



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN010140 - Helios Renewable Energy
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Part 3
Date:	12 March 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.

ISH2 S3 Redacted Version

Created on: 2025-03-13 14:39:21

Project Length: 01:37:07

File Name: ISH2 S3 Redacted Version

File Length: 01:37:07

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:27 - 00:00:08:07

Good morning. It is now 10:00.

00:00:11:27 - 00:00:29:27

And and time for this issue. Specific hearing to resume. I'd like to welcome you again today to the issue specific hearing for the Helios renewable energy project. Can I just confirm that everybody in the can hear me clearly?

00:00:32:03 - 00:00:40:09

Thank you. Can I also confirm the pace team that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced? Thank you.

00:00:42:22 - 00:00:52:09

As there are different people joining the hearing today. I will run through the same introductions as yesterday with regard to housekeeping and general points.

00:00:54:24 - 00:01:01:12

My name is Philip Brewer. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as the single examining inspector.

00:01:03:21 - 00:01:15:13

To examine this application. You'll also hear me refer to as the Examining Authority or the Exa. I will now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person.

00:01:18:14 - 00:01:21:26

Can everyone please set the all devices and phones to silent?

00:01:24:17 - 00:01:47:23

Um. The toilets are located to the left, pointing out now. Through that archway, there are fire drills on Thursdays, so I don't expect anything. Uh, any drill today. And the assembly point is the flagpole, the front of the building. The fire exits are marked over the doors to my right and to the rear of this of this room.

00:01:52:00 - 00:02:00:00

Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way. Meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue, and some of you are joining us virtually.

00:02:03:01 - 00:02:05:11

Which may happen later. Um.

00:02:07:18 - 00:02:38:25

Using Microsoft Teams, I will make sure that regardless of how you've decided to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate in a recording of today's hearing we've made available on the Helios Renewable Energy Project section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as practicable after the hearing has finished. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone stating your name, who you're representing each time before you speak.

00:02:41:00 - 00:03:07:19

A link to the planning Inspectorate's Privacy notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. I assume that everybody here today familiarise themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to a member of the case team. If you have any queries or questions about this.

00:03:10:27 - 00:03:25:09

Issue, then the agenda for this issue specific hearing was published on the 3rd of March, and it has the examination library reference in the 8-001 and was for guidance only.

00:03:27:14 - 00:03:59:14

And I come on to again in a minute. I may add other considerations or issues as we progress. I will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked have been responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for me to prioritize matters and defer other matters to further written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or be quite time to get the information requested, then can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing?

00:04:02:20 - 00:04:26:25

Before we move on to introductions and with regard to the agenda, the headings were provided to enable the agenda topics to be discussed based on the latest information available at the deadline for consideration. I should just point out, with regard to attendance today, Natural England have confirmed they won't be here, and I understand that the Council will make necessary further submissions on item seven in writing.

00:04:28:10 - 00:04:36:08

Um, as a result, I expect our agenda item seven, which is a human, got the right one. Ecology. Biodiversity. Sorry.

00:04:36:10 - 00:04:50:01

Yeah. So, Catherine Tracy for the applicant. That's the first we've heard of that. We've brought our ecology and biodiversity expert with us. So I'd really would like to hear what they have to say orally today so that we can potentially respond. And if we need to follow up in writing, that's fine. Sir.

00:04:51:07 - 00:04:58:19

Can I just let me finish my point, and I'll. And I'll, um. And I'll, uh, uh, see if it's still applies. Yes. Um.

00:05:00:29 - 00:05:11:04

And council, a council respond to that point in a moment. Can you if I just go through my, my proposal and we can see where we, we where we get to, um.

00:05:14:11 - 00:05:53:06

So I say my, my, uh, introduction here, I've basically expect the applicant to provide an update on their discussions with Natural England under that item. Um, and those discussions with the council, such as they stand and others as necessary. And under that item, I'd like to hear from other IP's in the room. And item seven. All I would say is that my questions on that item will be dealt with under in writing in the SSC to um, and I expect those questions will remain mainly to HRA.

00:05:54:08 - 00:06:06:17

Before I move on. Um, as applicants raise that point, I'll just ask the council to, um, to, uh, respond if they can as to whether they.

00:06:09:26 - 00:06:16:20

Will be or have anybody available to talk about item seven today.

00:06:32:17 - 00:06:33:06

Sorry.

00:06:33:18 - 00:06:47:05

Um, we don't we don't have a representative here from for Ecology of Biodiversity. And, um, that's really just down to council resources and I'm afraid. Um, so we would need to take back any, any queries and respond in writing.

00:06:48:02 - 00:06:56:03

Thank you. So that's. So the applicant can make their submissions under item seven on that basis.

00:06:58:18 - 00:07:29:10

Catherine Tracy for the applicant. That's fine. It's in terms of responding to questions. It was more that the fact that the council seem to think that. Are they making submissions for the submissions because, um, I don't see why we can't hear what they what their concerns, outstanding concerns still are today, notwithstanding that maybe they don't have anybody here to speak about it because we we were under the impression that matters relating to ecology and biodiversity were resolved.

00:07:30:14 - 00:07:51:18

I think you're perfectly entitled to give your view under that item as you see it. The council unfortunately haven't been able to provide somebody today. And and so that's the way I'm not

suggesting there is a big problem with this. It's just I think to do with the availability and um. Uh, yeah, that's the way we'll take it. Yeah.

00:07:53:09 - 00:08:25:03

Um, I'll just comment. I mentioned written questions then. Um, clearly we are quite some way down the process at this point. Clearly. Um, the ECA was not able to submit a first round of written questions. Um, I would do my best to, um, keep the written questions that do come out at X Q2 to be focused and relevant and reflect the progress that's made in the areas, if that is clear.

00:08:27:07 - 00:08:31:13

Um, moving on, item eight, um,

00:08:33:09 - 00:09:09:06

will relate to, um, cumulative impacts with respect to landscape and visual. So it will be dealt with under item six. Just just for that clarity over that point. So I think that despite a little bit of a ripple there, I think that, um, enables me to move on to, um, introductions. Um, so please, could people introduce themselves and I'll start with the applicant, um, who they represent. And bearing in mind what I have just said, then, uh, which agenda item they, they wish to speak on.

00:09:09:08 - 00:09:11:02

So I'll start with the applicant right there.

00:09:11:21 - 00:09:45:19

Good morning, sir. Catherine Treacy, uh, advocate for the applicant, uh, director at Burgess Salmon. Um, with me today, I we've got Simon Myers who'll be speaking on landscape. Um, Howard fern in relation to ecology and biodiversity. Um, we've got Harry young. Sorry. Um, who will speak in relation to any of the management plans under the DCO heading in the event, um, that you've got any questions there? And I've got other members of the team with me, but I at the moment I'm not envisaging that they'll be needing to speak.

00:09:47:04 - 00:09:48:03

Thank you. Um.

00:09:50:10 - 00:09:54:24

And the other is, uh, starting, uh, with the council, please.

00:10:00:25 - 00:10:23:15

Get the microphone. Um, funeral wood from North Yorkshire Council. Um, I am standing in today for my colleague Linda Drake, who has been the case officer on this application because she's unable to attend. There is a clash with, um, a planning committee meeting today. So, um, I'm standing in for as best as I can today. Thank you. Okay.

00:10:23:25 - 00:10:24:11

Thank you.

00:10:25:28 - 00:10:30:19

Um, my name is John Wainwright. I'm a principal landscape architect for North Yorkshire Council.

00:10:31:00 - 00:10:43:19

Thank you. Thank you very much. Um, other IPS we have in the room. I think we have a representative of Holt here again today. Um. So if you'd like to.

00:10:44:28 - 00:11:10:12

Yes. My name is Leslie Marson, and I'll be speaking today on behalf of my residents and also on behalf of the Holt Group members. May I also ask on a point that you mentioned earlier regarding questions that were raised and, and these being fed to the applicant? Um, could I ask that? It's ensured that the applicant does answer questions raised from the open hearing, as several of those questions have been answered asked before and haven't been answered previously.

00:11:13:02 - 00:11:36:28

Okay. I'll respond to that on their behalf if you like. Um, they will make submit. They will respond to those points by the deadline. Correct. Yeah. So obviously then you can consider those responses if you consider that I haven't answered those questions adequately. Then you can then comment on the applicant's response, which is how the process works basically.

00:11:37:00 - 00:11:37:15

Thank you.

00:11:37:17 - 00:11:38:02

Very much.

00:11:38:17 - 00:11:59:28

And I will consider obviously and I will. I know, I know, things move in this sort of sequential way and I will, um, if there are things from that hearing that I think are worthy of a written question, I can also ask it through my written questions. So, so rest assured that everything that's raised will be considered and responded to.

00:12:00:03 - 00:12:01:22

Thank you. That's very appreciated.

00:12:01:24 - 00:12:06:08

Thank you. Um, Mr. Wilkinson, I think I recognize, sir.

00:12:06:10 - 00:12:14:14

Yeah. Uh, David Wilkinson, retired, lives in Cumbria near the Black Dog pub and is also a member of Holt.

00:12:16:08 - 00:12:30:01

Just for clarity, uh, Mr. Wilkinson. So I'm going to say that you're going to represent yourself in this here. Yes. And it smells represent home. So just just so that and when you introduce yourself, introduce yourselves that that's clear.

00:12:32:08 - 00:12:32:23

Okay.

