

AUDIO_BEACON_FEN_ISH2_S02_121125

Wed, Nov 12, 2025 3:19PM • 1:33:11

00:04

Good afternoon. It's now 1114, it's time for this hearing to resume. Thank you very much for

00:12

your time so far.

00:14

Before the break, we just started item four, landscape and visual. So I will continue on that item, and my first question is for the applicant. And can I start by asking the applicant,

00:29

excuse me to provide an overview of the ES chapter six landscape in visual particularly the assessment methodology, the assessment of effects, embedded mitigation proposed, and any residual effects, effects as identified by the applicant within the documents. Thank you.

00:45

Thank you, sir. Ian Mac for the applicant, so I'll just introduce Mr. David Stokoe, who's the Ibia expert for the scheme, and who prepared the chapter six. So he'll he'll talk you through both that initial question, and I expect we'll field the majority of the questions and discussions that follows. Thank you very much. Mr. Davies,

01:04

Thank you, Sir David Stoker, for the applicant

01:08

in relation to the methodology used for chapter six,

01:14

up 057,

01:17

it's been produced in accordance with industry standard guidance, and specifically the guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment,

01:28

and the full methodology is provided in accordance with appendix 6.2,

01:35

Up 084,

01:39

in addition the viewpoint figures up to 10 to two to nine, and the photo montages up 229, to 232,

01:51

have been prepared in accordance with the landscape Institute technical guidance Note 06,

01:58

19, which is a visual representation of development proposals.

02:07

Then in relation the assessment of effects,

02:12

the assessment is considered effects in relation to the landscape of the site area, which includes the solar rear area, the cable Route corridor and the bespoke access road,

02:27

also wider landscape current effects at a national and local level and effects on visual amenity In relation to residents, recreational users

02:40

and particularly public rights of way users and transport receptors within a five kilometer Ibia study area,

02:51

which has been defined as an offset from the DCOs order limits

02:56

and cumulative effects arising in relation to other relevant schemes within the Ibia study area have also been considered and assessed

03:12

in relation to embedded mitigation

03:17

measures relating to the siting and design of the proposed development

03:23

are set out in chapter three, alternatives and design evolution, which is up 054,

03:32

paragraphs, 3.6 point two to 3.6 point four. And Within chapter six,

03:41

landscape and visual

03:44

chapter, yep, which is up 057,

03:48

paragraphs, six point 3.15

03:51

to six point 3.17

03:55

and measures are also set out within the design and access approach. Document, which is up 278,

04:08

in relation to

04:10

specific landscape mitigation measures. They are described in paragraphs six, point 3.19,

04:18

to six. Point 3.20,

04:21

of chapter six, and they also illustrated in the landscape strategy plan, which is rep 2021022,

04:33

and 023,

04:38

so a summary of the embedded mitigation measures

04:44

in relation to the three parts of the proposed development.

04:51

So starting with the solar area,

04:56

the scheme has been designed

04:59

with.

05:00

Short the retention of existing landscape elements, Woodland, scrub and field boundaries and associated hedgerows and drainage ditches,

05:13

which essentially means that the underlying landscape pattern, the physical fabric of the land will not be fundamentally changed, and together with landscape mitigation measures, will

05:31

ultimately facilitate the restoration of landscape character following decommissioning.

05:42

In relation to proposed measures,

05:50

the general approach has been, rather than introducing

05:55

totally new features, we're seeking to strengthen existing landscape features, so existing boundaries,

06:09

yeah, rather than introducing those new features which could be perceived as being out of character

06:17

and resulting in new landscape patterns, essentially

06:21

in relation to the battery energy storage system and the on site substation, they'll be coal located to allow sharing of facilities and

06:34

mitigation measures,

06:36

and they've been located away from residential receptors in areas at risk of flooding,

06:43

as far as possible.

06:49

In relation to fences,

06:53

they have been designed to provide adequate security while keeping landscape and visual impact to a minimum through measures such as keeping them behind hedgerows where possible, and also utilizing agricultural style fencing, a deer fencing style, which is appropriate for

07:19

the the agricultural character of the landscape.

07:29

Existing trucks will be used to provide access where possible, within solar area,

07:39

again, to avoid disruption the landscape pattern and the need for vegetation removal.

07:51

Yeah, these new access arrangements have been designed to utilize existing gaps in vegetation wherever possible,

08:00

in relation to the solar PV x,

08:03

in relation to the solar array area

08:08

and the proximity of residential receptors. Solar PV exclusion zones

08:16

have been introduced, and

08:19

these zones are defined by

08:22

belts of native shrubs with trees

08:26

to provide screening for residential receptors.

08:32

Existing field boundaries will

08:37

largely be maintained and strengthened where possible.

08:42

And this will include the perimeter hedgerows, which will help to provide visual containment.

08:51

Introduction of new linear landscape features, hedges and native shrubs with trees will provide linkages with existing

09:02

mature plantations on the solar array area, another mature vegetation features.

09:17

Then in relation the cable route corridor,

09:21

the cable route corridor and its construction accesses will make use of existing gaps and hedgerows and vegetation wherever possible,

09:33

any public rights of way

09:37

crossed by the cable route corridor will be retained an impact kept to a minimum, an outline public rights of way management plan, which is rep 2039,

09:51

was submitted in the examination of deadline two, which sets out how the applicant will manage public rights of way due.

10:00

On construction and operation to ensure they've been suitably considered and able to operate effectively.

10:19

Is the 10th of your answer. Mr. Stoke, pardon, is that the end of your answer? Mr. Stoke, no, no, I'll just complete it in relation to the bespoke access road.

10:29

The indicative alignment of the bespoke access road has been informed by the requirement to minimize landscape visual impacts by where possible, routing the road to the edge of field boundaries and away from residential properties

10:47

from which no significant visual effects have been identified at any phase of the development. And again, existing gaps in vegetation will be utilized where possible to minimize vegetation loss,

11:05

landscape proposals will be designed where possible to protect the open nature of the area,

11:12

and this includes the sensitive siting of store soil storage mounds,

11:19

and Then again, in relation to public rights of way and rights

11:22

of way, some of which cross the bespoke access road, they'll be retained and impacts kept to a minimum,

11:33

and as noted above, the outline public rights of way management plan rep 2039,

11:39

sets out how the applicant will manage public rights of way.

11:46

Then finally, in relation to bespoke access road construction, compounds

11:54

used in relation to the construction of the road will be cited away from sensitive receptors wherever possible.

