



Planning Inspectorate  
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Dogger Bank South
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) – Part 4
<b>Date:</b>	9 April 2025

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

00:00:05:05 - 00:00:26:27

Good afternoon. The time is now 2:00, and I'd like to welcome everyone back to this issue specific hearing for the Dogger Bank offshore wind farms. I'm now going to hand back to Mr. Abramsky to deal with the next item on the agenda. But before that, I'm going to pass to Mr. Tandy, who's going to come back on one of the action points from this morning's session on hydrology and flood risk.

00:00:29:04 - 00:00:29:26

Thank you.

00:00:32:11 - 00:00:40:22

There was a action to come back on the applicants later today on one of the points raised. And I wonder whether now you're able to do so.

00:00:45:22 - 00:00:47:04

But the big numbers of

00:00:49:03 - 00:00:59:05

people involved are discussing that point right now. We're not yet able to respond, but we definitely will be before the examination, before today Closes.

00:01:00:07 - 00:01:38:01

Okay, great. You can come back to that then. And then just one other point, which was that, uh, it was in relation to item uh, 4.2 on the agenda. Uh, the applicant, you provided me with an answer and pointed me to paragraph 191 of the Outline Code of Construction Practice, uh, in terms of securing the use of existing land levels so as not to alter the surface water flow paths. I've taken the opportunity over lunch just to have a look at that. And it doesn't, um, do as I think that was being sort of suggested in terms of, uh, really securing that.

00:01:38:03 - 00:01:47:16

So I wonder whether we should add an action point for you to go away and have a look and confirm of it somewhere else, or perhaps it needs to be updated. Would that be appropriate?

00:01:50:10 - 00:01:52:22

We're happy to take that as an action point.

00:01:52:24 - 00:02:02:18

So thank you, Mr. Boswell. I shall now hand over to Miss Abramsky, who's going to pick up the next agenda item on the agenda.

00:02:04:02 - 00:02:13:10

Thank you, Mr. Tandy. Mr. puzzle, did you want to introduce your representatives that you've got regarding the unsure historic environment for item number six?

00:02:15:07 - 00:02:15:26

Yes, please.

00:02:18:02 - 00:02:32:02

Hello, it's doctor John Rabbit. I have a heritage lead involved in producing the environmental statement, which we have been providing support to the examination since then.

00:02:34:06 - 00:02:37:17

I'm not sure. Consent manager for the applicant.

00:02:43:21 - 00:02:44:13

Thank you.

00:02:46:01 - 00:03:10:06

So starting with item 6.1, which is the effect on heritage assets from construction. Thank you for all of your responses to date on this matter. I understand the applicant's position that overall effects from construction, the setting of designated heritage assets would be reversible, temporary, and of a sufficiently short short duration that they would not give rise to material harm or significant effects.

00:03:12:13 - 00:03:36:27

Yes. Chapter 22, with reference as 92, concludes that there would be no harm to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting as a result of construction. What I'd like to do is move agenda item 6.4 to now as it flows into construction effects. So that's the effects on Cashflows Hall, the Black Mill and Cobble Hall.

00:03:38:15 - 00:03:52:12

So just starting with Cap Foxhall, which is a grade two listed building, if I may. Uh, could the applicants display sheet eight of nine of the works plans, please, with reference rep 2005.

00:04:05:15 - 00:04:16:04

Thank you. Um, if we can zoom in a little on, uh, Cat Foxhall, which is towards the center of the sheet above the purple hatched construction compound. For context. That would be helpful. Thank you.

00:04:17:21 - 00:04:32:09

So, first of all, can the applicants tell me how far at the closest point, the construction works for the cable route nearby to the listed building would be. And how far would the construction compound to the south be located from the listed building?

00:04:46:22 - 00:04:47:07

So.

00:04:51:29 - 00:04:59:09

We don't have that information immediately to hand. We can provide it quickly.

00:04:59:17 - 00:05:00:13

I can look it up now.

00:05:00:16 - 00:05:01:27

Brian. So

00:05:03:15 - 00:05:09:03

Thomas is going to look it up now? Depends if you want to wait or continue.

00:05:09:22 - 00:05:26:11

That's fine. We can continue if you want to, um, let us know. Two later. Junction of the, um. This item agenda. That would be fine. Um, the council identified less than substantial harm to the setting of Catfish Hall during construction.

00:05:28:05 - 00:05:53:03

The applicants have responded and direct 343 by saying that change to setting arising from construction works would be observed, but this would be read by a viewer as works within a wider agricultural landscape, and would not affect that contribution to significance. Could the applicants confirm whether they consider that construction works would be incongruous or an in-keeping feature within the agricultural landscape.

00:06:05:18 - 00:06:22:29

Thanks, John. For the applicant and for response to your first question. The distance from the closest point of the fossil to the border limits is 170m.

00:06:27:02 - 00:06:32:25

In terms of the gravity of the um, of the works.

00:06:34:27 - 00:07:19:25

These would be temporary works within an agricultural landscape. I think the issue is not whether they are of themselves congruent or incongruous. The issue is how that congruency would affect the significance of the asset. So you have to remember that the reception is actually the significance of the asset and not the city itself. It's how that change in the setting would affect the significance and the, the view on on the assessment is that because this would be read as a temporary change, the character of that land would remain agricultural land.

00:07:20:12 - 00:07:32:09

It would still remain. That connection between cat fossil and the surrounding agricultural land would remain effectively unchanged. And that

00:07:34:09 - 00:07:50:02

that contribution of that direction is actually fairly limited because of this extensive screening from hedgerows around Foxhall. So as a result, there will be no changes. The significance of the asset.

00:07:55:04 - 00:07:59:00

Thank you. Could I ask for East Riding of Yorkshire Council's comments, please?

00:08:02:28 - 00:08:56:26

Uh uh, British Yorkshire Council. Um, I mean, to a certain extent, I think there is a comment about Congress and in Congress in the sense of while it would be development with an agricultural setting, it would be it wouldn't be something which you would know, development you'd normally associate

with. It's kind of why why our cultural setting. And I do think in terms of sort of the visual impact and the audit impact that it would have, it would affect how you experience that listed building. I do accept the point made by, um, though, in the sense that it would be, um, temporary and it would be and it would affect only one element that contributes to the significance of the heritage asset, which is why, um, the heart identifies the heart and to be less substantial, um, the impact to be relatively low and for that impact to probably be, um, limited to the construction phase as opposed to being a long term impact.

00:09:02:07 - 00:09:04:21

So the applicants have any response they wish to make to that?

00:09:08:29 - 00:09:30:12

John Leavitt for the applicant only really in the sense that, again, we're looking specifically at the historic nature of that, if we're looking at the significant relates to the historicity of the structure. And as a result,

00:09:31:29 - 00:09:56:11

the a lot of these changes to this will be views from it and the views of it, where they don't necessarily interact with that Significant in terms of seeing it as a historic building within and within a modern agricultural landscape that would not therefore affect the significance, as it is a historic asset.

00:10:01:24 - 00:10:02:17

Thank you.

00:10:05:17 - 00:10:08:18

You stated at deadline three that construction works.

00:10:11:01 - 00:10:49:07

On the on at the onshore cable would not change the viewer's perception of the identified assets. However, during the unaccompanied site inspection, the examining authority noted that cat fossil benefits from a fairly long, well maintained driveway. The cable corridor would cut across this, severing the access to the property from the highway and obscure views of the property from public vantage points, introducing large scale construction work to this area. Moreover, an additional access nearby to the property to serve the cable route would introduce more vehicular traffic in this area, and there would be likely to be noise disturbance from construction works at deadline.

00:10:49:09 - 00:11:07:17

Three East Riding of Yorkshire Council stated that the setting of Foxhall has a sense of separation and isolation, which contributes positively to the ability to be able to understand its historic function and relationship within its landscape, and that construction works would be visually intrusive.  
Intervention.

00:11:09:21 - 00:11:16:14

Do you still maintain the view that construction works would not change the viewers perception of the identified assets?

00:11:18:18 - 00:12:12:06

John Rabbitt for the applicant. Um, yes we do. I think that drive is quite a discernibly modern feature. Looking at the arrangement of the hedgerows and the, um, and the paving on it, I think what it might retain a historic route. It is still quite a modern engineered structure. I think the sense of isolation does derive largely from that quite secluded location within, actually within the hedgerow planting around at Foxhall, which is actually, again, is quite a modern and very well maintained set up to retain that sense of seclusion and traffic on the, um, along that north south road is a relatively minor change to that setting.

00:12:21:18 - 00:12:54:04

So just in terms of the the sense of isolation and seclusion that you've just referenced. I mean, presumably when the construction works are going on directly outside of the property, there would be, as I said, disturbance in that regard, and it might be a fairly busy sort of area with construction vehicles, etc. coming in and out. Do you think that that would, when the construction works are directly outside of it, it would still maintain a sense of isolation given the disturbed potential levels of disturbance I've just referenced?

00:12:58:12 - 00:12:58:27

I.

00:13:00:12 - 00:13:18:22

I think again, that might affect sorry for the applicant. Again, I think that might affect a sense of isolation to a degree. But again, we have to look at how that interacts with the significance of that matter and that, um.

00:13:20:23 - 00:13:21:08

It.

