

04.08.26
10am Session
Lighting

- Submissions raised in writing or by others – not to be raised again.
- Today's topic – lighting
 - Attendance
 - Marella Fyffe (Save our Sperrins)
 - Niall McAleer (Save our Sperrins)
 - Mary Brolly (Solicitor)
 - Fidelma O'Kane (Save our Sperrins)
 - Communities Against Mining and Independent 3rd Party Objectors)
 - Martin Tracey
 - Sean Tracey
 - Michael Conway
 - Raymond Dennehy
 - DfI
 - Julie Ellison BL
 - Barney McKay BL
 - Ms Layton
 - Mr Cromie (tomorrow only)
 - NIEA, DAERA
 - Neil McAllister
 - Liz Smith
 - Planning Dept Mid (MUDC)
 - Lorraine Moon
 - Emma McCullagh
 - Applicant/ Dalradian Gold
 - Scott Lyness KC
 - Dominic Meyrick (Hoare Lee)
 - Mr Gordon (planning expert)
 - NIE
 - William Orbinson KC instructed by Carson McDowell
 - Allister McKinley Tetretek (may be called)
 - FODC
 - Conor Fegan BL
 - Patrica Brock (consultant - Aecom)
 - Paul McDermot (lead planner with council)
 - 3rd party supporters
 - Mark Hanvey (Gravis Planning)
 - Michael Long (Gravis Planning)
 - Gerry Kelly

Query raised

Addressed by rebuttal or transboundary

Specially the base line – other questions on methodology

Fegan handed to Ms Brock (Aecom)

- Location of sky measurement – dark sky impact rather than residential
- Use of info in baseline
- Justification used was of concern re lighting assessment to do with reclassification
 - Input – about the classification – from rural to urban/ suburban
 - Clarification – existing is largely dark – from AO and B to industrial
 - Also measurements obtained, based on that point and time – but they may have different implication – and concern about what that might be used as a basis for.
 - Fegan BL – lighting impact TR 08 App 1 Pg 69 – section 6 – existing classification – E0 E1 and E3 and E4 areas – concerns raised about classification of E3 and 4 areas.

Q to Mr Lyness from panel – do these form part of the baseline reading?

- Mr Lyness - Confirmed - Existing site is within the baseline
- Is that beneficial as not starting from 'blank canvas'?
 - Haven't assumed any lighting – there is no lighting at the existing site. Doesn't make any difference – there is
- Query – has the existing site been assessed
 - Yes, then corrected No – not assessed, stated there is no lighting there.
 - Dalradian added – did not assume lighting on existing site, didn't reduce impact from proposed scheme.
- Panel – highlighted conflicting responses
 - Dal – TR 08 – Mr Meyrick's evidence – base line – no mention of existing, showing not taken account of.
 - PDF Pg 13 of TR 08 App 01 – Mr Meyrick to explain – sets out survey locations for baseline assessment. No survey location at existing exploration site.
 - Other points to FODCE[acronym unclear] Panel – to return to later after further Qs
- Panel – existing site – no lighting proposed
 - Dal – any lighting to existing site to be part of the development
 - Panel – is there any lighting/ security etc?
 - Dal – yes
 - Why not included, will it stay
 - There will be, to be part of 'conditions'
 - The amount of lighting on existing would be nothing like what would be on the site – Panel – still development
 - Dal concerned about incl things in the baseline
 - Panel – things are running in parallel
- Panel – assessments do not read – an amended site conditions was used?!
 - Mr Merrik – visited site – Fig 6 Pg 69 TR 08 App 1 = our assessment of existing environmental zones of the site and surrounding areas. Obviously other conversation on assessment and lighting on the site – professional judgement on site and surroundings.