12:04

Thank you very much. Mr. Stoke, so if I could draw our attention to I believe it's the same it's actually the same table. Please correct me if I am wrong. Mr. Stoke, I believe you have at the end of the visual landscape. Chapter that is chapter

12:26

six,

12:27

table eight, which summarizes the assessment matrix and lists all of the significant effects that have been identified by the applicant and their impact, and that matches, I believe the table 19.2 as well. I think that those two tables mirror each other. And what I would like

12:55

us to do at moment is actually just go through the creation of the table, what, what it means for the applicant, the different levels of impact identified, ie moderate adverse or major adverse.

13:13

And I would then like us to go through it in more detail,

13:21

residential properties first, and then public rights of ways and then the new bespoke access road. However, if we could just get an overview in terms of the assessment first,

13:35

and if you could talk us through the table and what the table actually tells us, that would be helpful. Thank you.

13:47

Okay, David Stokoe from the applicant,

13:51

yeah, generally, in relation that the table identifies

13:57

all the significant landscape and visual effects that

14:02

have been identified.

14:05

In Chapter Six

14:09

at all development stages.

14:14

So in relation to construction phase landscape effects,

14:22

we've identified significant effects at the site level

14:32

that's in relation to the solar array area, the bespoke access road and the cable Route corridor

14:43

and at a site level, effects would be major adverse during construction.

14:51

Then more like, more widely, we've also considered effects on

14:58

landscape character.

15:00

Areas

15:02

within the Ibia study area,

15:07

and in relation to the Fenland sub area

15:12

in which the solar rear area

15:15

is located and the cable Route Corridor is partly located,

15:21

were found that there'd be moderate adverse

15:26

effects during construction,

15:32

also in relation to the Holland reclaimed Fen

15:37

landscape character area which in which the southern part of the cable route corridors located and bigger fens substation is located.

15:48

We've also found during construction that there will be moderate adverse effects

15:57

because of essentially activity, construction activity and a landscape that is predominantly agricultural, although towards the southern end of the corridor, it is also characterized by large scale energy infrastructure

16:19

in relation to

16:23

construction phase visual effects,

16:29

we've found that residents in some properties in close proximity to the solar ray area will experience either major adverse or moderate adverse effects.

16:43

These include Property Groups, r1 r2

16:49

r4

16:51

and also R 20.

16:55

Just to clarify one point, Mr. Stoke, you just mentioned residual effects. Just so that everyone is clear, what do you actually mean by that? Could you just explain to the examination, please,

17:07

residual effect? Yes. So how do they differ from normal effects, and what has been applied in order for them to be residual? Yeah. Okay, so

17:17

the assessment is considered

17:20

affected construction operation year one, so when

17:25

the proposed development has been completed, and also, yeah, 15, after the effects of mitigation planning

17:37

can be considered, and it's at that point where effects would be considered to be residual. Thank you. So picking up on that specific point and going back to table 19.2

17:50

landscape in visual summary of likely significant residual effects, which you have now clarified what residual effects are,

17:58

obviously

18:00

we take on board your earlier response in terms of what mitigating what mitigation measures has have been considered and have been applied to your original assessment of the landscape and visual effects. However, if there are residual effects, then they are effects that, according to the applicant, even with the application of the mitigating measures proposed, they cannot be effectively mitigated against.

18:24

And I would like us to go through those so we in depth table. You have divided it into, I think, four broad categories, if I am not mistaken. So the first category is to do with

18:40

landscaping, visual in terms of construction phase, then you have operational phase Year Zero, operational phase year 15. And then you have decommissioning. So that will actually cover the whole lifetime in the decommissioning of the proposed development

18:58

across all of that, all of the time, across all of those different stages, there are always going to be significant landscaping visual effects proposed identified by the applicant.

19:13

I would like us to go through that in detail, particularly in relation to

19:21

what further mitigating measures have been concerned have been considered by the applicant, if any, and if no, further mitigation measures have been considered to try and meet and further mitigate significant effects.

19:37

How? What is the applicant's view on those in terms of the examination. So if we could, if we could go through, first of all, I would, I would actually like us to go through them,

19:54

the access route, the bespoke access corridor.

19:59

And.

20:00

I have some queries about that, because looking at different tissues that have been identified, it seems to me that all of the impacts that you have identified in relation to the bespoke access corridor, I linked

with how sensitive receptors interact with the bespoke access corridor, but not with the bespoke access corridor itself as a whole new

20:27

form of development that is going to be implemented within the landscape. Can you please clarify your thinking around that?

20:39

David, still go for the applicant.

20:46

Yeah. So again, considering effects, in relation to

20:53

landscape effect, the site area level, and in terms of a wider landscape character level,

21:03

we've found that, it has been found that there will be significant effects

21:09

at a site level. Sorry, sir, can you just clarify we're considering residual effects?

21:17

Yes, yes. So so that that's I'm only going to concentrate at this point in time in residual effects. So I am accepting the mitigating the mitigation strategy that the applicant has has applied, and that has been applied consistently and thoroughly across development. My question is got to do with significant residual effects, so the effects that are left after the application of mitigation measures.

21:42

Thank you for clarifying that

21:45

in relation to the bespoke access road, there would be significant residual effects

21:53

at a site level in terms of the landscape,

21:59

within the immediate context of the bespoke access road,

22:04

and that is because of the introduction of a linear infrastructure into what is essentially a rural landscape. But those effects will

22:18

just be experienced, as I said, within the immediate context of the route,

22:25

more widely,

22:30

the characterizing influence of the bespoke access road

22:35

would would be limited So it wouldn't have adverse, significant adverse effects on the central clays and gravels, sub area, which is the landscape character unit in which look, in which the bespoke access road is largely located.

22:58

Because, in essence, the bespoke access road is going

23:05

to be largely at ground level, at grade, with the exception of some soil storage mounds, so the visual influence will be very limited beyond the immediate context. Thank you, Mr. Stoke, when you say that visual I would characterize that interference, but

23:27

when you say that the visual interference with landscape will be minimal,

23:33

can you explain a little bit further your thinking on that?

23:38

As you said, it's a whole new form of development that does not exist in the landscape.

23:45

Yes, I accept the point, sir. And

23:51

in relation to

23:54

direct landscape effects, there will be

24:00

an effect in relation to some fragmentation of the landscape,

24:07

because it's going to, to some extent, cut through existing field units.

24:14

But visually it's, it's not going to be

24:20

have visual impact beyond the immediate context, because

24:27

the road is essentially at grade,

24:32

and the end of intervening landscape framework, the hedgerows in that area and existing blocks of woodland will essentially

24:44

screen longer distance views of the route.

