



Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN010148 - Tween Bridge Solar Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 2
Date:	15 April 2026

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.

AUDIO_TWEENBRIDGE_ISH_SESSION2_15 0426

Wed, Apr 15, 2026 12:50PM • 1:04:20

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

landscape character, visual effects, residential amenity, hedgerows, grassland conversion, solar panels, mitigation, council concerns, heritage landscape, agricultural land, receptor groups, glare assessment, property impact, technical guidance, local impact report

SPEAKERS

Speaker 6, Speaker 7, Speaker 3, Speaker 5, Speaker 4, Speaker 8, Speaker 2, Speaker 1

00:05

Okay, it is now 1126, and the hearing is resumed. Okay, we're moving on now to agenda item for a and environmental matters, the first of which is landscape and visual effects. So most of these questions are for the applicant, but I will invite interested parties to comment where appropriate. Feel free to raise your hand to draw my attention, if necessary. I'll start with some questions on landscape effects, followed by visual effects, including residential visual amenity. So during this agenda item, I'll be referring to the following documents, which I would be grateful if the applicant could try to show on the screen as they are discussed. And that is es chapter six on landscape and visual effects, which is examination library, reference a, PP, 043, and es environmental statement, Appendix, 6.2, which is the residential visual amenity assessment, which is examination, library, A, P, P, 062, okay, so we will begin with some questions on landscape effects, the proposed development. And the first question relates to the applicant's assessment of effects on landscape character at paragraph six point 5.50 to six, point 5.66 document reference a, p, p, 043, so that's paragraph six point 5.50 to six, point 5.66 so those paragraphs include a limited assessment of how operational effects of the proposed development would affect landscape character within the context of the relevant landscape character areas, so that there is a focus here, as in other sections, construction effects, for example, On the effect of the proposed development being limited by the fact that the proposed development would only occupy a small proportion of each respected, sorry, respective landscape character area. However, is it not the case that landscape character areas are designed to distinguish between prevailing landscape characteristics in different locations. They're not a spatial designation of value as such. The fact that only a small proportion of any landscape character area would be occupied is not a factor which reduces the effect on landscape character. I just wanted to understand the applicant's point of view on that so effectively, the applicant argues, in relation to most landscape character areas, that, well, the scheme only occupies a small proportion of this landscape character area, and that's a mitigating factor, and it's and that's that sort of conclusion is reached for every, nearly every landscape character area. And I just wondered why? Because their landscape character areas aren't a spatial designation of importance. Then, so the fact that there's a small proportion, I didn't quite understand how that would be a mitigating factor.

03:45

Tom mcnamar on behalf of the applicant, so I'm going to look to ms Curtis, who's to my right to respond to this.

03:55

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant. We're looking at several landscape character areas here in the Doncaster authority area, we're looking at g2 Thorn and Hatfield peat moorlands in the north Lincolnshire area. We're looking at flat, open, remote farmland, flat wooded farmland and flat drained treed farmland, for example, at paragraph six, point 5.0 we do acknowledge that there would be significant effects within those landscape character areas over the area that the the the application covers, but We do note, because they are larger spatial areas that the significant. The effects are not significant over the over the wider character areas. And the character areas are displayed on a plan at figure.

05:03

It's figure 6.2 landscape character areas, which does give you the spatial area of those landscape character areas and gives you an indication of the proportion which the application sits within.

05:20

Okay, but I think my question is, why? Why does the fact that the scheme only occupies, or would only occupy, a small proportion of any respective landscape character area? Why would that be a mitigating factor?

05:37

Because you're considering the effects on the whole of that character area, and if it's a small proportion of it, then it's only affecting a small proportion of the character area. Okay, it's a fairly standard approach that.

05:52

What is the council's view? Do we have a landscape expert from city of Doncaster or North Lincolnshire.

06:03

Hi. Andrew shankowski for city of Doncaster Council. I believe Emily Smith, who's online, will respond to us. Sorry. Emily Jones,

06:15

Hello, yes, for a point. Sorry, yeah. Emily Jones from Tetra representing city of Duncan Council in North Lincolnshire. We do have some concerns regarding how the landscape character has been assessed. Within the lbia, there are other available landscape character assessment guidances documents which haven't been referenced, and we feel that perhaps the detail isn't there in the assessment. So for example, there's the Isle of axome landscape character assessment from 2014 which hasn't been referenced in the Lvia. We would have expected that to have been

07:00

okay, but on the specific point of the applicant is effectively saying, in most instances, well, the proposal only occupies a small proportion of this landscape character area, and therefore there's no significant effect on it. What is your view on that approach.

