

TRANSCRIPT_SizewellC_ISH13_Session1_1 6092021

Thu, 9/16 12:59PM • 1:39:31

00:06

Good morning everyone and welcome. It is now time for me to open this issue specific hearing, which is being held in connection with an application made by nnb. Generation company s said c limited, who in order for development consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of the sizewell c project. Before I go any further Can I check with the case team that the recording and live stream of this event has commenced?

00:33

I can confirm the recording and live stream musculus. Thank you. For those people watching live stream. Let me explain that if the proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. When the meeting was resumed, you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Helen Cassini, I am a chartered town planner. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of examining inspectors that today either comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel are Wendy MCI, Edwin mod, David Brock and Neil Humphrey. They will now introduce themselves to you starting with Miss MCI.

01:21

Good morning, everyone. I'm Wendy MCI, I'm an examining inspector and lead member of the panel. I'll now pass over to Mr. maund.

01:32

Good morning, everyone. My name is Edward Moore, and I'm a chartered town planner. I too have been appointed to be a member of the panel. America pass on to Mr. Brock.

01:44

Good morning, everybody. My name is Dave Brock. I am a retired solicitor and the Secretary of State has appointed me as well as a member of this examining authority.

02:17

Apologies for that. Good morning, everyone. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel. I'll now hand back to Mrs. Cassini.

02:29

Thank you. We're also assisted at this hearing by the planning Inspectorate case team. Today, we have the planning Inspectorate case manager, Sean Evans, the other colleagues from the planning and spectra who will assist us today are Jake Stevens, and Edwin Maudsley.

02:45

If you have any questions or queries about the examination, or the technology we're using for blended events, the case team should be your first point of contact. their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you've received from us on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Before I get onto the main part of this hearing, I asked my colleague Mr. Humphrey, to highlight a few housekeeping and grap background matters for today.

03:12

As explained in the examining authorities rule eight letter annex D they issue specific hearings will be live streamed and recorded. The recordings will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes. To assist viewers and listeners, anyone speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings are retained and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies. Rule eight letter includes a link to the planning inspector at privacy notice, which provides further information on this topic. If there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential. It should be in written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off.

04:08

I will repeat the request made in the arrangements conference that in order to minimise background noise, please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted and that you stay muted unless you are speaking. In order to avoid fatigue. It is our intention to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals and a longer break over the lunch time period. No fire alarm testing is scheduled for today. Therefore if a fire alarm does sound Please evacuate the building by the nearest exit which which are clearly marked and you will be directed to the meeting point. The nearest toilet facilities are located just outside this room in the foyer. I will now hand over to Mr. maund will outline the purpose and conduct of this issue specific hearing.

04:56

Issue specific hearing provides an opportunity for the issue

05:00

is raised by interested parties and in particular the differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority.

05:08

The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in Section 91 of the Planning Act 2008. It is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations to

enable adequate examination of the issue, or to ensure that it is an interested party has a fair chance to put their case

05:30

as indicated in the agenda. Questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members. It is for the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations.

05:50

Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct of hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible, whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence would have identified the matters to be considered at this issue specific hearing, and those on which we require further information. And these are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing.

06:15

participants should know that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate by deadline date, which is Friday the 24th of September this year. I will now hand back to my colleague Mrs. Cassini. We will continue with the introductory matters.

06:35

Thank you. At this point, I'd like to ask those parties listed on the detailed agenda to introduce themselves please, starting with the applicant.

06:44

Good morning, madam. I appear on behalf of the applicant. My name is Harry would fill part QC. I'm instructed by Herbert Smith free hills. And during the course of the hearing, I'll be introducing some other speakers on individual items. Thank you. Could I ask Suffolk County Councillor to introduce themselves please?

07:05

Good morning, madam. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed by sharp Pritchard on behalf of the County Council. And I may introduce the other speakers as we go through the agenda items. Thank you.

07:16

Thank you, could I ask each separate council to introduce themselves?

07:24

morning madam, Andrew Tate QC for IE suffer cancel. And I will call upon Nicolas Newton who's the council's arboricultural and landscape manager and Robert scrimshaw, who's the council's principal design and conservation officer.

07:43

Thank you could I ask Suffolk coast and Heath AONB partnership to introduce themselves please?

07:50

Good morning, madam. It's Simon Amstutz, the manager of the area of outstanding natural beauties staff team and I'm here to represent the AONB partnership.

08:02

Thank you. We can market parish council please.

08:10

Hello, I'm Anne Westover representing wicker market parish Council. Thank you.

08:18

Thank you. miles fed parish Council. Please if you could introduce yourselves.

08:25

Good morning, madam. I'm Richard Cooper. I'm a counsellor on the multiple parish Council and I will be representing them today.

08:38

Thank you. Could I ask wholesale comm Carlton parish council to introduce themselves please.

08:46

Good morning. Edwina Galloway Vice Chair representing Kelsall comm Colton parish Council.

08:53

Thank you if I could ask the having him whole estate to introduce themselves. Yes, the

09:00

reason I'm counselling instructed by Norton rose Fulbright on behalf of having Hall estate, and I have with me Jason Clemens, director and head of heritage and townscape samples who are last speak beta.

09:13

Thank you very much. And I understand. Mr. Collins, are you representing a number of people today?

09:21

Indeed, Thank you, Paul Collins for seven years us parish council stops as we'll see.

09:28

There's the two today. Although Alison Downes may join us for later on when I have to depart for a short while. Thank you.

09:38

Thank you very much. I also note that there are people in attendance today who requested to speak at this hearing, but are not on the list of invitees set out in a detailed agenda. I won't ask you to introduce yourself now. But the first time you're invited to speak please can you introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organisation of the people you represent?

10:00

Hope you've had a chance to read the detailed agenda for this hearing. During the hearing today, I have questions for the applicant and the other invited parties if they're invited parties, interested parties who wish to speak on some of the agenda items. Once I'd finished my direct questioning on an agenda item, I'll ask if interested parties would like to make any submission relating to that agenda item before moving on to my direct questioning on the next agenda item. I'd like to remind you that this is not an open floor hearing on landscape and design or heritage matters. And submissions made or really should relate only to the agenda item we will be discussing. Once reassure you that your previous submissions have been read and noted. Understand that there may be other issues on not on the agenda that parties wish to raise. But submissions on these matters should be made in writing at deadline date, Friday the 24th of September this year. Thank you in advance for your current cooperation with this approach. List of the documents I may intend while I tend to refer to today has been made available on the project website. Please note that any page number references I make in this hearing relate to the electronic versions of documents and not to paper versions. So I'd now like to move on to Agenda Item Number two, which is sizewell link road. Mr. Collins, could you turn on your camera and microphone for me please?

11:28

Thank you, I do have a question for on representing a stop size while say so in your pre in previous submissions, both Everton and eastbridge parish council unstop size while cevo expressed concern that the link road would be an over engineered feature which would be facially inappropriate in a rural location. And a more sensitive and appropriate solution should be found. The applicant has confirmed that they are working with both councils to get an agreement in respect of the detailed design for the link road. And this includes landscaping features. In addition, the applicant has stated that no alternative design standards would be acceptable to Suffolk Highway Authority. I'd like to hear from yourself in respect of the parties that you're representing as to what differences you think could be made to the design of the proposed link road. Bearing in mind it must comply with local Highway Authority standards.

