

██████████
██████████
████████████████████

Project 02-12-26 05:09 pm

Created on: 2026-02-12 17:09:35

Project Length: 01:13:06

Account Holder: ██████████

File Name: Steeple_ISH2_120226_PT6-MP3.mp4

File Length: 01:13:06

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:00 - 00:00:14:05

10 to 4 and time for this issue. Specific hearing to resume.

00:00:18:16 - 00:00:38:05

Okay. Um, agenda item 8.3, which is the effects on North Levittown manor house on North Edison Windmill. Associated with the requested removal of the area of solar rays by Nottinghamshire County Council. So again, I'm going to ask the applicant to display that, uh, document that was on before.

00:00:39:27 - 00:01:11:08

And it's appendix three of that particular document, which I think was the page before the previous one. That is the one. Thank you. Um, I've really just a couple of questions for the council to clarify, really in terms of North Levittown Manor House. Um, can the council confirm? Is it. Is it views walking eastwards along footpath 24 towards this asset that you're concerned about.

00:01:12:21 - 00:01:44:09

Uh, Jason Morden, Nottinghamshire County Council, uh, both directions. Sir, it's, um, as you leave, um, the, uh, North Petherton walking in, uh, north westerly direction, you passed past the manor house, and, um, I think the seller arrival will sit, uh, quite strongly in that view, even though there are some hedgerows, um, to help break up some of the view, it'll still feel increasingly dominant as you leave the village.

00:01:44:12 - 00:02:11:08

Um, and of course, on return, you find that the sort of present open fields, um, will become increasingly dominate. Well, they are dominated by views of the solar arrays as you walk along footpath 24. Um, so it was in essence to create a buffer, uh, to those people who were, who might be using that footpath and appreciating the village and its agrarian setting.

00:02:14:05 - 00:02:27:14

Okay. And in terms of the significance of North Petherton manor house, could you just explain a little bit more to us about what is it about the significance that you would be that you're most concerned about?

00:02:27:26 - 00:02:59:15

It's, uh, a good example of, uh, Georgian farmhouse of that particular. Well, it's last phases of the Georgian period, and it's, it's got, um, reasonable, uh, aspects both to the north and south. Um, it's a good example of the type of North Notts, uh, architecture which falls into the grade two category. Um, and it certainly Helps, uh, in terms of that asset itself.

00:02:59:17 - 00:03:28:23

Its wider rural and agrarian setting is a very clearly a component of its setting. Um, and I think those people who might want to appreciate it as they pass by it or towards it, would also sense that the open field and agrarian setting around it are contributing to its to its, uh, character and setting. And that, in essence, is the core of its significance.

00:03:30:02 - 00:03:39:20

Okay. Um, thank you for clarifying that. And are you of the view that that significance would be harmed by the proposal as, as it stands?

00:03:40:18 - 00:03:41:29

Uh, yes, I am.

00:03:50:20 - 00:04:04:27

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, I'll turn to the applicant to respond. I know you've already provided some comments on it. My question is for some clarification from the council, but I will give you the the opportunity to respond. As Garcia on the points that you raised.

00:04:06:00 - 00:04:37:29

Sorry. Okay. Thank you. Um, Laura Garcia, for the, uh, for the appellant. Um, just to discuss this, uh, asit, just briefly, it is, um, an early 18th century grade two listed building. Um, but I think it's it's worth noting that the historic context of this asset has been almost entirely removed. It's situated in a modern cul de sac. It's surrounded by modern development on all sides. Um, the the principal facade faces south.

00:04:38:09 - 00:04:43:06

Um, away from away from the site. Um, and there is a.

00:04:45:14 - 00:05:16:17

Wing, a western elevation, which has two, two windows in, in the upper floor. That's the significance of that asset. Again, it was assessed in our baseline in the appendix one Gazetteer. Um, and we assess no harm to that asset. Moving. The significance of that asset, I would say, is, is primarily formed by its physical fabric. And any such elements of that may be retained of 18th century fabric. And its setting is really very limited indeed.

00:05:16:19 - 00:05:48:08

Now because of the changes to its immediate surroundings, it's entirely suburban ized. Moving. I noticed Mr. Morgan's comments about its the journey west and east, um, along footpath 24. So if if I take the journey north west first. So you're you've you've passed the manor, let's say past the manor on your left hand side and you turn left to, to go up the footpath. The footpath whilst on the plan seems to go near Manor Farmhouse, actually in 3D.

00:05:48:10 - 00:06:18:14

In the flesh you're really quite removed. You're removed from it by modern developments. You're not ever adjacent to the path. There is no clear views. The only clear views of the asset are from the road to the south. So once you're on footpath 24, there are no clear views that illustrate the key elements of the significance of that asset. Moving northwest, you're not that the asset isn't clearly, in your view, it's very much in the periphery and blocked. And you're moving towards where the scheme would be, but it would be behind.

00:06:19:13 - 00:06:52:17

It would be behind a hedge, which from day one would would screen views. And that and those views would only become more and more screened as, as the development as the vegetation matured. You the as I said this, the asset is behind one, as one is travelling northwest and there is no relationship between sort of views as you're walking northwest along that path and the asset itself moving east, you can't see the manor house and therefore there would be no views.

00:06:52:27 - 00:07:30:00

Conversely, back until you are outside of the scheme, until the scheme is is behind you, you sort of, um, there is an existing hedgerow where the scheme starts and you don't you, when you're standing by that hedgerow moving southeast, the asset is not visible. So by the time the asset becomes visible, insofar as it is visible at all, um, the scheme is far behind you and you are within an open field and can still appreciate again, to the extent that that setting makes any contribution at all to the asset, you will still be able to appreciate it.

00:07:30:02 - 00:07:49:18

Um, in in views looking towards the asset. So in the views from the asset you will that there will still be a view of an open field. Um, so that contribution will, will be preserved. So in short, in relation to the manor, we don't believe that that field needs to be removed.

00:07:52:10 - 00:08:04:27

Thank you very much. I'll know whether Mr. Morden has anything in particular he wants to respond. On that point, um, or whether you. You're satisfied with the case you put forward.

00:08:06:04 - 00:08:40:12

Um, no, there's a there's a difference of opinion on this. Um, I albeit it's not the, um, strongest contribution that, uh, a rural field could make to the setting of an 18th century farmhouse. It is still a contribution, and you still do get a sense of the rural setting of that building. Um, yes, I accept that there's been modern, um, development around it. And that has, of course, uh, eroded that setting to some degree. But the height of the building in particular gives does give some, um, uh, views out of and of.

00:08:40:25 - 00:08:45:06

Um, so no, we're we're going to remain a disagreement about that one.

00:08:46:27 - 00:09:17:15

That's fine. That's clearing just for parties and awareness. A side note will be going up at some point next week. We have walked this footpath a couple of days ago, and also I've walked the footpath affected by Crow Tree Farm. So the clarifications I've heard today have been useful for me to, um, to understand your, your, um, evidence that's being put forward to us on that. Um, I'll stay with, with Mr. Morgan because I want to understand.

00:09:18:22 - 00:09:27:09

Does this removal of this area that you're requesting, is that also associated with reducing any effects to North Petherton Windmill?

