



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Day 2 - Part 5
Date:	29 April 2026

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

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

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

00:00:05:11 - 00:00:19:15

Thank you very much. It's, uh, 1540, and the issue specific hearing is resumed. Um, we've been having a conversation. Um, as I flagged during the break about what to do with the agenda for today. Um.

00:00:22:14 - 00:01:00:27

Clearly, we've got all of the heritage still to go and a chunk still of landscape on the agenda as well. Um, the best option that we can think of is to complete landscape today. Um, and then in terms of heritage is for our questions to put them into rule 17. Um, they're primarily to the applicant, but we do have a few questions to some other parties, mainly Historic England. Um, and for us to hear from the key parties today about their heritage concerns, if they have some, um,

00:01:02:12 - 00:01:25:29

not in an open floor hearing style. But if you have any concerns that you don't think have been addressed or answered, should I say by the applicant so far? Um, and they can deal with those in writing as well. I think that seems to be the best solution to ensure that we finish by 5:00. Um, does this sound,

00:01:27:16 - 00:01:29:04

uh, okay to people? Uh.

00:01:29:27 - 00:01:40:03

It sounds okay to us. So Russell Harris KC um, it's whatever really suits the examining authority. Um, and we'll, we'll, we'll fill in either way.

00:01:40:16 - 00:01:44:28

Thank you. Um, Mr. Bedford or any other council's

00:01:46:14 - 00:01:48:06

so selfishly.

00:01:48:08 - 00:02:25:16

Um, Mike Bradford, Suffolk county Council. Um, because, uh, the heritage section is confined to above ground matters, we were not expecting to participate much in that section. And therefore to that extent, we don't have a particular issue. But I would simply say that clearly, if there are people here who had heritage concerns, whether that is Historic England or any of the other parties, clearly they've arranged to come here today. It certainly would be fair to allow those parties who are heritage based to allow them to have at least some opportunity this afternoon given, say, the the overall agenda.

00:02:27:09 - 00:02:34:24

Yes. Thank you. I quite agree. Um, if we could go to, um, Claire Curtis online, please.

00:02:36:01 - 00:02:41:16

Claire Curtis, South Norfolk district council, I think we agree with your approach. Thank you.

00:02:41:27 - 00:02:43:26

Thank you. And Curtis.

00:02:45:26 - 00:03:02:16

Thank you sir. Curtis baby, district councillor, Mid Suffolk District Council I think we're generally happy to respond to the points that we'd like to make in writing, but, um are aware that there are members of the community, Interested parties that represent assets in the room with you, so would like them to have the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

00:03:02:24 - 00:03:04:24

Thank you. Um, miss Pearson.

00:03:05:19 - 00:03:20:00

Rosie. Pearson, pylons, East Anglia. Um, don't disagree with your approach, but we have got, um, Virginia Brewer, who we've paid for for today. Um, and obviously we have to pay for more if we need another day or more time. So if you have got questions for her, we would love it if you could ask her today.

00:03:20:04 - 00:03:21:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:03:23:03 - 00:03:49:09

Um, I'm aware, obviously, that there are people in the room as well who, um, wish to talk about, um, heritage assets directly. Um, as I said before, we we will we should have time as well to hear those concerns under this. Okay. Thank you. So if we carry on, then, please, we've, um, just to consider, uh, great. And little Waltham, um, and I will cut down my own questions.

00:03:53:21 - 00:04:01:07

Since, uh, we've answered some of them in terms of the Waveney Valley. Really? Um.

00:04:03:20 - 00:04:08:13

I have a question to Chelmsford City Council. Um.

00:04:10:14 - 00:04:23:12

In, uh, the applicant has proposed changing the three low height pylons south of the River Chelmer with two standard height pylons.

00:04:25:20 - 00:04:29:18

Um, to move them further down from windmill House.

00:04:31:11 - 00:04:35:26

Um, it was your view on whether that would reduce effects to an acceptable level.

00:04:39:11 - 00:04:40:18

Sorry, sir. I'm from Colchester.

00:04:40:20 - 00:04:44:00

I know you are sorry. I don't think, Ruth.

00:04:47:06 - 00:04:51:00

But we might have a landscape person for Chelmsford online.

00:04:52:06 - 00:04:53:27

MH, online. Thank you.

00:04:58:17 - 00:04:59:05

Michael Hirsh.

00:04:59:07 - 00:05:29:21

Chelmsford City Council. Uh, thank you sir. Um, in relation to the question, um, I think certainly the change is welcomed. Um, and it will reduce the heritage impacts, particularly on, um, non designated heritage at windmill House. Um, but in terms of the impacts on, um, the Great Wharf and Conservation Area. Um, and the other designated heritage sites in the city. Um, I don't think there will be a significant reduction in harm. Um, so it doesn't overcome our concerns.

00:05:29:23 - 00:05:30:25

It's a simple answer.

00:05:31:29 - 00:05:33:14

Thank you. It's useful.

00:05:35:27 - 00:06:12:04

Okay. And I have a question for the applicant. Um, at rep 1261. Um, the North West and South West Chelmsford Parishes group submitted a landscape assessment of the Waltham Gap carried out by Alison Farmer associates, um, which consider that it was surprising that the effect of the proposal on the churches of Greater Little Waltham hadn't been assessed. Um, from Wheeler's Hill towards Little Waltham Church. And that historic maps show that the historic landscape at Langley is extended further than the existing registered park and garden.

00:06:12:17 - 00:06:15:07

Um, I wondered what your views on that document were.

00:06:20:23 - 00:06:52:29

I'm not immediately familiar with those comments. Um, in terms of the, uh, the previous extent of Langley's, uh, park and garden, um, we have certainly considered in terms of assessment that the setting of the park and garden extends beyond the designated area. Um, particularly as it goes towards the River Chelmer itself. Um, and that is reflected in our assessment for that. Um, I think the other one you mentioned was the church and little Waltham.

00:06:53:01 - 00:06:58:15

So church at Little and Great Walter, but yes.

00:06:58:18 - 00:07:28:17

Um, so those have been considered within appendix 11.1 Historic Environment baseline report. Um app 209. Um, I think in both cases with those ones, um, our conclusion was that they sit sort of firmly within the settlements. Um, and so they're setting is, um, kind of mostly informed by their settlement location. Um, rather than having a strong relationship with the area of the project.

00:07:31:19 - 00:07:32:29

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:07:34:18 - 00:07:41:23

you mentioned you weren't familiar with the the document that I, that I stated a one two, six one. Is that correct?

00:07:43:00 - 00:07:48:29

Um, I would need to check that. Sorry. Sorry. For the applicant, I would need to check that.

00:07:49:09 - 00:08:08:04

Um, so, yeah, it's a it's a response from North west and southwest Chelmsford Parishes group. And they've commissioned a landscape assessment from Alison Farmer Associates. So I think it's something you need to respond to or to flag up your response to if you already have done.

00:08:08:09 - 00:08:14:17

Yes. If we could take that. Sorry for the applicant. If we could take that away. Um, it is possible we have responded to it, I apologize.

00:08:15:06 - 00:08:16:00

Thank you.

00:08:21:00 - 00:08:25:17

To, uh, the Chelmsford Parishes Group wish to comment at this point.

00:08:31:09 - 00:08:38:07

I'll go to, um. Miss, is that the apologies?

00:08:39:06 - 00:09:04:09

Yeah. Good morning. Can you hear me soon? Yeah. Um, Martina, I believe my colleague, uh, John Blake. I'm from Arizona farmer, and I'm supporting the, um, North and South Chelmsford group. Um, apologies. My colleague, um, my client, John Blake, was having issues. I believe he's back online, so I was subbing in for him, but he wishes to speak first. Maybe I should let him do it, if that's okay.

00:09:04:22 - 00:09:06:12

Okay, so, Mr. Blake.

00:09:13:00 - 00:09:17:22

No, he's still having issues. Is it okay if I, um, continue, then?

00:09:18:03 - 00:09:19:06

Yes. Of course. Yes.

