



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Event Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Event:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Day 1 - Part 4
Date:	28 January 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. 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 event.

File Name: SL_28JAN_ISH2_PART4.mp3

File Length: 01:50:37

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:10:04 - 00:00:24:06

The hearing is resumed, can I just confirm with the case team that they can hear me and that the recording has recommenced? Thank you. So if the applicant could now show, um.

00:00:26:14 - 00:00:31:27

Viewpoint four, which is app 209.

00:00:37:03 - 00:00:37:28

Thank you.

00:00:39:15 - 00:00:53:28

Um, does the council agree with the applicant's assessment that this would be a major adverse effect at year one, reducing to, um, moderate but still significant at year 15?

00:00:55:24 - 00:00:59:25

That's um a Suffolk please.

00:01:01:03 - 00:01:27:01

Um, Nicholas Newton, Suffolk council. Yes, we certainly agreed the, uh, the significant adverse, um, construction year one. Um, it still comes back to the success of the planting. Um, we would hope. And it'd be like to be reduced to moderate if if growth rates are difficult, then it will be a challenge. And there could still be major moderate effects at year 15.

00:01:29:24 - 00:01:36:08

Thank you. Um, Suffolk County Council. Would you like to say anything? I could see a hand up.

00:01:36:15 - 00:01:41:10

It's already cutting for Suffolk County Council. I just wanted to say I concur with East Suffolk Council. Thank you.

00:01:41:20 - 00:01:54:28

Lovely. Thank you. Does anybody else want to say anything about whether they agree that it's major adverse at year one, reducing to, um moderate but significant at year 15.

00:01:55:14 - 00:01:59:11

Nicholas Bridges on behalf of seas. I agree with the councils.

00:01:59:26 - 00:02:23:20

Thank you. Um, could the applicant. I was going to come to this point of, um, the effects of, um, unreliable rainfall in terms of landscape mitigation planting later, but it's come up a couple of times. So could you just give me something, um, some comment on that, please? Mr. Morrison.

00:02:23:22 - 00:03:12:00

On behalf of the applicant, um, this is something that we've been acutely aware of throughout the pre-application period, during all the thematic meetings have been having with Suffolk and East Suffolk, um, landscape officers and others. Um, and so we have specifically written into an adaptive management aspect, into the outline and landscape ecology management plans, both for Kent and Suffolk. Um, and this will allow the best possible opportunity for the planting to be managed in a way that would be closely monitored, and then a reactive and responsive mechanisms in place to ensure that the management can change to reflect, where necessary, any of the potential changes in climatic conditions and rainfall.

00:03:12:02 - 00:03:22:20

So with details such as the time period of post planting be subject to approval in the lamp.

00:03:23:24 - 00:03:34:02

The detailed lamp will provide more information on how the adaptive management will be delivered, and that will cover those aspects as well as others.

00:03:34:15 - 00:03:38:08

Okay. Does, um, a Suffolk want to comment on that?

00:03:39:14 - 00:03:39:29

Yeah.

00:03:41:24 - 00:04:13:27

Uh, Nicholas Newton, East Suffolk Council, um, I mean, we're pleased to hear about the adaptive management. We have talked about this through the consultation stages, and it's something that we've developed with the other major projects that are going on in this region. So basically what we will anticipated including is that if if trees need replacing because they have failed, it will reset the clock in the liability period. So it's not a it's not a fixed end point of liability and maintenance. It will reset the clock and start again.

00:04:13:29 - 00:04:37:03

But we will also be looking keenly looking for, um, the specific wording of the planting specification we'll be looking for mulching will be looking for. There will have to be provision for artificial watering. Um, but that's as much as we can have. It is a very difficult situation. But we will we will be looking to the applicant to work with us and developing the right, the best specification possible.

00:04:38:01 - 00:04:39:28

And the applicant comment on that.

00:04:40:09 - 00:04:55:26

Ruth Markson, on behalf of the applicant, um, concur with um, what Mr. Newton saying and the as I explained earlier, the detailed lamp will provide further information on these adaptive management mechanisms.

00:04:56:02 - 00:05:06:24

Thank you. Um, I see there's another hand up, but I just wanted to move on to my next question, and obviously I'm happy to go back. Okay. And there's another one there. Thank you. Yes.

00:05:06:26 - 00:05:27:15

Thank you. Michael Mahoney from Preston Parish Council. Very briefly, there was a specific requirement, but there is a requirement in the EA two and EA one NCOs concerning replacement. And we would like to see that requirement in the ceiling DCO to the extent that it's necessary in terms of scenario one versus scenario two. Thank you.

00:05:31:05 - 00:05:33:17

The applicant comments on that please.

00:05:35:12 - 00:05:37:20

Morrison, on behalf of the applicant, um.

00:05:37:22 - 00:05:40:08

Or is that something you'd like to take away? Yes.

00:05:40:10 - 00:05:43:06

Because I'm not in a position to be responding about a.

00:05:43:08 - 00:06:02:09

Okay. So that's an action point to um, consider whether wording in relation to replacement. Effectively replacement of planting that's failed would be secured through the DCO.

00:06:02:20 - 00:06:10:27

It just said that the relevant wording is in the EA two DCO and it relates to things which fail, but also things which are diseased as well. And there's a ten year period. Thank you.

00:06:11:19 - 00:06:13:14

Yeah. Well thank you. Thank you.

00:06:23:19 - 00:06:50:26

Um, so I would just like and I'm aware that, um, Suffolk County Council want to speak, but I would like to just ask if there's, if the councils consider their scope for additional planting in this location that would assist in mitigating the impacts further. Well, I don't know whether the applicant can show. I believe this is year one.

00:06:52:12 - 00:06:56:02

Um, might be helpful to show year 15 as well.

00:06:59:18 - 00:07:07:14

Um, who would like to go first? Could we hear from maybe the county council as you had your hand up anyway?

00:07:11:02 - 00:07:27:19

Sorry. Cutting for Suffolk County Council. I mean, layering of mitigation would be useful. I'm now not fully aware how far the, uh, the DCL boundary extend here, but, um, it would certainly help to have foreground planting, I would say. Um, yeah.

00:07:28:27 - 00:07:31:00

Thank you. Did you want to make another point about.

00:07:31:03 - 00:07:53:05

Well, I wanted to make another point about the about the previous question. Um, I just wanted to point out that it's really important that the the outline lamp allows for, um, detail, the detail lamp to specify, uh, the, the adaptive, um, aftercare that we're seeking and that it doesn't. Doesn't preclude that. That would be quite important.

00:07:53:11 - 00:07:59:23

I believe there is provision in the lump already for some adaptive aftercare. Is that right?

00:07:59:25 - 00:08:00:11

Yeah.

00:08:00:13 - 00:08:02:20

Seeing nods. That's correct. Yeah.

00:08:02:22 - 00:08:03:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:08:09:18 - 00:08:18:11

Um, Suffolk County Council have any I mean, sorry, East Suffolk have any suggestions in terms of additional mitigation planting from this viewpoint.

00:08:21:08 - 00:08:24:19

And Mark Weston Smith for East Suffolk Council.

00:08:24:25 - 00:08:57:13

Um, we did we agree with the points made by Suffolk County Council and in particular, um, we're not convinced that there's a space in the order limits at this location for material new mitigation planting. But it is a point we'll take away and just reflect on and come back. Because to the extent that one can layer on further mitigation. Obviously there is um, that would be beneficial because there is scope for further mitigation, um, if possible, within the order limits.

00:08:57:29 - 00:09:05:10

Thank you. Um, would the applicant like to respond in terms of potential for additional planting?

00:09:06:04 - 00:09:38:18

Written on behalf of the applicant? This viewpoint is located on the corner of Mr. Rick's land and the Christmas tree plantation that you can see in the foreground. Um, on the edge of, um, the view there, you can see the, um, an indication of the hedgerow, hedgerow, tree planting that's being proposed. Um, we've provided a cross section at deadline three to indicate the space in the order limits there, taking into account the drainage ditch and other aspects, we consider there is space to provide a hedgerow and hedgerow trees.

00:09:38:20 - 00:09:53:23

And for the, um, consider that it's a balance in this location between providing some layering in the landscape along this section, balanced against the um aspects of the landowner challenges that were discussed yesterday.

00:09:54:02 - 00:10:02:06

Thank you. Um, I'd quite like to move on to viewpoint five if there's nothing further on this viewpoint.

00:10:07:00 - 00:10:29:08

Thank you. So again, um, I'd like to hear from the council's. I think the, um, applicant's assessed this is major adverse in terms of visual effects at year one and year 15. Probably the applicant could just show the year 15 view.

00:10:34:15 - 00:10:37:06

Thank you. And if you go back to the year one.

00:10:40:14 - 00:10:45:25

Did the council's want to comment on whether they agree with that assessment. I imagine they.

00:10:45:27 - 00:10:49:02

I was going to say if we take it shortly, I think we can agree with that one.

00:10:49:09 - 00:11:02:26

I thought you probably would. Um, so I'm moving on to whether you consider those additional planting that would help mitigate or anything else that could be done that would help mitigate this viewpoint and the effects.

00:11:04:22 - 00:11:08:02

Um, does anybody want to answer that?

00:11:08:04 - 00:11:16:20

Well, I saw Mr. Stookey, I think. Well, this cuttings now come online. I'll ask her for that view because that's obviously a judgment issue.

00:11:16:22 - 00:11:17:12

Yeah.

00:11:18:10 - 00:11:45:26

I think there's a bit of a theme developing and I might be repeating myself. Um, layering and foreground planting is, is is key. And um, it's kind of making the case for what we've been arguing for, I think is the sort of wider landscape restoration that could go hand in hand with this proposal that, you know, also with a view of a legacy, which might be a topic that we're talking about later or in writing. Thank you.

00:11:45:28 - 00:11:55:16

Okay. Thank you. Could the applicant comment on that? I'd be interested to hear whether you consider the scope for additional planting.

00:11:58:01 - 00:12:31:22

Either for the applicant. Um, I mean, I'd just like to sort of come back to the point here that the this isn't land that the applicant owns. So this is all land subject to compulsory acquisition. And obviously we had the compulsory acquisition hearing yesterday, but the tests for compulsory acquisition are high. It must be necessary. It must be a compelling case in the public interest. So we're very aware. Um, from a landscaping perspective that we've sought with the councils and with other consultees to do as much as we can to, to mitigate effects.

00:12:31:25 - 00:13:03:00

But as to whether or not we can go beyond that to deliver additional measures, Um, that would require additional compulsory acquisition powers. That does require a balance. It is not because it's not in our gift to to just say yes. Okay, this might be a this might be a minor benefit. Let's improve the landscape. Um, because we can't get compulsory acquisition powers, those grounds. And I'd also just like to say that there are other restrictions in these sites.

00:13:03:02 - 00:13:21:25

So there are existing utilities where trees can't be planted over them, particularly along the, um, 1119. So we are working in a context here where we're trying to find everything possible that we can do, but we do need to be considering this in the context of compulsory acquisition.

00:13:22:03 - 00:13:28:08

So in this case there's a the residual effect is still major. So.

00:13:31:26 - 00:13:39:07

It does beg the question of whether there is scope for additional mitigation, which I think probably might be able to be considered essential.

00:13:40:23 - 00:13:42:24

Written on behalf of the applicant.