12:29

Thank you. Yes, I think I think we've asked the applicant on multiple occasions about why there are so many embankments and cuttings throughout the length of the sidewall link road.

12:41

It would appear that some of that is now due to the fact that they actually want to glean 90,000 tonnes of material from the development as they go through this. Originally, we thought this would be a much less in intrusive

12:57
design.

12:59

We have questioned at times whether the DMV dmr standard is, is is the right one for such a what is eventually eventually going to be a fairly rural being road, but not really had any answers on that either. I do understand that the highways authority is here to have the final say on the design. It seems to me that this was quite an intrusive design for this particular area.

13:31

Thank you very much before I move on, to chat to other interested parties, are there any other matters in respect to the link road you'd like to add in respect of landscaping, mitigation and monitoring?

13:48

Not really, although we're still puzzled. And I see in your examiners questions three, you've asked about this entire issue of being used as a haul road during construction. And the only part of that that might come into landscape design, or at least the interface with the B 1122. At the area closest to the to the side entrance, if that is actually going to happen, how that's going to be managed during the period when we have both the B 1122 running and the sysvol link road being built. But other than that, I don't think we have any other particular questions on that on that subject. There have been there have been a couple of questions about the number of

14:36

drainage ponds and soakaway ponds. I can't remember the exact term for these things along the length of this particular around there do seem to be an awful lot of them. But that's clearly something that I'm sure Suffolk County Council on the highways group will be better

14:53

in a better position than I am to actually comment on that. Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Collins.

15:00

I'd like to turn to Suffolk County Council next, if that's possible.

15:11

Thank you Mr. Bedford. The council As previously stated that the design principles for link road require revision in order to form a robust basis for the discharge of requirements. We noted that there was some concern in respect of ongoing maintenance of parts of the landscaping, and that Suffolk County Council only wish to be responsible for land within approximately two metres of any highway strictures, cuttings and our embankments. And much of landscaping extends beyond this. Suffolk County Council then stated that it's important for there to be a mechanism to ensure the long term maintenance of these areas.

15:49

discussions have also been going on with the applicant in respect of requirement 22 A, which deals with highway landscape works, the associated developments, the applicant remains to the opinion that eats Suffolk County, East Suffolk council or the appropriate discharging authority. I understand from your response to the second examination question at Li 230, which is rep 7158 that the council was also waiting for the applicant to provide updated plans to help better understand requirement 22 way could you just let me know whether this correctly reflects your current position? And have you received at the additional information? Are you content with East Suffolk remaining as the discharging authority? And also, do you have any other comments in respect of Mr. Collins comments made with regards to the link road?

16:47

Thank you, Madam, I'll bring in Mr. Mary in a moment. But first of all, in terms of dealing with this this issue? I'm working on the basis that the premise of your questions is the size worldlink Road as proposed as a permanent feature to be retained. Post the end of the construction period. And so that's the premise in which you're exploring this issue.

17:19

That's correct. Yes, quite so. So just clarify that because honestly, you know, we've got a wider issue about that, which I will now spend time on. On that premise. Firstly, in relation to the specific matter on requirement 22.

17:35

There has been constructive dialogue between the applicant, the County Council, and he suffered counsel, which we think has led to a suitable resolution of the issue that was raised as to discharge of the requirement. In summary terms, the resolution that I think is now common ground between the three parties is that he suffer council will remain as the discharging or authority. But in so far as any of the proposals that are submitted under requirement 22

18:22

relate to the proposed highway,

18:26

the applicant will engage in a pre application consultation with the County Council on those proposals. So that the county council gets input to the as it were the design process before an application is made for discharge under requirement 22.

18:52

And then he suffered council would be the discharging authority on that application.

19:00

And the county council would itself be consulted under the general arrangements in sheduled 23. For any matters that the District Council is the discharging authority for so that hopefully deals with that matter. I say we have between the parties, we put some wording, which isn't before the examination out

yet, but we think we've reached an agreed position on that it will obviously feature I suspect in what gets submitted to at deadline eight as to the mechanics for that as to the other issues in relation to the

19:39

areas of landscaping. There is a relationship with the matters that we were discussing on

19:46

Tuesday in relation to drain inch, because as you know there are still outstanding issues in relation to the nature of the drainage design that has implications for the identification of the highway boundary that also

20:00

has implications for the extent of suitable and appropriate landscaping. And perhaps on on those matters. I'll bring in Mr. Mary, to just summarise the current position. But I'm afraid we're not yet in a position of agreement on all of those matters.

20:20

Hi, good morning, madam, Steve Marisa for can't cancel, just amplify the comments Mr. bed was made, we are still in discussion with the applicant on in terms of the size road specifically, it is to determine the drainage followed by the highway boundary. And I would also point out on the plans for approval, there is a feature shown, which is labelled as the highway boundary fence. We do not accept that as being the highway boundary, nor that the fence would actually be within the highway itself. Usually it's on the third party land adjacent to it.

20:55

From a highways perspective, we are reluctant to take on additional areas of land that is not necessary for the public highway due to long term maintenance cost. Yes, some of that can be addressed through committed sums. And we would be seeking payment committed to get some sort of landscaping from the applicants but they only have a finite timescale and we are looking at well, potentially a permanent acquisition of this as public highway.

21:26

We are confident that these can be addressed through the detailed design but it is critical we have those days drainage day drainage details agreed first that is the driver behind those. So they are the main concepts going to make in terms of the highway boundary.

21:43

The comments made by thupten Parrish cares about the drainage gains that is it an issue we have raised with the applicants and from a high risk perspective, again, we prefer fewer drainage lagoons, but it does depend on their liquid location, and particularly the drainage, the drainage design. Also the point made about the design of the seismic link road, yes, it is designed to the MLB. And we have considered that to be the most appropriate design for this road I on the basis that is going to carry considerable amount of construction traffic, and that is a large number of large vehicles. It is the most appropriate one. We do have our own county standards, but they are typically for residential designs.

And this is obviously not a residential road. It may be useful for the panel to know that when the first design came through, it was originally designed for 50 miles an hour. We consider that was inappropriate on the basis that enforcement would be difficult. And that would have raised significant safety issues by traffic going above 50 miles an hour on a road that it was designed for 50 miles an hour in terms of the curvature and particularly the visibility at junctions. So that may be useful information in the background, though that's the end of the comments unless you've got any particular questions you would like to ask. No, that's very useful. Mr. Murray. And Mr. Bedford, do you have anything else you'd like to add? Here's what I'm interested in terms of the the wider issue raised by

23:09

Mr. Collins on behalf of the parish Councillor stop signs well see.

23:14

We, as Mr. mareas explained, consider that if the road is to be there, it needs to be designed to meet suitable highway standards. And that has obviously therefore, implications in terms of engineered appearance and the nature of embankments and cuttings. We don't subject to those detail points about drainage matters.

23:40

Outstanding, we don't challenge the design ethos for the road, if it's to be there on a permanent basis. And obviously, the wider point, inevitably, if you put a new road, which is to serve the function that it has into the landscape, there will be an impact on that landscape. Because of the engineered nature of what you are imposing on that landscape. We don't say that there is a better design, that's achievable.

