Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	EN0110013 - The Droves Solar Farm
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 1
Date:	09 September 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

1
00:00:02,880 --> 00:00:03,440
Good morning.

2
00:00:04,840 --> 00:00:07,680
It's now 10:00 o'clock and time for this hearing to begin.

3
00:00:07,800 --> 00:00:11,620
I'd like to welcome you all to the third issue specific hearing for the

4
00:00:11,680 --> 00:00:15,660
Droves Solar Farm project. Can I just confirm everybody can hear

5
00:00:15,700 --> 00:00:16,920
me clearly?

6
00:00:18,060 --> 00:00:21,060
I'm getting nods in the room. Everybody can hear me online?

7
00:00:24,580 --> 00:00:27,020
Yes. Thank you for confirming that.

8
00:00:28,040 --> 00:00:31,760
Can I also confirm with Sarah Norris that the live streaming and recording of this

9
00:00:31,800 --> 00:00:33,000
event has commenced?

10
00:00:34,500 --> 00:00:37,620
Yes. Thank you, Sarah. My name is Anthony Johnson.

11
00:00:37,740 --> 00:00:41,620
I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State

12
00:00:41,700 --> 00:00:45,180
as the single examining inspector to examine this application.

13
00:00:45,820 --> 00:00:49,020
You'll also hear me referred to as the examining authority.

14
00:00:50,040 --> 00:00:53,740
The case manager is Sarah Norris, who's being supported here today by Rachel

15
00:00:53,780 --> 00:00:57,600
Owen and James Ledham and Tim Hole are providing support remotely.

16
00:00:58,760 --> 00:01:02,400
I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person.

17
00:01:03,140 --> 00:01:06,400
Can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent?

18
00:01:07,360 --> 00:01:10,620
The toilets are located at the front of the room towards the entrance.

19
00:01:11,390 --> 00:01:15,280
There is no fire alarm drill scheduled today, so should the fire alarm

20
00:01:15,320 --> 00:01:19,040
sound, please treat it as real. The fire exits are at the

21
00:01:19,080 --> 00:01:20,440
front and back of this room.

22
00:01:21,480 --> 00:01:25,140
The fire assembly point is in the rear car park on the right-hand side.

23
00:01:25,320 --> 00:01:27,480
Please wait there for further instructions.

24
00:01:29,020 --> 00:01:32,920
A short break is planned for mid-morning at 11:30, and I'm aiming to

25
00:01:32,960 --> 00:01:34,900
finish no later than 1:00 PM.

26
00:01:36,860 --> 00:01:40,780
In terms of agenda and logistics, this meeting will follow the agenda published

27
00:01:40,820 --> 00:01:44,560
on the National Infrastructure Planning website on the 25th of August,

28
00:01:44,840 --> 00:01:45,740
2026.

29
00:01:46,580 --> 00:01:48,200
Examination library reference

30
00:01:48,580 --> 00:01:52,520
EV2-004. It would be helpful if you

31
00:01:52,560 --> 00:01:56,440
had a copy of this in front of you, and could the applicant also

32
00:01:56,480 --> 00:01:58,700
display the agenda on the screen, please?

33
00:02:01,210 --> 00:02:05,070
The agenda is for guidance only, and I may add other considerations or

34
00:02:05,120 --> 00:02:08,920
issues as we progress. I will conclude the hearing as soon

35
00:02:09,021 --> 00:02:12,680
as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked

36
00:02:12,780 --> 00:02:14,040
and responded to.

37
00:02:14,880 --> 00:02:18,700
But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for

38
00:02:18,740 --> 00:02:22,460

me to prioritize matters and defer other matters to further written

39
00:02:22,500 --> 00:02:23,020
questions.

40
00:02:24,200 --> 00:02:28,170
Likewise, if you cannot answer the question being asked or require time to get

41
00:02:28,220 --> 00:02:31,700
the information requested, then can you please indicate that you need to

42
00:02:32,040 --> 00:02:33,080
respond in writing.

43
00:02:34,700 --> 00:02:38,540
Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid or blended way, meaning some of

44
00:02:38,580 --> 00:02:42,460
you are present with us at the hearing venue, and some of you are joining us

45
00:02:42,480 --> 00:02:44,320
virtually using Microsoft Teams.

46
00:02:45,800 --> 00:02:49,480
I will make sure that however you've decided to attend today, you will be given a

47
00:02:49,580 --> 00:02:52,880
fair opportunity to participate.

48
00:02:52,960 --> 00:02:56,660
A recording of today's hearing will be made available on the Droves Solar Farm

49
00:02:56,760 --> 00:03:00,360
section of the National Infrastructure Planning website as soon as

50
00:03:00,480 --> 00:03:02,880

practicable after the meeting has finished.

51
00:03:03,900 --> 00:03:07,630
With this in mind, please ensure that you speak clearly into the microphone,

52
00:03:07,840 --> 00:03:11,600
stating your name and who you are representing each time before you speak.

53
00:03:12,540 --> 00:03:14,700
To use the microphones, just turn the red

54
00:03:16,200 --> 00:03:20,120
light to green by pressing the button, and you don't need to hold

55
00:03:20,160 --> 00:03:23,460
it while you're speaking. And when you're finished, just press it again, so it

56
00:03:23,520 --> 00:03:24,220
turns to red.

57
00:03:26,340 --> 00:03:30,280
If any group or individual wish to use social media, report, film,

58
00:03:30,420 --> 00:03:34,340
or record during today's or any subsequent hearing, then they are free to do

59
00:03:34,380 --> 00:03:34,540
so.

60
00:03:35,380 --> 00:03:39,170
But please do so responsibly and with proper consideration for other

61
00:03:39,200 --> 00:03:42,980
parties. This must not be disruptive, and the material must

62
00:03:43,060 --> 00:03:46,880
not be misused. The definitive recording is the one that is being

63
00:03:46,960 --> 00:03:50,680
made by the audio-visual company and will be published on the National

64
00:03:50,780 --> 00:03:52,340
Infrastructure Planning website.

65
00:03:52,880 --> 00:03:55,160
Does anyone have any questions on this matter?

66
00:03:58,260 --> 00:04:01,820
Thank you. If you have any concerns, please contact the case team.

67
00:04:03,320 --> 00:04:06,560
A link to the Planning Inspectorate's privacy notice was provided in the

68
00:04:06,600 --> 00:04:08,640
notification for this hearing, reference

69
00:04:08,840 --> 00:04:12,440
PD-010, dated 3rd of July

70
00:04:12,640 --> 00:04:16,481
2026. I assume that everyone here today has familiarized

71
00:04:16,500 --> 00:04:20,079
themselves with this document, which establishes how the personal

72
00:04:20,180 --> 00:04:23,960
data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set

73
00:04:24,080 --> 00:04:25,780
out in data protection laws.

74
00:04:27,060 --> 00:04:30,520
Please speak to Sarah Norris if you have any questions about this.

75
00:04:33,780 --> 00:04:37,240
I'll now move on to item two, the purpose of the hearing, which I'll

briefly

76
00:04:37,260 --> 00:04:37,800
explain

77
00:04:38,940 --> 00:04:41,060
the purpose of this issue specific hearing.

78
00:04:42,060 --> 00:04:45,640
This hearing seeks to cover specific issues on a range of issues, which

79
00:04:45,720 --> 00:04:49,260
includes, as shown on the agenda, landscape and visual,

80
00:04:49,720 --> 00:04:53,450
flood risk, hydrology, and water resources, and

81
00:04:53,560 --> 00:04:54,220
population.

82
00:04:55,400 --> 00:04:58,760
As mentioned previously, I'll aim to finish no later than 1:00 o'clock at the

83
00:04:58,800 --> 00:05:02,780
latest, and if necessary, any things we can't cover today will be carried over into

84
00:05:02,820 --> 00:05:04,160
my third written questions.

85
00:05:05,260 --> 00:05:09,140
I do have a fairly extensive list of questions which are primarily aimed at the

86
00:05:09,200 --> 00:05:13,120
applicant, but there are also some other questions for other parties, particularly

87
00:05:13,160 --> 00:05:14,980
the local authorities who are here today.

88
00:05:16,110 --> 00:05:19,700
The purpose of the hearing is to enable me, as the examining authority, to gain

89
00:05:19,760 --> 00:05:23,460
further understanding of the evidence relating to the various topics

90
00:05:23,560 --> 00:05:24,360
within the agenda.

91
00:05:25,680 --> 00:05:29,280
I'll run through all of my questions on each topic agenda before then

92
00:05:29,360 --> 00:05:31,960
asking for any contributions from interested parties.

93
00:05:33,080 --> 00:05:36,800
Any representations from interested parties must relate directly to the

94
00:05:36,840 --> 00:05:40,720
discussion undertaken, and it's important to say that today is not an open

95
00:05:40,760 --> 00:05:44,400
floor hearing session to give wider submissions on each of the topics of the

96
00:05:44,440 --> 00:05:44,840
agenda.

97
00:05:46,200 --> 00:05:49,720
If you do have wider points to make, please provide these in writing at deadline

98
00:05:49,780 --> 00:05:50,010
four.

99
00:05:51,160 --> 00:05:55,000
And it's important to note that written submissions carry exactly

the same weight

100
00:05:55,060 --> 00:05:58,780
as oral submissions. So I will only have questions in relation to the

101
00:05:58,820 --> 00:06:00,420
purpose of the hearing today.

102
00:06:02,852 --> 00:06:06,192
I would ask for those present not to interrupt whilst another person is giving

103
00:06:06,272 --> 00:06:09,492
evidence, even though you may strongly disagree with what is being said.

104
00:06:09,792 --> 00:06:13,492
It's important that everyone has a fair opportunity to put their case without

105
00:06:13,572 --> 00:06:15,912
interruption or other distraction.

106
00:06:17,792 --> 00:06:21,692
I may refuse to hear evidence which is, in my view, irrelevant, vexatious,

107
00:06:21,932 --> 00:06:24,622
or frivolous, relates to the merits of a

108
00:06:24,672 --> 00:06:28,032
national policy statement, repeats other

109
00:06:28,052 --> 00:06:31,812
representations already made, or relates to compensation for compulsory

110
00:06:31,822 --> 00:06:35,392
acquisition of land or an interest in or over land.

111
00:06:36,672 --> 00:06:40,612

Additionally, I may request any person behaving in a disruptive manner to leave

112
00:06:40,652 --> 00:06:44,252
the hearing or to remain only if that person complies with

113
00:06:44,352 --> 00:06:46,252
specific conditions.

114
00:06:47,412 --> 00:06:50,752
I'm now going to ask those of you who are participating in today's meeting to

115
00:06:50,792 --> 00:06:54,172
introduce yourselves. When I state your organization name,

116
00:06:54,852 --> 00:06:58,012
could you introduce yourself, stating your name and who you represent, and which

117
00:06:58,472 --> 00:07:00,092
agenda item you wish to speak on?

118
00:07:00,932 --> 00:07:04,672
If you're not representing an organization, please confirm your name, summarize

119
00:07:04,712 --> 00:07:08,652
your interest in the application, and confirm the agenda item upon which you

120
00:07:08,692 --> 00:07:12,152
wish to speak. And could you also state how you wish to be

121
00:07:12,232 --> 00:07:12,752
addressed?

122
00:07:13,792 --> 00:07:15,872
I'll start with the applicant. Thank you.

123
00:07:16,792 --> 00:07:19,572
Good morning, sir. Good morning, everyone. My name is Alex

Tresadern.

124
00:07:19,652 --> 00:07:23,622
I'm a senior associate at Pinsent Masons LLP, acting on

125
00:07:23,652 --> 00:07:27,092
behalf of the applicant and therefore intend to speak on all agenda

126
00:07:27,632 --> 00:07:28,522
items in this hearing.

127
00:07:29,512 --> 00:07:33,332
As was the case with yesterday, I'll be joined for the various topics by

128
00:07:33,372 --> 00:07:37,192
various consultants and experts in relation to those fields and

129
00:07:37,232 --> 00:07:41,012
therefore propose that they introduce themselves as and when they speak.

130
00:07:42,812 --> 00:07:46,582
Thank you. Can we now move on to the organizations and individuals that have

131
00:07:46,592 --> 00:07:48,772
given notice of their intention to speak?

132
00:07:48,832 --> 00:07:52,212
I'll start from this end of the table and work that way.

133
00:07:52,612 --> 00:07:53,712
Breckland District Council.

134
00:07:54,572 --> 00:07:57,772
Thank you, sir. Simon Wood, representing Breckland District Council.

135
00:07:57,892 --> 00:08:01,712
I also have two colleagues online who I will ask to introduce themselves when you

136
00:08:01,772 --> 00:08:02,992
get to that point. Thank you.

137
00:08:03,652 --> 00:08:04,092
Thank you.

138
00:08:05,132 --> 00:08:07,312
Borough Council, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

139
00:08:08,552 --> 00:08:11,181
Good morning, sir. Julie Barrow for the Borough Council.

140
00:08:11,572 --> 00:08:15,312
Here primarily in relation to item one on the agenda, but available to

141
00:08:15,332 --> 00:08:16,892
answer any other questions. Thank you.

142
00:08:18,352 --> 00:08:19,832
Thank you. Norfolk County Council.

143
00:08:20,712 --> 00:08:23,652
Thank you, sir. Andrew Szarkowski for Norfolk County Council.

144
00:08:24,872 --> 00:08:28,492
I don't intend to speak on any particular issue but will comment as required.

145
00:08:28,872 --> 00:08:32,832
I will be supported by two colleagues today who are attending

146
00:08:32,932 --> 00:08:36,632
virtually, and I'll introduce them when they

147
00:08:36,832 --> 00:08:37,712
join the discussion.

148
00:08:39,072 --> 00:08:42,012
Thank you. Spool with Palgrave Parish Council.

149
00:08:42,432 --> 00:08:45,772
Mike Bennett, representing Spool Parish Council.

150
00:08:46,872 --> 00:08:49,892
I wish to speak to landscape and visual and

151
00:08:50,352 --> 00:08:51,012
population.

152
00:08:52,392 --> 00:08:52,812
Thank you.

153
00:08:55,192 --> 00:08:56,052
Dr. Mark Holmes.

154
00:08:56,472 --> 00:08:59,092
Dr. Mark Holmes, local resident. Good morning.

155
00:09:00,232 --> 00:09:03,872
No particular issue to raise, but I'd like to be able to comment on any

156
00:09:03,912 --> 00:09:05,452
issues as they arise. Thank you,

157
00:09:06,312 --> 00:09:06,512
sir.

158
00:09:07,792 --> 00:09:10,432
Okay. And Castle Acre Parish Council.

159
00:09:11,212 --> 00:09:14,792
Good morning, sir. Anne Mason, Castle Acre Parish Council.

160
00:09:15,272 --> 00:09:19,012
I would like to be able to comment on any issues raised during this agenda.

161
00:09:19,692 --> 00:09:20,132
Thank you.

162
00:09:23,512 --> 00:09:26,092
Good morning, sir. Tim Hubbard, Castle Acre Parish Council.

163
00:09:26,972 --> 00:09:28,752
Like Anne, I would like to

164
00:09:29,712 --> 00:09:33,012
make comment on any agenda items as necessary.

165
00:09:33,952 --> 00:09:34,252
Thank you.

166
00:09:34,752 --> 00:09:35,152
Thank you.

167
00:09:36,092 --> 00:09:39,312
Okay. Now, could I ask if there's anyone else in the room today who wishes to

168
00:09:39,412 --> 00:09:41,132
speak? If they could let me know now.

169
00:09:42,712 --> 00:09:45,232
Okay. We'll bring a microphone to you.

170
00:09:48,852 --> 00:09:52,332
Again, if you could introduce yourself and let me know which agenda item you wish

171
00:09:52,372 --> 00:09:52,812
to speak.

172
00:09:58,612 --> 00:10:02,352
Hello. Yeah, good morning. It's Tony Morgan, local resident of Castle

173
00:10:02,412 --> 00:10:02,752
Acre.

174
00:10:03,612 --> 00:10:07,192
I would like to talk on all topics as they arise, if possible.

175
00:10:07,452 --> 00:10:07,772
Thank you.

176
00:10:09,972 --> 00:10:10,512
Thank you.

177
00:10:13,252 --> 00:10:15,372
Now, if we could move on to virtual attendees.

178
00:10:15,552 --> 00:10:18,932
If you are with us on Microsoft Teams, please could you raise the virtual hand and

179
00:10:18,992 --> 00:10:22,332
again, introduce yourself and let me know which agenda item

180
00:10:23,272 --> 00:10:26,592
you'll speak on. I'll work my way around

181
00:10:27,292 --> 00:10:30,652
on this. So I'll start with Morgan Harrington, please.

182
00:10:35,792 --> 00:10:39,332
I'm having trouble with some sound at the moment, Morgan. Oh, that's better.

183
00:10:39,732 --> 00:10:40,172
Carry on.

184
00:10:41,852 --> 00:10:44,752
Morgan Harrington on behalf of the Environment Agency. Good morning.

185
00:10:45,812 --> 00:10:49,752
I would like to speak on items two, flood

186
00:10:49,792 --> 00:10:53,742
risk hydrology and water resources, and possibly

187
00:10:53,832 --> 00:10:57,492
on item three, population.

188
00:10:59,512 --> 00:10:59,602
Thank you.

189
00:10:59,602 --> 00:10:59,972
Thank you.

190
00:11:00,052 --> 00:11:03,892
I'll go next in no particular order, but just

191
00:11:03,972 --> 00:11:05,712
around the screen. Michael Doyle.

192
00:11:08,972 --> 00:11:12,032
Good morning, sir. Michael Doyle, representing Breckland Council.

193
00:11:12,352 --> 00:11:14,052
I will speak on any item where required.

194
00:11:21,032 --> 00:11:24,912
Thank you. And John Wilson from the

195
00:11:25,172 --> 00:11:27,272
Defense Infrastructure Organization.

196
00:11:28,992 --> 00:11:32,342
Good morning. John Wilson from the Defense Infrastructure Organization,

197
00:11:32,532 --> 00:11:34,272
representing the Ministry of Defence.

198
00:11:35,012 --> 00:11:38,792
I'm attending with my colleague, Chris Waldron and Steve Speak.

199
00:11:39,092 --> 00:11:42,832
We are available to respond on any issues that may arise in

200
00:11:42,852 --> 00:11:44,252
relation to item one.

201
00:11:47,912 --> 00:11:48,372
Thank you.

202
00:11:49,272 --> 00:11:50,312
And Sarah Luff.

203
00:11:53,072 --> 00:11:54,832
Good morning, sir. My name is Sarah Luff.

204
00:11:54,992 --> 00:11:58,852
I am representing the Lead Local Flood Authority for Norfolk County Council,

205
00:11:59,572 --> 00:12:03,452
and I am here to discuss flood risk, surface water,

206
00:12:03,572 --> 00:12:06,052
and soggy things. Thank you.

207
00:12:07,752 --> 00:12:10,312
Thank you. And James Wild, MP

208
00:12:14,162 --> 00:12:16,542
Good morning, sir. James Wild, MP for North West Norfolk.

209
00:12:16,762 --> 00:12:20,222
I'll seek to comment as appropriate on any issues. Thank you.

210
00:12:21,922 --> 00:12:25,822
Okay. Thank you. Just one more hand. Peter Richards.

211
00:12:28,322 --> 00:12:30,742
Good morning, sir. Peter Richards. I'm a landscape architect.

212
00:12:31,482 --> 00:12:34,842
I'll be assisting Breckland Council on item one.

213
00:12:35,372 --> 00:12:36,902
That is regarding landscape and visual.

214

00:12:40,982 --> 00:12:42,022
Thank you. Okay.

215
00:12:53,482 --> 00:12:57,162
Okay, I'll now move on to agenda item three, which are the main

216
00:12:57,202 --> 00:12:57,582
issues.

217
00:12:58,562 --> 00:13:01,962
So we're starting with landscape and visual.

218
00:13:02,082 --> 00:13:05,562
And the first question is, could the applicant provide an update regarding the

219
00:13:05,602 --> 00:13:09,492
potential implications for landscape and visual effects resulting

220
00:13:09,522 --> 00:13:13,322
from the potential mitigation options for aviation

221
00:13:13,362 --> 00:13:13,772
effects?

222
00:13:15,342 --> 00:13:18,082
Certainly, sir. Alex Tresadern on behalf of the applicant.

223
00:13:18,202 --> 00:13:22,122
So, as was touched upon yesterday, the applicants

224
00:13:22,222 --> 00:13:25,792
had a very helpful meeting with the Ministry of Defence on Friday,

225
00:13:27,902 --> 00:13:31,762
particularly in relation to this matter and how the mitigation is going to be

226
00:13:31,802 --> 00:13:35,622
secured on the face of the DCO. And I touched on yesterday

227

00:13:35,632 --> 00:13:39,142
the fact that that will be via a requirement on the

228
00:13:39,162 --> 00:13:42,812
DCO, the wording of which is currently being agreed with the Ministry of

229
00:13:42,862 --> 00:13:46,822
Defence representatives. The reason for that is that

230
00:13:46,862 --> 00:13:50,722
the applicant submitted proposals for technical mitigation

231
00:13:50,762 --> 00:13:54,462
to the Ministry of Defence, but these were confirmed not to be feasible, and

232
00:13:54,522 --> 00:13:57,742
therefore, the applicant and the Ministry of Defence have agreed in

233
00:13:57,782 --> 00:14:01,742
principle that the impacts on precision approach radar as

234
00:14:01,762 --> 00:14:05,622
a result of certain areas of the scheme could be mitigated via a

235
00:14:05,662 --> 00:14:09,042
combination of bunds and fences throughout the affected areas.

236
00:14:09,082 --> 00:14:12,602
And those affected areas, again, as was touched upon yesterday,

237
00:14:13,102 --> 00:14:16,942
relate to three specific areas of mitigation within the order

238
00:14:17,002 --> 00:14:20,582
limits, which will be shown on a plan that we will submit into the

239
00:14:20,621 --> 00:14:24,411
examination at deadline four. But I think the key point to note is that

240
00:14:24,462 --> 00:14:27,802
these areas comprise significantly less

241
00:14:27,862 --> 00:14:29,032
hectareage than the

242
00:14:31,142 --> 00:14:34,822
initial total comprising all the fields that the Ministry of Defence

243
00:14:34,862 --> 00:14:37,142
referred to in their relevant representation.

