



## Trawsgrifiad Gwrandawriad

<b>Prosiect:</b>	Fferm Wynt Alltraeth Mona
<b>Grandawriad:</b>	Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol 3 (ISH3) – Rhan 2
<b>Dyddiad:</b>	16 Hydref 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 3 (ISH3) – Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	16 October 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\_ISH3\_16 OCT\_PT2**

Created on: 2024-10-16 13:07:13

Project Length: 02:18:26

File Name: Mona\_ISH3\_16 OCT\_PT2

File Length: 02:18:26

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:19:07

Okay. Welcome back everybody. Um, it's 11:11 and time for this issue specific hearing to resume. And I'm now going to come, uh, to landscape and visual aspects of the onshore substation agenda item.

00:00:21:27 - 00:00:39:27

So I have a small number of questions related to the landscape and visual impact assessments for the substation. And then I'll come to good design, and I'd like to ask questions primarily to the councils and to the applicant, but of course, give interested parties who may wish to speak an opportunity to do so.

00:00:44:02 - 00:01:06:01

So I'd like to start by considering the landscaping mitigations which are described in the outline. Um, landscaping, the ecology management plan and the design principles documents and in particular those which are at the receptors viewpoints two and three within the landscape assessment and also which are shown in the visualizations.

00:01:09:05 - 00:01:36:27

So if I could come to the council's um, with regards to your first written questions response, where you have said that you believe that the residual changes at those viewpoints will remain large and medium, respectively, with both experiencing major and significant residual effects. Could you provide a brief synopsis of why you think those residual effects are significant at year 15, after the mitigations have established themselves?

00:01:41:21 - 00:02:15:01

Hi, Ben Eichmann here on behalf of the councils, Denbighshire and Conway. Um, yeah. I think that the, the quantum of of of change that's shown in the visualizations, uh, and is achieved by the mitigation that establishes over the period of time does not reduce the amount of harm to the extent where it becomes insignificant. So it doesn't change the category of the magnitude of change that's been assessed and therefore the, the, um, effects, the visual effects remain significant beyond year 15.

00:02:15:23 - 00:02:20:17

Um, that's a very brief synopsis. Does it answer the question? Um, or

00:02:22:02 - 00:02:23:05

are there more specific?

00:02:24:00 - 00:02:32:12

But I think my follow up to that would be do you think, uh, any additional different types of mitigations could reduce these residual impacts and effects?

00:02:33:18 - 00:03:11:16

Uh, no. I think we've stated elsewhere in the, uh, in the the written representations and the statements of common ground that actually, uh, the approach to the, uh, to mitigation that the applicant has presented in the, in the landscape mitigation scheme is appropriate and proportionate to the to the effects identified. Um, obviously it's not possible to mitigate all effects through landscape mitigation. However, the the remaining residual effects which we consider to be significant um, do justify I think, um, uh, the need for additional further mitigation, perhaps offsite.

00:03:11:18 - 00:03:16:28

So that could be offsetting or enhancement, uh, measures that may or may not be achieved within the order limits.

00:03:19:17 - 00:03:22:25

Okay. Thank you. Um, and could I ask the applicant to comment, please?

00:03:28:17 - 00:03:40:04

Uh, Barada. Corinna Dewi, I'm going to address. Good morning. My name is Karen Adama. I'm the landscape consultant for the applicant.

00:03:42:03 - 00:04:19:09

We discussed in our statement of common ground meeting with um, Denbighshire County Council. Can we can can we can we? County borough. Sorry county Council, that we had the possibility of within our red line of further mitigation works, but that at present, because of the unknown location of the cable routes, uh, we were unable to say for certain whether we could actually undertake those works.

00:04:19:21 - 00:04:39:17

Uh, once that, uh, we know the location of the cable routes and the extent of the National grid works, then we would be able to actually, um, formulate some other, uh, works within our red line.

00:04:43:03 - 00:04:43:26

Uh, less done on.

00:04:43:28 - 00:05:21:12

Behalf of the applicant, I think, um, just to just to put that in context, and I think it's, it's it's probably clear in terms of the way that the outline landscape plan works. It is an outline at this stage, obviously. Um, and the applicant has proposed mitigation, um, at an outline stage. It will be subject to that detailed design, as Mr. Musk indicated around, actually, when we know where all the various elements of infrastructure are going to be located. The the landscape plan will need to be, um, will need to be accommodate those effectively in order to deliver.

00:05:21:14 - 00:06:07:18

It's considered a worst case. Um, and um, it may well be that, um, that the landscaping, um, there can be further landscaping once effectively once those as she said, once those locations of infrastructure have been identified. But I think the important thing to to to sort of acknowledges that within the proposals that we have put forward at this stage, it's it's agreed and understood within the statement of common ground with the councils that that it is it is appropriate in terms of the approach that's been taken to, uh, to landscaping around the substation and what can be delivered, albeit the council's view that there will be there will still be a significant impact at year 15.

00:06:08:14 - 00:06:20:03

Okay. Thank you. So if I can just recap that, um, so there is general agreement on the general approach, but then there will be further refinements and obviously a detailed design stage.

00:06:21:02 - 00:06:24:05

At least on the part of the applicant. That's correct.

00:06:24:08 - 00:06:25:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:06:27:06 - 00:06:42:14

And could I just come back to the councils please, and just ask, just, um, concerning your comments about offsetting or enhancement of sites, any particular, um, further detail on that, any particular schemes that you could suggest or would.

00:06:44:06 - 00:07:15:02

Um, yeah, the, the, the residual effects. Um. It's appreciated. Sorry. Going back to, um, what the applicant was saying, that the the additional measures may be achieved, but, um, obviously those can't be committed to in this process. Um, before the DCO is, is determined. Um, so the residual effects remain, um, and, and are significant in our view, um, in terms of what could be achieved offsite as additional or offsetting measures.

00:07:15:04 - 00:08:07:07

Um, it I refer probably to hourly more um, uh, statement of uh, rather section 106 agreements and things that have been committed in that process as an example. Uh, things like, uh, recreational improvements to provide upgrades to existing footpath and connectivity where footpaths are severed. Um, other items, including uh, interpretation around the development for the local footpath and right of way users, uh potentially other hedgerow improvements and uh, well, um, landscape element improvements, um, to improve the condition of the existing landscape, uh, around the substation off site, such as, uh, tree planting, hedgerow improvements, um, and the like, um, so we can, uh, hash out any, any details in terms of, um, what would be appropriate through agreement later.

00:08:07:09 - 00:08:10:19

But that's the sort of thing that we had in mind. Does that answer your question?

00:08:10:27 - 00:08:12:12

Yes. That does. Yeah. Thank you.

00:08:15:02 - 00:08:48:05

So I list on on behalf of the applicant. Can we come back on those? Yes, yes. Thank you. Um, so just to pick up on, um, some of the points that have been raised. Um, you'll be aware that whilst the councils consider that there will be will remain, um, significant effects at year 15, that is not the applicant's position. And the landscaping has been, um, has been offered and provided in order to reduce the effects of the onshore substation from significant to not significant.

00:08:48:22 - 00:09:20:00

Um, in terms of those other, um, elements. Um, just to point out that, um, hedgerow improvements are being proposed as part of the application. Um, there are no footpaths that are being severed permanently. Um, any, any temporary footpath diversions are just in respect of construction. So there are no permanent impacts there. Um, and just to be clear, the hourly more um, section 106 agreement and fund was in respect of seascape effects, not landscape effect.

00:09:23:08 - 00:09:28:00

Okay. Thank you. I think that's quite clear from from both parties there. So, um. Yeah. Thank you.

00:09:31:07 - 00:10:04:00

Um, I'd like to come into more detail now just to the mitigation planting, um, where we have obviously the design principles document. Um, it states that mitigation planting would which comprise a mixture of faster growing nurse species and slower growing species, with the nurse species growing 7 to 10m in height after approximately 15 years. Um, so my question again for the applicant is, um, are the nurse species expected to die after a given period of time? Uh, would they remain in situ for the life of the substation.

00:10:05:18 - 00:10:42:15

Carina Da on behalf of the applicant? No. The mix of species would include nurse species, which obviously would achieve, um, a faster, uh, a greater height in, in a short amount of time. The climax species of the woodland would be native species, which is primarily oak, um, which will take longer to grow. So the idea is that, um, the fastest species, um, will bring we'll we'll get the height. And when we think we've reached the height that's appropriate, We will then let the oak species come through.

00:10:42:17 - 00:10:51:17

No, they wouldn't grow. They wouldn't die. Naturally. We would take them out. But I can't give you a time on that because it depends on the climax species coming through.

00:10:53:09 - 00:10:56:09

So there would be a degree of management then that would be required for those.

00:10:56:11 - 00:11:02:12

Absolutely. As set out in the um, Olympe. Sorry, the outline landscape and ecology management plan.

00:11:02:14 - 00:11:03:12

Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

00:11:09:24 - 00:11:23:09

Could I perhaps just, um, follow up on that with a quick question? Ben Eichmann, on behalf of the councils. Yes. And what period could the applicant please provide? What period the management of those landscape features is committed to in the complete.

00:11:29:18 - 00:12:07:00

List on on behalf of the applicant. The ongoing management is something that's to be agreed with Natural Resources Wales and the local authority in respect of the outline landscape and ecology management plan, and clearly the whichever species are planted and how they grow and then need to be managed will be factored in in terms of that longer term management. It might be worth I know it hasn't come up as a question, but I'm happy to address the point around the requirement in the draft development consent order that relates to the obligations on replanting for five years, because I know there have been some discussions around that.

00:12:07:02 - 00:12:14:16

Yes, yes. Thank you. That was going to be a question. Yes, I thank you. If you could just explain that and address that. And I might have a couple of questions there. Thank you.

00:12:15:01 - 00:12:41:08

Liz. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so there have been a number of questions and the applicant has put in responses regarding, um, the replacement of planting and then going and then the ongoing maintenance of that planting. Um, I'm just going to find my draft development consent order. So the draft development consent order requirement. Uh uh.

00:12:43:24 - 00:12:44:26

Uh, which one is it?

00:12:46:18 - 00:13:19:28

Uh, it's requirement eight. Um, requires, um, uh, landscaping works to be carried out in accordance with the landscaping plans and states that requirement 82 that any tree shrub planted as part of an approved landscaping scheme, that within within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or become seriously damaged or diseased, that must be replaced in the first available planting species. So the applicant has provided clarity that that is effectively an ongoing, uh, position.

00:13:20:00 - 00:13:52:03

So it isn't that the planting will go in if it dies after five years and then is replaced. That's it. Effectively it. The five years then runs again from the replacement planting that is, how can I just check where that will be secured? Is that going to be an update to the Olympe or. Yes, in the requirement list on on behalf of the applicant. It'll be it'll be the the requirement is a pretty standard drafting. And I think to draft that into the requirement would be, would be more complicated than perhaps it needs to be.

00:13:52:06 - 00:14:24:19

So it will go into the outline landscape plan. Sorry. Sorry for interrupting you there. That's fine. Um, and then, um, and then separately to the requirement to replant clearly as the, as the landscaping is providing a mitigation function, it's important that it's managed in the way that Miss Demers explained around ensuring that those longer term species, the the species that will take longer to grow,

can come through um, and, and provide that, sort of that, that more substantial cover, um and and landscaping going forward.

00:14:24:21 - 00:14:57:28

So that's what will be dealt with in the final landscape and ecology management plan, the details of how long that maintenance will be for, um, and how it will be managed. Um, clearly the landscaping needs to be in place for the duration of the existence of the substation as as it's providing mitigation for something that's effectively permanent. Um, so that will be agreed with the local authorities in consultation with Natural Resources Wales. Um, there was just one final point I wanted to make about the five year.

00:14:58:08 - 00:15:29:22

Um, the five years, because I know there's been discussion as to whether that should be a longer period. Um, five years is a is as as those involved in the in the planning world will know is a pretty standard, uh, standard duration. In fact, some three years is often used. So five years is a sort of standard duration. It is actually also the period that is specified in Welsh Government's circular on the Use of Planning conditions. Um, I think it's 16, 2014.

00:15:29:24 - 00:16:18:22

It's quite old, but I mean, I'm assured it is still in force. Which their standard, uh, landscaping condition specifies a period of five years. There is nothing to indicate that, uh, there wouldn't that the landscaping planting planted would not manage within five years, and that a longer period is justified here? The applicant is aware that on other projects which have been, for example, in very exposed coastal sites or with different ground conditions, have have um, had a longer period of up to seven years, but the applicant does not consider based on on the this is agricultural land, fertile agricultural land with plenty of water and away from the sea, that there would be any justification for requiring seven years for that, for that replanting.

00:16:20:29 - 00:16:36:05

Yeah. Sorry. Can I just come in on a couple of points? Um, you say that the maintenance period is going to be agreed with Natural Resource Wales and the councils. Will that be agreed prior to the end of the examination, or is that something that you see happening afterwards?

00:16:36:11 - 00:16:50:09

Les Don, on behalf of the applicant, that will be part of the final landscape and environmental management plan, which is agreed after the, um, effectively before those landscaping works carried out. So it's a it's a post consent.

00:16:50:11 - 00:16:51:06

Planning consent.

00:16:51:08 - 00:17:03:08

When the detailed design for the substation has been done, the detailed design and the planting species for the landscaping has been done so that then it can take account of of the appropriate species that are being being used. Okay.



