

TRANSCRIPT_VIKING_ISH3_SESSION3_170 724

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. It's now 145 And I'm resuming this issue specific hearing into environmental matters. And the next matter on the agenda is cultural heritage. I'm going to assume that the the applicants team has already reshuffled after the break.

Yes, that's absolutely right. Once again, it will be myself and Mr. Monroe during the double act to Mr. Monroe's, right is Kristin Moore is Chris is Mr. Chris Moore, and beyond him is Mr. Neal McNabb, both of AECOM and they will be assisting as regards matters, archaeological and heritage more generally.

Thank you very much. And I am aware of that being noted that there are apologies from Lincolnshire county council that the the archaeology officers have sick, what I will do is I will read the archaeology based questions anyway, so that you can hear them. And so that if the council can speak to them in any way, please do so. Otherwise, they can be taken away and responded to at the next available deadline. And then also, it will give the applicant a chance to respond today if they wish. And it also give other counselors if they feel so compelled to make a response to the questions as well. And then later on in the questioning, there are questions about heritage assets, listed buildings, etcetera in due course, which I believe were fully equipped to answer. So without further ado, then I'll come to link to account accounts in respect of archaeology. And the first question is that having read the council's response that deadline free, there are hints there are hints in there, that the proposed development and the accompanying environmental statement are not consistent with NPS en one, the National Policy Statement and one or the infrastructure planning EIA regulations. That is a quite an allegation. And I just like to explore that and see whether you do indeed think the information before the examination is or is not compliant with national policy.

Thank you. So just being proud of the Lincolnshire county council. And thank you once again for acknowledging the absence of our archaeologist. today. I will do my best to try and answer your questions. And of course, we will respond fully in writing thereafter to those that I'm unable to. To answer today. I believe the the archaeologists has sent sort of a an up to date sort of position to me for today's hearing. And I think generally speaking, the council's position on archaeology is a positive one for this scheme, in that we feel that the scheme is progressing in the right direction. And but we have raised a few issues and made a few statements primarily around the contents and statements that are made in the draft Kemp, now they argue our county archaeologists did have an opportunity to have a look at the latest draft version of the Kemp. And the camp appears to be the same as the previous version. So the comments that we made at deadline three, are effectively still our position at this point. The areas of concern being around the fact that WSI for the written scheme of investigation for mitigation does not yet exist. And an inaccuracy within the or believed inaccuracy within the written statement, which is referring actually to the evaluation, trenching WSI and not the mitigation to that effect. The archaeologists comments are that there is a technical non compliance with one of the

national policy statements en three in that the the the results of the previous determine a predetermination archaeology evaluation is needed to inform the design of the scheme and any related archaeological planning conditions. So it's at this point we don't have the Mytek as I understand it, we don't have the mitigation WSI. We're were to receive that in advance of the the hit the the examination closing then we would be able to sort of comment on that and I understand it the relationship between the county archaeology and Wessex archaeology is a good one. And I would be hopeful that they could reach a position where they both agree. I hope that's helpful.

That is before just go to the applicant. You mentioned en three. What was that? Was that correct?

Yes.

The archivist has referred to the N three, which is in the comments that deadline three, which is the renewable energy infrastructure, national planning policy, I appreciate that it's not a directly relevant one to this proposal.

Okay. Oh, come across to the applicants team, then, first of all, in relation to this mitigation, WSI, if you could respond to that point, and if we're likely to see anything like that in the examination, and then the second, obviously, we've done the planning policy position at the onset of this examination, in which it is said that MPSC and one an MPS and four were important and relevant, notwithstanding your points about section 104, section 105. But just in terms of en three, what comments you may have in respect of that place.

Just being proud of Lincolnshire county councils. Sorry, that was for the applicant wasn't.