00:09:29:21 - 00:10:05:07

Jason morden, Notts county council. Yes. Thank you sir. Yes it is. That is the second element of its contribution, although obviously there's a railway line that separates, uh, this parcel of land from, um, the Windmill. Of course, the windmill is a tall structure and from the top, um. It is possible to see out over this and over a very large area, to be fair, but this particular, um, parcel of land is, uh, probably in the most close proximity to the windmill.

00:10:05:09 - 00:10:18:19

I think we can see that on the plan. So yes, I do feel it has, it has that contribution. Um, and that by removing it, it would help buffer the impacts on the setting of the grade two star listed windmill as well.

00:10:21:02 - 00:10:29:20

To in terms of setting would help buffer the setting that's views towards the windmill in that context. Is that correct?

00:10:30:09 - 00:10:48:05

Again it's both. Thank you. Jason morden, Notts County Council. Yes it is. It is views of and from um the windmill. So the windmill is a tall structure and you can see it from a long way, but you can also get views out of although the window arrangement doesn't allow view directly of this particular parcel of land.

00:10:49:25 - 00:10:51:24

I could be corrected on that by.

00:10:52:19 - 00:11:22:28

And just also to add to what I was saying before, we did do also do an access required site inspection to the windmill on Tuesday where we also considered um views also in terms of views out of the windmill. Then you consider that the removal of this area would help to put a buffer towards a buffer. It would add a buffer to solar development that is proposed further away from the windmill.

00:11:23:00 - 00:11:28:13

And that's what you would consider to be a sufficient mitigation.

00:11:31:07 - 00:11:50:22

Joseph Morden, not Notts County Council. Yes, it certainly adds a buffer, um, which we would feel was reasonable in under the circumstances to, uh, in light of the significance of the asset and its particular landmark qualities, which clearly part of its significance.

00:11:52:13 - 00:12:14:02

Okay. Thank you very much. I'll let the applicant respond when I've I've taken other points in the room, because I'm sure you'll want to respond on some of those points. Does anybody want to in the room want to raise any comments, Mr. Barlow, or do you want to raise anything on this particular discussion? Uh, James Barlow, thank you. Uh, not.

00:12:14:04 - 00:12:45:25

Particularly on the the manor house, but obviously it is very important manor house. And it is part of the footpath route that goes between the windmill and the village, which is used very regularly. So certainly for the as we were saying earlier, the well-being of people from Laverton, it's it is going to affect their wellbeing. Their views to open countryside and the views to both the windmill and to the manor. Um, looking at the diagram, the ladies in front of me, that is one of the closer fields of proposed development to the windmill, but it is only one, obviously.

00:12:45:27 - 00:13:16:25

From the diagram we can see to the left is equally as close to the windmill and equally affects the views to the windmill. If you're on Retford Road, looking to the windmill and looking to the north and the views looking out of the windmill looking to the north, so it has a major, majorly significant and every time again, it's one of those things we keep talking about. How significant are things? And I know it's all opinions from us.

00:13:16:28 - 00:13:26:11

It is a major significance, not these minor significances that we keep hearing about. Um, looking at the windmill and from the windmill. Okay.

00:13:27:23 - 00:13:39:20

Thank you very much, Mr. Barlow. Has anybody got any other comments they wish to raise on removal of this area? Okay. I will turn to the applicant for you to provide your response to what you've heard.

00:13:40:03 - 00:13:43:22

Thank you, Laura Garcia, for the appellant. Um.

00:13:45:15 - 00:14:19:06

Oh, well, to go to the end first. Firstly, we don't believe that that field would need to be removed. Um, as a as a general point, we've derived the harm that we've assessed the minor adverse effect to this windmill from the change to the wider agricultural landscape. So the removal of that field will not make a material difference. Um, to, to that assessment specifically in relation to four point footpath 24. Um the the views of the windmill from footpath 24.

00:14:19:08 - 00:14:50:07

So for example the view southwest sort of across the railway line, um as you're moving west and then, then you turn south, those views of the windmill will be retained. There are no panels to in between, um, the footpath and the views of the windmill. So those views will be unaffected. in there in entirety. Um, and then as you turn south to move along that footpath, as you emerge up from underneath the railway line, um, there is a striking view of the windmill.

00:14:50:09 - 00:15:23:01

Um, in a purely in a completely a sort of open field where you can see the, the entire extent of the windmill without any, without any power generation. So, for example, the West Burton Power station can't be seen behind it. It's you can see the Windmill cottage and the windmill in the context of an open field. As you're moving down that footpath, that will not change as a result of the scheme. Um, the views, uh, in terms of the removal of that field in, in how it would affect views from the South looking.

00:15:23:09 - 00:15:52:16

Sorry. I'll start with how it would affect views from the windmill itself. There would be there would still be views of the scheme. Um, from that, from that window. Um, now, um, as we have already said, it is our position that the longer range views from this window are incidental, um, to the significance of the assets and the removal of that field will, in my opinion, make no real material difference. You will still see the scheme, um.

00:15:54:27 - 00:16:28:07

And you will see it sort of the same distance as was just suggested, because you've got the area of panels to the west. We do not consider that to be harmful in and of itself. The harm arrives derives from the change in character in views of the assets from the south, say from from Retford Road again. Um, how much of that particular field would be visible or not? Is is debatable, but that is one particular view of that asset that there are many other views in and around the landscape of that asset which would be unaffected by the scheme.

00:16:28:09 - 00:16:32:07

So we don't consider that to be a material change either.

00:16:34:26 - 00:17:04:28

Thank you for your, um, comments on that. Um, one question for Mr. Appleyard. If you could just address it to to me, please? Yes. Fill up. Yeah. Uh, certainly. Steve. Parish council. Throughout this process, there doesn't seem to be much ground, given it's all a big fight. What were the true cost in megawatt terms? Percentage of the development terms, did you say? Yeah. We meet you halfway. We'll take that field out.

00:17:06:28 - 00:17:07:18

Thank you.

00:17:09:29 - 00:17:21:02

I'll let you have the right to reply. I don't expect you to respond in terms of the megawatts because I appreciate you probably don't have that. I'll give you the opportunity if you want to respond to that point.

00:17:21:11 - 00:17:53:18

Just, just I can't speak to the to the megawatt point. I don't have those those figures to hand. But it's it's about harm. What I'm considering is harm to the significance of heritage assets. um. And it is it. We have we have found some harm to the significance of of the windmill, um, derived from the wider changing character. And it is our position that the removal of that field will not, not reduce that to a level of zero harm. So we don't consider that that, um, field is, is one that needs to be removed.

00:17:54:17 - 00:17:55:25

Thank you for that.

00:17:57:13 - 00:18:34:09

Thank you for that. Um, okay. I'm going to move on now to the effects on the setting of the grade two star listed Burton Chateau. And my comment, my questions are mainly for Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, and my question is, is the following the applicant's response to execute 111 .0.8, which they clarify the theoretical visibility of the scheme from the asset would be limited to the bears, which is the battery energy storage system, which they consider would not be readily discernible.