00:13:43:03 - 00:14:21:29

And this is one that we looked at quite considerably during the pre-application stage, for all the reasons that are being discussed at the moment. Clearly, where we have residual effects of this nature, we try and do everything that we can to try and reduce them. And just to give a little bit of context about the location, from this viewpoint, it's representative of a bridleway and a local road to properties in a farm, and it's obviously a lower position looking up towards the converter station, which is shown in all of these um, visualisations in its maximum, uh, limits of deviation.

00:14:22:01 - 00:14:55:06

Now that one that is beyond a worst case, because it will never, ever be built out to that full maximum 26 meter extension across the site. So perhaps it's worth some of these just referring to rep 1296, which are the Suffolk illustrative visualizations that were prepared from a number of locations. But but that aside, and this particular location we've tried to cite, as I mentioned before, the converter station is far south and the site as possible for various reasons, some of which I explained earlier.

00:14:55:26 - 00:15:26:03

By doing that, we have looked and have brought the order limits further south quite considerably to provide a belt of woodland which will be undertaken in advance of operation to provide some early establishment. Um, the slight challenge in this location is that the land drops. It falls from where you're seeing the converter station. We, for obvious reasons, have a large attenuation on there at a lower point on the site.

00:15:26:17 - 00:15:52:13

Um, and so the planting we're proposing is working with these constraints. But, but pointing out we have taken quite a large area within our order limits that we wouldn't, which have been purely taken to accommodate planting, with the understanding we're trying to do everything we can to try and minimize where we can affect on landscape and on visual receptors.

00:15:53:02 - 00:16:02:16

Thank you. I think it would be helpful to just briefly show the the lamp. Figure one of the lamp at that point. Thank you. Um,

00:16:04:04 - 00:16:15:14

hey, Suffolk, would you like to comment on this? So I think viewpoint five is to the south east of that of the converter station.

00:16:16:26 - 00:16:49:22

Yes. Mark Westman and Smith for East Suffolk Council. Um, we agree with what Suffolk County Council has said on this. The reality is there's clearly scope for greater mitigation, but a decision was made at the time of selecting the scope of the order land and the red line not to incorporate further mitigation at this location and which heard from the applicant. Some of the competing concerns that fed into that decision.

00:16:49:24 - 00:17:27:00

But the result of that is that there is a major residual effect from this location that could have been mitigated downwards, and that needs to go forward to the overall consideration and balance on the scheme. Um, but it's not right to say they could not have sought land for mitigation, planting, um, and

compulsory purchase powers for that purpose if it is justified, if there's a compelling case in the public interest, then, um, they would have, um, likely got those powers.

00:17:27:02 - 00:17:35:19

So there was certainly further scope, but there's just been a decision made earlier in the process not to pursue that further mitigation planting.

00:17:36:24 - 00:17:41:24

Thank you. Could I hear from. Sorry. Um, sorry, Suffolk County Council.

00:17:43:13 - 00:17:43:28

Sorry.

00:17:44:00 - 00:18:19:18

Thank you. Um, it's it's already cutting from Suffolk County Council. Um, just to point out that there might also be a middle way where it doesn't have to be via, um, compulsory acquisition. There might also be landowner agreements that could be reached for additional landscape restoration. And the other point I would like to make is that this viewpoint, uh, number five, obviously isn't the only view from the south where the converter station will be quite dominantly visible as all along Stanfield Road, and then also when you go further, further south, um, up up the the valley side again.

00:18:19:20 - 00:18:27:17

So, um, again, um, a layered approach would have been welcome. Thank you.

00:18:27:28 - 00:18:29:10

Thank you. Could the.

00:18:29:12 - 00:19:09:27

Applicant. Could I just supplement that with just a small, um, um, practical point as a request? Simply this. You'll recall that when we were talking about, um, viewpoint one, the applicant indicated their intention was to provide within the order limits, some additional planting and that they would illustrate that with further cross-sectional cross-sections, which obviously we welcome that and we'll see that, etcetera. When we then came onto viewpoint for the applicant said that they considered that was scope within the order limits for additional planting, but they didn't make an offer to illustrate that with further plans or, um, cross-sections.

00:19:09:29 - 00:19:48:06

And then in relation to viewpoint five, I'm not sure that I've heard that the applicant is suggesting there is scope, but can I just put it as a point that if the applicant is going to submit further material on viewpoint one, they certainly ought to submit further material on viewpoint for and if it's practical to do so on viewpoint five and that when we get on some of your other viewpoints, the same point would carry across, but just would be helpful, I think, to all of us to see within the current order limits what the applicant thinks is, as it were, the limits of what's achievable, because that would then inform your view as to whether, in fact, the order limits have been, as it were, adequately defined or not.

00:19:48:11 - 00:19:59:06

I think my understanding of what the applicant said was that it was purely along the the 1119 that you were proposing additional planting, is that correct?

00:19:59:26 - 00:20:08:23

And on behalf of the applicant? That's correct. Other than it's to a point, it's not the entire length be 1119.

00:20:08:25 - 00:20:10:22

Because of Mr. Rick's land.

00:20:10:24 - 00:20:35:00

Correct. So actually for viewpoint for I don't think I did say that there would be additional planting. I said there's existing planting. Well, sorry, there's proposed planting that is contained within our application documents along that section, which is a hedgerow and trees. That's indicated on the visualisations. And that isn't an area that we are proposing additional planting.

00:20:35:03 - 00:20:37:18

No, but well madam.

00:20:38:00 - 00:20:40:27

We've got the recording so we can all check in due course.

00:20:41:22 - 00:20:48:01

My understanding was that they were explaining the the planting would be just out of view to the right.

00:20:48:03 - 00:21:19:00

Well, well my well sorry, my note and I appreciate it. I say we've all got a recording was that Mr. Westmoreland? Smith said in relation to viewpoint four, we do not think that the order limits would allow for more planting, to which the applicant's response was we consider there is scope. So whilst the applicant might not have been putting that forward, the applicant was asserting to you, certainly according to my note, that they considered that within the order limits there would be that scope.

00:21:19:02 - 00:21:21:09

And that's what I was saying. But can that be illustrative?

00:21:21:11 - 00:21:29:28

I think that's what what it comes down to is what the applicant can actually do, rather than what we might have understood by that. So if you could just explain.

00:21:30:00 - 00:21:51:20

On behalf of the applicant the avoidance of doubt, I was saying that the cross section that we presented at deadline three along this particular section of the B1 11 nine sorry, B11 19 um, is sufficient and wide enough to accommodate the current proposed planting, which is a hedgerow and hedgerow trees.

00:21:52:13 - 00:21:53:08

Thank you.

00:21:55:04 - 00:22:10:14

Um, and I would expect an updated Olymp and as you said, a cross section. Thank you. Um, if we could move on to, um, viewpoint 20 on app 203.

00:22:18:06 - 00:22:23:01

So this is. Sorry. Could you show me the winter view, please?

00:22:34:00 - 00:22:45:18

So this is the, um, the view from the west, from the public footpath over the famous valley towards the, um, converter station on the hilltop.

00:22:47:29 - 00:22:52:12

I think a winter view, if you've got one available, would be easier to see.

00:22:54:05 - 00:22:57:12

Thank you. Um, with the converter station in it.

00:22:57:27 - 00:23:18:19

Uh, Ruth Moritz, on behalf of the applicant, perhaps I could just come in here to explain. That is the winter view. But we provided additional photography because, yes, we've taken in the winter, but there was a crop clearly in it. The summer one has a crop that's been cut. But we also provided additional winter photography for you. Um, in

00:23:20:12 - 00:23:26:17

rep 1-298 300 which provides. Yeah.

00:23:26:23 - 00:23:33:24

So I think on this view, um, the applicant's assessment is major reducing to moderate at year 15.

00:23:34:24 - 00:23:35:17

Along.

00:23:36:22 - 00:24:02:18

Because somebody's got their microphone on. So if you introduce additional landscaping towards the top of the hill, um, either side of the access road, that might help to screen the building from this perspective. And I'd be interested in the council's views and the applicant's views on that, because it is land within the order limits.

00:24:08:10 - 00:24:10:18

Applicant if you want to go first. But yeah. Thank you.

00:24:11:00 - 00:24:21:00

Alright, so on behalf of the applicant, I think this relates to um, East Suffolk Council in the Local Impact report identified this area, a near hotspot.

00:24:21:02 - 00:24:25:28

Was suggesting somewhere a bit further south nearer the access road.

00:24:26:06 - 00:25:11:28

So there's we've we looked at this again, as in any of them, where it became quite apparent in the iterative process of design and assessment and using these as tools to see where the converter station is going to be appearing as in more prominent areas. And this is a particularly sensitive area near hurts, all in terms of the historic landscape. Um, unless you're meaning further south beyond that, um, within the layers, but within the context of the historic, um, Hertz Hall landscape, we had a lot of discussions, um, with heritage um, officers both at Suffolk and Suffolk, about the appropriate treatment, for example, of the access road, um, as it rises up to the converter station.

00:25:12:00 - 00:25:34:19

And it was very much considered that additional planting in a large woodland type form would not be appropriate and would result in adverse effects on heritage assets there. Um, and so we've looked to do as much planting as we can along the ridgeline within without compromising the impacts on the heritage asset.

00:25:35:06 - 00:25:48:06

Okay. Do the councils agree with that conclusion, that additional woodland planting along the horizon there would be harmful in terms of heritage such that there wouldn't be landscape benefits?

00:25:50:07 - 00:25:50:22

That wasn't.

00:25:52:21 - 00:25:53:06

Okay.

00:25:53:22 - 00:26:01:06

I didn't want to jump in before East Suffolk, so I was going to wait until he, Suffolk had spoken because I see they got their hand up and then I was going to ask Mrs. Cutting.

00:26:01:08 - 00:26:04:02

Okay, can I, can I hear from East Suffolk?

00:26:04:04 - 00:26:34:10

Please excuse me. Nicholas and East Suffolk Council. Um, I yes, I, we do understand the applicant's position on this. There is a degree of historic landscape pattern as well, in relation to Hertz Hall and the historic, wider estate that used to exist around it. Um, I we're not going to make a major from our point of view. A major issue of this one. Um, it's it's it's not of the same scale of concern as, say, the viewpoints.

00:26:34:12 - 00:26:37:14

We've just concerned one, four and five. Previously discussed.

00:26:38:12 - 00:26:39:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:26:42:09 - 00:26:44:08

Um, Mrs. Cutting, is it?

00:26:44:10 - 00:27:20:14

Yes, I saw it cutting for Suffolk County Council. Um, I concur with East Suffolk Council. However, I'm a little bit, you know, if I look at the the, the lamp plan view and, um, and then at the viewpoint again, I'm surprised that, you know, the, the proposed planting within the, within the DCO boundaries hasn't got more effect because, you know, it seems to you know, it it would kind of, you Yeah. There's hope that it screens it better than it shows on this view, as what I would like to say, but also, um, sort of her tool is in a is in quite a wooded context.

00:27:20:16 - 00:27:45:20

So additional woodland from this perspective would, would, would be good. But I as a council as well, I, you know, agree that there are historic landscape patterns that, you know, need to be respected. And I also just want to say that it's a this view shows how useful foreground vegetation is. Well thank you.