00:12:32:25 - 00:12:39:29

Sorry, sir. Um, and I'd like to speak on, uh, landscape and visual And cumulative impact.

00:12:40:13 - 00:12:41:20

That's fine. That's fine.

00:12:42:07 - 00:12:43:21

And sorry.

00:12:43:25 - 00:12:50:06

And yes, I'd also like to speak on landscape and visual biodiversity and on cumulative impact.

00:12:50:17 - 00:12:51:08

Thank you.

00:12:51:11 - 00:13:13:11

Thank you. That's that's good, that's good. Um, have we any virtual attendees? I don't think we have. Have we? Put your hand up if you're representing an IP on IP. No. Okay. Um, have we any other interested parties in the room who wish to speak on today's agenda?

00:13:17:05 - 00:13:18:17

No. Right. Good.

00:13:22:07 - 00:13:55:01

Okay, so that's more than enough introductions. And, um, for me, um, I'm going to then move on to item six, landscape and visual and cumulative effects of landscape and visual. Um, I'm actually going to, um, go straight in. I'm going to actually start with the council, and I'm going to just to give you a couple of seconds I've got in front of me your deadline for submission. Your principal areas of disagreement. Uh, summary statement and under.

00:13:59:11 - 00:14:35:12

Landscape. Um, it lists, and I'll just read it out. The council has several areas of concern on the cumulative effects. Green infrastructure strategy, local landscape and visual effects. Long term maintenance and management. Just over the page. And and in the next column. Next column. Continue to work with the applicant to develop the landscape strategy to secured through the outline. I think there's an outline landscape, um, uh, a management plan and the DCO.

00:14:35:24 - 00:15:04:12

So really, I just wanted to ask the council, really, um, if you go back to the actual headings. I want to sort of introduce those or introduce those topics to give some more detail and context. But really what my question really is. As per as per the title of that column. Um, what change is actually seeking to the draft DCO and or the, the um, outline management plans?

00:15:07:27 - 00:15:38:23

Um, John Wainwright for North Yorkshire Council. Um, I think at this stage we're accept we're in agreement with the applicant that there are likely to be significant residual effects. And we have actively worked with, um, the applicant to try and reduce those adverse effects, um, through the outline landscape Ecological management plan, um, and the on site landscape strategy.

00:15:39:09 - 00:16:07:22

Um, but we do have an overriding concern, and it's about the, um, the negative effects on the sensitive receptors in that locality. Um, the negative cumulative effects on the local communities. Um, and we think it's reasonable and possible to provide further mitigation to offset those residual effects. Um.

00:16:10:19 - 00:16:30:00

We've, um, suggested to the applicant at various stages that we'd welcome opportunities to further discuss, um, mitigation strategy to help offset those residual effects. And following a meeting we had with them. Um.

00:16:43:28 - 00:17:23:22

Uh, two weeks ago to review the um, local impact report report and comments. And we basically suggest that we would put forward a mitigation proposal, which we did do yesterday. So we're at the stage where the council believes that there is a way to offset residual effects. And we've put together we've put forward a, uh, an outline proposal of how that could be done. Um, and we're at that stage really, and we're just encouraging the applicant to discuss and liaise with us how that could be achieved.

00:17:24:28 - 00:17:46:25

Do you want to go into any specific details or any specific examples where you've made proposals for quality improvements or further mitigation. Is that helpful to you or for the members of people in the room? I mean, are there any documents or any locations you could reference and we could perhaps call something up? I don't know, I'm just giving the opportunity for you to say.

00:17:53:14 - 00:18:26:00

We haven't submitted anything formally to the examination at this stage. We've been encouraging the applicant to discuss and liaise how that could be achieved. Um, but yesterday we did submit a more formal proposal to the applicant. And that basically explains how we may be able to use a mitigation fund, um, to achieve mitigation in those landscape community areas to benefit, uh, well, to mitigate and offset those effects, to benefit those communities affected.

00:18:26:18 - 00:18:28:09

Um, I think it's.

00:18:30:12 - 00:18:35:16

The same thing. It's going to change. That is.

00:18:35:23 - 00:19:15:23

Yeah. So the the focus of the proposal would be a five kilometer, uh, priority area. And what we would be seeking to try and achieve is, um, a range of projects delivered through a fund, um, secured

by, uh, implemented and supported by delivery partner. Um, and we'd be typically looking at a range of landscape environmental projects, um, that would relate to landscape mitigation, biodiversity, um, green infrastructure, um, look, green space improvements, um,

00:19:17:20 - 00:19:51:18

other schemes which may relate to um, local health, wellbeing initiatives, um support active travel schemes. Really we're looking at a scheme which could evolve. The details would need to be, uh, developed in partnership with communities affected. Um, but basically we see a five kilometre priority area as a good starting point. Five kilometres is the study area that we've agreed for the assessment of the project.

00:19:51:20 - 00:20:10:10

Five kilometres, um, is the area which would incorporate and we feel justified because that's incorporates the the cumulative schemes that have been considered where cumulative effects have been identified, um, as a significant residual effect.

00:20:12:12 - 00:20:30:05

Thank you. Now, I think I appreciate all that. I appreciate recent from what I thought he heard you say there. Um, so I will turn to the applicant, recognising this. If I heard them correctly, it's quite a recent, um, I'll say offer or proposal from from the council and let you respond.

00:20:30:26 - 00:21:04:13

Um, Catherine Tracy, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes, sir. That came over to us yesterday, and and we have had the opportunity to consider it. Uh, the long list of projects to which this could be, um, applied is, um, it doesn't it isn't seeking mitigation for the scheme. It isn't. There are no specific proposals that will mitigate our impacts. This is very much about compensation and offsetting, uh, the long list of projects listed and the lack of specification at this stage, um, in our review.

00:21:04:15 - 00:21:48:09

So it reads as though it's a community benefit fund that is being asked for, um, for the benefit of the local community. And while we are not saying we would not do that, that is a matter for post consent as it's not a material consideration and you're unable to take that into account. So in the event. And to be clear, the applicant's position is that that is not appropriate or necessary in this case. We have provided mitigation, um, that is appropriate. And um, the council, while they don't think we've gone far enough, we say we have done all that is reasonable and necessary, um, and in compliance with the NPS policy requirements.

00:21:48:12 - 00:21:57:05

And we still don't have any specific additional mitigation we could, uh, consider from the council. So.

00:21:59:23 - 00:22:02:28

I think that's I think I understand you. I understand your position. Um,

00:22:04:15 - 00:22:18:21

okay. I do recognize that it's still ongoing discussion between you, but I yeah, I don't know that we're going to get much further on that today, and I'm happy to come back. Yeah, by all means. Um.

00:22:20:05 - 00:22:20:21

Uh.

00:22:21:22 - 00:22:27:23

I suppose my question was, is do you. Let's try and phase this very carefully. Uh, it was one of my questions. It does does

00:22:29:10 - 00:22:30:00

I mean,

00:22:31:25 - 00:22:41:09

does the council agree with the applicant's assessment of the likely significant effects accounting for the mitigation they put forward?

00:22:44:24 - 00:23:16:08

John Wainwrights for North Yorkshire Council, I think we're in broad agreement that there are likely to be significant adverse residual effects landscape and those related cumulative effects, um, through our submissions and our response to the Local Impact report. We've explained how we think those effects potentially are even understated. So we would say as the local authority, we think the effects are at least those stated by the applicant.

00:23:17:05 - 00:23:17:20

Um.

00:23:20:26 - 00:23:21:24

Okay? Okay.

00:23:22:06 - 00:23:22:21

Um.

00:23:25:15 - 00:24:00:03

I'm happy to sort of rewind a bit here and give that a chance to, to actually take us through, because we've got the specialists here, um, to take us through the methodology, the process a bit about and, and how you see. Yeah, the usual kind of the usual approach, but what the policy requires, what guidance you've deployed. Um, why you why you basically stand by your assessment and how you got to it without two. Not, not not a long version perhaps, but a but a really, um, concise version of that would, I think, perhaps be helpful.

00:24:01:16 - 00:24:08:27

Yes, sir. I'll ask Mr. Myers to do that as he's been involved in this, um, for a long time. Thank you.

00:24:11:23 - 00:24:45:21

Simon Myers for the applicant. Um, when we've looked at the project from from its from the start. We look at it. Um, both um, we look at the key components of the project and how they would relate to the baseline landscape character. So we start by looking at that character. Um, the key elements, the

condition is elements within the landscape. And we do that through, um, field survey, uh, review of Ordnance Survey maps, aerial photography, similar. Um, we'd also review the landscape character assessments that published for that locality.

00:24:46:10 - 00:25:16:00

Um, and in particular the key objectives and priorities there are for that landscape. Um, we'd also look at the key constraints that there are, um, within and around the site, um, focusing on things like, um, um, buried or overhead utilities, whether they would constrain landscape proposals that go with the project, um, buffers from residential properties and maintaining suitable stand off distances. um.

00:25:17:01 - 00:25:22:05

Let's go on that one. That's interesting. It sort of came yesterday in relation to safety, but is there a guy is there.

00:25:22:07 - 00:25:22:22

A.

00:25:23:06 - 00:25:35:24

Is there a separation? I mean, I've heard people say, well there'll be uh, I'm paraphrasing there'll be banks are so otherwise at the end of my garden. I mean, is that is that is that to what extent is accurate?

