

Transcript_Bramford_ISH4_Session2_091123

Thu, Nov 09, 2023 4:54PM • 1:32:22

00:06

Okay, if we can resume please.

00:11

And I'm moving on to Agenda Item five, which is landscape and views.

00:17

The first item on the agenda is the examining authorities and accompanied site inspection for

00:25

political authorities have asked the examining authority in the deadline to submissions, which viewpoints had been visited. And if appendix 6.4 of the environmental statement was used in the field, to inform the understanding of landscape and visual impact assessment issues, alongside the photo montages of the relevant viewpoints.

00:49

I'm sure that the novelty of the examining authority being asked to answer a question, rather than ask them will probably entertain you, but I'm giving you a welcome break. So I'm happy to do so.

01:01

I'm not sure where this question was formulated before you'd seen the examining authorities notes on a company's site inspections, which of course are available through the examination library. But these do confirm the specific viewpoints that were visited alongside other locations that the examining authority considered

01:20

merited inspection in relation to a broader appreciation of landscaping views. If it helps, I can point you in the direction of our notes, for site inspections, one, two, and four, which are in the examination library as ev 001 and E v zero 20.

01:41

So that will give you a full list of the actual viewpoints that were visited.

01:47

In terms of the examining authorities approach to the consideration of those viewpoints, and I can confirm that the inspection and the professional landscape and visual analysis was aided in the field by the use of a laptop and tablet that held appendix 6.4 and the viewpoint visualizations. Alongside the

Ordnance Survey Explorer, Matt went out of key comments from representations, and the examining authorities at home preparatory notes from a thorough analysis of the visualizations, and all of the other landscaping visual impact assessment material which was submitted into the examination.

02:23

Can I add any further clarification to that?

02:29

Sir Michael Beth at Suffolk County Council, so we are extremely grateful for that additional elaboration, and I suspect that you may well be right. Insofar as points were queried by Suffolk County Council as to what you had seen, there may have been something of a lag either between the information in your ASI note being

02:57

published on the website, or even if it had been published, being picked up and absorbed by the county council. So clearly, there are issues around those areas views that we have

03:12

made comments on may very well want to make further comments on but we're very grateful to you and your colleagues are providing that clarity, both in the written note and in your oral comments, which certainly does exactly what we expected. It reassures us that it was a very thorough and informed site inspection.

03:32

Thank you Miss Bedford. I didn't know whether Mr. Bennett was going to follow up with some written questions to date.

03:41

submit those at deadline six.

03:45

Okay, the next item on the agenda relates to the setting of the dead unveil Amb.

03:53

The Case for additional undergrounding and Section F of the proposed route in relation to effects on the a&p and the Stour Valley.

04:02

Obviously, we've had quite a number of submissions from quite a few parties on this particularly the analysis of the setting of the a&p and the associated case for additional undergrounding.

04:15

I want to come back to the specific point about the location of the dead and very least cable ceiling and compound a little later. So I'm talking here about the generalities of the EMP and the stove alley.

04:29

I obviously appreciate to evaluate project areas not within the paper, given the Section F is the potentially affecting both I think it takes makes sense to address them both together.

04:42

We've seen the a&p position statement dated November 2016. We've seen the applicants case and the environmental statement, including the supplementary settings study

04:53

and the further analysis provided a deadline one in the applicants response to written representations

05:00

So we don't need to go back over that material.

05:03

But I would like to understand if any of the parties who have made representations on the setting of the a&p still have outstanding concerns with this matter. Noting that Natural England has confirmed in its written representation, which was rep two, zero to six

05:22

have all of the queries have been made around the setting of the MP being addressed?

05:29

Who would like to go first to local authorities

05:35

is to Bedford so I think in the first instance, we would tend to defer to the AONB

05:43

partnership on

05:46

that matter.

05:49

All of the local authorities happened in that in that case, talk to Mr. Amstutz.

05:56

Okay, stands does do you want to respond to that?

06:00

Simon Amstutz on behalf of the AONB partnership.

06:06

For brevity, I've got nothing further to add from the partnership beyond what was in our rep 3067 response to the

06:19

questions we were asked.

06:23

Can you just clarify for the person people might not have read that so you do have outstanding concerns?

06:29

We don't have outstanding concerns. On this

06:34

case, can I move on to the group of counts, parish councils that by Essington,

06:42

your advisors have your intention to seek expert landscape advice, specifically in relation to establishing whether the applicant submissions around the setting of the end have been competently interpreted in conformance with relevant national policies and the associated effects. And thank you for your updated deadline three,

07:06

which I acknowledged our comment in our first written question that deadline night will be far too late. In the examination to provide any any additional information or evidence or a professional advisor, we have read your submission deadline three, which I can assure you is in itself of value to us. We do appreciate your evidence comes from a community perspective rather than a professional landscape perspective. But that is also important to us. So thank you for that.

07:36

Hopefully you now appreciate that we have a very short time available in the examination to take evidence of that nature.

07:45

If you do wish to pursue some professional guidance, steal

07:50

the risk of some gloves from around the table. I just wonder whether you might approach one of the district council landscape officers to see whether they might be able to assist you.

07:59

Just a suggestion.

08:02

So we had your submissions in relation to the setting of the Lamb. Is there anything you want to add today? Tony how go for the for the group of parish councils. Thank you, sir.

08:11

I don't need to recapitulate all the arguments. But we feel very, very strongly that the precedent of the of the applicants great great upgrade Norwich Tilbury project, which has proposed undergrounding without the AONB at its southern edge around great Hawksley is a very relevant comparator for for this project. Throughout the whole of Section F the the proposed line is within no more than 1.6 kilometers of the AONB. The topography of the area is such that the line will vary substantially be visible from the AONB and from the store value project area. And we'd have and given the scale and the increased proximity of the line. And we believe that it cannot fail to implant views into out of the AONB and also views over the over the access routes. And we would appeal that it'd be that it'd be looked at in in conjunction with that, with that precedent, particularly given the

09:13

the distinction in Section F, that there are two cable sealing and compounds which are required, which have a very significant impact on the landscape close to the AONB into the project area in and of themselves, which would not be required. If the if the section were under grounded. That's very different from the great Hawksley example that I just cited, where there are two cables ceiling and compounds required simply for the underground section adjacent to the AONB.

09:43

And, given the lack of these cables, ceiling and compounds were they to be removed would not only have a very significant positive impact on the landscape, it will also have a very positive impact in terms of cost because of the because it would obviate the need to purchase to a right

10:00

Under maintain the cable out Caelian compounds for the life of the line. Well, Oliver, thank you

10:10

is there anything from the ANP project in relation to this specific point about the setting?

10:16

I think you've just told me actually, you're happy with that. I think my question probably is, you expressed some outstanding concerns. You responded to our question.

10:30

We've read your concerns about the impacts on setting.

10:34

But we would also like to understand whether you're now content with the applicant's definition of the setting of the MB.

10:45

Mr. Amstutz?

10:48

Yes, Simon Amstutz representing the A and B partnership. It is

10:55

a matter

10:57

that is still being

11:00

considered as part of our statement of common ground on the on the issue of the setting document. So I would hope that we will be able to reach agreement either by the next deadline or the deadline after that.

11:19

Thank you. And just while I've got you for the avoidance of doubt.

11:25

On page two of your deadline three submission, refer to the proposed revised location of the Dedham valleys cable ceiling and compound and also to the revised location of the stairway West cable ceiling compound.

