

WEBVTT – This file was automatically generated by event.video

0

00:00:00.400 --> 00:00:03.800

Okay, thank you. Everyone quarter to 12 hearings resumed.

1

00:00:03.800 --> 00:00:06.800

What I propose to

2

00:00:06.800 --> 00:00:10.400

do is to move on to articles 9

3

00:00:09.400 --> 00:00:13.300

and 11 consent for

4

00:00:13.300 --> 00:00:17.600

Street Works, unless anybody

5

00:00:16.600 --> 00:00:19.400

has anything to raise on

6

00:00:19.400 --> 00:00:21.700

the preceding articles.

7

00:00:22.600 --> 00:00:25.900

If not then say.

8

00:00:29.500 --> 00:00:32.100

We'll have a look at the this has to do with

9

00:00:32.100 --> 00:00:33.900

consent for Street works.

10

00:00:35.400 --> 00:00:37.300

and article 11

11

00:00:38.400 --> 00:00:42.200

And amendments are proposed by Cambridge County

12

00:00:41.200 --> 00:00:47.700

Council in its document re-p-6-057.

13

00:00:44.700 --> 00:00:49.400

And

14

00:00:47.400 --> 00:00:52.100

it's comments page

15

00:00:50.100 --> 00:00:53.900

pages 40

16

00:00:53.900 --> 00:00:56.600

and following of its

17

00:00:56.600 --> 00:00:59.100

submissions. And those are it's comments on

18

00:00:59.100 --> 00:01:02.300

the applicants submissions. That made it

19

00:01:02.300 --> 00:01:02.900

D5.

20

00:01:04.400 --> 00:01:07.400

So in essence as I understand it the

21

00:01:07.400 --> 00:01:10.700

council wishes article 11 to

22

00:01:10.700 --> 00:01:14.700

be amended currently, it

23

00:01:14.700 --> 00:01:17.500

reads article 11 1

24

00:01:17.500 --> 00:01:20.500

reads the Undertaker during and for

25

00:01:20.500 --> 00:01:23.400

the purposes of constructing or maintaining the

26

00:01:23.400 --> 00:01:26.600

authorized development May temporarily stop

27

00:01:26.600 --> 00:01:29.900

up prohibit the use of authorized the

28

00:01:29.900 --> 00:01:32.400

use of alter or divert any public right of

29

00:01:32.400 --> 00:01:36.300

way and for and may for any

30

00:01:36.300 --> 00:01:39.900

reasonable time and then so I

31

00:01:39.900 --> 00:01:43.300

understand it the council wants to add the words only as

32

00:01:42.300 --> 00:01:45.700

the last resort in accordance with

33

00:01:45.700 --> 00:01:48.500

the detailed construction traffic management plan

34

00:01:48.500 --> 00:01:52.200

approved under schedule to requirement 16.

35

00:01:54.600 --> 00:01:55.000

and then

36

00:01:56.300 --> 00:01:59.700

article 11 3 is proposed

37

00:01:59.700 --> 00:02:00.500

to be amended.

38

00:02:01.400 --> 00:02:05.000

Currently it reads the Undertaker must

39

00:02:04.500 --> 00:02:08.400

restore any streets that has been temporarily altered

40

00:02:07.400 --> 00:02:10.000

under this order to the

41

00:02:10.600 --> 00:02:12.700

reasonable satisfaction of the street Authority.

42

00:02:13.400 --> 00:02:16.800

Then it's desired to add the words through inspection

43

00:02:16.800 --> 00:02:19.200

and certification by the

44

00:02:19.200 --> 00:02:22.200

street Authority in accordance with the

45

00:02:22.200 --> 00:02:25.300

procedure set out in the legal agreement

46

00:02:25.300 --> 00:02:27.100

between the relevant parties.

47

00:02:27.900 --> 00:02:29.800

and so I'm assuming that

48

00:02:31.200 --> 00:02:34.200

my anticipate that if the legal agreement

49

00:02:34.200 --> 00:02:36.300

is not completed for some reason then

50

00:02:37.100 --> 00:02:40.500

in accordance with the protective Provisions for

51

00:02:40.500 --> 00:02:44.100

the local Highway authorities might be substituted for

52

00:02:44.100 --> 00:02:44.800

that reference.

53

00:02:46.900 --> 00:02:49.600

so actually I think that should be article 9

54

00:02:49.600 --> 00:02:53.400

9 3 it's I

55

00:02:52.400 --> 00:02:55.300

think it's down in the council's comments

56

00:02:55.300 --> 00:02:58.500

as article 11 3 to be amended, but I think that that

57

00:02:59.500 --> 00:03:02.600

That is a reference to the wording in article 9 3.

58

00:03:04.700 --> 00:03:08.100

But as far as the substance of the proposed amendments

59

00:03:07.100 --> 00:03:11.200

are concerned is is that have

60

00:03:10.200 --> 00:03:13.900

I got that right? Yes. I I

61

00:03:13.900 --> 00:03:16.100

was just about to make that

62

00:03:16.100 --> 00:03:20.700

correction you you have and you've also got the our

63

00:03:19.700 --> 00:03:22.300

insertions also right

64

00:03:22.300 --> 00:03:23.100

there, so

65

00:03:25.100 --> 00:03:25.300

you

66

00:03:26.500 --> 00:03:29.500

thank you. So okay, Mr. Tony don't comments

67

00:03:29.500 --> 00:03:29.700  
on that.

68

00:03:30.700 --> 00:03:33.500  
Thanks there Richard Turney for the applicant.

69

00:03:35.100 --> 00:03:39.300  
So overarching point is on

70

00:03:38.300 --> 00:03:41.400  
these issues the side agreement

71

00:03:41.400 --> 00:03:44.300  
which obviously leads to further controls and

72

00:03:44.300 --> 00:03:49.100  
the need for Authority from the relevant highways

73

00:03:47.100 --> 00:03:50.600  
authorities for the work

74

00:03:50.600 --> 00:03:53.900  
to kind of work that we're anticipating but onto

75

00:03:53.900 --> 00:03:58.100  
the specifics of the drafting of the order the first

76

00:03:57.100 --> 00:04:01.300  
point in terms of Last Resort,

77

00:04:00.300 --> 00:04:03.500  
we don't think that's an

78

00:04:03.500 --> 00:04:07.200  
appropriate piece of drafting the language.

79

00:04:06.200 --> 00:04:10.800  
I don't think has any precedent that we've

80

00:04:10.800 --> 00:04:14.600

seen all these not any relevant precedent. I don't

81

00:04:14.600 --> 00:04:18.600

recall it Mr. Mohamed Mike from other statutory

82

00:04:17.600 --> 00:04:20.400

instruments, but it

83

00:04:20.400 --> 00:04:22.500

would seem to be inappropriate as a phrase.

84

00:04:23.500 --> 00:04:25.700

The better controls obviously are in the

85

00:04:27.100 --> 00:04:30.400

ctmp for these issues and that's that's

86

00:04:30.400 --> 00:04:33.700

probably where we should look

87

00:04:33.700 --> 00:04:34.600

for drafting.

88

00:04:36.900 --> 00:04:37.100

the

89

00:04:38.700 --> 00:04:42.000

I think the other point in

90

00:04:41.200 --> 00:04:44.200

respect of the addition of a reference to

91

00:04:44.200 --> 00:04:48.400

inspections certification, we gave

92

00:04:48.400 --> 00:04:52.700

a response to this at deadline six which explains

93

00:04:51.700 --> 00:04:56.400

that paragraph 7.2.15

94

00:04:54.400 --> 00:04:58.600  
through to 7.2.16

95

00:04:57.600 --> 00:05:01.600  
of the outline ctmp.

96

00:05:02.800 --> 00:05:06.400  
Includes a requirement to carry out pre-construction conditions

97

00:05:05.400 --> 00:05:08.700  
surveys and to carry out reinstatement works.

98

00:05:09.600 --> 00:05:12.300  
So we think that's sufficient to address

99

00:05:12.300 --> 00:05:14.100  
the concern that's being raised there.

100

00:05:14.900 --> 00:05:16.700  
the suggested

101

00:05:18.400 --> 00:05:19.100  
Amendment

102

00:05:21.700 --> 00:05:22.200  
I think

103

00:05:23.400 --> 00:05:26.200  
we were concerned about the reference to 11:3, but I

104

00:05:26.200 --> 00:05:26.400  
think

105

00:05:29.100 --> 00:05:32.200  
That having been clarified as being reference to nine three that  
does make

106

00:05:32.200 --> 00:05:35.500  
sense. I was going to say it doesn't make any sense as well. But  
we've got



107

00:05:35.500 --> 00:05:38.200

the answer to the point Remains the Same. We think it's the

108

00:05:38.200 --> 00:05:38.800

ctmp.

109

00:05:39.600 --> 00:05:40.200

Okay. Thank you.

110

00:05:41.400 --> 00:05:42.400

so

111

00:05:43.500 --> 00:05:46.900

in terms of where we're at with the ctmp.

112

00:05:47.800 --> 00:05:50.800

Does that in your estimation deal with the first

113

00:05:50.800 --> 00:05:51.300

points?

114

00:05:52.200 --> 00:05:54.200

I know you don't like the phrase Last Resort.

115

00:05:55.300 --> 00:05:58.500

He says something in the ctmp that is equivalent.

116

00:06:00.200 --> 00:06:03.400

So the ctmp does

117

00:06:03.400 --> 00:06:04.900

make provision.

118

00:06:07.500 --> 00:06:07.800

I just

119

00:06:09.800 --> 00:06:12.300

briefly show you the bit I was going

120

00:06:12.300 --> 00:06:12.400

to

121

00:06:16.200 --> 00:06:19.700

Referred sorry my version ctmpi wrongly closed.

122

00:06:25.500 --> 00:06:28.100

And now my internet connection is working. The

123

00:06:28.100 --> 00:06:32.600

reference I have is paragraph 6.3.10 of

124

00:06:32.600 --> 00:06:37.100

the ctmp which makes

125

00:06:35.100 --> 00:06:38.000

provision for the use of

126

00:06:38.600 --> 00:06:41.000

managed Crossings for public rights where users so in other words

127

00:06:41.300 --> 00:06:44.500

that the interference with the rights of way can be

128

00:06:44.500 --> 00:06:47.800

mitigated during the construction phase

129

00:06:47.800 --> 00:06:50.000

to ensure that where there is a

130

00:06:50.100 --> 00:06:53.600

into where there is an interaction between

131

00:06:53.600 --> 00:06:56.700

a construction root or

132

00:06:56.700 --> 00:06:59.400

construction area and a public right of way.

133

00:06:59.400 --> 00:07:02.200

It can be managed through having a

134

00:07:02.200 --> 00:07:05.400

proper crossing point for that right-of-way. Sorry can be

135

00:07:05.400 --> 00:07:08.600

managed through having a proper Crossing Point rather than

136

00:07:08.600 --> 00:07:11.200

through of all reading the right way all together.

137

00:07:11.200 --> 00:07:13.100

So in other words, it's it's

138

00:07:14.600 --> 00:07:17.400

No, not moving towards the last resort but

139

00:07:17.400 --> 00:07:20.400

saying that the actual impacts are acceptable of doing that

140

00:07:20.400 --> 00:07:21.400

because they can be managed.

141

00:07:27.200 --> 00:07:28.000

Okay. Thank you.

142

00:07:34.100 --> 00:07:34.800

Good either of the

143

00:07:37.300 --> 00:07:40.400

local Highway authorities like to come back on that Mr.

144

00:07:40.400 --> 00:07:40.800

Bedford.

145

00:07:42.800 --> 00:07:45.800

So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, I've got

146

00:07:45.800 --> 00:07:49.000

a separate point about article 9,

147

00:07:48.600 --> 00:07:51.600

but it doesn't relate to this

148

00:07:51.600 --> 00:07:54.900

issue. So I don't know whether it might confuse to

149

00:07:54.900 --> 00:07:57.400

deal with it now and perhaps if I

150

00:07:57.400 --> 00:08:00.100

deal with that separately if that's of course,

151

00:08:00.100 --> 00:08:00.900

I'll come back to you.

152

00:08:02.800 --> 00:08:05.800

Camilla Rose

153

00:08:05.800 --> 00:08:08.800

came to council. I had a point about article 9 whether you

154

00:08:08.800 --> 00:08:11.400

want me to do that now or not.

155

00:08:13.100 --> 00:08:16.400

What what did you

156

00:08:16.400 --> 00:08:20.000

want to to to say Mr. Rose the issue

157

00:08:19.500 --> 00:08:22.200

and the problem is article 9.

158

00:08:22.800 --> 00:08:23.100

11

159

00:08:24.000 --> 00:08:24.100

and

160

00:08:25.100 --> 00:08:28.800

potentially also the legal agreement and protective provisions and schedule two

161

00:08:28.800 --> 00:08:31.900

are all into linked and they go back to article 9

162

00:08:31.900 --> 00:08:34.300

and in our submissions.

163

00:08:36.300 --> 00:08:41.300

and we end in our response to the examiners question

164

00:08:39.300 --> 00:08:43.900

written questions to we

165

00:08:45.200 --> 00:08:47.000

said that article

166

00:08:47.900 --> 00:08:51.100

nine one B needs

167

00:08:50.100 --> 00:08:53.700

to refer also to schedule six.

168

00:08:54.900 --> 00:08:57.600

not just schedule five and this is fundamental because

169

00:08:57.600 --> 00:09:00.400

schedule six deals with the rights of

170

00:09:00.400 --> 00:09:03.600

way and if it isn't included, then

171

00:09:03.600 --> 00:09:07.800

they're not swept up with the restoration reinstatement

172

00:09:07.800 --> 00:09:08.600

Provisions that

173

00:09:10.100 --> 00:09:11.500

that article deals with

174

00:09:12.600 --> 00:09:15.200  
and then things flow from there. Yes. I

175  
00:09:15.200 --> 00:09:18.400  
had that as separate point. I don't know what they're interested.

176  
00:09:18.400 --> 00:09:21.700  
No. No, but I I

177  
00:09:21.700 --> 00:09:25.600  
don't know this stage you would

178  
00:09:24.600 --> 00:09:27.200  
that this is just stealing on

179  
00:09:27.200 --> 00:09:30.400  
that particular issue whether we can include that reference in

180  
00:09:30.400 --> 00:09:32.700  
article 91b.

181  
00:09:33.300 --> 00:09:36.100  
Would be rich anything for the

182  
00:09:36.100 --> 00:09:36.300  
applicant.

183  
00:09:37.900 --> 00:09:38.600  
It's

184  
00:09:39.600 --> 00:09:40.300  
it's a slightly.

185  
00:09:41.900 --> 00:09:45.000  
It's a slightly confusing point in the sense that it expands

186  
00:09:44.700 --> 00:09:47.300  
the rights that we

187  
00:09:47.300 --> 00:09:50.000  
have under the order to interfere.

188

00:09:51.500 --> 00:09:54.500

With those rights of way, so it's taking what's

189

00:09:54.500 --> 00:09:55.800

otherwise, right? That is.

190

00:09:56.500 --> 00:09:57.600

constrained

191

00:09:58.300 --> 00:10:00.100

to alter the layout Etc.

192

00:10:00.900 --> 00:10:03.300

And expanding it to include any rights of way

193

00:10:03.300 --> 00:10:05.700

that we might want to interfere with.

194

00:10:07.200 --> 00:10:10.300

For the purposes of ensuring that appropriate mitigation is

195

00:10:10.300 --> 00:10:13.600

provided. So it's it's a

196

00:10:13.600 --> 00:10:15.300

suggestion that we expand the power.

197

00:10:16.300 --> 00:10:19.000

To address the mitigation and I think

198

00:10:19.300 --> 00:10:23.600

that's that's for me counterintuitive and not

199

00:10:22.600 --> 00:10:25.800

something that we need. I think

200

00:10:25.800 --> 00:10:28.600

the better way to deal with the this to make

201

00:10:28.600 --> 00:10:33.200  
clear in the in the Kemp so far

202  
00:10:33.200 --> 00:10:36.400  
as we have not already done so that the

203  
00:10:36.400 --> 00:10:39.100  
need to make good any

204  
00:10:42.600 --> 00:10:44.500  
impact on those rights of way that we cross.

205  
00:10:47.900 --> 00:10:48.500  
communities

206  
00:10:52.400 --> 00:10:55.600  
Yes, what do you think about that mister? And I take and

207  
00:10:55.600 --> 00:10:58.200  
Mr. Turney's point and certainly we wouldn't want

208  
00:10:58.200 --> 00:11:01.800  
to see an expansion of the powers

209  
00:11:01.800 --> 00:11:04.300  
relating to right. So I do take that point. I think

210  
00:11:04.300 --> 00:11:07.200  
the critical concern for us. Is that

211  
00:11:07.200 --> 00:11:11.100  
right way our highways and therefore equally

212  
00:11:10.100 --> 00:11:13.400  
need to have the same level of

213  
00:11:13.400 --> 00:11:14.100  
protection.

214  
00:11:15.300 --> 00:11:18.900  
that high other highways roads have and



215

00:11:18.900 --> 00:11:21.500

perhaps then it would be more appropriate to add

216

00:11:21.500 --> 00:11:23.500

something and simply relating to

217

00:11:25.600 --> 00:11:28.200

the restoration of Rights of

218

00:11:28.200 --> 00:11:31.400

way that a similar provision that is in article

219

00:11:31.400 --> 00:11:34.500

9 but under article 11 specifically relating to racks of

220

00:11:34.500 --> 00:11:37.100

way the appreciating it might be in the sense as well.

221

00:11:37.100 --> 00:11:40.100

But that's why our highways and they should have the same level of

222

00:11:40.100 --> 00:11:40.600

protection.

223

00:11:41.400 --> 00:11:44.200

So Richard anything for the applicant just to say that's sounds like

224

00:11:44.200 --> 00:11:48.900

the way to deal with it. So an equivalent of nine three in 11

225

00:11:47.900 --> 00:11:50.800

11. Yes. But

226

00:11:50.800 --> 00:11:53.100

yeah, I think about it. We're about soon enough.

227

00:11:57.200 --> 00:11:58.400

Presumably it will be a new.

228

00:11:59.700 --> 00:12:02.400  
a new sub article article

229  
00:12:03.300 --> 00:12:03.800  
11 8

230  
00:12:26.100 --> 00:12:30.100  
now, let me just read out the relevant part of the county  
submissions.

231  
00:12:32.200 --> 00:12:33.000  
article 9

232  
00:12:34.300 --> 00:12:35.400  
9 1V

233  
00:12:37.600 --> 00:12:38.200  
is that

234  
00:12:39.200 --> 00:12:42.200  
that was your reference Mr. Edwards that nine one B.

235  
00:12:42.200 --> 00:12:45.500  
She be amended so that it refers to part one of schedules 6

236  
00:12:45.500 --> 00:12:48.400  
which governs the temporary stopping up of

237  
00:12:48.400 --> 00:12:49.700  
public rights of way.

238  
00:12:50.600 --> 00:12:53.400  
If it doesn't refer to part 1

239  
00:12:53.400 --> 00:12:56.400  
of social 6 and there's no provision the dco for control

240  
00:12:56.400 --> 00:12:59.600  
of reinstatement power effect. It is that that's there

241  
00:12:59.600 --> 00:13:02.500

is for streets listed in schedule 5 this because article

242

00:13:02.500 --> 00:13:05.100

11 yes earlier, so so it would

243

00:13:05.100 --> 00:13:08.400

be better I suppose in article 11.

244

00:13:11.300 --> 00:13:12.300

Yeah, okay.

245

00:13:27.600 --> 00:13:30.000

Right then. Could I ask the parties to

246

00:13:30.300 --> 00:13:33.300

agree the form of wording then offline and you can

247

00:13:33.300 --> 00:13:34.600

include that in the next?

248

00:13:36.800 --> 00:13:39.300

Yes, happy to do that. Yeah. Thank you.

249

00:13:48.900 --> 00:13:51.500

Good. Okay now.

250

00:13:58.900 --> 00:14:01.300

So just coming. I just want to come back to

251

00:14:01.300 --> 00:14:04.400

article 11 1 and article 11

252

00:14:04.400 --> 00:14:07.500

3 Mr. Mohammedi said

253

00:14:07.500 --> 00:14:10.400

that the construction traffic management plan should be

254

00:14:10.400 --> 00:14:14.100

capable of dealing with that that issue of

255

00:14:16.100 --> 00:14:19.500

recognizing that closures would only be as the

256

00:14:19.500 --> 00:14:22.700

last resort that in effect.

257

00:14:22.700 --> 00:14:23.200

They would be

258

00:14:24.200 --> 00:14:27.400

and The Passage would be

259

00:14:27.400 --> 00:14:27.800

managed.

260

00:14:29.100 --> 00:14:33.900

Through Provisions in the ctmp of

261

00:14:33.900 --> 00:14:35.600

the temp. I'm sure which

262

00:14:41.800 --> 00:14:44.500

amendments to the ctmp again as part of our response

263

00:14:44.500 --> 00:14:46.200

to the written question.

264

00:14:49.900 --> 00:14:52.400

2.9.10 and I'm not aware that

265

00:14:52.400 --> 00:14:56.000

we've received a comment back yet on that.

266

00:14:57.100 --> 00:15:00.100

Right, okay, and we'll give given that

267

00:15:00.100 --> 00:15:03.200

this morning. We're focusing on the wording of

268

00:15:03.200 --> 00:15:04.400

the dco itself.

269

00:15:06.300 --> 00:15:09.500

I might add. I mean if you're saying

270

00:15:09.500 --> 00:15:12.700

that you're that it looks like you'll be content for

271

00:15:12.700 --> 00:15:15.600

that for that to be dealt with under the ctmp. That's

272

00:15:15.600 --> 00:15:18.600

one thing. But if you might if you're reserving

273

00:15:18.600 --> 00:15:18.900

your position.

274

00:15:22.100 --> 00:15:25.100

What my little friend said Mr.

275

00:15:25.100 --> 00:15:27.800

Tony, I think we are.