244
00:14:37,222 --> 00:14:41,142
So through those discussions, it's clear that that area, i.e., the area that

245
00:14:41,182 --> 00:14:44,182
needs to be mitigated, is significantly smaller.

246
00:14:45,342 --> 00:14:49,242
Given that approach, the applicant will, at deadline five,

247
00:14:49,742 --> 00:14:53,662
update the design principles, parameters, and commitments

248
00:14:53,742 --> 00:14:57,302
document to include additional mitigation

249
00:14:57,402 --> 00:15:00,922
parameters in relation to those bunds and fences that I've

250
00:15:00,962 --> 00:15:04,322
referenced. But this will be in line with the

251
00:15:04,342 --> 00:15:08,142
environmental statement that's been presented with the application, i.e.,

252
00:15:08,222 --> 00:15:11,542
there will not be any new significant environmental

253
00:15:11,562 --> 00:15:14,112
effects on the receptors that have been assessed.

254
00:15:14,602 --> 00:15:17,742
So just as an example of some of the things that will be

255
00:15:17,782 --> 00:15:21,542
included in that update to the DPPCs, the

256
00:15:21,562 --> 00:15:25,442
bunds and fences won't be higher than 4.5 meters, which is the current

257
00:15:25,502 --> 00:15:27,982
maximum parameters in that document already.

258
00:15:28,502 --> 00:15:32,152
They won't be outside the already planned fenced areas of the solar

259
00:15:32,222 --> 00:15:36,182
panels, i.e., work number 1A. They will be vegetated with a

260
00:15:36,222 --> 00:15:38,142
naturalistic slope of one in three.

261
00:15:38,862 --> 00:15:42,682
They won't impede any surface water flow paths, and they will

262
00:15:42,722 --> 00:15:46,242
allow for the movement of wildlife through them or over them.

263
00:15:46,322 --> 00:15:49,542
So that's currently the applicant's position in relation to this matter.

264
00:15:49,642 --> 00:15:53,482
I have got Mr. Ollie Wheeler from WSP Landscape Consultant

265
00:15:53,522 --> 00:15:57,312
with me for further landscape input, but I hope that

266
00:15:57,362 --> 00:15:58,982
answer suffices in the first instance.

267
00:16:00,582 --> 00:16:01,542
Okay. Thank you.

268
00:16:03,262 --> 00:16:06,782
Yeah, so I think I would have liked to have seen a drawing.

269
00:16:07,562 --> 00:16:11,202
But in the absence of that, are we able to show the field

270
00:16:11,282 --> 00:16:14,702
numbering plan on the screen, which I think

271
00:16:16,262 --> 00:16:20,242
is reference APP-071?

272
00:16:20,362 --> 00:16:24,342
So I'd just like to talk about what the situation of where we were when the

273
00:16:24,382 --> 00:16:28,362
relevant rep came in and where we are now, and I'd like to see that visually.

274
00:16:28,422 --> 00:16:30,161
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresadern on behalf of the applicant.

275
00:16:30,522 --> 00:16:34,182
The reason I'm hesitating about showing the plan on screen is that it's a plan

276
00:16:34,222 --> 00:16:37,412
that's been sent to us by the Ministry of Defence and therefore hasn't been

277
00:16:38,162 --> 00:16:39,682
formatted by the applicant, if you like.

278
00:16:39,722 --> 00:16:43,602

However, if the Ministry of Defence's representative is happy for us to show

279
00:16:43,642 --> 00:16:46,962
that on screen now, we can do so. I'm just conscious it hasn't yet been

280
00:16:47,302 --> 00:16:51,012
submitted into the application. But if you're happy with that and Mr.

281
00:16:51,202 --> 00:16:53,022
Wilson is, then I think we can do that.

282
00:16:55,182 --> 00:16:56,942
Let's ask Mr. Wilson to comment.

283
00:16:58,442 --> 00:16:59,722
John Wilson for the Ministry of Defence.

284
00:16:59,822 --> 00:17:03,112
Yes, we're quite content for the plan to be shared and shown.

285
00:17:03,882 --> 00:17:05,083
Okay. Thank you.

286
00:17:06,103 --> 00:17:07,462
Okay, we'll just get that up then, sir.

287
00:17:07,502 --> 00:17:07,682
Yep.

288
00:17:49,122 --> 00:17:51,122
Peter Richards, you've got your hand up.

289
00:17:51,162 --> 00:17:53,622
Shall I come to you once we've seen the plan?

290
00:17:59,002 --> 00:18:01,722
You can keep your hand up as a reminder. Thank you.

291

00:18:11,142 --> 00:18:14,762
Sorry, sir. We're just waiting for the email to land in the inbox of the screen

292
00:18:14,822 --> 00:18:16,062
sharer. Hopefully, it'll only be a moment.

293
00:18:22,582 --> 00:18:26,462
In the meantime, would it be useful to see the field numbering plan so

294
00:18:26,522 --> 00:18:28,682
that we can just understand the position

295
00:18:30,122 --> 00:18:33,802
that the Defense Infrastructure Organization had at the time of their relevant

296
00:18:34,122 --> 00:18:35,042
representation?

297
00:18:35,842 --> 00:18:37,502
Thank you. So in the

298
00:18:38,522 --> 00:18:42,362
Defense Infrastructure Organization's relevant representation, which is dash

299
00:18:42,602 --> 00:18:43,282
051,

300
00:18:44,622 --> 00:18:48,482
they were concerned about the photovoltaic arrays in fields

301
00:18:48,702 --> 00:18:52,042
two, three, four, five, 10, and 11.

302
00:18:52,162 --> 00:18:55,902
So those are on the western side of the proposed development.

303
00:18:57,342 --> 00:19:01,022
So could you describe which fields are now affected?

304
00:19:01,082 --> 00:19:04,152
So recognizing the position at the time then,

305
00:19:05,982 --> 00:19:07,642
are we able to see the-

306
00:19:08,502 --> 00:19:10,792
I can describe it. It would be much more helpful if I could-

307
00:19:11,012 --> 00:19:11,012
Okay

308
00:19:11,012 --> 00:19:13,282
... if I could show the plan on the screen, because that will show that-

309
00:19:13,382 --> 00:19:13,502
Yeah

310
00:19:13,512 --> 00:19:15,442
... yeah, as I've alluded to, significantly

311
00:19:16,602 --> 00:19:16,982
fewer

312
00:19:18,442 --> 00:19:19,922
hectares are now affected.

313
00:19:46,162 --> 00:19:49,642
Sir, in the meantime, could I raise a point of clarification?

314
00:19:51,202 --> 00:19:52,242
Is it related to-

315
00:19:52,602 --> 00:19:52,612
Yes

316
00:19:52,612 --> 00:19:54,042
... this topic? Yes, go ahead. Yeah.

317
00:19:54,262 --> 00:19:56,882
Thank you. Dr. Mark Holmes, local occupant.

318
00:19:57,882 --> 00:20:01,802
Yesterday, John Wilson did say that the bunds and fences may well be

319
00:20:01,882 --> 00:20:05,682
higher than 4.5 meters. The applicant today said they wouldn't

320
00:20:05,722 --> 00:20:05,922
be.

321
00:20:06,982 --> 00:20:08,742
Just for clarification. Thank you.

322
00:20:09,322 --> 00:20:09,942
Okay. Thank you.

323
00:20:13,102 --> 00:20:14,882
How are we getting on with this drawing?

324
00:20:18,522 --> 00:20:19,522
Okay, so you've-

325
00:20:20,242 --> 00:20:20,312
It's

326
00:20:21,122 --> 00:20:22,352
on

327
00:20:23,342 --> 00:20:24,122
the right machine.

328
00:20:24,222 --> 00:20:25,061
Okay.

329
00:20:32,051 --> 00:20:33,082
Here we go. Right.

330
00:20:33,201 --> 00:20:33,502

Thank you.

331
00:20:33,782 --> 00:20:37,142
Thank you, sir. So as you can see, it might be helpful to

332
00:20:37,182 --> 00:20:41,022
have both the... It might be too small on the screen, but I

333
00:20:41,082 --> 00:20:44,912
wonder if you could have the field plan and this plan together

334
00:20:45,482 --> 00:20:48,442
to helpfully show which areas of those fields

335
00:20:50,342 --> 00:20:51,242
remain affected.

336
00:21:15,282 --> 00:21:17,482
Thank you, sir, so hopefully, that's helpful.

337
00:21:17,502 --> 00:21:21,142
I appreciate, as I say, we'll transpose these

338
00:21:21,182 --> 00:21:24,582
mitigation areas onto the fields plan for the plan that we submit into the

339
00:21:24,602 --> 00:21:28,542
examination, which will be more helpful. But you can see there a few...

340
00:21:28,582 --> 00:21:31,282
I appreciate it's not shown on the right-hand side, but on the left, you can see

341
00:21:31,342 --> 00:21:35,302
the line running on the end of mitigation area three

342
00:21:35,422 --> 00:21:39,362
corresponds with the red line boundary of the order limits by field

343

00:21:39,422 --> 00:21:42,682
six. So that sort of gives you a bit of perspective as to where these mitigation

344
00:21:42,742 --> 00:21:46,522
areas are. And you can see, I mean, we referenced previously, the entirety of

345
00:21:46,582 --> 00:21:50,162
field two, field three, field five, field six, field 10, field

346
00:21:50,222 --> 00:21:53,802
11. As you can see, the areas are significantly smaller now.

347
00:21:56,782 --> 00:22:00,542
Okay. And just a bit more of an explanation around what that

348
00:22:00,582 --> 00:22:04,452
mitigation area looks like. So are we saying that

349
00:22:04,642 --> 00:22:08,602
around the whole of the boundary of each of those mitigation

350
00:22:08,662 --> 00:22:09,022
areas?

351
00:22:10,222 --> 00:22:10,872
I do have my-

352
00:22:11,142 --> 00:22:11,152
Just-

353
00:22:11,182 --> 00:22:12,662
Sorry, Alex Tregon on behalf of the applicant.

354
00:22:12,722 --> 00:22:16,662
I do have my colleague, James Plum, from Page Power Online, who may be able

355
00:22:16,702 --> 00:22:19,502
to speak to the mitigation a bit more clearly.

356
00:22:19,522 --> 00:22:22,722
But our understanding at the moment is that rather than encompassing the

357
00:22:22,762 --> 00:22:26,622
entirety of each mitigation area, which would lead to quite

358
00:22:26,682 --> 00:22:30,602
high bunds as been referenced, the mitigation would be in between the

359
00:22:30,642 --> 00:22:34,442
rows of solar panels, and therefore each bund/fence could be

360
00:22:34,542 --> 00:22:38,442
smaller in order to mitigate the impact of the panels to which it

361
00:22:38,482 --> 00:22:41,442
relates, rather than encircling the entire field.

362
00:22:41,462 --> 00:22:44,942
But James, online, please do jump in if there's anything further.

363
00:22:50,502 --> 00:22:52,822
Yes. Thank you. James Plum on behalf of the applicant.

364
00:22:53,802 --> 00:22:54,062
So

365
00:22:54,922 --> 00:22:57,662
while I would stress at this point,

366
00:22:58,582 --> 00:22:59,082
none of these

367
00:23:00,162 --> 00:23:03,962
plans are confirmed, and we're looking to design a detailed

368
00:23:04,002 --> 00:23:06,402
plan at the detailed design stage.

369
00:23:07,402 --> 00:23:11,302
What we've looked at as a very initial look is how

370
00:23:11,342 --> 00:23:13,102
feasible it is to put

371
00:23:14,262 --> 00:23:17,842
4.5-meter-tall obstructions in these fields, whether those be

372
00:23:17,942 --> 00:23:21,242
fences or bunds, and screen panels behind those.

373
00:23:21,822 --> 00:23:23,222
As part of that, we've also looked at

374
00:23:24,382 --> 00:23:27,902
whether it'd be possible to drop the panel heights to provide more

375
00:23:28,202 --> 00:23:32,042
screening with fewer bunds. But it's not sort

376
00:23:32,082 --> 00:23:35,362
of one fence encircling that whole mitigation area.

377
00:23:35,422 --> 00:23:37,862
Instead, it is blocking the relevant

378
00:23:39,182 --> 00:23:41,892
field of view from the PAR, which is located

379
00:23:42,702 --> 00:23:44,382
southwest of these areas

380
00:23:45,722 --> 00:23:48,122
through to the mitigation areas. So

381
00:23:49,342 --> 00:23:52,402
in most cases, it would be a bund along that,

382
00:23:53,722 --> 00:23:56,982

a bundle fence, sorry, along that southwest

383
00:23:57,542 --> 00:24:00,912
boundary of the mitigation areas, and then

384
00:24:00,922 --> 00:24:02,762
potentially further

385
00:24:04,022 --> 00:24:07,382
fencing within those areas such that each

386
00:24:07,722 --> 00:24:09,002
fence does not

387
00:24:10,542 --> 00:24:14,082
block the views for the entire mitigation area, but rather sort of

388
00:24:14,322 --> 00:24:16,822
one section of it, such that we have

389
00:24:16,882 --> 00:24:20,682
a combined plan which would

390
00:24:20,722 --> 00:24:21,742
then look to

391
00:24:23,182 --> 00:24:23,702
screen

392
00:24:24,654 --> 00:24:28,634
All of the areas or the majority of the areas without having to have
any

393
00:24:28,674 --> 00:24:32,114
of the individual obstructions exceed that 4.5-meter height.

394
00:24:35,374 --> 00:24:39,234
Okay. So you're saying that you need to block

395
00:24:39,294 --> 00:24:42,914
it on the southwest side. Would there still be

396
00:24:43,374 --> 00:24:47,354
photovoltaic arrays within those mitigation areas as

397
00:24:47,414 --> 00:24:47,634
well?

398
00:24:50,394 --> 00:24:50,994
Alex Treseden.

399
00:24:51,004 --> 00:24:51,614
James Plum on behalf-

400
00:24:52,434 --> 00:24:53,074
Go on, James. You go.

401
00:24:54,434 --> 00:24:56,174
Sorry. James Plum on behalf of the applicant.

402
00:24:57,234 --> 00:25:00,614
The intent is to design the scheme such that

403
00:25:01,334 --> 00:25:03,894
photovoltaics can be maintained within these areas.

404
00:25:05,214 --> 00:25:05,514
The

405
00:25:07,674 --> 00:25:10,114
MOD objection, not to put words into Mr.

406
00:25:10,314 --> 00:25:11,234
Wilson's mouth, but

407
00:25:12,134 --> 00:25:16,054
that is predicated on the fact that there are photovoltaics within

408
00:25:16,094 --> 00:25:19,704
these areas, so one solution to that would be for the applicant to

409

00:25:19,714 --> 00:25:21,894
remove the photovoltaics from this area.

410
00:25:22,094 --> 00:25:25,473
That's obviously not the preferred solution.

411
00:25:25,514 --> 00:25:28,174
So what we've looked at is these

412
00:25:29,114 --> 00:25:32,614
physical obstructions, which would then allow us to put
photovoltaics behind them

413
00:25:32,694 --> 00:25:34,914
and keep these areas as part of the scheme.

414
00:25:37,414 --> 00:25:37,694
Okay.

415
00:25:39,614 --> 00:25:39,934
Thank you.

416
00:25:40,154 --> 00:25:42,994
And sir, might I be able to respond to Dr. Holmes?

417
00:25:43,034 --> 00:25:43,514
Yes, go ahead. Yeah.

418
00:25:43,654 --> 00:25:47,544
Yeah. So the point raised there was about whether the bunds and

419
00:25:47,594 --> 00:25:49,554
fences would be higher than 4.5 meters.

420
00:25:49,614 --> 00:25:52,124
So in the design principles, parameters,

421
00:25:53,454 --> 00:25:57,134
and commitments document we've got, we set out the maximum
parameters

422

00:25:57,294 --> 00:26:01,174
as being 4.5 meters, and the updated deadline five will include

423
00:26:01,534 --> 00:26:05,394
additional measures in relation to these

424
00:26:05,434 --> 00:26:09,294
mitigation proposals, and that will ensure that none of the

425
00:26:09,834 --> 00:26:13,314
bunds or fences go higher than 4.5 meters in this scenario anyway.

426
00:26:13,694 --> 00:26:16,774
So therefore, if we get to the point at detailed design stage

427
00:26:16,814 --> 00:26:20,474
whereby the MOD's objection isn't satisfied by

428
00:26:20,534 --> 00:26:24,174
those bunds and fences being that high, we wouldn't be able to build the solar

429
00:26:24,194 --> 00:26:27,654
panels because we'd be breaching the design principles that are secured under the

430
00:26:27,694 --> 00:26:30,534
DCO, so we wouldn't be able to go higher than 4.5 meters.

431
00:26:32,094 --> 00:26:32,974
Okay. Thank you.

432
00:26:33,014 --> 00:26:33,874
Can I respond?

433
00:26:34,034 --> 00:26:37,754
Well, I would like to give the local authorities the opportunity to respond because

434
00:26:37,814 --> 00:26:38,034
I think

435
00:26:38,854 --> 00:26:39,654
we're in danger of...

436
00:26:40,534 --> 00:26:44,314
I can see the points are related, but I'd just like to follow in

437
00:26:44,374 --> 00:26:44,614
order.

438
00:26:46,034 --> 00:26:49,954
Okay. Could we go to Breckland District Council for any

439
00:26:50,014 --> 00:26:52,394
comments on the mitigation proposals?

440
00:26:54,174 --> 00:26:56,114
I would make one point, sir, before I ask Mr.

441
00:26:56,294 --> 00:26:57,434
Richards to-

442
00:26:57,474 --> 00:26:57,484
Okay

443
00:26:57,484 --> 00:27:01,424
... comment on our behalf. I hear what has been said about

444
00:27:01,474 --> 00:27:05,254
ensuring that they are no higher than 4.5 meters. I share Mr.

445
00:27:05,454 --> 00:27:09,414
Holmes' concerns that yesterday we heard that potentially they could
be higher

446
00:27:09,454 --> 00:27:13,414
than 4.5 meters. I think it would be useful to understand from the

447
00:27:13,494 --> 00:27:17,064
MOD the likelihood of that, but I will ask Mr.

448

00:27:17,954 --> 00:27:20,014
Richards to address the issues.

449
00:27:27,994 --> 00:27:31,154
Good morning, sir, again. Peter Richards, landscape architect for Breckland

450
00:27:31,214 --> 00:27:31,554
Council.

451
00:27:32,474 --> 00:27:36,124
I note the applicant referred to the bunds

452
00:27:36,354 --> 00:27:39,054
sitting within the parameters that have been set.

453
00:27:39,774 --> 00:27:40,774
I would say that

454
00:27:41,574 --> 00:27:44,874
we haven't to date assessed the introduction of such

455
00:27:45,354 --> 00:27:48,554
large features in the landscape. A

456
00:27:48,754 --> 00:27:52,014
4.5-meter bund, which would be the worst-case scenario,

457
00:27:52,814 --> 00:27:55,634
would, with one in three sides, lead to a berm

458
00:27:55,734 --> 00:27:59,654
some 25 to 30 meters in width. So we're

459
00:27:59,694 --> 00:28:02,434
talking about a considerable amount of cut and fill,

460
00:28:03,234 --> 00:28:07,194
and quite an incongruous feature being introduced

461
00:28:07,214 --> 00:28:10,694

into the landscape. So that would need to be taken into

462
00:28:10,734 --> 00:28:13,174
consideration within the environmental statement.

463
00:28:14,614 --> 00:28:18,134
I'd also note that berms such as this, from previous

464
00:28:18,194 --> 00:28:18,894
experience,

465
00:28:20,994 --> 00:28:24,714
you need to consider the drainage patterns that they start to alter.

466
00:28:24,794 --> 00:28:28,654
So it's not as simple as just the bund itself, but it's looking

467
00:28:28,694 --> 00:28:32,534
at the drainage characteristics that the bunds will change.

468
00:28:33,134 --> 00:28:36,994
And during the construction, there's going to be a considerable
amount of cut

469
00:28:37,034 --> 00:28:39,334
and fill required to form these bunds.

470
00:28:39,354 --> 00:28:43,054
So it'll be interesting to identify where this cut material is

471
00:28:43,134 --> 00:28:46,734
coming from. I do understand that the 4.5 is the

472
00:28:46,834 --> 00:28:50,434
worst-case scenario, and if the bund was shared with a fence,

473
00:28:50,894 --> 00:28:54,633
then that would come down, say half and half, but you're still
talking about

474
00:28:54,774 --> 00:28:55,554

bunds which are

475
00:28:56,414 --> 00:28:58,914
at half that height, 10 to 15 meters in width.

476
00:28:58,974 --> 00:29:00,174
So we're still talking about

477
00:29:01,694 --> 00:29:05,504
very notable and incongruous features being introduced into the landscape,

478
00:29:06,034 --> 00:29:09,414
which I think need to be considered within the LVIA.

479
00:29:10,294 --> 00:29:10,574
Thank you.

480
00:29:11,934 --> 00:29:12,914
Thank you, Mr. Richards.

481
00:29:13,874 --> 00:29:14,594
Alex Treseden.

482
00:29:15,514 --> 00:29:19,234
Thank you, sir. Alex Treseden on behalf of the applicant. I'll pass over to Mr.

483
00:29:19,434 --> 00:29:21,494
Wheeler in a moment to deal with the points that Mr.

484
00:29:21,694 --> 00:29:25,294
Richards has just made, but I'd like to make it very clear that,

485
00:29:25,834 --> 00:29:28,744
and perhaps I haven't explained myself clearly enough, the design principles,

486
00:29:28,874 --> 00:29:32,074
parameters, and commitments document is secured as a certified

487

00:29:32,114 --> 00:29:35,454
document by Schedule 13 of the draft DCO.

488
00:29:35,594 --> 00:29:39,134
Therefore, if the DCO is consented, that becomes a

489
00:29:39,214 --> 00:29:42,854
binding statutory instrument, and the parameters and commitments

490
00:29:42,864 --> 00:29:46,574
secured in that document are binding upon the applicant, and
therefore, it would be

491
00:29:46,634 --> 00:29:50,013
a criminal offense for the applicant to not comply with them.