11:40

Do you mean by this locations that have been revised from the situation before the application was made?

11:47

Simon Amstutz representing the VA convinced a very partnership. You're correct in that session. Okay, thank you. Your your journey with this project has been much longer than that hour. So I was just checking to make sure we hadn't missed something.

12:03

Also, whilst I've got

12:05

Mr. Howe craft terms of your deadline three submission.

12:11

He makes several references to Greenbelt land in that in that submission. Can I just check with you using that term interchangeably with green spaces rather than statutory Greenbelt?

12:24

34 I think on this occasion, Addington parish council alone.

12:29

That is beyond my expertise, and I would have to, I would have to refer on it. Yeah. It's just

12:35

99% Sure it is just an interchangeable term the way you're using it. But given the Greenbelt does have a statutory definition.

12:44

Very different policy environment. You might just wish to clarify that in a future reference for us. Noted. And thank you. Thank you.

12:54

SCOTUS.

12:57

Thank you, Brian Curtis for baby District Council. Sorry, I was just wanting to come in before we moved off this point just for the benefit of those that haven't had the opportunity to see our deadline three submission, that in response to one of the execution questions, we have raised a concern that significant residual localized adverse effects could remain in terms of the setting of the OMB. So that's in our submission, and I won't restate what we've already already said in the Li Er, but but similar sorts of concerns about effects on the receiving landscaper in that submission. And just if it helps, I can confirm that there is no statutorily designated Green Belt in baby District.

13:40

Thank you. Thank you.

13:42

Yes, we've seen that representation. So

13:45

hearing all that, does the applicant wish to come back with anything regarding the setting of them? They?

13:51

I don't think so.

13:55

So I think our position is pretty clearly set out and we understand other party's positions. And I'm not sure that therefore there's much to add unless anyone to my left particularly wants to say anything.

14:12

Thank you

14:16

if we can move on to

14:22

Sorry, sorry. Apologies Tony aircomfort Addington, parish council, having having just referred to to the Addington alone submission. The reference to Greenbelt comes from the Addington neighborhood plan, which designates that the green spaces under the plan ought to be treated as Greenbelt. And it's for that reason that we have then that we have then taken up the references to Greenbelt from the National Planning Policy Framework. That's helpful. Thank you.

14:56

I think also in that setting, can we move on to the state

15:00

Valley issues.

15:02

Again a number of submissions raised the perceived benefits of undergrounding approximately five an additional five kilometer of the proposed overhead cable through Section F.

15:13

The benefits for the sewer valleys special landscape area and Stour Valley project area. I think the benefits seen not only as the removal of invisible line and the associated pylons, but also as it's just been mentioned, the removal or removal of the necessity for two of the cables, ceiling and compounds.

15:34

This is something raised by Babel and we've heard already

15:40

could be handled the LMP project briefly summarize the rationale for suggesting that this part of the proposed development should be under grounded.

15:57

Simon Amstutz representing the Denver Amb. And Valley Partnership,

16:06

a very brief response to that question that we consider that the the quality of the Stour Valley project area. And the the SLA is such that that it warrants that additional investment. And also in the opinion of

16:30

a a&b consultant, an area of outstanding natural beauty consultant that there was an area

16:39

to the west of the current area of outstanding natural beauty boundary that met the criteria for A and B designation. And so this

16:51

the stir Valley crossing comes into the setting of that area.

16:59

Thank you. Again, whilst I've got you on screen before you disappear,

17:04

happens every time. Sorry.

17:07

We've had some suggestions. And just for the avoidance of doubt, you're probably the best person to answer this question. There have been some suggestions that are still valid and are already part of the ANP. An alternative very soon will be. Could you give us an update on what your understanding of that is?

17:25

Yeah, my understanding of that is I think it was in 2020 that the government announced proposals for two new areas of outstanding natural beauty and two extensions of existing areas of outstanding natural beauty. Unfortunately for us locally, the Dedham Vale aspiration for boundary extension that was made in 2009 wasn't taken forward. And you're not given any notice in that 2020. Might have been 2021. My apologies, government announcement.

18:08

Thank you. That's very helpful. Does the applicant wish to add anything to that or to the what we've heard about the perceived benefits of undergrounding, that additional five kilometers for before before the applicant does? Because I know that it's a matter that was raised in our local impact report, paragraph 3.1. This was this. Not the undergrounding point, but the factual point about the still valley as part of the AONB. And I know the applicant has responded to that in their comments on the local impact report. And without being too tiresome about it, I suspect it comes down to simply use of the English language, in that there is obviously the

18:55

still Valley project area, which is a notation, as it were a designation which clearly sits outside of the area of outstanding natural beauty. They butt up against each other, but they are two distinct areas that I think is clear, and it's simply innocence beyond factual argument. But then there is the valley of the river stir

19:23

as a watercourse. And I think that what has happened is that we've used the word in paragraph 3.1 of the local impact report, where we say that the affected parts of the store Valley are high landscape and

parts of it are statutorily designated as the dead unveil AONB. What I think we mean to say by that is that there are parts of the valley of the river stool,

19:48

clearly do as a matter of fact run through the AONB, and those parts of the valley of the river Stewart are within the AONB, and so on. So I think it's probably just a

20:00

to possibly loose language on our part or using an uppercase V for Valley when we perhaps should have used a lowercase the valley that has created the confusion. But I don't think that we are seeking to suggest to you that any part of the project area is part of the AONB. I think we were trying to make the point which I think you already understand the river store itself and therefore it's fairly parts of that flow through into the AONB. That's helpful clarification. He also is not the only submission to raise and possibility.

20:34

Anything from the applicant in relation to the as I say the what you've just heard about that if necessary, and also the undergrounding of the additional 5k?

20:43

No, sir, again, I think our position is, is very clear and Mr. Bedford has

20:53

clarified any confusion about the areas the you know, the the areas, both the AONB and the store, South Valley project area are quite clear. There's no doubt about that. And we've set out our views on the sections of the overall line that are above ground between those two areas. There's anything you want to specifically ask and I've obviously got the experts here, but I think our position is clear. We have read your submissions. Thank you. Mr. Hamsters. Did you want to add something?

21:26

Yeah, just so Simon Amstutz representing the Del Valle AONB instead of a partnership.

21:33

Just to remind the examining authority that the stir Valley project area is also subject to public investment through countryside management project and there is a joint management plan for both the AONB and Stour Valley project area. So the AONB management plan is a statutory obligation on local authorities with AONB and that has been extended into the Stour Valley project area, which I think demonstrate the importance that is made for the state of any project area. Thank you. Thank you.

22:15

Before we move on to the statutory purpose, was there anything else on that particular issue?

22:22

Let's move on then to the third bullet point, which is the statutory purpose of the AMB, and I'm hoping I'm thinking that we're quite close to agreement on this at the moment.

22:35

Obviously, there's quite a bit of background in the in the application documents and the relevant representations again about this. And the applicant did undertake an additional assessment,

22:46

which concluded that the didn't change the conclusions that were set out in the environmental statement. And we've also noted that at deadlines three Natural England have expressed contentment

23:00

that the there is no impact on the statutory purpose, the nd although it was encouraging us also to take careful account of any advice on the A and B partnership. I

23:14

guess it's coming to you again, Mr. Amstutz? Is there anything outstanding from your position in terms of the impediment to achieve the statutory purpose?

