

Medworth ISH5_18 May_PT3

Created on: 2023-05-18 12:41:02

Project Length: 01:21:35

File Name: Medworth ISH5_18 May_PT3

File Length: 01:21:35

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:07:23

Check that everyone can see me and hear me clearly.

00:00:09:00 - 00:00:10:12

Yes, we can. Mr. Pinto.

00:00:10:29 - 00:00:51:03

Right. And I can see that we now have the applicant back online. Welcome back. And when. Before we adjourned the hearing, I believe that we were looking at table 7.21 establishing sensitivity of receptors. And there was, um, and there was a question that was asking in relation to competing factors that were mentioned by the applicant, um, in how these were addressed in light of establishing the sensitivity of receptors.

00:00:51:05 - 00:00:56:01

So if I could ask the applicant to continue with that response, please.

00:00:58:09 - 00:01:11:27

Charles Hayne on behalf of the applicant. Um, what, what. There was a break and somebody had put their hands up and we lost power then. So I don't know what, what was said thereafter.

00:01:12:06 - 00:01:31:10

You might, you might have lost power a little bit, a couple of seconds before I thought I did. I did recognize that Mr. Human has wanted to intervene on that point, but I just wanted to give you an opportunity to actually finish the answer to that question. So just acknowledging that. So when you finish, I will bring Mr. Human in.

00:01:31:23 - 00:02:12:19

So, um, it was just to summarize that the, the sensitivities, um, go into the, the matrix to determine the major moderate significance, but irrespective of how it comes out in the sensitivity. So significance matrix, we, we were looking to, to mitigate any significant effects, whether or not strictly speaking the the matrix would compel me to do so or not.

00:02:14:13 - 00:02:14:28

Um.

00:02:15:05 - 00:02:31:18

Right. And could, um. And could you please just, um, explain to me a little bit further in terms of I'm assuming that some professional judgment is used in that and that was you what you're referring to in terms of compelling you to proceed or not?

00:02:32:12 - 00:03:09:01

Um, there is some professional judgment, but we have used the threshold of significance from British standard 5228 Annex A as the the basis for residential receptors. And then there was that bespoke,

um, criterion that we agreed with, with Fenland, which was actually, um, it provides a significant, um, reduction over what the,

00:03:11:03 - 00:03:50:12

the state standard could, could be interpreted to provide to industrial and commercial receptors. So we were comfortable that what we were proposing as, as the criterion and was agreed with fenland is a betterment than could be applied strictly speaking. So that that's where our professional opinion came into, into that. Um, elsewhere it's, we're driven by the, by the predictions and, and guidance as to whether or not to consider them as significant.

00:03:51:07 - 00:03:56:01

Right. Um, thank you for that. Mr.. Hain. Mr.. Human.

00:04:01:04 - 00:04:45:27

Good afternoon, sir. AM My name is Councillor Peter Human. I'm chairman of Wisbech Town Council and I have spoken at the previous meetings we had at the boathouse. Um, I'd like to challenge the applicant on a matter. He's talking about operating theatres. He seemed to minimise the effect the operation would have on the operating theatres at the excellent Hospital and Cromwell Road. Um, there's got full operating facilities there and didn't think the applicant representative, with all due respect, gave enough importance to the effect that the effect on the incinerator while in construction and more importantly once once it's built.

00:04:46:04 - 00:05:05:10

Um, because anybody who's had operations there knows how carefully you have to be going there and coming out of there. And the wonderful facilities they have there, I mean, it's on the doorstep, immediate neighbours and it could form a danger to people having operations. Just a small point, sir, but very important to the people of Wisbech.

00:05:05:26 - 00:05:11:10

Certainly. Thank you very much. Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to reply to this point please?

00:05:14:24 - 00:05:41:15

Giles Hine on behalf of the applicant. We we certainly haven't minimized the importance of the eye clinic. It is attributed as as a high sensitivity receptor, and we have liaised specifically with the management of the site to to determine their vibration requirements. So I don't agree with what the commentator just said.

00:05:42:28 - 00:05:56:14

Thank thanks for that. But can I please press you in terms of can you be a little bit more specific in terms of what sort of liaison you have done and what sort of work has been carried out in order to actually ascertain the impact more fully?

00:05:56:27 - 00:06:35:14

Yes, certainly. We have spoken with the management as to their the construction of of their sites in in both vibration isolation terms and in the the sound insulation properties of the operating theatre. We have looked at the the slab that they're constructed on and considered that in relation to the predicted vibration levels that have been ascertained in relation to five 2 to 8 Part two.

00:06:36:01 - 00:07:11:09

And, and that's the code of practice for construction vibration, which has a mechanism for prediction of impact piling and for rotary and piling. But the, the slab would not quite have completely dealt with the the vibration if if it was impact, but it would have done a very good job of doing so.

00:07:11:11 - 00:07:25:14

So the fact that we've moved well not move from but that we've considered the impact piling and then found that the applicant was already using continuous flight auger piling.

00:07:26:07 - 00:07:41:09

Sorry, just just to clarify for everyone's benefit, when when you mentioned that do actually mean that you have done tests inside the clinic in order to ascertain that? Or how was that method and not made?