00:09:19:12 - 00:09:54:05

Yeah. Um, so, as I said, I'm 17 frozen farmers. So, um, um, worked with her on the report. Um, the thing that we would wanted to raise in relation to, particularly the Walthamstow is, um, as it has been picked up, obviously there is impact on the CCA, but the um, on the, on the conservation areas. But the one key point that I think has been mentioned vaguely before and hasn't really been tackled in detail is the impact on the Channel Valley Valley landscape, which is the landscape contextual to the Walthamstow.

00:09:54:16 - 00:10:30:16

This was identified as a special area, as a special landscape area in the um. In fact, in the previous Great Waltham Village Landscape Appraisal and indeed in the old local plan, but more recently in the Bruntsfield Landscape appraisal, which is actual is the reference is a reference. Um rep three. Um, 1 or 5? Um, sorry, I've got a rep three, 1 or 6. Um, is the brownfield, uh, review of Local Greenspace and Value landscape, which identified the chairman values about your landscape.

00:10:30:18 - 00:11:04:21

The reason why I wanted to bring it up, um, is also in relation to methodology of the ES, which were briefly mentioned at the beginning. Uh, I think the. Yes. And the area quite rightly referred to the Landscape Institute technical note in terms of value landscape what consider value landscape outside of value landscapes. Uh, but um, it seems to fail to actually assess the impact on the more granular landscape and landscape character areas that are identified in these two, um, two documents I've just referred to you, and therefore I don't think it's a coherent is a is a very comprehensive assessment.

00:11:04:23 - 00:11:34:25

It doesn't give the full picture. Um, as such, we think there will be an impact on, uh, on a locally value landscape and therefore, um, effectively I need to apply those for all for the rule to, uh, to avoid impacts on local landscape. In terms of mitigation, um, I think that's, uh, that's all I was going to say for this. I don't know if my colleague John, in the meantime, has managed to come back on, but, um, anything else? We'll put it in writing, I'm sure.

00:11:35:07 - 00:11:41:01

Thank you. That's that's useful. Thank you. Um, if we could go now to Chelmsford City Council, please.

00:11:42:25 - 00:12:18:20

Michael Hirsh. Chelmsford City council. Thank you sir. I just wanted to come back on the point about the, um, the parish churches. Yeah. Um, Saint Martin's, um, grade two church. Uh, it's all from, um. City Council accepts National Grid's evidence in relation to its setting, uh, in relation to, um, Saint Mary's and um Saint Lawrence. Grade one church in the centre of Great Waltham. Um, there are significant views of the church tower when you approach the village from the north west along um Plessey Road, um, where the pylons would form a backdrop to it.

00:12:18:22 - 00:12:50:04

And I think those views are particularly significant in how the conservation area is experienced and how the church is also experienced in terms of the topography, where it sits in a hollow in the side of the valley. Um, and I draw your attention to view um, high 15 um e which does does show that one of the views from from Plessey Road to the northeast. I mean, there are a number of views on that approach as a kinetic experience where you approach the village and the kind of views unfold.

00:12:52:14 - 00:13:01:06

Thank you. Okay. Does anyone else wish to raise any comments about, uh, great and Little Waltham at this time? Thank you, Mr. Michelob.

00:13:02:09 - 00:13:03:04

I just want to.

00:13:03:16 - 00:13:35:01

Say a few points. If you could introduce yourself. Sorry. Oh, sorry. Charlie Macklin from Langley's estate. Um, firstly, I believe it was National Grid's always to revert back to standard height. Pylons makes consultation very difficult. In their original draft DCO document in August 25th, they still had the limit of deviation. Paragraph five states they could move it 18m. Uh, I think it was on about page 5320 something.

00:13:35:12 - 00:14:18:11

Uh, sorry. I have a very sad life. Unfortunately, um, that they stated they were going to revert back to the, um, full height pylons list in the consultation feedback again, August 25th. Uh, they then they stated the reason for the variation of the 18m. In response to your questions in February. Uh, question one uh, was they need the 18m in case they reverted back. Um, they then have now said in response also on uh, your the, the uh, covering letter to um, the uh to question one that they're not going to get diagrams out until June the 10th, which I think Deadline's deadline five.

00:14:18:29 - 00:14:51:24

Um, the applicant was talking earlier about arguing about five working days. Surely nine months is quite a good deadline. Like it's unfair and asked. We're trying to get soil samples and stuff done as farmers. We're trying to actually, I've got to spend a lot of my time. They get paid to search through all the documents. I do not, and it's just becoming very unfair on that point. Another point they do argue. Um, we've got grade one listed. Langley's. They're arguing that trees are a good screening method for it.

00:14:51:29 - 00:15:22:07

Uh, a lot of the trees are currently talking about are cricket bat willows. These are a commercial crop. They're not just planted trees for visualization. They have about 10 to 15 year lifecycle, and then they're cut down. And at the moment, the majority of them are quite mature, getting close to cutting down, which will suddenly have a significant effect on the change of it, which I think is they're they're cricket bat willows. They're regarded no different to us as wheat in the ground, not like planting oak trees or something.

00:15:22:25 - 00:15:54:15

Um, so it'd be interesting to see what the applicant, uh, says about that. Uh, again, a lot of the visualizations in, as I said earlier with, um, the, um, limits and five. They can raise the heights by six meters. Um, that again, does not reflect in their visualization pictures. Um, and the visualization pictures only reflect from, um, the ground floor. Langley's in its current form was built in.

00:15:54:17 - 00:16:25:04

I think it was about 1719. It's a three story house that's 18m tall. That taking a picture from the ground floor and saying it's got very significant, very insignificant effect does not contribute to the size of the house and to that's from one view. It's three storeys up from the second and third floor. You will always be able to see them. I put the drone out on the lines the other day, about 40m, roughly where the drones and I could see clearly into the garden. You'd see them from the walled garden.

00:16:25:06 - 00:16:57:09

You'd see them from wherever you are in the house. There is no mitigating it. And in Historic England's, um, words they have. Um. They have said that there would be a number of high value heritage assets that would experience a significant effect from the erosion of rural landscape at this location, and that is talking about the whole area of the great little wolf and Gap. Um, we have tried going talking about alternatives. So you've got the great wolf and alternative that was dismissed very quickly.

00:16:57:23 - 00:17:36:13

Um, I just want to point out by pushing for this. It is not NIMBYism because it actually affects us greater as, um, landowners, and we'd end up with more pylons from this route. But we are looking at it to try and push the pylons away from not just the grade one listed, Langley's or the parkland or the church or anything like that. It's all the other grade two listed houses all down little Wolfram. It would just affect such a significant community. And by pushing it into the farmland, open farmland, it would have a lot less detrimental effect to everyone else as saying it would affect us more.

00:17:36:28 - 00:17:51:04

Which so just is just pushing these points because it's, um. Everything seems to just fall on deaf ears, and we're just trying to help everyone, not just look out for ourselves. Thank you.

00:17:51:21 - 00:17:52:26

Thank you, Mr. McLean.

00:17:56:18 - 00:18:01:00

If I could ask the applicant to respond to those points, please.

00:18:01:24 - 00:18:13:04

On alternatives, Russell Casey on alternatives. I'm going to, um, pick that up. Mr. Wilson will pick up alternatives to Langley's.

00:18:14:29 - 00:18:15:16

Um, yeah.

00:18:15:18 - 00:18:48:04

I can also just talk on some of the points on limits of deviation. Just to clarify. So I think we have confirmed, um, I think in a submission deadline three, the, um, change in the pylons so that the one south of the River Chelmer are the standards. Um, there is a I think we've got in um, G.G. 34 and the against sorry, G.G. code 34, which is in the code of construction practice. Um, I will confirm the the number of that document referenced in the written material.

00:18:48:06 - 00:19:18:08

Um, there is a restriction on, um, pylon TB 136 in terms of height limits, limits of deviation. Um, and I think we've also introducing in I think it's a response to a 121, um, limits of trying to move the pylon. Now TB one for one south of the Chelmsford Road further south. So there are some changes to restrict, um, the, the effects and the arising from those pylons.