23:24

Simon Amstutz representing the Danville AONB and Stour Valley Partnership. And we we see the the gains from losing the 132 line.

23:38

For the new underground line, we would perhaps suggest that the existing 400 kV line will be the dominant feature

23:49

in certain sections. But I think the point that I really want to make is that while those benefits can will accrue during the operational phase, the a big partnership has concerns about the ability of areas that will be subject to trenching procedures to deliver statutory purpose and we would draw the examining authorities attention to the precedent of the Scottish power, renewables lines coming in under the Suffolk coast in haste AONB? Well, I think there was an acceptance that there would be damage to the halo MB during construction.

24:37

And can you just confirm my understanding that your concerns in this respect, therefore are related to the installation phase of the underground cables and the ability to conserve and enhance natural beauty during that period?

24:50

Yeah, that's correct. I think you're using the word installation. I'm using the word construction. Well, I think we're broadly talking about the similar issue

25:00

See applicant wish to come back on

25:03

a keralite on behalf of the applicant. And one of the long term things that we've looked at as part of this project is that the alignment that we've got now is within corridor two, which was seen as an opportunity corridor to remove the 132 KV overhead line from the landscape, particularly through the area of outstanding natural beauty. So that alongside with the underground cabling has embedded in the long term benefits. The applicant recognizes that in order to achieve those long term benefits, that doesn't need to be some short term impact in order to get those benefits. So the applicant does acknowledge that during construction, there will be short term temporary impacts on the AONB. However, we believe that this is in a part of the AONB, that is, has got very limited public access in terms of where people can experience that and it would affect a very small component of the AONB, which we did set out within the document that we provided a deadline one that dead unveil AONB special qualities and statutory purpose document rep one dash 032. So, therefore, we do not think that the construction of the project will overall in terms of the AONB in its entirety, affected statutory purpose.

26:23

I'd like to come back to that particular point about parts of the NBA and the entirety of the NBA surely, but I just wanted to check whether the local planning authorities had anything to say on terms in terms of the statutory purpose of the AMB

26:38

as Curtis

26:42

Thank you bronchitis on behalf of baby District Council was just to reinforce what we've already submitted in our additional li our submission and just to confirm what you just said, So regarding the dual aspects of conserving and enhancing and that that is applicable to land outside the designation as well as within the designation. Thank you. Thank you.

27:10

And there's another hand

27:12

this damsels again,

27:15

Simon Amstutz from new Denver representing the Denver a&b in store Valley Partnership.

27:22

Just responding I know we're not here to

27:27

argue things here, but I've just bring your attention to the fact that the AONB partners ship's position is that the AONB is a single entity. And where there is impact upon part of the a&p, we will consider that impact onto the A and B as a whole. And I think we also need to consider the length of this temporary installation or construction phase. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Amstell. So that's why I was just coming on to as I was saying, but you've done that formula, which is very good. But the applicant like to respond to that particular point, which has been raised that

28:09

is assessing the impact on parts of the MBA rather than the whole.

28:13

Yes, I

28:17

mean, the implication of that always seems to be if you're going to have an impact on a small part, you might as well have an impact on a very large part because it makes no difference. And I find that proposition somewhat difficult to

28:31

understand it's clearly

28:35

relevant, particularly where we're dealing here with an underground cable and what the impact we're talking about is a construction impact which will be for a temporary period to to take that into account when considering

28:55

this short term adverse effect, but Ms. White may want to say more on that or indeed

29:05

Miss Gibson was well

29:08

I try to on behalf of the applicant, and the applicant would also like to point out that through the AONB, the routing has

29:16

chosen the arable farmland we we've purposely gone through a section of the AONB where it can be reinstated very quickly. And we're avoiding woodland trees, landscapes that would be harder or take a longer term to reinstate. We have also got the trenches crossing in the river box valley as well which again would further limit the impact on the the landscape and construction.

29:43

So it gives some on behalf of the applicant. I'd also like to add that the area of the proposed undergrounding is is there it's already affected by the 400 kV line and it is already affected by proximity to the commercial fruit farms. So the

30:00

The quality the landscape in that location, although it is designated, we will say we have selected one of the areas that is going to be least compromised. game in terms of point, Mr. Amstutz in terms of the point of principle you've raised here about damaged part of the EMP being damaged to the FBI. Do you have any personal references to policy or guidance on this be useful to us?

30:27

Can I can I take that as a future question to come back to you on? If you can come back to us on that that would be very useful. And similarly, if the applicants aware of any particular guidance on that point, we'd be grateful to receive it, perhaps for deadline for if that's acceptable? Yes. So as I say, I think the

30:49

the the point is to make clear is, is really that clearly when considering

30:57

any harm, albeit short term harm,

31:01

the extent of the harm clearly must be material to that to that issue.

31:09

Because otherwise, as I say, one wouldn't distinguish between a project that clipped the edge of an AONB in a project that destroyed a large part of it. It clearly is a material consideration. But we'll have a look at

31:26

anything, anything in policy. Thank you.

31:31

Is there anything to local planning authorities want to add terms to the special qualities?

31:39

It's already cutting for Suffolk County Council. Just a brief statement, which was added to the you know, part of the AONB affected means the whole a&p is affected it's it's partly a philosophical question, but partly it also has practical implications because there will be a displacement of recreational activity. People will not want to go where the construction is happening, they will go to other areas, possibly within the a&b and therefore then put more pressures on to those. Thank you. Thank you.

32:09

An

32:10

applicant solid had Chow White on behalf of the applicant would just like to note that there is only one public right away within the AONB in the area that would be affected by the underground cables.

32:27

Anything else Mr.

32:31

Trump's stats got back on screen. You got another point?

32:36

Yep. So hamsters representing the Delaware Ohio minster very partnership. And so you mentioned special qualities, which I had found as the next bullet point. And I wonder whether Are we moving on to that? Or would it come back to that explicitly, where our bullet point four, which is a special qualities?

32:55

Could I just make one point? Sorry. I'm just sorry. I'm Excuse me. We're just moving on to that.

33:05

Okay, I'll wait for you to introduce that. You want to make your point?

33:11

Yep. So I think the Aom Simon Amstutz didn't bow beans too early partnership, I think are the partnerships point on special qualities and is a slight rehearsal of the previous discussion. That qualities such as landscape quality, scenic quality, tranquility, relative wildness will be impacted we consider during the construction period.

33:42

And we think that that should be recognized and compensated for from a project that is a nationally significant infrastructure project that is being

33:57

undertaken within a nationally designated landscape where there is a presumption against

34:05

major development. Thank you.

34:10

Are there any final comments on their special qualities of the EMB?

34:15

Thank you, nothing local authorities. We've noticed the reference in

34:23

MB projects deadline three submission to the reference in the leveling up and regeneration Act.

34:31

In relation to this

34:35

given that the bill did become the Act last week, we'd welcome any party's interpretation of any changes to the situation in terms of special qualities, the MB if that if there's anything you feel needs to be highlighted in relation to that, if that could come in a deadline for as well that will be useful to us.