07:23

I think we feel that should be more detail in addressing that point, rather than just summarizing it as a small proportion. It may come to the same conclusion, but just a small, brief statement to say that isn't sufficient.

07:39

Okay, does the applicant have a response?

07:47

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think we stand by the fact that we identify that it's a small proportion of a wider character area and but we do acknowledge that there are significant, significant effects on those parts of those character areas that are affected by the proposed development. But when you look wider and spatially across the whole of the character area, we don't believe those to be significant.

08:19

Okay, I All right, so we'll move on to ES table six. Point, sorry, six. Six, which describes the residual landscape and visual effects of the proposed development. And I just wondered if the applicant could explain why it has separated landscape feature effects from landscape character effects. Aren't they intrinsically linked? And I just wonder what the purpose for that approach was to separate those two?

08:57

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, yes, landscape features form part of the landscape character component, but we feel that it's important to separate them out and deal with them as individual elements, to explain how they form part of that overall component. It's particularly useful to look at individual elements such as vegetation. Here, we're able to demonstrate a beneficial effect on on vegetation cover, particularly in respect of of hedgerows. But we just feel it's a helpful and additional component to landscape character to separate those out.

09:42

Okay, so in terms of hedgerows, es, paragraph six, point 5.42, outlines that 65 kilometers of new hedgerow is proposed across the order limits, and the applicant concludes that this would lead to beneficial effects, as you just alluded. It to however, I don't think the applicant has explained why this would be beneficial to landscape character. So the applicant refers to biodiversity and screening benefits, but obviously that section of the environmental statement relates to landscape features, as opposed to visual effects or biodiversity. So I don't know why there would be a benefit. Why should additional head rows be assumed to be beneficial without the context of prevailing character provided

10:32

kit Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, hedgerows form an important component part of this landscape that they have done over many years, they've been subject to some removal and over time, but still form an important and layering component in visual land, in terms of landscape pattern, and we feel that's a major benefit to the scheme that's replaced, and indeed, additional hedgerows are provided as we work through the landscape. There's quite a lot of examples where new hedgerows are being provided, particularly along the canal corridor, but there are other hedgerows within the landscape that are being added to and repaired, and this is part of that approach.

11:27

Okay, so I'm not sure that's necessarily reflected in the rationale for concluding on those benefits, but thank you. That's useful in the same vein. Es, paragraph six, point 5.44, dr, document reference a, p, p, 043, suggests that converting arable farmland to grassland would lead to a beneficial effect. However, the applicant has previously identified farmland and arable fields as key characteristics of the order limits and the associated landscape character areas. Again, biodiversity benefits are referred to, but the applicant has not explained why grassland would be beneficial in landscape character terms.

12:13

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, it's in landscape character terms, the change from arable to pasture would be a different component, but it wouldn't be at odds with this landscape, because there are elements of pasture within this landscape existing, and it contributes in landscape terms, in terms of protection to soils and providing a rich visual environment, in terms of the species Rich grasslands that would be

13:00

provided, okay, but if the prevailing character is a farmland and arable fields, then is the provision of grassland a beneficial landscape character effect?

13:14

Kate Curtis on behalf of the applicant, it's still an agricultural landscape. It's just storal as opposed to

13:23

arable, okay, but is there a benefit in landscape character terms? I understand it. Obviously, in terms of biodiversity, there would be benefits, yeah, but in terms of, we're talking about the landscape character effects, the development, I'm just wondering if there is actually a beneficial landscape

13:41

character effect. I think Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think there is in terms of those landscape components and how we've taken those as components of character. Kate,

13:58

can you explain why, though,

14:02

because it can, it would provide a visually rich component in terms of the Wildflower grasslands, okay,

14:15

and city of Doncaster, Council. I think it's ms Jones participating virtually. Do you have a view on the acclaimed beneficial effects on landscape character associated with the new hedgerows proposed and grassland?

14:42

Well, obviously the sorry Emily Jones, city of Doncaster Council and North anchorage Council, the addition of hedgerows to the landscape character would be a change in the landscape character the grassland. And I do have comments on whether this is actually achievable, which is slightly a separate point, because there isn't sufficient detail to explain how the grassland habitat proposed will be able to be established on sort of nitrate, rich and phosphorus, rich farm and grassland. So a slightly different point, but is, is what's being proposed, actually achievable to make the beneficial impacts explained? But I guess back to your question is, Is it beneficial? Yes, the addition, or it would be maybe an improvement on some of the landscape character features on the area, if it was achievable, okay, yes.