00:25:35:26 - 00:26:08:09

We, we don't we don't apply a specific distance because it when it comes down to individual properties, we'd be looking more at the context of those properties and how they relate to the project. So are they direct views from the property? Is there other, other factors around the properties that will provide mitigation, um, planting um, or or vegetation within the intervening landscape. So there's no set buffer. Um, but the applicant sought to maintain, um, a good separation distance between, between the panels and the properties.

00:26:08:19 - 00:26:11:22

Okay. Sorry. I just wanted to just touch on that.

00:26:12:10 - 00:26:12:25

Carry on.

00:26:13:10 - 00:26:52:06

Um, in this particular instance, um, one of the key constraints is looking at the watercourse buffers. We've got to maintain separation between the, um, the project and also the landscape elements from the, uh, the ditches and drains that are within and around the site. Um, and there's also buried archaeology, um, or potential heritage receptors that we have to avoid when it comes to things like planting so we don't create disturbance. Um, in terms of the key objectives for the project, we've we've looked at retaining the field boundary structure so that the project is set within that, um, baseline landscape framework.

00:26:53:04 - 00:27:02:09

Um, that's looking at the hedgerows, the ditches, the woodlands, so that we're respecting those and, um, avoiding removal. Um,

00:27:04:08 - 00:27:37:05

we then looking at, um, the seeding of suitable grass mixes so that we can have a mixture of biodiversity enhancement and also, um, ensuring that agriculture can continue through grazing under the panels and around the panels. Um, and then we look at how we can reinforce the baseline landscape. It is a landscape which is undergone change. Um, field boundaries in many instances in relatively poor condition or in some cases have been removed. So it's looking at how we could restore certain features, strengthen the framework.

00:27:37:18 - 00:28:05:19

Um, improved connectivity, um, within the site and between habitats around the site. So we're looking at that from a landscape perspective and also biodiversity perspective. Um, so we can improve that framework. Also looking at where we could potentially introduce historic field boundaries. And we've done that in the case of the landscape strategy for this project. So how we could help, um, restore some of the framework that's been lost over time. Um,

00:28:07:06 - 00:28:48:00

looking at the wetland and, and, and ditches and field margins and how they could be enhanced and complement biodiversity objectives. Um and um and enhancement. Um and similar when it comes to woodlands and shelter belts, we've made a very conscious effort when we've looked at the landscape strategy for the site to ensure that we're focusing on the places where mitigation is important, but we don't want to introduce features or elements which are in characteristic. So making sure that those are in scale with and complement the baseline landscape, framework and character rather than introducing something that's new and potentially uncharacteristic.

00:28:49:04 - 00:28:49:19

Um,

00:28:51:08 - 00:29:25:17

we've also made it a key objective to mix up that structure as well, to some degree, so that rather than having continuous blocks of planting or, um, sort of continual continuous blocks of woodland, mixing that with woodland and your scrub planting so that you get diversity both in terms of habitat, but also when you're looking across that landscape, everything is not at a consistent height, so that you're trying to mirror what's in that baseline landscape as it is where you where you've got a mixture of the woodland blocks combined with the hedgerows and the scrubby vegetation.

00:29:26:01 - 00:30:01:23

Um, so when we're looking at the mitigation from a particular settlement, we haven't got, um, just a simple block of planting, but something that's a bit more diverse, um, and in its makeup, um, and then also looking at, um, permissive patterns and connectivity that there are, there are footpaths and small lines within and around the site that provide connectivity, um, both for recreation, um, and also providing a degree of connectivity between settlements.

00:30:02:09 - 00:30:20:16

Um and the applicant's proposing a permissive path between Carlton and Campbell's Forth to reinforce that network and that that would also link with them one of the biodiversity improvement areas, so that we're creating a more interesting route for people to walk along. Um.

00:30:23:15 - 00:30:42:13

Um, and then we when it comes to the assessment that's been taken as an iterative process, that process. So we've looked at where the effects of the project are, and then how those measures and the landscape proposals could be incorporated to actively address the the effects are identified early on in the assessment process.

00:30:46:20 - 00:31:13:26

Thank you. There's one question that came up, I think, on Monday, which was interesting, at the open floor, which was um, about obviously I've been through the the visualisations and the, the baseline year one, year 15. One of the questions that came up, which I thought was an interesting question, was obviously it takes time to establish, Um. So could you just describe. Could it be could it be established quicker? But what I shouldn't say. But could it be established quicker?

00:31:15:22 - 00:31:34:28

Um, yes. At the same time, what would be the consequences of trying to establish, uh, alcoholic vegetation screening for one of the better generic term? Um, what would be the consequences of adopting a more. Uh, a faster, yeah, far faster approach to that, if that's possible.

00:31:35:02 - 00:32:06:27

Okay. Um, Simon Myers for the applicant. Um, we've proposed a mixture of planting as part of the landscape strategy. We tend to focus on, um, younger planting. Um, so relatively small works, which might look relatively ineffective a year. Year one. Um, the principle behind that is that the younger plants will establish better, more effectively, Tively and there's less risk of failure as as they as they grow.

00:32:07:18 - 00:32:08:03

Um,

00:32:09:14 - 00:32:49:02

it would be possible to plant larger species, but they they come with a more inherent risk of failure. Um, and we would tend to expect the younger plants to, um, provide better screening and grow more effectively as time goes on. So whilst in the assessment, we've assessed the effects at year one. So shortly after planting and um, where the the project would be quite apparent in the landscape, we've then also assessed year 15 to give, um, opportunity for that planting to establish when it comes to demonstrating how effective we think that planting will be.

00:32:49:19 - 00:33:03:26

Um, but we would also expect that planting to become effective sooner than that. So it wouldn't be a case of it wouldn't be effective until year 15. But I would expect that to be a gradual reduction in effect between year five and year ten.

00:33:05:28 - 00:33:42:29

Okay. I've done. Yeah. Thank you for that. Um, I'll ask the council to come back on anything that they've heard. Um, and then I'll open it up, perhaps. And while the applicant may want to respond by opening up more widely, I think, and then that perhaps applicant can then come back on everything they hear. Um, so over again to the council, please, for any any comments on. I mean, I suppose perhaps I meant to say, I mean, do you do you basically agree with the approach, the process methodology that the applicant has followed? Um, um, but but yeah, but by all means make your own comments as you see fit.

00:33:45:08 - 00:34:33:13

John Wainwrights, on behalf of the Yorkshire Council. Um, I think there's a few points just to potentially pick upon. Um, early on there was mention of distances and buffers. And what I would like to just mention is that within the parameters and design guidance list, aspects such as buffers are down as design guidance rather than a parameter. So I think that potentially, among other aspects of the list, the working list of parameters and design guidance secured in the DCO, I think we'd be hoping to review that and to look at which aspects we would want more certainty, which could potentially be secured as a parameter rather than general design guidance.

00:34:33:15 - 00:34:51:25

Yes, I suppose I suppose my I think it probably pre-empted by my question is, do you feel you have enough control influence over the detailed design as it moves forward, if you like, in this area, or do you have some issues around that? I see here that you have got some issues around that.

00:34:52:00 - 00:35:22:10

We do have a number of issues and concerns. We are in the process of reviewing the the draft DCO and a further draft was submitted, which we need to respond by the next deadline. Um, but there are aspects in there which relate to quality of design, which potentially for us affects mitigation. And there are elements, particularly relating to design guidance, which gives us a degree of uncertainty because there could be good or bad outcomes.

00:35:22:12 - 00:35:45:28

And as a local authority, we would be then trying to agree and discharge those details as a discharge requirement. Um, and it then puts us in a difficult position of trying to negotiate a good outcome, and maybe we can get good outcomes, maybe we don't. But, um,

00:35:47:27 - 00:36:04:05

I think there are elements in there that we would seek as a parameter because potentially there isn't a good reason why it's in this his design guidance. It could be described as a parameter. The distances of buffers, for example.

00:36:05:14 - 00:36:14:18

Can you actually pin that down? I mean you talked about parameter. I mean is there a Canibus. How specific can you get on those sorts of issues?

00:36:16:21 - 00:36:19:26

Definitive or specific or quantitative or whatever word you want to use?

00:36:25:29 - 00:36:43:04

Well, as an example, in the list of parameters and design guidance, the minimum offset from award to cost is described as seven meters. And that's seen as a design guidance. I don't really understand why that can't be a parameter.

00:36:48:23 - 00:36:51:25

Concept can respond to that sort of specific point.

00:36:54:06 - 00:37:24:11

I'm Catherine Tracy for the applicant. Um, this is where there is the design guidance point is really where there's external, um, particularly for the offset to the watercourse. It's the design guidance from Selby and IDB that say that you need to be offset by seven metres. Um, and this is so that's, that's where that comes from. Um, and there's then there's further limitations on what we can do set out by the parameters that we've assessed in the environmental statement.

00:37:24:13 - 00:37:42:28

We've assessed a reasonable worst case scenario. If we were going to stray into watercourse buffers, that we have assumed that we won't in our environmental assessment for the effect. So if you stray into them, we would then potentially be creating a different effect, which every um application is limited by its environmental impact assessment.

00:37:43:00 - 00:37:57:00

So yeah, I think I understand I think your point, um, I'll let the council just carry on a bit. I did, I did sort of, um, Interrupt you slightly. So if you want, if there are some other points you once made. That's fine. You carry on. Yeah.