35:01

I'm moving on that case to bullet point by

35:06

Mr. Amstutz. Yep, sir. Sorry. Just Simon Amstutz from the didn't bow and beans to Valley Partnership. Yeah. Just on your point around the the leveling up and regeneration. Bill. Yeah, as you rightly surmise that the duty now is to further the purpose of the a&p to conserve and enhance natural beauty. And we do consider that to be a significant change from pay regard. And we will can make that point in deadline for as well if helpful. Yeah, thank you, and anybody who wishes to make a comment on that if they could do that deadline for

35:52

So, moving on to bullet point five, which is the location of the Dedham Vale, East, cable ceiling and compound

36:02

had quite a large number of relevant representations from interested parties and others.

36:08

With the suggestion that the environmental effects of this cable ceiling and compound posted Heath could be reduced by continuing the undergrounding for approximately 200 meters further east to the disused gravel pit, which I think is also known as lamb quarry

36:28

has seen some parish council pass we could come to you first on this. We heard from you in the early hearings. And you summarized in your submission that deadline we want in your notes about this.

36:39

You believe that the likely impact of dead unveilings sealing compound could be substantially mitigated by citing the cable ceiling and compound in the quarry?

36:51

Have you had the opportunity to see the applicants further explanation of deadline one and three, which explains the rationale the applicant went through when concluding that the dead unveil East cable sealing and compound should be cited at the proposed location.

37:16

Tony Hancock for the for the combined group of parish councils I think we will need to we will need to reflect that and develop how to a deadline for if you could just check on those that would be useful to still ask us now what are your current position lighters?

37:34

Same, the same topic really. But for the applicant,

37:38

as submissions I've just mentioned and your rationale for deciding not to move the location or not choosing the quarry as the location for the cable ceiling on compound. You talk about potential being constrained by two blocks or woodland Middlefield wood and the existing operational overhead line as the rationale for not choosing the quarry.

38:04

Can you explain why and how those factors represent a constraint? The extent to which they constrain that particular option and the degree to which mitigation might have been achieved.

38:22

So I think you have heard from Miss Rotherham before, but she didn't introduce herself,

38:30

because she wasn't on the front bench, but I think was rather I was going to deal with this one. Thank you.

38:36

So I'm Miss brother, I'm Miss Sally rotheram. I'm a consent officer national grid. So the siting of cable Caelian compounds have obviously been a prime consideration in developing the project.

38:49

That unveil ceiling and compound was located back in 2013, on the edge of the OMB boundary. That was where the project was paused. When we did recommence the project in 2020. We went initially to a non statutory consultation so we could get feedback on the location of psyllium compounds in particular, we did get a lot of feedback about proximity to the OMB boundary, which is why we sought to move it outside of the immediate setting of the OMB boundary and also away from posted conservation area. So we saw sites that were suitable because they had natural screening or natural topography that we could use to screen the ceiling and compounds.

39:34

And also, we do have obviously had to comply with national policy and our own statutory obligations as transmission operator,

39:43

which allows us to be

39:46

looking at immunity and landscaping visual impacts, but also we do need to be economical and efficient.

39:53

And obviously undergrounding is considerably more expensive technology than overhead lines.

40:00

So we did move the overhead line by about a kilometer into the areas between Millfield wood, north and south.

40:08

And this did look to provide the natural scheme air screening we were looking for.

40:14

And it also provided a plot of land where we could do additional plantings. So we have committed to embedded planting

40:21

to screen the ceiling and compound, it becomes constrained in that location because of the location of the two woodlands we need a working area obviously to construct the cables beneath ground, but also there is a live 400 kV line that that will remain.

40:38

So to actually extend that further towards lamb quarry would mean extending the undergrounding. And I think it's further than 200 meters, I think it'd be more like 800 meters. And so it would incur additional costs to underground it.

40:53

And we were struggling to find policy drivers to do that because we'd moved it already outside of the AONB setting or the immediate setting.

41:03

So it was a good site that was well screened away from the AONB away from the conservation areas. We also did look at Lane quarry as a possible option. But when you look at it, it has lots of mineral safeguarding areas. And whilst overhead lines are fine there, and they can work beneath the overhead lines, obviously with underground cables, that that wouldn't be a possibility and lay inquiry as well. Also, although it's not operational at the minute they have got planning permission to operate up to 2032.

And we understand their wishes are to recommence in the future. So there was quite a few factors involved. It wasn't necessarily

41:44

about the a&b. It also involved the conservation area, the operational carry minimal safeguarding, and obviously the duty to be economical visit efficient with

41:54

Bill pays money, obviously to look at how much undergrounding we actually did.

42:00

Thank you very much. I think we appreciate the rationale in terms of costs, which came through in your submissions. I think the thing that wasn't quite so clear to us was how those two blocks are woodland and the existing operational line presented a further constraint to move to the quarry. I think, am I correct in what you've just explained? This simply isn't the area to do that.

42:24

Probably rather, yes, that's correct. Thank you. Does anybody else wish to talk about that? Andrew Wade on behalf of southern parishes.

42:35

One of the drivers the applicant could take on board is the requirement on visibility from an AONB.

42:43

Cable ceiling and compound is visible from about a kilometer in southern direction.

42:49

Holford three rolls demands that structures aren't put in the most inconspicuous place, the topography of lamb quarry. The Ordnance Survey contour on the field to the west is 60 meters of altitude, altitude, and the quarry floor is 48. So we have a 12 meter differential.

43:13

The structure of the cape oscillogram compound is some 415 meters high and the gantries the thing would disappear if it was put in the quarry.

43:24

Yes, there is a cost. It's about eight or 900 meters that's accepted, netting off the cost of two or three new pylons, it wouldn't be necessary.

43:35

It's a judgment call that the impact in our views, the impact of the cable sealing company in between multiple word

43:45

is unacceptable. And the extra cost is worth paying. Thank you.

43:52

Did you want to come back on that?

43:54

No, sir. I think I think our position as to why we haven't gone to lay inquiries is hopefully clear. And I note that the Suffolk councils have accepted the general principle of that location deadline three.

44:10

So is there anything else from the local planning authorities in relation to this matter?

44:18

It's

44:20

the Attorney General for the southern parish council if I if I may. It sounded as the fundamental reasoning there for not selecting for not undergrounding further outside data and be was

44:33

principally because of cost. This then feeds directly into the question of the setting of the AONB, and whether the setting of the AONB ends rigidly at its boundary. So as as Mr. Wade identified the visibility from the south and the cable ceiling and compound here means that it does have an impact on the setting that sets up a cost benefit analysis discussion between the incremental cost of undergrounding and the and the

45:00

need to be able to be financially efficient? Yeah, thank you. I think we have that point. I think we, we heard a few of the reasons and the rationale for the choice as well. But we have all of those points. So thank you to everybody for that.

45:14

Today, anything else on that cable ceiling and compound location?

45:19

Notes. So moving on to the sixth bullet point, I want to talk about a number of the additional viewpoints and assessments which had been raised principally by the local planning authorities.

45:34

Before I do that, can I just check with the applicant what the process was in terms of agreement or representative viewpoints with the local planning authority and at what stage that was done and how

45:47

Charl White on behalf of the applicant. And so in terms of agreeing the viewpoints, and also additionally, the photo montages, we've had meetings with the councils and provision the shared viewpoint locations with them back in 2021. And through those discussions, we agreed the locations of those viewpoints as set out within line 3.4 point two and statement of common ground with the local authorities at rep one, Dash 015.

46:18

So we believe those viewpoints have been agreed. As part of that process with the council's did identify some additional viewpoints, which we took on board and those were included within the application.

46:31

Thank you.