00:17:03:10 - 00:17:37:25

So we depended on the species. My my worry with that is I think at the minute are you are you pulls apart in terms of what you both see on that. So I think the council have said in some of their submissions that they would quite like a 30 year maintenance period for some of the planting. I think we would like to be sure during the examination that you're not you're not at opposite ends of the scale on that. You know, if you if you only see a five year period and they see a 30 year period, I think we would like some assurance that, um, you know, we're not going to get to post consent and they're going to be disagreements on that.

00:17:41:02 - 00:18:23:08

Could could I perhaps, um, offer a point in that respect? Um, yes. I'd actually like to clarify that it's not the replacement planting period that we're, we're, um, concerned about. I agree that a five year period is appropriate for that. Um, the issue is that during this DCO process, it sounds unlikely that we'll be able to get any commitment from the applicant to, um, establish how long the, uh, landscape elements will be managed for to achieve their mitigation potential. Um, and I suggest that what we need in there is to deliver to, to secure the delivery of a 15 year mitigation period to secure the the delivery of that mitigation over 15 years.

00:18:23:10 - 00:18:45:08

The the applicant needs to commit to manage those measures for their 15 years. Um, and if, uh, the biodiversity net gain or biodiversity net benefit achievements are to be achieved and which rely on a 30 year horizon. I would argue that the applicant needs to commit to deliver the management appropriate management for those landscaping and habitat measures for a 30 year period.

00:18:47:28 - 00:18:51:10

It's not just about the replacement planting, which we agree can be five years.

00:18:52:19 - 00:18:56:14

Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to respond to that, please?

00:18:56:24 - 00:19:27:28

Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant, that's a helpful clarification, certainly, on the distinction between the replacement and the management from the local authority. And I don't think we are poles apart, because I think our position is that the appropriate time to be discussing the precise length of time of management is when we have the details of the final landscape management plan that we put forward. As Mrs. Dunn says, that does depend on the species, on the mix, on the way that we're bringing forward, um, mixes of species in different areas around the site.

00:19:28:09 - 00:20:02:00

Um, and that is in the local authority's control as the discharging authority for that, um, landscape and the ecological management plan. And it is also directly by consultation with, with NRW. So we can take away the point about about 15 years, I think our position would remain that, um, we would prefer to be discussing it based on that final design rather than have an arbitrary timescale that assumes some, um, percentage mix of species or way that we're bringing forward the mitigation and but we're happy to come back on that particular point.

00:20:02:17 - 00:20:21:00

Yeah, I think that that would be good. I think as an examiner, I thought we would be really reluctant to, um, put a requirement on that we knew was then going to cause trouble further down the line because you were at such opposite ends of the scale in terms of of what you knew you would agree to or wouldn't agree to. So if you could take that away and look at it, that would be that would be great. Thank you.

00:20:21:11 - 00:20:56:09

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. I just would also like to say that, um, we have had an opportunity to meet with, um, Ben Altman. Uh, with respect to the local authority statement of common ground on on this topic. Um, and, uh, he might correct me if I'm wrong, but it's useful to have that clarification in terms of what the local authority is seeking. I don't think we got into the specifics of the statement of common ground process, but obviously that will continue going forward. And I think between now and at the end of examination, will at least be able to understand specifically what we, you know, where we stand versus where they stand if it does not align in the statement of common ground process.

00:20:56:11 - 00:21:02:23

So there are still many conversations to be had between now and the in the examination to hopefully give that assurance.

00:21:03:12 - 00:21:15:27

I think it's fair to say, isn't it, that you're now going to own that land in perpetuity. Therefore, you could manage and maintain that landscaping in perpetuity for the lifetime of that, for the lifetime of the substation.

00:21:22:08 - 00:21:35:23

Forecast on behalf of the applicant. Yes. The there will be, um, ownership of the land by the, um, off toe by the offshore transmission network operator rather than us as the applicant. So we have to pass that land on. But the obligations obviously go with it.

00:21:35:25 - 00:21:40:08

So there's no reason why that landscaping also couldn't be managed for the lifetime of the.

00:21:41:13 - 00:21:46:24

And I would say that's going to be part of that final discharge of the of the landscape ecology management plan.

00:21:47:15 - 00:21:48:12

Thank you sir.

00:21:48:27 - 00:22:08:16

And just to clarify again sorry, it's it's not the detail about how things are going to be managed for 30 or 15 or 30 or the lifetime of the project is just a commitment that the applicant will manage those elements for a period of time. That's all we need, I think, and it should be secured within this DCO process.

00:22:09:29 - 00:22:15:25

That's a helpful clarification. Thank you. I think the applicant is going to take that away. Yeah. Thank you.

00:22:18:14 - 00:22:48:20

Okay. Thank you for that. No further comments. Um, on that. And I'll just move on to the next question that I had, uh, regarding, um, the landscape matter. So I'd like to pick up on comments, um, from the councils again in their local impact report. Um, statement of ground in concern, the Denbighshire Crematorium. Um, and I believe there have been discussions around whether the crematorium should be included within the landscape and visual impact assessment as a receptor, and these discussions are ongoing.

00:22:49:14 - 00:23:02:04

Um, and I've obviously noted each of your respective positions, but I just like to first ask the councils, um, to provide if you can provide a brief synopsis of why you think the crematorium should be included as a receptor.

00:23:04:12 - 00:23:44:02

Yeah. Thank you. Ben Oakman, uh, representing Conway and Denbighshire. Um, yeah. So we we believe that the the crematorium users of the crematorium and highly sensitive visual receptors, Um, and uh, they are geographically located in a similar location to other, uh, highly sensitive, uh, visual receptors, such as public right of way users, which have been represented by viewpoints. Um, and the assessment uh, emitted uh, the crematorium uses as receptors. So we asked that that be covered. Um, our opinion is that the, uh, our default opinion is that the effects on those receptors, visual effects would be, um, significant based on the assessments carried out for nearby receptors.

00:23:44:04 - 00:24:16:23

We've had the opportunity to speak to, uh, the applicant in our statement of common ground conversation, uh, the other week. And they have since been back to site and, uh, visited the, the crematorium and taken, uh, photographs, which they were able to share on screen with us. And, uh, we came to the agreement that they would provide, uh, um, an annotated set of those photographs at some point during the examination process, and that they would accompany that with an assessment of the effects on the visual. Visual effects on of the users of the crematorium.

00:24:18:27 - 00:24:21:02

Thank you. I come to the applicant then. Please. Thank you.

00:24:22:02 - 00:25:05:05

Corinna for the applicant. Yes. We, um, we tabled, uh, three, uh, photographs that were taken, uh, from the crematorium, one from the entrance, one from the memorial park and one from the closest corner looking at the, uh, towards the substation. And we agreed that we would provide annotated photographs of these. They wouldn't have to be photo montages, just annotated photographs. These showed that there was, um, considerable amount of planting around and within the memorial park and crematorium and also intervening in the landscape we looked at.

00:25:05:07 - 00:25:12:06

We also looked at viewpoint four, which is a high sensitivity receptor, closer, but in the same sort of, um,

00:25:13:25 - 00:25:52:26

uh, orientation as, um, as the memorial park. This was a high sensitivity receptor because it was on a public footpath. And the outcome that we have a viewpoint for was that it was a high sensitivity receptor. The impact magnitude from that location was small. And winter year one would be minor to moderate, adverse and not significant. And this is because of the, um, sort of topography, but also the intervening, um, vegetation, existing vegetation of trees and hedgerows.

00:25:52:28 - 00:25:58:28

So you get a layered effect, um, on that, uh, intervening, um, vegetation.

00:26:03:03 - 00:26:10:10

Thank you. Um, are you intending on submitting those, um, photographs and that analysis, if you like, into the examination.

00:26:10:21 - 00:26:14:08

We can do that for deadline for because we have the photographs already.

00:26:14:10 - 00:26:16:16

So yes. Okay. I'll take that as an action then. Thank you.

00:26:33:23 - 00:27:04:02

Okay. Um, my final questions about the landscape and visual impact assessment, uh, again for the councils, um, and concern the effects on the range and devalue national landscape. Um, and in your local impacts report, you states that the moderate adverse cumulative effects experienced by visual receptors using the office dyke path and Euclidean range and devalue landscape itself would be significant effects as opposed to non significance as assessed.

00:27:04:04 - 00:27:08:24

And I'd just like you to explain why you believe these would be significant. Please.

00:27:11:16 - 00:27:44:27

Thank you. Ben Oakman from, uh, and, uh, Cornwall Council. Um, and this goes back to, uh, an issue with, uh, what we consider to be a flawed methodology, um, in the assessment used in the assessment, um, and particularly around the fact that the significance threshold, um, is too high within the assessment that's been carried out. Our argument is basically around the issue that, uh, moderate level effects are usually considered to be significant in landscape visual impact assessment or at the very least on the cusp, where they can be either significant or non-significant.

00:27:45:08 - 00:28:26:03

Uh, in which case, obviously the, the, the assessor needs to set out which and why, whether it's significant or not. Um, in this case, um, the the the wider environmental uh statement methodology agrees that, um, that moderate effects can also be significant and crucially, the definition provided for

moderate effects in the landscape. Visual impact assessment methodology is that effects that are demonstrably out of scale or at variance with the landscape, character, or views, and just the wording of that alone, enables the Council to draw a conclusion that we consider those effects to be significant rather than not significant.

00:28:26:13 - 00:28:30:27

Um, yeah, that's that's the summary at that point, I think.

00:28:31:20 - 00:28:45:14

Okay. Thank you. So that's the question of the methodology. Um, and the threshold of significance is in relation to what the moderate effects which are your, your concerns there and why you believe.

Okay. Thank you. Enough. I've come to the applicant to respond. So please create.

00:28:45:16 - 00:29:21:23

A demo for the applicant. Uh, we've, um, agreed with, uh, Dembski and Conway that the overarching methodology was GL via three. That's guidelines for Landscape and Visual impact assessment, third edition from the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment. That, um, assessment, sorry, that guidance in that document doesn't actually specify what the thresholds and what thresholds, what the definitions.

00:29:21:25 - 00:29:54:17

It doesn't give you any definitions. It's up to you, um, to define it, uh, as, as long as it's transparent, which we have done. Um, we believe that the moderate effect or sorry, the, the effect from the office type path, we have said that it's a very high sensitivity receptor. It's a national trail going through a national landscape. And we've identified the sensitivity of receptors using that path as very high.

00:29:54:19 - 00:30:09:13

However, um, the actual magnitude of impact is, um, so low from that distance and from the path itself that it is barely the the

00:30:11:03 - 00:30:30:17

onshore substation is barely, um, visible from the path or from anywhere else on the Clarion Range and D Valley National Landscape. Um, we provided um, we also provided cumulative um.

00:30:32:18 - 00:31:03:10

Photo montage photo montages from that location at deadline three. So those are rep 047048. And I think part three, we had to split it into three parts because two of the clude in range and D Valley photo montages have become pixelated. So I just know that as 16.3.

00:31:03:12 - 00:31:38:28

So it's 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3. Um, and the cumulative photo montages as well, um, didn't increase the significance till. So we showed on those cumulative photo montages, the, um, a GIS version of the ah, well, a more onshore substation, because that's the tallest element that would be there. And we also showed, um, in sort of translucent box form, uh, what the national grid, um, extension might be.

00:31:41:09 - 00:31:46:01

Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. Um, and do the councils have any further comments to come back on them?

00:31:46:21 - 00:32:21:20

Um, yeah. Sorry. I may have been slightly misleading in what I said there. Um, that actually the direct visual and landscape effects on the clothing range. Um, Andy Valley National Landscape are not recorded as significant. They are recorded as minor. I believe it's the cumulative effects, uh, cumulative landscape effects, um, and the cumulative visual effects on the, um, users of the, um, Offa's Dyke Path and the, um, um Cullinan Range and D Valley National Landscape are considered to be moderate by the applicant.

00:32:21:22 - 00:32:28:15

It's those that we should consider, uh, are significant. It's the cumulative effects rather than direct and indirect landscape and visual effects.

00:32:30:21 - 00:32:32:07

Thank you. Um, and the applicant?

00:32:41:24 - 00:32:47:29

Um, I don't know whether it's helpful for Mr. Griffin Beale to actually bring those cumulative

00:32:49:17 - 00:32:50:21

few points up.

00:32:51:16 - 00:32:52:23

Yes. Yeah, yeah.

00:33:05:13 - 00:33:28:23

And just while we're searching for those. And before they come up again, it's not it's not a methodological issue with how they get to how the applicant has got to a moderate cumulative adverse effect. That we're disputing is the fact that that moderate adverse effect is, in our opinion, significant rather than not significant for the reasons I stated before here. Thanks.

00:33:28:25 - 00:33:30:01

Yeah that's great. Thank you.

00:33:37:11 - 00:33:42:20

So you can see that from the one that's on screen. Tom, can you tell me which number that is.

00:33:44:10 - 00:34:17:09

Viewpoint 11 okay. So this is from including range and De Valley National Park. And there's a series of them I think there's four of them. And uh, you can see that we have some staff and we have ourselves, uh, sorry. Moana onshore substation. And we have, um, the national grid extension marked on those. They are so, um, distant, uh, that we've had to just annotate them, um, to show you where they are as well.

00:34:17:19 - 00:34:24:12

So we stick with our assessment that it is moderate but not significant from this distance.

00:34:27:09 - 00:34:27:24

Thank you.

00:34:30:08 - 00:35:01:11

I'm just sorry. I'm just going to come in, I think just so that, um, I'm right in my understanding, I think it isn't actually, uh, how how you've assessed it or how you've completed the assessment. I think they can't. What the councils are saying is it's actually just a matter of disagreement between how you, um, qualify what the significant effect is. So because you don't consider a moderate adverse effect significant. The councils are just in disagreement with that I think is that is have I understood at that point correctly.