24:13

What Once you accept the premise of doing it, but obviously that implication has consequences for our wider argument about whether it should be retained. Once we say there is no longer a proper justification for it in terms of its function in sensors. The wide point

24:34

though, just make that point clear, but we don't say that there's some specific things that could be done in terms of the proposal, if it is the proposal, where we say that you could avoid the design doing what it is doing. So that makes that sort of clear.

24:51

Thank you very much Mr. Bedford. I'd like to turn to East Suffolk council next. Pleased

25:02

Thank you madam

25:05

in relation to the

25:08

spirit of feedback, thank you

25:12

in relation to the point raised by Mr. Bedford as to the appropriate discharging authority under requirement 22 A what he indicates is correct.

25:25

And

25:27

there is now agreement, at least between

25:32

the county council and his Suffolk count. So as to that matter that is Suffolk is the approving authority and discharging authority but that there is to be written in words to reflect a pre consultation round in relation to the county's position. That's point one.

25:56

In relation to

26:00

this issue more widely sighs well link road

26:04

requirement 22. A does provide for details the landscape works to be approved by by the Council.

26:15

The council will be expecting to see consideration of planting options to address lateral light spill pursuant to that process.

26:26

But that appears to be a matter which is within the scope have the powers to approve under requirement 22 a. And the third point

26:36

relates to

26:39

the lighting options themselves. And under requirement 20. The

26:45

ad sites

26:49

requirements requirement,

26:51

which requires incorporation of the relevant tables in those in the principles document which is now rep 734. And we need to be sure that there is scope within that just that discharge of requirements stage four lighting options have the least amount of upward but also lateral light spill

27:15

capable of being proposed and agreed. So those are our three points in relation to size to our liquid.

27:25

Thank you Mr. Tate, you beat me to the questions I was gonna ask you about lighting. So thanks for that. And I'd like to turn to kill sale come Carlton parish Council, if I may, please.

27:43

Hello. Hello, I'm aware from the submissions that the parish Council have made during examination that concerns remain in respect of location as proposed. You start that again the location of the proposed link road. in respect of landscape related issues, the concerns seem to focus on the impact on dark skies and tranquillity experience and it you remain of the opinion that the proposed design makes no concession to the existing complimentary landscape and setting. Am I correct in your position in respect of both lighting and landscaping? And is there anything else that you'd like to add at this stage, particularly in respect of landscaping, and mitigation and monitoring?

28:28

Yes, that's absolutely correct. In fact, I looked up the word landscape in the Oxford English Dictionary just to double check. It confirms everything you can see, when you look across a large area of land, and especially in the country, the woods and fields that are typical features of an English landscape. urban landscape, it refers to bleak, barren, rugged landscape in an area.

28:53

A resident asked how much design actually went into the link road beyond simply meeting the statutory requirements. This is a point or more to the fall by the current Nautilus non statutory consultation, which suggests the 2025 staff for their project with a lifespan of in excess of three years, including a five hectare site built a converter station 24 metres high, again with water the developer doesn't have with one potential site being near the proposed pretty road bridge. As you're aware, this bridge is being put forward as a design solution to enable connectivity and access to service centres for local communities as a consequence of the poor siting of the link road.

29:37

local communities are and always have been infected by single carriageway roads following historic route roads.

29:46

These were not designed for speed they will simply designed to maintain connections with neighbouring parishes, taking into account local landscape and to enjoy the surroundings. Those neighbouring parishes the applicant will seventh as a result of that

30:00

choice of location of the road and the 60 miles an hour minute.

30:05

This is not a road that's been designed with the user communities in line beyond the applicant who wants it as a route to site that also facilitates access to bring backfill. Our paper after the issue specific hearing five, which was rip five to 30 outlines a view of the parish council that literally imagination little design, and little time has been spent on trying to create something that really works for local communities. I will not repeat all the issues raised in that paper here today, but do ask the examining authority to reflect on it. Because design and landscape have clearly not been the primary driver in this proposal for the link road. There are additional inbuilt issues such as rat running through nearby parishes, anti social behaviour and access issues to facilities which have now been created for residents. But what is evident is the lack of thought and creativity on the integration of the link road scheme into the environment. The appalling lack of detail on the plates and maps provided doesn't assist and neither does the narrative. The location of it between two conservation areas the Oxford and kill sale in a broader area that has had quite lien designations agreed. Further cementing the network of lanes connecting middle income forwardly saboten and eastbridge. And Cal Cellcom Colton just demonstrates how the user need has not been designed in a reduction in the speed limit should be considered for the benefit of all the parishes connected to the SLR.

31:37

So rather than looking at the road in isolation, the knock on impact on other roads must be considered. If not, I guess we will all need to use reasonable endeavours to cross the road and hope our hedgehogs and other mammals have their running shoes on.

31:52

A more positive action by the applicant would be to respect the needs of all residents, the uses of the public rights and ways and the wildlife of the surrounding areas and implement a maximum 40 miles an hour speed limit for the entire length of the size will link road.

32:08

The parish council would like to understand also whether the planting proposed and the landscape design takes into account the funding required to maintain this into the future. I including and beyond the construction phase.

32:21

As a hosted part of the link road, we have been informed by the applicant. It's their firm belief that once people get accustomed to using it, it will become the preferred safe direct route to least than sizewell Beach and minsmere from the a 12 albeit according to their own figures, less than 30 people actually wanted it retained. As a footnote, the applicant's assertion is dependent on traffic wanting to go to least

and from the south. Continue up the a 12 b on Friday St. Saxmundham and indeed Cal Cellcom Carleton to the link road rather than using local roads with knock on impacts on road miles and consequently pollution. So hopefully that answers your question.

33:05

Thank you very much, Miss Galloway.

33:08

I'm just going to see if there any interested parties. Before I turn to the applicant, Mr. Cusack, I can see that you've got your hand up.

33:20

Thank you.

33:26

You want to go ahead?

33:28

I can I can see and hear you. So if you'd like to go ahead. Okay. Thank you. During cusec and chair of Middleton comm for the parish Council.

33:39

I would just like to reiterate our serious concerns about the impacts of the SLR on the landscape and views from particularly Middleton more. One particular concern is the height of the carriageway as it crosses fogli Road, which will make it extremely visible to residents along that route.

34:08

And also the height of the road, making it in practice very difficult to consider a design of any feasible footbridge that could take the public rights of way over the carriageway, and thereby leaving us with the option that's been put forward by the applicant that any pedestrian wishing to cross this road will have to take their chances against the 60 mile per hour, two way traffic that they will face.

34:40

We're also concerned about the impact of lighting, particularly at the roundabout Mills mall link and elsewhere lights it's spilling into what has traditionally been a very dark landscape and valued as such by our residents.

34:59

And I will

35:00

I'd like to make a further detail point. And that's my last point about the attenuation problems, which Paul Collins referred to earlier. Again, we are surprised the number of them. But wonder this is a question really, perhaps for the applicant or Suffolk County Council, whether if they have to be there,

whether there isn't a way to make them more useful from a biodiversity point of view, acknowledging that the SLR we're going we'll be going through a habitat area, which is well documented as a as a considerable population of great crested newts using the existing historic or natural ponds. And I'm just wondering whether the design of the attenuation ponds cannot be made in such a way that there can be water in them year round. So they can be additional breeding habitats for those particular endangered species. Thank you.

36:03

Thank you very much. They amb partnership, you've got your hand up.

36:11

Thank you, Madam Simon. I'm

36:14

representing the amb partnership.