00:37:58:24 - 00:38:52:12

Jon Wainwright for North Yorkshire Council I think really I was just trying to pick up on one example, but I think there are numerous aspects of the design, the parameters list and the design guidance which would seek to review basically, um, I think the aspects that we'd like to tighten up on potentially, um, aspects that we think could be set out as parameters and that will give us more certainty of the outcome and the quality of design later on. Um, moving on to some of the other points that the, um, the applicants described in terms of the process for landscape and the development of the mitigation strategy generally, we're very supportive of the, um, outline landscape strategy, the landscape and ecological, uh, management plan, um, for the on site scheme, um, based on the area.

00:38:53:28 - 00:39:30:03

Um, and we've actively worked with the applicant, uh, through the application, uh, process. Um, we're very supportive of, uh, a mixed approach. Um, and in terms of planting the range of planting, in terms of planting, the smaller a mixture of smaller, uh, plants transplants. Um, I think we generally in agreement that that, um, generally achieves a more successful establishment scheme. And if that's intermixed with more mature planting, which is what is proposed, then we would be very supportive of that approach as well.

00:39:30:20 - 00:39:44:10

I think obviously where we disagree is how that scheme relates to an amount, because the amount of development on the site.

00:39:46:15 - 00:40:40:13

Is linked to the scale of the effects, particularly when we're talking about cumulative effects. And in my. It seems to us that the amount is within the applicant's control. And by reducing the amount of development, by reducing the density of the development that does have potential, for example, of reducing adverse effects that are being described. Um, if the applicant is wanting to propose the scheme as they've suggested with residual adverse effects, then this is the point that we've put forward where we'd be seeking to try and, uh, agreeing offsetting mitigation scheme through an off site project, basically to help of, um, offset and reduce those to help mitigate those effects for those communities affected.

00:40:42:16 - 00:40:50:27

Now, thank you. I think when you were saying your piece, I think in my mind I was thinking offsetting was the words that sort that came into my head. Um, um.

00:40:52:09 - 00:41:24:14

If I could just, um, add another point, perhaps, um, in relation to offsetting mitigation projects of this type. North Yorkshire Council does have experience of delivering other similar projects on large scale schemes such as this. So this isn't unusual for us to do this, to try and seek, um, particularly on the larger schemes, uh, mitigation proposal for offsetting offsite where, uh, residual effects can be dealt with on site.

00:41:27:21 - 00:41:48:01

And have you, have you sort of highlighted that in your written submissions. But I think if you're if you're referring to what I'm going to refer to as comparator schemes, where the developer, I'll use that as has agreed to something akin to what you are putting to this applicant. Is that is that what you're saying?

00:41:50:26 - 00:41:52:18

I'm sorry. Could you clarify a little bit?

00:41:52:20 - 00:42:09:14

So on this, I think you talk about other schemes where you've reached an agree I call it an agreement to do offsetting or something else. You've got examples where that has been the case that you actually don't have to tell me all the details now, but but you clarify that.

00:42:09:16 - 00:42:37:06

We haven't submitted examples. We could do that, but we have, uh, suggested examples and discussed examples with the applicant. Um, but as an example, um, we have we did see seek a mitigation proposal through an offsetting off site fund, uh, with um, the Drax repowering CIP, which was approved, uh, several years ago back in 2019.

00:42:38:20 - 00:42:45:21

Okay. Thank you. Um, I'll ask the applicant to come back on on that because you obviously raised some, important points there.

00:42:47:25 - 00:43:23:26

Thank you sir. Catherine Tracy for the applicant. Um, I mean, I think we should start from the position that we have for significant residual effects for this scheme. Um, three are on viewpoints, which we can discuss if you'd like. And we're willing to, um, if it's desirable, we could screen the development and further at those points. But this was a conscious decision not to screen those, um, because it comes with additional consequences, um, or different, different effects, I should say. Um, and then we have a significant residual effect on the landscape character area, which just can't be avoided because and that's a cumulative effect.

00:43:23:28 - 00:43:58:13

It's not as a result of our development. It's a cumulative one with other developments coming forward. So, um, I think it's important to note that, um, in one paragraph, 3.3.63, um, acknowledges that there is an urgent need for critical national priority infrastructure and it will in general outweigh any of the residual impacts not capable of being addressed by the application of the mitigation hierarchy. Um, we suggest that we have met that, um, we we can't mitigate the cumulative impact on the landscape character area.

00:43:58:24 - 00:44:33:27

Um, if it was desirable. We are happy to discuss with the council, um, about preserving the position to do further mitigation to those three, um, viewpoints, which we can talk about. Um, the offsite mitigation fund that they may have agreed with. Drax power station is for a fundamentally different type of development to ours. Um, we have been able to mitigate the landscape and visual effects. We are delivering biodiversity at a level that would comply with 10% if the statutory regime, um, applied.

00:44:33:29 - 00:44:41:17

We are providing permissive paths through the site. So, um, I don't think, sir, that we are, um.

00:44:44:13 - 00:45:06:17

Uh, wanting to discuss further about mitigation. Uh, sorry, offsetting or compensation, but we're more than happy if there's further discussion to be had on mitigation within the site. Um, that can be secured as part of the OMP, um, process as we go through detailed design to preserve that flexibility.

00:45:10:08 - 00:45:11:26

Okay. Thank you, thank you. Um,

00:45:13:18 - 00:45:30:01

I'm I'm inclined to open it up to to wider audience really at this point. Um, obviously heard you had the benefit of having some of these discussions between counsel and the applicant. Um, so I think I'll start with Holt, uh, as. Yeah.

00:45:31:00 - 00:46:07:04

Leslie Morrison, on behalf of, um, our residents and also as a Holt representative. Um, I would just like to, um, cover some of the aspects that have been mentioned already. Um, the applicant mentioned

the aim to establish more interesting walks in my own view point, and I know of many other members. What is more interesting than the country works with natural habitats and biodiversity that we see around us. This is one of the reasons why we chose the location where we live on one of those very lanes. On the other hand, walking through an industrial area that would certainly not peak my interest, that is for sure.

00:46:08:15 - 00:46:40:17

We, um, also had mention about the immature planting. Um, I would suggest that probably comes more down to cost than anything else. And has the applicant actually asked the community which they would prefer to see, the immature planting or the mature planting that has a risk of possibly not developing in the same way? I think they would probably go for the the mature planting that gives far more coverage from an early stage in the project, and not having to wait 15 years for possibly something that may not even mature when it comes to that point.

00:46:40:25 - 00:47:01:03

Um, as we discussed at the previous session, um, and in terms of the effect on the landscape, um, and this not being able to be, um, avoided due to the cumulative effect, um, and the impacts of that, is that not more reason to look at other locations and other alternatives?

00:47:04:05 - 00:47:13:08

Thank you for that. Um, contribution. Um, does the applicant want to come back on that or I'll wait for Mr. Wilkinson to have his, um, uh, say.

00:47:13:29 - 00:47:16:06

I'm content to wait for Mr. Wilkinson, sir.

00:47:16:08 - 00:47:17:25

Thank you, Mr. Wilkinson.

00:47:18:13 - 00:47:52:29

Thank you, David Wilkinson. Uh, landscape and visual. What? We discussed the best yesterday, which is 575m from my property. So with this, that's been discussed. So what is being proposed? Helios are proposing to take 476 hectares of high quality food producing land out of service and impose upon us feels full of mind numbing rows of three metre high monotone glass solar panels.

00:47:53:20 - 00:48:17:07

They say after 15 years you won't be able to see them due to the very high screening fences they are putting up to surround them. They will also screen the views that I have, just, you know, described yesterday anyway. So if we could look at the environmental statement appendix 7.7 visualisations part one of two, please. Can we get this on the screen.

00:48:18:12 - 00:48:28:19

Can you um well can you if you can give us a specific reference, we can ask the applicants to, to find it. And then you can hopefully carry on and then we can bring it out. Oh.

00:48:29:02 - 00:48:30:21

I have asked earlier. I did ask.

00:48:30:25 - 00:48:36:08

It even better. You were ahead of me. Excellent. Carry on. That's if that's what you expected to see.

00:48:37:26 - 00:48:39:17

Have you got any binoculars? Oh.

00:48:42:02 - 00:48:48:13

Right. What I'd like to look at is that viewpoint three A is that 3AI can't see from here.

00:48:50:14 - 00:48:52:01

I can see it on there. Yeah.

00:48:52:03 - 00:48:55:19

Is that three a top existing.

00:48:55:22 - 00:48:57:13

That's right. Yeah, yeah.

00:48:58:13 - 00:49:01:16

Well can you see the houses on the left there.

00:49:01:24 - 00:49:04:09

Yes, yes that's Chester.

00:49:04:14 - 00:49:18:02

Got cottages just beyond it is the Black Dog public house. And just beyond that is Harden's yard lane, which has in the area a substantial amount of housing.

00:49:19:27 - 00:49:25:10

Now, if we can look at, uh, year one, three, eight, year one.

00:49:30:18 - 00:49:32:17

There's the eight Jack Gardell.

00:49:33:17 - 00:49:36:15

Do you want the bottom or the other? Can you.

00:49:37:04 - 00:49:49:29

Can you can you see just how close that complex is to the housing? Now, the best I've measured is 375, approximately meters. But that will be closer.

00:49:51:29 - 00:50:00:14

I suspect. So I'm gonna have to have a look at that when I get home. But that will be closer to then how you can actually see how close those houses are.

00:50:02:04 - 00:50:27:15

And that land just to go up road is the main artery, one of the main arteries for recreation in the surrounding area and the areas beyond. The amount of people that come down there are, uh, dog walkers, joggers, you name it, photographers, families, cyclists is phenomenal.

