

TRANSCRIPT_SizewellC_ISH13_Session2_16092021

Thu, 9/16 2:14PM • 1:27:37

00:07

is now 1155 and issue specific 13 has resumed Mr. Philpott before we move on to Agenda Item Number four, I just like to revisit a point which I probably should have made earlier. So I apologise. And when we were discussing the fact that you were going to provide detail on the landscaping discussions you're having with the landowners, can you clarify for me their position as to whether they consider that to be mitigation or enhancement? And what factors do you say that we should rely on in our assessment of the weight to be attached to that consideration?

00:46

And if I can deal with that in two parts, I'll deal with the second part. But I'm going to ask Mr. Kraft who has been involved in the discussions, whether they're considered to be mitigation or enhancement, because that's really a question. I think that his expertise. Thank you.

01:03

Fine, I was the crap for the applicant.

01:08

My opinion is that the proposals that were submitted with the decio provided sufficient mitigation

01:16

for the scheme, the discussions we're having with landowners, I believe to be enhancement

01:24

that addresses more specific issues to do with visual immunity

01:29

for landowners.

01:33

The Wait, I will pass back to Council. Thank you.

01:39

Thank you very Yes, in terms of weight, you have our case that what's been put forward is adequate by way of mitigation. He will also have heard in your consider representations made by various interested parties to the effect that more is required. And that also, overall, people will make representations about the balance between impact and benefit. When you're considering as part of that the question of landscape impact. An important consideration will be the extent to which that impact can be mitigated and are offset by enhancements, the material that we are intending to provide to you,

02:29

as a result of the work that's been undertaken in conjunction with landowners will demonstrate what we believe can be achieved within the red line pursuant to the dsred landscape schemes that are to be destroyed to be approved pursuant to requirement. So in terms of weight, you will need to form a view as to the likelihood of the landscaping that can be provided and dealing adequately with the impasse that had been assessed.

03:05

Bearing in mind that these drawings and the explanation that will accompany them, will show you what can be achieved, it will be appropriate to attach weight

03:18

to that, and because it illustrates what is capable of being done at the detailed stage. Important in that, of course, is that the public interest in ensuring that any particular scheme is acceptable will be protected by the role of the discharging authority, which is well provided in terms of expertise in judging these matters. And they will be informed, of course, by the material that they have seen provided as part of the examination which shows what is capable of being done. So in those circumstances, it is appropriate to attach weight to those drawings, as part of the judgement that has to be reached as to the overall adequacy of the scope for landscape mitigation and enhancement to the extent that that's the judgement that the panel and the Secretary say formed about the role that particular parts of the landscaping would play.

04:19

I hope that helps. But if there are further questions, I'm happy to do my best to answer them. No, that's useful. Thank you, Mr. Phelps. And before I move on to Agenda Item Number four, Mr. Cooper, you've got your hand up. Is there a points you wish to make on the discussion? I've just been having?

04:35

It Can I just go back to some comments that were made by Mr. Kraft in relation to the seven park and ride. Just briefly.

04:47

I don't want the examining authority to think that we're ignoring the concessions that were made as a result of our meeting with the applicant on the eighth of October 2020. And we welcome the

05:00

reinstatement of the Northwest buttoned, and we accept that some work has been done to the the ancient headrow.

05:09

What we're still concerned about, and I think the applicant is minimising the effect of this is is the western boundary where I think it's going to be nigh on impossible to screen the southern park and ride from the by bridleway because, as I understand the

05:32

room has been made for hedging, but of course, hedging is going to take a substantial amount of time to provide any form of screening.

05:42

So, we'd like the applicant to take another look at that.

05:49

Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Mr. Phelps, I don't want to keep revisiting but I was cursed to say I did want to let Mr. Cooper have his say, is there anything you wish to add? I just look to my left.

06:05

I don't think at this stage there. Thank you.

06:10

Thank you. In that case, I'd like to move on to Agenda Item Number four, which is a to village bypass. I do have a question for East Suffolk Council.

06:32

Thank you, Mr. Tate. From from my reading. I mean, a lot of a lot of the issues have been raised by yourself. Isa council do relate to heritage related issues, which isn't necessarily the topic of this particular agenda item. But as we know, heritage and landscape and visual do do have some overlap. In concern regarding visual impact arising from

07:01

the to village, bypass roundabout and its visual presence in the connection between Park gate farm and St. Mary's parish church. I understand that it's the council's position that this issue requires further consideration and mitigation. And currently, as measures stand, they are in adequate to minimise the impact of the roundabout adjacent to park gate farm on the wider setting.

07:28

The applicant did provide responses in their second written questions that Li to 31 to 33 at Rep. 753. I understand that discussions were ongoing in respect to possible landscape enhancements. Do you have any comments to make at this stage regarding those discussions? And are you still of the opinion that additional work is required?

07:52

Thank you, Madam Yes, we are still of the opinion that additional work is required. We raised this issue in the Li are at 1247 and annex k which is read 156.

08:07

We have seen what the two vintage bypass lamp says rep 577.

08:15

And although it has an indicative status, it doesn't show any planting in the area where we think that it will be necessary as as mitigation to minimise the impact of the roundabout

08:32

on the wider setting and into visibility between Park gate farm and St. Mary's parish church. So we that hasn't been addressed yet to our satisfaction. There appears to be scope within the order limits to provide such additional mitigation

08:55

requirements. 22 will allow details to be approved, but we think

09:00

it's important that the Lemp

09:03

rep 577 is amended to reflect that and that is the discussion we've been having

09:10

with the applicant, which I don't believe has reached a conclusion yet. Now just see if Mr. Newton, the council's landscape

09:22

manager has anything additional to add to that.

09:34

Good morning, Madam Nicholas Newton, he suffered counsel.

09:38

We haven't actually had a discussion with the applicant on this point. So we as Mr. Taylor said, we do regarded as outstanding as a matter that does need addressing but there does seem to be scope within the red line boundary. So we hope that the levels to be opportunity to consider this matter.

09:57

Thank you, Mr. Newton. Mr. Chairs Is there anything else

10:00

You'd like to add in terms of the to village bypass in terms of lighting wider landscaping issues,

10:08

though it's it's the same point that I made in relation to the other two items about lighting. I think we are looking just for a little bit of adjustment to the ad principles document rep 734. To ensure that some of the aims in relation to the lighting

10:26

principles reflect the vision that we have for that, but nothing else. Thank you.

10:33

Thank you, Mr. Tate. If I could move to Mr. Bedford of Suffolk County Council, please.

10:43

Thank you.