36:18

Obviously, we have an interest of where the link road is proposed go through the National designated amb, we wouldn't see that the introduction of such a road will contribute to the statutory purposes of the amb.

36:37

We think commend certain elements of the mitigation. But I think no amount of mitigation or compensation can adequately offset the impacts on on the amb. And I would ask that

36:55

those charged with the design of the link road or reflect their 695 countryside rights of way and pay regard to the purposes of the AONB when they design the road through so it doesn't minimise the impact on the defined features around the scenic quality, landscape quality, tranquillity and so forth. Thanks very much.

37:28

Thank you, Christopher Wilson from task.

37:37

Thank you This, casinos wanted to follow up a little bit on the lighting issue. And just in terms of the the applicants own assessment of the impact of the writing on the ESR.

37:51

Basically, in their document, a pp 457 like it was they recognise that the BIA a high magnitude and moderate adverse effect with the lighting, they went on to then say that that impact wouldn't be significant. And their justification for that was given the relative lack of existing artificial lighting within this LCT. I mean, basically, we were saying that conclusion is perverse. It's it as as as, as others have said, is intrinsically adults guy area, so that you're introducing so much light into that area, you can

hardly say, well, it's not a problem, because you You didn't start with much light to start to start with. I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

38:39

Thank you very much, Mr. Wilson. I don't see any other hands up. And I don't think there's anybody in the room. So I'd like to turn to the applicant for your comment, please. Thank you, again, to deal with this in two parts. First of all, I'm going to pick up a number of points that were raised, and then I'm going to turn to Mr. Allister craft melda. Design his to my left, who will deal with questions of landscape and visual impacts,

39:08

which is obviously the agenda item. And the number of interested parties have made points about those impacts and to the lighting impacts, and he can respond to those. But I wanted to start by picking up. First of all, Mr. Collins points. He was the first person

39:27

who responded and the question that was put to him was essentially what differences could what differences could be made to the design, having regard to the constraints in order to serve this purpose and so on. And it's notable that there are no specific alternative proposals for the design that we can respond to.

39:55

It's also notable that Suffolk County can

40:00

Ansible does not say that a better design could be achieved. In other words, assuming as one master because that is the proposal that this is a permanent highway, then the Highway Authority does not consider a better design could be achieved. In other words, this is the this is not only an appropriate design, but it is the best achievable design. And, in the only exception amongst the coins for interested parties in terms of specific proposals was a request to consider whether as part of the detailed design, the balancing ponds might have any wider biodiversity benefits. And as the details of those in terms of the landscaping element is obviously a matter for approval in due course, I don't have any biodiversity witness with me today. But we can come back at deadline eight with whether there is scope for that as part of the detail design, but that would be a matter for that subsequent stage that would be useful. Thank you. Thank you. And then he alluded to a question that's in amongst the exam. The authorities third round questions will obviously be respond to them deadline eight, rather than try and deal with that. Now. Moving on, then to Suffolk County Council, the question was raised about changes to requirement 22. A to deal with who should be the discharging authority. And I can confirm on behalf of the applicant, that the position as he related and as confirmed by Suffolk counsel is also agreed by the applicant that will be reflected in wording that will come forward at deadline eight.

41:53

And then as Mr. Mehra confirmed in terms of the ongoing question of maintenance, that would be determined effectively through the detailed design stage of identifying what would be part of the

highway. Those elements which are part of the highway would be maintained by the Highway Authority with commuted sums dealing with the ongoing cost of that those which are not would be The Undertaker's responsibility to maintain in accordance with requirement 22 A which imposes a requirement for ongoing maintenance. And the question that was raised by a Suffolk Council in relation to the scope of requirement 20. And its ability to deal with all of the lighting effects that are of concern to them. That's a matter I'll need to take up outside the examination to get confirmation. We can discuss that with the counsel, we can confirm the position that deadline eight I don't have an instant answer on that point. So those are the points that I was going to respond to are now going to ask Mr. Kratt. If there are points amongst those made by interested parties in relation to impact Mr. Philpott? Sorry, I think Mr. Murray did say that there was some drainage information that was he was awaiting while the drainage discussion we had earlier in the week. And that is a subject of ongoing discussion, as you heard, we explained that we are seeking to address the concerns that have been raised. And that takes that discussion takes place in the context of the drainage details being a matter for approval post decio. And the question at the moment, is whether in principle they're capable of being resolved through that means that's something we are discussing with Suffolk County Council, hopefully with a view to resolving. If not, obviously, we'll need to report on what is not agreed at the end of that process. That would ultimately then form part of the details to be approved.

44:04

But I don't have any update on what you heard earlier in the week about that matter. Thank you.

44:09

So I was then going to ask Mr. Kratt, if there are points that he wishes to respond to, in terms of the points made about impacts.

44:22

Thank you, Ambassador Kratz on behalf of the applicant.

44:26

I've endeavoured to make notes of the issues raised in the various exchanges and also trying to seek to address those sequentially. I have 10 points, I think in summary, and I'll try and make those as efficient as possible.

44:44

The first are referring to the intrusive nature of the design.

44:50

Firstly, I've had confirmation from my fellow engineering team that the SLR road scheme actually generates surplus capacity

45:00

It isn't a net and receiver of balancing material from the main development side by example.

45:06

And that is an outcome of the design work we've been doing with the engineering team to look at the best alignment within the landscape, which involves elements of cutting, as well as fill.

45:21

More generally on the principles of the design, I was involved in the original route selection referred to that in earlier hearings. And that original route selection process followed good practice and looking at major concerns and considerations in looking at alignment and how the road would best integrate with landscape, obviously making note of the wider setting issues and the ability of that landscape to receive that change and how mitigation could be brought into play to allow for its integration. So we have been properly involved in that process and are involved in the ongoing process of the detailed design

46:10

of the road scheme.

46:13

With regard to the issue relating to design principles, and those set out for the sidewalk link road again, we have been involved in the curation of those and acknowledging the council's desire to minimise

46:33

adoption expense, we also acknowledge that it is important that there is a forward plan for ongoing management of landscape elements, it will be part of normal practice to agree those extensive adoption. And we are again supporting the highway engineering team and the client team on that matter. The resolution of what is within the adopted highway and what is not, I believe is

47:08

not a particular challenge in terms of how that might be dealt with in terms of commuted sums or third party management and maintenance, if that's required, and happy to provide further detail on that in a follow up node.

47:23

With regard to the recent discussions, really just to confirm, Mr. Tate

47:32

perspective on this and also the counties in relation to the discharging authority.

47:37

We confirm recent discussions regarding that process where ESC will be the discharging authority with a relevant consultation with the County Council where appropriate, and we certainly support that. And my understanding is that a refinement to requirement 22 A will be forthcoming to confirm that position.

48:03

With regard to sorry, fourthly, with regard to the nature of our the information that is presently in hand for a number of landowners that we've been involved in consulting.

48:20

If I can report more generically now and it may well come up in later sessions as we move through.

48:27

We have been involved in ongoing discussions with a number of

48:32

land interests along the length of the route to explore enhanced mitigation. The original scheme we believe, addressed appropriate levels of integration of planting and mitigation to address the integration of the road into the landscape. These discussions are to explore further enhancement to address

48:55

particular land owner issues and interests. The intention is that we submit

49:03

work in progress on those enhancement proposals for D eight, with intention that prior to that we issue an update to the relevant landowners on the progress we're making. With the author of our follow up meeting to continued discussions.

