

AUDIO_AQUIND_ISH3_Session1_15122020

Tue, 12/15 1:19PM • 1:10:38

00:07

Good morning, and welcome to issue specific hearing three, which forms part of the examinations application for the wind interconnector nationally significant infrastructure project. This issue specific hearing addresses a range of environmental matters, specifically those relating to habitats landscape, the marine environment, noise and socio economics. Before we proceed, Can I check with the case team that you can hear me and that the recording has started?

00:39

Good morning, Mr. meyen. Having Johnston case manager. I can't confirm that can hear you clearly and the recording has started. thank

00:47

thank you very much. Please could all participants ensure that they are muted unless invited to speak and please turn off your mobile phones and unless they're being used to access this hearing, we would also ask you to keep your cameras switched off whilst you are not speaking. This hearing is taking place virtually online on the Microsoft team's platform. But the format content and procedure will be very similar to the traditional face to face hearings, as have been held for previous dcl examinations. We will go through the usual introductions and introductory remarks for the record and for the benefit of new participants and those watching the livestream and the digital recording. Hi, I'm Andrew man. I was appointed on the 12th of February 2020 under Section 65 of the Planning Act 2008. Under delegation from the secretary of state as the lead member of a panel to examine this application. I have a background in ecology and environmental impact assessment. And I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect. My fellow panel members were appointed on the same date. And I'll ask them to introduce themselves starting with Mr. Wallace.

02:06

Thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. My name is David Wallace. I'm a chartered member of the wall Town Planning Institute. And I have academic qualifications in environmental planning. I'll hand over to Mr. Roscoe.

02:19

Good morning. I'm

02:20

Steven Roscoe and a chartered civil

02:22

engineer and I have a background in engineering and development.

02:27

Thank you both. And can I also mention our colleagues in the planning Inspectorate case team who are working with us on this examination, some of whom you will be familiar with already having Jones as the case manager, and here's a company today by two case officers, Stephen Parker and Paige Hall. You will find information about the application and documents produced for this examination on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure website. This has a landing page for this project, and further pages that set out examination procedure, the examination timetable relevant representations and examination documents are rule eight letter of Tuesday the 15th of September 2020 includes the web address. The hearing is being held on Microsoft Teams, but the chat function is not in use today. The examining authority will invite participants to speak at appropriate times, but should you wish to make an urgent comment, you may use the hand up function. Though Please be advised there may be delay before we see it. And please do wait to be invited to speak. Telephone participants should clearly state their name if they wish to make an urgent comment. But again, please wait to be invited before making your contribution. Please speak loudly and clearly when you are making submissions, especially those on the telephone. applicant has arranged for the hearing to be live streamed on the website of production 78. Please be aware that the chat function on the production 78 webpage is not in use. Please could those watching the live stream refresh their browser after each break to ensure that they do not miss the restart. If you participate in the hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and live streamed and that a digital recording with subtitles will be published. It will be made available on the project page of the national infrastructure website that I referred to earlier. The planning inspector to practice is to retain the recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Because the digital recording is retained and published, it forms a public record contain your personal information and to which the general data protection regulation applies. So avoid the need to edit the digital recordings. Please do not add information to the public record that you wish to be kept private and confidential. If you all we consider that there is no alternative to the disclosure of such information, we will agree a process to enable it to be made available without it forming part of the public record. Mr. Roscoe will be taking notes of any post hearing action points as they arise during the course of the hearing. And he will seek to agree these with the applicant before we close the hearing. And Mr. Wallace will now take us through agenda item two.

05:33

Thank you very much. This is the hearing into a number of environmental matters, where as felt that they would benefit from the giving of all evidence, the examine 40 have issued a detailed agenda, to which I hope you all have a copy to hand or which you may download from the project pages of the national infrastructure website. The agenda is set out in the form of questions that the examining authority wishes to explore in this hearing. Before I explain how he will deal with the questions today, we have exceptionally agreed to allow the local Member of Parliament, Mr. Stephen Morgan, to make a five minute presentation to this hearing. So Mr. Morgan, if you are ready, and I will hand over to you and we welcome your contribution.

06:25

Thank you very much for that and good morning. I'm very grateful to the examining authority for providing this opportunity for me to present the views of my constituents on the aquin development. Since 2018. I've been listening and representing concerns of local people on this development. I've received dozens and dozens of emails, messages letters, Canvas residents views through survey work, and met the applicant on a number of occasions and attended a public consultation. I've since submitted formal evidence the examining authority in the applicant, and have written separately to ministers and submitted written parliamentary questions on this matter of importance to my constituents. Today, I want to return to reiterate my concerns as well as those the city council and formally place my objection on behalf of constituents on record examining authority. The construction of the proposed interconnector would take up to seven years and would cause untold damage and disruption to people, businesses and our environment in Portsmouth. The proposed corridor where trenching is due to take place threatens to disrupt key elements of transport infrastructure, including highways that act as vital arteries for our city. The city council believes that there will be significant disruption to residents, from noise to anti social hours to dust and lots of natural light in a wide ranging area from Farmington Avenue in the north, down to Fort Cumberland in my own constituency. This has certainly been reinforced by those constituents I've spoken with this congestion and disruption will inevitably have a detrimental impact on local traders who have already injured a year of lost revenue, and I'm preceded uncertainty. It will also cause long term disruption to Portsmouth valued open spaces with the unmitigated loss of recreational space at Milton common and farlington. playing fields. A season of more play would be lost at farlington bathans, and University of Portsmouth with few alternatives in the meantime, in addition to the air pollution created by construction, there is a risk to our city's precious wildlife at Milton common. I've raised before the threat that the development poses to local allotments, which have been a lifeline for those who tend to them particularly during the pandemic. As it stands, the planning applicant has been unable to demonstrate sufficiently to the people of Portsmouth and elected representatives any positive benefit that this scheme would bring to the city. Throughout this process. There have been concerns about the transparency of the applicant, and its apparent inability to disclose information necessary to fully assess the impact of the proposed development. I'm aware that changes would have been made the proposed route, but I know many remain concerned that more could be done to engage with those impacted by the construction and avoid the worst of its effects. constituents also continue to be troubled by reports the Atkins previous donations to political party, and concerns by the project companies financial and dumb salary arrangements, or whatever the apparent merits of this project may be at a national level to ignore the overwhelmingly negative impact it would have on Portsmouth's people, businesses and the environment would be a dereliction of duty, ultimately, is extremely disappointing that the decision on this proposal has been taken away from the local planning authorities like the city council, would be much better able to reflect the views of local residents. On behalf of residents across Portsmouth south. I would therefore like to record my objections on behalf of constituents, I would urge you to ensure the views are raised by residents are given a strong hearing so that objections are heard loud and clear.