00:18:34:11 - 00:18:44:12

Could you provide your comments to this response by the applicant, and whether your concerns regarding the effects of this asset, in terms of views out of it remain?

00:18:47:10 - 00:19:13:24

Jason Morden, Nottinghamshire County Council. Yes. Disagree again on this point. Um, I think the views, uh, are there. They've admitted that there's a view of the best. I think that there is going to be a change in the landscape and a degree of harm caused. Um, I'm it was scoped out. Um, and as such hasn't really been properly considered. I, I think we could say.

00:19:19:20 - 00:19:28:10

Okay. So I'm taking from that, that the position is not going to change on this. And this is looking like it will be an area of disagreement going forward.

00:19:29:26 - 00:19:33:11

Jason Warden, Notts County Council. Yes, that's my position on this.

00:19:33:26 - 00:19:45:26

Okay. That's fine, thank you. I'll give you the opportunity to respond, but I know you've already responded in in response to first written questions. Is there anything you want to add to what you've you've already responded to?

00:19:45:28 - 00:20:19:12

Just to point out, the asset was fully considered at 6.52 to 6.57 of the baseline. It wasn't scoped out. It was scoped out of the ES because it was it was assessed there would be no harm. We haven't admitted

that there would be visibility of the best. There is theoretical visibility of the best based on, um, the generated model, which I don't I don't want to repeat the raps, but, uh, that doesn't include, um, localized areas of vegetation. And I would point out, historically, this asset has always been shrouded in woodland.

00:20:19:15 - 00:20:41:28

The historic maps show around that sort of, um, north western arc. It faces north, and that's that's on the historic maps as we have them. So it's it's historically always had that aspect out across the parkland to the southeast. But um, I think yeah, you you have our submissions on that. Um, and we maintain the position of no harm.

00:20:44:02 - 00:21:14:29

Thank you very much. Just staying on this particular, um, asset. And I just like Nottinghamshire County Council to just explain a little bit more about how the financial viability of, um, the chateau contributes to its significance because you raise concerns about, um, the financial and financial viability in your in, in your response to our questions, which we did question you. Excuse me, can I. Sorry, sorry. Can I just interrupt? Sorry, sorry.

00:21:15:09 - 00:21:32:12

Please not when the proceedings are on. Thank. Thank you. Sorry. Um. Yeah. So could you just explain to us a little bit more about, um, your concerns about the financial viability of the chateau and In particular, what I'm interested in is how that contributes to the. To the significance.

00:21:34:23 - 00:22:05:13

Hello. Jason Morden, Notts county council. Yes. Um, it's an area that I think is under researched to some degree in scenarios such as this. Uh, although we do have, um, uh, reports, I think it's chapter ten that cover, uh, some aspects of impacts on local economy and tourism. Um, I very rarely do they drill down into sort of individual assets. Uh, this asset isn't in our county. It's in Lincolnshire.

00:22:05:15 - 00:22:47:21

Um, but it's owned by the Landmark Trust. Who, uh, you know, who's, uh, up there. Their thing is to is to have unique and unusual buildings that people stay in, um, and pay premium prices to do so. Uh, the concern I would raise is that based on my own assessment that there is an impact on the setting, and that the setting is very clearly part of the special interest of that building, not only in its significance, which, yes, is primarily derived from the historic parkland, which is mostly to the southwest, but also includes views out over the Trent.

00:22:47:26 - 00:23:06:10

And I think that's reinforced by the Landmark Trust's own, um, uh, promotion on this particular site that, um, that, that this will impact potentially on, on the sale ability if you like, of the of the asset.

00:23:12:15 - 00:23:28:01

Thank you, Mr. Morden. Um, I'll turn to the applicant to response. I know your response has referred to your response to tourism. You know, the tourism point, I think, was the relevant rep. I'll give you the opportunity to just reply. Yeah, to reply to what you've heard from Mr. Mallen.

00:23:28:13 - 00:24:00:15

Thank you. Laura Garcia, appellant. Um, the Landmark Trust had not objected, um, to this application. Um, it is the case that the scheme. Well, the scheme is not even if one were to accept the the XV. The wider scheme is not visible from this asset. Um, the the the marketing blurb, I suppose you'd call it on the Landmark Trust website is, is it describes the views south along. Uh, yeah, south along the River Trent.

00:24:00:17 - 00:24:29:26

And it is the case that the successful operation of this asset as a place to stay is not incompatible with large scale energy infrastructure, because the website itself references the power station at West Burton almost as a sort of, uh, positive element of it. So the successful operation of this, Of this um, asset as a, as accommodation is not incompatible with power generation. Infrastructure.

00:24:33:09 - 00:24:33:24

Thank you.

00:24:33:26 - 00:24:45:29

And just to reassure you, as part is we we visited this site two days ago as well. And there'll be a note going out to confirm that. So we've stood and observed the views.

00:24:48:23 - 00:25:21:24

Thank you, Mr. Fleming. You have your hand up. I'll let you, um, address the question to me. Bob Fleming feels for farming. Um, we've heard what the. We've heard the views of both sides. Does anybody realise what this best unit and this best compound is going to look like? It's going to have 41 40 foot containers, painted glass white with cooling equipment, fans and the light on the top around it is going to have another 41, um, 40 foot containers painted, whatever colour I don't know.

00:25:22:03 - 00:25:52:18

Um, and above that, it will have the various, um, um, structures and things like that. It's got to be a blot on the landscape, and people don't realize what these things look at. We know now, the young lady's gone. Now Karen's gone. Um, but we went to, um, till just before. Before Christmas in November, before we came to the meeting. Um, and I was quite surprised how big and how much these buildings stand out because they're, they are literally a blot on the landscape.

00:25:52:25 - 00:26:24:19

Um, they're bright white gloss white structures. You can't hide them unless it's hidden behind the hill. You simply can't hide them. Um, and that's all I can say, having seen them. And no, at the like. In fact, I've just tried to find a photograph on my camera, but I haven't got one. But they are. You'll get a you'll get a shot if you if you walk down and see how big this as I say, this is 41 white containers plus another 41 plus all the infrastructure that's going to go around it, plus all the fencing, plus all the cameras and everything else.

00:26:24:22 - 00:26:27:09

It's a big chunk. Thank you.

00:26:27:27 - 00:27:21:17

Thank you for that. And we will consider that in our deliberations in terms of use out from this this asset. Okay. That brings us to the end of this particular part of, um, agenda item eight. I'm going to move on to certain steeples, Christian Heritage and the Pilgrim Trail. My my question really is, is more to the parish council than the steeple parish Council on this, because this I've read the submissions that you've made on this particular thing, and the only thing that I really want you to explain a little bit more to me is, um, how how the the Christian heritage, um, contributes to the significance of the heritage assets in, in the area, in your opinion? Well, unfortunately I'm not really a person for that.

00:27:21:19 - 00:27:49:05

The lady who is knowledgeable, I thought she was coming today, but she hasn't gone. I believe she's coming tomorrow, so I don't know if she could find space for tomorrow. I'm not qualified to talk really on this one. I don't think we will be able to because we've got a specific agenda. Although Mr. Morden has put his hand up for Nottinghamshire County Council, who may be able to to assist. If you can try and assist with my question, then that would be really useful, Mr. Morden.