- Panel – query around accepting decreasing lighting conditions
 - Merrik – change is purely on the site itself – there is NO change outside that area from the baseline condition.
- Panel (McParland via ?) – construction site/ proposed infrastructure/ entire red line
 - Merrik – proposed infrastructure
 - Mr Lyness – take to plan showing T 08 App 3 Pg 23 Fig 3.2 – shows extent.
 - Panel – 3.3 horizontal light spill – query which doc
 - Confirmed infrastructure site
 - Mr Lyness – low light level on ground and relationship to development site - taken into account.
- Panel – Fegan to come back on methodology
 - Largely debate for assessment stage
 - No change to other separate location – talking about several different things
 - Sky glow
 - Light leak
 - ?
 - No sure Mr Lyness point about ‘conditions’ dealing with it is likely to be achievable.
- Panel – types of lighting – extent of document – is all lighting considered – vehicle, security, emergency, etc.
 - LIA cover permanent lighting on – an installation – no assessment of vehicles as transient, emergency – substantially impacting amount of light, security would have drastically lower
 - Taking ‘worst case scenario’ of permanent lighting only
 - Panel – site is 365/24 hrs – confirmed by Meyrick
 - Mr Lyness – construction lighting – not considered as part of Mr Meyrick, but not to say it’s not been App B2 includes nr of measures to mitigate construction lighting. Panel queried where is the assessment – Lyness – assumed to be dealt with as a ‘condition’.
 - Lyness – Meyrick qualitative assessment of lighting, other assessment in ES on qualitative
 - Construction is within the LVIA
 - Panel – broader landscape – so where is it in the lighting
 - Lyness – doesn’t want to go too broad, any debate they should be reached in landscape context. Residual technical issues.
 - Panel – repeatedly asked to be taken to the document
 - Lyness - Appendix C16 Vol 1 to begin – main report, 5.9 on Pdf Pg 25, lighting in LVIA, examples:
 - Pg 64 – local landscape area South Sperrins (character areas)
 - Pdf 65 – potential effects of lighting (done for a number of sites throughout the report)

- Panel queried if comments were the extent of the consideration?
 - Lyness – that’s right
 - FAI further commentary under LVIA banner
 - Ms Oxley prepared LVIA (qualitative assessment?) v Meyrick quantitative assessment
- TR13 at PDF Pg 59 – para 1.5.1 – 1.5.3 – Hoare Lee
 - Further references confirm – rebuttal report 13 Pg 107 and PDF 75 responding to FODC.
 - Panel – clarification Meyrick is based on 2024 design amendment – but landscape considerations – they consider 2024, but what about operational – there are no drawing – Lyness clarified there are.
 - Meyrick proposals were taken in to account by Ms Oxley in preparing LVIA (updated from 2017 report).
 - Fegan BL – flag agree with Lyness re division between technical quantitative v landscaping.
 - Panel confirmed several concerns of Commission/Panel
 - Lyness – references given – 2017 LVIA –
 - Panel query – need to read together but some parts are superseded.
 - Lyness – can all be debated with landscape witnesses
 - Panel – minimal questions for lighting in landscaping (same person dealing with them) McParland – we have set timetable – 3 days for lighting to deal with nuances – if there are questions on viewpoints/ characters... that is it! The technical aspects are being done this week.
 - Lyness – impacts on lighting have been fed into other reports – some we can deal with from technical aspects – but when moving into judgement – that’s for separate areas!!
 - Panel had side discussion – dealing with receptors this week, impact on character will be otherwise but receptors this week,
 - Lyness challenged this and was corrected that it would be dealt with this week.
 - Fegan – align with Lyness – but take Panels comments on that – ready to discuss technical issues, landscape expert is not here.
- Panel questions to Council/ Fegan – from initial submissions
 - No overall lighting plan or scheme effect as a whole
 - Ms Brock -
 - Calculated outcomes in isolation only
 - Ms Brock - Update considers performance as a whole for the site – understanding performance from a technical perspective
 - Performance analysis to consider 365 and all light sources, constant alignment or normal operations – has that been addressed