00:07:41:11 - 00:08:22:28

We've not done testing in situ. It was the specifications on the slab that they spoke to us. And and this is only in relation to impact piling, which is not on the table. So that that was in the past and we didn't need to, to delve any deeper on that because we were confident that with continuous flight auger piling, which has negligible vibration generally from 20m away from the the screw auger and I've measured negligible levels from continuous flight auger piling.

00:08:23:09 - 00:08:57:02

Um, and the hospital is, is 500m away from the site such that it it's much further out of the study area than would would constitute a something that we would look at normally and it was only because we considered the impact piling might be a, a an option that we even had to look at vibration at the the clinic with, with CFA.

00:08:57:24 - 00:09:18:03

It's not an issue for vibration and irrespective of the fact that they have got an anti vibration slab protecting the the building such that they can carry out very, very sensitive operations, it's not an issue for vibration emission from the site.

00:09:18:27 - 00:09:22:29

So just just to clarify, because this is a particularly technical point.

00:09:25:05 - 00:09:49:19

Im right in saying that, that what you are stating is that actually you have changed some of the methods that originally you were planning on using for the construction of facility, which then means that the impact that you are more confident that perhaps you will before that, that there is not going to be vibration impact on the clinic. If you could just clarify that point, please.

00:09:51:02 - 00:10:19:10

Yes, that is the case. But I just want to clarify that we had assumed that in polling as a consultant, we had assumed that impact polling might take place when we spoke to the applicant as to the potential issues around impact polling. They confirmed to us that they weren't considering impact polling. It was to be so it was our own assessment rather than the driven by the applicant.

00:10:19:16 - 00:10:26:17

Thank you for clarifying that. Can I just ask Mr. Human it would you like to come back on this point or does that answer your question?

00:10:30:27 - 00:10:57:11

That does answer my question, but I still have reservations. When you have a cataract replaced, it's a very sensitive thing and the slightest vibration from anywhere. Be it lorries, transport, anything like that, can obviously cause a major problem in the operating theatre. I just thought the. I just thought that the applicant minutes seemed to minimize the effect with the eye hospital. Thank you, sir.

00:10:58:02 - 00:11:16:13

Thank you. Thank you very much. Uh, I would like. I would ask the applicant to pick up on this point, particularly in terms of, um, the, the impact, not just of construction, but also, um, movement and lorry movement.

00:11:21:27 - 00:12:06:09

Project for the applicant. Just before we move on to that, we were just wondering whether it would be helpful for those listening because appreciate that we've had a number of technical terms being used, but we can provide a very simple explanation of the difference between the different types of construction technique if either yourself or any if that would be helpful to those listening into the hearing to describe the difference between the two types of construction and piling techniques. But if we feel that that that matter is now closed, we can move on to how the applicant has taken a very conservative approach in relation to construction traffic and operational traffic vibration.

00:12:06:11 - 00:12:11:03

And I think, yes, I think that that would be helpful if you could. But yes.

00:12:13:02 - 00:12:21:27

The question in terms of construction, traffic and operational traffic would still remain. So if you could answer that point as well, please.

00:12:23:02 - 00:12:36:00

Care of the applicant. Yes. Mr. Wade will just provide a very brief description of the differences, and then Mr. Hine will go on to explain consideration of construction, traffic and vibration. Thank you. Thank you.

00:12:36:29 - 00:13:10:09

John Wade. For the applicant. The two methods of piling that have been mentioned in Mr. Hines responses percussive piling or impact piling and continuous flight auger piling. The significant difference between them is that impact piling is the old traditional method of piling, which is driving the pile into the ground via a hammer driven device, hydraulic hammer driven device, which would obviously cause quite a significant vibration.

00:13:10:27 - 00:13:46:26

As soon as we knew that there was a sensitive receptor, even being even some distance away, we took the decision to eliminate the possibility of using driven piling and we moved to the continuous flight auger piling, which is a method of installing piles in the ground by drilling into the ground with a rotary auger. The hollow rotary auger concrete is then pumped down the auger as the auger is withdrawn and this forms the pile in the drilled hole.

00:13:47:11 - 00:14:24:12

Once the auger has been taken out, a reinforcing cage is put into the lowered into the concrete before it sets. So as Mr. Haynes said, the the vibration effects of rotary drilling into the ground, particularly with the sort of ground we have on the site, is much less than any sort of percussive piling. So our decision to go to that was driven by recognizing the sensitivity of particularly the eye hospital receptor.

00:14:24:14 - 00:14:29:07

Thank you. And now if we could address the point in terms of operational phase.

00:14:31:23 - 00:15:24:20

An operational phase traffic In terms of the traffic vibration, we we have compared the numbers of HGVs in the traffic assessment with the the baseline traffic traffic counts. There are significant numbers of heavy vehicles accessing Cromwell Road to go to the various industries industrial estates

off wisdom lane um that already pass the eye hospital and it is considered that the eye hospital was constructed with those those baseline levels in mind and that because there is in.

00:15:26:06 - 00:15:47:22

In traffic terms, a negligible increase in significance for noise and vibration. We believe that the existing construction of the hospital will already mitigate any potential increase in vibration from from the site.