492
00:29:50,154 --> 00:29:53,894
Therefore, as it does and as it will in relation to this additional

493
00:29:53,934 --> 00:29:57,634
mitigation, if that document says the bunds and fences can't be
higher than

494
00:29:57,794 --> 00:30:01,414
4.5 meters, the applicant cannot build bunds or

495
00:30:01,454 --> 00:30:03,974
fences that would be higher than 4.5 meters tall.

496
00:30:04,194 --> 00:30:06,774
That to do so would be a criminal offense once the DCO is made.

497
00:30:06,834 --> 00:30:09,654
So that cannot happen, and I'll pass over to Mr.

498
00:30:09,874 --> 00:30:11,754
Wheeler on the points made by Mr. Richards.

499
00:30:15,534 --> 00:30:15,734
Yes.

500

00:30:16,294 --> 00:30:20,234
Yeah. I totally understand the DCO process and

501
00:30:20,414 --> 00:30:24,134
the implications of a DCO that has a specific height within it.

502
00:30:24,534 --> 00:30:27,704
I think my concern is making sure that the height that's specified in the

503
00:30:27,734 --> 00:30:31,134
DCO is the height that is required to serve the purpose for which

504
00:30:31,234 --> 00:30:35,153
it's designed. And that's why I was suggesting that maybe we hear from

505
00:30:35,224 --> 00:30:38,354
Mr. Wilson to clarify whether or not that's an agreed

506
00:30:38,854 --> 00:30:41,474
position, and that's what will be embedded within the DCO.

507
00:30:42,314 --> 00:30:43,854
Sorry, sir. Alex Trestard on behalf of the applicant.

508
00:30:44,154 --> 00:30:47,714
Our point, though, is that that is the maximum height that we will set.

509
00:30:47,834 --> 00:30:51,194
And therefore, if we get to the detailed design stage and the Ministry of Defence

510
00:30:51,214 --> 00:30:55,134
isn't happy with the mitigation that can be achieved via

511
00:30:55,194 --> 00:30:57,914
that height, the solar panels will not be built in that area.

512
00:30:57,934 --> 00:31:00,334
They won't be able to be built in that area. That's our point.

513
00:31:00,374 --> 00:31:03,674
That's the maximum to which we'll go, and therefore, to go any higher would be a

514
00:31:03,694 --> 00:31:07,254
criminal offense. And if that's what's needed to build the panels so that they

515
00:31:07,274 --> 00:31:09,654
satisfy the MoD, they won't be built in those areas.

516
00:31:11,234 --> 00:31:13,944
Okay, thank you. I'd like to go to Norfolk County Council next.

517
00:31:14,123 --> 00:31:15,914
Sorry, sir. Would it be all right if Mr. Wheeler came back on Mr.

518
00:31:16,074 --> 00:31:17,064
Richards' points first?

519
00:31:18,474 --> 00:31:18,914
Sorry.

520
00:31:20,413 --> 00:31:23,944
Let's just see if the local authorities have got any further comments, and then

521
00:31:23,974 --> 00:31:26,834
perhaps Mr. Richards can address all in one go.

522
00:31:27,394 --> 00:31:30,873
Okay. Thank you, sir. Andrew Szarkowski for Norfolk County Council.

523
00:31:32,174 --> 00:31:32,694
Yeah, I think

524
00:31:34,254 --> 00:31:38,014
really just to follow on from what Simon would've said, that there is a concern

525

00:31:38,074 --> 00:31:41,954
here about really understanding what the impact of the mitigation is going to be.

526
00:31:42,034 --> 00:31:45,394
I take the point you've just made, and I don't disagree with that, but it still

527
00:31:45,434 --> 00:31:48,274
begs the question in the first place that actually, what's the limit that you're

528
00:31:48,314 --> 00:31:52,024
going to set in terms of the parameters and whether or not that's acceptable in

529
00:31:52,034 --> 00:31:53,704
terms of the environmental impact assessment?

530
00:31:54,314 --> 00:31:57,434
Because it's one thing looking at that plan on the screen, it's quite another thing

531
00:31:57,514 --> 00:32:00,534
actually understanding what that impact will be.

532
00:32:00,894 --> 00:32:04,254
And I think if I've got a concern on behalf of the county council, it's that we

533
00:32:04,274 --> 00:32:08,084
really do actually understand, and the examining authority understand, what

534
00:32:08,134 --> 00:32:11,754
that impact is going to be in terms of the landscape and visual impact

535
00:32:11,794 --> 00:32:14,354
assessment, as I think Mike Richards has already alluded to.

536
00:32:14,834 --> 00:32:18,674
So there's that point first. Secondly, I think my

537
00:32:18,694 --> 00:32:21,974
colleague Sarah Luff would just like to come in and make a comment from

538
00:32:22,514 --> 00:32:25,594
a flood risk perspective. So I'll hand over to her.

539
00:32:27,454 --> 00:32:28,474
Okay. Thank you, Sarah.

540
00:32:29,474 --> 00:32:33,234
Hello, sir. Sarah Luff for Norfolk County Council, lead local flood authority.

541
00:32:34,034 --> 00:32:37,814
At the moment, the panels areas

542
00:32:38,094 --> 00:32:40,074
of the development are

543
00:32:40,914 --> 00:32:44,634
proposed to be drained in accordance with the natural field patterns.

544
00:32:45,194 --> 00:32:49,023
Introducing these structures would not be natural, and therefore, the

545
00:32:49,054 --> 00:32:50,994
drainage would not operate as planned.

546
00:32:51,854 --> 00:32:55,194
I'd say a substantial amount of drainage alterations would be

547
00:32:55,254 --> 00:32:57,863
needed to facilitate the bunds.

548
00:32:58,894 --> 00:33:02,634
While I appreciate that earlier on, the applicant

549

00:33:02,754 --> 00:33:06,194
stated that there would be a 1 in 3 side slope and it would be

550
00:33:06,274 --> 00:33:07,014
vegetated,

551
00:33:07,854 --> 00:33:11,274
this bund, or multiple bunds, would

552
00:33:11,314 --> 00:33:14,974
be compacted and therefore would not operate in the same way

553
00:33:15,174 --> 00:33:16,314
as a natural ground

554
00:33:17,154 --> 00:33:18,734
that is currently in place in the field.

555
00:33:19,474 --> 00:33:22,694
So therefore, they would need to be drained structures, and you would need to

556
00:33:22,754 --> 00:33:26,154
attenuate the flow. This means that there would be a substantial area

557
00:33:26,834 --> 00:33:30,774
needed for holding water before it is discharged some way, shape,

558
00:33:30,794 --> 00:33:34,514
or form. And that water still needs to have

559
00:33:34,654 --> 00:33:37,773
a discharge location identified. Thank you, sir.

560
00:33:39,274 --> 00:33:40,954
Okay. Alex Trestard.

561
00:33:41,934 --> 00:33:45,234
Thank you, sir. I'm conscious there are a few points outstanding for us to respond

562
00:33:45,294 --> 00:33:49,054
to from Mr. Richards, Norfolk County Council, including the

563
00:33:49,074 --> 00:33:51,254
representative on screen. I think we might take Mr.

564
00:33:51,434 --> 00:33:54,614
Richards' points first on effects, please. And I do have Mr.

565
00:33:54,814 --> 00:33:56,934
Nevins with us as well, in case you want to say anything in response-

566
00:33:56,954 --> 00:33:57,094
Okay

567
00:33:57,114 --> 00:33:58,594
... to the water courses point.

568
00:33:59,114 --> 00:34:03,094
Just before you do that, I will come to Borough Council of

569
00:34:03,194 --> 00:34:04,594
Kings Lynn and West Norfolk as well.

570
00:34:05,934 --> 00:34:07,934
Julie Barrow, Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

571
00:34:08,254 --> 00:34:09,694
I don't think we've got anything additional to add.

572
00:34:09,725 --> 00:34:09,725
Okay.

573
00:34:09,774 --> 00:34:10,574
I think it's all been covered.

574
00:34:10,694 --> 00:34:11,214
All right. Thank you.

575

00:34:13,234 --> 00:34:13,654
Thank you.

576
00:34:14,674 --> 00:34:15,754
Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

577
00:34:16,774 --> 00:34:20,524
To try and address those points in order, Mr.

578
00:34:20,694 --> 00:34:24,394
Richards firstly pointing out an incongruous nature of

579
00:34:24,594 --> 00:34:28,374
bunding. That is acknowledged, and I do accept that introducing bunding into the

580
00:34:28,415 --> 00:34:32,194
site would be discordant with the existing characteristics, given the

581
00:34:32,234 --> 00:34:35,415
nature of the topography and the characteristics that currently exist.

582
00:34:36,294 --> 00:34:40,214
I think the key point is that an introduction of bunding, fencing,

583
00:34:40,394 --> 00:34:43,935
or a mitigation option in line with the parameters such that the

584
00:34:44,134 --> 00:34:47,614
4.5 meters being the ceiling height of the scale of whatever's

585
00:34:47,634 --> 00:34:51,435
proposed, and the extent of development is still within the DCO

586
00:34:51,495 --> 00:34:55,034
scheme limits, that there'll be no new significant

587
00:34:55,114 --> 00:34:58,554
landscape and visual effects. However, there may be an increase in

588
00:34:58,594 --> 00:35:01,994
significance of those already effects that are significant.

589
00:35:02,014 --> 00:35:05,514
An example of which is the landscape character areas within the site,

590
00:35:05,974 --> 00:35:09,894
LCAs D1 and E6 both have significant

591
00:35:09,934 --> 00:35:10,854
landscape effects.

592
00:35:11,914 --> 00:35:15,854
It would be, and potentially could be acknowledged that the significance

593
00:35:15,914 --> 00:35:19,894
of those effects could be greater when taking into account these mitigation

594
00:35:19,934 --> 00:35:23,894
options. But there would be no new significant effects

595
00:35:23,934 --> 00:35:26,814
on other receptors otherwise identified within the study area.

596
00:35:28,114 --> 00:35:29,294
Do you want to

597
00:35:29,354 --> 00:35:32,894
say

598
00:35:33,534 --> 00:35:33,734
anything?

599
00:35:36,134 --> 00:35:39,964
And sir, just in relation to the points on water, the updated

600
00:35:40,054 --> 00:35:43,534
design principles and parameters and commitments document will

secure all matters

601
00:35:43,574 --> 00:35:46,274
in relation to drainage in respect of the new bunds.

602
00:35:46,294 --> 00:35:49,724
And I should stress as well that we are talking about bunds and/or fences, not

603
00:35:49,734 --> 00:35:51,574
necessarily exclusively bunds.

604
00:35:59,634 --> 00:36:02,114
Okay. So on your first answer,

605
00:36:02,994 --> 00:36:03,544
Alex Trestard,

606
00:36:04,434 --> 00:36:08,074
you said that they would be updated in line with the environmental statement.

607
00:36:08,934 --> 00:36:11,614
Are you proposing to update the environmental statement

608
00:36:12,094 --> 00:36:13,274
following the

609
00:36:16,634 --> 00:36:17,274
mitigation

610
00:36:18,118 --> 00:36:18,778
proposals.

611
00:36:19,278 --> 00:36:20,758
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

612
00:36:20,858 --> 00:36:21,058
So,

613
00:36:22,238 --> 00:36:25,358

given that the proposed mitigation measures would be in line with the existing

614
00:36:25,378 --> 00:36:28,958
parameters, i.e., the ceiling height of proposed development and the extent,

615
00:36:29,538 --> 00:36:33,278
the effects and the extent of significant effects do not change.

616
00:36:34,078 --> 00:36:37,398
Therefore, an amendment to the chapter would not necessarily be required because

617
00:36:37,418 --> 00:36:41,158
the conclusions would still conclude that effects on LCA

618
00:36:41,198 --> 00:36:44,298
D.1, LCA E.6 are still significant and they

619
00:36:44,338 --> 00:36:46,398
remain. And also,

620
00:36:47,258 --> 00:36:50,778
visual effects in the long term for visual receptor group one, being

621
00:36:50,838 --> 00:36:54,288
those in close proximity to the mitigation areas,

622
00:36:54,798 --> 00:36:57,948
would be non-significant in the long term, taking into account the mitigation

623
00:36:57,978 --> 00:37:01,907
proposals. However, it is acknowledged, as it is already,

624
00:37:01,938 --> 00:37:05,678
that in the short and medium term there would be significant visual effects.

625
00:37:05,698 --> 00:37:07,738
But that already is stated within the ES chapter.

626
00:37:08,918 --> 00:37:09,278
Thank you.

627
00:37:09,498 --> 00:37:11,998
And, sir, Alex Treseder on behalf of the applicant.

628
00:37:12,058 --> 00:37:15,978
That's also important in the context of the planning statement and the planning

629
00:37:15,998 --> 00:37:19,498
balance because as we've said, the applicant's confident that physical

630
00:37:19,558 --> 00:37:23,538
mitigation required wouldn't introduce further or additional residual adverse

631
00:37:23,578 --> 00:37:26,538
significant effects to those reported in the environmental statement, as Mr.

632
00:37:26,738 --> 00:37:30,578
Wheeler's just said. But indeed, even if there is a shift in the assessment of

633
00:37:30,618 --> 00:37:34,378
harm, this wouldn't have an effect on the conclusions related to the

634
00:37:34,418 --> 00:37:38,318
planning balance presented in the planning statement because a likely significant

635
00:37:38,358 --> 00:37:42,018
effect is already concluded in respect of the relevant LVIA

636
00:37:42,078 --> 00:37:43,778
impacts, and that would remain the case.

637
00:37:43,858 --> 00:37:47,508
So the conclusions in respect of the planning balance wouldn't

change, in

638
00:37:47,578 --> 00:37:51,338
which a negative weight is already attributed to these matters.

639
00:37:57,798 --> 00:37:58,538
Okay, thank you.

640
00:38:00,038 --> 00:38:03,218
Peter Richards, you've still got your hand up, and so have you, Sarah Luff.

641
00:38:03,258 --> 00:38:05,178
Did you want to come back on any points?

642
00:38:07,078 --> 00:38:09,158
Yes, please, sir. Peter Richards on landscape for Breckland.

643
00:38:09,678 --> 00:38:10,928
I'd just like to raise that

644
00:38:12,778 --> 00:38:16,498
bunds of such size would entail quite a lot of cut and

645
00:38:16,558 --> 00:38:20,518
fill. So I think the LVIA should be considering

646
00:38:20,578 --> 00:38:24,238
where that cut is coming from. It's going to be a considerable amount of ground

647
00:38:24,278 --> 00:38:27,738
modeling. That would be the first point that the LVIA needs to consider.

648
00:38:28,458 --> 00:38:29,398
And the second is that

649
00:38:30,398 --> 00:38:33,838
come the end of the project, what is the decommissioning

650

00:38:33,958 --> 00:38:37,918
proposed for these bunds? Is the ground to be returned to

651
00:38:37,958 --> 00:38:39,567
its original form? Are they to be left?

652
00:38:39,718 --> 00:38:42,778
I think these points need to be covered again in the

653
00:38:42,898 --> 00:38:44,278
LVIA. Thank you, sir.

654
00:38:47,238 --> 00:38:49,458
Thank you. And Sarah Luff.

655
00:38:52,198 --> 00:38:55,138
Hello. Sarah Luff for Norfolk Lead Local Flood Authority.

656
00:38:56,698 --> 00:38:59,138
The water chapter would also need updating.

657
00:38:59,268 --> 00:39:03,227
These bunds had not previously been considered in the assessment of

658
00:39:03,298 --> 00:39:06,398
surface water management and flood risk that's within that chapter.

659
00:39:07,158 --> 00:39:10,878
So they would also need to be revisited.

660
00:39:11,358 --> 00:39:14,858
The flood risk assessment would also need to be updated as it
supports

661
00:39:15,058 --> 00:39:17,378
the chapter as well. Thank you.

662
00:39:18,618 --> 00:39:20,287
Thank you. Alex Treseder.

663
00:39:20,438 --> 00:39:23,418

Thank you, sir. Alex Treseder on behalf of the applicant. I'll pass over to Mr.

664
00:39:23,598 --> 00:39:27,408
Wheeler in a moment. But just to confirm again, we're

665
00:39:27,438 --> 00:39:29,338
talking about bunds and/or fences.

666
00:39:29,378 --> 00:39:33,258
I think the narrative is such that this would

667
00:39:33,318 --> 00:39:36,748
exclusively be extremely large bunds, but we're not necessarily saying that would

668
00:39:36,778 --> 00:39:40,178
be the case. It could be fences, and it will be in line with the parameters already

669
00:39:40,218 --> 00:39:44,198
assessed. And in relation to the point about decommissioning, my colleague's

670
00:39:44,218 --> 00:39:48,178
just informed me that the land will be returned to the original form as

671
00:39:48,198 --> 00:39:50,118
per the agreement with the landowner.

672
00:39:51,958 --> 00:39:54,378
We've got nothing further to add on those matters, sir. Thank you.

673
00:39:54,458 --> 00:39:55,298
Okay. Thank you.

674
00:39:56,358 --> 00:40:00,038
I can see there are hands up. I would like to hear from you, but I also have an

675
00:40:00,098 --> 00:40:04,058

extensive list to get through, so I'm going to come back to you at the end of

676
00:40:04,098 --> 00:40:04,838
my questions.

677
00:40:06,238 --> 00:40:06,538
Okay.

678
00:40:08,738 --> 00:40:12,358
So we'll move on to question... Oh, sorry, James Wild MP, I've just

679
00:40:12,398 --> 00:40:13,817
noticed your hand's raised.

680
00:40:17,278 --> 00:40:20,678
Thank you, sir. Just on the point that the applicant just made,

681
00:40:21,638 --> 00:40:25,428
I wonder if the Defense Infrastructure Organization could comment on whether

682
00:40:25,458 --> 00:40:28,558
fences would have the same mitigation impact as bunds.

683
00:40:30,058 --> 00:40:33,038
Okay. Thank you. John Wilson, could you respond, please?

684
00:40:37,058 --> 00:40:39,398
John Wilson for the Ministry of Defense.

685
00:40:39,958 --> 00:40:43,058
We have had some experience of a wooden

686
00:40:44,098 --> 00:40:48,038
wall, quite a robust dead structure, being used to

687
00:40:48,078 --> 00:40:51,818
mitigate a solar farm from affecting a

688
00:40:51,838 --> 00:40:54,498

precision approach radar at a different MOD air base.

689
00:40:54,918 --> 00:40:57,177
So in principle, yes, it is possible.

690
00:40:58,478 --> 00:41:02,028
We've also had the experience that an earthen bund has been used, and that was

691
00:41:02,138 --> 00:41:05,998
also suitably effective. So it should be possible that

692
00:41:06,058 --> 00:41:09,798
some form of wooden structure could be used.

693
00:41:09,808 --> 00:41:13,478
My colleague, Steve Speak, who's our radar specialist, can probably

694
00:41:13,558 --> 00:41:15,638
provide further comment on that as well.

695
00:41:15,678 --> 00:41:18,198
Let me just pass over to him on that.

696
00:41:18,818 --> 00:41:19,078
Thank you.

697
00:41:25,198 --> 00:41:27,128
Steve Speak, on behalf of the

698
00:41:27,978 --> 00:41:31,918
MOD. Yeah, there are things called radar fences available, which

699
00:41:31,978 --> 00:41:34,578
is a type of absorbent material that

700
00:41:34,638 --> 00:41:39,258
effectively

701
00:41:39,338 --> 00:41:43,018
screens the development in the same way that a bund or a fence

would.

702
00:41:43,098 --> 00:41:43,338
So

703
00:41:44,258 --> 00:41:47,898
it isn't necessarily got to be a brick wall or a solid fence as

704
00:41:47,918 --> 00:41:48,318
such.

705
00:41:50,458 --> 00:41:53,278
Okay. Thank you. Alex Treseder.

706
00:41:53,418 --> 00:41:55,028
Thank you, sir. No, nothing further to add.

707
00:41:55,058 --> 00:41:57,038
That's helpful confirmation from the Ministry of Defense.

708
00:41:57,098 --> 00:42:00,458
And as I say, it's bunds and/or such fences as have been described.

709
00:42:00,898 --> 00:42:03,838
Thank you. I'd like to move on to the second question now.

710
00:42:05,518 --> 00:42:09,258
So could the local authorities explain what local planning controls are in

711
00:42:09,278 --> 00:42:12,958
place to protect the existing woodlands, including Bartholomew's

712
00:42:13,338 --> 00:42:14,418
Hill Plantation,

713
00:42:15,318 --> 00:42:19,018
which provides screening for the proposed development adjoining the order limits?

714
00:42:19,208 --> 00:42:21,598

And I'll go to Breckland District Council first.

715
00:42:22,662 --> 00:42:26,362
Thank you, sir. This sits outside the order area,

716
00:42:26,602 --> 00:42:27,942
we're aware of.

717
00:42:28,942 --> 00:42:32,562
There's nothing in place at the moment that seeks to protect

718
00:42:32,702 --> 00:42:36,682
the woodland. The council could, if they feel it's appropriate to do so,

719
00:42:37,982 --> 00:42:40,662
institute a woodland protection order.

720
00:42:41,262 --> 00:42:45,122
The only current protections in place are through the Forestry Commission's felling

721
00:42:45,222 --> 00:42:46,902
license, which is my understanding.

722
00:42:48,082 --> 00:42:48,502
Thank you.

723
00:42:56,982 --> 00:43:00,202
I'm sorry, could you just repeat what the protection that you could

724
00:43:01,262 --> 00:43:01,662
introduce?

725
00:43:01,822 --> 00:43:04,722
We could introduce a woodland

726
00:43:05,502 --> 00:43:08,382
preservation order if it's appropriate to do so.

727
00:43:10,442 --> 00:43:13,922

At the moment, the only requirement would be for anybody

728
00:43:14,002 --> 00:43:17,782
removing or taking down significant parts of the plantation would be a

729
00:43:17,882 --> 00:43:21,862
felling license through the Forestry Commission. That's my understanding.

730
00:43:22,102 --> 00:43:24,382
Thank you. And Norfolk County Council.

731
00:43:25,302 --> 00:43:28,982
Yeah, sir, Andrew Turokowski from Norfolk County Council.

732
00:43:29,022 --> 00:43:31,262
I'd concur with what Simon Wood has just said.