- Assessed against lower boundaries recommended by ILP?
Doesn't necessarily align, but probably does except sky glow – no concerns technically.
- Outdated guidance re CIE 150-2003 light ratio – should be updated? Still contained in current submission for direct upward and indirect. Panel – outdated guidance? Updated? Not updated or it is a blend.
 - Panel relevance/ consequences? Updates to some methodology – more about calculation, but impact of direct/indirect – not clear how applied or relevance. Particularly metric (upward flux ratio) did not exist in 2003. 2003 and 2017 documents are referenced within the assessment.
- Formal lighting assessment against guidelines should be provided, has it? Yes, it's been expanded to include those details.
- TR8 only static not other moving/temp along access roads etc. – not part of Meyrick's consideration, still in issue? Fegan doesn't form part of formal application – however, it still clearly real world relevant as people will notice it – and should be included, in LVIA analysis. Debate to be had later, character areas impact of lighting of vehicles etc. Accepted referenced in LVIA, but Fegan will want to make submission on that at that stage.
- Insufficient information – environment performance on wider basis – glare, glow, etc. Given commentary that areas are unlit - ? some conditions should be placed on light.
- Overreliance on outcome visual performance, that don't align with technical performance - what is the concern? Total of lights didn't really tie in with the potential outcome – not understood by council – to return to this issue.
- Isolated work areas – don't show full site with connected work areas impact – has the whole been looked at? Fegan – yes we can now make an assessment of the whole.
- Not quantitative, subsequent findings are mixed, resolved? Largely resolved – however, leads into cross over between technical outcomes v subjective perception of the observer.
- Operational lighting – mitigation, resolved? More information provided – some to be addressed in 'conditions'. Panel – is council satisfied with the approach? yes
- Lyness to rebut?
 - Points recognise previous lighting work not Meyrick's work – improved lighting, up to date guidance and standard, across whole site
 - FODC rebuttal App 7 – no substantive points re Merrik's work
 - Para 1.9 PDF Pg 2 – recognised TR8 = improved response to concerns, outstanding issues – not substantive concern with Meyrick's work. Just readability and understanding.

- Dark skies – technical – no point in technical rebuttal, not technical lighting
- Outdated methodology (UFR) – some references – zero consequences – didn't exist in 2003, but it was specifically considered.
- Machinery, vehicles – agree with Fegan – raised not as technical lighting matter – made by Mr Ingram in landscaping context. Does not fall within technical lighting context.
- Variants of light levels between different locations – only base point by council/Aecom – receptor locations no short comings in baseline in terms of survey locations and attribution against each of those locations.
- Mr Meyrick
 - Recognised in guidance IRP Gen 08 – lighting and bats – complete darkness numerical number is 0.2 lux horizontal, 0.4lux vertical. There is an acceptance in guidance that light – natural/ artificial – exists at night. In order to have a baseline position. When taking 0.15 horizontal and vertical = it is complete darkness. Only relevant if numbers change in assessment report – there is no change.
 - Guidance – clerical error – should have said 2017 not 2003. FODC pointed out – confirmation. App 1 PDF Pg 6 identified as 2017.
 - Lyness – PDF Pg 7 para 1.22 representative measurements are not uncommon for unchanged conditions – general recognition of Meyrick's judgement application across locations is not uncommon/ inappropriate.
- Panel moved to Other Parties
 - Mr Tracey
 - Identify of final lighting scheme is not concluded (2017, 2019, 2020, 2024). 'Dimming unnecessary' no explanation.
 - Corrective colour temperature – 2017 4,000k – 2019, 2020 but in 2024 changed without being accounted for in calculations.
 - Main junction – 15 lux with UO – 0.4 in 2017, 2019 – omitted in 2020. In 2024 – 100 lux horizontal, 25 lux vert;
 - Docs in 2024 – marked
 - Panel – 2024 scheme – final scheme –
 - Tracey – evolution – but drawing – status F Preliminary
 - Can support impact assessment
 - Any credible – need design freeze
 - 2700k
 - Sept 2024 – Ex1 – Ex18 – detail lighting schedule – Ex3 3000k
 - Design parameter – detailed schedule of files manufacturer's own files – Panel said similar question from Council and they were to return to Panel.

- What needs to be done is the provision of native files showing assumptions.
- Panel – issued warning – experts acting professionally – even if paid, doesn’t undermine independence.
- Tracey – only detail done with native files not merely interpretation by appointed professionals.
- Environmental zone classification – circular assessment – E0 / E1 – to an E3 / E4. Clarification needs to be sought.
- Assessment based on two visits on site – 15 and 16 September 2021, conditions – partially cloudy with moon light. 1 October 2021 – more suitable visit - 2nd reading clear night – perfect conditions – no reading taken that night. Would have an impact on results.
- Full on lux readings should have been provided – not rounded down numbers.
- Construction and DFS lighting not subject to assessment –
- Vehicles etc.
- 2025 Final CEMP – reference to looking at it later on! Is this acceptable for planning purposes?
- Lighting scheme – large building – no apparent assessment of light escaping from various sources.
- Raised human rights matters – receptors/ local homes – 365/24/7 heavy construction site.
- 12642-2[?] submitted detailed scheme after BS in 2024, bare minimum gap analysis done. Entire lifecycle of lighting arrangement, 5.10.4 ecology – each independent species assessed not as a whole, as per 2024 standards.
- Fence as diffuser – further reduce spill light – argument – no evidence provided of material etc. 2024 BS gives figures for materials outdoors – not considered.
 - Panel asked what is the fencing proposed – Dal Dr Gordon – suggested wooden fence – need to check; McParland – clarifying what was allowed – Mr Gordon to check and confirm.
 - Further questions from Tracey that could arise based on the confirmation of fence type
- No light pollution – exceeds what the model approves
 - Move from limited calc to absolute statements. But acknowledge – E01 – 02 – 03 – 04 transformation within the site.
 - Evidence doesn’t support blanket statements
- 3D modelling claimed to have been carried out – none of this has been provided. Those native files should have been provided.
 - DFF acting as mitigation, topography isn’t flat, it’s a valley and hilltop.
- Assessment doesn’t express a curfew time or limits. Without a defined scheme – can’t control during nighttime hours. Nuisance