00:15:49:00 - 00:16:07:08

Uh, okay. I might want to revisit this point later on. And this item, uh, particularly in terms of um, how the applicant has actually assessed the cumulative impact in terms of all of that, but will, um,

00:16:08:26 - 00:16:42:12

will revisit that point later on. But if I could now bring our attention then to table 7.34 and 7.35 of zero 34, which I believe shows the results of the four one for 2014 initial estimate of impacts for the weekday and weekend periods. So if I could just draw that table to our attention and I'm going to try and share that now as well.

00:17:07:02 - 00:17:47:20

And I hope that you can see my table. I believe that you can. Um. I just wanted to then check. Um. And the applicant. Please talk us through the significance of this table. And I'm looking at table 7.34, and 7.35 is well for weekdays and weekend periods. And considering the sensitivity and the discussions that we have had in terms of the receptors, um, would the applicant please provide us with some information regarding

00:17:49:15 - 00:18:04:04

increases that appeared to be anticipated by the applicant in terms of the initial estimated impact? Um. On those identified receptors.

00:18:08:09 - 00:18:09:06

Uh, yes.

00:18:09:12 - 00:18:12:18

So a job home for the applicants. Um,

00:18:14:05 - 00:18:44:21

British standard for one for two is a standard that has been used for for many, many years. Um, that takes the, the concept of a background noise level, which is the, the underlying noise without the site and that is the, the lowest ten percentile of, of measurements in the absence of, of any activity.

00:18:45:12 - 00:19:25:10

But that can include the, the fact that the site is in an industrial area. And so the the industry is part of that background noise level and and then takes the specific level, which is the the level that we have predicted from the site and rates that with correction penalties for tonality for intermittency and intermittency for impulsivity and and for general character of, of noise outside the, the ordinary.

00:19:26:01 - 00:20:05:04

Um, we have been to the site and we have characterized the, the local area as, as industrial at the nearest receptors. Given that there is significant noise generated from the cold store down the lane as well as from the the wider Wiesen Lane industrial estate. So there hasn't been a rating penalty applied to the specific levels.

00:20:05:19 - 00:20:13:27

Um, the exception to that is during the, the daytime at

00:20:15:25 - 00:20:47:04

the receptors along Newbridge Lane, where we have determined that the addition of traffic between salters way and the the site entrance as well as movements on on the site near to the entrance represents a significant difference to the character of the sound levels that are experienced at those particular receptors.

00:20:47:06 - 00:20:48:25

So the.

00:20:49:02 - 00:20:52:18

And could you please tell me which numbers are those receptors, please?

00:20:52:28 - 00:21:02:21

Those those are receptors two and three which represent nine and ten Newbridge Lane.

00:21:03:07 - 00:21:19:29

Right. Um, and can I just clarify, so the last column that says writing level minus background, I am assuming that that that that column actually represents the additional noise that will be created by the proposal by proposed facility.

00:21:20:04 - 00:21:46:11

That is not correct. That is that is the assessment level for 442, which provides the initial estimate of impact, which we then use to determine significance of impact. But if you turn to tables 7.36 and 7.37, those are the additional noise generated by the the site.

00:21:47:08 - 00:21:57:00

Right. Thank you very much for that clarification. Um, if we then look at table 36 and um.

00:22:04:04 - 00:22:26:10

If we look at table 36 and notice that this table is for weekdays is the table for weekends. It's table 7.37 in page 781, I believe. So that would be the equivalent table but for the weekend prediction rather than weekdays prediction.

00:22:27:02 - 00:22:27:24

Yes.

00:22:27:26 - 00:22:47:27

Yes. Right. So understandably, because of the conversation that we have had before in terms of how sensitivity is defined and how you have actually identified receptors, I believe that all of the receptors that are listed on those on these two tables are receptors are one to our ten.

00:22:50:04 - 00:22:51:00

Is that the case?

00:22:51:15 - 00:22:52:21

That is correct, yes.

00:22:53:02 - 00:23:02:08

Which which as we have seen before. And is set out in table.

00:23:13:18 - 00:23:31:10

I believe you will stay both but 37.30. No apologies. It's table that we have shared before the receptor table. The receptor table that lists all of them. Could you please confirm the name for me, please? The number for me?

00:23:31:27 - 00:23:32:26

Yeah, sure.

00:23:36:17 - 00:23:39:03

That would be table 7.14.

00:23:40:13 - 00:23:40:29

Thank you.

00:23:48:16 - 00:24:20:10

But. Exactly. Thank you very much for that. So this 71.4 is you have just mentioned. Now, obviously, all of the all of the receptors that you have identified, which is receptors 110 are all listed here in terms of residential, which obviously, as we have established before, you have considered as part of your assessment as a medium sensitivity. So can I ask, um.

00:24:22:02 - 00:24:32:23

Why you have included on that specific table are one to our ten and not our 11 to our 15, which are also residential.

00:24:35:04 - 00:24:36:03

Um, that.

00:24:37:22 - 00:25:11:17

That may be a an error on our part. What I would say is that with with the exception of receptors are two and our three, no significant impacts were were determined from operational noise and and the significant impacts from operational noise were particularly in relation to the movements of waste transfer vehicles past the the receptors on on Newbridge Lane.

00:25:11:24 - 00:25:18:09

There were no significant impacts from the operational site itself and plant therein.