733
00:43:31,302 --> 00:43:33,942
Okay, and Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

734
00:43:34,962 --> 00:43:36,862
Julie Barrow, Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

735
00:43:37,222 --> 00:43:41,062
The plantation lies outside of our district, so as far as I'm aware,

736
00:43:41,142 --> 00:43:43,582
we don't have any particular powers over that area.

737
00:43:51,942 --> 00:43:53,602
Any comment, Alex Tressidder?

738
00:43:55,562 --> 00:43:58,782
Ollie Wheeler for the applicant. Also agree with all of that.

739
00:43:58,962 --> 00:44:01,002
I think it's just worth noting that

740
00:44:01,962 --> 00:44:05,782

with the location of Bartholomew's Hill, the scheme also does have in place

741
00:44:05,822 --> 00:44:09,802
some protections during construction, operation, and decommissioning as

742
00:44:09,822 --> 00:44:12,922
part of the outline landscape and ecological management plan.

743
00:44:12,962 --> 00:44:16,682
That's REP3069, and that's put in

744
00:44:16,702 --> 00:44:18,802
place by the applicant as well.

745
00:44:19,862 --> 00:44:23,742
And could you give us a bit more detail on what those protective measures

746
00:44:23,782 --> 00:44:24,022
are?

747
00:44:25,342 --> 00:44:27,402
Ollie Wheeler for the applicant. Yes.

748
00:44:27,502 --> 00:44:30,942
I think my colleague who's not here today, who's probably undertaken the

749
00:44:30,982 --> 00:44:33,582
arboricultural impact assessment, that's

750
00:44:33,702 --> 00:44:35,912
REP2014, it's probably

751
00:44:37,022 --> 00:44:39,442
more appropriate to provide written representation on that.

752
00:44:39,922 --> 00:44:43,832
But I can provide some guarantee. It is to do with

753
00:44:43,882 --> 00:44:47,272
offsets from root protection areas during construction,

754
00:44:47,582 --> 00:44:51,162
siting of construction mounds, and siting of development to

755
00:44:51,202 --> 00:44:55,182
ensure that existing vegetation is retained and remains healthy

756
00:44:55,202 --> 00:44:58,062
throughout the duration of the scheme. Thank you.

757
00:45:00,862 --> 00:45:03,142
Okay. I think it would be helpful if you could provide a note,

758
00:45:03,942 --> 00:45:07,822
just to summarize where those protection measures are

759
00:45:07,882 --> 00:45:08,422
referenced.

760
00:45:09,962 --> 00:45:10,962
Yep. Okay, thank

761
00:45:10,982 --> 00:45:17,202
you.

762
00:45:21,502 --> 00:45:24,402
Okay, I'll move on to the next question.

763
00:45:25,242 --> 00:45:28,862
Could the applicant explain what would be the implications for the landscape and

764
00:45:28,902 --> 00:45:32,102
visual residual effects described in the environmental statement

765
00:45:32,802 --> 00:45:36,422
for a scenario whereby the existing woodland areas adjoining the order

766
00:45:36,462 --> 00:45:39,972
limits could be removed or altered subject to local planning

767
00:45:40,042 --> 00:45:40,692
restrictions?

768
00:45:42,482 --> 00:45:44,302
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

769
00:45:44,642 --> 00:45:48,382
I think it's worth just stating there is no foreseeable reason why these woodlands,

770
00:45:49,722 --> 00:45:53,682
including Bartholomew's Hills or any others within or adjacent to the order limits,

771
00:45:53,782 --> 00:45:54,582
would be removed

772
00:45:55,422 --> 00:45:59,302
or removed in part. The second part to this is that these

773
00:45:59,362 --> 00:46:02,472
woodlands have been considered as part of the baseline consideration of the

774
00:46:02,522 --> 00:46:06,282
landscape and visual impact assessment, that's AS016,

775
00:46:07,402 --> 00:46:11,322
which is in line with industry standards for the guidelines for landscape

776
00:46:11,342 --> 00:46:13,202
and visual impact assessment, third edition.

777
00:46:13,942 --> 00:46:17,842
I think it has to be acknowledged that because the LVIA does rely on

778
00:46:17,882 --> 00:46:21,582

these woodlands for inherent screening, as would be

779
00:46:21,622 --> 00:46:25,562
appropriate, that a removal of any woodland would increase the

780
00:46:25,602 --> 00:46:27,202
indivisibility towards the scheme.

781
00:46:27,922 --> 00:46:28,442
However, this

782
00:46:29,462 --> 00:46:33,442
has to be coupled with the existing vegetation other than the

783
00:46:33,462 --> 00:46:36,972
woodlands. So the hedgerows, sporadic trees that may exist within the scheme,

784
00:46:37,622 --> 00:46:40,982
and the field boundaries, and also the proposed mitigation measures

785
00:46:42,162 --> 00:46:45,982
that's proposed on behalf of the applicant, such as existing additional

786
00:46:46,002 --> 00:46:49,482
trees, additional hedgerows, and gapping up of those hedgerows. Thank you.

787
00:46:51,022 --> 00:46:52,782
Okay, thank you. Simon Wood.

788
00:46:57,562 --> 00:47:00,862
I've nothing to add to that, sir. Thank you.

789
00:47:03,502 --> 00:47:04,472
Okay. Julie Barrow.

790
00:47:06,002 --> 00:47:08,102
Julie Barrow, Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

791

00:47:08,522 --> 00:47:11,442
Appreciate we are on the topic of landscape and visual.

792
00:47:11,822 --> 00:47:13,022
From our perspective,

793
00:47:14,542 --> 00:47:18,242
it's the heritage impact that we're particularly concerned about, in terms of

794
00:47:18,322 --> 00:47:21,962
the loss of Bartholomew's Hill plantation in particular,

795
00:47:22,422 --> 00:47:26,242
because the scheme is heavily reliant upon that area of

796
00:47:26,262 --> 00:47:30,222
woodland screening from the areas of Carse acre and South acre.

797
00:47:30,282 --> 00:47:34,192
As I say, I don't want to stray into another topic, but if it could be noted that

798
00:47:34,662 --> 00:47:37,322
that's where our concern lies. Thank you.

799
00:47:41,062 --> 00:47:42,462
And Andrew Turokowski.

800
00:47:43,242 --> 00:47:45,382
Thank you, sir. Andrew Turokowski for Norfolk County Council.

801
00:47:45,522 --> 00:47:48,242
I don't think we've got anything to add to the comments from either Breckland

802
00:47:48,302 --> 00:47:51,462
District Council or the Borough of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.

803
00:47:52,862 --> 00:47:53,362
Thank you.

804
00:47:53,922 --> 00:47:56,802
Sir, I just have one comment, if I could.

805
00:47:56,842 --> 00:47:59,422
Just one question related exactly to this point.

806
00:47:59,742 --> 00:48:00,122
Okay.

807
00:48:02,642 --> 00:48:05,242
What I was going to actually ask later

808
00:48:06,542 --> 00:48:10,142
in relation to this was, is there any way in which

809
00:48:11,442 --> 00:48:15,062
the woodland like Bartholomew Hill's plantation and the other

810
00:48:15,222 --> 00:48:17,882
fields along there protecting the

811
00:48:19,302 --> 00:48:20,502
woodland, protecting the

812
00:48:21,762 --> 00:48:25,482
BESS and the substations, is there any way that

813
00:48:25,542 --> 00:48:27,582
those could be included in the order limits?

814
00:48:29,542 --> 00:48:30,562
I just asked the question.

815
00:48:30,742 --> 00:48:31,482
Okay. Alex Tresserdin.

816
00:48:35,662 --> 00:48:38,962
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresserdin on behalf of the applicant.

817
00:48:39,302 --> 00:48:42,212

We don't propose to update the order limits to include that.

818
00:48:42,282 --> 00:48:45,442
The order limits are set, and that's what's been assessed as part of the detail

819
00:48:45,522 --> 00:48:49,002
application for the scheme, and the applicant doesn't consider it necessary to

820
00:48:49,402 --> 00:48:52,502
amend the order limits to include the woodland that's just been suggested,

821
00:48:52,522 --> 00:48:56,512
because there's no foreseeable reason why any of this

822
00:48:56,542 --> 00:48:57,442
would be removed.

823
00:48:59,362 --> 00:49:00,042
Okay, thank you.

824
00:49:05,462 --> 00:49:06,562
Excuse me.

825
00:49:12,182 --> 00:49:16,012
Right. I'm going to move on to the next question, which is regarding the landscape

826
00:49:16,102 --> 00:49:16,602
character.

827
00:49:18,762 --> 00:49:20,322
Could the applicant provide an update

828
00:49:21,342 --> 00:49:25,312
about Breckland District Council's request for some further work analysis of

829
00:49:25,402 --> 00:49:29,362
the landscape to be undertaken by the applicant to understand the

changes

830
00:49:29,402 --> 00:49:33,222
in the landscape since the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment in May

831
00:49:33,642 --> 00:49:37,552
2007 assessment, and

832
00:49:37,602 --> 00:49:41,242
also an assessment of the cumulative effects of energy infrastructure in

833
00:49:41,302 --> 00:49:45,012
relation to the following Breckland landscape character areas,

834
00:49:45,402 --> 00:49:48,822
D1 Swaffham Heath and E6 North

835
00:49:48,962 --> 00:49:50,172
Pickenham Plateau?

836
00:49:52,442 --> 00:49:55,842
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant. I'll take those separately.

837
00:49:55,962 --> 00:49:57,422
So with regards to the first point,

838
00:49:58,482 --> 00:49:59,602
additional work since

839
00:50:00,622 --> 00:50:02,532
the publication of the character assessment.

840
00:50:02,662 --> 00:50:06,552
So the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment was used as the primary

841
00:50:06,602 --> 00:50:10,422
evidence-based document for the landscape and visual impact assessment, which

842
00:50:10,462 --> 00:50:12,202
is relatively standard practice.

843
00:50:12,762 --> 00:50:16,552
But noting the date of this additional narrative and

844
00:50:16,642 --> 00:50:20,462
highlights within the original chapter, which is AS016, were

845
00:50:20,482 --> 00:50:21,002
provided.

846
00:50:21,802 --> 00:50:25,482
Through ongoing discussion with Breckland and other local authorities,

847
00:50:26,782 --> 00:50:30,662
we've agreed and at deadline three have submitted additional work

848
00:50:31,182 --> 00:50:34,602
as part of a technical information note for landscape and visual, and that's

849
00:50:34,762 --> 00:50:37,381
REP3083.

850
00:50:38,541 --> 00:50:41,902
This work highlights any nuances in the change in

851
00:50:41,962 --> 00:50:45,562
landscape since the publication of this document and also provides

852
00:50:45,602 --> 00:50:48,482
additional viewpoints and pros around the assessment.

853
00:50:50,942 --> 00:50:52,532
With regards to your second point,

854
00:50:53,662 --> 00:50:55,642
which I believe related to cumulative impact

855
00:50:56,382 --> 00:50:59,142
on the host landscape character

856
00:50:59,662 --> 00:51:03,482
areas, it's a very similar point that we covered in the first

857
00:51:03,522 --> 00:51:07,362
hearing. These landscape character areas have both been assessed in

858
00:51:07,402 --> 00:51:11,062
regard to cumulative impacts. The primary scheme

859
00:51:11,382 --> 00:51:14,502
for cumulative is High Grove Solar Farm, which I think we're all aware of.

860
00:51:15,482 --> 00:51:19,402
With regard to landscape and visual, cumulative impacts are primarily driven

861
00:51:19,422 --> 00:51:20,472
by intervisibility.

862
00:51:21,462 --> 00:51:25,362
So we've taken account of the cumulative methodology, which has been included

863
00:51:25,402 --> 00:51:29,082
within REP3063, the cumulative schemes

864
00:51:29,102 --> 00:51:33,082
appendix, and then this has further been sifted and refined for landscape

865
00:51:33,102 --> 00:51:34,102
and visual receptors,

866
00:51:35,462 --> 00:51:38,322
which eventually has led to the High Grove Solar Farm scheme.

867

00:51:39,382 --> 00:51:43,182
This concludes that there would be significant adverse landscape effects during

868
00:51:43,202 --> 00:51:46,702
construction and operation on landscape character area

869
00:51:46,802 --> 00:51:50,482
E6, North Pickenham Plateau LCA only. Thank you.

870
00:51:56,882 --> 00:51:58,202
Thank you. Simon Wood.

871
00:52:00,542 --> 00:52:04,022
I'll hand over to Peter Richards. Thank you, sir.

872
00:52:04,082 --> 00:52:06,442
Thank you. Peter Richards online.

873
00:52:08,042 --> 00:52:11,712
Thank you, sir. I think this goes to the heart of the disagreement or

874
00:52:11,842 --> 00:52:15,202
difficulties we have with the applicant's work at this time.

875
00:52:16,742 --> 00:52:18,572
I would thank Mr. Wheeler and his colleagues, though.

876
00:52:18,572 --> 00:52:22,562
They have provided a considerable amount of new visual information, which

877
00:52:22,622 --> 00:52:24,602
is welcomed and very helpful.

878
00:52:26,142 --> 00:52:29,922
At the heart of this issue we have is,

879
00:52:30,722 --> 00:52:34,652
from the outset, we asked the applicant if their assessment,

880
00:52:34,722 --> 00:52:38,242
their LVIA, would include local landscape character areas,

881
00:52:38,922 --> 00:52:39,422
which is

882
00:52:40,402 --> 00:52:44,322
good practice, and we had a number of conversations about

883
00:52:44,842 --> 00:52:47,622
GLVIA, GLVIA3, and its application.

884
00:52:48,262 --> 00:52:52,162
And our position is that GLVIA supports that

885
00:52:52,202 --> 00:52:53,702
it's appropriate and proportionate

886
00:52:54,522 --> 00:52:58,362
for the assessment to identify and consider local landscape
character

887
00:52:58,422 --> 00:52:59,322
areas around the site.

888
00:53:00,362 --> 00:53:03,762
Why this is requested and needed is because

889
00:53:04,542 --> 00:53:05,562
the Breckland

890
00:53:06,622 --> 00:53:09,942
Landscape Character Assessment is now some 20 years old,

891
00:53:10,482 --> 00:53:14,202
and whilst it's broadly still correct, it is, in many

892
00:53:14,242 --> 00:53:15,382
areas, quite out of date.

893

00:53:16,422 --> 00:53:18,372
The assessment

894
00:53:19,302 --> 00:53:22,582
in the Breckland assessment of, for instance, parcel

895
00:53:23,282 --> 00:53:25,462
E6 or character area E6,

896
00:53:26,262 --> 00:53:30,022
nowhere in this assessment, which is

897
00:53:30,142 --> 00:53:33,422
20 years old, does it pick up on all of the

898
00:53:33,482 --> 00:53:37,422
energy-related developments that have arrived within the borough over

899
00:53:37,462 --> 00:53:40,172
the last 20 years,

900
00:53:41,682 --> 00:53:45,542
which I think is a sort of deficiency in the landscape character assessment.

901
00:53:46,162 --> 00:53:47,322
The other deficiency is

902
00:53:48,202 --> 00:53:52,002
a very broad-brush assessment. The character area

903
00:53:52,062 --> 00:53:55,382
E6 is about 19, 20 kilometers in width.

904
00:53:56,082 --> 00:53:59,202
So we sit at the western end, and

905
00:54:00,002 --> 00:54:03,942
we have very little interrelationship with what's happening much further

906
00:54:03,982 --> 00:54:07,742
to the east. A local landscape character area assessment

907
00:54:07,862 --> 00:54:11,582
would've addressed this deficiency because the local landscape character

908
00:54:11,702 --> 00:54:12,262
areas would have

909
00:54:13,122 --> 00:54:16,422
straddled a site in places and would've extended out

910
00:54:17,242 --> 00:54:20,282
probably in line with the ZTV information that's been collected.

911
00:54:21,022 --> 00:54:21,262
Now,

912
00:54:22,302 --> 00:54:26,002
this is self-evidently correct in my mind because at the

913
00:54:26,062 --> 00:54:29,902
moment, the landscape character assessment work that's being done by the applicant

914
00:54:30,902 --> 00:54:34,211
has significant adverse effects stopping at the

915
00:54:34,282 --> 00:54:37,722
boundary of the scheme. And in their opinion,

916
00:54:37,782 --> 00:54:41,692
the effects beyond the edge of the scheme fall away there.

917
00:54:42,382 --> 00:54:45,382
Now, a local landscape character assessment would have addressed that because the

918
00:54:45,442 --> 00:54:49,262
character areas would have been straddling the boundary.

919
00:54:49,282 --> 00:54:50,322
And it's self-evident that

920
00:54:51,482 --> 00:54:55,402
a significant adverse effect is highly unlikely to stop at the boundary

921
00:54:55,422 --> 00:54:59,122
of the site. Just like a pebble being dropped in a pool,

922
00:54:59,582 --> 00:55:03,271
the influence of the scheme, the adverse effects of the scheme, ripple out into the

923
00:55:03,322 --> 00:55:06,962
wider landscape. And to my mind, that's not been adequately

924
00:55:07,002 --> 00:55:10,802
addressed within the work the applicant's undertaken because of this

925
00:55:10,822 --> 00:55:11,942
slavish

926
00:55:14,962 --> 00:55:18,862
reliance upon the Breckland landscape character assessment work. Thank you, sir.

927
00:55:20,222 --> 00:55:22,062
Okay. Thank you. Alex Trestard.

928
00:55:24,102 --> 00:55:25,562
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

929
00:55:25,822 --> 00:55:27,962
Not much further to add, just to reiterate that

930
00:55:28,862 --> 00:55:32,622
it's my belief in professional judgment and in standard

931
00:55:32,682 --> 00:55:35,102

terms, and I agree it is good practice.

932
00:55:35,902 --> 00:55:37,182
But it's also good practice

933
00:55:37,982 --> 00:55:41,122
for reports to be reasonable and proportionate, and I think that the assessment

934
00:55:41,182 --> 00:55:44,462
submitted is both reasonable and proportionate in line with the additional

935
00:55:44,502 --> 00:55:47,962
information submitted. And I disagree that the assessment is

936
00:55:48,002 --> 00:55:48,602
broad-brush.

937
00:55:49,742 --> 00:55:52,982
In the assessment table, table 6.11 of

938
00:55:53,022 --> 00:55:56,522
AS016, we've broken down the landscape receptor

939
00:55:57,302 --> 00:56:01,282
specifically to address this issue for assessment within the order limits and

940
00:56:01,322 --> 00:56:05,062
also outside of the order limits to provide some granular detail with that

941
00:56:05,102 --> 00:56:05,482
regard.

942
00:56:06,762 --> 00:56:09,262
And sir, if I might just add one point to that, please.

943
00:56:09,292 --> 00:56:10,722
Alex Trestard on behalf of the applicant.

944
00:56:11,042 --> 00:56:14,102
Would like to just reiterate again that the planning balance

945
00:56:14,782 --> 00:56:18,642
conclusions in the planning statement in relation to this matter afford

946
00:56:18,942 --> 00:56:21,442
landscape and visual impacts moderate negative weight.

947
00:56:21,782 --> 00:56:25,252
So it's not as if the applicant is saying that this matter should be given positive

948
00:56:25,282 --> 00:56:29,122
weight when the Secretary of State comes to make a decision on the development

949
00:56:29,162 --> 00:56:31,582
consent order, nor indeed should it be given neutral weight.

950
00:56:31,642 --> 00:56:35,002
It is acknowledged that this is negative weight in the planning balance already.

951
00:56:37,522 --> 00:56:41,202
Okay. Thank you. And is it clear in the statement of common ground,

952
00:56:42,382 --> 00:56:45,251
Simon Wood and Alex Trestard, what the position is?

953
00:56:46,512 --> 00:56:46,892
Your position.

954
00:56:46,902 --> 00:56:49,762
Ollie Wheeler for the applicant. Yes, the statement of common ground is up to date.

955
00:56:50,262 --> 00:56:50,422
Okay.

956

00:56:50,462 --> 00:56:50,802
Thank you.

957
00:56:52,182 --> 00:56:55,822
Thank you. Okay, I'm going to move on to the next question then.

958
00:56:57,882 --> 00:57:01,352
Regarding visual amenity, could the applicant comment on Breckland District

959
00:57:01,422 --> 00:57:05,182
Council's request for an assessment of any areas where the zone of

960
00:57:05,302 --> 00:57:09,042
theoretical visibility studies of proposed or existing

961
00:57:09,062 --> 00:57:13,002
solar farms intersects with the zone of theoretical visibility for

962
00:57:13,042 --> 00:57:14,062
the proposed development

963
00:57:14,862 --> 00:57:18,662
in order to assist in the assessment of cumulative visual effects?

964
00:57:21,242 --> 00:57:22,902
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

965
00:57:23,102 --> 00:57:26,962
So just taking from my previous point, Highgrove solar farm remains the primary

966
00:57:26,982 --> 00:57:29,662
cumulative consideration for landscape visual impact.

967
00:57:30,602 --> 00:57:34,582
With regards to zone of theoretical visibility, this approach is a tool

968
00:57:34,642 --> 00:57:38,302
that's mainly used at the start or the central area of an

969
00:57:38,342 --> 00:57:42,182
assessment process for an assessor such as myself to understand the

970
00:57:42,262 --> 00:57:45,722
scale and extent of potential visibility towards a scheme

971
00:57:46,202 --> 00:57:50,142
within its location. However, this is a working tool, and this

972
00:57:50,182 --> 00:57:54,022
is then ground-truthed through extensive site visits and further desk study.

973
00:57:56,142 --> 00:57:59,742
So my point here would be that cumulative ZTVs

974
00:57:59,842 --> 00:58:03,612
don't necessarily tell you the full picture, and their

975
00:58:03,662 --> 00:58:06,302
usefulness is sometimes to be disputed,

976
00:58:08,382 --> 00:58:12,282
particularly when taking into account the scale of the solar PV arrays and

977
00:58:12,342 --> 00:58:15,122
how they sit within the existing landscape structure.

978
00:58:17,802 --> 00:58:20,822
Okay. Thank you. Simon Wood or Peter Richards?

979
00:58:22,942 --> 00:58:23,932
It'll be Peter Richards, sir.

980
00:58:23,982 --> 00:58:25,242
Okay, Peter. Thank you.

