



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Part 4
Date:	29 July 2025

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.

File Length: 01:40:54

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:07:14 - 00:00:09:03

Okay. Thank you everybody.

00:00:15:16 - 00:00:53:23

It's now 325. So time to continue the hearing. It was getting a little bit warm and hot before the interval, but uh, I think there's been some measures put in, so in fact it's now feeling a little bit better. So the venue is trying its best to keep everybody as cool as possible. So we're moving back to item three A on the agenda, which is landscape visual and green belt. Uh matters. Obviously there's been a lot of material already, uh, put in writing on these matters, and I don't want to go back to points that have already been made or repeat those points.

00:00:55:00 - 00:01:34:00

The examining authority carried out a very helpful accompanying site inspection a few weeks ago, which was also very helpful to us. On this topic, we have, I think, because I want to predominantly concentrate on the effects of the substations, not that those are the only effects, but I think it's probably agreed they are the main effects in terms of landscape and visual matters. So that's what I want to talk about uh, this afternoon. And just in terms of the obviously the statements of common ground with the two relevant councils, Lancashire County Council, I think that was all yellow.

00:01:34:02 - 00:02:13:17

The the last version on this one with items being considered. And obviously we're waiting for the filed, uh, updated statement and common ground. I think we're going to get it for. So I appreciate it sort of some, some measures, some things might have moved on from what was in the previous statement of common Ground. So I will come back to that. But just a few questions of clarification from myself first. And the way I'll do it is go through landscape and visual effects, proposed landscape and, um, mitigation and management measures, some questions on good design and the applicant's outline design principles, and then move on to green belt considerations.

00:02:13:21 - 00:02:43:23

And I want to absolutely ensure that we finish before 5 p.m., because we'll probably need ten minutes or so for the action points as well. Uh, if we finish earlier, we're going to move on to some offshore ecology matters. So just in terms of significance, of landscape, of visual effects, just going back to one of the questions that we asked. I think it's written question 13.12. It's on this issue about moderate effects not being considered as being significant. Uh, as far as the S is concerned, I've got a question on that in that.

00:02:46:21 - 00:03:02:00

The landscape visual chapter ten explains that for the purpose of the assessment, any effects of a significance level of moderate or less are not considered to be significant, noting that an accumulation of individual moderate effects may be judged as being significant in some circumstances.

00:03:04:13 - 00:03:39:06

And the s goes on, I think it's paragraph ten 1146 to describe that moderate beneficial or adverse effects have the potential to be important and may influence the key decision making process where proposed changes would be demonstrated out of scale or at variance with the character of the area, which is understood and probably agreed, going on to some effects as why I want to ask this question beyond the answer that's already been given by the applicants. Is that the effects on landscape character of the proposed substations on the Fylde Coast Dunes character area operation year one major effect.

00:03:39:09 - 00:04:15:07

This is direct effects and moderate effects for indirect effects. And then at year 15, moderate adverse effects, direct and minor adverse effects. Indirect and then the visual impacts of the proposed substations. Major adverse from operation at year one. And this is a certain viewpoint viewpoint one, viewpoint three, viewpoint six, and moderate adverse at year 15 at those viewpoints, and then moderate adverse at year one at viewpoints 12 and 13. So there are quite a few circumstances, well, quite a few scenarios where there are moderate adverse effects that are reported.

00:04:18:00 - 00:05:00:13

But if we go on to the non and those are all reported in the Is but of course the moderate effects are not significant effects. So you get on to the to the non-technical summary which only reports on the significant effects. And again in the planning statement, which I think is intended to wrap everything up in terms of the overall balance, there's only mention of, again, the significant effects. There is no mention at all of any moderate effects in the planning in the applicant's final planning balance. As far as I as far as I can, can make it out. Uh, so for example, in the final planning balance, there's no mention of any long term effects on landscape character because they're all deemed to be, uh, moderate or less at year 15.

00:05:00:20 - 00:05:35:02

So just going back to my I understood what the applicant has said, and I know that in other dsos, moderate effects have been agreed to be non significant, although there are some dsos where moderate effects have been deemed to be significant. But really this point that they still have the potential to be important to influence the key decision making process, but they don't appear anywhere in the applicant's conclusions in the planning statement, which creates a question mark as to, well, how have these effects actually been considered in the final weighing up? I mean, obviously we've got critical national air priority, etc.,

00:05:35:04 - 00:05:54:09

etc. and perhaps we'll come on to the implications of that at the next set of hearings or through three questions, which is a wider sort of general topic. But for example, they didn't apply and there was a general weighing up from the applicant's interpretation of things. Those moderate effects don't not appear to have been considered. Should they be? Really is the question.

00:05:58:10 - 00:06:30:07

Good afternoon. My name is Alastair Craft, and, um, I'm representing the appellants. Um, I'm a landscape architect. And, um, the conundrum that you've outlined is, um, often the subject of a much

discussion, um, in terms of the response, just for clarity, for those present, we sought to address the substantial issues raised, um, in our responses to your, um, examination, uh, questions.

00:06:30:09 - 00:07:08:06

And the response we provided was that, uh, Q13 1.2 of uh document uh Rep 3056. Um, I won't repeat that. Um, but to summarize the position, which we did outline in the narrative, merely because a moderate effect is not considered to be significant for the purposes of EIA, does not mean to say that it is not considered in the balance of judgments.

00:07:09:05 - 00:07:41:19

Um, it doesn't consign it to the bin. Um, but it is part of the proper consideration. An environmental impact assessment is undertaken to inform the decision maker on what are significant environmental effects. And it is for the environmental statement to record those using professional judgment. So you are right that, um, there are various approaches taken. The approach that's taken in this assessment is the same as the one I would normally use.

00:07:42:10 - 00:08:13:16

Um, that effects of moderate and below are not significant for the purposes of environmental statement significance in reporting significant outcomes. But the criteria that are used are very clear within the guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, which is our industry standard that provides a very clear matrix and breakdown of the judgments that are made to allow any reader to understand what it is we have considered in making those judgments.

00:08:14:04 - 00:08:39:24

So I can't speak for the planning statement in terms of whether it refers to other non-significant outcomes associated with other environmental chapters in the balance, but to provide confidence in the assessment. Any effects over and above moderate are significant for the purposes of environmental statement judgment and anything below that we consider not to be.

00:08:42:00 - 00:09:09:16

And I understand that answering Obviously the next day I have to go away and consider what it thinks are the effects on which are significant or not, which we will go and do, you know, in the round, but shouldn't it be? Probably not a question for you, but shouldn't it be that the moderate effects are actually reported in the overall planning balance? Because the planning balance shouldn't just be about what's significant in the is because I mean, you say yourself they are

00:09:11:16 - 00:09:43:03

important and what's the phrasing that is used may have the potential to be important and may influence the key decision making process. That's quite clear, isn't it, just reading that statement. But they don't appear in the applicant's non-technical summary or in the applicant's planning balance in the planning statement, which, as I say, I presume is the idea of that is to prevent an overall, you know, balancing exercise. Uh, shouldn't they be there if, uh, they may influence the key decision making process? It just seems as though they've been lost from the ES chapter to the non-technical summary to the planning.

00:09:43:05 - 00:09:53:11

To the planning statement. And potentially we'll go on to talk about green belt, but potentially the green belt assessment too when you consider other considerations. We'll come on to that as separately.

00:09:54:11 - 00:10:28:03

I think the the point, if I may, relates to the purpose of an environmental statement, which is to inform the decision maker on significant judgments. And to the extent that the planning statement which I didn't author, but for the purpose again, sorry, no, I'll happily move it forward. Is that better? Great. Um, so for the purposes of the, um, planning statement, um, uh, obviously it presents the, uh, the project in the round.

00:10:28:21 - 00:11:02:12

Um, for the purposes of what is in there to support and understanding. Um, I have no doubt whether it's explicit or implicit, that the planning statement provides a rounded it. Overview of the professional judgments embodied within the environmental statement. And I think it is for the decision maker with the environmental statement in front of them, including the landscape and visual impact assessment, to make a judgment as to how they consider the professional judgments have been executed. I do not think the intention certainly is to circumvent the, uh, the matter.

00:11:02:23 - 00:11:11:06

Um, but just to be clear, moderate is not significant for the purposes. And that is a standard approach taken in landscape and visual impact assessment.

00:11:13:01 - 00:11:23:13

Okay. Thank you. And as you say, we have, you know, will come to our own conclusions and we have to decide what weight to give to certain measures in the final balance, etc.. Is there anything, any of the,

00:11:25:02 - 00:11:31:03

the sort of probably Lancashire or Fylde Council that you want to say on this?

00:11:34:22 - 00:11:58:15

On behalf of Fylde Borough Council. So I think I think we essentially in large part agree with what has been said by the applicant in terms of and moderate effects are still important effects that need to be taken into account. I think I think the point, again, as we agree, is that this is probably a planning question, which is how are they taking into account? And we certainly think that there are relevant matters that should be assessed as part of the overall planning balance.

00:12:00:17 - 00:12:05:06

But from a methodological perspective, there's nothing we particularly disagree on on what's been said. Yeah.

00:12:05:08 - 00:12:06:13

Okay. Thank you.

00:12:07:13 - 00:12:08:03

Okay.

00:12:11:13 - 00:12:30:06

Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. And just for everybody's clarification in terms of the difference moving on to landscape character effects. Can you just very briefly so everyone is aware about the difference between determining a direct effect on landscape character and an indirect effect on landscape character?

00:12:32:22 - 00:13:06:21

Um, sure. Um, so, um, direct effects tend to relate to the physical assets associated with the impacts on a site, so that may well be the loss of a feature of woodland or hedgerows, or an alteration in topography. Indirect is the um the consequence of that on the perception of that um landscape. Um, and the methodology within the Elvia sets out those judgments, um, in the relevant section.

00:13:07:15 - 00:13:25:20

Um, which I'll just I think it's in section 10.12. Um, but that is the essentially the, the issue. And because visual effects, um, are only to do with perception. Um, that is always an indirect, um effect in terms of its reporting.

00:13:29:09 - 00:13:48:03

Excuse me, is there a particular because of direct effects affecting the actual site itself. Landscape character of the site itself, literally the. In this case the substation platform and the directly affected area. And then the indirect effects is effects on the the wider landscape character.

