

Steeple_ISH_12 NOV_PT2

Created on: 2025-11-12 12:27:30

Project Length: 01:20:28

File Name: Steeple_ISH_12 NOV_PT2

File Length: 01:20:28

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:12 - 00:00:35:20

12:00 and it's time for this issue specific hearing to resume. Um, just before we commence, can I just check with Mr. Barrowman that the live stream has recommenced? I see it hadn't. Thank you very much. Um, so just before we, uh, went to the break, we were coming to the end of item four. But before we move on, I will now, um, open up whether anybody in the room wants to raise any comments on what they've heard.

00:00:35:22 - 00:00:37:22

And I'll start with Mr. Barlow.

00:00:40:00 - 00:01:13:04

Hello again. Uh, James Barlow, North London windmill. If I can just put my glasses on. Okay. Um, the windmills also affected by the, um, hall to himand and power cable and nothing to do with this meeting today. Although the interaction between the two is, um, I think the applicant said the connection is for 600MW. That's correct. And they also suggested that the high power line would lose them a substantial amount of ground if it was to go ahead.

00:01:13:25 - 00:01:30:11

I'm guessing that the 600 megawatt connection is very important to you and to fulfill that requirement. So if you're going to lose substantial amount of ground to the Himalayan power line, will you be looking to expand the area that that you've currently displayed?

00:01:32:27 - 00:01:35:24

I'll give you an opportunity to respond to that.

00:01:36:15 - 00:01:37:07

Thank you.

00:01:37:15 - 00:01:40:25

Thank you for your question. Do you want to respond to that now, Mr. Robinson?

00:01:41:01 - 00:01:41:18

Thank you, Patrick.

00:01:41:20 - 00:01:42:05

Robinson.

00:01:42:07 - 00:01:45:01

For the applicant. Uh, no. As I think.

00:01:45:03 - 00:01:55:23

We dealt with in the open floor hearing yesterday, there isn't really a process by which you can amend a DCO to increase its boundaries for any reason effectively.

00:01:56:24 - 00:02:05:24

Thank you. I hope that that answers your your question. Um, is there anybody. Is there anything you wanted some clarification on? Uh, yes.

00:02:06:03 - 00:02:28:16

Please. Um, if you look at the maps, they put up their area of consideration. I suppose you'd call it as a red line around the outside of it. Although the area that was shaded, I believe there we are. Pink, um, for solar panels doesn't cover all of the area that you've got as area of consideration. Am I right in saying or not?

00:02:31:01 - 00:02:37:22

And so are you. Are you giving us absolute guarantees that you're not going to go out of what we see now as a pink area?

00:02:40:04 - 00:02:52:28

Thank you, Patrick, for the applicant. Um, it's the red line. Dark red line boundary. Is the application or the application that that won't change. There isn't a process to change the application boundaries. Now we're in examination.

00:02:54:03 - 00:03:06:05

And that's just for clarity. That is the red line. But can somebody actually, um, who's controlling the screen but put a cursor on if it's possible just to annotate where that red line is?

00:03:10:27 - 00:03:13:15

Can everybody see that? Can you see that?

00:03:23:20 - 00:03:31:17

I I'm still unsure on that. If I look at the map in front of me, that's disappeared. Uh, if.

00:03:34:00 - 00:03:36:27

Can the map go back down again?

00:03:39:17 - 00:03:46:14

Um, on the map on the bottom right hand corner, there was an area that was shaded sort of pink that doesn't have a red line around it.

00:03:49:03 - 00:03:50:23

I think the other thing is, is trying to find.

00:03:51:04 - 00:04:12:01

So this particular, um, clarification is about the pink shade. The pink shading as Mrs. Bridges took us through is the air. Effectively all the area that's been under consideration from the start of the process? The dark red line is where we fix the pond for the application boundary. Um, and

00:04:13:27 - 00:04:44:15

when I'm saying the the application boundary once made, um, yes. There are processes by which an application boundary, if there are errors in it or things which would need to change, but a significant change. I think the way the question is being put, if you were to lose a significant area of development, would you think about adding in now a significant compensatory area of new development outside that dark red line? That would be a significant change to the application. There isn't a process to make significant changes to an application once made.

00:04:44:27 - 00:05:08:24

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. So I think from what I see, this plan might be maybe slightly out of date and that there's some pink areas shown on it that were part of a previous consideration as to whether it would be within the in the application site boundary, but where that cursor is at the moment, that's not one of those areas because it's not within the red line boundary. Is that correct?

00:05:09:02 - 00:05:20:06

Correct. So it's not so much the plans out to date. The plan attempted to show the evolution of design. So it included pink areas that were under consideration but didn't make it into the application.

00:05:21:13 - 00:05:42:03

So I think just to just to clarify what was being said, basically, once the red line boundary is within the order limits, the developer cannot then come forward to try and compensate as part of this application with another area. It would have to be another application, which I think was the point that was raised in the open floor hearing session yesterday. Okay.

00:05:42:15 - 00:06:13:10

Okay. Thank you. So, so I think I'm right that I've seen pictures that show images, if you like. Of where the lines to show where the where the solar panels are. Which I think is a later sort of map from that. And somewhere within that red line there's areas that don't show, um, solar panels as in a illustration of solar panels. Um, I'm not really sure whether it is part of what's addressed as solar or not, to be fair.

00:06:14:06 - 00:06:14:21

Yeah.

00:06:15:15 - 00:06:20:09

Uh, 6.2 is the maths site layout.

00:06:27:11 - 00:06:42:06

Which is very quickly have a look at this plan. And if, if, if not then it might be. What I might ask you to do is to put it in something in writing for deadline, one that highlights where it is, and then we'll get the applicant to respond in writing at the next deadline.

00:07:37:06 - 00:07:39:08

Did you say it was on sheet six?

00:07:55:17 - 00:08:10:00

So happy to just comment. I think we've been asked a question about the sort of area not shown with any panels in white right in the middle of town, that that's an area that's been excluded from panel development because of archaeological constraint.

00:08:12:06 - 00:08:18:00

Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. Has anybody else got any further questions? Yes.

00:08:19:02 - 00:09:02:04

Julie Barlow for fields for farming. Um, I know the examining authority would be aware there's there's plenty of policy, um, around, um, cumulative effect, both spatial and temporally. Um, and I won't sort of go through what those are and list them, but they relate to noise, health and quality of life. Um, for for us that living with this. Um, I'd like to suggest that you might want to consider two maps, one of the similar scale to what we've been looking at this morning that shows the, um, the direct impact on the village of Stirton and the wider community, including North Laverton and Wheatley and Fenton, Littleborough.

00:09:02:23 - 00:09:39:05

But that map also includes the projects that we're already living with that will also overlap these Nsic projects that are coming down the line. We've got the demolition of West Burton A, the ongoing gas power station ash recovery at West Burton Power Station. There is planning permission for another West Burton gas power station that's been passed. It's never been implemented, but it's passed. So it's a potential. It's been publicly declared that West Burton Current Gas Power Station is looking at a project to link that with the, um, the Viking project.

00:09:39:07 - 00:10:09:15

That's I don't know if it's been approved by in CIPs or it's certainly in the NSA's program. And that will involve a pipeline to the East Coast. Um, we've got this project, obviously, the quarry. Um, the ones that we've we've talked about over the river. So that would be one and one thing that's not been mentioned today. Um, we've got the grid pylons, both the existing and the maintenance, and we are subject to ongoing maintenance. We have some last year. There's some more coming up imminently.