981
00:58:28,522 --> 00:58:29,902
Peter Richards for Breckland Council, sir.

982
00:58:30,362 --> 00:58:33,962
We haven't received the ZTV information for the

983
00:58:34,702 --> 00:58:37,682
nearby schemes, so we're unable to, at this time,

984
00:58:38,762 --> 00:58:40,262
progress that discussion.

985
00:58:44,362 --> 00:58:45,772
Okay, and is the applicant

986
00:58:46,662 --> 00:58:48,221
proposing to share that information?

987
00:58:50,661 --> 00:58:53,162
Ollie Wheeler for the applicant. No, I believe that's with the other schemes to

988
00:58:53,182 --> 00:58:56,822
provide a submission. It would be a model run on their scheme and their

989
00:58:56,902 --> 00:58:57,782
submission documents.

990
00:59:00,962 --> 00:59:01,722
Okay. Thank you.

991
00:59:02,582 --> 00:59:05,102
Any further comments, Peter Richards?

992
00:59:08,942 --> 00:59:09,602
No. Thank you, sir.

993
00:59:14,102 --> 00:59:15,962
Any further comment from the applicant?

994
00:59:17,802 --> 00:59:18,742
No. Okay.

995
00:59:22,922 --> 00:59:25,472
Yes, sir. Please, could I make a comment to that?

996
00:59:26,622 --> 00:59:27,922
Basically, what's just been said.

997
00:59:28,402 --> 00:59:32,362
I would like to just try and get through the list that I've got.

998
00:59:32,392 --> 00:59:32,392
Okay.

999
00:59:32,422 --> 00:59:33,882
We are very

1000
00:59:34,922 --> 00:59:36,102
challenged with time.

1001
00:59:37,102 --> 00:59:38,402
So I will come back to you.

1002
00:59:39,352 --> 00:59:40,802
I'm going to move on to the next question.

1003
00:59:41,642 --> 00:59:44,842
Could the applicant comment on Breckland District Council's concern that the

1004
00:59:44,882 --> 00:59:46,542
following views have been underplayed?

1005
00:59:46,742 --> 00:59:50,642
So this is views along the A1065, viewpoint group

1006
00:59:50,742 --> 00:59:51,702
one within the site,

1007
00:59:53,062 --> 00:59:56,342
viewpoint group two within the site, and viewpoint group four.

1008

01:00:00,862 --> 01:00:02,282
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1009
01:00:03,162 --> 01:00:05,582
The applicant does not agree they've been underplayed,

1010
01:00:06,562 --> 01:00:09,442
for all the reasons that we've set out within the written representations to date.

1011
01:00:10,042 --> 01:00:13,702
The assessment is robust. It's as per professional practice.

1012
01:00:14,222 --> 01:00:17,482
All of the evidence that's been provided has been accurate

1013
01:00:18,662 --> 01:00:21,602
and recorded as per GLVA3, and that's within

1014
01:00:21,662 --> 01:00:22,962
AS016.

1015
01:00:24,002 --> 01:00:26,442
Just in relation to those three receptor groups,

1016
01:00:26,982 --> 01:00:30,742
their sensitivity does vary between those receptor groups,

1017
01:00:31,222 --> 01:00:34,382
and they're in different locations within the study areas, and this picks up on the

1018
01:00:34,422 --> 01:00:36,142
different baseline considerations.

1019
01:00:37,590 --> 01:00:40,790
for views to and from these receptors that are

1020
01:00:40,830 --> 01:00:44,770
situated. The assessment is robust, and I stand

1021

01:00:44,810 --> 01:00:46,450
by the original judgments. Thank you.

1022
01:00:50,030 --> 01:00:52,830
Thank you. Simon Wood or Peter Richards?

1023
01:00:53,809 --> 01:00:55,290
It'll be Mr. Richards, sir.

1024
01:00:55,670 --> 01:00:56,110
Thank you.

1025
01:01:00,330 --> 01:01:04,310
Thank you, sir. To be able to address this, answer this point, may

1026
01:01:04,410 --> 01:01:06,950
I share my screen so I can share with the

1027
01:01:08,730 --> 01:01:11,870
hearing the work that's been submitted by the applicant?

1028
01:01:13,650 --> 01:01:15,890
Certainly. Do you have an applicant,

1029
01:01:16,710 --> 01:01:19,530
a document reference number, and we can perhaps show it here
instead?

1030
01:01:21,430 --> 01:01:24,810
The document that I have on my screen is the

1031
01:01:24,930 --> 01:01:26,070
landscape note.

1032
01:01:27,890 --> 01:01:29,770
Have you got the reference? Is that the deadline-

1033
01:01:29,830 --> 01:01:29,879
Yep

1034
01:01:30,150 --> 01:01:30,860

...31, is it?

1035
01:01:33,070 --> 01:01:35,379
It's at the end. It's R something, isn't it?

1036
01:01:35,390 --> 01:01:36,030
Alex Trezian.

1037
01:01:36,070 --> 01:01:38,610
The document reference I have is APP

1038
01:01:39,630 --> 01:01:41,550
stroke 8.18.

1039
01:01:42,870 --> 01:01:44,510
Thank you, sir. Alex Trezian on behalf of the applicant.

1040
01:01:44,590 --> 01:01:48,410
I think just in relation to the examination library reference, I believe that's

1041
01:01:48,450 --> 01:01:52,330
Rep 3-083, the technical information

1042
01:01:52,390 --> 01:01:54,670
note on landscape and visual. So we're happy to share that.

1043
01:01:55,150 --> 01:01:56,630
Gabriel's beaten me to it.

1044
01:02:02,650 --> 01:02:06,130
So if it'd be possible to go to page 30 of 78.

1045
01:02:13,170 --> 01:02:13,510
This is

1046
01:02:14,770 --> 01:02:18,050
Viewpoint 21, which is one of the additional viewpoints the applicant

1047
01:02:18,130 --> 01:02:21,870

kindly returned to site to collect earlier in the year

1048
01:02:22,470 --> 01:02:26,350
and shows the expansive open view.

1049
01:02:28,150 --> 01:02:31,970
This and the sister photograph, which is on the following page, if you

1050
01:02:31,990 --> 01:02:34,590
wouldn't mind going to page 31.

1051
01:02:35,570 --> 01:02:36,940
So currently,

1052
01:02:37,950 --> 01:02:41,050
motorists on the A1065-

1053
01:02:41,090 --> 01:02:41,750
It's not on the mobile

1054
01:02:41,790 --> 01:02:41,790
...

1055
01:02:42,650 --> 01:02:44,490
as they pass this part of

1056
01:02:45,950 --> 01:02:49,590
the eastern side of the site, they have these open, expansive views

1057
01:02:49,670 --> 01:02:51,290
across the landscape.

1058
01:02:54,230 --> 01:02:57,150
The other view that I would like to take you to is view...

1059
01:03:08,850 --> 01:03:12,110
Sorry, so it's a large document. Is page 27 of

1060
01:03:12,450 --> 01:03:12,870
78.

1061
01:03:18,590 --> 01:03:21,370
This is again on the A1065 and shows that

1062
01:03:22,930 --> 01:03:26,290
along the line of that road, there are notable gaps

1063
01:03:26,930 --> 01:03:30,870
or broken areas of hedgerow that provide these open, expansive views

1064
01:03:30,910 --> 01:03:33,750
across the landscape. The applicant's

1065
01:03:34,510 --> 01:03:38,490
mitigation would introduce new hedgerow planting, and I think

1066
01:03:39,030 --> 01:03:41,590
that's reflected in the CGIs,

1067
01:03:42,170 --> 01:03:45,550
which remove this view in its

1068
01:03:45,590 --> 01:03:49,150
entirety because they screen out the PVs.

1069
01:03:49,450 --> 01:03:53,330
And the issue we have here is that we disagree with

1070
01:03:53,390 --> 01:03:56,970
the effect dropping to slight in the long

1071
01:03:57,090 --> 01:04:00,530
term. The applicant believes or puts forward the case

1072
01:04:00,590 --> 01:04:04,150
that the planting screens the PVs, therefore

1073
01:04:04,510 --> 01:04:06,990
it's effectively mitigated the issue.

1074

01:04:08,790 --> 01:04:10,250
Our difficulty with this is that

1075
01:04:11,370 --> 01:04:14,190
at the moment, people traveling along this road

1076
01:04:14,850 --> 01:04:18,350
experience this countryside as part of the enjoyment of their route between the

1077
01:04:18,410 --> 01:04:22,250
villages. And the planting, whilst, yes,

1078
01:04:22,490 --> 01:04:25,950
screening the PVs, will effectively remove

1079
01:04:25,990 --> 01:04:29,670
these attractive, open, distant, and expansive views that

1080
01:04:29,730 --> 01:04:32,090
the motorist currently experiences.

1081
01:04:32,570 --> 01:04:34,190
So in the long term,

1082
01:04:35,370 --> 01:04:39,050
we don't share the view that the effect will drop to slight to

1083
01:04:39,110 --> 01:04:42,890
moderate. The loss of this view, we think would result in the

1084
01:04:42,970 --> 01:04:45,790
higher levels of effect. That's the issue that we

1085
01:04:46,630 --> 01:04:50,470
maintain in the statement of common ground as we're going backwards and forwards

1086
01:04:50,510 --> 01:04:52,330
between ourselves and the applicant.

1087

01:04:54,310 --> 01:04:54,949
Thank you,

1088
01:04:55,810 --> 01:04:56,530
Mr. Richards.

1089
01:04:59,210 --> 01:05:00,010
Sorry.

1090
01:05:00,170 --> 01:05:00,390
Thank you.

1091
01:05:00,399 --> 01:05:01,570
I've forgotten your name. Ollie Wheeler.

1092
01:05:01,670 --> 01:05:01,870
Yes.

1093
01:05:02,310 --> 01:05:02,950
Okay. Thank you.

1094
01:05:03,150 --> 01:05:03,470
Thank you.

1095
01:05:05,030 --> 01:05:05,800
Thank you, Mr. Richards.

1096
01:05:06,810 --> 01:05:10,320
With regard to the first point and for showing the work that we've put to date,

1097
01:05:11,610 --> 01:05:15,370
visual receptor group one from River Road, from memory, so they both

1098
01:05:15,410 --> 01:05:18,570
coincide where the road runs through visual receptor group one.

1099
01:05:18,810 --> 01:05:22,750
I think it's worth noting we're being, not blamed, but pointed out here

1100

01:05:22,790 --> 01:05:26,170
for underplaying. But the assessment notes significant

1101
01:05:26,230 --> 01:05:29,870
effects for this view and visual receptor group

1102
01:05:30,450 --> 01:05:32,450
within the early stages of the scheme.

1103
01:05:32,860 --> 01:05:36,850
It's only until the long term, once the mitigation proposals have established,

1104
01:05:37,370 --> 01:05:39,710
that these effects drop to non-significant.

1105
01:05:40,510 --> 01:05:43,690
And that's how the assessment has been taken for that visual receptor

1106
01:05:43,730 --> 01:05:47,470
group. With regard to the second point, the A1065, I think it's worth

1107
01:05:47,530 --> 01:05:48,510
noting that

1108
01:05:50,830 --> 01:05:54,750
effects upon this route, sequential is probably not the right word, but you have to

1109
01:05:54,790 --> 01:05:57,950
address effects on this route along the entirety of the route, not standalone

1110
01:05:58,030 --> 01:06:01,730
viewpoints. So whilst the view that was shown on screen may

1111
01:06:01,790 --> 01:06:05,630
present some views further northwards, there are also stretches of

1112
01:06:05,670 --> 01:06:07,190

this route which have very abrupt,

1113
01:06:08,070 --> 01:06:11,150
channeled, enclosed views as the topography falls towards

1114
01:06:11,210 --> 01:06:13,110
Castleacre to the north.

1115
01:06:14,130 --> 01:06:17,910
So this has to be balanced. The scale of effect has to be balanced, and the

1116
01:06:17,930 --> 01:06:21,790
balance for visual effects on this route is as such as we've

1117
01:06:21,830 --> 01:06:24,750
concluded in that effects table in table

1118
01:06:25,010 --> 01:06:27,690
6.11 of AS016.

1119
01:06:29,510 --> 01:06:29,930
Thank you.

1120
01:06:33,050 --> 01:06:33,570
Thank you.

1121
01:06:36,090 --> 01:06:37,870
I'm going to move on to the next question,

1122
01:06:39,130 --> 01:06:39,950
which is could the-

1123
01:06:41,506 --> 01:06:45,226
Could the applicant comment on Breckland District

1124
01:06:45,306 --> 01:06:48,736
Council's concern about cumulative landscape and visual effects in Breckland and

1125
01:06:48,766 --> 01:06:49,996

the wider county area?

1126
01:06:52,246 --> 01:06:53,606
Thank you. Ollie Wheel of the applicant.

1127
01:06:53,746 --> 01:06:55,736
I think this is similar to what I referenced earlier,

1128
01:06:56,686 --> 01:06:59,426
High Grove Solar Farm being of the primary consideration.

1129
01:07:01,346 --> 01:07:05,016
It's the only scheme within the study area for landscape and

1130
01:07:05,086 --> 01:07:08,186
visual, and also of the schemes that were on the long and short list that were

1131
01:07:08,206 --> 01:07:12,106
included on Rep 3063, Appendix 2.4

1132
01:07:12,166 --> 01:07:15,966
cumulative schemes. So having addressed all those and reviewed those, High

1133
01:07:16,026 --> 01:07:19,566
Grove is the only scheme that would produce cumulative effects,

1134
01:07:20,126 --> 01:07:22,576
and those have been outlined in full in Section

1135
01:07:22,886 --> 01:07:25,686
6.11 of the landscape and visual chapter,

1136
01:07:25,826 --> 01:07:29,386
AS016. And just for clarity,

1137
01:07:29,786 --> 01:07:33,446
I've already referenced this, but significant effects on character relate

1138

01:07:33,486 --> 01:07:35,106
to LCA E6.

1139
01:07:37,186 --> 01:07:37,546
Thank you.

1140
01:07:39,646 --> 01:07:41,426
Simon Wood or Peter Richards?

1141
01:07:42,406 --> 01:07:43,566
Peter Richards, sir.

1142
01:07:43,786 --> 01:07:45,426
Thank you. Peter Richards.

1143
01:07:46,966 --> 01:07:47,366
Thank you, sir.

1144
01:07:48,446 --> 01:07:52,216
Would it be possible for the applicant to share the statement of

1145
01:07:52,346 --> 01:07:54,286
common ground, last page, please?

1146
01:07:56,426 --> 01:07:56,766
Okay.

1147
01:08:03,166 --> 01:08:05,246
And could you just

1148
01:08:06,386 --> 01:08:08,726
tell us which reference number that is as well? Thanks.

1149
01:08:08,766 --> 01:08:10,006
Alex Trezise on behalf of the applicant.

1150
01:08:10,046 --> 01:08:13,926
That's AS-070 with Breckland Council.

1151
01:08:20,346 --> 01:08:22,786
Okay. Can you see that, Mr. Richards?

1152
01:08:23,366 --> 01:08:23,996
Yeah. Thank you, sir.

1153
01:08:24,186 --> 01:08:24,387
Okay.

1154
01:08:25,007 --> 01:08:28,246
We added this to the statement of common ground in the last issue, sir,

1155
01:08:29,186 --> 01:08:29,826
to try and

1156
01:08:30,726 --> 01:08:34,666
explain this point. We accept the applicant has undertaken the

1157
01:08:34,706 --> 01:08:36,927
RVIA in accordance with the PIN's methodology.

1158
01:08:37,486 --> 01:08:41,026
The difficulty the authority has is that this

1159
01:08:41,087 --> 01:08:44,887
approach does not adequately allow for an

1160
01:08:44,946 --> 01:08:48,346
assessment of the schemes that are arriving within the district,

1161
01:08:48,826 --> 01:08:52,135
and this plan quickly shows you the

1162
01:08:52,746 --> 01:08:54,427
sort of quantum of schemes that are

1163
01:08:55,366 --> 01:08:59,246
either built or in the planning system, such as the HAS, or

1164
01:09:01,126 --> 01:09:02,467
have permission. So,

1165
01:09:03,427 --> 01:09:07,146
this is a significant kind of change that's happening to the

1166
01:09:07,186 --> 01:09:11,047
Breckland landscape that's not been addressed or picked

1167
01:09:11,087 --> 01:09:14,196
up in any of the assessment work at the moment.

1168
01:09:14,696 --> 01:09:18,666
And this goes back to the point that we started on, which was the

1169
01:09:18,706 --> 01:09:22,486
difficulty we have with the Breckland landscape character assessment

1170
01:09:22,526 --> 01:09:26,406
work. It too has not got the schemes within

1171
01:09:26,446 --> 01:09:27,246
it at this time.

1172
01:09:28,646 --> 01:09:32,186
So it's a sort of an uncomfortable and difficult position

1173
01:09:32,246 --> 01:09:34,286
Breckland find themselves in, in that

1174
01:09:35,666 --> 01:09:39,626
the cumulative assessment is not picking up adequately these schemes
that are

1175
01:09:39,686 --> 01:09:43,226
arriving between Swaffham and Dereham, as shown on this

1176
01:09:43,306 --> 01:09:44,626
drawing.

1177
01:09:48,467 --> 01:09:49,486
I'm not sure if my colleague,

1178

01:09:50,866 --> 01:09:52,946
Simon, would like to add anything to that.

1179
01:09:55,206 --> 01:09:56,986
Not at the moment, no. I think

1180
01:09:57,826 --> 01:10:01,186
even though Breckland hasn't got an up-to-date assessment, I think it still

1181
01:10:01,406 --> 01:10:05,386
behoves the applicant to do this work and take

1182
01:10:05,406 --> 01:10:07,126
these into account.

1183
01:10:09,646 --> 01:10:13,466
Okay, thank you. And from Breckland District Council, so the statement of common

1184
01:10:13,526 --> 01:10:15,366
ground at deadline three,

1185
01:10:16,246 --> 01:10:18,226
which I think is an additional submission, isn't it?

1186
01:10:19,026 --> 01:10:20,906
Yes. It was in between deadlines three and four.

1187
01:10:21,106 --> 01:10:21,246
Yeah.

1188
01:10:21,286 --> 01:10:22,586
So AS-070.

1189
01:10:23,086 --> 01:10:26,395
Okay, and that accurately reflects the current position?

1190
01:10:28,106 --> 01:10:29,366
That's my understanding, sir, yes.

1191

01:10:29,406 --> 01:10:30,186
Yeah. Okay.

1192
01:10:30,226 --> 01:10:30,866
That's correct, yeah.

1193
01:10:35,246 --> 01:10:35,946
Okay, thank you.

1194
01:10:36,286 --> 01:10:37,906
Sir, can I just add one thing to that?

1195
01:10:38,056 --> 01:10:38,056
Please.

1196
01:10:38,186 --> 01:10:40,606
If I might just very briefly for the record.

1197
01:10:42,226 --> 01:10:44,586
Just to reiterate again my point that

1198
01:10:46,506 --> 01:10:50,036
for an applicant to submit representations for a scheme,

1199
01:10:50,486 --> 01:10:53,216
cumulative effects are born from into visibility.

1200
01:10:53,626 --> 01:10:55,726
From the plan that was just flashed up there,

1201
01:10:56,966 --> 01:11:00,766
we were given the schemes that were 10 to 20-plus kilometers away
from the order

1202
01:11:00,805 --> 01:11:01,166
limits.

1203
01:11:03,006 --> 01:11:05,866
I would like it to be explained, perhaps at another point, but how

1204
01:11:07,206 --> 01:11:11,066

visual cumulative effects can occur for schemes that are that far

1205
01:11:11,126 --> 01:11:14,766
away, and also for developments that are already existing within the

1206
01:11:14,806 --> 01:11:18,046
landscape. These we also could consider as part of the baseline.

1207
01:11:18,346 --> 01:11:20,886
So that's also affected our approach. Thank you.

1208
01:11:20,946 --> 01:11:24,206
Okay. You can explain that now. I think this is the best

1209
01:11:25,066 --> 01:11:26,686
appropriate point to explain.

1210
01:11:28,166 --> 01:11:28,926
No, that's fine.

1211
01:11:29,886 --> 01:11:33,126
My point being, the schemes that were flashed up there, High Grove,

1212
01:11:33,936 --> 01:11:37,926
has been proven through the zone of theoretical visibility that
we've provided, our

1213
01:11:37,966 --> 01:11:41,956
three-kilometer study area that has been included, and the numerous
viewpoints that

1214
01:11:41,966 --> 01:11:44,256
we've also shown as part of the baseline assessment.

1215
01:11:44,356 --> 01:11:48,126
That whilst there are other schemes within the context of our site,

1216
01:11:48,766 --> 01:11:52,296
up to 20 kilometers away, that are included on the cumulative
schemes'

1217

01:11:52,426 --> 01:11:55,786
long shortlist, these have been sifted.

1218
01:11:55,846 --> 01:11:59,836
And therefore, High Grove has been proven to be the only

1219
01:11:59,966 --> 01:12:03,786
scheme that will have outcomes of potential cumulative effects, and

1220
01:12:03,806 --> 01:12:06,846
that demonstrates that the chapter is robust in this approach.

1221
01:12:12,966 --> 01:12:16,046
Thank you. Any further comments from Breckland District Council?

1222
01:12:18,066 --> 01:12:20,206
Not unless Mr. Richards has, sir. No.

1223
01:12:25,586 --> 01:12:26,466
Sorry. No, sir. Thank you.

1224
01:12:26,866 --> 01:12:27,466
Okay, thank you.

1225
01:12:28,846 --> 01:12:30,266
Moving on to the next question then.

1226
01:12:30,606 --> 01:12:34,086
Could the applicant comment on Breckland District Council's concern related to

1227
01:12:34,166 --> 01:12:38,046
sequential cumulative effects along key routes within the

1228
01:12:38,086 --> 01:12:41,806
district? With the A47 between Dereham and

1229
01:12:41,886 --> 01:12:43,886
Swaffham being a particular concern.

1230
01:12:46,126 --> 01:12:47,506

Yes, Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1231
01:12:48,386 --> 01:12:52,166
There are no significant cumulative effects, particularly for the A47.

