

File Name: OES_SEPT3_ISH2_PT1.mp4

File Length: 01:32:13

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:06:00 - 00:00:16:06

Good afternoon everyone. It's now 3:00 and it's time for me to open this issue specific hearing. Is everyone hearing me clearly? I'm getting a bit of an echo.

00:00:17:29 - 00:00:18:21

Okay,

00:00:20:09 - 00:00:28:03

I've just checked that those attending virtually can see and hear clearly. If you can just give us the hands ups using the function within teams.

00:00:29:21 - 00:00:32:04

Yeah, I'm saying that as well. Thank you very much.

00:00:34:23 - 00:00:42:05

Um, I just verify with, uh, our case manager that the live stream and the recording has commenced.

00:00:44:08 - 00:00:59:17

Yeah. Thumbs up at the back. Thank you very much. Uh, my name is Edwin Maund. I'm a chartered town planner and planning inspector. I've been appointed by the secretary of state with the lead member of the panel to examine this application. And I'll now hand over to my colleague to introduce himself.

00:01:01:01 - 00:01:14:25

Thank you. My name is Alex Jack. I am a chartered transport planner and a planning inspector, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of examining inspectors to examine this application.

00:01:16:24 - 00:01:22:19

Yeah. As this morning, I'll just ask Mr. Jack to go through a few housekeeping matters.

00:01:29:03 - 00:01:34:27

Thank you. So, firstly, can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent?

00:01:36:28 - 00:01:46:29

If you need the facilities, the toilets can be found either through the double doors at the back of the room, or alternatively, walk down the stairs and they will be on your left.

00:01:49:18 - 00:02:08:09

We've been informed that there will not be a fire alarm test today. If the fire alarm sounds. Please exit the building using one of the marked fire exits at either end of this floor. The meeting point is on the road opposite this building. Are there any members of the press here today?

00:02:12:03 - 00:02:12:24

Okay.

00:02:15:19 - 00:02:23:18

So this meeting will follow the agenda published on the National Infrastructure Planning website on the 26th of August, 2025.

00:02:25:19 - 00:02:50:22

It would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you, and the applicant will also display this agenda on the screen. The agenda is for a guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions are asked and responded to.

00:02:52:08 - 00:03:16:18

But if the discussions can be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize the matters and defer other matters to further written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked or require time to get the information requested, then can you please indicate that you will respond in writing?

00:03:19:11 - 00:03:37:14

Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue and some of you are joining us virtually on Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that, however you have decided to attend today, you'll be given a fair opportunity to participate.

00:03:39:03 - 00:04:11:17

A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the One Earth Solar Farm Project section of the National Infrastructure Planning website, as soon as practicable after the hearing is finished. With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into the microphone stating your name and who you are representing each time you speak. If you are not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone. So please wait for one of these to be brought to you before you speak.

00:04:13:24 - 00:04:41:07

A link to the Planning Inspectorate Privacy Notice was provided in the notification for this hearing. We assume that everybody here today has familiarise themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to Mrs. Haraway, our case manager, if you have any questions about this.

00:04:45:26 - 00:04:54:01

So moving on to agenda item two. Um, I'll now briefly explain the purpose of this issue. Specific hearing.

00:04:56:22 - 00:05:30:15

This issue specific hearing today will cover a series a series of environmental matters relating to the application. The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in section 91 of the Planning Act, 2008. It is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations, to enable adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that an interested party has had a fair chance to put their case.

00:05:33:07 - 00:05:41:18

As indicated in the agenda. Questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by the other panel member.

00:05:44:03 - 00:05:58:11

In addition to this, the issue specific hearing today provides an opportunity for the issues raised by the interested parties, and in particular the differences between them, to be explored further by the examining authority.

00:06:08:12 - 00:07:04:00

It is for the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations. Our aim is to use our powers of control over over the conduct of the hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible, whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence. We have identified the matters to be considered at this issue specific hearing and those on which we require further information, and these are set out in the agenda that was published in advance of this hearing, participants should note that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the Planning Inspectorate by deadline three, which is Tuesday the 16th of September.

00:07:09:03 - 00:07:16:14

Thank you. So I'll come now to the parties who are present and ask them to introduce themselves. And I'll start with the applicant.

00:07:18:23 - 00:07:50:08

Good afternoon sir. My name is Richard Griffiths, partner at law firm Pinsent Masons LLP, representing the applicant, One Earth Solar Farm Limited. I'm joined by my colleague to my left, Lexis Common, and together we'll be responding on all points. Uh, on, on on today's agenda, we're also joined by various representatives of the applicant's consultant team, either in person or online. And I propose that we will introduce, introduced those consultants. As we progress through your agenda.

00:07:51:03 - 00:08:00:17

Thank you. And if I can start here on my right with the councils, if you could introduce yourselves first, please.

00:08:02:15 - 00:08:03:27

Yes. Good afternoon.

00:08:04:02 - 00:08:21:12

Russell Clarkson, development management team manager representing West Lindsey District Council. To my immediate right is Miss Danielle Peck, senior development management officer. And to my left, Mr. John Barker, associate director at Atkins Wireless. Thank you sir.

00:08:22:26 - 00:08:26:20

Thank you. If I can then move to your right.

00:08:31:02 - 00:08:37:12

Good afternoon. Simon Betts, Newark and Sherwood district Council. Um, planning major projects. So sorry.

00:08:37:14 - 00:08:43:09

For clarity. And representing your consumer district council. Um, I'll also let my colleague to my left introduce himself.

00:08:46:12 - 00:08:48:17

Good afternoon. My name is Oliver Brown.

00:08:48:19 - 00:08:59:28

I'm a landscape architect with Arch consultants. Uh, I'm here today representing, uh, four host authorities. Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, Newark and Sherwood and Bassetlaw.

00:09:03:01 - 00:09:06:19

Thank you. I come now to Lincoln County Council.

00:09:07:13 - 00:09:25:21

Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Constanza Bell of Council. And sitting to my left is Miss Alison Richards of Lincolnshire County Council. I think policy manager is the right job title. And we will also be relying on Mr. Oliver Brown, who's already introduced himself. Thank you.

00:09:26:09 - 00:09:29:03

Thank you. I'll come to Mr. Fox.

00:09:30:23 - 00:09:33:17

My name is Stephen Fox. I'm a resident of North Clifton.

00:09:34:12 - 00:09:35:05

Thank you.

00:09:37:03 - 00:09:39:16

As a fox resident of North Clifton.

00:09:40:10 - 00:10:09:14

Thank you. Um, I know that there's other people in the audience behind, but, um, I'll ask you to introduce yourselves if it's necessary later on. Um, now, I know that there are, again, additional parties virtually, but again, so that we can get on. Um, are there any other parties who wish to introduce themselves at this stage? Uh, so that we know that you're in attendance?

00:10:12:28 - 00:10:15:06

Okay, so, Mr. Lawrence.

00:10:15:22 - 00:10:16:07

Yeah.

00:10:16:09 - 00:10:16:28

Mr. Lawrence.

00:10:17:00 - 00:10:17:15

Uh, planning.

00:10:17:17 - 00:10:32:06

And infrastructure manager at Nottinghamshire County Council, uh, will be represented by Oliver Brown this afternoon. Uh, and other officers of the council will be joining in person tomorrow to discuss those issues. So this is just to note that we're here and we'll be there in person tomorrow for those items.

00:10:33:09 - 00:10:35:25

Thank you. Uh, Mr. White.

00:10:39:06 - 00:10:50:27

Hi. My name is David White, and I'm representing the saying no to one of Solar Farm Action Group and save our Heritage Villages and the parish of North and South Clifton.

00:10:52:24 - 00:10:53:28

Thank you, Mr. White.

00:10:58:14 - 00:11:06:10

I can see another hand up, but unfortunately I can't read the name initials of CM, so. Hello. Thank you.

00:11:06:12 - 00:11:13:00

Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Carey Murphy and I'm a spatial planning manager representing Anglian Water.

00:11:14:29 - 00:11:15:24

Thank you.