16:00

David Hornsby for donkey City Council coming

16:08

Good morning, sir. My name is David Hornsby. I'm the Conservation Officer at Doncaster Council. But also my background is that of a chartered surveyor, although retired now working around Doncaster for

the last 50 years. And I just want to make a couple of points that has been mentioned about the landscape. And firstly, there's reference to hedgerows, and I'm talking now about the agricultural land, which I know reasonably well, one of the features of this area, and I will speak later on about it being a very distinctive local land resource and asset, it has been drained. It was drained originally by Cornelius, vermouth, and there have been since his work, the Hatfield chase company has carried out, under their guise, a very detailed stewardship of that land, particularly agricultural land, and a feature that has evolved is the small fields with drainage And there is a lack of hedgerows in that particular area, and that is quite obvious because of the continued maintenance that needs to go into retaining That land for agricultural use. And my fear is that the changing it to grassland will do away with all this very careful stewardship that's taken place. The Hatfield chase company have been involved in that to my research knowledge since 1820 ish, so you've got a very area, you've got a land that's been managed very carefully. And I think that there could be consequences turning over large areas to grassland and the and the statements so far are woefully inadequate in terms of how that will impact, not only just impacting on on the land affected, but also adjoining land. And this is something that does need careful consideration. The other point I would make that this is a heritage landscape, or it is a historic landscape recognized in previous landscape studies, which have not been mentioned in the statements, and it's difficult to understand where the applicant is coming from, without reference to studies which are recognized as important features, and, quite frankly, not not referring to them. I think is a grave underestimate of the situation. That's basically all I want to say, sir.

19:48

Okay, thank you. Would the applicant like to respond to Mr. Hornsby's comments?

19:55

Okay? Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think we may be straight. Into heritage matters that you may want to deal with separately later in terms of some of those comments.

20:08

Well, you may you can respond how you like, if you think that those points are heritage points, then they fall outside your remit, then don't respond to them, okay?

20:19

Well, just in terms of the landscape matters that I can deal with, I would agree that it's a heavily engineered and managed landscape, but that is that's because it was originally a natural habitat of Heath and mares and drained over time and the river's diverted. I and some of these landscape interventions will take us back towards sort of Heath and mare's and natural the natural landscape, there's layers and layers of interventions over this landscape. There's been the peat extracted, sand and gravel extracted. We've got local and major transport corridors across and over it. There's quite a lot of vegetation in this landscape, and the depth and extent of it varies. It's from. It ranges from tree individual trees and groups and hedgerows and hedge lines, of which many have been denuded in actual fact, and you can see odd remnants of hedgerows, maybe just a single tree or small items left in the landscape. There's shelter belts, often around the farm properties, and there's woods and regenerating Heath as well on the edge of thorn Moors and Hatfield Moors, and all of this vegetation layers up and gives you little references through the history of the landscape and how it's developed and changed over time. You've mentioned the ditches. The ditches are maintained very clear of vegetation, again, with some of the hedge lines that were originally there removed over time, as farming is intensified, it is currently a large scale arable landscape with lots of commercial farming and large scale buildings as well. And then layering on top of that, we've got wind turbines and pylons. We've also got former World War Two airfields and other depots in this landscape, which is subject to car storage and peak distribution works. And the other thing that's happened over time is that some of the

farmsteads have fragmented and have been subject and now subject to sort of suburban influences, such as horticulture, horsy culture, culture and the other thing just to note as well about this landscape is that access is really limited to it. From a sort of pedestrian point of view, most of this landscape is viewed at speed when traveling through the landscape, often by cars and vehicles. So that's just to give you some context to that to the landscape and how it's evolved over time.

23:14

Okay, thank you, Mr. Hornsby, would you like to respond?