00:27:45:27 - 00:28:15:25

It seems to me that if it's a parkland setting, there may still be some scope for additional individual trees within the the parkland. Um, I think it's the land that was set aside for Skylark. Um, mitigation is the scope within there on the horizon for some additional tree planting, even if it's not in a woodland, but as individual trees. It might be helpful to look at the plan as well.

00:28:18:06 - 00:28:54:15

On behalf of the applicant, we looked at this section by modelling trees in our viewpoint to see exactly before we responded to the Local Impact report, specifically about area A and IT whilst affecting that area of woodland affecting the heritage asset, it also did not. Partly because of the limitations on height that we've agreed with both authorities in terms of how we're displaying a very conservative conservative height of the planting at year 15, um, did very little.

00:28:54:17 - 00:29:18:26

But I think it's important to also note that in the design, there's a design principle specifically identified around this location. And, um, it requires consideration to putting the tallest parts of the built infrastructure as far south as possible to avoid what you're seeing here in the, um, uh, full, um, limit of deviation.

00:29:18:28 - 00:29:21:15

Okay. Thank you. Um.

00:29:23:16 - 00:29:29:15

If we could just move on to viewpoint 21, app 213.

00:29:36:02 - 00:29:43:15

So again this is major reducing to um moderate. Do the councils agree with that assessment.

00:29:49:02 - 00:29:50:00

East Suffolk

00:29:51:29 - 00:30:15:08

uh Nicholas Newton East Suffolk Council um well not entirely know and and I still come back to the growth rates issue. Um but we've covered that in the adaptive management. Um, but I think moderate is quite an optimistic conclusion. I think there is still a notable risk that there will be significantly adverse effects at year 15 in this viewpoint.

00:30:18:00 - 00:30:25:15

And in terms of additional planting, would you suggest anything within the order limits?

00:30:27:03 - 00:30:38:24

I feel slightly like within order limits there probably isn't much scope. So without wishing to sound like a stark record, it comes back to ward limits and and landowner consents and what have you.

00:30:40:05 - 00:30:42:06

Okay. And the applicant.

00:30:43:02 - 00:31:13:09

All right. So on behalf of the applicant, I think what this viewpoint shows is that, um, if you move we've we've obviously taken it where there's the most open view from this particular part of the public right of way. Um, if you move further down, there are immediate trees that will provide a degree of screening and the view as you move along it clearly in different directions as well. This is a section where we've suggested that we can look at our existing order limits, and looking at some possible enhanced planting within that.

00:31:13:11 - 00:31:18:00

This isn't looking towards, um, Mr. Rick's land. Um, and so.

00:31:18:02 - 00:31:22:13

So this is over looking over the, um, be 1119.

00:31:22:15 - 00:31:26:06

That's correct. Yes. Um, yeah.

00:31:26:09 - 00:31:27:28

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

00:31:28:16 - 00:31:36:01

I was just going to say that save time. I think the county council's decision would be to concur with what the Suffolk have just said to you about those reservations.

00:31:36:03 - 00:31:52:03

That's fine. Um, I'd just like to briefly talk about the landscape character assessment in Suffolk. Could, um, a Suffolk just let me know other areas where you disagree with the applicant's assessment.

00:31:55:01 - 00:31:55:16

Okay.

00:31:56:26 - 00:32:02:21

Uh, Nicholas Newton, Suffolk. No, we are in broad agreement with the landscape character assessment.

00:32:02:23 - 00:32:03:08

Okay.

00:32:03:10 - 00:32:05:18

Thank you. Landscape effects rather than visual.

00:32:07:14 - 00:32:15:23

Does anybody else want to say anything about the, um, Mr. Bridges? Would you like to say something about the landscape character?

00:32:15:26 - 00:32:38:23

Yes. Thank you. Madam. Um, I'm disappointed that you didn't include viewpoint two in your sort of roster of views, because that is, um, down in the valley from a valley, looking straight up at that gap where the, um, the converter shed will be visible. Um, but, you know, I think, you know, you know, what Michelle, um, has said about that.

00:32:38:25 - 00:32:44:15

Is the applicant is the applicant able to show us viewpoint two? I think it will be in the Mr. Bridges.

00:32:45:08 - 00:33:16:28

Yes. So view viewpoint two, um, is on the side of the B1 one two, which is the place by which most people entering Saxmundham on the historic road will be looking at either way, also that we're going to the town, but also on the side. Um, so that gap that you can see on the horizon, um, is critical because it's wider. We're going to see more of the extent of the proposed project. And it's also right in the setting of Hertz Hall.

00:33:17:09 - 00:33:51:27

Um, so I think this this one, I don't know if it's unmitigated or not. I'm not a landscape architect, but when I'm looking at this, I'm thinking it's going to take an awful long time for those trees to grow up to, to hide that 26 meter high building. Um, I don't want to say any more about the visuals, because, um, a time is short. Um, so moving on to character. Um, I've mentioned the Frome Valley and, um, I'm pleased that the X has drawn attention to Suffolk Coastal district councils.

00:33:51:29 - 00:34:26:03

Um, documents on landscape sensitivity and, um, the landscape character areas. Um, are not going to repeat anything from there because we can read them ourselves. And Michelle Bull just drawn attention to them anyway. But I would ask you to look at this. What? They have special, um, features in the form, special qualities and features and strategic objectives and for um, landscape for Frome Valley it is, um, very special.

00:34:26:22 - 00:34:57:20

Um, it is, it is an axial, uh, northward looking view framed by the contours, which is for East Suffolk is quite rare. Um, and it is uh, you have the feature of, of, um, her tall listed building. You can see the tower of Saint John's Church. And critically, the southern edge of the settlement of Saxmundham is the historic settlement. So you have this very unusual Group around the town.

00:34:57:22 - 00:35:30:04

21st century, where you have all these things together and that elegance elevates its value. Um, the other character areas I would ask um, Mr.. To be considered is L1. That's happening in a nutshell, which goes around, um, the famous valley. Uh, we've obviously looked at the viewpoints, um, at the where they are at the moment. Um, but the point is that that structure is in good condition. It's, um, it's unspoilt, quiet and generally undeveloped.

00:35:30:06 - 00:35:52:15

So in assessing the change that is, is obviously a major one. Um, I think the, the other thing which is missing here, which may come on to later and heritage is, is character area J4, the old estuary. Um, I want to raise a point now, which, um, I've raised in all my representations.

00:35:52:23 - 00:35:56:09

So are you able to submit this in writing?

00:35:56:11 - 00:35:57:07

Because I will.

00:35:57:09 - 00:35:58:20

I'll just say we have got a lot to.

00:35:58:22 - 00:36:32:02

I'll just mention the topic. It's the view of the project from the old estuary. Um, the p z TV plan showed that both Friston and the converter stations would be visible. But what has been submitted here with exactly the same design? The drawing does not show that. So either there's an error in the drawing or something else is going on. It was a PR role, but I think there is a whole layer of assessment which is missing from this assessment of the views and the landscape character.

00:36:32:15 - 00:36:46:06

The older, um, estuary is something that I've raised at the in the supplementary agenda, so I'll look forward to hearing from the applicant from that. Thank you about that. Thank you. Um,

00:36:48:02 - 00:37:05:06

can I just understand? I think East Suffolk has raised Concerns about the landscape mitigation planting around the River Francis Bridge, but I think it has now said that they are neutral on that. Is that is that correct? Have I understood that correctly?

00:37:06:25 - 00:37:37:23

I just had one thing on that. I mentioned the actuality of the view North. It's a very long, straight view, and it's great because it focuses the eye towards the town and heritage assets. The what will happen when that bridge and its embankments and its landscape is done? It'll be like a scalpel cutting across. It'll change that into two spaces and you'll see forever the traffic going up and down that road. And it's totally antithetical to that landscape character.

00:37:38:21 - 00:37:39:27

Okay. Thank you.

00:37:41:26 - 00:37:50:03

East Suffolk, did you. Were you raising questions about the height of the bridge and the mitigation planting?

00:37:52:04 - 00:38:04:00

I'm Mark Westerman Smith for East Suffolk Council. Now, you summarized our position correctly. We're not taking a point against the mitigation planting in this location.

00:38:04:18 - 00:38:05:25

Okay. Thank you.

00:38:07:27 - 00:38:08:17

Um,

00:38:10:12 - 00:38:21:10

I would like to come to turn to Kent now. Um, just looking at the visualizations there. So looking at VP five. First of all.

00:38:31:07 - 00:38:33:15

That's app two for one.

00:38:55:06 - 00:39:10:23

Thank you. So the assessment is that this would be moderate effect at year one and year 15. Um, I would just like to hear from Fanous if they are available as to whether they agree with that assessment.

00:39:12:18 - 00:39:24:06

Hello. Thank you. And with regard to the viewpoint, it might be helpful for me to give an overarching view on the viewpoints rather than you have to go through them separately, because I've used quite similar for each of them. Obviously you might go through them, but just to give you an idea.

00:39:24:08 - 00:39:25:05

That'd be helpful.

00:39:25:29 - 00:39:48:16

Basically, we've outlined our position within the Local Impact Report and the draft CCG, and we note that only viewpoint four is assessed as major adverse by the applicant. But the council considers that viewpoints three, four, five, six and 11 should also be assessed as major adverse at year one and 15. And so there is a discrepancy there that we've, that we've highlighted a number of times.

00:39:49:24 - 00:39:58:27

And do you consider that, um, there's scope for additional mitigation, planting or any other mitigation that could reduce those effects?

00:39:59:28 - 00:40:42:10

We have considered this, but I think, um, that we that we've looked at in terms of the size, scale and form of the buildings proposed together with the landscape and the topography, and don't really feel that there's anything more that can be done. Um, we don't feel that the mitigation that is planned or that, you know, there is any more that could be done to meet the NPS. Um, you know, in terms of the, um, the mitigation and the harm, and I think that it's been actually, um, accepted by the applicant as well, that the, you know, the mitigation can only go so far in this instance, um, just because of those factors and that I think we're in agreement that, you know, that there is there is harm that that, you know, mitigation can't can't help further, I think.

00:40:43:14 - 00:40:56:00

Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. Um. While you're there. Do you have any comments to make about the the landscape character assessment that's been carried out and the findings?

00:40:56:09 - 00:41:24:22

I do. Thank you. Um, yeah. So in terms of, um, the landscape character area taking specifically the Stour Marshes landscape character area. The applicant has assessed that there will be no residual significant adverse effect at year 15. However, we consider that impact would be significant adverse for the full duration of the project. Given, as I've said, the location and the scale and, um, you know, the the characteristics of the landscape as it stands and that that we consider that would be significant.

00:41:25:20 - 00:41:37:01

Thank you. Um, I think do you think viewpoint four is, um, shows that the view across Stour Marshes quite effectively?

00:41:38:08 - 00:41:48:07

Yes. I'd say I think we could probably look at any of the viewpoints and see that in our opinion, it's, um, significantly addressed. But I think that that's as good a visualization as any of them. Thank you.

00:41:49:11 - 00:41:53:09

Could the applicant respond on on those points, please?

00:41:53:25 - 00:42:25:02

Ruth Morrison, on behalf of the applicant, um, and the interest of time, I wonder if it'd be helpful if we provide for deadline for a specific response to the viewpoints that were have just been raised by Janet. Um, so that's three, four, five, six and seven. Um, so we will provide that at deadline four. Okay. Um, turning to landscape character in our assessment affects on the style Marsh's landscape character. So we assess that there will be significant effects at year one operation.