00:13:48:05 - 00:13:49:06

Yes, yes.

00:13:49:08 - 00:14:00:02

Is there a sort of particular sort of threshold? Probably is somewhere. Uh, is there a particular distance threshold in terms of from the edge of the substation site where it goes from direct indirect effects?

00:14:00:20 - 00:14:33:14

Uh, no. I think it's safe to say that the, the, the boundary is not defined in guidance. Um, but the physical effect is wherever that physical effect takes, um, effect. So the site, for the purposes of the substations, um, anything to do with loss of hedgerows for cable routing. Um, so there will be areas across the landscape where, um, direct effects occur on the landscape character, but there is nothing defined in guidance in relation to the absolute boundaries to be drawn.

00:14:34:15 - 00:14:37:06

but it does relate to physical loss. Yeah. Yeah.

00:14:40:16 - 00:14:45:24

And from the council's perspective, everyone was satisfied with that.

00:14:46:09 - 00:15:26:10

Louise Eccles from Lancashire County Council. Um, yeah. Yeah. I don't disagree with the way that direct and indirect is described. I think you have to be careful in the way that you look at the effects

when they're described on the wider landscape, because you can't assume that even with the development of the scale that we're talking about is going to have an effect on the whole of that character area. It's only going to have a direct effect on the immediate area, so it shouldn't be penalised if it's considered not affecting a wider area.

00:15:29:03 - 00:16:02:03

If I'm if I may just provide further clarity and I don't I don't disagree with the comment. Um, because the landscape character areas that form the basis of the baseline are large. Uh, it's important in making the judgments that one doesn't over dilute the effect on the landscape character area just because it's a relatively small site in a much bigger area of landscape character. So it's really important that the judgments you're making are not unduly influenced by the scale of the receiving landscape character you're working within.

00:16:02:12 - 00:16:05:09

That overall dilutes it to the extent it's not relevant.

00:16:06:00 - 00:16:11:22

Could you say a little bit more on how that works? That's one of my follow up questions in terms of because you could have a

00:16:13:12 - 00:16:34:06

very large landscaped area, landscaped character area with a development on it that only takes up, you know, a 1% or even less of that area. And that could potentially be argued not to be a significant effect potentially, but actually it on that basis, it probably it probably could be extended into effect just because of the way you define the.

00:16:34:08 - 00:16:36:03

Geography within which you operate? Yes.

00:16:36:05 - 00:16:41:24

So how has that worked in this respect in terms of the two proposed substations, in terms of how that assessment has been? Sure.

00:16:42:14 - 00:17:17:08

I think the fundamental base would be the definition of the study area, probably as the sensible point of reference, which was agreed at, I think, five kilometres for the substations within scoping. And that would define the reasonable extent within which the visible change within the landscape was considered appropriate. And I would suggest that that is, broadly speaking, a safe extent of geography to be considering. But the narrative would acknowledge that the character effects, um, would be greater towards the site than that more distance.

00:17:17:15 - 00:17:21:01

But I think the study area would be a safe boundary to consider.

00:17:25:10 - 00:17:29:00

Okay. Thank you. Any any more points on that?

00:17:31:20 - 00:17:43:12

Eccles, principal landscape architect. Lancashire. Um, I think the other thing that I would say with regards to the landscape effects is that the.

00:17:45:14 - 00:18:17:10

Where you can mention a national or a, a local designation and it carries some weight in terms of effects. Just because it doesn't have that designation doesn't mean that it's not an important landscape. And even though Greenbelt might not count in terms of a local designation, it does, um, denote a characteristic or characteristics that are worthy of retention of that landscape character type, an area specific area.

00:18:18:04 - 00:18:24:00

Okay. We'll go on separately to talk about the greenbelt after we've done landscape and visual effect. I understand.

00:18:25:01 - 00:18:56:21

If I may, just because I think it's possibly a difference from the discussions we've had today myself regarding potentially, um, how green belt is addressed. I think green belt is a separate judgment in relation to visual and spatial openness. And I think for the purposes of valued landscapes, it is recognised in policy that countryside in and of itself has inherent values. Um, but I would suggest for the purposes of value associated with green belt as it relates to landscape and visual impact assessment, it is not a consideration.

00:18:57:16 - 00:19:01:17

Um, it is a separate assessment that we, um, we need to address.

00:19:02:03 - 00:19:12:20

Yeah, I understand it. And in terms of the NPF paragraph, I don't know what paragraph it is. No one's making the case that this is a it's difficult using this terminology because I'm sure

00:19:14:08 - 00:19:25:18

I'm sure it is valued. But in terms of the NPF definition, would you say it's a valued, a valued landscape in terms of the definition of what a definition is. It's what makes it difficult.

00:19:26:05 - 00:19:31:23

Yes, I would say that. Louise Eccles, Lancashire. I would say it's a valued landscape. Okay.

00:19:32:12 - 00:19:35:00

Would the applicant agree? Applicants agree with that.

00:19:36:09 - 00:19:52:17

I think to the extent that if one looks at the gradation of value, um, it's at best local value because it doesn't carry with it any designations. Um, and the methodology I refer to my colleague. Um.

00:19:56:04 - 00:20:16:08

So what papers up there? I'll give you the reference in due course and in the note. But I think it's important that, um, we understand that the value of the landscape is acknowledged, but in terms of how it impacts the assessment judgment. Um, it doesn't escalate it beyond, um, normal countryside.

00:20:16:14 - 00:20:17:14

Yeah. Okay.

00:20:18:05 - 00:20:29:02

And in terms of the NPF, PPF definition, I don't think actually there's this actually is in the MPs. This is it. But in terms of the MP. Would you say it's a valued landscape?

00:20:31:09 - 00:21:14:20

Sorry. I think it comes back to policy definition in relation to, um, uh, countryside in and of itself having value associated with it. Um, the guidance that um, is provided in our industry standard provides a mechanism to make judgments on the basis of value. And there are supporting papers by the Institute on this matter, which has become more talked about in recent years. So I think, um, for the purposes of good practice, it is not a value landscape, but it is not to say it is not valued by local residents, and therefore it has local value when one comes to make a judgment about effects arising upon it.

00:21:15:08 - 00:21:47:01

Uh, sir Lasdun, on behalf of the applicant, I can refer you to paragraph 5.1. 12 of NPS one which does mention valued landscapes. In that context, it says outside nationally designated areas, there are local landscapes. There are local landscapes that may be highly valued locally, where a local development document in England or a local development plan in Wales has policies based on landscape or water scape character assessment. These should be paid particular attention.

00:21:47:05 - 00:21:58:16

However, locally valued landscapes should not in themselves. I think there's words missing there. Be justified to refuse consent as this may unduly restrict acceptable development.

00:21:58:23 - 00:21:59:13

That's fine.

00:21:59:15 - 00:22:02:13

That's five 1012 five 1012 one one.

00:22:02:17 - 00:22:03:07

Yeah.

00:22:04:21 - 00:22:14:20

I just saw a hand up at the back. Just if there's anything you want to pick up on what's being said. Would you like to just. Do you want to stand up? And a microphone is on its way. Introduce yourself and.

00:22:15:18 - 00:22:16:08

Okay.

00:22:16:15 - 00:22:47:09

Thank you Robert Silverwood again. The inspectorate came past our house when they came onto John Fair's land at Marsh View Farm. And I'm sure they recognised that on the A58 four side, which is where we are. There is only one walk. And if we talk about health and wellbeing these days, which seems to be massive. Our health and wellbeing means that we can physically and mentally walk down the lane. That's the track and turn left.

00:22:47:15 - 00:22:51:06

And for those few minutes we're away from everything

00:22:52:22 - 00:23:17:09

and we are going to have a substation, two substations within visual and noise. Um, except affecting us on our walk, we won't do it anymore. And I just think that it's rather sad that when you consider all the other, other, all the other routes and there were routes that these people could be taking, and, you know, if Hillhouse would have been the, the one that the consultant.

00:23:17:11 - 00:23:18:01

Okay.

00:23:18:03 - 00:23:18:21

Well, let's. Right. Okay.

00:23:18:23 - 00:23:19:13

Yeah.

00:23:19:15 - 00:23:20:05

But let's.

00:23:20:07 - 00:23:20:22

Just.

00:23:20:24 - 00:23:21:14

That point is understood.

00:23:21:16 - 00:23:53:15

Yeah. Thank you. Well, let's just consider health and well-being. You know, being that is such a massive thing. So the only walk that we can take is literally down our lane, up and round and back, and that's it. And it's also a bridle way. So we get horses, particularly on a Sunday. And the vibration and the sound and so on. And whether a rider would actually want to go down there anyway, but the horses can spook and so on. And, you know, you talk about mitigation. There is no mitigation for it. We're going to have to live with this forever as long as we're alive.

00:23:54:19 - 00:23:56:16

Thank you. People have all walked off.

00:23:57:06 - 00:24:25:02

Absolutely. Points are absolutely noted. And obviously, yeah, we have seen the site and we've seen the site from where you're in terms of the relation to your property as well. And we've also read your representation and lots of others which have put forward similarly sort of strong objections to the development. So we're absolutely aware of the point at this point and other points in relation to it. So whilst I don't need all that repeated today because we're already aware of it, because it's been told to us at open floor hearings.

00:24:25:19 - 00:24:27:12

You're so emotional.

00:24:27:14 - 00:24:28:04

Thank you, thank.

00:24:28:06 - 00:24:29:19

You, thank you, thank you.

00:24:30:24 - 00:24:31:23

Thank you. Thanks for listening.

00:24:32:00 - 00:24:32:15

Okay. Yeah.

00:24:32:17 - 00:24:33:14

No, thank you very much.

00:24:38:08 - 00:24:39:21

Yes. There's a hand up over here.

00:24:41:16 - 00:24:43:05

Can we have a microphone, please?

00:24:58:07 - 00:25:29:02

Um, thank you very much. Um, I'm Councillor Richard Radcliffe, I'm chairman of planning at Fylde Council, and I'm deputy leader of final Council. I wasn't going to say anything because I'm very much aware of all the different terminology we've been using this afternoon in terms of planning, and I also know the power of language and how significant some planning terms are. I mean, we've addressed them, haven't we, today? Um. Major effects.