10:46

Mr. Bedford at Rep. 5176, which is your post hearing submission following issue specific hearing number five, it was stated that the design principles in respect of the two village bypass required revision to form a robust basis for the discharge of requirements. And it was the intention that these were to be resolved prior to deadline five. Can you just give me an update as to where you are in terms of this? Were there any specific landscape and visual issues remain unresolved? Please?

11:19

Thank you, madam.

11:22

I'll bring Mr. Mary in on that matter. I'm not aware that there has been any specific resolution of what we said in our Rep. Five submission, blubbery Mr. Murray to confirm the position. Thank you.

11:40

Hello, good morning, Steve. Mary's Suffolk County Council. There's been no movement we were in the process of undertaking technical to or approval a preliminary stage of the applicant. And on a lot of the landscaping drainage and highway issues we had reached agreement. There is one specific issue I would raise which we also raised in is h 11. And this is to do with the location of the drainage lagoon number two, which is around change 600. This is located to the east of the river old Valley, as we pointed out is that we've been supplied details that suggested that the lagoon was going to be proximal to the main line of the carriageway, which makes sense most close to the highway. It's highway infrastructure.

12:30

In the original DCI submission, and still in the latest plans for approval, which is rep 5020. They lagoon is shown separated from the highway by an access track. So that is probably the key issue in terms of landscaping and drainage on the two village bypass that remains unresolved. My understanding is there was a meeting this afternoon, which hopefully this will be discussed that so I'm confident with the engagement with the applicant, we can resolve this, but he does does reflect the tensions between so high redesign, drainage and landscaping. The one point I would make is that one of the issues I understand has been raised is the the cutting that would be required for the access track. If the lagoon is located next to the to village bypass would point out that from initial examination of the plan, so that again is rep 5020. But also rep 512 which has a drainage strategy, which does actually have a snippet of the alternative design on there is that the location of the cut for the this minor access track

13:46

even if it's pushed as close to the red line as possible next lagoon that is still in your order of 25 to 30 metres away from wind Cole COVID which is an area of woodland. And we do note that the distance from Fox for word the red line is is very close to Fox for word and it is about the same distance from the edge of Fox word to the scarf of the embankment for the two valleys bypass. So in terms of landscaping, there are some of the key issues we need to sort of find a way through.

14:21

Thank you Mr. Mehra.

14:26

Mr. Bedford, are you content that lighting issues can be dealt with at the detailed design and discharge of requirements stage?

14:36

Yes, so far as lighting is concerned. And so far as the wider issues

14:44

I'm getting a bit of a feel

14:48

a bit of feedback sorry. And so far as the the wider issues about highway boundary and implications of drainage and so on is the same as we've made already in relation to the SLR the same point

15:00

Carry across to the to village bypass. So there are still some outstanding discussions were having with the applicant. And as Mr. Mary's indicated there is a meeting this afternoon and laid out hopefully we will make further progress on those matters.

15:15

Okay, thank you Mr. Bedford. And I am trying to remember to switch off my microphone.

15:21

I don't think that is anybody else. Know, Mr. Wilson. Do you have your hand up? You'd like to put your camera.

15:32

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Thank you, Mr. Sweeney. I just wanted to make a point to village bypass as I understand it, whilst it falls outside the air in the last section will be in the special landscape area.

15:47

The road will run through the rolling estates and lands, Valley Meadow lands and the plateau state farm lands lcts.

15:55

The assessment the tides, to the applicants own assessment is a permanent, moderate adverse effect on all three of those lcts. And again, they acknowledge as with the two previous sociated development site as adverse effects from lighting as you've heard before, because again, it's in a very low low light level area. This wouldn't make the point though all three actually conflict with Suffolk coastal local plan their policies LCL p 6.4. And s c sorry, lp 10.41 says where policy is to minimise light pollution from artificial light sources and ensure the retention of dark skies and the other says protect and enhance tranquillity and dark skies across the plain area. Now those policies within the Suffolk coastal local plan are consistent with paragraph 185 C of the National Planning policy framework, which actually encourages enjoins the decision makers to limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on the intrinsically dark landscapes. There just wanted to make the point we touched just believe that this conflict should carry significant weight. Thank you.

17:19

Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

17:22

I don't see any other hands up. So if I can turn to the applicant, please.

17:30

Thank you, Madam deal briefly with a couple of points. And then I'm just asked me to crash to pick something up. So far as the Suffolk Council's point is concerned. I've heard what they have said about the desire for the lamp to say more about the planting that they would like to see in a scheme that's submitted for approval in due course. And we can pick that up with them outside the examination. That sounds like the sort of point that's best discussed in that way. And we can report back at deadline eight.

18:07

I note it when it comes to Suffolk County Council there was a similar point there about drainage which is subject of meeting this afternoon. I don't see to prejudge that. But again, we can report back on what comes out of that a deadline eight.

18:24

And then finally, before I just turn to Mr. Kratz to deal with one other point raised on behalf of the current council by Mr. Mary about the location of the cart for the miner access track, heard what Mr. Wilson says on behalf of task. Of course, any impacts associated with the two village bypass or indeed, the other ad sites have to take into account their essential nature and role which is as mitigation. So one of the points that those who oppose, for example, the two village bypass must consider and grapple with and what they invite you to do is whether if the scheme is go ahead, it should go ahead with or without a bypass because the impacts have to be considered in that context and not in isolation.

19:22

I'll then turn to Mr. kratt. Just to deal with the specific factual point raised by Mr. Mary.

19:33

Thank you, Elsa crowd for the applicant.

19:36

Two points if I may. Firstly, with regard to park gate farm and the integration

19:44

of the roundabout, I would align myself with Mr. Newton's view that there is sufficient land within the red line to allow for an adequate outcome to be secured and we would be pleased to enter discussions in that regard.

20:01

And we'll see to progress that.

20:05

Secondly, and just a factual point on the special landscape area designations are within the local plan. Were not carried forward in the most recent local plan.

20:17

And having regard to how that impacts value and the impact that has on assessment, that is a relevant consideration, but just wanted to correct the record in that regard.

20:31

Thank you. Thank you.

20:34

Miss Philpott is that the that's all responses Thank you.

20:39

I'd now like to move on to agenda item number five which is terrestrial heritage and I'd like to invite having him whole estate to turn on their camera please.

21:12

Having him whole estate

21:18

Yes, ma'am. I apologise, I lost my action. I'm gonna re admit

21:24

that that's fine, not a problem from your submission at Rep. 2287. concern was raised by the estate that the applicant had failed to adequately address the significance of heritage assets located on the estate, which include the cockfield whole complex of buildings the significance of heritage assets within the Oxford conservation area, which includes the cockfield whole complex, and the contribution of setting being the surroundings in which your heritage asset is experience. In response to the concerns the

applicant responded at rep 3042, stating that the potential effects on cockfield whole had been considered and consulted upon and it was agreed that only the effects on cockfield Park and cockfield Lodge arising from construction and operation, you Oxford roundabout would be assessed.

