



## Trawsgrifiad Gwrandawriad

<b>Prosiect:</b>	Fferm Wynt Alltraeth Mona
<b>Grandawriad:</b>	Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol 2 (ISH2) – Rhan 6
<b>Dyddiad:</b>	18 Gorffennaf 2024

**Sylwer:** Bwriad y ddogfen hon yw i gynorthwyo Partion â Buddiant, nid yw'n air am air.

Cynhyrchir y cynnwys gan ddefnyddio llais i'r testun deallusrwydd artiffisial ac nid yw'n cael ei olygu. Oherwydd ymarferoldeb Microsoft Teams, mae'r trawsgrifiad yn arbennig o anghywir gyda'r iaith Gymraeg. Peidiwch â dehongli'r cyfieithiadau mor gywir. Mae'r recordiad fideo yn parhau fel prif gofnod y digwyddiad.



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Mona Offshore Wind Farm
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Part 6
<b>Date:</b>	18 July 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties; it is not verbatim.

The content is produced using artificial intelligence voice to text and is unedited. Due to the functionality of Microsoft Teams, the transcript is particularly inaccurate with the Welsh language. Please do not interpret the translations as accurate. The video recording remains as the primary record of the event.

**Mona\_ISH2\_18 July\_PT6**

Created on: 2024-07-18 10:01:28

Project Length: 01:35:18

File Name: Mona\_ISH2\_18 July\_PT6

File Length: 01:35:18

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:24 - 00:00:34:00

Okay, the time is 1050 and it is time to resume this hearing at item eight, which is landscape, seascape, and visual effects. So I will start by asking questions related to seascape matters and then move to landscape and visual matters. And on this item we've had requests to speak from Councillor Barlow and from Mr. Hussey. So I will ensure that you have the opportunity to speak during this item, but please do indicate if you wish to come in at any point to. Thank you.

00:00:38:04 - 00:01:09:25

So to start with seascape, and I'm going to ask a small number of questions for the applicant about the general approach and methodology of the seascape assessments. And these questions will include the maximum design scenario, the representative viewpoints and the assessment of effects for statutory designated landscapes. These questions are primarily to explore the approach to the seascape assessment, but also to aid my understanding and also to explore 1 or 2 issues raised by Natural Resources Wales in their relevant rep.

00:01:10:15 - 00:01:24:22

But as they are not present today, and as I would have liked to have asked them directly about their representation, I'll deal with this. and the applicant's response by first written questions and then potentially into the next hearings. So my questions today primarily for the applicant.

00:01:26:24 - 00:01:52:15

So my first question concerns the two design scenarios for the turbines. And these are defined in the project description which is reference app 050. And the scenarios one and two which are the bounding scenarios. So could I ask the applicant? Um, how will the turbine siting and layouts within both of these scenarios be chosen to avoid visual harm in the context of seascape and visual impacts?

00:02:19:21 - 00:02:20:12

Baradar.

00:02:23:09 - 00:02:27:21

Cutting the demo duty and Congress deal with.

00:02:29:25 - 00:02:35:22

Good morning. My name is Karina DeMar. I am the landscape consultant for the applicant.

00:02:37:28 - 00:02:48:25

So if we're talking about seascape um we are talking about the layout. So so the MDS first of all is um,

00:02:50:10 - 00:03:20:23

that of three six four meter high turbines. The fewer, taller turbines. The taller turbines were chosen because when running the Z TV for those taller turbines at 364, that through the Z TV, a wider, uh, landscape and seascape area. So that that was the turbine chosen. Type chosen.

00:03:21:29 - 00:03:31:26

It was chosen as edge weighted. So there would be more turbines on the outer edges of the boundary. Um, of the Moana array area.

00:03:33:17 - 00:03:44:07

Moana array area would not change for either Ms1 or MS2 two, or anything in between. That is the set boundary.

00:03:46:18 - 00:03:52:11

List done on behalf of the applicant. I think responding to your question in terms of how design will then be taken.

00:03:52:13 - 00:04:30:19

Into, or how C scope considerations will be taken into the final design of the project. Um, the applicant's assessment, um, demonstrates that as the distances we are discussing for the purposes of both and we are talking about the wind turbine array here. Not not the onshore elements. Yes. Um, that, um, that at the distances, um, at the distances where we're discussing the applicant's assessment considers that there are, uh, no significant effects as a result of, uh, of the presence of the turbines.

00:04:30:21 - 00:05:20:25

I think that's correct on, um, on, uh, visual receptors or on, um, national landscapes. And at that distance, the design of the wind farm is not going to change the assessment of significance, um, of those effects. So it isn't going to be, um, uh, whereas with other projects that are perhaps closer to shore, where you do have the sense of, um, of the scale of the turbines, the layout, those sorts of matters, the distances we're talking about here, which are over 28km, I believe, um, are such that the layout of the turbines is isn't going to, um, affect the final, um, uh, impacts that this game causes in respect of both visual effects and national landscapes.

00:05:22:11 - 00:05:31:19

Corinna Tanner for the applicant that. That's correct. They're actually over. The closest point is that to Penman Point and it's 29km away okay.

00:05:31:21 - 00:05:56:03

Thank you. So if I'm understanding correctly then so um policy statement um in three states siting layout obviously then should be chosen appropriately to minimize harm. So then is your response to that, that the distance obviously of the turbines offshore such that then that that consideration, um, essentially is, you know, essentially because they're so far offshore and you wouldn't the layout doesn't quite matter. As such.

00:05:56:12 - 00:05:58:25

We're in a demo for the applicant. That's correct. Yes.

00:05:59:03 - 00:05:59:27

Okay. Thank you.

00:06:02:21 - 00:06:03:06

Yeah.

00:06:03:08 - 00:06:31:03

I'm Paul Carter on behalf of the applicant. Just to just to add to that, um, clearly, uh, seascape landscape visual impacts was relevant to the sighting of the array boundary and is therefore, uh, the national policy statement requirements, um, is talked to by the sighting that we've undertaken of the array itself. The point you make about design, therefore not being the layout, not being relevant to that. Um, that uh, requirement in the National Policy statement is correct. Okay.

00:06:32:14 - 00:06:32:29

Thank you.

00:06:41:00 - 00:07:10:21

So then I think this question then probably follows on from that slightly as well. And I would imagine the answer is perhaps integrated into what you've just said. But so I did have a question in terms of, you know, in terms of visual impacts. Then at this distance, you know, could there be any significant difference then between a smaller, large, smaller number of larger turbines or a larger number of smaller turbines? And then how would that follow on then to essentially mean, um, the second scenario, which you've taken forward is the worst case scenario.

00:07:14:11 - 00:07:45:23

Is done on behalf of the applicant. Um, the way that the two scenarios were modeled. Um, the MDS, um, B was used, which is the smaller number of taller turbines. However, when the assessment was done, those turbines were placed right the way across the array area. So they don't they? Um, in terms of the modeling, they, um, they were placed they were what's called edge weighted, which means that all the turbines are towards the front so that you, you have the maximum movement towards the front.

00:07:45:25 - 00:08:04:24

So you get the greatest, um, you get the greatest, uh, visibility of the greatest number of turbines towards you over the widest extent. So they've been modelled across the whole array area. From an Slavia perspective, I think Miss Denmark's point. Um um,.

00:08:06:13 - 00:08:37:17

um, being that um, and then the larger turbines were chosen because they have the greatest visibility. So from a, from the Z TV perspective, the Z TVs and this probably comes to the points that were made earlier around the. But the Z TVs were modeled on the six six, sorry, three six four meter tip turbines. So they have the greater visibility. So therefore they were considered to be that was that that was the MDS that was taken forward for the assessment to do the worst case assessment.

00:08:37:27 - 00:08:58:16

Okay. Thank you. And then and again, I think you may have answered my question, but I was going to ask two is between the two scenarios in terms of the the sort of theoretical significance of effects. And then as you've assessed them, could be could there be any difference? Or are we to assume then that, you know, as you've assessed this is the the effects of the significance is the worst case.

00:09:01:06 - 00:09:11:17

List on on behalf of the applicant that there could potentially be minor differences using the smaller turbines. But at those sorts of distances they really aren't perceptible.

00:09:12:01 - 00:09:13:09

Okay. That's clear. Thank you.

00:09:26:20 - 00:09:50:06

Okay, so you've also said that the maximum blade tip height for scenario two has increased since the preliminary environmental information report. And that's being full from 324m to 364m. Um, and that this does not increase the significance of any potential effects. So could you explain again, I think I think this may come to the same point because you just explain how you came to that conclusion.

00:09:58:24 - 00:10:19:06

Karina. Daniel, for the applicant, uh, we've obviously redone the assessment from the pair from the three, two four 324 to the 364 height. Uh, it has been assessed on that higher turbine height. And um at that distance again it makes no difference to my to our assessment.