00:35:01:17 - 00:35:04:05

Then out from Conway and I'm sure yes that's correct. Yeah.

00:35:06:01 - 00:35:21:16

So I think on that point, that's just a point for us to take away as an examining authority. And we will have to we would have to consider that in any recommendation report because we're just at different, um, just on different opinions as to how you've assessed that. I think that's I think that's my understanding of where we are on this matter.

00:35:23:00 - 00:35:27:20

Here in a demo for the applicant. Um, that's yeah, that's fine if you take that away.

00:35:28:18 - 00:35:57:24

Valerie Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, I think we've made reference to the statement of common ground process within that statement of common ground process, um, conversations that Mr. Oakman made reference to. We have agreed to review the list of moderates that he has picked up. And, uh, to provide potentially additional context around those to justify are not significant determinations. So that is work which I'm making reference to future and will be submitted, I believe, at deadline five.

00:35:58:19 - 00:36:00:23

Okay. That's really helpful to know. Thank you.

00:36:01:08 - 00:36:09:16

Thank you. Um, I can see we have a virtual hand up as well. Um, we'd like to come in, please. Thank you. Baradar.

00:36:10:12 - 00:36:52:19

Uh, good morning everyone. Uh, John Jeffcoat here from Natural Resources Wales. I'm a senior landscape advisor at Natural Resources Wales. Uh, I appreciate we hadn't indicated that we wanted to speak on this item, but I just wanted to raise a point of clarification around the the cumulative images. Um, so the so the cumulative photo montages that you just saw on screen, um, I believe are a product

of our request for those we request those in our written representations. Um, primarily, we wanted to understand the combined impact with the existing infrastructure in that area, but also with um, uh um, uh, all the more they are, the more substation in particular.

00:36:53:10 - 00:37:29:17

Uh, helpfully, the applicant has provided those images and they've provided them from, I believe, at least three within the Claudine range and Dee Valley National Landscape, which is, which is the area that we're interested in, um, those viewpoints being points 11, 12 and 19. Um, by way of background, when we received those images at deadline, or I believe it was a deadline three sorry, uh, there was an issue with the photo montages for viewpoints 11, 12 and 19, and I'm sure you're aware of that.

00:37:29:26 - 00:38:04:19

Uh, and that's resulted in a updated version being submitted to you and being loaded to the examination library. Uh, with those errors fixed, the errors being that the the photo montages were just very heavily pixelated so that you couldn't. you could you couldn't make out the image. Basically, you couldn't make out what it was showing. So they've been replaced. Um, unfortunately, looking online, I can only get to viewpoints 11. I can't find viewpoints 12 and 19. And I note the applicant has referred to a different document reference.

00:38:06:05 - 00:38:39:11

Um, so so the document references for the examination library that we're talking about a rep 3046 Rep 3047. But the actual name of the documents had a number that was referred to by the applicant, and they referred to a 16.1, a 16.2, and a 16.3. Now, 16.3 doesn't appear to be there in the library. It's missing. So we haven't got the viewpoint 12 and viewpoint 19. Very happy to be corrected if I've missed this, but I can't find it myself.

00:38:39:13 - 00:38:49:09

So it's those two viewpoints, those two photo montages, I should say, from the collodion range that are of interest to us, but are not currently uploaded to the to the library.

00:38:55:04 - 00:39:28:10

List done on behalf of the applicant. Shall I pick this up? Um, so, um, I think we probably need to take it away and, um, discuss with the team. Um, in terms of of what was submitted, there was an issue with pixelation of the documents that were provided at deadline, i.e. the applicant notified the planning inspector that as soon as we saw that they are very large images. And, um, I think my understanding of what happened is they had to be produced into two parts because they were so large. So rather than being a single package with everything in, there were two.

00:39:28:19 - 00:39:37:10

Um, my understanding is those were provided, but perhaps they haven't made it up onto the. But we will we will check with that and confirm.

00:39:38:02 - 00:39:53:15

We'll also do a check of uh weather there, and we will make sure we'll we'll get that up and let you know. Uh, Mr.. Jeff, if we, um, once we get them, once we get that sorted, we maybe let you know after lunch or before.



00:39:54:21 - 00:39:55:11

Thank you very much.

00:39:55:20 - 00:39:56:06

Just. Yeah.

00:39:56:26 - 00:40:29:25

And just if it's okay to make one other comment at this point, just a general principle for how we deal with these documents. Uh, going through this session, if we're bringing up photo montages on screen, obviously that's that has inherent difficulties in terms of reading those images. But it's crucially important that whenever you're looking at them that they're enlarged to 100%. I think when we brought those up a moment ago, they were shown as 50% scaled images. So everything's going to look a lot smaller than it would do in reality.

00:40:29:27 - 00:40:34:29

So I think whenever we're looking at those images, they need to be at 100% or ideally looking at the hard copies.

00:40:37:03 - 00:41:08:21

Point taken. I think that's something that we can make sure that they're showing it 100% in future. But we can also give the examination library reference numbers for people so that they can also have a look at themselves on their own screens. Or if you do have a hard copy, not everybody has a hard copy. That's the um, most of the examination is online. So not everybody has a hard copy. That's our issue. But we will get those. We will check those documents for you. In the meantime, um, we'll ask Case Team to have a look into that during the hearing session.

00:41:08:23 - 00:41:12:10

And hopefully we can get an answer to you as soon as possible. On on that.

00:41:13:10 - 00:41:14:18

Much appreciated. Thank you.

00:41:14:26 - 00:41:15:15

Thank you.

00:41:16:17 - 00:41:18:21

Thank you. Did the applicant want to come in and.

00:41:20:29 - 00:41:28:24

Bring a demo for the applicant? Yes. Um, hard copies were couriered to NLS yesterday and they arrived yesterday.

00:41:29:26 - 00:41:30:11

Thank you.

00:41:36:12 - 00:41:37:03

Mr. Hussey.

00:41:38:21 - 00:41:58:14

Good morning, Martin Hussey. Could I just ask in the photo montages? Um, as you say, the worst case scenario has been used, and you've mentioned a lot about the building height being 15m above finished ground level. Can you tell me in those photo montages what platform height you've indicated?

00:42:04:21 - 00:42:20:19

Uh, Fiore Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, the platform height for the visualisations is as stated in Design Principles document, which is 57m above ordnance data, up to 61m above ordnance data in the south west corner.

00:42:20:21 - 00:42:30:17

Perhaps I can just clarify my question better. What is the platform height you've you've visualised in your photo montages above current ground level?

00:42:33:28 - 00:42:35:15

Yeah. The applicant come back please.

00:42:36:06 - 00:42:55:09

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Um, the platform height above ground level varies because we're talking about a relatively flat platform, and so I could give you numbers per points, but it varies. It depends where you're referring to.

00:42:56:12 - 00:43:18:27

I'll refer to the northeast corner then where you say the platform height is 57m above Ordnance Datum. You also say that that land is 41m above Ordnance datum. That would imply a platform height of 60m, which are your substation building would be 30 meter high building. Is that what you've included in your photo montages?

00:43:20:24 - 00:43:52:24

That's Hillary Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the figures that you've given are perhaps not quite correct. And so your calculation doesn't quite work out in the north of your document. So in our in our document, in the Design Principles document, we state that the lowest point of the onshore substation site, not the onshore substation platform, is 46m above or above ordnance data in that that would be the northwest corner, which is the existing ditch which runs north south to the National Grid substation.

00:43:52:29 - 00:44:15:27

The north east corner of the onshore substation platform site is approximately 56m above ordnance data, and therefore the above ground above the existing ground level platform level will be approximately. I am talking very rough numbers, indicative approximately a metre higher in the northeast corner in the. I could go around the corner if you'd like, but hopefully that illustrates.

00:44:15:29 - 00:44:47:02

No, I just I just want a straight question is in the photo montages, the visualisations, you've obviously used the substation building height of 50m. I'm saying what platform height of you actually used? Are you saying you've used one metre platform height in that visualisation? Or have you actually gone for worst case scenario, which is probably going to be more than ten metres, which would make the substation height at the bottom end where we visited yesterday over 25m.

00:44:49:13 - 00:45:20:11

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, and as I said, we have used a platform height of 57m above ordnance data, up to 61m above ordnance data. If you use the I mean, it's not submitted into the application, but there is the topography of the onshore substation platform varies and therefore in the cut and field balance, when you put it on a 1 in 100 gradient platform, there are different parts that will need to be elevated. So for example, there will be a fill of approximately one metre in the northeast corner.

00:45:20:13 - 00:45:44:27

There would be a fill of approximately five metres in the north west corner. And that would bring you up to a level depending on the existing topography. So We we. The building height is then 15m on top of that um, meter ridge above ordnance data, which is 61. In the south west corner, down to 57. In the northeast corner.

00:45:49:11 - 00:46:22:07

Uh, sorry, I understand that I'm probably being stupid here, but I'm still unclear as to the actual height at your northeast corner or the north. The bottom end of the substation. That, I will say, is the height with the substation building at 15m. What is the actual height that you anticipate above current ground level? And you keep saying indicative and whatever else. But some of the photographs you're showing things that look as if they're about halfway up the tree height and some of your visualizations and others you're showing nothing.

00:46:22:09 - 00:46:29:20

So I'm unclear as to actually how high the substation building will be Above current ground level.

00:46:33:00 - 00:46:33:21

The applicant please.

00:46:36:16 - 00:47:07:01

Yes. Done. On behalf of the applicant. I think just to to, um, the, the, um, information that has been built into the photo montages is exactly as Mr. Williamson has, has discussed. Um, in terms of where there will be increases, um, in the platform level as a result of the infill exercise and then with the buildings put on top of those. So the photo montages show the ground raising that Mr.

00:47:07:05 - 00:47:19:01

Williamson has just for the ground levelling that Mr. Williamson has just talked through with those buildings. Then, um, uh, on top of effectively where that level platform has been created.

00:47:19:03 - 00:47:38:17

And I think, I think I'm writing, what Mr. Hussey is asking is, is the maximum is is the the worst case scenario of 15m maximum height is that once you get, once you've raised the platform or you're then talking 15m from that, or are you talking 15m from the existing ground level as is, is that is that your question?

00:47:38:22 - 00:47:51:17

Well, they keep the 50 metre building height is above a finished ground level, so that ignores the platform. So I'm trying to understand how high is that actual platform. Because obviously that has a huge impact on the visualisations.

00:47:51:23 - 00:47:55:02

What the height would be if you were looking at it, comparing it to.

00:47:55:04 - 00:48:05:13

Worst case scenario is what the applicant is saying it's using. So what is the worst case scenario? Are we talking a nine metre platform, a ten metre 50 metre? It's unclear.

00:48:08:14 - 00:48:09:27

Could the applicant respond please?

00:48:10:21 - 00:48:31:17

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant in um, in order to, I guess, answer your question. I know in your representation you include a you include a long profile and what we can do is produce one that actually illustrates that what we believe to be correctly and basically aligns with what has gone into the visualizations. And we could submit that at a deadline. Five for you.

00:48:33:02 - 00:49:05:10

Okay. But I guess I'm coming at I know hourly more is irrelevant. But in that instance, you did indicate the height of the platform as being a certain certain distance. I think it was nine meters, if I recall correctly. Whereas at the moment you can't specify the height of the platform and its worst case scenario, i.e. at the the, the northern eastern side, you can't quantify how high that platform is likely to be. You can quantify the building height of 50m, but you can't quantify how I the actual platform is.

00:49:06:23 - 00:49:07:23

On the applicant piece.

00:49:08:18 - 00:49:10:22

So it's done on behalf of the applicant. Um,

00:49:12:09 - 00:49:44:27

I think the um, so in order to provide clarity, the above audience datum levels have been used because they are more accurate than current ground level, and I appreciate that creates some uncertainty as to what your where you are in terms of above ordnance datum, based on where you're sort of effectively starting from, I think, Mr. Williamson suggestion that we will look at this and sort of an annotate a, a diagram, um, to indicate where those things are.

00:49:44:29 - 00:49:59:00

But it those measurements are the measurements that have been built into the photo montages model. So they are showing the ground level rising, plus the 15 meter building on top of that where the level platform is created.

00:50:00:09 - 00:50:04:23

Is it is it possible that you could provide sort of worst case sections across the site?

00:50:07:18 - 00:50:10:03

Listen, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, we can do that.

00:50:10:05 - 00:50:13:01

And do you think you can do that by deadline for.

00:50:18:26 - 00:50:23:25

Lasdun on behalf of the applicant we may need to just confirm. We'll provide it as soon as we can. Okay.

00:50:23:27 - 00:50:57:07

Thank you, thank you. I'm just going to come in on on something. I'm sorry. Just to be picky here in the hearings, there isn't to be no cross examination between parties. And no, it's really easy because you sat so close to each other to almost end up in a conversation. But the discussion should be led by the examining authority. Now, it is likely that we'll ask the applicant to respond to most of the things that you can do. But if we can just avoid getting into conversations between yourselves in the hearings, if that's all right, and if I could just remind you just to speak your name every time you speak.

00:50:57:09 - 00:51:00:13

Mr.. Just so that for the recording under.

00:51:00:24 - 00:51:05:27

Understood, I accept that it's just that this is the only opportunity we actually have to engage with the applicant.

00:51:06:11 - 00:51:18:15

Completely appreciate that. And it's as I say, it's highly likely that we will ask the applicant to respond. But sometimes you might something say something that we also want clarification on so that we understand what you're asking before we ask the applicant to come back in on on it.