00:19:18:10 - 00:19:49:02

Um, in terms of the sorry, in terms of the routing of the alternatives, we've previously identified the, um, the route to the The west of the Waltons again. Sort of. Midway between Great Waltham and Plessy. Um, that's, uh, reviewed and set out in the design development report app 122. Um, around section 9.2. Um, again, it's, as I mentioned on previous, um, uh, sort of responses.

00:19:49:04 - 00:20:12:27

The the alternatives are not, um, devoid of their own effects. And, um, we've taken a view that this route is not unacceptable. Um, and this is the one that we, we, we prefer. So those are alternatives. And there are other, um, arrangements that have been looked at, but those are reported and considered less preferred.

00:20:19:22 - 00:20:23:09

For the applicant, um, with regards to the representation.

00:20:23:11 - 00:20:55:24

That was mentioned. Um, we have responded previously on the Alison Farmer Report. Um, it's, um, I think the, the, the best option to refer to is document 8.4.1.2, which is a zero nine. Um, there's a note in there. Um, in this response, um, including the suggested routes. Um, my colleague Paul has spoken to those. We also talked about landscape, landscape, character and, um, the areas that were covered in the report.

00:20:55:27 - 00:21:33:27

Um. Also in aspects such as Broomfield Neighbourhood Plan and Writtle Neighbourhood Plan. And we've covered those off in terms of our approach to the landscape assessment. Um, we have identified significant event effects in the Chelmer Valley in response to the questions about not acknowledging the value of that landscape. Um, I'd like to refer you to, um, we have a I'll just have to lift this. I'll just have to lift this up so you can hear me. We have a landscape value assessment set out in appendix A of the Landscape Baseline and Assessment, which is app 228.

00:21:34:07 - 00:22:10:20

This sets out a consistent approach to assessing landscape value and across the entire study area. So it's very consistent. And it takes into account site observations as well as desktop research. The approach is based on guidance from Glover which is the guidance for Landscape visual impact

assessments third edition. Um, it also takes into account as I'm sorry, I've forgotten the name of the person, but the representative on the screen who talked about the Landscape Institute technical guidance note, um, which is assessing landscape value outside of designated landscapes.

00:22:10:26 - 00:22:45:26

And this defines landscape value as the relative value of importance attached to different landscapes by society on account of their landscape qualities. So the guidance notes that the landscape value can be assessed in different stages in the planning process, including as part of the LVI, which is what we've done. Each LCA or landscape character type has been systematically assessed against the value factors which are presented in appendix A are documents. Um, and this has informed the sensitivity judgment in relation to the landscape in relation to the landscape assessment.

00:22:47:11 - 00:23:11:13

Um, the approach avoids the potential for downplaying specific qualities and areas that are not designated. And this is an important point because there's talk about the special landscape area. We've taken this approach specifically. So we have a consistent approach to value whether they are currently designated or not designated. We've tried to take a consistent approach. So this has been considered carefully.

00:23:11:17 - 00:23:33:24

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. And I presume that the, uh the submission at deadline three, you'll respond to a deadline for from the parishes group, which is free 106. Yes. Okay. Thank you. Um, was there something else on Historic, I believe? Yes. Thank you.

00:23:34:05 - 00:23:43:01

Uh, Laura Bishop for the applicant. Um, yes. I was just going to respond regarding the visualizations that have been used to inform the historic environment assessment.

00:23:45:20 - 00:23:49:03

Um, so the, um.

00:23:54:29 - 00:24:35:25

Is me. Sorry. Move my screen. Um, yeah. So we've we've got a number of, um, viewpoints and visualizations, both within, uh, Langley's registered park and garden and within the surrounding area as well. Some of those have already been referred to, um, in terms of how we've used those visualizations. They've been a very important element to inform our assessment. But they are not the only, um, aspect that we consider when we're forming our our judgment on impact. Um, with respect to Langley's Grade one house in particular, um, that viewpoint was selected um, and micro sited on site, um, when we were given permission to take it.

00:24:36:03 - 00:25:08:12

Um, we accept that it is a ground level view. Um, but we have had regard to the use of the house. Um, and it is our understanding that there is no, um, sort of significant rooms designed to have kind of, uh, group functions such as, um, drawing rooms, long galleries, that type of feature that might be on an upper floor and from which views might be a significant consideration. Um, in general terms, um, so we consider that the location of that is a useful viewpoint, um, to represent the impact.

00:25:08:18 - 00:25:40:10

Um, and we think that our impact of lower lessens substantial harm for Langley's is appropriate. Um, whilst we would, we would acknowledge that there is change within the setting of that asset. We do think that there is significant kind of screening, um, not just from the cricket bat willows, but from other um built form, um, with the surrounding buildings on the estate itself, as well as the sort of mature and intentional planting of the registered parking garden.

00:25:42:13 - 00:25:58:19

Okay. Thank you. Um, just to confirm, obviously, um, Mister McLean, that we had the request to visit Langley's as part of the accompanying site inspection. Should we do intend to take up that request if it's acceptable. I think that would be useful to the examining authority.

00:26:02:07 - 00:26:04:28

I just respond to that thing a second. Langley.

00:26:05:00 - 00:26:05:16

Briefly, please.

00:26:05:18 - 00:26:36:16

Yeah, yeah. Langley's private house always been private. How? National grid. Find out what rooms we have in the house is actually quite amazing. Um, considering we don't allow anyone in it but family. Really? And friends. Um, and we've always worked with National Grid. We've never actually refused them access. If they wanted to see views, I would be more than happy to let them have views from the house. Um, but they and they just stated it was a desktop survey from the house. No one's come out, viewed anything and they've fully relied on pictures.

00:26:36:19 - 00:27:11:05

And then can I respond to just the great Wolf and alternative one as well? Um, it'd be two lines quickly, but one of the main things on, um, why they couldn't was it was going to impact the Wilderness Foundation, which are based at Chatham Green. Uh, the Wilderness Foundation also are based at Man Wood, which is probably I don't know which pile on exactly, but it'll be around TB 120 to 130, I think. So the arguing that they can't go near because it's a charity for children for the great wolf and alternative is slightly irrelevant because they go near it and their man's woods is one of their main base as well.

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

Thank you.

00:27:12:15 - 00:27:17:14

Thank you, Mr. McLean. So, anything you wish to come back on there.

00:27:19:12 - 00:27:20:04

Thank you.

00:27:39:24 - 00:28:03:02

Okay. Thank you. Um, we'd move on then to. I'd say we move on to Ingot Ingatestone. I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly. Um, Abbotsbury. Um, my question on that was solely about, uh, historic environment, so I'll save that for the rule 17 I suggested before. Um, is there anyone who wishes to talk about that area? Ingatestone and Barbara.

00:28:07:22 - 00:28:32:06

Okay. Thank you. So we'll move on to human two effects. Um, could you outline a question for the applicant? Could you outline how the residual into project effects have been arrived at and when a methodology for cumulative effects can be found? And also if there's a specific cumulative landscape and visual impact assessment if one's being prepared please.

00:28:42:02 - 00:28:43:09

Eight burrows please.

00:30:02:27 - 00:30:09:24

Perhaps while we're waiting. I know, Mr. Bell, you wish to talk about cumulative effects. Did you want to make your point now?

00:30:10:27 - 00:30:12:14

Uh, so, uh, yes.

00:30:12:20 - 00:30:57:04

I mean, obviously, oddly, throughout submissions has been trying to demonstrate the sheer volume of, um, development that's coming to the album and the cumulative effects that, that, that has. What we were concerned about, um, in particular, um, is all set out in our submissions, so I won't repeat those. But we were concerned when we saw the applicants response to your question live at 1.13, where the conclusion of the applicant's response is, um, a statement that the cumulative assessment is being reviewed and any changes to the conclusions and likely significant effects will be published into the examination.