22:18

And the scope of the assessments undertaken hadn't been challenged by either East Suffolk or Suffolk County Council. And in addition, I noticed that a suggestion was made by the estate or heritage mitigation contribution as a ring fence part within the sysvol see community funds, which would be administered by the Suffolk Community Fund. The applicant declined this suggestion but stated that within schedule 14 of the draft deed of obligation, there is provision for community Fund, which doesn't preclude money from being allocated to heritage related schemes or projects, provided that the bid meets the criteria of the fund. But it is not intended as mitigation for setting effects. I've got three main areas I'd like to discuss with you whether Firstly, whether that is a valid reflection of your situation today. Secondly, whether disagreement remains in respect of cockfield Hall. And whether you consider the provision within schedule 14 of the draft date of

23:16

draft deed of obligation is adequate in respect of mitigating the residual impacts of the project, in respect of the heritage assets located within the estate. And as a separate point whether you have any further monitoring or mitigation suggestions. I appreciate that was quite a lot of information. So mistreat and if you want me to go back at some point, that's fine. No, ma'am. I have a note of that. If we start with your first question, whether that's a valid reflection, I think essentially, that is a bad reflection of our case, although there's some amplification which we can draw out in relation to the other points. Save that I think there are further aspects of monitoring and mitigation that we've set out in detail. And perhaps we can deal with that when we come to the monitoring mitigation aspect of the discussion.

24:09

I'm going to introduce Mr. Clemens to address impact on cockfield Hall and it's complex. And so it might be unless there's something I can assist you with on your first question, which is the valid reflection that I hand over to Mr. Clemens now, that's fine.

24:29

Come on. Jason Clements from heritage head of heritage and townscape at sahravis. uk. Yes, ma'am. Our principal concern is the methodology and application of guidance is strikingly guidance that's been used by the applicant in respect to the impact of development upon the setting and significance of a number of heritage assets primarily is the complex at cockfield Hall.

24:57

The Atkins in response to options

25:00

station rehab addressed our concerns that acknowledged that the part coffered Hall Park might be impacted upon, but you can't distinct distinguish coffee apart from the complex itself is awfully strong

historical associations between the park itself and the complex. The park itself is a local designation is a non designated heritage asset.

25:25

But the council,

25:28

southern coastal District Council have included the park now as part of the Oxford conservation area. So it has become part of the designated hedges asset. And that's in recognition that the contribution of the three parks around the Conservation Area make to the significance of of the assessment as a whole. And it's impossible to distinguish them and separate them from each other. But we're looking at Caulfield Hall itself. As you saw on site Mom, it's too complex of 11 listed buildings. Most of them are great too, but coffered Hall itself is great one. And there's a complete permitted mid 16th century Kagan house which is great to start.

26:13

The importance of those assets cannot be underrated, as grade one listed building represents the top 2.5% of listed buildings in the country, and therefore is one of the most important listed buildings in the country. And the grade two star details represents the next 2.5% most important discoveries of the country. So in applying the considerable importance of weeks that need to be applied to impact upon Mr. buildings, they really be considered and given considerable weight and significance.

26:42

Not only are they 11 separate listed buildings, but they are a group. And they have very strong interconnections historical and visual and aesthetic connections, which elevates their importance even greater. And my concern is is really the interpretation and application of historic humans guidance on this.

27:02

It's been referred to by the applicant in their response. It's the historic environment, good practice advice, note three, I will provide mom details in our written response. So I don't expect you to record

27:16

all the notes now. But I just can touch on some some certain elements in it is a very important document. And I've attended over 30 public inquiries giving evidence on issues of setting and it is the well fund document that we will will use

27:31

the definition of setting goals defined in the nppf. But this guidance takes it a lot further, and makes us understand how we apply it. Because I'm just pleased to three three quick paths on page two. At the same time, I'm going to refer to these in detail in submissions, setting his surroundings which an asset experience and may therefore be more than extensive and is curtilage. And I prefer that because the palette app can refer to the park is quite clearly defines the curtilage of cultural Hall, but doesn't define it setting it setting can't extend way beyond its curtilage extends in importance to cities expressed by

reference to visual considerations or views of or from an asset will play an important part. The way in which we experienced acid in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration.

28:28

And going on to is a very useful section, which deals with a checklist. This just gives you more information in terms of how we understand how we establish what is the setting of an asset and how it might contribute towards the significance of an asset. And it's quite often those factors which still remain today and we can appreciate today from the building when it originally was built and subsequently has been inhabited. So those elements can relate to an

28:55

noise or vibration, tranquillity the feeling of remoteness, sense and smells even can be important.

29:03

Sense of enclosure seclusion intimacy, types of land use and rarity of surviving settings.

29:11

Those characteristics would lead me to say that the setting of Cockfield Hall is readily experienced today. We saw that on site in terms of the long distance views that are available. There's not just the views, it's that the tranquillity that exists.

29:29

And that's very important when we look at the impact upon a proposal upon significance. Because it's not just whether you're going to see it or not, is whether it's going to have some impact upon how you experience that quality of setting and significance. And the areas of concern that we have our dynamic kinetic issues in terms of traffic's moving, increased fast moving but also stationary vehicles that now can be visually present leading up to the roundabout. Light spill at the moment.

30:00

Have an evening time, night time. There's very limited lifespan in this location. So you can appreciate how the building was 200 years ago, 300 years ago, that's going to change the six metre height icons around about there will be a change in niceville. Next Gen urbanisation. And we were thinking about one of the most important buildings in the country and the complex is and is still in, in what OSHA is, is quite unusual. So it is a very special site. It's case one that needs protection. And do we've given to, to considering how we we protect it.

30:40

I've touched upon the assets, harmful impacts, light spill sounds of moving traffic, I would refer to the obviously to the strikingly response, who have acknowledged there will be an impact upon the heritage assets. I would question is talking this response because they clearly are thorough in their submissions, and I'll refer to this in detail to visibility. Again, visibility in its own right is not

the application of guidance is much more than that. So I do question whether he's talking when it does happen. Inspectors don't fully embrace the guidance that they actually produce themselves.

31:21

Thank you.

31:28

Mr. Stratton? Yeah, I just follow on from what Mr. Clemens was saying. And in particular, the historic England position, which you will note is rep 2138.