00:11:26:15 - 00:11:32:03

Okay. So thank you for that everyone. I'll now move then to the, uh,

00:11:33:21 - 00:12:04:00

just a couple of points prior to the agenda. I don't know whether you will have noticed, but we have taken a procedural decision to accept a letter from Robert Jenrick MP that is now part of the examination library. The reference is A.S. 056. So should you wish to? You obviously have the opportunity to respond at the next deadline. I just thought I'd make a note of that, uh, for you so that everyone's aware. So if we then now move on to the topics before.

00:12:04:02 - 00:12:45:12

As landscape and visual as the main heading for the moment. And this is now part of E's chapter 11 revision four, which is Rep 2026 and Rep 2027 is the tracked version. And what we will seek to do in the first instance is get views of the parties of the suitability of it, two km search area and a broader understanding of the effect on the landscape character areas. So I'd just like to confirm with uh, parties That our understanding is that that two kilometer search area was agreed during the pre consultation period.

00:12:45:14 - 00:12:51:22

So can I just check that that understanding is correct with everyone if I just come to the applicant in the first instance.

00:12:53:00 - 00:13:25:26

Thank you sir. Rich Griffiths on behalf of the applicant. Yes, that is correct. And it is recorded in the statements of Common Ground with the authorities. Uh, and, um, I can give you the reference numbers for those. That's helpful where this is recorded. Um, so in respect of Lincolnshire County Council, uh, Stone of Common Ground, it's ref oh seven, hyphen zero two. And that's in the document library rep two. Hyphen 061. In the Statement of Common Ground with Nottinghamshire County Council.

00:13:26:18 - 00:13:56:23

Uh, that's ref oh five hyphen oh two. And that's in examination library reference rep two. Hyphen 063. In respect of Wen's West Lindsey District Council. It's at reference 0502, and that's in the library at rep two. Hyphen 6065. In respect to the statement of common ground with Bassetlaw District Council, it's at ref. Hyphen zero six. Hyphen zero two in the library rep two. Hyphen 067.

00:13:58:27 - 00:14:11:05

And then, in respect to the stemming of common ground with Newark and Sherwood District Council, it's at 0402, and that's in the library at rep two. Hyphen 069.

00:14:13:28 - 00:14:22:14

Thank you. And so moving on from that, um, is it also agreed that the, um.

00:14:25:17 - 00:14:32:12

Extent of visibility, uh, is limited beyond that two kilometer search area?

00:14:39:20 - 00:14:40:17

Mr. Brown.

00:14:41:23 - 00:15:06:19

Olive brown for the, uh, the host authorities? Um, yes. I mean, just to just to clarify the point. Yeah, we discussed, um, the the study area at the, um, the consultation stage, uh, and agreed, two kilometres. Um, there may be some potential views beyond two kilometres, but if there are, it's just such a distance, uh, in this landscape that we wouldn't perceive there would be any significant effects from that.

00:15:08:07 - 00:15:09:23

Thank you for that clarity.

00:15:11:09 - 00:15:26:06

So what I then need to really try and understand. Bearing in mind there is agreement on those two main points, is the position that the councils appear to be taking in. Um.

00:15:28:23 - 00:16:10:19

Seeking, you know, a broader understanding of the case that you are making because and it's not entirely consistent. It seems to me across all of the councils Nottinghamshire, in Lincolnshire. I think and I'm paraphrasing here, saying there's a significant effect on landscape at scale. And Newark and Sherwood is saying all areas would be subject to significant residual effects. So what I would like to try and understand from you is, in light of the agreement that beyond two kilometres, you are agreeing that the visual effects are minimal.

00:16:12:16 - 00:16:16:22

What is it that you are saying to us in that broader term?

00:16:20:19 - 00:16:58:11

Oliver Brown from the the host authorities. So just to clarify, in terms of the landscape effects, um, we've we've had several discussions with the applicant's team. In regards to the findings of the Elvia, um, we are broadly in agreement with the findings of the landscape, uh, effects essentially across the, uh, the order limits, significant, um, landscape effects have been identified, which we agree with, uh, where we had some queries with regard in regards to landscape character areas which obviously span across and go beyond the, um, the order limits.

00:16:58:23 - 00:17:31:14

Uh, there's a variety there in terms of the assessment of, of effects, uh, and through discussions, uh, it's been clarified, uh, which we agree with is that the variety of um, of significant of effects, significance of effects across those characters is due to the varying levels of above ground development. So within some character areas we have a direct effect across the, the that area. Some others, the majority of that character area will be made up of mitigation or would not have above ground development.

00:17:32:14 - 00:17:48:20

The the wider just. Just to clarify, I think because the point you may be looking at is where we're looking at the wider effects is we're looking at cumulatively. We're not suggesting that that this site, this, this development, um, in isolation would have those regional effects.

00:17:55:21 - 00:18:01:06

The other councils that you're not representing in agreement to that or do you have a different view?

00:18:08:08 - 00:18:28:09

Russell Clark's on behalf of Westland Sea. Yes. I think we'd be in agreement with that. I think, you know, in terms of our representations, our view in terms of beyond two kilometres is particularly in regard to the cumulative impacts and the specific massing of nationally significant development within this area. So we we would agree with that, sir. Yes.

00:18:29:06 - 00:18:30:23

Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

00:18:39:05 - 00:18:54:17

And again, just for clarity, obviously the effect changes over time with the mitigation, uh, improving over time as its it grows. So.

00:18:56:18 - 00:19:13:00

Does the concern that the council has identified also reduce over time as that mitigation, uh, improves or comes into fruition is perhaps a better way of doing it?

00:19:14:22 - 00:19:47:29

Well, Oliver Brown from the host authorities. Yeah. Obviously the mitigation will reduce the level of effects. However, we still have a concern that beyond 15 years and beyond. Once the the mitigation planting is likely established across the order limits, there's still been identified moderate adverse effects. So we should still see that as an important point to make. Um, so, you know, that's that's that's a large area that will be, um, unable to be fully mitigated to not be significant.

00:20:02:05 - 00:20:06:21

Okay. And again, to West Lindsey. Uh, agree with that.

00:20:08:28 - 00:20:12:03

Uh, Russell Clarkson, on behalf of Western. Uh. Yes, sir.

00:20:12:22 - 00:20:13:13

Thank you.

00:20:27:07 - 00:20:49:25

So you've obviously mentioned it already, Mr. Brown. The interconnectivity between this site and the other solar schemes. Um, just trying to understand the council's approach to that. Um, if you're agreeing that beyond two kilometres, this site is not having a

00:20:51:14 - 00:21:06:00

a noticeable effect and there aren't other solar schemes within that two kilometre zone of influence. Explain to me the how the cumulative element comes into being.

00:21:09:07 - 00:21:13:10

Thank you. Oliver Brown from the host authorities. Um, so

00:21:15:01 - 00:21:50:24

the key concern is the change of this landscape, but not within a localized area. It is across a regional area. If we look at, say, Lincolnshire, I believe there are five national character areas that span across this region. Um, there is there isn't a um, a region wide character assessment, essentially. But if we take those five, uh, national character area assessments, currently they're showing common attributes.

00:21:50:26 - 00:22:10:11

This is an agricultural landscape. It's got sparse settlement. There's a high level of tranquillity across this landscape. There's no mention in those in regards to solar development, especially not at the scale that we're looking at at the moment. Um, and also, if we're looking at the time scales of this change to this landscape also. So

00:22:12:10 - 00:22:42:27

what the two key concerns, one is in the landscape terms, the change of land use. So to calibrate that, if we look at the character assessments, even at local level roots in the national character area assessments, we judged that once these sites are built out, both the approved ones and the ones that are in the system at the moment, that solar and renewables will become a defining characteristic of this landscape, it will change.

00:22:43:05 - 00:23:17:10

Um, and I just want to stress that in terms of the guidance, a change to the landscape does not necessarily have to be seen. So we're talking land use. One of the key elements of this landscape is the agricultural land use. So that is going to change on a scale that is unprecedented both in the region and also in my almost 25 years as a landscape architect, I've not seen the potential change at this scale, um, across such an area visually.

00:23:17:16 - 00:23:50:02

Um, we're not suggesting that there'd be one point where you would have into visibility between one Earth and another site. But what our key concern is, is this sequential views, as people are moving through this landscape and the perception and the erosion of the agricultural rural characteristic. So without travelling along roads, potentially on public rights of way, um, and also for communities, um, coming in and out of settlements or from, from isolated areas as well.