09:55

Thank you.

09:58

Thank you very much, Mr. Morgan. That's me. Appreciate it for your time today. I will not be expecting the applicant to respond at the current time. Obviously this is a scheduled point to the agenda beforehand. And therefore, if the applicant could respond a deadline six with any comments they wish that would be most welcome. Thank you. Continuing on then with this agenda item, I will shortly ask other people who are intending to speak today to introduce themselves. In most instances, the questions are aimed at the applicant per response. Once the applicant has given their answer, the examining authority will invite responses to see what is said from participants. In other cases where the question is aimed at a particular interested party, that party will have a chance to set out their answer before a response is invited from the applicant. The examining authority may ask questions at any time. In all cases, the applicant will be offered the last word in common with earlier issue specific hearings, we are aware that some of the agenda items have at least been partially addressed in documents submitted to us at a deadline for or deadline five. In these cases subject to other parties comments, were generally content for the applicant to respond with a very brief summary of the situation and a reference to the relevant submission where appropriate. Speakers will have the opportunity to provide us with a written summary of their all submissions together with any supporting evidence by deadline six on the examination timetable, which is Wednesday 23rd of December 2020. The applicant also be invited to respond to the points made in writing by the same deadline. In terms of speakers, I would like to confirm for the purposes of the public record those parties who are here today wishing to speak when I call you please identify yourself with your name and your role at the organisation where applicable. Start with the applicants representative please.

12:12

Thank you and good morning. My name is Simon Bird Queen's Counsel in Australia by Herbert Smith free Hill, and I together with Mr. Martin Jarvis of Herbert Smith, free Hill will be appearing on behalf of the applicant today. And as far as our principal team is concerned that we Mr. Ian Ellis of Ws p, who's an associate director in the ecology team at Ws holds a master's in research in ecology and environmental management as a member of the Chartered Institute of ecology and environmental management. And he is the ecology lead in relation to the application. And he's going to be dealing principally with the onshore ecological issues. Secondly, Mr. Ross Hudson, of natural power, who I previously introduced to the examination, who's dealing with the marine elements of the habitats regulation assessment, will then have this Beretta Bowden of Ws p in relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment issues. And again, I previously introduced her to the examination, and she'll be supported as necessary by Dr. McLeod and Mr. Hamad much of RB of W. Sp, in relation to any engineering issues as they arise which relate to the landscape of visual impact matters. On noise matters, it would be Mr. Tom Farmer of Ws P, and he's a senior consultant in the acoustics team at W. Sp, and associate member of the Institute of acoustics and he holds a master of environmental science honours degree in environmental sciences, and a Post Graduate Diploma in acoustics and noise control from the Institute of acoustics. And then finally, sir, firstly, the Stevenson a Ws P is a technical director, who holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in geography and archaeology and a Master of Science in environmental assessment and management. And she's a full member of the Institute of Environmental Management and assessment and a chartered environmentalist. And so she'll be addressing the socio economic assessment in due course, that's the team for today. So thank you.

14:11

Thank you very much and welcome everyone that I asked now who is here representing Hampshire County Council place. Good morning, sir. My name is Tim Guymer. I'm the spatial planning leads at Hampshire County Council. Thank you very much, Mr. Gamma and welcome. Back by asked though, who appears on behalf of Portsmouth City Council, please.

14:38

Good morning, sir city Nickhun Council for Portsmouth City Council. I'm here with five others. And I'll ask them to introduce themselves subsequently, but I will just list their names firstly Miss as still who and then Edward Chapman Stapleton David Stribling Andrew Knight and lastly instructing solicitor Kira Lavan, I'll just ask them to introduce themselves. So as I say,

15:03

Okay, thank you. Hello.

15:09

I'm Ray, Lorraine esto.

15:12

I'm from regulatory services.

15:14

I cover the noise aspect. My role has been covering noise for 20 years, and also got post grad Diploma in noise and acoustics. Thank you,

15:32

mom. That's it. Yes. Good morning, sir.

15:35

Sorry, on mute quoted. Yep. My name is Mr. Chairman salesman. I am a charter town planner. I'm a development management team leader here at Portsmouth city council alarm assisting the Portsmouth city council Action Team on planning related matters. Thank you. Thank you. Good morning. My name's Dave. Those dribbling of Parks and Recreation worked in parks for 40 odd years now. So I've got extensive knowledge of courses, parks and open spaces.

16:11

Thank you very much. Good morning.

16:16

My name's Andy. No, and I'm about cultural officer for the planning team at Portsmouth City Council.

16:21

Thank you.

16:25

And lastly, good

16:26

morning says My name is Karen Iave and I'm the solicitor for Portsmouth City Council.

16:31

Thank you very much welcome all. I ask now who is here on behalf of Winchester City Council, please.

16:40

Good morning, sir. I'm Steven Cornwell. I'm the lead officer for Winchester City Council. I'm joined today by three other colleagues and I'll let them introduce themselves.

16:51

Catherine knight to legal services

16:55

on the charge environmental health practitioner covering

17:01

Good morning, Sir Stuart Dunbar Dempsey. I'm the council's landscape architects. I'll be covering landscaping visual impact matters for the authority.