46:33

So can we look specifically at some of the comments that have been raised in relation to viewpoint H 07. And these this has been raised by Braintree District Council and Essex County Council thinking the joint impact local impact report. I think there's two related questions.

46:54

Related to the first question, we asked brain drain Essex to explain why they consider viewpoint 807, which is from rectory lane on the edge of Wickham St. Paul, to be too far away to assess the FFT and impacts and to confirm that the receptor of concern as users of the public right away network, and why they do not believe that viewpoints 808 and 809 already served this function.

47:22

And we asked them if they could suggest a precise location for additional viewpoints shall be located.

47:29

Same time we've also asked for an explanation from the applicant as to why viewpoint H 07 was chosen as representative of impacts on us as a public rights away in this area, rather than a view from a public right away closer to the proposed development.

47:48

A second related question has to do with the effectiveness of proposed mitigation,

47:54

which is highlighted in the visualization from that viewpoint years one and 15.

48:02

So terms of my question, first question is to Braintree and Essex.

48:08

In terms of the general suitability and representativeness of viewpoint 807, the applicant has responded to this matter in his comments to your local impact report. That's rep three zero 50. And I was wondering if you've had a chance to see this yet.

48:25

And be sir. Matthew, our range of different counsel.

48:30

So we we haven't got a landscape witness available today for comment. So I have got some general comments based on the agenda that was provided.

48:43

And maybe that I have to defer back in writing, post hearing.

48:49

On any specific points.

48:52

I don't believe the comments that I've got were informed by the deadline three comments on our local impact report on these particular points.

49:02

So

49:04

I'm happy to read what's been given to me in terms of trying to answer your questions.

49:12

But equally, I'm happy to have a look at that. And if it's easier, put that in post hearing submission system in case there's an issue or if it's been addressed or in details or any duplication. I'm quite happy for that to commit a deadline for it and it's due course. Bearing in mind this as I said, there's two related answers from the applicants the questions you've raised, said you could submit those in full deadline more very happy with that. Yes, sir. Thank you

49:47

Sorry, Carol White on behalf of the applicant, um, just to confirm that this is in relation to the grid supply point substation, the same viewpoints was submitted as part of the planning application that went in

50:00

With the Town and Country Planning application that was that was approved by Braintree District Council. So this viewpoint is associated with that planning concerns for the grid supply point substation, which has started construction. We've seen that point as well in your representation, but thank you.

50:20

So can I move on to the next proposed additional representative viewpoint?

50:27

Again, this is raised by Brain Train Essex, so we may be going down the same route. But it was a suggestion that there should be additional representative viewpoints and assessments from the public rightaway network east of the a 131. And I think the public rights away which you labeled as twin stead 23, two instead, one, and great Henny 18, was specifically mentioned.

50:53

So again, Mr. Weil, the applicant responded to this matter, written rep three zero 50. And was going to ask if you'd seen this, but your response presumably is the same as it was the previous question. So could you take that on board and coming back to the deadline for as well?

51:10

Yes, Matthew, our branch District Council? Yes, certainly, we can have a look at that. I think we did provide some comments in our own deadline free response on this particular issue. Appendix one of our deadline free response showed assessment locations at the junction of 2021 21 and 28.

51:33

So yeah, so there is we have put some, I think one of the questions you had about the location in your examiner's questions, so I think we did sort of answer that, hopefully. But certainly I'll

51:45

take the question away. Can we use? Sorry? No. Can we have a believe we have the plan with the green.on it available to demonstrate, which is from

51:57

Braintree and Essex's response to x q1, which I now refer to in my notes as the green spot plan. That's the one there.

52:06

That's the one we're referring to, I think is in this world. Yes.

52:10

That large green blob has the suggested location? Yes, sir.

52:15

I think for the record, it's around about Ordnance Survey reference tie 49371, which I think is at the very sharp end in the green line. Does the applicant see any merit in an additional viewpoint from?

52:33

Cal White on behalf of the applicant? And can we just confirm is that a viewpoint looking east or west?

52:40

Looking towards the GSD?

52:44

I believe Mr. R Mackey, wild Pinterest. Counsel, I believe it is looking to the west to the crude supply point. I think just picking up on a point that was raised earlier just about the pre engagement of the viewpoints with the council's obviously we really appreciated that, that discussion with the applicant.

53:08

We, during the course of the application, there has been a change in the landscape witness that we are using jointly with vapor and mid Suffolk councils.

53:19

So that unfortunately, that landscape officer wasn't on the project at the time, it was first put forward. So obviously looking at it with a fresh pair of eyes. That's the this is one of the viewpoints that she are asking when it's believed was be appropriate. So that's kind of where it how it sort of transpired in that way. Hope that helps for clarification. Thank you. I'm not gonna put words into his mouth. But I suspect the point is the same that this was this is the subject of the Town and Country Planning Act consent from muscle authority without this viewpoint keralite on behalf of the applicants, and yes, I mean, it would be difficult to do a few points. Take a viewpoint of this now, because the grid supply points substation is under construction. However, I would like to just point out that we did have viewpoints page 05, which was just the north of lodge farm. So obviously not quite as far north where it sits on the existing overhead line, but it is in that vicinity. And also haitch 11, which was towards the end of green line

54:23

where it joins the roads by generous farm. Well, we're waiting to hear from Mr. Wells colleague, landscape when necessary, whether there's anything further wish to progress with that, but I assume your response at the moment is you don't see any merit in this traditional view. I think that's right. And there's an in a sense, another more fundamental point with all of these

54:46

viewpoints that there

54:49

an aide memoire for inspectors who will actually go out on site and look at these things. They're not a replacement for your own eyes and your own job.

55:00

Hmm, that's why you have cypresses there simply a way of recording something. So we have no objection, if you want to go to that particular point and look back at you doing that and you forming a judgment. I'm I'm not,

55:17

you know, I'm genuinely not sure that actually producing a photograph of it particularly assists you. I think we understand that Representative viewpoints and assessment has taken over a much wider area.

55:33

We're going to get Mr. Wilder break, because the next one I want to talk about comes in the deadline to submission from Baber mid Suffolk,

55:40

which suggested a closer viewpoint assessment and photo montage is needed for the store Valley East cable ceiling and compound in relation to receptors on the public right of way.

55:54

Come baby confirm this is correct.

55:59

And can you can you explain to us why you think this will be this additional viewpoint will be useful.

56:07

So Brian Curtis for Babor District Council, similarly to my colleague at BrainFood, not supported by a landscape expert today. But I do have a brief note, which just reiterates the submission that you've just referred to as double oh seven, and explains that an assessment and photo montage from a closer point would aid understanding of the extent of mitigation to be provided and the likely effectiveness after 15 years. And if there's any more that you'd like on that I can put that into a deadline for Thank you.

56:39

If there is anything else, which you can add to that that will be useful.

56:44

Be useful to understand whether that's related to the low low level landscaping, which has to be installed above the underground cable.

56:55

Because I think those was out on the air. So I have a better understanding of that now.

57:02

It may well be that's the case. Is there anything applicant wants to add on that one.

57:08

So sorry, Gibson on behalf of the applicant. I wasn't actually on the accompanying site visit on Tuesday, my colleague was but I think it was demonstrated that there's very little visibility from the nearby public rights away.