23:18

Yes? Please, sir, there is quite a lot of variation. I think, as far as the agricultural side is concerned, it's been mixed farmland, mainly agricultural, if you go back historically, but you also had areas of grassland. Quite surprisingly, you'll probably find that the grassland, historically, if you look at transactions that have taken place, commanded a higher value because of the mixed farming operations that took place there. Yes, you needed the arable land, but also you needed pasture in order to, well, provide manure for the and the type of farming that took place, there are quite a few things which I would probably come on to in my heritage statement, because the two factors, landscape and heritage are intertwined. You know, you can't separate them, the distinctive local distinctiveness is part of the DNA of the area, the Isle of Axholme, and certainly the part of the agricultural land that is in the city of Doncaster area. I think there are reasons for that, but it's this distinctiveness that has been evident since the 18th century, and the government reports to indicate that, and this was, this is partly what made the landscape, partly makes it the more social, the wider distinctiveness of the Isle of Axholme and the area around Thorn. Terms of hedgerows, I find it difficult to know what's happened there. I suspect that some hedgerows were there, but they have been cut back as part of the process of careful stewardship in terms of the management that has taken place. And there are records to that effect, there's probably other points I can mention in response, but probably that might be easier under the heritage,

26:13

yeah, and obviously the local impact reports are still to come. So yeah, if we focus on my questions, the responses to the applicant's response, I appreciate you've got a lot to say on those subjects, but we don't want to preempt the local impact report, and there's no need to at this stage. But thank you very much. To come back on any of that. I Duncan,

26:44

just to acknowledge that grassland and mixed arable is apparent in the landscape, and we're pushing the balance further towards grassland within the scheme mentioned Hatfield Chase and the representative from landscape representative for the council's mentioned a further landscape character document that identifies that the scheme sits wholly within Hatfield Chase and not within the Arlo vaccine character areas.

27:23

Okay. Thank you. So moving on to visual effects. If the applicant can please display es table six, six, which is examiner pre reference, a, PP, 043, I'd be grateful. So thank you. Es table six, six in dealing with residual visual effects, so that that's landscape features being displayed on screen. At the moment, if you scroll down to visual visual effects. It's quite a long table, so es table six, six, in dealing with residual effects, only focuses on three broad categories of receptors, so residual receptors users of footpaths and users of the transport network, and it does not explain residual significant effects on specific viewpoints or receptors. What I'd really like to see summarized is precisely which receptors would experience significant residual visual effects. Could the applicant explain the rationale for

grouping receptors in that way in that summary table? And I think I'd find it more helpful if any significant effects are highlighted specifically, rather than grouped. Could you explain the rationale for that approach?

28:54

Please? Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think we've just sought to condense the information. Perhaps that's being condensed too far for your requirements, but it does acknowledge significant effects on all of those visual receptor groups, and the detail is within the text of the chapter on the residential visual amenity assessment.

29:29

So can I just add on on that? If you turn to the residential visually visual amenity assessment itself, that comprises a very long table that runs to possibly 40 pages. So that would add very significantly to the length of table, six, six in chapter six. So I think what we've done is try to make it as succinct as possible, but we haven't sought to disguise the effects they are in Appendix six. Point two, but obviously we're in your hands as to how you'd like the information presented,

30:08

right? No, that's useful. What would be helpful is if the significant effects are sort of picked out, if you like, for the purposes of my report, and that would be helpful.

30:23

Okay? Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I can give you a quick run through now, if that would be helpful,

30:31

I don't think that's necessary. I think we will. If you could do so, you could either amend that table or make a submission in writing that, okay, provides me with that summary, I'd be grateful. Okay, so the next few questions relate to the applicant's residential visual amenity assessment, which is exam, Library Reference, a, PP, 062, okay, so if the applicant could display that on screen. That'd be helpful. That's a PPP 062, and paragraph one, point 2.7, of that document states that a number of properties have financial involvement with the project, and due to their understanding of the scheme, despite the proximity of the scheme to their curtilage, they have not been considered for sorry within the rva and table one one lists the involved properties, and I just wondered if the applicant could explain why these properties have not been included in the ince in the assessment. So why is the fact that they're financially involved have a bearing on whether they experience adverse effects on resident visual amenity? Why should that make a difference?

31:58

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, it's it's a fairly standard practice to take out the involved properties in a residential amenity study. We have visited several of them, and we've looked at them in the context of understanding the baseline as well, and these are all set out on the accompanying figure, which is under a P, P, 149, and they're circled as as yellow on that diagram, and where We have had dialog with some of the residents directly and visited some of those properties. But it's fairly standard to take these out.

32:51

Okay? I mean, the fact that you're alleging it is fairly standard isn't really a justification. Why does the fact that they're financially involved have a bearing on whether they're included in an assessment of residential visual amenity or not.

33:09

Curtis on behalf of the applicant, because they have some control over over the how the projects developed in relation to their property.