00:10:20:11 - 00:10:21:02

Okay. Thank you.

00:10:29:05 - 00:10:47:12

And then I think, yeah, referring to the references we provided earlier, and I think you've just confirmed then that the seascape assessment definitely was undertaken with the zone of theoretical visibility based on the 64 meter height. So then I might assume, I think where there were a couple of inconsistencies is that there's something that was an inconsistency in those documents lays.

00:10:47:14 - 00:11:16:02

Down on behalf of the applicant. Yes. That's where um, there are um, as you'd imagine, some of the material that was used for the final assessment was based from the material that was used at play, and those were things where keys or, um, things weren't updated and should have been. The assessment has been done on the three six four metre maximum tip height. We're happy to run through and do an errata corrections list there, just to make sure that everybody understands that. And it's clear.

00:11:16:12 - 00:11:24:06

Yes, that would be great. Thank you. If you take that as an action to, um, do the updates, the um, is will provide a list and thereafter list, I think.

00:11:33:07 - 00:12:02:23

Okay. So I'm now going to ask a few questions about the representative viewpoints for the seascape assessments. And again this is this is mainly to further my understanding of your approach. Um, I just like to ask the applicant, please, how how to describe how the representative viewpoints for the seascape assessment were chosen. So I'm not I'm not looking for a description of every viewpoint. Um, you know, the justification. It's more just the, the process, the perhaps the process and the consultation that you went through to, to get to those particular views. Thank you.

00:12:06:05 - 00:12:40:08

Karina demo for the applicant. Yes, we ran the Z TV at three, six, four meters high, and, uh, we passed that in front of, um, natural. Uh, well, all statutory consultees and the statutory consultees are requested that we look at the key points that were used for our well and more, and we took those. Some of those weren't relevant because of the location where we were in the sea.

00:12:40:10 - 00:13:02:05

So we were further west northwest. Um, so we were able to, uh, strike those out, but we looked at are the ones that we picked up from that lay within the Z TV, and we looked at additional ones that requested by consultees as well. So that's how they were chosen.

00:13:04:11 - 00:13:22:15

Thank you. Um, and then for the statutory designated landscapes, obviously we've got a very national park, the Isle of Anglesey, included in range in the Valley national landscape. Were there any with this particular process in in terms of the viewpoints from those areas? Um, any further consultation or was it broadly similar?

00:13:23:06 - 00:13:53:21

Corinna Tomar for the applicant? Yes. Again, um, we looked at and we suggested um, viewpoints within the national nationally designated areas. Both the National Park Area National Park and Natural Resources Wales confirmed that they didn't want us to look at our weather and um, due to the fact that it was beyond 60km from the Mona Ouray area.

00:13:54:07 - 00:14:24:03

The others, um, taken up were suggested by NSW. Um, we also suggested some additional ones in Ararat because we recognise that The height of the mountains there might give you a wider view. So not only Kenneth Llewellyn, but we looked at Kenneth David and we looked at, uh, one lower down and also one towards the, uh, closer, but lower down to 11.

00:14:25:20 - 00:14:26:05

Thank you.

00:14:37:11 - 00:14:52:08

Um, and then obviously, when deciding those particular viewpoints, perhaps the actual aspects that you're looking at. Was there any consideration or specific, um, consideration of reference to the special characteristics of these landscapes? Um, as defined.

00:14:55:17 - 00:15:28:16

In a demo for the applicant. Yes. We looked at the special qualities of all three of the nationally designated landscapes. So we looked at the Isle of Anglesey National Landscape National Park and the Corinthian Range and Deep Valley National Landscape. And those are in a separate, um, they're summarized within the chapter AP 060. And uh, they're also, um, investigated in a because it was quite a large study.

00:15:28:25 - 00:15:36:19

We had a separate, um, annex to the chapter which looks specifically at those special qualities.

00:15:41:27 - 00:16:10:07

Oh. Let's see. Um, were they relevant to, um, choosing the viewpoints? No. Um, we chose the viewpoints because they were the most obvious. So if they were visible, then if the turbines were visible in that they lay within the TV. Then of course, there was a possibility. There was the potential for an effect on those special qualities. So those were the viewpoints chosen. So viewpoints weren't chosen if they didn't lie within the said TV.

00:16:11:14 - 00:16:12:03

Okay. Thank you.

00:16:25:29 - 00:17:02:03

And then so I think you will have seen that the examining authority undertook an unaccompanied site inspection last month, in June. And and as part of that, we looked at certain locations in and around some clandestino. So some heritage locations, for example, but also, um, where there could be seascape views which form a part of their setting. Um, so a couple of examples are the Happy Valley Pleasure Gardens and Clandon Napier. And we also separately visited Galloway Castle, which has used towards the Moana Offshore Array area from the Nancy Bell Tower.

00:17:03:03 - 00:17:08:29

Um, and I'd like to ask would with these, were these considered as potential viewpoints for the assessment?

00:17:11:14 - 00:17:27:06

Group for the applicant. As landscape consultant, I don't look at the settings of heritage assets so that that's for my heritage colleagues. Um, no. We looked at publicly accessible viewpoints and that's what we look at only.

00:17:27:15 - 00:17:28:12

Okay. That's clear. Thank you.

00:17:35:05 - 00:18:05:25

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the settings of, um, coastal. Onshore infrastructure and and and potential impacts on those listed buildings is is in is within app 150. Uh Greg castle is considered in that, um, I would need to double check on Clandestino pier. Um, and Happy Valley. I don't think Happy Valley was that's listed, but, um, certainly, uh, app 150 has the full consideration of of those potential effects.



00:18:07:17 - 00:18:10:21

Yep, they are in there. That's correct. And I think a significant.

00:18:10:23 - 00:18:42:20

Effect is identified for those assets. I think the question is the interrelationship between the two. So where you've identified significant effects in the The heritage chapter, sorry, that might not be the right title, but that that chapter of the environmental statement. Um, I think our question is, is there an interrelationship between the setting for some of those heritage assets, which might include seascape as part of their setting and where the viewpoints were chosen from those things as part of the landscape, because there is an interrelationship there.

00:19:21:16 - 00:19:52:27

Karina. Demo for the applicant. Um, so leading on from what I said about doing the representative viewpoints from publicly accessible areas. These are representative viewpoints only. And so the groups of people at those particular positions, we've actually assessed as group receptors in App 060. So we haven't just looked identified just and assessed just the, um, what people can see from those representative viewpoints.

00:19:52:29 - 00:20:06:00

But the wider area suspended now. And we've actually looked at night time effects on those groups of people as well. So we haven't just restricted ourselves to what you can see from that representative viewpoint.

00:20:07:03 - 00:20:07:22

Okay. Thank you.

00:20:21:04 - 00:20:51:19

Okay. So, um, I noted some concerns raised about the seascape visualizations from RW and, um, obviously your response to those. Um, and again, I think as I said earlier, I might deal with this slightly later on in the process. Um, first written questions, but I would just like to pick up on one of their points raised about the seascape visualisations. Um, and they did um, ask or request um, cumulative wildlife visualizations showing the whole animal development. Um, along with the other tier one developments.

00:20:52:07 - 00:21:03:21

They said that this would be useful. Um, and I think this would be particularly useful for, um, the visualisations given the proximity of those two developments. So is this something that you would be able to provide for us, please?

00:21:19:02 - 00:21:26:22

I forecast on behalf of the applicant. Could you just confirm that you're talking here about the offshore array and the Alamo offshore array? Yes. I'm.

00:21:29:18 - 00:21:55:21

Going to demo for the applicant. Yes. We undertook wire lines, cumulative wire lines that for the, uh, that included the Alamo, um, array as well as all the other tier two um arrays in there at the back of um, the seascape visualisations. Sorry. App part seven of the seascape visualisations.

00:21:55:28 - 00:21:57:26

We can confirm the number for that shortly.

00:22:00:19 - 00:22:03:12

Yes. Is that something just to be able to confirm please. Yeah. Thank you.

00:22:05:15 - 00:22:10:08

Corona demo for the applicant. That's app 159.

00:22:17:18 - 00:22:19:13

Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I'll take that away. Thank you.

00:22:25:04 - 00:22:31:05

And I'm. We did have a hand up from Miss Cressy, but But I see the hand has gone down now. Did you want to come in?

00:22:34:04 - 00:22:47:19

Sorry, I tell you from Welsh Government. I was just going to add that anything from cattle we can include in the letter. We've committed to sending in by the 7th of August, the first deadline.

00:22:49:12 - 00:22:50:07

Okay. Thank you.

00:22:56:07 - 00:23:02:09

Karina. Demo for the applicant. Sorry. Could I correct that? App number is app 112.

00:23:03:00 - 00:23:03:26

Thank you. Um.

00:23:12:13 - 00:23:19:00

And just to confirm that they definitely do show the the all the more um, in the wireline visualizations.