49:24

I believe we're making good progress from the last set of meetings. These issues are not without

49:31

challenges. But we are making a good progress on the work that my team have been preparing I believe, will move us substantially forward in understanding both the impact of the scheme but also the extent of enhanced planting or other measures we can put in place

49:51

physically with regard to design standards,

49:56

it is normal practice to work to the DMR

50:00

Have a design manual for roads and bridges and the standards appropriate. The dmr does identify good practice with regard to landscape treatments. And that would be a normal part of our practice and advising clients and engineering teams on those standards, and what is appropriate.

50:21

A proper understanding of the context of the landscape that that roads sit within is a very important driver and looking at the integration of the roads and how they lie within them. And really just to confirm that we've been involved in that process.

50:40

Sixth point about already actually stated the point regarding ESC and sec and the pre consultation process, so

50:50

reduce the number to nine rather than 10.

50:54

With regard to requirement 22 a.

51:00

We do anticipate that by the end of the process, we will hope to have achieved a significant level of approval for the enhanced landscape scheme that will be presented at D eight.

51:13

And in terms of issues raised by Mr. Tate in relation to dealing with lateral lights bill. The scheme proposals are seeking to address issues related to lighting impacts. I would say that within the scheme design is only the roundabout junctions that are lit.

51:35

And those have been the subject of detailed design and ongoing detailed design. Those lighting drawings that are already submitted, indicate a commitment to explore further mitigation with regard to the type of lighting and the nature of the fittings. And we think see no reason why those proposed mitigations are not taken forward to address lighting in accordance with good standards and good practice.

52:05

Eight flee or seven flee power such words exist.

52:11

Addressing the location of the SLR and concerns regarding landscape setting and severance between conservation areas. Again, just to reiterate that a road of of this length and for this purpose inevitably has effects that are arising in looking at the options for the size while link road, just to confirm that I was involved with each of the routes that were explored.

52:37

And our recommendation was the route that has been developed and put forward into the DCA was the preferred route.

52:46

Looking at all landscape matters in the round, and we've been involved in obviously evolving that design ready for submission.

52:57

Ninth point and relation to lighting impact and I again, I can make submissions rather than referring to my my detailed notes.

53:06

To provide clarity and immediate direction on these matters. We entirely accept that the nature of the landscape of the road extends through is fundamentally have a fairly dark sky environment. It's not a totally dark and

53:24

the assessment has taken that into consideration in making judgments on assessment outcomes. And I will happily just give direction on that in my my detailed follow up note if that's considered to be appropriate.

53:42

Final one relating to the AONB, and really just for clarity.

53:47

The site or link road doesn't lie within the AONB as a designated area.

53:55

The benefits arising from

53:58

the road and the sufficiency of moving traffic and the balance to be struck with other elements of transport movement as for others to comment and not for myself, but safe to say that many of the principles regarding minimising impact and seeking

54:14

appropriate outcomes forms part of normal good practice. And many of the issues that were raised by the A and B partnership are fundamental to good practice and dmr. Anyway.

54:27

And with that, I'll conclude and happy to take any further questions. Thank you. You have raised a point that I was going to raise perhaps at the end, we are aware that there are a number of conversations going on with landowners in respect of enhancements, additional landscaping, what would be really useful that deadline eight if you could provide a table I know you've already alluded to doing this, but across all of the associated development sites as to who you're talking to where negotiations have got to and if you aren't

55:00

Not able to maybe meet in terms of common ground as to what people have requested why you haven't that that would be extremely useful. I understand that you my colleague, Mr. Humphrey, you have a question. Mr. Kratz? Yeah, it's just a point about the highway design. I'm not a highway design. I'll make that point first, and nor is is a question about highway design. But I heard Mr. Murray say at the

beginning, the original consideration was for a 50 mile an hour road. Now it's a 60 mile an hour road. And I heard Mrs. Galloway talk about

55:32

the parish council thinking they would like a less speed limit. Now it occurs to me, as I say, I'm not a designer. But the horizontal and vertical geometry in designing a 50 Mile Road is different from a 60 mile an hour road. So what if any impact could there be on the landscape?

55:52

On the landscaping you would need on a landscape setting if the speed limit was lower, and the design standards were appropriate to the lowest speed limit?

56:00

So I think that's going beyond Mr. Kratz expertise in looking at the impact of it, I think we'd need to go back to W. Sp, who have been in charge of designing and to get a proper answer to that. I understand the question, we've got a note of it, and we'll come back on that deadline aid. Thank you.

56:18

Madam, you asked about the provision of a table in relation to where we were with landowners. It would be helpful if I just took the opportunity while we're on the topic just to explain what else we have in mind in terms of reporting to you on those points. Because, as you're aware, and as Mr. Kraft has alluded to, we are in ongoing and we think productive discussions with a number of individual landowners as to what might be incorporated in the detailed designs that are to be submitted for approval in due course, pursuant to requirements.

56:58

Just to be clear, and I'm sure you already understand this, what we're contemplating is not therefore changes to the proposals that are before the Secretary of State for approval, but rather

57:13

identifying at this stage, what can be achieved within the red line and pursuant to the approval of details. So that there is scope there for for the discharging authority to understand what can be done. And for you to understand as a as the recommending body to the Secretary state, what can be achieved in terms of landscaping to better inform your understanding of where

57:42

the landscaping might end up, bearing in mind that it's not for approval at this stage. So it is clearly relevant to your consideration. To understand what is possible, even though you're not asked to approve it in detail. At this point, what we have in mind is to provide an update of where we are a deadline eight

58:08

so that you can understand that the current position. And then at deadline, I anticipate it will be deadline 10 we would provide such details as we are able to at that stage, hopefully in quite

58:29

reasonable detail as to what we believe can be achieved in terms of additional planting and matters of that sort

58:38

in relation to those areas that have developed further. But understanding of course, that that the purpose of that is to inform both yourselves and the Secretary of State as to what can be achieved through the approval of details, as opposed to being committed to those particular details at this stage. That clearly, although one is not committed to those details, for the ultimate discharging authority, having seen those plans, and it being aware of what can be achieved, that will be something that it would take into account in deciding the acceptability of proposals submitted to it in due course. So it is it has that further purposes as well. In addition to that, there are of course, discussions going on with individual landowners about agreements, private agreements that would be reached with them in relation to, for example, planting on land outside the order limits. But those are not documents that we intend to put before the examination. They're not something we anticipate would influence the decision in their details because they're private arrangements depending on what can be achieved with individual landowners and the overall package of the deal. But you may see reference to those in various places. But though those are matters that are being pursued as part of individual land,

1:00:00

agreements, as opposed to something that's going to be secured to the decio. That's the current intention. Thank you. Is that the end of your comments on the link road? I should have confirmed that. Yes, that's that's our unless you have further questions those matters. We wanted to say by way of response to what we've heard. Thank you No doubt. At this point. I'd like to move on to Agenda Item Number three, which is the southern park and ride. Could I ask miles third parish council to turn on their camera? And microphone, please.