00:25:22:08 - 00:25:45:15

And. If I'm going to have to press you on that point, because I do understand that the sites are 11 to are 15 are actually identified as per the distance from the proposed facility, the connection and associated construction activities. Yes.

00:25:45:17 - 00:26:00:22

My my colleague has just pointed out these are receptors in relation to the connection which which are not. They are receptors for construction noise and not operational noise because of the nature of the works.

00:26:02:02 - 00:26:14:14

Right. Okay. Um. So if we go back if we go back to the tables that we were looking at, table 7.36 and table 7.37.

00:26:21:17 - 00:26:22:09

Yes.

00:26:31:02 - 00:26:37:08

It seems to me that these are included in the operational noise.

00:26:39:22 - 00:26:53:19

That is correct. Our one to our ten are operational noise receptors. They are in in the study area for the main site and and access road.

00:26:54:07 - 00:27:06:20

Right. In that case. Can you actually point me to a specific figure where that difference is highlighted in where I can see the location of our 11 to 15 and why it's separate from this table?

00:27:07:27 - 00:27:21:03

Um, I believe that they were in the, um, in the original little receptors that you showed on the first, um, figure that you provided.

00:27:21:22 - 00:27:25:11

Um, it was my.

00:27:27:12 - 00:27:34:17

So you mean figure 7.5 in figure 7.1.

00:27:37:28 - 00:27:42:18

If 7.5 is the work site.

00:27:42:20 - 00:27:45:03

Study area, which is the one that I'm sharing now.

00:27:45:05 - 00:27:47:04

Yes, that's that's right. Yeah.

00:27:47:18 - 00:28:23:25

Right. In that case, I'm afraid I'm going to have to press on this point again because actually, according to the operational noise study area, um, we can see that that figure figure 7.5 includes, for example, R 13, which is right at northern edge of the um, green, um, operational noise study area that you have identified. Therefore, I'm still not 100% clear in terms of why these were not included as part of the assessment.

00:28:39:00 - 00:28:43:18

Can just check that we have not lost the applicant and you are just conferring.

00:28:43:20 - 00:29:22:21

We are just conferring the the answer to your question is that our 13 being on the the outskirts of the the study area, there are receptors that we have included in the assessment that are closer to the the works, to the operational noise from the site itself that are not significant. And so we haven't drawn the assessment out further because if they're not significant at those locations closer to the site, they won't be significant outside.

00:29:22:27 - 00:29:40:27

In that case. My my question again is. That might well be the case. But where can I see the process that you went through in order to make that decision? And if you could point me to that information and where it's clearly laid out within the documents that you have provided.

00:29:42:24 - 00:30:03:09

Within the discussion of methodology in AP 034, we discussed the fact that we were looking at the nearest receptors to the site in all directions. Our 13 is close to the

00:30:05:04 - 00:30:33:25

line of roots, and so we've included that as a construction noise receptor because it's closest to the the works as they progress along. But it is not an operational noise receptor on the basis that it's much further from the works than from the operational site than receptors that we have assessed in between it and the site itself.

00:30:34:20 - 00:30:44:10

But in that case, can I please ask you to point me to the figure where that is clearly set out and where we can actually see the location of those boundaries and the location of those receptors?

00:31:22:11 - 00:31:54:23

So the standard practice in operational noise assessment is that you look to determine the the nearest receptors sensitivity and were they determined as being unacceptable. The study area is expanded to include more receptors to determine where the the limit of acceptability lies.

00:31:55:22 - 00:32:11:18

And because the closest receptors in all directions, with the exception of nine and ten Newbridge Lane, were were not significant. That's where we kept the the assessment focused in on.

00:32:12:03 - 00:32:47:24

Right. Okay. Um, my question is on that specific table you have identified as other residential, other residential receptors in addition to those two. And what I am trying to understand is the. Where can you show me the evidence and your thought process and your consideration in terms of separating receptors are 1 to 10 from our 11 to our 15.

00:32:58:29 - 00:33:21:21

Um, that may not be present in the report, but it is a standard approach. It was agreed with the Fenland District Council. Um, consultant who where, where we did agree receptor locations for for assessment. And we can provide additional information in a.

00:33:22:23 - 00:33:45:14

I was going to suggest that it seems to me that it might be beneficial for us to register an action note for the applicant to provide further information regarding their assessment in relation to those two tables that um. Would be table at.

00:33:49:04 - 00:33:57:11

7.36 and 7.37. Believe. And right. I'll move us on from this point. Um.

00:33:59:01 - 00:34:09:22

In terms of table 7.38 operational noise assessment, non non-residential receptors. And I'm going to try and share that table as well.

00:34:26:10 - 00:34:30:17

This table. If you can confirm to me, please, that you can actually see this table.

00:34:32:21 - 00:34:33:17

Yes, we can. Yes.

00:34:34:07 - 00:35:11:11

Thank you. Thank you very much. So this table sets up the operational noise assessment for non-residential receptors. And as we have seen on the previous table that have highlighted as well. And those receptors are obviously non-residential and receptors are 16 or 25 and are 27 have been classified as having a moderate indicative significance of effects, which are 16 being Books Limited goes away, which is 20m from the site are 25.