00:13:23:26 - 00:13:48:29

Is still within within the wider world, that there are still quite noisy activities that will happen there during working hours at different times of, of the year. And that that wall. It doesn't exist in total isolation. So. And it's a discernibly modern agricultural landscape. So I don't think that that reaches a point that would be construed as harm.

00:13:50:29 - 00:13:55:25

Thank you. Um, did East Riding of Yorkshire Council have any further comments that they wanted to make?

00:14:01:12 - 00:14:01:27

Uh.

00:14:02:09 - 00:14:20:00

Priorities for the council. Um, I don't think there's anything more to make on that. I think it's sense of obviously it's there's a discrete between whether it would be a low level of harm or no harm at all, but I don't think there's anything additional to kind of add to or kind of add to the conversation.

00:14:21:06 - 00:14:35:09

No thank you. Um, thank you for providing the distance to the, um, the nearest point in terms of the order limits. Did you have a distance available to the construction compound that I requested?

00:15:00:07 - 00:15:03:20

Are you getting that one? Yeah. So it's two.

00:15:06:19 - 00:15:08:09

And 300?

00:15:10:03 - 00:15:10:18

Yeah.

00:15:10:29 - 00:15:15:15

I work for the applicant. We have a distance of about 350m.

00:15:22:25 - 00:15:23:17

Thank you.

00:15:26:08 - 00:15:41:25

I'll move on to, um, Cobble Hall now, which is a grade two listed building, and it's shown here on the same sheet of the works plans as Cat fossil. If we follow the cable route down to the southwest, we'll come to Cobble Hall at the bottom of the page.

00:15:48:25 - 00:15:55:12

Uh, could the applicants confirm how far away? At the closest point with the construction corridor for the cable route to Cobble Hall, please?

00:15:57:12 - 00:16:01:19

I don't know, but for the applicant, we have 330m.

00:16:05:13 - 00:16:16:12

Thank you. Um, I don't believe that it's identified as a heritage asset in, er, chapter 22 as potentially being temporary affected by the construction of the cable corridor. Can you confirm why that is?

00:16:19:10 - 00:16:31:20

I think this was one of the ones we looked at and we considered but did not scope in in the in the end because we thought it was going to be an adverse effect.

00:16:37:06 - 00:16:41:18

Can you confirm why it wasn't scoped in? Why you considered there wouldn't be an effect? For what reasons?

00:16:43:08 - 00:16:55:11

For the applicant, it was the nature of the asset and the nature of its setting. I think we've expanded on in the responses to the written questions.

00:17:02:10 - 00:17:11:22

Thank you. And East Riding of Yorkshire Council, could you elaborate a little more on why you consider that there would be less than substantial harm to the setting of this asset during construction?

00:17:13:00 - 00:17:49:11

Are British properties in Yorkshire Council? Um, it's for space reasons to um cat parcel. Although I appreciate the distances is greater between the, uh, urban limits and, um, the couple that holding is between them and Cafaro. It's again, it's a it's a attractive building. It's a good example of a local vernacular architecture set within a slight rise within the landscape, which, uh, and it's sort of to a certain extent, it appears to be a building which has been, uh, has used that change of topography to give it a sort of, um, a bit more sense of place in the landscape.

00:17:49:13 - 00:18:24:04

One way you can appreciate its architecture and a slightly longer distance. In one way you can it appreciates its wider landscape. Um, and again, the, the, uh, introduction of construction works within the wider setting. It's something that would be kind of incongruous that you would have those sort of visual and audio effects. It would, um, but again, they would be, um, temporary and they would be extremely limited to the construction period if, um, mitigated afterwards. Um, again, I think with this, uh, there's probably less impact on this than there would be on capital simply because of that sense of separation.

00:18:24:06 - 00:18:29:22

But again, it is development with development within that wide open landscape which would be incongruous.

00:18:37:13 - 00:18:41:10

Thank you. Did the applicants want to provide any comments on this?

00:18:45:01 - 00:19:20:15

Matter for the applicant? I think we we have largely covered this one off in the first position in the response to the written questions. Um, I think the key thing for me is that it is very much, again, in a modern agricultural setting. Um, it does have a very attractive aspect when you view it from the, from the West, but that would be from the, the proposed works wouldn't intervene in that view.

00:19:21:04 - 00:19:45:19

Um, it is quite well screened from the proposed works as they pass to the north of it, by planting in the garden and other buildings and parts of the native farm at this point. So it is another one with modern activities, is a lot less. Um, it is not really something that is incongruous by its nature.

00:19:53:18 - 00:19:54:11

Thank you.

00:19:56:05 - 00:20:07:21



Um, turning to the black mill. Um, a grade two listed building. Could I just ask? East Riding of Yorkshire Council, just to elaborate a bit on why they considered there would be less than substantial harm during construction?

00:20:12:12 - 00:20:46:06

Uh, British Council. Um, again, I think when I was looking through the responses as well, there is some Summit in indivisibility noted. Between uh, or where the site and the construction will be, or the listed building and the construction will be, um, viewed together. Um, it is also, uh, that the, the compound, the nearby compound, I forget what it was would be sort of partially screened, which again, the applicant put up in their response. It's one of the ones where it is that the building isn't, um, uh, functional anymore.

00:20:46:08 - 00:21:20:29

It is sort of it's it's been sort of partially denuded. It's so really one of the things is, is quite a its significant part derives from its, its historical value, but also from it being a bit of a sort of landscape feature, I think as well something where, you know, um, these mills I've worked across, I worked across the country and in terms of these mills are something that's quite kind of, um, uh, characteristic of these riding. And we've got a much greater kind of concentration and collection than there maybe have elsewhere. I mean, I think in potentially places like, um, East Anglia, where there's also similar concentrations.

00:21:21:01 - 00:21:53:12

But it's a lot of its significance probably derives from its evidential value, but also from its landscape value. And there would be some impact on how you appreciated, uh, those who, um, it was in that wide landscape. I do, however, accept that it is one where, um, the impact is again limited and limited to a particular viewpoint. And I do want to take on board the comments the applicant the applicant made in their response about the fact that there is also other similar infrastructure which you would get in that view, including some the wind turbines.

00:21:53:23 - 00:22:13:21

Um, so it is one where we did pick up the that being an impact, the impact potentially having an impact on the significance of this building. But I do again appreciate that where the impact where that, um, falls in the sort of spectrum of harm, as it were, is probably going to be less substantial and quite low and really quite a long way down that sort of spectrum of impact.

00:22:19:03 - 00:22:35:12

Okay. Thank you. And I you have referenced the applicant's response on this. I will give them the opportunity to respond if you wish. But obviously we are aware of your comments and and stance on the blackmail. But if you'd like to offer comments on the Yorkshire Council comments now, please do.

00:22:39:25 - 00:22:40:27

Okay, I think.

00:22:41:07 - 00:22:41:22

My.

00:22:42:12 - 00:23:10:07

To point out that that there are very few. I think there's only 1 or 2 publicly accessible locations where the blackmail and the works would be invisible. Um, blackmail is a very distant feature in that view, which is from an existing, quite busy road. So this separation bill, which I think is up to 600m, that we, we, we felt that was one where the

00:23:12:03 - 00:23:23:24

contribution of the sort of architectural value of the black metal was quite, quite limited. It was quite generalised. Um, so that was all we needed to add to that.

00:23:30:02 - 00:23:59:08

Thank you. Um, just turning to effects on construction on the anti-aircraft farm, which is scheduled monument. The applicant stated at deadline three with reference rep 327 that works at the converter station zone during construction could last 48 months compared to works along the onshore cable route being 33 months, albeit not in one area for that length of time, and works at the landfall could be likely to take 18 months, albeit not consecutively.

00:24:01:03 - 00:24:08:25

Do you consider that the works at the converter station zone would be perceptible from the scheduled monument at Boat Farm?

00:24:11:09 - 00:24:30:15

I think It's traumatic for the applicant, I think. Yes. They would clearly be perceptible from the monument at Butt Farm. I think again, this this issue of, um. How does that interact with the significance of the asset? It's not just about the susceptibility.

00:24:45:20 - 00:24:54:04

And, um, would construction result in noise or light intrusion to visitors at the scheduled monument during construction?

00:25:04:16 - 00:25:37:27

But for the applicant, I think. Yes. Would be audible from the, um, From what? Construction noise would be audible from the monument. But again, we need to consider significance. And looking at, um, actual, there is fairly limited guidance on noise heritage assets, but there is Historic England guidance that sets out, um, types of heritage asset that would be considered sensitive to noise and changing noise in their setting.

00:25:38:09 - 00:26:10:13

And this does not fit one of those categories. Um, that would be I mean, that guidance is in the context of aviation, but it is the only advice on that one. Um, there is also in terms of nighttime working light would be perceptible. But we do again have to consider who is actually accessing that asset at night and what that contribution of darkness or light would actually make.

00:26:14:18 - 00:26:28:11

Sense for the applicant. It's also worth noting that the site is not publicly accessible. Some private land so limited number of visitors in terms of and this is the camp site.

00:26:30:11 - 00:26:41:19

For the applicant. I think most of the permissive access to that site is actually weekends, when there wouldn't be construction works that would be being controlled

00:26:43:13 - 00:26:53:07

and it would be done, and that work was being controlled under the various noise provisions that have been discussed and the working hours provisions.

00:27:07:19 - 00:27:16:19

And do you consider that any of the elements that we've just, um, considered to be harmful to the setting of the scheduled monument?