00:23:19:16 - 00:23:29:26

They do indeed. And we ran the TVs for all of these groups of T1 and T2 as well. And those are at the end of the chapter. Um app 060.

00:23:30:03 - 00:23:30:18

Okay.

00:23:30:20 - 00:23:31:05

Okay, thanks.

00:23:41:09 - 00:24:22:18

Okay, so I now briefly consider the assessment of effects within the seascape assessment. Um, and again noting concerns from Natural Resources Wales. And we'll come to those again later on. Um, so I think it would be more um, yeah. As I say, I think it would be more appropriate to explore this, perhaps by written questions. But the last one question about how you've judged significance of effects in the context of the special characteristics on the statutory designated landscapes. And again, to aid my understanding of this really. So, um, in the assessment in the international Nationally designated landscape study, you've said, um, sorry app um 105.

00:24:23:05 - 00:24:54:17

You've said, referring to the Olivia three um, guidance. That's the assessment of significance is essentially a matter of judgment as well as the process of the assessment. Um, and this is also something that you've said in the seascape assessment. So just like to ask if you could expand upon how you judge between significance and non-significant in this context. So for example, where, you know, you do have obviously a, a matrix that will then show that in the assessment, you have also said that sometimes it's not necessarily just going through that process.

00:24:54:19 - 00:24:58:28

So we're just like to understand a little bit more about that please. In the context maybe of Moana.

00:25:00:24 - 00:25:35:07

In the demo for the applicant. Yes. Our um, our methodology is set out in our, um, specific annex to, to the landscape and the seascape chapters. Um, that set out quite clearly. Um, we follow Govea through as our Landscape Institute's guidance and our EMA guidance. We also have taken on board the so so all of our definitions of where we sit, where the impact assessment and the sensitivity is set out there quite clearly.

00:25:35:09 - 00:26:06:06

And the matrix, uh, refers to those um definitions as well. So that so it is set out clearly. Um we use and we take our guidance from also on seascape on the DTI 2005 guidance which white 2020 uses. Um and he confirms that that's um correct. That is key guidance. So Govia three and DTI 2005.

00:26:06:26 - 00:26:54:06

And um, he actually states that, uh, he actually states that when he's judging significance or the DTI, when they're judging significance, sort of minor, up to minor, moderate are not significant and moderate major are significant and moderate. The the definition of moderate or the judgment at moderate has to be made. And he um, he basically says what DTI say and confirms that DTI um 2005 say which is how we use it as well, which is the effects of moderate adverse significance, could be judged as significant, although it is most likely that they are not.

00:26:54:28 - 00:27:12:22

And so that's that's where we use our professional judgment to actually make that decision. If they are a moderate effect coming out of our matrices that we use in our methodologies, then we use our professional judgment to decide whether they are major or not. Sorry, significant or not.

00:27:13:21 - 00:27:23:27

Thank you. And could I ask, um, would I be able to ask what might that professional judgment include? What might what may you be looking at as part of your judgment in.

00:27:23:29 - 00:27:40:28

A demo for the applicant? Yes. It's the sensitivity. The actual sensitivity of the resource or the receptor will, will, will tip it. And so what we actually look at is, for example, is it a nationally designated landscape if we're looking at a landscape resource.

00:27:46:05 - 00:27:46:20

Thank you.

00:27:53:23 - 00:28:12:17

And then I have one last question on, um, seascape effects. And this is concerning the mitigations. And and it's just a quick question. I think, um, the turbine color I noticed secured by the Maryland license. But the lighting, which is a mitigation tool, is in the DCO. And would you be able to explain the rationale for that, please?

00:28:52:09 - 00:29:25:21

List done on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think you're referring to the marine licence condition 14 one and 14 two. Um, that separates out the, um, the color of the, um, the, uh, struct, the the foundation structures and what you'd call the transition piece structures that the turbines sit on. They are, um, required by Trinity House guidance to be yellow color or all 023. So that is a that's a safety requirement in terms of that color.

00:29:26:03 - 00:29:59:06

Uh, in terms of the other color that's mentioned, uh, which is for the for the remainder of the, um, the, the tower and then the blades, those are listed in the DCO at sorry, in the D marine license at, at condition 14 two as grey colour or a L7 035. Um that I think is just standard practice. It's appeared in a number of other. It hasn't been specified by any party, but it tends to be a recessive colour that binds are painted at.

00:29:59:19 - 00:30:07:19

We can check whether whether it's been raised by any party, but it's it appears in a number of um Dean marine licenses and has just been included here.

00:30:08:00 - 00:30:40:04

I think our question is, um, that is put forward as the mitigation for seascape effects the color. It's not necessarily about what the color that you've chosen. It's the rationale behind it. Is that the correct place for that to be secured in the DML, or should that also be part of the actually be on the face of the DCO as well, because you've got like you've got lighting and color or are both proposed mitigation for seascape effects lighting secured in a requirement on the face of the DCO, whereas colour is only at the moment in in in the DML condition.

00:30:41:03 - 00:31:11:12

List done on behalf of the applicant. Um the landscape mitigation through lighting is, to be honest, a tag on to the lighting requirement for CAA and mod. So it it's it's always kind of sat within that area. Um we can look at whether it's whether this is the right place for it. Um, uh, but typically I haven't seen that, I haven't seen that or used that previously on.

00:31:11:14 - 00:31:14:18

But we will, we will look at it as to as to whether it's in the right place.

00:31:14:20 - 00:31:15:06

Thank you.

00:31:19:03 - 00:31:27:06

Okay. Thank you. Um, and that now brings me to the end of my questions concerning seascape. Um, and I'll now move on to landscape part of this agenda. But.

00:31:29:25 - 00:31:30:26

May I ask a question, please?

00:31:30:28 - 00:31:31:13

Yeah. Please do.

00:31:31:20 - 00:32:15:21

Okay. Um, Martin Barlow, Kevin Merida community council. Um, it's probably my unfamiliarity with the acronyms that have been used, But, um, from a purely layman's point of view, it from what's been said. Someone could go away with the impression that the turbines are virtually invisible, um, due to distance, etc.. Um, could I just to be absolutely clear. Um, confirm that, in fact, the whole array is visible from, uh, the shore, but it but the the effects are deemed to be the visual effects are deemed to be insignificant.

00:32:18:29 - 00:32:57:14

Let's done on behalf of the applicant. Um, the turbines will be visible from shore in certain conditions because of the distance. There will be many days on which they won't be visible and an information has been provided about about those, the visualizations that have been provided. So there are um, photo montages and um, vertical wireframes, which is where you remove any of the background information. You literally just show the turbines, um, do show the visibility of the turbines on, on the days, on very clear days when it will be possible to see that distance.

00:32:57:16 - 00:33:17:28

So the assessment that has been undertaken, um, has been undertaken, uh, on those turbines being visible. However, taking account of uh, based on meteorological data and other things, the likelihood and the sort of duration of those of, of the visibility of those turbines.

00:33:20:10 - 00:33:25:00

I have you have you, have you had a look at have you had sight of those visualizations?

00:33:25:02 - 00:33:46:08

I have, but you have not recently. Um, Martin Barlow Community Council, just for information, is it possible the figure of 28, 29km offshore has been mentioned? Is it possible to give an indication of how that compares with, say, the current wind farms in Samoa and so on?

00:33:57:26 - 00:34:05:06

We can provide that information and show you a figure that includes that if that's acceptable. Or we could put it on the screen, whichever the preferences.

00:34:05:22 - 00:34:09:13

I think. Are you just asking as a as a comparison? Um,

00:34:11:05 - 00:34:11:23

yes. Yes.

00:34:11:25 - 00:34:12:12

I mean, you know.

00:34:12:14 - 00:34:16:02

Obviously this is going to be more at so you can make a comparison between.

00:34:16:04 - 00:34:18:00

Precisely I mean, one is aware of.

00:34:18:02 - 00:34:20:16

The I think that is in the application documents and.

00:34:20:18 - 00:34:27:14

Where the information is in the application documents, I will provide you with that. It's significantly further than the existing windfarms that you think.

00:34:27:16 - 00:34:31:27

It probably would be helpful if you could put that up on the screen for Councillor Barlow. Thank you.

00:35:06:27 - 00:35:18:19

If it's helpful for the decision, we believe we've seen the distances in the other offshore um, users chapter that's helpful to you. That's why we can't help it is.

00:35:18:21 - 00:35:21:05

I think we were going to bring up a figure that showed it visually, but.

00:35:21:10 - 00:35:27:25

It's not it's not necessarily necessary to see it now, but it would be useful to have future reference to it.

00:35:28:06 - 00:35:34:22

Maybe if if the applicant can just draw attention, have you got it? Have you got it to hand? No. That's fine.