light must be considered. Two domestic planning applications and dwellings under construction.

- 16264 BS – update must have gap analysis done.

- McCulloch
 - Methodology and x only
 - Lighting standards out of date, but has been addressed
 - Raised by objector – drawing not finalised – outdoor lighting 2700 degrees – international dark sky colour temp max of 3,000. Want to make sure the final figure doesn't exceed that at its max.
- Barbar Ward
 - Original site – different answers. Lights in compound day and night and v noticeable at night.
 - Compound hasn't been taken down as ordered,
 - Cameras following residents 24/7 against human rights.
- McAleer
 - Echo – Tracey points
 - ALP standards – changes to heavy industrial operations – no independent auditor as to meeting standards at the boundary of the site.
 - Reference to another fencing line – E0 E1 – remote rural – proposed development will create E3. Applicant is saying there's no spill – through a mesh fence with downward light – but it's 8m high on the top of a hill.
 - Omission of existing infrastructure site – baseline levels weren't impacted – but 1.2 mile away lights off sustained for 25 years – LVIA Pg 64 – 65 = moderate/ significant impact for duration of project. – not an argument to say it will return in 25 years.
 - Remarkably dark area – inevitable Sperrins will be stripped of their character.
 - Simulations – based on assumptions – not compatible with nature of Sperrins. Appears contained on dry night – will actually be glowing doom – droplets, hanging, low cloud, etc. Lights for GAA field is an example only on for a short time.
 - Nocturnal continuity of landscape character – legal framework – Timmons v Borough Council 2014 visual impact cannot mask intrinsic harm to natural character.
 - Operational lighting classed as transient – hundreds of vehicles/ daily. Modelling only fixed sources = not realistic excluding vehicles – high contrast flash glare, more disruptive to ecosystems and local residents.
 - Absence of control curfews – no commitment to smart lights, motion sensors for security. Violates dark light principles.
 - Fedelma – artificial light – Panel – will be dealt with in ecology section – and impact on protective species.
- Tracey
 - Point of discrepancy – Hoare Lee – when were they appointed? TR13 re reference to 2024 report. TR 8 – employed Aug 2021, TR13 – appointed in Aug 2019. Re the report itself, several issues with the report. New baseline work, new conclusions,

- Does it supersede, is it an addendum, does DFI believe it's a new report? Panel – will go back to applicant.
 - Can DFI confirm TR 8 was considered under [inaudible], is it on record, does it comply with updated standards. Not a complete assessment of lighting, excludes future or include several types, there is no single coherent submission:
 - Reg 21 2015 regs allows for submission of new information – DFI had no say in the process. It came in through the enquiry and was provided to DFI. It's on public record. No requirement in legislation, even if new environmental information, it suspends consultation within Northern Ireland.
 - This information should have been deemed new environmental information and taken into account – puts 'them' on notice of the issue.
- Ms Brolly
 - Technical lighting inadequately scoped – excludes several sources and fails to take account of winter conditions.
 - Assessment confined to fixed lighting – that omission = assessment is inconsistent with assessment practice and cannot be regarded as sufficient for robust assessment.
- Mr Tracey –
 - Ecology refers to out of date bat information – assessment is outdated.