00:23:50:09 - 00:24:36:29

So it's that it's that regional change. Um, and, you know, in terms of the guidance, there's nothing I'm aware of that the Landscape Institute was provided on this. I think this we're all sort of finding our feet a little bit on this. Um, and, you know, the cumulative effects were normally looking at quite a defined area. But again, just going back to my, you know, the entirety of my career, I've never seen a change to a landscape Gape potentially as what we're looking at now cumulatively. So really it's looking at what at what point is that tipping point in terms of when solar or renewables completely

changes that key characteristic of landscape? We're not suggesting for a second that agriculture is not going to be a dominant feature.

00:24:37:08 - 00:24:49:23

But if I was redoing the character assessments now as a landscape architect, once these schemes are built out, large scale solar will become a key part of the landscape, a key characteristic.

00:24:58:04 - 00:25:11:22

Is it possible for the applicant? Display the plan showing the other, uh, solar schemes relative to this one? It came in as part of Rep 174, I believe. Uh, figure two.

00:25:44:18 - 00:26:14:21

So just to expand a bit further on on what you've said, um, is it very much this area is that annotated on this plan that is giving you cause for concern? Uh, or is it beyond that? Because obviously there are further solar schemes further south as well. Um, so just for clarity, for my understanding of what it is you're saying.

00:26:15:14 - 00:26:20:25

Does this plan effectively cover the area of concern that you have, or is it something beyond this?

00:26:23:04 - 00:26:54:19

Thank you. Oliver Brown for the host authorities. Um, this this area is of key concern. This is obviously a concentration of of of of development. But if we start to look much wider than this countywide, you know, we're seeing, uh, national grid schemes that are being proposed several within Lincolnshire. Um, we're looking at, you know, um, solar and battery developments at a town and country planning scale as well across this region.

00:26:54:21 - 00:27:13:23

I realise we have to draw a line at some point because we could we could go on. But yes, I would suggest that this is the key area of concern because of the multiple schemes in this area. But if we do start looking at across this landscape, you know, this, this, this change is noticeable. Um, and that is also a concern as well.

00:27:15:29 - 00:27:18:18

So, um,

00:27:20:05 - 00:27:24:22

where in national policy can you point to me to say that, uh.

00:27:27:09 - 00:27:53:09

There is a, a problem or a, an area where the scheme trips up because even if we accept what you're saying, um, the accumulation of schemes in this location, is there anything in national policy that you can point us to us that says this shouldn't happen? Uh. Or not?

00:27:56:04 - 00:28:03:00

Olive brown for the, uh, the host authorities. Uh, we will take that away, and we will, uh, will provide a response, if that's okay.

00:28:03:29 - 00:28:14:26

Okay. We'll make a note of an action point to that effect. Thank you. Thank you. Um, So would West Lindsey wish to add anything further beyond that which Mr. Brown has said?

00:28:20:11 - 00:28:51:21

Crystal Clarkson, on behalf of West Lindsey District Council. Yes. I mean, we we we we share those concerns, sir. Um, this is the fifth such one of these developments within our district within a short period of time. And one of the things we feel is on that regional level, um, residents of our district are living, working environment. We've got people within our district that we're very concerned with. Will. These will become an unavoidable presence in their daily lives, I think, for residents of Gainsborough.

00:28:51:23 - 00:29:23:17

If you travel north, east or south, you're going to encounter these developments that are going to be very obvious presence. Um, we will return in writing on some of these points, but I think in terms of some of the issues you've raised and where it points it out. Um, certainly the written ministerial statement by Claire Coutinho. I think it was last year. Just talk about the cumulative impacts and specifically to cite Lincolnshire as one of those areas where they do seem to be grouping. So I would draw your attention to that, sir, but we will follow that up in more detail in writing.

00:29:24:05 - 00:29:25:03

Thank you sir.

00:29:26:00 - 00:29:26:23

Thank you.

00:29:31:06 - 00:29:40:18

Okay, then I'll open it up to the floor to see if anyone has any additional points that I'd want to make on those specific aspects of this agenda item.

00:29:43:06 - 00:29:45:20

No, I have a hand up, Mr. white.

00:29:52:12 - 00:30:23:15

So I forgot to put my camera on. Um, I just want to agree with, uh, what Mr. Brown was saying. Uh, I think, um, I agree with pretty much there's a really good remarks. Um, there are so many parts of the countryside around here where you can easily see past two kilometers, in particular high points such as where the footpaths are, where the Roman fort is. And, uh, look, that's looking east towards Lincoln Cathedral. Uh, and that's very beautiful.

00:30:23:17 - 00:30:43:27

And also looking, uh, west towards flatbread and also, um, the sheer scale of it and, uh, I just want I think I've said this before, this solar farm doesn't affect the landscape. And this goes with what Mr.

Brown is saying. It doesn't affect the landscape. It becomes the landscape. And that's the big issue here.

00:30:48:00 - 00:30:49:05

Thank you, Mr. White.

00:31:03:13 - 00:31:06:05

Okay, so if I can return to Mr. Griffiths.

00:31:07:02 - 00:31:43:08

Thank you, sir. Richard Griffiths for the applicant. If I pass to you, I think Mr. Ben Gurney, uh, from, um, the applicant team will discuss more about the cumulative impacts. But just to pick up on a few points on the sequential point, we have a question later on on that. So we'll probably go into more detail on that. But uh, at a high level point is that, um, we will have such a minimal or negligible, uh, effect that people walking along those, um, sequentially, um, there will be no cumulative effects in that respect.

00:31:43:10 - 00:32:13:26

But we'll come on to that in more detail. Um, in terms of I mean, I look forward to seeing the council's written point summary on the on your question on the policy in NPS and one, um, as I think the answer, uh, would be that it won't help them. Um, and you've also got the critical national priority point, and landscape does not fall within one of the exceptions to that test. But we'll wait to see the council's written answer to your question.

00:32:14:06 - 00:32:18:10

But I'll pass down to Mr. Ben Gurney, who will talk about the cumulative impacts.

00:32:20:22 - 00:32:26:04

Good afternoon Ben. On behalf of the applicant. So there was reference to the.

00:32:26:27 - 00:32:27:12

Regional.

00:32:27:14 - 00:33:02:01

Character area assessments and the national character assessments. I just wanted to point out that the, um, the applicant's of the view that it would not be fundamentally changed as a result of the proposed development in isolation or cumulatively, landscape character, by its very definition, by its very nature, by its definition is is dynamic and constantly evolving. So I've published landscape character assessment is only ever a snapshot in time. Therefore, whether a published landscape character assessment is outdated or needs updating is not an appropriate way of measuring landscape.

00:33:02:03 - 00:33:51:10

Impact of a new development with regard to the national character area 48 the Trent and Beaver Vales which the site is situated within. Agricultural is agriculture is noted as being dominant land use, and that will very likely remain true with the proposed development and the cumulative schemes. Coal fired power stations are also noted as being immense and exerting a visual influence over a wider

area, in part due to the associated pylons and power lines. Now, with the shift from coal and gas fired power stations to solar, the proposed development and cumulative schemes are likely to exert the same visual influence, but nonetheless the influence of energy infrastructure is already acknowledged as being a key part of this landscape, and this is also reflected in the regional landscape character assessments.

00:33:55:23 - 00:34:11:01

Is it fair to say that the effect would be the same. They're very different in appearance. The soul is likely to be much closer to the ground and possibly a much larger surface area. So it is. Is it a fair comparison?

00:34:15:12 - 00:34:38:27

But not. I don't think the applicant, uh, that we would say that they were are the same. I think the point to make is that the landscape is perceived as a, as energy infrastructure is perceived already in the landscape. It's not a purely kind of rural landscape without any influence of energy infrastructure. The pylons and and such are already part of this landscape.

00:35:07:10 - 00:35:08:05

Thank you.

00:35:12:06 - 00:35:19:10

Sorry I didn't catch you there, Mr. Fox. Isn't it fair to say that the power stations have long moved on?

00:35:23:18 - 00:35:25:23

I'm sorry, I'm not following the question, but.

00:35:25:25 - 00:35:26:10

The visual.

00:35:26:12 - 00:35:32:05

Effect of the power stations is not a fair comparison. They are long gone, basically.