17:11

Excellent. Thank you very much and welcome. Everyone. could ask now who's appeared on behalf of the South downs National Park Authority please. Good morning, sir.

17:23

My name is Mike Hughes. I'm a charter town planner at South Mountain National Park Authority. I'm joined by two colleagues today. So if you're agreeable, I'll let them introduce themselves starting with Robin butcher. Thank you, sir.

17:39

Good morning, sir. My name is Robin butcher. I'm a chartered member of the landscape Institute, an external consultant working on for the southdowns on their landscape and visual impact issues.

17:50

Thank you. Good morning, sir. My name is Ben Terry. I'm a design officer for the National Park.

17:58

Thank you very much. And welcome everyone. class now who is appearing on behalf of East Hampshire District Council, please. I'm expecting Miss Charlotte Adcock. Oh there.

18:22

So filtery for witches sticking down. So I have Sheldon Kok.

18:27

She's an agreement for me to represent

18:29

the view jointly of East Hants province and Winchester on noiser.

18:35

Okay, excellent. Thank you very much for that clarification. That's much appreciated. And finally, then, last, but by no means least, who appears on behalf of the marine management organisation, please.

18:50

Good morning, sir. I'm Jennifer Ford, and I'm a case manager at the marine management organisation. We also have Daniel Walker. He's a case officer.

19:00

Thank you very much. And welcome. Thank you, everyone, for those introductions. Is there anyone else here wishing to speak who have not yet introduced? Okay, nothing heard. Just to remind everyone that we have a lot to get through today. And although we're under no particular time constraints, not to make best use of the hearing time and to ensure fairness, please do not repeat points that have been made by others. And be assured that we have understood the point and we have heard it. I should also point out that if you bring up matters which are not relevant to the examination, we may interject to explain this and ask you to move on to your next point. Please also refrain from disrupting or interrupting the event. This will be unhelpful to you as it is to us. We will be seeking to adjourn for regular breaks to ensure no one suffers from screen fatigue during the proceedings. Lunch will be convenient and appropriate. Time. I would encourage you all to keep connected to this hear in during the breaks and lunchtime to avoid confusion and the need to re enter re login to the hearing. At such times, turning your microphone and camera off will suffice for your privacy. Please note that those watching the live stream may need to refresh their browsers after a break to continue watching. I'll now hand over to Mr. Man to take us through agenda item three.

20:32

Thank you, Mr. Wallace. Agenda item three relates to the habitats regulation assessment. And the first point here was the visual disturbance as a likely significant effect in the habitats regulations assessment and this was in relation to Brent geese, and other qualifying features of the Chichester and Langston harbour SPN Rams our site. We were aware there was an earlier difference of opinion between the applicant and natural England in relation to the inclusion of visual disturbance for the European site and for the supporting habitat. But this has now been addressed. And we know that the HRA report and matrices have been updated to include potential visual disturbance effects at stage two of the HRA. We also have a written response from natural England the deadline five confirms that the applicant's proposed screening mitigation is an acceptable approach and that it is addressed natural England's concerns. So unfortunately, natural England are not with us today. But can the applicant add anything to that summary?

21:44

That we have nothing to add as far as the applicant is concerned?

21:48

Thank you. Does anybody else wish to make any sort of representation on this agenda item, which case we'll move on to B, which is a request for the applicant to provide an update on the HRA and the extent of progress towards common ground with natural England. The statement of Common Ground submitted earlier in the examination suggested that all matters matters have been resolved, but we note that the document was still labelled draft. We've also seen the updated statement to common ground at deadline for beyond what we've just discussed in the first item. Is there anything further that the applicant can add by way of updates and timetables for this please?

22:32

So I'm going to ask Mr. Ellis to respond to that if

22:34

I may. Thank you.

22:46

Mr. Ellis, you're very very faint. I can't hear you. Could you try a bit closer to the microphone? That's a little better than you get the better it gets. I'm sorry, Mr. Ellis. We can't hear you. Can I just check it's not me Can the case team here Mr. Ellis

23:08

and Mr. Bond having Jones case manager I'm the same as you. Mr. Ellis's appear at Sony very quiet. And thank you very much.

23:18

The fallback position is always the headphones and speaker can hear it again. This trellis.

23:24

Like you said, I can you hear me now?

23:26

Oh, that's perfect. Thank you. Excellent.

23:28

Thank you. Yes, indeed. Good morning. There are two statements of common ground between the applicants and natural England one covering marine matters. One covering onshore matters. With regard to onshore matters, the standard common ground was submitted at deadline five. And and within that stemmed a common ground as we've touched upon in the previous question or HRA matters are agreed. There are other outstanding matters outside of habitat speculation assessments, which are subject to further update at deadline six. And if I may pass over to my colleague, Mr. Hudson, you could comment on the marine matters, stamina, common ground

24:06

and

24:07

stress.

24:09

Warning Russ Hudson for the applicant and just regarding marine matters and the marine sector Common Ground basically confirms that all matters regarding HRA are resolved. Again only issues outstanding with natural England are non HRA matters refer to uncover arbitration appeals. Under the marine licence also provide an update regarding the draft watermark. This was several common grounds we submitted a deadline for with this removed and so that matters should be rectified and it will also add the reinstatement of common ground as a joint socg between ourselves jncc and natural England, I would receive a signature from JMC to add to the statement common grounds which will be submitted at deadline six

25:00

Thank you very much. Mr. Watson's peaceful. Does anybody else wish to make a comment on this particular point? Nothing heard this. So let's move on.

25:13

Sir. Mr. Man, sorry.

25:16

Sorry, who's that?

25:17

I can't say Edward Chapman sales in Portsmouth City Council. Just Just very quickly just to seek confirmation from the applicant that they are going to be submitting something at deadline six regarding paragraph 4.2. point seven in the natural England onshore statement Common Ground regarding the molten carbon sink. Okay.

25:38

Does the applicant have a response to Mr. Bird?

25:43

Mr. Ellis?

25:45

Yes, indeed, we're providing an update on 4.2 point seven, those conversations in natural England regarding moved to common Island going and we will provide an update on the status of that deadline six.