00:35:34:24 - 00:35:36:14

We'll draw Mr. Butler's attention during the lunch time.

00:35:36:16 - 00:35:37:20

Yeah that's fine, thank you.

00:35:40:13 - 00:36:10:19

Okay. Thank you. Are there any are there any other comments about any seascape matters or issues. And no I don't see any hands. So yes, I'll now move on to the landscape assessment and the landscape. Uh, this um, this uh item. So again, my questions are mainly for the applicant, but I appreciate other interested parties may also wish to come in to speak. So please do indicate if that's the case. Um, and also make sure that there is an opportunity for you to speak after I've asked my questions.

00:36:11:20 - 00:36:33:02

Um, my questions are primarily about the methodology and assessments of the landscape assessments. Um, and these kind of theoretical visibility, representative viewpoints and the assessment of impacts. So I'll start with the zone of theoretical theoretical visibility. Um, and I'd just like you to describe how you determined this will be. Onshore substation site, please.

00:36:37:13 - 00:37:12:28

Put in a demo for the applicant. Yes. The, um, onshore substation site. Uh, the finished level of the platform that it will be built on is actually sloping. And it slopes from, um 61m AOD to 57m AOD. We then put a height of a building, the tallest building of 15m on top of that, and so the Zed TV was run at 72 to 76m AOD.

00:37:14:03 - 00:37:15:18

That's how we ran the TV.

00:37:17:17 - 00:37:28:16

Thank you. I noticed that the, um, you mention as well that there are lightning protection masts, which are 30m high. And would these be a factor at all in determining there's a TV or.

00:37:30:22 - 00:38:01:18

So we run this Z TV on the bulk of the building. Um, you're correct that the lightning protection would be up to 30m high. I think requirement six says that there will be up to 12 of them and those. Um, so if you, uh, we did an assessment looking at the height of the we don't know where they'll be on that platform, which is why they weren't put in the visualisations.

00:38:02:07 - 00:38:49:19

The Z TV was run to ten kilometers from the outer edges of the um substation platform, which would take into account, uh, the, uh, buffer required for something of 30km, but agreed that the Z TV was run on the building height. Um, if we consider that the overhead lines, uh, the 400 kV lines that are in the views, our 50 to 54km s kilometres metres high, then we can see that the 30 metre high lightning

rods wouldn't break the skyline of the cloud range from the west, which is where the most sensitive viewpoints are.

00:38:51:27 - 00:39:03:23

So. So we've done a we've done a comparison if you like. But but if you wish us to put the lightning conductors on us on a visualization, we can do that. We've discussed that. Doing that.

00:39:03:25 - 00:39:09:23

Yes please. Yeah. That would be useful. Um, I think it would be useful just to see how visible they are from, from different viewpoints.

00:39:10:02 - 00:39:10:20

Understood.

00:39:10:25 - 00:39:25:01

And perhaps also add them into I think in your design principles documents, you have figure one, two, um, which I know is a sort of notional layout, but it may also be useful to, to see the scale of them in terms of, you know, in relation to the rest of the buildings. Thank you.

00:39:29:00 - 00:39:55:10

Um, and you mentioned there as well that the, um, the zone of theoretical visibility is determined on the sort of the bulk layout of the buildings. Um, but from my understanding of the, um, you know, the substation, uh, design and the assessments and then the design principles, that layout doesn't really appear to be finalized yet. So. So would there be any could there be any effect on the assessment given that, you know.

00:39:59:24 - 00:40:26:25

We're in a demo for the applicant. Yes. We put the, uh, buildings to the north of the platform, which is the most exposed area of the platform. So obviously the electrical layout might change slightly, but we have put them in the to the north. So the most prominent position on that platform and assessed that and we've assessed it without any, you know, facade optimisation on colour and things like that. So yes.

00:40:27:17 - 00:40:29:07

That's the worst case. Sorry.

00:40:29:29 - 00:40:49:28

And that most prominent location is from both close up and afar. So let's say, you know, from the assessment of viewpoints, obviously we have a number of viewpoints which are very close and the number of viewpoints which are quite far away. So if I understand them, then that assessment is essentially you can see it from both close and far away. And the most prominent location.

00:40:50:06 - 00:40:52:24

Karuna demo for the applicant. That's correct. Yes. Thank you.

00:41:01:29 - 00:41:21:27



Mr. Hobbins. Can I just ask one question, please? Yes. Please do. Sorry. Um, can you just clarify? Clarify for me? Probably my ignorance. When you say platform, what does that actually mean? Is that the substation building itself, or is that the sort of the whole whole, um, hardcore substrate?

00:41:24:26 - 00:41:40:12

Um, it's the it's the it's the starting point. It's effectively the foundation B of substation. So it's, it's the point where the, where the substation is level, that's the platform on which the building will be the erected.

00:41:43:06 - 00:41:50:17

That would include all the different, all the different buildings, etc., etc. it would be that all the concreted area if I like.

00:41:53:19 - 00:42:05:12

Forecast on behalf of the applicant. Correct. So when we're talking about the platform, we're talking about the area with inside the fence line of the substation, which is hardstanding, upon which any above ground structures would be placed.

00:42:05:14 - 00:42:05:29

Thank you.

00:42:08:03 - 00:42:47:07

Could I? Could I ask a follow up question, please? Martin. Kevin. I do. And you mentioned that the the ground sloped from 61 down to 57m above sea level, I think. Um. Presuming that the platform is horizontal, would Would thee. How can I put it? Would the platform be set in to the. Would the slope be excavated so that the platform is at ground level, at the lowest point of the site where the slope slopes down?

00:42:49:29 - 00:43:21:25

But Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, your Your understanding is, is more or less correct. The reason for the slope is to primarily tie in with the drainage requirements for the onshore substation. So obviously that will target the low point which where we're where we've identified our sustainable drainage system, the the pond essentially for attenuation purposes. And so the slope is to take it from the the cut into the slope I think in this the southwest corner down to the northeast corner as it's currently aligned.

00:43:27:00 - 00:43:29:01

Is that answer your question, Councilor Barlow?

00:43:29:16 - 00:43:31:22

I think so, thank you.

00:43:36:11 - 00:43:54:05

So I'm now going to, um, come to the zone of theoretical visibility again. And, um, then in combination with the representative viewpoints. So could I ask, um, that you display the landscape assessment that's at 069 and figure 6.4, please. Okay.

00:44:33:05 - 00:44:47:14

Sorry. Thank you. Um, so just a couple of questions on this. Um, so, firstly, um, could I ask you, as before, to explain the broad process for how these viewpoints were selected and chosen? You know, consultation, as you said?

00:44:50:15 - 00:45:32:25

Here in a demo for the applicant? Yes, partly they were derived from when we had a pair, when we had two different options. Um, we identified again the most sensitive viewpoints or the most, um, obvious closest viewpoints. So that's that's how we identify them. We were very keen to get the viewpoints within the fluid in range, particularly those from the office type path, because that's a national trail through the meridian range. So our highest sense of sensitivity viewpoint, which is partly why we extended it to ten kilometers to include that and get the effects on the special qualities again, which are in that study.

00:45:33:12 - 00:46:07:19

Um, and then we looked at other sensitive public viewpoints, which are generally public rights of way. They are, um, if there are any areas of access land, and there were in the Claudine range. So we looked at that. And then where the view where the view of the substation was most open as well. So we looked at a variety, so geographical um, location as distance, but also where the Z TV indicated so from around, uh, different uh, geographical locations, according to the compass as well.

00:46:08:28 - 00:46:40:03

Thank you. Um, and so then if we were to look at the, um, the southeast of the ZT on this, um, on the screen here, you can see there's a, there's a sort of the bottom, right. Really. There's kind of an arc, if you like, of, um, an area which is, um, located at if I get the pronunciation correct, I think is Mueller Park, and that's on the meridian Meridian range in the Valley national landscape. So yeah, it's just that the, the bottom right of the, the zone of theoretical village at the last yellow, um, sort of uh, section if you'd like.

00:46:40:15 - 00:46:42:19

Yes. If you come down bottom, bottom. Right.

00:46:46:06 - 00:47:02:27

To that. Yeah. That's correct. Yeah. Thank you. Um, so this this area also has a section of the office dyke, um, path on it too. But I notice that there isn't a representative viewpoint from this area. So I would just like to understand why why there wasn't one taken from here.

00:47:04:04 - 00:47:35:03

Grenade em off the applicant. Um, this is partly on distance and partly on actually going there and having a look and seeing what we could see. So it's the angle. So, so, so basically what you've got uh, with the um, substation, it's in quite a wooded landscape. When you look at as you look at it from the Indian range and from that distance it's the angle. So you're not getting, um, sort of a full on view from that. And when you look at the actual, um, Z TV, it.