00:51:21:08 - 00:51:21:23

Okay.

00:51:24:04 - 00:51:36:29

Okay. I think that's a good place now to perhaps move on to the next section in this agenda item, which is on to good design. Um, excuse me, could I just ask,

00:51:38:20 - 00:51:40:06

could I just ask a question there?

00:51:40:08 - 00:51:48:00

Martin Barlow, Kevin Marietta community council. Sorry. I hope this is the right place to ask. I think it is. Please do. Um,

00:51:49:18 - 00:52:43:19

in my submissions for the. On behalf of the community council, I've expressed concern over the grid of the matrix of 12 lightning masts that, uh, it's been suggested, will be included in the plans. And I've been, uh, particularly concerned about the fact that, uh, the assessment is that it will have no effect on the existing assessments of visual effects. Um, Yesterday on the site visits, the subject sort of came up tangentially, and the applicant used the expression, if necessary, to talk about in talking about, um, the installation of the these 12 30 meter masts, uh, and then acknowledged that there were other possibilities for lightning conduction now.

00:52:43:26 - 00:53:14:15

Um, it having been noted by, well, Mr. Hussey amongst others, that uh, the other substations that we take account of um Bank quantum or National Grid, etc., they don't seem to have these um, 30 meter high lightning masts. So I will ignore the views that have been expressed locally that the, the, the masts were put into the attic Okay.

00:53:15:20 - 00:54:17:14

We're included in the application in order to be taken out as a sort of, uh, concession and would just ask, you know, what is the current situation regarding thinking regarding the masts? Are they necessary? Are they an option? Is there a reasonable likelihood that they will? They will. There are different option not involving masts will be found in in line with the other applications that we're talking the other existing substations that we're talking about because it is you know, the my belief and the belief of the community council, obviously, that despite the assessment that they won't make any difference to the previous visual impact assessment, a matrix of 12 30 meter high masts, particularly mounted on a platform whose height we haven't yet established, um, will be a defining visual characteristic of the finished substation.

00:54:18:27 - 00:54:21:03

And the applicant like to respond. Please. Thank you.

00:54:22:14 - 00:55:03:23

Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we haven't included those. We wouldn't include infrastructure that we absolutely know is not necessary. There is a possibility that lightning masts would be needed in the final design. Um, as Councillor Barlow noted notes, um, there are projects in the vicinity that don't have lightning masts of that nature and have alternative lightning protection systems. Um, it will be part of our detailed design based on our final layout, based on our final infrastructure, and based on the conversations that we need to have with our supply chain as to what the final lightning protection system will be, which may involve lightning masts and may not, and therefore is a worst case.

00:55:03:25 - 00:55:07:16

We've included lightning masts within our envelope. Um,

00:55:09:06 - 00:55:26:21

somewhat anecdotally, I've. I've worked on other DCO projects that have included them and then not built them. It's not uncommon that projects come forward and don't use them, but you need to include them in your envelope so that you cover that worst case and ensure that you do have all of the systems of lightning protection covered within the envelope that we're being we're applying for.

00:55:29:00 - 00:55:30:08

Thank you, Councillor Barlow.

00:55:33:01 - 00:55:34:18

Yes. That's fine. Thank you.

00:55:34:27 - 00:55:35:26

Okay. Thank you.

00:55:42:15 - 00:55:44:00

Yes. Thank you.

00:55:45:06 - 00:55:48:02

So, Edward Sample, on behalf of, um, other.

00:55:48:04 - 00:55:48:21

Land, are.

00:55:48:23 - 00:55:50:12

We all right at this juncture to.

00:55:50:14 - 00:55:51:03

Ask a few.

00:55:51:05 - 00:55:52:19

Questions concerning.

00:55:52:24 - 00:55:53:09

Uh.

00:55:53:11 - 00:55:54:23

Visualisations and.

00:55:54:25 - 00:56:01:29

Landscape? Yes, yes. That's perfect. Thank you very much indeed. I mean, firstly, I have a matter of interest.

00:56:02:04 - 00:56:03:09

Um, more than.

00:56:03:11 - 00:56:25:07

Anything else, is there a is there an engineering reason why these sort of substations need to be such a drab gray. I mean, I appreciate it rains a lot in North Wales and the general color can be of gray, but, um, is there any, uh, reason they could not be a a different color scheme behind that? Thank you. First question.

00:56:28:14 - 00:56:36:21

Just a note. We are going to come out onto that, um, into the next agenda item. Um I'll ask the applicant to respond. But yeah, we will cover this today. Thank you.

00:56:37:12 - 00:56:59:25

Okay. Secondly, on on the schematic, the visualization photographs that have been provided, um, it is something I may have missed, granted, but I just wonder whether any visualizations are of images, um, containing the adjacent property known as Tana Brennan. Tana Renuka. Which are the properties you'll have seen on your on your inspection yesterday?

00:57:02:01 - 00:57:03:08

Okay. The applicant could respond.

00:57:03:10 - 00:57:03:25

Please

00:57:05:10 - 00:57:47:27

listen on behalf of the applicant. Um, uh, Mr. Simple, um, might be aware that we have produced a design Principles document, and there has been discussion in the examination regarding, um, the facade treatment of the, uh, substation, um, and, um, discussions around use of Natural Resources Wales colour palette. Um, we will talk about that, no doubt. Um, when we come on to that topic, um, in respect of the, um, whether there are visualisations from the properties identified, um, we have no is the answer to that because they are private properties and we have not done, um, we have not taken visualisations from private views in that sense.

00:57:49:02 - 00:57:50:24

Thank you, Mr. Samson.

00:57:51:07 - 00:58:06:12

Would it be possible, in due course, to request those visualisations of those, those residential properties that are owned by the Kevin estate? And secondly, would it be possible to obtain visualisations of, uh, the orientation from Saint Mary's Church.

00:58:06:14 - 00:58:08:19



Kevin and the applicants.

00:58:16:23 - 00:58:47:20

List on on behalf of the applicant. In respect of Saint Mary's Church, there is a um viewpoint viewpoint 14, which is very, very close to Saint Mary's Church, um, which will indicate the view from there. And it's it isn't the applicant's intention to do, um, photo montages from individual properties. If, um, the landscape and visual assessment, um, does, as I have said, does not consider or need to consider the impacts from individual properties as part of the assessment.

00:58:47:22 - 00:58:51:25

So at this stage, it's not something that we would be intending to provide.

00:58:53:01 - 00:58:54:25

Okay. Thank you. Thanks.

00:58:57:08 - 00:58:57:23

Yep.

00:58:58:07 - 00:59:30:11

Duly noted. Thank you. Um, on the on the matter of landscape and and habitat. Uh, mitigation. Um, just query, uh, the, uh, 15 year visualization and asking the applicant the position, um, concerning deer management. Uh, we have um, uh, a constantly with, with a significant amount of woodland in the area and woodland, uh, operations and management.

00:59:30:13 - 00:59:38:15

One of our blights is, is the, the deer matter. And just, um, if we could just ask for clarity on that, please.

00:59:38:27 - 00:59:40:10

Okay. And the applicant, please.

00:59:40:12 - 01:00:14:27

Thank you. It's done on behalf of the applicant. Um, the the we're the applicant is aware of, um, of the deer population within the Katherine estate and the need to manage that population. Um, as we've made clear, we, the applicant, has been seeking to meet with the estate. There was a meeting booked in for Monday, which unfortunately the estate has had to postpone. So that I understand, is to be scheduled sometime in November. Um, clearly these are the sorts of details that we will want to discuss with the estate.

01:00:14:29 - 01:00:53:15

However, it is worth noting that the outline landscape management plan, which is rep 2-034, identifies that all sites um identified for natural colonisation will be used and will be protected using deer fencing. The applicant's very aware of the presence of deer, um, within the site and the need for the landscaping that will be, uh, put in an established, um, as part of that for there to be appropriate deer fencing in place so that, um, the applicant is not continually needing to remove to replace that landscaping because it's been removed or eaten by deer.

01:00:55:25 - 01:00:56:10

Thank you.

01:00:57:12 - 01:01:06:05

If I may just add, my colleague Daryl Spittle has a few queries as well. Thank you. Thank you. Start from calculus.

01:01:06:07 - 01:01:38:04

I'm representing Karen tonight. This is a landscaping query. This is a sort of a concern over the size of the scale of the construction of this substation, which has been proposed, and obviously that the applicant is looking to divert and also some watercourses. So looking at the what we already have so far on the substation platforms and all the infrastructure have been a concrete base, which is one of the most sort of carbon hungry sort of things we're looking at. There's a concern that the local water supplies, subterranean water supplies, are going to be affected.

01:01:38:06 - 01:02:08:21

So which could affect the drinking water to relevant adjacent landowners or cause unnecessary flooding to adjacent landowners because you're sort of cutting out rather large footprint of, of Earth. So we would like to understand from the applicant's perspective how they're looking to manage that going forward. What is any sort of monitoring being put in place currently or in the future that's going to notify that there's a lack of water elsewhere or more water elsewhere, and how we can manage that going forward.

01:02:11:04 - 01:02:12:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, the applicants please.

01:02:23:12 - 01:02:38:12

What I would say is that it's when we talk about water and drainage isn't something that we necessarily had on our agenda. So I don't necessarily expect the applicant to have an answer to hand, but it might be something that the applicant may need to take away and perhaps submit following the hearing.

01:02:39:03 - 01:03:11:03

That is done on behalf of the applicant. Thank you, madam, for that. Um, just to be clear, we don't believe that there is a private water supply, drinking water supply, um, on the estate, um, that the residents of the estate use as drinking water, If that seemed to be the implication of what was being said, I don't know if that's correct. Um, the second point is around drainage is clearly drainage of the site, and drainage onto the rest of the agricultural land is a very, very important consideration in the design of the substation.

01:03:11:11 - 01:03:32:09

Um, and there will be a drainage plan produced which will identify how the substation site will be drained. There are attenuation ponds proposed and all those, those elements, these are the sorts of elements that we've been hoping to discuss with the estate and actually, um, be able to explain in more detail, but I haven't had the opportunity to, to date.

01:03:33:15 - 01:03:39:07

But you so you did say you had a meeting programmed. Is that right, Liz?

01:03:39:09 - 01:03:50:13

Done. On behalf of the applicant, I understand that the meeting has been postponed until the middle of November. Okay, so if there is an opportunity to bring that further forward, we would clearly welcome that.

01:03:52:10 - 01:04:02:21

Well, obviously we we can't get involved in your, your your arrangements. But obviously the applicant has offered to meet and perhaps some of your concerns can be sort of discussed outside of outside of the hearings.

01:04:04:18 - 01:04:39:25

That the other one has to touch base on really is more again, of a slightly engineering sort of thing. Again, from a visual impact. We know these things are quite large and intrusive. You've got your converter stations. Um, it'd be nice to know if we have the availability to understand what type of building is going to be, if it's going to block the quarter current stall converter, or the sort of the alternative current source converter station, because they have a different scale of size. And from a visual perspective, with all the national grids, the type of substations that are going to be placed on the the site, there's going to be far greater than anything else.

01:04:39:27 - 01:05:09:18

So from a visual impact, has the applicant sort of take in consideration that of natural green walling, live walling to screen this location or place green roofs on some of the buildings. We did touch base very above the color scheme, but it's one thing if the applicant has actually considered green walling or green roofs to try and blend in this very large sort of, you know, these these things are quite huge and very square and angular. And has that been considered at any point in this process? Thank you.

01:05:10:01 - 01:05:33:05

I can just come in now. I think I am going to move on to this these kind of discussions and questions in the next, uh, agenda item or sorry, next item as part of this agenda item. So I think perhaps if you can can answer that there. Um, I'll come into that in a moment. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Um, just before I move on to that, are there any further questions or comments from anybody?

01:05:36:19 - 01:06:00:15

Um, yeah. Ben Oakman, on behalf of the council's apologies, just to pick up on Councillor Barlow's point about lightning conduction. Um, I've just reviewed the the maximum design scenario table in the Landscape Visual impact Assessment, which talks about lightning conduction lightning conductors up to 30m, but it doesn't commit in there at least to any number of these or locations. Um, I'm

01:06:02:05 - 01:06:33:10

concerned that that if Councillor Barlow is right, that there are potentially 12 of these installations throughout the substation, that that might not have been considered as a worst case in the visual effects assessment. And and I'm also looking at the, um, viewpoint photo montages from viewpoints

two and three and can't see any lightning conductors in illustrated on the visualizations and wondered if, uh, if and how those had been considered within the landscape visual impact assessment.

01:06:34:23 - 01:06:35:21

Um, the applicant please.

01:06:36:03 - 01:07:10:24

Let's done on behalf of the applicant. Um, following the hearings, um, in July, it was, uh, where this was discussed. Um, the applicant updated the photo montages. Um, for, uh, winter year 15. Um, uh, it's rep 071 Rep 047048, which all include the lightning masts. It had been requested by the examining authority, um, at that, that the first set of hearings, that those would be updated and that was done.

01:07:10:26 - 01:07:27:11

And there is confirmation that it doesn't change the conclusions of the assessment in terms of the effects of the project. They are also sorry, the the maximum number of lightning rods is also secured in requirement. Um, which one it is of the DCO. Thank you ma'am. Madam.

01:07:29:02 - 01:07:32:09

Uh, Ben Oakman from the councils, thank you very much for confirming that I appreciate it.