00:35:11:13 - 00:35:38:06

The Anglican Community Service Clinic, which is 400m from the site. And then our 27 being can be an Education Foundation learning center, which is 200m from the site. Can the applicant please expand on why it considers that the potential significant effects identified are then not significant as set out in paragraph 7.9. 73?

00:36:04:06 - 00:36:11:05

Collaborate with the applicant. We're just finding the right information and we'll just respond in a moment. So just bear with us one second.

00:36:11:07 - 00:36:11:24

Thank you.

00:36:54:20 - 00:37:00:21

Okay. In terms of the the eye hospital eye clinic, we

00:37:02:17 - 00:37:43:07

had, again, discussions with the the receptor on on the construction of their building. And in terms of the the surgery areas, they are subject to obviously clean room, hygienic ventilation requirements such that they benefit from quite a high level of sound insulation. So that's why it wasn't significant at that location. At the the other two, they are situated within a very noisy industrial area.

00:37:43:13 - 00:37:53:25

And so although we've got some moderate levels of of noise generated, they're still not.

00:37:55:11 - 00:38:06:23

Um, such that it would be a departure from what the the industry locations are currently subjected to.

00:38:07:25 - 00:38:45:19

Uh, but doesn't the applicant consider that in relation to operational noise assessment? Uh, and particularly considering the point that you have made in terms of there is already a certain amount of, uh, of noise experienced in the area. Uh, doesn't the applicant consider that, um, it should look in terms of additional noise created, particularly considering the sensitivity of those particular receptors and it having a moderate indicative significance of effects?

00:38:56:09 - 00:39:01:00

So the assessment has been undertaken on an absolute noise level

00:39:03:05 - 00:39:43:28

basis, which which does not consider the the underlying noise. But what we've tried to what we've tried to do is provide a very, very stringent requirement against which to to assess such that at the point where significance trips over from not significant to significant, um the the levels experienced inside the buildings are still conducive to a normal office or industrial environment.

00:39:44:18 - 00:39:46:26

So mean we can we can claim so we can

00:39:48:16 - 00:39:54:15

describe further in in written submission on exactly that point.

00:39:54:24 - 00:40:08:16

It's it might be helpful, but I also think it's important for me to actually clarify this point here because I think, I think that, um, although I do accept that they are not, um.

00:40:10:03 - 00:40:43:23

A significant apologies. They are not as um. They are not receptors that are identified as particularly sensitive to noise. And I accept that. Nevertheless, I I'm not clearly in fully clear at the moment in terms of how the existing noise, which particularly considering the work that you have carried out in terms of the baseline, was not considered as part of your overall assessment.

00:40:44:04 - 00:41:02:11

So it's it's about the additional noise, any noise that you are creating which will be additional to the existing noise. And my question is, why are we looking at the assessment of just noise that you have created and not the noise that will be existing in the area?

00:41:03:27 - 00:41:39:14

Uh, that's because we would need to actually go and measure inside the, the so the, the receptors buildings, which is not feasible. So we've had to, we've had to come up with a, uh, a methodology that was acceptable to the, to the local authority that gave prominence to, to these low sensitivity receptors whilst having a measurable, um.

00:41:41:02 - 00:41:47:21

Assessment technique to to allow us to to come up with a determination of significance.

00:41:49:13 - 00:42:21:07

And this was the best we could come up with. The there are no criteria for commercial receptors and operational noise. The the best we could use would have been the control of noise at work regulations. But the local authority were very uncomfortable with with that being the method for assessment. So we had to go away and find a a criterion that applied.

00:42:21:09 - 00:42:24:04

And that was the

00:42:26:02 - 00:42:29:19

the levels that were referred to in, in the

00:42:31:10 - 00:43:05:08

assessment itself, the 65 for for offices and and 75 for for industrial units at the back end of the annex in 5228. But it's not a regularly used assessment technique because it's old there just are no suitable criteria that we would normally use for such receptors. And and as such, this is far more detailed than would normally be provided.

00:43:06:14 - 00:43:06:29

And.

00:43:08:11 - 00:43:15:21

Wouldn't the applicant to be able to actually do some sort of modeling from measurements from outside the area?

00:43:17:24 - 00:43:49:05

Because you have just mentioned that you would have to go inside the building. So am I'm trying to actually understand if there would if there is a possibility for us to have some sort of information that would be able to provide us with a little bit more certainty in terms of how existing receptors, which are very close to um, the proposed development. As I have mentioned, one of these is 20m from the site, for example.

00:43:49:15 - 00:43:53:24

And. What the full impact is actually going to be.

00:44:21:25 - 00:45:07:00

So in terms of of such a, a prediction methodology, um, it's, it's feasible that, that we could use detailed monitoring around the industrial site. But a decision was taken that we would agree the methodology with, with FENLAND and it was discussed at length over, over three iterations of discussion that the best way to assess commercial receptors and this was agreed with Fenland District Council as being a robust and and precautionary approach.

00:45:07:23 - 00:45:10:24

So I I'm not sure what else to say.

00:45:13:11 - 00:46:08:20

Sir, if I may. Tim Marks for the applicant. Just to add, as part of those lengthy discussions that we had with Fenland District Council's Environmental Health Officer to agree the methodology and approach to the noise surveys and including reviewing the the assessment work that was carried out by our consultants. This also led to the development within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan, RPP 3023 and refer you to Appendix F the the Construction Noise and Vibration Management plan and also the wider consultation arrangements that are embedded into the outlines construction environmental management plan, where we look to engage with those local businesses and other users within the vicinity of the site so that we can engage with them in the event of any any complaints regarding noise.