33:21

Okay, what is the council's view on on that? What is city of Doncaster Council's view on on that specific point? Mr.

33:32

Hornsby, thank you, sir. I'm not sure whether we're talking about the dispersed farms on this but they do form part of the landscape being dispersed. You see them from quite a distance. You see their settlements from quite a distance, all the buildings that have gone on around them, then they form a distinctive part of the landscape. But also it's important that it's not just the views out of those buildings, but it's the views that they create for people either mentioned going on at high speed on the on the road, you probably going high speed on the on the m1, 80, but on the on the A, 18, around levels, the road dips. It goes with the contour of the land. You can't go at high speed. I travel that road quite frequently, and I know I'm coming back onto issues of heritage, but you get long views. You get a perception of. Of wide open skies, and this is one of the characteristics which was mentioned in one of the landscape studies, certainly the one for Doncaster and the idea of putting hedgerows up to screen the development loses that wide open view that that you get either going by a car or, let's not forget, that people use The area for leisure facilities, for walking. I've been down there several times recently, and the number of dog walkers enjoying the features, it is going to affect them. There is no, no doubt. So I probably come more onto that in the in the heritage, right? Okay, I think it's they shouldn't be dismissed.

36:04

Okay, thank you. So we are discussing the residential visual amenity assessment, which is a very specific assessment. Perhaps the applicant would just like to summarize the purpose of the assessment. What is that assessment actually looking at?

36:22

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, the purpose of the residential visual amenity study is to assess essentially, private views, not, not, not public views, which is the purpose of the environment the Ibia two fundamental differences.

36:41

Okay, can I just add to that? Because just to bring back to your point around the reference to financially involved and I think that that goes to the heart of it. The purpose of the assessment is to consider the implications on on private views when we refer to financially involved parties, those are people that have entered into an agreement with the applicant in relation to the proposed development. Proposed development, and therefore can be deemed to have accepted the principle of development on their private view by entering into an option agreement or some other form of legally binding an agreement. And it's in that context that those parties were excluded from the scope of this because, as I say, the fact that they have entered into that agreement indicates that they, whilst there might be an impact on views from their Property, they've accepted that impact.

37:38

Yes. Miss Brooke, hi.

37:42

Samantha rook. Just a couple of points on when the visual assessment was done on my dad's property, Kate came out. The in it is property. 200 on the chart, just in case you need reference to that they've put solar reflections are possible. They've put that less than 60 minutes per on any one day. Will to get reflections from there. Now where the property lies, it's south facing the solar panels adjacent to Dad's property. So there's two fields there. Dad's property here. I don't know how that's going to just be less than 60 minutes per day on glare when he works and he lives within the same property. Also, they've said natural screening will avoid a lot of the view. It won't, and that'll take 15 to 20 years to mature. That's going to take most of the remaining of Dad's lifetime. So he's going to be affected, really, for the remainder of his life. Other points there is also it shows on a mapping of yellow glare. I've asked Kate to get clarification today on what yellow glare is, and that is within the two fields opposite dad's property. So I'd like a little bit more clarification on what yellow glare is and how that would affect because my sister has a neurological condition, and brightness, glare and sounds can trigger that and make that worse. So just want a bit of clarification on that, and I didn't want to interrupt you earlier, but this is on hedgerows, where she says that hedgerows have been removed over previous time the landscape has been open the ditches, it's crisscross of dikes. Them. Dikes need constant access year round, so there's not been hedges around the dikes. And if you have a look at an aerial footage, you'll see the dikes criss crossing the landscape. There may have been hedgerows just here or there. There. Side of a road, possibly, but the landscape as a whole is hedgerow free. There's not been hedgerows, numerous ones removed over time.

40:12

Okay, and that's a couple of points there. Yeah, let's just let the app pick them up. So I think you're referring to the glint and glare assessment. Is that right? Yeah, so I'd finished that particular point on our Vaa. I have more questions on rvaa, but if you could perhaps respond on the clinical point and the comment made about hedgerows as well, that would be useful.

40:44

You may, you may respond in writing, if you prefer, on the specific issue of Mr. Brooks property and

40:51

Tom McNamara on behalf of the applicant, sir, I think, I think we would take that offer up, if that's okay. We heard the concerns, and we will provide a full response. We don't want to come up something off the heat on the Yeah, okay, that

41:04

makes sense. That does make sense. So they're going to respond specifically on

41:09

Yeah, no, that's perfect. Thank you. And just one other point as

41:12

well, that if you could introduce yourself, sorry.