276

00:15:30.400 --> 00:15:34.000

Comfortable with it being dealt through the ctmp subject

277

00:15:33.200 --> 00:15:36.800

to the wording that we've thought about in light

278

00:15:36.800 --> 00:15:39.900

of what what Mr. Tony has said so I don't want to

279

00:15:39.900 --> 00:15:42.300

make things difficult and sort of say we reserve our

280

00:15:42.300 --> 00:15:45.100

position that it might not be so I think I think it makes sense

281

00:15:45.100 --> 00:15:48.800

to try and deal with it through the ctmp and we've suggested

282

00:15:49.700 --> 00:15:52.100

the wording and hopefully we can get some sort

283

00:15:52.100 --> 00:15:54.700

of agreement if that principle is agreed.

284

00:15:56.700 --> 00:15:59.800

Good. Okay. Thank you. Everyone Miss

285

00:15:59.800 --> 00:16:02.100

Tony. Is that all right Richardson of the

286

00:16:02.100 --> 00:16:05.400

applicant? Yes. It is. We say we say this the

287

00:16:05.400 --> 00:16:08.800

ctmp in as drafted reflects that hierarchy in

288

00:16:08.800 --> 00:16:11.200

the sense that it should be a last resort that we

289

00:16:11.200 --> 00:16:14.100

have to close because we should manage but I

290

00:16:14.100 --> 00:16:18.000

think we can sharpen that up either going adopting

291

00:16:17.400 --> 00:16:20.700

ccc's wording

292

00:16:20.700 --> 00:16:20.900

or

293

00:16:21.800 --> 00:16:24.500

Something between our position and there's to make

294

00:16:24.500 --> 00:16:27.300

clear that as I think the ctmp does

295

00:16:27.300 --> 00:16:30.000

that it should be the last resort. It's just retaining that

296

00:16:30.800 --> 00:16:32.000  
good statutory language.

297

00:16:35.300 --> 00:16:38.300  
Thank you. Okay, any other final comments

298

00:16:38.300 --> 00:16:39.200  
on that issue?

299

00:16:41.400 --> 00:16:41.400  
Thank you.

300

00:16:44.500 --> 00:16:47.900  
So does that actually deal

301

00:16:47.900 --> 00:16:50.200  
then with the issues on

302

00:16:50.200 --> 00:16:53.600  
articles 9 and 11 and there any other issues you

303

00:16:53.600 --> 00:16:57.000  
want to pick up Mr. Bedford? Yes the point I mentioned earlier.

304

00:16:56.200 --> 00:17:00.000  
So yes, Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. It's

305

00:17:00.900 --> 00:17:01.800  
a point which

306

00:17:02.400 --> 00:17:05.600  
is likely to fall away if the side agreement

307

00:17:05.600 --> 00:17:08.400  
is concluded because it is

308

00:17:08.400 --> 00:17:12.400  
an issue that we picked up through the side agreement proposals,

309

00:17:11.400 --> 00:17:15.500

but asthma stand

310

00:17:14.500 --> 00:17:17.900

if you look at article 9 1

311

00:17:18.700 --> 00:17:20.700

And then you look at article 9 2.

312

00:17:21.700 --> 00:17:25.400

Article 9 1 authorizes the

313

00:17:25.400 --> 00:17:28.400

alteration of layout or Works in a

314

00:17:28.400 --> 00:17:28.500

street.

315

00:17:29.700 --> 00:17:33.200

as specified in schedule

316

00:17:32.200 --> 00:17:33.800

5

317

00:17:34.900 --> 00:17:37.600

And part one are the

318

00:17:37.600 --> 00:17:41.100

permanent alterations and part two of schedule

319

00:17:40.100 --> 00:17:41.500

5.

320

00:17:42.400 --> 00:17:43.900

of the temporary alterations

321

00:17:45.400 --> 00:17:48.800

But there is no requirement for consent.

322

00:17:49.900 --> 00:17:51.900



in relation to those works

323

00:17:54.400 --> 00:17:56.800

article 91 simply gives the power.

324

00:17:57.900 --> 00:18:00.400

to imitate those works

325

00:18:01.100 --> 00:18:02.500

article 9 2

326

00:18:04.200 --> 00:18:07.600

relates to locations, which is perfectly any

327

00:18:07.600 --> 00:18:08.100

Street.

328

00:18:10.500 --> 00:18:13.400

so if there are other locations outside of those

329

00:18:13.400 --> 00:18:14.400

in the schedules

330

00:18:15.400 --> 00:18:18.700

but there is a safeguard in article 9

331

00:18:18.700 --> 00:18:19.400

4

332

00:18:20.600 --> 00:18:23.300

which is if you're relying on the power in article 9

333

00:18:23.300 --> 00:18:26.400

2 that is subject to the consent of

334

00:18:26.400 --> 00:18:29.200

the street Authority and so

335

00:18:29.200 --> 00:18:32.800

at First Sight you might think well, that's that's a sensible

336  
00:18:32.800 --> 00:18:35.200  
distinction one set of Works have been

337  
00:18:35.200 --> 00:18:35.900  
identified.

338  
00:18:37.100 --> 00:18:40.300  
The other haven't but when you then look

339  
00:18:40.300 --> 00:18:41.500  
at schedule 5.

340  
00:18:42.900 --> 00:18:43.900  
What it does?

341  
00:18:48.200 --> 00:18:51.800  
And this is Paige's 54 55 and

342  
00:18:51.800 --> 00:18:54.400  
onwards but one could take it from the example at page

343  
00:18:54.400 --> 00:18:55.000  
54.

344  
00:18:58.600 --> 00:18:58.800  
Yes.

345  
00:18:59.900 --> 00:19:01.900  
And I'll just take the first the first.

346  
00:19:02.800 --> 00:19:05.000  
Item in the schedule. You've got

347  
00:19:05.300 --> 00:19:08.700  
a location. So you've got frackham Road identified. Yes.

348  
00:19:08.700 --> 00:19:12.100  
He's anchored a description of alteration which is

349  
00:19:11.100 --> 00:19:14.500

works for the provision of permanent means

350

00:19:14.500 --> 00:19:18.100

of access to the authorized development within the area hatched

351

00:19:17.100 --> 00:19:20.200

orange on sheets one to four of the

352

00:19:20.200 --> 00:19:24.000

excess and rights of way plan reference as for but

353

00:19:23.200 --> 00:19:26.700

when you look at that plan, I don't invite you to that you

354

00:19:26.700 --> 00:19:28.400

need to do so now all it is

355

00:19:29.400 --> 00:19:31.900

Is a Zone which has been hatched?

356

00:19:33.300 --> 00:19:34.700

So it's an outline area.

357

00:19:36.500 --> 00:19:39.300

But there is no specification of the nature of the actual

358

00:19:39.300 --> 00:19:40.200

works.

359

00:19:46.700 --> 00:19:49.300

So effectively there is no control on the

360

00:19:49.300 --> 00:19:50.700

form of those works.

361

00:19:52.600 --> 00:19:56.600

That is put to the street Authority for its approval.

362

00:19:55.600 --> 00:19:58.600

Now I say that is likely

363

00:19:58.600 --> 00:20:01.200

to fall away if the side agreement is concluded because

364

00:20:01.200 --> 00:20:04.600

that will provide that control mechanism but at

365

00:20:04.600 --> 00:20:07.600

the moment we think that if

366

00:20:07.600 --> 00:20:09.100

the side agreement

367

00:20:09.800 --> 00:20:12.700

It doesn't deal with that matter effectively. What

368

00:20:12.700 --> 00:20:15.700

we would like to see is the control in nine four.

369

00:20:16.400 --> 00:20:19.300

also applies to the power in

370

00:20:19.300 --> 00:20:20.000

91

371

00:20:20.700 --> 00:20:23.200

as well as it does to the power in

372

00:20:23.200 --> 00:20:23.600

92.

373

00:20:38.600 --> 00:20:39.700

Yeah, thank you.

374

00:20:41.400 --> 00:20:45.500

Send it seems logical. Well Richardson

375

00:20:44.500 --> 00:20:47.800

for the applicant. It's the the principal

376

00:20:47.800 --> 00:20:50.600

is logical but it's not to be secured. We

377

00:20:50.600 --> 00:20:53.500

say through our change to article 9 it's in

378

00:20:53.500 --> 00:20:56.100

the protective Provisions as draft. It has proposed by

379

00:20:56.100 --> 00:20:59.400

the applicant that security say that lock is already there in

380

00:20:59.400 --> 00:21:00.700

our draft protective provisions.

381

00:21:01.400 --> 00:21:04.400

and it is in the side agreements coming

382

00:21:04.400 --> 00:21:04.900

forward so

383

00:21:06.700 --> 00:21:10.400

the place for it would be protective Provisions unless

384

00:21:09.400 --> 00:21:12.700

they're found to be unnecessary, but

385

00:21:12.700 --> 00:21:15.300

it's already in there and this is a very

386

00:21:16.300 --> 00:21:20.500

well precedented provision this

387

00:21:19.500 --> 00:21:22.800

article article 9.

388

00:21:26.100 --> 00:21:28.000

so are

389

00:21:30.200 --> 00:21:33.400

our viewers that it is it is an

390

00:21:33.400 --> 00:21:36.400

appropriate way to draft article 9 and that the protection of the street Authority

391

00:21:36.400 --> 00:21:39.900

comes somewhere else. Can you identify where is in the protective

392

00:21:39.900 --> 00:21:40.500

provisions?

393

00:21:41.400 --> 00:21:42.800

Yes, it's in.

394

00:21:48.600 --> 00:21:50.200

paragraph three

395

00:21:52.500 --> 00:21:55.600

before the commencement of the construction really

396

00:21:55.600 --> 00:21:58.400

specified work the Undertake must submits throughout the local Highway Authority for

397

00:21:58.400 --> 00:22:02.800

its approval proper intuition plans must not commence until approved and

398

00:22:02.800 --> 00:22:05.900

specified word means any work which

399

00:22:05.900 --> 00:22:08.300

as forms part of or is

400

00:22:08.300 --> 00:22:09.500

intended to become part of a highway.

401

00:22:12.100 --> 00:22:12.500

so

402

00:22:13.500 --> 00:22:14.700

specified work

403

00:22:17.400 --> 00:22:17.700  
here

404

00:22:18.900 --> 00:22:19.700  
over the

405

00:22:30.200 --> 00:22:33.300  
Yeah, so much of any part of the authorized development

406

00:22:33.300 --> 00:22:36.500  
has forms part of as intended to become a highway or part

407

00:22:36.500 --> 00:22:37.600  
of any such Highway.

408

00:22:38.900 --> 00:22:41.500  
Yes. Yeah, so special would that

409

00:22:41.500 --> 00:22:42.000  
cover?

410

00:22:43.400 --> 00:22:46.200  
The the item Works in

411

00:22:46.200 --> 00:22:49.700  
paragraph one in nine one. Otherwise

412

00:22:56.400 --> 00:22:59.800  
so microwave is for County Council in principally daughter.

413

00:22:59.800 --> 00:23:02.500  
I'm just I'm just trying to think and it may be a completely.

414

00:23:05.200 --> 00:23:07.200  
theoretical possibility as to whether

415

00:23:08.200 --> 00:23:11.500  
depending on the nature of the excess Improvement part of

416

00:23:11.500 --> 00:23:14.300  
it maybe on land which is not intended to be part of the highway,

417

00:23:14.300 --> 00:23:16.400  
but there is still an interaction with the highway.

418

00:23:17.400 --> 00:23:20.800  
but that might be that might be quite theoretical abstract point

419

00:23:20.800 --> 00:23:21.800  
so perhaps

420

00:23:24.100 --> 00:23:28.500  
We just need to take that away reflect on that. We certainly

421

00:23:27.500 --> 00:23:30.200  
not precious as to whether it's dealt within

422

00:23:30.200 --> 00:23:33.900  
the article or it's dealt within the protective Provisions. We

423

00:23:33.900 --> 00:23:34.800  
just want to make sure that

424

00:23:35.600 --> 00:23:38.300  
it is dealt with and we'll we'll reflect on

425

00:23:38.300 --> 00:23:41.400  
whether that part of the protective Provisions is sufficient.

426

00:23:41.400 --> 00:23:42.100  
Okay?

427

00:23:43.200 --> 00:23:43.800  
understood

428

00:23:46.100 --> 00:23:49.500  
rigid only for the applicant. I'm going to give a very cheeky  
precedent reference

429

00:23:49.500 --> 00:23:52.700



which is the Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing order 2020

430

00:23:52.700 --> 00:23:55.800

Mr. Bedford and his clients are familiar with it being

431

00:23:55.800 --> 00:23:59.300

the applicant for that order. So we've

432

00:23:58.300 --> 00:24:01.100

used his great knowledge on how to

433

00:24:01.100 --> 00:24:02.200

draft article 9.

434

00:24:04.900 --> 00:24:07.300

Like about the Suffolk County Council, I think one should

435

00:24:07.300 --> 00:24:10.300

be careful because the Great Yarmouth order is actually

436

00:24:10.300 --> 00:24:11.000

in Norfolk.

437

00:24:12.100 --> 00:24:15.300

And whilst I did have some clients involved in

438

00:24:15.300 --> 00:24:17.200

that case. It wasn't Suffolk County counts.

439

00:24:21.800 --> 00:24:25.800

Thank you both for that. So

440

00:24:24.800 --> 00:24:27.900

it looks as if that can be resolved offline

441

00:24:27.900 --> 00:24:28.100

then.

442

00:24:31.300 --> 00:24:33.300

So we'll move on.

443

00:24:36.900 --> 00:24:40.100

That was the point on articles 1911 schedule.

444

00:24:41.300 --> 00:24:45.000

Right now I'm going to jump and

445

00:24:44.500 --> 00:24:47.000

that's anybody has any thing to

446

00:24:47.400 --> 00:24:50.300

raise in the into media articles

447

00:24:50.300 --> 00:24:52.400

article. I'm going to go to article 18.

448

00:24:53.400 --> 00:24:54.800

18 1

449

00:24:55.600 --> 00:24:58.100

And the post decommissioning environment.

450

00:25:00.500 --> 00:25:04.400

So the point is made by Suffolk County

451

00:25:04.400 --> 00:25:05.400

Council, I think.

452

00:25:06.300 --> 00:25:09.900

about the scope of the compulsory acquisition

453

00:25:09.900 --> 00:25:12.700

power that might

454

00:25:15.100 --> 00:25:19.400

in the event include maintenance after decommissioning

455

00:25:20.300 --> 00:25:23.000

and I think this was touched upon earlier in the week.

456

00:25:24.800 --> 00:25:27.500

And we're looking at what's page

457

00:25:27.500 --> 00:25:31.400

18 of the dco, I think suffolks common.

458

00:25:33.700 --> 00:25:37.800

We're looking also at requirement 10.4 and

459

00:25:36.800 --> 00:25:39.800

I think we're looking at the in particular

460

00:25:39.800 --> 00:25:41.200

at the stone Curlew.

461

00:25:41.900 --> 00:25:44.700

The maintenance of the offsetting habitat

462

00:25:44.700 --> 00:25:47.700

for stone Curlew

463

00:25:47.700 --> 00:25:51.000

in requirement 10-4. I'll just

464

00:25:50.300 --> 00:25:54.200

read out the Undertaker must maintain the offsetting

465

00:25:53.200 --> 00:25:56.500

habitat provision for stone curlews in

466

00:25:56.500 --> 00:25:59.400

accordance with the update of the offsetting habitat

467

00:25:59.400 --> 00:26:03.000

provision for stone curly is specification approved

468

00:26:02.800 --> 00:26:05.900

pursuant to subparagraph one throughout the

469

00:26:05.900 --> 00:26:08.400

construction of operation of the authorized development

470

00:26:08.400 --> 00:26:11.800

and during the carrying out of decommissioning works.

471

00:26:11.800 --> 00:26:16.100

So that provides for maintenance.

472

00:26:19.100 --> 00:26:23.000

Yes, it provides for maintenance of that habitat

473

00:26:22.900 --> 00:26:25.700

during the decommissioning works.

474

00:26:28.300 --> 00:26:31.100

and then I think there was an issue

475

00:26:31.100 --> 00:26:31.700

about whether

476

00:26:32.900 --> 00:26:35.500

the the ca power which is essentially

477

00:26:35.500 --> 00:26:37.700

contained in article 18 one.

478

00:26:39.800 --> 00:26:41.300

is appropriate to

479

00:26:42.400 --> 00:26:45.400

Empower works in the

480

00:26:45.400 --> 00:26:47.600

post decommissioning environment

481

00:26:48.800 --> 00:26:49.500

Should they be?

482

00:26:50.300 --> 00:26:52.100

imposed on the Undertaker

483

00:26:54.300 --> 00:26:57.400

First of all, I don't suppose Mr. Bedford. You're not

484

00:26:57.400 --> 00:27:00.400

contemplating a change to article 18 one itself.

485

00:27:03.400 --> 00:27:05.700

Michael Bradford Suffolk County Council, no

486

00:27:07.900 --> 00:27:10.400

the breadth of 181

487

00:27:12.300 --> 00:27:12.900

is sufficient

488

00:27:14.600 --> 00:27:16.600

We say to enable it to deal with.

489

00:27:19.100 --> 00:27:20.600

post decommissioning

490

00:27:22.300 --> 00:27:26.300

What acquisition that would allow you to undertake post-decommissioning

491

00:27:25.300 --> 00:27:28.900

management and maintenance of whatever?

492

00:27:29.800 --> 00:27:32.000

feature had been acquired

493

00:27:34.700 --> 00:27:37.300

the there is there is

494

00:27:37.300 --> 00:27:38.900

a slightly wider issue which

495

00:27:40.600 --> 00:27:41.200

May

496

00:27:43.600 --> 00:27:45.900

circumvent the need to discuss some of the detail

497

00:27:48.800 --> 00:27:51.900

So it's subject to confirmation from

498

00:27:51.900 --> 00:27:55.200

the applicant. But as I understand matters based

499

00:27:54.200 --> 00:27:57.300

on recent dialogue.

500

00:27:58.300 --> 00:28:01.700

The applicant is not a

501

00:28:01.700 --> 00:28:02.100

verse.

502

00:28:03.300 --> 00:28:05.100

to the principle

503

00:28:06.400 --> 00:28:08.500

of there being a mechanism.

504

00:28:10.200 --> 00:28:14.900

for regulation of the post decommissioning

505

00:28:15.800 --> 00:28:16.700

environment

506

00:28:22.300 --> 00:28:22.600

but

507

00:28:25.100 --> 00:28:29.000

that would only be for those parts of

508

00:28:28.000 --> 00:28:29.800

the

509

00:28:33.100 --> 00:28:34.700

mitigation works

510

00:28:35.900 --> 00:28:36.300  
which

511  
00:28:37.200 --> 00:28:40.400  
It has been concluded after a review

512  
00:28:40.400 --> 00:28:40.900  
process.

513  
00:28:41.900 --> 00:28:45.400  
at the end or towards

514  
00:28:45.400 --> 00:28:47.100  
the end of the operational period

515  
00:28:49.700 --> 00:28:51.200  
finds that those mitigation measures.

516  
00:28:53.800 --> 00:28:56.800  
Survey valuable purpose and therefore ought

517  
00:28:56.800 --> 00:28:59.600  
to be retained in the post

518  
00:28:59.600 --> 00:29:01.600  
decommissioning environment.

519  
00:29:04.500 --> 00:29:08.000  
And I think we I said we've had discussions fruitful

520  
00:29:07.400 --> 00:29:11.900  
discussions on that principle and

521  
00:29:14.200 --> 00:29:17.900  
Wheel on the part of the County Council are not

522  
00:29:17.900 --> 00:29:20.600  
precious about the mechanism

523  
00:29:20.600 --> 00:29:21.900  
that is used to.

524

00:29:22.800 --> 00:29:26.700

Deliver on that principle. Yes, you'll

525

00:29:25.700 --> 00:29:29.800

recall from our representations. I

526

00:29:28.800 --> 00:29:31.400

think in relation to action point eight.

527

00:29:31.400 --> 00:29:34.200

We refer to adjusting the olimp.

528

00:29:37.300 --> 00:29:40.300

to deal with that but we perfectly accept that it

529

00:29:40.300 --> 00:29:41.400

can be done by adjusting the

530

00:29:44.800 --> 00:29:46.400

decommissioning Environmental Management plan

531

00:29:50.100 --> 00:29:50.500

Yes.

532

00:29:52.500 --> 00:29:52.800

and

533

00:29:55.300 --> 00:29:57.800

we don't necessarily.

534

00:29:59.700 --> 00:30:02.300

Need the long-term controls.

535

00:30:03.700 --> 00:30:07.600

To be inevitably secured through

536

00:30:07.600 --> 00:30:09.900

a continuing requirement.

537



00:30:12.200 --> 00:30:13.500  
post the decommissioning

538  
00:30:15.600 --> 00:30:16.000  
provided that

539  
00:30:17.800 --> 00:30:20.500  
there is at that time put in place and

540  
00:30:20.500 --> 00:30:23.000  
alternative mechanism, which could be

541  
00:30:24.400 --> 00:30:25.000  
for example

542  
00:30:26.300 --> 00:30:29.700  
a planning obligation secured under section 106

543  
00:30:31.200 --> 00:30:32.800  
that related to the relevant land.

544  
00:30:34.200 --> 00:30:36.200  
and tied the landowner to

545  
00:30:37.600 --> 00:30:38.500  
ongoing management

546  
00:30:42.400 --> 00:30:43.900  
without that would have to be completed.

547  
00:30:47.200 --> 00:30:50.500  
Earlier rather than later. Well, this is

548  
00:30:50.500 --> 00:30:53.300  
where the discussions are. I say, there's still some what evolving

549  
00:30:53.300 --> 00:30:54.700  
but what we would envisage.

550  
00:30:55.500 --> 00:30:58.900  
Is that the the Dem sets out a regime

551

00:30:58.900 --> 00:31:01.600

and the democracy is secured as

552

00:31:01.600 --> 00:31:03.300

a requirement of the dco.