00:10:09:17 - 00:10:44:29

So again, we've got that that to live with. But there's also, um, I can't pronounce the name of the company I apologize. The oil transfer line that also goes under this land and there's, there's that that, that to consider. And then a second map. Um, well, that map also includes a small project. You've talked of water line. Um, because obviously that's that's in progress, although we don't quite know what's happening with it. And then a second map that that includes the wider 15 km um area because I think it's now being referred to.

00:10:45:01 - 00:11:13:18

Um, gentleman from Notts County Council referred to the power stations that have now been announced for Cottam and Hymenium, and it's now referred to as a supercluster, I think is the official term. And that also includes a series of very large solar farms as well. So when you're talking of cumulative impact that we will have to live with for a long period of time, it's not just these three projects. Thank you.

00:11:14:17 - 00:11:45:08

I understand that. I think just for the time, I'll take one more one more question from from someone. And then if anybody's got any further questions on this topic, I think it might be best just to put them in writing. But also the report on the interrelationships of other projects will be submitted by the applicant at deadline one. So for those of you, you will then have the opportunity to read that and provide comments at a deadline to. Okay. So if there's any further comments on that, I'd recommend you do that. I'll take one further question from Mr. Appleyard and then we'll move on to.

00:11:45:18 - 00:12:20:03

Fairly quick, hopefully, uh, Mr. Appleyard. Certainly. Steve Parish Council, I spoke yesterday regarding the, uh, Woodland solar farm. Uh, it's now under the control of the same landowners for this, um, application. And I just wanted you to know, is there a mechanism to incorporate this into the application or is it outside? We're a bit of a loss. As what I appreciate, it's not the applicant's true, uh, authority, but if they could offer any help on where it's going.

00:12:20:20 - 00:12:21:15

Thank you.

00:12:22:17 - 00:12:26:23

I'll ask you to briefly respond to that question.

00:12:27:13 - 00:13:01:13

Uh, thank you, Sir Patrick Robinson for the applicant. I can respond very briefly. It is a separate project. It's separately consented. It's capable of Being developed cumulatively with studying the impacts of what would happen if they both developed together, but they um, or were both there at the same time. But that as far as this um, examination will want to look at it, is what would be the cumulative impacts if they were both in, in present at the same time or constructed at the same time?

00:13:02:21 - 00:13:41:07

Okay. Thank you for that. I hope that that answers the question. Um, if anybody else has got any further points that they want to raise, if it comes to them afterwards, then do you please write in in your submission to deadline one, and then the applicant have a opportunity to respond the deadline to. Um, I'm now going to move on to agenda item five now, which is landscape and visual. Does the applicant need to change? You've done that already. Brilliant. Thank you. Um, okay. So, um, landscape and visual. The, um, first part of this agenda I'm going to focus on is the methodology that's been adopted to the, um, in your environmental statement.

00:13:41:09 - 00:13:55:21

Um, in the applicant, just sort of briefly talk me through your methodology, methodology for assessing the likely significant effects of the proposed development in the landscape and visual impact assessment.

00:13:58:29 - 00:14:06:28

Thank you. Sir. Um, yes. Mr. Turner's, um, joined us at the table, um, and can introduce himself. And he's going to take us through the matters of detail on this.

00:14:08:29 - 00:14:11:12

Yes. Good morning, sir. Dale Turner from Pegasus Group.

00:14:12:01 - 00:14:48:17

Representing the applicant on landscape and visual matters. Um, I'll start with the question on methodology and say that the, uh, the landscape and visual impact assessment known as Elvia, um, that's document Ape zero 64 was prepared in line with the overarching principles set out in guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, third edition, known as GL VA A3. The methodology for the identification of significant effects was explained in full in section 6.3 of the LBA, but in summary, an assessment was made as to the level of effect by combining a judgment on the sensitivity of the receptors and the magnitude of the impact.

00:14:49:09 - 00:15:19:18

Effects were set out on a five point scale from major to minor, and effects which were identified to be major, major, moderate, and in some cases moderate were identified as being significant. GL via A3 notes at paragraph 332 that there are no hard and fast rules about what effects should be deemed significant, but should always distinguish clearly between what are considered to be the significant and non-significant effects. This is done in the AA, which clearly notes which effects are significant and which or not.

00:15:20:03 - 00:16:01:16

GL A3 goes on to discuss how the judgment of significance is set out, and states that paragraph 333 that the final judgment of effects is often summarized in a series of categories of significance reflecting combinations of sensitivity and magnitude. These tend to vary from project to project, but they should be appropriate to the nature, size, and location of the proposed development. The approach taken in the 80s using a five point scale to identify the level of effects and then setting out which of those effects would be significant, is in line with this guidance. In August 2024, the Landscape Institute issued a technical guidance note titled Notes and Clarifications on aspects of the third edition of the Guidelines of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

00:16:01:28 - 00:16:34:18

It's of note that the Technical Guidance Note reiterates that the purpose of LDA is to explain which aspects of landscape and visual change are more important to the decision to be made and why, and achieving this outcome is more fundamental to good Elvia than the detailed mechanics of specific, specific assessment methodologies. And the Elvia has indeed explained which aspects are most important to the decision in line with this guidance. Other environmental topics in the AIA had slightly different approaches to the identification of significant effects based on best practice guidance applicable to those topics and the professional judgment of the chapter authors.

00:16:34:20 - 00:16:51:24

However, in all instances, the methodology used were clear and the effects which were identified to be significant were clearly identified from those which were not significant. It is not unusual for the approach to identify significant effects to vary between environmental topics within an ES, and indeed it may also vary between one layer and another.

00:16:53:27 - 00:17:25:21

Okay. And thank you for that. And you've mentioned about the the five, the five steps that you've had in terms of the major, etc.. Um, and paragraph 6.3.46 of your environmental statement states those effects described as major, major, moderate, and in some cases moderate may be regarded as significant effects. Can you explain to me how significant and not significant effects have been differentiated, where moderate effects have been identified?

00:17:26:22 - 00:17:50:12

Yes. So with respect to moderate effects, the moderate is effectively a range of effects which sits between major moderate and moderate to minor. And so those effects at the higher end of the moderate spectrum, closer towards major moderate, are the ones which would be considered to be significant, and those at the lower end of that spectrum closer towards moderate minor would be the ones that were considered to not be significant.

00:17:59:18 - 00:18:17:27

Um, how when you're reading your environmental statement, is that clear? Where the moderate where on the scale it sits? And in particular, the thought process of how you've got to that finding. Can you explain that to me, please.

00:18:18:03 - 00:18:51:29

So with regard to any moderate effects identified, it then sets out straight after whether that moderate effect is significant or not significant in each case, and with respect to how the decision was decided. As I say, it reflected whether or not the moderate effect was considered to be at the higher or lower end of the moderate spectrum. Um, and uh, there's various mechanisms by which that might be understood, uh, relating to the relative scale and prominence of the development, the extent of the angle of view which would be taken up and, and other factors, including with respect to the sensitivity of the receptor in question.

00:18:52:02 - 00:19:02:22

Um, but on the whole, it was a considered process which, um, you know, as I set out, considered both the sensitivity and the magnitude before coming to that level of effect.

00:19:03:21 - 00:19:34:05

And how you've, um, assessed that sensitivity of the receptor. Because when you look at the guidelines for landscape and visual impact assessment, um, my understanding is susceptibility can have three components that that go into that sort of the size and scale of the effect or the duration of the effect. Is there anywhere in your environmental statement that actually sets out how you've come to the findings on each of those points to them. That feeds into the moderate effects that you've assessed.