41:15

Samantha Brook, again, some of the photos that they have used for existing screening. We would maybe like a point of each photo that's been used to pinpoint exactly on a map where it is, because I've noticed that quite a few of the photos are not relevant to the development. I can point you out on a map where they are. It seems like we've drove around to have a look for high hedges, established

hedgerows or tree lines, and taken a photo, but it's not going to cause any natural screening to the development that's been planned. Thank you.

41:54

Which photographs are you referring to? Of course. Have you got any references? Have you got the reference.

42:01

So let's have a look, if it gives a so the picture on page 290 it says Street View imagery at road receptor b1, that is back from the green tree, heading towards Hatfield. And then the one below that, that is even further along the road, so heading further into Hatfield. And then let's see if I've got the page number on this where it says significant vegetation screening for road receptor D, 26 that's actually the trees on dad's field tree line. And there's no solar going in that. And behind that hedgerow is our sheep field, 30 acre sheet field, so it's not going to cause any Okay, natural screening.

43:07

Thank you The thank you for the references, so I think you're still referring to the Clinton glare assessment. Is the applicant clear on those references, and will you be able to respond in writing on those

43:17

comment them on behalf of the applicant? Yes. Thank you for that. We we've taken down the references, and we all provide our response, okay, in writing. That would be helpful.

43:25

Okay, excellent. If we move back to residential visual amenity assessment, I'll take you, take your point on the involved properties, understand what you're saying in terms of my next question, it relates to the categories or criteria that the applicant is used to effectively, effectively sift out residential properties. So it's a step process with four, four stages or steps, the fourth being that a property is subject to the residential visual amenity assessment. Right? My understanding is that in order to have a detailed assessment for individual properties under stage four of the rvaa process, the applicant asserts that a very high magnitude of change must occur. The applicant's rvaa does not find that there are any such instances where a very high magnitude of change would occur, and therefore no detailed assessments at stage four are required. Paragraph one, point 2.13, of the rvaa seems to indicate a very high magnitude of change is one that has a dominating or overbearing influence on the overall view. Is that consistent with the technical guidance note 219, and. Is the applicant, therefore suggesting that there are no instances where the development has a dominating or overbearing influence on the overall review, overall view of any residential receptor, is that the conclusion being reached?

45:17

Curtis on behalf of the applicant, yes, that's correct, we haven't identified any of the very high magnitude effects. In terms of the definition of very high magnitude of change, overbearing and dominating is often attributed to to wind. In addition, the guidance note 2.9 indicates that overly intrusive is also applicable to to solar development, which might be a slightly more helpful terminology in this case.

45:59

Okay, so you're, are you saying overly intrusive is the key consideration in terms of considering a high, sorry, a very high magnitude of change. I think it's

46:11

relevant in terms of

46:12

solar, yeah. Okay, and in what instances would a solar farm lead to that level of effect? I mean, some of the if you're looking at the layout indicative layout plans, some of the properties are surrounded, effectively on multiple sides by proposed solar patterns or solar panels. At what point does a solar farm lead to a very intrusive effect?

46:41

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, it very much depends on lots of lots of variables. It depends on the offsets and aspects of the of the of the installation, but it also depends on the baseline of the receptor that, in this case, the properties. So it depends on the setting of that receptor, the direction of key key views and windows, and how the gardens and approaches are laid out. So each each property is assessed in terms of its baseline and the resulting arrangement of the proposed installation.

47:29

I'm just wondering, within that context, which I just described, I'm wondering at what point would stage four be triggered for a solar farm?

47:42

It would be if it was particularly in close proximity to a property, and in that situation, we were not able to provide sufficient mitigation that may be able to address that. But it could also equate to multiple aspects that the installation can be viewed from as well, but again, it's closely linked to the mitigation that can be provided to address that situation.

48:14

Okay, thank you. Is there anyone who has anything to say in terms of residential visual amenity assessment

48:24

before we move on. I think Andrew for Doncaster Council. I think Emily Jones wanted to come in there.

48:30

Yes, okay, Hi, yes. Emily Jones, city of Duncan's Council and Northampton Council, we would question whether the rbaa is thorough because it does seem quite limited. It does focus on just the panels and doesn't relate to all the other infrastructure that's going in, such as the substations and the busses and, for example, the topic you've just been talking about now property labeled as 44 is completely surrounded by solar panels and without further detail in the rva. We're not sure whether that one would be a property, for example, which should have triggered the stage four. So we would like to see more detail in the RVA and be ensured that it has considered all this other infrastructure in both the rva and the LVA a the infrastructure hasn't been considered sufficiently Okay.