25:57

Thank you, Mr. Ellis. Thank you. And that answers your question. Thank you very much.

26:05

No problem.

26:07

Okay, let's move on to see in that case, and this refers to our first written question, HIV, one 118. Where we asked the natural England to provide electronic copies of the conservation objectives for the relevant European sites. We will refer to in the answer to links to external websites, we have a concern that this information is technically not an examination, because those links could break or indeed, the objectives could theoretically change during or after the examination. And we did ask if it was possible for the applicant and natural England to agree the information for the applicant to submitted into examination. We've had a response from natural England on there's been more general discussion between natural England and the planning Inspectorate on this, there are certain issues which we do understand with the maintenance of that and those conservation objectives. Nevertheless, could the applicant explain the approach that was taken to conservation objectives and supplementary device attributes in the relevant tables in chapter 10 of the HRA report, where they do seem to be some links to the natural England website for that full information. Is it possible to upgrade those links, such that we do have the full information when we produce our release in February, and when we finalise our recommendation to the Secretary of State? We're aware Secretary state also requires the current background information when he considers his decision. And when he undertakes his appropriate assessment. As such, it would be beneficial for the examination to see a full set of available conservation objectives at the time of the examination as part of the full HRA audit trail, rather than just a selection of or a link to a website that could change over time. We are of course whether or not all of the European sites currently have published conservation objectives, especially some of the more recently designated ones. So could the applicant just expand please on the reasons why it's not been possible to provide copies of the available conservation objectives as an annex to the HRA report?

28:19

They're gonna address that, please.

28:22

Thank you, starting

28:24

Russ Hudson for the applicant. Um, we are currently in the process of collating the relevant information for the UK designated sites, including attributes and with the associated sites, features and some features. So just to confirm that you what you require from us is a full list of conservation objectives and a list of attributes for each of the UK sites being considered as part of the appropriate assessment stage of the assessment. Is that correct? That's correct,

28:52

please. Yeah, as I say, I'm aware that the information is not fully available for all of the sites. But nevertheless, there are sort of two page PDFs for several European sites available on the designated sites natural England website, and is stated that we would like as an appendix if possible to report so we do have that full audit trail in front of the Secretary of State.

29:15

Okay, and that that that we can do, just just to advise that we have started this process, and part of the reason which some of these particular attributes from the supplementary conservation advice, and they were a large number of them, for example, solid maritime SOC, instead of pulling together the actual list for submission deadlines, six runs to approximately 47 pages, just to include those. So they are quite long tables, but these, you know, can and will be provided, if that's what you require a deadline six.

29:49

I think if we have those as an electronic appendix to a relevant document, I think that will be give all of the information that we in the Secretary of State require

30:01

Yeah, we can provide that. I'm gonna just confirm that there's no further work which you require for bear such as you'll note, as part of Section 10 of the HRA, not all attributes were listed out and justification provided for how they were considered as part of the AIA stage. And this was agreed with natural England's when we consulted on a draft HRA price submission. And I just really want to just confirm that you're happy with independencies covering the conservation objectives and attributes for submission and not seeking any additional work.

30:37

Yeah, just those that are already included as a greeter naturally will be fun. Okay, thank you. If you could actually make that point as part of the process, it will be useful to Okay. Thank you very much for that, Mr. Hudson, that will be very useful. Do you have any idea? What's the timescale you're working to on that?

30:58

We

30:59

received some for the applicant, we are working to the submission deadline sets.

31:03

That would be very useful. Thank you very much, Mr. Hudson.

31:06

I'm sorry, one minute, I would also make just just for an update, it's that we noticed in a previous HRA submitted that there was some numbering issues for table two in Section 10. And we will update and address fees with that resubmission a deadline sets. So it'll

31:22

be a complete new report a replacement report. Yes, I

31:28

believe that's the case yet updated section 10 tables and dependencies for construction objectives and attributes.

31:35

Thank you very much. We look forward to receiving that deadlines six. Are there any other parties who wish to comment on this matter? No, in which case that brings agenda item three to a close. And I'm going to move on to agenda item four. And this is to deal with landscape visual impacts and tranquillity. The first item under this heading relates to lighting. And I'm conscious, we will probably will come back to things like cranes later on. But if we can confine this particular item to lighting, for clarity, can the applicant please confirm the number height and construction of lighting columns and lightning masks to the converter station site, including any on the roofs of the building? We have obviously the transcript from the applicant. So I'd be happy with a summary of the key points in relation to this. Who's going to do this, Mr.

32:37

Bowden, please, sir.

32:38

Thank you, Miss Burton.

32:40

I'm sorry, Mr. Bird. I'm going to pass that comment to the engineers who are actually dealing specifically with lighting. And so that would be Norman MacLeod. Dr. McLeod.

32:55

Thank you, sir. Good morning, Norman MacLeod on behalf of the applicant. The proposal for lighting within the converter station compound is to instal lighting along the perimeter of the converter station. Is it intended to be six metre high lighting mass to illuminate the exterior of the station. In addition, we'll have much taller lighting particularly intended to be 15 metres tall in the outdoor high voltage equipment. These lights are only ever be used for emergency purposes. The intention of this station is that the station will be unmanned at all times they know personnel Paramount are located at the station and hence no need for lighting at the station. But if any emergency walk was required overnight, to bring the station back on line again, of course we switch on the lights. Suddenly, if there's any intruder alarm on the perimeter fence, the lights would come on to allow the CCTV cameras to spot any intruders. I would also make the point that the access road from Broadway lane to the converter station light station site will not be eliminated there is no intention to have lights along the access road. In terms of lightning masts, these are much taller structures potentially up to 30 metres in height. These are essential for a station of this type to protect the equipment against that lightning strikes. a lightning strike could very easily destroy any equipment in the station. And like all tall buildings throughout the

country, we provide lightning protection. So individ a combination of individual lightning masts in the high voltage compound, and like lightning spikes on top of the large buildings. So as I said the lightning masks could be up to 30 metres in height, typically over fairly slender construction, either steel or steel. Construction either tubular steel or a matrix type arrangement on the top of the building simple spikes to attract lightning and be potentially four metres tall on the top of the buildings. All of this is intended to be fairly standard equipment fairly normal station engineering as we would find in the adjacent Loggins high voltage substation. Thank you.