00:47:35:05 - 00:48:18:18

Yes, it takes into account block areas of woodland from the west 1 to 25,000, but it doesn't take into account individual trees, hedge banks, things like that. So. So um, or buildings indeed. So we had closer viewpoints where the impact was more, um, significant, if you like. Um, although we found that it wasn't significant. But if you see what I mean, it was it, was obviously more open and from closer representative viewpoints, and we were not asked to do any further viewpoints, um, than those that had requested.

00:48:19:16 - 00:48:20:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:48:31:18 - 00:49:09:16

Okay, so I now come to, um, the maximum design scenario and then on to, um, visualizations. So the maximum design scenario for the onshore substation, um, which is outlined in the um landscape assessment again. So that's at 069 and it's detailed in table 6.19 does describe the main equipment of the substation will either be housed within single or multiple buildings in an open space, or a combination of buildings and open space. So this may relate to a question that I did ask earlier, but some again could this affect landscape assessment and impacts I think really.

00:49:10:00 - 00:49:27:21

Because we again, I think as I alluded to earlier, we don't quite know what the layout of these buildings. There may be multiple, Okay. And it does. Yeah. You did say that the XPT was generated on the sort of the bulk aspect of it. Um, so could there be any potential effects of this on the assessment?

00:49:32:16 - 00:49:48:20

For in a demo for the applicant, as, as we said before, we've done the worst case. So, um, so we have looked at the, the 15 metre high building in the most prominent place. Any rearrangement of that would be a lesser significance.

00:49:49:01 - 00:49:49:23

Okay. Thank you.

00:50:10:07 - 00:50:32:11

Okay. So I'm now going to ask you the apologies. I should have asked you to take that down to. I'll ask you to display another, um, uh, reference, please. So that would be, um, PDA 034. And then that's one of the landscape visualizations, um, which were submitted, I think was submitted at the procedural deadline as part of the, um, figures. So it would be figure three on page nine.

00:50:45:13 - 00:50:49:16

That's correct. Thank you. Um, and again, I think

00:50:51:02 - 00:51:06:09

just like to understand a bit about how you've done these visualizations and what they're showing. Um, so am I'm right to assume then, that these visualizations are worst case in terms of the design scenario. And, um, you know, everything that flows through.

00:51:15:09 - 00:51:24:19

Cabinet. And after the applicant. Yes. Those show the, um, the maximum height of the tallest buildings. 15m. Yes. Okay.

00:51:24:21 - 00:51:25:06

Yeah. Okay.

00:51:25:22 - 00:51:36:21

Um, and do they show the perhaps the indicative or, you know, they're realistic in terms of the number of buildings and the, you know, the layout of the equipment and sort of the massing and how you arrange it.

00:51:38:00 - 00:52:02:00

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the layout that you see, the indicative layout that you see in the visualizations is representative of an electrical functional, uh, onshore substation, therefore a realistic worst case. But that also aligns with placing the tallest buildings in the northernmost corner as Mr. Ma has outlined.

00:52:03:27 - 00:52:04:12

Thank you.

00:52:12:14 - 00:52:42:19

And then one other question about the visualizations and how you've done them. So it's a note that the visualisations which are closer up, there's a slight colour difference to the substation. Um, compared to them, when you see on the perhaps the further visualizations which are further back. So from the meridian range and the valley, um, you know, they tend to be shown in the slightly darker brown, um, where you can see the substation, you know, in relation to the, um, the trees and the on the horizon, whereas here it's shown in a lighter color.

00:52:43:05 - 00:52:56:15

And I just wonder if that's if that's something that's, um, kind of an artifact of the way you've done the visualizations or is that sort of showing a realistic, um, view of how the color may change or how it may change from the distance.

00:52:58:12 - 00:53:14:12

In the demo for the applicant? The only reason that they're sort of brown in the ones that are further away is so that you can see them. So if you like, we've emphasized the color of them. If they were gray, they would disappear into the, the, the distance. That's the only reason.

00:53:14:16 - 00:53:15:12

Okay. That's clear.

00:53:15:14 - 00:53:16:10

Thank you. Okay.

00:53:29:15 - 00:53:50:08

Okay, so I'm now going to ask about the assessment and then significance of effect as assessed in the landscape assessments. Um, and I'll firstly I'll just pick up on the question which was asked by Mr. Hussey yesterday and that concerns the construction work during the hours of darkness. So would you be able to clarify? Um, I think just to clarify your definition of darkness, please.

00:53:57:04 - 00:54:02:16

Confirm all for the applicant. Um, yes. What what we, um.

00:54:04:09 - 00:54:22:18

So basically, there will be task lighting during the hours of darkness. Um, for example, around the substation where the construction, um, compounds wrap around the substation. That's actually in the MDS. Um, within my table.

00:54:24:18 - 00:54:44:21

6.19 and it's page 69. So that it says that, um, security lighting and task lighting may be required. And within that particular area, the task lighting might be for example, um, such as the 24 hour drill to do to go under the road.

00:54:45:03 - 00:54:51:15

And, and does that then relate to lighting specifically for construction? Um, so during the two years. That's.

00:54:51:17 - 00:54:52:02

Yes.

00:54:52:04 - 00:54:53:24

So that task lighting.

00:54:53:26 - 00:54:55:01

Task lighting was.

00:54:55:13 - 00:54:57:01

Would be okay. Okay.

00:54:58:00 - 00:55:31:26

Uh, Liz, done. On behalf of the applicant, it's it's worth noting, I think the the reference that Mr. Hussey picked up yesterday was a, um, was um, on page eight of, um, of the landscape assessment, which is a comment in respect of the NPS policy test around lighting. That's not correct. If you actually follow through the documentation, it's clear that, um, there is a task lighting within the temporary construction compounds is proposed, and therefore is there a temporary construction compounds at the substation.

00:55:31:28 - 00:55:56:25

There would be task lighting there so that that reference is incorrect. We will there won't be, there won't be, it won't be floodlit and there won't be lighting, you know, all the way through. But if there

are activities being undertaken at night which require tight lighting, there will be task lighting. Thank you. Not at night. I mean, in the hours of darkness. Not outside the working hours that are authorised.

00:55:57:01 - 00:56:05:05

So you're going to take that? I think you can understand from Mr. Husky's perspective, that's a bit misleading in terms of the construction hours. And and absolutely.

00:56:05:07 - 00:56:06:17

We will correct that. Thank you.

00:56:09:03 - 00:56:39:04

Sorry. Just, um. Yeah, the the one I read yesterday was more for the reference. It appears to reference to the core construction hours where it actually says no, no work will be undertaken during the hours of darkness, which I read because it is answering, as you say, the national policy statements for, um, visual effects of noise and light on receptors like myself.

00:56:39:06 - 00:56:51:11

And that is quite the way I read that. It's not ambiguous. It says that there will be no work, no construction work during the hours of darkness. Um, if that's incorrect, then.

00:56:55:02 - 00:57:18:03

I think what, uh, Mr. explaining is it probably doesn't read correctly what what you've read is now going to be taken out of that of that document, and the applicant is, um, proposing the construction hours that we discussed yesterday, and there would be task lighting. Correct me if I'm wrong for certain works, I think, such as 24 hour drill, I'm guessing cement pouring or something like that.

00:57:18:12 - 00:57:28:29

It's not just the lighting. Sorry. So they'll actually be construction works and activity, trench digging, piling, etc. during the hours of darkness.

00:57:29:20 - 00:57:32:20

Seven till seven is what the applicant is.

00:57:32:28 - 00:57:54:17

Yes. And I asked whether there's any seasonal variation. And obviously the answer is no. I take it then. So it would be 7 to 7 actual core working operations with diggers, excavators, etc., etc.. 7:00 in the morning till 7 p.m. at night in a December winter's day. Similarly to a June summer's day.

00:57:56:03 - 00:57:59:07

It's done on behalf of the applicant. We will take this one away and confirm.

00:57:59:29 - 00:58:01:00

Thank you. Thank you.

00:58:02:20 - 00:58:28:06

There's also just one question I think, which follows naturally from that just with respect to darkness. And obviously, as you'd written it in response to the policy, um, testing the M1, um, does the landscape assessment then need to consider, does it consider then the task lighting for construction? Obviously you have the construction element of the assessment of effects and impacts. So would that then have been included.

00:58:30:19 - 00:58:34:29

In the demo? For the applicant? Yes. We've assessed everything that's in our MDS.

00:58:35:01 - 00:58:42:05

Okay. So the task then. Yes the task lighting is to find and construction lighting and. Okay. Thank you.

00:59:00:22 - 00:59:20:13

So I'm now going to ask a few questions about the significance of effects from certain representative viewpoints at the onshore substation location, um, namely viewpoints one, two and three, which are shown in also in the landscape assessment. Um, and these are provided in the submission. Um PDA 034.

00:59:23:08 - 00:59:34:22

So could I ask you to display um, this reference please. So PDA 034 or go to um figure one I think in the in the landscape visualizations at the last of the document.