49:32

Thank you. I think what might be helpful is in in the local impact reports, if the respective councils have a look at the RVA. And if there are instances where they consider that stage four is triggered that they highlight those and will address it from that point. But would the applicant like to come back on any of that?

49:56

Yeah, I just reference that we've come. Said the scheme, and it references the scheme in each of those, each of those tables, so that does include all of the component parts in relation to each of those properties, but is summarized as the scheme in the terminology.

50:15

Okay. Thank you.

50:18

Yes. Miss Brooke. Samantha Brooks, sorry, I'd just like to ask how Kate has got the visual on dad's property as moderately affected the bedroom window, the living room window, both living room windows and the kitchen window, all overlook with no natural screening other than a hedge that's already there that we keep at a certain to let light into the property, because if we let it grow, it would block the light. How? Kate said, that's only going to be moderately affecting dad. Visually, the field opposite is on a gradient. The it goes up as you get further away the land. So he's looking out over a field of solar panels, and I don't know how they can say that that is moderately affecting him. That's all. Thank you.

51:18

Okay, thank you. Would the applicant like to respond on that?

51:23

Can we just Yes? Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, can we just clarify whether we're talking about glinton Glare again or the rvaa,

51:33

okay, sorry, that's okay. We can move. I think the applicant is saying they're going to pick that up in writing that point, but yeah, they'll be submitting their response to me, specifically addressing your comments, because it's quite hard to do that on the fly without the documentation in front of them. Thank you. Okay, yes, on

51:58

behalf of the applicant, just for clarity, though, your property is included in the residential visual immunity assessment property reference.

52:08

32 Yes. So they're two different they're two different documents. Miss Brooke, so the rvaa considers the effect on private views in terms of visual amenity and whether it is an overly intrusive effect. So I'd be interested to know whether you consider there would be,

52:33

can we ask that anything specifically gets then sent towards report on the property? Because we haven't had that sent. I had to go through the document, and it's made very difficult to find which properties which, because they use just longitude and latitude. And when you're in a group of 450 I would just ask that any reports that I've done, can we have them sent to us please just how it affects our publicly.

53:02

Thank you. Okay, Miss Brooke, I think the applicant will address this particular point in relation to your father's property in their written summary of oral submissions or append, perhaps to that which will be uploaded to the planning Inspectorate website at deadline one, I think

53:27

Correct, yes.

53:29

So if you, if you check the website deadline one, written summary of oral submissions, they'll specifically address your your points you've raised today in that document. Okay.

53:42

Do you have anything to add to my on behalf of the applicant? No, sir. I mean, if it would be helpful, we can send that directly to you once, once we submitted it, that would be great. And we can highlight, you know where, where the specific assessment relative to your property is, is banned.

53:59

Okay, thank you. So we are going to be there will be another issue specific hearing on landscape and visual effects. This is very much high level. I had a couple of queries that I wanted to discuss in person. We've done that now. I've got 20 plus written questions on the subject. But and obviously got the local impact reports to come. But within that context, does anyone have anything else to add on, landscaping, visual effects? Yes. Mr.

54:30

Hornsby, just thank

54:32

you, sir. Introduce yourself.

54:34

David Hornsby, city of Doncaster, Council, just on the issue of what point the situation dictates, stage four, I think one of the points that I need to make is that the one of the land characterization studies that did take place. Refer to wide open skies, and the views that some of the properties get benefit from wide open skies within their curtilage, and the fact that there's been no reference to these previous landscapes, makes me wonder how much regard has been had to individual properties from this basis, it's something that probably needs to be addressed.

55:33

Okay, would the applicant like to respond on that point?

55:38

Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I think we'd agree that wide open skies are a key component of this landscape, just by the nature of it being relatively level. But I have spoken also about the layering of vegetation within this landscape, and that all the components of that of that layering provide quite strong containment in bear in certain locations, and obviously I've mentioned garden vegetation as well has an effect on that which has been considered as part of Our assessment.