31:40

Historic England say that with screening the relevant wouldn't have a significant effect. And that harm would be at the lower end of less than substantial. And we are here talking about quickfield, which is a grade one listed building. And there's a recognition by the government statutory advisor of the potential for the lower end of less than substantial, but still harm which attracts the duties in the regulations. And so our position is given that the promoter itself recognises harm to the park, and that park contributes to the significance of the whole, it's impossible to say that there'll be no harm to the significance of the whole because if you're harming the significance of the park, you're harming the significance of the whole and and if you push it through the legal mechanism, you're required to recently described by Mr. Justice Holgate, and the safe Stonehenge decision that we're all aware of a paragraph 117. Ask yourself, what's the significance? And what's the impact, as soon as you do that, you'll find that there's an impact upon the significance of the whole because there's an impact upon the Parkland, which is part of the significance of the whole part of it setting. And you're impacting that, the significance of that, and then for impacting the significance of the whole. So we do say, as Mr. Clements has explained in detail, that the approach of the promoter to that asset, and indeed to the complex of assets, the group value of them, and their interrelationship is unsatisfactory. I can turn them, ma'am, unless you have more questions on that. No, that's fine. Thank you mitigation.

33:11

And in terms of that, there are there are two issues. The first of which is your issue.

33:18

Three, I think relating to the community fund. And now as I understand it, what you've asked is whether we're satisfied by the promoters response, which is that that can be taken from the community fund, generally, and there's no need for a specific heritage mitigation contribution. And our response to that is no, the promoters approach is clearly that the

33:46

contribution that there is to be the community fund is not intended as mitigations for settings and effects. Those are the words taken from rep 3042, which you I think, also read out earlier man. Of course, the Promote says it doesn't preclude it. But in our submission, there's a clear distinction between promoting economic and social well being of communities and the quality of life, and mitigating the residual adverse effects on heritage assets. Those are two different tests if you'd like two different things to look at. And if you approach this solely through the community fund, rather than through a

separate heritage mitigation contribution, then you risk overlooking those residual effects which might involve the need to instal secondary glazing say at the property because of the noise impact within a listed building, and then impact or its significance or it might involve cleaning a building because of construction effects upon it and its appearance. And those are just the sorts of things which you should have a heritage mitigation contribution in place to deal with we've proposed a mechanism for it. It's not the same as promoting economic and social

35:00

wellbeing, it's different from that it's promoting the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment. And if you don't have that fund in place, well, then the reality is that the need for that mitigation that residual level is going to fall upon the custodians of the listed buildings and other heritage assets themselves and we say that be quite wrong. So, we do say that there should be in place that heritage mitigation contribution.

35:30

Man, the second aspect of mitigation with which we are concerned in is really in relation to the specifics of the two aspects of associated development close to the estates designated heritage assets, namely the Oxford roundabout, and the northern park and ride. And we've dealt with this in writing in our comments on the decio. That's rep 2285.

36:00

But just to summarise, essentially, what we say is, firstly, that the northern Park and rides design should be submitted in detail to a Suffolk Council for approval. Secondly, the landscape planting under requirement 23 should be for 10 years, not for five years in terms of monitoring, essentially, because it's a 12 year construction phase. And so if plants or shrubs or trees die, within five years, there's still another seven years of construction during which they weren't in place. So that's why we say it should be a 10 year monitoring and replacement period and requirement 23. Thirdly, we say there needs to be an approved reinstatement scheme under requirement 24. To ensure that the land foreman planting on reinstatement are in keeping with the historic landscape setting of this area. Fourthly, we say there should be a new requirement for detailed approval of soft landscaping, in particular in relation to the roundabout where that landscaping falls within the conservation area, and is going to be permanently maintained and retained afterwards. And we said if you are changing a conservation area permanently, it's right. There should be detailed approval by a separate Counsel of what that landscaping and how that conservation area looks in perpetuity. And I know that the promoters position in relation to the conservation area is that not all our normal parts of the Conservation Area contribute to its significance, but we say the expansion of the conservation area to include the various parts, including the cockfield Hall Park is specifically a recognition of the fact that that does contribute to its significance. And so we say it needs to be done right. fifthly, we say there should be an operational management plan for the Northern Park and right. And again, that's because it is very much within the immediate context of cockfield Hall. And effects such as lighting, which obviously you discussed earlier today in the context of the Southern Park and Ride need to be appropriately managed and maintained to avoid there being unnecessary adverse effects, and sickly, we say there should be a requirement that the Oxford roundabout be reduced in size, certainly during the operational phase, and we've dealt with that

previously in the context of transport. And I know there's a deadline late submission, rep 7050 from the promoter,

38:30

which appears to recognise the potential for as they put it, euphemistically optimization through detailed design. And we say, given that you're talking about development within a conservation area, and within the setting of a grade one listed building, it's very important that that is limited and got, right. So just if I could finish on monitoring mitigation with an overarching point, and that's this, I know, it's something well understood by the examining authority. And indeed, I've seen the note dated the ninth of December on this point, but the promoters response generally, and in particular, in its deadline pre submission at rep 304 to 8.2, point seven to 8.2. Point 16 is essentially the all of those issues are dealt with through the requirement for general accordence with the associated development design principles, which is they put it allows for a limited amount of flexibility. We don't agree with that at all. As I've tried to explain, we're dealing here with harm to the setting of a grade one designated heritage asset, a complex of other important highly graded designated assets and a conservation area. And so the precise nature of how that is designed and mitigated is of significant importance to ensure that there aren't unassessed impacts on heritage assets and general accordence simply

40:00

doesn't satisfy that requirement leaves far too much slack in the rope. If you go back and apply the

40:09

approach in safe Stonehenge a paragraph 170, identify the significance and identify the impact if you don't closely confined the way in which the mitigation and design is going to be put forward. If you leave the ability for Value Engineering by the developer, then you risk having impacts which have not been assessed through the examination process, which then we can all agree would be undesirable. So I'm just going to check whether I've covered everything in Yes, I don't have anything else to add. But we covered your three questions, or I scribbled them down very quickly when you read the map. Yes, I think hopefully, we have. You have Thank you very much. I'm grateful.

40:58

I'd like to turn to a Suffolk counsel

41:04

to see if you have anything you'd like to add at this point.

41:11

Thank you, madam. No, we have nothing to add at this point.

41:15

Thank you. And the same question to Mr. Bedford of Suffolk County Council place.

41:23

Thank you, Madam now you will know that we have answered. I think it's question TT two point 17 in our

41:33

deadline seven response or to the second round of questions on the technical matters in relation to the roundabout size.

41:43

Obviously, we set out opposition there. We don't have anything further to add. Thank you.

41:49

Thank you. Before I turn to the applicant, I know Mr. Silver, all you've got your hand up.

41:58

Thank you, madam. John's counsellor, John several. I'm a member of the Oxford

42:05

parish Council. And then speaking of such, the

42:10

Mr. Stratton was making the point that

42:14

they are they sit within the oxygen conservation area, which is clearly the responsible party responsibility of the occupiers Council.