00:19:34:28 - 00:20:10:11

Yeah. So we set out our assessment criteria in detail within the within the RBA. And as you say, sensitivity is indeed a function of both susceptibility and value as set out in the guidance. And so a consideration of of those factors is, is included within a consideration of sensitivity. And the sensitivity relates to the to the receptor themselves. Um so for example with respect to public rights away, it's, it's the users of the public right of way. Not not the public right of way itself, which which have the sensitivity. Um, and we're clear in our assessment that, for example, those in residential properties are considered to be of a high sensitivity.

00:20:10:17 - 00:20:15:10

Um, whereas users of something like a, a trunk road would be of a lower sensitivity.

00:20:17:28 - 00:20:40:07

It might be useful if we could have an example. Let's talk through an example of how you've applied this in practice. And I think viewpoint 20 might be quite a useful one, um, for it to do. So, if I can ask you to display the photo montage from viewpoint 20, which is just get the reference number for you, I did have it written down.

00:20:57:27 - 00:21:15:07

So either up zero 97 or 0 98 one is the summer. Um, and the other one is the winter, um argument saying we'll, we'll if you can display the winter photograph which is up 098.

00:21:42:04 - 00:21:42:22

And.

00:21:45:10 - 00:21:46:16

This is just

00:21:48:03 - 00:22:00:03

for context. This is a viewpoint where you've identified a level effect as moderate, but it's not a significant effect. So I'd be interested to understand how you've come to that that finding.

00:22:13:15 - 00:22:16:18

Is it 20 sir 2.26.

00:22:16:20 - 00:22:18:05

Viewpoint 20. Yes.

00:22:48:23 - 00:23:30:04

So as you set out, sir, we've prepared a photo montage for this viewpoint. One of the few points that we did. And as you say, we prepared those both for the summer period and the winter period. Um, but the assessments made in the LVA were based on the the worst case assumption of the winter period, where there would be less vegetation on the, uh, on the hedgerows and the trees notwithstanding, obviously, that for much of the year there would be would be greater growth. We're also cognizant of the, um, the cycle of cutting of off hedgerows and vegetation as well, which changes throughout the

year, and mindful that in particular, the photo montages we have on the screen at the moment is capturing that sort of worst case, lowest period of the cuts to the vegetation to ensure we've got that worst case scenario collected.

00:23:30:06 - 00:24:05:16

Um, we do an assessment of effects, um, three phases in the year. So join the construction phase, uh, during year one when any mitigation has just been planted. And then at year 15, when mitigation has had a chance to mature. And we provide three assessments accordingly for those three phases. Uh, but the sensitivity remains the same throughout the sensitivity of the receptors. Using the public rights of way in and around the site was identified to be high. Um, and so then it comes to the magnitude of change, um, that would occur.

00:24:06:15 - 00:24:41:10

Uh, and uh, as I say, we we will be mindful of that in terms of the knowledge picked up on, on site, um, Experiencing the full context of the view from the viewpoint. So not just the the photo montage or the viewpoint, but the the experience on site of taking in the view in all directions, walking up and down the route. And we're mindful, as I say, of the seasonal changes to the vegetation. Um, and then what we're looking to, to understand is the extent of change, which would be likely to take place to the view in terms of the scale and nature of the development, that would be that would be visible when taking in the view as you walk up and down the route.

00:24:41:18 - 00:25:19:11

And in the case of the year 15 assessment, we're also considering the extent to which the mitigation proposals would have grown out by that stage. So the mitigation included for allowing the hedgerows within the site to grow out, whether existing hedgerows up to a height of three meters, or in the case where there may be breaks in in the existing vegetation or no vegetation, in some cases new hedgerows or planting or proposed to help to help screen those views. So, uh, we would be also cognizant of that. And, and the photo montages helped to understand what that would look like by showing an example of when new mitigations proposed, how that how that would grow.

00:25:19:27 - 00:25:28:08

But in terms of how that judgment is made, it's about understanding the extent to which the development would be visible from the location in those different time periods.

00:25:29:05 - 00:26:07:19

Yeah, I understand that. And I understand why you've given a sensitivity rating of high for the receptor. What I'm not understanding is how you've arrived at a magnitude of change of medium to low. And the reason I say that is because when you look at paragraph 6.3.5 of your environmental statement, it sets out five magnitudes of change being very low, low, medium, high, very much very high magnitude of change. And then when I look at the assessment findings in appendix 6.3, you have medium low for all periods.

00:26:07:23 - 00:26:23:08

How do you get to that medium to low lo magnitude of change finding. And I know you saying on site, but how when I'm reading the environmental statement, do I understand how you followed that process and clearly how you got to that finding?

00:26:24:03 - 00:26:55:09

Yeah. So within within the different steps there are also part categories. So um, the nature of a of a change is I would say it's more akin to a scale rather than just five specific points. And so if you find that you've got an impact which sits between the two levels, we will use a, a medium to low or a medium to high category. To summarize the fact that it sort of sits between the two bands. Um, so rather than it being a, a binary one thing or another, it gives us the flexibility to properly communicate the, the level of change that we're seeing.

00:26:55:11 - 00:27:02:16

And if that sits between two, we will we'll capture that with a, as I say, a medium to low or a medium to high type categorization.

00:27:03:12 - 00:27:11:21

And those individual parts that you've just referred to, are they set out anywhere in your assessment in terms of what you found for each of those.

00:27:12:01 - 00:27:35:24

So within the text there is there is a narrative which helps to explain the judgments that were made. But obviously there is an element of professional judgment within the assessors process, which, you know, is not fully set out on paper, but which is just inherent part of the the process of following a gallery to implement landscape and visual judgments.

00:27:37:29 - 00:27:52:19

I have to decipher the text that you've written to try and work out whether it's medium, medium to how you've got to that medium low binding. So it's not a clear sort of table or something that shows me how you've got to that medium to love finding.

00:27:54:10 - 00:28:12:20

The the narrative text which accompanies the either the viewpoints assessments or the discussion of the visual receptors will explain the nature of the change, which will then be summarised in a in an a magnitude judgment. So the combination of the text provided, and then that that magnitude set out is the explanation of the of the effect.

00:28:15:03 - 00:29:01:02

Okay. So if if this was supposed if this was in because when you read your this paragraph 6.35, which seems to set out quite clear narrative as to how you would determine the magnitude of change. So a low magnitude change, you put some change in the view that is not prominent, but visible to some visual receptors. And then you've put a medium magnitude of change, which is some change in the view that is clearly noticeable in the view. So at this particular photomontage, would you say that it's a change in view that's not prominent or or whether it's clearly notable because to me I think it would you would be able to make a judgment between those two different aspects, whether it's not prominent or clearly noticeable.

00:29:02:06 - 00:29:37:06

Yeah. So the, um, the, the explanation you set out that we provided gives an indication of those factors which might lead you to getting to either a low or medium, or a high. It's not prescriptive in its own right, but it does give you a clear understanding of how we've helped to come to those judgments and to what extent something is noticeable or, you know, or prominence is in an inherently, um, subjective point and linked to the specifics of the individual viewpoint and circumstances in question.

00:29:37:08 - 00:29:59:20

And, um, you know, it can vary based on the distance, um, the extent of the, the view which has been taken up by the development, the extent to which the mitigation, um, which would which would screen the extent of other views available, the nature of the, the view in the round. So, uh, it's a it's sort of a holistic judgment that brings lots of factors together in order to, to come to those conclusions.