35:26

Thank you very much, Dr. Glenn, just for clarity. And I think I do understand the intention, therefore, is not to have any lighting on the access road, but have lighting on the road around the perimeter of the converter station site, but that would only be activated in an emergency. Is that correct?
Understanding?

35:42

Exactly. So So we've only ever come on under emergency conditions.

35:47

Thank you very much. Does anybody else have a comment or a representation on this matter, please? Okay, I didn't hear any request there. So I'm going to move on. The next point is we noted the applicants comment deadline to that the that there'll be no flashing lights on the lightning masts. And we asked if the applicant could confirm whether this referred to Aviation Safety lighting. And if any part of the proposed development, including the cranes and other plant that will be used during the construction of the converter station would require Aviation Safety lights. Again, we've got your response to this in the transcript. And we have confirmation this does does refer to aviation safety, lighting, lighting. Is there anything to add on that?

36:42

Thank you, sir.

36:43

Thank you. You're told that the tall cranes would be retracted at night. But would they be used in the house of darkness in the morning and evening? And if so, would the lighting be required on the four cranes at these times?

37:00

So that's addressed by the construction. But again, Mr. McLeod can confirm that.

37:08

Thank you. So I can confirm that the tall telescopic cranes would not be used in the areas of darkness that would be dangerous to the personnel. So they would only ever be used during daylight and then retracted overnight, these cones are not left elevated overnight.

37:25

Thank you very much. Does anybody else like to comment on aviation lighting or cranes lightning lighting. Nothing seen that moving on then. So the next point was about lighting the proposed telecommunications building and its compound near to the converter station, and whether that would also be limited to emergency use. Again, we have the summary of we have the transcript from the applicant, a very brief summary would be useful here for the record of that please.

38:01

also spoken to provide that pleaser. Thank you.

38:06

Yes, I think so in terms of in terms of lighting and telecommunications building will have no lighting except for courtesy lighting above the entrance door operated by a proxy proximity motion sensor with an automatic turnoff. And third party users of the building will not have the right to instal external external fights as light. So apologies lighting scheme will be agreed as part of the lightning scheme for the converter station area in accordance with climate six clause one being a part of work number two, and that approved lighting scheme will be subject to requirement 23 which requires no lighting during the hours of darkness. Also, again, it forms part of work number two to which the requirement applies.

38:56

Thank you very much, Miss Burton. Does anybody else wish to raise any questions or points about lighting at the telecommunications building? Nothing raised that let's move on again. So moving on now to the proposed developments likely effects on the international dark skies reserve and the degree to which Common Ground can be confirmed between the applicant and the relevant local authorities. We have seen the most recent updates on position from the south downs National Park Authority under relevant local authorities. And it does seem to appear that there is now Common Ground could the applicant please just summarise the position.

39:38

Again, Miss Bowden please.

39:40

Yes, of course. We spoke on behalf of the applicants. So the South downs National Park international dark sky reserve designate in May 2016 seeks to protect the dark skies about the National Park as well as the landscape on the ground. In effect dark skies of special quality of the South dance Generally to find the skies relatively free of light pollution, where you can see clearly it's clear starry sky. The dark skies are protected through Sutton's national parks and local plan policy, SD eight, which sets out a hierarchy for new development. It also applies different criteria different areas according to their sensitivity to new lighting. Stock skies technical advice note, April 2018, provides guidance in the steps to minimise the impact of lightning on dark skies. References made to the international dark skies reserve and section 1.3 of appendix 15.5 of the South downs National Park review. In discussions stance National Park revisions have been made to the outline onshore camp. The document now includes an obligation under Section 5.5 point two for the preparation of lightning scheme for the construction operational stages the converter station area. The lightning scheme makes specific reference to general lighting principles in the south downs national parks technical advice note and

states the lightning scheme bill after consultation with the South downs National Park be submitted for approval to the relevant local planning authority. It will be developed in accordance with the South downs National Park technical advice note 2018 dark skies. And just to conclude the update updated statement of common ground with the South downs National Park submitted deadline five, which is referred to as rep 050 26. States at paragraph 4.5 point four that the inclusion of the lightning scheme in the outline onshore camp has been agreed on. And the South downs national parks response in question four D. four states South downs National Park is content that the proposed development will not cause harm to the international dark skies deserve.

42:02

Thank you very much. Miss bell. Mr. Hughes, do you have a link say or anyone in your team in relation to that?

42:08

Thank you, sir. Mike Hughes, the South downs National Park Authority. And Miss Bowden has given accurate estimation of our views. And I'm happy to say that we've reached common ground with the applicant on this matter. Thank you, sir.

42:21

Thank you very much into any of the other local authorities have a comment on this. Or anybody else have a point on international dark skies reserve? I have a hand. Sorry, I have a hand. And I'll see as Mr. Burns. To feedback, Mr. Bird.

42:48

I hope I've corrected the B button as well. Just wanted to make a brief point in iOS h1, Mr. Roscoe asked that we consider taking the operational mitigation out of the client camp, which we're presently considering for deadlines six and the issue of lighting is and the detailed lighting for the operational stage is likely to be included in the design principles which will be translated into the design and access statement. That's just for one user. That's

43:19

thank you for the warning and it sounds like a quite a sensible suggestion. Okay, so there's no more points on the dark skies reserve. I'm going to any other questions about lighting generally in relation to the scheme?

43:36

Cornwell? Yes, thank you. So I apologise it Steven como from Winchester City Council, I apologise if this is already covered. But obviously, as I think you've noted, lighting is a sensitive issue. And we have worked hard with the applicant to seek clarification. I've just been looking through the draft development order. And obviously, whilst there is a requirement relating to the lighting scheme, I couldn't immediately see an indication that no additional lighting beyond that which is approved, is installed on site. So could I ask the applicant if that was to be included as part of the draft development? consent order, please.