That one was for me. Okay, taking matters in stages. Firstly, a short point, if I'm here before we come to WSI and mitigation, just a short point, by way of context. In terms of the relationship with the county council, I would echo what you've already heard, which is to say that there is a good and as I understand it, constructive relationship between the parties. And I have been working closely together. It's not only the county council that we've been working with in this regard, we've been working also closely with Historic England. And I should say that we are now we we don't have a smart copy yet as to in terms of a statement of common ground, but we have agreed the content of a statement of common ground with Historic England and they are entirely supportive of the position which we are now in and you The examination will have that statement of common ground at deadline for obviously, we say that is significant. That is a historic England as the statutory consultee on all matters heritage related their position, and their endorsement of the approach adopted by the applicant is a significant matter in terms of the specific issue raised in terms of the WSI, as regards mitigation, that is essentially the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy, which is in the course of preparation and finalization. And that will be with the county council by mid August. I think that's the document that's being sought. As regards en three, I'm afraid I didn't get a note of the particular reference that the county council was taking as to you have opposition in relation to the suite of national policy statements more generally. And as you noted, we've discussed the and one and the end for the particular point on the end three Was that was that could be reiterated and I can take some instruction on that point or pull that up. Yes, indeed.

I was asking, I was essentially asking the county council just to reiterate the point in relation to en three.

Sorry, I was just wanted to be clear that you wanted me to come in there just being proud of her Lincolnshire county council. And that the the points on the reference two and three was that it states in a footnote 94 that the results of the predetermination archaeology evaluation, they informed the design of the scheme. And related then therefore the related archaeological planning conditions. So that is effectively saying that we need that archaeological evaluation upfront, which will then help to inform the design of the scheme and the mitigation that's necessary.

Mr. Booth, I'm going to have to pull that up and just consider it and we'll come back to it later in that session, if that's okay, later in this session, if that's okay, because I just want to ensure that I've read that footnote in its context. So perhaps if we can come back to that matter in a short while.

Yes, indeed. I'll just come back to Lincolnshire county council, in terms of just making clear what has worked Why'd now and what is required post consent if indeed consent should be granted. If it may be difficult to speak to, but sort of a chronological order, if you like, of what you'd expect to see and when, because I understand things like influencing the design of the scheme is, you know, based on archaeological sort of fines and trenches and whatnot is probably likely a post consent, discussion and submission between the parties more than for the examination, but if you could just help if you can just let me know what's expected now, and what's expected know later down the line.

Justin, proud of Lincolnshire county council, this may be sort of stretching my my knowledge of archaeology a little bit here, but as I understand it, we require the evaluation, trenching scheme, which has been provided already, and then follow on from that evaluation, we would then expect a mitigation WSI to come forward. But I'd be happy to provide you with comments from archaeologists on this particular matter at deadline for so we can actually set out a clear kind of logic of what we were expecting, and why if that helps. Okay,

thank you very much.

I appreciate sorry.

Sorry, Mr. Booth. I know you're about to come back on the en three point, but just a question about the WSI mitigation that you sent who had been with the archaeological mitigation strategy that would be submitted to the council mid August. We obviously have deadline five on the second of September, after which there's only one more deadline for responses to be submitted. So do envisage that if you would submit that archaeological mitigation strategy by deadline five, that issues would have been resolved by deadline six, which is, in effect, almost the very end of the examination.

Yes. So that would be the hope and expectation, obviously, we can't state with certainty in the absence of the document having yet been completed. And certainly we've not had obviously comments back from the county council, but we don't anticipate any reason why matters wouldn't be resolved by deadline set.

By Okay, thank you. Did you want to just touch on the entry point now or a lot later? Yes.

So I just to come back on it very briefly. And I appreciate that the county council don't have their archaeologist with them. But it's just that insofar as footnote 94 goes, quite simply, so we simply do not say that that applies to this development. You'll be familiar with that section of the national policy statement, it is concerned with a specific form of renewable development, that is to say solar, and it does not apply to pipelines, such as this one. We say that the relevant guidance in national policy for the purposes of this project is that found in Section 5.9 of en one, and in essence, that is where the examination and the examining authority should go to for the purposes of relevant policy tests and relevant policy guidance.