57:21

There is a short section of the footpath near Soyuz farm that might have used towards it, but they're likely only to see that the very top of the gantry certainly not going to give rise to significant visual effects in the applicants view. Thank you. Just confirm my final question then this is Randy does the applicant have any intention to progress any further assessment from this

57:47

point?

57:51

Certainly not unless you requested I think we've set out our

57:56

our views on on these

57:59

things. We think these the the viewpoints that we agreed with?

58:07

The principal authorities

58:10

are appropriate. You've obviously gone out on site visits. We think that that is sufficient? If you tell us that is something you want, then of course we will do it. But we're not anticipating doing it otherwise. Okay. Well see what comes in deadline for local authorities.

58:28

There is one final one I'm afraid is back to Mr. Wilde.

58:33

The deadline, your deadline to submission suggested the need

58:38

for an additional viewpoint to show the whole road probably a 131 to the store Valley West cable ceiling. And

58:46

can you clarify the precise location in which you thought a viewpoint would be helpful? Whether you're suggesting relates to revision just to baseline photography also just also visualization.

59:03

Matthew out braintrust route counsel, I think that will have to be one I refer back to so and post hearing submission deadline for that that's okay. That's fine. If the answer to the question was yes, it was also a visualization, it will be useful to understand what form that would take given that the two islands of

visualizations are generally used above ground structures. Not quite sure what they would show in terms of a whole road.

59:32

Anything from the applicant?

59:36

Thank you.

59:38

Is there anything else from anybody about the representative the range of representative viewpoints

59:45

that were raised but those are the particular ones that I wanted to draw attention to today.

59:51

Thank you.

59:53

Moving on then to the sufficiency of the visual mitigation of cables, ceiling and compounds

1:00:00

Can I start by just noting the suggestion that Natural England has made in its response to our first written questions, that the screening, planting for sealing and compounds should be maintained for the lifetime of the scheme and must be properly secured. To see applicant want to clarify what the situation would be, I try to on behalf of the applicants. So in terms of the embedded planting around the cable city and compounds and around the grid supply, put in substation that would be maintained for the life of the asset. And that is secured through the landscape and ecological management plan, which and

1:00:41

which is secure through requirement four of the draft DCO. So that presumably means that all of the planting, on which the assessment is based for those particular features falls into that category, all the embedded planting around those features. Yes.

1:00:58

And the joint submissions from the Suffolk councils deadline to have suggested the further mitigation is required at the cable ceiling and compounds, particularly for the dead and well West, cable ceiling and compound.

1:01:14

And then, in response to our first written questions, you've gone on to explain further concern that the mitigation planning for the store Valley West cables skinny and compound is also insufficient, and has implications that both could be proved

1:01:31

to did you wish to summarize your concerns in relation to these?

1:01:37

What Sir Michael Weber and Suffolk County Council,

1:01:41

I think we have set out in written form, what those concerns are, we've identified the locations we've identified where we think additional planting is required. I mean, if it's helpful, I can ask.

1:02:00

And this is cutting, if there's anything particular that she wants to say. But I think we feel generally, we've identified where we think more is required. So since it becomes no matter for you to form a view on but ours is cutting, whether it's anything in particular, she wants to highlight to you, he'll be interesting to understand that particularly in the light of what we heard and saw on a company's site inspection.

1:02:24

is already cutting for Suffolk County Council. And with the regards to then then unveil West

1:02:34

lemon he

1:02:37

I think the additional planning that I would like to see would be along the B Road, sort of on the northern side, where possible were cables permitting, and also to the right of the sort of the east of the axis track.

1:02:52

Apparently, in conversations on on the side was a date, there may well be such landing envisaged, possibly. So it's,

1:03:03

it's I think it's about layering, the mitigation planting. Because if you have if you have one hedge and you can see through it, and then you have unmitigated views, whereas if you have several hedges, then that becomes a lot more peak. But I would I would be. And I would also like to see the hedge mix where possible in application using the hedge mix of trees, rather than just temperatures. And then, but the bigger concern really is the

1:03:32

the ceiling and compound at athelstone. of I think the

1:03:40

current mitigation doesn't really

1:03:44

successfully mitigate the visual impact on effects from the south where the points are taken. And

1:03:53

I acknowledge that there is a difficulty because of the cables coming in on that side. But do you think plants could be more sort of firm or ambitious to provide more, even if it's closed near further south, and it might have to be offside potentially.

1:04:12

Thank you nice explanation anything from the applicant in response?

1:04:18

I try to on behalf of the applicants and in terms of the feedback from the cyclists so obviously we'll we'll take that away and have a look at that as part of the response for deadline for in terms of the staff ally West cable said income and compound one. I think that's one that's meant

1:04:35

in terms of the planting ground, the cable ceiling and compound we have got the cables coming in there. So that is one reason why the planting to the south is difficult because of the not being able to plant trees over the cables. This is also quite a large arable field and we've been working quite closely with the landowner at this location because this is an area where we would like to do net gain proposals. So we're working very closely with them to understand what planting works.

1:05:00

In terms of their farming as well, and trying to minimize the impacts on on the farming as well as balancing that planting, so that is something we're looking at and trying to avoid further dissecting the field, the arable sort of field that he's got. So just bearing in mind that that's something else we've been discussing with the landowner and trying to work through with them what what works in that location, but at the moment, we believe that the embedded planting around the cable simian compound is sufficient to screen that from as part of the project. And as a result of those further discussions, is anything likely to be coming into the examination?

1:05:38

I can take that away I'm not positive in myself, but I couldn't find out yeah, we'll put something a deadline for to clarify. Thank you Thank you.

1:05:57

Okay, shall Is there anything else in relation to those cables, ceiling and compounds? Yes, sir. military aircraft for the combined group of parish councils. If I may add a point simply on the store Valley East CSEC. We note that there is an access road which is likely to be highly visible from the store Valley project area. So while the location of the ceiling and compound itself is relatively well shielded locally, we believe that a that the access road will be bisecting a very strongly rural landscape and sudden will be affecting excessive use an elevated point from the project area. Thank you anything on that?

1:06:39

I try to on behalf the applicant. I'm not too sure what that route that is without going investigating further. And it'd be useful to clarify, do you know what that's a permanent one to the table city and compound? Or is that a temporary one? My understanding is it's permanent. It's not my it's not my personal patch gravel. Yeah. Okay. Well, we'll take away and have a look at those plans.

1:06:58

Yep, confirm permanent from behind me, okay to the permanent one. Okay, we'll take that away and have to, if you could include that in the post hearing note that will be useful. Thank you.

1:07:14

Okay, if we can move on from the specifics of the cable sealing ends. We've also had representations from some of the local authorities about the landscape and visual mitigation measures proposed by the applicant and the extent of planting proposals more generally,

1:07:32

favor mid Suffolk, your deadline to submission,

1:07:35

whilst acknowledging the adverse landscape and visual effects cannot be mitigated through landscape planting. Because of the height and the nature of the proposed development. You do suggest that our significant landscape and visual compensation package should be drawn up by the applicant in association with the relevant local authorities. This will be over and above the softening measures which are already suggested.

1:08:01

You will also make reference in that representation to the biodiversity net gains to be provided. Can you just explain your reference to biodiversity net gain in this landscape and visual context? And then go on to explain your suggestions here

1:08:19

is Curtis.

1:08:22

Thank you bronchitis for baby District Council.

