the in respect of the individual chapters. So the methodology used to carry out the review is the same.

01:34:05:18 - 01:34:47:06

There isn't a need to set out the same information again in that like significant six years document, because the methodology that which instance is the same methodology that is in chapter two of the environmental statement and any of the relevant appendices. So, um, I don't think it's correct to say we haven't provided any information because we've used the same methodology as was used to undertake the original environmental statement. But I note that, um, Mr. Topping has said that we will provide some further information specifically in relation to Elvia and how when obviously the using the Bolivia methodology, that this the conclusions are the same.

01:34:47:27 - 01:34:55:27

Um, but we will address that in writing. But it was just to note the point that there is information about the methodology used, and that's where you can change any industry. Thank you.

01:34:56:19 - 01:34:59:21

Thank you, Mr. Broderick. Mr. Schaake, did you want to come back?

01:35:00:09 - 01:35:37:15

Yes. Yes, please miss Western District Council, but as a point, that which I ought to clarify from this project's benefit is that we're not suggesting that the methodology has changed. What we're asking for is an explanation as to how the methodology has been applied, because we're not entirely clear from the Summary of Significant Effects document as to whether or not the extended duration has been incorporated into the magnitude of change, and if a professional judgment has been reached as to whether this is in the media, it is still remained in the long categories in terms of temporal, um, limitations.

01:35:37:17 - 01:36:04:00

Whether or not we're talking about long or something beyond that, for instance, very long, and how importantly, if another 20 or 50 years or something beyond that were added, how that would be incorporated, applying the theory and the duration of change to the magnitude of change. So that's our question. It's a we would invite explanation as to how the conclusion has been reached. Applying the methodology.

01:36:06:27 - 01:36:07:28

Thank you, Mr. Sheikh.

01:36:10:27 - 01:36:51:00

All right. It's it's now, um, 4:06, and I'm going to suggest we have a break. Um, before we do that, um. It's looking. Looking like it may be a bit of a challenge to to get through everything today. And I noted early on we have got tomorrow, tomorrow morning in reserve. I just wanted to ask, um, I did indicate earlier on that we would finish, um, around five to today. Does anybody have any particular time constraints this evening? Um, would anyone object to finishing, let's say 5:30 or 6:00? Does anyone want to make any comment?

01:36:52:19 - 01:36:53:26

Yes, Miss Broderick.

01:36:55:26 - 01:37:09:09

Uh. Um, I think from the applicant's perspective, we would appreciate the opportunity to run a bit longer and try and deal with all of the agenda items today, if that, if that's possible for others, particularly as we've got quite a large cast of.

01:37:11:14 - 01:37:26:16

Impacts. Um, and we're not quite sure how many of those are actually going to be required as to whether, you know, it's going to be a maybe when we get to agenda item five, we can have a further review. But that's definitely our preference if that's if that's um, understood.

01:37:27:15 - 01:37:29:24

I'll hear from others. I'll hear from others. Mr. McBride.

01:37:31:26 - 01:37:39:20

Continue with providing some kind of counsel. I'd certainly struggle to go up beyond 5:30 to go to 5:30, but I'd have to leave then.

01:37:40:00 - 01:37:43:12

Understood. Thank you. Um. Uh, Mr. Brown?

01:37:45:17 - 01:37:52:07

At Oliver Brown, Lancashire County Council. Yes, same as Mr. McBride at 5:30. Okay. Fortunately.

01:37:52:09 - 01:37:55:00

All right. Lovely. Now thank you. And and, Mr. Sheikh.

01:37:55:08 - 01:37:55:23

Uh.

01:37:56:15 - 01:38:07:18

Ma'am, unfortunately, on my side, I think 5 p.m. is the cut off, at very least for Mr. Blake. And he's going to struggle to to stay beyond that. So I'd be reluctant to say that we're happy to go beyond that.

01:38:07:27 - 01:38:12:04

And. And is Mr. Blake dealing specifically with, with landscape matters?

01:38:12:11 - 01:38:20:26

Uh, Mr. Blake has been dealing with a number of matters, including landscape. So I would prefer that he be in attendance for landscape and the cumulative assessment.

01:38:21:04 - 01:38:34:29

All right. Okay, well, we'll have a short break now. Um. Very short. Um, could could we return at, um, at 415, please? And then we'll progress and see how far we get this afternoon. Thank you very much, everyone.