24:50

Okay,

24:52

if we accept that, I do have some further questions on that which I think are impertinent to clarify.

25:01

Are the applicants thinking on this specific issue? So my first question is linked with, you know, obviously, part of the argument that the applicant has put forward for the construction of this route is the fact that the other alternative access routes to the solar panel area are particularly difficult for the type of vehicles that the applicant expects are needed in order to build the solar array area,

25:29

and therefore I assume that that means that the proposed bespoke access road will be larger and will be wider than the roads within the existing network, is that the case?

25:58

Simon? I think the answer is yes in terms of the field sciences, considerably, considered, I mean, obviously not wider or larger than the return off you would wouldn't amount to your argument correctly if it wasn't so. So accepting that so that will be actually an access road that will be out of character within the other access roads that are located within the area. So how has that characteristic of the proposed bespoke access corridor has been taken into consideration as part of your visual and landscape assessment.

26:38

David Stokoe from the applicant do

26:43

Yeah, it's accepted that

26:47

the dimensions of the bespoke access road will be

26:53

greater than, say, for example, other existing access tracks,

27:00

farm access tracks used by landowners in the area.

27:06

But the construction of the road will be of a comparable in nature. So it will be a, essentially a sub base road with a bound gravel surface. So it will, it will have that rural character comparable to other access tracks in the area.

27:30

Apologies, Mr. Stock, I'm not clear on how a road that is going to be significantly wider and straighter with a completely different layout from any other road, any other road within the proximity of the area is going to be similar in character,

27:49

just in terms of the materials used, sir, I understand that, but I'm assuming that the landscape and visual assessment has gone beyond the materials being used and actually looked at the whole impact of the proposed access road on the landscape. Why didn't just materials being used? Yes, that's correct. So accepting that I'm not clear why it would still be characterized as similar in character to the other rural roads within the area, certainly, and that for the applicant. Just before, I invite Mr. Stoker to reconfirm the basis of his assessment. Would you mind if we provided a bit more clarification on the design principles of the bar, because that might inform some of the comparisons to the other roads in the area. And also gives Mr. Stoker a bit of time just to find his references within the assessment. So with your permission. So I'll ask Mr. Turnbull just to provide some clarification on the design principles that inform

28:49

the bar here. That's, that's that is acceptable, and I'm happy to do that. But just try and to keep us on the topic that that we're here, I don't, I accept that there might be something to be said about that, but I think the design principles that we have agreed on are only going to be confirmed. So I'm not, still, I don't think, I think it's unlikely that we'll hear information that will be material to how the character is going to be different. Thank you, Sandra. I think that the limit of the point is to provide some assurance around the parameters of the bar, because I think that is relevant to the question you're asking terms of the assessment implications. Okay, comparison, I'm happy to allow that. Thank you. Thank you.

29:34

Colin Tom Hall, for the applicant. So in the design principles, which are appendix one of document 5.6,

29:40

sorry, I should know the examination reference

29:45

work. Number eight, we've said that the bespoke access road one

29:51

design principle will be that street lighting, road markings and other street furniture are not proposed except at times or locations strictly required for safety purposes. So that's the.

30:00

Example, where this is not going to have the character of a public highway.

30:05

We've said also the bespoke access road will, in general, have the appearance of a farm track or rural driveway, although wider. We've also said gates will be of a suitable specification to prohibit unauthorized access, and safe crossing points will be designed for PRW at each point it crosses the bespoke access road. So I think that sorry, Mr. Turnbull, could I just ask you to repeat that last bit I couldn't quite catch it, please. Certainly safe crossing points will be designed for each public right of way. At each point it crosses the bespoke access road, and the design principles are secured by requirement five.

30:41

So these principles, I would argue, ensure that the character of that road will not,

30:49

you know, look and feel like a public highway, will look like a wide farm track in general.

30:56

Thank you, Mr. Turnbull,

31:01

thank you for explaining the design criteria that have led the design of the proposed bespoke access corridor. I am still not 100% clear how

31:15

significantly wider roads than all of the roads that are

31:21

within the vicinity of the area with a completely different layout that is actually very straight and without the bends and curves that actually characterizes so much of the route to the site is going to be similar in character to everything else that is within the minute surrounding area of the of the proposed development. I accept Mr. Turnbull's point in terms of lightning,

31:46

the lighting being different, and attention to character in crossings. I accept all of that, but still, the fundamental point is it's going to be a road. It's going to have a significantly different layout and a significantly different width within the area, and I don't really quite understand how that fits in with the rural character.

32:12

Thank you. So Ian Mac for the applicant, so that's that's heard and understood. I think it might help if we invite Mr. Mr. Stoker just to go back through his assessment on this point and see to what extent you can clarify some of those points for you. Thank you.

32:25

Mr. Stoke.

32:28

Thank you, Sir David Stoke, off the applicant.

32:36

Yeah, so I understand and accept the point you're making about the road being

32:44

larger scale and

32:47

straighter in nature than comparable agricultural access tracks, and

32:55

that has been reflected in the assessment outcomes. So it has been found that there's significant effects in relation to the smoke access road

33:09

that will include

33:11

significant effects on the public right of way network,

33:16

so at construction and completion, so operation year zero,

33:25

the public rights of way network to the west of osgooby Lane

33:30

and to the East

33:32

will experience

33:36

significant effects.

33:40

But yeah, 15,

33:45

sorry, sorry. Could I just make a correction there? Certainly, yeah, sorry.

33:53

At construction is the public rights of way network to the west of oscoby Lane and to the east will experience significant effects. In operation, only the public right of way network to the west of as could be lane will experience significant effects,

34:13

and that's essentially because that part of the network crosses the alignment of the bespoke access corridor,

34:25

so right away, receptors will experience very close distance views of the route result which is going to result in those significant effects.

34:38

Thank you for that response. Mr. Stoke, that actually, so I accept then that is how it is reflected within your assessment, and that is why you identify a series of significant effects linked to the

34:56

bespoke access road at all stages of the development.

35:00

Development. However, then my question will be,

35:06

if we do accept then, as you have just stated now, that actually the construction of the road itself will actually be a significant impact on the landscape, why is the bespoke access road not identified as such,

35:25

as a unit, if, if I'm making myself clear so we do have so defects linked with the bespoke access road. For example, if we take the effects linked to the bespoke access road at operational Year Zero, visual they are linked with the

35:49

public right of way, which obviously will offer close views to the proposed new bespoke access road, and that's why it's correctly identified. However, my question is, why isn't the road identified itself as

36:09

a significant effect on the landscape as a unit,

36:14

in addition, in addition to the public right of way in the effects on the public right away?