1:08:27

I was going to make a comment on the previous item. But because I do have some notes on that. But I'm more than happy to put those into our post hearing submission for deadline for

1:08:37

on this point. I don't have an enormous amount to add at this stage in the absence of our landscape expert except to refer back to the submission and also the joint host authority letter on community benefits, which I'm not. I'm not sure it's been submitted yet.

1:08:58

I'll need to confirm that. But if I could ask my colleague Miss Sutan if there's anything she's able to comment on at this point on the biodiversity side of things, if not, we'll take that away for deadline for please.

1:09:12

It was specifically were you looking for additional landscaping visual compensation over above the biodiversity net gain. So as I was trying to make the relationship see what the relationship between those two things were.

1:09:28

Thank you, sir. Sue Hooton,

1:09:30

representing baby District Council and in this context.

1:09:36

We do have concerns that about the replanting proposals, not specifically for the biodiversity net gain, and we consider that

1:09:47

additional information is required from the applicant in relation to natural regeneration of woodland, whether that's appropriate here, so but we will take this away and follow up with the applicant. Thank you

1:10:00

Okay.

1:10:04

I think stuffer councils make a similar point. Is there anything you wish to add? Mr. So yes, I think, again, it's this part of a broader point that we've made in relation to

1:10:17

the control documents. And in relation to the Lemp

1:10:22

landscape environmental management plan is an illustration of it, the applicants approach is the document that's put before this examination is the final document, it will become a certified document, there's no

1:10:36

as it were further loop involving further discussion, and then agreement on matters of detail with the local authorities. And so we think that the measures that are proposed in terms of the elements of mitigation are insufficient as At present, we think that

1:10:57

there needs to be

1:11:00

more security for their delivery, a number of the matters are said to be matters that will be resolved in due course, with agreement with landowners, but there's no loop that brings the local authorities into that process. And we consider that that is not adequate. And then there is the

1:11:24

also the wider question of whether there are residual impacts which are identified, but which are not capable of mitigation, using mitigation in its in its narrower sense of a measure, which reduces an adverse impact. Because obviously, mitigation is sometimes used in a broader context to describe all, as it were a military measures. But there are clearly residual impacts, which are not capable of mitigation in the narrow sense. And the case of those residual impacts. We see there as being a need for compensation, compensation, not using that necessarily in a financial or pecuniary sense, but compensation, meaning an offsetting measure, which can be, as it were put into the balance to weigh against the residual impact.

1:12:24

We think that the applicant is not doing enough by way of bringing forward compensatory landscape measures that more needs to be done, and that we don't consider it to be an adequate approach to simply say, Oh, well, there are those residual impacts, which we're not able to mitigate. They should simply be weighed against the benefits of the scheme. We think that really the the approach ought to be you mitigate where you can you compensate where you can't mitigate. And it's only as it were, the irresolvable things that you can neither mitigate for nor compensate for that you then end up weighing against the benefits of the scheme. So that's a kind of a wider philosophical debate, you're going to have to form a view on but as I say, we see it at the moment that the applicant has not made sufficient efforts to provide compensatory redress in the landscape for yield for those things that it's not capable of providing mitigation for

1:13:29

sampras's You want to come back on that.

1:13:34

So our broad point is that we think that the scheme is extremely well mitigated, there is a full package or landscape planting and replacement This is secured through different mechanisms, both the lamp and requirement for but also requirements, nyan on replacement, planting, and, and so on. And therefore,

1:14:00

you know, this is one of those stages, points on which we just don't accept the premise of the point that's being put against us.

1:14:09

I suspect we're not going to take it very much.

1:14:12

Does anybody else wish to comment on this particular matter, which is the sufficiency and security of landscape and visual medication generally.

1:14:23

Then we'll move on

1:14:30

there was a series of questions I had in relation to the cumulative effects, particularly the exist existing Bramford substation, but I'm going to skip most of those because some of the people I would like to ask about that are not here. But I would like to ask a specific question of the applicant.

1:14:48

In your comments on the relevant representations, which was rep one, zero to five at page 64. You make an offer to work internally with

1:15:00

Are your colleagues in the Norwich to Tilbury project, and to engage more widely with other developers in the area to ensure a combined and joined up approach to the landscaping proposals around the Bramford substation. He also made reference to mid Suffolk district councils and strategic cumulative working group for the Bramford area.

1:15:25

Either of those things do you think if you can you explain how you would follow up those offers? And what the implications for the evidence in front of this examination might be in relation to cumulative landscape of visual effects in the Bramford substation area?

1:15:41

Yes, I think in part, certainly, maybe in wholeness as for

1:15:46

the other end?

1:15:49

Yes. So we're aware there's a lot of development going on at Bramford, but many of the developments are at the early stage of development. And we coated the Norris Teutoburg, project their their nonstatutory consultation phase and taking on feedback. So they are at the very early design stage.

They're very aware of what's going on with our project. So we are in regular contact with them and obviously, trying to work together as much as we can.

1:16:15

So we do, and with the working groups, we're happy to participate, provide information with other developers in any way we can really.

1:16:25

I think probably we're ahead of many of them that are coming through.

1:16:30

So we're happy to help and participate in any way we can. I just think the other development that we would have come to effects with are at such an early phase, it's hard to mitigate anything around those projects at the minute. And but we'd as I say, as our proposals develop in terms of landscape planting, because at the minute rosehip block planting phase and we will

1:16:54

turn those into more detailed will obviously take into consideration what's going on with the other project. Okay.

1:17:01

Curtis, do you want to come back on behalf of mid Suffolk in relation to that?

1:17:08

Yes, please thank you. Vaughn Curtis for mid Suffolk District Council. The area around the Bromford substation is of particular concern to Brown for district

1:17:18

to mid Suffolk street Council and the Branford area parishes including Burstall, floatin somersham and the other parishes that are in baby district but are in the vicinity. And the concerns regarding the cumulative visual impact of the developments that are enabled by the presence of the substation there but also the transmission network upgrade work, including Brampton transit and Norwich to Tilbury.

1:17:47

It is important for us to secure for the communities at the appropriate point mitigation which is on a strategic landscape level and doesn't respond just to the individual developments without thought of the others and the cumulative impact of the of those together. And that's not just in zip scale developments. It's 10 of Country Planning developments that are enabled by connections to the substation as well. So it is a matter that the applicant is aware of we have had discussions in the past about how best to achieve that with the applicant and also the developers for the other projects in the area. But it's a matter that's unresolved between us at the moment. And we would welcome further discussion. Thank you.

1:18:34

Thank you, sir. I think Suffolk County Council wishes to add Mr. Bedford. Thank you. So microbead for Suffolk County. So we would echo and endorse those comments. By Deva mid Suffolk District Council we share exactly the same concern.

1:18:49

I just repeat what I'd said earlier on in relation to the lack of deliverables deliverable controls through the lamp. And we see certainly a need for a strategic approach to the landscape mitigation and the Brownfield area given not only the effects of this project, but other planned projects, and we think that we'll need to do more than they are currently doing.

1:19:15

Thank you, Mr. Hamsters. Did you have a point on this?

1:19:19

It is slightly broader point Simon hamsters Denville own beans to Valley Partnership. I think the partnership would very much welcome any joined up thinking about trying to address cumulative impacts. And from an IRB point of view, we're talking about the fourth smallest AONB at just 90 square kilometers that is subject to this project. Norwich to Tilbury in a significant Anglia water under ground pipe project. So I think we're just saying that any work to reduce those cumulative impacts, whether that's through to

1:20:00

Timing or types of work or when that work is carried out, would be welcome. Thank you. Thank you for that have found anything finally from the applicant in relation to the cumulative Bramford?