00:30:02:12 - 00:30:30:00

Okay. And just briefly looking at your methodology. Um, if this was to have followed this particular paragraph 6.3 and you came with this as a magnitude medium of change, would that represent a significant effect at this viewpoint? So you'd have a high sensitivity receptor, even if it was considered to be a medium magnitude of change, which is a change in the view that is clearly notable in this view. Would that represent a significant effect?

00:30:31:06 - 00:31:00:23

Not necessarily. As I said earlier on. Not all moderate effects are necessarily a significant effect. It depends whether it would fall at the higher or lower end of that moderate spectrum. And in many cases, um, with respect to the year 15 scenario, with the mitigation planting in place, uh, you know, we identify that significant effects wouldn't, wouldn't, wouldn't occur from, uh, locations, you know, in and around the site due to the nature of of that planting and the way in which it was specifically designed to mitigate those significant effects.

00:31:02:03 - 00:31:18:22

Thank you, Mr. Turner. I'll leave it there for the time being to digest. So I'll turn to Nottinghamshire County Council now, because I know that your relevant representation has voiced some concerns of how this has been done. So I would be interested to hear from you on what you've just heard.

00:31:20:20 - 00:31:41:13

Thank you sir. I'm going to just introduce my colleague John Brody, who I think is trying to get in anyway on online. So without further ado, I'll just hand over to John. We've appointed a consultant to our landscape and planning consultancy, have worked extensively on solar projects in this area. Thank you.

00:31:44:13 - 00:31:53:14

Hello, I'm John Brody, landscape architect, and I'm representing the host authority, Nottingham County Council on Landscape and Visual Issues.

00:31:57:18 - 00:32:05:23

And we've been asked to comment on the methodology. And, um, I think we would like to make the point that, um,

00:32:07:19 - 00:32:39:27

uh, the, the, the moderate effects are usually, uh, judged as significant and, and are significant in, in the is wide sort of significance criteria. And in our experience, uh, we, we of other inset projects. So including solar schemes that h have advised on, uh, we have found that um, moderate effects are usually judged as significant.

00:32:43:11 - 00:33:04:02

So we're a little bit concerned that, uh, if they're not being judged significant, then there could be an overuse of professional judgment without transparent explanation. And, um, after reviewing the LV thus provided we feel that that that that is the case.

00:33:06:08 - 00:33:23:19

Was there anything that, um, Mr. Turner explained to us just know that has, um, made you understand how in this case, a moderate effect has been considered to be not significant in this case? Was there anything there that that helped explain that to you?

00:33:26:01 - 00:33:30:20

I think there's still a bit more work to be done in that department.

00:33:33:09 - 00:33:43:18

Okay. Um, I'll be right in assuming that are you going to be expanding upon your, um, concerns on this matter in your deadline? One submission.

00:33:44:14 - 00:33:45:09

We will.

00:33:47:07 - 00:33:56:14

Okay. Okay. Well, I'll leave it there for the time being, and I'll consider more. Is there anything, Mr. Turner, you want to respond on what you've just heard from? From the council.

00:33:57:16 - 00:33:58:18

Not at this time.

00:34:00:09 - 00:34:08:14

Okay. Um, does anybody in the room want to make any comments on what they've just heard? No. I'll start. Yes, I'll start with you, Mr. Barlow.

00:34:10:14 - 00:34:49:01

Hello? James Barlow. Windmill. Um, if it's possible to go back to that viewpoint. 20. Um, I just I'm unsure on its relevance. Um, it's obviously taken from a low level looking at a power station that's being demolished. From that viewpoint, if you look to the right, you can see a grade two star listed building. Why did the applicant choose to look at something that's been demolished instead of something with historic value that I believe has significance, even though they say it doesn't? That they could have used to say this is what would happen to something that is remaining.

00:34:49:03 - 00:34:57:09

And once the, um, mitigation panels are there, the view to the windmill will disappear. Thank you.

00:34:57:13 - 00:35:24:04

Okay. I think I know from my own observation you've got a photo montage looking in the direction towards the windmill. From this viewpoint, I think you're showing. Is that. Is this. Is this the one? Because that's looking towards. Could you do you want to just point out where the windmill is on that particular photo montage, and maybe just explain a little bit more about how you've assessed the views towards the windmill from this viewpoint?

00:35:28:17 - 00:35:59:21

Yes. So as you've noted, the the photo montage doesn't just point in one direction. We actually pick up all directions in which the proposed development would potentially be visible, including the view broadly in the in the direction of the of the windmill, which I think can possibly be just made out in the, uh, in the distance, albeit I can't immediately see it a moment. But when we did assess the route, not just the viewpoint, because just to just to confirm, obviously the viewpoints are only one part of the assessment.

00:35:59:23 - 00:36:35:19

And we did do an assessment of the full extent of the of the public footpath in this location, where we are aware that from routes within the site there are um, views towards, uh, the windmill. Um, on occasion as you move around the site. Um, and uh, the nature of the effects, uh, on, on the views was mindful of, uh, the baseline context of those views, um, including in this case, the wide open nature of the view, the existing built form within it, um, and any features of notes such as the windmill, if it were to be visible.

00:36:35:21 - 00:36:44:06

So, um, uh, like all features in the view, um, it's something which is, which is considered as part of the assessment process.

00:36:46:00 - 00:36:48:19

Does that help answer your question?

00:36:49:07 - 00:36:56:21

I still haven't seen anything in their report that says significant or not significant with the view towards the windmill.

00:36:59:16 - 00:37:29:17

It's it is whilst it's been raised. It is a question on what the relationship is between the historic environment chapter and the landscaping visual. And I know there was some comments raised in one of the sort of the scoping stage about the importance of the interrelationship between those two different disciplines. Is there something you can just explain briefly now of how the two disciplines have considered, um, sort of overarching issues such as towards the the windmill?

00:37:30:27 - 00:38:01:22

Yes. So obviously the the EIA process as a whole involves all of the consultant team working collectively, both throughout the design process, the development of the mitigation and during the assessment of the effects. Um, in particular, um, I work closely alongside my colleague, um, Laura Garcia, who's here today to speak on heritage matters with respect to that crossover between landscape and visual and and cultural heritage. And Laura was cognizant of the viewpoints that we were including with the assessment and how they might help inform her judgments, as well as the judgments that are set out in the Elvia.

00:38:01:28 - 00:38:13:18

Um, but obviously, with regard to the matter of the setting and significance of the setting of the windmill, that's something to which is addressed fully in the heritage material as opposed to the landscape and visual material within the EIA, but is addressed nonetheless.

00:38:15:16 - 00:38:33:00

Thank you. Um, is there anybody else got any more comments that they would like to make on the methodology based on what they've heard? I don't see any hands up in the room. Or I see one hand up that's just, um, that's just gone up at the back of the room if we can just bring the roving mic.

00:38:36:07 - 00:38:41:13

And if you could just introduce yourself and who you're representing. Um. You speak.

00:38:41:28 - 00:39:18:14

Um, Karen Hodgson feels for farming. I know this area like the back of my hand. And I would like to ask the examiners. If I were to go out to take attractive photographs of the area. I would imagine that is very possible. I could go out and take photographs of this area, not underneath a hedge where your camera is pointing to a hedge, but there are multiple viewpoints across these large, open, wide ranging fields where photographs could be taken.

00:39:18:16 - 00:39:49:27

Even if the hedge is in 15 years time with three feet higher would still show open green rolling countryside dotted with hedgerows and copses, etc. so whatever the methodology is showing, I would say that's inaccurate because how it will look is a sea of glass. So that is my point. I don't think this is a valid or acceptable mythology, methodology or representation of how it will look.