36:20

So why is that not being considered as a receptor in itself?

36:29

David Stoker, for the applicant, in terms of assessment methodology,

36:35

you wouldn't normally consider

36:39

receptors using parts of the proposed development as a receptor.

36:49

Thank you. Mr. Stoke. In that case, my question for the applicant would be, how does the applicant propose that it will be able to wholly capture the impact of the excess road? Do

37:05

the summary of effects

37:08

that have been described is intended to provide that summary so

37:15

it is acknowledged that

37:18

effects landscape effects

37:22

on the site area. So that's considering the bespoke access road as a whole is significant.

37:31

So in other words, that that means that then if we take operational Year Zero visual effects, the applicant believes that the only visual effect created by the bespoke access road

37:47

that will be of any significance at Operation Year Zero is in relation to the public right of way network to the west of ascabi.

37:58

No

38:00

sir, we've identified that landscape effects. So effects on the site area of the bespoke access road will be significant. So that's a landscape effect. Okay, Mr. So could you point me to where in this table that effect is registered? Please

38:27

Sorry, it's

38:30

operation Year Zero, landscape effects, Landscape character of the site for

38:44

page 100

39:12

Okay, apologies if I am not following you clearly here, but in terms of Operation E is zero landscape, character of the site. The description of the impact is changed to the landscape character of the site through introduction of solar PV arrays and associated infrastructure. So does that

39:34

in terms of associated infrastructure that bespoke access corridor?

39:39

Yes, that's correct. Okay. Then why is that different from the table that you have included in the summary of the likely significant effects, table 19.2

39:55

because I thought that we had established that they mirrored each other. Yeah.

40:01

In actually applicants, bear with us one second. Why would we do that cross cross reference?

40:24

Oh, it is. It's buff Finland sub areas that IT landscape, character of the site. Okay,

40:31

okay.

40:39

Yes, I think you're looking at the same table we are now. So that's on page eight, and it's the first and it's the first row under operational year landscape. So

41:03

okay,

41:05

thank you. That's that's helpful. That has clarified situation for me. Thank you very much for that.

41:13

So could I provide an additional explanation in relation, in relation to how the

41:21

chapter six has assessed landscape effects.

41:26

Yes, please.

41:29

Effects at a site level have been

41:34

grouped together effectively. So essentially,

41:38

effects on the solar array area, the cable Route corridor and the bespoke access road

41:47

have also have all been considered under that headline, site landscape effects,

41:55

which is the reason the bespoke Access Road site level effects

42:03

aren't coming out, perhaps as clearly as ideally there would be

42:09

okay. Thank you very much for that. Mr. Stoke. This

42:14

leads me that to my next question, which would be considering that, as we have now established, the applicant recognizes and

42:25

classifies and includes in its assessment

42:30

the impacts, the wider impacts of the proposed bespoke Access Road.

42:36

Can I ask what

42:40

options and alternatives have has the applicant considered

42:46

in terms of the usability of this road? I

42:55

your case for needing this road is very much based on its need for construction stage. So

43:04

it is proposed that the applicant will keep the structure during operational stage for maintenance of the solar array, in doing decommissioning stage for the decommissioning of solar array, are the

43:20

characteristics of the roads needed the same for all of those different phases of the development, and if they are not, have the impact been considered and alternatives been considered to that.

43:34

So you might be applicant. So if you bear with us, because I think this ancestry is beyond, to be fair to Mr. Stoker, the Lvia

43:41

element of this. And so I just want to make sure, if we can give you a good answer on this, that we give you the right one. So definitely, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mac. Thank

44:32

Thank you, sir, Ian Mac for the applicant. So. So I think the narrow answer to whether the function of the roads remains the same from construction through to maintenance is, yes, it's just clearly the volume of traffic will be significantly reduced, visibly, the construction traffic being removed, in terms of the very quickly to complete the alternatives, part of it as well, if that helps us so, from a issue, an issue specific, hearing one we talked about the alternative.

45:00

Alternatives, and how we arrived at the bar as a specific proposal. And we don't have our traffic expert here today, but I think he talked you through some of the the functional elements that inform that and why it was preferred in that location. So the best source of information for that and the explanation for why we arrived at where we did is within the bespoke access road appraisal document, which is a P, P, dash, 080, I think that will provide the kind of source elements to why we've arrived at the position we have. That's the sort of general background to the bar and the functional elements to it, which is then, in turn, informed from a use perspective, construction and use perspective, Mr. Stoker's Lvia assessment was there very briefly. So in case any of my colleagues want to supplement or correct anything, I've just said

45:53

Colin turbo for the applicant, I just would add that we included in our statutory consultation round

46:03

those options, we consulted,

46:07

you know, we sought public and constitute views on those appraisal options.

46:18

Thank you. I

46:21

I accept that. I, if I can actually suggest, in the interest of brevity, for us to actually take this offline, perhaps So, if I can ask for the applicant to take note of an action to provide further justification for why the same road that is required for the construction

46:45

with the same characteristics, I'm looking particularly at what could potentially be done to reduce its impact, its landscape impact, and its visual impact. So why the same road with the same characteristics, which as we have established, is significantly different from the characteristics of the surrounding roads. Why that is needed in its in the same form as during the construction phase. If Does that make sense as an action point for you? It does so just, just to make sure that we answer it properly as well. Is the is the kind of inference whether it shouldn't be maintained post construction, and the land

restored and or halted in some, some way which might produce any perceived impact that there is. I I don't I think that my question is,

47:36

what has the applicant what considerations has the applicant given to that possibility

47:45

and

47:47

why, or why it could not be reduced,

47:52

or why can it be reduced? But obviously within the context, as I have explained early in my question, within the context that I think that what we are looking here is to actually

48:05

try to diminish the impact that the excess corridor will have on the landscape. Therefore, I think that the easiest way to do that would be through the reduction of the

48:19

impact of the roads rather than anything else, but there would be other, perhaps other possibilities that might have been considered. But that's why I'm asking the question, really. So now that's understood. So we'll set out the route, the consideration we gave in the rationale for why we've arrived at where we are. Thank you. Thank you very much for that.

48:39

I would like us now to actually go through the impacts, particularly

48:46

on residential visual amenity. So I would like us to move on to that specific topic, please. So could the applicant very briefly just step out

48:59

the approach taken to the assessment of those receptors, residential receptors, in the mitigation proposed.