00:27:21:20 - 00:27:28:29

For the applicant not considering the significance of the asset and how that setting contributes?

00:27:31:18 - 00:27:32:03

No.

00:27:35:23 - 00:27:38:24

Sorry, I'm struggling to hear you a little bit. Can you just repeat that?

00:27:41:05 - 00:27:48:06

Taking into account the significance of the asset and the contribution of its setting. Um, I would say no.

00:27:59:03 - 00:28:04:07

Thank you. Um, can I ask each one of you, Yorkshire Council, for any comments they might have on that?

00:28:10:00 - 00:28:50:26

Uh, British British Council. I mean, I think the other thing I would say is that obviously, in terms of contribution to the contribution to setting doesn't necessarily require public access or public visibility, um, which you just can't. So in terms of when it, when, when and when it won't be, um, be audible or visible, um, that there is a it's not a sort of a catch all. Um, in terms of, in terms of the, um, the impact of sort of the, the like the impact, I'd probably, um, defer to Historic England, whose comments I think they've comments on that in their, um, uh, in their, in their response.

00:28:50:28 - 00:28:56:15

Um, and raise some concerns. I think, I don't think I'm necessarily going to anything more to add than they've said already.

00:29:01:01 - 00:29:02:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:29:04:21 - 00:29:39:04

So I'm going to move on to decommissioning effects. Which item number 6.2. Can the applicants please explain for the purposes of reporting on the proposed effects, what the what they consider that the examining authority should set out in the report on Decommissioning Effects on Heritage Assets, the examining Authority notes that the applicants consider that the effects from decommissioning would be no worse than during construction or operation of the proposed development. This would it be appropriate for the examining authority report on a worst case scenario basis, that the effects would be minor, adverse and not significant?

00:30:03:19 - 00:30:32:06

For the applicant. I think there are. There are some. There are some points to consider here. Firstly is that there wouldn't be. Direct physical effects on heritage assets during decommissioning because intrusive works would take place in that already been disturbed. And in any case, that scope of intrusive works would be significantly lower than what is what has been done for construction.

00:30:35:01 - 00:31:09:21

In terms of change to setting up again, works on the landfill would be very limited because that those works would be significantly less in terms of scope and duration than anything that's predicted. And we're currently not predicting change setting during construction. Um, and Decommissioning of the onshore converter station would effectively represent removal of any visible and obvious development from the setting of that farm.

00:31:11:09 - 00:31:20:24

In addition, any effect will be controlled by the decommissioning plan. So I don't know if my colleague was seeing more on the machine.

00:31:21:28 - 00:31:39:22

No, just I don't exactly know, just exactly as John said, just to know that a decommissioning plan would be, um, um, developed, um, which would consider any potential impacts as well. It could manage any potential effects. Um, nothing else to add.

00:31:41:13 - 00:31:49:29

Okay. Thank you. So what would you suggest that the examining authority reports on in terms of the effects from decommissioning?

00:31:52:27 - 00:31:53:12

Um.

00:31:54:06 - 00:31:57:03

For the applicant. We can't.

00:31:57:05 - 00:31:57:27

Identify.

00:31:57:29 - 00:32:12:06

Any harms other than those which could be precluded by appropriate controls on working methods and areas. Um, and that would be around things like those pillboxes at landfall. Should just get us in the construction.

00:32:14:18 - 00:32:15:09

Books.

00:32:25:21 - 00:32:32:08

Okay. In terms, what would you say? That the effects are negligible.

00:32:35:08 - 00:32:36:13

Not significant.

00:32:40:18 - 00:32:41:03

Okay.

00:32:42:08 - 00:32:49:08

That would be. They would be discernibly less. And in any case, no worse than construction.

00:32:52:13 - 00:32:52:28

Okay.

00:33:05:03 - 00:33:07:08

Sorry. I'm struggling to hear you.

00:33:10:25 - 00:33:11:22

Sir. John.

00:33:11:27 - 00:33:26:02

John. Yeah, they would be. Any effects would be in the absolute worst case. No worse than construction. But in, in or in any individual case would be lower than.

00:33:29:10 - 00:33:30:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:33:35:24 - 00:33:55:28

So moving on to the, um, anti-aircraft gun site. Um, the schedule monument nearby to Book Farm. So just looking at the effects reported by the applicants, I just wanted to make sure that I've got my understanding, um, completely clear in terms of the impacts of the proposed development on the good site during operation.

00:33:57:16 - 00:34:19:03

In table one two of Rep 259, which is the applicant's responses to issue specific hearing. Two supplementary agenda questions. Appendix A Heritage assets. It sets out that prior to mitigation, there

would be less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale. But this this would produce no harm after mitigation.

00:34:20:18 - 00:34:38:18

Can you just confirm it's premeditation at year one of operation and therefore post mitigation represents your turn of operation? Or if not, how should we interpret the pre and post mitigation stages referred to in terms of, um, less than substantial harm? Um, moving to no harm at all?

00:35:09:13 - 00:35:19:24

For the applicant. I think the person that we need to answer this isn't currently in the room, but is in the building, so we can come back to you at a later point if that's okay. Once they've once we've got them to come into the room.

00:35:20:15 - 00:35:21:18

Yes. Yes. Okay.

00:35:32:25 - 00:36:06:27

I have got some questions on the effects. I mean, I don't know if you're going to be able to answer these based on what you've just said, but I should ask anyway, um, is chapter 22, which is, uh, reference as 92 identifies the residual effect in AIA terms on the scheduled monument as minor at first during operation, which is not significant. Therefore, the environmental statement does identify negative effect, albeit not not significant. Can the applicants therefore explain why in their view, this does not equate to less than substantial harm on the heritage asset.

00:36:10:18 - 00:36:48:04

John Lovett for the applicant, I think we discussed this in the response to one of the various written questions, um, where we explained that there was effectively a difference between the policy test and the, um, the sort of strict application of the EIA methodology so that, um, negligible, negligible effects were construed as no material harm. But but because obviously harm is material that needed to be set out in terms resolve.

00:36:48:14 - 00:36:50:00

Is it harm or not?

00:36:50:14 - 00:36:52:00

And yet.

00:36:53:09 - 00:37:03:16

Effectively, we are looking at a negative effect as something is visible or something is discernible and may or may not be incongruous or would cause harm to that significance.

00:37:07:26 - 00:37:08:12

So.

00:37:10:28 - 00:37:22:03

Can you just explain to me in terms of the environmental statement, what's the difference then, between negligible or no impact in terms of the magnitude of effect?

00:37:23:12 - 00:37:23:27

Um.

00:37:28:01 - 00:37:47:16

John, I have it for the applicant. I think as as I've just said, negligible is an acknowledgement that something is going to be discernible and maybe may or may not be considered Congress or incongruous, but that it would not affect the significance of the asset.

00:37:53:12 - 00:37:55:21

So how is that different to. No impact.

00:37:59:27 - 00:38:04:02

Um, John Lovett for the applicant. In effect, it is. It isn't.

00:38:13:09 - 00:38:26:04

That has a the difference between no impact and negligible. Would would that have a difference if you if you said that the magnitude of impact was different, would that have an overall effect on the significance of effect.

00:38:38:10 - 00:38:39:20

Um could could.

00:38:40:10 - 00:38:46:18

Could could you John, could you just repeat that question again and I'm just trying to follow through that question.

00:38:46:25 - 00:39:16:11

So we're looking at the magnitude of impact. And we were talking about negligible versus no impact. So you said that effectively that there isn't a difference between negligible and no impact. But in terms of then assessing the significance of effect. If you look at a different magnitude of impact. So say if you look at negligible or no impact, would you have a difference of effect? The final result in terms of looking, you know, if you cross-reference it with the sensitivity.

00:39:26:19 - 00:39:30:22

Applicant that there is no no impact in the in the matrix.

00:39:32:05 - 00:39:32:24

I know.

00:39:36:27 - 00:40:12:09

And I think to to to expand on that The EIA methodology requires. Um, it's, it's that straight computation of value versus impact, whereas the harm test is does not take any take any um, regard to

value of a receptor. So the EIA methodology is effectively designed to scale relatively, whereas the Harm test is an absolute test.

00:40:13:29 - 00:40:18:21

And so the two do not match up particularly comfortably.

00:40:28:05 - 00:40:34:15

Okay. Um did you have that person back in in the room. Now that could answer my previous question. Or do we need to come back.

00:40:36:00 - 00:40:40:03

For the applicant? Yes, we do, madam, but would you mind just repeating the question for the Benefit?

00:40:40:06 - 00:40:44:06

Yeah. No problem at all. Um, yes. So.

00:40:46:18 - 00:41:27:04

In table one, two of rep 259, which is the applicant's responses to issue specific hearing to supplementary agenda questions, appendix A Heritage assets. It sets out that prior to mitigation, there would be less than substantial harm at the lower end of the scale, but that this would reduce to no harm after mitigation. I just wanted to confirm whether I understood this correctly or you had a different interpretation, but is premise near one of operation and therefore post mitigation? Would you say year ten of operation or if not, how do we interpret where pre and post mitigation stages lie and where the level of harm lies?

00:42:11:10 - 00:42:21:12

She'll move it for the applicant. That post mitigation scenario is once the measures in the death have been applied.

00:42:29:06 - 00:42:29:21

For the.

00:42:29:23 - 00:42:30:22

Applicant. And just to add to.