00:27:50:12 - 00:28:23:02

Okay. Jason Morden, Nottinghamshire County council. Yes. I'm not to talk over our friends from Staunton Parish Council who are, of course, the experts here on this. I would say that as part of the Mayflower Pilgrim trails, um, certainly steeple and the church there, um, sits quite strongly. It's promoted within the North Notts tourism. Um agendas and is in the visit Nottinghamshire.

00:28:23:06 - 00:28:55:27

Uh it's on the on the web page. It's also in the north um in the, in our own Nottinghamshire County Council. Uh, uh, visitor economy strategy for the site. So it, it's a well known and well respected, uh, component of cultural heritage interest that affects not just stainless steel, but other other villages across north north, South Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. Sorry, I can't I couldn't give you more precise detail than that at this moment.

00:28:56:08 - 00:29:31:07

No. Okay. That's fine. I'll turn back to to Mr. Appleyard. Um, now that you've heard, that is the only one that's about the limit of what I could have managed. Um, with, um, recently had a Pilgrim, uh, structure in the park on the playing field, if you like commissioning by local artist. Um, we've the stones place in the Pilgrim trail is, well, well recognized, and it is becoming a tourist asset.

00:29:31:09 - 00:29:54:17

There's, um, a lot of people come from America to to find their roots in actual fact. Um, it's just unfortunate if they would have been better prepared, if I'd known I'd got this to speak up. But I'm not really the person, unfortunately. But we have made this submission. Um, and what what lies in the submission still holds.

00:29:56:03 - 00:30:09:06

Okay. That's fine. Um, it was just if there was, you know, it was an opportunity to explain verbally to us today. Um, I will have a hand up for Mister Morden. I'll bring you in, and then I will go to Mr. Fleming.

00:30:11:15 - 00:30:44:04

Uh, Mr. Jason Morden, Notts County Council. Uh, just just, um, elaborate a little bit. Um, not on so much on the detail of John Robertson or any of the people involved or the main characters in the stories of the Mayflower Pilgrims. But really, as part of the wider conversation around impacts on viability of the tourism and visitor economy, um, the socioeconomic chapter at ten provides some information about impacts of the proposed scheme.

00:30:44:06 - 00:31:32:09

But when it comes to tourism, I think that ought to be fair. This is not not only this particular scheme, but all of the schemes that have come across seem not to recognise necessarily the, um, very effectively the what will become a potential impact on visitor economy. They, they focus very clearly on the socio economic benefits of having people move in during the construction phase and during the dismantling phase of the project, but they don't really examine whether or not there will be a long term impact on people's sense of place, and whether that in turn will likely impact on the, um, potential for visitor economy.

00:31:32:11 - 00:32:07:13

And I think this is particularly relevant for North um, uh, Laverton Windmill, which is very much, uh, linked to the intangible heritage components of the agrarian, um, it's agrarian setting and context. So very much the fact that it, you know, it uses the grain produced locally. It's a clearly part of the farming, um, technology and an ancient technology. It has a cultural traditions that are linked to it, all of which, um, really do focus very hard on that.

00:32:07:15 - 00:32:32:12

The Trent Valley as an agrarian space and landscape and that this although we have components of industrial uh, in it, which we picked up on a moment ago when we're talking about assets in Lincolnshire. Uh, it's it this is a very different, um, uh, change, I think, to landscape. And there's some I think there is some area for further evaluation.

00:32:34:20 - 00:32:58:26

Okay. That and it sounds to me that you're saying that really this is going further than, uh, than a historic environment assessment. It's more getting into the socio economic sections. And are you saying that you would you would actually that the socio economic chapter of the environmental statement should be looking at this in a bit more detail, this particular issue.

00:33:00:10 - 00:33:31:27

Jason Morden, Notts County Councillor yes. Uh, personally I think it should, but in having read other socio economic and tourism chapters of environmental environmental impact assessments. It's they rarely do I think, give proper what I will think will become an emerging issue. I think this is something that, um, we hear from Icomos, this concept that intangible heritage is not a new concept. It's been around for quite some time.

00:33:31:29 - 00:33:55:12

Whether or not we're giving proper and due respect to the likely impacts of these, uh, landscape wide changes to the rural, um, character. I, I'm, I don't believe we are at this at this time. So I do think if

there were an opportunity for a chapter like that to be expanded to, to give that sort of consideration. Yes, please. It would be very helpful.

00:33:57:28 - 00:34:34:04

Okay. Thank you for for this submission. I think the way that I'm going to ask you to give the applicant opportunity to, to respond is probably in two stages, really. We've got the Historic environment section. You've provided responses to that. Miss Garcia, at first written in your response to the party's responses to our first written questions. Um, I'll give you the opportunity whether you want to, um, elaborate any further on that, but particularly how your assessment has considered the historic significance when considering the significance of assets.

00:34:34:06 - 00:34:56:22

I think it's just to really focus on that particular point. Um, and then the separate issue about, um, whether the socio economic chapter is sort of outside of this and whether it's really something, whether the applicant can provide more detail in writing as an action point. But if you could just explain being the historic environment point first, that would be appreciated.

00:34:56:26 - 00:35:00:15

Um, historic environment in relation to the to the Christian heritage point? Yes.

00:35:01:02 - 00:35:11:09

And particularly the how it's relevant to the identifying the significance of the assets? Yes. How you've considered that within your assessment.

00:35:11:11 - 00:35:42:27

Yeah. So, um, with regards to the Christian heritage and the Pilgrim Trail and contribution rates, the significance of heritage assets and how that was addressed in the s chapter, the Pilgrim Trail was not addressed specifically because the Pilgrim Trail isn't a heritage asset. Um, aspects relating to Christian heritage were assessed in terms of the significance of the Church of Saint Peter and Paul, with one of the elements of the setting being the settlement of the steeple where the congregation is is drawn from.

00:35:42:29 - 00:35:50:22

So that's that's how that was assessed. Um, in terms of how the Pilgrim Trail and Christian heritage

00:35:52:10 - 00:35:52:27

relate

00:35:54:18 - 00:36:41:10

it. The as I said, the Pilgrim Trail isn't a heritage asset. It's a modern it's a modern construct. And, um, it's not the pilgrim trail in and of itself has no. Has no value. It's not the Camino de Santiago, for example. People aren't walking from place to place. It's a driving route. There's no particular suggested itinerary, so there are no walking routes suggested to certain people on the app. For example, the Mayflower 400 app. It's a destination on a driving tour, so it's the Christian that the Christian heritage, as it relates to the pilgrim and the history of the Pilgrim movement, is one that's

understood through moving through the landscape and vehicles landscape, which, um, covers a 50 kilometer area.

00:36:41:12 - 00:37:17:06

So you're going through urban settlements, suburban, commercial, industrial, you're moving through a whole range. So the site, if we were to talk, I mean, Christian heritage isn't a heritage asset either. But if we were to talk about the site and how it affects the understanding just slightly linked to the tourism point, I suppose if the pilgrim trail it, it doesn't. It makes no particular contribution to the Pilgrim Trail or the understanding of that, because that's focused on the settlements themselves. It's it's a it's a trail that leads you from settlement to settlement rather than the journey in between.