00:30:57:21 - 00:31:40:01

Um, it doesn't appear to be a time frame, um, for that. And certainly it's something that the parish councils would want to respond to, uh, when it, when it comes in. But also it raises the question as to why. Now, late in the day, when these are not new points that the parish council has has been raising. Um, does the applicant consider that the cumulative assessment needed to be reviewed? Um, you're entitled. Um, in the parish council submission to be assessing this development, um, based on the information that was, was originally filed, and it's down to the applicant to make sure that that is all present and in order at the time.

00:31:40:03 - 00:31:51:15

And this, uh, backtracking, almost, um, that appears in response to this question causes us some concerns as to how thorough the original assessment was.

00:31:55:12 - 00:31:56:09

Thank you, Mr. Bell.

00:31:59:10 - 00:32:08:08

Uh, is it the applicant ready for the initial question or indeed. Um, to respond to Mr. Bell's comments there.

00:32:09:14 - 00:32:40:20

That's the hardest case. I'm being told. Two minutes. Unfortunately, during the move, the laptop died. Okay, the laptops got the notes, and I don't think it's fair to ask the the witness to to to extempore. Um, uh, in terms of what's just been said, I think to be fair, um, if you look at the, um, environmental statement, there are there is a chapter on, uh, cumulative assessment. Uh, we stand by that chapter. We don't think it's in any way legally deficient.

00:32:40:29 - 00:33:06:29

Uh, in terms of the answer that we gave to the question that you asked, we were seeking to be as helpful and as fulsome as we could and also bringing the cumulative assessment up to date. Um, but there's nothing sinister or inappropriate about about that. It doesn't in any way. Um, betokened the, the, uh, or suggest that the original assessment was in any way faulty, legally or otherwise?

00:33:09:14 - 00:33:09:29

Yes.

00:33:12:15 - 00:33:13:00

I'll pick.

00:33:13:02 - 00:33:43:11

I'll pick up some Oxley for the applicant. Um, whilst Kate reinstates her computer. So essentially, um, the cumulative effects are presented in document 6.17 Environmental Statement, chapter 17 Cumulative Effects, which is App 281, the assessment methodology um which was agreed for the assessment of everybody's cumulative effects.

00:33:43:13 - 00:34:14:27

So all subject areas was agreed through um the scoping report which is app 288 to app 296 and the scoping opinion which is app 297. It was also undertaken in accordance with the Advice Note on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment Planning Inspectorate 2024.

00:34:15:16 - 00:34:51:04

The assessment included both inter project and intra project cumulative effects, and we could speak to those two different types of effects if necessary. Um, in terms of the cumulative landscape and visual assessment, sorry, these notes are spread around. Um, so the landscape and visual methodology final issue a um is set out in environmental statement, appendix 13.1.

00:34:51:17 - 00:34:58:18

Um, that's AIP 227 uh document 613 A1.

00:35:01:07 - 00:35:09:29

Uh, in terms of I think you were just asking about methodology, weren't you? Or you were asking how residual effects were, um, taken account of.

00:35:10:01 - 00:35:14:21

Yeah. Um, and if there was a specific cumulative Elvia.

00:35:17:01 - 00:35:17:16

Say.

00:35:23:11 - 00:35:32:03

There is the residual effects in relation to landscape. Um, and visual are set out in,

00:35:33:19 - 00:35:44:29

uh, AP 284 um, which is appendix 17.3 into project cumulative effects.

00:35:47:16 - 00:35:48:15

Okay. Thank you.

00:35:48:17 - 00:36:14:03

And there's a long list. So yes. Um, also a couple of points to note are, um, given that the cutoff date for the cumulative assessment was, um, some time ago now just because of the lapse of time and the need to decide upon your list and undertake the assessment. The cumulative assessment is being updated and I believe that's going to be presented at deadline four.

00:36:14:06 - 00:36:14:25

Okay.

00:36:16:01 - 00:36:16:16

Uh.

00:36:16:21 - 00:36:17:06

Yeah.

00:36:17:08 - 00:36:20:07

Yeah. Kate Borrás, on behalf of the applicant. Yeah. Deadline for there'll be an update.

00:36:20:09 - 00:36:28:21

Sorry. Okay. That would be useful. Thank you. Um. Was there a response to the specific questions that Mr. Bell raised?

00:36:35:19 - 00:36:39:15

We just have a reminder of that question, please. Thank you.

00:36:43:03 - 00:36:44:24

Sorry, Mr. Bell, if you wouldn't mind. Thank you.

00:36:44:26 - 00:37:20:10

So the first point was when we can expect the revised cumulative assessment. And the second one, in summary, um, was why has the decision been taken now to review it, particularly in light of the fact that the parish councils have been raising all of these developments at various points. And does that suggest that actually the approach taken to the cumulative assessment that has already been submitted was, was, was deficient? I know Mr.

00:37:20:12 - 00:37:22:18

Harris has already answered that point, but, um.

00:37:23:17 - 00:37:24:03

Thank you.

00:37:24:05 - 00:37:33:02

I think we need to repeat that answer. See, I don't know when, um, I think we just said by deadline. 503.

00:37:33:04 - 00:37:33:19

Yes.

00:37:35:03 - 00:38:07:28

And Sam Oxley for the applicant. Just to repeat the point, um, it's not that the assessment is, uh, deficient, although there have been, um, 1 or 2, um, clarifications that we will be making when we update it. It's more a case of the fact that, uh, cumulative is an ever changing feast. And since the cumulative cut off date, which was nearly a year ago. Now, I think there has been a number of changes. And so in order to bring the assessment up to date, that's why further work is being done now.

00:38:08:20 - 00:38:12:18

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Um. Bronchitis on line, please.

00:38:15:15 - 00:38:44:16

Thank you sir. Bronchitis for baby district council. And apologies if I've missed this, but could I just ask the, um, applicant to confirm where we can find confirmation that the viewpoints for cumulative effects, uh, of the OECD, together with North Wales and five estuaries infrastructure, is consistent with those submitted by um, North Wales and five estuaries because we did have additional viewpoints added at the examination for five estuaries. Thank you.

00:38:46:14 - 00:38:47:06

Thank you.

00:38:49:17 - 00:38:50:10

Uh, the applicant.

00:38:56:14 - 00:39:36:13

Um, Rebecca Richards for the applicant. Um, in terms of our visualisations, we don't have any, um, detailed, um, cumulative visualizations. We do have several viewpoints where we identify the maximum parameters for North Wales and five estuaries with the dashed line, and we can confirm in writing which ones these are, I can't remember, off the top of my head. Um, I'd also like to note they're not part of the application documents, but five estuaries offshore wind farm deadline five document does comprise a photo montage which illustrates the proposed five estuary substation, together with the Norwich Toby project.

00:39:36:25 - 00:39:43:08

Um, that is 10.34 .32 Barn Lane. Public right of way.

00:39:45:06 - 00:40:00:03

North falls have also produced a cumulative visualisation at the onshore substation, including the Norwich Tilbury pylons, wire lines And we can send links to those documents if that's helpful. Furthermore, um,

00:40:01:22 - 00:40:30:10

yeah, the environment area for the econ is um, is also shown with the joint substations design guide for North Falls and five estuaries offshore wind farms. Um, slightly different to the photo montages, but that may also be of use to yourselves. Um, that's in the Joint Substations design guide in figures 8.17 and 8.9. And those figures really clearly illustrate the interrelationship between the substations and how, um, the landscape mitigation has been coordinated in that area.

00:40:31:14 - 00:40:38:09

Okay. Thank you. If, um, documents that we don't already have, if they could be submitted into the examination, that would be useful. Thank you.

00:40:41:20 - 00:41:08:13

Okay. If we could move on to, uh, mitigation. Um, I don't have any further questions on mitigation after the ones that we went through this morning. Um, I do have one about habitat maintenance, but I'll reserve that for either the rule 17 or for second written questions. Um, what does any do any council's wish to raise? Any other points about mitigation?

00:41:10:21 - 00:41:11:17

Mr. Bedford?