01:07:33:29 - 01:07:53:06

Thank you. Sorry. Just before we move on, just because we discussed that in there for, uh, Mr. Jeff Cook, uh, 16.3 is, Speaker 16.3 is actually in the examination library. References as 027.

01:07:56:24 - 01:08:01:05

Just checking you're still on online. Mr. Jeff Cochrane have heard I am.

01:08:01:07 - 01:08:03:09

Thank you. Thank you for checking that. So that's it.

01:08:03:11 - 01:08:08:26

Sorry it was missed off our heading. So apologies for that. But it is actually in there in as 027.

01:08:09:17 - 01:08:10:06

Thank you.

01:08:14:24 - 01:08:15:29

Okay. Yes this is face.

01:08:20:29 - 01:08:57:15

Sorry. And uh Rebecca face. Uh interested party. Um, on the the topic of the landscape and the visual assessments on seeing those photographs just then. Um, I understand the montages, but there was one specific one that caught my attention. It was of, uh. Well, basically, it was of a hedge, and yet there was a gap clearly visible in that photograph. I wonder why the. I'm not placing it as a question. It's just some of the photographs could have been taken better. I feel if you'd move to the gap to see the view, then perhaps we would all have a better understanding of what that visual impact would be.

01:08:57:21 - 01:09:06:05

If I point out this beautiful room, the Wedgewood Suite, if I walked into the room, see why it's called the Wedgewood Suite and held a book over my eyes.

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

I'm not going to say anything, am I? I'm going to think, why would you call it that? That's silly. The photographs could have been better taken, I feel. And that's. Oh.

01:09:19:27 - 01:09:21:21

Thank you. Um, the applicant like to respond to.

01:09:23:15 - 01:09:43:14

A demo for the applicant? Yes. It's the community of ones who are talking about, um, when, uh, you we took it from the same place as the view towards the substation. So viewpoint, it's viewpoint three, I believe, which is on the public right of way?

01:09:53:04 - 01:10:24:27

Yes. So what we did was we had, um, photography. Um, already from viewpoint three, which extended round. Uh, so we used that same photography obviously for viewpoint three, we were looking directly at the substation. So when we extended it around, the photography that we had did indeed include a hedge in the summer. Um, you it was it was overgrown. The public footpath does run along that um, to if you like the side that we are taking it from.

01:10:24:29 - 01:10:58:19

So the hedging actually intervenes. Um, when you extend that viewpoint, the winter viewpoint, you can actually see it was just to extend it to our well and more that particular viewpoint, you have to turn your head to see all three, um, cumulative effects and ah, well, ammo is quite well screened in winter. Um, and it would be even more so in, in summer. So, so so, um, if you like, you have the worst case where you can actually see where our weather more is.

01:10:59:18 - 01:11:26:10

Um, and we've done a winter year one. Um, I think what what happens if you move, um, sort of up or down, you lose one or the other. So. So we just extended the one that we had already. Um, so I think, um, the assessment still stands. The assessment we did as the winter one where you can see our, well, a small substation.

01:11:29:19 - 01:11:31:24

Um, misplaced any further comments?

01:11:33:18 - 01:11:34:03

Thank you.

01:11:34:15 - 01:11:35:04

Excuse me.

01:11:36:13 - 01:11:36:28

Councillor?

01:11:38:06 - 01:12:09:02

Um, excuse me, Martin Barlow community council. I'd just like to endorse, really the view that's just been expressed because, you know, as a member of the community, when you're trying to assess the impact it's going to have, you know, which we know is going to be major from our point of view. Um, when you look at the visualisations and all you can see is our heads, you're thinking, why are you showing us a hedge? Um, and I feel that the response that's been given is only. Well, it's not terribly helpful, shall we say.

01:12:09:08 - 01:12:09:23

Thank you.

01:12:10:07 - 01:12:11:18

Thank you. The applicant.

01:12:22:00 - 01:12:54:21

Is done on behalf of the applicant. It would be very helpful to actually have specifically pointed out which viewpoints it is that that are of concern. Um, there are a very large number of viewpoints, a number of which are obviously from some distance from the site where, where there's very clear visibility of the site. Um, those of you points that are closer, it can be quite tricky to actually get the the right angle into the site to be able to see across the whole of the site. And the there are often circumstances in which there are other, um, elements in the view that that cannot be avoided.

01:12:54:23 - 01:13:06:17

If there are concerns about very specific viewpoints, I would ask that we are that those are raised in terms of the specific photo montages, and we can explain rather than talking generalities, which is what we're doing at the moment.

01:13:07:00 - 01:13:28:27

I'm just I'm very conscious of time, and we have got quite a lot to get to from the day, and I think that's a good suggestion. So if I could Councillor Barlow or Miss Face, if there are particular viewpoints that you are referring to, if you could put them in your, uh, post hearing submissions and then the applicant would be able to to respond to that in writing, would that be okay for us to ask you to do that?

01:13:30:27 - 01:13:31:25

Thank you. Mr..

01:13:46:20 - 01:13:52:07

Okay. Um, I think now is probably the appropriate time to move on to good design. Um.

01:13:55:06 - 01:14:11:21

So I would like to consider design principles again and, um, which I don't wish to repeat what has been previously discussed and covered issue specific hearing to I dislike to to further expand upon the general approach taken to good design by the applicants.

01:14:14:13 - 01:14:14:28

Um.

01:14:17:03 - 01:14:50:28

So in the relevant representation representation from the Design Commission for Wales, there were a series of observations made in relation to achieving good design. Um, with the summary which stated in part that a rigorous process had been followed. Um, there was a narrative that was required, um, and needed required to reflect the qualitative commitments and ambition of the project, uh, beyond just the technical requirements. Um, but also that the design narrative should reflect a positive enhancing approach to the landscape rather than just mitigating impact.

01:14:52:02 - 01:15:05:29

Um, so I'd like to come to the applicant and ask first, how do you believe that the substation could potentially be, uh, you know, an enhancing, uh, contribution to the local landscape? Um, and what in your design principles would reflect this?

01:15:10:25 - 01:15:56:15

Uh, les done on behalf of the applicant. Um, I am noting your question, so I just want to, um, put this in the context of the requirements of the national national policy statements around good design. Apologies. I don't have the paragraph in front of me at the moment, but I can come back to it, which, discusses good design and clearly good design, is an important consideration of the development of projects. But it also, um, uh, refers to the technical requirements of projects and recognizes that in certain circumstances, um, the ability to apply good design to a particular type of particular electricity development is quite limited.

01:15:56:17 - 01:16:29:26

And I think we we discussed at the first hearing, um, around the opportunities there, the, the, um, the design of the substation will inevitably and must inevitably be engineering led. It has to provide the function of a substation. It has to operate as a substation. It also has to be something that, um, can be built at an economic price, at an economic cost. Um, and that, um, can function as it needs to.

01:16:29:28 - 01:17:04:18

So I think the applicant provided information around, um, around good design. And we'll go on to those in terms of what what can be done. But I think we have to consider all of that in the context of what the engineering requirements are of this substation and what it needs to do to be able to, to operate. So, for example, um, it is not possible to include landscaping within the substation footprint. It is not possible to include planting or vegetation in close proximity to electricity infrastructure.

01:17:04:20 - 01:17:35:10

So there's some sort of fundamental principles that I think it's really important that we understand when we talk about what can be done in terms of good design. We've obviously discussed, uh, questions around sort of facade treatment, those sorts of elements in respect of the buildings. Um, but

the um, but the, the layout of the buildings, sorry, the layout of the infrastructure and the buildings has to be led by those engineering and electrical requirements.

01:17:35:17 - 01:18:10:18

Um, with, with design being effectively applied to those, rather than this being a position where there is complete free reign for the applicant. In terms of how this is designed, I just I think it's very important that when we talk about that, we talk about that in that context. And for the design, um, Commission for Wales. Um, um, their input has been very helpful in terms of looking at those things. Um, and as you'd expect, they are pushing for better design, which is, which is clearly something, um, that is important.

01:18:10:24 - 01:18:24:06

Um, but I think, again, their comments need to be considered in the context of actually what is possible with electricity infrastructure and what can be delivered. I will now pass on to, um, who's going?

01:18:24:08 - 01:18:24:23

Good?

01:18:26:06 - 01:19:09:01

I'm just furlong on behalf of the applicant. Um, so section 3.9 of the Design Principles document, which I'll get the reference for in a second, does include that narrative requested by the Design Commission for Wales. It's worth noting that that meeting with the Design Commission at the end of summer 2023, we've actually done quite a lot of update on the design principles documents since that meeting that was then submitted as part of the application. Um, and paragraph 3.9.1.6 includes the bullet points on um, the key aims of the landscaping proposals and what it tries to achieve in terms of enhancing, um, the current environment and providing screening and, um, providing woodland context in line with the long established environment in the wider area.

01:19:10:08 - 01:19:15:03

Um, and the number is rep 2026. It's the latest version.

01:19:18:04 - 01:19:51:01

And forecasts are on behalf of the applicant. If I could just add one comment on on top of what, um, Mrs. Dunn was saying about the, uh, constraints of design, of electrical infrastructure. And just in reference to a comment that was made, um, either by, I think by Mr. Sample about green roofs. Um, that's an element which would be very difficult to do safely within a substation where you would need to maintain that with electrical safety rules governing how you deal with and operate around equipment.

01:19:51:11 - 01:20:20:15

And it would require a level of maintenance that might require outages with equipment, which of course takes the substation and the generation supply offline. So those are the sorts of things you look to avoid in a substation which has a functional, um, um, deliverability of supply, and that's its main function. So there are certain things that we can do, and that's what the design principles is setting out



in terms of facade treatments and other things. And there are certain things that we absolutely can't do either because of design constraints or because of operability constraints.

01:20:22:14 - 01:20:32:12

Lasdun, on behalf of the applicant, before we go back to and the reference from um, the uh, National policy statements is N1 and it's 4.7.2.

01:20:39:12 - 01:20:45:13

Um, thank you for that. Um, Mr. Sample, would you like to come back on, um, the comments there about the green roofs?

01:20:49:14 - 01:21:22:21

From member states? Yeah. I appreciate the terms of the engineering, and I understand that. But there will be elements of the building that won't be classed as operational. So depending what type of building you're doing, will there be opportunities for buildings that are not operational to be screened or covered? Is there other areas that could be used outside of the main buildings? If you've got cladding on a main building? Could that cladding be placed slightly off the applicant? I was considering Environmental issues and mitigation elsewhere on the site, which comes at a cost.

01:21:22:23 - 01:21:46:25

And from finances and landscape itself. So in terms of maybe a swap, can there be additional thought or consideration is placed on other elements as part of the building structures into the painting colours as additional mitigation that enhances the area and visual impact as well as maybe I understand the roof, forget that, but there must be other areas that could be considered as well. Okay.

01:21:47:17 - 01:21:48:24

Um. And the applicant can.

01:21:52:15 - 01:22:24:25

I put Castle on behalf of the applicant. I think our position is it's not an either or or it's a it's a both that we, the the design principles will bring forward what we can do within the substation footprint in order to, um, provide good design. Um, and we've talked about, um, facade treatments and other things. And obviously the detail of that will be determined in the final design of what the infrastructure actually is, and therefore the design principles will pick up on how that can be treated, and that is as well as the mitigation that we do outside.

01:22:24:27 - 01:22:41:02

And we've been assuming both of those things as we take the project, as we take the project forward. Um, you know, an obvious thing to say is we can't be planting trees within the substation footprint. So where planting is required as screening and that has to be provided outside of the footprint of the substation.

01:22:42:23 - 01:22:43:12

Okay. Thank you.

01:22:53:15 - 01:23:17:06

Um, if I could come to the, um, councils, please. Um, just like a question about, um, the possibility of a local master plan for the area. Um, given the amount of infrastructure development that's going on in the area local to the substation. Um, this was something that was suggested by the Design Commission for Wales. Um, I would just like to ask, is this something that would be progressed or.

01:23:20:14 - 01:23:24:18

Sorry, was the question, is this something that has been progressed or that could be progressed.

01:23:24:28 - 01:23:26:04

That could be progressed?

01:23:26:21 - 01:23:37:15

I'm absolutely. And we would welcome it. Yeah. I'm not prepared to sign my clients up to, to to deliver that at some at some point without them in the room. But yes, I don't see why not. And I think the counselors would welcome it.

01:23:40:11 - 01:23:42:18

Okay. Yeah. Thank you I understood, um.

01:23:51:28 - 01:23:59:08

And then to come back to the applicant, um, you mentioned earlier also obviously your meetings with the the design Commission for Wales. Um,

01:24:00:27 - 01:24:22:21

obviously they have um, stated at deadline three in their last submission that, um, you know, they had invited, um, essentially invited, um, you know, It reviewed further reviews to take place, but that hasn't happened yet. And they said they hadn't had communication from from you. Um, is that something you can provide an update for or comment on, please?

01:24:23:18 - 01:24:54:18

Yeah. Just furlong on behalf of the applicant. Um, so it was our position. We had not had another design review because it was our position that we thought it would be best done when the design was progressed further and we had detailed design information. Um, following the representation from the Design Commission for Wales, we got in touch and asked, would they like an update meeting? It's sort of mid point, but um, they expressed that they can only really contribute by completing a design review. So we've agreed to do that. Um, interim design review. Um, the earliest it could be accommodated was mid-November.

01:24:54:20 - 01:24:56:15

And we're in the process of working out a date.

01:24:57:07 - 01:24:58:08

Okay. Okay. Thank you.

01:25:04:02 - 01:25:10:02

What, you do expect to have had that meeting and be able to feed back into the examination the outcome of that? Yes. Yeah.