Return to Dal

- Fences
 - Post and wire
 - Timber
- Close board fence during construction
 - Wooden
 - 2.5m
 - Not permanently retained
- Geotextile
 - Construction only
 - Prevents sediment entry to water courses
- Lyness
 - Mr Sean Tracey – didn't see any of those detailed points raised reflected in written submissions.
 - Baseline/methodology went much further – but will try to deal with them
 - TR8 – does supersede App B 11 chroma lighting scheme
 - Content to sign up to 'those proposals' that scheme to be for approval for operational lighting – TR8 App 2
 - Reject suggestion of any issue with Mr Meyrick impartiality
 - Re modelling results – points not raised before, no one has requested information – submission it is not necessary to provide
 - E3/E4 approach to site – Meyrick to deal in detail. While lighting impact assessment states – post development status; the assessment of lighting impacts does not depend on treating the site as E3-4 post development. If

you take light spill/glare – there will be no change. Panel – asked why then is E3-4 included in assessment.

- Meyrick – counter intuitive – environmental zone not dependent on amount of artificial lighting. Read guidance – ch environmental zone Pg12 – where planning authority hasn't set limits – application to use objective assessment on character of area – crucial step.
 - Panel – how has rural area been designated built up area?
 - Meyrick – it is a field – but with road, farming, etc. – not still a field
 - Panel – assessment being based on development not done.
 - Meyrick – baseline = E0 – E1 assessed – App 1, Pg 69 Fig 6 – site is in an E0- E1 (graphic not clear – top right of page confirms) – a field.
 - Lyness – fundamentally – scheme against standards was not on the basis of E3 – E4.
 - Lyness – survey work across 2 nights – there will be no light spill/ glare outside the site. The area outside the site will not be affected whatsoever. Demonstrated by 0.5lux levels.
 - Machinery and vehicles – not part of this assessment but LVA assessment
 - Ecology – another date to deal
 - Curfew/ Post curfew – way standards applied re light spill. App 1 TR 8 Pg 7. Table 3.2 pre curfew and post curfew. Relates to prior point – distinction is not material in this case where having zero effect outside site – no need to apply pre/post curfew.
 - Receptors – similar – if it is as Dal say, zero effect on identified receptors in impact assessment – same conclusion applies to any other receptors. If you're preventing spill/ glare = there's no effect on receptors outside the site.
 - 2700 v 3000 – content for 2700 to be read across the board. Can be reflected in any approved operational scheme pursuant to conditions.
- Re Mr McAleer
 - LVIA – mischaracterising what the text says – PDF64 – south sperrins character area – moderate effects – localised effects and will be negligible during construction operational phases – having regard to lighting from south will be seen in context of other existing artificial lighting.
 - Sky glow and atmospheric conditions – not strictly baseline. Ask Meyrick to explain his position but might trespass in dark skies territory.
 - Vehicles – not ignored, part of LBIA
 - Smart lighting – Meyrick to explain, some merit in suggestion. Some smart lighting could be achieved – no movement = turn off/ dimmed. Can be picked up through approval process. Worst case assessment has been carried out with full power at all times.
 - Mr Martin Tracey
 - Instruction in Aug 2021

- Panel summary of legal position is correct – TR 8, dealt with PG 10 para 43.
 - Ms Brolly
 - Inconsistent with accepted practice – not include machinery within LIA – Meyrick to explain. No part of formal FIA re moving sources.
- Mr Meyrick. (DAL Lighting Expert)
 - Confirmed 2700 kelvin colour temp of light. Co-related colour temperature. Suppliers can be unclear between 2700 v 3000 – Dal will ensure all fittings are 2700.
 - From ecology perspective – re bats – recommend less than 3000, 2700 is normal go to temp – happy to sign up to.
 - Conditions for LRA – essential to have worst case scenario for methodology purposes.
 - Dimming/ adaptive lighting – advised client to be careful – objectors will attest security lighting flashes on and off re cats/ foxes. That on/off effect can be as disturbing as something permanently on. Bringing in dimming (makes sense energy wise) but no impact assessment wise. Over a period (imperceivable) to say 30% - to a timescale – Dal is happy to sign up to.
 - Upward flux ratio – (McAleer) intrinsic darkness – area doesn't have clear conditions, it's in Meyrick report – slight haze will be visible from the site, reflected light. This is not light pollution issue. Sky glow – fundamentally about blocking out human receptor to block out the stars. From quantitative aspect – the stars are not seen. In clear conditions such light would not be perceivable [?!].
- Fegan
 - Baseline methodology – E3, E0, E1 – does not depend on [x]
 - TR8 App 3 – lighting impact assessment Pg 24
 - Indirect sky glow (3.4 and 3.4.3) within guidelines for E3, 3.4.4 – if planning permission is granted – it would be within guidance for new classification.
 - So site is classified as E0 E1 but here it states with are within E3! – this is the 'slight of hand' that people are complaining of. That is the concern with the methodology.
 - Pg 26 – conclusion at 5.3 – may change local character to E3 – E4 it is confined to the working areas. – It is not while the work is on going, it is the nature of the works/site.
 - TR8 App1 Pg10 – Table 3.6 – max values of upward flux for installation – standards are much higher for E3 than E0. Notes to table – not usually expected within these zones – this is the concern of the council and the 3rd parties.
 - EIA perspective – baseline E0 E1; introducing development – lighting is acceptable BECAUSE we've granted planning permission. It doesn't make