1:20:15

I think we've given our position insofar as it's been suggested that, you know, we will continue discussions with people, of course, of course we will.

1:20:27

But I think Ms. rotheram, has set out our position, and we've set it out in writing. Thank you.

1:20:33

Thank you for that. And finally, in this landscape and Views section, are there any other matters? In relation to these agenda items, which come out of

1:20:44

our first written question answers, we don't have anything further? Has anybody got any further they wish to raise? which case we move on to agenda item six, which lasts about two seconds, because I have no questions. So unless anybody around the table has anything in relation to the agenda item points, which were originally set out.

1:21:05

Good, thank you. And then which case I'm going to hand over to Mr. Corsi to deal with agenda item seven, and today's action points. Thank you. Does anybody have any other points that they want to raise that are related to the subject of today's agenda?

1:21:22

Mr. Wilde?

1:21:24

Thank you, mom. Mackay, Wild Ranger District Council. Just as you know,

1:21:31

in our local impact report, we

1:21:35

wanted the NSA to look at potentially the removal of additional 132 kilovolt line between the Twin City and the grid supply point.

1:21:47

There was just

1:21:49

as part of our local impact report, we submitted a letter

1:21:53

from UK Power Networks who own that line.

1:21:57

Which was appendix two, I believe. That's rep one, not three, nine.

1:22:04

It was just too as to have you invited UK PN to or UK PAC networks to comment on this project at all? Or are you satisfied with the letter that is in the local impact report?

1:22:21

In terms of, you know, the fact that the lines no longer necessary? Thank you.

1:22:27

I believe, Mr. Wilde that we may have raised something at the x q one. But if you just bear with me a minute, I confer with colleagues, it certainly sounds familiar. Thank you. Yeah, I was just because obviously hasn't been raised today. I just want to check that you're happy or not already submitted something.

1:22:53

We have

1:22:55

seen

1:22:58

it's it's not something that we would pursue parties for information unless they are in solicited or sorry, offered as part of the process. Mr. Humphries, is this something that you can assist us with? This is the

1:23:19

position for UK Power Networks and and

1:23:24

the length of line near Twin City? I mean, I think we

1:23:31

set out in I think it was issue specific hearing. One are

1:23:37

because position on this, that this is their, this is their asset? I don't I think our order limits now don't include that element of mine, and therefore,

1:23:53

we can't

1:23:55

you know, we can't do anything to force them to take it down. And we wouldn't want to do so they, I think will have a sense, as in all section 37 consents inherent powers ultimately to decommission their line, if they if they wanted to. I can quite understand

1:24:15

that the district council has a has a view and would like some resolution on that. But it's very difficult for us to pursue this. We've had that discussion with UK power network, they've made their position. They've made their position clear.

1:24:31

And I don't I don't think we can take that very much further forward.

1:24:40

Okay, thank you, Mr. Humphries. Mr. Wilde, I know that's possibly not the answer that you want, but that that's where we stand at the minute.

1:24:48

Thank you, ma'am. Okay, thank you. Is there anybody else who wants to raise anything as other business? I don't see any of them indication in

1:25:00

The room are online. So I'll move on.

1:25:05

This is the final hearing of the week.

1:25:10

And time has been reserved in the examination timetable for further hearings, if required in the week commencing the 11th of December 2023. A decision on those will be made very shortly.

1:25:27

Given that we have most of the regular attendees here this afternoon, wanted to just conduct a straw poll, a little participatory active activity at the end of a long day. And it's without commitment to judge your opinion on holding any hearings that week virtually on Microsoft Teams only. Would anybody have any strong? Well, not strong? objection to that?

1:25:58

No, Katelyn, madam, Suffolk County Council, Michael Bedford.

1:26:04

No, in obviously, as you know, through your own experiences during the pandemic, there were a number of developing consent order examinations, which were conducted entirely remotely and successfully, including some very large projects. I know also, that there have been some instances where the it has broken down in remote hearings. But I'm very reassured that this

1:26:42

examination, whether it is improvements in the technology, or whatever, but we have not been either the the hybrid persons attending or otherwise we have not suffered any of those problems. So I'm, I'm reassured that if we went to a remote format, it would not disadvantage, I think the county council, obviously who I can speak for, but I suspect it wouldn't disadvantage any party. Thank you. Minister Bedford was certainly take that on board.

1:27:13

there anybody else wants to make any point? Secretary aircraft for the southern parish councils, if I may beg leave to reserve our position on that until we see what the subjects will be of the hearings? Maybe and what contribution we may be able to bring? I realize that's, that's an unhelpful answer. But if we can pay for some some latitude, but do you feel that if when you saw the agenda that there was assistance that you could give us in the in the third set of hearings? Would there be any perceived disadvantage in making your contribution in the remote format? Or the virtual format? Sorry?

1:27:57

I find it with apologies if I find it difficult to deliver, deliver concrete answer without without consulting with my with my fellow parish councils.

1:28:06

Would it be okay to to undertake that we will, we will raise a hand on that very, very quickly if required.

1:28:18

I think our problem with that is we need to make our decision about whether we actually need those hearings by next Monday.

1:28:30

Please.

1:28:38

I yeah, I'm detecting reluctance from the fellow parish councils to, to to, to agree sort of sight unseen with apology. If it helps your position.

1:28:50

We're minded at the moment we have a number of potentially further hearings in mind. My view would be and I can't speak for you. But my view would be that not the topics that you've made contributions to so far, very much. There's no in that case, no objections.

1:29:07

Thank you. That's very helpful.

1:29:10

I think the

1:29:12

other thing to bear in mind, I think this came up at the preliminary meeting is just the practicality of booking. So this venue is not available. We believe the venues in Ipswich are not available. It's not only of course, the venues to hold the event. There's also hotels and and other things not just for us, but production 78 yourselves

1:29:38

and others and so I think I think there are practical problems about having in person events and therefore if there are to be events.

1:29:50

They will they will need to be online there is a silver lining, I'm not available at all.

1:29:58

But in this clutter

1:30:00

A is so I in a sense don't have a particular view. But I think our general view is that it would be extremely difficult to have in person events and therefore, we have a strong preference if there are to be events,

1:30:15

that they be on teams. Okay, thank you. Mr. Humphrys will certainly note that as well and as say we have a fairly short timescale to, to deliberate and and to advise on what's happening that week. So thank you.

1:30:36

I move on, then unless that there are no other contributions. I'll move on to Agenda Item eight, which is action points. I do have a very substantial list of action points on this particular hearing. What I'm proposing to do is to publish them at the start of the week, together with those from the three hearings previous to this afternoon.

1:31:08

So thank you will actually not as soon as possible. So that brings me on then to agenda item nine, and the close of the hearing. If there are no other items that are relevant to this hearing, may I remind you that the examination timetable requires parties to provide post hearing comments on or before deadline for which is Thursday the 16th of November 2023. May I also remind you that the recording of the hearing will be placed on the planning inspectors website as soon as practicable after we close? Can I thank all of today's participants for their time on their assistance. During this hearing. We will certainly consider your responses carefully. They will inform our decision as to whether further hearings and written questions will be necessary.

1:32:04

And the time is no 443 and the issues specific hearings now closed. Thanks again.