00:35:36:05 - 00:35:53:09

Okay. I mean, I understand the point you're making, but equally, I understand the point that Mr. Gurney's made in that the the landscape character of the area includes energy infrastructure currently, albeit of a very different type. So I think that's the point he's making.

00:35:55:24 - 00:36:20:23

No longer there. Well, some of it is still there. The pylons are still there. The there are still some cooling towers, albeit less than there were following the recent demolition. Okay, so it is changing, isn't it? It's it's fluid. If you're a resident of North and South Clifton, I think it's probably 15 years since they disappeared. Okay. Thank you.

00:36:31:08 - 00:36:57:22

I can then move on to sort of item two. Then, in understanding the applicant's approach to and justification for the assessment being based on a temporary period. But before I do, I notice, um, I've

got a couple of additional hands up which I'm assuming are relating to, uh, the last point, Uh, I can't quite see the names. Initials, CW.

00:37:03:14 - 00:37:46:04

Uh, Craig Walker, uh, resident of North Clifton, uh, in relation to Mr. Gurney's comments about the landscape. Uh, I, I, I fail to see the comparisons. Uh, I, I accept that the landscape is constantly evolving, but the power stations are localized in the fact that they, they don't, uh, they can all encompass an area into a 360 degree view that they're, they're all there's nobody where they will totally surround some of these residents.

00:37:46:28 - 00:37:51:16

So I, I, I can't understand the comparison. said.

00:37:54:16 - 00:37:57:04

Okay. Thank you. And Mr. White.

00:38:01:04 - 00:38:41:03

Hi. Yes, thank you, David White, for the action group. I just want to agree with what Mr. Fox was saying. And Mr. Walker was saying also, I think the last statements about comparing the power stations, everything. Um, I think it is missing the point. I think what some people would say is missing the point slightly. Uh, what Craig said about 360 degree view is completely right. I lived, uh, just a couple of miles from the power station, and, uh, it it was quite imposing, but you soon get used to it, and it's just one small section of, of of your view.

00:38:41:05 - 00:39:11:26

So if you're out walking north or walking east, you wouldn't necessarily see the power station. Um, but, uh, wherever you're walking Around here you would see the solar farm. I think also mentioned it was mentioned about the landscape's change, uh, around here, um, though this area has seen some developments, but they've all been part of, uh, what would be expected possibly in countryside developments. We've got poultry farms and things like that.

00:39:11:28 - 00:39:34:24

And there's a number of those and they fit quite nicely into the, into the landscape. And uh, you know, they're providing local employment and local businesses and people get used to seeing them. And again, they're not 360 degree views. Wherever you are around here, you would see the solar farm. It's not like that for, for for the other things that we've had around here.

00:39:36:21 - 00:39:43:13

So thank you. Thank you. I'll just then refer to Mr. Griffiths to see if there's any fallout you'd wish to make.

00:39:44:02 - 00:40:15:26

Thank. Thank you. Sir. I think the point that the applicant is making that, uh, We have to recognize in your assessment has to recognize that this landscape is a is a energy landscape as well as in our cultural landscape. And that is evidenced by the history of, um, the landscape. Um, and that is the

backdrop to the applicant assessment. Um, and that we've recognized that energy history, that energy landscape. Um, uh, and that's been, that's formulated as part of our assessment.

00:40:15:28 - 00:40:31:06

So we have to recognize that this is not purely an agricultural landscape there. There is an energy aspect to it. The current energy aspect to it is the overhead lines. Previously there are power stations in the area. Um, and that's, that's the form, the backdrop of our assessment.

00:40:32:18 - 00:40:33:11

Thank you.

00:40:40:06 - 00:41:11:21

Okay. So just then moving on to point two, um, Assessment being based on a temporary period. We know your response to the local Impact report, which is Rep 2083 on page five and again page 82 within the local Impact Report response. Um, but also, uh, response to our written question. 3.0.1. Um.

00:41:13:28 - 00:41:25:01

If the scheme had been assessed as permanent, are you able to advise? Would there have been any difference in the outcome or degree of significance that you would have concluded?

00:41:28:07 - 00:42:03:09

Richard Griffiths on behalf of the applicant, the answer is no. Um, it's going to go back a bit to explain that. Um, and also to, to highlight, um, the just, you know, the questions about the justification. Um, and so effectively MPs in three, um, clearly states that, uh, where a consent, uh, has a time period of operation, um, and doesn't give a it says 40 years is a typical, um, time period, but, uh, doesn't require a solar project to have a 40 year consent.

00:42:03:11 - 00:42:49:00

It can be shorter. It can be longer. Uh, and indeed, recent consent have granted, um, longer than 40 years, such as gate Burton at 60. Um, where a time period where the operation is time limited, then NPS in three says at paragraph 2.1.66 that a time limited consent where granted is described as temporary because there is a finite period for which it exists, after which the project would cease to have consent. That is, the policy position and, as I said, has been reflected in recent Secretary of State decisions where and in the case of Cape Burton, the Secretary of State, said that the 60 year lifespan is temporary and reversible for the majority of the land.

00:42:49:23 - 00:43:21:27

And we highlight that also in our planning statements as well. App hyphen 168. What this does not mean is that the land that the level of impact, um, uh, in our assessment has been reduced by virtue, by virtue of being, uh, time limited in this case to 60 years. So where the Elvia assessment has concluded that the proposed development would, for example, have a major impact. That is the assessment conclusion that has not then been diluted down to moderate.

00:43:21:29 - 00:44:01:19

However, in the planning balance, um, what you have to do is examining authority and what the Secretary of State has to do is, uh, have a note that there is a major. Well, taking that example, major impact on an aspect of the landscape, uh, for 60 years. But then you also have to apply, Um. Excuse me. Negative weight to that in your planning balance. But then you also then have to add a note in your planning balance that in 60 years plus, um, that um, impact, uh, would be reversible and therefore be removed and no, and therefore post 60 years, that impact would be there.

00:44:01:21 - 00:44:35:09

And then again you apply, uh, what weight uh, you consider is appropriate for that, uh, consideration. What you can't do is ignore the fact that in 60 years of 60 plus years time, that impact, um, won't be there. So that's the position we have. Not that any impacts have not been, uh, reduced as a result of the 60 years that we've assessed the impact that is the long term impact. But what the planning balance has to do is then have regard to the fact that the consent is time limited.

00:44:35:11 - 00:44:44:21

And so in, in this case, 60 years plus, the particular impact in impacting question would then be removed and you have to have regard to that.

00:44:50:14 - 00:45:08:27

Thank you. I think the councils in their representations took a slightly different stance to that. So I just be interested to hear what your views on what Mr. Griffiths has just said and whether you concur with it or have a different view.

00:45:13:13 - 00:45:55:28

Oliver Brown for the health authorities. Um, the comment that was made is relating to the assessment, uh, in relation to, to the EIA. So what we looked at is, is, is the guidance, um, and how that has been applied to the Elvia. Um, and clearly in the, the, the summaries and the conclusions in terms of the, the overall um effects, um, the the effects are talked about being partially reversible, which indicates that it's not a permanent in terms of the assessment.

00:45:56:06 - 00:46:01:15

Um, so that's the that's the position that we have taken essentially in regards to that comment.

00:46:05:26 - 00:46:10:18

Okay. And do any of the other councils wish to add anything further?

00:46:17:24 - 00:46:46:20

Russell clots and Baths of Westlands District Council. Yes. I mean this is something we we've we've raised our viewers that 60 year times go is acknowledged. Em one does refer to 40 and that isn't a a cap or a limit. But our view is with 60 years, it's such a significant period of time that this will be across several generations. Oceans and the impacts are, to all intents and purposes, you know, can be. Can be compared with with permanent impacts. So we we you know. That that is our position. So.

00:46:49:15 - 00:47:02:25

And do you consider that what the applicant has done is reflective of that or. Do you think that there would be something different that you would expect. Uh, as a consequence.

00:47:05:26 - 00:47:24:03

So Clarkston, West Lindsey, I think our view is that the position that it would be temporary is something that should be afforded limited if wait. And I think the applicant did say at the beginning that their assessment wouldn't have come out with a different result if they had treated as permanent, which, you know, we note and takeaways.