00:25:29:18 - 00:26:04:03

Uh, moderate effects. Significant effects. Direct effects. Indirect effects. There's a whole range of designated terms that we can use to describe effects. And what we're actually talking about here are effects on the countryside and on our communities in terms of development. And we have to accept that whatever development in the nature of that development, it's going to have an effect.

00:26:04:15 - 00:26:35:14

And sometimes we can get rather strung up on these technical terms. And I want to come to this point. We've got areas in Fylde that are designated countryside. We've got areas in file that are designated greenbelt. We've got areas of separation which is a local designation. Ask ourselves one question. They are designated for a good reason.

00:26:36:06 - 00:27:19:19

They are there to do a job, and that is to afford a level of protection in that particular part of the world. And I think what we have to be very mindful of is that once a development is there, there is a permanent effect. It will never, ever be the same before. And I think we talk about the tilted balance in planning and the experience that I've had over the last 14 years on my planning committee is that actually that planning judgments are all about balance.

00:27:20:04 - 00:27:56:16

You're balancing up all the relative factors. And then determining whether this is providing benefits which outweigh dis benefits. But what we're looking at here, B under no illusions, is obviously a development that will have you can use this language if you want. Certainly a significant effect on our countryside, on our communities and on the landscape, which is the topic that we're looking at at the moment.

00:27:57:05 - 00:28:30:06

So please, everybody, don't get too strung up by technical terms, because can I just endorse the slight criticism that has been made that moderate effects are not reported in the in the plan in the planning statement. Moderate effects can significantly alter people's lives. Moderate effects can significantly affect in many ways the landscape of our local countryside.

00:28:30:17 - 00:28:36:22

So I hope you listen to those words and everybody take them on board in your persuasions. Thank you very.

00:28:36:24 - 00:28:37:14

Much. Okay.

00:28:37:16 - 00:28:43:11

Thank you. Councillor Redcliff. Thank you. No need for any. It's a formal occasion. Please. I know people have strong feelings.

00:28:46:07 - 00:29:07:18

Okay. There's what I don't want this to become. It's not an open floor hearing. We've got to get through certain questions. So again, I don't want to hear what's been said by some people in terms of repeating things, etc. but I do want new points, not repeat of points that have already been made. So if it's a new point on what's been said, uh, lady at the front, please.

00:29:10:09 - 00:29:16:12

A couple of people behind me. Who wish to raise new points. I'm not sure you can see them from the pillar.

00:29:19:13 - 00:29:24:02

Have you got them? Okay. If you can. If you can. Is there a seat there for you? Yeah.

00:29:24:12 - 00:30:08:16

Andrea Slinger from the transmission assets steering Committee. The direct effects of the Morecambe and Morecambe substation seem to be bigger than they need to be, covering a bigger footprint than other schemes of an equivalent size. If their footprints could have been smaller, perhaps non greenbelt sites, possibly including brownfield sites, could have been chosen. There are 14 masts planned for the Morgan substation and eight on the Morecambe substation, 22 masts in total, all 30m high, which will presumably also have a light time illumination.

00:30:09:13 - 00:31:00:07

The creatures that rely on natural darkness, open skies, and habitats will pay a heavy ecological price. In particular, the flocks of birds that fly over our villages are heading to the rebel estuary, and the Martin Mir Wildlife and Wetlands Trust directly to the south of the rebel River. River Rebel on the opposite side of the river from where we live. The estuary and surrounding areas provide a vital stopover for thousands of birds which settle there or pass through, including, as we've heard, up to 30,000 pink footed geese from Iceland and Greenland, whooper swans and birds that rely on Ribble salt marshes and muddy mudflats to rest and refuel.

00:31:00:17 - 00:31:07:15

It's not just a local treasure, it's an international sanctuary, particularly between the months of November and January.

00:31:07:20 - 00:31:14:21

I'm sorry to interrupt, but we are dealing with landscape and visual effects. Okay. Because it's very important that we stick to landscape and visual effects.

00:31:14:23 - 00:31:31:08

Please. The airspace over our homes form part of the East Atlantic Flyway, which is a superhighway for millions of migratory birds flying from the Arctic breeding grounds all the way to southern Africa. It's important because it's.

00:31:31:21 - 00:31:39:01

I'm really. I'm really sorry, but this, this, this this is an item on landscape and visual. Sorry. Can you. This is an item on landscape and visual effects.

00:31:39:03 - 00:31:49:21

The birds will be flying either side of the masts into the airspace. If they go north to one side. And if they go south to the other side directly in.

00:31:50:00 - 00:32:01:11

If you can keep your representation to landscape and visual effects, please. Because this is it's a very different hearing sort of open floor hearing as I explained earlier. So we must keep to the topic agenda please. So new points on landscape and visual effects.

00:32:01:13 - 00:32:07:10

Affects the East Atlantic Flyway and the masts will have impact. Thank you.

00:32:09:03 - 00:32:36:06

Thank you. Sorry. It's just because it's a very different hearing to an open floor hearing where any points can be made. It's points on the agenda items that we want to hear about which will help us make our recommendations. So. Sorry if I interrupt on some points, but it's important that we do get through our questions as well, as well as hearing new points on the subject matter. Anybody else who would like to? If I have a microphone, please? Um, yeah.

00:32:37:03 - 00:32:38:09

That one on. Yes. It's on.

00:32:38:20 - 00:32:41:00

Um, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

00:32:41:02 - 00:32:47:20

I fully appreciate your points. And I'm going to talk about renderings. And I know they've been mentioned many times before, but I'm bringing new elements in.

00:32:47:22 - 00:32:48:20

And give your name first.

00:32:48:22 - 00:33:22:06

Please let Sharky and I am talking on behalf of the task, the transmission assets steering Committee. So I want to focus on the alarming absence of proper visual All renderings of the proposed substations and the consequences this has for all of us in assessing the impact it has on the landscape and the visual effects. Architectural renderings are essential. The community. They help communities and decision makers fully understand how the proposed infrastructure will sit within the real world surroundings.

00:33:22:16 - 00:33:52:20

Yet in this case, we've had virtually nothing. And I'm just going to come on to evidence that in October 23rd, in the preliminary Environmental Information report, in the non-technical summary, just one page was actually given to substations. No visual representations. The supporting volume offered little more than abstract lines that levitated over the landscape. This is not meaningful consultation.

00:33:52:22 - 00:34:24:00

You couldn't work out from that. What that means in terms of what a substation would look like. then later on in the outline design principles in September 24th, we got just two images, and I'm afraid they appear misleading. In figure ten, for instance, the trees are shown taller than the 20 metre lightning

masts. It's an unrealistic portrayal, and it risks misinforming both the public and planning officials at your June visit.

00:34:24:02 - 00:34:54:02

Pegs were put out for the substations. They were just put out as you arrived. They were taken shortly after you left. If you stood and looked at one peg, you couldn't see the next one. In some instances, there was no tapes to connect the posts, so you couldn't actually work out any indication of height. We've got no sense of how the sloping terrain on which these substations are going to sit will be handled. Other substations going to be dug into these huge slopes.

00:34:54:05 - 00:35:27:08

Are they going to be raised up on big platforms. This has a huge visual impact on us and we just don't know from anything we've been given thus far. This development is on greenbelt. Land is visible from public rights of way and historic footpaths. They're not just open fields, they're a cultural and historical landscape and people's livelihoods. I have mentioned before the group of traditional buildings on Grange Lane, and I know in a later agenda item there will be more heritage assets mentioned.

00:35:28:03 - 00:36:05:19

But without these accurate visualisations, we cannot assess how the substations will affect the settings. We cannot see how they might dominate the rural views, or how the noise and light could disrupt the area's tranquillity. And it's not just a minor issue, it is a failure to assess heritage impact properly, as required by national planning. Policy setting is not just about distance, it's about context scale, visual harmony. If the applicant says designs aren't finalized yet, then worst case scenario should be provided from key viewpoints.

00:36:05:21 - 00:36:39:17

Those key viewpoints shouldn't be tracks that nobody knows about. They should be homes. They should be schools, they should be businesses, and they should be heritage assets. This is about due process, transparency and respect for the community. Without visual renderings, this application lacks the evidence needed to assess its full impact. So in closing, I respectfully urge the examining authority to require the applicant to provide full scaled renderings from critical viewpoints.

00:36:40:04 - 00:36:46:15

This DCO should not proceed on the basis of inadequate and misleading information. Thank you for listening.

00:36:47:02 - 00:36:59:01

Thank you, Miss Sharkie. Thank you. There's several points there with the applicants. Like to come back to them. One on topography. Hold off from please because I've got another question about that. When we get to the outline design principles.

00:36:59:03 - 00:37:26:22

Fine. Um, I think the points were well made and I tried to make notes just to make sure I can cover them. Um, firstly, in relation to the masks that were referred to, um, we don't anticipate them being lit

at the moment. The pylons that cross the site that are a little bit shorter by about 4 or 5m, um, are not lit. Um, there will be

00:37:28:20 - 00:38:08:12

um, but the um are subject to any safety assessments or otherwise. The view is that the mask will not be lit. Uh, in relation to the status of the design. And I know the examining authority have asked questions in relation to these, uh, previously. Um, we have provided, uh, responses on those matters, and I won't repeat them for efficiency of time. But I think it is important that we fully anticipate and are very keen to progress discussions with, particularly with Fylde, in relation to the governance of design for the project moving forward.

00:38:09:01 - 00:38:39:06

We have submitted an Outline Design Principles document that establishes, um, some design codes and um objectives and principles that we believe the design moving forward should align with. And I fully anticipate that in working those through in a post consent environment, that visualisations would be a necessary part of informing both the treatment of any buildings in terms of colour, but also their form and their nature.

00:38:40:04 - 00:39:11:14

At this stage of the project, and it's not uncommon with infrastructure of this type. We are working with Parameters because the nature of the design is in its infancy, but the general operational requirements for the schemes are understood. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has undertaken the assessment based on worst case scenario. I do appreciate that the visualizations are, um, gray.

00:39:11:16 - 00:39:55:12

They are not rendered representing material choices. That is yet to come. We have issued a technical note, um, for D3 and the document reference for that is rep 3-064. Um, and in that document we provided, um, the indicative layouts for both of the substations, um, to help an understanding of the quantity of built form in terms of buildings and how much of it was essentially likely to be open, Those models that we've indicated there were used to inform the visualizations that were provided within the landscape and visual impact assessment.