00:41:12:09 - 00:41:28:24

All I all I was going to say sorry, Michael Bedford was I thought that, um, Essex County Council, through Miss Dring, had reserved a position on compensation. Um, I wasn't going to say anything about that, but I just know that she did at that earlier stage.

00:41:28:27 - 00:41:29:20

Thank you.

00:41:31:21 - 00:41:33:24

Miss Dring, are you still with us?

00:41:35:23 - 00:42:10:14

So I am, thank you. Yes. Thank you. I don't know whether this is the appropriate point, because obviously we it was covered in some detail quite a lot earlier in the session. Um, so I don't necessarily want to kind of go back over old ground, but just wanted to kind of align ourselves with what Mr. Bedford had said earlier on about the policy position, and we think that there's potentially a gap between the. Well, the applicant's position seemed to be clearly that there was no requirement for all residual impacts to be compensated.

00:42:10:16 - 00:42:46:00

But but then also to say that essentially national policy specifies particular, um, particular impacts which would potentially need compensation. I think trees and natural landscapes were mentioned, but it seemed to us there was a sort of gap between those, those two positions. Um, so we we are concerned still that the starting point of the applicant has essentially been that landscape compensation isn't really necessary because it's not specifically mentioned, um, within kind of topic specific policies.

00:42:46:14 - 00:43:26:07

Um, whereas the, the policies that some of the policies that Mr. Bedford referred to earlier um in and one in particular 4.3.4 the mitigation hierarchy and 4.2.12 about compensating as far as possible for residual impacts are obviously points of, of general applications. So, um, we clearly think there is there is a role for that. Um, so I think we can cover this further in writing in due course, but I think it will look to provide some further detail, um, about some specific locations if we can, and look to progress that um, with the applicant.

00:43:26:25 - 00:43:41:01

Um, there's obviously discussions going, going offline about that and potentially picking up with a deadline for submissions as well. So that was all I feel like it's, you know, the moment kind of moved on. But um, that was the those were the points I wanted to make.

00:43:41:21 - 00:43:52:15

Thank you. It's appreciated. Um, does anybody else have any comments that wish to make about mitigation at this juncture. Um, one hand in the audience, please.

00:43:59:07 - 00:44:29:12

Um, Jenny McLean, on behalf of Langley's estate. Um, I don't really understand the mitigation and the fact that, um, through the Waltham Gap, my son's house are being affected. My house is being affected, Langley's is being affected. Um, and all of it says no mitigation needed. You can put a great big pile on, ruin the view from the house. Um, and National Grid don't have to do anything. Surely they could plant some trees, but they just say part of the enjoyment of some of these grade two listed houses are the views.

00:44:29:14 - 00:44:39:03

But they've destroyed the views with the pylons. So why don't we have any mitigation? It just says mitigation not needed. Am I being a simpleton? Sorry.

00:44:39:05 - 00:44:41:29

Okay. No, it's a legitimate question. Thank you.

00:44:46:06 - 00:44:46:21

Oh.

00:44:47:01 - 00:45:17:06

Sorry, just one with mitigation. Earlier they said every tree they want to cut down, they're going to hopefully plant three. Uh, can they confirm what size trees. Because if they're cutting down a 100 year oak tree, are they going to provide us with a two centimeter whip? Are they going to provide us with a two meter tree? Because that's quite a distinctive, um, definition we need. Because knowing they'll get away with giving us tiny trees which take hundreds of years to go back. Not. And so it would be helpful if they can specify age of tree.

00:45:17:11 - 00:45:17:29

Thank you.

00:45:18:01 - 00:45:19:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:45:20:25 - 00:45:25:13

I can revert to the applicant, please. Maybe a reference to the video poll.

00:45:25:25 - 00:45:51:15

Uh, Sam Oxley for the applicant. Uh, there aren't, um, specific size specifications in terms of the 3 to 1, uh, tree replacement scheme, although I believe that's going to be agreed through one of the requirements in further detail. But there are, um, specifications set out for the sizes of trees in the environmental areas. So, um.

00:45:54:23 - 00:45:56:10

So the.

00:45:56:12 - 00:46:04:29

The plant specifications are contained in an appendix. I'll give you the reference for that in a moment. Um, essentially though, um.

00:46:06:16 - 00:46:07:08

That's.

00:46:10:06 - 00:46:45:21

That's app three two for outline landscape and ecological management plan. Appendix C planting schedules. But essentially, um, it is best practice to plant trees, uh, when they're young and vigorous. Um, and the proposals for the majority of planting will be to plant, uh, transplants, WIPs. Uh, and some light standards, because essentially that's when trees are most vigorous and grow grow at their best.

00:46:45:23 - 00:47:21:12

It's fully appreciated that you can't transplant a 100 year oak, for example. Um, and nor should you. Uh. That's why. Uh, the 3 to 1 replacement scheme is provided in part to help compensate for the fact that the trees will be younger. Um, I also wanted to respond on mitigation more generally. So, um, just it's just useful to think about everything that's included in mitigation.

00:47:21:14 - 00:47:52:04

So mitigation measures are embedded into the design. So these include decisions that are made through routing and siting discussions and decisions around undergrounding rationalization of infrastructure. Um consideration of low height or other types of pylons. The mitigation also includes the environmental areas that are associated with the various substations.

00:47:52:21 - 00:48:18:06

It includes, uh, clipping the order limits in order to reduce tree loss, or to reduce the potential to move closer to settlements, for example. And it also includes the 3 to 1 replacement planting scheme. So there are a whole series of different measures which take them together or all form mitigation. Thank you.

00:48:18:17 - 00:48:32:05

Okay. Thank you. Um, we have a hand up online. Uh, Mr. Blake, I believe I know you're having some issues earlier, Mr. Blake. Um, is your point about mitigation?

00:48:40:00 - 00:48:41:28

We can't hear you at the moment.

00:48:43:16 - 00:48:46:03

If he could be unmuted.

00:48:47:00 - 00:48:48:01

He could hear me now.

00:48:48:09 - 00:48:49:02

Yes. Thank you.

00:48:49:04 - 00:49:22:01

Yes, yes. Thank you sir. John Blake, for the north and west of Chelmsford Parishes group. Um, yes. Yeah. And my apologies for the technical problems I was having earlier. Um, to answer your question, yes, it is to do with mitigation. Uh, the point I just wanted to make was that, um, we found that the, um, corridor, preliminary routing, um, and siting study, which is, um, I'm actually referring here to the appendices, which is, uh, rep one uh, 068.

00:49:22:08 - 00:50:11:28

Um, in terms of mitigation, we found this one of the reasons why we found this a very unsatisfactory, uh, document is that it didn't, um, distinguish between a scenario where mitigation was to be applied and where it wasn't. Um, particularly this was in reference to the possibility of mitigating by undergrounding the the 132 kilovolt line to the east of Chelmsford. Um, because it didn't distinguish,

it came up with, um, an assessment of that corridor, which, uh, really kind of the crux of it in landscape and visual terms seemed to be that it would be introducing a third line, um, in addition to the existing 440 and the existing one, three, two.

00:50:12:00 - 00:50:46:17

Now, obviously, if mitigation was introduced to underground, the one, three, two, then you wouldn't be introducing a third line. Um, so we felt that was a significant weakness in that document. Um, and it meant the conclusions that were drawn from it, um, then should have been revisited. Um, so given that everyone says that mitigation should be considered at a very early stage. Uh, we felt that the conclusions stemming from that analysis were fundamentally flawed.

00:50:47:01 - 00:50:48:05

Uh, thank you, sir.

00:50:48:13 - 00:50:55:25

Thank you. Um, I have, uh. Yes. Um. Again, please. For Essex. Thank you.

00:50:57:01 - 00:51:31:07

Thank you sir. Um, I didn't introduce myself again last time for Essex County Council. Um, just wanted to make one point about the the replacement planting of 3 to 1, uh, replacement plant planting proposal, just to flag that. As far as Essex are concerned, there are still some unresolved issues around that, um, particularly around things like veteran trees and like for like replacements. So I don't want to go into the detail of it now, but just to flag that we've still got some concerns about that, and it's something that we will propose to pick up at deadline for.