00:42:30:24 - 00:42:31:11

That in the.

00:42:31:13 - 00:42:41:24

Design and access statement as well. Some of the key measures are obviously the design panel and their input and the color assessment and the final coloring of the building. So that would all be part of the construction. So what's.

00:42:41:26 - 00:42:42:15

The construction.



00:42:42:17 - 00:43:14:09

Is complete. The gray structures that have been updated, our partners will be will have the final color applied. So and if that helps you obviously as well we've got a year on without any planting at all. And then a year ten we have with the planting in place. So that ten year period in landscape terms where some relate to the cultural heritage and that's where the larger impacts will be, significant impacts will be seen until that planting has grown up. But the color of the color element and the external placement would be part of the final completion of the construction.

00:43:14:16 - 00:43:17:04

So does that help? Quite a bit more about time. Yes.

00:43:18:28 - 00:43:22:26

Yes, I just I just want to be absolutely clear though.

00:43:24:12 - 00:43:38:00

So you're saying that that the lesser substantial harm is reduced to no harm at the point at which operation commences. Is that what you're saying?

00:43:40:00 - 00:43:45:10

Because you've just. You've just stated that a lot of the effects are reduced over that ten year period.

00:43:57:24 - 00:44:04:13

Yeah, I think it's okay. We just happened to have a discussion about this one and come back to you. It'd be possible just to clarify it. Blindfold.

00:44:05:27 - 00:44:36:27

Yes, please. Because I think you can probably understand where I'm coming from in terms of I'm just trying to identify that there's obviously there's identified substantial harm at the lower end of the scale. And if that's post mitigation, is there then a ten year period in which there would be less than substantial harm to the heritage asset during operation? So if that's not the case, I just need to understand what what where that's identified and for what period of time the lesser substantial harm would potentially occur.

00:44:37:01 - 00:44:37:18

Okay.

00:44:59:17 - 00:45:33:09

So this is a linked point. Um, so the ER states that prior to mitigation, the effects on heritage assets would be described as being, um, moderate adverse and significant. And I had a question as to what point the effect would be reduced and not significant. So albeit a different point, but a linked point in terms of at what point the mitigation would reduce the significance of effects. Um, I don't know. Is that something that you can answer now, or something else that you would want to take away.

00:45:35:08 - 00:45:45:20

For the applicant. I think that's something that is very dependent on that. It is so interrelated that something we would need to take away. I think.

00:45:59:08 - 00:46:05:09

Did East Riding of Yorkshire Council have any points that they wanted to make of it on um on these points?

00:46:10:00 - 00:46:41:06

Uh, Richard Rogers, East Radio Arts Council. Um, I don't think anything more than we added in our, our, our previous comments and striking as comments, but only just to kind of clarify that. Um, I think both ourselves and Historic England see a higher level of harm caused by the, uh, Paris was then um, has been identified by the applicant. Um, I'm not sure necessarily that, um, uh, that that's necessarily one that. Yeah. I think it's just a sense of we've kind of had that conversation before.

00:46:41:08 - 00:47:17:15

We, we, we identify that even with the mitigation, even with the thing, it would still be a fairly dominant, intrusive, um, intervention to the wider, uh, setting in which that house is experienced and that that wider setting of Irish assets does make an important contribution to the significance of scheduled monuments in the sense of it, you know, it being a gun battery. It's naturally its function and its use. Are you understanding that the function use naturally has quite important interrelationship with its wider landscape, the wider area around it, because it's not work, it's not functioning in isolation.

00:47:17:17 - 00:47:57:03

It is functioning as part of a wider defensive structure that is meant that it's meant to be, um, uh, using its wider, uh, its wider Landscape. And even if there was sort of natural landscape in that, within that setting during its functional. Um, uh, so, you know, the North west woodlands and that's why you're setting while it was, um, in function, I don't think necessarily that, um, any sort of planting scheme is going to replicate historic woodland. I don't think it's necessarily going to change the fact that historically you had a, um, a functioning military site within, um, an open natural landscape.

00:47:57:06 - 00:48:24:01

You've currently got a, um, former military site within landscape that has changed a certain degree with sort of the road infrastructure and those sort of things. But you would then have a military site for a military site within a landscape which is characterized by um, well, modern industrial, um, development or modern, uh, modern infrastructure and um, with a sort of, say, associated planting that you associate with that sort of infrastructure.

00:48:25:15 - 00:48:44:14

Okay. Thank you. Um, at one point, that was going to come on to later, um, with the council actually is. Can you just confirm what's led to the change in stance between earlier deadlines? Um, in terms of, um, the change in stance on the significance of, uh, harm to the heritage asset, please.

00:48:44:24 - 00:49:15:11

Is this in relation to substantial and which I brought to council? Uh, if this is in regard to the, uh, change from being substantial to substantial harm. Um, the very the very simple answer is it should it

should always have had less than a chance to harm. And that's just, that's just a that's just an error in terms of what's coming, what's come across. It is um, I'm not sure how that occurred. I'm sure I may have. It may have been some involvement in that. But just to confirm it is that we do believe that's an actual harm. And, um, that would be that.

00:49:15:13 - 00:49:16:08

That's our stance.

00:49:16:24 - 00:49:18:01

No, that's fine, thank you.

00:49:19:20 - 00:49:58:19

Um, so I'll move on to the, uh, the next point, which was lighting in regards to the scheduled monument. I noted that Historic England has still maintained some concerns at deadline three and direct 343 regarding potential harmful effects of lighting on the scheduled monument. Whilst I recognise that you propose to work up a lot of this detail post consent, is there any scope for the applicants to commit to ground or low level lighting such as bollard lighting? Uh, defining areas where lighting could or might not be used? Or consider installation of lighting after the screening is installed, which would ensure that lighting would not have an effect on the scheduled monument.

00:50:03:19 - 00:50:05:18

Applicant. Um, as we've.

00:50:05:24 - 00:50:06:09

Outlined.

00:50:06:11 - 00:50:10:27

In the chapter 22, are under archaeology S092 and.

00:50:10:29 - 00:50:12:00

We've provided details.

00:50:12:02 - 00:50:12:19

There about the.

00:50:12:21 - 00:50:13:06

Type.

00:50:13:08 - 00:50:47:28

Of lighting. And the substation would not have continuous lighting. Um, any lighting, um, once operational would be for operational occasional operational maintenance uses. So, um, between. Yeah. Short term, um, for unexpected maintenance for uh, lightings required. So, um, we don't feel that we need to sort of provide any further details at this point, apart from to commit to the, um, the sign up of the lighting plan, which is, um,

00:50:49:22 - 00:51:02:14

yeah. So we controlled through the DCO. Um, so at this stage with, with the lighting that's proposed, um, that's yeah, that's the appropriate level. Um.

00:51:04:16 - 00:51:21:01

Um, John Merritt for the applicant, I think Historic England, in their response to question 1.223043, they indicated agreement that requirement nine is appropriate for the control of potential lighting effects.

00:51:22:06 - 00:51:32:17

Yeah, I'm aware of what historically is said in their comments. Um, my concern focuses on the statement that they cannot judge the degree of harm that lighting will cause to the scheduled gun site.

00:51:38:01 - 00:51:47:04

But if for the applicant, if they're content, that could be controlled to a point that's not harmful, then.

00:51:49:18 - 00:51:50:03

Um.

00:51:50:29 - 00:51:51:15

Yeah.

00:51:52:29 - 00:52:26:12

Okay. Thank you. So I'll move on to the significance of effects. Um, at deadline three and direct 343, Historic England provided information on the World War Two network of anti-aircraft sites and described a defensive box which for which they formed around Hull and the Humber. Historic England stated that the field of fire for Bert Farm was to the south towards Hull and the Humber, but each field of fire for each gun site would have been butted up against its neighbours in order to preserve a continuous arc of fire.

00:52:27:06 - 00:52:44:02

So in looking at one gun site, it is necessary to look at the way in which they fitted into a bigger pattern. To what extent have you considered the contribution to which the scheduled monument makes to the wider network of gun sites which Historic England refers to? And what effect, in your view, would the proposed development have on this?

00:52:46:03 - 00:52:57:01

The applicant? Um, I think there is a lot in historic England for you there that we agree with that. What a gun box. These are part of a design scheme.

00:52:58:18 - 00:53:31:12

They are designed to interact. The problem is that Historic England are suggesting that this is to this battery fire southwards, when it's on the north western Northwestern edge of the gun off the gun box, with other sides to the south and to the east of it. It's of a standardized pattern, um, which was designed to maximize volume of fire in one direction.

00:53:31:28 - 00:54:02:08

And that direction is effectively the apex of the triangle formed by the gun emplacement which points northwest. Um, the guns used didn't have enough range to foreign aircraft attacking from the south, because the tactic was to fire on an aircraft as they approached the target, because they had to fire straight and level, and the aim was as much to disrupt an attack as it was to actually shoot down the aircraft. And they could maneuver once they dropped bombs.

00:54:02:22 - 00:54:34:11

So they typically gain range of this battery would result in shrapnel and any unexploded shells on the hull if they go firing southwards. There's also this wood to the south of the battery which affects the open aspect. The effects of operation radar. And it's designed to protect against an attack on Hull from the northwest as part of a function of this.

00:54:34:15 - 00:54:35:10

This box.