1:00:36

Hello, and good morning. Again, I understand from your submissions that outstanding concerns remain, as you contend that the southern parking rise will have a significant negative impact on the communities surrounding the proposed infrastructure in respective lighting. I'm assuming you've seen response from the applicant in response of question Li 234, regarding low level down LED lighting, and how if low level lighting was implemented, this would significantly increase the number of lighting columns required. I'd like to hear your views on the applicants response if you've seen it, and lighting in general, and also an update in respect of any further discussions you may have had with the applicant in respect of any specific landscape mitigation measures, monitoring and legacy planting, please.

1:01:34

Okay, thank you very much. Can I deal with your last question first, because the last time we had any significant engagement with the applicant on landscape issues at the sun park and ride was the eighth of October 2020. And we haven't really had any further discussions with them since then. But we have continued to flag our concerns.

1:02:02

As far as lighting is concerned,

1:02:06

the lighting columns as we're as we understand them, as they're proposed in the original decio are six metre columns.

1:02:15

And these will clearly be visible above a three metre band. And given that the site is on high ground in the area, we think that the lighting columns are going to be very visible. Now that's, that's an issue during the daytime. But our major concern is is the visibility at night as well, because we think that the applicant has underestimated the the nighttime visibility of the side, which we think will be much wider than they would suggest and and they've really

1:02:54

been quite scant in their coverage of the nighttime effect.

1:02:59

Largely because they argue that human activity at the receptors is low at night. But we would argue that

1:03:09

actually at night, the Eric impacted by the lit park and ride is going to be quite wide.

1:03:20

Can I just read to you a piece from appendix six B from the

1:03:26

landscape and visual impact assessment 1.4 points 13. They provide this pretty confused

1:03:39

summary, the proposed development would introduce a large area of lighting within the LCT in an area where there is a small area of existing lighting of a similar type and intensity, but some distance from the site. This would result in long term effects on these LC t that would be medium scale and occur over a localised extent, effects would be medium magnitude resulting in a moderate adverse effect, which is considered to be not significant given the relative lack of existing artificial lighting in the vicinity of the site. Now, problem we got with that is that we would argue that the fact that there is

1:04:27

already a low level of light pollution in this area is surely going to mean that the impact is going to be greater than the applicant is suggesting.

1:04:41

So that's, that's our concern now.

1:04:45

We would welcome any measures that the applicant could

1:04:51

provide to reduce light spill. Now whether that is down to low level lighting or I don't know but

1:05:00

We want to make sure that the light is as far as possible, contained within the site. And just on that issue of LED lighting, and I understand that the the lighting will be led, can I draw the examining authorities attention to

1:05:23

a piece of research that's just very recently been published by Newcastle University, which indicates an adverse impact on insect populations from early days.

1:05:37

When it does also say is that

1:05:40

there isn't good news on that in the sense that led is can be monitored far more easily than sodium lamps.

1:05:49

For example, by reducing intensity through dimming and using filters to block blue wavelength light. The what I would say to the applicant is that if they are going to pursue LED lighting for the park and ride, which seems likely, then those measures to help combat the adverse effects on insects should be employed.

1:06:20

Thank you, Mr. Cooper, do you have anything else to add?

1:06:25

We we do? Yes. Would you like would you like to add it? Do you want me to cover planting? If you have anything with landscaping, monitoring? mitigation? Okay, now would be a good time to do that. Okay. Well, can I can I make the general point that I think that the applicant is underestimated the impact of the Southern park and ride on the surrounding landscape. As you will know, the southern parking ride sits on a fairly elevated site between two were designated as special landscape areas.

1:07:08

And they have categorised the majority of this site in landscape terms as community value. And we think that this undervalues the landscape, particularly given its position between the two essays. And we think that that designation has led to the applicants, underestimation of its impact. So we would like that

1:07:38

assessment of landscape value revisited.

1:07:45

In terms of planting,

1:07:49

the the applicant is has made comment on a number of occasions that they want to leave

1:07:57

legacy benefits for affected communities. And we think that planting is one of those issues where legacy benefits can be relatively easily provided.

1:08:11

Some of it needs to be provided off site outside the red line. And I'd particularly refer to the eastern side of the B 1116. hatches done, which would improve screening for of the B 116. b 1116. And the properties to the west of the of the road, particularly the rookery

1:08:38

that would provide land or landscape legacy benefit. There should be more offsite planting from the five ways round about to the park and ride and beyond it. And it's particularly important that

1:08:55

the applicant improves the existing existing hedgerows not only to provide better screening, but to provide a legacy benefit

1:09:07

and a particular concern to ourselves and

1:09:12

we can market parish council perhaps them parish Council is the western boundary of the Southern arc and ride

1:09:22

you'll probably be aware that along the western boundary runs a bridleway.

1:09:30

And at points, that bridleway is probably less than 10 metres from the service road inside the park and ride Now, when we met with the applicant. They did talk about the possibility of moving that access road further into the site to give greater separation between the road and the bridleway that doesn't appear to have happened in the most recent set of dreams.

1:10:00

It's still incredibly close. And because of its proximity, it's going to make it extremely difficult to screen it. So anyone using the bridle way, is going to have a full view of the park and ride.

1:10:17

The other issue of concern on

1:10:22

planting and vegetation is a veteran oak which is very close to the entrance to the park and ride.

1:10:32

The applicant has said that they will be taking measures to protect it, we'd like to hear from them that it will be protected and the access through the ancient headrow of which the veteran oak is part is minimised, so we lose as little as possible of the agent headrow.

1:10:57

So that's, that's planting.

1:11:01

We've got a concern about the tema. I'm sorry, this is going on a bit, but they're genuine concerns.

1:11:11

We got a concern about the use of the traffic Incident Management Area,

1:11:19

particularly in relation to lighting.

1:11:23

Now, the applicant has said that it won't be lit, unless it's in use. I think that begs the question of what are the criteria that govern its use under what circumstances will it be used? I don't think the explanation in the DTO documents is adequate to give us the comfort that we need, but it's not going to be used on an ad hoc basis.

1:11:53

So we would like to understand more from the applicant, what their proposal is for lighting,

1:12:01

surfacing and drainage of the of the Teamer

1:12:06

and generally how it will be used.

1:12:10

We've got concerns about plans which are not for approval and these these strike us as being important issues because they cover over the whole site, the whole of the Southern parking rides, site,

drainage lighting, signage and buildings. These are matters that as we understand it will be determined by the local planning authority. And as parish councils this multitude hatches done, we can market it and Campsie ash, we want to make sure that we have a say in the approval of proposals for for drainage lighting, signage and buildings, they are important issues, buildings particularly will be visible as well lighting and we think the local community should have a say in that

1:13:09

we have discussed elsewhere and you'll have seen our references to a pedestrian and cycleway and this has got two aspects to it. One is from wicker market to the park and ride and from Mulford to the park and ride.

1:13:28

I know that Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk, want to see this. But we haven't yet seen proposals from the applicant on how it's going to be Bri provided and how it's how it's going to be landscaped.

1:13:44

It is important because it provides a sustainable transport route from both we can market and for a multitude and allows models for residents to get into wicker market which is main service centre.

1:14:00

And finally, you'll be pleased to know I'll finish up on restoration.

1:14:08

It is acknowledged in the decio. That restoration will be to agricultural land. We support that. But we would want to make sure that the conditioning is robust enough to

1:14:24

avoid any backsliding on that commitment.

1:14:30

And I think you've probably heard enough from me.

1:14:33

Thank you, Miss Cooper that was useful when you submit your written submissions. Could you include a reference to the Newcastle University paper? You spoke about please? I've got it. I will do that. Yep. Thank you.