00:51:32:18 - 00:51:33:12

Thank you.

00:51:33:18 - 00:51:34:09

Thank you.

00:51:35:07 - 00:51:37:27

Is there anything in the applicant wishes to come back on? On the one.

00:51:37:29 - 00:51:52:08

Three, two to the east of Chelmsford and undergrounding. We'll deal with that in writing. Noted in terms of veteran trees and the 3 to 1, we are in discussion with both of the parties on with all of the relevant parties on that issue.

00:51:52:10 - 00:51:53:29

Thank you. Um.

00:51:56:09 - 00:52:09:19

Is there any other matters anyone wishes to raise about landscaping and visual effects? Um, I'll come to you in a second. Um, we have one hand up in the audience. If we could have a microphone, please. To the lady at the end of the front row.

00:52:28:05 - 00:52:46:15

Um, Carolyn Mason Ardley. Um, just a practical question. with all of the mature trees. Other trees and hedgerows are going to be removed. Destroyed. Are there enough trees hedgerow plantings in the country to replace it?

00:52:47:24 - 00:52:51:20

Thank you. Um. And Mr. Blake online.

00:52:56:18 - 00:53:27:27

Thank you sir. John Blake for the north and west of Chelmsford Parishes group. Um, this is a general point. Although I could hear while I was having my problems, I could hear what other people were saying. Um. And I want to just. And it is a general point, so I hope it's relevant here. Um, this was about the Alison former landscape study. Um, I heard somebody from the applicant and not sure who say that it had been responded to. Um, and our position is, is that it hasn't.

00:53:28:03 - 00:53:59:06

Um, we looked at, uh, document reference as uh 089, which is the applicant's comments on relevant representations and in the relevant section. It doesn't note that there's been this report, and then it goes on to talk about some other landscape issues. But there's been no. As far as I'm aware, there's been absolutely no proper detailed response to that document, which I also heard you saying was a very important one. Thank you for that, sir.

00:53:59:12 - 00:54:31:07

Um, and and I think that's really important. Um, unless I've missed it, in which case I'd be grateful for the reference. We haven't had a proper, detailed response to that report, and we feel it should carry a lot more weight than the initial, um, CPRS appendices. Uh, rep 01068, because it is much more direct comparison of the roots of the south and east of Chelmsford compared to the preferred routes.

00:54:32:03 - 00:54:42:15

Thank you sir. There was also one other point I would have made about the Waltham, but I'll make that in writing to avoid going back to that issue. If you. Unless you want me to make it now, sir.

00:54:42:29 - 00:54:45:00

Now in writing is fine. Thank you, Mr. Blake.

00:54:45:13 - 00:54:46:03

Thank you.

00:54:46:09 - 00:54:59:04

Thank you for that. Um, if I could just go back to the applicant, please. On the practicality point. And also, um, I don't know whether you, uh, the response to Mr. Blake. I'm not sure whether that should be in writing as well.

00:55:01:03 - 00:55:11:22

That's the Harris case. Yes, it will be. And it should be in terms of the farmer report. You've asked us a specific question in relation to it. We will ensure that we reply to it in full.

00:55:12:09 - 00:55:19:25

Thank you. Um, and the the, uh, the question from the lady in the audience about the practicalities of, um, replacement landscaping.

00:55:19:29 - 00:55:32:29

I suspect that will take a deal of working out. We'll deal with that in writing the particularly in the way it was framed. But it might be useful for the examining authority to understand what our strategy is for the 3 to 1, in any event.

00:55:34:05 - 00:55:40:11

Yes. Okay. Thank you. Yeah, that could tie in with the comments made by Essex County as well. Thank you.

00:55:42:02 - 00:56:18:04

Okay. So, um, in rather truncated form, if we can move on to, um, the historic environment. Um, as I mentioned before, um, my questions here, um, we will put into a rule 17. Um, and I think given that we have around about 25 minutes left, I think that the most appropriate form that we do now is that if I could ask for, um, concerns from interested parties in terms of the historic environment that haven't been previously raised or addressed.

00:56:18:06 - 00:56:26:23

Um, and if I could come to Historic England first, please, if they have any specific issues they'd like to raise. Thank you.

00:56:31:06 - 00:56:44:21

Thank you very much, sir. Will Fletcher. For historic England. Um, we are very happy to go to a rule 17 letter. If you have any questions. Specifically, we are here to mainly answer questions. If that was as appropriate.

00:56:44:28 - 00:57:15:15

Our primary questions for yourselves, um, which you're welcome to deal with in writing, if you wish were. Um, there are various questions within our first written questions. The responses from the applicant, um, where we referred to your, uh, written representations and it was your views on their responses, if you, like, were our main questions. Um, specifically where the applicant is disagreed with your, uh, assessment of harm weightings?

00:57:16:10 - 00:57:20:16

Uh, yeah. We can pick a pick all of that up by, um, in writing.

00:57:22:08 - 00:57:22:28

Okay.

00:57:23:00 - 00:57:31:13

Yeah, that would be acceptable. We did come with notes to respond to that, but excuse me, we could put that into writing if that would be okay.

00:57:31:15 - 00:57:32:03

That'd be useful.

00:57:32:05 - 00:57:32:22

Thank you.

00:57:32:24 - 00:57:33:10

And would.

00:57:33:12 - 00:57:34:00

You?

00:57:34:09 - 00:57:39:09

Those are the ones that the specific cites, to be clear, which you raised in first questions.

00:57:40:08 - 00:57:48:27

Um, yes. Um, I've just so I was thinking specifically about.

00:57:51:13 - 00:57:55:26

Mellis conservation area. Uh, badly. Church green,

00:57:57:15 - 00:57:58:26

little William Castle.

00:57:59:02 - 00:57:59:18

Mhm.

00:58:00:18 - 00:58:01:09

Um.

00:58:04:12 - 00:58:05:25

Fearing. Berry. Manor.

00:58:07:21 - 00:58:11:21

Ravenhill. Place. Newnes. Farmhouse.

00:58:13:08 - 00:58:13:25

Yep.

00:58:14:22 - 00:58:15:15

Um.

00:58:17:18 - 00:58:23:07

Highlands Park RPG. Um. Langley's.

00:58:26:20 - 00:58:28:12

Um, I think that's.

00:58:28:14 - 00:58:32:21

That was it. Okay. Um, a number of those raised consistent.

00:58:32:23 - 00:58:56:19

Issues about essentially the definition of setting, which you may have noticed. In fact, I'd like to add into that if I might comment on addressing temple. But again, like most cases, we broadly agree. But again, this comes up as if it's okay. We'd like to add maybe 1 or 2 extras where that issue, where there seems to be some difference from essentially the express methodology and how we.

00:58:56:21 - 00:58:57:08

Would use that.

00:58:57:10 - 00:59:01:13

Of course, that would be useful. Um, increasing temple and indeed any other assets that you wish to raise.

00:59:01:15 - 00:59:02:22

Thank you very much. Thank you.

00:59:04:12 - 00:59:04:27

Yeah.

00:59:04:29 - 00:59:05:15

Okay.

00:59:05:22 - 00:59:13:22

Um, do the, um, councils wish to raise any points about heritage assets at this juncture?

00:59:17:09 - 00:59:28:02

Not seeing any hands in the room or online from councils. So I think we'll go to uh, Virginia Brewer online for Pan on East Anglia please.

00:59:31:16 - 01:00:13:20

Hello. Thank you. My name is Virginia Brewer. I'm a heritage consultant for East Anglia. As I'm taking a view of the impact to the historic environment along the entire route of the Norwich Tilbury line. I will be talking about the overall concerns of the methodology employed by the applicant, and the flaws and failings in the process that will result in considerable harm to the heritage assets designated and non designated along the route. Rather than talk about individual heritage assets, the applicant has concluded after many years that the impact of the historic built environment along the

entire Norwich to Tilbury route will equate to less than substantial harm, as they claim that the mitigation hierarchy has been followed.