553

00:31:04.600 --> 00:31:06.500

So the dent would shut down to regime.

554

00:31:07.200 --> 00:31:10.700

Which would include a review mechanism in relation

555

00:31:10.700 --> 00:31:11.500

to the features?

556

00:31:12.900 --> 00:31:14.400

And then those which are found to be.

557

00:31:17.300 --> 00:31:20.900

Of value and which should be retained longer term

558

00:31:20.900 --> 00:31:22.000

post decommissioning.

559

00:31:23.100 --> 00:31:26.600

Are to be retained and the demp would establish.

560

00:31:31.100 --> 00:31:31.900

the regime

561

00:31:33.200 --> 00:31:33.700

for that

562

00:31:36.600 --> 00:31:38.900

and so the damp would continue to bite.

563

00:31:39.600 --> 00:31:42.500

But the Dem could

564

00:31:42.500 --> 00:31:43.500  
include within it.

565  
00:31:45.700 --> 00:31:46.300  
the ability

566  
00:31:47.500 --> 00:31:50.700  
For the on requirements of

567  
00:31:50.700 --> 00:31:53.400  
the debt to be discharged if they were replaced by

568  
00:31:53.400 --> 00:31:56.300  
a suitable alternative, which I say

569  
00:31:56.300 --> 00:31:57.800  
could be then a section 106.

570  
00:31:59.500 --> 00:32:02.300  
Agreement or similar right? So that's

571  
00:32:02.300 --> 00:32:02.500  
how

572  
00:32:03.700 --> 00:32:05.100  
You will envisage it I say so.

573  
00:32:06.100 --> 00:32:08.500  
the DC of itself in terms of its requirements

574  
00:32:09.600 --> 00:32:12.800  
would include the requirement for the demp the

575  
00:32:12.800 --> 00:32:15.500  
dent would include as one of the elements for

576  
00:32:15.500 --> 00:32:18.600  
the final setting out

577  
00:32:18.600 --> 00:32:21.400  
this mechanism and that would include

578

00:32:21.400 --> 00:32:24.300

within it this flexibility that would allow for

579

00:32:24.300 --> 00:32:25.400

the dent requirement to be

580

00:32:26.400 --> 00:32:29.100

Discharged if it was replaced by.

581

00:32:30.100 --> 00:32:34.300

A suitable alternative replacement mechanism and the

582

00:32:33.300 --> 00:32:36.500

The Damp

583

00:32:36.500 --> 00:32:39.700

is obviously secured itself as a

584

00:32:39.700 --> 00:32:41.500

certified document. Yes.

585

00:32:44.500 --> 00:32:48.200

But in the absence of a an alternative mechanism,

586

00:32:47.200 --> 00:32:50.400

then you see that as

587

00:32:50.400 --> 00:32:51.700

non-going obligation.

588

00:32:52.600 --> 00:32:55.500

Well, it would be because it well, if obviously the

589

00:32:55.500 --> 00:32:58.500

terms of the damp addressed the post decommissioning period

590

00:32:58.500 --> 00:33:01.900

yes, then there would be an obligation to

591

00:33:01.900 --> 00:33:04.300  
comply with the content of the

592

00:33:04.300 --> 00:33:07.500  
Dem. Right and has that been canvased with

593

00:33:07.500 --> 00:33:10.100  
the applicant? Yes. I say the discussions of

594

00:33:11.400 --> 00:33:13.700  
have reached the stage of the principle.

595

00:33:14.400 --> 00:33:17.800  
Has been outlined but we neither side has

596

00:33:17.800 --> 00:33:19.600  
got the stage of formulating.

597

00:33:20.500 --> 00:33:21.800  
particular wording

598

00:33:24.300 --> 00:33:24.500  
Okay.

599

00:33:25.100 --> 00:33:27.200  
But I say that I essentially you.

600

00:33:28.500 --> 00:33:28.800  
are

601

00:33:30.400 --> 00:33:33.200  
position is that if the principle is

602

00:33:33.200 --> 00:33:38.100  
recognized we are very happy to discuss with

603

00:33:36.100 --> 00:33:39.700  
the applicant mechanisms, which

604

00:33:39.700 --> 00:33:40.200  
achieve

605

00:33:40.900 --> 00:33:43.600

The objective that we desire and we're

606

00:33:43.600 --> 00:33:46.100

not and since overprecious as to precisely how

607

00:33:46.100 --> 00:33:49.000

that which which route you used to achieve that.

608

00:33:49.900 --> 00:33:52.800

Thank you very much. And Mr. Tony

609

00:33:52.800 --> 00:33:55.500

first is to principle I suppose

610

00:33:55.500 --> 00:33:58.000

and so average to any of the

611

00:33:58.300 --> 00:34:01.900

applicant and certainly canvas in the sense that we this

612

00:34:01.900 --> 00:34:05.300

isn't something that I've been discussing with Mr. Bedford.

613

00:34:04.300 --> 00:34:06.700

So we've been trying to establish.

614

00:34:07.700 --> 00:34:10.400

The principles behind this if I can just

615

00:34:10.400 --> 00:34:12.200

take it just take it step by step.

616

00:34:13.400 --> 00:34:17.300

First of all, we don't think that this should be a measure

617

00:34:16.300 --> 00:34:19.200

in the lamp.

618

00:34:20.700 --> 00:34:23.300  
And we don't think that on any basis it

619  
00:34:23.300 --> 00:34:26.100  
would be justified to compel us to compulsory acquire land.

620  
00:34:26.800 --> 00:34:29.800  
At this stage in anticipation that

621  
00:34:29.800 --> 00:34:33.800  
it may serve some continuing purposes ecological

622  
00:34:32.800 --> 00:34:35.800  
or landscape mitigation. Once

623  
00:34:35.800 --> 00:34:38.500  
the scheme has gone away as

624  
00:34:38.500 --> 00:34:39.200  
we've already explained.

625  
00:34:40.300 --> 00:34:43.300  
The principle means by which we intend to secure the

626  
00:34:43.300 --> 00:34:46.000  
relevant land interests through races. We're not

627  
00:34:46.300 --> 00:34:49.100  
talking about any land outside the order limits. No, no absolutely  
not

628  
00:34:49.100 --> 00:34:52.400  
but it's whether we should we should be because the terms of

629  
00:34:52.400 --> 00:34:56.500  
an outline lamp or the terms of another article forced

630  
00:34:55.500 --> 00:34:58.900  
to acquire land permanently when we

631  
00:34:58.900 --> 00:34:59.200

could

632

00:35:00.100 --> 00:35:03.400

Otherwise for the purposes of delivering the development for

633

00:35:03.400 --> 00:35:06.600

its operational life enter into lease agreements

634

00:35:06.600 --> 00:35:09.300

for that land. So that's the position that we want to avoid

635

00:35:09.300 --> 00:35:12.600

and why the point of principle was a sticking

636

00:35:12.600 --> 00:35:12.700

point?

637

00:35:14.600 --> 00:35:16.100

so the proposal that we're

638

00:35:17.500 --> 00:35:20.500

looking at is broadly as

639

00:35:20.500 --> 00:35:21.700

Mr. Bedford describes.

640

00:35:22.700 --> 00:35:22.900

that

641

00:35:24.400 --> 00:35:28.700

The Damp will include an obligation to report on

642

00:35:30.200 --> 00:35:34.400

the features the measures

643

00:35:33.400 --> 00:35:37.100

that were secured through the original lamp.

644

00:35:38.200 --> 00:35:42.400

and identify what if any continuing value



645

00:35:41.400 --> 00:35:44.700

they would have absent the scheme so

646

00:35:44.700 --> 00:35:45.500

there will be

647

00:35:46.700 --> 00:35:49.100

Hedges that serve no purpose other than

648

00:35:49.100 --> 00:35:52.300

to mitigate the presence of solar panels if they were removed

649

00:35:52.300 --> 00:35:55.600

at the end of the period operational

650

00:35:55.600 --> 00:35:55.900

period

651

00:35:56.800 --> 00:36:00.400

their absence would not be a

652

00:35:59.400 --> 00:36:00.800

concern.

653

00:36:02.100 --> 00:36:06.600

There may be other areas where there is some broader value

654

00:36:05.600 --> 00:36:08.500

on going value for their attention.

655

00:36:10.300 --> 00:36:10.900

in the long term

656

00:36:12.100 --> 00:36:15.700

The position that we've adopted in the demp so far is that the Undertaker in

657

00:36:15.700 --> 00:36:18.300

removing the infrastructure and

658

00:36:18.300 --> 00:36:21.400  
remediating the site and so on will not

659

00:36:21.400 --> 00:36:23.500  
strip out any of those mitigation measures.

660

00:36:24.300 --> 00:36:27.000  
But the question then arises what might happen next.

661

00:36:28.400 --> 00:36:29.900  
if the landowner were to

662

00:36:32.100 --> 00:36:35.800  
chop down trees that have been planted for instance by way

663

00:36:35.800 --> 00:36:38.600  
of landscape mitigation. What would

664

00:36:38.600 --> 00:36:38.700  
happen?

665

00:36:40.600 --> 00:36:43.500  
So what we propose is a process of assessment.

666

00:36:44.500 --> 00:36:47.800  
Consideration and then at that and with through the

667

00:36:47.800 --> 00:36:50.000  
approval of the demp process with the authority.

668

00:36:50.900 --> 00:36:53.400  
Identification of the means by which

669

00:36:53.400 --> 00:36:55.600  
long-term retention can be secured.

670

00:36:56.500 --> 00:36:58.200  
So the approval of the demp.

671

00:36:58.900 --> 00:37:01.700  
Will be conditional upon the authority

672

00:37:01.700 --> 00:37:02.900  
being satisfied.

673

00:37:04.300 --> 00:37:07.400  
That interests which is to retain in the long term

674

00:37:07.400 --> 00:37:10.200  
can be retained in the long term through some measure.

675

00:37:10.900 --> 00:37:14.200  
And it may be for instance. We're talking about Something's Gonna

676

00:37:14.200 --> 00:37:16.300  
be happening in 40 or 50 years time, but

677

00:37:17.300 --> 00:37:20.600  
it may be for instance a section 106 agreement would

678

00:37:20.600 --> 00:37:22.100  
satisfy the authority that stage.

679

00:37:23.300 --> 00:37:24.100  
It may be that.

680

00:37:25.500 --> 00:37:26.800  
a conservation Covenant

681

00:37:28.500 --> 00:37:31.300  
the exercise by the authority of statutory Powers such as

682

00:37:31.300 --> 00:37:34.600  
making of tree protection orders. All of

683

00:37:34.600 --> 00:37:37.200  
those measures may be adequate to

684

00:37:37.200 --> 00:37:40.200  
address these these you couldn't but you

685

00:37:40.200 --> 00:37:42.600  
couldn't give it if it was towards the end of the loose.

686  
00:37:44.400 --> 00:37:47.100  
Note that the proposed how would that the proposal is

687  
00:37:47.100 --> 00:37:50.400  
that the the proposed The Damp?

688  
00:37:51.700 --> 00:37:53.100  
That is submitted saying.

689  
00:37:54.400 --> 00:37:56.200  
40 years time 38 years time

690  
00:37:57.400 --> 00:38:00.300  
will say these are the features which we

691  
00:38:00.300 --> 00:38:03.000  
see there might be a case for retaining in the long term.

692  
00:38:05.200 --> 00:38:06.900  
This is how it suggested it should be done.

693  
00:38:08.300 --> 00:38:11.500  
And that will say for

694  
00:38:11.500 --> 00:38:13.000  
instance in respect of this parcel.

695  
00:38:13.800 --> 00:38:16.300  
We suggest you exercise your TPA powers

696  
00:38:16.300 --> 00:38:19.500  
and respect of this parcel. We suggest to section 106

697  
00:38:19.500 --> 00:38:22.400  
agreement whatever it may be. Hmm, and the

698  
00:38:22.400 --> 00:38:25.900  
authority would then have to be satisfied and discharging the demp

that

699

00:38:25.900 --> 00:38:28.700

those measures were appropriate and

700

00:38:28.700 --> 00:38:31.100

that addressed it. What we're trying to avoid is a

701

00:38:31.100 --> 00:38:34.300

position where effectively you have a tail end of

702

00:38:34.300 --> 00:38:37.300

an easier the schemes gone, but you have a tail end

703

00:38:37.300 --> 00:38:37.900

of the DCA.

704

00:38:39.200 --> 00:38:41.100

That says you've got to retain.

705

00:38:42.100 --> 00:38:42.400

forever

706

00:38:43.400 --> 00:38:46.300

a hedge the difficulty is

707

00:38:46.300 --> 00:38:49.400

that then the means by which authority is

708

00:38:49.400 --> 00:38:53.900

achieved for chopping down that hedge will be difficult because it

709

00:38:52.900 --> 00:38:55.500

would be a conflict

710

00:38:55.500 --> 00:38:58.100

with the development center to be a criminal offense to chop down

711

00:38:58.100 --> 00:39:01.400

that hedge the powers to maintain the powers to lop

712

00:39:01.400 --> 00:39:04.200

and fell would have all Fallen away. The Undertaker would have gone.

713

00:39:05.800 --> 00:39:08.100

Well that I suppose that I don't know.

714

00:39:08.100 --> 00:39:10.800

I mean there's an interplay of the statutory.

715

00:39:11.700 --> 00:39:12.900

statutory dco

716

00:39:14.200 --> 00:39:17.800

and the strategy powers of the authorities and any

717

00:39:17.800 --> 00:39:19.300

any agreement.

718

00:39:20.500 --> 00:39:23.500

any section 106 agreement or whatever that seeks

719

00:39:23.500 --> 00:39:24.000

to try and

720

00:39:25.500 --> 00:39:28.100

Preserve the position is it say that

721

00:39:28.100 --> 00:39:32.400

they did proposition? Yeah. Sorry. I'm sorry. So,

722

00:39:31.400 --> 00:39:34.200

how is it how is it proposed to

723

00:39:35.200 --> 00:39:39.300

to effectively maintain that

724

00:39:38.300 --> 00:39:40.600

those features

725

00:39:42.700 --> 00:39:45.000  
in a way

726  
00:39:45.100 --> 00:39:49.300  
that can in a way that can actually be within

727  
00:39:48.300 --> 00:39:51.600  
within the the dco.

728  
00:39:52.800 --> 00:39:56.200  
A view of the dco. It's

729  
00:39:55.200 --> 00:39:59.200  
it's actually it's not it's to

730  
00:39:58.200 --> 00:40:02.000  
use the dco to require

731  
00:40:01.400 --> 00:40:04.400  
us to make those proposals in 40

732  
00:40:04.400 --> 00:40:07.100  
years time as to how we'll secure them in

733  
00:40:07.100 --> 00:40:07.600  
the long term.

734  
00:40:08.700 --> 00:40:11.300  
And then the the demp if the authority is not

735  
00:40:11.300 --> 00:40:12.700  
satisfied, they'll refuse The Damp.

736  
00:40:13.800 --> 00:40:16.300  
If they say well no we disagree. We think that

737  
00:40:16.300 --> 00:40:20.000  
this parcel of land should be protected in the long term as a

738  
00:40:19.200 --> 00:40:22.600  
ecological mitigation

739

00:40:22.600 --> 00:40:25.600

area or it should be protected as a tree line and

740

00:40:25.600 --> 00:40:28.200

we're not satisfied with your proposals as to what you should

741

00:40:28.200 --> 00:40:31.100

protect and how you should protect them. They're refuse the demp.

742

00:40:32.400 --> 00:40:35.200

If we don't like that, we can appeal against the refusal of the demp

743

00:40:35.200 --> 00:40:37.900

and that can be satisfied that can be dealt with by the Secretary of State.

744

00:40:38.900 --> 00:40:41.400

But what it's trying to do is ensure we don't get to position

745

00:40:41.400 --> 00:40:46.000

where there's this ongoing dco requirement.

746

00:40:47.500 --> 00:40:48.800

running for forever

747

00:40:50.100 --> 00:40:53.200

But all the DCA Powers have fallen away. So there's

748

00:40:53.200 --> 00:40:56.500

nothing we can do in terms of not being

749

00:40:56.500 --> 00:40:59.300

felling management maintenance and so on all the authority has gone

750

00:40:59.300 --> 00:41:05.300

away and all we're burdened with is just the the obligation

751

00:41:03.300 --> 00:41:07.100

to retain a



752

00:41:06.100 --> 00:41:09.700  
particular piece of planting but

753

00:41:09.700 --> 00:41:12.800  
you say the GCO Powers would fall away. Yes.

754

00:41:13.900 --> 00:41:14.200  
Yes.

755

00:41:15.900 --> 00:41:18.300  
Oh, sorry that sorry the requirement the requirement to

756

00:41:18.300 --> 00:41:21.300  
comply with the damp does not fall away. But the point is that

757

00:41:21.300 --> 00:41:23.600  
the damp itself will not say.

758

00:41:24.800 --> 00:41:28.700  
Thou shalt retain Forever This

759

00:41:27.700 --> 00:41:30.400  
parcel of land it will instead

760

00:41:30.400 --> 00:41:30.800  
say

761

00:41:31.800 --> 00:41:32.900  
We propose.

762

00:41:33.700 --> 00:41:37.300  
A section 106 agreement will be entered into to secure

763

00:41:36.300 --> 00:41:39.500  
the long-term retention of that

764

00:41:39.500 --> 00:41:42.300  
parcel and that takes it outside the DCA framework.

765

00:41:44.900 --> 00:41:47.400

Thank you. We say that's a much

766

00:41:47.400 --> 00:41:50.500

more sensible way to deal with it because otherwise the local Authority is slightly

767

00:41:50.500 --> 00:41:53.700

constrained as well because they just have to go to the magistrates to prosecutors for

768

00:41:53.700 --> 00:41:56.100

breaching to prosecute the later landowner of

769

00:41:56.100 --> 00:41:59.900

moving a bit of planting as opposed to using their

770

00:41:59.900 --> 00:42:02.500

normal planning enforcement Powers,

771

00:42:02.500 --> 00:42:05.700

whether that might be through tpoing trees

772

00:42:05.700 --> 00:42:08.400

or through a section 106 agreement or any other measure that

773

00:42:08.400 --> 00:42:09.400

might exist at that time.

774

00:42:10.800 --> 00:42:13.400

Okay. Thank you Mr. Bedford today. I'd like

775

00:42:13.400 --> 00:42:13.700

to come back.

776

00:42:15.100 --> 00:42:19.100

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. So yes,

777

00:42:18.100 --> 00:42:21.900

I think in principle, we're not

778

00:42:21.900 --> 00:42:24.900

a verse to proceeding in the way

779

00:42:24.900 --> 00:42:28.200

that Mr. Turney has been

780

00:42:28.200 --> 00:42:32.400

outlining but there does need to be a

781

00:42:31.400 --> 00:42:35.500

check a safeguard written into

782

00:42:34.500 --> 00:42:39.000

the terms of

783

00:42:38.100 --> 00:42:41.600

the requirements regulating in

784

00:42:41.600 --> 00:42:46.200

this instance the depth so it would be part of requirement 22.

785

00:42:47.700 --> 00:42:50.300

That if that is that the vehicle that is being

786

00:42:50.300 --> 00:42:51.300

used to deliver this.

787

00:42:52.300 --> 00:42:53.800

then the terms of

788

00:42:55.600 --> 00:42:59.700

Article 22 and in particular, I think article 22 sorry

789

00:42:58.700 --> 00:43:01.500

requirement 22 and

790

00:43:01.500 --> 00:43:04.900

requirement 22. It's paid 47 server of

791

00:43:04.900 --> 00:43:06.000

the track change version.

792

00:43:10.200 --> 00:43:13.100

Yes, that would require some amendment to expand.

793

00:43:14.100 --> 00:43:14.600

the content

794

00:43:18.400 --> 00:43:21.400

of the relevant plan to be submitted as

795

00:43:21.400 --> 00:43:21.900

part of the

796

00:43:23.700 --> 00:43:26.500

them to ensure that these adequately

797

00:43:26.500 --> 00:43:27.600

deals with this measure.

798

00:43:31.100 --> 00:43:33.600

So that there is a requirement in place.

799

00:43:35.500 --> 00:43:37.800

And the effect is the default will be.

800

00:43:40.200 --> 00:43:44.900

That potentially if there is a breach of that requirement there

801

00:43:43.900 --> 00:43:46.300

would be as Mr. Tony, right? It

802

00:43:46.300 --> 00:43:47.200

says criminal liability.

803

00:43:50.800 --> 00:43:52.900

because that provides as it were

804

00:43:53.500 --> 00:43:55.400

the teeth that then ensures

805

00:43:58.500 --> 00:44:01.500

that suitable alternative replacement measures are put in

806

00:44:01.500 --> 00:44:04.400

place and I say they could be in the form of a planning obligation

807

00:44:04.400 --> 00:44:05.700

or or similar.

808

00:44:08.300 --> 00:44:10.200

So I think the

809

00:44:11.600 --> 00:44:14.500

the principle it would

810

00:44:14.500 --> 00:44:14.700

seem

811

00:44:16.100 --> 00:44:19.900

is not fundamentally in dispute.

812

00:44:21.600 --> 00:44:24.200

We do take a different view to the

813

00:44:24.200 --> 00:44:27.600

applicant on what compulsory purchase

814

00:44:27.600 --> 00:44:30.400

could be justified for because clearly if a

815

00:44:30.400 --> 00:44:33.000

requirement of a dco required you to do certain things.

816

00:44:33.900 --> 00:44:36.800

Then it would be perfectly proper use of compulsory purchase

817

00:44:36.800 --> 00:44:39.800

powers to do those things because you would be meeting what

818

00:44:39.800 --> 00:44:42.400

you were required to do in the dco. So we

819

00:44:42.400 --> 00:44:44.200

don't have a we don't see a problem with that.