00:46:08:26 - 00:46:46:06

Those can be then addressed through the the the structure of the outline construction environmental management plan. And I'll also refer you to appendix seven D, the outline Operational Noise Management plan, which is document reference APG 077, where we have a similar set of procedures and controls and mechanisms to ensure that in the event there were any adverse noise effects, temporary adverse noise effects to those business users on the industrial estate, they can certainly come to us as the operator and discuss those and we can address those points.

00:46:46:08 - 00:47:02:17

So the the kind of general principles that have been put forward in not only the methodology of the approach to the environmental statement, but also the mechanism to secure these controls were agreed at length with defending District Council Environmental Health Officer Thank you.

00:47:03:09 - 00:47:34:02

Thank you very much for that clarification, Mr. Marks And I would then in that case request, um, the applicant, if it is possible to actually submit some information regarding that agreement and those conversations, um, I'm not sure if you need to actually check that information with Fenland District Council, but if we could get an action please, for the applicant to liaise with Fenland District council and then submit that information that would be useful.

00:47:34:26 - 00:47:37:23

Um, is that, is that, is that an agreement?

00:47:38:25 - 00:47:53:18

Clare project for the applicant. We believe that information is already within the application, right, the suite of documents, but we don't have the references to hand. So we will as the action, we will either provide the references or if, if they appear not to be there, we will provide the information.

00:47:53:20 - 00:48:22:12

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. And then the the other issue that that I wanted to raise in relation to this is that, um, um, I have some further questions in terms of monitoring further on. So we will actually pick up on those documents that were mentioned now, but for sake of brevity, I propose that we actually move on. Um, so I wanted us to also have a look at this table still.

00:48:29:04 - 00:48:35:03

At receptors 26 and receptor 28.

00:48:41:21 - 00:48:42:09

Um.

00:48:43:06 - 00:49:11:09

Which are the TB Unity Academy and Thomas Clarkson Academy? Actually, that was my question. Apologies. Um, receptors 26 and 28, which are the Unity Academy and the Thomas Clarkson Academy. Uh, do not feature in this table. Um. Can the applicant please explain why?

00:49:20:18 - 00:49:40:10

Well, they're not in that particular table because they are educational establishments and so they are covered by the standard 442, which the commercial receptors there are not. But I am trying to find a way to the.

00:49:40:12 - 00:49:43:08

Table where that information is laid out. Please.

00:49:43:18 - 00:49:45:27

If you just let me refer to my notes, please.

00:49:46:04 - 00:49:46:20

Sure.

00:50:08:29 - 00:50:16:29

My apologies. The Arth 27 as the Cambrian Academy.

00:50:17:10 - 00:50:25:16

Ah, 26. I believe I might. I'm. I might have my numbers incorrectly, but believe it's our 26 and our 28.

00:50:26:09 - 00:50:29:09

Our 27 is the Cambrian Academy, is it not?

00:50:32:15 - 00:51:01:08

Which is closer to the, um, the, the operational noise and, and in a direct line with both our 26 and 28. So from an operational noise at the the site itself, the AR 27 is covered by those. But in any case, we we have done a four and four to assessment which may not be reported. And so sorry.

00:51:02:02 - 00:51:38:19

If just may Mr.. Hein I, I understand and can see that our 27 is actually included on the table. My question is to do with our 26 and our 28. Which are two educational facilities within the study area

that we have looked at first. Um, and that obviously as we have actually looked at before in terms of sensitivity to effects are it's higher and it's same sensitivity as residential.

00:51:38:21 - 00:51:53:08

So my question is, if we have gone through that table that we did in terms of the assessment for residential, this one be picking up non-residential receptors, why isn't that assessed? Why can't I find the assessment of our 26 or 28.

00:51:54:08 - 00:52:30:20

Claire project for the applicant? Just to clarify because think there might be some confusion. We mentioned before when we were considering why only certain residential receptors were listed in the table and Mr. Hines explained that you, you started to kind of closest point to the facility and then you moved outwards until you found the receptor that did where the noise levels were acceptable. And you then considered that receptor B to be representative of any receptors of a similar nature that were located further away.

00:52:30:22 - 00:53:04:26

So you stop the assessment at that point. The same principle applies for table 7.38 and for receptor 27, which is an educational establishment that has been included within the assessment and that is the closest educational receptor to the proposed development. And because that was considered to be negligible in terms of significant effects, it was not necessary to then consider educational establishments located further away from the proposed development.

00:53:04:28 - 00:53:32:25

But we've already got an action point for explaining in more detail the methodology for tables 7.36 and table 7.37. So I would suggest if you if you are happy with this approach that we also include in that summary table 7.38 so that you have a comprehensive note of the of why certain receptors are listed in that table compared to all of the receptors that were identified in the baseline.

00:53:35:10 - 00:53:35:25

Um.

00:53:36:11 - 00:53:39:26

Thank you. That. That will be helpful. Um.