sense. Regardless of that being how the expert does it – doesn't make sense from an EIA perspective. People are struggling to see the logic. It doesn't add up.

- Lyness – response – in context from outset – never suggestion from Aecom report. Re 'sleight of hand' is inappropriate, raised 'partial reading' by the council. In summary – no light spill/ glare outside the site – then environmental issues don't arise for receptors. Panel sought to clarify – environmental zoning judgement doesn't depend on it.
 - Re direct light spill – Meyrick to explain – by para 3.36 – no change of existing condition – not depending on post development spill.
 - Within 2% guidelines of E3, E3 is higher than 2% (at 8% in table).
 - On fair reading of summary/ report – results speak for themselves and standards can be applied.
- Meyrick – limited to counsel's comments – draw attention App 1 Pg 10 Fig 3.6 – top in description UFR measures – direct and indirect sky glow.
 - Bigger concern astronomy – upward light ratio – table above – difference is that you have doom above head, when a fitting has upward light or tilted to direct light to sky (direct upward light) – it is this light that is most light polluting of all aspects.
 - Upward reflected light – bounces off surfaces – dissipates over sky doom – appreciates Fegan's comments – direct upward light does not exist off this site. You wouldn't perceive at all but for the atmospheric conditions here raised before. Similar to street lighting in Greencastle and Rooskey.
- Fegan
 - Answer received isn't clear, doesn't answer nub of concern
 - Methodology set out in report TR8 App 1 Pg 10 Table we've been to. That's what they've signed up to.
 - Answer has tried to evade that methodology – you don't need to pay attention as there won't be much sky glow.
 - Calc hasn't been undertaken
 - It shows within E0 zone – 1.54,
 - 21.2.5. – lighting of this type not usually expected in these zones – workaround – not direct. But Table requires you to look at it holistically
 - TR8 App 3 g 24 para 3.4.1 – CIE 1.5.0 2017 the total upward light can be calc'd = upward flux ratio. Para 3.4.3 = 1.54. UFR post operational within guidelines for E3. Not misreading report. These are the critical paragraphs – no attempt to grapple in the responses for Lyness and Meyrick. E0 = NA, they would be in trouble if they applied E0 standard. This is traced through to Pg 26 – rising to E3 – E4 environmental zone.
- Mr Meyrick
 - Take Mr Fegan's point – it is an E3 site. Statement of fact that if it became an E3 site – the codes and guidance
 - Acknowledges it is an AONB, which is an E1.

- Guidance on AONB allows 2% upward flux
- It's not an amenity site or sports site, it is a mine. 'My interpretation' in certain circumstances upwards flux will exist.
- 'Not for me to comment' on whether this should go ahead, just what flux will come from a site.
- Argued that even if half of the proposed lighting existed there would still be light [not sure I've caught his point as this doesn't]. Claims it would be imperceptible but definitely there.
- Lyness – takes issue with the language used. Again claimed 'doesn't appear to be any issue with' several aspects. Point appears to be in relation to indirect light spill. And that's not supposed to be perceptible by any external receptor. Accepts Mr Fegan's point re E3 – but still claims to be within the environmental zone, not claimed to be E3.

Disclaimer:

These are not word-for-word transcripts of the proceedings. This note was taken by an independent observer in real time. Transcription errors may be present.

PILS have not edited the notes, other than to correct minor formatting issues or to clarify where text is missing due to inaudibility.

This note of the proceedings before the conjoined public inquiries into the Curraghinalt Project is for general information purposes. It does not, and is not intended to, constitute legal or other professional advice.

PILS cannot guarantee the accuracy of the note; any views expressed during the inquiry by participants are their own.