00:37:17:16 - 00:37:47:16

Um, and it's and it's, you know, the center of Stirton has, has the, the noticeboard, the information board by the church. The site can't be appreciated from that. It's also the point that the landscape that one moves through to, to reach Stirton on that trail is not a landscape that is analogous with a 16th or 17th century landscape, which it would have been when John Robinson was around as the power station. The roads are tarmac, railway, all the modern developments, etc..

00:37:47:27 - 00:37:49:15

Um, so

00:37:51:03 - 00:38:18:08

in answer to that first question, we don't that the Pilgrim trail doesn't contribute to the significance of assets, but we have considered Christian heritage in terms of certain estoppel, in terms of that contributing to the significance of the church through it being where the congregation was drawn, was, was, and is drawn from on the South. I mean, I'm not sure I can really speak to to that point.

00:38:18:10 - 00:38:46:00

No, I think it was more for I was going to bring Mr. Robinson in here. I appreciate you here for the historic fine. That's all. I was going to ask you. What? Um. It was just whether. Mr. Robinson, you can explain whether the applicant can probably provide something more in writing based on what you've done. So not based on how much your socioeconomic chapter has considered this, or whether you need to elaborate a little bit further based on the concerns that have been raised.

00:38:46:19 - 00:38:47:05

So, Doctor.

00:38:47:07 - 00:38:49:19

Robinson, for the applicant, yes, indeed. I think.

00:38:49:21 - 00:38:50:06

We.

00:38:50:08 - 00:39:24:09

Were is tuned in to the phrase action point. I think that in a sort of passing reference a few a few moments ago, and It is very difficult to say that we have nothing more to say on the point. I mean, the

socioeconomic chapter does address tourism impacts. We were quickly looking to remind ourselves where we were on scoping in and out. But I think your question, if it's put, please, can the applicant address us on the relevance of the Pilgrim trail to its socio economic impact? It's difficult for us.

00:39:24:11 - 00:39:43:18

Even if we can easily take you to that, then we should take you to that if there's more to say. I sense what I'd like to be, but you'd say, fine, we'll get your experts to write it down. I'd want to extend a comment on it, and we're happy to do that if that's an action. I think so, and I think it's about.

00:39:43:20 - 00:39:44:09

The historic.

00:39:44:11 - 00:39:45:18

Association.

00:39:45:22 - 00:39:46:26

In terms of.

00:39:47:28 - 00:39:49:03

What, if any, effect.

00:39:49:05 - 00:39:49:20

That may.

00:39:49:22 - 00:40:16:23

Have on the socioeconomics. It's because it has been raised saying, I think it's just some clarification whether the documents. The s chapter ten has considered, if not of just elaborate a bit further on on your on your position on that. So we will add that as an action point. I will take one question from Mr. Barlow and a very brief on for Mr. Fleming, and then we will move on.

00:40:17:15 - 00:40:50:24

Thank you. James Barlow, North London windmill. Uh, first I'd like to totally agree with what Mr. Morden said about the financial side of the tourism that I do not believe has been looked at at all. And we believe that this will impact the sustainable financial sustainability of the mill within tourist numbers. And secondly, I've just heard that the Pilgrim Trail is a driving route. It is actually a walk. There is a number of pilgrim walks around the villages of Stirton. I just dislike hearing false information at these things.

00:40:51:01 - 00:40:54:15

And it is a walk that also incorporates part of the Trent Valley way.

00:40:58:22 - 00:41:23:03

Sir, I don't mean to interrupt. I appreciate Mr. Barlow speaking, but to use the phrase false information is, if that is intentionally provocative to do so. Well, consider us provoked will make the point. There is no need whatsoever for language like that. Okay, well, at this point, and I would just say I would echo sorry, sorry.

00:41:23:05 - 00:41:24:18

I know it wasn't intended.

00:41:24:20 - 00:41:57:01

No, I know it's I'm just a layman. I know it's maybe a tip of the tongue. Okay, I accept that. But yeah, I think it's it's a point that's well made. If we can just keep things, um, respectful between parties, that would be very appreciated. Um, but I understand. I've noticed your comment, though, about the Pilgrim trail, in your opinion, is saying it's a walk. I've made a note of that. Um, Mr. Fleming, a very, very brief point. Then I'll go to Mr. Morden, who's got a hand up, and then we will move on.

00:41:58:18 - 00:42:22:29

We mentioned earlier on about the profound influence on the Christian religion as far as the state was concerned. Let's take ourselves back to the 15th and 16th century. These people that lived in and around the area, if that was it, if that was today, they'd be called terrorists. And in fact, there was a resident of the state who was burned at the stake.

00:42:24:17 - 00:42:31:05

And when I hear the comments from the appellants or the applicant, I think I'm looking at a bunch of philistine.

00:42:31:07 - 00:42:35:00

I'm going to I'm just going to stop. I'm going to I'm going to. Right. I'm going to.

00:42:35:09 - 00:43:06:15

The Baptist church was founded in Stirton. The steeple, the Baptist religion in the whole of America was founded on certainly stable. Some of the women in the stable were wives of the Pilgrim Fathers. That's the influence. That's. And that's what's in our blood. board. It's in our bones. That's what happened from our village. And when I hear this comment, this is not this. It's not that. It's not the other. It's not in financial terms. I'm not a I'm a Christian, but I'm not a Bible bashing Christian Christian.

00:43:06:22 - 00:43:18:00

But when I hear people say, no, it's not this. And it's and it's all in financial, it's not financial. It's a spiritual thing as well. So let's not look at it in financial terms. Look what people sacrificed and died for.

00:43:18:06 - 00:43:35:22

Okay. I think I think we've I've, I understand the points that have been raised on the Christian heritage and, and I'm, we're happy that that's been brought to our attention. But I think we will move on from this point now. Mr. Morton, I'll allow you to have the final say on this.

00:43:37:10 - 00:44:18:27

Uh, Jason Morden, Knox County Council, thank you very much for that. Yes, I, I it's just, um, I think it is worth just saying that the landscape of the Trent Valley, as we see it today isn't that dissimilar to the landscape that would have been familiar to the Founding Fathers, Pilgrim Fathers and the

Mayflower 400 trail. Okay. Yes, it course it does use tarmac roads and suchlike, but these are roads and trackways that have existed for many centuries. The agrarian nature of the River Trent and the water meadows and the Trent Valley itself, uh, is a is a very significant element of the landscape that I think has persisted.

00:44:19:00 - 00:44:51:03

Yes, it has changed. And we do have power stations and suchlike, um, all of which are different. But yeah, I've just to pick up on something that Mrs. Garcia said to give the impression that this wouldn't be, um, if the if those people, those, uh, pilgrim fathers themselves of the late 17th, early 18th century were passing through, um, this area of North Notts, that they wouldn't recognize it. Now, I don't think that's a fair, um, reflection of the of the reality.