00:39:50:00 - 00:40:03:15

Because you can stand back at different points across the footpaths, across the bridleways, not under a hedge, and it will look very different. It won't look as it's being portrayed, it won't be concealed. Thank you.

00:40:03:27 - 00:40:22:12

Thank you. I'm not going to ask for a response now, because I think that's going to lead on to the next part of the agenda item where we talk about the viewpoints and choice of location. So I will be wanting a response to that, but it probably ties into the next question I'm going to ask. Is there anybody else that wants to make a comment on the methodology?

00:40:23:28 - 00:40:49:08

No, I don't see any hands, so I'm not going to move on to the next part. Within agenda item is the content of the photographs and the photo on charges and and and this follows from the question that's just been asked really if you could actually explain how your viewpoint selection was finalized following the receipt of the scoping response that you received, how you actually came to choose these viewpoint locations.

00:40:51:08 - 00:41:16:02

Okay, so the viewpoint photographs included in the survey illustrate the views from a series of 26 number representative locations, and those viewpoints were photographed in summer 2024. Um, the photo montages, including the Arbor, illustrate how the proposed development would look from a selection of a number of those viewpoints during year one and year 15, in both winter and summer periods, as we've discussed.

00:41:20:25 - 00:41:54:24

The photo montages include the proposed planting I'll set out in the uh, shown to reflect either the summer or winter conditions. Um, and detail regarding the nature of the planting. Expected growth rates were set on the RBA in paragraphs six, eight, 5 to 6 eight nine. Uh, effort was made to agree the locations for the viewpoint and photo montages locations with the relevant consultation bodies through the EIA scoping and peer stages, with a request for feedback on the proposed locations included within both the scoping reports and the peer review comments on the viewpoint.

00:41:54:26 - 00:42:10:22

Locations were provided through the scoping or peer stages, with the comments which were received being discussed in section 6.5 of the RA and related primarily to feedback from the Canal and River trust, who wished to ensure there was appropriate illustration of views from the River Trent.

00:42:14:10 - 00:42:26:07

Okay, so you've agreed the viewpoint in collaboration with other consultees such as the council and an actual viewpoint, action and locations were agreed. Is that correct?

00:42:26:15 - 00:42:35:13

So at both the scoping and the peer stage, we set out those 26 viewpoints and asked if consultees wanted any further locations and councils did not come back and request anything different.

00:42:37:06 - 00:43:09:24

Could you display, um, document app 096. Um, and particularly want to see the photograph at viewpoint 18. And whilst that's loading up, um, this viewpoint is stated to represent receptors on the Trent Valley way. Um and other public rights of way. And I'd like your explanation as to why this location has been chosen to represent this receptor. So when the photograph comes up.

00:44:11:09 - 00:44:33:17

That's the one. So this is when you are walking on the Champ Valley Way and you walk under the railway line, and then you are approaching the rest of the footpath towards walk towards the village of Stirling, the steeple. Can you explain to me why you've chosen this location to represent effects from this footpath?

00:44:34:15 - 00:45:15:03

So within the LGA, we discuss the full extent of the Trent Valley Way as it passes through the study area and articulate the level of change and the effects that would occur across those, those. The full extent of the route, including as it passes through the site. Um, part of that narrative discusses how when you pass under the railway line, um, although you are in very close proximity to the development at that point, the nature of the dip under the bridge means that you wouldn't, uh, have the ability to see the development due to the offset between the, uh, the boundary vegetation and the panels and, uh, and the height of the panels.

00:45:15:05 - 00:45:56:15

And this, which is one of a number of viewpoints along the Trent Valley Way, including the one we were looking at a moment ago. A few point 20, uh, helps to illustrate that point, which otherwise on paper might be difficult to understand on first reading, given how it looks to be located so close to the site. So it just helps to illustrate that whilst, um. The route at this point would appear to be immediately adjacent. It actually dips down and as you pass under the bridge, you wouldn't then have that that view. Um, and like I say, it helps to illustrate the narrative that we have as we, uh, discuss the length of the route, which explains how, um, the proposed element would come in, in and out of visibility rather than being constantly visible.

00:45:56:18 - 00:46:08:16

And there would be many occasions whereby proposed development would not be visible due to either existing vegetation or in this case, the way that the topography changes and you get the dip under the under the railway.

00:46:10:12 - 00:46:44:25

Okay. How does this location represent a worst case scenario along that route, though? From between viewpoint 20, which you had before all the way to the steeple, because when you get to the end of that, when you walk up that that slope, it opens out. Is there any viewpoints that that you'd even that you consider to choose along that stretch of the route to illustrate the effects that you've just explained that you have. I see that you've included the narrative along that route. Why have you not chosen a photo montage to represent that a lot of that route?

00:46:48:15 - 00:47:23:02

So as you get closer towards a certain village, there is another viewpoint, um, along there. Um, and we can't provide viewpoints across every single, uh, location which we assess. The viewpoints are only an aid to support the judgment. The thing which matters is the ultimate assessment judgment on the route. And we do fully identify the nature of the change and the level of effects, including where the effects are greater than they are at this location. Um, and we acknowledge that there are greater effects at their heart than they are from here.

00:47:23:04 - 00:47:38:02

And we don't purport to set out that the viewpoints are the worst case locations. They are simply snapshots which help to illustrate the narrative. But we're not in any way trying to suggest this is a worst case location along this section of the route. That's not the purpose of the viewpoint.

00:47:40:00 - 00:48:17:20

Okay. And I think the viewpoint that you're referring to before, which is on the edge of the village is, is, is viewpoint one. But for, for sort of to understand and the assessment of effects in particular it's paragraph 6.7.8 and it's trying to understand particularly how you've you've got your written narrative in there, which um explains and it does identify significant effects, but then documents the appendix 6.3 is the viewpoint assessment, which is what you've used to then identify the number of significant effects.

00:48:17:22 - 00:48:45:11

And at this viewpoint, you've identified not significant effects, but you have to go into the document to try and understand where all the significant effects are. And I'm a little bit concerned that they're not being reported all the way through by omitting some of the photo montages. Is there anything you can explain to me to, to suggest that that that's a to to to sort of comfort, whether that's correct or not.

00:48:46:16 - 00:49:17:27

So the full assessment of the Trent Valley Way is in the main body of the LVA itself. Not not within an appendix. Um, and for each section where there would be potential visibility of the scheme, a separate assessment judgment is set out. Um, and so, um, that starts with, uh, where the route first comes into the study area. Um, as it passes through the site and then as it moves out again, um, and a range of effects along the route are identified, including some significant effects in the location that you were referring to as the route moves from here, uh, to wards the village.

00:49:17:29 - 00:49:49:13

Um, that assessment was undertaken based on, uh, walking those routes and understanding the level of nature of the change, as you would. And whilst the viewpoints help, as do the photo montages to provide an aid to that judgement, the process is the the or the on site appraisal of what the change would be and that is articulated in the main text, and where there are significant effects on a small number of routes within the site. This that is clearly set out.

00:49:51:08 - 00:50:17:19

Thank you. I'll consider the comments you've just said there and and we'll come back if we have any more questions on that. Um, I'll turn to the council first. And for your comments on the viewpoint selection, and in particular, firstly, whether you're satisfied with the viewpoint locations in the photo montages that have been selected and importantly, whether you're likely to request any further locations during the examination.

00:50:21:24 - 00:50:59:11

Hello, I'm John Broadley, landscape architect representing the host authority, Nottingham County Council. Um, we've reviewed the, uh, viewpoint locations and the photo montage locations. Um, and we think there's an adequate spread, uh, appropriate for the LV, but we did feel that there was limited coverage of residential receptors. Um, so by that we would mean, um, the public realm that the residents would be exposed to or views from the public realm.