00:39:56:22 - 00:40:08:03

So ask one question on that. Yes, please. The one for because there's one for. By all means put those up on the screens if you if you can. Well whilst we're, whilst we're talking if you.

00:40:09:11 - 00:40:10:19

Yeah. We'll get those up now.

00:40:10:21 - 00:40:30:05

Yeah, yeah. The one for Morgan is obviously based upon gas insulated switchgear because that's what Morgan is proposing. Yeah. Morgan's. Sorry. Morgan is proposing either gas insulated or air insulated, but there's just one indicative substation layout for Morecambe. Is that reflective of.

00:40:30:13 - 00:40:32:06

G of gas rather than.

00:40:32:08 - 00:40:36:08

Air? So that's gas. I think it was because probably because of the number of buildings.

00:40:36:10 - 00:40:48:11

Again, in terms of worst potential, worst case scenario, if built form, um is representative of that, then we've selected um GIS gas insulated for that purpose.

00:40:49:15 - 00:40:55:23

And if that was to be air insulated. I'm presuming there'll be less buildings on it.

00:40:56:00 - 00:40:56:15

Yes.

00:40:56:18 - 00:41:20:03

Can you go into more detail on what the impact of of actually what would be in terms of, in terms of the in terms of the I know it's indicative. I know this is only indicative. This is not a firm proposal. It's indicative way of showing how how the substation could potentially be developed based upon the maximum parameters. But if you could explain a little bit more about the difference between how gas insulated and air insulated would manifest themselves.

00:41:20:05 - 00:41:52:09

Absolutely. Within the same document I've just quoted, we did provide some, um, illustrations, uh, to help and understanding of the difference between, um, the visual appearance, certainly in the character of, of gas and air um, systems. Page 12 of that document, um, has some indicative, uh, Illustrations, which I'll ask Oliver just to pull up in a minute. So a two minute warning if we can go back, please, to the the plans

00:41:54:02 - 00:42:31:14

that we looked at before. Sorry, those ones. Just for clarity, the, um, the description of the post consent environment that we want to establish with the local authority in terms of design evolution. Um, whilst accepting there are some rules around the layout of these facilities that are operationally led and all about the physics of of how it all works. There are opportunities to influence layout. Um, and there are opportunities to influence how planting and earthworks and other things, um, may influence the amount of screening we have set out as clearly as possible.

00:42:31:16 - 00:43:02:21

And the requirement. Um, number four, within the DCO is very explicit about the elements of detail that we anticipate submitting and having Discussions with the local authority about before any submission is made in its final form. Um, so the schemes as shown at the moment are, uh, without any influence or otherwise, with ongoing stakeholder engagement, residents and or at the local authority in relation to how the schemes would develop, um, to allow for that requirement to be discharged.

00:43:03:12 - 00:43:10:03

So hopefully that's clear and helpful if we sorry I'll. My colleague wishes to say something.

00:43:10:06 - 00:43:49:24

So Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant from a design to your question, the difference between AOS and GIS from a project design perspective, an EIS substation footprint is significantly larger than a GIS substation footprint. The applicants, or certainly the Morgan applicants, um, did not propose an ER insulated switchgear substation primarily for that reason because of the significant size of footprint. Uh, I want to state that the current location would not be achievable with an air insulated switchgear substation because of its significant increase in size.

00:43:50:11 - 00:44:15:23

Part of the site selection process had that in mind. When we were looking for that for the coordinated approach to the site selection, and it was felt appropriate to make that early commitment to a gas insulated switchgear substation so that we can we could site onshore substation, an onshore substation, bearing in mind the number of physical constraints in that five kilometres radius around the National Grid substation.

00:44:19:04 - 00:44:50:01

To hopefully illustrate that, if we can turn to page 12 very quickly of the same document. Um, technical note um, the top of the page, um, we've provided illustrations of, um, a gas insulated um, station at Hornsea Two, recently completed and an air insulated scheme at Raleigh. The fundamental difference is the presence or not of buildings, but also the scale.

00:44:50:05 - 00:45:22:06

As um Philip referred to um and the nature of the enclosures. Um, so whether um the, the scheme includes um numbers of buildings or has reduced numbers of buildings. The wording of the requirement is very clear about the importance of the design of each of those elements in relation to colour, finish, scale, um, and other material matters. Um, there is no reason for the client to push to the upper scale of the parameters if they don't need to.

00:45:22:10 - 00:45:57:19

I've been involved in design reviews and design evolution for a number of onshore schemes. Um, in the last few years. Uh, working on essentially on both sides of the table. Um, and it's not in the interests of a promoter to, um, create large scale buildings. They're not necessary, essentially. So the ongoing design evolution is very important. The ongoing discussions with the local authority, which we're very keen to make sure we settle, um, the approach taken with design principles and the coding so that the rules for engagement post consent are nice and clear and has confidence in them.

00:45:58:09 - 00:46:04:11

Um, okay, I'll come back. I've got some questions on the outline design principles to come from my colleague, Mr. Gorse. Question.

00:46:05:23 - 00:46:37:24

Thank you for that. Um, clearly the ones that, uh, you've indicated there, certainly Hornsey and Bristol are very much on flat land. Um, and when I look at, um, the plan that you put up earlier from rep 364 that's entirely on flat land, the previous page, um, shows a little bit of an incline. Now, when we went, um, on the site inspection, it was very clear that there was a very significant, um.

00:46:38:17 - 00:47:02:05

The land fell away quite significantly. Uh, and I think one of the previous speakers did refer to this. And I'm just wondering, is it possible that you could give a representation which takes into account in any way the fall of land? Because to say the previous page, I don't think does take into account the, the, the um, degree of which lands falls away.

00:47:04:00 - 00:47:22:00

Um, yeah. I'm happy to, to, to answer that, the, um, there is an additional figure within the same document I referred to which shows, um, the, uh, the hard platform for both Morgan and Morecambe inserted within the existing levels of the landscape surrounding.

00:47:22:02 - 00:47:24:14

I was going to ask a question about those. Do you want to get those up now?

00:47:24:16 - 00:47:27:21

Yeah. Well, maybe just to answer the question, in relation to levels, the the.

00:47:27:23 - 00:47:28:13

General.

00:47:28:15 - 00:48:00:10

Approach is to have a gentle gradient across the piece. Um, and we've indicated spot levels on the the plan included within that document I refer to, it would be normal to, um, have a gently falling site, um, rather than stepped. Um, uh, one of the criteria that was used in relation to the site selection was a consideration of topography. And in identifying zone one, within which these two um, substation sites are sited.

00:48:01:03 - 00:48:33:12

Um, these were relatively preferable within that zone in terms of the existing topography. So very early on in the process of site selection. Through the process, we went through land levels and the gradients were an important consideration. Uh, the work that has been done on preliminary cut and fill to understand the, the extent of, of effects arising is understood. And that's reflected in the spot levels when it comes to further discussion with Fylde in relation to post consent approvals.

00:48:34:06 - 00:48:56:18

Full levels design and the understanding and appreciation of that is a very important part of it. Just finally on this, we were very keen to make sure that we minimised export of material off site, which is why it's such an important issue early on because we want to minimise, um, traffic movements in relation to material shift. So it's been a very important part of the process.

00:48:58:19 - 00:49:04:13

And any visualisations moving forward would indicate any falls in levels that would be required.

00:49:05:10 - 00:49:34:09

I hear that and thank you for that explanation, but I think the point I'd make is that the original plan you showed up, which is, um, the penultimate page in rep 308, Rep 364. It doesn't show. Yeah. That that one there. Thank you. Sorry on that one there. It doesn't show that layout in the context of the land that you're looking to acquire.

00:49:34:11 - 00:49:55:09

No, these are merely illustrative to indicate the nature of the components. The visualizations that were prepared were prepared based on modeled heights, so the visualizations that are within the environmental statement landscape and visual assessment are based on known site levels. So they are actually articulated on the level rather than on a flat plane.

00:49:56:10 - 00:50:02:00

Right. So for the benefit of people in the room, which documents should they be looking at for that?

00:50:02:02 - 00:50:06:21

So that is volume six of seven of the landscape of the environment.

00:50:06:23 - 00:50:09:02

If someone could look up an examination library.

00:50:10:18 - 00:50:50:04

So Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicants, just a couple of points to note in terms of the indicative layout which was shown on screen. Um, it does have a gentle slope on it. Um, I would have to very explicitly point it out to you where that becomes apparent. But there is a slope which is essentially taking it from the it's the northwestern corner down to the southeastern corner, because that's where the drainage attenuation basins would be. Um, and then when it needs to be viewed in combination with what's in the same document, in terms of the topography, we essentially try to we try to establish what is more or less obviously there is a gentle growing, but more or less a flat platform.

00:50:50:22 - 00:51:05:03

That platform contour is shown in rep 3064 with cross sections trying to illustrate how that is within the landform. The contours as you see on screen.

00:51:06:22 - 00:51:07:12

Um.

00:51:09:15 - 00:51:42:00

Essentially what we're talking about is cutting it into the slope slightly. So obviously working with what is there and as, as Mr. Crack explained, trying to create that cut and field balance so that there is some landform rising in at the bottom of the slope, but more cutting into the top of the slope. Um, so I think when you look at those images in combination, that essentially results in what is in the the visualizations, which are in rep 3015.

00:51:42:21 - 00:52:01:08

Um, obviously it does not show the exact kind of bird's eye view or isometric view, because that is not an achievable viewpoint or a necessity viewpoint. For the purposes of the Elvia, the Elvia uses viewpoints which were agreed with filed by the Council in relation to sensitive visual receptors.

00:52:02:10 - 00:52:14:24

Is that that platform that's shown on that, that drawing? That is the proposed platform, as I understand it. Yes. Well, the proposed level of the platform could be, as I understand it.

00:52:15:03 - 00:52:38:07

Yes. So the we provide a typical cross-section through each of the substation sites in context. So this is a zoom in effectively of a larger section included within the report. If only I could maybe zoom out, and that is taken roughly through the middle of the site, at the level at which we anticipate the gradient would be at that location.