00:59:41:24 - 00:59:57:18

Thank you. So could I, um. Could I just ask you to explain then how you've assessed this? Essentially. So just to sort of give an explanation as to why you concluded that this would have a minor to moderate adverse significance, um, in terms of landscape effects.

01:00:01:00 - 01:00:34:29

In a demo for the applicant, apologies. So we have to take into account the existing infrastructure that's already there in the view. Uh, we take account of the um, the actual receptor, uh, sensitivity in this point. So it's not a public right of way. Um, it's not open access land. It is a minor road. So. And it has, uh, obviously you can see the 400 kV line there coming over, but also uh, the sealing in compound for National Grid as well.

01:00:35:01 - 01:00:49:24

So, so there's a lot of infrastructure already there. Um, so what we're saying is that, um, yes, there will be an impact, but it's, it's at a distance. And so that's where we came to our minor to moderate.

01:00:50:10 - 01:01:03:28

And also then if I understand correctly, it's the presence of the existing infrastructure. Exactly, such as the pylons. Okay. And the fact also that it's not a public right of way or specific point where we are. Yes. Okay. Okay.

01:01:06:21 - 01:01:08:25

May I just start a small question then.

01:01:09:11 - 01:01:09:26

Please.

01:01:09:28 - 01:01:15:01

Do. Did I understand the applicant's representative to say that it's not a public right of way?

01:01:19:26 - 01:01:26:18

Karina. Demo for the applicant. Correct? That is, it's a minor road at that point. It's not a public right of way.

01:01:28:00 - 01:01:32:00

It's a public right of way used by quite a few people living in Colorado.

01:01:34:11 - 01:01:44:08

Carrying a demo for the applicant. The public rights of way are shown on the map. Um, it's not a public right of way as marked on the map or.

01:01:50:27 - 01:01:58:16

Mr. Hussey. Could we just ask that you turn your microphone on when you speak? Because it wouldn't get sorry. It would get picked up otherwise on the recording.

01:02:02:01 - 01:02:13:03

I Martin Barlow community Community Council. I have to come back on this I. Are we talking about the road to the right of the picture? The photo?

01:02:15:12 - 01:02:33:08

During the demo for the applicant. The representative viewpoint is from the road. The road turns at that. Um, at that point. Um, it actually turns from running south east to south west. So it's on that corner of that road.

01:02:35:02 - 01:02:44:04

I mean, that is. It's Martin Barlow. That's a, that's a public road used by Mr. Hussey among many others and myself.

01:02:46:18 - 01:02:57:08

It's used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, uh, farm everybody. It's uh, maybe a definition of what you call a public right of way, but a road is a public right of way.

01:02:59:20 - 01:03:30:18

Carrying a demo for the applicant. We have to make a difference between what are stated and not statutory, but what our rights of way. Um, and actually crossing, uh, fields and marked on the OS map, um, as opposed to roads. And that's and that's the difference. The sensitivity of people using the uh, footpaths and bridleways, um, are different to those using the um, road network.

01:03:33:06 - 01:03:49:16



Can I just I just come because I think we might be talking across. I don't think anybody is disputing the fact that this is publicly accessible. Um, I don't think it matters, but by. By who? Whether that's cyclists, road users. I don't think the applicant is disputing that it's not a publicly accessible viewpoint.

01:03:49:18 - 01:04:06:17

Yeah, I think it's something I've put in my representation. But basically the the assumption that, uh, trans people and views from afar are more important than people who actually live and use that area is incorrect.

01:04:11:07 - 01:04:13:08

Yeah, I like to respond to that.

01:04:23:07 - 01:04:29:27

It's done on behalf of the applicant. We will respond to to Mr. Hussey on this separately. Okay. Thank you.

01:04:33:04 - 01:04:38:10

Okay. So we, um, come to the next, uh, viewpoints, please. The second visualization down.

01:04:44:07 - 01:04:46:09

Um, sorry, just the next image. Sorry.

01:04:47:28 - 01:04:56:26

So, yeah. Um, again, could you just explain how you've assessed this at minor to moderate adverse significance, please?

01:04:59:09 - 01:05:01:04

Excuse me. Um.

01:05:05:11 - 01:05:35:15

Could you. Yeah. Excuse me. Um, could you explain all the detail here, the mitigations that you've shown. Um, so if we come to the next image down. Um. Thank you. Just to explain how these mitigations work, please. I'm. I've sort of look at this image, um, in relation to. So this is year two, year 15. Um, and then the image above is year one. Um, and I, I have to admit I can't quite see where the mitigations work. I think a lot of the vegetation shown there appears to be the existing vegetation, which is in the summer.

01:05:39:04 - 01:06:27:27

Demo for the applicant? Yes. The mitigation, um, on the fields that we've been allowed to retain, our, um, is the woodland and primarily that is screening from the northwest side, and that's from the most sensitive uh, receptor closest to the, uh, public receptor closest to the um, substation, which is the footpath. Um, coming in from the northwest and we're able to, um, plant woodland on a, uh, Earth modelled area which screens from that the, the again, this viewpoint is from a minor road, publicly accessible but a minor road.

01:06:28:11 - 01:07:04:25

So So that's where we've come to it. And again, it's got a view of the, um, infrastructure, not only the National grid model within substation, but also the 400 kV line. Um, and we are um, you'll see from oh, you'll have seen from the landscape illustrative landscape plan that we're also, um, building up hedgerows where we can um, obviously there's a balance with what land we can, um, take from the landowner, acquire from the landowner to plant up.

01:07:04:27 - 01:07:08:04

So what we have, we have used.

01:07:09:12 - 01:07:39:17

Okay. Thank you. Um, so, yeah, we have um, I'll just add as well we have visited this area. Um, so sort of quite familiar with sort of the lay of it. Um, could I just come back to to what I asked, please, which is what specifically? Um, yeah. You've assessed this viewpoint. And as it is assessed in the landscape assessment, um, and where at year 15 the effects are, I think, um, moderate or least um, and non non significant.

01:07:40:00 - 01:07:54:06

Where is it? Year one the effects are assessed as moderate to major adverse and therefore significant. And I just find it hard in this view. What specifically would then, um, allow you to sort of reduce the assessment of harm as such?

01:08:09:15 - 01:08:19:11

A full court on behalf of the applicant. And perhaps we could take this one away to produce a plan that shows where the mitigation that's relevant to this view is to aid your understanding of that.

01:08:19:15 - 01:08:29:27

Yes. That would be really helpful. Thank you. I think perhaps for the the visualisations, if you could do that, the ones which are closer to the onshore substation, I think that would be very informative and very helpful. Um.

01:08:30:21 - 01:08:31:14

We will do that.

01:08:31:24 - 01:08:32:18

Thank you, thank you.

01:08:32:20 - 01:08:59:16

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, I think it is worth noting that the, um, that the outline landscape plan is outline at this stage. So clearly it's when the final design of the substation is done, the landscaping will these are indicative to demonstrate what could be done. But they're not fine. The landscaping that's proposed is an outline that will be then refined alongside the design of the substation as well.

01:08:59:28 - 01:09:01:08

Yeah. Okay. That's helpful. Thanks.

01:09:07:14 - 01:09:29:27

And then can we move to the next, uh, visualization down, please? So, uh, yeah, this one here. So again, would you be able to explain for this viewpoint, I mean this assessment of the significance of effects here? I think these are, um, year one moderated versus not significant. Um, and then year 15, they're not significant either.

01:09:35:00 - 01:09:51:05

So what we have here is again a view of the substation. But but with the 400 kV line in view. We also have a National grid substation and go into more substation in view as well.

01:09:52:27 - 01:10:27:07

Uh, this view here is um, shows that in its worst case. So so as before, the substation is to the north west, The largest building is to the northwest. So what happens here is that, um, if we go down to 15, it's. So it's not breaking the the tree line. You can see the tree line in the plane before the Clarion Range. So it's not breaking the tree line. It's certainly not breaking the Clwyd Range from this viewpoint.

01:10:28:11 - 01:11:00:01

And if we go down to the next viewpoint, you can see, excuse me, you can see the effect of. So we've what we have done. Sorry. I beg your pardon. Could we go back up? What we have done in year one is we've done the earth modelling and the earth modelling actually screens the or begins the screen, the lower level clutter from the um from the substation. So what we want to do is we want to, um, provide as simple, um, a view as possible.

01:11:00:03 - 01:11:03:19

And in year 15, if we go down to year 15.

01:11:05:27 - 01:11:20:06

You can see that the woodlands that we've proposed on our illustrative landscape master plan is taking effect here. And we're getting this, this very simple, um, line, clean line in front of the substation.