42:23

I'd also add that within yachts, but apart from the list of buildings that have been mentioned, there are nearly 100 other listed buildings within that conservation area.

42:36

I would like on behalf of the parish council to endorse fully the points that were made by Mr. Stratton,

42:47

Mr. Clemens, I'm just endorsing those points fully agree with all the points that are making. Thank you.

42:55

Thank you very much. There are no other hands up. So I'd like to turn to the applicant, please.

43:02

Thank you, Madam, before I turn to the substantive points, and I'm going to in a moment, are asked Mr. JOHN mabbott, from wood who sits to my right here to respond to the allegations about effect and assessment issues. I just want to make a couple of preliminary points. The first is this is your be aware. And as you mentioned, in your introduction, we provided a detailed response to the representations that

have been put in writing on behalf of the estate. I'll be corrected if I'm wrong. But I think that this is the first time we've had anything by way of response to that, despite deadlines having gone by when such a written response could have been made. So Better late than never, as it were. But we'll wait with interest to see this put down in writing. We respond in detail in writing.

44:04

But it is worth perhaps noting a couple of points by way of introduction.

44:13

First of all, much of what Mr. streeton said, builds on the assumed premise that there is harm to the significance of the heritage, asset and harm at a level that we don't in our assessment, recognise as being correct. And so it's important to bear that in mind when dealing with what Mr. streetman says are the consequences of that. No doubt he'll set those out in writing and we'll have a chance to respond to them. But in the meantime, and in a moment, I'll ask Mr. Mabus, to explain our view in relation to that matter. Secondly, so far as and the provision of funding permitted

45:00

is concerned, as you'll have seen where the assessment shows that there is harm to heritage assets, and where it's appropriate to provide mitigation by way of funding. In other words, that that is both necessary and proportionate,

45:19

and will actually deliver something, which is of relevance and value in the context of the harm that has been identified. We've done that we've identified specific assets where that is appropriate, and those are built into the deed of obligation.

45:36

And that is not the case here.

45:41

It's not the case that there is an identified harm where mitigation is needed. Nor is there evidence of harm that would justify the provision of funding in order to achieve some specific outcome.

46:01

Because, of course, as one would expect, the policy in the MPs on provision of obligations provision of funding is very carefully drafted to ensure that funding is only required, and obligations are only required, or it's necessary, necessary and proportionate. And the evidence simply doesn't establish that in relation to the assets that we're considering. Now. That's why the state is directed to consider the community Fund, which is an option for people to apply for funding from for matters which don't otherwise, register significant effects and register as something that would be justifiably therefore specifically dealt with by finding the deed of obligation. The final point by way of prelude to Mr. Mabus response is the question of general accordancy. And what I didn't pick up from Mr. straightens submission submissions, was any recognition or grappling with the implications of the changes that have made the definition of general accordancy in sheduled, two, paragraph one of the decio a

deadline seven, where, as you will have picked up paragraph four, which deals with the question of general accordancy, and is now drafted so as to have removed the word substantively from the phrase substantively consistent. And also, as a consequence, to take out the additional words at the end, which deal with the scope for material new or materially different environmental effects, because that no longer arises with a tighter definition of general accordancy. So it would appear that the concerns that were raised were really directed at the previous iteration of that definition, and fall away with its replacement. So I'm not going to pass on to Mr. Mbit

48:17

suffice to say that any other detail points that emerged from the written account, and particularly in relation to the application of the law, will pick up in writing.

48:31

Thank you, John, for the applicant.

48:35

I think

48:37

while we intend to respond in detail later, as set out, I think there are some key points to make that we're doing in response to the points made by Mr. Street. And

48:51

I think the first one of those is that we have not completed curtilage and setting. I think that would be a very difficult thing to do.

49:03

The eight of itself, which is where most of these effects are considered to be arising from by having them whole is out with the park.

49:12

And we've considered certainly effects arising from traffic on the a 12.

49:19

I think we've also considered Cockfield Park as part of the conservation area and that is clear from the assessment. We consulted with the Suffolk council before the at the time that the decision was made to extend the conservation area. And we took that extension into account along with the additional parks and non designated parks that were included within the conservation area.

49:47

In terms of whether we have applied

49:51

Mr. England guidance appropriately, I think there we would have to point to the responses from the Suffolk Council and historic

50:00

England, who are both in agreement with the methodology of the assessment, and that's stated fairly explicitly in the local impact report and the historic England response.

50:16

If

50:18

you read the

50:20

environmental statement chapter, which is a pp 499, it will explicitly state that we've considered the effect of traffic movements. And we've considered effects of traffic movements throughout the

50:34

operational period of the roundabout throughout the construction period of the proposed about the size policy development as a whole.

50:44

That is actually set out at

50:51

section 9.3. point one six,

50:56

the environmental segment chapter.

51:05

So

51:07

I think that those are the key points that we considered in the decision to scope out effects on

51:16

cockfield Hall.

51:18

That was taken that was taken, it was consulted with the Suffolk Council and with historic England. And they were both in agreement with that decision. So those effects have been considered. they've not been assessed in great detail that they weren't considered appropriately, and the relevant prescribed consultees work content for that decision.

51:48

Thank you. And just finally, Madam, as it is worth noting, in this, that the historic England response, rep 2138 points out, as

52:03

is common in these cases that their primary remit is to advise on the impact of the proposed development on grade one and grade two star this two buildings, amongst other things, had historic England and thought that there were significant concerns about the impact on the grade one and grade two star assets that Mr. streeton referred to one would have expected them to make that clear. Similarly, if they thought that there was a need for specific mitigation, or would have expected to make that clear to and they have not, and they don't maintain any objection, in relation to the impact, or indeed, as I understand it, in relation to the mitigation that's offered or any suggestion that additional mitigation needs to be offered in relation to these assets, had they thought that that was appropriate, reasonable to infer that they would have said so.

52:59

But beyond that will respond in writing.

53:07

Thank you, Miss just

53:09

greeting.

53:11

I have given the applicant is

53:15

I know, says if it's something

53:19

new Can you put it in writing? Or is it something very short? It's very short, I just would ask you, ma'am, to note and look at what historic England say in Rep. 2138 about cockfield tall and it's paragraph 2.150.

53:36

Thank you, I will do. Dr. Fletcher. I notice you've got your hand up now. Would you? Would you like to add something?

53:47

Just thank you.

53:50

Ma'am. I'm Dr. wil Fletcher from historic England.

53:54

I've heard various references historically and as you know, sort of our guidance and from both the applicant and and from Mr. Clemens and Mr. streeton.