00:52:39:17 - 00:52:42:01

Maybe it's partly because it is there a.

00:52:43:02 - 00:53:00:18

Plan that could be provided which actually or might have been provided somewhere? It has to be sort of a suitable scale because we're talking about obviously a large extent of, but so's the existing gradient. And then what's the proposed gradient on this or maybe indicative proposed. Because obviously this is indicative.

00:53:01:18 - 00:53:03:03

It should be on the same drawing.

00:53:03:05 - 00:53:35:10

Actually it's on the same drawing. I think it's because the scale doesn't really work on this to be honest. Again, because when I went on the site visit, I remember walking down to one of the one of the posts and I think I actually disappeared from view from everyone else, which indicates that although I suspect I got as far as where it does, the land lander's slope weigh on the right hand side of the. Yeah, it's gone out of that drawing, but I don't know if there's a way of actually providing a drawing which because clearly that site does slope. But looking at this, even with my poor short distance eyesight, it's hard.

00:53:35:15 - 00:53:42:06

It's albeit with my eyesight it's hard to, uh, pick out what actually the difference is between existing and proposed. Sure.

00:53:42:08 - 00:54:14:15

Could I? Could I just say from walking the site the other day, Louise Eccles, um, Lancashire County Council. Um, there are slight ridgelines as well. If you walk down the bridleway, um, it looks as if the site is climbing a little bit and that's more pronounced as you go towards the Morgan side of things. So there's going to have to be extensive cut and fill within that area. Um, and the question would be there where to put the this this bill really.

00:54:15:00 - 00:54:23:24

Um, once the cuts taken place in order to try and achieve, Um, the screening and the mitigation that you want to achieve.

00:54:24:02 - 00:54:55:08

Yeah. Just for clarity, if it's helpful, the modelling that we've done, which is indicated on this plan and, um, we've worked with existing levels of information that we have, um, the, the gradients that you appreciate on the site. Um, uh, sit between those contours. So you don't at this level, it's quite difficult to see local undulations. Um, but um, particularly you can see on the Morgan plan, the proposed levels that support the accommodation of the creation of that platform.

00:54:55:23 - 00:55:26:11

Uh, we're very clear about the need for offsets from Dale Brook by example, to make sure that we're not grading all the way to the river corridor. Um, and we have a proper understanding of the cut and fill associated with each of those sites to find that balance in relation to platform level, provide levels of screening that are appropriate. Um, and to create an appropriate gradient across the piece. But we can certainly look if if this isn't sufficient for your purposes, we can provide.

00:55:26:16 - 00:55:27:17

It could be clearer.

00:55:27:21 - 00:55:35:13

When I first looked at it, my first thought. Surely that site is more sloping than that. And that was just. That's from my observations. Of course, you know.

00:55:36:03 - 00:55:36:21

We can take that away.

00:55:36:23 - 00:55:38:13

It may just be the scale, the scale of it.

00:55:38:15 - 00:55:39:05

But actually.

00:55:39:07 - 00:55:45:08

It may well be. We can do some what they refer to as interpolation between the contours to at least show greater levels of detail.

00:55:45:14 - 00:55:46:04

Thank you.

00:55:46:06 - 00:55:46:21

We can look into that.

00:55:46:23 - 00:56:17:20

Other points I want to get through, some more points I want to make in terms of just going back to the landscape and visual effects, because we moved around quite a bit over the last half an hour or so that this is just a request. It doesn't need an answer rather than yes or no, hopefully yes in the next statements of common Ground, because the applicants have provided, obviously, their assessment of environmental and visual effects in the environmental statement. And I think Lancashire County Council has probably gone further than Fylde in this respect in terms of saying which ones they disagree with.

00:56:17:22 - 00:56:44:20

You've helped to go on for each viewpoint. For example, it'd be very helpful in the next round of Statements of Common Ground, uh, that both Fylde Borough Council and Lancashire County Council give their interpretation of where they disagree or agree with the applicant's assessment of each landscape, character and visual effect. And where there is disagreement. Just a short outline of why there is that disagreement.

00:56:46:13 - 00:57:04:09

Is that is that clear? That what what what I'm asking for just and then obviously what we will then do. So a lot of this actually we need to go and we've been already twice. And we will go again before the end of the examination for an unaccompanied site inspection to have a further look. And then obviously we have to make our recommendation. Mr. cope, you didn't want to.

00:57:05:04 - 00:57:38:05

John Coates take full council. Um, yes. We we can provide those comments. We will. But related to that, another request we have in terms of, uh, the assessment that's presented. And this goes back to something you said at the start of the topic about gaps in the assessment and the discussion about direct and indirect impacts. Um, these things are all relevant to the Fylde Local Plan policy GD three, which relates to the area of separation, um, and the applicant's landscape and visual resources report.

00:57:38:09 - 00:58:12:13

EP 123 defers area of separation policy discussions to the planning statement. Um rep 1032 um. The planning statement picks up policy GD three, but does not carry out any assessments. It simply states that there will be no effect and claims compliance, but without any discussion at all. Um, we are of the opinion that the development will have an effect, and we therefore request that the Landscape and Visual Resources Assessment and the planning statement are both updated to include the applicant's assessment so that we can respond.

00:58:12:15 - 00:58:13:05

Bond

00:58:14:13 - 00:58:47:09

is done on behalf of the applicant. We noted the request from filed and I think the points been made previously. Um, certainly my understanding of an area of separation policy is that you have to be in the area of separation to engage the policy. The schemes are not in the area of separation, and that's why the area of separation policy is not engaged. We understand that the councils are maintaining a position that there is a buffer to the area of separation. Therefore, that's what needs to be considered and that somehow we're in the buffer.

00:58:47:11 - 00:59:15:04

I think we fundamentally disagree that an area of separation policy, which in itself is a spatial policy. Effectively identifying an area can itself have a buffer because it should be either part of the area of separation or not in the area of separation. So I think we fundamentally disagree in that we're happy to make those representations. We've picked it up in filed deadline three response and we will be responding at deadline for.

00:59:15:06 - 00:59:45:04

I think do so. I think I read these submissions obviously beforehand, and I think I understand both parties positions on it, and I think it's one of the things we'll have to take away and recommend. We don't necessarily need to sort of sort of discuss it in sort of like huge amounts of detail because it's in writing and you understand the the parties positions. I think a final sort of summary of the applicant's position on that as to where you are. Yes. That would be very, very useful. Could could I to sorry if this file wants to come back with anything on that or is that filed?

00:59:45:08 - 01:00:13:10

Um borough council. So I don't think we need to respond on that. Obviously we disagree in terms of application interpretation of that policy. Um, you have our position. It would certainly be helpful to have an updated summary position of the applicant. And if that's their position, it would be helpful to see that in writing. And we can of course respond. But I think the point is, if they disagree on interpretation application, that policy, they need to say so clearly so that we can provide our respective positions. And you can take a view. Yeah, absolutely.

01:00:13:12 - 01:00:14:09

Yeah. Thank you.

01:00:14:21 - 01:00:16:14

I think I would just add Louise Eccles.

01:00:16:24 - 01:00:18:19

Lancashire County for the recording, please.

01:00:18:21 - 01:00:38:03

Sorry. Um, yeah. Louise Eccles, Lancashire County Council. Um, I think I'll just reiterate what the gentleman behind me said that, um, the greenbelt area and the area of separation worked together and therefore, um, that's why it's important that you need to read the two together.

01:00:38:09 - 01:00:43:00

Okay. I understand that argument. Yeah. And I think the applicant probably understands that entirely addressed.

01:00:43:07 - 01:00:43:22

And I think.

01:00:43:24 - 01:00:44:14

The difference.

01:00:44:16 - 01:00:50:04

In the position can be established in the statement of common ground, and we're keen to progress with that. Thank you. I know.

01:00:52:20 - 01:01:26:12

And on we've not yet discussed in great detail the proposed landscape mitigation and management measures. Obviously there is an outline landscape management plan, which I don't know to what extent the county council and any of the councils, in fact, have looked at in detail. I imagine that you have. But again, if there's any points in that that you disagree with or think could be enhanced, it could be raised in the sense of common ground that would be very, very useful if you want to.

01:01:26:15 - 01:01:55:04

I don't think I need you to do a I was going to ask you to do a summary of it. I don't really think I think it can be taken as read. I think people are interested in it, will have read it because it's been in the examination for three months now. Um, so with time moving on. But I think where there is any disagreement or where you feel that could be enhanced, then obviously set that out in statements of statements of common ground and have a conversation about those matters. I think on the outline design principles, I think it seems there are going to be conversations on.

01:01:55:06 - 01:01:55:21

I.

01:01:55:23 - 01:01:57:20

Think, on that. So those need to continue.

01:01:58:20 - 01:02:32:17

Yeah. Louise Eccles, Lancashire County Council I think it's fundamental from my assessment of what's been produced to date that it doesn't screen or mitigate the effects of the scale of the building, and really, the only way to do that is to take more land take up, because it's working with very tight boundaries where you cannot achieve what you're wanting to achieve. Um, and in terms of the mitigation with regards to the footpath, you know, there's a you could move the footpath altogether so that the local people, when they use it.

01:02:33:02 - 01:03:03:23

Um, I suggested that you could move it down towards the down Brook area. May not be immediately, but then at least there's some degree of openness, um, that people can enjoy to the east, and perhaps some more tranquility that they might not get if they maintain along the bridleway. Um, but it's working with the landscape character as well. Um, what I don't like to see is the fact that fields are cut in half and the pattern of the landscape isn't replicated, and I feel that that should have been taken on board more mower.

01:03:04:01 - 01:03:38:13

In terms of the landscape planting and fundamentally where the the ponds are proposed in what looks like a little cramped in area just to satisfy the replacement ponds for the ones that are lost, the

character of the landscape is to. If you look on a Google map, even you can see the ponds and the nature of the ponds, how they're dotted throughout the landscape. Um, and it is within the National Character Area 32. It refers to the ponds quite regularly as part of that character.

01:03:38:22 - 01:04:09:23

So when you look for mitigation, you're looking for the ponds back in field areas, one, because of the pattern and two, because of ecology reason species don't just stay in one area. They need the they need their ponds to be in different field areas so that they can move from one to another. Um, and, and you can apply the comment on ponds to the whole of the transmission assets. As I understand it, the ponds aren't going to be replaced. And I think as part of the landscape character, they should be replaced.