00:53:41:12 - 00:54:09:17

Finally NDCs. Um, another point that I just wanted to actually pick up very quickly. So figure 7.3. Which believe that am sharing now, which is construction and operational noise study area connection grid connection and could ask the applicant to please talk us through the information included in this specific figure.

00:54:13:10 - 00:54:32:21

Charles Hine for the applicant, the the line that you can see in red are the Ord limits for the grid connection. And and we have applied the the 300 meter study area to to that or to limit.

00:54:34:07 - 00:54:48:06

Thank you. And obviously, you also have plotted noise sensitive receptors within that boundary, long term monitoring locations in short term monitoring locations. Correct?

00:54:49:15 - 00:54:50:16

That is correct.

00:54:50:23 - 00:54:53:26

Right. In that case, can I please ask.

00:54:55:20 - 00:55:08:27

Is. Could you. Could the applicant please talk me through their reasoning in terms of not there being a long term monitoring location? Close to the substation was the substation.

00:55:10:27 - 00:55:28:07

In terms of the operational noise from the substation, and it's generally the operational noise that drives whether we need the level of granularity that a long term monitor would provide.

00:55:29:28 - 00:55:50:09

The the switchgear going into the substation are not considered noise generating equipment. And so it doesn't require a full operational noise assessment. And that's why we've not undertaken long term measurements there. We've undertaken measurements for construction noise.

00:55:52:10 - 00:55:53:24

Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:55:55:11 - 00:56:25:28

And Claire project for the applicant notwithstanding the reasons for for the assessment. During conversations with the host authority, the applicant has amended the outline operational Noise management plan and the draft DCO to provide for noise management to be more measures to be put in place for the substation.

00:56:26:00 - 00:56:41:13

So there was there were some comments raised by the authority in relation to that point and amendments have been made to the outline management plan to address those, but that's obviously taken place subsequent to the information contained in the environmental statement.

00:56:42:24 - 00:57:02:16

Right. Sorry. And I would also again reiterate that the the monitoring locations and the the nature of short term versus long term monitoring monitors was agreed with with both both authorities before deploying.

00:57:04:18 - 00:57:05:06

Thank you.

00:57:07:14 - 00:57:51:11

We I'm planning on further later on in this session actually asking for comments from the local authority on this. So we might revisit this point. But thank you very much for that answer now and for that clarification. Um, I was just wondering if the applicant could please also confirm the role of the outline operational travel noise management plan, and that would be rep one. That's 013 and the outline construction environmental management plan and that to be rep 3023 and their role in managing noise and vibration and how this have been considered as part of the overall implementation of the environmental measures as set out in 711 and how it forms part of the considerations in table 740.

00:57:54:29 - 00:58:28:12

Two marks for the applicant. I'm. I'll take you through the outline. Construction environmental management plan to summarize where we address the construction noise. And then we may refer to other colleagues for further details. But the in general, the Construction Environmental Management Plan encompasses a number of measures to mitigate potential impacts, and this also includes a section on noise and vibration.

00:58:28:18 - 00:59:06:01

I would refer you to appendix F of RRP 3023 for the outline noise and vibration management plan, and this considers the measures that we would employ during construction to minimize and control impacts and where appropriate, if there is a a a noise source, which is I'll call in my term, I'll call it loud, that we have a complaint about, um, there are measures in there to then report it and for us to undertake action, i.e.

00:59:06:03 - 00:59:51:13

a complaints procedure. And this would I'd also refer back to my earlier comment where in terms of the general construction environmental management plan and the commitments within it, that relates to all measures, we will be setting up a community liaison group with and inviting local businesses, the host authorities, which could include the environmental Health officers, the Environment Agency and other interested organizations to be part of that so that there is there would be an open dialogue at that time with the with interested parties, local businesses and members of the public to to to be able to raise any concerns or issues with ourselves.

00:59:52:01 - 01:00:22:26

Um, in a similar vein, we have, um, appendix sorry, the we have the outline operational noise management plan which I referred to earlier. Again, that's appendix 70 of documents app dash 077. And once again, for the operational phase of the development, there are there are a range of control measures which are set out in this document to adequately control noise and vibration matters during operation of the proposed development.

01:00:22:28 - 01:01:01:13

We do also have available today um, our head of construction and also our head of engineering who can provide further sort of details on the day to day, um, real, you know, day to day activities and provide further information on their from their experience. So hopefully that provides some some suitable comforts that we have got a number of management plans to be in place for the duration of construction and for the duration of operation, and these are secured through the draft DCO requirements.

01:01:02:15 - 01:01:03:20

Thank you. Um.

01:01:04:03 - 01:01:27:12

Can I just can I just clarify one point in your answer, please? Mister Marx, you mentioned loud, um, in terms. In terms, in terms of loud, uh, is that going to be linked with any sort of guidance? And is that guidance expected to trigger any sort of monitoring and action?

01:01:27:14 - 01:01:29:05

And what is the action?

01:01:29:07 - 01:01:45:06

Yeah. Tim Marx for the applicant. My apologies, sir. I hold my hands up. I am not a the noise expert here, so I'll perhaps just pass that over in terms of the significance or the threshold to, to to Mr..

01:01:45:08 - 01:01:47:03

HEIN to quantify that. Yes.