820

00:44:44.900 --> 00:44:47.500

But I say we're not Precious on

821

00:44:47.500 --> 00:44:50.300

the mechanism and I think what I'm hoping that the

822

00:44:50.300 --> 00:44:53.200

dialogue that we've been having in the the course of

823

00:44:53.200 --> 00:44:56.600

the last day also can now progress things

824

00:44:56.600 --> 00:44:59.500

forward. Hopefully by deadline seven.

825

00:44:59.500 --> 00:45:00.500

We will have something more.

826

00:45:01.300 --> 00:45:04.300

Coherent or Coates that we can put before

827

00:45:04.300 --> 00:45:07.800

you for your consideration? Thank you,

828

00:45:07.800 --> 00:45:09.300

Mr. Bedford. So

829

00:45:10.400 --> 00:45:14.500

essentially then I can say that.

830

00:45:16.300 --> 00:45:20.700

the Suffolk County Council provide proposed

831

00:45:19.700 --> 00:45:22.900

amendments to requirement 22 which

832

00:45:24.200 --> 00:45:25.200

from its point of view will

833

00:45:26.100 --> 00:45:30.700

Will Aid the the mechanism that

834

00:45:30.700 --> 00:45:32.700

you've that you've outlined?

835

00:45:34.300 --> 00:45:37.200

Distance learning is that bridge attorney for the applicant? We?

836

00:45:38.100 --> 00:45:41.400

We don't think article sorry requirement 22 requires

837

00:45:41.400 --> 00:45:44.400

any Amendment. We think that the best place to

838

00:45:44.400 --> 00:45:46.800

deal with this is through the framework.

839

00:45:47.600 --> 00:45:50.600

Damp, which is secured.

840

00:45:51.400 --> 00:45:54.500

And the demp that's a bit

841

00:45:54.500 --> 00:45:57.400

improved has to comply with the framework done. But can we

842

00:45:57.400 --> 00:46:00.500

just I think we should take that issue offline. We've had a really productive discussion

843

00:46:00.500 --> 00:46:03.400

over the last of 18 hours on this.

844

00:46:03.400 --> 00:46:06.400

So I think the precise formulation of it. I

845

00:46:06.400 --> 00:46:09.500

would hope we can make some progress on as well. Okay? Well, I

846

00:46:09.500 --> 00:46:13.600

mean if that can be agreed that would that would be good strikes me

847

00:46:13.600 --> 00:46:13.800

that

848

00:46:15.200 --> 00:46:18.400

well, I don't know what the precedents are. But I mean it strikes me

849

00:46:18.400 --> 00:46:18.500

that.

850

00:46:21.200 --> 00:46:24.500

post decommissioning and you know outside that

851

00:46:24.500 --> 00:46:26.100

scenario might be something that

852

00:46:26.900 --> 00:46:28.900

might be something that needs to be.

853

00:46:29.900 --> 00:46:32.600

Whatever's in The Damp might be

854

00:46:32.600 --> 00:46:35.200

something that needs to be reinforced in in the

855

00:46:35.200 --> 00:46:38.100

requirement. I don't know so, you know

856

00:46:38.100 --> 00:46:41.400

anyway with that observation and I'll leave

857

00:46:41.400 --> 00:46:45.200

it to you to come up with hopefully agreed

858

00:46:44.200 --> 00:46:46.200

Edition.

859



00:46:47.300 --> 00:46:48.000  
Thank you Stanley.

860  
00:46:50.900 --> 00:46:53.900  
So thank you everyone as

861  
00:46:53.900 --> 00:46:57.800  
anybody anything to add on that. Yes, Mr. Mohamad. I

862  
00:46:56.800 --> 00:46:59.300  
was also part of that conversation with

863  
00:46:59.300 --> 00:47:02.300  
Mr. Tony just two observations on our part.

864  
00:47:02.300 --> 00:47:05.700  
We we are of the view that The Damp

865  
00:47:05.700 --> 00:47:08.500  
is probably the best we're going to be able to do in the  
circumstances.

866  
00:47:10.500 --> 00:47:13.600  
and secondly, we want

867  
00:47:13.600 --> 00:47:16.500  
to make sure that the damp is absolutely clear about

868  
00:47:16.500 --> 00:47:19.800  
the approach that was described by my learner friend so that

869  
00:47:19.800 --> 00:47:22.700  
there is very little ambiguity and then

870  
00:47:23.900 --> 00:47:26.500  
Then it's a question of timings for us. So

871  
00:47:26.500 --> 00:47:27.100  
for example

872  
00:47:28.600 --> 00:47:31.600

We don't we don't want to wait until the end when

873

00:47:31.600 --> 00:47:34.500

the decommissioning starts for the section 106 or

874

00:47:34.500 --> 00:47:37.900

whatever agreement to to

875

00:47:37.900 --> 00:47:40.600

maintain or Preserve.

876

00:47:41.400 --> 00:47:44.500

features to start being discussed at

877

00:47:44.500 --> 00:47:45.400

that stage, but maybe

878

00:47:46.900 --> 00:47:48.900

a few years before that so that

879

00:47:49.900 --> 00:47:52.600

the assessment and the consideration that

880

00:47:52.600 --> 00:47:55.400

my learner friend is talking about is done slightly

881

00:47:55.400 --> 00:47:58.600

earlier. So that by the time we get to decommissioning where

882

00:47:58.600 --> 00:48:01.300

we're actually very clear about what's going to be retained. What might

883

00:48:01.300 --> 00:48:04.500

be lost. What isn't much value what's a hedge

884

00:48:04.500 --> 00:48:07.700

and what's an ecological feature that is worth retaining.

885

00:48:07.700 --> 00:48:10.200

So I think timings is quite important for us

886

00:48:10.200 --> 00:48:13.200

and otherwise the principle and the use of

887

00:48:13.200 --> 00:48:16.200

The Damp is probably the best we can do. Okay, so presumably you'll

888

00:48:16.200 --> 00:48:19.200

be liaising with yes Bedford us to as to any

889

00:48:19.200 --> 00:48:22.300

timing provision. Yes to be proposed to be inserted in when

890

00:48:22.300 --> 00:48:25.200

we're already being liaising of email last couple of

891

00:48:25.200 --> 00:48:26.600

few hours anyway, so yes.

892

00:48:27.500 --> 00:48:31.200

Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else for any

893

00:48:30.200 --> 00:48:31.600

else?

894

00:48:33.400 --> 00:48:36.800

I'm going to move on now. I'm going to move

895

00:48:36.800 --> 00:48:37.900

to

896

00:48:39.800 --> 00:48:40.700

article

897

00:48:41.800 --> 00:48:43.200

27

898

00:48:44.200 --> 00:48:47.300

I think think this

899

00:48:47.300 --> 00:48:51.400

was East Cambridge District Council about article 27 in

900

00:48:50.400 --> 00:48:53.400

their comments that deadline five

901

00:48:53.400 --> 00:48:58.200

on the revise dco Library reference. Sorry p5-073

902

00:48:56.200 --> 00:49:00.800

article 271

903

00:49:00.800 --> 00:49:03.200

a says the Undertaker May remove

904

00:49:03.200 --> 00:49:06.700

any vegetation. I think that should be reference to 27 1B

905

00:49:06.700 --> 00:49:09.600

should May remove any

906

00:49:09.600 --> 00:49:12.900

buildings agricultural plants and apparatus drainage.

907

00:49:13.700 --> 00:49:16.700

Fences debris and vegetation from that land

908

00:49:16.700 --> 00:49:19.200

and the council considers that it should

909

00:49:19.200 --> 00:49:22.400

be possible for the applicant to provide information prior to

910

00:49:22.400 --> 00:49:25.100

determination as to where trees and other vegetation will be

911

00:49:25.100 --> 00:49:28.800

required for removal to facilitate access

912

00:49:28.800 --> 00:49:31.700

making this Clause redundant and

913

00:49:31.700 --> 00:49:33.300  
unnecessary.

914

00:49:34.100 --> 00:49:38.000  
I think might be one or two other Provisions that relate

915

00:49:37.300 --> 00:49:40.100  
to vegetation and trees.

916

00:49:42.400 --> 00:49:45.700  
Mr. Mohammed do you just like

917

00:49:45.700 --> 00:49:48.300  
to yes on your time the other

918

00:49:48.300 --> 00:49:50.800  
the other ones are also

919

00:49:51.700 --> 00:49:54.900  
36 37

920

00:49:56.900 --> 00:49:59.300  
as well and the reason why we

921

00:49:59.300 --> 00:50:00.000  
think that

922

00:50:00.800 --> 00:50:01.600  
the ultimate

923

00:50:02.400 --> 00:50:05.100  
redundancy will come is if for example

924

00:50:05.100 --> 00:50:09.200  
we look at page 42 Under The

925

00:50:09.200 --> 00:50:12.100  
Heading designed detailed design

926

00:50:12.100 --> 00:50:12.800  
approval.

927  
00:50:14.400 --> 00:50:17.500  
You'll see there in red it talks

928  
00:50:17.500 --> 00:50:18.600  
about how the design.

929  
00:50:19.500 --> 00:50:20.400  
of that

930  
00:50:21.300 --> 00:50:24.400  
phase has taken account of either. Sorry. Sorry

931  
00:50:24.400 --> 00:50:27.000  
must have it which page I'm on page

932  
00:50:27.700 --> 00:50:30.200  
42 Under The Heading of the dco of the dco.

933  
00:50:33.300 --> 00:50:36.700  
Requirement six. Oh, yes. I have it. Thank you detailed design

934  
00:50:36.700 --> 00:50:37.100  
approval.

935  
00:50:38.800 --> 00:50:40.300  
Yes and there.

936  
00:50:41.300 --> 00:50:44.900  
What what I'm afraid? I don't have my landscape person

937  
00:50:44.900 --> 00:50:47.300  
and trees officer here today. So I'm

938  
00:50:47.300 --> 00:50:50.400  
trying to piece together a few bits of information in

939  
00:50:50.400 --> 00:50:53.900  
in addition to what you've already highlighted were in

940

00:50:53.900 --> 00:50:56.300

our written material and you will see

941

00:50:56.300 --> 00:50:59.300

there how the design of that phase has taken account

942

00:50:59.300 --> 00:51:02.400

of either the arboricultural impact

943

00:51:02.400 --> 00:51:05.700

assessment or any updated tree surveys

944

00:51:05.700 --> 00:51:08.800

for locations within the phase what we're concerned

945

00:51:08.800 --> 00:51:11.000

about not withstanding the fact that

946

00:51:11.300 --> 00:51:14.400

we've raised questions about the arbor or cultural impact

947

00:51:14.400 --> 00:51:17.800

assessment and how it's assessed various species and

948

00:51:17.800 --> 00:51:20.800

how that needs to be updated. Anyway, what we

949

00:51:20.800 --> 00:51:23.100

are concerned about is if at the stage of

950

00:51:23.100 --> 00:51:24.500

the detail design requirement

951

00:51:25.500 --> 00:51:28.700

There should really be no ambiguity that requires an

952

00:51:28.700 --> 00:51:29.900

all provision there.

953

00:51:30.900 --> 00:51:33.200  
In such that if we are clear about what's

954  
00:51:33.200 --> 00:51:33.800  
required.

955  
00:51:35.200 --> 00:51:36.500  
in a way it does make

956  
00:51:38.200 --> 00:51:41.300  
Article 36 37 and the

957  
00:51:41.300 --> 00:51:44.400  
article that you had referred to earlier redundant and

958  
00:51:44.400 --> 00:51:47.600  
so we were just trying to square those aspects

959  
00:51:47.600 --> 00:51:50.200  
and to try and understand that we can get

960  
00:51:50.200 --> 00:51:52.300  
a little bit more certainty in the requirement.

961  
00:51:53.500 --> 00:51:56.700  
There are a few other Clauses articles that wouldn't necessarily be

962  
00:51:56.700 --> 00:51:57.900  
needed. Hmm.

963  
00:51:59.700 --> 00:52:00.200  
Okay.

964  
00:52:01.200 --> 00:52:05.600  
Thank you. And before I go to miss attorney to

965  
00:52:04.600 --> 00:52:07.400  
the other authorities have any

966  
00:52:07.400 --> 00:52:07.700  
comments.



967

00:52:09.600 --> 00:52:09.900

Okay.

968

00:52:11.100 --> 00:52:11.800

yes, so

969

00:52:12.800 --> 00:52:13.200

Richie

970

00:52:15.200 --> 00:52:15.500

Barracks I'm

971

00:52:16.700 --> 00:52:19.500

Say yes, we we take on board what Mr. Mohammed

972

00:52:19.500 --> 00:52:22.300

says and that makes sense the any other comments. We wanted to add.

973

00:52:22.300 --> 00:52:25.000

So if we go back to article 27

974

00:52:28.100 --> 00:52:29.300

and if we were leaving in

975

00:52:30.400 --> 00:52:31.100

vegetation

976

00:52:32.500 --> 00:52:36.100

if then we would like to see some additional

977

00:52:35.100 --> 00:52:39.200

warding which already appears at

978

00:52:38.200 --> 00:52:41.500

362d which

979

00:52:41.500 --> 00:52:42.800

is about the Undertaker.

980

00:52:43.400 --> 00:52:46.400  
Effectively mistake steps

981  
00:52:46.400 --> 00:52:49.600  
to avoid a breach of the provisions of the wildlife and Countryside  
act

982  
00:52:49.600 --> 00:52:52.400  
1981 and the conservation of habitats and

983  
00:52:52.400 --> 00:52:55.400  
species regulations or any successor acts and

984  
00:52:55.400 --> 00:52:57.200  
regulations. So it's just

985  
00:52:58.200 --> 00:53:02.400  
we've already got that protection in 36, so

986  
00:53:02.400 --> 00:53:06.000  
we would like to see that replicated in article 27.

987  
00:53:05.300 --> 00:53:07.100  
Yes. Okay, so just

988  
00:53:08.900 --> 00:53:09.500  
alsoever we go.

989  
00:53:10.800 --> 00:53:13.000  
That's page 29 of the dco.

990  
00:53:13.800 --> 00:53:16.800  
And it's reference to the top of

991  
00:53:16.800 --> 00:53:17.400  
the page.

992  
00:53:19.100 --> 00:53:22.200  
And then the page before says in carrying out any activity  
authorized.

993

00:53:23.100 --> 00:53:26.100  
Under thrust by

994  
00:53:26.100 --> 00:53:29.100  
paragraph one or four that's the felling or lopping of trees  
removal of

995  
00:53:29.100 --> 00:53:32.100  
hedgerows the Undertake a must and

996  
00:53:32.100 --> 00:53:35.500  
then D take steps to avoid a breach of the permission

997  
00:53:35.500 --> 00:53:39.000  
of the 81 act 2017 regulations.

998  
00:53:38.900 --> 00:53:41.000  
Yes, so you want to

999  
00:53:41.200 --> 00:53:42.300  
see that replicated?

1000  
00:53:43.100 --> 00:53:45.400  
Yes on on the basis that if

1001  
00:53:47.100 --> 00:53:47.400  
vegetate Within

1002  
00:53:50.100 --> 00:53:50.400  
the moments

1003  
00:53:50.800 --> 00:53:53.300  
point but the second point is if we were to retain the language

1004  
00:53:53.300 --> 00:53:56.200  
of vegetation being in article 27, then we

1005  
00:53:56.200 --> 00:53:59.800  
would like to see the additional and inclusion of

1006  
00:53:59.800 --> 00:54:02.300

the words that we currently see in 306 in

1007

00:54:02.300 --> 00:54:04.400

article 27. Yes.

1008

00:54:17.100 --> 00:54:17.900

whereabouts

1009

00:54:34.100 --> 00:54:37.400

and so it might just have to be a new sub-paragraph.

1010

00:54:38.100 --> 00:54:41.300

Because I'm not sure there's any other yeah, so paragraph

1011

00:54:41.300 --> 00:54:43.100

that has that formulation at the start.

1012

00:54:46.600 --> 00:54:49.500

So this will be a requirement that applies.

1013

00:54:51.900 --> 00:54:54.000

in the exercise of any powers under

1014

00:54:55.400 --> 00:54:57.200

particle 27 would it?

1015

00:54:59.400 --> 00:54:59.900

Yes.

1016

00:55:01.400 --> 00:55:02.900

so it would I mean if

1017

00:55:03.500 --> 00:55:04.700

It's really just a deal with.

1018

00:55:05.800 --> 00:55:06.000

the

1019

00:55:06.900 --> 00:55:09.500

27:1 B, which is the removal of

1020

00:55:09.500 --> 00:55:12.300

any vegetation from that land. Hmm.

1021

00:55:14.200 --> 00:55:17.800

So do you want to confine that requirement to charge seven one be

1022

00:55:17.800 --> 00:55:18.000

then?

1023

00:55:19.200 --> 00:55:22.400

To remove any buildings agricultural plants, etc, etc

1024

00:55:22.400 --> 00:55:25.600

subject to compliance with and then

1025

00:55:25.600 --> 00:55:30.000

replicate the wording in article 362d.

1026

00:55:28.700 --> 00:55:31.700

Yes that yes

1027

00:55:31.700 --> 00:55:33.500

that would satisfy us.

1028

00:55:45.800 --> 00:55:48.500

Thank you. So if I may just

1029

00:55:48.500 --> 00:55:51.500

come in before my learner friend, I think Mr. Bedford wants to to come

1030

00:55:51.500 --> 00:55:54.900

in short for

1031

00:55:54.900 --> 00:55:55.300

us.

1032

00:55:57.200 --> 00:55:58.500

if an adequate

1033

00:55:59.200 --> 00:56:02.500  
AIA report was done. That was very clear

1034  
00:56:02.500 --> 00:56:04.500  
about what tree loss was going to be.

1035  
00:56:05.600 --> 00:56:08.100  
Experienced here and crucially whether

1036  
00:56:08.100 --> 00:56:12.100  
the current version of the AI AIA report

1037  
00:56:11.100 --> 00:56:14.000  
talks about tree loss being

1038  
00:56:14.100 --> 00:56:15.400  
the worst case scenario.

1039  
00:56:16.400 --> 00:56:19.700  
Then why do we need two sections here? 3637?

1040  
00:56:20.700 --> 00:56:23.500  
Removal of TPO and Conservation Area trees

1041  
00:56:23.500 --> 00:56:26.600  
without essentially needing to notify or

1042  
00:56:26.600 --> 00:56:27.800  
get approval from the LPA.

1043  
00:56:28.600 --> 00:56:29.300  
So what?

1044  
00:56:30.400 --> 00:56:32.400  
In a nutshell if you would summarize our position.

1045  
00:56:34.200 --> 00:56:36.100  
If a more comprehensive work is done.

1046  
00:56:37.000 --> 00:56:37.200  
and

1047

00:56:38.300 --> 00:56:40.900

the applicant is clear about what's on the ground.

1048

00:56:42.900 --> 00:56:44.400

We should be able to do away with.

1049

00:56:45.400 --> 00:56:47.100

article 36 and 37

1050

00:56:48.600 --> 00:56:50.300

That's essentially the number of the point.

1051

00:56:52.500 --> 00:56:52.700

Thank you.

1052

00:56:55.300 --> 00:56:56.500

attorneys

1053

00:56:58.200 --> 00:57:02.300

Is the likelihood of any more information coming on the

1054

00:57:01.300 --> 00:57:03.500

AIA which?

1055

00:57:04.900 --> 00:57:07.400

Which will assist us in reducing

1056

00:57:07.400 --> 00:57:09.800

the length of the dco.

1057

00:57:10.900 --> 00:57:13.200

Now switch over the

1058

00:57:13.200 --> 00:57:16.400

applicant. No, no further. Nothing further coming forward on

1059

00:57:16.400 --> 00:57:19.500

the AIA front before the end of the examination.

1060

00:57:21.900 --> 00:57:22.400  
I think we've

1061  
00:57:23.400 --> 00:57:26.100  
We're talking I think it's slightly cross

1062  
00:57:26.100 --> 00:57:27.900  
purposes. I'm going to take away.

1063  
00:57:28.900 --> 00:57:30.600  
This parax point on.

1064  
00:57:31.500 --> 00:57:34.500  
Inclusion of the provision and

1065  
00:57:34.500 --> 00:57:35.600  
article 27 I think.

1066  
00:57:36.400 --> 00:57:39.100  
Got to see what art the function the article 27 is

1067  
00:57:39.100 --> 00:57:42.200  
performing. It's not authorizing us to chop down trees.

1068  
00:57:43.100 --> 00:57:46.400  
In terms of a public the public side of it.

1069  
00:57:46.400 --> 00:57:49.100  
It's authorizing us to use someone else's land and drop down

1070  
00:57:49.100 --> 00:57:53.400  
their trees and that's the the way

1071  
00:57:52.400 --> 00:57:55.300  
that's been framed. But if it's

1072  
00:57:55.300 --> 00:57:56.700  
necessary to put in that protection,

1073  
00:57:57.900 --> 00:57:59.700  
That's been referred to we can deal with that.



1074

00:58:01.100 --> 00:58:05.900

I don't I don't see how the

1075

00:58:04.900 --> 00:58:08.800

provision of any AIA or

1076

00:58:08.800 --> 00:58:09.100

any

1077

00:58:10.500 --> 00:58:13.700

detail that design stage obviates the

1078

00:58:13.700 --> 00:58:16.300

need for statutory authority to

1079

00:58:17.300 --> 00:58:20.300

furlough trees or remove hedgerows

1080

00:58:21.100 --> 00:58:24.400

that that's an essential part of the order.

1081

00:58:25.200 --> 00:58:28.400

So we need to have that statutory authority to

1082

00:58:28.400 --> 00:58:28.800

do that.

1083

00:58:29.800 --> 00:58:32.500

So you can't delete 36 and 37.

1084

00:58:33.400 --> 00:58:33.600

through

1085

00:58:34.500 --> 00:58:38.200

An approval of detailed design on the under the AIA you've

1086

00:58:37.200 --> 00:58:40.400

got to have the authority to do those.

1087

00:58:41.900 --> 00:58:45.700

Works and of course they extend to removing.