1232
01:12:52,726 --> 01:12:55,566
The chapter itself in A016

1233
01:12:57,966 --> 01:13:01,406
shows through the ZTV that the intervisibility is very

1234
01:13:01,506 --> 01:13:05,406
limited to almost no visibility towards the scheme from this highway

1235
01:13:05,446 --> 01:13:08,876
that travels east-west broadly to the south of the site within the study area.

1236
01:13:10,086 --> 01:13:12,236
And as such, with no views,

1237
01:13:13,186 --> 01:13:14,656
how can you possibly have significant cumulative

1238
01:13:15,946 --> 01:13:18,386
effects with a scheme that you can't see? Thank you.

1239
01:13:19,926 --> 01:13:22,386
Okay. Thank you. Simon Wood or Peter Richards?

1240
01:13:24,786 --> 01:13:25,226
Thank you, sir.

1241
01:13:26,446 --> 01:13:30,426
I would just like to point out that intervisibility is not

1242
01:13:30,466 --> 01:13:32,906
the sole indicator of whether

1243
01:13:34,046 --> 01:13:36,466

or not there'll be a landscape character effect.

1244
01:13:38,106 --> 01:13:40,966
Intervisibility is one component of the judgments that are made.

1245
01:13:41,786 --> 01:13:45,466
The second point would be, I would just invite the inspector on the site

1246
01:13:45,526 --> 01:13:48,986
visit that in traveling up and down the

1247
01:13:49,126 --> 01:13:52,386
A1065 to note that

1248
01:13:53,006 --> 01:13:56,806
this is a classic example of a sequential series of views between two

1249
01:13:56,886 --> 01:13:57,426
settlements.

1250
01:13:58,246 --> 01:13:58,546
And

1251
01:13:59,646 --> 01:14:03,526
given the residents of these villages, these communities, will be traveling these

1252
01:14:03,586 --> 01:14:07,166
routes continually, they will be aware of the PV

1253
01:14:07,366 --> 01:14:09,686
farm in the background behind the hedgerows.

1254
01:14:11,086 --> 01:14:15,046
So I just urge the inspector to carefully look at those

1255
01:14:15,106 --> 01:14:18,986
views traveling down the A1065 on the site visit, please.

1256

01:14:21,346 --> 01:14:24,406
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Richards. Anything further, Simon Wood?

1257
01:14:26,726 --> 01:14:30,196
Just to add, sir, that we did, at the beginning of the week, send in a plan that

1258
01:14:30,366 --> 01:14:34,186
suggested three additional viewpoints in relation to the

1259
01:14:34,286 --> 01:14:38,126
site visit itinerary, and it may be that at some stage today we'll

1260
01:14:38,146 --> 01:14:39,686
need to pick those up.

1261
01:14:41,786 --> 01:14:44,726
Okay. Sorry, could you confirm when that plan was sent in?

1262
01:14:47,886 --> 01:14:51,766
Simon Wood, Breckland Council. I'm fairly sure it was sent early on Monday.

1263
01:14:55,625 --> 01:14:57,886
Okay. I'll check with the case team

1264
01:14:58,906 --> 01:14:59,126
on that.

1265
01:15:02,686 --> 01:15:04,936
Thank you. Any further comments from the applicant?

1266
01:15:05,486 --> 01:15:07,616
Just one final one, thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1267
01:15:08,686 --> 01:15:11,326
Just in response to Mr. Richard's response.

1268
01:15:12,146 --> 01:15:16,106
The question was in regard to visual, not landscape character, and it was also in

1269
01:15:16,146 --> 01:15:20,006
regard to the A47, not the A1065. So my response

1270
01:15:20,286 --> 01:15:22,546
differed to Mr. Richards in that respect.

1271
01:15:25,286 --> 01:15:25,666
Okay.

1272
01:15:28,106 --> 01:15:28,866
Can I make a comment?

1273
01:15:29,266 --> 01:15:29,886
Certainly, yeah.

1274
01:15:31,066 --> 01:15:32,726
Sorry, I got confused then.

1275
01:15:34,886 --> 01:15:37,546
I would like to just continue with the agenda.

1276
01:15:37,606 --> 01:15:39,406
I will come to you at the end.

1277
01:15:40,046 --> 01:15:41,746
Okay. There's another comment to this point, but-

1278
01:15:42,046 --> 01:15:44,206
Okay, but we can return to it.

1279
01:15:44,566 --> 01:15:45,346
Okay. Thank you.

1280
01:15:47,726 --> 01:15:50,386
Okay, so anything further from the applicant?

1281
01:15:51,246 --> 01:15:51,726
No, thank you.

1282
01:15:51,846 --> 01:15:53,106

No. And Simon Wood?

1283
01:15:54,946 --> 01:15:55,486
No, sir.

1284
01:15:55,566 --> 01:15:55,826
Okay.

1285
01:15:57,206 --> 01:15:57,386
So

1286
01:15:58,426 --> 01:16:01,026
the next question is regarding glint and glare.

1287
01:16:03,166 --> 01:16:06,946
Could the applicant provide an update on its proposal for further work on

1288
01:16:07,086 --> 01:16:10,846
panel configurations to complete geometric modeling of the cumulative

1289
01:16:10,906 --> 01:16:12,915
impacts for receptor 20,

1290
01:16:14,046 --> 01:16:18,006
and further comment on Breckland District Council's request for securing a glint

1291
01:16:18,046 --> 01:16:21,346
and glare complaints procedure?

1292
01:16:22,016 --> 01:16:24,606
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresadern on behalf of the applicant.

1293
01:16:24,766 --> 01:16:28,636
My colleague, James Plumb, is joining us online and is best placed to answer this

1294
01:16:28,666 --> 01:16:29,286
question.

1295
01:16:35,026 --> 01:16:37,366
Thank you. James Plumb on behalf of the applicant.

1296
01:16:38,926 --> 01:16:42,766
So with relation to the cumulative impacts, the glint and glare assessment

1297
01:16:42,786 --> 01:16:46,306
considers the cumulative impacts with respect to High Grove Solar Farm,

1298
01:16:46,946 --> 01:16:50,926
and has identified that dwelling receptor 20 may have views of both

1299
01:16:50,966 --> 01:16:53,726
sites whilst having predicted reflections from the Droves Solar Farm.

1300
01:16:55,246 --> 01:16:57,906
As such, there is the potential for cumulative effects.

1301
01:16:59,146 --> 01:17:02,826
It's worth noting that the two sites would not be visible from the same locations

1302
01:17:02,866 --> 01:17:06,426
within the dwelling, nor would any predicted reflections be likely to occur at the

1303
01:17:06,486 --> 01:17:06,996
same time,

1304
01:17:08,466 --> 01:17:12,226
due to the geometry between the receptor and the two developments.

1305
01:17:13,166 --> 01:17:16,256
But there is the potential that reflections could occur over a greater range of

1306
01:17:16,366 --> 01:17:19,706
times due to the cumulative impacts.

1307
01:17:20,786 --> 01:17:24,496
Currently, there is insufficient information available regarding
High Grove Solar

1308
01:17:24,526 --> 01:17:26,966
to determine the extent of any cumulative impact.

1309
01:17:28,886 --> 01:17:32,096
It is only possible, therefore, at this current time to confirm that
there is a

1310
01:17:32,096 --> 01:17:35,996
potential for cumulative impact based on the receptor having views
of

1311
01:17:36,006 --> 01:17:39,566
both solar projects. If further information is released

1312
01:17:39,706 --> 01:17:43,186
regarding High Grove Solar, it may be possible to revisit this and
accurately

1313
01:17:43,206 --> 01:17:45,966
determine whether there's potential for the resident to be affected
by both

1314
01:17:46,006 --> 01:17:49,686
projects, and if so, whether this could affect the overall level of
impacts

1315
01:17:49,946 --> 01:17:52,086
upon this dwelling receptor.

1316
01:17:52,926 --> 01:17:56,606
One final matter to note with regard to this receptor is the

1317
01:17:56,646 --> 01:17:59,115
distances between it and the two projects.

1318
01:17:59,656 --> 01:18:03,426
It is over 700 meters from the closest reflecting

1319
01:18:03,446 --> 01:18:07,006
panel area from the Droves Solar Farm, which

1320
01:18:07,646 --> 01:18:11,506
is a relevant factor in terms of reducing the predicted level of impact due

1321
01:18:11,606 --> 01:18:14,776
to the distance impacting the intensity of the glare.

1322
01:18:15,126 --> 01:18:18,886
Essentially, the further you are from the panels, the lower the intensity that is

1323
01:18:18,906 --> 01:18:19,406
possible.

1324
01:18:20,526 --> 01:18:24,316
The receptor's also approximately 500 meters from the closest High Grove Solar

1325
01:18:24,766 --> 01:18:25,426
PV area,

1326
01:18:26,266 --> 01:18:27,086
and as such,

1327
01:18:28,306 --> 01:18:32,245
there is a lesser potential for impact than if it were directly adjacent to both

1328
01:18:32,286 --> 01:18:35,826
projects, whilst recognizing that there is still a potential for

1329
01:18:35,846 --> 01:18:36,906
impact.

1330
01:18:38,766 --> 01:18:42,266
With relation to the complaints procedure, Section

1331
01:18:42,546 --> 01:18:46,366

2.17, Public Consultation and Liaison of the outline

1332
01:18:46,966 --> 01:18:48,846
operation environmental management plan

1333
01:18:50,242 --> 01:18:54,202
includes details for the process which we put in place to ensure

1334
01:18:54,262 --> 01:18:57,742
that any community concerns are heard and responded

1335
01:18:57,822 --> 01:19:00,962
to throughout the duration of the scheme's operational phase.

1336
01:19:02,142 --> 01:19:05,642
As a result, any concerns or complaints, including those relating to glint and

1337
01:19:05,682 --> 01:19:09,622
glare, can be raised through this process and be addressed accordingly.

1338
01:19:11,882 --> 01:19:13,502
Okay. Thank you. Simon Wood.

1339
01:19:14,982 --> 01:19:17,982
Can I ask Mr. Doyle to come back on this, please?

1340
01:19:18,042 --> 01:19:19,062
Certainly. Michael

1341
01:19:19,122 --> 01:19:22,162
Doyle.

1342
01:19:22,262 --> 01:19:24,282
Thank you. Michael Doyle for Breckland Council.

1343
01:19:25,782 --> 01:19:29,082
The council welcomes the applicant's commitment to undertake further geometric

1344

01:19:29,162 --> 01:19:32,022
modeling for receptor 20 in due course, if possible.

1345
01:19:33,202 --> 01:19:36,702
That commitment acknowledges that cumulative effects for this receptor warrant

1346
01:19:36,782 --> 01:19:39,722
further examination, and the council looks forward to seeing the outcome of that

1347
01:19:39,782 --> 01:19:40,802
work in due course.

1348
01:19:42,302 --> 01:19:45,862
In terms of the complaints procedure, the council's request is not based on a

1349
01:19:45,902 --> 01:19:48,622
conclusion that significant effects will necessarily occur.

1350
01:19:49,582 --> 01:19:53,222
Rather, it reflects the fact that some uncertainty remains regarding the

1351
01:19:53,282 --> 01:19:55,802
cumulative effects experienced by receptor 20

1352
01:19:57,022 --> 01:19:59,542
and that further assessment work is currently being undertaken.

1353
01:20:00,002 --> 01:20:03,312
In those circumstances, the council considers it reasonable and proportionate that

1354
01:20:03,342 --> 01:20:06,922
a mechanism exists to investigate and respond to any substantiated

1355
01:20:06,942 --> 01:20:10,682
complaints should unforeseen effects arise during operation.

1356
01:20:11,802 --> 01:20:12,082

Thank you.

1357
01:20:13,282 --> 01:20:15,562
Okay, and just a question to Breckland then.

1358
01:20:15,602 --> 01:20:18,832
In terms of your statement on common ground, does that reflect your

1359
01:20:19,342 --> 01:20:19,822
position?

1360
01:20:22,342 --> 01:20:24,302
Yes, sir. I believe that reflects the current position. Yes.

1361
01:20:24,742 --> 01:20:25,772
Okay. Thank you. And

1362
01:20:27,262 --> 01:20:31,182
I'll ask the applicant to come onto it in a minute, but in terms of the

1363
01:20:31,242 --> 01:20:35,022
glint and glare management plan that we talked about yesterday for the Defense

1364
01:20:35,102 --> 01:20:36,462
Infrastructure Organization,

1365
01:20:37,962 --> 01:20:38,302
would that

1366
01:20:39,262 --> 01:20:42,702
plan encompass all glint and glare aspects,

1367
01:20:43,222 --> 01:20:47,192
or would it be restricted to the elements relevant to the

1368
01:20:47,602 --> 01:20:48,042
DIO?

1369
01:20:48,642 --> 01:20:51,022

Thank you, sir. Alex Tressiden on behalf of the applicant.

1370
01:20:51,062 --> 01:20:54,962
It would be the latter, so related to the DIO only.

1371
01:20:55,182 --> 01:20:57,142
However, I would just reiterate the point that Mr.

1372
01:20:57,382 --> 01:21:01,111
Plums made about the existing complaints procedure in the

1373
01:21:01,122 --> 01:21:04,642
paragraph that was referenced of the outline operational environmental management

1374
01:21:04,662 --> 01:21:07,282
plan. So that mechanism is in place for such

1375
01:21:07,302 --> 01:21:09,402
complaints.

1376
01:21:15,762 --> 01:21:19,722
Okay. Thank you. Simon Wood, did you want to come back? Michael Doyle.

1377
01:21:23,742 --> 01:21:25,402
Michael Doyle for Breckland Council.

1378
01:21:25,562 --> 01:21:26,342
Just to note that

1379
01:21:27,342 --> 01:21:30,602
I believe there's standalone complaints procedures for other

1380
01:21:30,622 --> 01:21:34,542
potential nuisance issues such as noise, so the council just feels

1381
01:21:34,582 --> 01:21:37,762
that it would be appropriate to have a standalone complaints procedure for glint

1382

01:21:37,782 --> 01:21:39,402
and glare also. Thank you.

1383
01:21:42,122 --> 01:21:44,782
Thank you. Any further comment? Alex Tressiden.

1384
01:21:45,862 --> 01:21:48,482
Thanks. Alex Tressiden on behalf of the applicant. That's noted.

1385
01:21:48,522 --> 01:21:51,522
We'll take that away and come back in writing and consider if that's
something

1386
01:21:51,542 --> 01:21:52,402
we'll add to the plan.

1387
01:21:54,682 --> 01:21:55,482
Okay. Thank you.

1388
01:21:57,422 --> 01:22:00,402
Conscious, Mr. Hubbard, would you like to come in?

1389
01:22:02,642 --> 01:22:05,322
Thank you. Tim Hubbard, Castle Acre Parish Council.

1390
01:22:06,282 --> 01:22:08,122
Just referring back to

1391
01:22:09,782 --> 01:22:13,602
the mitigation that is potentially intended

1392
01:22:13,662 --> 01:22:16,822
for the issues that the MOD have.

1393
01:22:17,582 --> 01:22:21,102
From the point of view of clarity, can you tell us whether
additional

1394
01:22:21,242 --> 01:22:21,782
fields

1395

01:22:23,362 --> 01:22:27,182
are implicated in terms of the mitigation area

1396
01:22:27,262 --> 01:22:27,562
that is

1397
01:22:28,682 --> 01:22:29,242
proposed?

1398
01:22:33,342 --> 01:22:34,482
Sorry, yes, go ahead.

1399
01:22:34,562 --> 01:22:36,582
Thank you, sir. Alex Tressiden on behalf of the applicant. No.

1400
01:22:36,842 --> 01:22:40,722
It's just the areas within the existing fields highlighted in

1401
01:22:40,782 --> 01:22:42,582
the Ministry of Defense's objection.

1402
01:22:42,622 --> 01:22:46,462
But as I say, specific areas within those existing fields and
nothing further.

1403
01:22:47,082 --> 01:22:48,842
I note there's a question at the back of the room, sir.

1404
01:22:49,262 --> 01:22:51,202
Okay, thank you. Can I just go to Dr.

1405
01:22:51,402 --> 01:22:53,322
Mark Holmes first, and then I'll come to you?

1406
01:22:54,362 --> 01:22:57,262
Thank you, sir. So just two outstanding questions.

1407
01:22:57,742 --> 01:22:59,862
Firstly, with regards to the

1408
01:23:00,062 --> 01:23:04,002

4.5-meter height, I take the

1409
01:23:04,062 --> 01:23:07,902
applicant's many points about that and the fact they want to stick to that

1410
01:23:07,961 --> 01:23:11,882
height. But John Wilson has definitely stated that the

1411
01:23:12,522 --> 01:23:14,802
4.5-meter height may be breached.

1412
01:23:14,842 --> 01:23:17,482
It may need to be higher than that for the bunds and fences.

1413
01:23:18,312 --> 01:23:21,582
So I'd be very grateful to hear from John Wilson, the applicant,

1414
01:23:22,242 --> 01:23:25,982
what if that scenario happens, we are going

1415
01:23:26,042 --> 01:23:28,292
higher than 4.5 meters, what will happen?

1416
01:23:29,342 --> 01:23:32,822
That was my first point. My second point was really an

1417
01:23:32,862 --> 01:23:36,322
obvious point. The fact we have a huge amount of

1418
01:23:36,362 --> 01:23:39,862
tourism in the Nar Valley, many Airbnbs,

1419
01:23:40,022 --> 01:23:40,632
BnBs,

1420
01:23:41,482 --> 01:23:41,802
other

1421
01:23:42,682 --> 01:23:45,882
minor pubs and hotels where people stay.

1422
01:23:46,622 --> 01:23:50,372
And now instead of driving down the 1065 and having a beautiful

1423
01:23:50,462 --> 01:23:53,772
view of the rural idyll of the Nar Valley,

1424
01:23:54,442 --> 01:23:56,922
which is very famous and many people

1425
01:23:58,482 --> 01:24:02,252
are amazed when they first discover it, they will now be driving into an industrial

1426
01:24:02,282 --> 01:24:06,222
landscape as they have the High Grove on one side and the Droves on

1427
01:24:06,242 --> 01:24:09,502
the other. This will have a serious impact on tourism,

1428
01:24:09,842 --> 01:24:13,702
serious impact on people's livelihoods, and I would very much

1429
01:24:13,742 --> 01:24:17,382
like to hear some comments as to what is going to be done for

1430
01:24:17,442 --> 01:24:17,781
that.

1431
01:24:18,922 --> 01:24:22,802
Because we're talking about a loss of income, a loss of livelihood, a loss of

1432
01:24:22,842 --> 01:24:23,882
people's mental health.

1433
01:24:25,662 --> 01:24:27,442
These can't be ignored. Thank you.

1434
01:24:27,962 --> 01:24:31,782
Okay. Thank you. I'll go first, the first part of your question to

1435
01:24:33,022 --> 01:24:36,582
Mr. John Wilson, Defense Infrastructure Organization.

1436
01:24:39,762 --> 01:24:41,682
John Wilson for the Ministry of Defense.

1437
01:24:42,342 --> 01:24:45,942
In the hearing yesterday, I made the comment that it might be

1438
01:24:45,982 --> 01:24:48,062
possible that the shielding structures

1439
01:24:49,002 --> 01:24:52,982
might need to be greater than 4.5 meters simply because the larger type

1440
01:24:53,022 --> 01:24:56,122
of solar module that's included in the development

1441
01:24:56,242 --> 01:24:58,402
proposal is 4.5 meters.

1442
01:24:59,310 --> 01:25:03,130
I'm very mindful that the application site, particularly mitigation

1443
01:25:03,190 --> 01:25:06,970
area three that they've identified and the plan we submitted, the ground

1444
01:25:08,390 --> 01:25:10,290
is elevated and continues to ascend.

1445
01:25:10,790 --> 01:25:14,550
I think at its western edge, the ground is roughly 60 meters

1446
01:25:14,610 --> 01:25:15,610
above Ordnance Datum,

1447
01:25:16,410 --> 01:25:20,170
and at its eastern extent, furthest from the precision

1448
01:25:20,210 --> 01:25:23,450
approach radar, it's approximately 80 meters above datum.

1449
01:25:23,990 --> 01:25:27,890
So if shields are going to be

1450
01:25:27,930 --> 01:25:30,690
installed in between each row of arrays,

1451
01:25:32,130 --> 01:25:34,010
it's possible that depending on the

1452
01:25:35,050 --> 01:25:39,010
lateral separation of the shielding structure from the array, that

1453
01:25:39,070 --> 01:25:42,030
given that the land is continuing to ascend away, a

1454
01:25:42,230 --> 01:25:45,750
4.5-meter-high structure might not completely shield

1455
01:25:46,170 --> 01:25:49,910
a 4.5-meter-high solar array. However, we note that the

1456
01:25:49,950 --> 01:25:52,730
applicant has stated today that if a

1457
01:25:52,790 --> 01:25:56,210
4.5-meter-high shielding structure is not going to

1458
01:25:56,250 --> 01:25:57,770
suitably conceal

1459
01:25:58,610 --> 01:26:02,450
the arrays, then those arrays that aren't suitably concealed would
not

1460
01:26:02,490 --> 01:26:05,830
be constructed. So it is very much down to the

1461
01:26:05,890 --> 01:26:09,840
applicant to consider this matter, and as

1462
01:26:09,870 --> 01:26:13,710
they consider necessary, update their design parameters if they

1463
01:26:13,750 --> 01:26:17,730
want to, to ensure they've got suitable flexibility to enable

1464
01:26:17,770 --> 01:26:21,110
them to fully address the MoD's safeguarding points.

1465
01:26:23,330 --> 01:26:25,540
Okay, thank you, Mr. Wilson. And Alex Tresserdin.

1466
01:26:26,150 --> 01:26:28,910
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresserdin on behalf of the applicant.

1467
01:26:29,270 --> 01:26:33,170
I apologize if I'm not making myself clear on this matter, but it's

1468
01:26:33,230 --> 01:26:36,430
very important to know that the parameters

1469
01:26:36,890 --> 01:26:40,880
secured via the design principles, parameters and commitments document that

1470
01:26:40,930 --> 01:26:44,590
are certified as a document under the DCO, to which the

1471
01:26:44,630 --> 01:26:48,550
applicant must adhere to, lest it be a criminal offense if they don't,

1472
01:26:48,950 --> 01:26:52,790
will not include the ability to go higher than 4.5

1473
01:26:52,830 --> 01:26:56,610
meters on bunds and/or fences. Even with the updates that the

1474
01:26:56,650 --> 01:27:00,490
applicant's going to provide to this document at deadline five in relation to these

1475
01:27:00,530 --> 01:27:04,330
mitigation areas, the applicant cannot and will not legally be

1476
01:27:04,370 --> 01:27:07,750
able to go above 4.5 meters in this regard.