00:54:47:00 - 00:54:47:15

Sir.

00:54:47:23 - 00:54:52:02

So in short, yes. We have considered those those issues.

00:54:53:27 - 00:54:55:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:57:16 - 00:55:31:11

Um. Historic England also describes the gun site at Bert Farm as one of the rarest surviving heavy anti-aircraft gun sights in England. Given its continuous use as a gun site. They also state that, um, the farm gunsight is extremely rare and hugely important site in the development of defensive infrastructure. And in the applicants comments at deadline three, you stated that the preservation of the farm site was survival of the permanent emplacements, and loss of the ancillary structures is typical of these sites, with related structures being relatively ephemeral.

00:55:31:24 - 00:55:39:09

Can the applicants just explain how this seems to be? You've come to a slightly different conclusion to Historic England on this.

00:55:40:29 - 00:56:13:12

Subject for the applicant. Um, yes, we can explain that. Um, Historic England's comment that this site is rare and unusual is not incorrect. If you look at the figures that we both recite, they're identical. Um, there are 60 of these designated sites across the country. Uh, so as a as a time off site is a rare survival as an example of that type of site.

00:56:13:14 - 00:56:35:25

It is actually entirely typical. It is of a standardized pattern. The nature of its use is entirely typical, the nature of its garrison. This detachment is again entirely typical of the period it was used for. Its survival into the Cold War period is.

00:56:37:28 - 00:56:55:29

Again, this is another one where it is unusual for the types for the those sites as a whole of the sites that survive. Actually, those Cornwall reuse are overrepresented. There were approximately 980 of these sites

00:56:57:27 - 00:57:10:23

in operation during World War Two, of which slightly under 60 is designated. That was reduced to about 190. In the immediate period of the Cold War.

00:57:13:14 - 00:57:28:06

And at least 30 of the sites have survived, have cold waves. So that's about sixth of the Cold War. Site is still surviving. There is about 60 out of 100.

00:57:30:13 - 00:57:50:26

Significantly smaller proportion of the wartime sites survive. Um, so so yes, it is an it is a great survival. It is a very important site. But much of what's been cited as being unusual is not specifically unusual for those sites. They survive.

00:58:04:21 - 00:58:05:13

Thank you.

00:58:06:28 - 00:58:44:26

At deadline three, the applicants and direct 327 stated that any sense of awe derives from the understanding of the function and operation of the site, and from the viewer's imaginative reconstruction of the experience of the site in operation, and would again not be affected. However, the onshore Infrastructure Settings assessment with reference app 178 states that the visibility of the onshore converter stations to the south of the Har gun site would detract from the viewer's ability to appreciate the historic purpose of the asset, to a degree which seems slightly in odds with the first statement I made.

00:58:45:16 - 00:58:51:08

Can you explain how you have reached these two different conclusions, and what implications for the assessment this would have?

00:58:52:04 - 00:58:52:19

Um.

00:58:53:02 - 00:59:25:18

Yes, John, but for the applicant, I don't think those are specifically contradictory. The comments about the sense of all reflected, um, Historic England statement that the site inspired all. Now, that is not the physical sense of all. It's not a large or overpowering structure. It is one where that sense comes from thinking this was what this was used for. This was what this must have been like in operation.

00:59:26:22 - 00:59:36:02

And that is an imaginative reconstruction in terms of our comments in settings assessment that was reflecting the, um.

00:59:38:16 - 00:59:57:24

Viewers ability to understand and appreciate that tactical operation. And to to that extent, there is a sense that the landscape is important. So um, but those those are two, two clearly very different aspects of, of that significance.

01:00:07:21 - 01:00:11:27

So I just. I just want to make sure that I've understood this properly. So.

01:00:15:10 - 01:00:18:04

You say that the function and operation of the site

01:00:20:00 - 01:00:32:05

would not be affected, but then you also say the viewers ability to appreciate the historic purpose would be affected. Aren't they the same two things?

01:00:42:11 - 01:00:47:15

That I thought you referenced the sense of all that, um, sorry. England were.

01:00:50:01 - 01:01:24:25

Were discussing. Um, I think this this is one where I think the it's about that sense of relative proximity. And I think this is where the mitigation works. So we're talking about in terms of effects before mitigation, if there is something large in that, you might consider an appropriate open landscape with clear views all round. Um, that would that would clearly be harmful to a degree.

01:01:24:27 - 01:01:34:01

And that's where we identify that pre mitigation effect, post mitigation actually create a sense of a greater sense of distance. That effect falls away.

01:01:35:25 - 01:01:40:02

That that was that's effectively the difference then.

01:01:46:05 - 01:01:53:26

Thank you. I'm just going to move on to some questions specifically regarding the the heritage assets setting.

01:01:55:14 - 01:02:16:04

Um, I know the applicant Africa's position that the key views from the heritage assets to the north would not be affected by the proposed converter stations during operation. Can you? Can you talk a little bit about how the setting of the heritage asset has evolved over time, and what contribution the setting now makes today? So that sort of evolution of the setting.

01:02:18:09 - 01:02:18:24

Um.

01:02:22:26 - 01:02:23:16

I think,

01:02:25:07 - 01:02:25:25

um.

01:02:29:14 - 01:02:54:01

For the applicant, um, the if we look at the construction of the asset that's built to the north and west of Hull, it's built close to the the Victoria Barracks at Beverley. Um, other targets, uh, Cottingham and Beverley lack and field.

01:02:55:21 - 01:03:09:11

And it's effectively located on a slight rise above the, um, countryside to the north and west, which creates as much as visibility. It creates a radar horizon.

01:03:11:28 - 01:03:27:02

Now, at that point, there was, uh, we had bendy wood to the south of the Bassett, which effectively disrupts that radar horizon quite significantly with the, the the early radar.

01:03:28:21 - 01:03:44:02

Um, you have the old farms, the farmstead farm, you have the accommodation site arranged around that. You have technical buildings along the access road between Buck farm and the gunsight itself.

01:03:45:23 - 01:04:04:09

These were all set up in 1941 after the whole blitz. Before then, the spraying operation had been to put all of the guns to the east of Hull to protect it here, to attack from the coast. And it reflects this strategic realignment of that process.

01:04:07:09 - 01:04:21:16

During during the Cold War, we think there's relatively limited change. It seems to go to something of a maintenance basis, if not retained as part of what was referred to as the nuclear force. Beyond 1950,

01:04:23:07 - 01:04:24:19

it gets out of use.

01:04:26:18 - 01:04:56:29

It would appear that some of those buildings of the accommodation site remain. Um, certainly the radar map to the south of the battery is taken up. Um, these areas that I think have been suggested were playing fields that they would return to agricultural use with radar that, um, the federal Buildings over time. Perhaps there's perhaps an accommodation.

01:04:57:03 - 01:05:29:08

The more solid buildings, the more technical structures along the access roads. Still surviving are in ruins today, and the hedges grow around it. At the same time, there's a process of, um, agricultural mechanisation, which results in quite a bit of hedgerow loss. Woodland loss. Um, I think Bethany



Moore Wood appears to be broadly cleared by. It's certainly still there in the in the 1960s. Whether it's it's not there in 1992.

01:05:30:11 - 01:06:16:22

So at some point between that Bethany Moore Wood is cleared. Um, that changed things a bit. You have the reuse of the field for camping in sort of recent years, but otherwise it returns for an agricultural use. Um, in terms of how that setting affects the significant, the sort of tactical purpose becomes slightly harder to define. The relationship between the gun side and the non-designated elements of the site become a bit lost and sort of archaeological remains of the of, of that sort of wider boundary site are, are lost now.

01:06:16:24 - 01:06:22:26

So that's quite another, quite an imaginative reconstruction required to fix that.

01:06:31:12 - 01:06:32:03

Thank you.

01:06:41:15 - 01:07:08:22

Can I just a question for East Riding of Yorkshire Council please. Um at deadline two under reps 257. The applicant suggested that following construction of the converter stations, the heritage asset would remain as being experienced in a regionally distinctive and discernibly rural setting within its designed arc of if arc of fire intact and with views of the asset from the remainder of the battery site and change. To what extent does the council agree with this statement?

01:07:12:15 - 01:07:50:27

Which British Council? I mean, to a certain extent. It's it's um, well, we agree with it to a certain extent, in the sense obviously, that there won't be any development within that, um, arc of fire towards the northwest. Um, it will, you know, there will be, um, elements, kind of a wide element of it setting where it will it will remain the open landscape. Um, but in terms of how the asset is experienced and appreciated, obviously you will have what is quite a, a large, dominant, uh, sort of intrusive structure within that.

01:07:50:29 - 01:08:28:29

What is that wider setting which will be even, even if at the very least, it's just forming a background within sort of views within and out. Without the site, it will be, um, an element which alters how you, how you appreciate that, um, that heritage asset. And as I say it not being, well, some heritage assets. The significance makes the setting and its very limited contribution to its significance in the sense of, um, it's it's either got a very contained setting or, um, that setting doesn't relate to how it's it's how you appreciate its architecture or its history, you know, that is uh, as talking about as well.

01:08:29:01 - 01:08:54:19

It is an asset which, you know, is intended to be appreciated, um, within its wider landscape or was functionally appreciated in its wide landscape. Um, so I would I would probably say, well, we agree to a certain extent and that the development won't affect Potentially the elements of setting which make the greatest contribution to its significance. That doesn't necessarily translate to say it won't affect it won't affect the contribution that CC makes to the significance.