00:50:59:29 - 00:51:03:11

Um, that residents might experience.

00:51:06:05 - 00:51:41:06

Um, we also felt that there was a there were a few things missing in terms of like the methodology for the photography wasn't in the LV. So, um, we're assuming that technical guidance note uh, zero 19. It has been used, but that's not explicitly stated in the, uh, in the Elvia. And we were all sort of concerned that, uh, like yourself that, um, some the visualizations don't really represent the worst case scenario.

00:51:48:27 - 00:51:54:29

Thank you for that. Mr. Brody. Are you are you going to be reporting more on that in your deadline one submissions?

00:51:55:06 - 00:52:15:23

We are we have we have, um, we have produced a detailed landscape, uh, well, LVII review, which is going to be appended in the local impact report. And that's been written so that, that, that that has more information than I'm able to provide right now. Um.

00:52:16:25 - 00:52:31:26

Well, we'll, we'll wait for that, um, that document and obviously the applicant will have the response. You know, you get the option obviously to respond to that. Um, is there anything that you want to respond to what the council has just said there at this moment in time?

00:52:33:15 - 00:52:38:21

No, I think we'll await the, um, the formal material and review appropriately.

00:52:40:10 - 00:52:48:14

Thank you for that. Um, is there anybody who wants to make any comments on the viewpoint selections and what you've basically just heard today?

00:52:51:00 - 00:52:51:27

I mean, I'm quite happy.

00:52:53:15 - 00:52:57:04

I will start with Mr.. Mr. Barlow and then we'll go to the end.

00:52:58:09 - 00:53:32:23

Okay. Thank you. Uh, James Barlow, I'll say, speaking on behalf of Bill's performing and also as a resident of Stoughton. Um, when I look at the I. I was born and brought up in the area. I know the lines very, very well. And I know the viewpoints very, very well. When I look at just about all the viewpoints. I will say they are either of no relevance because they're looking towards areas where panels aren't even going, aren't proposed to be put, or they're looking in areas of worst case scenarios where the view is minimal.

00:53:33:01 - 00:53:54:25

I couldn't really say, as I could see any of those photos that were looking at what I would call or from what I would call a viewpoint as you walk the area. There are viewpoints, as there are. It's the Trent Valley way. It's there because there's viewpoints. So why have none of the viewpoints being used where you look at the countryside? Thank you.

00:53:57:15 - 00:54:05:03

Okay, I'll hand over to Mr. Gibson and then I'll let the applicant respond to you. Thank you. Well, thank you, sir. That's very good.

00:54:05:11 - 00:54:48:27

Yeah. In much the same way. Um, from the the Notts Council contribution from arch. Uh, it's about views from the public realm if you like, and as part of the local amenity of dog walking, walking, riding, whatever around. I like Mister Barlow. Don't believe that the photos are particularly, um, particularly the photos and the photo montage are not truly representative of the views of the Trent Valley around here that I certainly recognize from my riding and walking time, albeit only 25 years, so a bit shorter than Mister Barlow.

00:54:49:08 - 00:55:01:24

So I just question the selection of the viewpoints and the selection of the photographs. I don't think they are as representative as they could be. Thank you.

00:55:02:09 - 00:55:16:00

Okay. Thank you. Um, I don't see any further hands up in the room or online, so I'll let the applicant have a final opportunity to respond. Oh, there is one more. Yes. Um, just bring the roving microphone down.

00:55:20:08 - 00:55:55:08

Ruth Edwards this time fields performing. I would say the two photographs that we have seen are typical of a promoter seeking to minimize the effect that he will have on landscape. They do not show the rolling green fields landscape, which would be totally devastated along with the associated wildlife, by this scheme. They are a false representation of what would be seen in the event of this scheme going ahead.

00:55:55:10 - 00:55:56:05

Thank you.

00:56:00:21 - 00:56:06:24

I'll turn to the applicant and I will allow you the opportunity to respond on the points that you've just heard there.

00:56:07:10 - 00:56:39:04

So regarding the viewpoint selection, um, obviously we've looked at two out of the 26 viewpoints which are provided. So there are a number of other locations covering a variety of different receptors for the different footpaths and rights of way roads and the residential settlements in and around the site. Um, we believe they provide a useful aid to help the process of understanding the level of effects, but they themselves are not the sole basis on which those judgments are made.

00:56:39:15 - 00:57:16:24

Um, they are an aid to help inform the judgment. And, you know, it's neither, uh, you know, possible or realistic to expect we can have a viewpoint from every single receptor that, that we assess. So we

inevitably have to rely first and foremost on the written judgment. And I have a few points to help supplement that. Um, from some locations which are useful to informing the narrative. And in some cases, as with the one we discussed, um, under the railway bridge, that they are as much to demonstrate locations from which it you know, it may at first appear that you would see something, but actually in reality you wouldn't.

00:57:16:26 - 00:57:55:14

And then in other instances, you know, they are locations where there are clear open views in all directions. And we do show, um, a few point photography and in some cases in 360 degrees from, from locations where there would be that potential to see elements of the development in, in all directions. Um, where possible, we do try to microsite, um, to things like field gaps and the like, but in some instances where you have long rows of established hedgerows, um, it's not possible to, um, to illustrate the wide open view, because it may just be that along that length, um, the most representative thing to show is a location where the hedgerows are more prominent.

00:57:58:09 - 00:58:10:24

Thank you for that response. That brings us to the end of this particular agenda item. Um, sorry. Off of item Two five. Um.

00:58:17:04 - 00:58:23:16

So sorry to interrupt, but if that is the end of item five, I think it's not.

00:58:23:18 - 00:58:54:04

It's. Sorry. It's the it's the end of that sub part of item five. Just to just to clarify that. Um, so yes, it's not the end of item. It's the end of the. So I'm going to move on to the landscape and visual assessment. I'll probably go on for another 15 minutes or so before breaking for lunch, if that's okay to everyone. Um, so I'll quickly start on, on. Um, the conclusions on the landscape and visual assessment. And I'm going to start with the landscape effects.

00:58:54:06 - 00:59:15:01

Um, and I first want to ask some questions on the on the assessment of the effects on landscape features. Um, so could the applicant set out, um, how the assessment of effects on landscape features was undertaken, and particularly how you. Selected the landscape features for the assessment.

00:59:18:08 - 00:59:49:06

Yes. So with respect to landscape features, um, we consider all landscape features within the site as part of the assessment. Um, and that was divided into different categories. Um, so we considered the woodland, we consider the individual trees, we considered the hedgerows. And then we considered the the ground cover or land cover making up the site itself. So either agricultural or pastoral use.

00:59:49:15 - 01:00:28:06

And then we considered the effects on each of those sub elements, uh, during the construction period and then thereafter into the operational period when mitigation would have had the opportunity to begin to mature. Um, and we have a differing level of effect identified accordingly. So during the construction period, um, we saw, um, no, no significant effects. Indeed no material effects at all on the

woodland or individual trees, because the design had sought to ensure that they were protected with appropriate offsets, and also with respect to the majority of the hedgerows as well.

01:00:28:10 - 01:01:07:15

Uh, there was, uh, no effect, but some, uh, effects to hedgerows, uh, were identified where their breaks were required for access or were associated with the cable route. Um, and some localized significant effect was identified as a result. Um likewise with respect to the ground cover, the land cover of the site itself again during the construction period, whilst activity would be taking place on site, vehicle movements, etc.. Uh, a significant effect was identified on the land cover of the site itself during the construction period, Moving through to the operational period again.