01:00:13:22 - 01:00:44:29

The applicant need not take any further measures in accordance with NPS, n1, so everything the applicant has been leading up to comes to this. Out of 8846 heritage assets that were initially identified in the five kilometre swathe. Only a handful of the total number of heritage assets will be impacted a bit. A few will be impacted slightly more, but none will be impacted enough to trigger NPS in one. Whilst I understand Historic England concur.

01:00:45:01 - 01:01:23:00

Based upon the information received to date, I understand that they have yet to agree a statement of common ground and are still in dispute over many issues. National Policy Statement Ian one confirms that notwithstanding the strong need for energy infrastructure harm, to ensure heritage assets and their settings must be clearly justified and lawfully weighed. Section 104 of the Planning Act 2008 provides that consent must be refused where adverse effects, impacts and outweighs benefits. These provisions require a balanced judgment rather than an than automatic approval where significant heritage or landscape harm has been identified.

01:01:23:14 - 01:01:56:12

We have already heard today that many believe that significant landscape harm will be core to the Cone Valley and other areas and pylons. East Anglia believe that significant harm will be caused to a substantial number of heritage assets. Also, when assessed against Historic England guidance. Ian one confirms that indirect and setting harm must be assessed and justified, and accepts that infrastructure can alter the way that heritage is experienced, not just seen. Ian. One also requires that assessments of heritage assets to be fit for purpose and transparent.

01:01:56:14 - 01:02:27:25

It does not endorse formulaic matrices where these obscure professional judgment which pylons East Anglia believe has been in the case here. We would also challenge how the settings assessments have been undertaken within the if and provided in previous historic environment assessments, and believe that significant harm is caused by the cumulative effect of the tall and linear infrastructure on numerous heritage assets, which have either been inaccurately assessed and have often been scoped out from assessment altogether.

01:02:28:22 - 01:03:04:00

With regards to the level of harm, the applicant states that there is no direct impact of the project on any designated heritage asset. All relevant impacts are indirect impacts. This consequently scopes out all NDAs which are directly impacted by the project, of which there are many. Together with buried archaeology, which has not been designated, I would like to point out that in one states that non designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are of demonstrably equivalent significance of scheduled monuments should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets.

01:03:04:10 - 01:03:40:13

The absence of designation for such heritage assets does not indicate a lower significance, or necessarily imply that it is not of national importance. Floored and Roman villa, which was razed

earlier, is one such site which will be obliterated by one of the pylons within the environmental statement. Most assets have been assessed by the applicant as suffering from lower, less than substantial harm due to slight or small changes within the setting of the designated asset. As these changes would be largely screened from the asset, or because they are at the limit of the setting of the asset.

01:03:41:00 - 01:04:18:11

Highlands East Anglia considers this methodology to be flawed, as setting depends on numerous factors which have not been taken into account. Being screened alone does not divorce an asset from its setting. It is how the asset has experienced that should be assessed. We were told that many of these assessments are therefore flawed. The applicant claims that less than substantial harm is assessed where the changes within the setting of the designated asset would be noticeable within, with little or no screening. Pylons. East Anglia argued that this may be the case from one kilometre away, but the tool and linear infrastructure would be far more noticeable in all cases.

01:04:18:13 - 01:04:48:23

Within the within 500m of the route, they would dominate the landscape and cause high to very high levels of harm. We were told that many of these assessments are therefore also flawed. The applicant claims that the upper, less than substantial harm is assessed where changes would significantly alter a large proportion of the assets setting. No assets within the ES have been assessed at this level. Pylons. East Anglia disagree. The changes would not need to alter a large proportion of the assets.

01:04:48:25 - 01:05:23:05

Setting the changes would merely need to be of a scale that they impact the environment in which the asset or group of assets are experienced by such a degree that they dominate the landscape and or views, and which potentially destroys the rural environment in which the assets are appreciated. Pylons. East Anglia would also suggest that substantial harm occurs in a limited number of cases as a result of direct harm to EHS, including River Hall Park and Fordham Roman Villa, and as a result of indirect harm to a key aspect of an aspect of an asset's significance.

01:05:23:15 - 01:06:00:10

The word quay is important here. This may occur where development introduces large scale, tall, vertical or industrial elements into a setting whose significance depends on openness, horizontality, or calmness, or where it interrupts principal or iconic views, which has been previously discussed in the Cone Valley, for example, that are central to how the asset is understood and fundamentally alters how a place is experienced. Dominance, proximity, scale and contrast are all critical considerations in assessing harm, which has not been sufficiently undertaken in the ES.

01:06:01:15 - 01:06:33:26

Pylons. East Anglia would therefore state that the overall assessment of less than substantial harm has not been undertaken in accordance with the methodology outlined in Ian N1. Failures to properly assess setting, particularly through disk based matrix driven approaches, are therefore not just methodological methodological issues, but policy failures. When measured against domestic policy, professional judgment must be demonstrable, consistent, and grounded in an on site understanding of place where matrices obscure rather than explain harm.

01:06:33:28 - 01:07:06:12

The conclusions are not robust. I know I've been going on for a little while, but I just like to touch. Also on cumulative harm for heritage I know we did it for landscape. Um, to assess cumulative harm, the applicant has used methodology as defined by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, which has been agreed. I know, rather than the internationally accepted heritage guidance as laid down by Icomos, which states that incremental or corridor wide change can degrade, setting to the point of serious harm, even if the individual effects appear to be modest.

01:07:07:20 - 01:07:46:28

As a result, the applicant considers that cumulative impacts to be derived from separate developments. Only Pillans East Anglia accept that there is no policy or legal mechanism that allows multiple, separate, less than substantial harms to be automatically combined into a new or higher level of harm. Both UK legislation and guidance does not treat harm to numerous unrelated heritage assets from a single development as cumulative harm in itself. Pylons. East Anglia would assert that a cumulative harm can arise where impacts combine in a meaningful way, for example through shared setting into visibility or historical relationships.

01:07:47:18 - 01:08:21:01

Historic England Guidance GPA three explains that cumulative effects arise where changes interact over time or space, such as on impacts to groups of assets that share a common setting, landscape, or historic relationship, such as those in Ardley, for example, or in Great and Little Waltham, or in fact any conservation area. A cumulative impact can also arise as a result of incremental erosion of a coherent historic environment, for example, into visible historic landscape.

01:08:21:19 - 01:08:27:13

In these cases, harm may properly be described as cumulative and should have been taken into account.

01:08:30:10 - 01:09:02:16

East Anglia would therefore attest that the scale of harm to multiple assets still matters, whilst less than substantial harms cannot be added together to create a fictional substantial harm category. The overall extent and spread of harm across many assets is a material consideration in the planning balance. The decision makers are entitled, therefore, to weigh how many assets are affected, how widespread the harm is, and whether it changes the character or appreciation of the historic environment as a whole.

01:09:03:12 - 01:09:16:00

To summarize the scoping out of vast numbers of heritage assets and the processing of hundreds more, has provided a misleading picture of the overall harm to the historic environment along the route of the project. Thank you very much.

01:09:17:24 - 01:09:20:19

Thank you, Mr. Brewer, and thank you for your patience.

01:09:22:20 - 01:09:49:25

There was a couple of other hands online before, but which they've gone down. Um, I had Mr. Cheeseman, if you still wanted to say anything. Yes, Mr. Cheeseman. Um, I should say as well, just before you speak, Mr. Cheeseman, that we are intending also to visit Flood Hall during our accompanying site inspection to, um, aid our considerations. If you have any comments now, they'll be welcome. Thank you.

01:09:50:18 - 01:10:27:04

Thank you. Sir. Um, Nicholas Cheeseman, uh, interested party. Um, I have to say, most of what I wanted to bring up was, has just been covered in general terms, but in particular relation to fraud. If you're coming to see it, that's absolutely super. One of the problems that we've had here is that we have a grade two star listed building, which is the main house and two grade two barns. Um, the applicant has taken them as individual assets. In actual fact, all three are grouped together to form an area which is effectively greater than the sum of their parts.