00:47:26:05 - 00:47:39:25

Okay. Thank you. You're looking at me, Mr. Brown, as you've got something further to say. You're just looking in my direction. Okay? Okay. Uh, does anyone else have any points that we wish to make? Mr. white?

00:47:43:13 - 00:48:34:03

All right. Uh, yes. Thank you. Uh, David White for the action group. Um, uh, I understand, uh, you know, the point about 60 years and what's been trying to be made here. We were told it was 40 years, by the way, when this all started, including at the first consultation. Uh, it was reduced to 60 years. Uh, without any, uh, without, uh, coming back to us or. Um, the other point I wanted to make is, um, does the applicant have first choice of what happens after the 60 years is up? Because we've heard that part of the, uh, agreements in place and some of these solar farms is that the, uh, you know, the applicants and the developers have, if you like, first dibs on what happens next.

00:48:40:05 - 00:48:42:10

Well, I'm not sure.

00:48:44:18 - 00:49:11:01

Well, I'm trying to trying to make the point I'm trying to make. Is it started at 40, then it moved to 60. And is it up to the applicant at the end of 60 years, whether it is returned to agriculture, or could the applicant suddenly decide that they want to continue use of it for other things, either a solar farm or something else, in which case it would be permanent and it would be up to the applicant, whether it is permanent or not.

00:49:14:12 - 00:49:51:14

I mean, I suspect it's similar to most planning applications that are granted that there is always the opportunity in the future for things to change. What we can't say is how they would change and what the future plans are for 60 years in the future. And so what all that we have before is and what we need to assess is the proposal that is before us as of now. And we can't, um, use a crystal ball to assume what might happen in 55 years time.

00:49:52:09 - 00:49:57:19

Um, we have to assess it on the basis of the application before us. Okay. Thank you.

00:50:00:17 - 00:50:02:18

Mr. Griffiths, do you wish to come back?

00:50:02:20 - 00:50:32:20

Thank you sir. Yes, I agree with what you just said, sir. Um, I mean, in short, um, the consent does have the 60 year, uh, requirement for decommission, and so, um, that is the should should the development consent order be granted? Um, uh, that is the that is the life operational life of this project. Um, the only way it could be extended would be through a variation, which would have to go through the usual planning process.

00:50:32:22 - 00:51:04:05

Um, uh, about the consent will be, uh, would have that 60 year cut off point. That's the first point. And the second point, uh, in terms of, um, uh, own lease arrangements, they are uh, they do not be go beyond that 60 year points. They marry up with the development consent order. But the key critical point here is the development consent order itself, should it be granted, has that 60 year point and a decommissioning management plan, which requires the above ground infrastructure to be removed? Uh, in terms of the council's um, uh, comments.

00:51:04:10 - 00:51:36:27

Um, I go back to this is a balancing point that, um, uh, we have not the, the, the assessment. And if you need to hear from our landscape assessments, Mr. Gurney can go into detail on on it. But the assessment is not, uh, where we've concluded a significant a particular significance of effect. That level has not been reduced because it is reversible after 60 years. It is given that effect and it's classed as a long term effect.

00:51:37:03 - 00:52:09:25

Um, but as I say, because the consent is, um, time limited in the planning balance, you would have to then acknowledge that time limit, that the particular effect would then be removed after 60 years. Now, what weights you attach to that is down to your discretion and the Secretary of State's discretion. What I can reassure you on, though, is that the impact for the 60 years has not been reduced as a result of that. It's acknowledged for 60 years there would be this particular impact that's in the assessment for you to apply what weight you want to apply to that.

00:52:10:05 - 00:52:16:22

Um, and then after the 60 years, it will be removed. Again, you apply what weights you want to apply to that in your planning balance.

00:52:18:05 - 00:52:19:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:52:23:15 - 00:52:33:05

So I'll move on. Um, Mr. Walker, your hand is raised. Um, is there a point that you were wishing to make on this?

00:52:33:09 - 00:52:59:05

Uh, yeah. Uh, Craig Walker, resident in Clifton. Uh, I think, uh, what Mr. White was trying to get to is, uh, we've been led to believe that the applicant are signed contracts to with landowners, uh, which, uh, agree to. They have, uh.

00:53:01:08 - 00:53:03:02

A first, uh,

00:53:04:23 - 00:53:29:29

uh, option to extend the, um, 60 years. Uh, I think that's what Mr. White was trying to get to. That's why the question of will it extend that 60 years? I think that's why. Because there That is. That might be totally untrue. That is just a rumor as well. I think that's what they were trying to get to.

00:53:33:05 - 00:53:39:29

Okay. Thank you for that. I don't have anything further to to say. Anything further you would wish to.

00:53:41:10 - 00:53:55:26

Because I know I've answered. I've made it clear. The key point here is the consent. Is time limited. I've also made the point about, um, uh, our our lease arrangement. Um, so there's nothing further for me to it.

00:53:57:14 - 00:54:01:05

Okay. So if I then move on to item

00:54:02:21 - 00:54:48:05

uh, three, I think it is Roman three. The. Just to try and understand this distinction, the parties are, are making between, um, static views and, uh, views on the move, as it were. Uh, sequential views. Can I just seek an explanation of, um, is it particular routes that the councils are concerned about where cumulative effects you consider would occur, or is it something different from that? And if it is specific routes, could you identify them? If not today, then by providing information in due course.

00:54:48:07 - 00:54:51:00

So I can come to Mr. Brown in the first instance.

00:54:52:29 - 00:55:24:19

Oliver Brown for the host authorities. Thank you. Yeah, we've had several discussions and separate meetings trying to work through the Statement of Common Ground with the applicants on on this point. Um, I think framing the discussion, you know, the visual assessment does provide us with an identification of the key, uh, visual issues associated with the scheme, um, where we have the disagreement. And we've been having the discussion is there's two elements to it.

00:55:24:21 - 00:55:28:16

The first one is the site. Um, in isolation,

00:55:30:10 - 00:56:14:14

we feel that the consideration of a receptor is not fully explained. So the the assessment relies on a static viewpoint. And what I mean by that is that, say you're travelling down a public right of way. Your experience and your views of a scheme will change. And also, um, the extent and potentially the time period that you see the development, uh, or not essentially will change. So in terms of that sequential experience along a um user group, so users or public rights of way we feel is not fully, um, described or assessed within the Elvia.

00:56:14:24 - 00:56:48:16

So for an example, um, the broader way that essentially runs through the site. A viewpoint has been utilized to describe that baseline view. Now, obviously, that view will change for those users. Typically, a static view would be, say, from a residence or a particular outlook essentially. So we just feel that that that information is, is essentially missing from from from that visual assessment. And what you get by that is the sequential views. The moving views is over a period of time is essentially fatigue.

00:56:48:21 - 00:57:20:26

You know, it potentially will increase that level of effect. Um, for um, for that receptor. So that's in terms of what our concern is, um, in relation to the, the site by itself cumulatively. Um, and I think we touched upon this on point one a little bit in terms of, yeah, this does routes through this landscape. Um, I mean, I think the there's The guidance does talk about key routes and well-used footpaths.

00:57:20:28 - 00:57:57:02

However, we think because of the potential or because of the extensive ness of of development through this landscape, there are multiple opportunities where receptors will be travelling through. We can identify specific routes. I mean, one that we've identified would be, say north to south on the A1 133 and A156. So within um, the area for one Earth, there's been residual significant effects identified for users of that road. But also if we cross-reference that with gate Burton, there's also significant effects from from that route as well.

00:57:57:04 - 00:58:37:09

And potentially some views of Cottam and West Burton. So really, again, it's what we're getting at is that fatigue is that that repeated views of, um, solar, that introduction of more urbanizing, uh, industrial elements into a rural landscape for for users that are passing through this landscape so we can, you know, can go away and identify some specific routes that are concern for us. But I think going back to that earlier point, there's also the concern of of communities using this area, you know, traveling to work, commuting, as well as using public rights of way within the area that got potential sequential views passing past, um, development.

00:58:37:11 - 00:58:52:09

And these don't have to be, um, open, expansive views of multiple sites. It can be infrequent glimpsed views, but it's just that, um, I suppose that the cumulative effect of fatigue, of seeing those specific elements within this landscape.