49:07

I know that the applicant has already explained consideration of buffers and planting in order to mitigate against the impacts of development, but then just briefly set out any further consideration that has been given to residential visual amenity and how it can be mitigated. Thank you.

49:31

Thank you, Sir David Stokoe, for the applicant.

49:39

So broadly visual effects have been considered in relation to residential receptors

49:49

within settlements. So we've considered effects on

49:55

settlements as a whole and also in relation to.

50:00

Effects of residents in individual Properties and Property Groups.

50:10

We've considered which parts of the development result in those effects. So in relation to the solar rear area, it's been found that significant effects will be experienced at Property Group are one,

50:30

you be Thorpe farm and you be Thorpe Lodge.

50:34

Property Group r2 which is hown farmhouse, as could be barns in westmorelands farm and property r4 gasses barn.

50:48

Property R 20 crown cottage and keepers cottage,

50:57

in relation to the cable Route Corridor, we've found, if we could just stick to residential now, please, if, if that is okay,

51:08

yeah, I was just going to go on to say that there will be significant construction phase effects for residential properties within the cable corridor, but that will just be at construction phase. So

51:24

in relation to

51:26

residual effects. So after mitigation planning has been established,

51:33

it will just be the

51:36

significant residual effects will be experienced at one property, which is r4 gas is born.

51:44

Thank you so

51:46

Mr. Stoke, as you have highlighted,

51:49

the applicant anticipates there will be significant impacts on residential receptors, r1, r2 r4, and R 20,

51:58

Year Zero, year 15. The applicant only anticipates that there will be

52:07

significant residual effects in property r4 which is gaseous barn.

52:13

Putting property r4 to one side, for the time being, I will ask some further questions on that today. But putting that specific property for one side, can the applicant please explain its reasoning for why

52:31

properties are one, r2 and R 20 were removed from having significant effects at year 15 or

52:43

yes, in relation to all those properties, there'll be the introduction of a PV exclusion zone, which will provide a buffer between the Property and energy infrastructure.

53:00

At the edge of that buffer, there'll be the introduction of native shrubs with trees,

53:11

which ultimately will

53:14

screen views of solar PV arrays for for those three receptor groups.

53:25

Thank you.

53:28

In that case, if we actually go a little bit more into the detail of what the impact is going to be on those properties, and I am being

53:40

informed here by the applicant's own residential visual amenity assessment, but I'm also being informed here by my own site visits to the

53:51

local

53:53

and evidence and submissions made into the examination by residents and people With an interest on those specific residential groups.

54:02

And it seems to me that even

54:06

though the

54:08

mitigating the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant will go some way, is to block the view of the proposed development from those properties, it seems to me that there will to just a very significant change in character and a change in residential amenity from those properties,

54:32

because one of the key characteristics is actually open fields and an Open view across a wider area, and with the planting that that the applicant is proposing to do in order to screen the development, that will be quite a significant change from what is the current outlook from those residential receptors. So

54:58

accepting that and taking that in.

55:00

A consideration, how does the applicant feel that that is not going to be a significant effect at year 15,

55:13

it's accepted that the will, in each of those cases, there will be a change in the visual character of VIEWS from each of these Properties and Property Groups,

55:26

and while staff accept that the landscape is generally open

55:33

in Each of these cases,

55:37

the introduced mitigation planning will relate to existing planting and in the view or existing mature vegetation cover. So for example, at Crown cottage,

55:56

there is a mature hedgerow

56:00

immediately beyond

56:04

the property, which will screen views from

56:09

from ground floor,

56:13

and it will provide

56:17

An element of green infrastructure into which the mitigation planning will be able to meaningfully

56:26

relate.

56:30

Thank you, Mr. Stoke, in that case, if I could ask perhaps for a document to be shared. Now

56:37

I'm looking at the residential visual amenity assessment. That's appendix six, point 6.5, I believe the reference is a P, P 087,

56:47

if I could ask the applicant to please share that document, if that's at all possible, thank you. And I would like us to go to page 26, of actually,

56:58

it might be easier to start with another page. If we could go to page 24 please. 24 out of 34 that's Howell fan farmhouse.

57:14

Thank you. That's correct. Thank you very much. So this is from the applicant's own examination evidence, and we have, what I believe is the current outlook from that residential property, the next page, I think, shows Year Zero,

57:33

25

57:36

if we could share the next page please, thank you. Yes, 25

57:41

and then the next page, 2615

57:45

years after completion.

57:51

So if we compare the baseline, which is the existing outlook from that specific property, and the outlook of the proposed view 15 years after completion, I would find that from a landscape and visual amenities sort of perspective, it would be significantly different from what is currently the baseline, in my view. But I would ask the applicant to please confirm what the applicant's view is on that in what, in the nature of the assessment, and why, at 15 years,

58:28

those specific residential properties were removed from having a significant effect, so why the applicant does not consider that that is significant. Thank you. Thank

58:55

Yeah, so, as I

58:58

mentioned earlier, we accept, in relation to these properties, that the mitigation planning is going to result in a loss of openness

59:09

to some extent, or

59:12

the

59:14

characterization of The view will change to some extent.

59:22

Thank you, Mr. Stoke, so am I to assume then that the applicant characterization of loss of openness, then, in the applicant's view, that is not significant?

59:41

That's correct, sir. So in relation to these images, it also needs to be factored in that

59:52

from each of the three properties we're considering, these views will only be available from a part of the property.

1:00:00

Perhaps some windows or some external areas, but not from all parts of the property. So yes, I accept that, but considering that most people tend to spend a lot of time in their home,

1:00:16

considering the

1:00:19

lifetime of the proposed development and how long it is expected to be

1:00:25

in operation, and the like the likely daily impact that this will have on residential amenity, I still query the applicant assumption that that will not be a significant change. So

1:00:44

yeah, the applicant maintains the position that the effect would not be significant when considering the visual amenity from the property as a whole and considering that

1:00:57

the mature or the established

1:01:01

vegetation will almost completely screen views of energy infrastructure, although, again, I do acknowledge that the character the open characteristics of the View will be partially diminished.

1:01:20

Thank you for that.

1:01:26

I think that at this point in time, then and for the interest of brevity, I would like us to perhaps defer this further to written questions, but I would like to see from the applicant

1:01:42

significant justification for its position,

1:01:47

because

1:01:49

I think that there are a couple of concepts here that I think are very key for us to understand. And one thing is residential amenity, and another thing is actually going to be the visual impact from a receptor of the proposed development.