54:05

I just felt it was worth putting down to to ESB, we understand our own guidance. In fact, I was present and responsible for partly for his drafting which is which is interesting. It may be of interest to to to that we have considered this within the remit and within our within our sort of wider remit. I don't find any reason to to update or change our advice. We were comfortable with our position.

54:32

If there are further questions that the examining authority would like to put historically, then we'd be more than happy to answer those, if you if if requested in writing. Thank you.

54:43

Thank you, Dr. Fletcher. Mr. Hill parts. Is there anything else you'd like to add? No, I'm quite happy for you to look through what has already been said about this. I don't believe that when you look at it. It says anything other than is consistent with what I've said.

55:00

said, but I do think we're no doubt as to where one goes in the representation, but there's nothing substantive to add. Thank you I am I am aware of the representation. So I'd like to move on to the next point on Agenda Item Number five, which is National Trust Coast Guard cottages. Unfortunately, nationals just aren't able to join us today. However, they have provided a written submission in lieu of their attendance, which outlines their position and this has been published in the examination library at reference ev 142 H.

55:35

just in summary, because I'm aware that not everybody will have seen this, this note confirms that the scale of impact on the Coast Guard cottages remains an area of disagreement.

55:46

They also go on to say that the applicant has confirmed proposed some which is to be included within the dnh Heath resilience fund within the deed of obligation and iron. also understand that they are waiting for technical note on the historic environment. I'd like to turn to East Suffolk council if I may, with regards to this agenda item.

56:13

Thank you, Madam, you will have seen from the feedback Thank you, you will have seen from the National Trust letter that their position is to agree with

56:26

the local impact report, which has expressed the position of disagreement as to the scale of impact on the cottages.

56:41

Your suffix position is that is a moderate adverse and therefore significant effect.

56:47

And the applicants position is that it's minor not significant and no mitigation required.

56:55

Having regard to the National Trust letter, which reflects negotiations with the applicant, that they are minded to agree at present, that these some that has been offered

57:11

for enhancement and interpretation of the cottages

57:16

to address or provide appropriate mitigation. Having regard to that, on that basis is suffix position is that

57:27

if that isn't the the position, we would agree that that would be appropriate and requisite mitigation to address these impacts. The scale of impact remains in disagreement, but on the basis that that is accepted by the National Trust, then that mitigation would appear to us to be appropriate.

57:49

Thank you very much. If I could ask Suffolk County Council if they have any comments I wish to make

57:57

the matter Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council we endorse and defer to the position of Isa Council.

58:05

Thank you, if any other interested parties wish to comment on this agenda item.

58:15

don't see any hands up at the minute is to fill part.

58:20

Thank you melody, anything I would say is I've taken instructions, I understand that the technical note has now gone to the national trusts. So hopefully in line with their letter will be able to confirm the position in an updated statement of Common Ground deadline aid. And we look forward obviously to discussing that with National Trust once they've had a chance to consider the node.

58:43

Thank you for confirming I therefore like to move on to the next agenda item please. Which is separate coasts and hates area of outstanding natural beauty cumulative impact.

58:58

So did you find qualities of the amb, detailed within rep 1079 which is a natural beauty and special quality indicators of the era and B this document was developed with the applicant in consultation agreement with the AONB partnership Isa council Suffolk County Council and sets out natural beauty in special qualities of the air MB

59:24

and the impact on air and bees are wider than just landscape and visual impacts and the AONB management plan confirms this and states that the concept natural beauty embraces wider matters than just landscape and scenic quality and also includes relative wildness intuitiveness relative tranquillity natural heritage cultural heritage and human associations.

59:50

As you will be aware question and the latest round of examination questions has been asked to the applicant in respect of cumulative impacts on the AIA when

1:00:00

But I'd also like to ask here whether in interested parties as to whether significant weight has been given to all the defining qualities of the AONB. And I'd like to firstly ask that question to the AONB partnership please.

1:00:20

Thanks, madam Simon Amstutz from the representing the AONB partnership. On the first bullet of the agenda around adequacy of assessment. The ANP partnership recognises that the the assessment that would perhaps diverged from the opinion of the applicants were, we consider that the impact to one part one element of the AONB damages the whole AONB.

1:00:56

Thank you. And could I also ask you whether you maintain that the recreation and monetary value of the RMB has been downplayed, and that the value for the wider public benefits of the RMB natural beauty and special qualities has not been fully assessed.

1:01:13

I would concur with the who I think we would be born if it concurs with, with what you described that.

1:01:20

Thank you.

1:01:23

Could I therefore turn to Mr. Collins on behalf of stop size was see and together against sizewell See, please and ask the same question as whether significant weight has been given to all of the defining qualities of the AONB.

1:01:45

Good afternoon thing.

1:01:48

I think Mr. Collins advised the case team he was having to step out for a short time so I'm covering for him. And I think our we would like just like to endorse the comments made by Mr. Amstutz the OMB partnership on this point. But I did also want to express our disappointment that your

1:02:09

I think very strong encouragement that was given to the applicant to previous hearing to consider providing accurate visualisations of the build do not appear to have been responded to by the applicant at least we certainly haven't seen any to date and maybe

1:02:27

we can expect some in the future. But I'm not aware that that's the case. And I just wanted to sort of reiterate I know there was a qualification to that encouragement about, you know, the difficulty of especially choosing a point in time, but with the applicants experience of construction at Hinkley Point C it would seem to us to be not outside the bounds of

1:02:50

their capacity and ability to provide those visualisations and I think it would be helpful if they were submitted to the examination before the close.

1:03:00

Thank you Miss Downes. Could I therefore ask the same question in regards of significant weight to all the defined qualities to a Suffolk council please?

1:03:15

Thank you, Madam, as you point out the AONB special qualities document was drawn up in anticipation of this development. The Council's position is that it hasn't agreed with all the assessments as set out in the NAR particularly at 627 and and following, but that in crafting the mitigation,

1:03:40

sufficient weight has been given to the divine qualities of the Lamb. And having regard to the special qualities document. So

1:03:54

that has been integral to that process of crafting the mitigation

1:03:59

which is agreed as set out in the deed.

1:04:05

Thank you. Could I ask the same question to Suffolk County Council please?

1:04:15

Thank you. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Madam it may not be

1:04:22

the most important point but I know that the agenda on this item had used the phraseology has sufficient weight being given to the defined qualities. And I think your formulation of the question so the previous participant referred to has significant weight being given to the qualities.

1:04:45

Obviously, there's a potential difference between those two

1:04:49

formulae relations. The opposition is as Mr. Tate has indicated, as set out in the local impact report that the set

1:05:00

work that was presented with the application we did not consider gave sufficient weight or indeed significant weight to all of the qualities of the AONB.