00:50:29:11 - 00:50:33:01

Right? So if we can look at year 15, please.

00:50:35:24 - 00:50:39:15

Kind of looks at you. Now. Isn't that a blessing to behold?

00:50:44:03 - 00:50:51:25

So all these people all want to walk down there now and look at the ever changing panorama and the nature.

00:50:54:00 - 00:50:54:26

I'm going to say that

00:50:56:23 - 00:51:08:27

possibly. And guess what? On the other side, which is probably, uh, I don't know, it's three b, is it the opposite side to that?

00:51:11:00 - 00:51:11:21

Not.

00:51:13:27 - 00:51:14:21

With the scroll

00:51:16:21 - 00:51:17:14

three feet in it.

00:51:20:02 - 00:51:21:05

What about 3D?

00:51:28:00 - 00:51:37:21

So that's the opposite side yet. So that as is now, so can we see in uh when, when it's not when it's established the next phase after a year.

00:51:41:24 - 00:51:45:28

Yeah, that's the next phase after a year that's grossly ordered, by the way,

00:51:47:16 - 00:51:48:21

across the world

00:51:50:20 - 00:52:10:06

who've got buzzers in their racket. We've got peregrine falcons. We've got, uh, sparrow hawks, we've got kestrels, we've got chief chaps, we've got chaffinch, we've got missile thrushes, the myriad of wildlife just in that one location. It's phenomenal.

00:52:11:21 - 00:52:21:07

So can we look at year 15 on that? So that'll be, uh, the next one. Scroll down please. On scrolling. Scrolling.

00:52:25:19 - 00:52:28:17

So is is that year, uh, 15.

00:52:30:23 - 00:52:47:08

So coming down that road, which is a main artery for leisure and recreation, uh, you're going to be blessed with that on one side. And if we can go back to the, uh, year 15 on, uh, was it three? Yeah. Year 15 on three AA.

00:52:49:19 - 00:52:59:22

Can we go back to three plays? Yeah. So that's what you're going to be greeted with. Well you know you might as well. We're walking in a maze aren't you. I'm walking with blindfolds on.

00:53:01:09 - 00:53:23:03

So where we are at the moment we have high quality agricultural, agricultural food producing land, some with underground aquifers. Last year we had a glitch and a two year dry spell. And guess what? The farmers just brought out the water cannons and there it was on hand.

00:53:24:19 - 00:53:57:05

Panoramic everchanging autumn fields with views as far as the eye can see. Lovely lanes and footpaths which people use to mentally refresh themselves, as well as providing physical refreshment. Such a diverse variety of wildlife, including deer, badgers with next to no physical barriers to corral them or anything else for that matter. The variety of birdlife is amazing, a list of which I mentioned in previous submissions.

00:53:58:05 - 00:54:35:20

Just living with nature on my doorstep, I feel very lucky to live in this beautiful area of Campbells. With the impending devastation of this area with solar panels, screening noise generating devices, etc. will make a few people very rich. To some who do actually live in this area, but it will make a substantial amount of local people very poor in ways, although the monetary.

00:54:38:11 - 00:55:10:10

Now, the gentleman went on about, uh, improving the roads and this that until the this is arable land you don't have to fence animals in. So it's not paramount that, uh, you know, if they say, yeah, well, we're going to really improve this and join all the fields away with, uh, hedges and that it's not

livestock. They're trying to keep it, and it's, uh, it's arable land. It's. I came here in 83, and I've never seen produce come out of them.

00:55:10:12 - 00:55:13:19

Feels like I've seen come out of their fields. Phenomenal.

00:55:15:08 - 00:55:16:10

So, uh,

00:55:18:04 - 00:55:27:14

I think, uh, I mean, that best. I talked about it yesterday, but do you want me to just go over? What? It's what I talked about because. Christ.

00:55:28:21 - 00:55:29:25

I think I think that'll do.

00:55:29:29 - 00:55:45:15

But it's the westerly winds as well which are really important. In fact, just because we've got new, new, new guests here, uh, and I think it's important for them to, to wear about these, this base and where it's situated, it's absolutely ridiculous.

00:55:47:03 - 00:56:03:15

575m from substantial dwellings with, with the prevailing westerly winds that blow directly onto them and then beyond them, just over a kilometer and a half onto Campbell's village.

00:56:05:15 - 00:56:31:05

I think it's looking at, I think, remember, everything we're saying here is is recorded. There'll be transcripts. Um, the points you've made, I think you've already made him your representations, you've written versions and already so I think our colleagues. Yeah. Um, the council to my right are well aware of, of these this information. And it is, um, in the examination library.

00:56:31:10 - 00:56:34:15

Have you seen that information, by the way, please? Yeah. Thank you very.

00:56:34:17 - 00:56:39:03

Much, sir. Comment on that, you know, as they as they wish. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for that. Um.

00:56:39:13 - 00:56:47:04

Sorry, sir. I do have several more questions I would like to ask. My initial comments were only on the points raised already. If that's.

00:56:47:06 - 00:56:48:03

Possible. Carry on.

00:56:48:05 - 00:57:19:11

Yeah. Um, so Leslie Mason, again, as a resident and on behalf of Holt, um, I would like to provide a little background before each question, to give some context before the questions themselves. 7.23 on the landscape and visual aspects, um, references. The landscape effects arise not only from the sensitive sensitivity of the landscape, but also the nature and magnitude of the change proposed by the development, stating that the design of the proposed development should aim to minimise harm to the landscape.

00:57:19:13 - 00:57:56:13

The CPC recognises that continuous rows of glass panels completely alter landscape. Character boundaries are changed by security fencing and intrusion of CCTV. Residential neighbours have the setting of their property altered and industrialised. Peace and quiet is destroyed by industrial grade traffic, noise and light pollution. References are made in 7.2 15 to reducing the scale of the project, to mitigate the visual and landscape effect of the proposed project. However, reducing the scale may result in a significant operational constraint and reduction in electricity generation output.

00:57:56:15 - 00:58:30:08

It is stated that there are exceptional circumstances where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in function. In these circumstances, the Secretary of State may decide that benefits of the mitigation to reduce the landscape and or visual effects outweigh the marginal loss of function. I would like to ask when considering a project of such a size in both overall scale and height of panels, that the impact be considered alongside the cumulative impact of the already approved solar farm surrounding the village of Campbell's Worth and those proposed in the local area.

00:58:30:10 - 00:59:06:03

As this would be a huge burden for one rural community to bear. Would this not be a case that warrants the need to draw on the Exceptional Circumstances Clause to insist on a substantial reduction in size, as opposed to the token above ground visible reduction seen? The applicant has reduced the overall extent of the proposed development. It is said to include specific consideration of local residents. However, a large part of the reduction in size was in the area which was deemed to be for underground cabling and was never going to have an effect on the visual landscape as above ground equipment or panels were never proposed for this area.

00:59:06:08 - 00:59:36:09

Only small reductions have been made to areas where panelling was proposed. I would therefore question whether the reduction has had much in the way of impact or consideration of residents. 7.2.16 identifies that the scale of the energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area. The Secretary of State should judge whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits, including need of the project.

00:59:36:13 - 01:00:18:02

The applicant states that the characteristics of the development mean it is comprised of relatively low structures. They recognize that the footprint of the proposed development is a key consideration of the assessment. Certainly, the footprint should be a key consideration as it equates to over a thousand football pitches in size and stretches for miles across 47 fields from one village to the next. But as for

the structures being relatively low, I would question the sincerity of this statement as the panels are not low ground mounted panels. They are tracking panels which reached three metres at the highest tilt angle, some of the largest panels that are known. The photographic examples shown within the appendices do not give a true reflection of the panels proposed.

01:00:18:04 - 01:00:48:06

These are photographs of low ground mounted panels, which I find somewhat misleading. This is without also considering the other structures which are alien to a rural arable landscape, which include at least 76 shipping containers each at 3.5m in height, and an equally huge number of similar sized inverter stations. A control room at 5.7m in height, and equipment such as a substation including transformers at 6.48m.

01:00:48:17 - 01:01:21:08

I would ask the applicant to quantify their definition of relatively low. Please excuse my cynicism, but relative to what a bus perhaps it is also said that the proposed landscape strategy has been designed to help integrate the proposed development and reduce the perception of the build elements in the local landscape. The landscape strategy, it said, relies heavily on provision of new boundary hedgerows and improving existing hedgerows in order to screen the proposed development, but it has been recognised that this would be a radical shift in the current landscape.

01:01:21:10 - 01:01:57:19

Management. It is recorded that it is unclear that the method of landscape screening stated could be achieved without a reasonable timescale, or that this alone would be sufficient to reduce adverse effects. I have personally walked the roads around the various parts of the proposed area, and the majority of hedgerows do not even reach two metres in height. It is said that new hedgerow should be established and maintained at a target height, relating to the local context and scale of the development, and that the height of PV panels should not be taller than existing hedgerows in the area.

01:01:58:00 - 01:02:28:01

The developer has selected a panel of three metres in height. Knowing that this far exceeds the existing hedgerow height of the area is totally out of character, and will therefore be visible from many viewpoints and not hidden from view. As suggested in a reaching judgment, the Secretary of State should consider whether any adverse impact is temporary, and or whether any adverse impact on the landscape will be capable of being reversed in a time scale. The Secretary of State considers reasonable.