01:01:07:17 - 01:01:44:03

The protection to the existing woodland and individual trees would remain, but this time, with respect to the hedgerows, we actually see a beneficial effect as a result of the hedgerows that are planted as part of the mitigation proposals, and collectively we identified that added up to a significant effect with respect to those hedgerows. Um, and then with regards to the land cover, um, underneath the panels there would be a mix of um, uh, grassland and wildflowers, um, and a more species rich environment than is currently the case with the arable or pastoral fields.

01:01:44:09 - 01:01:52:18

Um, and therefore they would no longer be that significant negative effect. And instead there would be a minor beneficial effect with regard to the land cover.

01:01:54:22 - 01:02:03:09

And on the the land cover that you've erred to. Can you just confirm what, um, features fall within that category.

01:02:04:09 - 01:02:04:24

Yeah.

01:02:04:26 - 01:02:08:18

So. So you've got arable or pastoral farmland. Is there any others?

01:02:08:24 - 01:02:23:29

So as, as the sites divided up, if you, if you take away the woodland, the trees, the hedgerows, the remainder of what is left in the site, which is effectively the ground cover is what's then encompassed in, in that category.

01:02:26:24 - 01:02:49:07

I'll on that point. I'll bring Nottinghamshire County Council in at the moment and on ground cover, because your relevant representation refers to the exclusion of arable land as a landscape feature from the assessment. Could you just explain further where you consider that this is missing in the assessment? And it's so where does it need to be included?

01:02:52:13 - 01:03:08:10

I think I don't know the answer to that question, I'm afraid. And we'll have to provide you with something in writing at a later date. Um, I'm not the author of, um, our landscape review. Um, but I will make a note of that. Uh.

01:03:10:12 - 01:03:13:02

We'll add that as a as an action point for.

01:03:13:04 - 01:03:13:29

Fear, as an action.

01:03:14:01 - 01:03:20:05

Point. You can revisit those comments that you've made just to confirm what the situation is.

01:03:20:07 - 01:03:28:21

Sure. I would like to make a point about the hedgerow, uh, being being, um, being classed as beneficial effects.

01:03:29:00 - 01:03:43:16

I'll hold you there because I'm going to come on to explain about the how the effects of being arrived at in a moment. So I'm going to ask the applicant in a bit more how that they've got to that. So that and then I will bring you in to talk about that.

01:03:43:18 - 01:04:12:21

We're a bit confused about that, because it seems to be that the taking away with one hand and then giving with the other, um, and that would actually result in a neutral or even a minor adverse effect rather than a beneficial effect on hedgerows. Um, I believe that they're actually going to remove, uh, up to a kilometer of hedgerow and to then say it's beneficial at year one because they're planting more hedgerow. Um, seems a bit, uh, disingenuous.

01:04:14:05 - 01:04:45:09

Okay. Well, we'll come on to that in a moment. So I'll, I'll turn back to the applicant now. And you've explained some of the effects on the, on the landscape, um, features and the findings just now. Um, and during the operation phase, the environmental statement and this is paragraph 7.6.31 and 7.67.732, predicts that effects on landscape features would result in moderate beneficial effects at year 50.

01:04:46:05 - 01:04:50:10

Can you explain how beneficial effects of these receptors occur?

01:04:52:17 - 01:05:20:19

So this is the benefit to the hedgerows that I referred to previously. Um, so, um, during the construction period, there would be, um, removal of some sections of hedgerow, as was just discussed. However, the mitigation proposed includes, for a far greater extent of new hedgerow planting than would be removed, um, and as a result that the the overall net benefit is one which is beneficial. Um.

01:05:25:06 - 01:06:03:18

Okay. Um, and paragraph 7.6.7.31, it, it refers to the planting of new trees, woodland, hetero and and also species rich planting for the majority of the site which based on that, um, what you've just said now appears to be the main reasons for why you've concluded that in your opinion, there would be beneficial landscape effects. Um, but to what extent would beneficial effects be experienced at year one, given the length of time that planting will take to mature or be noticeable.

01:06:06:09 - 01:06:40:20

So the volume of new hedgerow planting, but also the individual trees and small areas of woodland wood would collectively be, you know, be notable. Um, the stock size, um, with which the planting would be implemented would uh, would not be, uh, insurmountable. And, uh, already by year one, there would be a notable benefit to the, to the landscape, albeit not one that would be as great as when that vegetation is matured, but it would go in, in such a nature as to make an impact given the, the volume and, uh, and collective nature of it.

01:06:44:04 - 01:07:16:16

Okay. And, um, just taking that on further, um, in the respect of, um, Hedgerow planting, and we talked about before how a moderate effect could potentially be well, in your it's either not significant or it is significant. And in this case, you consider that the moderate significant beneficial effects as a result of hedgerow planting would be a moderate significant beneficial effect. Why is it significant in this instance?

01:07:18:09 - 01:07:51:15

So as I previously articulated, moderate to spectrum is either towards the higher end or the lower end. In this instance we considered that it was towards the the higher end of moderate. Um, as discussed it's a it's a notable volume of additional hedgerow planting, um, far outweighing the minimal levels of removal, uh, the extent to which it would, uh, repair, uh, gaps in existing hedgerows and restore hedgerows that may have been lost from the historic, uh, pattern of the landscape, uh, collectively added up in this instance to what we believe to be a significant Significance effect.

01:07:57:13 - 01:08:13:13

Two just just so I've understood that it is the volume of hedgerow planting, in your opinion, that tips it as into the higher end of moderate, um, the moderate effect that makes it a significant beneficial effect.

01:08:15:06 - 01:08:31:20

It's a combination of factors, one of which is the the volume of the planting. But as I say, also the extent to which it would, you know, relate well to the local landscape characters, which it would repair existing gaps in hedgerows to which it would restore historic pattern. Those all collectively add up to demonstrating that significant effect.

01:08:37:27 - 01:09:19:11

Okay. Thank you. And in terms of the beneficial effects for arable or pastoral farmland which falls under ground cover, which you've, um, identified that there would be, um, well, a major moderate significant adverse effect of construction stage, primarily because of the loss of that. But then that would, um, tend to beneficial effects further due to the planting of new species rich grassland. Could

you explain to me why the planting of new species rich grassland is beneficial over the loss of arable or pastoral farmland as a landscape feature.

01:09:20:22 - 01:09:55:05

So as a landscape feature um, arable and pastoral farmland is is common um and is not especially species diverse. And there's an overlap here with with the ecology work as well. Obviously working closely with our ecology colleagues in terms of biodiversity, um, and the proposed mitigation would have a much more biodiverse grassland mix with a greater degree of species diversity, which in terms of landscape features would be beneficial when compared to the regular arable or pastoral use.

01:09:56:20 - 01:10:06:12

So that arable or pastoral farmland is not. You've not regarded it as a high value feature. Just, just so I've understood.

01:10:06:14 - 01:10:19:01

That's right there in strictly landscape and visual terms, um, that's that's commonplace and not particularly of value compared to a more species rich, diverse wildflower mix, which would be proposed as part of the scheme.

01:10:19:05 - 01:10:43:26

So in other words, you are putting a higher landscape feature if if a lot of that and it might sound like a really simple question, but if most of that feature is covered with solar panels, how is that beneficial? How to what extent is the species rich grassland going to be of benefit? If it is, if it is under solar panels.