1:05:12

In relation to the mitigation that has now been proposed and put forward. There are still some outstanding issues where the county council considers that insufficient weight has been given to detrimental effects and you know that we have a position on the power export connection in terms of the continued intention by the applicant to use pylons in that location. We have

1:05:46

concerns in relation to the outage carpark and the justification for that. And we have outstanding concerns in relation to the triple si crossing and the treatment of that, albeit that that's primarily a biodiversity issue. The biodiversity quality is itself part of one of the special qualities of the A and B. So there are some specific issues where we consider that the applicant is still not given sufficient weight to those particular attributes of the AONB. Having said that, we certainly recognise that the applicant has moved significantly,

1:06:30

to address the impact through the mitigation package proposed. I know that we may talk more about some of the detail tomorrow, but we just do want to stress that it's not simply a question of the natural environment fund. There is also the environment trust, which has been the subject of discussion, and we see the matters that the applicant has put forward as being essentially them going.

1:07:01

As far as we've been able to identify as practicable subject to those previous comments I made about the pylons, the outage carpark and the triple si crossing,

1:07:15

to mitigating the impacts. But we are obviously concerned that there are still residual impacts on the lamb.

1:07:29

Thank you very much. Could I now turn to Christopher Wilson of task please?

1:07:39

Thank you Miss Cassini. Chris Watson. On behalf behalf of together bank sighs We'll see. This, I just wanted to endorse the comments made by the AMD partnership and some downs. And also, Mr. Bedford just referred to outstanding areas that they were concerned of, and they align with ours with regard to the pylons, the outage car park on the triple si crossing, and we wanted to say was that

1:08:09

the the attributes of the amb are obviously recognised, but it's in terms of the significant impact on those

1:08:18

attributes that were where we have a difference of opinion. And obviously, in terms of looking at the cumulative impact of all this, it seems to us that there's also the beach Landing Facility SRP.

1:08:34

We had the base Landing Facility was it was a relatively new addition.

1:08:40

And we have the soft coast and our coasts, sea defences sort of plans changing. So it's very hard to actually fully assess until we've actually got a completed project in front of us as to what we do in the fall impacts to be

1:08:57

and,

1:08:59

and the issue with visualisations not being presented, as far as I'm aware

1:09:04

is where we agree with stop size or see as well. And yes, so really just wanted to make that point that also the amb seems to be a bit of a fall guy.

1:09:16

It ended up suffering because there was too much transport on the roads. And so there'll be more sort of ships for the temporary jetty more man made structures on the beach, I mean, all issues that the OMB partnership have raised before, but it just seems to task that he always seems to be the amb, and its attributes suffering, and to try and cope with the inadequacies of the of the overall development. Thank you.

1:09:49

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. I don't see any other hands up. So at this point, I'd like to turn to the applicant please.

1:09:58

Thank you very much.

1:10:00

And before I turned to Mr. Kraft, to deal with the adequacy of assessment point, I just wanted to pick up a couple of things. First of all, so far as the AONB partnership point of approach about impact on one part being impact on the whole,

1:10:24

we have set out our case on that extensively in writing, I believe we touched on it in the issue specific hanging on landscape. And I don't believe there's anything we can really usefully add to that debate. Now, simply in relation to the Suffolk County Council points about export connection, the car park and the triple si

1:10:46

crossing, we've got our case on those, those points. And I'm not gonna traverse over those now. And to be fair to Mr. Bedford, he only list of the middle and seek to go into the minute in any detail. And he also mentioned the environmental trust, and we'll pick that up tomorrow to explain what that is. But it is not something that we are relying on for the purposes of this application, that the natural environment fund is however, something relying on.

1:11:16

I don't want to go through all the matters we'll deal with tomorrow in terms of the environmental trust, but it's not before you and it's not before you because we're not asking you to take take account of it.

1:11:26

And I was encouraged, though, to hear that so far as the county council is concerned, subject to those matters. It believes that the applicant has gone as far as possible to mitigate the impacts. And as you've heard both is of a council and the county council, as I'm starting to agree with the mitigation that is put forward by way of funding in the deed. And that that is appropriately reflective of the full defined causes of the error and being the impacts upon them.

1:12:02

Finally, I heard what Mr. Wilson said on behalf of task about the BLF and the coastal features. And he said that will the LMB is the Fall Guy. The two points to make in response to that first is that the impacts of those features on the LMB have been fully and properly assessed, taking proper account of the parameters used to define them in the application. And there's no shortfall in the information available, or indeed in the adequacy of the assessment. And the second point, which is really a point about

1:12:46

approach and perspective here

1:12:50

in in raising the concern about the impact of those features on the AONB what the task submission touches upon, but doesn't then fully deal with is the balance that needs to be struck when deciding what is the appropriate freight management strategy to deal with the construction of a power station at this sort over extended period of time, in terms of balancing the various different impacts that arise depending on whether or not you build infrastructure or temporary infrastructure to take in

1:13:26

materials through the sea. Which is of course something that is specifically encouraged in strong terms in the MPs and the impact that that has on a temporary basis on the AONB as against the impacts are bringing in more by road, which might dispose of the need for the infrastructure for marine, but brings with it of course, its own impacts, we think we strike the right balance was not clear and would need to be grappled with to make give any weight to task submissions as whether it would prefer a different balance in the freight management strategy, doing away with the BLF, which was a specific point concerned and putting more hgvs on the road. Unless parties properly grapple with that balances we have had to as the applicant, then less weight must attach to any criticisms they make the impact associated with it. Because that is a balance. We have to strike as a balance ultimately with the Secretary statement we'll have to strike. And we think we've got it right for the reasons we've set out. Against that background. I'm now going to ask Mr. Kraft to deal briefly with the two specific matters I want him to cover. There may be other things he's heard he wants to respond to. The two specific things are Firstly, whether the assessment has adequately taken account and given appropriate weight, whether it's described as significant or sufficient to all all

1:15:00

The defining qualities of air MB and the second point is in relation to the adequacy of the visualisations that have been provided to inform a judgement on those points.

1:15:14

Thank you Alyssa crap for the applicant.

1:15:17

There are a few other items I will

1:15:21

refer to but to address the two principal issues raised by Mr. Phil part

1:15:29

regarding the assessment adequacy and wait,

1:15:33

the document you've already referred to Madame, the natural beauty and special quality indicators document was prepared, as you'll be aware, specifically to allow the project design but also the assessment undertaken to define the criteria by which we make a judgement of impacts on the AONB. That document doesn't merely seek to set up landscape matters, but properly address on the basis of an agreed understanding of all of those criteria that were explored with the relevant stakeholders. And indeed, that document as you'll be aware, as an adopted document,

1:16:15

political authority. So for the purposes of making sure that the basis of our judgement and our assessment was cracked, I believe the baseline understanding and position is correctly aligned, the position with regard to the judgments that are made, and how those are made and the adequacy of that

1:16:39

if I could just walk through

1:16:42

the how each of the criteria have been addressed, and it is going to be picked up in our response

1:16:50

at deadline, eight to the question that's actually already been raised under cu 1.0, which is presently in hand with my team. But just to walk through.