1088

00:58:48.100 --> 00:58:51.600

Trees or lopping trees that constitute danger to persons

1089

00:58:51.600 --> 00:58:54.700

using the authorized development and so on so that so that will

1090

00:58:54.700 --> 00:58:58.000

include for example lopping branches

1091

00:58:57.200 --> 00:59:00.600

from trees that become a

1092

00:59:00.600 --> 00:59:03.600

problem in the 40 year lifetime of the project. So I

1093

00:59:03.600 --> 00:59:06.200

don't see how the approve of detailed design and the terms of

1094

00:59:06.200 --> 00:59:08.500

those articles can in any way address.

1095

00:59:09.300 --> 00:59:12.300

Obviate the need for articles 36 and

1096

00:59:12.300 --> 00:59:15.800

37 which are of course common articles.

1097

00:59:15.800 --> 00:59:18.600

No, the protection is is

1098

00:59:18.600 --> 00:59:21.100

in requirements six in terms of

1099

00:59:21.100 --> 00:59:24.700

providing the relevant details and either

1100

00:59:25.900 --> 00:59:28.600

those the protection that Mr. Hamid

1101

00:59:28.600 --> 00:59:31.500

referred to in article cities is precise that

1102

00:59:31.500 --> 00:59:35.900

it is a protection and it provides for the

1103

00:59:34.900 --> 00:59:38.200

details to be provided as

1104

00:59:37.200 --> 00:59:40.800

to how those works of taking into account that

1105

00:59:40.800 --> 00:59:42.200

assessment or any updated.

1106

00:59:42.900 --> 00:59:45.700

Survey work where that's assessment

1107

00:59:45.700 --> 00:59:48.600

is has been overtaken.

1108

00:59:50.100 --> 00:59:53.300

So that's I think there is

1109

00:59:53.300 --> 00:59:55.700

a bit of disjunct here. I don't I don't understand how

1110

00:59:56.900 --> 00:59:59.200

Detailed design approvals could obviate the

1111

00:59:59.200 --> 01:00:02.500

need to empower us to remove no, but I hear

1112

01:00:02.500 --> 01:00:05.700

you about that. But I mean assuming that

1113

01:00:05.700 --> 01:00:09.000

3637 won't be deleted it

1114

01:00:08.300 --> 01:00:11.100  
if needed you could deal with

1115  
01:00:11.100 --> 01:00:14.600  
the article 27 one Amendment. Yes.

1116  
01:00:14.600 --> 01:00:17.600  
Yeah and was was there

1117  
01:00:17.600 --> 01:00:18.000  
another one?

1118  
01:00:23.500 --> 01:00:23.700  
Sorry.

1119  
01:00:26.400 --> 01:00:29.200  
So I was just saying I think when you asked was there another

1120  
01:00:29.200 --> 01:00:33.200  
one I think it might with the other one. We mentioned was 27:1 B.

1121  
01:00:34.200 --> 01:00:35.200  
Yes, that was the one I think.

1122  
01:00:36.500 --> 01:00:38.400  
Miss Park was mentioning.

1123  
01:00:40.200 --> 01:00:43.600  
Okay, so then there's there's also.

1124  
01:00:46.300 --> 01:00:48.900  
article 36 to be

1125  
01:00:50.500 --> 01:00:52.200  
page 28

1126  
01:00:56.300 --> 01:00:59.700  
So just before you go to that article, could

1127  
01:00:59.700 --> 01:01:02.800  
I just say that I only referred to say

1128

01:01:02.800 --> 01:01:05.000

is this two controls that we need

1129

01:01:05.100 --> 01:01:08.500

to think about because there's the detailed design control which

1130

01:01:08.500 --> 01:01:11.700

has to take into account the AIA or any updated survey.

1131

01:01:11.700 --> 01:01:13.100

There's also the controls in the camp.

1132

01:01:13.600 --> 01:01:16.200

And I think it might actually be the campus more relevant to

1133

01:01:16.200 --> 01:01:19.300

the kind of point that Mr. Muhammad has in mind because that

1134

01:01:20.100 --> 01:01:23.100

requires the identification of impacts on trees and

1135

01:01:23.100 --> 01:01:28.500

mitigation and so on. So just for say that my submission

1136

01:01:26.500 --> 01:01:29.400

is probably understood.

1137

01:01:32.700 --> 01:01:33.000

Thank you.

1138

01:01:35.100 --> 01:01:35.400

and

1139

01:01:37.200 --> 01:01:41.500

so I think we need to mention article 36

1140

01:01:40.500 --> 01:01:44.800

to be page 208.

1141

01:01:46.700 --> 01:01:49.900  
in carrying out any activity authorized

1142  
01:01:49.900 --> 01:01:51.200  
and second must

1143  
01:01:54.900 --> 01:01:57.300  
ensure that all works carried out to a reasonable

1144  
01:01:57.300 --> 01:02:00.500  
standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations

1145  
01:02:00.500 --> 01:02:03.500  
of appropriate BS or other more suitable

1146  
01:02:03.500 --> 01:02:04.800  
recognized codes.

1147  
01:02:05.500 --> 01:02:08.600  
Provided these meter exceed the appropriate British standards

1148  
01:02:08.600 --> 01:02:11.300  
except for what not except for where not

1149  
01:02:11.300 --> 01:02:13.800  
practically practically possible.

1150  
01:02:14.600 --> 01:02:16.300  
and I think there was a

1151  
01:02:17.400 --> 01:02:20.600  
request to delete that phrase from the

1152  
01:02:20.600 --> 01:02:24.600  
Suffolk County Council because it would said to

1153  
01:02:24.600 --> 01:02:27.600  
compromise the effectiveness of the provision, Mr. Bedford.

1154  
01:02:31.500 --> 01:02:34.700  
Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, so yes

1155

01:02:34.700 --> 01:02:38.200  
that that is correct. We

1156

01:02:40.400 --> 01:02:44.200  
Can see superficially it sounds sensible

1157

01:02:43.200 --> 01:02:47.000  
to have a caveat as to

1158

01:02:46.400 --> 01:02:49.500  
you don't have to do something where it's not practical to

1159

01:02:49.500 --> 01:02:49.900  
do it.

1160

01:02:51.100 --> 01:02:51.400  
However

1161

01:02:52.800 --> 01:02:55.700  
What it actually introduces is significant

1162

01:02:55.700 --> 01:02:56.700  
ambiguity.

1163

01:02:57.800 --> 01:03:02.000  
Because it is difficult to

1164

01:03:01.900 --> 01:03:05.500  
assess who makes

1165

01:03:04.500 --> 01:03:07.700  
that judgment. It's going

1166

01:03:07.700 --> 01:03:08.000  
to be

1167

01:03:09.700 --> 01:03:12.500  
an ongoing requirement over

1168

01:03:12.500 --> 01:03:12.700  
the

1169  
01:03:14.600 --> 01:03:17.200  
life of the project and we think it

1170  
01:03:17.200 --> 01:03:21.100  
removes the ability to comply or

1171  
01:03:20.100 --> 01:03:23.600  
rather removes the

1172  
01:03:23.600 --> 01:03:26.100  
rigor of the requirement to comply with

1173  
01:03:26.100 --> 01:03:29.700  
either British standards or recognized codes could

1174  
01:03:29.700 --> 01:03:31.200  
practice which will themselves.

1175  
01:03:32.200 --> 01:03:35.700  
Recognize the practicalities of doing things. Otherwise,

1176  
01:03:35.700 --> 01:03:38.100  
they wouldn't be in the approved guidance.

1177  
01:03:39.300 --> 01:03:43.700  
So we also think that that particular Clause

1178  
01:03:42.700 --> 01:03:46.600  
is not precedented. Whereas

1179  
01:03:45.600 --> 01:03:48.700  
we do think that the overall

1180  
01:03:48.700 --> 01:03:51.900  
terms of perfectly articles

1181  
01:03:51.900 --> 01:03:54.600  
361 and 36 to do have



1182  
01:03:54.600 --> 01:03:57.500  
respectable precedence, and we would

1183  
01:03:57.500 --> 01:04:01.600  
refer for example to the recent a47

1184  
01:04:00.600 --> 01:04:02.900  
a 11/6 or

1185  
01:04:04.700 --> 01:04:05.400  
Junction

1186  
01:04:06.900 --> 01:04:10.200  
development consent all of 2022 where

1187  
01:04:09.200 --> 01:04:13.300  
article 39 to be is

1188  
01:04:12.300 --> 01:04:15.400  
in similar terms. Sorry. Which

1189  
01:04:15.400 --> 01:04:18.300  
order is it? It's the a47 a

1190  
01:04:18.300 --> 01:04:20.800  
11 6th or Junction.

1191  
01:04:21.600 --> 01:04:24.500  
You'll be well you may be familiar with that Junction of

1192  
01:04:24.500 --> 01:04:30.300  
the oh, yeah, just outside Norwich and it

1193  
01:04:27.300 --> 01:04:30.500  
was

1194  
01:04:30.500 --> 01:04:33.600  
Article 39 to be that I say

1195

01:04:33.600 --> 01:04:37.000

it's a similar terms, but it doesn't include that as

1196

01:04:36.100 --> 01:04:39.700

it were caveat at the end for except where

1197

01:04:39.700 --> 01:04:42.200

not reasonably practical. So we

1198

01:04:42.200 --> 01:04:46.300

think that that's an unnecessary addition in this instance and

1199

01:04:45.300 --> 01:04:48.500

therefore we don't

1200

01:04:50.700 --> 01:04:53.700

That support is inclusion. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turney.

1201

01:04:54.700 --> 01:04:58.300

Richard Tony for the applicant will will check perhaps

1202

01:04:57.300 --> 01:05:00.100

Mr. Bedford's clients competitors towards the

1203

01:05:00.100 --> 01:05:03.400

provisions in the British standard that provide the answer if they

1204

01:05:03.400 --> 01:05:06.600

provide a similar exception then that probably

1205

01:05:06.600 --> 01:05:08.800

would be acceptable. Okay. Thank you very much.

1206

01:05:10.800 --> 01:05:13.600

So going to move on now. Sorry,

1207

01:05:13.600 --> 01:05:16.400

I just yes itchy. Barrack Wester for

1208

01:05:16.400 --> 01:05:19.800

cancel. But can I just explain my hearing

1209

01:05:19.800 --> 01:05:22.300

isn't over the best and when somebody

1210

01:05:22.300 --> 01:05:25.400

speaks and I can't always direct myself

1211

01:05:25.400 --> 01:05:28.300

immediately to play this sounds coming from so to

1212

01:05:28.300 --> 01:05:30.500

apologize for that new problems and

1213

01:05:31.600 --> 01:05:36.000

Yes, just a final point if I me on 37, so

1214

01:05:34.400 --> 01:05:37.300

I take on board what

1215

01:05:37.300 --> 01:05:40.400

Mr. Johnny says which is that on the TPO points,

1216

01:05:40.400 --> 01:05:43.400

you know, a lot of this will be identified at the design stage in

1217

01:05:43.400 --> 01:05:46.600

the camp. But and that's probably right

1218

01:05:46.600 --> 01:05:49.300

for the construction stage. So what we say is

1219

01:05:49.300 --> 01:05:49.400

that

1220

01:05:50.500 --> 01:05:53.300

it's too broad because it goes beyond construction. It also

1221

01:05:53.300 --> 01:05:54.800

deals with maintenance and operation.

1222

01:05:55.600 --> 01:05:55.700  
and

1223  
01:05:57.200 --> 01:05:59.900  
by comparison if you look at the Hedgerow.

1224  
01:06:00.300 --> 01:06:03.400  
the power to remove hedgerows in 36

1225  
01:06:04.200 --> 01:06:07.300  
364 that specifically restricted to

1226  
01:06:09.600 --> 01:06:12.600  
The but for the purposes of constructing the authorized development,

1227  
01:06:12.600 --> 01:06:15.900  
so we say that for 37 when

1228  
01:06:15.900 --> 01:06:18.900  
you're looking at gpus again, it's more appropriate to

1229  
01:06:18.900 --> 01:06:21.200  
limit that to you and filling or

1230  
01:06:21.200 --> 01:06:24.100  
lopping of trees necessary to do so

1231  
01:06:24.100 --> 01:06:27.500  
in order for basically for the construction fees and then anything  
beyond

1232  
01:06:27.500 --> 01:06:30.300  
that receives to do broad, right? So

1233  
01:06:30.300 --> 01:06:34.200  
the phrase in 36 for required

1234  
01:06:33.200 --> 01:06:37.000  
for the purposes of constructing the authorized development

1235  
01:06:36.900 --> 01:06:38.800

should be replicated.

1236

01:06:39.800 --> 01:06:42.900

In 37 yeses

1237

01:06:42.900 --> 01:06:45.300

and not too much the freezing replicated, but

1238

01:06:45.300 --> 01:06:48.400

the scope should be replicated such that the scope

1239

01:06:48.400 --> 01:06:51.500

of 37 one is limited to construction phase because

1240

01:06:51.500 --> 01:06:54.300

we accept that for the construction phase. We will have the chance to

1241

01:06:54.300 --> 01:06:57.500

review as Mr. Dani was saying by a

1242

01:06:57.500 --> 01:07:00.600

design and game for that that same

1243

01:07:00.600 --> 01:07:01.800

opportunity won't be there for

1244

01:07:03.500 --> 01:07:06.500

moving forward and in light of the comments that Mr. Mohammad's already

1245

01:07:06.500 --> 01:07:09.100

made about us the council's not

1246

01:07:09.100 --> 01:07:12.500

considering the AI to be sufficiently thorough

1247

01:07:12.500 --> 01:07:15.200

at this stage. We say that 37s do

1248

01:07:15.200 --> 01:07:18.400

Broad in school, right? Okay. Will you

1249

01:07:18.400 --> 01:07:19.700  
supply a proposed?

1250

01:07:20.500 --> 01:07:22.300  
Addition to that then please.

1251

01:07:24.200 --> 01:07:24.400  
Thank you.

1252

01:07:33.300 --> 01:07:36.000  
Mr. Attorney, I don't know if you

1253

01:07:37.100 --> 01:07:40.900  
want to address that now or wait until the specific wording

1254

01:07:40.900 --> 01:07:43.200  
is is provided. Well, I

1255

01:07:43.200 --> 01:07:46.500  
think we've got I don't we need the wording sir? Thank

1256

01:07:46.500 --> 01:07:49.200  
you. But we've got the point that we can we can take

1257

01:07:49.200 --> 01:07:50.800  
that away. I think we need to

1258

01:07:51.600 --> 01:07:52.200  
put that on.

1259

01:07:53.600 --> 01:07:56.600  
West suffolks desk, it's whether

1260

01:07:56.600 --> 01:07:59.600  
we should constrain that to construction,

1261

01:07:59.600 --> 01:08:00.700  
which I suspect would be.

1262

01:08:02.100 --> 01:08:05.900

From deleting the words maintenance or operation from article

1263

01:08:05.900 --> 01:08:08.400

of those six one a oh, sorry.

1264

01:08:08.400 --> 01:08:11.100

Third thirty seven one thirty seven one.

1265

01:08:13.100 --> 01:08:13.900

We'll take that away.

1266

01:08:16.400 --> 01:08:18.100

Okay. Thank you very much.

1267

01:08:19.600 --> 01:08:19.900

now

1268

01:08:22.100 --> 01:08:25.000

the next issue is

1269

01:08:26.700 --> 01:08:29.600

article 44 traffic regulation

1270

01:08:29.600 --> 01:08:32.900

measures that's on page 32 the

1271

01:08:32.900 --> 01:08:35.900

dco. I think actually those have been agreed and

1272

01:08:35.900 --> 01:08:39.000

are in the dco that's that

1273

01:08:38.300 --> 01:08:41.400

we're looking at but I

1274

01:08:41.400 --> 01:08:43.000

think there's no standing issue.

1275

01:08:44.200 --> 01:08:47.000

In relation to what is meant by

1276

01:08:47.300 --> 01:08:48.500

a local advertisement?

1277

01:08:52.100 --> 01:08:55.800

Just I think this is Suffolk County council's comments.

1278

01:08:57.100 --> 01:09:00.500

At deadline for on the applicant's dco.

1279

01:09:01.400 --> 01:09:05.100

If you look at article 44.

1280

01:09:06.200 --> 01:09:07.700

page 32

1281

01:09:10.800 --> 01:09:11.900

I think

1282

01:09:15.600 --> 01:09:17.300

there is a reference there to

1283

01:09:23.800 --> 01:09:26.400

yes, that might be

1284

01:09:26.400 --> 01:09:29.300

covered. Actually. It's in subsection sub.

1285

01:09:30.600 --> 01:09:33.000

Not only not to go 44.

1286

01:09:37.100 --> 01:09:37.400

5

1287

01:09:38.700 --> 01:09:41.400

prices so we Sorry microwave for

1288

01:09:41.400 --> 01:09:45.100

some account Council. We think it simply a drafting point on 44.



1289

01:09:46.900 --> 01:09:50.500

5 okay, we are

1290

01:09:49.500 --> 01:09:52.800

grateful to see the addition with

1291

01:09:52.800 --> 01:09:53.800

the reference to.

1292

01:09:56.300 --> 01:09:59.600

Circulating in the area to which the traffic regulation measures

1293

01:09:59.600 --> 01:10:02.200

are proposed, but we think that

1294

01:10:02.200 --> 01:10:04.900

the current wording.

1295

01:10:05.800 --> 01:10:08.700

Is a requirement to carry out 21 days

1296

01:10:08.700 --> 01:10:12.200

consultation with the affected Highway users

1297

01:10:11.200 --> 01:10:14.500

by means of site notices

1298

01:10:14.500 --> 01:10:18.000

that's clear enough but then says and local

1299

01:10:17.700 --> 01:10:20.500

advertisement circulating in the

1300

01:10:20.500 --> 01:10:24.100

area. We think it's simply should take local newspaper

1301

01:10:23.100 --> 01:10:26.200

advertisement. So we think it's just

1302

01:10:26.200 --> 01:10:28.500

a drafting point because otherwise it doesn't really make

1303

01:10:29.300 --> 01:10:31.300

It very clear what is required?

1304

01:10:35.100 --> 01:10:38.900

Okay, so simply replace advertisement with

1305

01:10:38.900 --> 01:10:41.700

newspaper or sync add

1306

01:10:41.700 --> 01:10:45.300

the word newspaper local news local advertisement.

1307

01:10:44.300 --> 01:10:47.600

So you local

1308

01:10:47.600 --> 01:10:50.900

newspaper advertisement that we can use cases but

1309

01:10:56.300 --> 01:10:59.900

it used to be two local newspapers circulating

1310

01:10:59.900 --> 01:11:01.000

in the area and

1311

01:11:02.700 --> 01:11:05.700

But anyway, and this attorney we

1312

01:11:05.700 --> 01:11:06.500

can cope with that.

1313

01:11:08.400 --> 01:11:08.800

Thank you.

1314

01:11:10.100 --> 01:11:11.400

right

1315

01:11:16.400 --> 01:11:18.900

Didn't you schedule two requirements?

1316

01:11:20.400 --> 01:11:23.800

Requirements 6 detailed design approval we've

1317

01:11:23.800 --> 01:11:26.500

talked about that

1318

01:11:26.500 --> 01:11:27.600

to some extent.

1319

01:11:30.500 --> 01:11:33.600

Now I think Cambridge County Council in its

1320

01:11:33.600 --> 01:11:37.400

response to our xq2.9.12.

1321

01:11:38.300 --> 01:11:42.200

requested an additional Clause requiring pre-comment

1322

01:11:41.200 --> 01:11:44.400

condition survey to be completed and

1323

01:11:44.400 --> 01:11:46.800

that's Jay is that I think that's in that maybe in

1324

01:11:51.200 --> 01:11:52.400

to which 42

1325

01:12:04.300 --> 01:12:05.500

So requirements.

1326

01:12:08.000 --> 01:12:08.500

six

1327

01:12:13.600 --> 01:12:16.200

Yeah, I'm not sure if that's in no. I

1328

01:12:16.200 --> 01:12:19.400

haven't. I haven't seen it. I think that's been added. So the

1329

01:12:19.400 --> 01:12:23.000

the Clause decide to be added is is J

1330

01:12:22.900 --> 01:12:25.900

the pre-comment condition survey

1331

01:12:25.900 --> 01:12:28.500

of all proud public rights

1332

01:12:28.500 --> 01:12:31.900

way of affected by Hall Road cable route

1333

01:12:31.900 --> 01:12:34.500

Crossings has been completed in accordance

1334

01:12:34.500 --> 01:12:34.700

with

1335

01:12:35.800 --> 01:12:38.700

5.2.11 of the construction and

1336

01:12:38.700 --> 01:12:41.200

traffic management plan and Doreen statement plan of

1337

01:12:41.200 --> 01:12:44.200

The Proud surfaces and widths agreed.

1338

01:12:45.400 --> 01:12:47.600

Is that Mr. Tony B?

1339

01:12:48.600 --> 01:12:50.600

Your clients aware of that have they?

1340

01:12:51.300 --> 01:12:52.900

Been able to take that on board.

1341

01:12:53.700 --> 01:12:56.900

And rigid any for the applicant, we it

1342

01:12:56.900 --> 01:12:59.700

doesn't need to be in the in requirement 6

1343

01:12:59.700 --> 01:13:01.300

it's dealt with in the ctmp.

1344

01:13:01.900 --> 01:13:04.200

I'll find the provision might take

1345

01:13:04.200 --> 01:13:07.200

a moment to do so, but it doesn't need a change

1346

01:13:07.200 --> 01:13:07.900

for requirements.

1347

01:13:11.300 --> 01:13:11.500

Okay.

1348

01:13:14.400 --> 01:13:14.800

Mr. Harvard

1349

01:13:16.100 --> 01:13:19.300

I'll have a look at what the ctmp says the section that

1350

01:13:19.300 --> 01:13:21.700

I'm that way that we're being told deals with it and

1351

01:13:23.700 --> 01:13:24.600

and take of you.