01:02:28:09 - 01:03:06:21

The applicant states that the landscape and visual effects occurring in relation to the proposed development are temporary and reversible, without having a defined operational life for 40 years. I would question the definition of temporary and reversible. 40 years is a very long time during which any number of changes could happen. I don't have a crystal ball, so I certainly cannot predict the future. And I'm sure that stands for everyone in this room. As solar developments are a relatively new concept, particularly at such a large scale, no one can provide assurance of reversal like the like at the end point of this, and it has not yet been seen to be tested.

01:03:07:04 - 01:03:38:21

7.2. 20 identifies the utility scale. Solar farms have two main impact issues that determine distances to receptors visual amenity and glint and glare. At yesterday's hearing, we heard that the applicant is looking to alter the angle of the panels to satisfy the aviation concerns raised by Burn Gliding Club in terms of glint and glare. If there is to be such an amendment to the originally assessed, will this result in a full new glint and glare survey being conducted, as this change could have implications for other receptors.

01:03:38:23 - 01:04:09:22

Residential, road and rail. The Selby District Local Plan 2005 environmental three relates to the provision of outdoor lighting and that developments will only be permitted where light schemes are designed to minimise glare and spillage. The initial glint and glare study undertaken by the applicant reported within the text that 14 residential receptors fell within no reflection zone if failed to mention in the text that 136 did have potential to be affected by glare.

01:04:10:04 - 01:04:42:23

This information could only be found in the mapping of the receptor points. Similar was the case for road and rail receptors, with the majority of points falling in the reflection zone, so I am sure you will understand my concerns. Local planning policy Selby District core strategy. Local plan. References. Proposals for all new developments will be expected to contribute to enhancing community cohesion by achieving high quality design and have regard to local character. Identifying context of its surrounding, including open countryside.

01:04:43:15 - 01:05:27:17

Both residential and non-residential development should meet these key requirements and make the best, most efficient use of land without compromising local distinctiveness, character and form. The applicant may reject the word development, as this is classed as temporary at 40 years plus, but the principles surely still stand. I would like the applicant to explain to me how this development in any way contributes to enhancing of community cohesion as regard for the local character, identity and context of the open countryside, and how taking out just under 100% BMV land from food and food production for the duration of the project can, in any shape or form, be the best and most efficient use of this land.

01:05:28:07 - 01:06:00:07

The Selby District Local Plan goes on to say that the council will seek to ensure that the former Selby District area remains a special place to live, protects and enhances the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, recognising the important role it plays in the local economy for the health and wellbeing of local residents and as a biodiversity resource. It is not so long ago that we were being encouraged to go outdoors once a day during Covid lockdowns, encouraged to take walks for our physical and mental wellbeing.

01:06:00:09 - 01:06:35:09

And what better place to do this than the peace and tranquility of the open countryside. Local policy is to increase access to nature, to improve public health. If this proposal is accepted, we will be trading countryside for industrialisation, tranquillity for constant noise and open views for prison like compounds. How does this in any way promote the health and well-being of local residents? Why do

we have local plans and policies that are written with specific localities at the forefront, if little heed is paid to them? I do have a number of questions also on the cumulative side.

01:06:35:11 - 01:06:37:23

Would you like me to stop at that point? I'll continue.

01:06:42:06 - 01:06:47:16

With the applicant, like to respond to what they've heard, or would they like to hear everything and then and then and then respond?

01:06:50:09 - 01:06:53:00

So I think, I mean, there's, there's quite a lot.

01:06:53:02 - 01:06:53:20

That's quite a lot.

01:06:53:22 - 01:06:56:21

So I'm I'll submit it in writing also.

01:06:56:23 - 01:07:00:29

Of course. That's absolutely great. That'd be fine. Yeah. Do you want to say some more now or do you want to?

01:07:01:01 - 01:07:02:15

Yes. That's fine, no problem.

01:07:02:21 - 01:07:13:12

I really want to make sure you have a good chance to say make your contribution, because it's been very detailed. It's been a lot of interesting points raised there. So I suggest you carry on. Yes, certainly.

01:07:14:10 - 01:08:05:23

Um, so again, Lesley Masson, as a resident and as a Holt, um, representative. So speaking on the cumulative effects, Professor Michael De details that developing land use plans is the responsibility of Defra, that government has a clear responsibility in putting in place a strong regulatory framework and that the Planning Inspectorate should then oversee the implementation of land use changes. Nick EIA scoping response from July 2022 states that consideration should be given to cumulative landscapes and visual effects in conjunction with other similar developments in the study area, including those currently being considered or approved by planning authorities but not yet implemented, and that communal Cumulative assessments should consider the number of long, large long term schemes around Drax Power Station, the study area.

01:08:06:03 - 01:08:48:13

There is a need to consider additional arrays assessed with other existing and or approved projects. These have potential to affect views and the landscape, character and setting, and with operational effects over long periods of time. It is said that there is potential for ongoing erosion of the landscape baseline in the area over a number of years. Therefore, we would recommend that the landscape

strategy should consider a landscape framework capable of offsetting the wider cumulative effects. With this in mind, why has the applicant scoped out the majority of projects known to be proposed or accepted in the area, even though the impacts on the local area and residents is likely to be immense? Choosing to only scope in two of the land pro solar farms.

01:08:49:09 - 01:09:21:05

Schedule four of the EIA regulation states that it's important that solar PV does not have a defining influence over the overall landscape character that the development remains in scale with the landscape in which it's located, and that views from nearby settlements are not compromised by solar PV in proximity, where settlements could be seen to be enveloped by PV installations. When the village of Campbell will find itself completely encircled by solar developments, and glass panels will be all that can be seen for mile after mile in the local area.

01:09:21:07 - 01:09:57:24

How can such a large proposal not be viewed as having a defining influence over the overall landscape character, and how can views not be compromised when this is all we can see in every direction? A concern was raised at the last hearing regarding the fact of the importance of views from local roads should not be understated, since these form the main access to the entrance of adjoining settlements and the important part of the immediate study area. The response was to the point, and was understood that the landscape strategy has evolved to include additional mitigation in relation to views from local roads.

01:09:57:26 - 01:10:28:11

I can only surmise that the additional mitigation will be more and perhaps taller, screening, forming a tunnel like approach to settlements. Please correct me if I'm wrong and share on what these mitigation measures may be. As residents, we currently enjoy the open outlook of the arable countryside around us, stretching for miles. It's the character of the area and a big part of why we chose to live here. With deer fencing proposed throughout the site and welding steel mesh fencing proposed around the substation and BSS compound.

01:10:28:13 - 01:11:13:10

The character of the area in which we live cannot fail to be changed. We are not talking about a small parcel of field, a small parcel of land with perimeter fencing, but instead an expansive area covering 47 fields. From the freedom of open space, the word prison comes to mind and together with cameras and peer lighting over such an extensive area. This will only add to the oppressive nature of such a large development. I firmly agree with the comment made in the last round of hearings that collectively, this has the potential to radically change land use within several kilometres radius of the grid connection point for a long time, 40 years plus and that that on that assessment magnitude criteria, this be considered a permanent and large change.

01:11:13:17 - 01:11:54:06

I would like I would be interested to hear the developments comments on this, as it feels like the word temporary is very convenient to be able to push through an enormous project that will completely change our lives and those of other local residents as we know them, potentially for the remainder of our lives. Not significant seems to be a term that's bandied about in relation to the effects of the related development of this large scale project. Who determines these effects as not significant? Does

the developer self-assess marking their own homework, so to speak? I am sure as a resident who is likely to feel these effects firsthand, I would be marking that homework very differently.

01:11:54:19 - 01:12:28:14

The developer talks of considerations being made in relation to residents and communities, but if they're truly considering residents, then why have they not spoken directly to the very people who are impacted upon to hear their views and concerns, working with us rather than against us? 7.5.36 in relation to landscape character, the majority of the site lies within Campbells, with farmlands LCA and 7.5.49 states that a comparable major moderate and significant effect would occur in relation to the canvass for farmland.

01:12:28:16 - 01:12:59:19

The LCA, in which the majority of the proposed development will be located. The proposed development would occupy a large proportion of this LCA and would result in a large level of landscape change. The applicant only considers the two land pro solar farms alongside this project within the scope of the cumulative effect, if only considering these through three solar farms, we are still looking at a substantial cumulative impact and loss of BMV land. And this is without considering other proposed developments in the area.

01:12:59:28 - 01:13:30:19

Campbell Smith Solar Farm for example, 46% BMV land to be lost for the duration of the project. Similarly, for Carleton Solar Farm, 57% BMV and now the Helios Solar Farm 97% BMV. With such a loss of prime agricultural land over 40 year period and possibly even longer. I would ask how such a project can even be given consideration. Landscape, visual and BMV losses are not the only cumulative effects we can expect to experience.

01:13:30:21 - 01:14:09:16

Both traffic and noise also require due consideration, and yet the applicant only appears to consider roads within the actual proposed project area. How can roads leading to this area be ignored in the equation? Construction trucks related to project have to travel on roads outside the project area to get to the site and so will be impacted on in much the same way. The same approach seems to have been taken in relation to noise, with various other schemes in the local area having been scoped out in relation to cumulative effect due to their distance from the proposed development at least 800m, or having incomparable noise impact profiles with the proposed development.