00:42:25:04 - 00:43:16:01

But consider by year 15, there'll be the opportunity for the planting to affect the positively, um, assist with reducing effects on the perceptual qualities of the wider, um, star marsh landscape. Um, acknowledging that the site is positioned in which I think then it agree with the least sensitive part of the wider Stour Marsh landscape, and that the landscape proposals have been put forward, in particular the planting around the northern and outer edges to provide a degree of separation and definition to what is a former marsh and the agricultural land there, relating to the existing network of woodland that surround Richborough Energy Park.

00:43:16:03 - 00:43:26:10

And on that basis, and the fact that we consider the perceptual qualities, um, the effects on those have reduced is why we consider there wouldn't be residual effects at year 15.

00:43:26:28 - 00:43:35:16

Did you consider, um, additional planting further away from the converter stations? Could you just explain why you ruled that out?

00:43:35:18 - 00:44:10:08

Certainly. Um, so we looked, um, as part of the whole process. Where, where? How we could do that and understanding the landscape. So, um, we walked quite considerably around the network of public rights of way that exist within the wider, um, star Marsh character area and the adjacent ash levels. Um, the routes are predominantly follow the existing drainage network where there's um, degrees of riparian planting. You get pockets of kind of scrubby planting, um, in locations, but typically it's not a landscape.

00:44:10:15 - 00:44:29:29

Um, by its very nature that has kind of defined wooded or heavily planted, um, roots within it. And we felt that by doing that at a distance from the site, that that wouldn't, that would be contrary to the characteristics that would be very important to retain within the wider former marsh landscape.

00:44:30:15 - 00:44:40:14

Thank you. Does anybody want to say anything else about the the landscape and visual effects of the development in. um, in Kent.

00:44:45:09 - 00:45:10:15

I can't see any hands up or anyone here. Um, thank you for those. I would like the applicant to. I think we probably had more suggestions being made in relation to Suffolk, so I would like a detailed response to, to those and consideration for whether there is scope within the order limits for additional planting. Okay.

00:45:13:02 - 00:45:52:20

Um, turning now to the effects in Suffolk on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Um, I know we have had some additional information from the applicant on the, um, assessment of the effects on the AoNB in, um, the section 85 duty technical note. Um, Ah. EP one. Um, 121. I would just like to hear briefly from, um, the council as to whether they consider that that is now, um, an appropriate level of assessment for the effects on the OMB.

00:45:53:26 - 00:46:13:01

And Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Just briefly, the answer. No, there are still outstanding concerns about that. And we know that some further information, I think, was provided in response to your questions, in the excuse that the applicant put in at deadline three, and we'll pick up on those in our comments at deadline four. So I'm afraid it is still an outstanding issue.

00:46:13:03 - 00:46:19:07

Okay. Thank you. Um, East Suffolk, do you have any anything you wish to add to that?

00:46:20:03 - 00:46:20:25

No we don't.

00:46:20:27 - 00:46:25:28

Mark Weston Smith for East Suffolk Council. No, we don't need to add to that. Thank you.

00:46:26:00 - 00:46:59:09

Okay. I think it's probably a case of waiting for Suffolk to to make a response. And then I could hear from the applicant writing later on on that. Thank you. Um, so then, um, having regard to paragraph, um, 5.1.32 of the MPs N1, which sets out the exceptional circumstance, exceptional circumstances in which the Secretary of State may grant development consent in the AoNB.

00:47:00:13 - 00:47:18:23

Um, I would like to hear from the councils whether they think that the circumstances of Sealink could meet that exceptional test, and if not, why not? And if you would rather put that in writing at deadline for. That's that's fine.

00:47:18:25 - 00:47:30:19

I think just because of the interrelationship between that policy test and the statutory duty, I think we'd probably prefer to put that in writing so that you've actually got a coherent position rather than a yes, as it were.

00:47:30:25 - 00:47:38:00

I'd rather have that than an off the cuff. Um, does anybody else want to say anything on that on the OMB?

00:47:39:27 - 00:47:44:28

Again, very happy to to have something in writing at deadline for. Um, but Mr. Bridges.

00:47:45:01 - 00:47:48:16

Just mentioned that the alternate history are all in the OMB.

00:47:48:19 - 00:47:55:16

Yeah. Thank you. Well, I'm hopeful that the applicant will address that at deadline for as well.

00:47:57:10 - 00:47:58:01

Yes.

00:48:00:27 - 00:48:01:18

Yes.

00:48:04:12 - 00:48:05:01

Um,

00:48:06:22 - 00:48:30:05

so, um, going back to the NPS in one, um, in relation to the section 85, duty obviously sets out quite similar wording, um, to the section 85 duty. So the Secretary of State should be satisfied that measures which seek to further the purposes of the designation are sufficient, appropriate and proportionate to the type and scale of the development. Um,

00:48:31:27 - 00:49:03:22

So, um, I know in this case, the applicants put forward the acid grassland restoration. Um, and Natural England unfortunately not here, but have raised various questions about that. And I think you've responded to most of them, but I do still have some questions. Um, so I understand now. And obviously I was at the seea hearing as well that you're looking at a smaller area. The rest of the land is likely to be taken out of the order limits.

00:49:03:24 - 00:49:05:05

Is that correct?

00:49:06:06 - 00:49:10:10

On behalf of the applicant. That is correct. The six hectare parcel will remain.

00:49:10:12 - 00:49:48:23

Okay, so, um, I'm aware that there's quite intensive pig farming on the land to the, to the north, obviously separated from this from the enhancement area, as has been, you know, in the reduced size. But if the land is outside the order limits, The applicant would have no control over how that land that would be taken out would be managed. Is there a risk of nutrient enrichment from if that land were to be used for a more intensive agricultural use, such as pig farming? Is that something you've given consideration to.

00:49:48:25 - 00:50:05:03

Ruth Moreton on behalf of the applicant? It is. It's something that Natural England raised and we responded to in deadline three, responds to Natural England. And the information's contained in in there with regards to that and why we consider that that isn't a risk.

00:50:05:05 - 00:50:05:27

Okay.

00:50:07:12 - 00:50:17:29

I think my point was this land that isn't currently being used for pig farming, but could be if it comes out of the order limits. I don't think that was covered by Natural England's comment.

00:50:18:20 - 00:50:23:29

Ruth Moritz and on behalf of the applicant, we'll take that away and make sure that if it hasn't been that, we will cover it.

00:50:24:01 - 00:51:02:27

Thank you. Thank you. Um, so in terms of compensation land. And I realized the acid grassland is sort of a multifunctional compensation area, not just in relation to landscape, but, um, so the NPS in one, in paragraph 5.4.45, um, sets out that normally it's the 30 year compensation period. And I know you have responded to this to explain why, um, ten years, but I would just like a bit more clarity on that, because if it, you know, to be an enhancement and to be proportionate.

00:51:04:06 - 00:51:07:15

Is there a need for a more lasting enhancement?

00:51:09:18 - 00:51:41:05

And on behalf of the applicant, um, I think our technical note that we provided for the section 85 has a timeline within it, which indicates that there will be a period of time in which the acid grassland will be, um, will take to be fully enhanced to what can be considered a suitable sward. And then there's approximately a four year period on top of that within that kind of ten years of complete enhancement. And within that, we consider that remains appropriate in our response to the duty.

00:51:41:15 - 00:51:48:21

Um, that particular parcel of land, um, is in agreement for the ten year period.

00:51:50:14 - 00:51:59:13

Do the councils have any comment to make on the on that the appropriateness of the ten year period in terms of meeting the section 85 duty item?

00:51:59:21 - 00:52:05:13

Just briefly we do, but we'll cover those in our written comments rather than thank you with it now.

00:52:05:15 - 00:52:43:04

Thank you. That's appreciated. Um, so sorry. Just sticking with the, um, the designated landscape for one more question. Um, actually, there might be a couple more. Um, so the MP's paragraph five point 10.8 makes it clear that, um, when considering, um, the effects of projects, it relates to land outside the designated area boundary as well as inside. I wasn't really clear the extent to which you've actually considered that in in your landscape and visual assessment for Suffolk.

00:52:44:12 - 00:53:41:18

Moreton on behalf of the applicant. So talking about the setting of the national landscapes. Yeah. So the setting of the national landscape has been considered within our assessment. So that's primarily looking at the setting of the national landscape during construction will be the offshore aspects of construction activity that's been included within our detailed assessment. And then looking at the kind of other side, if you like, of the western edge, that could be considered to be the setting of the national landscape, um, which is primarily agricultural land, and that's where the HVDC cable corridor construction will work through that in terms of that activity, the machinery required and all the aspects that have the potential to affect the natural beauty indicators have been included in our assessment and further information was supplied by us at deadline three in relation to the various sub factors of the natural beauty indicators.

00:53:41:20 - 00:53:45:12

So we do consider we have fully assessed the effects of setting.

00:53:45:14 - 00:54:15:04

Thank you. I do have some more questions, but I think in the interest of time, um, on the landscape and the Heritage Coast, I will make those action points. Um, I would just like to talk about the landscape mitigation for the Kiln Lane substation. Can you please display the overlay with the landscape mitigation, um, for the SPR scheme and your mitigation, which is as 063.

00:54:23:06 - 00:54:57:20

Thank you. So for my reading of this, if you look to the north of the substation, there is less landscape mitigation planting for Sealink than there is for the SPR scheme. So I think the um, diagonal lines indicate Sealink. But if you zoom in, you can see there's quite a lot of other mitigation shown that's not included for Sealink.

00:54:58:14 - 00:55:16:04

And I'm just wondering how, therefore the Sealink consent would stand by itself, if necessary, without having the landscape mitigation planting that was obviously considered necessary for the SPR schemes.

00:55:18:06 - 00:55:25:24

If those schemes didn't come forward, that landscaping wouldn't happen because it wouldn't be in the Olympics.

00:55:27:04 - 00:56:02:04

Ruth Moritz and on behalf of the applicant. Um, this plan was obviously developed based on Speer's, um, consented landscape scheme, which has considerably evolved since that point. Um, it's understandably a little bit complicated of a plan to read. Um, and some of those areas are actually grassland rather than structural planting. It also includes areas of planting that SPR originally had for various aspects of their schemes, such as the ceiling and compounds that they're no longer requiring.

00:56:02:06 - 00:56:42:23

So it is really quite out of date in that respect. But what it perhaps does show is that our ceiling cables, both, um, HVAC and the DC cables, would only could weave their way through the planting without without particular interfaces other than on that eastern edge. What we are proposing to do for deadline

for is submitting a plan which updates our figure five in the Suffolk o lamp, which um reflects SBA's um submitted, recently submitted landscape master plan for the site.

00:56:43:06 - 00:57:05:11

Um and consider that that that would be um if c link was to construct um the substation. That is what we would be using. It will obviously show how our cables can successfully work with the planting, with a difference in species to be proposed. Um, rather than affecting any aspect of their function.

00:57:05:13 - 00:57:41:16

It's not so much the interaction, although clearly that is an issue, but it just seems to me that there's planting that would only happen if the SPR consents happened and wouldn't happen based on this. So, for example, the new access off to the West Sea link planting is only shown on the south side of that. The solid green line is SPR, but there's no equivalent for Sealink. And then if you look to the north west or yeah, west, you've got lines of trees going across.