44:27

Happy to ask the applicant on your behalf. Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Bird, is there anything in the TCL to control additional lighting?

44:33

Good morning sir. And so the lighting that may be built is the lighting that's approved it would not be permissible to build lighting which hasn't been approved because it would then be out with the terms of requirements discharge. And this position with regards to the control of operational lighting is covered in requirements 23 already, which concerns that there will be no external lighting of works number two during hours of darkness, given those matters are already confirmed so it's not considered awesome. necessary to include for an avoidance of doubt wording to confirm that no further lighting may be approved after the lighting has been approved. Thank you, sir.

45:09

Thank you for that explanation, Mr. Jarvis. Okay, if there's nothing else on lighting, I'm going to move on to subsection E of the agenda, which is the landscape and visual impact assessment. I'm going to ask the applicant please. To summarise why the South downs National Park is said to be a medium sensitivity for the landscape and visual assessment and in particular, how this relates to the usual approach to environmental impact assessment and the guidance set out in glba. The original question says given the nationally nationally important status of the National Park and the purposes behind its designation, does the medium sensitivity rating undervalue its overall importance? As Bohner, you're going to give me a summary of what's in your transcript, please?

45:59

Yes, I'm happy to do that. And so the landscaping visual impact assessment was based on agreed methodology described in further detail in appendix 15.3. landscaping visual assessment methodology app for one. And this is consistent with Libya, which is guidelines for landscape visual impact assessment, edition three, published in 2013. Table 1.2 of appendix 15.1 consultation responses app. First, sorry 399 refers to the local authorities agreement of the methodology which was discussed at a meeting held on the 15th of October 2018. Landscape sensitivity is combination of judgments in relation to the stability of landscape to the type of change development proposed and the value attached to landscape. The EIA concluded that the National Park was of high sensitivity. The characteristics associated with landscape sensitivity are defined in table three of appendix 15.3 and high sensitivities described as landscape character characteristics elements were through consideration of the landscape resource and characteristics. There would generally be a lower capacity or scope for landscape change, or positive enhancement, and a higher landscape value, and quality. Often it includes landscapes which are highly valued for their scenic quality, including my statutory, national internationally designated landscapes, ie the South downs National Park. It also refers to elements features that could be described as unique or nationally scarce and mature vegetation with provenance such as ancient woodland, or mature Parkland trees. Under mature landscape features which are characteristic of contribute to a sense of place and illustrate time depth in a landscape. A div replaceable could not be replaced other than in the long term. To inform this judgement, the assessment drew on susceptibility to change which was considered to be high with a low ability to accommodate the specific proposed change, undo consequences the maintenance of the baseline

situation, are you receptive value under achievement of relevant planning policies or strategies, and landscape value with categories based on condition features, quality and recognition, including national parks. The EIA, therefore considered that the impact on the character areas identified within the national parks were high, as evidenced in table two of appendix 15.4 at 402. For the National Park, sorry for the South downs National Park darland mosaic de to humbled and clanfield downland, the landscape is of high sensitivity where there is no overlap of character areas sitting within and outside the National Park namely, WCC 17, humbled and Dan's w two and H sorry, eh DC LCT downlands mosaic three f i haunting clanfield edge. These were described as being a medium to high sensitivity, with levels increasing progressively away from the converter station area, and where the South downs National Park exerts an influence in terms of condition of management. This approach has consistently applied throughout the assessment of the local landscape character areas and types within and outside the national park with the assessment, concluding that for both w two and three ephi the landscape character within the comfort station area and its immediate edges was of immediate sensitivity. In terms of the setting of the National Park, the AIA appendix 15.5 South downs National Park app for three consider the converter station area in terms of the criteria used in the south dance landscape background paper to the local plan and found it to be a mixed value and therefore medium sensitivity. The criteria used for determining setting in table one Based on guidance for assessing landscape for designations as national parks that serve as national parks or areas of outstanding natural beauty and England, and this was produced by natural England in 2011. This covered landscape quality such as intactness condition and influence scenic quality, relative wilderness, relative tranquillity, natural heritage features and cultural heritage, wealth landscape value and susceptibility to change were not stated as such, the assessment drew on the methodology referred to an app for one to inform the judgement and sensitivity as well as conclusions.

50:39

In terms of medium susceptibility to change, which is identified in table one of appendix four One, it refers to a moderate ability to accommodate specific proposed change someone do consequences for the maintenance of baseline situation, under achievement of relative sorry relevant to planning policies or strategies. Table two, which refers to medium value covers regional recognition, none of which is specific onto this category to the area of the converter station. And a number of distinguishing features worth of conservation, evidence of degradation and occasional detracting features. An ordinary two good quality landscape features or features with some potential substitution, a reasonably attractive landscape its refers to will feature the findings just to conclude in relation to the setting of the National Park don't undervalue the importance of the National Park, while it recognises that the area's not designated because it doesn't meet the standards required for designation, which were informed by the criteria outlined in appendix 15.5 South downs National Park. And that concludes my summary. Apologies.

51:50

Thank you very much, Miss Burton. Mr. Hughes. I think this was originally came from the south downs National Park Authority question. Is there anything you wish to add or mishpacha?

52:05

Thank you, sir. It's Mike using something else National Park Authority. We have nothing further to add on this point this stage. Thank you, sir.

52:11

Thank you. Anything else from any of the local authorities or indeed any other party on this matter? Nothing seen there. And it's been Can you confirm you refer to 2011 natural England guidance on the setting of protected landscapes? Let's see whether or not that is an examination.

52:35

So the actual document isn't that we're more than happy to put up a submit a copy of that particular document if needed. Is it referenced

52:45

in your

52:46

Yes, it's policy, sir. Yes, it's referenced in in appendix 50. Sorry, Appendix 15.5. South downs national park at four three.