01:14:09:18 - 01:14:41:15

I appreciate noise was discussed yesterday's hearing, but I feel all projects that could result in noise within the local area should be taken into account, as the overall impact would be great. The developer also seems overly focused on the impact that Drax Power Station has as a feature in the local area. Then, on the positive impact the expanse of the countryside has on residents. Residents have either grown up with Drax power station on their doorstep and as such have become accustomed to it, or they've moved here of their free choice.

01:14:41:17 - 01:15:23:12

Knowing the power station was their freedom of choice in this way is being taken out of our hands simply due to the close proximity to National Grid connection point, residents and local communities

are having one after another of these such developments forced upon them. When will enough be enough? When will well being considered be considered more important than a rush to meet targets and economic gain? I would like to finish by saying, like many other members, I am not against renewable energy. I am an environmental scientist and sustainability manager, so I fully appreciate the need for renewables but of the right type and in the right places, and not at the detriment of our countryside and those that live there.

01:15:24:10 - 01:15:24:27

Thank you.

01:15:26:02 - 01:15:51:00

I thank you for that submission. Um, it was very detailed, comprehensive, um, uh, very interesting. Um, I think unless the applicant disagrees, um, and they want to respond to any particular points. I think there's a lot of material there. And if you could do a post hearing response to that is that is. Would that be would that be um, unless you disagree, is that what you would propose to do?

01:15:51:16 - 01:16:13:19

Um, I think to be to be fair to the representation that Mrs. Parsons made, I think that would be the right response to respond in writing. If you've got it written down, would it be possible for us to take a copy of it today before you go, so that we can respond to it in a post hearing? No. In the interest of speed? Yes, please.

01:16:13:24 - 01:16:18:23

Then then yes, it was the ability to photocopy that. That would be fine.

01:16:18:27 - 01:16:23:29

I'm happy to take a picture of it and work from a photograph scan, no problem, and then respond.

01:16:24:01 - 01:16:31:27

In writing a hearing submission, I'll come to Mr. Wilkinson and, um, and then that'll hopefully give the applicant time to respond by deadline. Five other than.

01:16:34:02 - 01:16:34:22

Is that what we're.

01:16:34:24 - 01:16:42:21

Yeah. That's fine. And then we will be. Yes we will then possibly not as a post summary note. But we can provide a response for deadline five.

01:16:42:23 - 01:17:01:06

Absolutely, sir. Because as I think as you say, I think we both picked up if there's when you get a lot of comprehensive information and I think we will agree on that. Um, to, to show it, you do regard we need to take some time to, to to respond properly. Yeah.

01:17:01:13 - 01:17:09:24

Yes, sir. With the one exception that where we have covered points before, we may well point you to where that's already been covered in the application material means.

01:17:09:26 - 01:17:29:08

Yeah. In terms of. Yeah. In terms of keeping it concise, that's absolutely fine. But to make sure that we cover off the so we've got a clear record of the, of the questions raised that were woven in, if you like, to that um, submission. Um, then we can see what the responses are. I think Mr. Wilkins had had a further point and that's that cumulative impact.

01:17:30:10 - 01:18:03:22

Uh, so, uh, so we have Drax power Station. There are two additional solar farms which have been passed and are starting to be constructed around cameras for well. Camilla Lange closed the northern village boundary of Campbell's Forth on 113 hectares Warehouse Lane on the south east of Campbell South. Together with the holiest site, Campbell's Park, will be totally surrounded and placed inside an industrial complex. Boom power is hoping to build a solar farm near Howdon, which is just to the east of Drax.

01:18:03:24 - 01:18:34:16

This will negate 1200 hectares of food producing land. We also have a Russian wind farm, which is a 12 turbine windfarm located near Drax. Drax power is going to start recovering a lifetime deposit of pulverised fuel ash BFA. Some by rail but the rest by road. Drax power is to receive power from up north to come from Bridlington. With all the upheaval that that will entail.

01:18:35:04 - 01:19:08:05

Drax Power is looking to put in a carbon capture pipeline to the North Sea. All of these will put extra vehicular strain on the A1, all for one which is already struggling at the present time, and the A645, irrespective of the new homes that are being built and are going to be built in the area. The combination of all these schemes that we will miserably have to endure will take years to build.

01:19:09:20 - 01:19:46:03

Is this concentrated area not doing more than enough for the energy needs of our country? Please do not suffocate with this industrial complex and labour some of the quality of life that we have at the moment. Together with this project, the village of cam was almost totally surrounded. Please remember, these fields provide more than just food, but also provide the lungs of our lovely village and give us sustenance and well-being in many other ways.

01:19:47:09 - 01:20:17:22

My philosophy is leave it at least as good as you got it. But if not better, please leave something of worth not only for our children, but for our children's children. Oh, and incidentally, we get the occasional hot air balloon landing in these very same fields. So to sum up, priority for me sat me down to evaluate the safety and wrongly sacking of the B s and substation taking the westerly prevailing winds.

01:20:17:24 - 01:21:11:20

I think that more scrutiny slash facts need to be carefully looked at with regards to the bees being so close to substantial local housing, providing 24/7 365 days a year guaranteed noise, plus the potential

of fire associated with lithium ion batteries and the complications trying to put them out, as well as the extremely toxic fuels. This large, imposing, threatening complex is a potential ticking time bomb, being approximately a mere 575m from, uh, a substantial number of hours, plus approximately 625m from the black Dot public house and a mere 1425m from Kambosos village, which is in the direct wind firing line.

01:21:11:22 - 01:21:12:18

Thank you for that, sir.

01:21:13:06 - 01:21:42:27

Thank you, Mr. Wilkinson. Thank you for that. Um, I, I, um, some of that sounded familiar, I think from, from yesterday. I think those if, if all that is already covered in your written submissions, we've already got that. Um, if there's anything new in there that you wish to submit. Um, I think that's the best way to, uh, make it public and allow the applicant and any others to respond in due course. I think that's the way I would just bring that to a, um, conclusion. Um,

01:21:44:20 - 01:22:02:03

now I'm just conscious now of the time, and I'm conscious of where we are on the agenda. What I'd like to do is move on, um, to item seven, because I think that should be quite short. Um, hopefully. And then we'll break after that. So it'll take as long as it takes, but we'll break after that.

01:22:04:06 - 01:22:19:27

Okay. So we'll move on to item seven. Um, ecology and biodiversity. So I think as I sort of trailed at the start, could the applicant provide an update with respect to its discussions with Natural England and, um, and the council?

01:22:20:25 - 01:22:24:17

Catherine Tracy for the applicant. Yes, sir. I'll ask my colleague, Mr. Fern to do that.

01:22:24:19 - 01:22:25:23

Thank you. Fine. Thank you.

01:22:28:22 - 01:23:01:03

Howard. Fern, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so with regards to matters of biodiversity, I'll update on the discussions with Natural and First and Natural England's main concerns previously were regarding the habitats regulations, assessments and the potential for impacts on functioning functionally link land with regards to special protection areas. And there's been considerable movement on that position now where essentially natural are satisfied on all points raised. Version three of the Habitats Regulations assessment is with natural, and we most recently received comments from last week.

01:23:01:05 - 01:23:27:12

There are some minor technical revisions that they would like to see with regards to, um, procedure and a little bit more detail on a buffer, different distance between an area proposed for mitigation for one of the key species, lapwing. But essentially, I think we can confidently say that that is just a

procedural requirement and an amendment which we fully anticipate naturally going to be satisfied with the content of the air and the conclusions and agree with the conclusions once that's resolved.

01:23:28:20 - 01:23:38:21

Because be clear just what you mentioned, the version that you mentioned of the habitat speculation assessment is that is that, um, the one that's currently published? Not it's not a later version, that.

01:23:38:26 - 01:23:42:02

It's version three version as submitted to naturalness.

01:23:42:04 - 01:23:44:25

Okay. And that's in the that's we've got a reference for that.

01:23:45:15 - 01:23:47:07

Sorry. It was submitted deadline for.

01:23:47:09 - 01:23:57:20

I think that's what I was getting at. That's simple as that. Thank you. Yeah. Um, and just as just to reiterate what I said earlier, I'm not going to ask questions about that here now, but we'll have some.

01:23:57:24 - 01:24:00:26

Questions on just just to be clear, that will be updated for deadline five as well.

01:24:00:28 - 01:24:07:12

So I suppose I'm thinking of timings here to some extent, whether deadline five would be the 20th of March.

01:24:07:24 - 01:24:16:29

At deadline five. So the version that will be submitted will be the version that is agreed with Natural England as a final HRA, and the statement of Common ground will be updated at the same time to hopefully.

01:24:17:01 - 01:24:17:16

We'll have.

01:24:17:18 - 01:24:18:15

Time to close that out.

01:24:19:04 - 01:24:20:18

If we've got if we've got any.

01:24:20:20 - 01:24:22:24

Further. So then it would only be if you have any further questions.

01:24:22:26 - 01:24:41:15

Yes, there will be a time for us to consider your what was gonna be version giving to version version fall. Um, that will come on the 20th. Ahead of our written questions. Yeah. So I'm just sort of thinking aloud here, just thinking through the timings. Um, thank you for that. That's that's that's helpful. Um.

01:24:42:01 - 01:24:56:05

I think just in terms of the version you've got before you now, I think you are, you could be confident in reviewing that for any substantive questions, because the points raised by Natural England that are outstanding are, are very minor.

01:24:56:07 - 01:25:16:08

So what we'll we'll do that. Uh, I'm on the understanding that the change will be small subsequently. Therefore, hopefully our work will start from scratch. But yeah I understand. Yeah, but, um, in discussions with other parties, um, do you want to the council, uh, for example.