01:08:57:11 - 01:08:58:04

Thank you.

01:09:03:06 - 01:09:42:00

Um, I stopped in state at deadline three and direct 343 that the experience of understanding appreciating the scheduled book farm gun site and the wider battery site will be diminished and changed dramatically with the introduction of the proposed converter stations. East Riding of Yorkshire Council at Deadline three and direct 337. Um state that the ability to appreciate the interrelationships between the physical elements of the battery site is not just appreciated in a vacuum within the site, but also appreciated in the views that look through and out from the site, which provide an ability to appreciate the group as a whole.

01:09:43:23 - 01:10:04:02

The NPF defines the setting of a heritage as the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. This extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to. The significance of an asset may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.

01:10:05:27 - 01:10:27:23

The Pbg states that although views of or from an asset will play an important part in the assessment of the impacts on setting, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smell and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

01:10:29:09 - 01:10:43:04

Perhaps the applicants bearing these definitions in mind, could you provide a view on Historic England or East Riding of Yorkshire Council's comments on the effect of the converter stations, with reference to the experience of the asset and views from the asset.

01:10:47:01 - 01:10:49:04

John Rabbitt for the applicant.

01:10:50:27 - 01:10:57:18

I think that raises a lot of a lot of points, I think. To take them.

01:10:59:24 - 01:11:20:21

Um, individually, I think in terms of use across the site, in terms of relationship with the, um, wider battery site and structures there. I think the wider battery site is largely.

01:11:23:12 - 01:11:52:05

Um, indiscernible in many ways, that there are no real and very limited physical elements of that surviving. There's the access road from the farm. There are some very ruinous structures on to the sides of that. That and then you have the scheduled side. So that key experience is that movement from but from blocking access to the

01:11:53:23 - 01:12:25:11

to the schedule side and then around the schedule gunsight. And that's quite a close and intimate thing for all that it's designed to look and far on more distant and upwards forgetting primarily firing upwards. Um, then these are um and then that that's that's the simple sort of experience you once you experience the physical physicality of the planes.

01:12:25:22 - 01:13:10:16

It's not to say that the rates are visible, don't have a sense of place or a setting of their own, but that's a very different Front thing again, because it requires that leap of imagination where those um, that how to do combination was and try and reconstruct that in some way and understand how that might relate to the scheduled site. The schedule itself is actually quite difficult to say, is deliberately designed to be low in the ground, is designed to be hard to see, um, and kind of, um, layout and experience in terms of that plan for

01:13:12:13 - 01:13:45:07

look at things like the radar map and look at how the radar map relate, relate to the, um, gun gun battery, but or the gun site, again, that's still very much an imaginative reconstruction. You can't really see where you can see where the, um, the radar was, but you can't really experience it in the same way. And again, those views across, because of the way the hedgerows are, tend to be heaps looking outwards in that in that arc of fire.

01:13:45:09 - 01:13:54:07

And there is a reason why that site was chosen the way it was chosen. So we think.

01:13:54:09 - 01:13:54:24

That.

01:13:56:03 - 01:13:57:00

Those are,

01:13:58:23 - 01:14:09:18

that that are the setting to experience in terms of moving around the site is, is um, yes, that's the contribution.

01:14:13:27 - 01:14:14:19

I think

01:14:16:08 - 01:14:43:28

also raised issues around archaeological remains within the wider site. Um, that's something that we have looked at in some detail. We've carried out a geophysical survey of the entirety of the battery size would limit. We've carried out trial trenching there. We haven't identified any discernible archaeological trace of gun battery.

01:14:45:19 - 01:15:14:24

You can expect to see a lot of that. A lot of those structures, the ancillary structures were deliberately quite ephemeral. They were designed to be built very quickly and very quickly. So they were

frequently ground bearing structures, ground bearing heights. Um, there's a suggestion. There might have been concrete blocks used in the raid to secure a post, but again, we haven't seen any evidence of that in either geophysical survey or

01:15:16:09 - 01:15:20:22

trial trenching. So that that seems from.

01:15:23:01 - 01:15:23:28

What we have evidence.

01:15:29:20 - 01:15:50:23

In terms of the other sensory elements is setting. And yes, again, I think we've talked about sound and noise briefly. I think this is not a heritage asset that we necessarily consider to be sensitive to noise in and of itself. There is.

01:15:52:24 - 01:16:09:02

There is discernible road noise. It's not a noisy location, but it's not one that's absent of modern, of modern noise in any way. Um, so it is one way where that's not, by its nature, incongruous.

01:16:12:14 - 01:16:15:12

I think that covers off the various points you raised.

01:16:26:08 - 01:16:27:09

Okay. Thank you.

01:16:34:21 - 01:16:43:29

I had a question, actually, on the, um, comments from, uh, Historic England on the, um, potential archaeological remains, but, um.

01:16:48:09 - 01:16:52:23

I think you've probably answered that to the, to the extent that you need to. Thank you.

01:16:57:06 - 01:17:03:06

Do you do you think, in your view, would the converter stations visually compete with the heritage asset?

01:17:06:19 - 01:17:11:04

Particularly when viewing the asset from the the track that leads towards it?

01:17:13:28 - 01:17:14:13

Um.

01:17:14:22 - 01:17:20:07

John, for the applicant, just to clarify, is this a track that leads to water from but far.

01:17:20:23 - 01:17:22:11

Yes. Yeah, yeah.

01:17:22:16 - 01:17:23:01

Um,

01:17:24:21 - 01:17:36:03

I think if you viewer isn't looking towards the converter stations in that do you think would be in, um, a sort of.

01:17:37:29 - 01:17:38:14

Um.

01:17:39:24 - 01:18:11:06

In, in, in, in the viewers, you as you, as you scan across the site, you look generally what's around. So in that sense it wouldn't compete. It's not a simultaneous view. I think those structures aren't designed to attract attention. They're not they're not designed, designed catches that they are designed to be somewhat hidden and that your attention is drawn to them because that's what you're going to see. And there's a certain degree of intrigue about looking at these sort of mysterious smaller structures.

01:18:11:20 - 01:18:15:00

So, so in that sense, I don't think there would be that competition.

01:18:22:03 - 01:18:25:26

Thank you. And the same question to, um, East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

01:18:32:13 - 01:19:03:16

Are rich products from Yorkshire Council? Um, to a certain extent uh, to pick you up on uh what that was just said just that I think. I think it, I think they would compete, I think would compete is that there would be large structures within, uh, the, uh, sort of wide environment, which I appreciate. The list of those is actually a monument. Um, and to a certain extent, they, they would the sense that the shed monument are structures that were intended to be seen and therefore aren't naturally sort of prominent.

01:19:03:18 - 01:19:37:22

Striking features in the landscape does sort of add to that in the sense of what you'd have is, uh, a monument which is something which is, is something which you would go, you would be going to visit, but it's not necessarily something that sort of jumps out and is imposing on a landscape, whereas you'd have new structures that were particularly with their associated planting as well. So I think in the sense of it being a competing factor, you would that there was there was a danger, particularly in that sort of wider environment. As you come towards that, they would be what your eye got drawn to and not the scheduled monument.

01:19:38:12 - 01:20:15:15

Um, there is I do appreciate in comments the point of is it that they're not necessarily, uh, in terms of their significance, not necessarily structures that are intended to be prominent. In fact, they are, uh,

you know, given their, their function, you don't really want them to be something which people can sort of spot from a mile off. But in terms of being able to kind of get yourself into the mindset and experience and understand the function and understand that recreation comes here has had before to have something within that world environment that is so imposing, um, is a was going to detract from, uh, how experienced it and therefore compete.

01:20:31:00 - 01:20:31:21

Thank you.

01:20:34:15 - 01:20:36:20

So just turning to the, um.

01:20:38:05 - 01:20:46:15

Sorry. I just wanted to ask. We have touched, as you said upon noise, um, a little bit. Can you tell.

01:20:46:17 - 01:20:47:02

Me.

01:20:47:04 - 01:21:01:28

What types of noises are likely to come from the converter stations during operation? Is it are they hums, or are they likely to be other types of, um, noise effects which are likely to come from the converter stations at all?

01:21:06:10 - 01:21:08:14

Noise B um, as you.

01:21:08:16 - 01:21:11:26

Can see, in finalisation of electrical equipment. Um, so they're kind of.

01:21:13:27 - 01:21:25:11

The equipment that predominantly would be the effect of the cooling equipment. Um, so the air they're cooling system and transformers and the coolers for the HVAC valves,

01:21:27:10 - 01:21:30:21

associated cooling equipment for electrical equipment.

01:21:32:28 - 01:21:40:01

And will that be audible from the, um, from the scheduled monument?

01:21:40:15 - 01:21:43:09

Uh, I hope that from this. I mean, there's a.

01:21:46:00 - 01:21:59:04

Lot there in terms of the applicant. Um, we don't have any specialists here, so perhaps we should come back to that one. But, um, I think it would be possible that they'll come back and confirm to what extent.

01:22:02:12 - 01:22:03:05

Thank you.

01:22:06:11 - 01:22:09:18

Uh, turning to the access road. Um.