00:58:54:18 - 00:59:34:04

Okay. That's helpful in terms of, um, the assessment that the applicant's done and the guidance they've followed. Are you suggesting that they've not followed the correct guidance, or is it there's a different interpretation of the guidance which Results in a use of a static view as opposed to what you're describing as a sequential view. So in terms of what might be regarded as best practice for undertaking these assessments, are you taking a slightly different stance from the applicant or again? Am I how should I interpret what you're saying to us?

00:59:36:21 - 00:59:51:09

Oliver Browne from the host authorities. I think we've been provided with enough information in the visual assessment to understand those key significant effects. Um, however, I think by

00:59:53:04 - 01:00:37:05

using a static viewpoint, there are potentially other views or potential receptors that would have a higher level of significance. So there's that potential for us to move up in terms of the guidance we've got Via three, which is the key document that we use. Uh There's flexibility within that document, which leads to multiple conversations like this, unfortunately. However, I believe it was. I can't remember the exact date. I think it was last year. A clarification note came out, um, in regards to this point, because it has caused a lot of discussions in the past, and that clearly states about using visual receptors for the baseline and using viewpoints to represent those views.

01:00:37:07 - 01:00:51:08

So while, you know, I think there's enough information within the assessment for us to to understand those key key issues. Um, I don't think for the alliance with with the most recent Landscape Institute technical guidance note.

01:00:53:24 - 01:01:01:13

And have you referenced that technical guidance note or as in your written responses? Okay.

01:01:01:15 - 01:01:02:00

We have.

01:01:02:02 - 01:01:07:20

Yes. And so do we have a copy within the examination area. Can you provide us one. So we can.

01:01:07:22 - 01:01:08:17

We can provide one.

01:01:08:19 - 01:01:09:15

Yeah. Thank you.

01:01:11:27 - 01:01:16:08

And so effectively, what you're saying to us, I think, is that had the.

01:01:18:27 - 01:01:38:11

Sequential approach been taken, we would have ended up with a slightly different, uh, conclusion and one that you're saying to us would have regarded or indicated a more significant effect over a wider area, or am I, uh, putting words in your mouth?

01:01:39:17 - 01:01:55:26

Oliver Browne from the House. Do authorities know that that is that is the potential. Uh, I've not been through that process. It's not my Elvia. Uh, we can have a look at that. If you think it would be useful. But. Yeah, I think there's there's the potential there because of what we feel is, is that information is potentially missing.

01:01:57:26 - 01:01:58:18

I think.

01:01:59:14 - 01:01:59:29

What's.

01:02:00:01 - 01:02:16:06

Crucial for us to be able to report fairly to the Secretary of State is understanding with absolute clarity what the difference between the parties is and how that comes about. And if there is a

01:02:18:03 - 01:02:21:27

disagreement between professionals about the interpretation of

01:02:23:15 - 01:03:04:22

the guidance, why there is that difference. And, um, we then perhaps need to come to say, okay, what others have other schemes done. How has that guidance been interpreted? And, uh, where does that take us in terms of understanding the difference of views between the parties and ultimately, what we can recommend the Secretary of State in understanding the differences and which side of the argument we might fall, or whether we would take a third view, um, if that were the case.

01:03:04:24 - 01:03:18:02

So we do need to get that clarity as to, um, exactly where the differences lie on where that takes us in terms of the conclusions that you're reaching. But

01:03:19:18 - 01:03:52:26

I think it's agreed that, uh, there are major significant effects in the local landscape, irrespective of whether it's as a static or a sequential. So is it likely? Are you able to say whether it would alter those conclusions? Are we still going to be effectively saying there's going to be a major adverse effect that is significant in landscape terms?

01:03:57:00 - 01:04:22:26

Oliver Brown from the the host authorities? Yeah, I think again, you have to be definite. So probably the sensible thing to do is to go away and identify those where we think there will be a difference to that. And again, just just to clarify, yeah, there are major moderate significant effects identified at year 15. Um, and I think it's just us we can provide, um, where we think there'll be a difference of opinion on those specific receptors.

01:04:24:21 - 01:04:34:11

And is that something that you'll be able to do on your own, or do you wish to work with the applicant at what's the best way to try and progress matters?

01:04:35:11 - 01:04:53:04

Uh, probably through the statement of common ground. So I would need to go away, review those, and then we can discuss that through the statement of common ground. And then we can very clearly state each position that we have on that. And again I just want to state, you know, we have been

having meetings. We have been discussing these elements to try and move this forward and get it clarified.

01:04:53:16 - 01:05:11:17

Okay. That's that's helpful. Thank you. And in West Lindsay's perspective, is there anything further you would wish to add, or any difference of you that you would wish to express to us that the applicant needs to hear and we need to hear this afternoon.

01:05:21:03 - 01:05:57:25

Yes. Russell Clarkson, West Lindsey District Council, uh, yes. I mean, we're we're we're, you know, share this with similar concerns to, to those that Mr. Brown raises really in terms of we appreciate the methodology employed by the applicant as well as via. But one of the things we're concerned with is there is a very sort of unique cumulative situation here. The development sits on the A11 33. We're very conscious that this is one of the main routes for our district to the south, joining the A1, and is a corridor which residents will traverse as their approach in our districts.

01:05:57:27 - 01:06:30:27

And getting to those Welcome to West Lindsey signs will be encountering the development. And there's one traverses then into the western half of our district. They will come to further further solar developments, really. So, uh, again, that sequential approach is one traverses through the landscape, uh, is something we are conscious of really. And we think part of the issue is because it's a it's a fairly unique to my knowledge situation we have here in terms of just this sheer amount and scale of these similar developments occurring at a similar time.

01:06:31:24 - 01:06:32:16

Thank you sir.

01:06:33:20 - 01:06:34:27

Okay. Thank you.

01:06:46:15 - 01:06:47:08

Um.

01:06:49:22 - 01:06:50:25

Mrs. Fox.

01:06:56:14 - 01:06:58:04

There should be a red light. Yeah, yeah.

01:06:58:06 - 01:07:16:22

Thank you, Thank you sir. Heather Fox, resident of North Clifton. When I leave my home where I walk, cycle, ride a horse, drive a car, I am going to encounter solar infrastructure whichever way I go. That's going to be my visual effect.

01:07:21:06 - 01:07:22:28

Okay, Mr. Fox.

01:07:25:06 - 01:07:27:26

The there's a significant.

01:07:27:28 - 01:07:30:02

Cycling community from the.

01:07:30:04 - 01:07:31:04

Whole of Lincolnshire.

01:07:31:06 - 01:07:39:15

And going into Yorkshire. Most of our routes will now be impinged upon by solar developments.

01:07:42:18 - 01:07:44:21

That's I think that's a sequential effect, isn't it?

01:07:45:22 - 01:07:50:16

Okay. Yeah, I understand where you're coming from. Thank you.

01:07:56:15 - 01:08:06:02

Before I come to the applicant. Is there anyone else wishing to say anything further on this particular, uh, element of the discussion that we've had so far?

01:08:09:00 - 01:08:11:17

Now, I'll come back to the applicant and.

01:08:12:21 - 01:08:43:01

Thank you, sir. Richard, give us some part of the applicant. Um, Mr. Brown has confirmed, uh, already in this hearing that and I quote, there is enough information in the assessment. Um, and that's a quote directly from Mr. Brown. So there is enough information in the assessment before you to make your conclusions. Um, and the information that we have provided in the, in the application is, is actually the information that Mr. Brown is asking for. And Mr.

01:08:43:03 - 01:09:13:07

Gurney, uh, will shortly explain why, uh. Um, with an example for you. Um, secondly, I know that I note that Mr. Brown referred frequently to the word potential in saying there's potential for impacts, but there's no evidence in front of this examining authority or indeed before us to say that our assessment would change as a result of this. So that's an important point as well for you to have regard to. Um, but I now pass to Mr.

01:09:13:09 - 01:09:22:13

Gurney from Icen Projects, just to go into a bit more detail about our approach, uh, and the fact that we have to take into account that technical guidance note referred to by Mr. Brown.

01:09:25:06 - 01:10:06:00

Ben Gurney, on behalf of the applicant. Firstly, a precise approach to visual assessment is not specified anywhere in the industry guidance. Instead, the onus is on the assessor to select the most appropriate approach and ensure the most important issues are reported. And that's clearly stated in section 6.7 of the notes. A clarification on Aspects of V3, also known as LTN 2020 401, the chapter 11 on landscape. A visual is focused on visual receptors likely to be affected at a specific viewpoint, as per paragraph 6.31, as explained in appendix 11.2.