Okay, thank you very much for that. And perhaps a takeaway for the county archaeologists is just to expand on the reasons why they believe en three is applicable to this to this scheme, and in particular, that footnote 94.

One further question for the the council. Notwithstanding what has been said about the WSI mitigation that's forthcoming. I believe there was also some requested changes to some of the measures within the construction environmental management plan in the camp. So you can revisions. Can you just elaborate on what the changes that you hope to see what they are and why they're necessary, please.

Just being proud of the Lincolnshire county council. As I said, when I'm answering the first question that the county archeologist has looked at the latest version of the cam, and the no changes have been seen between the previous version which was commented on to Deadline three. The I don't have any further to add at this stage to what is provided in our submission at deadline three, which sets out the concerns regarding various parts of the camp. Um, but I'll, I'll be happy to provide an expansion on that for deadline for.

Okay, thank you very much. I've just flipped to the applicants team and say you've probably had a chance to digest some of what is submitted at deadline free. And you've seen the the week recommended changes to the Kemp. Will you be revising it? And if so, what would that look like? Please?

Thank you. So I'm going to ask Mr. Moore to address the various points raised by the county council and to provide effectively a headline view as to what we make of them.

Thank you, Chris, more for the applicant. So the camp includes 12 measures for archaeological mitigation effectively and provisions. One query that has been raised regards point D three, which concerns targeted archaeological monitoring. And the county council has commented that let me just check my wording Exactly.

It concerns the applicability of targeted archaeological monitoring and the circumstances for it. So targeted archaeological monitoring is one of a range of measures that are described or listed under point D three of the camp and D three, D two, I beg your pardon D three expands on the circumstances

under which targeted archaeological monitoring would be undertaken. And it says specifically in areas where prior archaeological evaluation indicates this approach is appropriate. And or in areas where archaeological investigation and recording in advance of construction are not feasible due to safety or logistical considerations, or undesirable due to environmental or engineering constraints. So in our submission to targeted archaeological monitoring is just one component that will form part of the mitigation strategies that detailed archaeological mitigation strategy and accompanying outline written scheme of investigation that would constitute the WSI that is sought by the county council. And in our submission, the dams and the WSI will provide for targeted archaeological monitoring to be applied where that would be a reasonable archaeological mitigation response. From our perspective, so we don't see that the camp needs to be amended in terms of how it provides for that means of mitigation at this stage as the dams and the algae and subsequent documents that will be approved by Lincolnshire county council and others will make clear what those circumstances are elaborating further from the provisions in the camp.

Thank you very much. Mr. Hall. Thank you for that.

Mr. Goss,

do you have a question?

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Wallace. Just to try and it's Mr. Moore, thank you for that explanation and trying to reduce it to a practical level which a layman like myself might be able to understand. If we look at the immediate area around here, we've got three grade two star listed buildings being the church it's telling bro the church rebei And also the gun site, which is quite close. slightly further, but proximate to the pipeline is a medieval village. And the there's a whole road which will go right next to a moat of that medieval village. So in practical terms, what it what is likely to be taken to ensure that any any remains it's not designated this the site, but in practical terms, what steps are going to be taken to ensure that anything else is carefully monitored and looked after in that particular location? I'm just using as an example, because I happen to wander around there yesterday through the footpaths, which are very well maintained by Lincolnshire County Council. Thank you.

Thank you, Chris, more for the applicant. So targeted archaeological monitoring doesn't just involve an archaeologist standing around watching. The targeting element comes from an understanding of the context of that part of the route taking the example that you've you've cited and those aspects of the historic landscape and environment around it indicate some potential If and where if archaeological trial trenching has not been undertaken, where there may still be some undefined potential. That's just such an area where targeted archaeological monitoring might well apply. In order to make that effective the camp, if I could revert back to the camp wording, and the bring it up again, there we go. It says the works contractors preferred method of working would be controlled as necessary by the supervising archaeologist to allow archaeological recording to take place to the required standard. So so this is a constraint placed on the works to ensure that there is opportunity for archaeological remains, if present, to be identified and properly recorded. And in the case of unexpected archaeological finds, there will be a provision included in the detailed archaeological mitigation strategy that ensures that the county

archaeologist is consulted on the nature and significance of those fines and agrees how the mitigation strategy should then be applied to such fines. Thank you.