01:10:44:07 - 01:11:02:13

So obviously the panels themselves don't cover the entirety of the site. You've got margins which are left specifically, which can be planted with the species rich ones. But also grassland does grow well underneath panels, and it doesn't impede its ability to be a landscape feature. Um.

01:11:05:12 - 01:11:12:27

Thank you. Your responses to that. I will now bring in Mr. Brody again from from Nottinghamshire County Council. Um,

01:11:14:26 - 01:11:24:26

for your comments on what you've heard and basically to elaborate further on what you were you were saying before about how the concerns you've got about how beneficial these effects really are.

01:11:25:10 - 01:12:05:21

Yeah, I think our concern is that, um, it's been claimed that the hedgerows will be of benefit will have a beneficial effect from year one when, uh, and, and there's a bit, there's an overreliance on the volume, uh, being, being provided. Um, and there's no guarantee of maintenance and, and survival. And, you know, there's no, you know, the survival rate of what's planted could be a factor. Um, I think basically there's being a there's an overreliance on the mitigation plan to survive, all of it surviving, which is unlikely to be the case.

01:12:05:25 - 01:12:21:06

And, um, we would suggest that, uh, there needs to be a detailed maintenance plan and, um, that the the, the the success of the planting needs to be monitored, um, after five years.

01:12:22:24 - 01:12:26:04

And that that should be stipulated in the DCO.

01:12:29:12 - 01:12:34:22

Okay. Um, I'll, I'll let the applicant respond back to the points you just heard there.

01:12:35:13 - 01:13:20:23

So included with the application was an outline of a landscape and ecological management plan, which does allow for the ongoing maintenance and management of the planting. Um, including consideration of, uh, if there's planting failures within the first five years, revisiting, planting and providing new to ensure that the mitigation is successful. Um, we will in our judgments around growth rates and and the assessments, building a consideration of the fact that there may be some degree of failure. But the way that the the planting is specked ensures that there is sufficient to enable that benefit to accrue, even with the the natural deterioration you may get from some vegetation, but nonetheless, if there's more substantial decline for any particular reason, extreme climate factors, etc.,

01:13:20:25 - 01:13:23:26

there is provisions within that within that limit to to control that.

01:13:32:00 - 01:13:40:17

Okay. Thank you. Does anybody want to raise any comments on what they've heard on the landscape features. And I will start

01:13:42:15 - 01:13:43:18

with Mr. Fleming.

01:13:45:06 - 01:14:19:08

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The previous comments. I'll make one fact. Our landscape is dynamic. It changes month by month. You can, at the moment, in the field next to my house, as winter wheat has been planted, has been planted. In the summer. That will be wheat. It will be high. When I look out across the valley, I can see the different plants, the different crops, the growing, the colour changes over the years, over the years. When we walk down our down our our footpaths and round around the village, the seasons change.

01:14:19:10 - 01:14:54:09

The smell of the and the. The smell of the land, the smell of the. The crops that are growing, the seeds that are growing. It changes not monthly, but it certainly grows. It certainly changes every three months. So the whole of our landscape is a dynamic landscape. It's not going to be done a dynamic landscape when it's covered in panels. Because the panels are never going to change, the panels are not going to grow as winter wheat from little roots to grow into a full crop. And what I can't get over is the fact that there's so much wasted land with these panels.

01:14:55:05 - 01:15:08:13

It's just it. I'm sorry I can't say any more, but it's just that we live in a dynamic environment. And these, these, these explanations do not reflect the actual reality on the ground. Thank you.

01:15:08:27 - 01:15:15:19

Okay. Thank you for your submission. And does anybody else got any further comments? Yes there is. And then there's a hand up at the back as well.

01:15:16:00 - 01:15:52:19

Hello. James Barlow. Uh, fields for farming. Um, just listening to that, it suggested that the arable land has a low environmental value of. As for species for live livestock and animals. Most a lot of the land that's been put forward has been on either higher level environmental schemes for many years. Or medium term schemes for many years which are there to promote wildlife diversity. Are we suggesting that those schemes have done no good over the years? To say that the starting point is low? Our starting point is high.

01:15:52:25 - 01:16:30:03

We already have a lot of wildlife. It's not a low starting point because it is arable land. Secondly, we've talked about hedgerows. Hedgerows. Established hedgerows have far more value than new hedgerows. So suggesting that if you take one metre, one kilometre of old hedgerow out and plant it with one metre, one kilometre of new hedgerow, gives a an even impact, it doesn't. It's a negative impact because you're replacing old hedgerows, which many species live in with new hedgerows which nothing lives in originally.

01:16:30:05 - 01:16:40:24

So rather than saying it is minor beneficial impact, it should always say it could be a minor, but it's a minor negative impact, not a positive one. Thank you.

01:16:42:05 - 01:16:48:21

Thank you, Mr. Barlow. And there was a there was another hand up towards the back and we'll just know. And that will be the.

01:16:48:28 - 01:17:20:00

Karen Hodgson from fields for farming. Um, just echoing what James has just said, but also um, I would ask the developers, are they going to employ a team of conservation workers? Um, this is a huge landscape. Uh, it's not a matter of just planting at year one, leaving it for five years. You would need a team, um, to, um, be working on this land to create the biodiversity gain that they're talking about.

01:17:20:17 - 01:17:56:29

As James mentions, it's rich in skylark. The ecology report already says that that population would be pretty much decimated. It will fall. Um, there are numerous, um, wildlife studies that we will quote in our report that show that in other solar farms, only one nesting skylark was found. So there is evidence out there which we will put in our comments when we do the report by the 25th. There is. It's also rich in hair, numerous hair, which wasn't even surveyed by race and the ecologists.

01:17:57:05 - 01:18:11:29

Um, so, you know, my question is, um, are the developers really going to invest long term in creating this biodiversity haven? Because I, we really don't trust that they will do. Thank you.

01:18:13:03 - 01:18:24:15

Okay. Thank you. That that will be the last question and I'll take on this particular point, but I will turn to the applicant for you to respond to any of those, um, queries that have just been raised, please.

01:18:26:02 - 01:19:06:01

With regard to the interaction between landscape and ecology, as I mentioned earlier on the landscape and ecological management plan will address that point and it will be a considered scheme which encompasses both the landscape requirements and the ecological requirements, and it will have those control measures in place to ensure its successful and with respect to the landscape features of the site. Um, as discussed, you know, the majority of the site is, uh, agricultural, pastoral and therefore, um, as, as, as I mentioned before, the change from that to something a little bit more species, which is why we came to the conclusion regarding a beneficial effect.

01:19:07:19 - 01:19:30:07

Okay. Um, thank you for those comments. Um, it doesn't bring me to the end of, um, discussing the, um, landscape and visual assessment conclusions. I do have some more questions, but I think it's, it's it's getting to there is a hand up on line. I'll take that question and point. That's on line by Mr. Welsh.

01:19:30:21 - 01:19:54:16

So it's not on this, this topic. It's just as a matter of courtesy to let you know that I won't be here this afternoon. So with regards to agenda item nine, review of issues and actions arising, I won't be able to assist you. I'm sorry about that. It's unavoidable, but a member of the N get team will of course pay careful attention to to to that item and we'll take a note of whatever actions are arising and set out by you.

01:19:55:01 - 01:20:05:01

Okay. Thank you for that, Mr. Welsh. Um, so the time is coming up to 1:20 now is a 45 minute lunch okay. Sufficient time for everyone.

01:20:08:10 - 01:20:21:18

Is that okay for everyone? Yeah. Right. Okay, so we will have 45 minutes and we will resume at five plus two. So this hearing is now adjourned until 2:05. Thank you.