1:14:50

Could I hear from Wickham market parish council Next please.

1:14:58

Hello, yes, hello.

1:15:00

Thank you. I'm aware that you raise some very similar issues to that have mastered parish Council, including lighting for the traffic Incident Management Area. Do you have anything else in addition that you would wish to add?

1:15:15

From what Mr. Cooper's already said? Thank you. Yes, Richard. And I've been working on this for a long time along with the other parishes. He's summed up

1:15:26

virtually everything we wanted to raise. And we've also put that's all set out and our deadline five submission as well. I just wanted to elaborate on a couple of points. We, Richard Cooper is right to say the only meeting we've had with EDF on this is eighth of October 2020.

1:15:48

We have subsequently asked them about the teymur. And they have

1:15:55

clarified that the access into the team is alongside that western boundary. For some reason that isn't clearly shown on the drawings, you can see where the lorries will exit, but not enter. So Richard is right, we are extremely concerned about that western boundary, as we pointed out to you at the site visit the use criteria. And the way that this has been going to be controlled and conditioned we feel is extremely important in order to make sure that it is used for the purpose that it set out, as and isn't expanded on in any way whatsoever. We welcome the reinstatement of the northwestern bond, of course.

1:16:40

But the western boundary of the site and the area around the entrance to the southern Park and Ride site is extremely vulnerable in terms of local and wider landscape input impacts. The two additional view points which were assessed for some reason, they weren't scoped into the elvio to start with. But the two additional viewpoints that LDA have now assessed from weakened market and pet history that's broadly speaking to the rear of King Edward Avenue, and just off chapel lane.

1:17:16

Both of those views will contain the southern Park and Ride site, show the impacts to be adverse. And on that basis, we still, as Richard has set out requires some further landscape mitigation, broadly speaking, looking towards the southwest corner of the Southern Park and Ride site in the area where the access will come off these slip road. As I say this is a very vulnerable area, we have raised the fact that the main central part of the site is some

1:17:50

eight metres above that access point. So this carpark will be visible in the wider environment. So I think the only other thing I would say is Mr. Cooper referred to the local parish councils wanting to have a role in future and understanding any conditions that are submitted to a Suffolk for approval if the

government are minded to approve the application. And that also should include the landscape details as well. Thank you very much.

1:18:27

Thank you, I'd like to turn to Mr. Tate now with the Suffolk Council.

1:18:39

Thank you, Madam agitate is suffered. Thank you. And as I understand your position is that East Suffolk have no significant ad standing concerns, other than every effort must be made to meet the lighting plan management Prince lighting management plan principles, and as much planting is to be left as possible for legacy planting. Is that a correct reflection of your position? Is there anything else you'd like to add in respect of landscaping and monitoring? That is a correct

1:19:12

and concise statement of opposition.

1:19:16

Not sure I can add anything we accept that we want to make sure that requirement 20

1:19:23

and the ad principles to which it relates do ensure that

1:19:29

that which we're seeking can be secured ie

1:19:36

the legacy the potential for legacy planting to remain and also to ensure that the lighting options have the least amount of upward and also lateral lights spilled and planting options to address lateral load spill can be addressed through those mechanisms. So

1:19:55

nothing more to say thank you.

1:19:58

Thank you Mr. Tate. Could I

1:20:00

Turn to Mr. Bedford of Suffolk County. Councillor please?

1:20:07

Thank you. I understand that Suffolk County Council's position is that they too are satisfied that the proposal can be adequately controlled. Again, I'd just like to check that is your position? And is there anything else that you would like to add in respect of the park ride site today? That is opposition. And no, thank you, madam.

1:20:29

Thank you. I don't see anybody with their hands up in terms of interested parties wishing to speak about the southern park and ride in that case, I'll turn to the applicant, please.

1:20:42

Thank you, Madam, I'll deal with a number of matters. And then I'll ask Mr. Kratt, to deal with questions in relation to impacts and mitigation.

1:20:53

First dealing with mass for the parish councils point, I suggested it is significant, that there was no clear response to the particular question that was asked about Li 2.34. Madam, as you noted in the response to that question,

1:21:17

we did explain the implications of using lower height columns in terms of the need for a significant increase in the number of columns. I don't believe that that is disputed. And I don't believe it was said that that would be effectively a price worth paying. So I don't believe that there is anything specific that is said that we should be doing differently. There. We will, of course, look at the Newcastle University study. If it's possible to send that across to us outside the examination straightaway, we can get on with that. The key thing, as I understand it, that was being said, is that that

1:22:06

gave rise to the need for additional considerations to be taken into account when putting together the ultimate lighting design. If that's right, the natural home for anything further would be by way of an addition to the Associated development design principles. And those are also referred to in the answer to Li 2.34 as being the means by which lighting design is controlled. So if Milesplit parish Council has specific suggestions, what that it would like us to consider as a result of what it means in the Newcastle University study, we would of course, be happy to receive those and we can consider them and respond to them. But that would seem to be the natural home for that.

1:22:59

question was raised also by master parish council about when the traffic incident management area would be used. I don't have our transport consultants here and my understanding in broad terms is that it will be used in the event of an incident on the highway in line with the timber traffic Incident Management Plan. That obviously is a high level answer. What I suggest is if we put in a brief note a deadline eight that just points to the relevant places where which identifies the circumstances which is likely to be used, and also to deal with the point about lighting in those circumstances.

1:23:43

It was also suggested that in circumstances where he suffered Council is the discharging body that master parish council would wish to have a say in the discharge of details on matters such as lighting. And whilst it is, of course, possible to identify now, in respect to the requirement all parish councils and other bodies who might appropriately be consulted by the discharging authority. Generally, that's not

done unless there's a very good reason to do it because it's appropriate in the normal course of events, to leave that for the discharging authority to judge on a case by case basis depending on what details are before them and what issues they give rise to and therefore who might be affected. So we could do that we suggest that probably neither necessary nor appropriate. We anticipate that in the normal course of things if we suffer council thought that master parish council might have something relevant to say on those proposals it would consultant in the normal way.

1:24:56

A further point was raised about restoration and seeking

1:25:00

comfort in terms of whether or not that would be done appropriately. And pursuant to requirement 24.

1:25:12

Within 12 months of completion of the construction works, Southern Park and Ride must be demolished. And then paragraph two, a scheme for land restoration work must be submitted to an approved by East Suffolk Council. Now, that's clearly important because it provides an appropriate safeguard in terms of what that scheme contains. And whether or not the details will be adequate to achieve appropriate land restoration, in order that it is suitable for agricultural use thereafter. And so we say that that is an appropriate protection in the public interest and hopefully, addresses that, that specific concern. And it, those are the matters that seem to me to fall within my remit. I'm okay to ask Mr. Krabs, to deal with

1:26:10

the range of other matters that were raised about impacts and mitigation, if I may.

1:26:16

Thank you, I'm Alistair crap for the applicant.

1:26:21

Again, I've endeavoured to capture the primary points, I think that were being made. And I'll walk through those, make it eight, but it may change the seven. If I find this vintage application.

1:26:37

The first point that was raised in relation to our response to Li two point 34 in relation to lower lighting,

1:26:47

and the opportunities for that.

1:26:51

I think the first point to make is that when we're talking about light, we're talking about visible light rather than light spill.