Thank you. That's helpful explanation appreciated back to Mr. Wallace.

Thank you very much that has for archaeology for the archaeological side of heritage. covered all my questions. Is there anyone else who just wants to touch on the archaeology side any further questions or points anyone wants to raise? Okay, nope, nothing heard. which case I'll move on to the next stage of the cultural heritage. She talked about listed buildings and if you'd like above ground heritage assets to Lincolnshire county council in the relevant representation you submitted. There are some queries about the scope and the study area that were used in compiling the Historic Environment desk based assessment. The applicant responded to this at deadline one, stating it was a proportionate study area, and the scope had not been objected to during the consultation phase of the project. Following those comments, I had not seen any specific rebuttal from Lincolnshire county council on that point. Can you confirm to me whether that point has been resolved and it's gone away? Or if you still have concerns about the study area and scope use the desk based assessment?

Just being proud of Lincolnshire county council, I'd like to bring in my colleague, Mark Knighten, who's joining us online. Mark is the historic buildings officer at Lincolnshire county council. Okay,

thank you. Thank you, sir. We have we're satisfied with the applicants study area. We've no no further comments to add on that particular point.

Okay, uptake that it's been resolved. So thank you for that and sticking sticking with you, Mr. Knight. And in the deadline one submission, you raise the number of designated and non designated heritage assets, stating that more information is needed to understand their significance and understand the impacts upon them. The list of assets I have from that is manor house, Ashley farm, both of which are great to listed, and then decode house. The poplars, lordship farm, the range farm and little dams, all of which are down as non designated heritage assets. Can you confirm just regarding each of those assets individually? If your concerns remain? And if so what information you would require on them from the applicant place?

Well, we're satisfied with the applicants responses to our comments set out in the XA. Table for built heritage. So the non designated farm says that we identified on our being taken forward for assessment in the yes chapter. Regarding the designated assets, we've no points of difference with the applicant or Historic England, and we would refer to their statement of common ground, but isn't homestand being prepared.

Okay, thank you very much that that? No, just wasn't clear from previous. So that's helped me to put a cap on on that. And just again, I know it is written in your submission, but I will refer this to you and then to other councils. I believe that you have said that the project as a whole would cause less than substantial harm, but that the public benefits of the poses. All would outweigh that lesson substantial harm. Can you confirm that is still your position?

Yes, we reiterate that as our response in your initial questions.

Next. Okay. Thank you very much for that. I will ask that same question to the other councils, if they want to raise anything wherever they feel less of substantial harm is occurred. And if the public benefits outweigh that, if there's any comments at all, from any other councillors, by all means, let me know now. Nothing heard Allah make the assumption. You're okay with that

assumption there. Okay. Bear with me one minute whilst I check my notes.

Okay, in which case, I think that covers my questions in respect of heritage assets. Does anyone else have anything burning they wish to raise about heritage that they want examination to be aware of? Now, okay, nothing heard. In which case, I'll pass to you, Mr. Ghost for the next agenda item.

Thank you, Mr. Wallace. So we're moving on now to any other business. And firstly, the question is, is there anybody either in the room or in the virtual room who has anything else they wished to raise? And there's no one in the room. I'll give the virtual room a few more minutes. few more moments, sorry. No hands raised in the virtual room. So on that basis, we just need to confirm the action points that have been raised in during the course of today's hearing. So we'll adjourn for 15 minutes to consider those. And therefore the hearing will resume at and in fact, we're going to take 20 minutes because it's going to take two minutes for us to to get out. So we'll say at 230. The meeting the hearings adjourned till then thank you very much.