00:57:41:18 - 00:57:50:16

Well they're only shown for SPR, not for Sea Link. So I just don't understand why there's no mitigation in that area for Sea Link.

00:57:54:01 - 00:57:56:09

Is that something you want to take away or.

00:57:57:00 - 00:58:01:22

Mum. Thank you, Sarah, for the applicant. I think at this point, yes, I think there probably is.

00:58:01:29 - 00:58:03:07

I just wanted to explain.

00:58:03:09 - 00:58:06:25

I've understood the question. No, no. Completely understood the point. Um.

00:58:07:11 - 00:58:11:16

We need to plan for a scenario where SPR. Yeah. For some reason, didn't happen.

00:58:11:21 - 00:58:18:28

Completely understood. And I'm sure there's an answer, but it's just getting lost in translation at the moment. We'll take that back. Thank you.

00:58:20:27 - 00:58:23:23

Yeah. That's fine. Um, Mr. Mahoney?

00:58:23:25 - 00:58:55:09

Yes. Very briefly. Thank you. Michael Mani from the Preston Parish Council. I mean, you know, our overall view on what's going on with landscape mitigation. Preston substation. I mean, I think we're trying to hit a moving target here. I mean, I want it to be clear because there is the discharge requirement process, and the landscape management plan is quite an advanced state. It's my

understanding, and it may be that Esk would like to comment on this, but I think I heard that whatever is being approved now for the SPR scheme will be taken by National Grid and used as their plan, unless I misunderstood something, but we have clarification on that.

00:58:55:11 - 00:59:04:13

That's what I think I understood. I mean, my point was that there's a big mismatch on this plan, but thank you. Yeah, I think I think you're going to go away.

00:59:04:15 - 00:59:05:04

And we've got it.

00:59:05:06 - 00:59:05:28

Have a look at it.

00:59:06:00 - 00:59:09:07

Yeah. Completely understood all the points. Thank you.

00:59:09:12 - 00:59:17:08

Um, I can see there's another hand up and, is it ScottishPower renewables? Is that right? It's difficult to see from this distance.

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

Yes.

00:59:18:20 - 00:59:19:20

Collins and half of ScottishPower.

00:59:19:22 - 00:59:21:15

Renewables and the related companies.

00:59:21:20 - 00:59:22:22

Um, suffice.

00:59:22:24 - 00:59:27:02

To say I think, um, to understand the context, not only do you need to.

00:59:27:04 - 00:59:27:19

Have.

00:59:27:21 - 01:00:09:17

Regard to the alarms that were produced for the East Anglia project, but also the substations design principle statement, which was a additional submission. 133 in the East Anglia submission. And in effect, um, I think it's very important to understand and I think this was a matter that Mr. Martin was alluding to, is that it committed to an approach to the development of a holistic approach to the design

of the various elements of, uh, landscaping design of substations in and around the Kill Lane substation.

01:00:09:22 - 01:00:49:06

And that document essentially provided that there would be integration between the discharges of requirement 12 on detailed design of the substation, requirement 14 on the provision of landscaping requirements, 17 fencing and means of enclosure requirement 21 the Ecological Management Plan requirements, such as two public rights of way and Requirement 41 the Operational Drainage Management Plan. That document also provided a framework for how that design would be taken forward, and that included extensive consultation with local residents and local groups in and around the Kiln Lane substation.

01:00:49:08 - 01:01:22:25

And it was so detailed it was mentioning individual properties that would be engaged with in the final design process. So it is not surprising that the design which you have here is not the one that has been submitted, um, and finalized for discharge, because it's been one that's been through a process where all these aspects have been taken into account to produce a finalized design that would deal with these matters, and that is a key part of the discharge provisions.

01:01:22:27 - 01:01:53:24

And going back to the whole approach to the development of Kiln Lane, it was the response to the concerns expressed. And during the examination, the East Anglia substations, the two to the south went through design iterations to modify the design to reduce effects. The same did not happen with national grids because their design was not detailed. It was indicative and we didn't know whether it was going to be IES, GIS or what connections would be used.

01:01:53:26 - 01:02:27:12

So a worst case scenario was used to deal with that situation. In addition, the original plans also dealt with at the time of the examination, uh National Grid Ventures also raised concerns about how landscaping might influence the design, and therefore during the examination, the wings were tested against the substations, the National grid substations, to see how they could be accommodated within the design. So when you talk about sterilization, the IOMS, that is a reference to that exercise.

01:02:27:19 - 01:03:05:23

So it was always anticipated that the outline landscape plan would be developed during a design process which was heavily committed to, in and secured in terms of the DCA. Um requirement 12 five requires the substation uh designs to be brought forward in accordance with the substation design principle statement. And I just want to put that framework to you, because it then explains the way to discharge and understand that the last deadline, the applicants put forward reps at 369 at 370.

01:03:05:27 - 01:03:26:23

I'm not going to go through the discharge point. That's a matter of Suffolk Council and it sits with them at the moment. The relevance of this to this examination is it provides the context for you, considering what needs to come next in relation to the applicant's proposals. And I'm just providing a context and we will provide the full written detail at the next deadline.

01:03:26:28 - 01:03:38:03

Thank you. That's much appreciated and I'm sure the applicant will want to respond to that. But maybe in the interests of time. Um, I'll move on.

01:03:38:05 - 01:03:45:22

Well, uh, sorry. Sheet for the applicant. Yes, ma'am. If that's acceptable to you, we will respond to that. But, um, by the deadline for. Okay.

01:03:45:24 - 01:03:47:10

Thank you. Um.

01:03:50:17 - 01:04:20:22

That's pretty much got to the end of my, um, questions on, um, landscape. I do have some questions about lighting, but I can put those into an action point. Um, we have decided That, um, the next section, which is also mine, is, um, about design and that could be appropriately dealt with on Friday morning with the DCO. Um, as they are DCO matters mostly. So I will hand over to Mr. Rennie. Now I apologize. Cultural heritage?

01:04:20:24 - 01:04:38:12

Yes. Sorry. It's. I'm conscious. James Burton, on behalf of seas. Um, Mr. bridges will not be here on Friday. Uh, he has, I think, a funeral I'm afraid to go through. So could he just have an opportunity to say something about design? Because he won't be able to say otherwise. Thank you.

01:04:39:26 - 01:05:11:20

Yes. Nicholas Bridges, on behalf of C's. Thank you very much, madam. The point about design, um, is what what we are looking at here. What what is in the DSD eco application drawings which are being permitted. Um, the in the submission, there are lots of very good documentary. I would like to design an access statement which explore massing and explore materials. Locations form very good, competent work.

01:05:11:22 - 01:05:43:08

And as an architect. I look at this thing. Yes. It's great. These guys know what they're doing. What's next? And then you go back to the application drawings and you see incredibly detailed, um, plan elevations, sections of all the electrical equipment and the sheds are just blocks. And that's what we saw earlier today in all the visualizations. It's just a simple block. So that affects the assessment of the landscape, the visual, the character and indeed the design. Now, I think there's so much information here.

01:05:43:10 - 01:06:16:21

National grid could put in a detailed application, which would be great for the WSA because they would know what they're controlling. Um, local authorities here know that they want documents that they can control development. I think with these documents, you will not be able to control development. I speak that as an architect for 40 years, something that I've always deal with with planners. They want to see. I want this drawing, I want this detail. I can condition it, but I know what I'm going to get here. We do not know what we're going to get. So in terms of design, I think it isn't there yet.

01:06:17:07 - 01:06:47:15

Um, the, um, National Infrastructure Commission Design Principles is a document I will refer to later in writing. Um, I think the the other thing, key thing here is the Rochdale envelope. Mr. Justice Sullivan was very clear in his judgment about this. He said that the, um, it should not be used as an excuse for not providing detail. And that's also in the inset policy about the Rochdale envelope.

01:06:47:17 - 01:07:02:09

I repeat, Mr. Justice Sullivan's judgment, and I think this is an example where National Grid could use the Rochdale envelope to try and get out of it. And we are looking to the Exa to uphold all the policy that covers this.

01:07:02:14 - 01:07:27:01

And thank you. That's really helpful. If you've got any further points you want to make. Mr. bridges, I'd be very grateful to receive those in writing at deadline for. Thank you. Um, I'm sure there's things that you would like to say about design, but we will talk on, um, on Friday about securing the means of securing design. Okay.

01:07:27:03 - 01:07:28:21

Thank you. Thank you. Ma'am. Understood.

01:07:29:25 - 01:07:33:11

Madam, can I just clarify? Have you, as it were, relegated.

01:07:33:13 - 01:07:33:28

What I.

01:07:34:00 - 01:07:42:15

Think would be the last three bullet points of agenda item nine to simply be picked up in people's post hearing submissions.

01:07:43:15 - 01:07:50:11

I will, um, make action points. Yeah, to be specific. Yeah. Thank you.

01:07:55:19 - 01:07:56:04

Okay.

01:07:56:06 - 01:07:57:07

Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

01:07:57:09 - 01:08:31:27

Um, I know it's late in the day, but this shouldn't take too long. So, um, I've got some questions here. Um, first of all, I wanted to thank the applicant for the submission of the table, which includes all the heritage assets scoped out of the ES. Uh, within library reference rep 370. Uh, it was very useful. Um, though I do have a couple of questions on this. Um, firstly, there are items listed which have been

scoped out but are described as having an adverse impact on the heritage asset from the proposals, uh, though less than substantial at the lower end of the scale.

01:08:32:19 - 01:09:01:06

An example is for asset ID 1215749, which is Buck's Low Manor in Suffolk. Um, if the applicant considered there to be a minor adverse effect, why was this not scoped in? And that would be the same not just for Butler Manor, but there's several other Cases where there's a heritage listed building where it's termed to be the lower end of less than substantial.

01:09:01:28 - 01:09:12:04

Thank you, Sarah, for the applicant. Um, so we're going to ask, um, Doctor Gillian Scott, um, who is the built heritage lead on behalf of the applicant to assist you with that?

01:09:12:06 - 01:09:12:26

Thank you.

01:09:14:08 - 01:09:48:14

Thank you, doctor. Gillian Scott, on behalf of the applicant, um, the assets that were scoped out of assessment in the EPs were scoped out due to either having no impact identified or negligible impacts identified, which is the case in the three, um, assets that you are discussing, which I believe, or the Church of Saint Mary Magdalene, Boxall Manor and Sternfeld House. So that's the reason why they were scoped out. The purpose of the environmental impact assessment is to look for significant, um, effects.

01:09:48:16 - 01:09:57:06

Um, so as we didn't identify the potential for significant effects to those assets. They were scoped out in the dead space assessment.

01:09:58:02 - 01:09:59:09

So essentially

01:10:00:25 - 01:10:05:28

negligible would be the same as the lower end of less than substantial in your view.

01:10:06:10 - 01:10:07:07

That's correct.

01:10:07:09 - 01:10:09:04

Okay. Um,

01:10:10:21 - 01:10:15:09

is Historic England here? I'd just like to get their thoughts on that point.

01:10:18:22 - 01:10:19:14

Uh, it's not.

01:10:19:16 - 01:10:28:15

A good factor for historic England. Um, I apologize. The question is, do we agree with the assessment presented by the applicant?