01:11:21:24 - 01:11:52:10

We're not able to take the woodland all the way up to the listed building. You can see the red roof of the listed building there, the listed barn. So there are objections from, um, Cadw that we they didn't want woodland right at the way up. So we have to we have a field in front of that, um, which is just wildflower meadow, not woodland. And so and after that field, we then, um, plant the woodland.

01:11:53:25 - 01:11:55:17

Thank you. Um.

01:11:57:18 - 01:12:14:19

Perhaps that difficult question I'm just asking to describe it. Year 15 in the winter, would there be where that where you've got the earth modeling and the trees are placed on top of that? Um, would there be any would you be able to see anything, perhaps through the trees or any further?

01:12:19:06 - 01:12:41:08

Demo for the applicant. Um, if if we, um, if you think about the thickness of the woodland, what you'll get is, um, the trickiness of the trees, actually, um, forming a screen themselves. So I'm happy that that will, um, that will be the same significance at year 15.

01:12:42:12 - 01:12:49:24

So that could I just can we just ask you to speak up ever so slightly? It's just struggling to pick you up on the the recording.

01:12:50:00 - 01:13:17:06

Sorry. Yes. So, uh, winter year 15. The twiggy ness, the amount of trees, the depth of trees. Just as you would. Depth of hedgerows. You'll get screening. So again, you'll get screening from the actual depth of trees themselves. Not even without the leaves. But, but, but you know, sort of um species the degree of native conifers would, would also aid that.

01:13:17:17 - 01:13:25:23

And then in the intervening years, from year one to year 15. Um, I mean, how how likely is this how fast will this grow, essentially.

01:13:26:18 - 01:13:45:24

It it depends. It depends on the on the maintenance. We couldn't say or we can say as we can assess it as year one with very little tree planting and year 15 with tree planting. And it will gradually improve the situation as as it grows. We can't give you a timetable for that. Thank you.

01:13:50:18 - 01:14:15:28

Mr. Hobbins, can I just ask one point of clarification, please? I mean, this one is a very emotive subject to me particularly, but, um, there is one question, um, the tree planting area that you have there, there's actually cables going through that. Uh, Scottish Power, Manweb cables going through. And you show it in year 15 as well. Are you planning to plant trees underneath the cables?

01:14:28:21 - 01:14:40:28

Basically basically is it is are you going to still leave the the Scottish Parliament cables there? So there'll be a track of no trees where the Scottish power cables are.

01:14:54:19 - 01:15:25:24

Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant and what we're showing here. And as Miss Dunn mentioned, Mrs. Dunn mentioned earlier, the outline landscape and ecology management plan is indicative at the moment based on the layouts that we have in the assessment. Clearly, once we've looked at our final layout for the substation, we'll design a final lamp. Um, landscape and ecology. Uh, management plan. Uh, that's fit for the final design.

01:15:26:07 - 01:15:58:01

Um, that may, uh, change the shape, the location of the ground raising, and therefore may change where we need to plant trees on it. And we'll be looking for the best possible mitigation solution for the land raising and for the planting. If there are, if there is conflict with infrastructure, we will look at whether we avoid it, whether we divert it, and that will all be part of the the final design that we will undertake for the for the mitigation around the substation.

01:15:59:02 - 01:16:08:18

So I understand that. Thank you for that. Um, I'll just say then that if that's that's indicative and could change, so could your judgment of visual impact.

01:16:17:01 - 01:16:17:16

Um.

01:16:18:12 - 01:16:43:18

If I understand your question correctly, the the judgment of visual impact, uh, wouldn't change. We've we've used a worst case in order to assess this. So, um, our view is that the visual impact would only lessen based on a design that has, um, placement of key infrastructure structures, a large GIS building, and a less sensitive location within the footprint of the substation.

01:16:44:07 - 01:17:04:21

Could I could I just come in there as well, please? Um, but as I understand it, the judgment of impacts at year 15 is also depends on the, um, design of the mitigations, which you've said are indicative. So and that's essentially year 50 difference between year 15 and the year one is those mitigations. So how would we be able to have confidence.

01:17:05:05 - 01:17:23:28

On behalf of the applicant that the mitigations are indicative because the design is indicative. So if we fix the mitigation then change the design. The mitigation wouldn't fit and suit the design. So uh, it's indicative in the sense that we know it may need to change based on the design that we bring forward. Okay.

01:17:38:10 - 01:18:13:13

And could I also ask, just with respect to this, um, viewpoint? Um, I understand as well here. So if we do look at the outline, um, ecology landscape management plan and also the plan that you provided within um, the landscape assessment, I think around this area, we also have the, the onshore cable routes corridor which passes through and then also takes it up to the Alamo or to the cable route to Alamo and other within. Um um., as I understand it, in that area, in the area of that onshore cable corridor, we would not be able to have, um, tree planting or in a certain area.

01:18:13:15 - 01:18:20:21

So would would be potentially see here as well a a sort of gap in the, in the mitigations in the trees that have been planted.

01:18:23:22 - 01:19:00:12

Uh forecaster on behalf of the applicant. Um, clearly, and I think we touched on this when we talked about the, um, yesterday or the day before about, um, the interactions with the national grid border with an extension. We do have a relatively large, um, order limit area. Um, as we approach the National Grid substation, um, because of the uncertainty in constraints, future constraints for design, um, clearly we will only be restricted to, um, planting trees over the top of the cables that we install where the final easement is not in the whole of those order limits.

01:19:00:14 - 01:19:12:19

So, yes, there is potential to be restrictions where we are, um, having cable easements coming in and out, but that wouldn't be, um, over the whole area of the red line boundary, as you can see it now.

01:19:14:03 - 01:19:18:24

Okay. Thank you. Would there be any other planting if there were? There were to be restrictions.

01:19:26:03 - 01:19:54:28

And forecasts on behalf of the applicant. So, um, hedgerows are possible to be planted over, over the cables. It's deep rooted species of trees that wouldn't. But of course, based on the final design of the substation, based on the final design of the cable entries and exits. We would be able to look at how planting could be done either side of it to screen views in an offsetting way. So there are opportunities to look at how the final design can be mitigated. And obviously, um, at this time,

01:19:56:16 - 01:20:02:19

at this time without a final design, it's very, very hard to say exactly where that planting will be in order to achieve that.

01:20:03:04 - 01:20:06:25

Okay. That's clear. Thank you. Um, and, Mr. Jones, would you like to come in?

01:20:07:15 - 01:20:29:11

Uh, yeah. Just just before, uh, we leave this viewpoint and obviously taking on board, uh, Mr. House's comments, uh, it was just really to sort of emphasize the point that we do have a request, I think, for Mr. Hussey, um, to visit your property on the, um, accompanied site inspection. So we are aware of that. We do feel that's an important part just to flag that for the applicant.

01:20:33:08 - 01:21:04:19

I'm Martin Barlow, Kevin Marietta community council. Just while this viewpoint is up, I would just like to put on record that the listed building referred to by the applicant's representative, the one with the, um, the tin roof. Um, I believe it's been excluded from consideration as a visual receptor on the grounds that nobody actually lives there. But it is, in fact, an artist's studio and regularly used as such by, you know, a fairly well known artist.

01:21:04:21 - 01:21:10:04

Not that that's got anything to do with it, but I just wanted that to be on record. Thank you.

01:21:11:23 - 01:21:26:12

Councillor Barlow is also with that, looking at the, um, the heritage chapter as well. It is assessed as part of the heritage chapter, and it is identified as having a significant effect on that particular listed building within that chapter.

01:21:43:20 - 01:22:13:22

Okay, um, there's one last question for myself. Um, and this concerns. And you can take this viewpoint off screen now. Thank you. Um, this does concern, um, potentially some of the properties in the vicinity of some of these viewpoints. But, um, you do mentioned in the landscape assessments.

Um, in chapter six, .5.7.4 that you've described it in relation to private viewpoints for the properties. Um, these properties do not experience such harms to make the private views a public interest matter.

01:22:14:01 - 01:22:30:11

And I would like you to expand upon this slightly, please. Um, perhaps provides what your definition of substantial harm in this context might be. Um, and then how would you determine whether the you owned properties would experience a substantial level of harm? Thank you.

01:22:35:22 - 01:23:24:22

Uh, lays down on behalf of the applicant, I'll give the sort of general explanation, and then I'll pass over to Mr. Moore, who can talk about the, um, the technical side of this. That's fine. Thanks. Um, um, it's it's acknowledged that where you have, um, significant effects on residential receptors. And Mr. Morrow, tell us which I think it's within via guidance the guide sorry guidance for landscape and visual impact assessment. Um, that where you have, uh, potentially significant effects on residential receptors, then, um, you undertake a residential vision, visual amenity assessment, um, to determine whether those effects are so significant that they actually affect the living conditions of the people that live in those properties.