56:16

Okay, thank you. Yes, Mr. Sorry, Skelton. Mr. Skelton North Lancashire Council, thanks. So yes, Paul Skelton North Lancashire Council, just going back to the exclusion of properties from the residential assessment understand to a degree, the point about the owners being involved. The only question I would have is whether they are all owner occupied properties, or whether other people who might not

have the benefit of that involvement could also be affected. Thank you. Yes, and I'd be interested in addition to know what the technical guidance note says on that subject Tom

57:09

McNamara on behalf of the applicant, so we I understand the point that's being made. I don't have the answer to hand right now. It will form part of our summary of oral submissions for deadline one, and I understand this, as I say, the question yes, so

57:25

in addition, the exclusion of involved properties is suggested that that's a standard approach. But I'd like to know what the technical guidance note says on that, if possible. Please. Thank you. Okay, are there any other issues or comments people want to raise on landscape and visual effects before we move to a lunch break. Oh, we've got a hand raise Suzanne stamp online, yes,

57:56

good afternoon, sir. I would just like to raise a point on I'm sorry. Sudan stamp, talking on behalf of City of Doncaster and North Lancashire Council, my query is regard to my colleague Emily Jones, mentioned we, we don't feel the whole scheme has been assessed. And Miss Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, has, has mentioned that the scheme has has been assessed as a whole. But I just have noted some ambiguity about the on site, 400 KV substation, and that it appears in the residential visual media study figure, which is figure 6.5 but it doesn't appear in the landscape and mitigation figure, which bear with me is figure 6.4 and when I refer to the closest photo montage location, which is viewpoint 26 it doesn't appear in the photo montage either. So there's some clarification there with regards to the location of that.

59:00

Thank you. Okay, thank you. So is the applicant across what has been said there? And do you have a response?

59:15

Okay? Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, yes, I can see in figure 6.5 that it's identified as a larger box, as a substation, I can see that there is a space within the landscape and visual mitigation strategy that would accommodate that there, in terms of the visual I'd need to go back and check through that reference, but I think it may be not appearing in that because of the screening of the by the by the panels in the in the foreground. But we'll have to just double check

59:55

that one. Okay, yeah, if you could pick that up and write. Think that'd be great. Okay, thank you. Were there any other issues people wanted to raise on landscape and visual effects before we break for lunch? No, okay, so it's nearly 1230 this afternoon. Sorry, sir. Yes. I was is there a hand? Yes. Miss Jones,

1:00:28

sorry, yes. Emily Jones, city of Duncan, council think landscape matters, yes. Just very quick. Sorry, it was a late hand. I just wanted to raise again. The establishment of the grassland habitats that have been proposed in the landscape design, and I just wanted some if we could get some clarity on if they are actually achievable in the type of soil that is present, which is heavily agricultural land at the moment.

1:01:04

Okay? I mean, does the applicant want to respond to that point now,

1:01:08

I think we might need to respond in a bit more detail, but just to say that it'd be addressed as part of the landscape and ecological management plan in terms of establishment of those of those habitats.

1:01:22

Okay? And I think as a more general point, if that feeds in Miss Jones to your the council's local impact report, the applicant can pick up that query at that point as well. Okay, thank you.

1:01:42

Yes, Mr. Hornsby. David Hornsby, sitting with Doncaster Council, I just want to pick up on the point that quite a lot of properties are vacant, and given the nature of the farming use, if the land is also vacant around there, has there been change from agriculture to grassland because they've been left fallow, or for some other reason? I think that needs some clarification.

1:02:18

Okay. Are you able to respond to that?

1:02:22

Kate Curtis, on behalf of the applicant, I can't advise on whether properties are empty, but we have found areas that are under fallow, but I think that's agricultural agreements.

1:02:38

Okay, presumably that the site characteristics are what they are, and they form the baseline that you have assessed.

1:02:48

Yes, correct. And obviously that's a changing. It's in flux that landscape because it's subject to whatever crop is being grown at any any particular time or not being grown.

1:03:01

Okay, all right, yes, Mr. Hornsby, David Hornsby,

1:03:08

city of Doncaster, Council, the only point I would add to that, all right, there may be some agreements, but it also be, may be part of crop rotation to have a fallow period. So I'm just wondering how reflective, true reflection, you know, this is. There's so many variables which have come to light this morning, and you know, I suspect there'll be more this afternoon.

1:03:42

Okay, thank you very much. Okay, we're going to move to a lunch break now, and this afternoon, we're going to be picking up flood risk and cultural heritage and biodiversity as well. So we'll have a 45 minute lunch break returning for quarter past one. Okay, so the hearing will resume at quarter past one, and the hearing is now adjourned. Thank you. You.