01:10:28:17 - 01:10:41:19

Well, the point is that there's been a few, uh, listed buildings that have been scoped out of the assessment, even though it's termed as having a less substantial impact. And I was getting a response on that.

01:10:42:10 - 01:10:42:25

Okay.

01:10:44:25 - 01:11:09:05

We understand. Well, we broadly agree with the assessment that been undertaken by the applicant, and we accept their conclusions on that. So, um, we would not have, uh. Additional comments to make on, on on the issue. We can, uh, look into that in, uh, in more detail and provide additional, uh, comments on deadline for. If that would be helpful.

01:11:09:23 - 01:11:39:11

That would be yes. It's the scoped. It's it's rep 3070. It's the appendices to um I think it was the written question responses at deadline three from the applicant. There's a list of scoped out, um, heritage assets and a description of why they were scoped out. So I'm just sort of following up on a couple of those. So it might be worthwhile if it's not going to be a comment on that list. And the reasons that would be, that would be good.

01:11:39:14 - 01:11:41:17

We'll review that list. Of course.

01:11:41:19 - 01:11:49:08

Thank you. Thank you very much. Uh, do the councillors want to have any, uh, comment on that aspect of the scoped out list.

01:11:51:15 - 01:11:53:20

Mr.. Councils or county councils.

01:11:54:17 - 01:12:08:17

So. So I think if I can just by clarity Michael Bedford's I think I think on above ground. Cultural heritage assets we generally defer to the district council. Yes. As opposed to the below ground which we have, I think a particularly.

01:12:09:01 - 01:12:09:16

Interesting.

01:12:09:29 - 01:12:15:18

Thing. So I was going to wait for Suffolk, East Suffolk to go first on this. Thank you.

01:12:15:21 - 01:12:18:08

Okay. And I thank East Suffolk Council is there now.

01:12:20:21 - 01:12:44:19

Mark Weston and Smith for East Suffolk Council. Um can I just introduce, um, Carolyn Lipman who's the senior design and heritage officer, and will it be speaking to you on this subject? But on the particular issue of, um, scraping out of assets, we are content with the applicant's position.

01:12:48:05 - 01:13:18:05

Okay. Thank you. Um, there is one other point on that which I just want to put to the applicant. Um, there are others listed. Um, I think all within the Suffolk area believe, uh, there is a rationale, given that the asset was scoped out, uh, because it was assessed as part of the consent for East Anglia A1 and A2 proposals, and as no additional impacts were predicted then, it was considered to have a neutral impact. Um.

01:13:18:07 - 01:13:25:03

However, this seems to be based on a consented but not built out development. Is this correct?

01:13:28:29 - 01:13:56:02

Jillian Scott for the applicant. Um, it is our understanding that the SPR scheme is now currently under construction and is therefore a consented and enacted scheme. And therefore, as you have articulated, we assessed whether our scheme would have any additional effect to those assets over and above the effects that were identified in the consented scheme.

01:13:56:06 - 01:14:27:14

Okay. I think what would be useful for me is to, uh, also know what sort of level of impact the ceiling proposal alone would have. Uh, notwithstanding the SPR schemes as well, whether there would be any impact from from that perspective, I understand it is consented, but um, the the first instance I want to look at what the, the ceiling proposals, what sort of level of impact that might be, it might still be not significant or less than substantial, negligible.

01:14:27:16 - 01:14:31:14

But um, uh, that would be quite useful to understand.

01:14:32:20 - 01:14:36:15

Certainly. That's something that we can take away and provide in writing, if that's okay.

01:14:36:17 - 01:14:39:08

Okay. That's very useful. Thank you very much. Um.

01:14:45:25 - 01:14:53:27

Just before. So you move on from scoping out? Yes. Mr. bridges does have something to offer on scoping out, if that's. That's appropriate. Thank you.

01:14:54:00 - 01:14:54:15

Yes.

01:14:55:04 - 01:15:34:16

On behalf of Seas, I think what's been missed here is the cumulative impact. There are so many listed buildings that are going to be whose settings are going to be affected by the proposed development, that by even by acknowledging harm at a minor level, if you put all those together, that could actually end up with significant harm to a great number of heritage assets. So it's a group value and it's a setting both key points in Historic England's guidance. The third point, I would say come back to the old history again, I'm afraid you have two listed buildings, some bottles, church I can grade two and you have Martello Tower CC grade two star.

01:15:34:24 - 01:16:07:26

These are shown on the Z TV plan as being interactive with the the visibility of both the Friston stations and also Sealink. They have not been assessed. This is a gap in the in the assessment. And again I say that this should be done even if it is proven that they are not significant. But it is. It is vital missing information because of the Heritage Coasts as well. Martello towers I have assessed the Martello towers all the way up for Historic England from um, from AA up to CC.

01:16:07:28 - 01:16:27:29

And um, I know all about this, and it is a very important part of our, our military and our historic, um, significance of the nation. And, um, I'm very disappointed that the applicant has not actually included this in its, um, its assessment.

01:16:28:25 - 01:16:47:25

Um, well, yeah, there's two things there. Um, first of all, um, just for the applicant, those those other heritage assets just mentioned. Is that something that we could get a response from you. Um, I would imagine in writing, um, to be able to, uh, respond to that.

01:16:49:15 - 01:17:13:09

Gillian Scott for the applicant, the assets that were mentioned in the estuary area are outside of the study area for the environmental impact assessment, which was defined as two kilometers from the permanent aboveground infrastructure. And that was agreed at the scoping stage with Historic England and the local authority conservation officers.

01:17:14:01 - 01:17:26:12

And nonetheless, though, if, um, as has been raised, would you be able to consider whether you believe there would be any impact on those particular heritage assets even though they're outside the study area?

01:17:28:29 - 01:17:52:23

We can take that away, but it would be an entirely desk based exercise, which wouldn't follow the methodology that we would usually proceed with as a robust methodology for the impact assessment. As we sit here now, having looked at that from a desk based situation already, I could say that it wouldn't we wouldn't be identifying an impact to those assets.

01:17:53:27 - 01:18:02:29

Well, anything like that, if you could produce that and and submit that, then I can have a look at it. And uh, with the evidence submitted from yourself sir. Okay. Thank you.

01:18:03:01 - 01:18:08:11

Sir. Sorry for the applicant. We will also consider if there's anything further we can do on that point to assist.

01:18:08:13 - 01:18:38:09

Thank you. Um, I was also going to come to, uh, cumulative impact a bit later on, but, um, I've been prompted to there, so I shall just move on a couple of questions to that one. So in terms of cumulative impact, can the applicant explain in some more detail how the combination of multiple large scale above ground infrastructure, uh, buildings would not have any significant effect on the setting of heritage impact of heritage asset. sorry, particularly in the Suffolk area.

01:18:41:24 - 01:19:17:08

Gillian Scott for the applicant. This was looked at as part of the co-location exercise and at that time, um, it was identified that actually the area that the substation is located, located in was one of the best areas, um, in terms of impacts to a broad range of multi-disciplinary um aspects of the environmental assessment. Um, and at that point in time, there was no significant effect identified in relation to cultural heritage.

01:19:20:16 - 01:19:53:28

It would from what's been submitted, we've got the cumulative impact assessment, which does cover cultural heritage. Um, what would be useful for me if that was expanded on a bit? Um, there is There is some information there, but I would I would ideally like a more detailed, um, review of the cumulative impact, if that was possible for the Suffolk area and considering the amount of buildings and things like that, and also the amount of heritage assets nearby.

01:19:54:00 - 01:19:56:18

Is that something that that could be done?

01:19:56:20 - 01:19:58:28

I think we can take that away.

01:19:59:10 - 01:20:04:16

Okay. Thank you very much. Uh, I believe there's a hand up on the Suffolk office.

01:20:06:01 - 01:20:07:07

Yes. Charlotte Fox.

01:20:07:14 - 01:20:10:14

Benton Stanfield parish council. Um, I noted.

01:20:10:16 - 01:20:11:12

You, uh, talked.

01:20:11:14 - 01:20:25:21

About scoping out of Stanfield Hall, Stanfield Church and Boxley Manor. Uh, but you didn't mention Hill Farmhouse, which actually is situated about 300 to 400m away from Sealink and is a great delisted asset.

01:20:26:06 - 01:20:32:18

Yes, I'm aware of Hill Farmhouse and that is in the s assessment. And I've got a question about Hill Farmhouse actually coming up.

01:20:32:25 - 01:21:01:27

Good. And my other point is to take Stonyfield as a whole. Um, there are, in fact, 18 um, listed assets in the village, of which 17 are listed buildings. Um, and it's like, you know, the little village of Stonyfield has been, um, been given a bad name as being a, an industrial, agricultural location. Um, without, um, it doesn't deserve that name.

01:21:04:02 - 01:21:11:03

Okay. Thank you. I understand. Um, I think there's, uh. Is it Gordon Young?

01:21:19:00 - 01:21:20:20

Uh, I can't hear you, I think I'm sorry.

01:21:21:12 - 01:21:21:27

Hello.

01:21:21:29 - 01:21:58:05

Hi. I'm Gordon young. I'm a resident of Saxmundham. Um, I would like to highlight to the examiners that, um, currently, um, National Grid is saying they don't have the information for visualizing with line link converter station, but within the current consultation of lightning, they have provided details and previously within the statutory consultation of National Grid for sailing. They have produced visualizations with the line link conversation on the same viewpoints that's been presented previously.

01:21:58:13 - 01:22:05:19

Um, I don't know whether I can actually share my screen, which actually has these viewpoints that they have produced previously.

01:22:05:21 - 01:22:27:09

Would be better to, um, maybe come back to that. And maybe if you could submit anything like that that you want to submit. Um, uh, and I think it's going to be picked up as an action point as well. Um, but I just want to keep to the questions I've got and the folks that I've got at the moment. But thank you very much. But I think if you've got anything like that, if you submit them for deadline for that'll be very useful.

01:22:27:11 - 01:22:28:17

Thank you. Okay. No we do.

01:22:28:23 - 01:22:30:29

Thank you. And Mr. Mahoney.

01:22:31:12 - 01:23:05:15

Yes. Thank you very briefly. Going back to the comments from National Grid, I didn't quite understand them because in the Scottish Power examination, it was found that the damage to the heritage assets at the substation site. Because the substation site is surrounded by listed buildings. The south, there's the grade two star church. But there it was found that the damage was at the higher end of less than substantial harm. And that was the only reason it wasn't substantial harm was because nothing was actually being demolished. So as bad as it could be without a building being demolished. So it might be helpful to look at the comments of the essay in the EA two and A1 examinations.

01:23:06:00 - 01:23:42:09

Thank you. I know there's a couple of hands up. I just want to move on a bit further. Um, there's a couple of more questions I want to raise, and some of them linked to what I've just heard. Um, uh, just to follow on from the table that were submitted with the scoped out heritage assets, which I said was very useful. Um, it would also be useful for us to have that in a similar form for the scoped in, uh, heritage assets. So we've got basically a like a gazetteer list at the moment, but it'd be good for each one just to just from a point of reference for us and just to make it as clear as possible.

01:23:42:11 - 01:24:18:27

So we know we've considered every heritage assets there as is required by the, um, Heritage Listed Building Act. Um, so basically what we've had for the scoped out. But but the same thing to be submitted for scoped in. So basically a list of the heritage assets that have been scoped in and uh, clearly what's significant. Well, if there's any impact upon the significance of the heritage asset, what that would be if there's any mitigation involved and also if possible, um, any, uh, linking with any cumulative impact, which we've been mentioning as well.