1352

01:13:25.800 --> 01:13:26.000

Okay.

1353

01:13:27.600 --> 01:13:29.700

So can I come in and requirements? Yes.

1354

01:13:31.400 --> 01:13:33.500

And Richie Barrack West Africa Council.

1355

01:13:34.500 --> 01:13:37.400

So this is and this relates to comment that we made at

1356

01:13:37.400 --> 01:13:38.900

our deadline six submissions.

1357

01:13:40.600 --> 01:13:44.400

effectively about securing within requirements six

1358

01:13:43.400 --> 01:13:46.200

something about

1359

01:13:48.400 --> 01:13:51.700

And ensuring that the design

1360

01:13:51.700 --> 01:13:54.400

is in compliance with the environmental color

1361

01:13:54.400 --> 01:13:57.500

assessment. And so this this is a dialogue

1362

01:13:57.500 --> 01:14:00.700

that we've had and I think what we now have is in

1363

01:14:00.700 --> 01:14:03.600

the olem we've got some wording about

1364

01:14:05.400 --> 01:14:08.500

using suitable materials and finishes and things like

1365

01:14:08.500 --> 01:14:11.400

that to ensure that the journal colors of the land of this

1366

01:14:11.400 --> 01:14:14.400

of the structures reflect the

1367

01:14:14.400 --> 01:14:16.000

landscape. All right.

1368

01:14:17.300 --> 01:14:20.200

And so that's secured in the lamp. Oh lamp.

1369

01:14:20.800 --> 01:14:23.600

For now, but because the

1370

01:14:23.600 --> 01:14:26.300

Olympic might come for all the length might come forward at a

1371

01:14:26.300 --> 01:14:29.600

different time to detail design. It might come after we're quite

1372

01:14:29.600 --> 01:14:31.600

like to just match that up and see.

1373

01:14:32.200 --> 01:14:35.500

Or rather ensure that that's properly considered as part

1374

01:14:35.500 --> 01:14:38.100

of detailed design because it's more detailed design point for us.

1375

01:14:38.800 --> 01:14:42.400

Indeed. Would it be covered by the external

1376

01:14:41.400 --> 01:14:42.900

appearance?

1377

01:14:54.500 --> 01:14:55.000

and

1378

01:15:04.600 --> 01:15:07.700

Yeah, so I think in general gems. Yes,

1379

01:15:07.700 --> 01:15:10.200

I think we might need to consider whether it's

1380

01:15:11.400 --> 01:15:14.200

Specific enough to satisfy us. I think this might be something we

1381

01:15:14.200 --> 01:15:17.100

could take away and just consider and then maybe chat to the

1382

01:15:17.100 --> 01:15:20.600

other side to find just pragmatic way to resolve. Yes

1383

01:15:20.600 --> 01:15:24.300

issue, right? Thank you very much you content

1384

01:15:23.300 --> 01:15:25.100  
with that Mr. Tony.

1385

01:15:26.900 --> 01:15:28.300  
Yes, thank you. I think the

1386

01:15:30.300 --> 01:15:33.100  
I think there's the answer probably is between it might be

1387

01:15:33.100 --> 01:15:36.800  
in the design principles together with the ability to approve  
external

1388

01:15:36.800 --> 01:15:37.200  
appearance.

1389

01:15:39.300 --> 01:15:39.600  
Okay.

1390

01:15:41.900 --> 01:15:42.600  
so

1391

01:15:44.300 --> 01:15:44.600  
then

1392

01:15:50.400 --> 01:15:53.500  
so I'm going to move on from requirements 6 then

1393

01:15:53.500 --> 01:15:56.400  
to requirement 10.

1394

01:15:58.300 --> 01:16:01.700  
I think there's a point that West Suffolk

1395

01:16:01.700 --> 01:16:02.400  
Council have

1396

01:16:03.200 --> 01:16:07.400  
in their comments on the dco at rep5. -101



1397

01:16:09.400 --> 01:16:12.900

Stone curly off setting Habitat to be maintained throughout

1398

01:16:12.900 --> 01:16:15.200

the decommissioning works.

1399

01:16:15.800 --> 01:16:18.900

The question was why cannot requirement

1400

01:16:18.900 --> 01:16:21.600

10 also include such maintenance for

1401

01:16:21.600 --> 01:16:24.700

a period of time beyond the decommissioning works. Well, actually,  
I

1402

01:16:24.700 --> 01:16:25.000

think that's

1403

01:16:26.500 --> 01:16:28.100

Something we've covered.

1404

01:16:30.700 --> 01:16:32.800

in insofar as

1405

01:16:35.400 --> 01:16:39.600

there may be a mechanism for for that but

1406

01:16:38.600 --> 01:16:41.200

miss parak. I think you were

1407

01:16:41.200 --> 01:16:45.600

interested in a contingency fund essentially

1408

01:16:44.600 --> 01:16:47.300

are supposed to guarantee the maintenance of

1409

01:16:47.300 --> 01:16:48.100

the habitat.

1410

01:16:52.300 --> 01:16:55.200

Relief Eric Wester for cancer. Yes. So that's

1411

01:16:55.200 --> 01:16:58.500

right about the I think some of that has been resolved by

1412

01:16:58.500 --> 01:17:02.900

all the discussion we've had already and the separate

1413

01:17:01.900 --> 01:17:05.000

point is this contingency fund

1414

01:17:04.400 --> 01:17:07.600

just to be clear that we we don't we're

1415

01:17:07.600 --> 01:17:10.700

not what we would like to see is incredible

1416

01:17:10.700 --> 01:17:13.400

contingency plan and within that

1417

01:17:13.400 --> 01:17:16.500

plan or contingency fund would be the absolute measure of

1418

01:17:16.500 --> 01:17:19.400

Last Resort and perhaps the

1419

01:17:19.400 --> 01:17:21.300

best way to deal with that is to

1420

01:17:21.800 --> 01:17:22.000

just

1421

01:17:23.200 --> 01:17:26.300

include that in the offsetting habitat provision

1422

01:17:26.300 --> 01:17:28.100

for stone curly specification.

1423

01:17:29.200 --> 01:17:32.300

Index sorry in which specific in the offsetting habitat

1424

01:17:32.300 --> 01:17:36.000

provision for stone values specification, right?

1425

01:17:44.400 --> 01:17:48.700

Right, so just to explain up position on this there's

1426

01:17:47.700 --> 01:17:50.200

two reasons why we think that needs

1427

01:17:50.200 --> 01:17:51.000

to be built in.

1428

01:17:53.400 --> 01:17:56.600

One because we need to account for a situation where the

1429

01:17:56.600 --> 01:18:00.100

object the objectives of the offsetting land in Eco

1430

01:17:59.100 --> 01:18:01.500

one to ECU 3.

1431

01:18:02.300 --> 01:18:03.400

are not met

1432

01:18:04.900 --> 01:18:07.200

and there's at least a risk of that because we know that

1433

01:18:07.200 --> 01:18:11.100

they're constraints here and respective archeology and that's been picked

1434

01:18:10.100 --> 01:18:14.200

up in the in combination impacts. And and

1435

01:18:13.200 --> 01:18:15.600

then the second point is that

1436

01:18:17.300 --> 01:18:20.300

it's actually quite hard and challenging and practice to secure

1437

01:18:20.300 --> 01:18:23.100

suitable mitigation land outside of dco land.

1438

01:18:24.100 --> 01:18:26.600

And because of the various units.

1439

01:18:27.100 --> 01:18:30.500

Soil type criteria and Etc that we need to meet and see.

1440

01:18:31.300 --> 01:18:34.000

that's why we say the contingency fund would

1441

01:18:34.100 --> 01:18:37.200

be the last resort because actually in practice if we just get a sum

1442

01:18:37.200 --> 01:18:40.300

of money to deal with it, that's that that makes it

1443

01:18:40.300 --> 01:18:42.600

very difficult for right and

1444

01:18:43.700 --> 01:18:46.600

but how how would that?

1445

01:18:47.600 --> 01:18:51.200

How would that contingency fund work and

1446

01:18:50.200 --> 01:18:53.700

how would it how would

1447

01:18:53.700 --> 01:18:55.500

it relate to the dco?

1448

01:18:56.700 --> 01:18:56.900

and

1449

01:19:00.600 --> 01:19:04.200

so we I think as I said because our

1450

01:19:03.200 --> 01:19:06.800

preference is not to really get into contingency fund.

1451

01:19:06.800 --> 01:19:09.600

What we would prefer to see is a contingency plan

1452

01:19:09.600 --> 01:19:12.200

so I can bring in Miss Fisher for example

1453

01:19:12.200 --> 01:19:15.200

to talk. Sorry to give you some examples of how this

1454

01:19:15.200 --> 01:19:18.500

works in other applications, but as I understand it

1455

01:19:18.500 --> 01:19:21.200

what we normally have for planning applications is that

1456

01:19:21.200 --> 01:19:24.600

there's offsetting land identified then there's

1457

01:19:24.600 --> 01:19:27.500

backup land identified in case the offsetting

1458

01:19:27.500 --> 01:19:30.100

land fails. That's the kind of process that we

1459

01:19:30.100 --> 01:19:32.400

would prefer because that's what works in practice.

1460

01:19:34.100 --> 01:19:37.000

And that could we could what we would like

1461

01:19:37.100 --> 01:19:39.700

to see is that to be built into the specification.

1462

01:19:41.900 --> 01:19:44.700

So you're really more interested in the specification and

1463

01:19:44.700 --> 01:19:48.200

beefing that up? Yes principally. Yeah.

1464

01:19:47.200 --> 01:19:50.200

Thank you, Mr. Tony.

1465

01:19:52.700 --> 01:19:55.100

So rich Tony for the

1466

01:19:55.100 --> 01:19:58.200

applicant and we think that

1467

01:19:58.200 --> 01:20:01.400

there's adequate provision in the lamp as drafted

1468

01:20:01.400 --> 01:20:04.400

together with the specific measures that we've identified for

1469

01:20:04.400 --> 01:20:07.400

stone curly we

1470

01:20:12.200 --> 01:20:16.400

Clearly we've got as one particular element of

1471

01:20:16.400 --> 01:20:16.600

that.

1472

01:20:17.600 --> 01:20:21.200

The ecology Advisory

1473

01:20:20.200 --> 01:20:23.000

Group who will be able to

1474

01:20:23.400 --> 01:20:26.600

provide overview in respect of

1475

01:20:26.600 --> 01:20:30.200

measures that may be required to achieve

1476

01:20:29.200 --> 01:20:32.700

the biodiversity objectives including

1477

01:20:32.700 --> 01:20:36.600  
in respective Stone curly. So

1478

01:20:35.600 --> 01:20:38.400  
that is an ongoing process that

1479

01:20:38.400 --> 01:20:42.000  
will allow for consideration of whether the measures

1480

01:20:41.400 --> 01:20:44.300  
have been effective or whether further

1481

01:20:44.300 --> 01:20:48.300  
measures need to take place. If that

1482

01:20:48.300 --> 01:20:51.200  
needs to be spelled out more clearly as a sort of

1483

01:20:51.200 --> 01:20:54.400  
contingency approach, then we can

1484

01:20:54.400 --> 01:20:56.800  
do so in the length, I think.

1485

01:20:58.900 --> 01:21:01.800  
I think Miss parrot rightly recognizes that

1486

01:21:01.800 --> 01:21:04.000  
it might not need to be on the face of the order and it might

1487

01:21:04.100 --> 01:21:07.200  
not be a fund. I think we should really

1488

01:21:07.200 --> 01:21:10.200  
focus on the terms of the lamp because it certainly Our intention  
to

1489

01:21:10.200 --> 01:21:14.900  
have ongoing monitoring of the ecological mitigation

1490

01:21:14.900 --> 01:21:18.400  
areas, but also the role of the eag in

1491  
01:21:18.400 --> 01:21:21.300  
making recommendations as to what measures might need to be taken.

1492  
01:21:21.300 --> 01:21:23.300  
Okay. Thank you and

1493  
01:21:24.500 --> 01:21:29.000  
Miss perk can I leave it with you then to if you

1494  
01:21:28.100 --> 01:21:32.000  
have any specific wording to add

1495  
01:21:31.300 --> 01:21:34.300  
to the lamp that would help

1496  
01:21:34.300 --> 01:21:34.600  
to.

1497  
01:21:36.600 --> 01:21:37.100  
clarify

1498  
01:21:40.300 --> 01:21:43.300  
And then if you could provide those deadlines seven, please.

1499  
01:21:43.300 --> 01:21:44.100  
Thank you.

1500  
01:21:47.700 --> 01:21:50.100  
I'm going to move on now from

1501  
01:21:52.800 --> 01:21:55.200  
real requirement tend to

1502  
01:21:55.200 --> 01:21:58.800  
requirements 14 and 15. I

1503  
01:21:58.800 --> 01:22:01.700  
think they are now with the references to Natural England being



1504

01:22:01.700 --> 01:22:04.700  
consulted that is now in the

1505

01:22:04.700 --> 01:22:07.600  
revised dco.

1506

01:22:10.200 --> 01:22:14.100  
I'm going to move on to requirement 23.

1507

01:22:15.600 --> 01:22:18.600  
Which deals with and scheduled

1508

01:22:18.600 --> 01:22:18.700  
10?

1509

01:22:19.500 --> 01:22:22.900  
this point on the crash site exclusion

1510

01:22:22.900 --> 01:22:23.400  
area

1511

01:22:26.100 --> 01:22:29.600  
page 48. That's a query that

1512

01:22:29.600 --> 01:22:30.000  
I have.

1513

01:22:34.500 --> 01:22:36.700  
It's really about the timing of the license.

1514

01:22:47.200 --> 01:22:50.400  
It would say helpful if if the GCO could

1515

01:22:50.400 --> 01:22:50.500  
be.

1516

01:22:55.300 --> 01:22:56.500  
more simply expressed to

1517

01:22:57.900 --> 01:22:58.500  
commit to

1518  
01:23:03.400 --> 01:23:06.500  
either the well, the potential expanded Crush site

1519  
01:23:06.500 --> 01:23:10.100  
exclusion area, if the if the appropriate licenses

1520  
01:23:09.100 --> 01:23:12.800  
available his granted

1521  
01:23:12.800 --> 01:23:13.400  
I just don't know.

1522  
01:23:14.100 --> 01:23:14.800  
I can't get

1523  
01:23:15.600 --> 01:23:18.200  
a feeling for when that is likely to be

1524  
01:23:18.200 --> 01:23:20.900  
granted if at all.

1525  
01:23:22.300 --> 01:23:25.900  
Bridge it's only for the applicant. The application is in and

1526  
01:23:25.900 --> 01:23:28.200  
we hope to be able to confirm that we

1527  
01:23:28.200 --> 01:23:32.200  
have a license by the end of the examination. Hmm. So

1528  
01:23:31.200 --> 01:23:34.300  
that's the time frame we're looking

1529  
01:23:34.300 --> 01:23:34.400  
at.

1530  
01:23:36.200 --> 01:23:39.300  
I mean to these what are they called again? So

1531

01:23:39.300 --> 01:23:40.300  
CC.

1532

01:23:43.300 --> 01:23:46.300  
So, has anybody had any experience of dealing with

1533

01:23:46.300 --> 01:23:46.700  
them?

1534

01:23:47.600 --> 01:23:50.300  
I haven't myself. No, I didn't we

1535

01:23:50.300 --> 01:23:53.400  
don't have Mr. Mays with us today. But I think it's fair

1536

01:23:53.400 --> 01:23:57.000  
to say it was a fairly novel process for the applicant.

1537

01:23:56.500 --> 01:24:00.200  
But what we do know, I

1538

01:23:59.200 --> 01:24:02.300  
don't identify any sort of comfort but

1539

01:24:03.100 --> 01:24:05.200  
when they received the application

1540

01:24:06.300 --> 01:24:08.400  
that it was commented that we had provided.

1541

01:24:10.300 --> 01:24:13.300  
I think sufficient and a lot more detail than they normally

1542

01:24:13.300 --> 01:24:16.400  
receive for such applications. In other

1543

01:24:16.400 --> 01:24:19.300  
words that we're done our bit and it was now over to them to

1544

01:24:19.300 --> 01:24:22.100  
consider what we've been provided with.

1545  
01:24:23.700 --> 01:24:26.200  
yes, and well, what I

1546  
01:24:26.200 --> 01:24:27.100  
would say is when if you

1547  
01:24:30.600 --> 01:24:33.200  
if you can pursue them

1548  
01:24:33.200 --> 01:24:36.700  
to make a timely response that I think would help us

1549  
01:24:36.700 --> 01:24:39.600  
and I think you would help clarify matters

1550  
01:24:39.600 --> 01:24:43.800  
for the Secretary of State not to

1551  
01:24:43.800 --> 01:24:46.900  
have to consider that particular issue

1552  
01:24:46.900 --> 01:24:49.600  
if if we can

1553  
01:24:49.600 --> 01:24:51.500  
clarify what the position is going to be.

1554  
01:24:52.400 --> 01:24:53.600  
before the examine

1555  
01:24:55.200 --> 01:24:59.000  
I mean that's not to say that we we couldn't include

1556  
01:24:58.200 --> 01:25:01.600  
it in the three months report period if

1557  
01:25:03.600 --> 01:25:06.100  
and happens but it's also it seems all a bit

1558

01:25:06.100 --> 01:25:07.100  
uncertain at the moment.

1559

01:25:09.700 --> 01:25:12.300  
Richardson if the applicant I recognize that the

1560

01:25:12.300 --> 01:25:13.400  
the provision

1561

01:25:16.500 --> 01:25:19.600  
We hope we'll be able to taken by the grant for

1562

01:25:19.600 --> 01:25:22.900  
license. Obviously as soon as we know anything further

1563

01:25:22.900 --> 01:25:26.800  
about that will provide that information but we

1564

01:25:26.800 --> 01:25:29.400  
are intention is

1565

01:25:29.400 --> 01:25:32.600  
that this provision should fight should establish

1566

01:25:32.600 --> 01:25:36.000  
a sound means of reflecting the

1567

01:25:35.500 --> 01:25:38.300  
obligation which which is intended in

1568

01:25:38.300 --> 01:25:39.300  
the DCA.

1569

01:25:41.800 --> 01:25:44.800  
And provides for those two Alternatives

1570

01:25:44.800 --> 01:25:47.200  
that there is a license in place where there isn't

1571

01:25:47.200 --> 01:25:47.900  
a license in place.

1572  
01:25:48.600 --> 01:25:51.900  
Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Tony. Just one

1573  
01:25:51.900 --> 01:25:58.000  
one question on article 237 great

1574  
01:25:57.300 --> 01:26:00.600  
235 Mr. Mohammad behalf of

1575  
01:26:00.600 --> 01:26:03.800  
the county 235 a

1576  
01:26:03.800 --> 01:26:05.100  
I want to just invite.

1577  
01:26:05.900 --> 01:26:08.300  
Mrs. Rhodes to say something about this

1578  
01:26:08.300 --> 01:26:11.800  
because this is just in terms of the interpretive board and  
commemorative

1579  
01:26:11.800 --> 01:26:12.500  
plaque.

1580  
01:26:13.300 --> 01:26:16.700  
Okay. Well, thank you. So that's page 48 48.

1581  
01:26:20.600 --> 01:26:23.300  
Yes, and and the questions around whether

1582  
01:26:23.300 --> 01:26:26.300  
it should be on on it says must be

1583  
01:26:26.300 --> 01:26:29.300  
on a highway and Mrs. Rose have

1584  
01:26:29.300 --> 01:26:31.100

got has got a few points to make on that.

1585

01:26:32.200 --> 01:26:33.200

Yes with friends.

1586

01:26:34.100 --> 01:26:37.600

Thank you. Commemora Road for Cambridgeshire County Council, and I'm not

1587

01:26:37.600 --> 01:26:40.500

a highways expert but I do deal

1588

01:26:40.500 --> 01:26:43.500

with interpretation boards and on rights

1589

01:26:43.500 --> 01:26:46.400

of way, and I'm certainly aware of what my college might say about.

1590

01:26:47.600 --> 01:26:50.200

Being obligated as a higher authority to have

1591

01:26:50.200 --> 01:26:53.600

an interpretation board on a road at which

1592

01:26:53.600 --> 01:26:56.500

I imagine is what the intention is that road in

1593

01:26:56.500 --> 01:26:56.900

this location.

1594

01:26:58.100 --> 01:27:01.500

And I don't think they should be obligated to

1595

01:27:01.500 --> 01:27:04.900

have I think it actually comes back to what we were

1596

01:27:04.900 --> 01:27:07.500

expecting to see was the board to

1597

01:27:07.500 --> 01:27:10.100

be on the permissive path Within.

1598

01:27:11.100 --> 01:27:13.100  
the bounds of the red line

1599

01:27:13.900 --> 01:27:16.800  
area 5, excuse me,

1600

01:27:16.800 --> 01:27:19.600  
which does come

1601

01:27:19.600 --> 01:27:21.500  
down to the point around.

1602

01:27:23.100 --> 01:27:26.200  
How you retain that

1603

01:27:26.200 --> 01:27:29.400  
in perpetuity and what we would have preferred

1604

01:27:29.400 --> 01:27:32.800  
would have been for that permissive part to be dedicated upon  
decommissioning

1605

01:27:32.800 --> 01:27:35.500  
in which case it would be retained within then

1606

01:27:35.500 --> 01:27:38.300  
a highway. Yes being a public right of way, but

1607

01:27:38.300 --> 01:27:39.700  
suitably off the

1608

01:27:40.800 --> 01:27:42.400  
Road carriageway Highway

1609

01:27:43.400 --> 01:27:46.400  
you do have an issue if it is on the highway version

1610

01:27:46.400 --> 01:27:49.400  
those versions are quite narrow on Beck Road, then if people



1611

01:27:49.400 --> 01:27:50.200  
are stopping to

1612

01:27:51.400 --> 01:27:54.600  
Look at it. There's not a proper provision for

1613

01:27:54.600 --> 01:27:57.600  
it necessarily unless the applicant

1614

01:27:57.600 --> 01:28:00.900  
proposes to create an additional space

1615

01:28:00.900 --> 01:28:03.700  
extend the highway subject

1616

01:28:03.700 --> 01:28:06.100  
to the higher extent, of course in that

1617

01:28:06.100 --> 01:28:09.900  
location. So I think that just needs to be thought a

1618

01:28:09.900 --> 01:28:12.500  
bit further about right, but your preference is

1619

01:28:12.500 --> 01:28:15.900  
to put it on the permissive path. So just an appropriate.