00:44:52:17 - 00:45:24:22

Okay. Um, thank you for that observation. Um, I'm not going to ask the applicant to respond to that point. Um, we've heard what everybody's had to say on that particular, um, item. So I'm only going to briefly move on to the to 8.6 because I'm going to cover the drafting of the DCO. Um, tomorrow on archaeology. I think that makes sense. And I only had one question, but I think it can go in writing on this particular one. So, um, that brings us to the end of historic environment.

00:45:24:24 - 00:45:36:05

And thank you for everyone's contributions on that particular item. We will now move on to agenda item nine. And there's not a huge amount to go on this particular agenda item. Um,

00:45:37:23 - 00:45:51:18

it's really to discuss the deadline two and deadline three submissions that have been submitted and to get comments on that, um, that would be submitted by the applicant. So. Um.

00:45:57:08 - 00:46:40:26

So, yeah. So just a bit of background. Um, we did raise a number of written questions on landscape visual impact matters. Um, the applicant has provided additional information and clarification on a number of queries raised regarding the assessment findings. As part of this agenda item, I'm just going to seek views of the parties on this additional information. So I'm going to firstly turn to Nottinghamshire County Council. Um, could you provide your comments on the suitability of the information that was provided by the applicant and whether it is addressed, any of your previous concerns raised, and if not, could you identify the areas of disagreement that do remain?

00:46:44:29 - 00:46:46:00

Hello my.

00:46:49:06 - 00:46:50:05

Mr. Brody.

00:46:51:29 - 00:47:00:06

Hello. My name is John Brody. I'm representing Nottingham, Nottinghamshire County Council on landscape and visual issues.

00:47:02:02 - 00:47:32:20

Um, I'll just quickly, uh, summarize our position. Our basically our position is, is unchanged. Um, Nottingham County Council consider that the steeples renewable project would result in significant adverse landscape and visual effects by reason of its mass scale and extensive land use change, and from, uh, from an open agricultural landscape to a landscape characterised by energy infrastructure.

00:47:33:27 - 00:48:01:01

While acknowledging that the levy has been undertaken broadly in accordance with the LV three ER three guidance. Uh Nottingham County Council have carried out a detailed review of the landscape and visual elements of the submission, identifying concerns with methodology, significance, judgments and potential overreliance on mitigation. Planting.

00:48:03:17 - 00:48:30:06

Residual, significant adverse landscape and visual effects are expected to remain, with additional concern regarding cumulative change across the region. We believe that any DCO should therefore secure robust landscape mitigation, long term management, which we think should be a minimum of 15 years, and post establishment monitoring as a minimum.

00:48:33:10 - 00:49:01:08

Regarding the the deadline two and deadline three submissions, a Nottingham County Council has reviewed the applicant's Submissions and considers that the additional information has not materially altered the conclusions previously reached. Core concerns relating to significant judgments, reliance on mitigation and cumulative effects remain.

00:49:03:25 - 00:49:41:01

The clarifications provided do not adequately address inconsistencies between the E.S., chapter six and the SC to significance criteria, and additional photo montages and visual material assist the illustration, but do not change the underlying assessment outcomes regarding the cumulative effects assessment. We maintain that the cumulative assessment under represents the combined effects of multiple insect scale energy projects within the region.

00:49:42:09 - 00:50:01:16

The applicants response does not sufficiently address concerns that we have previously raised. Um, uh, and we believe that further cumulative assessment is required, particularly in relation to landscape character change and sequential visual effects.

00:50:03:09 - 00:50:14:19

I think that that's a summary of, of our position. And, um, I don't know whether you'd like to respond. The applicant would like to respond now or or not.

00:50:14:25 - 00:50:41:15

And I will bring the applicant to respond. Um, we will park the cumulative point for the time being, because I'm going to come on to that next. Um, so I will allow the applicant to just provide what your response to that. And, and maybe if you would like to explain how you feel that the question, your responses to the questions have addressed a number of the concerns that have been raised.

00:50:44:14 - 00:51:18:03

At tail center from Pegasus Group for the applicant. Um, so each of the matters raised by Mr. Brody, uh, just now, uh, replicate what was provided, uh, within the council's local impact report, which we did respond to in detail in our responses. Um, both the deadline to and deadline three. Um, there's nothing new there that we haven't responded to in detail, and I don't propose to go through each of those responses again here, given what we've already set out. Um, I believe the methodology is robust and the assessment judgments can be relied upon.

00:51:18:05 - 00:51:30:12

I also believe that the further material that we've provided at deadline two and deadline three, uh, served to illustrate that those conclusions can be relied upon, um, and that, um,

00:51:32:10 - 00:52:07:11

there is no concerns regarding, uh, the, uh, the approach that we have taken, um, towards developing, the mitigation strategy or indeed advising the the applicant on the layout and the design of the proposals from its inception. Um, I believe it's it's well designed. Uh, there's been avoidance of effects, uh, directly through avoiding the most sensitive, uh, landscape features on the site, the woodlands and the trees. Um, and there's been mitigation in the form of offset from residential properties and settlements, as we've discussed in the previous session.

00:52:07:13 - 00:52:27:09

And of course, then, uh, where residual effects remain, remain. Mitigation planting proposed to, to seek to seek to reduce those down, particularly once you get to the year 15 period that we've assessed. So um, yeah, rather than going through each of those those points again in turn, if you're happy, I'd defer to the the response. We may previously wish to address each of those points.

00:52:29:21 - 00:52:30:27

I hear what you're seeing.

00:52:30:29 - 00:52:33:17

Um, Mr. Brody, is that is there anything that you'd like.

00:52:33:19 - 00:52:34:04

To.

00:52:34:06 - 00:52:34:21

Come back.

00:52:34:23 - 00:52:36:12

On and whether this, um.

00:52:36:14 - 00:52:38:19

Anything that you would any of your points made.

00:52:38:21 - 00:52:41:07

Before that? You would like to elaborate further?

00:52:42:21 - 00:52:47:28

Yeah, I think I think one of our concerns is, is that we don't feel that, um.

00:52:50:03 - 00:53:39:05

There's been a proper assessment of, of of one landscape character effects. Um, we're in a situation where, um, we're replacing open agricultural fields with extensive solar infrastructure and, um, that is that will that represents a substantial and long term change to the openness, tranquility and rural land use of the area. Um, and looking at, um, the earlier response from the applicant, uh, the state that they are talking that they will retain the grass, the, uh, the trees, the woodland, the hedgerows, um and the and the.

00:53:39:07 - 00:53:42:05

That's what will retain.

00:53:43:25 - 00:54:03:18

Well we'll continue to contribute to to landscape character but we don't feel they've really taken into account, you know, these issues of openness, tranquility and rural character of the area and in their assessment. And so that's kind of like 11. that I think I'd like to make.

00:54:12:27 - 00:54:13:12

Okay.

00:54:13:14 - 00:54:16:15

I hear what you're saying. Um, I will

00:54:18:00 - 00:54:26:11

I will allow the applicant one final opportunity to respond. Then I will check with the rest of the room, whether they want to make any comments on your deadline to the deadline.