01:10:06:02 - 01:10:36:01

At paragraph 8.11 .3.9. Representative viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of those different types of visual receptors, which accords with the Via three paragraph 6.19. So the host authorities have been consulted on on these viewpoint locations during the pre-application stage, and have since been formally agreed with nearly all House authorities within the respective draft statements to come around that was submitted at deadline to discussion on these remain ongoing, however.

01:10:36:03 - 01:11:18:18

However, with the West Lindsey after an additional three point was requested following deadline one, there may be locations where the site would be more or less visible, so in recognition of the sequential and varying views that visual receptors may experience of the proposed development when travelling through the landscape. More than one representative viewpoint has been provided for some of the receptors. For example, as set out in chapter 11 at table 11.9, people traveling through route 647 of the National Cycle Network are represented at different locations by viewpoints ten, 12, 25, 26, 34, 61, and 62.

01:11:19:06 - 01:11:30:12

Following this, through to the detailed assessment provided in appendix 11.4, one can gain an understanding of how the visual experience of the visual receptor varies across these specific views.

01:11:32:08 - 01:12:05:21

The applicant has sought to be geographically specific when designing defining the visual receptors. For example, people traveling along route 647, the National Cycle Network between North Clifton and Rigsby, and that so that the agreed viewpoints can be said to be representative of the experience of the people in those particular views. As such, the visual assessment does not reach a single judgement on people travelling along that route, but rather on the particular views experienced in different at different parts of that route, and this approach is considered to provide greater transparency to the assessment.

01:12:06:21 - 01:12:24:04

Now figure 11.1 the representative Viewpoint Location plan A029 can be shared on the screen. I can talk through that. I taught the examining authority through the residual impacts of these particular views to understand the sequential impacts along this route, if that would be helpful.

01:12:25:07 - 01:12:25:27

Yes, please.

01:12:29:24 - 01:12:48:19

So starting from east to west, um, the first few point is 3.12 just south of Thorney, which is 1.4km from the order limits approximately, and the residual effects were concluded in the LVA as no effect

01:12:50:15 - 01:12:51:00
then.

01:12:51:02 - 01:12:58:00
Sorry, can I just clarify because I'm struggling just to see this at the moment. Is this going along the cycle route? Yeah.

01:12:58:02 - 01:13:24:15
That's correct. Okay. That's the route. Cycle route. Yeah. Next we arrive at viewpoint ten, which is just southeast of Moor Farm, which is within the order limits. And the overlay concluded a high magnitude and major residual effects which are significant. Then moving on to onto the Flatbush Viaduct. 25 A and 26, eh?

01:13:26:00 - 01:13:35:01
Um, these are about 300m from the order limits, and the AA concluded very low magnitude and negligible residual effects.

01:13:37:05 - 01:13:54:15
Then finally, 34 A just off the road. It's about 200m from the order limits. Again, no residual Effects, and then from west to east we have viewpoint 62 just between Merrifield Farm and Park Cottage.

01:13:56:19 - 01:14:27:13
This is about two kilometres from the order limits, and there were no residual effects included in the IVII for that one. Similarly, with 3.61, which is a bit further along minor minor road, but closer to Merrifield Farm, it's still about two kilometres. Again, no residual residual effects on those. Similarly 34 B um, just off the road. No residual effects.

01:14:27:20 - 01:14:30:09
Looking in the opposite direction to 34.

01:14:32:06 - 01:14:47:08
Then to back onto the viaduct facing east for 25 and 26. B um, that obvi concluded very low magnitude and Negligible effects, which are not significant.

01:14:49:00 - 01:15:12:16
Um, the applicant has assessed sequential cumulative visual effects using the same approach. The applicant has assessed the combined or simultaneous visibility of cumulative schemes within the defined zone of influence, in particular, views experienced at different locations by users of the key routes, such as major roads, and promoted recreational routes such as route 647 that we've just broken through.

01:15:15:20 - 01:15:45:25

Okay. Thank you. But presumably you also acknowledge the point that Mrs. Fox made as a local resident when they leave their home that the even with your mitigation in place, there's going to be solar panels visible in lots of different directions. And so that there will be a change to the character of the area to, to a degree. And then obviously, the significance of that will vary from place to place.

01:15:48:04 - 01:15:57:22

That's correct. Yes. And we've yeah assessed a lot of different receptors. It's kind of straying on slightly to the next agenda item. But yes that's correct.

01:15:57:25 - 01:15:58:17

Thank you.

01:16:04:06 - 01:16:05:03

Mrs. Fox.

01:16:06:05 - 01:16:35:23

Thank you sir. Is your saying there seems to be no effect? Can you tell me what time limit that? How long before there's no effect? Because if I go out my door and the solar panels are there, in two years time, I'm going to see a wire mesh fence 2.2m high when I'm going along the cycle track and on the promised new permissive paths. So I just wonder, at what stage does it become no effect? I don't think I'll be around to see it.

01:16:38:28 - 01:16:39:17

Okay.

01:16:42:13 - 01:16:44:07

Does the applicant wish to respond?

01:16:46:15 - 01:17:03:16

And go on behalf of the applicant. So the assessment scenarios are set out within chapter 11 of the Asce. Um, those effects that we were just discussing. Um, with regard to route 647 were long term. So at year 15.

01:17:08:28 - 01:17:28:28

But in the shorter term, the year one, there's recognition from the various viewpoints along that route that there would be short term, medium term adverse effects. It's not because clearly the mitigation won't have uh.

01:17:31:08 - 01:17:34:14

Resolved any of the issues at that point.

01:17:36:18 - 01:17:43:28

That's correct. Yes. So we do acknowledge that that litigation will take some time to establish a mature.

01:17:47:17 - 01:17:48:20

Okay. Thank you.

01:17:49:02 - 01:18:19:15

Sir. Richard Gibson. I'm speaking to that, of course, as as the national policy statement. Ian, one makes it clear. All national, virtually all nationally significant energy infrastructure projects will have adverse effects on the landscape. That's a 5.1.5. And at 5.1. 13, all all proposed energy infrastructure is likely to have visual effects for many receptors around the proposed sites. Um, I don't think anyone is saying that otherwise.

01:18:19:17 - 01:18:42:17

Um, um, but it's important that we demonstrated what the councils are asking for, which is a sequential that that assessment, uh, can be done, um, uh, through one and year 15, um, in the application. So you have the information to make your judgment as to the weight you attach to the visual impacts and the impact on the landscape in your assessment.

01:18:43:26 - 01:19:24:29

I understand that, but N1 and N3 also have criteria for good design, don't they? And, uh, seek to ensure that, um, visual impacts upon the landscape are properly assessed. And three para 252 says should demonstrate good design, particularly in respect to landscape and visual amenity. And that's what I'm trying to get to the bottom of. I understand what you're saying about the assessment that you've undertaken and the conclusions that that reaches, but I think equally, the councils have a point about the experiences that people will have as they travel through that landscape.

01:19:25:01 - 01:19:29:17

And, uh, I don't think it.

01:19:31:29 - 01:19:49:26

We need to make sure that we're properly understanding the different perspectives that people are setting out, so that we can properly understand those positions and reflect on them and draw conclusions appropriately to advise the Secretary of State.

01:19:51:09 - 01:20:24:16

Which give us on Path applicants. And I understand that, and we've just explained why how. Um, and there is that information is before you to make that judgment as indeed the the councils have agreed in this hearing and regarding good design. Absolutely acknowledge that. And that is why we have the design approach document. We have to library reference rep to hyphen 0 to 1. That clearly explains the design approach that the applicant has taken to comply with the requirement of good design.

01:20:24:18 - 01:21:00:12

And in that document, um, it clearly sets out where we have sought, where we've removed, for example, areas of land or provided offsets for sensitive receptors, such as residential properties, to as do as the NPS requires us to to minimize where we can. The impact on landscape and visual effects. And so you have to look at the the scheme, all the application documents in the round to see how we've approached design. And that document clearly demonstrates, for example, on page 54 where we have removed land or provided offsets to minimise these impacts.