1:17:03

As I previously indicated, the assessment has been an iterative process with a number of disciplines.

1:17:13

Having regard to natural beauty indicators, the three criteria that we are looking at and for reference, my apologies, I'm going to refer to table 13 point 14 and table 13 point 17 in Volume Two, Chapter 13 of the Lv IAA, which is document a PP dash 216.

1:17:37

And I have in brackets habit to hand because I think it's important to

1:17:45

demonstrate the the depth that we've gone to to understand these issues and the judgments that have been made. So firstly, under the title of natural beauty indicators, these tend to be more landscape and aesthetic related special quality indicators, slightly different well, under natural beauty indicators under the factor of relative tranquillity

1:18:12

and addressing a particular point, we've made specific reference to the immunity in recreation assessment and my colleague.

1:18:21

Philip addressed those issues yesterday. That was a very important piece of work, even for the purposes of seeking definition of tranquillity. I would say from my experience in working with a number of major infrastructure projects I'm tackling the issue of tranquillity head on has been a very important part of the advice we've given to the client and one I believe that EDF have dealt with appropriately in terms of understanding what we're talking about, to allow the examining authority to make a proper judgement and the Secretary of State to understand this issue probably more particularly,

1:19:00

in having a duty of regard. So for the purposes of addressing the factor of roads and tranquillity. We believe it's been properly and fully assessed, and that the museum recreation technical chapter, Volume Two chapter 15

1:19:18

and I without repeating all of these references, I will provide them in a follow up note,

1:19:24

which I believe has been properly addressed. And to further amplify within that community recreation assessment, you will be aware that issues of noise, air quality, landscape and visual issues have all been considered in the round to inform judgement

1:19:43

under the factor of natural heritage features, we've had extensive dialogue with the terrestrial ecology and ornithology assessment in the work that we've been undertaking in the master plan, process and driving the project.

1:20:00

Towards considerable biodiversity net gain outcomes that I think Mr. Lewis has previously reported on. Again, I believe that there has been proper interaction with that technical assessment work to inform our proper judgement on what we actually mean when we talk about natural heritage features and the impacts associated with them.

1:20:23

Finally, under the natural beauty indicator of cultural heritage, my colleague, he's already given evidence here today, in part,

1:20:32

we've had proper crossover, having regard to the historic environment, and the technical assessment undertaken.

1:20:41

Putting all of those in the round, we have made a judgement on each of those

1:20:48

natural beauty indicator effects and the

1:20:53

environmental statements and within the landscape chapter provides a summary of those effects and I will give you reference to where those adjustments are made in in one minute.

1:21:07

If I may turn to a consideration of special quality indicators. leases are referred to earlier are slightly less related to

1:21:18

technical studies, but have been the point of reference certainly, in the last day or so when we've been talking about health and well being and touching on elements of economy. These are not my areas of specialism. But with the experience I've had in both coordinating EAS and directing large scale projects in my professional career,

1:21:40

the overview we've taken supported by the technical professional team, we have looked at the factor of health and well being.

1:21:50

And again, with detail reference to the mainstream recreation assessment chapter made judgments having regard to impacts arising on that special quality.

1:22:02

Under the issue of economy,

1:22:06

we've made reference to the size and agricultural assessment,

1:22:10

the museum, recreation assessment chapter, and also socio economics, and had dialogue with the team in coming to judgments in relation to that particular point.

1:22:22

Each of those natural beauty indicators and special quality indicators have subheadings within them, I don't propose to go through them. But in the assessment we've undertaken, those sub headings where they're relevant are considered to make sure that we have item by item addressed are those assessments. So in response to the the adequacy.

1:22:45

My professional judgement is that those have been properly assessed based on the sound basis of understanding with the correct level of integration and crossover with professional disciplines. And the assessments we have made having regard to

1:23:01

the effects on natural beauty indicators and special quality in the cases are recorded. I'm now going to desperately find the correct reference in my notes to those chapter conclusions. And if you just bear with me, one minute, I will seek to provide that if you want to do that deadline, yes.

1:23:22

But all I can say is that there is a proper apart from the tabulated work. There's a proper narrative associated with that assessment outcome. Having regard to wait, I refer to counsels point on that. I believe that proper consideration has been given in the round.

1:23:42

And that each factor has been properly considered.

1:23:46

Whether those judgments are agreed upon, I think is the matter of difference.

1:23:51

The second point related I think, two adequacy is that crappy. visualisations apologies Can't read my writing.

1:23:59

We are just completing the visualisations work which will be submitted in date. I have just reviewed yesterday. The near final work on those visualisations which were requested.

1:24:13

We've had fully integrated work with the construction logistics advisors, and other elements of the engineering team to make sure we represent that work properly. It's been an extensive piece of work and involved much time. But we'd be pleased to submit those a D eight and I believe will support the assessments we have already made in in terms of judgments and having to take questions on those points if possible. Thank you.

1:24:44

I don't have any questions at this stage. Thank you. Thank you. Then I think the only other thing to note that I've seen in obviously later agenda item that you want to talk about relevant schedules in the draft deed of obligation.

1:25:00

That that I assume is when you would want to talk about

1:25:05

the natural environment improvement fund and other matters, rather than dealing with those. Now as part of this, that wasn't actually on my agenda, I am going to look at schedule 17. If there's a point you want to make Well, it was simply this. You've heard from both councils in relation to the adequacy of the mitigation that is secured by that. And it might be helpful just for those who may not have

1:25:36

looked as far in the substantial amount of D seven information to the schedules which deal with this, but instead of the natural environment, there is a natural environment improvement Fund, which is administered the spending that is administered by natural environment awards panel,

1:25:59

assisted by a natural environment improvement officer employed by the county council funded by the applicant, and they distribute

1:26:11

funds within a defined area the natural environment improvement area, which includes a defined part of the AONB in the Suffolk heritage coast. And they do that by reference to criteria which are identified in 2.5 and 2.6. Bit include, as one might expect, consideration of whether relevant projects which are put up for funding would conserve and enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB and the heritage case in their setting. And the fund that is to be made available for these purposes, is a maximum of 12 million pounds. So a very significant sum of money to be spent for those purposes. And that is the as I understand it, the fund that was being referred to by the council's in their submissions.

1:27:11

Thank you very much. It's now 22 minutes past one. So I'm going to suggest we adjourn for lunch and come back at five plus two. Thank you very much.