01:25:19:10 - 01:25:53:13

Um, and then I come back to the applicant. Um, this is more about now the, the indicative, um, color palettes for the substation and some of the sort of supporting information around that. Um, so this is something obviously you provided it. Deadline one. Um, and while this, this was, this was quite useful. Um, it would be very helpful, um, potentially if you could expand upon this a little bit further, uh, in order to aid understanding of how some of these principles could be applied. So, for example, in the color palettes, how this could be applied to the substation buildings as they would be.

01:25:54:06 - 01:26:34:20

Um, and just to highlight obviously other projects through design access statements or other documents that have provided some of this kind of information. Um, and so I'd like to ask you if you could consider essentially sort of expanding the design principles, documents, um, you know, to include typically your information such as you know, obviously is the vision for the proposed onshore substation and the adjacent area. Um, and that could include the proposed extension to the bottle within grid substation. Um, an explanation, obviously, the range of beneficial beneficial outcomes and visits for the project and how the value of the area and the substations would be enhanced to the local environment and community.

01:26:35:16 - 01:27:09:12

Um, potentially an analysis of local architectural forms and materials to demonstrate how this might inform design as well. I think that would be very helpful. Um, you know, potential boundary treatments for the substation sites and roof scapes when viewed by sensitive receptors from a distance, um, an outline of the contents and program for consultation in relation to the design referenced um, in the design principles documents, um, and an outline program and timeline indicating how after the DCO application would be determined.

01:27:09:18 - 01:27:26:19

The design, delivery of the project and how this would be progress in the context of the design principles. Um, so is this something that you would be able to provide? Um, potentially deadline five. So just to really give it a more detailed picture. Um, again, draw upon what you've already completed.

01:27:27:09 - 01:27:42:22

Okay. Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant. Could I just check where that where that list is from that you read out? I'm afraid we didn't catch all of that. And it was quite a long list. What's the context of that in terms of guidance or where's that come from?

01:27:43:12 - 01:27:50:02

So contacts tab would be to, um, provide sort of a further, um, insight into.

01:27:52:14 - 01:28:09:02

What the sort of the range of outcomes could look like for the substation. I think the principles documents as it is, it's obviously talks, um, quite clearly, obviously about principles and, you know, mitigation and what that would be. Um, I think, yeah. Having a sort of plan, if you like, if

01:28:10:18 - 01:28:19:21

how, how it essentially could look, I think, you know, possibilities, you know, something that you might sort of reference to design access statements earlier. So how could that look essentially.

01:28:20:21 - 01:28:48:19

I think probably just just to back that a bit. It isn't from any of the it's not from a submission. It's our professional opinion about what we feel could be included within the design principles document to improve it or to to beef up slightly, um, help if it's I know we probably went through that quite fast. Is it more helpful for us to perhaps read those out again so that you can take notice? I don't think it's something that we'd expect you to be able to answer on the spot today, but to take away.

01:28:49:29 - 01:28:58:01

Paul Carter on behalf of the applicant, we would welcome that in an easier to digest format. Yeah, there was a long list there. Um, I think we would.

01:28:59:20 - 01:29:05:08

Yes. Yeah. Mr. Paul's just helpfully suggested that we could append that to the action list for you.

01:29:05:10 - 01:29:32:12

That sounds that sounds ideal. We're then happy to review it. I think we would sort of note that potentially some of that information feels more like for the final, um, design principles document, once the detail of the design comes forward. So we will certainly review it and see what could usefully be provided for an update to the Design Principles document, and what we feel might be more appropriate in a final, detailed Design Design Principles design guide.

01:29:40:26 - 01:29:45:13

Are there any further comments? Um, anybody would like to raise? Related to good design?

01:29:47:08 - 01:30:20:19

Uh, I think it's just a quick one, really. The applicant mentioned before that they're looking at gas insulated switchgear. So I'm just asking that the applicant really is has consideration been taken place. Obviously had the main converter station and you have your external target external source of busbar and switchgear. Everything else. Has there been any consideration for those to be containerized in a building? So you're not looking at lots of different things from a visual perspective, just looking at that one large building or two large buildings, is there any consideration place to look at putting those inside the building? Thank you.

01:30:21:10 - 01:30:22:08

From the applicant please.

01:30:27:02 - 01:31:02:07

Focus on behalf of the applicant. So so we do have a list of different buildings that may come forward as part of the final design, which includes control buildings, includes compensator buildings, includes power unit storage, um container buildings, workshops, as well as the main GIS um hall. So there will be, um, a number of pieces of equipment and aspects of the design that will be within buildings, and

there will be other parts that are likely to be outside. And the precise detail of that within the envelope that we're applying for will be part of the detailed design.

01:31:02:09 - 01:31:22:22

So we can't say that until we've been through that design process. Um, uh, post consent. So, um, that's section 3.5.2 of the design principles documents, which was um rep 2026.

01:31:30:08 - 01:31:31:05

Okay. Thank you.

01:31:32:08 - 01:32:04:07

Okay. Um, it's just a general agreement. If if the things are so tangible and so variable, how can the likes of the local authorities, local councillors, from the visual montage people perspective, how can they take for certainty what they're looking at is actually what they're going to look at because we're given information with this is what it might look like, but it appears there could be lots of change. So it just gives a lot of uncertainty and that can cause anxiety to the residents and the people.

01:32:04:09 - 01:32:05:18

It's just a view. Okay.

01:32:06:08 - 01:32:07:01

And the applicant.

01:32:12:18 - 01:32:33:05

Is done on behalf of the applicant. Um, it's pretty standard practice to undertake a, um, a landscape and visual assessment on the worst case. And the photo montages show, um, the building, uh, the tallest building height in the most prominent location. Uh, and that's the basis on which the assessment has been undertaken.

01:32:34:25 - 01:32:35:10

Thank you.

01:32:42:20 - 01:32:46:06

Okay. Anybody else like to comment any further on good design?

01:32:48:18 - 01:32:50:03

Good. Councillor Barlow? Yeah.

01:32:50:05 - 01:33:32:02

Martin Barlow. I'm just again endorsing the point that's just been made through attending the hearings and going through the documents, etc.. One is, you know, one's left with the feeling that we don't really know what we're going to get at the end of the day, you know, and the for the applicant to say. Worst case scenario, fine. But what we're looking at is visualizations, etc., which, um, well, we don't know if it'll be anything like that or not. At the end of the day. So it is a concern and the sooner the sooner within the DCO process that things can be tied down to final design, etc..

01:33:32:04 - 01:33:35:27

I think the better for everyone concerned, particularly local residents.

01:33:37:03 - 01:33:38:27

Thank you. Um, and the applicant speaks.

01:33:39:07 - 01:34:17:15

Less than on behalf of the applicant. Um, as as I've just explained that the assessment has been done on a worst case. And, um, as Mr. Barlow will be aware that the development consent order secures the approval of, um, the detailed design, um, of the various elements of the substation in uh, by the local authority, which involves engagement with various parties. Um, in order to do that, including the adherence to the design principles documents. So, um, the, the, the worst case has been assessed, which is the, which is the standard process for environmental impact assessment.

01:34:17:17 - 01:34:40:24

And then the design process itself is something that will be, um, ultimately will be signed off by Denbighshire County Council, um, with input from others as set out. And the applicant has sought, um, you know, as far as it's able and has gone beyond other projects in terms of those elements where there will be engagement with third parties, the provision of the design principles document, etc..

01:34:42:08 - 01:34:43:00

Okay. Thank you.

01:34:45:03 - 01:34:47:01

Any further comments, councillor? Bollocks.

01:34:48:17 - 01:34:50:06

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:34:53:02 - 01:34:53:27

Miss face, please.

01:34:55:14 - 01:35:17:13

So just one very small comment. I'd like to point out that the phrase worst case scenario is subjective. If you have two fields side by side that may have a cable going through, it goes through one, it doesn't go through the other. That's the worst case for one and the best case for another. It's a it's a misleading term. Thank you. Okay.

01:35:17:15 - 01:35:18:05

And the applicants.

01:35:20:26 - 01:35:38:02

List done on behalf of the applicant. The worst case scenario is, uh, is a sort of shorthand description for the maximum design envelope based upon the, um, the the sighting and the location identified by the applicant and the development that is being proposed. Just to be clear.

01:35:39:04 - 01:35:42:07

Thank you. Do you have anything to add? Um.

01:35:45:27 - 01:36:23:11

Okay, I can't see, um, anybody any further comments? So, um, in that case, I would like to move on now to the lighting subsection of this, um, agenda item. Um, and I would like to consider again the task lighting for construction, which was discussed at issue specific hearing to and for which the applicant has since confirmed. Um has been included with the landscape and visual impact assessments. And whilst I don't wish to repeat the discussion as such, I appreciate this has been raised by a concern by the councils and at this point still remains unclear to me.

01:36:23:17 - 01:36:57:28

So could I ask the applicant to clarify how the assessment of construction and task lighting effects was undertaken and included within the landscape and visual impact assessments? As as I read it at the moment, I do find it difficult to identify the assessment and exactly what has been done. Um, and this is also reflected by the council's um on their comments about nighttime visual effects in their local impact report. Um, and if there's if this does help your discussion, then please obviously do display any relevant sections from the landscape and visual impact assessment itself.

01:36:58:07 - 01:36:58:22

Thank you.

01:37:29:15 - 01:38:01:27

I feel very Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Um, so, um, construction task lighting is identified within the maximum design envelope within the landscape and visual impact assessment. Um and covers at compounds have obviously the nature of construction task lighting is that we can't define where that is specifically. And I will refer to my colleague Miss Miss Denmark in terms of how she undertook that in relation to the, the assessment itself. And then she could either hand back to me as to what we've agreed with in the local authority science on common ground.

01:38:03:26 - 01:38:34:18

Karen and Daniel for the applicant um construction, lighting. Um it will be tasks related. So you will appreciate that we cannot, um, give an accurate idea of what and when and where the tasks will be. We because of the short term nature of it, uh, the construction, we actually considered that, um, it was, uh, de minimis.

01:38:34:20 - 01:38:55:28

It was um, basically it we it would not have the potential to have a significant effect. And therefore, um, although we did a review of it and we sort of found out what it was going to be or likely to be, we didn't know where and when it was short term, and so it was not assessed as such.

01:38:57:17 - 01:39:02:08

And is this explained within the landscape and visual impact assessment or is this.

01:39:02:14 - 01:39:35:21

So, so when we reviewed it we reviewed it at a high level. So we just sort of discussed what it would be. And it was it was then decided that it wouldn't be have the potential to have a significant effect. And so using Govia theory, which only says identify potential significant effects, we then didn't do it. So we considered it at a high level, but we didn't then go in and do construction effects lighting because we did not know what it would be.

01:39:37:02 - 01:39:37:21

Okay. Thank you.

01:39:38:05 - 01:40:10:16

Sorry. If I may add, Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think it's it's fair to say that we've had similar conversations with the local authority through the Statement of Common Ground process, and through that process, we have agreed to do an, uh, to provide the high level assessment in narrative, because, as you point out, it's not explicitly within the chapter itself. Uh, so that narrative will be provided, and I can't recall the top of my head what deadline? We've agreed. Um, so I'll have to feed that back to you. But we have agreed to do that through the Statement of Common ground process for the local authority, and will be submitted to the examination.

01:40:10:18 - 01:40:11:25

Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

01:40:17:18 - 01:40:20:12

Uh, Ben Oakman from the councils, if I may add a point to that.

01:40:20:25 - 01:40:21:16

Yes. Of course.

01:40:21:21 - 01:40:44:19

Thank you. Um, yeah. As, uh, Phil, um, mentioned, we we did agree that there would be additional submissions, um, in relation to construction task lighting, but also in relation to operational lighting, which is mentioned in our written representation and statement of common ground as well, something that hasn't been assessed. Um, so I understand that we'll receive some, uh,

01:40:46:16 - 01:41:05:09

uh, assessment, um, on the potential for effects from, uh, visual effects on and on nighttime landscape character from, uh, construction task lighting, uh, and security lighting, but also, uh, operational security lighting, car park lighting and other, uh, lighting elements mentioned within the application.

01:41:06:17 - 01:41:09:13

Okay. Thank you. And the applicant, sorry.

01:41:09:15 - 01:41:25:22

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, uh, just to, um, to piggyback on what Mr. Bergman has said, the, um, essentially, we will be providing a note that consolidates the lighting points. So construction operation and covers the high level assessment. Um, so that's what will be submitted.



01:41:27:08 - 01:41:44:03

Thank you. Invite, if I can understand. Check my clarity. My understanding. Um, so that note will essentially explain why you sort of, as such, haven't gone further within the assessment. And you sort of initial high level, say high level assessments if you like.

01:41:45:28 - 01:42:24:18

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Yes. That's correct. I think the the details included within the project description, within the design principles and within the outline, um, artificial light submission plan, um, just I think need bringing together to make it clear, we can provide additional clarity on what we mean by what is security lighting, for example, down lighting that's motion censored rather than an idea potentially, that it's floodlit, a floodlit substation. So those clarifications will go into that that and that will feed through into um, basically the narrative around the high level assessment and why it was not considered required as part of the chapter assessment.

01:42:25:07 - 01:42:28:08

Thank you. And could you just confirm again when you would provide that, please?

01:42:32:28 - 01:42:40:19

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, I believe it's deadline five because that will that's when we'll provide an update on the statement of common ground through the statements of Commonality.