01:04:11:06 - 01:04:24:17

May I just respond just to give focus to what Louise has said? Sorry, Alistair. On behalf of the appellant, within the Outline Design Principles document, um, section 6.2.

01:04:27:14 - 01:05:03:03

Uh section 6.2, we outline the design code as we have prepared it. The entire strategy for this is to allow exactly what Louise has outlined, um, to form part of the discussions around the evolution of the design. The design that sits within the indicative landscape strategy is just that. It is a spatial organisation that allows the parameters of the work's plans, um, to be defined. There is pretty substantial wriggle room within those boundaries to achieve good levels of planting.

01:05:03:23 - 01:05:42:20

And, um, in terms of the design of, uh, uh, suds features or ponds or otherwise, and it's exactly that level of conversation that we feel we need to have, um, with, uh, filed and with, uh, other councils. Um, and we are very keen to do that, unfortunately, because of time constraints, uh, we haven't made as much progress as we would like. Um, but we have certainly indicated, um, an indicative strategy between D4 and D5 such that we're in a better position and hopefully the local authorities are a lot more comfortable with the amount of latitude that is available to respond to landscape, character and the issues that have been outlined.

01:05:43:04 - 01:05:59:04

Um, but certainly the framework and the discipline of those issues is outlined in the design code as our commitment. And we're happy to evolve that commitment, um, in discussions so that in a consent environment, there's a certainty around the the ability of the scheme to come forward in an appropriate way.

01:06:01:18 - 01:06:02:08

Okay.

01:06:03:17 - 01:06:34:24

Thank you. Just on a completely separate point. I think it's been a it's going to make a completely separate point. Something completely different. Apparently there's photographs being taken of the the screen of the was photographs being taken of the screen. And I'm not sure everyone has consented to photographs being taken of them necessarily. So if people could refrain from taking photographs. But

this this information has been shown is available on the website. And I'm sure if the website's not available to you and you want to have a copy of one of those drawings, then that can be facilitated rather than taking photographs.

01:06:35:02 - 01:06:46:24

Thank you. And Liz, done on behalf of that and all the things that have been shown here are in the examination library, there is absolutely nothing that's been reported today that isn't available as part of the application or the examination.

01:06:47:01 - 01:06:59:16

And if anybody sort of wants to know where these are and can't find them, then please talk to the members of the case team about where those are and how to find them, if you're struggling with the website, etc. because these things are publicly available.

01:07:03:02 - 01:07:04:09

Hello, I'm Kate Lythgoe.

01:07:04:11 - 01:07:42:24

I'm a chartered landscape architect for Fylde Council. Um, I have a fundamental concern about the, um, the siting of two substations within, um, the green belt and in an area that's ancient field enclosure and has been identified in the national character area as having a rich patchwork of arable fields and pasture with drainage ditches. I think the the scale of the two substations is, is huge and will have a significant cumulative effect.

01:07:43:03 - 01:08:16:10

Um, I think there'll be a considerable loss of hedgerow, which would be very hard to mitigate given the extent of the red line boundary that the applicants are proposing. Um, I think the where the transmission assets themselves might not be visible, the harm, the result that will result from them is insomuch as the loss of hedgerows. There's a limitation to the agricultural land use, um, and the what? The loss of features around the wider site.

01:08:17:03 - 01:08:29:23

Um, I think the substations will be incongruous with an existing view and have undue adverse effects on the special qualities of this particular location.

01:08:34:19 - 01:08:35:10

Thank you.

01:08:35:18 - 01:08:41:21

I think most of those points have already been raised in writing, which you responded to. So I don't I'm not going to propose that you respond to them. And I think.

01:08:42:00 - 01:08:42:20

I'd say the landscape.

01:08:42:22 - 01:08:50:22

But those points are noted. And as I've said before, these are matters. We're going to have to go away and consider and put into our recommendation.

01:08:51:12 - 01:08:53:02

May I add something as well that.

01:08:53:09 - 01:08:54:04

It's a new point.

01:08:54:06 - 01:09:18:01

Please. It's a new point. It's it's it's more the fact that I'm not entirely convinced that the because of the scale of the substations, they can be mitigated as effectively, but also where we're talking about tree planting and hedgerow planting, that's going to be limited in itself by the the development proposals.

01:09:20:11 - 01:09:21:01

Okay.

01:09:21:03 - 01:09:23:23

Thank you. I understand let's come back briefly on that.

01:09:24:03 - 01:10:05:05

Just very briefly. The landscape and visual impact assessment is very clear and open about losses and the effect of the change as a result of the site. Um, in relation to, um, the ability to deliver the mitigation. Um, the if one places a ruler on the measurements and even looking at the cross section, we believe there is sufficient space to adequately allow for planting to properly mature and to do its job properly. Um, and again, that we would anticipate being part of the conversation to make sure that, uh, there's adequate understanding, um, and code within the documentation.

01:10:05:18 - 01:10:36:16

And obviously, conversations continue between the councils and, uh, the applicants on these matters, including the outline design principles. I think I've read in the technical note that more meetings are arranged with the, uh, local authorities, Lancashire County Council and Fylde in particular on the substation design, um, approach or design code, etc.. What is the sort of programme for those in terms of how they will fit in with the remaining time in the examination, so that there is a in terms of the end result for.

01:10:36:17 - 01:10:37:08

Us to we've.

01:10:37:10 - 01:11:05:21

Drafted a programme. Um, we are aware that the that Fylde weren't able to meet before D4 um which does place certain pressure on timings. Um but we've drafted a programme that we'd like to agree immediately starting after D4. That allows us to move through a sequence of meetings. 3 or 4 are planned to allow us to reach D5. Um, so that that that is the intention and we hope to be able to progress with that.

01:11:05:24 - 01:11:13:16

And does it make sense? I think I read reference to the fact that there'd be separate meetings with Lancashire and Fylde. Seems to make sense to me, given it's the same stations that.

01:11:13:20 - 01:11:15:07

We ideally would like them to be the same.

01:11:15:09 - 01:11:15:24

Yeah, we.

01:11:16:02 - 01:11:26:02

I received an invitation yesterday for, for, uh, meetings. So. But, um, would you like us to meet with jointly with Fylde? Because I'm happy.

01:11:26:04 - 01:11:59:16

To. Well, it would seem sensible. It's not really a sensible preference. Both for the Lancashire are in the same meeting. Otherwise you're going to have slightly sort of different points being made. And, uh, yeah, if an update can be provided for the next deadline, just in terms of an overall programme for that, in terms of and then when they presumably there'll be a final outline design principles document submitted into the examination, what the timetable for that will be. Again, making sure that everyone else has a chance to be able to comment on that. It's important that the file documents where they've been changed. People will have a chance to respond on those before the end of the examination.

01:11:59:17 - 01:12:06:01

Understands the questions about timescale. Before I go quickly, I'll move on to a few points on the green belt. Do you want to.

01:12:06:14 - 01:12:13:20

See both Duckworth and parish councils? It's just a point of clarity, really. Are we saying that we won't know what these.

01:12:13:22 - 01:12:14:20

Substations are going.

01:12:14:22 - 01:12:29:18

To look like for local people until post consent? Or is or are there going to be some renderings that Mrs. Sharkey referred to that make sense to people who aren't, you know, savvy on planning matters?

01:12:32:12 - 01:12:46:20

I think on the one hand, I would would urge you to read the technical load on landscape and design matters provided by the applicant, because that will provide some further information in that regard. I mean, does the applicant want to add anything in terms of answering that question in short form.

01:12:46:22 - 01:13:17:18

In short, um, the elements that make up the scheme are defined, and the illustrations we had up on the screen earlier show one approach to layout. Um, but we do not intend to provide further detail design

at this stage. Um, we are seeking approval of parameters and design controls to allow design to be developed post consent. Um, that has become within reason um and accepted norm in relation to these types of projects.

01:13:17:22 - 01:13:28:23

It doesn't mean to say that it's carte blanche. You can do whatever you want. The controls we wish to put in place are significant and material and defined, but we do not intend to put them in at the moment.

01:13:29:00 - 01:13:42:19

So with parish councils, so we won't know whether the Morecambe substation is GIS or ies know until post concerns know. So how can we how can we assess the impact?

01:13:43:20 - 01:13:51:19

Well, if I may. At the moment, the assessment is based on worst case, which would be GUIs for the purposes of built form. And that's what the assessment has been based on.

01:13:51:21 - 01:14:01:10

If you want a separate conversation offline about these matters, because these matters are addressed in the applicant's documents, in terms in terms of how it all works, then possibly after this meeting might be might, might be helpful.

01:14:01:12 - 01:14:02:02

Yeah. Happy to.

01:14:02:04 - 01:14:02:19

Do.

01:14:02:21 - 01:14:03:12

That.

01:14:03:17 - 01:14:15:09

Could I just add one thing? Sorry. Louise Eccles, Lancashire County council. Um, it's the first time I've seen the technical note. Uh, information. Will you be wanting, um, comments on the technical?

01:14:15:11 - 01:14:46:10

Yes. Provide those for deadline for me as a sort of basic rule information that's submitted into the examination. Anyone is able to respond and comment on that at the next deadline. So deadline for is next week on Friday. So and that information and comments are very useful to us to have obviously the local authority of anybody's views and the county council's views on these, on these documents, etc. and again, with the design principles etc. on the greenbelt. There are a few matters which perhaps I could sort of.

01:14:46:16 - 01:14:51:14

Because again, these questions are based upon the greenbelt. Uh,

01:14:53:01 - 01:14:55:21

I was going to call it the Greenbelt. Technical note. Um,

01:14:57:15 - 01:15:30:17

what is it called? Maybe it's called the Greenbelt technical note. The applicant has provided a submission clarifying certain matters on the applicant's approach to the greenbelt, which is in the examination library. It is the greenbelt. Technical note it's rep 3069. And this was submitted at the last deadline. And again, I would urge people interested to read that and come back with any comments at the next deadline if they so wish. One of the questions that I start to go a few things, and one thing I'd like the authorities to answer.