1620

01:28:17.200 --> 01:28:18.600  
Covenant that then

1621

01:28:19.200 --> 01:28:22.400  
ensures it's permanence beyond

1622

01:28:22.400 --> 01:28:23.300  
the life of the scheme.

1623

01:28:24.200 --> 01:28:28.000  
Yes, well that's dependent on the on the 106, isn't it?

1624

01:28:27.600 --> 01:28:28.600

I think.

1625

01:28:29.400 --> 01:28:32.300

But in the first instance looking at

1626

01:28:32.300 --> 01:28:33.400

the dco.

1627

01:28:35.500 --> 01:28:38.800

Perhaps you might then be able to provide some wording

1628

01:28:38.800 --> 01:28:41.200

that that it in your

1629

01:28:41.200 --> 01:28:42.500

view would would.

1630

01:28:43.800 --> 01:28:46.400

Put the interpretation that are suitable

1631

01:28:46.400 --> 01:28:49.800

location. Yeah, we can a can certainly have

1632

01:28:49.800 --> 01:28:52.900

a go at that. I think my understanding from the applicant

1633

01:28:52.900 --> 01:28:55.200

is that the section 106 is

1634

01:28:55.200 --> 01:28:56.700

not going to be able to

1635

01:28:57.700 --> 01:29:00.400

Provide money for Creations within the red line

1636

01:29:00.400 --> 01:29:04.100

boundary because of the nature of those land agreements,  
unfortunately.

1637

01:29:05.800 --> 01:29:08.500

So we are constrained with how

1638

01:29:08.500 --> 01:29:09.900  
those monies would be spent.

1639

01:29:11.300 --> 01:29:14.800  
Right. Okay. So looking then

1640

01:29:14.800 --> 01:29:16.100  
Mr. Stoney for

1641

01:29:16.900 --> 01:29:19.600  
well, really just focusing on the phrase

1642

01:29:19.600 --> 01:29:23.000  
which must be on a highway given the fact that yes, it

1643

01:29:22.100 --> 01:29:25.600  
could go on optimistic path. Yeah, originally that

1644

01:29:25.600 --> 01:29:28.200  
that's I don't know why it's in there. It's wrong. It needs to be  
struck through

1645

01:29:28.200 --> 01:29:32.200  
so the the provision in

1646

01:29:32.200 --> 01:29:33.100  
parenthesis in

1647

01:29:34.600 --> 01:29:37.600  
requirement 23 5A needs to be deleted. It won't

1648

01:29:37.600 --> 01:29:38.800  
it won't be on a highway.

1649

01:29:41.600 --> 01:29:44.900  
Notwithstanding any other reasons it might rise. The intention

1650

01:29:44.900 --> 01:29:47.000  
is that it will be on the permissive path.

1651  
01:29:48.300 --> 01:29:50.100  
Which provides the circular route?

1652  
01:29:50.900 --> 01:29:53.700  
Round E5. Yes. So it's

1653  
01:29:53.700 --> 01:29:56.100  
just that it's just a drafting error. We will correct that

1654  
01:29:56.100 --> 01:30:00.200  
but no, we're not going to dedicate that

1655  
01:29:59.200 --> 01:30:02.600  
path. And obviously you can't require that

1656  
01:30:02.600 --> 01:30:05.400  
in a in a DCA because that's

1657  
01:30:05.400 --> 01:30:08.600  
been unlawful requirement. So okay with it.

1658  
01:30:08.600 --> 01:30:12.500  
We will delete the provision that Mrs. Rhodes

1659  
01:30:12.500 --> 01:30:12.800  
is healthy.

1660  
01:30:13.400 --> 01:30:16.100  
Points out but we won't go firm that

1661  
01:30:16.100 --> 01:30:19.800  
it will be on the permissive path. Would that such as funny cancel  
then

1662  
01:30:19.800 --> 01:30:20.600  
simply to delete that?

1663  
01:30:22.700 --> 01:30:25.500  
Wording in Brackets. Yes. Thanks. I think that is essentially

1664

01:30:25.500 --> 01:30:28.700  
what we're expecting. Okay initially. Thank

1665  
01:30:28.700 --> 01:30:29.000  
you very much.

1666  
01:30:35.300 --> 01:30:38.700  
I mean it would be our preference have a covenant as well to deal

1667  
01:30:38.700 --> 01:30:39.900  
with it in the longer term.

1668  
01:30:40.600 --> 01:30:43.300  
And there's that's got to be thought about what happens post

1669  
01:30:43.300 --> 01:30:44.100  
decommissioning.

1670  
01:30:45.300 --> 01:30:47.100  
Yes, that's part of the broader.

1671  
01:30:47.600 --> 01:30:48.400  
question that

1672  
01:30:49.400 --> 01:30:50.800  
this outstanding. Yes.

1673  
01:30:52.300 --> 01:30:55.000  
and I think that

1674  
01:30:57.400 --> 01:30:58.800  
then deals with the wording.

1675  
01:30:59.600 --> 01:31:03.800  
That you wanted to raise on that any other.

1676  
01:31:05.700 --> 01:31:07.500  
points before I move on to

1677  
01:31:08.900 --> 01:31:11.600  
Now I had a point scheduled one work 10

1678

01:31:11.600 --> 01:31:14.700

page 40 that is a reference to vegetation

1679

01:31:14.700 --> 01:31:17.800

and East Cambridge District. Council's.

1680

01:31:18.600 --> 01:31:21.900

thoughts about information on

1681

01:31:21.900 --> 01:31:22.100

the

1682

01:31:23.200 --> 01:31:26.000

On the AIA really but I think that's the same

1683

01:31:26.300 --> 01:31:27.200

point that we've discussed.

1684

01:31:28.100 --> 01:31:28.600

earlier

1685

01:31:31.100 --> 01:31:34.300

So a necessarily specific points on that.

1686

01:31:35.200 --> 01:31:37.300

I'm going to move on to.

1687

01:31:38.500 --> 01:31:39.500

schedule 5

1688

01:31:40.700 --> 01:31:44.200

alteration of streets that's on page 254

1689

01:31:43.200 --> 01:31:46.800

by the way, it's 20 past

1690

01:31:46.800 --> 01:31:49.300

one. We're making

1691

01:31:49.300 --> 01:31:51.100  
quite good progress only have

1692  
01:31:51.900 --> 01:31:54.500  
two or three more items

1693  
01:31:55.600 --> 01:31:58.800  
I'll just run through them the schedule. Well,

1694  
01:31:58.800 --> 01:32:01.400  
I don't have any particular points on

1695  
01:32:01.400 --> 01:32:03.300  
protective Provisions in general.

1696  
01:32:04.800 --> 01:32:06.000  
parties may have

1697  
01:32:08.700 --> 01:32:10.700  
I just want to check whether

1698  
01:32:12.200 --> 01:32:15.700  
parties are happy with the discharge of requirements schedule 13.

1699  
01:32:15.700 --> 01:32:18.200  
I don't have any particular points to raise on

1700  
01:32:18.200 --> 01:32:21.200  
it the the outstanding issue.

1701  
01:32:21.200 --> 01:32:24.500  
I just want to check through with the parties about the fees  
schedule

1702  
01:32:24.500 --> 01:32:27.100  
which may or may not

1703  
01:32:27.100 --> 01:32:28.600  
be thinking appended.

1704  
01:32:29.300 --> 01:32:33.600

To the schedule or dealt with in some way. So that's

1705

01:32:32.600 --> 01:32:34.400

all I have.

1706

01:32:36.200 --> 01:32:36.700

so

1707

01:32:39.400 --> 01:32:42.000

What people want to do and do you want

1708

01:32:42.200 --> 01:32:45.100

to take a short break now with a view to

1709

01:32:45.100 --> 01:32:48.100

finishing in in half an hour or so, or do you want

1710

01:32:48.100 --> 01:32:49.100

to press on?

1711

01:32:52.400 --> 01:32:55.200

Press on happy to press on from

1712

01:32:55.200 --> 01:32:55.500

this side.

1713

01:32:56.500 --> 01:32:59.600

Okay, thank you very much. So should you five

1714

01:32:59.600 --> 01:33:03.600

alteration of streets page 54 of the dco the

1715

01:33:02.600 --> 01:33:06.200

Cambridgeshire County Council says

1716

01:33:05.200 --> 01:33:08.400

that it should be noted in the schedule which roads

1717

01:33:08.400 --> 01:33:11.400

are public and which private in the



1718

01:33:11.400 --> 01:33:13.000

columns Parts one and two

1719

01:33:15.200 --> 01:33:15.400

now

1720

01:33:17.800 --> 01:33:20.600

there's a reason for that Mr. Muhammad, I

1721

01:33:20.600 --> 01:33:20.600

think.

1722

01:33:27.100 --> 01:33:29.800

A rose came to Count's Council. Yes, it's so that we can be.

1723

01:33:30.600 --> 01:33:34.000

We and the public anyone looking trying

1724

01:33:33.100 --> 01:33:36.000

to understand what works are going to be done.

1725

01:33:37.200 --> 01:33:41.000

Are they within the highway are they within a private Road or

1726

01:33:40.000 --> 01:33:41.100

Street?

1727

01:33:42.500 --> 01:33:42.700

Okay.

1728

01:33:45.100 --> 01:33:48.500

So that would involve putting an

1729

01:33:48.500 --> 01:33:50.500

additional column on the on the schedule.

1730

01:33:52.700 --> 01:33:55.600

If it's all to be contained within that one

1731

01:33:55.600 --> 01:33:57.600

schedule then yes, I get it would.

1732

01:34:03.900 --> 01:34:06.300

fifty four

1733

01:34:12.100 --> 01:34:15.200

Yes, Mr. Tony Richard only for the applicant identify with satisfy

1734

01:34:15.200 --> 01:34:19.400

the the councils if it was just in Brackets

1735

01:34:18.400 --> 01:34:22.700

next to each Street, identifying public

1736

01:34:21.700 --> 01:34:24.400

highway or private.

1737

01:34:28.900 --> 01:34:32.300

That would seem to be rather easier than adding a column just

1738

01:34:31.300 --> 01:34:33.500

next to the name of the street.

1739

01:34:40.200 --> 01:34:41.500

I don't think we'd be particularly.

1740

01:34:42.700 --> 01:34:45.400

Fussy as long as it's just very clear

1741

01:34:45.400 --> 01:34:48.200

fits a public Highway offensive private Street.

1742

01:34:48.200 --> 01:34:51.400

Okay, so what you're going to put after private access

1743

01:34:51.400 --> 01:34:53.100

and page 57

1744

01:34:59.900 --> 01:35:02.200

No, I he's just

1745

01:35:02.200 --> 01:35:05.400

that that particular word stands out.

1746

01:35:08.800 --> 01:35:11.500

I mean the majority of them might be just have

1747

01:35:11.500 --> 01:35:14.200

to be private. I think

1748

01:35:14.200 --> 01:35:17.700

I don't know the detail but I suspect is the way

1749

01:35:17.700 --> 01:35:19.100

it is some of the streets.

1750

01:35:19.800 --> 01:35:22.600

That are referred to are in

1751

01:35:22.600 --> 01:35:23.600

fact private rates.

1752

01:35:25.100 --> 01:35:28.100

But I don't know the detail. Obviously the private access one is I don't

1753

01:35:28.100 --> 01:35:31.600

know about which of the others are private. Yes, right, there shouldn't

1754

01:35:31.600 --> 01:35:34.400

be any difficulty in clarifying the position within that column.

1755

01:35:34.400 --> 01:35:35.300

Yep.

1756

01:35:36.100 --> 01:35:37.400

Okay, good. Thank you very much.

1757

01:35:42.900 --> 01:35:45.600

Right, so just looking at schedule

1758

01:35:45.600 --> 01:35:47.900

12 protective Provisions in general.

1759

01:35:48.800 --> 01:35:53.100

Are there any particular points that need

1760

01:35:52.100 --> 01:35:53.700

to be raised?

1761

01:35:56.600 --> 01:35:57.200

at the moment

1762

01:36:01.200 --> 01:36:03.800

If not, we'll move on to.

1763

01:36:05.600 --> 01:36:09.000

Schedule 13 discharge if

1764

01:36:08.300 --> 01:36:11.400

requirements. They're on schedule 12. Should

1765

01:36:11.400 --> 01:36:15.200

we provide an update on PPS and

1766

01:36:15.200 --> 01:36:18.500

where they've been agreed and not agreed in our written

1767

01:36:18.500 --> 01:36:18.700

summary.

1768

01:36:19.500 --> 01:36:22.500

Because otherwise, I'll just be reading out a list that will

1769

01:36:22.500 --> 01:36:24.700

be very helpful. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Tony.

1770

01:36:26.100 --> 01:36:29.700

So on schedule 12 part 8 which

1771

01:36:29.700 --> 01:36:32.000

on your agenda was a separate item, which is

1772

01:36:32.100 --> 01:36:35.500

why I was silent when you were dealing with your the general

1773

01:36:35.500 --> 01:36:38.300

point. So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council

1774

01:36:38.300 --> 01:36:41.900

simply to say that there has been fruitful dialogue between

1775

01:36:41.900 --> 01:36:44.100

the County Council.

1776

01:36:45.200 --> 01:36:47.200

and the applicant

1777

01:36:48.800 --> 01:36:51.500

Yes, we think the position has

1778

01:36:51.500 --> 01:36:54.400

now been reached that subject to some changes

1779

01:36:54.400 --> 01:36:57.800

which have been suggested to us by the applicant.

1780

01:36:57.800 --> 01:37:00.500

But obviously which don't yet reflect in

1781

01:37:00.500 --> 01:37:05.000

the version of the order that you have that resolves

1782

01:37:04.300 --> 01:37:07.000

the protective provisions of for the

1783

01:37:07.300 --> 01:37:09.800

County Council in terms of drainage matters, right?

1784

01:37:12.600 --> 01:37:15.800

That's good. Thank you very much for that, Mr. Bedford.

1785

01:37:20.100 --> 01:37:23.300

So yes, does anybody have any issues with the

1786

01:37:23.300 --> 01:37:25.800

discharge of requirements scheduled 13?

1787

01:37:28.100 --> 01:37:31.500

Big so we have

1788

01:37:31.500 --> 01:37:34.300

looking at the net sorry, Michael Bedford County. So we

1789

01:37:34.300 --> 01:37:38.300

have looking at the notes. I've been some very potential pedantic

1790

01:37:37.300 --> 01:37:40.100

minor drafting points, which

1791

01:37:40.100 --> 01:37:43.600

I think are much better. We just passed those to the applicant. I

1792

01:37:43.600 --> 01:37:46.900

don't think there's anything that would benefit your illumination to

1793

01:37:46.900 --> 01:37:49.400

outline those very minor drafting

1794

01:37:49.400 --> 01:37:51.100

points. Okay. Thank you very much.

1795

01:37:53.300 --> 01:37:56.900

Right. Well the the outstanding item.

1796

01:37:58.200 --> 01:38:01.500

as far as I can see to look at is the fees schedule

1797

01:38:01.500 --> 01:38:04.400

that's proposed by The District councils in

1798

01:38:04.400 --> 01:38:07.900  
relation to the discharge of requirements and

1799

01:38:07.900 --> 01:38:10.300  
both the East Cambridgeshire and

1800

01:38:10.300 --> 01:38:13.300  
West Suffolk have produced a fee schedule

1801

01:38:13.300 --> 01:38:16.500  
and I think it's in

1802

01:38:17.300 --> 01:38:18.400  
identical form

1803

01:38:19.200 --> 01:38:24.300  
and so that sets out the various fees. So

1804

01:38:23.300 --> 01:38:26.200  
those are agreed one with another

1805

01:38:26.200 --> 01:38:29.000  
as far as the districts are concerned. Yes, as far

1806

01:38:29.300 --> 01:38:31.700  
as we are concerned it's agreed and the only

1807

01:38:32.900 --> 01:38:35.600  
small perhaps detail is maximum

1808

01:38:35.600 --> 01:38:38.300  
fee of 300,000 and we've agreed that it's split.

1809

01:38:39.100 --> 01:38:40.900  
150,000 each

1810

01:38:41.600 --> 01:38:45.800  
But I don't think that that is yet agreed with

1811

01:38:44.800 --> 01:38:46.800  
the applicant.

1812

01:38:49.700 --> 01:38:52.100

Right. Okay, I'll go

1813

01:38:52.100 --> 01:38:55.900

to Mr. Attorney then and ask him what his clients' reaction

1814

01:38:55.900 --> 01:38:58.200

to that is Richard only for

1815

01:38:58.200 --> 01:39:02.300

the app. You know, that that's not it's not agreed the rationale

1816

01:39:01.300 --> 01:39:04.400

that's been put forward is I

1817

01:39:04.400 --> 01:39:07.300

think broadly based on sizewell C which we say is a project

1818

01:39:07.300 --> 01:39:12.000

of completely different level of complexity the

1819

01:39:10.800 --> 01:39:14.500

suggested references

1820

01:39:13.500 --> 01:39:17.000

to the approval of reserved matters

1821

01:39:16.300 --> 01:39:20.200

under a planning application is inapt

1822

01:39:19.200 --> 01:39:22.500

because of the level of detail that's

1823

01:39:22.500 --> 01:39:26.600

been secured at this stage and the

1824

01:39:25.600 --> 01:39:28.400

two made

1825



01:39:29.200 --> 01:39:32.400  
solar dca's don't require the payment

1826  
01:39:32.400 --> 01:39:35.000  
of fees for the approval of details at all.

1827  
01:39:35.800 --> 01:39:38.500  
Notwithstanding that position which the secretary

1828  
01:39:38.500 --> 01:39:41.200  
of state is found to be acceptable on two other solar Farms.

1829  
01:39:41.200 --> 01:39:46.100  
We're willing to agree a fee schedule which provides

1830  
01:39:45.100 --> 01:39:48.900  
for a approval fees

1831  
01:39:48.900 --> 01:39:51.300  
in respect of

1832  
01:39:51.300 --> 01:39:57.600  
discharge of requirements, but we

1833  
01:39:55.600 --> 01:39:58.700  
don't see

1834  
01:39:58.700 --> 01:40:01.500  
that the sort of quantum

1835  
01:40:01.500 --> 01:40:02.500  
of fees here which

1836  
01:40:04.900 --> 01:40:05.800  
I don't know whether it was.

1837  
01:40:06.800 --> 01:40:09.200  
300,000 or 600,000 but it's

1838  
01:40:09.200 --> 01:40:11.700  
it's too much and we won't be agreeing.

1839

01:40:12.300 --> 01:40:15.500  
the count of speed schedule so

1840

01:40:18.800 --> 01:40:21.500  
Essentially that's our response to it. We will

1841

01:40:21.500 --> 01:40:25.100  
propose that the schedule we have

1842

01:40:25.100 --> 01:40:28.100  
today's hits in the council. We're miles apart on

1843

01:40:28.100 --> 01:40:31.400  
it, but I think at the moment will be

1844

01:40:31.400 --> 01:40:34.700  
our fee schedule for inclusion. And so as

1845

01:40:34.700 --> 01:40:38.900  
a matter of principle, then you there's an

1846

01:40:38.900 --> 01:40:41.000  
agreement that in principle. There should be

1847

01:40:41.200 --> 01:40:44.500  
a fee schedule is is agreed that

1848

01:40:44.500 --> 01:40:46.400  
it should be inserted into the dco.

1849

01:40:47.900 --> 01:40:50.600  
Yes, and therefore that will go as

1850

01:40:50.600 --> 01:40:54.600  
a what as an addendum to to schedule 13

1851

01:40:54.600 --> 01:40:59.300  
then I suppose yes. Okay. It's right.

1852

01:40:59.300 --> 01:41:02.600

So so it's just a point of clarification and

1853

01:41:02.600 --> 01:41:05.400

we can put this in our submissions. I hear what my learner says.  
Well

1854

01:41:05.400 --> 01:41:06.300

one of the things that was being

1855

01:41:07.700 --> 01:41:11.400

disputed before was that

1856

01:41:10.400 --> 01:41:13.300

we had mentioned it as

1857

01:41:13.300 --> 01:41:15.800

being a sight area as opposed to a solar farm.

1858

01:41:16.900 --> 01:41:20.300

But the point there being whether it was a site

1859

01:41:19.300 --> 01:41:22.400

area calculation or whether

1860

01:41:22.400 --> 01:41:25.600

it was the solar panel sort of fees.

1861

01:41:26.500 --> 01:41:28.200

That maximum still comes out the same.

1862

01:41:32.400 --> 01:41:35.200

Okay. I tell a bit reluctant

1863

01:41:35.200 --> 01:41:35.700

to get.

1864

01:41:36.600 --> 01:41:37.300

involved in

1865

01:41:41.500 --> 01:41:44.800

the criteria for that if the criteria

1866

01:41:44.800 --> 01:41:45.700  
is still being

1867

01:41:46.600 --> 01:41:47.300  
discussed

1868

01:41:49.700 --> 01:41:51.100  
so Richie, boric Wester for

1869

01:41:52.500 --> 01:41:52.700  
gun cycle

1870

01:41:53.400 --> 01:41:56.200  
that what Mr. Mohammed Said is

1871

01:41:56.200 --> 01:41:59.700  
in terms of the revised gap of 150,000 and

1872

01:41:59.700 --> 01:42:02.400  
we've heard what Mr. Johnny has said and

1873

01:42:02.400 --> 01:42:05.100  
we will respond in writing so because I still need

1874

01:42:05.100 --> 01:42:05.800  
to take instructions.