01:22:11:25 - 01:22:42:05

He's riding of Yorkshire Council and Group 337. Note that figures 315, A3 and A4, showing a cultural heritage viewpoint. Two do not include the access road, but say that it's quite a significant significant element in this view and the applicant's deadline three response is indirect. 327 it is stated that the access road in parts would be raised above the ground by one metre on an embankment, and at some locations the ground level would be reduced to ensure suitable access.

01:22:43:06 - 01:23:08:15

The applicants also state that the nature of the proposed hedgerow planting and the access track means that it would not be possible to provide a visualisation that would actually accurately represent the appearance of the access track in all views from the monument, which would change significantly as the viewer moved around the gun site with visibility variously opened up or precluded, depending on the exact location of the viewpoint.

01:23:11:26 - 01:23:33:12

Good visualisation be produced which shows a worst case scenario from the heritage asset be provided. And if not, how can the significance of effects and the impact of the setting of the heritage asset be accurately determined? Given the importance which the applicant offers to the views of the north of the gun site where the access road would run through.

01:24:32:22 - 01:24:47:04

Job applicant. I mean, the access road has been considered in the assessment. So I think in that sense there wouldn't be the need for the additional visualisation.

01:24:54:15 - 01:25:02:08

Um, he's worried about Yorkshire Council. Do you consider that a visualisation should be provided which shows the access road from the scheduled monument?

01:25:16:01 - 01:25:46:00

British bronze round Yorkshire Council. Um, it would in a sense allow for, for for a complete understanding of the impact of development on, uh, the scheduled monument. Um, I confess I, I, I'm not sure where the the comments picked up in the first place. I don't think this came necessarily came from myself. So I may have to defer to, to Graham to, to comment on that further. Um, or indeed just refer to, to talking those comments as well. Um, so I apologize. I can't give you too useful an answer on that one.

01:25:53:21 - 01:26:00:07

Okay. Um, perhaps, uh, Mr. Varley, I can see that you switch your camera on. Did you have additional comments that you wish to make?

01:26:00:24 - 01:26:30:26

Uh, no. It was just in response to, uh, to Mr. Broadhead. Um, it's something we did discuss with the applicants last week, um, About whether there should be a visualization visualization or not. Also concerned that they couldn't necessarily show where the access where it goes through the hedge, uh, on the northern side of the site centers as well. Um, and I'll be honest offhand, I can't remember what the actual outcome of that was. Um, I was hoping Mr. Blackledge might be able to answer that, because he was also the, uh.

01:26:31:20 - 01:26:44:09

We are passing each other around at the minute. Um, but we certainly did discuss it, and I think it was something that we felt it would help. But as I say, I'll defer to Mr. Blackledge to see if he records the actual outcome of it.

01:26:45:02 - 01:26:59:12

Yes. Thank you. Bill Blackledge, Reese running the Orchard counsel. My recollection is that, um, the applicant said that they would, uh, go away and consider this, um.

01:27:02:26 - 01:27:36:25

Bearing in mind. I'm looking at it more from a landscape and visual point of view than from a heritage point of view. Uh, we do have a remaining concern that, uh, looking south from the gun emplacement, the difference between the, um, existing view now actually probably will be the year one view in the year ten view is that a hedge appears, which is the hedge to the east side of the access road, but the access road itself doesn't.

01:27:37:21 - 01:28:18:03

Um, so it it feels strange that we've got a hint of the effect of the access road, but not not the actual access road. And the one other thing that I would say, given that we're in the midst of a technical discussion, um, and the the applicants will be familiar with this argument that I make, uh, in respect to visualisation. Um, we can say that the, um, effect of the access road has been taken into account in the, uh, assessments heritage or landscape in the, uh, environmental statement.

01:28:18:12 - 01:28:44:23

However, there are more stakeholders here than just technical stakeholders. And visualization is tremendously useful in communicating in ways that plans cannot to non-technical stakeholders. Uh, and therefore, I think have a value in their own right, whether or not they would necessarily change the outcome of, uh, technical assessment, uh, on heritage or landscape grounds.

01:28:48:16 - 01:28:49:08

Thank you.

01:28:51:00 - 01:28:52:14

I think, um.



01:28:54:22 - 01:29:30:07

What I'm going to ask the applicants to do is have a look at this. I mean, I think that's a very good point that Mister Blackledge has raised in terms of ensuring that provision of visualizations to aid the assessment of effects for all. Um, and given the importance which the applicant has attached to the views to the north of the um heritage asset, it would be quite a key aspect in terms of determining the significance of effects and ensuring that, um, an accurate representation is provided of that.

01:29:30:09 - 01:29:45:12

So I will leave it as an action point to for the applicants to consider providing one. Um, to the north of the heritage asset and views of the access that will cut through that view.

01:30:02:06 - 01:30:06:24

Yes, we will go away and consider whether this can be done in what timeframe.

01:30:07:26 - 01:30:08:18

Thank you.

01:30:24:09 - 01:30:25:02

Thank you.

01:30:26:23 - 01:30:42:13

So just in terms of, um, any potential, um, loss of significance. Can I just ask East Riding of Yorkshire Council, do you consider that the proposed development would result in a loss of significance of the heritage asset?

01:30:47:03 - 01:31:18:25

Uh, Richard H. Brown, Yorkshire Council? Uh, yes, in the sense that it would well, it would have an impact on how you appreciated the significance of the heritage assets. Uh, I wouldn't. It would be that the impact would be less than substantial, so it wouldn't result in the, uh, complete loss or, uh, the, the loss or the complete loss of that significance. And it would be related to, um, one element that contributes to its significance and one element of that, um, of that setting.

01:31:19:03 - 01:31:20:10

Um, but there would be,

01:31:21:26 - 01:31:38:00

as I said, I wouldn't I wouldn't necessarily say that it would be a lot, uh, loss of significance so much as a detriment as much as a detrimental impact on how you appreciate that significance. If that if that isn't too much of a sort of, um, uh, caveat.

01:31:43:22 - 01:31:44:15

Thank you.

01:31:49:01 - 01:31:54:16

Uh, can I have an action point for Historic England, as they're not here to answer the same question?  
Thank you.

01:32:00:03 - 01:32:21:16

If the a question for the applicants. Um, if the examining authority were minded to agree um with Historic England and East Riding of Yorkshire Council that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the heritage asset at the higher end of the scale. Do you consider that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh such harm?

01:32:30:06 - 01:32:31:24

Okay. Um.

01:32:32:15 - 01:32:56:00

Yes. The that, um, weighting decision is one that's taken in the round of all of the public benefits, the scheme not not specifically the public benefit to the scheme to the asset. So clearly there are significant public benefits outweigh any substantial harm if it were to be judged that right.

01:32:59:05 - 01:33:09:02

Now. Madam, I think we would also position with me that we benefit from the critical national priority status in the M3.

01:33:16:14 - 01:33:20:10

And East Riding, Yorkshire Council, just the same question to yourselves.

01:33:30:14 - 01:33:56:17

Green Valley. Sorry. Green Valley, pig shredding in the Yorkshire Council. Um, yes, I think we would, uh, we would agree with, with the applicants, uh, within that I believe in our local impact reports. We did, uh, place weight on the, uh, the national, uh, requirements and the substantial public benefits as well in terms of weighing it against, Uh, not just the historic elements, but other elements as well.

01:33:58:15 - 01:34:09:18

Thank you. So just moving on to, um, mitigation. Um, we did, uh, touch upon this earlier. Um,

01:34:11:07 - 01:34:37:10

I was going to ask about, um, Historic England being assaulted on the design panel report, which, um, the applicants had suggested at the last deadline. But are you looking to review that again in terms of where to add potentially add Historic England as a consultee to that or following the discussion, um, on landscape and visual just can you provide a bit more information on that?

01:34:38:15 - 01:34:46:21

And then in terms of the applicant, we have um, previously suggested in um, I think it was the response to written.

01:34:46:23 - 01:35:29:00

Reps, um, that historic an appropriate place to consult Historic England on proposals would be to include Historic England as consultees on the Design Panel reviews report, alongside the parish

council. Ward councillors East Riding who would be consulted on that report. So we feel that would be an appropriate stage where they could have an influence and a good time for the engagement with Historic England. So we have proposed that we haven't heard back from Historic England as to whether they think that's something they would want to proceed with, but we have said that we would update the design and access statement to include them in that list of consultees if they wished, and I think we did commit to that earlier.

01:35:29:13 - 01:35:56:10

Um, anyway, so, um, that's the current status on that item. Okay. So that was the suggestion of earlier. Fine. Um, can um can East Yorkshire Council, um, can they determine if they find that acceptable in terms of the addition of Historic England, um, uh, To the Design and design and access statement. Um, and being consulted on the design panel report.

01:36:00:14 - 01:36:05:03

Green valley, green valley, East riding of Yorkshire. Yes, we support that approach.

01:36:07:24 - 01:36:17:00

Could I make it an action point for Historic England to provide a view on the proposal by the applicants for them to be consulted as part of the um, design panel report, please?

01:36:19:18 - 01:36:29:00

So just moving on to enhancements. Uh, could the applicants provide an update on any discussions with Historic England on the enhancements to the scheduled monument?

01:36:39:09 - 01:36:39:24

Yeah.

01:36:39:26 - 01:36:41:27

Thank you. I think I.