01:21:03:03 - 01:21:10:15

Thank you. Mr. Fox, Mrs. Fox, do you want to say anything further, Mr. Fox?

01:21:16:12 - 01:21:17:10

Can I just.

01:21:18:09 - 01:21:38:05

Put a loud voice? Anyway, um, we really weren't presented with sufficient information to be able to contribute to this discussion because we just weren't shown what we were going to get. And, you know, you keep talking about receptors and points. How are we supposed to judge what's coming? We can't do it from a flat map.

01:21:40:02 - 01:21:42:09

Okay. Thank you.

01:21:44:20 - 01:21:46:29

Do you wish to say anything further, Mrs. Fox?

01:21:47:20 - 01:21:50:14

Thank you sir. I think I've made my point. Thank you.

01:21:50:18 - 01:21:57:06

Okay. Thank you. And, um, Mr. Walker, uh, on teams.

01:21:58:29 - 01:22:20:23

Uh, Craig Walker, resident and Clifton. Uh, I'd just like to point out the, uh, differences, uh, which I showed you on the site visits, uh, between the, uh, render, the 3D renders and the, uh.

01:22:22:29 - 01:22:44:21

The differences between the renders and the size of an actual object Of the, uh, proposed panels, uh, so that even the 3D renders were given. Don't even show. The actual, uh,

01:22:46:08 - 01:22:54:09

views that were type of views that we're going to see, they seem to be massively different. Uh, and

01:22:55:25 - 01:23:33:25

the, the, the viewpoints that the renders were given seem to be in very strategic places so that he points in a specific, uh, viewpoint where you turn an over 15 degrees and then that views dramatically worse because of panel placing or because it's closer. Ah. So, uh, I don't I as agreeing with Mr. Fox, we, we weren't provided with, uh, good information to make informed decisions.

01:23:34:24 - 01:23:36:18

That's how I got to say thank you.

01:23:38:10 - 01:23:42:19

Hey. Thank you, Mr. Watkin. I'll come back to you, Mr. Fox, and then I'll return to the applicant.

01:23:42:22 - 01:23:53:06

I think the point is that we don't know. We we have no information to understand what the gentleman is saying or know whether he's telling us the truth or not.

01:23:56:16 - 01:24:32:12

Okay. Um, Mr. White, you've put your hand on trying to. Have you got any new points that you would wish to make before I. Yeah. I'm sorry. I understand. I understand where you're coming from. Um, yeah. I'm agreeing with what's being said here in a general thing. I just wanted to make the point as well that, uh, the the complaint, uh, quite rightly, is that people feel they've not been provided with enough information. And this goes back to the consultation phase where the plans that people were put in front of people where, uh, unfortunately, not properly to scale.

01:24:32:14 - 01:24:43:08

And I think people didn't understand until we built a solar panel up to the height that how big these things would be. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Griffiths.

01:24:44:15 - 01:25:21:07

Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just to respond to a couple of points there from, uh, Mr. Walker, Mr. Fox, Mr. White. Um, first of all, on the viewpoint, uh, viewpoints that I think Mr. Walker mentioned, all viewpoints, um, and the approach was agreed with the host authorities, and that's an important point to make. So the viewpoints were agreed, were not unilateral by the applicant. They were agreed with the host authorities. And secondly, in terms of consultation, um, a 3D model, uh, was available from any location within the Red line.

01:25:21:09 - 01:25:45:27

Red line boundary, uh, during statutory Free consultation. Um, and, uh. Um, so that was available for people to look at and see what the scheme could potentially be like. Um, and, um, we checked the visualizations yesterday, uh, and confirmed that all of those have been, um, accurate. So there was that 3D model available during the statutory consultation.

01:25:47:06 - 01:25:56:14

Is that something that we've seen as part of the examination, or is it just, uh, available prior to the during the consultation period?

01:25:57:06 - 01:26:10:06

Richard Griffiths on behalf of the applicant. The 3D model was was purely available. We have not submitted that into examination. It was part of the statutory consultation, uh, process to help inform, uh, people's understanding of the project.

01:26:11:08 - 01:26:21:20

I think it might be helpful if you were able to share, unless it's changed significantly, such that it's now materially different in some in some way.

01:26:22:00 - 01:26:49:17

Which will give us on behalf the applicant? It is different because the scheme as is good practice. Of course, took into account the responses from statutory consultation. Um, uh uh amended um and the scheme amended before we submitted it to the Secretary of State. So the 3D model at stake at statutory consultation does not represent fully the scheme that is before the examining authority because of the design changes that we took place in response to statutory consultation.

01:26:57:12 - 01:27:02:25

We are talking about the um, 24 inch screen model here. Are we?

01:27:05:19 - 01:27:08:09

Which gives the applicant. I'm, uh. I've been told. Yes.

01:27:08:24 - 01:27:20:13

Okay. And this was all agreed with the, um, local authorities. You were talking about things being agreed with the local authorities, but basically bypassing the local community. I believe.

01:27:21:27 - 01:27:40:13

Now I think you're talking at cross purposes. What Mr. Griffiths was saying was that the viewpoints that had been selected for the photo montages had been agreed with the local authorities. I think the 3D models something entirely different. Mrs. Fox.

01:27:41:22 - 01:28:13:04

As a Fox resident in North Clifton, sir, as a generation not computer literate, to be confronted by a screen that was leafy green going along a road, giving me a view which would probably 15 years down the line. I asked specifically, as a person of my generation, I would have liked to model a physical model which would have given a better perspective on size and height of solar panels and where things might have been. And would you like to have a guess why that was declined?

01:28:15:28 - 01:28:19:06

No, not really, but I'm sure you've had to tell me. Yeah.

01:28:19:17 - 01:28:21:23

It would be difficult to transport, sir.

01:28:26:08 - 01:28:27:15

Okay. Um.

01:28:30:18 - 01:28:48:29

Mr. white, you have your hand up again? Yeah. Going back to the gentleman that said that the plans have changed. And that's why the 3D model might not be completely sufficient at this time. Uh, the plans have changed that. They've got, uh, between 500 and 1000 acres larger. I just wanted to make that point.

01:28:51:06 - 01:28:53:11

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:28:56:22 - 01:29:37:08

Sorry, sir. Which I wanted to. That's not correct. The. It hasn't got larger between stack on and, uh, submission. Um, it's, uh, the scheme, the differences between statutory consultation and the, um, and submission is the design change is having regard to the consultation responses, both with statutory entities and local residents. And we're not going to put in a 3D model with examination. That isn't the scheme that shows, um, the illustrative masterplan. Um, that wouldn't be appropriate. The point about the 3D model is how we could help the community understand the impacts in a 3D model was what was the most appropriate way of doing that, in our opinion? Okay.

01:29:37:29 - 01:29:50:06

And I understand that other members of the interested parties would have preferred a different approach, but that takes us as far as it takes us. You know, um, Mr. Fox.

01:29:50:08 - 01:29:59:12

It was made abundantly clear to everybody at the consultation that the 3D model was totally inadequate.

01:30:01:03 - 01:30:04:06

The computerised way. Okay. Well, I.

01:30:04:12 - 01:30:07:17

Didn't see a physical one. We'd have been very pleased to see one.

01:30:08:13 - 01:30:38:26

Yeah, I think we've probably gone through this as much as we need to. We're not going to be able to move forward. Unfortunately, you know, the applicant isn't required to provide a model. However much, uh, local residents may have preferred it or whether I preferred it or not. Um, I think, you know, they have provided, uh, the information they've provided, and we are where we are, you know.

01:30:38:28 - 01:31:11:02

And I appreciate that you would have preferred something far more, but. Well, that's your view, I understand that. Um, I think we've probably got to the end of that item, and I'm just looking at the time. Um, it might be worth just taking a ten minute break. Um, and then we can move on to the next item. I'm mindful that we've still got a number of elements that we need to get through today.

01:31:11:04 - 01:31:27:07

So before I just check on that. Are there particular times today because we've got a number of elements on agriculture as well that people need to be leaving by? What's the sort of time period?

01:31:31:11 - 01:31:48:03

We don't have a specific limitation. Excellent. Till midnight then. Okay. Um, okay. Well, if we take a ten minute break and people can, uh, use the facilities and we'll come back at 20 to 5.