53:01

I'll be fine. We can find it. Thank you very much. Anything else on that point? Okay, the next point in which case is for the National southdowns National Park Authority. Please, could you confirm the relevance and importance of the additional viewpoints you've requested in answer to our first written question? Lv 191. Can you explain what additional benefits there would be from understanding the proposed development from those representative viewpoints? And is there an update on common ground with the applicant on this matter?

53:40

To us,

53:43

thank you. So it's me myself, Robin butcher answering the question on behalf of South downs National Park. So the southdowns have requested two additional viewpoints. One being the viewpoint from the east of Pru's hangar, and one thing of viewpoint to the east of the site, access road entrance, taking the first viewpoint and the reason that this outlines requested this is because it's a very different nature to other viewpoints, 112 and 17 that cover the same angle of the view. The viewpoint we've requested is one kilometre closer to the converter station than viewpoint one, and it's also around 30 metres lower than viewpoint one and it gives a very different nature of view with a far clearer and closer view of the converter station without any intervening blocks of vegetation. It also shows the converter station set against the more distant land for portdown Hill one of the key elements of views from the southdowns Park, when looking south, towards the towards these are this range of hills. The other viewpoint that mentioned 12 is a viewpoint that's much closer to the converter station and a lower elevation than the one we have requested. This viewpoint 12 looks at the converstation through an intervening line of trees, and viewpoint 17, which is also in the same direction is from butser. Hill and is a far more distant

view, and doesn't give that level of detail to enable the southdowns to make to a lake a much better judgement, a consideration on the potential effects of the converter station from the south as National Park. The second view that we've requested is that the entrance to the access road where this is set on the boundary of the South downs National Park, and we feel that the proposals at this point give rise to quite considerable landscape and visual changes. And it's also one of the most highly viewed areas in a busy road close to the position of the proposed converter station. The changes on the east on the west side of the road, where you have the new access. entrance, the access road will result in change from an rather enclosed headlined lane with quite a rural character to a far more open character with lots of vegetation and a new access point with associated signage, gates, etc. There's also a complete reconfiguration on the opposite side of the road on the junction of days lane and Broadway, Broadway lane with the loss of an existing hedge provision of additional roadway, new hedges, presumably considerable signage and what looks like three sets of new gates. Again, this would help the southdowns the provision of this would help the southdowns to make a much better judgement on the consideration of potential effects on the south downs National Park. Thank you.

56:46

Thank you. Could you just confirm or otherwise my understanding of what you just said? So in relation to the first additional, it's not actually an additional viewpoint, but it's a refinement of something you asked for originally, which was not perhaps fully reflected in what he received?

57:02

Yes, it's a it's a refinement of what we'd requested for Originally, we still haven't had that view provided.

57:11

Thank you. And in case in terms of the second one, which is the entrance to the access road, is your concern there in relation to the setting of the National Park? Or is it a concern relating to one of the roads which brings visitors into the National Park

57:28

is a concern regarding both the road runs along the immediate boundary of the south as National Park and its it affects the immediate setting of the down south as national park at that point, and no viewpoint has been provided at this point in the application

57:43

very much. Miss Bowden. We understand the applicant has arranged to take photographs in these viewpoints. Can you tell us when we expect to see them in examination?

57:54

Yes, we've, we've taken photographs on the additional viewpoints and we're willing to offer these deadline six. Just to confirm these will just be photographs and not visualisations including a wireframe.

58:07

That's understood. Thank you. Thank you. Are there any other submissions on this matter, please? Nothing heard there. So I'm going to move on to the next point, which is a request to x for the applicant

to explain why the cranes to be used in the construction of the proposed converter station were not included in the landscape and visual impact assessment. effect these will have on landscape and views over what extent and period and originally asked if an additional assessment might be necessary as a result. They also want to know why the applicant considers that the significance of construction stage effects would not change as a result of their presence. We'll be looking for comments also from the south downs National Park Authority and the relevant local planning authorities in relation to this. Again, we have your transcript spoken but assembly will be very useful.

59:06

Yes, of course, sir. So, the landscape visual impacts assessment States under Section 15.46 up 103 the assessment of the converter station was principally based on the maximum parameter design envelope as designed by us as designed in by the converter station, and telecommunications building parameter plans, sheet 123 which form part of the application. On this basis, the whole of the converter station was assessed rather than specific elements which then would be aggregated. This is a standard approach for assessing effects. The construction of the building of the size the converse station would require coinage, the RBI didn't express we refer to the cranes but the presence of large machinery was factored into the construction stage assessment. The description of specific construction impacts paragraph 15.3 point 6.2 of app 130 In the visual presence of large machinery, this was written with a scale of the construction operation in mind. HDD equipment is then specifically mentioned, to draw attention to the large machinery in places where this might not immediately be expected. The significance of construction stage effects would not change in light of details of the crane dimensions. This is because the assessment up one for you or defines the highest level of adverse effect. Major adverse weather development work would be visually prominent and close to essential sensitive receptors during construction, for example, residential receptors number one to 1011 and 12 sorry, 1112 and 13, for example, and made to moderate for other residential receptors edging the converter station with a direct view of construction activities. Such receptors are of high sensitivity and would experience either a large or medium magnitude change. for recreational receptors, moderate to major effects and moderate effects would be experienced during construction, where such receptors are in the immediate vicinity of the works. This clip includes users the monex way, who would experience moderate to major effects like residential receptors, such users would be of high sensitivity based on a high susceptibility to change and a high value landscape resulting in high sensitivity as stated in testing in our table nine in the methodology, Appendix, sorry, sorry, apologies appendix 15.5. A major adverse effect describes the development would become prominent feature and will result in a very noticeable change to an existing, highly sensitive and well composed view. a moderate effect by comparison states that the effect would result in some enhancing or distracting features to an existing or highly sensitive a well composed view, or one which is prominent with a less well composed or less sensitive view, resulting in notable improvement deterioration in the existing view. Going in terms of the cranes themselves, they're an important it's an important point to make that these would not be tower cranes. with large upper parts in place full time. The contractor would use a large, mobile, very large mobile crane for logistical and commercial reasons because it would provide a long horizontal reach, the most suitable would be a 500 tonne mobile crane with a telescopic boom that would extend it to four metres. The mobile cranes are anticipated to be in use for eight months out of the three year construction period. And this is referred to in rep 301. For the up to 84 refers to the typical maximum length of the boom for crane up to 26 metres high, it would be unusual for such a crane to be used vertically as a

mobile crane with a telescopic boom it would only be no small feature. So it would only be a noticeable feature, whilst in use. So whilst in use, when not in use, such cranes are normally parked in their retracted position as we referred to before, which would be five metres high when part that finishes my summary, sir.