00:54:26:13 - 00:54:27:17

Three submissions

00:54:29:05 - 00:55:18:27

for the applicant. Just on the matter of landscape character. The area does identify a significant effect on the landscape character of the site, both during construction and through operation. That is acknowledged. The change of the site and the character of the site is acknowledged in the overlay with the identification of that significant effect, but that significant effect is not identified to extend far beyond the bounds of the site, such that it would be significant on the character of the of the wider landscape character areas. Again, that's a matter that was discussed previously, and I won't go into into the full detail, but in part that relates to the, uh, the screening effects of the layers of hedgerows and vegetation within the landscape and the reduced height of the panels, which serve to mean that there is not extensive visibility beyond the bounds of the site itself, such as the point where it would have a significant effect on that wider landscape character.

00:55:19:14 - 00:55:20:27

That's my response to that point.

00:55:22:01 - 00:56:00:25

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turner. Um, do any of the parties want a minus cumulative? So I'm going to come on to that in a minute. Do any of the parties in the room want to raise any comments on the deadline? 2 or 3 submissions? Okay. I'm not showing. I'm not seeing any hands. So I'll move on to the cumulative effects. And, um, I think it would be useful for the applicant. Um, you submitted updated visualizations, which included some of the cumulative schemes, and you illustrated those in a wire line, for want of a better word, um, format on your visualizations.

00:56:00:27 - 00:56:17:22

Could you just explain to everyone how, in your view, the additional information, addresses or answer some of the concerns raised and in particular, how the information that you've submitted links with the assessments that you've already undertaken.

00:56:20:21 - 00:56:50:21

For the applicant. Um, so, yes, uh, at deadline two, we submitted a cumulative screen zone of visibility plan, um, at the request of the annex A and then a deadline three, we submitted additional photo montages, which included identification of where any cumulative sites were visible from from two locations, as well as annotated versions of the photo record and photo montages that had been previously provided. Now again, also with annotations to show where any curative sites would be visible.

00:56:51:00 - 00:57:27:02

Um, it's our view that having prepared that material that it serves to to validate the previous findings of the cumulative assessment, which is that some of the cumulative schemes would be visible in some of the views that we've identified. Uh, in particular, the developments in and around the former West Burton Power Station site. Um, there would be some potential for visibility of the developments at high demand and north and high mana in some of the views cross crossing, crossing the landscape, um, and longer distance views of some of the other developments in a very small number of the views.

00:57:27:08 - 00:57:39:11

Um, but there was nothing about that material that we prepared which led to a suggestion that we needed to change our conclusions that we previously identified, which would be the the potential for some cumulative effects, but not of a significant nature.

00:57:43:17 - 00:58:05:09

So you're of the opinion because I think you're particularly on the visual side of cumulative effects. Your assessment considered that there would be very limited visibility, assuming just at ground level. Um, and, and you are you think that your visualizations, um, back up your conclusions on that.

00:58:07:06 - 00:58:39:01

If the applicant. Yes. That's right. I mean, one of the main points I'd made previously was the extent to which the existing hedgerow vegetation serves to limit the potential for views of those wider cumulative sites, in many instances, from the viewpoints that we have. Um, and I think the marked up

material, again, serves to illustrate that, that, that is. That is indeed correct for the most part. As I say, views and those are the cumulative sights would be limited if I'm in and around, in and around the site for that reason.

00:58:39:03 - 00:59:10:06

Um, and, uh, you know, with respect to the landscape character, um, again, as I said before, you know, visibility of the site being relatively restricted beyond its bounds means the potential for the site itself to have wider landscape character effects is reduced. Um, it's acknowledged, um, in, you know, in the material that there are a number of other sites in there in the wider environs which interact with each other and that collectively there would be a greater cumulative impact of which our scheme would be a very small proportion.

00:59:10:17 - 00:59:19:21

Um, and again, um, there's nothing about the material that we prepared which would lead to a change in our understanding of that being the correct conclusion.

00:59:28:15 - 00:59:53:00

Thank you, Mr. Turner. Um, Mr. Brody, you have your hand up. Um, I will allow you to come back in at this point and set out the council's, um, concerns on, um, cumulative effects. And in particular, I'm keen to understand what additional assessment that you are seeking in terms of the sequential, um, effects. If you could explain that to us. That would be really helpful.

00:59:57:18 - 00:59:59:03

You're on mute, Mr. Brody.

00:59:59:05 - 01:00:32:18

Thank you. Pardon? Uh, John Brody, representing Nottinghamshire County Council on landscape visual issues. Um, I'd just like to say that, um, we've reviewed the STV plan, which is, uh, ret to, uh, 54. I don't know whether it's possible to bring that up on screen or not, but, uh, our conclusion is that, um, it's all it's mostly all orange and orange. suggested that you'd be able to see multiple developments from from within the orange area.

01:00:32:20 - 01:00:52:29

And, um, most of the site is colored orange. So we feel that it demonstrates that that that there is overlapping visibility or there will be overlapping visibility of multiple, um, multiple developments, um, throughout most of the most of the development area.

01:00:58:27 - 01:01:10:29

Okay. And unless I missed it, what additional assessment do you feel that's needed? Is it an additional assessment or is it a disagreement that you have with the assessment findings?

01:01:11:20 - 01:01:44:12

Well, the the limitation of the work that's been done thus far. Um, is that the is that um, I think as we said, there's been a lot more graphics and what there's been some more graphics produced, but that hasn't changed the underlying assessment outcomes at all. Um, that's one point. Um, secondly, um, the uh, assessment of of cumulative effects has has doesn't consider sequential cumulative effects.

01:01:44:16 - 01:02:14:23

Um, where where someone where someone's moving through the landscape from point to point and experiencing different development, um, sequentially. Uh, I, we haven't um, there hasn't been any work done on that so far. Um, and we feel that's, that's quite important because people, people on public rights of way and on roads will see, um, the proposed development in the context of other developments in the area.

01:02:14:25 - 01:02:48:12

Um, and that will have a cumulative impact on their perception of the landscape. And that has not yet been, um, fully explored. Um, in in one of. One of the applicants response responses um on deadline to the applicants and notes that NCC do not refer to which particular cumulative projects they consider we could would give rise to these sequential effects.

01:02:48:14 - 01:03:25:03

Um, now, I would say that chapter six, um, table 6.6 lists all the all the developments, um, that, that, that need to be considered sequentially. Um, and, and the cumulative effects of them. And the proposal should be considered. Um, so that table 6.6 is found on on page 75 of chapter six, which is the landscape and visual section of the environmental statement.

01:03:25:05 - 01:03:47:02

So I mean, it's I don't I don't understand why, you know, um, why they had difficulty in, in finding what projects needed to be assessed and, and also, um, within, within report to uh, 063, uh, which, um,

01:03:48:23 - 01:03:49:08

um,

01:03:51:06 - 01:03:52:29

basically in their response.

01:03:58:18 - 01:04:00:18

You've just gone to mute Mr. Brody.

01:04:02:14 - 01:04:05:14

Thank you. Pardon? I must have inadvertently hit my keyboard.

01:04:05:16 - 01:04:06:11

Right, fine.