01:15:30:19 - 01:16:05:17

You don't need to answer it now because we are running short of time, but it's about the overall approach to the applicants have taken to the greenbelt, and the first one is in relation to the fact that obviously the paragraph 143 talks about the the green belt serving five purposes. This is probably sort of quite standard sort of green belt sort of policy information that you know about and the applicant has, has, has said that it serves two of those purposes, A and C, which is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

01:16:05:18 - 01:16:22:17

I'd be interested and provide this at the next deadline. I think if you agree it's the two of the five, it's not any of the other ones of the of the five. I'm happy to respond to that in writing rather than answer now. So we can be clear on on that. And

01:16:24:17 - 01:16:58:03

the second point is the technical note talks about harm to the green belt occurring during the construction phase, mainly as a result of the temporary, uh, working compounds. And the applicants have stated in the technical note. This should not be a determining factor given its relatively short duration and full reversibility. I understand the point that there will be short duration and full reversibility, and I think there's reference to an appeal decision in limb on, I think, on temporary strictures in the green belt.

01:16:58:20 - 01:17:33:06

And later on in the paragraph 1646, the applicant state that the short term harm to be caused by the construction compound should be given limited, if any, weight in the determination of the application. But as I understand it in the green belt does either harm to the green belt in terms of openness and it being inappropriate, or there's not any harm to the green balance. But even if there's only a minor harm to the openness of the green belt, then that has to be considered. And in terms of MPP, uh language, it needs to be given substantial weight.

01:17:33:08 - 01:18:12:24

And I think there's a I'm not going to ask you to respond to a particular case, but the boot versus Elmbridge Council case 2016 talks about the fact that there was a sports facility where I think the council said that only B minor harm to openness, so it probably doesn't matter and it wasn't taken forward. And I think that was quashed because of the fact that, well, minor harm to the openness of the greenbelt, it's still harm to the greenbelt and any harm to the greenbelt. So the point and maybe

this is a point just to take away in terms of the technical note, is the applicant saying that there's actually no harm from the temporary working compounds on open on openness, or is there actually I think what's being said, there's minor harm.

01:18:13:06 - 01:18:25:07

If there's minor harm, it still harms the greenbelt. So still will carry substantial weight. Putting aside critical national priority and all that, put all that to one side because I think that comes right obviously right at the end. Still got to go. I don't think understanding.

01:18:25:20 - 01:18:49:03

That at any level of harm needs to be given appropriate levels of weight. I think the one the point is one of emphasis in relation to the permanence of the effect which is inferred in policy. So permanent effect on openness. So it's the relative, um, uh, issue that we believe reduces its significance in terms of the judgment.

01:18:49:05 - 01:18:50:19

Could you sorry, could you speak up a little bit?

01:18:51:01 - 01:18:52:07

Yeah. Sorry, sorry. Um,

01:18:53:21 - 01:19:26:02

our perspective on this is that the the policy inference relates to, um, permanent changes in greenbelt openness as a result of development. So whilst we acknowledge that it's important to identify harm arising from construction phase, acknowledging that it's relatively short term in comparison to permanent, um, the the judgment is therefore made regarding its presence and its effect, but it's the weight afforded to it that we believe is one that is a matter of planning judgment.

01:19:26:08 - 01:19:42:15

We've made an appropriate assessment of the harm arising from construction and stated that, Um, it's the level of significance afforded to that, um, uh, harm that we've identified that that's the planning judgment.

01:19:42:17 - 01:19:58:17

But you are saying that the construction compounds will be inappropriate development and will harm the openness of the greenbelt, but to, uh, obviously to, uh, not only words in your mouth, but to a minor extent. Yeah. And obviously that that has to be sort of counted in the greenbelt weighting exercise. Yes. Um.

01:20:04:17 - 01:20:08:19

One thing for the it's just moving on in terms of, in terms of.

01:20:11:13 - 01:20:50:06

Other potential harm. Again, going back to paragraph 153 of the framework says inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the greenbelt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. And then it says very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential

harm to the greenbelt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations. My question is what is any other harm? Because I think the technical note seems to talk about harms of principal relevance, and it talks about landscape harms as being any other harm.

01:20:50:17 - 01:21:10:12

But shouldn't any other harm relate to any other harm that the proposal results in? So it could be a harm from noise or harm from land use issues. It's those, isn't it? It's not just the greenbelt related harm. If you argue that landscape was greenbelt related harms, that seems to be the approach that technical note has taken.

01:21:10:23 - 01:21:44:01

If I can clarify, Sir Alastair, on behalf of the applicants. Um, yes. Other harms, um, relate to, uh, any other harms that would be identified through the environmental impact assessment process? Uh, the technical note, if it isn't clear and apologies if it isn't coming across our view, is that the harms arising from landscape and visual were probably the main ones arising. We have done, um, a supporting note in relation to other harms as we judge them in relation to green belt against transport, noise, air quality and the like.

01:21:44:11 - 01:21:55:00

And we're happy to submit that. Um, and we've played some quantification. Call it what you may to that harm. Um, but we acknowledge that it is all those harms you identify quite rightly.

01:21:55:02 - 01:22:07:16

Could the technical note be updated to reflect that at the next deadline? Because I think it does. I think from my reading of it, it does, it does it does need that. Yeah. Because when we report we're going to have to report on all these obviously and all these matters. Um.

01:22:08:20 - 01:22:14:24

Could I also add that, um, it would also include human health to the extent that's relevant, although it's. Yes, I think the chapter but yes. Yeah.

01:22:15:05 - 01:22:40:22

Yeah, yeah. And then just in terms of we've heard some submissions earlier and certainly before an examination in terms of effects on openness of the, of the substations. And it's something which I don't think the note quite clarifies is actually what, in the applicant's view, is the effect on the openness of the green belt of the proposed substations. Can you can you quantify the extent of harm on green belt openness.

01:22:41:12 - 01:23:11:16

Again, in terms of further, um, presentation of information? Um, we're happy to provide the quantification of that in relation to harms to both fundamental aim of of retaining openness, but also then the purposes of, of A and C. So we've also made a judgment in relation to the quantity of harm associated with the purpose and those two aims. And we're happy to add that to the technical note.

01:23:11:18 - 01:23:31:09

I think I think the note seems to concentrate yes, on the latter, on the purposes, but not on the, you know, the fundamental issue of harm to green belt openness, which obviously is an important issue. And even the statement of common grounds, the council could address that matter as well. In terms of do you agree with what the applicants are saying in terms of harm to the openness on the greenbelt from the proposed substations?

01:23:31:11 - 01:23:58:16

And if I can just add for clarity, and it's not in the technical note. Um, but we are obviously aware that, um, national planning policy guidance gives an indication of how you make judgments in relation to visual and spatial openness impacts or harms. And we've deployed that, um, criteria within that guidance note to make those judgments. And again, the update I would suggest could usefully include that to also help discussions with the local authorities.

01:23:59:10 - 01:24:32:22

Okay. Thank you. And again, again up at Penn Wortham at the existing substation where there is there's going to be engineering operations. So I think the technical note says it's not it's it's not considered to be inappropriate development. I think that's only if it preserves openness. So will those works preserve openness. I think that could be addressed. I think, for example, there's a marshalling building that's been mentioned in his and I presume that's part of this development.

01:24:33:04 - 01:24:38:00

Or is it not? Is it part of the national grid development? I don't know the answer to that question, but.

01:24:38:02 - 01:24:47:07

It is part of our development. It's within the existing substations. So it's a point of almost theory as to whether it affects openness or not. So built form in theory it would.

01:24:47:09 - 01:24:54:24

So if it's again if it's considered to be inappropriate, what is the effect on openness of it. From it. Um and then.

01:24:58:01 - 01:25:25:21

I think my final point I wanted to make on the technical note was the benefits, which obviously have to be balanced against the harm of the greenbelt, and any other harm includes community funds for transmission infrastructure. But given what's been said by the applicants in terms of community funds for not being a material consideration, I'm not sure that can be a material consideration in the determination of the application in terms of very special circumstances. Can it? It's a question.

01:25:28:06 - 01:25:31:14

Because I know we've talked before about community benefits and sons, etc..

01:25:31:21 - 01:26:04:07

Um, what we've been trying to do, I think in probably in response to the examining authority's questions, is to, is to sort of to explain how the community benefit element would it be maintain it isn't material. It shouldn't be a reason for the decision. Effectively, it shouldn't be material in the decision making. Will review the wording in the greenbelt note in terms of where that that nuance is.

But I think we've been trying to sort of pull the bucket together in terms of everything that's there, just so it's there.

01:26:04:09 - 01:26:10:16

But with that very strong caveat that this cannot be a reason, effectively a reason for granting consent for the project.

01:26:10:18 - 01:26:11:08

So should it be.

01:26:11:10 - 01:26:13:09

Considered a very special circumstance? That's the yeah.

01:26:13:11 - 01:26:14:01

You have.

01:26:14:03 - 01:26:14:18

A look.

01:26:14:20 - 01:26:15:10

At how it's.

01:26:15:12 - 01:26:16:02

Phrased.

01:26:16:04 - 01:26:17:24

Thank you. Uh.

01:26:24:24 - 01:26:26:13

And as I say, I.

01:26:27:18 - 01:26:56:01

Probably do need to ask some questions about critical national priority a bit later in the examination, uh, of, you know, notwithstanding whether or not it's relevant or not to any final decision. But does the Ian one just one question. Does the Ian one mitigation hierarchy test in terms of the mitigation hierarchy need to be demonstrated? That does relate to greenbelt considerations, I think is my interpretation. Uh, do you agree?

01:26:56:03 - 01:27:20:03

Listen, I know that it's not very clear in the end. One, I have to say, I think how those two things fit together. But our our interpretation of it is that in order for the CNP priority, uh, um, CNP priority to take effect, you have to have gone through the mitigation hierarchy. So you have to have you have to have got to the bottom of

01:27:22:02 - 01:28:04:11

the, um, sort of avoid, minimize, mitigate to then say this is what we're left with. We now apply that to basically say, does it outweigh the adverse effects of what are there and that the, the test that applies in respect of, of greenbelt, which is that that comprises very special circumstances, has to have come after you've gone through that effectively that cascade through the mitigation hierarchy. If you read in one some of the tables and things are not entirely clear, but I think from the basis of decisions to date and certainly from the approach taken from other examining authorities, I think that's the very clear steer as to how it should be interpreted.