1:02:07

And in addition to that, and linked with the hearing that we actually had yesterday, where we actually touched upon human rights and interference with human rights, I would like the applicant's position to actually be clarified in light of that as well in the responses that we heard from the applicant yesterday.

1:02:30

So can I ask if we can take this away as an action point? Please? Thank you, sir. That was going to suggest the same, and we're happy to provide clarification as to how we reach that assessment conclusion in respect of those three individual properties, noting the discussion we've had today. And we can do that, I'm sure, for deadline four, which you will then have the opportunity to reflect on before you submit your second round of questions. And to the extent we can, we'll weave that into, or at least acknowledge it as part of the further clarification we undertook in respect of the category three and the human rights considerations.

1:03:06

Thank you, Mr. Mac and just to clarify

1:03:09

the my questioning is particularly linked with, obviously, the difference in the change between the baseline

1:03:18

acknowledged by the applicant in its own evidence and actually

1:03:23

the significance or not of the proposed change, including the mitigation, because obviously mitigation might have an impact as well. I understand that mitigation is there in place in order to mitigate against development, but that does not excuse it from being subject to assessment of impact. That is my position at the moment. Thank you, sir. I think that's understood, I think by reference to page 26 of the RVA that we had on screen before. So your, your question to us is, how we justify the conclusion we've reached at that point in time with that mitigation in place? So that's understood, and we'll, we'll take that away. In addition to that, then I had a similar line of questioning proposed for gasses barn, but recognizing that, obviously the applicant does recognize that on that specific example, and considering that is going to be surrounded by panels and proposed mitigation by four sides clearly encircled that there is going to be significant amount of change. And that is recognized in the applicant's assessment. So I do accept that for gaseous one, however, similarly to what I have just highlighted for the other residential

1:04:32

receptors, I do not believe that the fact that we accept that there is going to be mitigation actually excuse us from looking in great detail in terms of what the impact is going to be, and that needs to be set up very clearly, particularly for that receptor. And I am particularly looking at for that specific one. I'm particularly looking for justification from the applicant in terms of being able to maintain its resident.

1:05:00

Short use.

1:05:02

Thank you, sir. That's that's noted in perspective, gasses behind. You'll have seen our response. Sorry. Ian, mag for the applicant, you'll have seen our response to question. LSV, one point 10 at XQ, one. So that provided an initial response to that point, but we're happy to take away that action in the same way seek to substantiate the conclusion and reasoning that we've, we've reached, accepting that there was a different conclusion reached in respect of gaseous bar and r4 than the other three properties that we discussed shortly before. But we'll, we'll factor that all into one general response to you, sir. Thank you very much. And as I said, on that specific one, just to reach where to point, sorry if I'm repeating myself,

1:05:38

it's, it's to do with the viability of its current use, which obviously is one step further than

1:05:46

the issue that is linked with all of the other residential receptors, absolutely. So yeah, for the applicant, no, that's that's understood. So we'll, we'll provide a supplementary answer in respective of gaseous bond to that point as well. Okay. Thank you very much. Now, very briefly, I am very mindful of time, and I was aiming to have a more significant lunch break at one o'clock. But can I just ask very briefly for the applicant to just talk us through the key significant effects on the public rights of ways and the proposed and its current uses and the proposed mitigating measures for that please.

1:06:34

David Stoker, for the applicant,

1:06:38

are we could I just clarify? Are we talking about significant residual effects. Yes, yes, yes, thank you.

1:06:52

Again, I can

1:06:54

split it up into the different parts of the proposed development, so the solar array area, the cable corridor route and the bespoke access road.

1:07:07

We've already talked quite extensively about the public rights of way network associated with the bespoke access road, and

1:07:18

identified that there will be significant effects for users of the public right of way network to the west of Osgoode lane.

1:07:30

But in relation to that element that, that will be the limit of the significant effects for public right of way users,

1:07:38

in relation to the solar array area, there will be significant residual effects

1:07:47

in relation to the public right of way network

1:07:53

near to the river Slee. So that's the area to the north east of the solar ray area,

1:08:05

and that's because of that part of the network passes in close proximity to that Northeastern extent of the solar array area, and

1:08:17

some right away users will experience close distance views of energy infrastructure,

1:08:26

also in relation to the solar array Area

1:08:31

users of EUA,

1:08:35

11, 031,

1:08:38

which

1:08:40

effectively links UB towards the solar rear area and is slightly elevated, will facilitate views of the solar rear area, yeah, from from A slightly elevated position, and

1:09:01

that will result in significant effects. Sorry, I'll just clarify that matter. That is a year zero in relation to residual effects, they would reduce to non significant levels for for that receptor. So

1:09:24

and then in relation to the cable Route Corridor during construction,

1:09:30

there would be significant effects for parts of the public right of way network, but no significant effects have been assessed at year 15, so no residual effects in relation to cable Route Corridor,

1:09:52

in relation to specific mitigation measures

1:09:57

relevant to the public right of way Network.

1:10:00

The proposal is to gap up the perimeter hedge

1:10:06

around the solar rear area and allow it to grow to a height of up to 3.5 meters,

1:10:14

which will provide considerable visual enclosure

1:10:21

the fans that, sorry, the hedge is currently fairly gappy, so that there is quite a lot of gaps in at the minute, so that that measure will be quite effective in terms of mitigating visual effects

1:10:38

for the two receptor groups have identified

1:10:43

in relation to your 1101,

1:10:49

there's a specific

1:10:52

belt of planting that's been introduced to the west of the On site substation in Bess.

1:10:59

So

1:11:01

we've categorized it as native shrubs with trees which, yeah, 15 will provide effective screening and reduce those effects to non significant levels.

1:11:17

Thank you very much, Mr. Stork for that explanation.

1:11:22

I wanted to ask some questions in proper in terms of what you mentioned, where you actually said that you will proposals and the mitigating measures will actually considerably. I believe that you mentioned

1:11:40

increase enclosure of the public right of ways at several different points. And how does the applicant

1:11:52

interpret that enclosure in terms of its impacts on landscape and visual facts?

1:12:01

David Stoker, for the applicant,

1:12:05

I would just like to clarify that that includes enclosure relates to enclosing the solar area, rather than

1:12:14

specific public rights of way. I

1:12:23

Okay, so in terms if, if it links to the solar the the

1:12:30

solar array area, rather than the public right of way itself,

1:12:36

can the applicant please clarify

1:12:39

where within the Indicative site layout plan and

1:12:45

landscape strategy plan,

1:12:47

I see areas where additional proposed native shrub mix and proposed planting is being

1:12:58

proposed close to public rights of waste. So how has the impact of that new planting and additional planting been taken into consideration?