1:03:08

Thank you very much. In addition to the sort of considerations of size and scale that you just mentioned, does the movement of these cranes out a new consideration to the visual assessment from Zoo new some viewpoints and other receptors

1:03:27

though from from our perspective, there would be a lot of other activity on site Yes, appreciating that the cranes would move slightly to adjust their position, very much considered that those trains would be relatively static once up, and then move down sort of during night time to their to their parked positions. The engineers may be able to clarify that a little bit more detail in terms of in terms of the nature of the movement, but I anticipate that would extend over the actual large buildings themselves.

1:03:59

I'm thinking probably particularly here about some of the receptors which may be at some distance, which will not necessarily have used at ground level and some of the activities going on near a ground level, but might see the tops of the cranes from some distance and where the movement would be added to those considerations in terms of visual assessment.

1:04:17

That has been considered already as part of part of the assessment process, but it wasn't considered to be wouldn't consider. Sorry, didn't wasn't considered to change the result of the effect.

1:04:30

Thank you. Mr. Hughes. Is there a response to a comment from southdowns National Park Authority on this matter?

1:04:38

From spreadsheets,

1:04:40

Robin butcher from on behalf southdowns National Park and southdowns report, do you feel that the position and the movement the height of the cranes is is important in that visual impact assessment, most notably in the long views, as you say, but also in close views from the monarchs way where the cranes will be highly visible above The height of intervening 10 and above the general working area of building the converter stations, and we would like to see that assessment revised to include the impact of those cranes.

1:05:17

Thank you to any of the local authorities have a comment on this.

1:05:23

School mom.

1:05:27

Thank you. So Steven come from Winchester City Council. I know, notice Miss Bowden said that, it wouldn't be practice for contractors to use a tower crane. In my experience, so tower cranes are appearing much more commonly on construction sites than they used to do. And I wondered whether the applicant was going to make it a specific requirement when contractors were being asked to tender to construct this building, that they didn't use tower cranes. But obviously, they would have a much more permanent presence in the landscape. Thank you.

1:06:05

Thank you. Can I come back to that in one moment? Just checking if there's any other comments from any of the parties before I ask for response to that, perhaps Mr. Jarvis. Anybody else with a comment on this visual assessment in relation to cranes constantly. Miss Jarvis, do you I want to your team was to come back on kormos point.

1:06:23

If I may come back on this, but just point Firstly, I think Miss Bowden clearly explained how we have assessed the impacts of cranes and their movement both in short and long distance views. So I'm not entirely sure what further assessment is being requested, given it has already been assessed. But if the south as National Park would like to clearly put forward a position in writing that we could consider that would be helpful, should it still be considered that it's necessary to either reconfirm how they've been assessed despite the submissions, or what further assessment they consider is required. And with regards to Mr. kormos comment, I would note that it's already addressed in the sense that it will be mobile cranes that are used and that they will be kept parked overnight. So I think the matter is already adequately addressed. But I can nonetheless recheck documents to confirm that position is clear. Because there is no anticipation of tower cranes would be used to taking into account the building that is to be constructed and the equipment that's required to do that.

1:07:18

Thank you, sir. point was, is there anything in the DCR to prevent tower cranes being used as Mr. Jarvis?

1:07:27

I think my point was, I think it's addressed in the sense that if it's not already addressed in the census to be complied with in accordance with the requirements, then we can look to address that in the sense.

1:07:37

Thank you. Could I ask for a post hearing note on that particular point, and could also ask for a post hearing note, it could be the same one in fact, rather than Well, in addition to the south downs, National Park Authority, perhaps providing some further information on the concerns, could the applicant please do a short note just to point out where in the documentation application documents, there's evidence

that the movement of the cranes in the presence of these cranes has been covered in the LBI people's homes but

1:08:08

yes, we can point specifically to it because as referred to so we only consider the parameters but we're happy to actually just pop that further Pisa

1:08:17

Thank you very much. So be very useful. Does anybody else have another point on this issue? Nothing heard that. So the final point in relation to this unconscious we're going to have a break very shortly. The final point under this heading relates to the proposed car park work number three. How this was assessed in the RBA, we do have the applicants transcript on this I'm happy with it. So unless any other party has a question or comment on that I intend to move on anybody with a comment on the construction carpark. Nothing scene there are going to take a short break in a moment before I do just for clarity and to square the circle. We talked about lighting earlier on Mr. Jarvis. We talked about emergency lighting at the optical regenerations that telecoms building popped me with the same process also applied to the optical regeneration stage now is the only permanent lighting emergency and access lighting.

1:09:22

I believe that to be the case, that I will need to double check that the point is noted and where we need to cover that in the requirements also. We will do so

1:09:32

much Miss Calhoun, you have a question.

1:09:37

Thank you. So yes, I was going to raise this later. And agenda item, agenda item four whoops, four h because the IRS comes into some references made by aquent in response to matters that related to the telecoms building. So I can deal with it then or Now, but but I'm grateful to hear that that the applicant is prepared to consider the same approach in terms of controlling lighting at the IRS as well.

1:10:11

If you could raise them later again at the appropriate point, this will be useful. Thank you. It's 10 past 11 we take a short screen break. In fact, it's just gone 10 past 11. Could we reconvene, please at 1118 Thank you very much.