01:25:16:10 - 01:25:46:11

Yes, certainly. So the position with North Yorkshire Council. Um, so I think there's a statement of common ground that was submitted deadline for um, and the and hearing one the discussion when we last spoke to the council. Any detail was really regards to updating the whole the landscape plan and to bring that in line with the biodiversity net gain process and procedure for measuring habitats and the, um, ways of guarantee that they achieve target status set within that.

01:25:46:13 - 01:26:20:09

Those documents have been fully updated. I think, um, at this point in time that the statement of common ground states that that that is all provisionally agreed with the council. Um, and we expect that to be to be the case. Um, in terms of the only outstanding issue that we see is with regards to statement of common ground that we're aware of is in relation to the requirement for monitoring and specifically the monitoring of protected species, um, the, the applicant's position. Our position is that monitoring of the habitats that are established through biodiversity net gain will be delivered.

01:26:20:11 - 01:26:36:03

It's a standard requirement to understand how those habitats are developing and need require management, and as such, that does provide them the monitoring and satisfaction and that everything will be implemented as as proposed under the Olympe and under the order.

01:26:37:19 - 01:26:38:04

Thank you.

01:26:40:11 - 01:26:54:01

I was going to ask the question. I know the answer is, are there any other statements of common ground with other parties in relation to this issue or we've, we've, we've done Natural England and the Council or any other interested parties.

01:26:54:29 - 01:26:56:19

Not some I don't know. I don't think so, sir.

01:26:56:21 - 01:26:57:06

No

01:26:58:14 - 01:26:59:22

thank you. Okay. Okay.

01:27:01:20 - 01:27:14:04

Does anybody I know that I mean, Councillor Chance, if they wish to make any general comments in response to what they've heard on those updates. But I understand that that that your specialist isn't available today. So.

01:27:16:13 - 01:27:49:06

I think our ecologist, um, has reached a general agreement over the, um, um, The ecological survey and assessment work, I think I think and the outstanding queries I think are being discussed through the, um, statement of common ground. So I concur with the position, um, that has been stated. I think the query had been raised as to how bag would be delivered, and I think there was some discussion, uh, about that not being able to be part of the, um, the development consent order.

01:27:49:08 - 01:27:58:19

So I think it was just, um, wanting to have the discussions on, on, on how that would be secured and delivered, um, through through the process.

01:27:58:21 - 01:28:22:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, we'll come on after the break to, um, more on the detail of the draft DCO, the management plans, outline management plans and the like. Um, we might come back to this, but we'll see how that unfolds. Possibly not today. Um, um, does anybody else want to, uh, comment on what they've heard from the applicant on the status of that? I appreciate that Natural England are here to comment on this. Uh.

01:28:24:27 - 01:28:28:08

I would like to comment on the biodiversity aspect of this.

01:28:28:20 - 01:28:30:18

Yes, that's right, that's right. Yes, yes.

01:28:31:07 - 01:29:12:18

Um, so again, Leslie Martin, as a resident and on behalf of the whole group, um, looking at the overarching national policy, um, this requires developments to avoid significant harm to biodiversity and the NPS for energy states that in taking decisions, the Secretary of State should ensure that appropriate weight is attached to biodiversity interest within the wider environment. The Selby District Core Strategy Local planning includes protecting, protecting and enhancing the environment, and the Selby Biodiversity Action Plan lists 13 priority habitats and 12 species and species groups of material consideration within the Selby District.

01:29:13:05 - 01:30:02:29

In a survey carried out by BSG ecology in 2019, the following statement was made. Ground mounted PV panels have the potential to cause the highest impact on nature as they are installed on land, which

may have at least some value to wildlife. How does the applicant plan to ensure that such habitats and species as identified are not negatively impacted upon by the proposed development, and will this be independently monitored if such impacts are identified? Will the developer be held to account to ensure remediation efforts are put in place? 8.5.37 as the proposed development, solar panels are raised off the ground and the perimeter fence security fence will be to retain suitable gaps for mammal gates at the base to allow free movement of priority mammal species.

01:30:03:01 - 01:30:40:08

No habitat loss or severance effects will result for small to medium sized mammals. What are the plans for larger mammals such as deer? As mentioned yesterday, we have already seen in the area a number of deer trapped by fencing during the early stages of a solar farm development within the local community. 8.5.97 details that some ground nesting birds of open landscapes such as skylark, yellow wagtail and lapwing may be subject to displacement, and the small numbers of waterbirds, most notably lapwing, may be subject to minor levels of displacement from the site or adjacent land.

01:30:40:10 - 01:31:17:17

However, the developer suggests that availability of extensive, similar arable habitats within the local landscape is considered likely to mitigate such minor non-significant displacements, with more developments popping up in the local area. In a race for connection to the national grid at Drax, more and more arable land is being lost for a significant period of time. How can the developer thereby suggest that there will be availability of extensive, similar arable habitats within the surrounding landscape? 8.6.6 given the nature of these developments and the proposed development.

01:31:17:19 - 01:31:48:24

The actual land taken and associated habitat loss is a small percentage, with construction effects largely temporary and reversible. Habitat losses comprise low ecological value. Agricultural land, and the solar developments provide clear commitments to achieve significant measurable biodiversity gains. Cumulatively, this represents a local gain in habitats of ecological importance, which will also cumulatively strengthen habitat connectivity in the wider landscape. This is a huge area of land.

01:31:48:26 - 01:32:20:16

Take over a thousand football pitches in size, offering a wide selection of habitats. How does the developer calculate a small percentage of habitat loss? Is there independent evidence to support this, and is there an actual percentage figure of habitat loss predicted, as opposed to simply stating a small amount as this can be relative? The 2021 environmental bill mandates most new development will deliver an overall gain in biodiversity, biodiversity, net gain.

01:32:20:19 - 01:32:55:14

This is important, an important aspect for all local planning authorities to consider in approving or rejecting planning proposals, in particular solar farms. The law does not apply to CIPs. Nevertheless, developers may wish to show their um CIP proposals do deliver Beng and so have subscribed to this approach. Biodiversity is measured by biometric three. Natural England 0207 21. However, some ecologists in the UK regard the metric as not fit for purpose.

01:32:55:16 - 01:33:29:23

Professor Kay Willis, a leading ecologist from Oxford University, states that being total will promote further loss and fragmentation of some of the UK's natural environment and even more important, the ecosystem. Services that flow and that net biodiversity gain will end up being net biodiversity loss. Doctor Sibert says the metric calculation only accounts for direct impacts on habitats within the footprint of a development or project. It is only a simple assessment tool and only considers direct impacts on biodiversity through impacts on habitats.

01:33:29:25 - 01:34:00:19

Indirect impacts are not included in the metric. Biodiversity metrics are focused on typical habitats and widespread species. Protected and locally important species needs, not needs, are not considered. The comments of Willis and Betts are backed up by research paper Zephyr Air magazine, et al. June 2021. The paper notes the losses in habitat areas as a result of the development will be traded for habitats of higher distinctiveness in the future.

01:34:00:23 - 01:34:31:01

The paper states. Mandatory BNG will generally trade biodiversity losses today for uncertain future gains. The Society of Conservation Biology, June 2021, research considered 55 BNG assessments and found that a promise of 25% increase in BNG delivered a 34% loss. It was also concluded that the safest mechanism for reducing biodiversity impact on infrastructure is to avoid impacts to biodiversity initially.

01:34:31:10 - 01:35:01:15

In practice, this means redirecting developments to previously degraded sites wherever possible. The area proposed for the Helios project is made up of 97% BMV agricultural land. The remaining percentage is three be graded. The area by no means could be classed as being a degraded site. I may be wrong, but a lot seems to rest in terms of biodiversity. Net gain on the introduction of species alien to the local environment, such as sheep and meadow flowers.

01:35:01:17 - 01:35:31:19

Should there not be more weighting on the net biodiversity impacts in terms of natural biodiversity? And so have said in appendix 28. The land will be sown to grassland and managed, including by being grazed with sheep for the duration of the operational phase. Their management will remain under the control of the current farmers, whether they choose to manage the sheep themselves or let others manage the sheep. It does not appear that Ndsu intends to have much involvement with regard to the species intended to be introduced.

01:35:31:21 - 01:36:13:10

It wasn't even clear at the issue one hearing. If the applicant does actually intend adding sheep, so does the biodiversity net gain still actually hold water? Is there also a clear management plan going forward, as meadow flowers are unlikely to flourish without this, which in turn would impact on the biodiversity net gain calculations during the duration of the project. What about the long term impacts? Or is this biodiversity net gain suggested even more temporary than the proposed development? Will these impacts simply reverse in the long term? If so, what was the actual gain and what was the cost in terms of losses? Thank you.

01:36:14:24 - 01:36:35:06

I thank you. That was again very detailed, comprehensive submission. Um, I propose that we deal with it the same way that we deal with the, um, landscape and visual. Um, I do appreciate that the applicant has got the relevant specialists here, but I think to give it to do it justice, I think that would be the best approach. Um, and again, can you make a copy of the whole material?

01:36:35:08 - 01:36:36:12

So certainly.

01:36:36:14 - 01:36:52:17

No problem. That's good. Um, okay. Um, I think it's time for a break. Um, so, uh, time now is 1137. Um, will adjourn until I think, uh, 11

01:36:54:09 - 01:36:55:06

1150.

01:36:56:24 - 01:36:57:12

Thank you.