01:10:27:14 - 01:10:57:21

Um, and we go back to 1103 when the house was originally built. And the hall shows that it's been in continual use and it shows how people live. The barns show how people worked and the environment in which they sit in show, uh, the cohesive, cohesive, um, element of it all. And this doesn't have this hasn't been taken into account when they looked at whether or not it's substantial harm or less than substantial harm or, um, or any of their grading in that, in that respect.

01:10:57:29 - 01:11:02:21

Um, I, I'll leave it there because everything else has already been covered. But thank you for your time.

01:11:03:01 - 01:11:10:29

Thank you, Mr. Cheeseman, and thank you for your patience. I just had Mr. Hurst as well online before from South Norfolk, I believe.

01:11:11:23 - 01:11:14:04

Uh, Michael Hurst, Chelmsford City Council, sir.

01:11:14:06 - 01:11:16:04

I do apologise. Chelmsford. Sorry.

01:11:16:07 - 01:11:50:11

Okay. Um, I was just going to raise a point about non designated heritage assets and the, the applicant's approach to assessing those because they're, they're largely sort of disregarded in the assessment. Um, I mean in our local impact report, we've identified 51 um, non designated charities within Chelmsford, um, eight of which we've identified significant effects. Um, the approach um, by the applicant is largely to, to disregard those on the basis that they're um, generally of low, um, value.

01:11:50:24 - 01:12:20:21

Um, therefore it is unlikely to be significant effects. Um, but, you know, applying the the matrix approach, if you've got a low value asset and there's a high level of impact. And obviously you can in certain substances have different effects, but also in the spirit of, um, M1. Um, you know, all the, the

heritage homes and all designated heritage asset should also be, you know, taken into account in the assessment.

01:12:22:07 - 01:12:23:01

Thank you.

01:12:25:13 - 01:12:32:28

Um, if we could have a roving mic, please, from the case team for, um, for Mister Buxton table over here.

01:12:46:29 - 01:12:48:13

Not sure if he's turned on. Sorry.

01:12:49:15 - 01:12:50:04

I've got it.

01:13:01:12 - 01:13:02:04

Is that better?

01:13:02:06 - 01:13:02:29

That is. Thank you.

01:13:03:01 - 01:13:40:17

Oh, good. Um, Karen, I would like to bring to your attention little Wenham Castle. Um, the the site has a long history going back into Roman times. Um, and actually, just for amusement, I brought two Roman coins, which were picked up in the in the farmyard about two months ago. Um, but what we're really talking about today is the castle, which was built in 1260 and which is a national monument, so is covered by the 1979 Archaeological Act.

01:13:41:05 - 01:14:12:18

Um, which requires a high degree of attention and also covers the setting. And the setting at Little Wenham is very important because there are altogether seven listed buildings, including the castle. Um, a grade one listed church, a grade two star tithe barn, and five grade two buildings including the farmhouse, all within a few hundred yards of each other. So it's a very important site.

01:14:12:27 - 01:14:52:12

The National Planning and Policy um unit says that a national monument needs to be treated with exceptional, exceptionally high standards when judging harm. And I find it very extraordinary that National Grid apparently are setting a standard of substantial harm to a national monument, which is governed by the 1979 act and the NPF standards.

01:14:53:02 - 01:15:24:08

Um, it's very interesting to look at that. I raised earlier the importance of the viewpoint photographs, which I which I've got here. It's very interesting when you blow that up and look at National Grid's own viewpoint. Um, this the castle and also look at the top of the castle where, um, historic England say that's where you should be taking views from.

01:15:24:22 - 01:16:00:03

Um, rather than ground level, which, of course, it's in the middle of a number of buildings. Um, look, from the top of the castle where this viewpoint comes from, and you stare straight at a J 27, which is the, um, corner post. Um, and that seems to me to be absolutely in contravention of the Holford rules, but nobody seems to have noticed that. Um, And you only notice it when you actually look at National Grid's own, um, own viewpoint.

01:16:00:25 - 01:16:33:21

Um, so we've we've got a line of pylons, uh, which are clearly visible from the top of the castle. Um, it's also interesting. Whilst I'm on the subject of Historic England, that this is a point at which they apparently disagree with National Grid because their assessment is that medium harm rather than lower harm, which is what National Grid come to national grids say.

01:16:34:06 - 01:17:05:06

Uh, and I quote, the project would result in a small change to the setting of the asset, but due to the partial screening, there would be low impact on the value of the asset. Now, if you look at this photograph, you'll see that there is pretty well no screening at all. And it's unfortunately National Grid's problem that this part of Suffolk is extremely flat. And you see these 200 foot pylons, many a long, long way away.

01:17:05:08 - 01:17:46:21

And they will affect this asset. We have made some suggestions. We prepared an alternative route, um, which National Grid rejected because it would affect other properties. We suggested t pylons. There's been a discussion about them today. Um, and they they were rejected. Um, and the the most satisfactory, uh, mitigation would actually be to underground further north from the ceiling end and take it up to about J20 because there are some dwellings on the way.

01:17:46:24 - 01:18:23:19

And it was interesting yesterday, um, that, um, Ray um, Raven Wings suggested doing that from the point of view of aircraft safety. So it might be just worth looking at that. Um, but I am amazed that National Grid have not taken a little when, um, Castle, a national monument, more seriously, given the statutory requirements for, uh, protection for this asset and also for the setting.

01:18:23:21 - 01:18:36:26

This setting is extremely unusual in the UK, which is why it's, it's referred to by Historic England in their written submission as highly valuable. Thank you.

01:18:36:28 - 01:18:56:06

Thank you, Mr. Buxton. And just to let you know as well that we, um, on our draft accompany site inspection. We do have little one, um, castle on that list as well, so that'd be very useful. Thank you. Um, I just have, uh, Miss Burrow online. If you if you have any brief points. Miss burrow?

01:18:56:21 - 01:19:27:09

Yeah. Sorry. I just wanted to raise the fact that I have also been to Little Wenham and undertaken a heritage, um, report there. This is a really good example of, um, of how setting should be looked at,

not just in terms of distance. Little Wenham was part of the Wars of the roses. This is 15th century. It was part of the Civil War. The whole point of this crenellated top was for people to look out over the landscape, to see invading forces.

01:19:27:11 - 01:19:48:24

It is now going to be looking out over pylons. That landscape hasn't changed for centuries. This is why setting should take in more than just distance. It has to take in historic background and other environmental, um, interpretations of what was there and has gone previously. I just wanted to add that about little one and all I could. Thank you.

01:19:48:29 - 01:19:55:08

Thank you very much. Um, so those points then, if, if the applicant could respond to those in writing.

01:19:56:27 - 01:20:05:24

Um, and I shall now, uh, pass to Miss Hunt. But, uh, thank you all for your patience and your forbearance.

01:20:08:09 - 01:20:45:17

Thank you very much, everybody. I have been noting action points, and there's been quite a few from today. Um, and I'm sure the applicant will have been noting those as well and the interested parties, but we will publish all the actions from all of the hearings this week, um, early next week, as soon as we can. And in the meantime, can I remind all parties to provide any post hearing documents on or before? Deadline for which is Tuesday, the 12th of May, and the recording of this hearing and all the hearings this week will be put on our website as soon as possible.

01:20:47:11 - 01:21:24:11

So I'd like to thank all of today's participants for their time and assistance today. It's been very useful. And just to let you all know, there will be no issues specific hearing tomorrow. There's only a compulsory acquisition hearing tomorrow. She's in Ipswich. This issue specific hearing will continue on Friday morning in Ipswich, again at Ipswich Football Club. And then we will cover items 11 and 12 on the agenda, which traffic and transport and public rights of way.

01:21:28:07 - 01:21:39:01

So the time is now 5:01 and issue specific hearing. Two on the Norwich Tilbury project is now adjourned. Thank you.