1875

01:42:07.500 --> 01:42:08.100  
All right. Well

1876

01:42:10.400 --> 01:42:11.100  
does helpful. Thank you.

1877

01:42:13.300 --> 01:42:16.000  
So because is it realistic to expect?

1878

01:42:17.100 --> 01:42:19.300  
You know will be approaching.

1879

01:42:20.600 --> 01:42:23.300

approaching agreement by deadline 7 at this

1880

01:42:24.100 --> 01:42:27.200

No, right. I don't want people to optimism

1881

01:42:27.200 --> 01:42:30.100

we've had a very positive engagement so far,

1882

01:42:30.100 --> 01:42:33.400

but I think this is an area where if they continue to say, they

1883

01:42:33.400 --> 01:42:36.800

want 300,000 for detailed design approvals. The

1884

01:42:36.800 --> 01:42:39.200

answer will be no. Well in in that case

1885

01:42:39.200 --> 01:42:43.300

then I could I just ask that the councils

1886

01:42:42.300 --> 01:42:43.600

to

1887

01:42:44.400 --> 01:42:45.000

think about

1888

01:42:45.900 --> 01:42:48.400

What would help us to

1889

01:42:48.400 --> 01:42:51.000

appreciate what is?

1890

01:42:52.400 --> 01:42:55.000

the proper and appropriate amounts that we

1891

01:42:55.900 --> 01:42:57.800

might agree should be

1892

01:42:58.900 --> 01:43:01.300

recommended to be included in the order.

1893

01:43:07.600 --> 01:43:08.000

right

1894

01:43:13.500 --> 01:43:17.300

Okay, right. Does

1895

01:43:16.300 --> 01:43:18.700

anybody else have any points?

1896

01:43:20.100 --> 01:43:23.400

On the dco that they want to raise at this stage.

1897

01:43:26.300 --> 01:43:29.300

No, thank you. It's my colleagues

1898

01:43:29.300 --> 01:43:30.300

wish to.

1899

01:43:32.800 --> 01:43:33.400

had anything

1900

01:43:35.100 --> 01:43:36.000

Thank you very much.

1901

01:43:37.100 --> 01:43:41.200

So that completes

1902

01:43:40.200 --> 01:43:44.100

a gender item six going on

1903

01:43:44.100 --> 01:43:47.100

to a gender item 7 any other matters that

1904

01:43:47.100 --> 01:43:49.500

the examining Authority may wish to consider.

1905

01:43:50.400 --> 01:43:53.200

I don't have any myself at this

1906

01:43:53.200 --> 01:43:53.600  
stage.

1907

01:43:56.300 --> 01:43:58.500  
But just tense my colleagues anything you wish to.

1908

01:43:59.600 --> 01:44:01.200  
Raise the moment. No. Thank you.

1909

01:44:06.600 --> 01:44:08.800  
before I move on to the agenda item 8

1910

01:44:11.300 --> 01:44:15.000  
since you're here, is there anything that that is a

1911

01:44:14.200 --> 01:44:17.000  
burning issue? That's not on the

1912

01:44:17.600 --> 01:44:20.100  
agenda that it will be helpful to for us to know

1913

01:44:20.100 --> 01:44:24.300  
about bearing in mind that this is the the last last hearing.

1914

01:44:25.800 --> 01:44:26.500  
scheduled

1915

01:44:28.500 --> 01:44:31.600  
No, good. Thank you. So a gender

1916

01:44:31.600 --> 01:44:33.600  
item 8 next steps.

1917

01:44:35.300 --> 01:44:38.800  
The only thing I well we'll check

1918

01:44:38.800 --> 01:44:41.900  
the transcripts and we'll publish the action points arising

1919

01:44:41.900 --> 01:44:45.500

from that early next week so

1920

01:44:44.500 --> 01:44:47.300  
that will that will deal

1921

01:44:47.300 --> 01:44:47.700  
with that.

1922

01:44:49.000 --> 01:44:49.300  
and

1923

01:44:50.700 --> 01:44:54.200  
yes bridge to any of the applicant. Can I just there was

1924

01:44:54.200 --> 01:44:55.400  
a there was an exchange earlier about?

1925

01:44:56.900 --> 01:44:59.600  
The approach to the the demp

1926

01:44:59.600 --> 01:45:03.200  
and long term retention. Yes, I think.

1927

01:45:04.300 --> 01:45:07.500  
As we concluded that you sort of left it with Mr. Bedford.

1928

01:45:07.500 --> 01:45:10.200  
I think we should own that drafting in

1929

01:45:10.200 --> 01:45:14.400  
the first instance so slightly strange

1930

01:45:14.400 --> 01:45:17.400  
request. But when you come to write your actions, can you direct  
that action

1931

01:45:17.400 --> 01:45:20.800  
at the at the applicant in the first place will provide

1932

01:45:20.800 --> 01:45:23.200  
our draft with the content of which I've already



1933

01:45:23.200 --> 01:45:24.000  
discussed at high level.

1934

01:45:24.700 --> 01:45:25.500  
With Mr. Bedford

1935

01:45:26.400 --> 01:45:29.200  
that can include consideration of whether the required the

1936

01:45:29.200 --> 01:45:32.700  
decommissioning Environmental Management plan requirement is  
changed and

1937

01:45:32.700 --> 01:45:35.300  
we'll send it to him and then he can comment on it rather than

1938

01:45:35.300 --> 01:45:38.500  
the other way around right? I mean, this is an area where you've  
had some productive

1939

01:45:38.500 --> 01:45:42.000  
discussions I recall so and but

1940

01:45:41.200 --> 01:45:43.000  
this is deadline seven.

1941

01:45:44.900 --> 01:45:47.400  
Action point isn't it? So yes,

1942

01:45:47.400 --> 01:45:50.300  
I think we should Endeavor to provide it to Mr. Bedford

1943

01:45:50.300 --> 01:45:53.600  
before deadline. Yes. That's right. Yes. So, is that

1944

01:45:53.600 --> 01:45:56.500  
right you so Mike Bradford

1945

01:45:56.500 --> 01:45:59.400  
Suffolk County Council. If Mr. Turney is happy to put his shoulder

1946

01:45:59.400 --> 01:46:03.800

to the wheel. I'm not going to insist that

1947

01:46:03.800 --> 01:46:04.700

we do it first.

1948

01:46:06.200 --> 01:46:08.600

Okay, so hopefully then you can provide.

1949

01:46:10.500 --> 01:46:13.400

Something to Mr. Bedford and meaningfully for

1950

01:46:13.400 --> 01:46:16.200

a response then to be

1951

01:46:16.200 --> 01:46:17.700

provided by deadline 7. Thank you.

1952

01:46:18.800 --> 01:46:21.300

Okay, good now so the other

1953

01:46:21.300 --> 01:46:23.500

issue which I'll raise.

1954

01:46:26.300 --> 01:46:29.300

Quite briefly is that in light of what's been

1955

01:46:29.300 --> 01:46:33.000

said by Mr. Bedford about the

1956

01:46:32.400 --> 01:46:35.000

the wording of

1957

01:46:35.200 --> 01:46:37.400

the dco in terms of

1958

01:46:39.500 --> 01:46:40.500

making provision

1959

01:46:41.400 --> 01:46:42.700  
for the eventual

1960  
01:46:44.100 --> 01:46:47.800  
deletion of parcel or

1961  
01:46:47.800 --> 01:46:48.700  
Parcels from the

1962  
01:46:49.700 --> 01:46:50.900  
from the order limits

1963  
01:46:53.100 --> 01:46:56.600  
what we have minded to

1964  
01:46:56.600 --> 01:46:59.600  
do is to adjust the

1965  
01:46:59.600 --> 01:47:00.200  
timetable.

1966  
01:47:01.500 --> 01:47:03.600  
and we'll review that and

1967  
01:47:04.700 --> 01:47:07.600  
make a decision on that early next week,

1968  
01:47:07.600 --> 01:47:09.300  
but

1969  
01:47:10.600 --> 01:47:12.000  
what we have in mind.

1970  
01:47:14.100 --> 01:47:15.500  
and I'll just

1971  
01:47:17.200 --> 01:47:20.400  
mention this now in case

1972  
01:47:20.400 --> 01:47:23.600  
there are people have comments about

1973

01:47:23.600 --> 01:47:26.700

it. Our let's say

1974

01:47:26.700 --> 01:47:29.600

the examining authorities commentary on or schedule

1975

01:47:29.600 --> 01:47:33.800

of changes to the draft seat dco is due

1976

01:47:33.800 --> 01:47:36.000

on Thursday the 23rd of February.

1977

01:47:40.300 --> 01:47:40.600

and the

1978

01:47:41.900 --> 01:47:42.500

county

1979

01:47:44.500 --> 01:47:48.200

Council is producing wording for the dco by

1980

01:47:47.200 --> 01:47:49.200

deadline 7.

1981

01:47:50.100 --> 01:47:53.400

Proposed wording for the dco by deadline 7,

1982

01:47:53.400 --> 01:47:57.400

which is Friday the 3rd of March. So essentially

1983

01:47:56.400 --> 01:47:59.700

I we're minded

1984

01:47:59.700 --> 01:48:00.400

to make three.

1985

01:48:01.400 --> 01:48:04.300

Specific changes to the timetable the first is to

1986

01:48:04.300 --> 01:48:04.600  
move.

1987  
01:48:05.800 --> 01:48:06.000  
the

1988  
01:48:07.200 --> 01:48:11.000  
examining authorities commentary on the dco to

1989  
01:48:10.100 --> 01:48:12.100  
the 10th of March.

1990  
01:48:15.500 --> 01:48:16.500  
the second

1991  
01:48:17.600 --> 01:48:21.100  
change will be to move from deadline

1992  
01:48:20.100 --> 01:48:21.600  
7.

1993  
01:48:23.200 --> 01:48:27.400  
The provision for comments on the excess commentary

1994  
01:48:26.400 --> 01:48:29.300  
on the dco to move

1995  
01:48:29.300 --> 01:48:32.400  
that to Friday the 17th of

1996  
01:48:32.400 --> 01:48:32.800  
March.

1997  
01:48:33.700 --> 01:48:34.800  
at noon

1998  
01:48:41.300 --> 01:48:44.100  
and then the Third change would be to

1999  
01:48:45.200 --> 01:48:47.200  
extend the

2000

01:48:48.900 --> 01:48:51.500  
final dco to be

2001

01:48:51.500 --> 01:48:54.600  
submitted by the applicant. Whereas that's deadline eight.

2002

01:48:55.400 --> 01:48:59.800  
If that is moved to Friday, March 24th

2003

01:48:58.800 --> 01:49:01.900  
that will

2004

01:49:01.900 --> 01:49:05.100  
provide time for the applicant to

2005

01:49:04.100 --> 01:49:07.500  
consider everything in

2006

01:49:07.500 --> 01:49:08.000  
the round.

2007

01:49:09.900 --> 01:49:13.400  
Before the examination closes there

2008

01:49:12.400 --> 01:49:17.000  
is in any event no real opportunity

2009

01:49:15.100 --> 01:49:18.600  
for comments on

2010

01:49:18.600 --> 01:49:21.600  
the final dco produced by the applicant.

2011

01:49:23.800 --> 01:49:27.400  
There's a very small window between the

2012

01:49:27.400 --> 01:49:30.500  
13th and the 28th in case

2013

01:49:30.500 --> 01:49:33.200  
we wanted to to ask anything but

2014

01:49:36.600 --> 01:49:39.800  
that I mean the GC0 at the end of the days for the applicant to

2015

01:49:39.800 --> 01:49:43.400  
to produce and it's entirely

2016

01:49:43.400 --> 01:49:48.000  
up to the applicant in what

2017

01:49:47.300 --> 01:49:50.400  
in which way it wants to

2018

01:49:50.400 --> 01:49:52.500  
submit the final version.

2019

01:49:55.200 --> 01:49:58.300  
But at the same time, I think it's right that

2020

01:49:58.300 --> 01:49:58.600  
we

2021

01:49:59.600 --> 01:50:00.900  
take account of

2022

01:50:01.800 --> 01:50:03.500  
the county council's

2023

01:50:06.600 --> 01:50:10.900  
wording that's to be provided before we make any

2024

01:50:10.900 --> 01:50:13.200  
commentary on changes that we would like to

2025

01:50:13.200 --> 01:50:13.500  
see.

2026

01:50:14.600 --> 01:50:19.400  
and then as I say given opportunity for all

2027

01:50:18.400 --> 01:50:21.800

interested parties to make comments

2028

01:50:21.800 --> 01:50:24.500

on on that and so

2029

01:50:24.500 --> 01:50:27.200

we we just say we'd move the comments on that

2030

01:50:27.200 --> 01:50:27.800

from the

2031

01:50:28.500 --> 01:50:31.500

Deadline 7 until Friday the 17th of

2032

01:50:31.500 --> 01:50:32.000

March.

2033

01:50:34.000 --> 01:50:34.300

and

2034

01:50:37.400 --> 01:50:38.100

does anybody have any?

2035

01:50:39.600 --> 01:50:42.100

objection to wave proceeding on that

2036

01:50:55.700 --> 01:50:58.000

so rich at any for the applicant if I might just

2037

01:51:00.300 --> 01:51:03.200

suggest and ask the

2038

01:51:03.200 --> 01:51:04.800

County Council for their position on this

2039

01:51:09.500 --> 01:51:09.700

we

2040



01:51:11.200 --> 01:51:14.700  
I think in the in the agenda in the timetable that

2041  
01:51:14.700 --> 01:51:15.800  
you've just read out.

2042  
01:51:16.900 --> 01:51:19.700  
We would not have an opportunity to count to comment

2043  
01:51:19.700 --> 01:51:20.600  
on the councils.

2044  
01:51:21.500 --> 01:51:24.900  
DCA wording before you give

2045  
01:51:24.900 --> 01:51:26.000  
your commentary

2046  
01:51:28.100 --> 01:51:30.400  
so might it be appropriate for

2047  
01:51:31.300 --> 01:51:34.800  
the council to propose their

2048  
01:51:34.800 --> 01:51:37.400  
wording. I think Mr. Bedford said

2049  
01:51:37.400 --> 01:51:41.300  
he already had something in mind when he

2050  
01:51:40.300 --> 01:51:43.300  
spoke to this issue yesterday if they

2051  
01:51:43.300 --> 01:51:44.300  
were to give that wording.

2052  
01:51:46.200 --> 01:51:49.300  
On say the 24th of

2053  
01:51:49.300 --> 01:51:50.300  
February in a week's time.

2054

01:51:51.900 --> 01:51:54.600

Then we can deal with it a deadline seven and

2055

01:51:54.600 --> 01:51:55.600

you can have both.

2056

01:51:56.600 --> 01:51:59.700

The wording from Mr. Bedford

2057

01:51:59.700 --> 01:52:02.300

and our comments on it when you

2058

01:52:02.300 --> 01:52:05.300

come to give your commentary a week after

2059

01:52:05.300 --> 01:52:05.400

that.

2060

01:52:08.300 --> 01:52:11.100

I don't if Mr. Bedford can I'm not suggesting you need to

2061

01:52:11.100 --> 01:52:14.300

change your timetable to do that or give a formal

2062

01:52:14.300 --> 01:52:17.800

procedure or decision. But if Mr. Bedford's side

2063

01:52:17.800 --> 01:52:20.100

could help us on in that respect. I think that

2064

01:52:20.100 --> 01:52:21.700

means we don't get into position where

2065

01:52:22.600 --> 01:52:23.300

we receive your

2066

01:52:24.300 --> 01:52:27.200

we're just bring this bit further forward so that your

2067

01:52:27.200 --> 01:52:30.000  
commentary can take into account are initial View at least

2068  
01:52:30.300 --> 01:52:31.400  
on Mr. Bedford twirling.

2069  
01:52:33.200 --> 01:52:36.300  
Well, I mean, it's likely that we

2070  
01:52:36.300 --> 01:52:36.600  
will.

2071  
01:52:38.700 --> 01:52:42.900  
I mean, it's likely that in the commentary

2072  
01:52:42.900 --> 01:52:45.300  
our commentary on the draft seat dco will

2073  
01:52:45.300 --> 01:52:48.400  
have to move to to take account of

2074  
01:52:48.400 --> 01:52:51.900  
the changes but proposed changes. So after

2075  
01:52:51.900 --> 01:52:54.500  
that it's a question of just devising a

2076  
01:52:54.500 --> 01:52:58.300  
you know, a fair timetable. That's

2077  
01:52:57.300 --> 01:53:00.500  
it. So I think it's it's everything stays the

2078  
01:53:00.500 --> 01:53:04.300  
same as you've just read out in your gesture, which is that your  
commentaries

2079  
01:53:03.300 --> 01:53:06.000  
move from the 23rd of February to the

2080  
01:53:06.300 --> 01:53:09.200

10th of March so that you're able to take him to count deadline

2081

01:53:09.200 --> 01:53:12.900

seven submissions. It's just that that the

2082

01:53:12.900 --> 01:53:15.200

as unless Mr.

2083

01:53:15.200 --> 01:53:17.500

Bedford can get us his wording earlier.

2084

01:53:18.300 --> 01:53:21.700

You won't be taking count of our view on Mr. Bedford's wording.

2085

01:53:21.700 --> 01:53:24.400

So it's just whether he can bring that forward by

2086

01:53:24.400 --> 01:53:24.700

week.

2087

01:53:26.600 --> 01:53:29.500

Well, okay, I don't

2088

01:53:29.500 --> 01:53:30.400

know but

2089

01:53:34.300 --> 01:53:38.500

so in principle, we think

2090

01:53:38.500 --> 01:53:40.300

that that should be achievable.

2091

01:53:42.600 --> 01:53:45.200

the person who might be doing some of

2092

01:53:45.200 --> 01:53:48.300

that drafting isn't in the room, but we

2093

01:53:49.900 --> 01:53:52.900

I think that that would probably help the

2094

01:53:52.900 --> 01:53:55.200  
process because I say we can we can

2095

01:53:55.200 --> 01:53:57.100  
understand the applicants.

2096

01:53:57.700 --> 01:54:00.800  
position that they would like to inform you

2097

01:54:01.800 --> 01:54:02.800  
of their position

2098

01:54:03.600 --> 01:54:05.500  
On what we say?

2099

01:54:07.100 --> 01:54:07.400  
and

2100

01:54:09.100 --> 01:54:12.400  
if that happens at deadline seven, then you

2101

01:54:12.400 --> 01:54:15.900  
can take that into account at your revised deadline for

2102

01:54:15.900 --> 01:54:18.600  
your commentary on the the dco.

2103

01:54:19.500 --> 01:54:23.300  
Whereas obviously if our material

2104

01:54:22.300 --> 01:54:24.900  
doesn't emerge until deadline 7.

2105

01:54:25.700 --> 01:54:28.200  
As Mr. Tony rightly says you won't know

2106

01:54:28.200 --> 01:54:31.500  
what the applicant's position is. Yes, and Friday

2107

01:54:31.500 --> 01:54:34.100

of next week should be

2108

01:54:34.100 --> 01:54:35.100  
achievable to us.

2109

01:54:37.300 --> 01:54:40.000  
Well, that's helpful Mr. Bedford. Thank you.

2110

01:54:42.300 --> 01:54:45.200  
I'm not going to suggest that the parents going

2111

01:54:45.200 --> 01:54:48.200  
to make a decision today, but we will

2112

01:54:48.200 --> 01:54:51.700  
consider it very carefully over the weekend and Monday

2113

01:54:51.700 --> 01:54:54.300  
Tuesday. I suspect ran the early

2114

01:54:54.300 --> 01:54:55.700  
next week. We'll we'll

2115

01:54:56.700 --> 01:54:59.600  
will set that in motion then.

2116

01:55:01.300 --> 01:55:02.900  
Okay, so we leave that there then.

2117

01:55:05.600 --> 01:55:08.000  
Good any other issues?

2118

01:55:08.900 --> 01:55:10.000  
to raise

2119

01:55:11.400 --> 01:55:11.800  
no.

2120

01:55:13.500 --> 01:55:14.700  
Good, right, well.

2121

01:55:16.600 --> 01:55:19.700

Just to say thank you very much everyone for

2122

01:55:19.700 --> 01:55:23.200

your participation and contributions. We will

2123

01:55:22.200 --> 01:55:26.400

consider everything

2124

01:55:25.400 --> 01:55:28.400

that's been said and review the

2125

01:55:28.400 --> 01:55:29.100

written material.

2126

01:55:30.100 --> 01:55:33.000

And if we find it necessary to pursue matters.

2127

01:55:35.900 --> 01:55:38.300

Further in relation to things that

2128

01:55:38.300 --> 01:55:41.200

aren't scheduled in the timetable then we

2129

01:55:41.200 --> 01:55:45.700

do have the rule 17 further information procedure which

2130

01:55:44.700 --> 01:55:47.100

which may be utilized.

2131

01:55:49.900 --> 01:55:52.800

I'd thank the case team for supporting the

2132

01:55:52.800 --> 01:55:56.200

hearings today and throughout the examination particularly

2133

01:55:55.200 --> 01:55:58.900

Michelle Gregory who's provided enormous

2134

01:55:58.900 --> 01:56:01.200

support to us, and I'm sure to

2135

01:56:02.300 --> 01:56:05.300

to the participants. So thank you Bishop.

2136

01:56:07.800 --> 01:56:10.700

So reminder to submit your post hearing submissions

2137

01:56:10.700 --> 01:56:13.300

and everything else we've asked for

2138

01:56:13.300 --> 01:56:16.900

by deadline 7, which is Friday three, March

2139

01:56:16.900 --> 01:56:18.500

2023.

2140

01:56:20.700 --> 01:56:22.500

so the time is now

2141

01:56:23.800 --> 01:56:27.300

20 to 2 and this issue specific

2142

01:56:26.300 --> 01:56:29.400

hearing is closed. Thank you very much everyone.