From:
To:

Byers Gill Solar

Subject: Additional Written Statement Part 2. Deadline 2. McKeown Family.

Date: 28 August 2024 14:16:39

Myra McKeown on behalf of the Mckeown Family (20048002)

IPR BGSF ATP 337

FOCUS: Visual Representation (Part 2).

'Does the Byers Gill Solar application present images in a considered and precise manner?

(APP 144) and (APP-133) Visuals Digital?

APP-144 6.4.8.1. Environmental Statement Appendix 8.1 Historic Environment Desk Based Assessment. Refer to Plate 8.

APP-133 6.4.72. Environmental Statement Appendix 7.2 Illustrative Views.

In this dDCO there a many images. Some are researched 'on the ground' and others captured from the Internet, or a mix of both.

When a comparison is made between these two views of a village it is clear to the community that one set of photographs is mis-labelled.

Research identifies a well-known software is the cause of this mis-step. Somewhere in the U.S.A. the name of a Lane situated on

the village outskirts is moved on to the Green ie. the village 'high street'.

There are several consequences. Other companies who read the same source sent assessors out to work at in the wrong area when

making deliberations. Further those who do not know the village were not free to question the efficiency of these findings etc.

(APP-081) 6.3.9.3 Figure 9.3 Map of Public Rights of Way Use of Sources

A very simple task with one focus ie. to identify the PRoWs to be found across the whole site.

Yet there is at least one omission in this map and this is seen in all phases of the development, including the application.

The Local Authority has a full description, including maps, of all the PRoWs they are responsible for.

the correct reading is only a click away.

Conclusion.

Is there a way in which the above findings could be better handled?

Could the correct identification of place in particular be addressed earlier with agreement between those employed as experts?

Perhaps at some point the applicant could apply a review of quality to the images used?

When it comes to attitudes to the presentation of information we are lead to believe 'that rigour is applied by the applicant to an appropriate level'.

See the overarching staetment made by the applicant's lawyer at the end of the Open Hearing part 2.

Why is it then in these examples provided that the system has so readily been allowed to over-ride the content?