01:23:25:00 - 01:23:56:07

That often known as an Arva residential visual amenity assessment, as I said, that is triggered when you identify significant effect on those properties or a number of properties in the vicinity of a proposed development, um, as I understand it. And Mr. Ma will correct me if I'm wrong. Um, we haven't identified a significant visual effect on, uh, residential receptors around the substation site, and therefore that hasn't triggered the need to do that.

01:23:56:09 - 01:24:00:00

Visual residential visual amenity assessment.

01:24:02:20 - 01:24:25:25

Karina. Demo for the applicant? Yes, the The Landscape Institute has actually put out, um, a technical guidance note on this matter, which I just cannot find at the moment, the reference to. Um, but it has to be not just significant, it has to be over and above substantial. And we did not find an over and above substantial effect on those properties.

01:24:26:18 - 01:24:32:26

Could could you perhaps describe a scenario or something to, you know, define what substantial would mean? You know.

01:24:33:17 - 01:25:06:26

Uh, I cannot I've given the distances, um, from not in this circumstances, but I've given the distances of those properties from the, um, substation location. And I have also described the views from those places. It's quite wooded in the sense that there are lots of trees there between these properties and the, and hedgerows, um, between these properties and um, the substation, the proposed substation.

01:25:07:19 - 01:25:39:01

Uh, not only are there that I mean, there are buildings as well. Um, so there are, there are outbuildings, there are trees, there are hedge banks. So I think what we're saying is that, you know, if there were no existing, um, hedge banks, trees or they were closer, then it would be getting towards substantial, but I'd have to look at it individually. Um, sort of. At that case, we are not in that category. We are we are further away.

01:25:39:03 - 01:25:43:24

There are intervening, um, structures and vegetation.

01:25:45:00 - 01:25:45:22

Okay. Thank you.

01:25:51:04 - 01:26:01:23

Okay. I'm now just going to, um. Or before I hand over to Mrs. Jones, who has a few further questions. I'd just like to ask if anybody does have any further points they wish to raise. Um.

01:26:02:27 - 01:26:31:12

Thank you, Mr. Robins. Um, obviously, I do have a number of comments to make regarding the impacts. Some of them have a personal impact, some of it of a wider impact. Obviously, I don't want to go into the detail here and now. I'll put it in writing as part of the responses for deadline one. Um, there are a number of things that I totally disagree with the the applicant. Um, and I'll try and keep my mouth shut now. Thank you.

01:26:32:11 - 01:26:33:05

Okay. Thank you.

01:26:35:12 - 01:27:07:21

Kevin. Marietta community council. Um, I'd just like really to concur with, uh, your suggestion that the 12 30 meter high lightning conductors be considered as in any assessment of the visual effects. I mean, I can understand the the point made that there's a a large pylon not too far away, but that, you know, in an individual 1 or 2 lightning conductors.

01:27:07:23 - 01:27:18:13

Yes. But a matrix of 12, I think, substantially changes the nature of the visual effect on the surrounding community and the landscape.

01:27:19:15 - 01:27:36:03

Sorry. Also, that was one of the thing. Um, cumulative effect. There's no inclusion of the national grid development, which is an integral part. There's four new pylons going up there. So if you consider hourly more, um, cumulative effect, you should consider National Grid as well.

01:27:37:06 - 01:27:39:11

Thank you. Yeah. Applicant to come back. Is.

01:27:39:27 - 01:28:11:06



Uh, Liz done on behalf of the applicant. Um, we've noted the point around the lightning. Um, the lightning mast, um, and we've we've indicated, I think Miss Demos explained how they've been assessed, and we will make sure that they're picked up on, on, um, on the, the, um, indicative layouts that we provide in terms of the cumulative impacts with National Grid. I think we explained, um, yesterday that in the absence of detail from National Grid, we're not in a position to undertake that detailed cumulative assessment.

01:28:11:08 - 01:28:42:15

Clearly, there is a the hourly mall proposal. There are, um, uh, in terms of, of its connection in um, um, actually its substation is is not within the it's, it's over the other side of Glasgow Road. So it doesn't um, the cumulative impact isn't as intense around this area, but without the details of the National Grid proposal, what the building looks like, where the heights are, where the 400 kV line is. But we aren't in a position to be able to undertake that kind of detailed assessment.

01:28:42:17 - 01:29:07:18

We've done what we have been able to do on the basis of the information that is in the public domain. Um, we recognise that if that information, if an application is made, um, during the currency of this, uh, examination or before a decision is made by the Secretary of state, we will need to review the assessment that's been undertaken. Um, but at this stage, we just don't have that material to do anything that would be meaningful.

01:29:09:11 - 01:29:16:10

Thank you. Um, I will now just pass over to Mr. Miss Jones briefly, who has a few further questions. Thank you.

01:29:17:13 - 01:29:27:07

Yeah. It's just if we could just ask some, uh, landscape related DCO, uh, questions, really, um, specifically around requirements seven, eight and 12.

01:29:28:25 - 01:29:48:23

I'm just wondering if you could give us, uh, if you could just give us a brief explanation of the relationship between those three requirements, uh, what their intention is, I think in particular, it's understanding purpose of uh, requirements seven against uh requirement 12.

01:29:50:11 - 01:30:36:29

Lays down on behalf of the applicant. Um requirement seven relates specifically to the um landscaping plan that is related to work number 22, which is the onshore substation. Um, and it sits alongside um requirement uh five and requirement six, which are sort of set together to secure details around the, the, um, the maximum parameters of the substation, um, and the landscaping that associates with that, uh, with the substation, uh, requirement 12 is the landscape and ecology management plan that relates to the whole project.

01:30:37:01 - 01:31:21:17

So it deals with, uh, with other matters as well. Um, and there there is potentially an overlap between the details that will be provided there. But as we discussed, um, yesterday, the likelihood is that the, um, there will be some staging of the or the requirements will be discharged by the local authorities,

not altogether but in stages. And this ensures that the landscaping around the substation area is connected to that, because it is an integral part of the design of that substation and is separate from the overall landscaping and ecology management plan that sits across the whole of the um of the onshore development area.

01:31:22:14 - 01:31:39:12

Thank you. That that is what I thought. Requirements. If I'm honest, I'm not quite sure the drafting quite reflects that because as it reads at the moment. It's in work. Number 22 must not be commenced until a landscape and a landscape plan has been submitted. Do you mean a landscape plan for those works?

01:31:41:11 - 01:31:44:15

It is done on behalf of the applicant. Yes. It should say that.

01:31:44:17 - 01:31:45:09

Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

01:31:52:00 - 01:32:17:11

And then just moving. Um, just a minor point really on requirement eight, uh, which is then, um, the implementation and, and landscaping for, for that requirement. So any information that's submitted under requirement seven this is the implementation uh and maintenance. It then refers to the landscaping schemes approved under requirement seven whereas requirement seven refers to a landscape plan.

01:32:18:20 - 01:32:22:14

Thank you. We will review the drafting there to make sure it's consistent.

01:32:23:20 - 01:32:55:10

Um, and then uh, just a final, final point. We've spoken quite a bit this morning about the impacts being reduced because of, um, the mitigation proposed after 15 years, which includes planting, tree planting, for example. Um, the requirement itself only requires uh, replacement planting if those trees, uh, sort of die within a period of five years. You're relying on planting at 15 years to reduce the the effects in your assessment.

01:32:55:12 - 01:33:07:22

What happens if those trees die in six? Yes, seven. How can we be confident that at 15 years your assessment is correct? If we don't know that those trees would be replaced if something were to happen to them in that period.

01:33:25:02 - 01:33:55:09

Please, Don, on behalf of the applicant, um, this, um, five year period for maintenance is, is, um, a fairly standard, um, a standard period, and I'm no ecologist, but, um, I understand that by five years if something's going to survive it, it will have survived by that point. So there is a, um, it's an appropriate period to require those, those, um, that landscaping to be maintained over that period.

01:33:55:18 - 01:34:21:20

Yeah. I mean, I've seen yeah, I've seen the five years on lots of discos. But in this particular circumstance you are relying on planting being the mitigation specifically to reduce, um, an effect which might be different from other DCS, for example, that might not you might not have gone from a significant effect to a moderate adverse effect because of that planting and certain scenarios. Whereas in this particular case that that is that is a situation.

01:34:22:01 - 01:34:42:21

Let's start on behalf of the applicant. I understand that on other DCS that has it has been the same that, that that reliance on or that reliance on landscape planting at 15 years to mitigate in effect has been aligned with a five year management period. But we will take it away and come back and confirm on that.

01:34:46:00 - 01:34:53:26

That's all the the questions. You don't have anything further on on this item. Does anybody else have any comments or questions on this item?

01:34:56:07 - 01:35:09:13

Uh, and uh, in that case then I'm going to suggest that, uh, it's a good point to break for lunch. Uh, we'll take, um, just slightly over an hour and we'll come back at 130 this afternoon. Thank you everyone.