01:24:19:02 - 01:24:21:12

Is that something that could be produced?

01:24:22:23 - 01:24:35:02

Jillian Scott for the applicant, if I could just clarify, are we discussing this in terms of built heritage assets and just wondering about the non designated archaeology? Would you wish that to be.

01:24:35:16 - 01:24:41:18

At this stage? It would be the built. It would be the list of buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments.

01:24:41:20 - 01:24:43:27

Yeah that's that's certainly something that we can provide.

01:24:43:29 - 01:25:07:16

Yeah. It's just a little bit more really than what you've already submitted already. Yeah. Yeah, that'd be great. Thank you very much. Um, and just on that point of Hill Farmhouse, um, just one of you Suffolk councillor here, because I think they've commented that they feel there would be more of a

moderate adverse impact to the setting of this listed building. Is East Suffolk Council here that could provide some explanation on that?

01:25:09:16 - 01:25:25:08

Yes. Thank you sir. Mark Westminster, East Suffolk Council, there's basically two assessments where we materially differ and that's um hurtful and also Hill Farmhouse. So I'll ask, uh, Miss Everman to speak to that.

01:25:25:20 - 01:26:02:06

Thank you. Caroline from East Suffolk Council. Um, so for a hill farmhouse. We do not agree with the applicant's position. There would be no impact. Instead, we consider that there would be a moderate adverse impact. Um, we disagree with the statements that the applicant has made in their comments on our local impact reports, that views of the asset in the surrounding landscape are not a feature of its setting that contribute to its significance. Um Hill Farm is a historic farmhouse with a long standing relationship to its agricultural setting, and that setting contributes to its historic interest.

01:26:02:14 - 01:26:38:06

Um, uh, we have, uh, in the previous section on visual and landscape. We have looked at landscape 2.5. Um, in that viewpoint, just on the left side of that viewpoint is, uh, cut off from the image. Is Hill Farmhouse. Um, and, um, the applicant has provided an additional, Um, expanded view of that viewpoint in appendix one on their of their comments on our local impact report, um, which shows that Hill Farmhouse can be appreciated in context with, um, the converter station.

01:26:38:21 - 01:26:58:21

Um, and also that, um, the trees around the north of Hill Farmhouse are not quite a dense woodland that would fully screen, uh, views of the development, especially in winter. Uh, and, uh, therefore the negative impact on, um, there would be a negative impact and intrusive impact on the setting of the listed building.

01:27:01:02 - 01:27:11:11

Okay. Thank you. Um, I just want to go across to Suffolk. There's a hand raised there, and then I'll come back to the applicant just to see if you want to respond to those points, particularly about the Hill Farm house.

01:27:14:11 - 01:27:45:12

Thank you. Uh, Marianne Fellows, Arbor resident. Thank you, sir. Um, Yes, it's clear that the assessment has been underplayed by the applicant, both in terms of the the size of the study area and the importance in this historic Heritage Coast area. Um, there's 33 listed buildings within within only 500m of the order limit. Um, which the applicant hasn't really given true assessment to.

01:27:45:19 - 01:28:17:12

Um, I believe 29 are grade two and four are grade two. Star within metres of the Suffolk landfall and cable run. You have the grade one start listed Moot hall building in Aldeburgh, which again the applicant is ignoring. The whole area is known for its heritage and even if one travels along roads that are have infrastructure or meet vehicles that are clearly HGVs.

01:28:17:22 - 01:28:43:21

infrastructure project accumulated traffic that has an implication on the heritage setting. We haven't even started to talk about the harm that's caused by vibration noise. Um, you know, to the perception of the area as well. So it's very disappointing. And I would encourage you to continue with your questioning, and we thank you for your attention to this subject.

01:28:44:09 - 01:28:55:11

Okay. Thank you. Um, can I go back to the applicant then on those points? Um, hill farmers and what you just heard from Miss Fellows as well. And, uh, if you want to provide some response.

01:28:58:04 - 01:29:38:21

Gillian Scott for the applicant with regards to Hill Farm House, the impact that has been identified by a Suffolk Council, which they are termed determining to be moderate, is very much in relation to viewpoint via viewpoint five, which it might be useful to show on the screen. In that view, in that viewpoint, which wasn't identified as a key heritage viewpoint from which to form our assessment, we had agreed a separate viewpoint from the south of the farmhouse on approach to the farmhouse.

01:29:39:03 - 01:30:14:01

And but obviously we do take into consideration all available viewpoints in the information. So when the first thing that we have to do when we try to consider whether change to a view would impact the significance of an asset, is to determine to what degree that view contributes to significance. And it is our view that this view of Hill Farmhouse does not make a contribution to its significance, principally because the asset itself is not visible.

01:30:14:03 - 01:30:46:07

And that is why we provided the expanded view as plate. That's on the screen now. And that shows the asset in a clump of trees where its heritage value is not conveyed in that view. And what I would also say is where the converter station is located to the rear of the agricultural buildings. What you experience in that view currently is an absence of development.

01:30:46:09 - 01:31:00:24

It's not agricultural fields. You don't see fields in that view. So it's our view that that view doesn't convey the heritage significance of change to that view cannot impact the asset significance.

01:31:03:10 - 01:31:23:11

Okay. In the interest of time, um, if, uh, the council wants to respond further on that, um, and, uh, then please do so by the next deadline. Um, I want to move on to the archaeology work. Um, just to finish this item. Um,

01:31:25:02 - 01:31:32:25

can the applicant update the examining authority on the current archaeological fieldwork and include when this will likely be reported?

01:31:33:14 - 01:31:42:05

Um, sorry for the applicant. Um, so we're going to, um, ask Doctor Jonathan Shipley, uh, to deal with this for you. Okay.

01:31:42:07 - 01:31:48:02

Jonathan Shipley, on behalf of the applicant, um, are you interested in oral archaeology or purely the area near.

01:31:48:04 - 01:31:48:19

Friston.

01:31:48:21 - 01:31:49:07

Where we've undertaken.

01:31:49:09 - 01:31:50:12

Some recent trenching?

01:31:51:03 - 01:32:00:01

Um, I'm just interested to know what we're still waiting for in terms of what's to be submitted, particularly that within the examination period. So wider really?

01:32:00:03 - 01:32:26:23

Yeah. No. It's fine. Um, so the recent work we've carried out has been on the enclosure near Friston. We've had the interim report for that last week that has been supplied to Historic England and Suffolk County Council. And they. They're both happy with what that report, um, contains. And that will be submitted. The next deadline for and there will be a full report within about four weeks which will follow at the deadline. Deadline five. Do we have that?

01:32:29:01 - 01:32:38:13

And is there anything else we're still waiting for in terms of on site, uh, work? Um, that might be reported within the examination period?

01:32:38:22 - 01:33:08:00

Um, the only possible piece of work now is the geo archaeological work, which is being undertaken in Kent. Um, that work should be completed by the end of February on site, and the report will follow in 4 or 6 weeks, we believe. But we need to see what comes out of that. Um, and then there's also going to be some geo archaeological work on the back of the ground investigation works taking place at uh, Saxmundham in Suffolk. That work is yet to start, so we aren't too sure when that will be reported.

01:33:08:06 - 01:33:08:28

Okay.

01:33:14:11 - 01:33:17:12

Is it likely to come in before the end of examination?

01:33:17:26 - 01:33:21:24

You'd need to look at the programme and comment. I couldn't see off the top of my head.

01:33:21:27 - 01:33:44:02

Okay. Um, and, uh, in terms of the, um, geologic geo archaeological work, um, is what sort of information would that, um, provide in terms of, uh, help to the examiners authority in writing? My recommendation for.

01:33:44:14 - 01:34:12:25

The work so far has been agreed with the science advisor in historic England for Kent and Suffolk, and it consists of some kind of modeling based on the the samples being taken. Um, so provides some cross-sections through the Minster marshes for Kent in a similar situation for the Farmers Valley. Okay. The idea behind it is that kind of hopefully we'll. We'll see if there are any deposits that might require some further works.

01:34:13:07 - 01:34:18:02

Mhm. Okay. Which then would have to come at a later date then I take it. Yes.

01:34:18:04 - 01:34:28:00

Yeah. Yeah. I mean that's also covered in the overarching WSI. Um there's a, there's a section there on New York which will be developed as we find out more about it.

01:34:28:10 - 01:34:59:20

Okay. Thank you. Um, also, it's understood from the deadline three responses that it's agreed. Um, it seems between the parties, the council stock England that some archaeological investigations would happen after, uh, or if any consent is given. However, what would be the process of further archaeological significant resource was uncovered at post examination? And what about if mitigation was required after consent, uh was given.

01:35:00:12 - 01:35:34:19

Shipping on behalf of the applicant? Um, we've agreed to continue to engage with Historic England and the two local authorities. I think the general view from all parties, in their most recent responses is that they feel anything that might turn up would be it would be possible to mitigate it and develop some kind of mitigation strategy. I don't think we're expecting anything of national importance. We've done a lot of work across society. You'll have seen from the figures that have been provided and produced and the only areas that haven't really been trenched, which is trenching, that gives you the most information and are areas where we aren't proposing to break ground.

01:35:34:21 - 01:35:43:10

Really. Um, it's areas that have been put aside for ecological mitigation. Um, and yeah, that's the current situation.

01:35:45:07 - 01:35:54:16

And could I just go across to, um, Stark England and see if you've got any comments on what you've heard about geo archaeological works and anything post consent.

01:35:55:14 - 01:36:38:00

It's not a good track for historic England. Uh. Thank you. Uh, we, uh, we agree with the approach, uh, presented by the applicant. In our previous representations, we made clear that there must be a process

to, uh, actually safeguard, um, the, uh, if the event of, uh, actually uncovering, uh, some, some unexpected remains which may be of national significance, I do appreciate that it is unlikely with the level of investigation undertaken by the applicant, however, we should have that, um, that sort of safeguard, uh, in the, in the Reac or DCO.

01:36:42:03 - 01:36:47:03

So you're looking at some way of securing securing that within the Reac.

01:36:48:03 - 01:36:48:18

Yes.

01:36:48:20 - 01:36:50:06

And yeah.

01:36:50:12 - 01:37:01:08

Perhaps a yeah. Just a clarity within the out. Um, uh, outline WSI um, how how that process will be managed.

01:37:02:00 - 01:37:04:16

Understand the applicant's response on that.

01:37:05:25 - 01:37:28:05

Jonathan Shippy, on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think this is something we need to go away and just confirm after reviewing the document. But, I mean, we're continuing to engage with all the stakeholders. And if anything was to come up, that was of national significance that we had to try and avoid, we would look at doing that where possible. But I think what we're looking at is, is kind of mitigation for excavation.

01:37:32:22 - 01:37:33:07

Um.

01:37:33:17 - 01:37:34:09

I'd also just.

01:37:34:11 - 01:37:52:00

Like to draw the panel's attention to requirement 14 on on archaeology, um, where we do already have the requirements to, to prepare these written schemes of investigation, and we get those schemes agreed. And yes, within those we would have agreement on how we deal with any evidence found.

01:37:52:07 - 01:37:52:27

Okay.