01:42:40:21 - 01:42:41:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:42:42:22 - 01:43:14:09

I could just just come in on a moment there and I might be I might be mistaken. Um, and I know this is this is probably one of the areas where there was a factually incorrect statement made in one of the the documents were said there was no there's no tax. There was no going to be no tax lighting, which has since been, uh, retracted. We now know that there is, I think, in further questions when we've spoken about this, we have asked the question about where it's being assessed. And I believe, although this is why I'm saying I might be mistaken, that we have had statements from the applicant saying that it has been assessed.

01:43:14:27 - 01:43:38:15

Would you just be able to check through what you have submitted to us? In case you have incorrectly stated that you have assessed us lighting or it has been assessed? Um, I don't want to bring up Arata again, but it might be that you have to correct things that you've said, uh, previously. Because I do believe that you might have said that you have actually assessed that at some point in the submissions.

01:43:41:06 - 01:43:44:19

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, yes, we can check that and that's fine.

01:43:45:00 - 01:43:45:21

Thank you.

01:43:49:02 - 01:43:53:09

Okay. Are there any further comments about, um, task lighting.

01:43:54:27 - 01:44:14:00

Uh, by Nachman from, uh, the councils? Again, just to reiterate that this is not just a landscape and visual issue. It also relates to ecology as well. And it would be good to have an understanding. I haven't looked myself or confess, uh, whether, uh, ecological impacts of lighting, whether it's construction, task lighting or uh, operational lighting has been assessed as well. Please.

01:44:15:18 - 01:44:16:27

Okay. Thank you. The applicant is.

01:44:23:17 - 01:44:40:01

Liz. Don, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I don't have that information to hand in terms of ecology, but we could. It will certainly be picked up in terms of reference in the note. We'd have to check. I'd have to check into the ecology chapter, which I do not have in front of me at the moment. So we can come back on that point.

01:44:40:12 - 01:44:41:23

Yes. If you could, please. Thank you.

01:44:53:01 - 01:44:56:06

Okay. Are there any last comments on lighting, please?

01:44:59:01 - 01:45:10:20

Okay. Um, if there are no further comments, um, then that brings me to the end of my questions about the task lighting. Um, and I think we'll move on to the next, um, subsection, which is about noise and vibration.

01:45:11:19 - 01:45:25:05

Just before we move on, this probably would normally be a time that we would break for lunch, but I don't think we we probably will be able to get through the remainder of the agenda in the next half an hour. Are people okay to continue? And then we'll we'll break for lunch around half one.

01:45:27:16 - 01:45:37:00

Okay. Uh, the the next part of the agenda relates to noise, vibration and working hours. Um,

01:45:38:28 - 01:45:52:13

it's noted from the statement of common ground with the councils that there is some further work being done on noise and vibration. Could you just give us an update on that, or explain to us exactly what it is that you're doing and when you intend to submit it?

01:46:03:22 - 01:46:05:12

Is that a question for the applicant? Sorry.

01:46:06:22 - 01:46:09:24

Uh, well, yes. Either either it could be for some of you, if you're.

01:46:10:00 - 01:46:12:01

I don't I don't have the information to hand. You don't have.

01:46:12:03 - 01:46:14:02

That. No. To the applicant. Then please.

01:46:23:09 - 01:46:30:14

Lori Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. To the Statement of Common Ground process. We've committed to doing an update on the construction vibration.

01:46:35:10 - 01:46:40:26

And at what point do you expect to have that completed and submitted into the examination.

01:46:41:08 - 01:46:44:07

Room on behalf of the applicant? Deadline for.

01:46:54:00 - 01:46:56:08

Thank you. Um.

01:46:58:27 - 01:47:30:17

We have we have quite a lot of onshore, um, site prep works, which will involve which will involve a certain amount of, of, of noisy working. And I think requirement nine now states that those works will be carried out in accordance with the outline noise and vibration management plan. Um, can I just ask if during site clearance there would be any methods, um, if there would be any sort of rock breakers used during those onshore cycles. Site clearance might involve them and they can be very noisy.

01:47:32:26 - 01:47:45:09

Valerie Williamson, on behalf of the applicant at no site clearance does not involve anything like rock breaking. Site clearance is predominantly to do with vegetation. Um, the I'll. I'll leave it there. So.

01:48:02:03 - 01:48:25:06

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I thought you were discussing to come back to me. Um, in terms of that, is there somewhere within that, um, within the outline noise and vibration management plan? Is there something in that that confirms what would and what wouldn't take place within the onshore in terms of noisy working just to secure secure that we don't go beyond the realms.

01:48:25:08 - 01:48:25:23

Of.

01:48:25:25 - 01:48:26:19

What we've discussed.

01:48:33:15 - 01:49:07:14

At Fillory. Williamson on behalf of the applicant. So within the outline noise and vibration management plan, there is a commitment to work to BZW fights for a British standard five, 2 to 8. There's more to it, but I can't remember all of it. 2009, I think. Um, which includes a commitment to looking at the noise and vibration and potential risks and impacts associated with construction activities. Um, and that would form the basis of the detail for agreement with the local authority. Um, so there is a commitment for the onshore site preparation works to work to that standard.

01:49:07:16 - 01:49:08:19  
RBS 5228.

01:49:08:25 - 01:49:09:27  
Okay. Thank you.

01:49:13:16 - 01:49:22:00  
If we could just tend to work in-house now, I know we have discussed that previously and I don't want to go back over that, um, in detail.

01:49:22:13 - 01:49:22:28  
Um.

01:49:23:16 - 01:49:58:00  
And we are aware of everybody's positions in terms of working hours and how everybody feels about that. Um, I just wanted to bring it back and explore something briefly. And that relates to the Yarralumla, um, development consent order. Uh, now, I think in the applicant submissions, you have used that as an example of a precedent that's been set for the 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. to 7 p.m., Monday to Friday. Now, an hour and more. The working hours that were consented on there for a Saturday were shorter than what you're seeking, and they were permitted 7 a.m.

01:49:58:02 - 01:50:09:14  
to 1 p.m.. So I guess my question would be, why would your scheme differ to I will and more? And what is the justification for you? Um, working until 7 p.m. on a Saturday as well.

01:50:10:00 - 01:50:41:21  
Lays down on behalf of the applicant. Um, the hourly more project sort 7 to 7 and the reduction in hours was something that was, uh, recommended by the examining authority and put in place by the Secretary of State. So in that sense, this project is following what really more had sought to put in or sought to secure and felt was a was a justifiable, um, um, period of working. Um, there are a lot of other examples, um, um, where the 7 to 7 has been granted.

01:50:41:29 - 01:51:13:13  
Um, so most recently in the Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon extensions order in the high net carbon dioxide pipeline, order net zero Teesside 2024, Boston Alternative Energy Facility Order 2023 and a number of others. So? So there is precedent for for um 7 to 7 on Saturday and that was what was sought by hourly more. Although the examining authority um recommended the shorter period. And then that was put in by the Secretary of State.

01:51:15:00 - 01:51:37:26

I think obviously I will the more would be you couldn't really get any closer in terms of a made development consent order. And there was obviously a reason why the czar recommended a shorter working period on a Saturday. And the Secretary of State obviously agreed with that reasoning. Is there anything that you can put to me that would justify a different approach on this side, with it being only just down the road?

01:51:43:27 - 01:52:01:28

Well, Castor, on behalf of the applicant, I think we'd provide the same justification for Saturday 7 to 7 that Alan Moore provided for Saturday, 7 to 7 that clearly the Secretary of State didn't agree with. But it's the same points that we are making, as are more made in their representations. Okay.

01:52:06:13 - 01:52:20:26

And if we're looking at this cumulative cumulatively with all the other developments that are proposed and consented already. Could a case be made for staggered working hours to lessen the impacts on on neighboring residents when you've got so many developments in the same area.

01:52:26:04 - 01:52:56:18

Luke Carter, on behalf of the applicant, I think firstly, we don't know when those other projects are coming forward and programs can change. I think the other important thing is there is a large amount of work that needs to be done. And this is a it's infrastructure that needs to be brought forward. And restricting the working hours extends. The program has potential increases in costs that get passed on through the cost of the project delivery. There is a delivery element to this.

01:52:56:25 - 01:53:22:15

Um, and we would want to try and deliver the project as fast as possible by utilizing all of the working hours available. In order to do that, it would be very complicated to use a staggered working profile that we wouldn't know ahead of time. Based on cumulative projects being managed by potentially the local authority. It would be a very difficult thing to manage with contractors and with possibly delayed delivery of the project itself.

01:53:23:27 - 01:53:41:26

I think on some more recent examinations, there has been examples of where working hours have differed between, um, different works numbers, where you have got more effects on certain parties at different different areas. Is that something that could work for this project?

01:53:44:00 - 01:54:11:04

Well, Carter, on behalf of the applicant, I don't think we've had any specific representations of that nature for particular works. If any were made, would clearly look at them. I think we would see the need to be delivering all aspects of the project as fast as possible, and with the maximum flexibility to be able to do them as fast as possible. And we wouldn't be looking to limit the working hours at any particular location. Thank you.

01:54:12:13 - 01:54:25:20

Okay. Thank you. Um, we've got Mr. and Mrs. Hussey here, and I have made, um, submissions on on Noise. Is there anything you would like to raise with us today?

01:54:27:00 - 01:54:33:25

Um, Martin Hussey um, the one thing I'm would like clarity on if I can please is, um.

01:54:36:15 - 01:55:11:23

In our submission at deadline one, we asked as to what actual distances had been used from our property to each and each of the construction activities to which the applicant referred us to the location of the temporary construction compounds, and also to the same document, which I think was AP179. That construction plant had been assumed to be situated within these construction compounds, and has been modelled along the boundary closest to the receptors. So my understanding is that taking our Property.

01:55:11:25 - 01:55:27:01

The example is that the distance for any construction activity, whether it be substation, whether it be underground cabling, that it's the distance from our boundary to the temporary construction compound, is my understanding correct?

01:55:28:13 - 01:55:53:06

Just just so I can, um, be certain on what you're asking, Mr. Hussey. You're really you're you're saying that the assessment appears to have been made from one point on the, on the site, whereas you're going to have construction a lot closer to your property. And there's been no measurements, uh, taken or assessments made of what the noise, uh, values would be at those points of the construction.

01:55:53:16 - 01:56:16:20

Uh, Martin Hussey yeah, I was going to come on to that a little bit. Depending on the answer I got is my first point was, is that my understanding correct that the distance is used and the distance is obviously a critical of influence in the model is the distance that's been used by my property from the nearest temporary construction compound to our boundary.

01:56:17:03 - 01:56:19:27

Okay. Could I ask the applicant to respond, please?

01:56:21:29 - 01:57:04:17

A for the applicant. Um, I can confirm that is in part correct the information that was given to the interested party at day two. Um, did say did refer to, um, the figures which showed temporary construction compounds as those locations where activities were assumed. Um, I can further clarify, um, following the submission made by the interested party at deadline three, um, that the substation works, um, are not within those temporary construction compounds.

01:57:04:19 - 01:57:16:17

They are within the substation footprint. So those works are a lot closer to the interested parties property, um, than we we gave the impression of at at deadline, so.

01:57:19:19 - 01:57:49:14

I'm not sure that quite answers Mr. Hughes's question. I think the question is, I think I think we can see that the substation is closer. I think Mr. Hughes's question is where were the where has it been

assessed in terms of the impact on his property? What distance has the the noise been assessed from? I think from our site visit yesterday, we can see the substations a lot closer to his house. We can see that the cable routes right outside of his back garden. Where has the impacts to Mr. and Mrs. Suzie's property being assessed from.

01:57:51:09 - 01:58:25:03

Pamela for the applicant? I don't have those exact distances out to hand at the moment, but that is something that we can provide, um, at deadline for and we can provide that, um, that distance The, um, the distance that we know that is from the substation footprint to the property is approximately 190 to 200m. So that is where approximately the substation construction works would have been assessed from. But I can provide the exact the exact distance in deadline form is not the exact.

01:58:25:05 - 01:58:53:12

Distance I think I'm trying to find that. Has it been assessed? Have you assessed the substation works in relation to Mr. and Mrs. Lewis's property, and also the cable route is is right outside of there via garden. So there will be considerable works going on outside of their property potentially, uh, trench techniques which can be noisy as well, uh, very close to their property has an assessment being made of, uh, the noise that would arise from those works.

01:58:55:02 - 01:59:11:26

For the applicant. Yes. I can confirm that the, um, the construction noise has been assessed for those works which are closer to the interested parties property for both the substation and trench less techniques.

01:59:12:05 - 01:59:18:25

Okay. And where where would Mr. Hussey be able to find that information? Oh, sorry, Mr. Hussey.

01:59:19:08 - 01:59:50:16

Sorry, Martin Hussey um, yeah I've seen the, the each construction activity and trench lease has been assessed, which the applicant indicates would be a noise impact of 39dB. Um, which for something that potentially could be 3.6m from my property seems totally ridiculous. Um, it implies that the use of diggers, excavators, dumpers, vibratory drilling generators, um, would be like sitting in a library all day.

01:59:51:06 - 02:00:25:02

Um, I've also looked at other nationally significant projects, and as an example, I found someone who's not doing trench less so open trench, which arguably is slightly quieter. And they referenced that that that receptor at 185m away would be impacted by 57dB. And someone who was 390m away would be impacted by 50dB. So how on earth, 39dB can become out of the model? Is is absolutely a mystery to me.

02:00:25:06 - 02:00:39:05

It implies that the background noise that currently exists will dominate the diggers and the excavators. So yes, there is a figure that's been evaluated, but clearly to me it's highly inaccurate.