01:04:06:13 - 01:04:46:01

That's fine. Um, yeah. The, um, the applicant himself themselves actually list, um, the public rights of way, which they have evaluated to have a high sensitivity. Uh, so that would include, uh, footpath 17 starting the staple footpath one, West Burton Cross, Common Lane, Trent Valley Way and Digges Hall Lane. Um, they say that the they've represented these with various viewpoints, but they haven't

actually assessed the implications of those views, uh, on, you know, cumulatively on, you know, in a cumulative way.

01:04:46:03 - 01:05:23:16

You know, there has been no assessment of that. You know, the, the, the dots haven't been joined as what I would suggest. Um, they also they also, uh, they also have key roads. They're also describe those would be uh, Low Holland Lane, Gainsborough Road, Thornhill Lane, Three Legs Lane and Laverton Road. Again we're relying on on on just view on sync on viewpoints. But the dots haven't been joined. So, um, we would suggest that there's still there's still more work to be done regarding sequential cumulative effects.

01:05:26:26 - 01:05:42:08

Okay. Thank you very much for that, Mr. Brody. Um, I will let the applicant respond to that. I know we had some discussion on cumulative and sequential effects in the previous hearing. Um, but I will still allow you the opportunity to respond to what you've you've heard.

01:05:43:14 - 01:06:29:23

Uh, Dale center for the applicant. So, yes, we did indeed discuss this much of the potential for sequential curative aspects previously. And, um, I said that it was a matter which had been considered, um, and it was not something that had been ignored. Um, with regard to, you know, which sites to be considered and fully aware of which sites were in the study area for cumulative assessment, having undertaken the cumulative assessment that the point was that, um, our view is very few of those sites from the locations that had been referred to, you know, would be visible And therefore it was a question of was there an understanding that, you know, there would be a greater visibility on any particular sites that they could highlight, which, um, you know, we didn't anticipate to be as visible.

01:06:29:25 - 01:06:37:01

And they are. But if it's just the case of it's all the sites, then I can say all the sites have have been considered. Um,

01:06:38:29 - 01:07:09:19

as we discussed previously, many of the the roads and rights of way beyond the site boundary have very little visibility of the project. And therefore, even if there would be visibility of other projects, our project is not bringing about the potential for significant effect on that route. There could be significant sequential effects as a result of a combination of other projects. But if our project is not a significant component of that view, that is not a significant Kim's effect brought about by this project. And I think that's an important distinction. I agree with Mr.

01:07:09:21 - 01:07:55:18

Brody that in the wider landscape there will be routes, roads and footpaths which have into visibility of multiple other schemes. But if our scheme is not a component of that, that is not a matter for this particular assessment to consider. And I think it was that that clarity with respect to some of those routes that we were seeking is our understanding that it is science which would be seen from our site and indivisible with our site, not just other sites that would be indivisible with with one another. Um, you know, we've provided extensive material now in terms of the marked up imagery, um, in all directions of all the sites which were in that list, um, as well as the ZTE plan, you know, the

limitations of which we did discuss previously with regard to, uh, the localized vegetation not not being picked up in that image.

01:07:55:22 - 01:08:33:05

Um, you know, indeed, there's many parts of that, um, uh, landscape shown on that plan where, uh, the color indicates that you wouldn't be seeing all of the schemes, even theoretically. In fact, you may be only seeing 1 or 2, and most likely those being the woodland scheme, which is immediately, you know, closest to rather than this wider suite of developments. Hence my point again about which schemes are really the concern here. You know, many of them lie very far away and have very limited potential visibility and providing further detailed analysis to come to that conclusion, when it was already the findings of the.

01:08:33:07 - 01:08:45:23

The LGA perhaps would seem to be a little duplicitous. But but but nonetheless, obviously I'm happy to acquiesce as we did previously. If that is deemed to be, you know, necessary and and required.

01:08:47:27 - 01:09:18:19

Thank you. Your positions are clear on that. And we will we will consider those um, going forward. Um, does anybody in the room want to make any comments on the cumulative landscape and visual stuff that's been submitted? I don't see any hands up. So, um, before we wrap up this, this item, I think it would be quite useful to us is that this? Seems like there's going to be areas of disagreement on this. All I can do at the moment is to.

01:09:18:21 - 01:09:53:25

Is for you to encourage you to try and find some way to getting some areas of agreement, if that's providing additional information that will help the council to, um, understand your findings and indeed everybody else. But, you know, if that is, is is what you can do, then then fine. But we understand and I understand the points that you've been raising as well and the position that you've been made. I suspect that, um, this matter will be covered in your draft statement, common ground.

01:09:53:27 - 01:10:27:11

So you'll see more on that. Um, and I think all we can do is just encourage you to keep working. Then if it gets to the end of the examination, then the position statements, as Mr. Robinson was saying before, which for those areas then, then we will consider that going forward. Okay. That's all I have actually. On on the landscape and visual agenda item. So we will move on to agenda item ten, which is a review of the issues and actions arising.

01:10:27:27 - 01:10:28:16

Um.

01:10:36:10 - 01:10:45:25

Okay. I won't go through all of the action points. There's not a huge amount. We've got about 10 or 11, but we will we will publish them as soon as we can. Um,

01:10:47:24 - 01:11:00:29

so moving on to agenda item 11. Um, we've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business relevant to this hearing, but is there anybody that wants to raise any other business, Mrs. Barlow?

01:11:01:09 - 01:11:02:18

Sorry, it's not really any.

01:11:02:20 - 01:11:05:29

Of the business. I'd just like to say, um, apologize.

01:11:06:01 - 01:11:06:25

On on.

01:11:06:28 - 01:11:08:26

Record because I didn't get the opportunity.

01:11:08:28 - 01:11:10:14

Early. If I used incorrect.

01:11:10:16 - 01:11:11:09

Terminology and.

01:11:11:11 - 01:11:12:03

Offended anybody.

01:11:12:05 - 01:11:17:20

When we were talking at heritage, it certainly wasn't intended. It's a very emotive subject.

01:11:17:22 - 01:11:19:01

And something that obviously.

01:11:19:03 - 01:11:25:14

I'm very passionate about. So I didn't mean to cause offence and I will find the individuals concerned and apologise personally if I did.

01:11:27:00 - 01:11:28:00

Thank you for that.

01:11:28:02 - 01:11:30:08

That's appreciated.

01:11:32:22 - 01:12:05:04

Thank you, Mrs. Barlow. Okay, so I'll move on to agenda item 12, which is the close of the hearing. So, um, there's no items and remained to discuss. Um, and if I could remind everyone that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide written summaries of the oral submissions

made during today's hearing, on or before deadline, for which is Thursday, the 19th of February, 2026. Mail also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Planning Inspectorate website as soon as practicable after this hearing.

01:12:05:25 - 01:12:36:01

And then before we close, we would like to thank everybody who has participated during the course of this hearing for their time and assistance. And for those of you that have taken time out of your day to day. We really do appreciate it. So thank you for that. And we found all the contributions extremely helpful in gathering information. We need to make our recommendations to the Secretary of State. So the time is now 5:02. And this issue specific hearing for the proposed Steeple renewables project is now closed.