01:37:53:17 - 01:37:58:24

I'm not sure we need an additional commitment in the Reac beyond that requirement.

01:38:00:22 - 01:38:08:10

Okay. Thank you. Um, just got a couple of hands up here. Um, Simon Mason, is it?

01:38:10:03 - 01:38:11:04

Yes. Um. Good afternoon.

01:38:11:06 - 01:38:13:23

Simon mason, Kent county council. Archaeology.

01:38:14:24 - 01:38:45:06

Yes. Um, in terms of the geo archaeology program, I mean that that will provide us with the significance of the very deep deposits within the former Watson Channel and the into the marshes. So we've already evaluated the upper the upper sequence of that. So it is more about the deeper deposits, which are very difficult to get to. So we would expect to have a detailed model of the, of the deposits and the significance and the chances of finding significant deposit archaeological remains within those deposits.

01:38:45:21 - 01:39:18:18

Um, mitigation would have to come afterwards and it would be very difficult. Um, other than further sampling and holding to, to do a great deal given the conditions there. Um and otherwise other evaluation works we've covered. There's been quite widespread evaluation across the scheme and the Kent and the Kent land area. And we are sort of micro sighting development to actually to get the sort of path of least resistance through the archaeology, which is rich archaeology generally around the scheme.

01:39:18:28 - 01:39:29:06

Um, if there's any additional areas come up, then we will look again at the, um, need for further evaluation trenching by imagine. It's not. We covered most of the sensitive areas.

01:39:29:27 - 01:39:33:04

Okay. Thank you. And, uh, Mr. Reed.

01:39:35:00 - 01:40:08:15

Uh, doctor Reed, please, if you would. Um, but that's all right. Um, just Christina Reed, Historic England as well. Um, I'll cover the Kent side of things. Um, it was just to reiterate that, uh, within the draft eco as a response to some of our previous comments, the deadline through submission has outlined Fairly adequately in our point of view, though this will be confirmed in writing. In due course that the appropriate consultation with Historic England will be had on the.

01:40:08:28 - 01:40:30:15

Size that will be forthcoming and any mitigation proposals that are put forward that will have controls and checks for, you know, those instances where we might not foresee more significant archaeology coming up. So we're satisfied that that it's adequately managed.

01:40:31:15 - 01:40:38:07

It's good to know. Thank you very much. So could I just on behalf of Suffolk County Council, sorry, Michael Bedford.

01:40:39:07 - 01:40:39:22

We've been.

01:40:39:24 - 01:40:40:09

Listening.

01:40:40:11 - 01:40:43:00

To obviously the debate and in very simple terms.

01:40:43:02 - 01:40:44:15

And aware of the time.

01:40:44:20 - 01:41:05:13

Essentially we think the direction of travel is fine. There are some outstanding areas, but again, we're not taking the view that anything is likely to emerge that would upset the apple cart, if I can put it that way, and therefore the processes that are already in train, we think should be sufficient to deal with the below ground matters where there hasn't yet been full investigation.

01:41:05:20 - 01:41:38:07

Good. That's positive. Um, there's, uh, one aspect, though, within Kent I just want to talk about. And it's the Ebbsfleet Peninsula multi period complex. It's a bit of a mouthful. Um, but, um, the examiner authority understands that it is currently a non designated heritage asset. Uh, but it's potentially of high value and importance um for the applicant. Can you explain what is proposed in the area of the complex. I think maybe compound hall roads potentially. And um, within the current order limits.

01:41:38:09 - 01:41:41:19

Is it possible to avoid much of that, that complex?

01:41:41:21 - 01:42:15:12

Jonathan Shipley, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yes. The area you're talking about is a large multi period site that covers that slightly elevated piece of land overlooking the Minster Marshes. Um, there's been a lot of work undertaken so far to avoid the most sensitive areas. So we've undertaken the geophysics and the trenching. The order limits there have been reduced to avoid the large enclosure at the south, which was always flagged as being an area of really high importance. Um, and this is um, Simon from, from Kent County Council has pointed out we've, we've, we've tried to route the scheme as much as possible through the quiet area of archaeology.

01:42:15:15 - 01:42:48:15

I think the positive is that the geophysics, the trenching has largely confirmed that the geophysics has shown. So we have a really good picture of what is there and what survives in the landscape there. Um, we've also agreed further areas that we are going to avoid now within the order limits. To go back to your question, I guess the works propose there will be the cable route coming through, as well as the permanent access, um, and one compound. There was going to be two compounds there, but

we've kind of moved the larger compound down to the Minster marshes to avoid the sensitive archaeology.

01:42:48:28 - 01:42:55:03

Um, and we've tried to avoid as much as possible, um, through the design process.

01:42:55:08 - 01:43:07:04

Yes. I mean, is it still likely, though, that you can't avoid it completely by the sound of it? Is there still likely to be some adverse impact as a result of the proposals within this complex?

01:43:07:08 - 01:43:28:18

There will be some physical impacts on the archaeology, and that'll be, um, all, all, um, it'll all be fully excavated as mitigation. Um, and certainly we're engaging with the engineers through the, um, to the ongoing design process to avoid as much of the archaeology as we know. But there will be some features which will be unavoidable.

01:43:29:05 - 01:43:35:02

And, um, what is the approach at the moment in terms of mitigation?

01:43:35:04 - 01:43:37:02

Then it'll be full excavation. It will.

01:43:37:04 - 01:43:37:19

Be.

01:43:37:21 - 01:43:56:11

Excavation full open and heavy excavation on the areas where we can't avoid it. But we are looking at, um, kind of limiting the working areas, um, within the order limits. So we take the, the, the kind of smallest piece of land possible. That's ongoing with two discussions with Historic England and also Kent.

01:43:56:29 - 01:44:02:20

Um, can I ask for Kent's response on what you've heard about the this, uh, absolute peninsula complex?

01:44:03:29 - 01:44:37:03

Yes. Just to clarify something, I'm Kent County Council. Um, just to clarify, I think what Jonathan's talking about there is mitigation through excavation of areas that are outside this compound of the enclosure. The enclosure itself won't be affected, as I'm aware and physically by the works. Um, there are some adjacent enclosures, Bronze Age ones, which will which are of high significance as well, in my view, which also slightly fall within the order limits. But I understand design is being looked at to try and avoid those.

01:44:37:05 - 01:45:10:03

And it's, you know, as we get some positive feedback on that. So I'm fairly confident that, you know, they can avoid physical impact on the enclosure within the sort of the outer limits. Um, you need to be

aware the enclosure itself does extend outside these fields and around the hill, but also into places like weather, these wastewater plants and the, um, absolute farm as well. So it is there's a lot of land holdings which are included under this monument.

01:45:10:18 - 01:45:39:18

But what are we. Quite good. And I was thinking about this is, um, just to, um, help sort of clarify, um, this complex, I don't know if maybe between the applicant and struggling, then maybe can council to produce some sort of overlay map or something like that, just to show what is generally thought of to be the, um, boundaries of this complex in terms of where you think they are the most important our archaeology is likely to be.

01:45:40:24 - 01:45:42:10

That's fine. We could do that.

01:45:42:24 - 01:45:43:21

Thank you very much.

01:45:44:03 - 01:45:54:08

Yes. Yeah, I agree, I think we have good records now from the previous work that's being carried out. But as part of the two five, six and the geophysics. So I think we can we can work together and provide that.

01:45:54:10 - 01:46:01:14

Okay. Thank you. And can I just ask Historic England if they got any comments they want to make? From what you've heard about the absolute Peninsula complex?

01:46:02:15 - 01:46:13:21

No, no additional comments. I'm in. Mason is too quickly covered, the perspective on it, and we agree. We've been working closely together with them across this evaluation period. So we're satisfied. Yeah.

01:46:14:05 - 01:46:33:05

Thank you. And while you're there, I'm just asking as well about Richborough Fort. Obviously this is a very important historical asset for, for the UK. Um, from historical perspective, um is the key point. The final design of the converter station when it comes to the setting of this asset.

01:46:34:13 - 01:47:13:17

We've obviously identified as Chris Reade, Historic England. That's an important uh, we've obviously identified that there is a level of harm here, which has been represented within the assessment. We feel quite strongly that the final design that's chosen within the design parameters, um, will have an effect on how visible it is in the landscape, particularly from the viewpoints of the Roman fort. Um, so we're quite keen to ensure that, um, throughout the process and we understand why it needs to be an iterative one.

01:47:13:19 - 01:47:21:10

But throughout the process that the appropriate design is the, the final design, um, that comes forward. So.

01:47:22:27 - 01:47:35:19

Okay. And also you've got the amphitheater also I think is just south of it. Um, is does that sort of come into the I mean, we're talking about the fort, but is that part of the same sort of complex and same sort of considerations.

01:47:35:28 - 01:48:03:26

As it is? Yeah. So the the amphitheater part of the Roman occupation is further to the south, of course, and so looking from. But it is higher ground. So it's quite raised and so looking off the amphitheatre towards the north, past the fortifications, um, and the fortified walls that that are still extant, um, is kind of the view across. So it is it's quite a long view, but it is still a view across.

01:48:04:26 - 01:48:10:00

Okay. And just want to come back to the applicant, if there's anything that you want to comment on what you've heard there.

01:48:11:00 - 01:48:42:18

No. Sorry. Jonathan Shipley for the applicant. No. Um, I think obviously kind of what we've provided now since the original DCO submission includes the illustrated visualisations from the fort, which I think has helped Historic England, um, feel more at ease with, with a lot of impact. Um, obviously kind of the amphitheater has been touched upon. Um, I think there's still this discussion about the, the appearance of the, of the proposed development in the backdrop. But I think obviously we've agreed to have Historic England involved in the design process was.

01:48:44:16 - 01:49:17:17

Okay. Thank you. Um, we are quite late on time, so if you have got any further comments to make, um, on anything that you've heard today on any of the subjects we've touched on when it comes to cultural heritage, then please submit them in writing by deadline for um, and they will be considered in full, just the same as if you've verbally made your points today at the hearing. So many thanks and thank you for your comments today on cultural heritage. Um, and I think we're at the time now where we're looking to, uh, adjourn the hearing.

01:49:17:19 - 01:49:48:15

So may I remind you that the timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any post, hearing documents on or before deadline for which is Tuesday, the 10th of February. I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Inspector website as soon as practicable after this hearing and before we adjourn, we just like to say thanks to everyone today for their participation and their time and assistance today. So the time is now 527 and this.

01:49:48:17 - 01:49:49:04

Yes.

01:49:51:08 - 01:49:58:28

Could I just check, sir, what is happening with. I think it was item eight, wasn't it? What is the plan for that item?

01:49:59:00 - 01:50:00:21

Is that the marine physical environment.

01:50:00:23 - 01:50:04:13

Yeah, including coastal erosion, which I know we wanted to say something about.

01:50:06:04 - 01:50:09:06

Uh, we're planning to have that just before lunch tomorrow.

01:50:10:03 - 01:50:10:18

Thank you.

01:50:10:20 - 01:50:31:19

Sir. Okay. Yeah. Sorry about obviously we had to change the the agenda today just to make sure we fitted in everything we could, and we'll we'll try to. There'll be probably some further amendments as we go through, as we were saying, uh, with that. So the time is now 527. And this is a specific hearing for the proposed ceiling project is adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow. Thank you.