1:13:13

David Stoker for the applicant, so that new planning has been introduced to

1:13:20

for a combination of reasons, to provide visual mitigation in relation to specific receptors. So in relation to the residential receptors we discussed earlier,

1:13:35

it's

1:13:37

also been introduced to provide

1:13:42

visual mitigation

1:13:45

also, as I mentioned earlier, in relation to views of the on site substation in Bess and it's also been introduced to provide linkages and connectivity between

1:13:58

existing areas of mature woodland

1:14:02

and plantations within the solar rear area.

1:14:12

Thank you, Mr. Stoke,

1:14:14

just as an example of the point that I'm trying to get at you mentioned in figure 1.4, indicative satellite out plan in relation to footpath s,

1:14:28

scheme eight, one,

1:14:31

I believe that if I am reading your proposals correctly in the satellite plan correctly, that there are proposed low land meadows and proposed native shrubs with trees along the new indicative,

permissive path route that is proposed. So has that been? Is? Is that an example of the enclosure that you were talking about earlier?

1:14:59

David.

1:15:00

Stoker for the applicant, the enclosure

1:15:03

I was talking about earlier specifically related to the perimeter hedgerow, rather than introduced

1:15:11

new native shrub planting.

1:15:16

Okay, so

1:15:18

I write in assuming that actually, on this specific example, the enclosure will actually target the proposed new footpath, or will it just target the satellite? I know that one is next to the other, so I'm trying to actually understand how the planting will affect the footpath, not just the solar ray area.

1:15:44

Thank you for that clarification. So could I just take a moment to just

1:15:49

have a closer look at the drawing? Certainly, certainly thank you. Thank

1:16:19

so just to stories and with apologies. Would you mind just reminding of the specific footpath or Pro that you're you're interested in here? So we can look so yes, certainly. As an example, I'm looking at sheet one of seven figure, 1.4 indicative set layout plan. And I am looking at indicative, permissive path route to connect existing footpath is scheme eight, one, which is along the mid for the dike.

1:16:48

So taking that as an example, and taking into consideration the response we just heard from Mr. Stokes in terms of the enclosure being targeted on the solar array area, how will the planting on that specific

1:17:05

route will be carried out in order to enclose the solar panel area, and is it to in order to include solar panel there? Or will it actually to protect the footpath as well as the solar panel area? So on what sides is the planting going to go?

1:17:24

David Stoke, off the applicant, the

1:17:27

planting along mid fodder bike or the car dike

1:17:34

is already the existing planting is already quite mature and tall and relatively complete

1:17:43

so, so there is no proposed additional one is that there's some small amount of gapping up, but that wouldn't notably

1:17:54

affect enclosure

1:17:57

along that boundary, Okay, due to the level of detail in the maps, which I think that we're all struggling a little bit at the moment with. Now can actually ask for the applicant to provide in relation to public rights of ways

1:18:15

where additional planting is going to be proposed for those and that probably will solve this issue so that we can have a better understanding of the impacts of that. So the applicant happy to I might just invite Mr. Turnbull to make a few points that may help to clarify and then potentially focus the action that we take away on this. So I'll just introduce Mr. Turnbull now. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

1:18:40

Colin Turnbull for the applicant, it may be useful just if we quickly call up the public right of way figure from the ES, the reference is a PP, 273,

1:18:54

this shows the existing public rights of way in the area now the path that

1:19:01

the that

1:19:03

we seem to be talking about along the dike, the need the new permissive path, that's a specific proposal of the applicants. So that's why it doesn't feature in the existing public rights away network.

1:19:19

Should,

1:19:22

yeah,

1:19:23

may we share a PP to some for you?

1:19:28

Yes, please. Thank you.

1:19:36

Thank you. So if we can zoom into the solar array area, please?

1:19:42

So

1:19:44

if we could, yeah, zoom in

1:19:46

a little bit more, please.

1:19:50

So what we can see with the labels, hopefully we can all see that

1:19:56

you were slash one two at the top. And.

1:20:00

And that's a stub that's unusable and accessible at the moment, it would require access across a bridge.

1:20:11

The permissive path proposal

1:20:14

is to extend that considerably, and that was something we've done in response to North Coast even District Council

1:20:22

request during the pre application stage. So we've, we've sort of proposed that so, so I think the focus of your intended action point is to explain our

1:20:34

proposed planting along the existing public right of way network such as UN nine, one and other existing probably rights away, but maybe

1:20:47

we could have clarification. Thank you, Mr. Turnbull, yes, that that is correct, and I just picked that one as an example, but the example that you have quoted is a very significant one as well as it would be, for example, kk LT four, two, kk LT five, one, which are linked with the access road. So those are other examples as well. So as I said, I think that perhaps if we could get that

1:21:20

document or that overview from the applicant in terms of how the planting will be proposed on the public rights of way, and how that will affect the experience of those that will be significant,

1:21:37

particularly For those that I have actually mentioned,

1:21:41

linked with the access corridor and linked with above ground structures, and that is why I mentioned that specific addition of footpath. I do believe that in terms of the experience will be different for all the footpath in public rights of way that are crossed by the cable route. However, the solar array and the bespoke access road will have a different sort of impact because of me being above ground structures, obviously. So I would focus on those, particularly in Mark of the applicant. Thank you. So yes, now that's that's helpful clarification, understood, we'll take that away. Okay? Thank you very much for that.

1:22:28

Is everyone okay for us to continue for half an hour longer?

1:22:35

If you have any problem with that, please raise your hands. I will promise to try and be brief and break latest at half past one.

1:22:45

I don't see any hands raised online or in the room, so I assume that everyone is okay with that. So I would like to now ask if there are any I would like to invite local host authorities to comment on issues to do with landscape and visual so if I could invite first Lincolnshire county council, please

1:23:07

Miss Hall. Yes, there's Stephanie Hall Lincolnshire county council set. We've got Mr. Brown with us from aah consultant. He's acting based on behalf of Lincolnshire county council and North Stephen. So he sits to my immediate left, so I'll let him speak on behalf of both authorities. Thank you.

1:23:26

Thank you. Ms Hall,

1:23:28

thank you. Oliver Brown, for the host, authorities.