1477
01:27:08,050 --> 01:27:11,710
If they are unable to secure sufficient mitigation to

1478
01:27:11,730 --> 01:27:15,510
satisfy the Ministry of Defence without going above 4.5 meters,

1479
01:27:15,810 --> 01:27:19,410
they will not legally be able to build the panels in those affected

1480
01:27:19,490 --> 01:27:19,810
areas.

1481
01:27:22,190 --> 01:27:25,350
Okay, thank you. And the second point regarding tourism.

1482
01:27:26,970 --> 01:27:28,270
Thank you. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1483
01:27:28,590 --> 01:27:31,460
So I can pick that second point up with regard to landscape in reference to

1484
01:27:31,510 --> 01:27:32,110
industrial.

1485
01:27:33,270 --> 01:27:35,190
I would disagree. I don't think the landscape,

1486
01:27:36,050 --> 01:27:39,630
in the long term, would appear industrial when you take into account the

1487
01:27:39,670 --> 01:27:41,110
mitigation measures proposed.

1488
01:27:42,430 --> 01:27:46,390
So there has to be accounted for. You refer to the A1065 as being

1489
01:27:46,930 --> 01:27:47,770
nationally renowned,

1490
01:27:48,610 --> 01:27:52,530
although it is a road receptor. These are lower sensitivity receptors

1491
01:27:52,550 --> 01:27:56,320
when considered alongside the Peddars Way, for example, much higher sensitivity

1492
01:27:56,390 --> 01:27:59,130
receptors considered in the general scheme of the assessment.

1493
01:28:00,690 --> 01:28:04,570
The visual impact of which along this route, it does reduce over time and

1494
01:28:04,610 --> 01:28:08,350
is judged to be not significant when taking into account the advanced planting,

1495
01:28:08,430 --> 01:28:11,360
which I may add has already been installed and is being maintained.

1496
01:28:12,190 --> 01:28:15,330
Additional trees that are being planted sporadically along this route,

1497
01:28:16,150 --> 01:28:20,050
and additional gapping up that has taken place as well. Thank you.

1498
01:28:22,290 --> 01:28:22,990
Dr. Holmes.

1499
01:28:23,090 --> 01:28:26,850
I'm afraid that most of your additional plants have already died in the drought.

1500
01:28:27,270 --> 01:28:30,710
I'm very sorry to inform you of that if you haven't been to the site and looked

1501
01:28:30,830 --> 01:28:31,270
recently.

1502
01:28:33,350 --> 01:28:37,070
And this is why it could take... How many years are we looking at?

1503
01:28:37,150 --> 01:28:40,610
We're talking 10, 20 years to get proper bushes,

1504
01:28:40,770 --> 01:28:44,590
trees to hide the industrial landscape, by which time

1505
01:28:44,650 --> 01:28:47,650
people think, "Oh, I won't come to Norfolk anymore." We have to make these

1506
01:28:47,690 --> 01:28:50,390
comments. I'm just telling the truth.

1507
01:28:50,810 --> 01:28:51,370
Okay, hang on.

1508
01:28:52,550 --> 01:28:53,210
Alex Tresserdin.

1509
01:28:53,410 --> 01:28:55,050
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresserdin on behalf of the applicant.

1510
01:28:55,130 --> 01:28:58,650
I completely appreciate you need to make the comments, and we welcome

1511
01:28:59,290 --> 01:28:59,850

you doing so.

1512
01:29:00,810 --> 01:29:04,630
It's not correct, though, to say that the planting has died, because

1513
01:29:04,690 --> 01:29:08,610
we've been on the site this week, and that's not the case.

1514
01:29:08,670 --> 01:29:11,410
And indeed, that'll be noted on the site visit tomorrow.

1515
01:29:12,750 --> 01:29:15,750
Thank you. I've got Peter Richards' hand up.

1516
01:29:15,870 --> 01:29:16,569
He looks very unhappy.

1517
01:29:17,129 --> 01:29:18,770
Peter, would you like to come in?

1518
01:29:19,110 --> 01:29:20,450
Thank you, sir. Peter Richards for Breckland.

1519
01:29:20,509 --> 01:29:20,650
And

1520
01:29:21,650 --> 01:29:23,110
just following on that conversation a

1521
01:29:24,250 --> 01:29:26,550
few moments ago about the planting

1522
01:29:27,890 --> 01:29:30,230
screening the PVs. And

1523
01:29:31,590 --> 01:29:33,410
with enough effort, I'm sure that could be achieved.

1524
01:29:33,490 --> 01:29:35,240
But my difficulty here is that

1525
01:29:36,470 --> 01:29:40,250
what needs to be recognized is that the planting is removing the

1526
01:29:40,290 --> 01:29:41,030
nice, tranquil,

1527
01:29:42,210 --> 01:29:43,820
expansive open views we see at the moment.

1528
01:29:43,870 --> 01:29:47,500
And that's where I have the difficulty is that the applicant is

1529
01:29:47,550 --> 01:29:50,870
focusing on, "Well, we've screened the PVs, therefore we've done our job." When,

1530
01:29:51,770 --> 01:29:55,730
to my mind, the loss of the views, the open, expansive views

1531
01:29:55,750 --> 01:29:59,410
across that rather nice landscape is the larger issue. Thank you.

1532
01:30:01,570 --> 01:30:04,310
Thank you. Just to go back on that. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1533
01:30:05,790 --> 01:30:09,610
Again, it has to be noted that the views along the A1065 are transient as you

1534
01:30:09,650 --> 01:30:13,410
move south to north from Swatham up towards Castleacre.

1535
01:30:13,450 --> 01:30:17,310
You begin the route with a wooded route to your side, a big shelter belt,

1536
01:30:17,350 --> 01:30:21,100
and raised hedgerow to your left. You then rise up on the topography.

1537
01:30:21,130 --> 01:30:24,130

There are gaps in the hedgerow where parts have died, and views may open up

1538
01:30:24,210 --> 01:30:27,050
intermittently. The topography then falls again.

1539
01:30:27,230 --> 01:30:30,970
The road drops into cutting and is then also aligned by gapped hedgerow.

1540
01:30:31,370 --> 01:30:33,890
So the mitigation proposed is not uncharacteristic.

1541
01:30:34,030 --> 01:30:37,890
It simply serves to reinstate and reinforce the existing character or the

1542
01:30:37,930 --> 01:30:41,750
historic character that once existed along that route.

1543
01:30:43,070 --> 01:30:47,050
And a minor point, but with regard to the advanced planting, any failure will

1544
01:30:47,090 --> 01:30:47,850
be reinstated.

1545
01:30:48,510 --> 01:30:52,310
Okay, thank you. And, sorry, just to come back on your description, which

1546
01:30:52,330 --> 01:30:53,870
direction were you traveling?

1547
01:30:54,990 --> 01:30:58,830
South to north through from Swatham along the A1065 to

1548
01:30:58,850 --> 01:30:59,470
Castleacre.

1549
01:30:59,830 --> 01:31:01,070
Okay, thank you. Simon Wood.

1550
01:31:02,114 --> 01:31:06,074
I think, sir, it's just emphasize the need for you to make sure

1551
01:31:06,094 --> 01:31:09,314
that you're familiar with that view. I don't share Mr.

1552
01:31:09,534 --> 01:31:13,514
Wheeler's interpretation of the character of that drive

1553
01:31:13,554 --> 01:31:14,774
from Swaffham up to

1554
01:31:15,954 --> 01:31:19,884
the north. I think one of the whole points of that drive is the

1555
01:31:20,634 --> 01:31:24,154
openness, the expansiveness that will be overcome by the mitigation

1556
01:31:25,094 --> 01:31:29,014
in this instance. So I think it's, as I say, very important that you make sure you

1557
01:31:29,154 --> 01:31:33,014
familiarize yourself with that going in both directions, sir.

1558
01:31:33,074 --> 01:31:33,454
Thank you.

1559
01:31:34,694 --> 01:31:38,104
Thank you. And any further comments, Peter Richards?

1560
01:31:40,134 --> 01:31:41,674
I'll come to you in a minute, Mr. Bennett.

1561
01:31:42,734 --> 01:31:46,614
Thank you, sir. Just to invite you to make your own decision when you

1562
01:31:46,634 --> 01:31:49,494
drive up and down that route, hopefully in the site visit work.

1563
01:31:51,014 --> 01:31:52,794
Thank you. Any comments,

1564
01:31:53,914 --> 01:31:54,514
Mike Bennett?

1565
01:31:56,014 --> 01:31:57,134
Thank you, sir.

1566
01:31:57,254 --> 01:32:00,074
Oh, hang on a second. I think Tony Morgan did have his hand up-

1567
01:32:00,254 --> 01:32:00,464
Oh, right

1568
01:32:00,514 --> 01:32:03,254
... before you, although you wanted to speak earlier, too.

1569
01:32:03,354 --> 01:32:05,634
But we'll start with Tony Morgan.

1570
01:32:05,894 --> 01:32:08,464
Yeah, good morning. Tony Morgan, local Castle Acre

1571
01:32:08,464 --> 01:32:11,974
resident. As far as the

1572
01:32:12,494 --> 01:32:16,294
draft ECO is concerned, you're contracted to build a 500-megawatt

1573
01:32:16,374 --> 01:32:20,334
solar farm. If, however, you have a discrepancy with

1574
01:32:20,374 --> 01:32:22,894
the MOD regarding the fields

1575
01:32:23,814 --> 01:32:27,254
and the bunds/fences,

1576

01:32:28,394 --> 01:32:31,614
would you be de-rating the sites of the solar farm?

1577
01:32:32,534 --> 01:32:34,254
And what provisions have you got in place?

1578
01:32:34,314 --> 01:32:36,034
Because obviously you've got a draft

1579
01:32:36,874 --> 01:32:40,034
agreement with Nesso to provide them with 500 megawatts.

1580
01:32:42,054 --> 01:32:43,204
Okay, thank you. Alex Treseden.

1581
01:32:43,274 --> 01:32:45,494
Thank you, sir. Alex Treseden on behalf of the applicant.

1582
01:32:45,554 --> 01:32:49,514
Any removal of panels in the affected areas wouldn't change the constitution

1583
01:32:49,554 --> 01:32:52,714
of the development as a nationally significant infrastructure project, and

1584
01:32:52,754 --> 01:32:54,914
therefore requiring a development consent order.

1585
01:32:56,614 --> 01:32:57,054
Thank you.

1586
01:33:03,554 --> 01:33:04,394
Yes, well,

1587
01:33:07,774 --> 01:33:09,034
Mike Bennett. Thank you.

1588
01:33:09,694 --> 01:33:13,394
Thank you, sir. Mike Bennett, Spallwith Palgrave Parish Council.

1589

01:33:15,854 --> 01:33:19,734
Picking up on cumulative impacts of landscape, which has

1590
01:33:19,774 --> 01:33:22,594
been one thing that we have talked

1591
01:33:22,654 --> 01:33:26,474
about quite a bit this morning, and I've talked about in

1592
01:33:26,554 --> 01:33:28,594
various meetings.

1593
01:33:31,834 --> 01:33:34,254
We had a discussion earlier with Mr.

1594
01:33:34,514 --> 01:33:35,054
Richards,

1595
01:33:37,154 --> 01:33:37,494
that

1596
01:33:38,894 --> 01:33:42,234
there were some issues around how you interpret

1597
01:33:43,854 --> 01:33:45,414
GLVIA-3,

1598
01:33:47,734 --> 01:33:48,834
which I understand

1599
01:33:49,634 --> 01:33:51,234
from previous meetings with

1600
01:33:52,374 --> 01:33:56,214
the applicant is the key guidance document

1601
01:33:56,294 --> 01:33:58,534
for assessing landscape and visual impacts.

1602
01:34:00,074 --> 01:34:04,014
The one thing, though, and one weakness it seems to me in some

1603
01:34:04,074 --> 01:34:04,634
senses,

1604
01:34:05,434 --> 01:34:08,994
is it still demands considerable amounts of professional judgment to

1605
01:34:09,034 --> 01:34:09,594
assess,

1606
01:34:11,794 --> 01:34:14,414
and this is admitted in the environment

1607
01:34:14,494 --> 01:34:17,974
statement, chapter six, on landscape and visual.

1608
01:34:19,434 --> 01:34:22,414
So therefore, it really then becomes a matter of judgment.

1609
01:34:25,954 --> 01:34:29,534
As a matter of judgment, it then becomes a balance between the professional

1610
01:34:29,654 --> 01:34:33,514
judgment of the landscape consultant, we've got two landscape consultants this

1611
01:34:33,554 --> 01:34:34,634
morning who disagree.

1612
01:34:36,334 --> 01:34:40,054
It's either that or it's against local feeling and sentiment

1613
01:34:40,554 --> 01:34:44,514
for the significance and scale of the visual impact, and we've also

1614
01:34:44,574 --> 01:34:48,354
had this morning the Breckland

1615
01:34:48,454 --> 01:34:51,534
Council rightly concerned that

1616
01:34:52,754 --> 01:34:54,854
we're not looking at the real local

1617
01:34:57,334 --> 01:34:59,694
landscape characteristic.

1618
01:35:02,354 --> 01:35:06,064
I'm not going to go on because we've already dealt with it and we'll look at it

1619
01:35:06,114 --> 01:35:06,614
tomorrow,

1620
01:35:08,254 --> 01:35:11,834
but there's a mention already of the significant nature

1621
01:35:11,954 --> 01:35:14,534
of the landscape and visual

1622
01:35:15,474 --> 01:35:17,873
impact off the Peddars Way.

1623
01:35:19,994 --> 01:35:23,104
And one of the things there is that there is

1624
01:35:23,854 --> 01:35:25,884
one point which we'll see tomorrow,

1625
01:35:28,674 --> 01:35:32,294
is where you can see six fields of

1626
01:35:32,374 --> 01:35:36,034
solar array all in a row going away to the

1627
01:35:36,074 --> 01:35:36,674
horizon,

1628
01:35:37,774 --> 01:35:41,494
and it's made significantly more of an

1629
01:35:42,374 --> 01:35:46,334
adverse impact, in my judgment, by the fact of the sloping

1630
01:35:46,374 --> 01:35:50,254
ground, with just being broken up by hedges.

1631
01:35:51,834 --> 01:35:55,574
And I note that Section 6.11 of the environment statement,

1632
01:35:55,894 --> 01:35:58,784
chapter six, landscape and visual, recognizes

1633
01:35:59,594 --> 01:36:03,414
the cumulative impacts caused by the Highgrove development, but

1634
01:36:03,514 --> 01:36:07,314
still concludes its assessment that visual receptor group

1635
01:36:07,374 --> 01:36:11,314
four, Great Palgrave and Little Palgrave, is only significant and

1636
01:36:11,394 --> 01:36:13,274
adverse during the construction phase.

1637
01:36:15,854 --> 01:36:17,964
We would want to contend that

1638
01:36:18,034 --> 01:36:21,254
this will be the same for the

1639
01:36:21,314 --> 01:36:24,914
operational phase as well, and the environment

1640
01:36:25,114 --> 01:36:27,734
statement needs amending to reflect this

1641
01:36:29,194 --> 01:36:30,434
because of what we can see.

1642
01:36:32,024 --> 01:36:35,884

The technical information note on landscape and visual, when

1643
01:36:35,914 --> 01:36:37,274
referring to the report on

1644
01:36:38,314 --> 01:36:40,474
interrelationships between projects,

1645
01:36:41,554 --> 01:36:45,514
notes that the detailed design and embedded mitigation measures

1646
01:36:45,554 --> 01:36:49,234
for the scheme and the Highgrove Solar DCO seek to

1647
01:36:49,274 --> 01:36:52,974
reduce the potential cumulative landscape and visual effects

1648
01:36:53,014 --> 01:36:54,334
between the two projects.

1649
01:36:55,194 --> 01:36:58,894
Also, it says, "The OLEMP

1650
01:36:59,414 --> 01:37:03,114
also seeks to ensure a cohesive and linked-up landscaping approach

1651
01:37:03,174 --> 01:37:04,474
between the two projects."

1652
01:37:06,738 --> 01:37:09,628
However, it then goes on to say,

1653
01:37:10,498 --> 01:37:14,298
where the projects are visible in combination from the higher ground
to the

1654
01:37:14,418 --> 01:37:17,818
east at representative viewpoint eight on the

1655
01:37:17,878 --> 01:37:21,848
Southacre Road, for example, only a proportion of both projects

1656
01:37:21,878 --> 01:37:24,438
would be visible within the same field of view.

1657
01:37:25,398 --> 01:37:26,418
This might be true,

1658
01:37:27,218 --> 01:37:30,498
but the visual impact is still significant adverse when

1659
01:37:30,538 --> 01:37:34,178
traversing the view from south round to the

1660
01:37:34,258 --> 01:37:37,678
southwest. The wireline photographs from viewpoint

1661
01:37:37,838 --> 01:37:41,598
eight only color the Droves area and not the Highgrove

1662
01:37:41,698 --> 01:37:45,558
fields as well. Now, I accept that we're at a stage

1663
01:37:45,818 --> 01:37:49,538
where we've only got the PEIR information from Highgrove.

1664
01:37:51,038 --> 01:37:54,878
But what I would suggest is that further wireline photos

1665
01:37:55,018 --> 01:37:58,598
are produced for this examination of all the

1666
01:37:58,658 --> 01:38:02,078
existing viewpoints and any additional viewpoints,

1667
01:38:02,558 --> 01:38:04,778
which will be looked at, say, tomorrow,

1668
01:38:05,678 --> 01:38:09,598
and that they should show not only the Droves, but also

1669

01:38:09,638 --> 01:38:11,018
the Highgrove fields

1670
01:38:13,538 --> 01:38:14,878
that have arrays in them.

1671
01:38:15,678 --> 01:38:19,258
So what we're asking for is, for example, on view viewpoint

1672
01:38:19,418 --> 01:38:19,737
eight.

1673
01:38:21,738 --> 01:38:24,088
I've walked past there regularly.

1674
01:38:24,088 --> 01:38:26,778
Would it help this conversation to display that-

1675
01:38:27,258 --> 01:38:27,778
Yes, it would

1676
01:38:27,818 --> 01:38:28,328
... viewpoint on the screen?

1677
01:38:28,338 --> 01:38:31,798
Yes. I'm not sure the reference. I do apologize.

1678
01:38:31,858 --> 01:38:35,598
It's difficult with all these references.

1679
01:38:37,538 --> 01:38:37,878
It's

1680
01:38:40,038 --> 01:38:41,038
at viewpoint eight,

1681
01:38:42,478 --> 01:38:43,338
and if we had

1682
01:38:44,858 --> 01:38:46,158
some of the wire

1683
01:38:48,198 --> 01:38:49,958
photos, the photo montage.

1684
01:38:50,958 --> 01:38:52,678
I don't know what page it is. I

1685
01:38:53,538 --> 01:38:54,938
can't remember what document it is.

1686
01:38:59,558 --> 01:39:03,458
I'm afraid as I was saying it, I thought I ought to have made that

1687
01:39:05,498 --> 01:39:06,538
reference. Sorry.

1688
01:39:12,318 --> 01:39:13,558
While they're doing that, can I just-

1689
01:39:13,998 --> 01:39:15,138
Yeah, continue. Yeah

1690
01:39:15,178 --> 01:39:15,178
...

1691
01:39:16,298 --> 01:39:19,918
really our contention is that there's still more work to be done

1692
01:39:21,378 --> 01:39:24,998
by really both projects to reduce the visual

1693
01:39:25,038 --> 01:39:25,618
impact,

1694
01:39:27,058 --> 01:39:28,718
as I think we shall see tomorrow,

1695
01:39:29,558 --> 01:39:29,758
and

1696

01:39:31,478 --> 01:39:34,018
we continue to hope for continued meetings,

1697
01:39:35,798 --> 01:39:39,528
as parish councils with both the applicant and

1698
01:39:39,598 --> 01:39:43,338
Highgrove to really come to satisfactory

1699
01:39:43,438 --> 01:39:44,058
solutions.

1700
01:39:47,498 --> 01:39:48,078
Okay, thank you.

1701
01:39:48,218 --> 01:39:51,418
I have got one other point that's not related to this.

1702
01:39:52,058 --> 01:39:53,848
If we're waiting to get to that-

1703
01:39:53,848 --> 01:39:55,428
What is the subject? Is it landscape or visual?

1704
01:39:55,438 --> 01:39:59,378
Well, it is actual visual, and it's in relation to the

1705
01:40:01,038 --> 01:40:04,538
substation and the base levels that,

1706
01:40:05,998 --> 01:40:09,218
for example, there was an appendix to

1707
01:40:09,318 --> 01:40:10,018
the

1708
01:40:13,658 --> 01:40:15,958
applicant's response to question one zero...

1709
01:40:19,378 --> 01:40:23,058
At the end of the applicant's responses to

1710
01:40:24,658 --> 01:40:25,478
your second

1711
01:40:27,138 --> 01:40:30,938
load of questions, Sir, there was an appendix at the back of that,

1712
01:40:31,518 --> 01:40:35,318
and the cross-sectional drawings on that were very

1713
01:40:35,438 --> 01:40:38,938
difficult to discern. Would it be possible to have a

1714
01:40:38,998 --> 01:40:40,458
full-scale drawing of that?

1715
01:40:41,398 --> 01:40:44,638
Because I'm concerned, particularly at the

1716
01:40:45,078 --> 01:40:48,838
base levels, the worst-case situation seem extremely

1717
01:40:48,878 --> 01:40:52,738
high, and we've already been talking about where we're going to get

1718
01:40:53,078 --> 01:40:56,908
earth for bunds. Well, it looks like

1719
01:40:58,138 --> 01:41:01,218
as you've currently got it, admittedly, it's a worst-case situation.