01:28:06:24 - 01:28:38:23

Okay. Thank you. There's obviously lots of other points that have been made on the greenbelt. And those just because we've not discussed those don't mean to say they're not being considered. I think they are very clear in writing in terms of parties objections on greenbelt terms, which we will understand and we'll be taking into account as well. But if there are any further points on Greenbelt people want to make, bearing in mind the Greenbelt technical note, I'm not going to copy it because it's too long to print out. But bearing in mind the technical note, uh, then please do so at ideally deadline for.

01:28:39:00 - 01:28:58:06

But if you can't do a deadline for because that is week after next and people are on holiday, etc., then for deadline five, although I would ask the councils if you can could do that for deadline for so we can then that will move us into the written question stage, our next written question stage, if we need to draw on anything at that stage, is that. Is that fine as an approach that okay.

01:28:58:21 - 01:29:31:19

So far Borough council. Can I just add. Well of course respond in writing. I think we need to see the additional information in terms of the any other harms that are going into that very special circumstances balance. And we also need to understand the additional information that's going to be put forward in addition to the Greenbelt belt. Technical notes. Just the point about policy interpretation, application, and relatively well-established through case law that in terms of green belt policy, inappropriate definition, inappropriate development by definition attracts substantial weight.

01:29:31:24 - 01:30:11:06

Then there's also any substantial weight to any impact on openness, which of course has visual and spatial openness. And we agree in terms of temporal nature, etc. set out in the PPG. The relevance of that has. And then of course, also any other harms which include not just landscape but absolutely everything, including those. A point was made about those assessed under the ES, including those which aren't significant, but also, as we've indicated, moderate, etc. and so we would welcome some further information on that to be able to fully assess whether or not we agree or disagree on which particular point do we agree and disagree on in terms of green belt assessment?

01:30:12:00 - 01:30:12:21

Thank you. That's helpful.

01:30:12:23 - 01:30:15:17

Yeah, we're entirely comfortable with that. Yeah. Yeah. Okay.

01:30:15:19 - 01:30:16:09

Yeah.

01:30:16:11 - 01:30:17:01

Thank you.

01:30:27:18 - 01:30:33:19

All right. Thank you, everybody, for all your contributions on that item. Uh,

01:30:35:09 - 01:30:49:12

that's as far as we're going to get to the agenda on the agenda today. We'll just go on to do the action points in a moment. But tomorrow we will commence at 930 and we'll be dealing with, I think, offshore

01:30:51:02 - 01:30:54:15

offshore ecology, which is item five.

01:30:56:14 - 01:30:58:20

So that will be at 930 tomorrow.

01:31:00:14 - 01:31:11:09

Is somebody ready to do. Go through the action points. Is somebody from the panel ready to go through the action points. You got the list up there. Okay I'll get them up as well. But if you could.

01:31:11:11 - 01:31:12:01

Have a.

01:31:28:04 - 01:31:46:01

Okay. So we are, Liz, done on behalf of the applicants. Um, this is the list of hearing action points that we have. Um, so, um, hearing action point one was for the applicants and for Newton. Uh, sorry. Um,

01:31:47:16 - 01:31:55:05

Newton with Clifton and Parrish Parish Council. Sorry. It's been a long day. Um, it's for us to submit the statement of common ground for deadline five.

01:31:56:19 - 01:32:14:15

Uh, the second action was for the applicants to provide a note on progress with Natural England in terms of the recent meeting and the list of documents that we'd agreed to update at deadline five. So that's the application documents that would be updated and that would be provided for deadline for

01:32:16:08 - 01:32:16:23

um.

01:32:17:09 - 01:32:17:24

Uh.

01:32:18:02 - 01:32:55:20

0.3. Was the applicant providing an overlay plan of the football pitches at Blackpool Road Recreation Ground against the plan with the change request, and include this in the change request application. Uh, that will be obviously put in with the change request application that's going in for deadline for uh, the next point, which number four was the applicant to update the change request notification to include the specifically include I think it's there within change for a but it's to draw out the construction access change, um, uh outside of Blackpool airport.

01:32:56:09 - 01:33:42:05

Um and to resubmit the change request notification, which we will do as soon as possible this week. Um, point five was for the applicant to ensure that the change request application includes a description of the effects of the change on each of the conclusions on the ES. On a topic by topic basis. Um, and that will go in for deadline for obviously with the change request. Uh, the next one, which was uh, for the applicants in Blackpool airport, um, to um submit effectively once the cooperation agreement has been has been signed by both parties and Blackpool Airport has withdrawn.

01:33:42:07 - 01:34:13:06

It's, uh, it's representations in respect to the project that we would provide a joint note effectively explaining how the relevant NPS policy tests are met through that. Uh, the next point for the applicants were was to provide a note to explain, um, how we've how the information submitted to date in relation to bird strike fits with the environmental statement. Um, and that was for deadline five.

01:34:13:08 - 01:34:43:19

I think that's drawing together that information. Um, in terms of, of of where it fits in the kind of application material. Uh, point nine was for the applicants to provide, um, clarification, um, on, um, the, uh, comments made in rep 1037 in relation to when bird strike was first raised by BAE um and how it was dealt with in the consultation report.

01:34:43:21 - 01:35:16:21

So it's, it's uh, uh, just confirming how it was considered and, uh, at what stages. Um, the next point, uh, is for the applicants to, um, provide a submission explaining how we are complying with NPS in one paragraph. 5.5.41. And that's in relation to the Wildlife hazard management plan and the sort of compliance with relevant policy around, um, mitigation of effects.

01:35:17:16 - 01:35:42:00

Uh, the next one, um, was for BAA and Blackpool Airport, I think probably not the, the applicants but would be optional. Uh, is to submit a document highlighting the similarities and differences between the airport and Blackpool Airport and Warton aerodrome. Uh, then the next one was for BAE to provide the which documents they can that have been.

01:35:44:11 - 01:36:30:03

Which documents they can that have that were requested as part of that outstanding request by the applicant. Um, uh, in terms of those that wouldn't fall under the non-disclosure agreement. And that

would be as soon as possible. Uh, but for deadline for certainly submitted, submitted to the applicants as soon as possible and into examination at deadline for um, uh, the next one, um, was for the applicants to submit a note, um, clarifying the position with Natural England, um, in respect of the Fairhaven salt marsh area in terms of its function and how it fits in the context of the increasing, um, obligations made around restrictions and those sorts of matters.

01:36:30:05 - 01:36:32:08

And that would be for deadline for,

01:36:34:05 - 01:37:09:20

um, the, uh, applicants to provide the without prejudice biodiversity benefit requirement. Um, at deadline for in terms of the securing of biodiversity benefit. Um, the next one is for the applicants to submit a note identifying where elements of peat soils and peat land habitats are being considered, uh, and responses to Natural England points raised and that will be in D D4. Um, the applicants will also provide a map detailing the phase one habitat survey coverage at D4.

01:37:10:16 - 01:37:42:21

Um Fylde Council, I think we're going to provide information on the usage of the access of Clifton Drive north to the existing sand winning compound. Uh, that was an action on the council. Our council? Um, the next one was for the applicant. Um, to, I think, draw together a plan showing the existing gradients and proposed gradients for the substations for Morcom and Morgan. Uh, next one was for the applicants and, uh, filed.

01:37:42:23 - 01:37:57:16

I think it is to provide a summary of the applicants. Sorry. This is probably just for the applicant to provide a summary of our position on the area of separation policy, which we'll be doing for deadline for, um, uh.

01:38:00:01 - 01:38:04:16

Uh uh, the next one was for the applicants. Um, I think too.

01:38:06:14 - 01:38:39:00

I'm sure about that one. What do you think? Uh, we've got provide an update as to when final design principles document. So everybody has an opportunity to respond. That's our timetable for engagement with the councils, isn't it? Yeah. Okay. So that that probably so that's for the applicants to provide a timetable for engagement with Fylde Council and Lancashire County Council in respect to the design Principles document. So to be able to provide an update at deadline five. I think that was what we agreed to do. So we would do um.

01:38:39:16 - 01:39:30:14

Uh, the next one was for the applicants, which was to update the Greenbelt technical note to include matters on other harms to review the position on the inclusion of community benefit. And, uh, there was something on wait, wasn't there in terms of the the quantification of home to be added there. Um, and then for, um, effectively for the applicants and the local authorities to ensure that in the next statement of common ground, uh, there is a clear sort of statement or record of areas of agreement and disagreement between the applicants and Lancashire County Council and FA Borough Council in

respect of I think it was landscape and visual impacts, wasn't it? Extent of impacts in particular areas and green belt.

01:39:30:16 - 01:39:31:06

Okay.

01:39:32:02 - 01:39:35:21

Uh, and that looks like everything we've got here.

01:39:39:00 - 01:39:40:18

Yes. Yes. Yeah.

01:39:43:02 - 01:39:43:17

Yeah.

01:39:47:07 - 01:39:52:09

Thank you. I think that concurs with what is on our list.

01:39:52:11 - 01:39:53:05

But if.

01:39:55:06 - 01:40:01:19

Because we're early in the week. That list can be sent through to the case team. We can just make sure that that is.

01:40:03:23 - 01:40:04:13

That is fine.

01:40:04:16 - 01:40:16:13

Yes. That's done. On behalf of the applicants. We'll tidy that up and get it over to the case team. Um, hopefully tomorrow and then we can, uh, I might be over promising there, but it'll certainly be in the next day or so. Yeah.

01:40:16:22 - 01:40:20:16

If that can be tomorrow, and then we can just, if possible, I know everyone.

01:40:21:04 - 01:40:28:18

We will do our best. Yeah. As you can imagine, we're quite busy over these days like everybody else is. So we'll we'll we'll note the request.

01:40:30:02 - 01:40:32:06

Okay. Okay.

01:40:32:14 - 01:40:33:14

Everybody happy?

01:40:33:24 - 01:40:35:05

Thank you. Thank you.

01:40:35:20 - 01:40:47:17

Okay. Well, thank you for everyone's contributions today that have been, uh, very helpful. As always. We will, uh, adjourn for today and reconvene tomorrow morning at 930.

01:40:47:22 - 01:40:48:13

Thank you.