02:00:41:25 - 02:00:43:24

Yes. The applicant to respond, please.

02:00:43:29 - 02:00:46:00

Lasdun, on behalf of the applicant, um.

02:00:48:03 - 02:01:07:26

We are very grateful to, um, Mr. Hussey for raising these points. We are checking through the figures in the, uh, in the noise report. Um, and we will produce an updated deadline for looking at those figures and provide the information to Mr. Hussey in respect of those.

02:01:08:14 - 02:01:31:26

And in terms, if I could just ask as the applicant, in your professional opinion, the noise backgrounds, obviously we've been on site. It's a fairly rural area with, you know, relatively low background noise levels, the noise, the background noise level that you have arrived at in your noise report is, is that unusually high for that type of area?

02:01:41:11 - 02:02:14:18

I'm sorry for the applicant. Um, if I can provide some more information in terms of how the the noise levels are derived at for the construction noise impact assessment, it's not based on background noise level, it's based on the noise level throughout the day, averaged throughout the day or the evening period or the nighttime period. And what we can confirm from the baseline surveys that were undertaken in September, sorry, November 2023, which, um, sorry September 2023.

02:02:14:20 - 02:03:02:11

My apologies. Um, that the that the noise levels that were recorded were low and were in accordance with what you'd expect from a rural, rural area. So there's nothing that to suggest that the noise levels were unusually high, apart from the, um, instances which the interested parties have raised in, in representations. Um, on the 18th and 19th of September. Um, we have we have looked back at those how we arrived at the baseline levels that we then produced for the construction noise impact criteria and can confirm that because there was rain in those days, because I know the issue was about wind.

02:03:03:01 - 02:03:33:01

We have also taped in deriving those construction impact levels. We have actually taken out or disregarded the rain on the 18th and 19th, some of which was coincidental with the windy periods which the interested party had had raised. And they, based on levels that we have actually used, um, represent the lowest representative, which has been taken from other days during the survey, which was from 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th of September.

02:03:33:11 - 02:03:33:26

Okay.

02:03:34:13 - 02:03:44:07

So as the applicant said, you're relooking at the figures on the basis of the submissions made by Mr. Hussey, and they will be will you share them with Mr. Hussey as well?

02:03:44:24 - 02:03:48:04



Les Don, on behalf of the applicant we will. Thank you, Mr. Hussey.

02:03:49:04 - 02:04:15:16

Yeah. I think fundamentally it's not just my property if the same thing has been done to everybody else in the cable corridor and around the substation, using temporary construction compounds. Then you'd have to question the figures. Full stop for everybody along the cable corridor. It would be useful if for each of the activities, as well as including the noise impact, the actual distances used would also. Um.

02:04:17:25 - 02:04:38:13

Stated as well. And that has been done on other uh national student projects, where they actually list the distances used for each of the construction activities. This is totally, um, missing for this here and just raises suspicions. It. I wasn't going to say it, but I'll say it. It almost looks as if this has been worked backwards.

02:04:41:06 - 02:04:53:06

Okay, well, I'm assuming that the distances should be easy for you to get because it would have been used in the assessment. So I'm assuming you can submit them in into the examination as part of this clarification note.

02:04:53:24 - 02:04:55:25

Is done on behalf of the applicant, yes we can.

02:05:04:12 - 02:05:12:09

Okay, I did have a couple of questions for the council, but Mr. Owen, I'm presuming that you're not, um, briefed necessarily on some of these matters.

02:05:13:18 - 02:05:16:17

Uh, okay. And for from the council's. No, I'm not on right now.

02:05:16:19 - 02:05:31:00

Okay. I think we'll defer some some of the questions to um. Yeah. SSC to then in, in that case on on that basis, is there any further points anybody wishes to raise on uh, noise and vibration before we move on? Mr. Hussey.

02:05:31:23 - 02:06:09:02

Yeah. Sorry. Uh, also my deadline three submission. I raised the query as to why thresholds had only been used and not changes in ambient noise, which has been used under the construction of a developments and is also mentioned in um, The overarching energy in PSM 12023. It's mentioned in IAM EMA guidelines, uh, about the impact from changes in uh, base level with construction noise, something which for construction, the applicant has not done.

02:06:11:11 - 02:06:13:12

Unless the applicant to respond, please.

02:06:14:11 - 02:06:52:12

Pam. Larry, on behalf of the applicant, um, I confirmed the approach we have used does take change into account, um, in a particular way. So for instance, the what we call the lowest observed adverse effect levels to the level at which adverse impacts occurs is set at the baseline level that we've recorded from our baseline surveys. And so when we, um, assess construction noise and we get a level that is the same as the baseline noise level, we say that That then causes an impact because when you get to noise, levels are the same.

02:06:52:25 - 02:07:06:05

Um, and then you add them together, you will then notice that that change. Um, so we have taken that into account in the methodology that, that we've used, but it's just not explained in that way.

02:07:07:20 - 02:07:12:17

Well, perhaps that's something you can, um, add to the clarification note as well.

02:07:12:19 - 02:07:25:06

Liz, Dan, on behalf of the applicant, we also haven't yet, as we're aware, on the timetable, responded to deadline three submissions because these hearings have come in advance of those submissions. So that is something we can address there as well.

02:07:25:14 - 02:07:28:14

Thank you, Mr. Hussey.

02:07:29:00 - 02:07:51:21

Yeah, I appreciate if, um, I don't want you to rely on deadline three submission, uh, responses to my submissions, because my previous responses from deadline one have been very political and perhaps not answering the questions. So I'm relying on it to be through this examination process, rather than the simple responses to my, um, submissions. Okay.

02:07:53:06 - 02:08:26:08

Uh, well, what I, what I would say is the hearings don't carry any more weight to, uh, written submissions. It's supposed to be a primarily a written process. Um, all I can do is ask the applicant if they can properly ensure that they read through all of your submissions to date. And when you do, uh, come to put your responses in at deadline for if you can ensure that you've thoroughly covered the points that have been raised by Mr. Hussey, and then there are further opportunities still in the examination for us to ensure that we're content that that has been done.

02:08:29:23 - 02:08:34:22

Uh, any other points on noise and vibration? Mr. Hussey?

02:08:35:02 - 02:09:09:18

Sorry, there was one, um, vibration which I think had been scoped out. Um, I in the responses to the examination questions, I did respond to that. I don't know if that's something to hear or whether that comes again in some sort of further response from the applicant. Uh, it's just that where I am my experiences today is that we have experienced vibration, particularly towards the south, uh, east and west of our property, when any activity has been done, whether it's replacing a telegraph pole or anything like that.

02:09:09:20 - 02:09:25:28

So my concern is around the fact that vibration is scoped out even though there's going to be piling works, uh, in pretty close proximity to my, to myself and other residents. So I'm just concerned that vibration at this stage has been scoped out.

02:09:28:03 - 02:10:19:04

Yeah. Please, Don, on behalf of the applicant, um, just to be clear, it hasn't been scoped out. Um, there is a, um, noise and vibration management plan, um, which will be aware of secured through the, um, code of construction Structured Practice, which applies BBS 5228 so as and when the detailed design for the substation is prepared, there will be a noise and vibration management plan which will look at the, um, the particular methods used for the purposes of the construction and will apply those RBS 5 to 2 eight standards in terms of what? So so it is not that it has not been, it has been considered and it will be considered at the appropriate time when the when the construction, um, when the code of Construction practice and the Noise and vibration management plan is submitted to and approved by the local authority.

02:10:22:28 - 02:10:25:00

Mr. Hussey, does that answer your question?

02:10:26:27 - 02:10:35:28

Uh, yes. Uh, obviously I was mistaken, but I'm sure I read that in the earlier, um, documentation that said, uh, vibration had been scoped out.

02:10:42:29 - 02:10:57:14

Okay. Um, before we move on, I am just going to hand over to my colleague, Mr. Corsi, who has a point to be made about something that has been raised, has been raised by the applicant relating to this landscape.

02:10:58:21 - 02:11:29:09

Yes. Thank you, Miss Jones. Yes. It's a point that both the council and the applicant asked the examining authority to consider whether the latter needs to submit a soundscape assessment in accordance with the Noise and Soundscape Plan for Wales 2023 to 28. And that's following the environment, Air Quality and Soundscapes Wales Act coming into force in April of this year, albeit the thought was after submission of this application for development consent.

02:11:29:22 - 02:12:02:02

Now, in accordance with section 26 of the act, the duty to have regard to the National Strategy and soundscapes doesn't actually apply to the Planning Inspectorate or to the decision making Secretary of State. However, whilst both those um entities aren't obliged to have regard to the policies and the natural national strategy on soundscape, they could be matters which the Secretary of State thinks are both important and relevant to their decision.

02:12:02:04 - 02:12:44:14

For the purposes of section 104, 2d of the Planning Act of two 2008. Note the duty under section 26 of the 2024 act requires local authorities in Wales and relevant Welsh public authorities to have regard

to the policies in the strategy when they're exercising any function of a public nature that could affect soundscapes. So this means, if there are any local authorities in Wales or relevant Welsh public authorities participating in the examination, they will be required to have regard to the strategy when they're considering the application and its impacts and when participating in the examination.

02:12:45:05 - 02:13:11:01

So on that basis, the Xa would welcome the council's views as authorities who must have regard to the national strategy in exercising their functions, as to whether they consider that further information is required from the applicant, or whether the information already provided to the examination is sufficient. So could I have some

02:13:13:00 - 02:13:18:07

input from the councils on that point, please?

02:13:18:23 - 02:13:32:10

Um, I think I'm the sole representative here from the councils and I apologize as as I stated earlier, I'm not briefed on the on the subject at all. What I can do is I can take that back to my clients and, and get confirmation from them for you in writing.

02:13:33:18 - 02:13:46:03

Please do, Mr. Oakman, because it's it's something that the applicant has asked for a steer on and we're halfway through the examination, so that would be appreciated if that could be be done like a deadline forward, please.

02:13:46:10 - 02:13:54:11

And that's a, um, notification as to whether the council's consider a soundscape assessment necessary or not. That's what's required.

02:13:54:13 - 02:14:07:12

Yes. For for the reasons that I've, um, set out in the question, which obviously can be reviewed on the recording in due course. So thank you for that. Is there anything that the applicant wants to add?

02:14:11:07 - 02:14:13:19

Les Don, on behalf of the applicant. No thank you.

02:14:14:00 - 02:14:14:22

Thank you.

02:14:16:07 - 02:14:46:08

Okay. Thanks. Mr. Corsi. Um, looking at the time and what we had left on the agenda and just who we have in the room with us, we had some traffic questions that were directed to the council, but on the basis of the information that, uh, Mr. Oakman has given us today. I do not believe that it's the correct time to ask him. And then we'll put those questions in EC2 for the council, which are to be published on the 19th of November. Uh, we'll do that.

02:14:46:10 - 02:15:16:19

And there are also some other questions that I have relating to site accesses, but I think we can defer that to, um, issue specific hearing five on on the DCO because it's interrelated with uh, requirements and onshore prep work. So we'll, we'll defer that. Um, and finally on the agenda is, uh, we had the accumulation and interrelationship of effects, which relates to a particular paragraph in Empson, one which is paragraph 4.3.19.

02:15:16:26 - 02:16:07:11

Rather than discuss that in detail. Now, what I think I'll do is, is give you give all parties an action point to take away and to make submissions on. And the basis of that is that we've discussed multiple issues today, and there are others relating to the onshore substation that we haven't necessarily had on the agenda today. Um, and my question would be, is it possible that even if those elements are considered acceptable, um, in their own right, with mitigation measures in place, could they add up, um, in total to have a significant effect on the community or the environment, either as a result of the project alone or cumulatively with other proposed developments? And I would like to invite submissions if I if I could on that in writing.

02:16:07:20 - 02:16:09:03

Um, for deadline for.

02:16:11:01 - 02:16:48:25

Les Dan on behalf of the applicant, there is um as you'll be aware, Matt chapter in the environmental statement on accumulation on interrelationships. Um, we have reviewed that and think that that's probably not not quite as clear as it could be in respect of um, it sought to consider both project lifetime effects, which are effectively sequential effects. So one thing happening after another, and receptor load effect where you've got a number of things happening to a particular receptor B that humans or others, part of that is dealt with in the human health assessment.

02:16:48:27 - 02:17:12:26

Um, but I don't think it's entirely clear how humans have been considered on the community element in the inter-related chapter. So we had picked that up as something that we would, um, be providing an update on. I suggest from the applicant's perspective, that's probably as much as we would provide in terms of saying we've brought all of that together, and then it's possibly for other parties to be making submissions on that. From their perspective.

02:17:12:29 - 02:17:40:23

That would that would make a lot of sense. As you know, we will have to we have to report on policy and how the application accords or doesn't accord with policy to have a submission from from you. Like that would be really helpful. And if parties want to make a submission now in advance of that. Based on their own opinion on whether it accords with that particular policy, that's absolutely fine. Or if people would like to wait until the applicant has submitted that a deadline for. And then you'll be able to respond to that, a deadline. Five that is also fine.

02:17:45:18 - 02:18:02:11

Okay, then. So before we close for lunch, and that will be the close of this particular agenda item on the proposal on your substation are that is there anything else anybody would like to raise before we can make a decision as to whether we do need to continue after lunch?

02:18:05:00 - 02:18:20:03

Not seeing any hands not online either. Okay. In that case, thank you everybody for your contributions this morning. They've been really helpful. Um, I suggest we take an hour for lunch and come back at 230. Thank you.