1:23:33

So

1:23:35

we've provided a detailed review the applicants. Lbia and

1:23:42

landscape and visual aspects of the submission, which was appended to the local impact report, which I'm assuming that you've seen. So I don't want to sort of go into too much detail and rehash a lot of that. I think that that detailed review sets out where we have either queries or issues with the applicant's information, and similarly, also sets out the position of the authorities as well. We have been in conversation with the applicants. We have a meeting set up for next week to discuss areas where we have where we're looking for clarifications, or where we have some disagreements, essentially on points, and I think the discussions that we've been held today as well will also feed into that as well, and that will probably manifest itself into the statement of common ground as they'll be developing as we go along.

1:24:36

As part of the review, we highlighted areas where we had some issues with the assessment,

1:24:44

which I can briefly run through now, or it's again conscious of the time.

1:24:50

But we do want to sort of state that you know, the scale and massing of this development is obviously a concern in both landscape and visual terms. So our judgment.

1:25:00

It will have significant adverse effects, which is highlighted within within the applicant cell via also in terms of the cumulative effects. And again, we go into a little bit more detail. In our review, there are no

1:25:15

landscape and visual cumulative effects identified. Now we've been looking at multiple sites across this region, and we're talking sort of, you know, the West Midlands includes, sort of Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, across a very vast area. We've got a bit of an unprecedented situation at the moment where we have

1:25:35

multiple large scale sole developments occurring pretty much at the same time, whether both in the system or they are have already been approved, and that's a big concern for us, and how that's captured and understood within

1:25:51

the assessments. It's a little bit of an evolving

1:25:56

field, I suppose, in terms of how landscape architects assess something at this sort of scale, the only thing that I've witnessed in my almost 25 year career is the

1:26:06

wind farm sort of rush that happened in the sort of early 2000s at the moment. In my experience, and from what I've seen across the UK, the

1:26:17

extent of the number of developments of this type in the same region is unprecedented. So that's a real concern that we have. I can provide more information. There's more information within our detailed review in regards to that, and I think we'll probably do within our written summary is just do a little sort of a paragraph or two in regards to our concerns, in regards to that,

1:26:41

and then in terms of some of the issues that have been discussed today, we share the concern regarding mitigation planting itself having potential adverse effects to views.

1:26:56

It's it's always a tricky balance, as a landscape architect, balancing that mitigation screening and yet altering that baseline view. But we share those concerns, particularly with the residential properties in very close proximity to the to the red line boundary,

1:27:13

and while there is some offset demonstrated from the above ground development from those properties, the scale of the development and with the mitigation planting, it does, as we saw on the image previously, it does significantly alter that view for the visual receptors,

1:27:34

similarly for some of the public rights of way users, as Well concerns about shortening, foreshortening the views that in this currently very open landscape. And it's a difficult balance, balance to take. But what I think we were looking for is maybe a little bit more information. It's something where we discuss what distance of those offsets, what are we looking at here? How? What does that, you know, actually mean in the real world?

1:27:59

So that's a key concern of ours as well.

1:28:04

And then

1:28:07

I think so how we want to sort of move forward is to have those discussions with the applicant team, see where we can understand where some of the issues that we've got with the Ibia can maybe be resolved. Maybe this is information missing, because there's a few technical points as well that we want to discuss with them that probably don't need to go through today, unless you would like to Okay. Mr. Brown, thank you for that. I have been taking notes of your your presentation to examination so far, and it seems to me that actually it's

1:28:39

your concerns that you are putting forward to us now, at the moment, is a real mix between, I think, topics that are

1:28:49

likely to take some time and some questioning, and

1:28:53

some topics that perhaps there might be one or two questions that you might have that might be able to Solve them more quickly. As I said, I am mindful of the time. Now, what I was going to suggest is, and I was going to ask you, Mr. Brown, if there are specific topics and specific questions that you would particularly like to raise with me now, and that I can ask for any comments from the applicant that we can take

1:29:23

quickly, and then we can go into some of the what I suspect are going to be more meaty issues that you might have, which I suspect are more linked with cumulative effects and how those have been taken into consideration, and landscaping, visual approaches in general, which we might be able to take after a lunch break. So I would ask for a sense from you in terms of

1:29:49

how that would play.

1:29:52

Thank you. Oliver Brown, from the host authorities,

1:29:58

I think because we have a.

1:30:00

Such a variety of issues and and sort of questions and queries that we're looking at getting getting to the bottom of,

1:30:10

and we would need more time. I think we need a lot of time to go through, okay, one for that is probably us taking it off and having that discussion, happy to list out, okay, a summary of those as part of the written Okay, in that case, then Mr. Brown, if I may ask, and with Miss Hall's permission as well, if I, if I, if I, if I, will then defer your questions to after a lunch break. And actually, may I ask now if any other of the host authorities present today? So that's Northwest Stephen county council in Boston Borough Council, if there are any burning questions that they have now that we can take before we break for lunch, which I did say that we were aiming to do latest at half past one, or if you would prefer to actually wait until after lunch as well when we have a more thorough discussion.

1:30:58

Stephanie Hall, Lincolnshire county council, just, for my part, obviously, give my permission

1:31:04

for that. I think it's probably useful lunch of the useful use of the lunch adjournment for us to sit down with Mr. Brown and prioritize what points we can usefully use a little bit of your time this afternoon, Sir, to explore and which points may be better being deferred, either to be made in writing or to being first explored through a meeting between Mr. Brown and his opposite number, and needn't trouble you at all, potentially, if they get resolved. So if we can use the lunch German just to headline a handful of points that we want to major on, and we'll come and make those points and ask those questions this afternoon and then the rest for another day. Perfect. Yes, I agree with that. Thank you very much. Miss Hall. Now, can I ask if northeast Stephen county council or Boston Borough Council have any burning questions that they would like to ask now, or if, similarly to what we have heard, would rather actually wait for a bigger slot in the afternoon. Yes. Thank you very much. Constanza Bell, for North Coast Stephen and we obviously jointly instruct Mr. Brown, so I think we would also benefit from the opportunity to sit down with him and we'll hold things over until after lunch, if that's all right. Thank you absolutely in that case, then Miss Hall and Miss Bell, can I ask you to liaise with each other and with Mr. Brown, and in that case, then I will break for lunch now, then would,

1:32:29

would an hour be so would,

1:32:33

because I'm mindful of the time. So

1:32:36

if we could then break,

1:32:39

if you could then break for an hour until a quarter past two then and then we'll resume. Then. If anyone has any objections to that, please raise your hands, either in the room or online.

1:32:54

I don't see any hands raised in that case, then this meeting is now adjourned and it will resume at a quarter past two. Thank you very much. You.