1:27:02

We don't dispute that the park and ride will be visible from certain points. But the extent of light spill, namely light cast on the ground,

1:27:14

is very much contained within the scheme design and the mitigations proposals that are

1:27:22

proposed for that area would seek to limit light spill beyond the immediate sight boundary. And I would anticipate that there would be a good level of containment in that regard. And if it was to extend beyond it, it would only be to a very limited extent.

1:27:41

In dealing with lighting design with the engineers, and the nature of lighting, requirements, and standards, there is an expectation to reduce awkward light into the atmosphere and the effects of skyglow and visible light, including points or slide. And certainly the lighting that would be proposed with full cut off London's would tend to minimise the throw of light into the atmosphere, obviously subject to the nature of the atmospheric conditions.

1:28:17

And certainly the provision of lower level lighting, which I'll come on to in a minute, does reduce the opportunities for spot source light namely looking at

1:28:31

points of light within a lighting proposal. Obviously, the higher the columns, generally speaking, the more accessible they are to view into the the source of that light.

1:28:45

We do recognise secondly, with regard to

1:28:52

what I understand mastered, I've indicated the welcome reduction in light spill as a result of the scheme. And maybe just to underpin and, and just clarify what has actually been proposed in response.

1:29:09

I'll come on to the timing of the discussions we've been having in a minute.

1:29:14

The following principles have been applied to the park and ride and we've been involved in supporting the engineering team to explore the feasibility of this and the merits of it. Column lighting limited to six metres in height within the site itself

1:29:31

is quite a significant reduction from our experience in terms of the usual approach. So it is far from standard from our experience in the approach being taken and therefore there is an embedded

understanding of the importance of keeping lighting levels, column heights as low as possible. There is clearly in our submission made it clear that there is an operational

1:29:58

consideration with regard to

1:30:00

The movement of buses and providing adequate light and finding that balance between the number of columns and the height of columns. And from my professional perspective, I consider the six metre strategy that's been taken to be an appropriate one and one that goes to a good measure to address wider impacts. uncommon lighting at a 10 metre height is proposed

1:30:25

in the carriageway extending from the roundabout junction, and that would be normal practice. But I would say that the quality of the light emitted from those lights would be of a better lesson trees of quality than the existing

1:30:43

two or three other points of relevance, the mitigation strategy would seek to secure

1:30:50

cut off lights to the site perimeter to limit the spread of light. And that would be normal practice. We've also explored at the request of the parish councils

1:31:04

exploring control of working zones within other Park and rides so that only active areas are lit.

1:31:12

And are those areas that are not required based on capacity would not be led to and again to minimise the effects arising.

1:31:20

And again, just in terms of lighting.

1:31:24

LED lighting is is the norm with regard to light quality and efficiency. And the ease with which that can be controlled with rear mounted shields to secure cut off both to the rear of the lighting area, as well as to the top is now increasingly common practice.

1:31:48

Thirdly, with regard to statements relating to the underestimate of impact on the park and ride on the landscape,

1:31:57

the community value that was aligned with the assessment, I believe is the correct value to be aligned given the methodology that's been agreed with both local authorities.

1:32:11

And I don't believe we've underestimated the impact of the park and ride on the local landscape.

1:32:20

I would note that the methodology and indeed the outcome of the assessment is agreed with both local authorities.

1:32:29

With regard to landscape, enhancements or changes made we do confirm our last meeting was in October last year. But following that meeting, we made rapid

1:32:47

or to rapid action in terms of seeking to provide a proportionate response to those issues raised by other parish councils to present an improved scheme. And for clarity, I just wish to refer to those. In summary.

1:33:05

Those landscape proposals were updated.

1:33:09

Figure 4.2 point two Volume Two of the first ies addendum document as dash 196 in response to comments received from the local parishes.

1:33:22

We provided, as you alluded to details of the changes in our response to examination questions Li 1.112, which is wrapped to dash 100. And those immediate changes that we made to the scheme working with the engineers comprise the following.

1:33:45

We extended the site's perimeter bond to provide greater levels of containment. Secondly, we confirmed the retention of the local double

1:33:57

hedge row considered to be veteran and confirmed existing trees to be retained that were unclear on the proposals. And thirdly, we provided additional space to allow for the perimeter hedge planting adjoining the public right of way on the western boundary

1:34:16

to allow for that planting to be established and secure, improve screening.

1:34:24

So I believe that we've provided a proportionate response to the key issues raised

1:34:30

but except there are further issues the parish would ideally like to be considered. We've given consideration to those who believe that those elements that we have provided are substantial in addressing the principal landscape concerns.

1:34:50

sixthly with regard to the additional viewpoints these were requested by the parish to

1:35:00

informed judgement. And we were happy to undertake those and the assessment outcome from those identified a small, negligible

1:35:12

significance of outcome for construction and operation. And our recommendation was that they did not generate the need for any additional mitigation.

1:35:23

And again, those were undertaken in accordance with the agreed methodology.

1:35:28

And finally, with regard to

1:35:33

the Suffolk Council's desire for us to work to the agreed principles, made reference to requirement 20. intention has been that the scheme that's presented for the decio

1:35:48

has aligned itself with those principles and the lighting strategy also, to align with the LMP principles as well. So we do not anticipate any misalignment of the schema design with the principles we've set out and are agreed with the local authority. Hopefully, that provides clarity, I'm not sure if that was eight or six, but I'll leave it with you. Thank you, Mr. Cupid did make reference to cycle rates? Um, yes, I should have said and I put across by that. I'm not able to address that. But I'm happy to take that away with my colleagues and provide a written response on that matter, that that would be useful. And Mr. Phil's pop before you offer probably a summary. I know.

1:36:35

Miss mons has a question which might be appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. In your response earlier, you made reference to requirement 24. And you quite rightly said that within it, there's a 12 month period of

1:36:52

specified for

1:36:55

or within the 12 months I can't speak within 12 months of the completion of the construction works. demolition is required to be done. But then within the second point under current requirement 24, a scheme for land restoration to be submitted and approved by a Suffolk Council. There's not a time period for that to be submitted. So I wonder whether there should be and because it seems to me there's there's two elements here. And then whether it would also be necessary to have

1:37:30

either

1:37:32

a time period to be agreed by suffered for it to be completed. So that there's a clear commitment and an understanding with the council as to when it would be done by

1:37:46

Sir, if I may say so those are, appear to me to be good points in terms of improving the drafting of this requirement. And I don't believe looking at it that there is at the moment, a clear timeframe for the submission and approval of the scheme. Nor is it clear at the moment that there is any timeframe for its implementation, it may well be that one could deal with both of those by requiring the scheme to include the timeframe for its implementation. And then on the face of making that clear on the face of the requirement. And then also making clear within paragraph two, when that scheme has to be submitted. So we'll take those points on board, we can pick those up in the deadline, a version. Thank you, they'll be very helpful. Just that gives me a follow up point, I'm afraid.

1:38:47

I suspect the wording may be repeated in other requirements. So it might be worth looking more broadly. We'll undertake an audit with that in mind. Thank you for that indication.

1:39:00

Thank you, Mr. Philpott. Do you have anything else or is that the end of I know that that's the end of our response? Unless you have any further questions? No, thank you. I am conscious of the time so I am going to adjourn. It's now 1140 so if we return it 1155 please It's out. Hearing is now adjourned.