1720
01:41:01,238 --> 01:41:02,308
To my mind,

1721
01:41:03,198 --> 01:41:06,418
as having done considerable amount of groundworks in my time,

1722
01:41:07,598 --> 01:41:09,878
you're going to import an awful lot of material.

1723

01:41:11,058 --> 01:41:14,798
And a cut and fill might be better, but I am

1724
01:41:14,878 --> 01:41:15,498
aware,

1725
01:41:16,678 --> 01:41:20,398
from my colleague at Castleacre, that there could

1726
01:41:20,458 --> 01:41:24,368
be significant heritage assets underneath there, and we've

1727
01:41:24,438 --> 01:41:28,178
also already mentioned the possibility of chalk substrata as

1728
01:41:28,238 --> 01:41:31,978
well. So I think we need to be able to see

1729
01:41:32,018 --> 01:41:33,698
what you're likely to be able to do.

1730
01:41:34,358 --> 01:41:36,198
So if we could have a drawing, that would be great.

1731
01:41:38,058 --> 01:41:38,678
Okay, thank you.

1732
01:41:38,778 --> 01:41:40,358
Here we go. Yeah.

1733
01:41:40,398 --> 01:41:42,398
Yeah. So we've got viewpoint eight there.

1734
01:41:42,518 --> 01:41:42,698
Yeah.

1735
01:41:42,718 --> 01:41:44,438
Would the applicant like to respond?

1736
01:41:44,638 --> 01:41:45,458
There is

1737
01:41:50,018 --> 01:41:53,718
a winter drawing, a winter photograph as well.

1738
01:41:55,778 --> 01:41:59,038
But to the right, you can see the

1739
01:41:59,498 --> 01:42:01,138
fields that are

1740
01:42:02,898 --> 01:42:06,738
the Droves, they're colored in. But to the

1741
01:42:06,818 --> 01:42:10,718
left-hand of the photograph, you're also looking across

1742
01:42:10,878 --> 01:42:13,178
fields that are

1743
01:42:14,758 --> 01:42:18,498
included in the Highgrove PEIR, and I

1744
01:42:18,578 --> 01:42:22,438
think they ought to be colored, perhaps in a different color.

1745
01:42:22,478 --> 01:42:25,788
But it would give a better overall

1746
01:42:25,838 --> 01:42:28,558
impression of what you're seeing at that point.

1747
01:42:29,538 --> 01:42:33,138
I think you'd see it better. There is a winter one, and you'd see it

1748
01:42:33,418 --> 01:42:34,178
even...

1749
01:42:36,178 --> 01:42:40,078
Because actually in the winter, the visual impact's going to be
greater because you

1750
01:42:40,098 --> 01:42:41,278
haven't got the vegetation.

1751
01:42:42,058 --> 01:42:42,278
Okay.

1752
01:42:42,398 --> 01:42:43,038
Or the crops.

1753
01:42:43,678 --> 01:42:46,718
Thank you. I did see Peter Richards, your hand was up.

1754
01:42:48,098 --> 01:42:48,878
Did you have a comment?

1755
01:42:50,218 --> 01:42:51,818
I swear my life on it.

1756
01:42:52,498 --> 01:42:56,138
Sorry, just to note, we are getting a bit of background noise from

1757
01:42:56,198 --> 01:42:56,918
yourself, I think.

1758
01:42:58,458 --> 01:42:59,058
Beg your pardon, Sir.

1759
01:43:00,038 --> 01:43:03,998
I was trying to help out in the document in which the

1760
01:43:04,038 --> 01:43:07,418
photo montages that the gentleman was referring to are in document

1761
01:43:08,078 --> 01:43:11,878
reference APP-818

1762
01:43:12,662 --> 01:43:16,582
And the two views that are relevant to what the gentleman is

1763
01:43:16,642 --> 01:43:18,442

raising is viewpoint eight,

1764
01:43:19,402 --> 01:43:23,122
which was on the screen a moment ago, and perhaps even more revealing

1765
01:43:23,142 --> 01:43:23,402
is

1766
01:43:24,242 --> 01:43:27,822
viewpoint 17. I'm not sure if you have the time to

1767
01:43:28,322 --> 01:43:32,162
quickly take you to that, because it shows you the expanse of our scheme with

1768
01:43:32,202 --> 01:43:33,462
Highgrove in the foreground.

1769
01:43:34,322 --> 01:43:34,332
Yes.

1770
01:43:34,382 --> 01:43:37,902
So page 56 of 78 in document

1771
01:43:38,122 --> 01:43:38,842
APP

1772
01:43:39,822 --> 01:43:41,562
stroke 8.18.

1773
01:43:43,142 --> 01:43:46,402
Thank you. Yes. And we've got a few minutes to look at that. Yeah. Thank you.

1774
01:43:52,122 --> 01:43:55,502
So you can see, sir, on the right-hand side is the

1775
01:43:56,822 --> 01:44:00,722
sort of expanse of the proposed PV farm,

1776

01:44:01,322 --> 01:44:04,842
and then I believe the Highgrove sits to the left.

1777
01:44:04,902 --> 01:44:08,222
So what the gentleman was referring to about seeing schemes

1778
01:44:08,822 --> 01:44:10,922
cumulatively would be nicely

1779
01:44:12,522 --> 01:44:16,442
picked out in this particular viewpoint and the viewpoint the gentleman

1780
01:44:16,462 --> 01:44:17,682
was talking about, viewpoint eight.

1781
01:44:18,382 --> 01:44:21,242
So I'll try to help out by taking you to the relevant documents and pages.

1782
01:44:21,702 --> 01:44:25,422
Okay, thank you. Could the applicant respond and also

1783
01:44:25,482 --> 01:44:26,782
describe with this picture,

1784
01:44:28,302 --> 01:44:31,542
where the Highgrove would be based on what we know?

1785
01:44:31,702 --> 01:44:34,282
Thank you, sir. Alex Trezhan on behalf of the applicant.

1786
01:44:34,602 --> 01:44:34,982
I think there's

1787
01:44:35,822 --> 01:44:39,662
a lot of points that have just been raised there, and I'm slightly

1788
01:44:39,722 --> 01:44:43,702
mindful of the time, it being quarter to 12 already, and we've got quite

1789
01:44:43,722 --> 01:44:47,182
a lot to get through in relation to other agenda items.

1790
01:44:47,622 --> 01:44:51,492
We are happy to respond now, on the points you've just raised, but if you'd

1791
01:44:51,502 --> 01:44:55,462
prefer us to do so in writing for the interest of time, we're equally happy

1792
01:44:55,502 --> 01:44:56,022
to do that.

1793
01:44:56,682 --> 01:45:00,242
I think if you could give an overview, and then if you want to respond in more

1794
01:45:00,282 --> 01:45:01,902
detail, that's fine.

1795
01:45:02,082 --> 01:45:04,182
Thank you. Yes. Ollie Wheeler for the applicant.

1796
01:45:04,242 --> 01:45:08,042
So this is an additional viewpoint provided as part of the technical information

1797
01:45:08,122 --> 01:45:09,122
note that we submitted,

1798
01:45:10,122 --> 01:45:13,402
at the request of Breckland, so that was Rep 3083.

1799
01:45:14,162 --> 01:45:18,002
So this should be viewed in the context of the wider technical note, and also

1800
01:45:18,042 --> 01:45:21,462
alongside the text that's provided at the base of the viewpoint,

1801

01:45:22,721 --> 01:45:26,492
which provides rationale and description on the existing view, and also a

1802
01:45:26,502 --> 01:45:30,172
prediction on the scale of effect of the view at

1803
01:45:30,202 --> 01:45:33,982
different time periods. With regards to what we were talking about in

1804
01:45:34,042 --> 01:45:37,662
cumulative here, so as rightly described, the scheme is

1805
01:45:38,202 --> 01:45:42,122
shown here. The panels can be seen central to the right

1806
01:45:42,162 --> 01:45:44,182
of the view, rising up onto higher ground.

1807
01:45:44,742 --> 01:45:48,082
The larger woodland blocks can be seen on the skyline.

1808
01:45:48,202 --> 01:45:52,152
Round Cover in particular is a notable woodland block that I think that we might

1809
01:45:52,202 --> 01:45:55,982
see tomorrow, I'm not sure, on the route if it takes us past there.

1810
01:45:57,042 --> 01:46:00,322
And Highgrove Solar Farm sits to the left of our scheme.

1811
01:46:00,902 --> 01:46:04,742
Now, I would point out whilst it's requested that we

1812
01:46:04,782 --> 01:46:05,582
superimpose,

1813
01:46:06,442 --> 01:46:08,902
albeit draft information from the PIR, so

1814
01:46:10,322 --> 01:46:13,851
probably inaccurate and not today information, for the Highgrove scheme.

1815
01:46:14,942 --> 01:46:18,511
For that to be requested and superimposed o-onto our visuals,

1816
01:46:19,662 --> 01:46:23,472
it wouldn't provide an accurate assessment because the basis of comparison,

1817
01:46:24,082 --> 01:46:26,762
how you can't assess a cumulative impact when you don't have the correct

1818
01:46:26,802 --> 01:46:30,702
information. And also, a degree of professional judgment can

1819
01:46:30,762 --> 01:46:32,842
be made, and that is almost...

1820
01:46:34,562 --> 01:46:37,842
That's part of the beauty of our landscape, is that it is interpreted by different

1821
01:46:37,882 --> 01:46:40,862
people around the world and the country in different ways.

1822
01:46:41,302 --> 01:46:43,362
And as professionals, we do infer

1823
01:46:44,202 --> 01:46:47,262
effects differently, but through the same approach to methodology.

1824
01:46:49,062 --> 01:46:52,662
And as my colleague correctly reminded me, that

1825
01:46:52,682 --> 01:46:56,582
Highgrove also have a responsibility to do a similar assessment,

1826
01:46:57,362 --> 01:47:01,022

in conjunction with us, given that they're spatially of a greater area, but that's

1827
01:47:01,062 --> 01:47:04,342
not today's discussion. The rest we can provide in writing. Thank you.

1828
01:47:04,622 --> 01:47:06,362
Yeah, just a couple of further points, please.

1829
01:47:06,502 --> 01:47:08,812
Alex Trezhan on behalf of the applicant. Mr.

1830
01:47:09,002 --> 01:47:12,882
Bennett raised the question of whether fur-further meetings could

1831
01:47:12,962 --> 01:47:16,602
take place to thrash out these issues. Absolutely is the answer to that.

1832
01:47:16,902 --> 01:47:19,962
And also there was discussion about one of the images being

1833
01:47:21,842 --> 01:47:25,742
clarified or extended, however we'd like to put it, to make it easier to view.

1834
01:47:25,802 --> 01:47:27,342
We'll certainly consider that as well.

1835
01:47:29,262 --> 01:47:29,942
Okay, thank you.

1836
01:47:30,762 --> 01:47:33,282
Anne Mason.

1837
01:47:33,362 --> 01:47:36,742
Thank you, sir. Anne Mason, Castle Acre Parish Council.

1838
01:47:37,902 --> 01:47:41,462
The agenda discussion has obviously placed emphasis on the

1839
01:47:41,682 --> 01:47:45,602
visual landscape, but I would like to point out that its

1840
01:47:46,022 --> 01:47:49,642
current visual appeal is precisely because it's a

1841
01:47:49,682 --> 01:47:53,422
historic landscape, and it is this historic

1842
01:47:53,842 --> 01:47:57,402
landscape which is going to be adversely impacted

1843
01:47:57,962 --> 01:48:01,762
and probably irreversibly. And I hope that this can be

1844
01:48:01,842 --> 01:48:04,962
considered during tomorrow's site visit. Thank you.

1845
01:48:07,162 --> 01:48:08,322
Thank you. Any comment?

1846
01:48:09,362 --> 01:48:11,322
No, sir. Alex Trezhan on behalf of the applicant.

1847
01:48:11,562 --> 01:48:15,462
Again, I think we're veering outside the scope of this agenda item here,

1848
01:48:15,502 --> 01:48:18,122
and note that the site visit's taking place tomorrow.

1849
01:48:19,762 --> 01:48:23,342
There's also an open floor hearing this afternoon for considerations on heritage,

1850
01:48:23,402 --> 01:48:26,802
for example, to be raised. I would just like to make one, hopefully final point on

1851
01:48:26,822 --> 01:48:30,702
this matter, and that is to reiterate that in the planning balance

concluded in the

1852
01:48:30,742 --> 01:48:34,532
planning statement, the applicant has afforded a negative weight to landscape and

1853
01:48:34,582 --> 01:48:37,892
visual effects. So everything that's being discussed needs to be considered,

1854
01:48:37,982 --> 01:48:38,792
please, in that

1855
01:48:38,802 --> 01:48:45,502
context.

1856
01:48:46,122 --> 01:48:49,902
Okay, I'm going to take any final comments before we move to a break.

1857
01:48:49,982 --> 01:48:52,442
So any other comments in the room? Simon Wood?

1858
01:48:52,742 --> 01:48:54,562
Yes. Simon Wood, Breckland Council.

1859
01:48:55,702 --> 01:48:59,602
Just to come back to the thorny issue of the M-

1860
01:48:59,682 --> 01:49:03,502
of the Marvin mitigation, sir, and I'm

1861
01:49:03,762 --> 01:49:07,242
well aware, as Mr. Trezhan keeps telling us

1862
01:49:07,342 --> 01:49:11,222
around the statutory powers of the

1863
01:49:11,282 --> 01:49:11,782
DCO,

1864

01:49:13,022 --> 01:49:16,782
and that the parameters will set the bunds and/or fencing

1865
01:49:16,842 --> 01:49:18,442
at 4.5 meters.

1866
01:49:19,542 --> 01:49:23,192
I would make the point that we- they seem to be designing mitigation without

1867
01:49:23,202 --> 01:49:25,622
knowing what mitigation exactly is required.

1868
01:49:25,662 --> 01:49:29,252
There seems to me to be an element of putting the cart before the horse here,

1869
01:49:29,462 --> 01:49:32,442
but that's an issue for you to

1870
01:49:33,002 --> 01:49:36,922
consider, sir. I think what concerns me is the ability of

1871
01:49:36,962 --> 01:49:40,462
interested parties, including the host planning authority,

1872
01:49:40,582 --> 01:49:44,482
to consider the details of the mitigation that's being put

1873
01:49:44,582 --> 01:49:48,462
forward. My understanding, and I'm happy to be corrected, is

1874
01:49:48,502 --> 01:49:51,892
that the details will be with you by, um-

1875
01:49:52,572 --> 01:49:56,332
Deadline five, which would give us two weeks to comment

1876
01:49:56,372 --> 01:50:00,252
by deadline six, and also that this isn't something

1877

01:50:00,312 --> 01:50:04,292
that is currently being addressed in the Statement of Common Ground.

1878
01:50:04,952 --> 01:50:07,992
I'll stop now because I can see that he's poised.

1879
01:50:08,431 --> 01:50:08,852
Thank you.

1880
01:50:09,692 --> 01:50:10,452
Alex Tresserdin.

1881
01:50:11,112 --> 01:50:12,952
Thank you, sir. Alex Tresserdin on behalf of the applicant.

1882
01:50:13,002 --> 01:50:13,382
I think there's

1883
01:50:14,272 --> 01:50:17,572
a few points to note there. So what will be included

1884
01:50:17,632 --> 01:50:21,292
at deadline five in the design principles, parameters, and commitments

1885
01:50:21,312 --> 01:50:25,272
document is an indication of those parameters for which the mitigation

1886
01:50:25,312 --> 01:50:27,432
will have to adhere to. The actual

1887
01:50:28,652 --> 01:50:32,272
mitigation will come forward at the detailed design

1888
01:50:33,132 --> 01:50:34,652
phase of the scheme, which is exactly the

1889
01:50:35,632 --> 01:50:39,452
point of that scheme. And whilst I appreciate the council hasn't seen this yet,

1890
01:50:39,532 --> 01:50:39,712
so

1891
01:50:40,592 --> 01:50:44,552
the representative makes a fair point, the requirement that we are agreeing

1892
01:50:44,592 --> 01:50:48,292
to put on the face of the DCO with the Ministry of Defence will

1893
01:50:48,332 --> 01:50:52,082
require a detailed mitigation plan to be submitted to and approved

1894
01:50:52,112 --> 01:50:55,432
by the local authority in consultation with the Ministry of Defence.

1895
01:50:55,472 --> 01:50:59,332
And, as I said, in relation to some of the requirements yesterday, you're

1896
01:50:59,352 --> 01:51:03,092
free to consult with any other bodies, not just the Ministry of

1897
01:51:03,152 --> 01:51:06,842
Defence. So there will be an opportunity to review and approve that mitigation

1898
01:51:06,912 --> 01:51:07,232
plan.

1899
01:51:11,372 --> 01:51:14,512
Okay, thank you. Any other final comments in the room?

1900
01:51:14,952 --> 01:51:16,312
Andrew Szarkowski.

1901
01:51:17,152 --> 01:51:19,082
Thank you, sir. Andrew Szarkowski from Norfolk County Council.

1902
01:51:19,082 --> 01:51:22,352
I'll just be very brief here. I think just listening to that final

point, I think

1903
01:51:22,412 --> 01:51:26,292
there remains a fundamental concern here about the fact that whilst we're being

1904
01:51:26,392 --> 01:51:30,242
given assurances that there isn't any fundamental change to the landscape and

1905
01:51:30,272 --> 01:51:31,372
visual impact assessment,

1906
01:51:32,892 --> 01:51:34,832
that's not really actually being demonstrated.

1907
01:51:34,872 --> 01:51:37,332
And I think from the point of view of the local residents, I think they've got a

1908
01:51:37,372 --> 01:51:40,732
right to actually understand exactly what the impact of that scheme is going to be.

1909
01:51:41,192 --> 01:51:44,312
So I'm afraid I don't think it's good enough to actually say, "That's our

1910
01:51:44,392 --> 01:51:48,002
conclusion, so that's it in terms of the environmental impact assessment." There's

1911
01:51:48,032 --> 01:51:50,552
a more fundamental issue here that needs to be addressed at this stage.

1912
01:51:51,952 --> 01:51:52,592
Okay, thank you.

1913
01:51:53,652 --> 01:51:54,332
Any further-

1914

01:51:54,792 --> 01:51:55,852
Can I just come back, sir?

1915
01:51:56,272 --> 01:51:56,492
Yeah.

1916
01:51:57,332 --> 01:51:57,932
Simon Wood, yeah.

1917
01:51:58,332 --> 01:52:01,832
Simon Wood, Breckland. And I am conscious of time, but I feel the point has to

1918
01:52:01,851 --> 01:52:05,602
continue to be made that Breckland will end up being the discharging

1919
01:52:05,692 --> 01:52:09,572
authority here. And without knowing the implications of the

1920
01:52:10,012 --> 01:52:13,652
mitigation that is being outlined as part of the DCO,

1921
01:52:15,112 --> 01:52:18,872
the perception will be that it's very much a done deal,

1922
01:52:19,272 --> 01:52:23,092
and it will put the local planning authority in a difficult position if it's

1923
01:52:24,412 --> 01:52:28,112
consulting with local residents, with local parish councils,

1924
01:52:28,552 --> 01:52:32,072
about a scheme that hasn't been through this

1925
01:52:32,092 --> 01:52:35,612
process, and been seen in the context of the

1926
01:52:35,692 --> 01:52:39,332
wider project. And I would express my

1927

01:52:39,372 --> 01:52:41,372
concerns about that.

1928
01:52:42,912 --> 01:52:46,572
I note that we are welcome to consult with

1929
01:52:46,632 --> 01:52:50,322
whoever we wish. I would hope that the Ministry of

1930
01:52:50,372 --> 01:52:53,772
Defence would be identified within this requirement,

1931
01:52:55,172 --> 01:52:55,412
sir.

1932
01:52:56,312 --> 01:53:00,252
But you know our views. We're strongly

1933
01:53:00,292 --> 01:53:04,172
concerned about the lack of detailed information about the

1934
01:53:04,192 --> 01:53:07,152
mitigation and the impact that will have on landscape,

1935
01:53:07,972 --> 01:53:11,472
ecology, environment, and drainage, sir. Thank you.

1936
01:53:11,692 --> 01:53:12,332
Okay, thank you.

1937
01:53:14,792 --> 01:53:15,472
Alex Tresserdin.

1938
01:53:16,412 --> 01:53:20,222
Thank you, sir. No, short of repeating my submissions made today, I
don't have

1939
01:53:20,252 --> 01:53:21,312
anything further to add. Thank you.

1940
01:53:21,392 --> 01:53:24,652

Okay, thank you. Anyone online have any further comments?

1941
01:53:24,752 --> 01:53:26,632
I'm not seeing any hands up.

1942
01:53:30,272 --> 01:53:32,772
No, no further comments in the room. No hands.

1943
01:53:32,972 --> 01:53:36,852
I'm going to move to a break in a minute, but I just wanted to just do a quick

1944
01:53:36,892 --> 01:53:38,532
recap on the actions.

1945
01:53:39,712 --> 01:53:43,141
So I'm not proposing on covering actions which were related

1946
01:53:43,141 --> 01:53:46,712
to defense or aviation that we covered

1947
01:53:46,752 --> 01:53:47,152
yesterday.

1948
01:53:48,572 --> 01:53:52,002
So there was an action regarding providing

1949
01:53:52,032 --> 01:53:55,772
the references to the tree protection measures in the

1950
01:53:55,852 --> 01:53:58,632
outline landscape and environmental management plan,

1951
01:54:00,332 --> 01:54:04,052
and also responding to Mr. Bennett's concerns about the

1952
01:54:04,072 --> 01:54:06,592
Highgrove development and those viewpoints,

1953
01:54:07,512 --> 01:54:10,831
and then the general point, of course, about Statement of Common

Grounds being up

1954
01:54:10,872 --> 01:54:11,252
to date.

1955
01:54:12,572 --> 01:54:14,832
Okay, so it's 11:54.

1956
01:54:16,552 --> 01:54:19,812
I'm going to adjourn for a break now, and if we can be back

1957
01:54:20,592 --> 01:54:24,272
at 12:10 where we'll be starting on the next item, which is flood

1958
01:54:24,312 --> 01:54:26,552
risk, hydrology, and water resources. Thank you.

1959
01:54:26,672 --> 01:54:27,972
So 12:10,

1960
01:54:28,812 --> 01:54:30,012
we will resume.