01:36:44:00 - 01:37:23:05

Can yes, we did meet with Historic England at the end of March to again discuss some proposals for the enhancement measures that we we put together to gain their views. And and the latest on that was that, um, they requested that we, um, put them all in in the WSI and the outline WSI, which we are submitting a deadline for, um, with everything brought together in an appendix with at these at the stages, a list of potential options that we could progress. And we are continuing to, um, sort of look at constraints and, um, you know, opportunities associated with them.

01:37:23:07 - 01:37:56:10

And we have approached, um, the owners otherwise, um, about the potential for, um, physical enhancements to the platform site, um, which we have a high level of agreement in principle, subject to them talking to the tenants and, um, carrying it with the tenants. But that's, um, been sort of, um. Yeah, it was in principle, there isn't an issue with that as a potential option. And yeah, in the next revision of the NWC, it will bring together all of all of the options.

01:37:56:12 - 01:38:05:21

But they are um, uh, proposals we seek to sort of implement, um, at a later stage during construction or post consent.

01:38:07:01 - 01:38:24:09

And there are options there that can be implemented without physical access to the monument if need be. So. So we would rely on the use of land control by the project or work that's independent of me of of land altogether. So.

01:38:28:23 - 01:38:38:15

Okay. Um, you'd predicted my next question was, uh, have the owners or tenants of a farm been involved in any discussions? Is is, um, is Mr. Julian still here?

01:38:44:17 - 01:38:45:06

Okay.

01:38:58:29 - 01:39:28:02

And the proposed enhancements, as I understand it, include enabling a better understanding of the site and how it functioned. Would this include the area to the south and how that was used? And a question of um, is this in turn likely to reduce the sense of separation between the heritage asset and the converter stations, if that was better understood or more well exposed? Um, and could the converter stations therefore have a greater impact on the functional setting?

01:39:30:29 - 01:39:36:02

One moment for the applicant. Can you just clarify what you mean by the land to the south?

01:39:37:07 - 01:39:41:07

It's the land to the south of the, um, scheduled monument.

01:39:42:08 - 01:39:48:25

So the land that formed the wider battery. The site, the battery site with the radar on it. And the accommodation? Yeah.

01:39:49:01 - 01:39:49:18

Yes.

01:39:49:20 - 01:40:41:03

Yeah. Um, I think yes. The proposals for research do relate to that. The whole battery side. Because clearly you can't take one element of the battery, which is legally protected separately from the rest of that battery site. I think we would not propose any physical works or works requiring access to that part of the site, other than to other than necessary to access the, um, the schedule side where that is agreed with the landowner and tenant, um, and that that area relates to issues around documentary research and, um, reconstruction and um, inclusion of that within any kind of Explanatory

01:40:42:22 - 01:40:43:20

interpretation.

01:40:45:20 - 01:41:12:23

Um, I think it's important to note that these are independent of any, um, these. We're not presenting these as, as mitigation measures that are there to enhance an understanding of the asset and enhance its significance that way, rather than addressing the specific change that that that may arise as a result of the project or any other activity in the area.

01:41:20:22 - 01:41:48:19

Okay. Thank you. And just finally, um, moving to cumulative effects at deadline three. Uh, and a rep 343 historically stated that should subsequent offshore projects be developed, which require onshore infrastructure to be located adjacent to the farm goods side. Cumulative impacts will arise which will have the potential to intensify the harm to the significant significance of the monument.

01:41:50:05 - 01:41:54:11

To what extent have you assessed this, and if not, should it be assessed?

01:41:56:28 - 01:42:32:24

For the applicant? We have assessed cumulative effects within the scope that we set out in the environmental statement. I think we are not in a position to assess effects arising from developments that are as yet unknown, and it would be a matter for those developments to assess those effects, both silent and cumulatively, as and when and if they arise. I think we can't assess a development that doesn't exist except very hypothetically.

01:42:37:19 - 01:42:40:17

I think that this is standard practice.

01:42:48:01 - 01:42:54:02

Just East Riding of Yorkshire Council have any concerns regarding potential cumulative effects on the scheduled monument?

01:43:07:25 - 01:43:43:21

Valley East Riding a future council? Um, to an extent, I agree with, um, the applicants that we we're trying to be, um, looking at what might come in the future and we don't particularly have those applications or proposals reach that stage at the minute. Um, from what I know, there are other potential developments in the area. Um, but nothing in terms of anything immediately adjacent in terms of the above ground built infrastructure. Um, so they may be in the proximity of the firm, but not necessarily immediately adjacent.

01:43:43:23 - 01:43:58:18

But again, I say if I just stress again, I agree that trying to look at it at this stage is extremely difficult. Um, I don't think we could really assess it in terms of the cumulative effects of something that may or may not, may or may not come forward yet.

01:44:00:15 - 01:44:14:18

Okay. Thank you. Could I ask for a potential for action point for Historic England to provide some more information on the nature of their concerns regarding cumulative effects on the scheduled monument, and how they could potentially be addressed. Thank you.

01:44:16:21 - 01:44:28:27

Okay. Those were the questions that I, I had, um, could I just ask if there's anything else that anyone wants to raise in relation to, um, the historic onshore historic environment? Uh, Mr.. Julian.

01:44:31:07 - 01:44:38:20

Um, sorry, I was just on a call. I understand that there was a question that you were trying to ask me. I was just hoping that you could maybe repeat that question.

01:44:38:27 - 01:44:54:08

Yes. Thank you. Um, it was really just regarding, um, the potential enhancements to the scheduled monument farm and, um, the extent at which the applicants had heard, um, discussed those options with your clients.

01:44:55:21 - 01:45:01:27

Enhancements with regard to what mitigation planting that was proposed and things like that. Is that what you mean by enhancement?

01:45:02:08 - 01:45:14:27

No, sorry. It was, uh, enhancements to the scheduled monument in terms of, um, better interpretation of the, uh, the scheduled monument. Um, so enhancements rather than mitigation?

01:45:15:08 - 01:45:23:07

Um, as far as I'm concerned, we've had no, uh, no discussions with the applicant and nothing has been offered as far as enhancements in relation to the gun site.

01:45:25:00 - 01:45:30:14

But, I mean, or for that matter, in relation to our client's business, um, at Book Farm, either.

01:45:30:27 - 01:45:45:11

Okay. Thank you. It may be something that you need to take away. Um, rather than being able to answer now. But the question therefore would be, um, would your clients be willing to accept um, or or, um,

01:45:47:09 - 01:45:51:03

uh, or have any objection to enhancements to the scheduled monument?

01:45:51:29 - 01:46:01:16

Okay. Um, just that I think it's something I'd have to take back and sort of understand what what's potentially being proposed. Um, and something that I would have to take back and discuss with my client in more detail.

01:46:01:24 - 01:46:22:16

No. Thank you. Uh, the proposal from the applicant is to update the potential measures in the outlying region scheme of investigation, which will be submitted at deadline for, as I understand it. So they

will certainly be in there. If not, obviously, I would encourage the applicants to liaise with yourselves on that. Um, but yes, we'll note that as an action point for you to come back at the relevant deadline.

01:46:22:23 - 01:46:23:11

Thank you.

01:46:23:23 - 01:46:26:09

I can see the applicants have got their hands up. Yes.

01:46:29:01 - 01:46:40:03

I learned some of the applicant. Um, so we understood that our land transaction manager had approached, um, otherwise about this in principle. But, um, we can come back and confirm.

01:46:43:22 - 01:46:45:24

Please. Yeah. Thank you.

01:46:51:00 - 01:46:54:09

Okay. Thank you. Um, I can't see any further. Hands up.

01:46:58:10 - 01:47:00:19

I'll hand back to my colleague, Miss Dowling. Thank you.

01:47:02:03 - 01:47:22:21

Thank you very much. Um, before we adjourn for a short break, I just want to check with the applicants as to what the status of their, um, geologist, uh, is in terms of attending the meeting, because we were advised they weren't available before 4:00. So just so we know what I. What order are we going to take the remaining items in? Um, are they yet available?

01:47:34:03 - 01:47:38:25

What options could we suggest that we do onshore ecology first if that's okay, madam.

01:47:40:24 - 01:48:00:06

Okay. That's fine. But if you could possibly come at the close of the break, come back and let me know if they are going to actually be available, because we have got quite a few of the land agents on the line who've been waiting very patiently all day. I can see can I just confirm that Mr. Stones joined us in regards to East Yorkshire Concrete and Mr. Byrne?

01:48:02:29 - 01:48:04:24

Oliver Stone's. Yes. I'm present.

01:48:04:26 - 01:48:28:16

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Okay. If you I think we'll probably we'll have to come back with an onshore ecology. But if you can just confirm if your specialist is going to be available today so that we can know how to deal with that item, because I think we had a discussion outside of the examination that possibly some of the land use questions could come first. So we just need to know how to reorder our questions if necessary. So anyway, the time is now.

01:48:30:14 - 01:48:54:26

Sorry. So I can confirm that our specialist is available. Okay. Thank you. I thought you meant immediately rather than after the break. No, no. That's okay. So I think this would be an appropriate time to take a short break. At the time. Is now 1548, and I suggest we take a break for 15 minutes. Um, is that all right with everyone?

01:48:57:08 - 01:49:17:14

Yeah. Um, while we were adjourn, can I ask that all the participants turn off their cameras and mute their microphones? Those people watching the live stream will need to refresh their browser, uh, when they want to. When the meeting restart. The meeting is now adjourned and will be resumed at 4:10.

01:49:18:00 - 01:49:18:18

Thank you.