01:01:47:29 - 01:01:51:16

Appreciate that. So thank you. I'll pass to Mr. Hein.

01:01:52:24 - 01:02:33:06

Uh, Charles Hein for the applicant in terms of loud, we're looking at the threshold of significance for construction noise as per annex of British standard 5228 part one. Um, there there is a tempering factor relating to the duration of such works whereby if, um, if the works are considered to be above the threshold of significance for less for fewer than ten days, in 14 or 40 days in six months, then they are not significant.

01:02:33:28 - 01:02:50:00

But a decision would be made for those works, whether additional mitigation would need to be put in place to address the the overall sound levels depending on on how loud they were.

01:02:51:00 - 01:02:52:21

And and in terms of what.

01:02:52:23 - 01:03:01:22

Where we can actually see that that requirement is set out. Can can the applicant please confirm where that will be, please?

01:03:01:28 - 01:03:05:24

That is set out in the construction noise management plan.

01:03:06:23 - 01:03:10:29

Thank you. So there will be a reference to the standards that you have mentioned.

01:03:11:28 - 01:03:37:08

Yes. Claire for the applicant, just to provide you with the reference, it's in section three of appendix F. So appendix F is the outlying construction noise and vibration management plan, and that forms part of the outline construction Environmental management plan. It's on page four. The page references F 16, but it forms part of rep 3023.

01:03:38:01 - 01:03:39:21

Thank you for that clarification.

01:03:42:15 - 01:03:44:14

Uh, now, very quickly.

01:03:44:16 - 01:03:51:12

I was just wondering if I could ask the applicant, um, to please, um.

01:03:53:12 - 01:04:13:11

Talk us through a table 7.39, which is summary of significance of adverse effects, particularly those areas in the summary table where construction noise is confirmed to result in effects which are significant and how the applicant proposes to then address this.

01:04:26:01 - 01:05:01:25

Charles Hein for the applicant. So the receptors where construction noise was confirmed to result in effects which were significant were both the receptors in close proximity to the facility itself. Um, and that has been dealt with through the, the mitigation in, in the control.

01:05:01:28 - 01:05:24:26

So in the construction noise management plan, um, and the section 7.10 such that those adverse effects were taken out of significance apart from at receptor two. Number nine.

01:05:26:16 - 01:05:58:26

Newbridge Lane for for information. The the mitigation for most of the receptors relates to. Management practices but for. Number are three number ten Newbridge Lane. We. Determined that an engineered mitigation was the only suitable.

01:05:59:07 - 01:06:08:29

Mitigation available to us. So that formed the acoustic barrier proposed for number ten. Newbridge Lane.

01:06:09:11 - 01:06:09:27

Yes.

01:06:10:00 - 01:06:22:15

And actually wanted to press a little bit more in terms of the acoustic barrier. So you mentioned that that was the most appropriate option that you have. Um.

01:06:23:01 - 01:06:23:17

Did you have.

01:06:23:24 - 01:06:28:10

Considered. Could you actually talk me through that process a little bit, please?

01:06:30:26 - 01:07:01:27

At club project for the applicant just before Mr. Hines goes on to explain that, I just wanted to provide the reference for where the measures are secured in the draft DCA And so requirement 19 of Schedule two to the draft, DCA makes clear that the works to improve new bridge lane may not commence until the residential use at and it refers to the plot numbers but that's number two.

01:07:02:06 - 01:07:32:13

Number nine new bridge lane has ceased, which it currently has, but that's just to confirm that the residential use must be in must not be in the in place at that point when construction commences. And then it and it goes on to say that it can continue to be used for residential purposes until such time as the authorized development is decommissioned. So it covers the whole of construction and operational phase.

01:07:32:25 - 01:07:58:04

And part three, it was a paragraph three of requirement 19 then explains or requires the applicant to put in place the acoustic barrier, which is work number ten prior to construction of the access improvement works to new Bridge lane commencing. So I just wanted to give that context before Mr. Haynes goes on to explain the nature of the barrier. Thank you. Yes.

01:08:00:19 - 01:08:03:09

The operational noise.

01:08:03:11 - 01:08:05:17

Was modelled in.

01:08:05:19 - 01:08:48:21

Proprietary SA modelling software sound plan, which uses ISO nine 603 methodology which which is the standard for noise propagation. And with the the vehicles moving past the the house, it was determined that significant sound levels would be experienced at that receptor that were between 5 and 10dB above the existing ambient noise level.

01:08:48:26 - 01:09:31:09

And that was a confirmed significant effect. So mitigation was considered and the the most appropriate mitigation was determined to be a barrier. We put various orientations and heights of such a screen into the model and we optimized the the barrier so that it achieved the the highest reduction for the the least intrusive city.

01:09:32:02 - 01:09:52:24

And whilst we we haven't got a landscape specialist here now, it did include the the consideration that an infinitely tall barrier would be oppressive. So we've tried to keep the the lowest height.

01:09:52:26 - 01:09:54:14

Profile three meters.

01:09:54:27 - 01:10:26:13

It's three metres tall. Yes. So below three meters it was still giving rise to um, not uh, not significant levels but but still higher than, than we would be comfortable with. So we've opted for a three meter fence as being the, the best compromise between the, the height of the barrier and the sound reduction.

01:10:26:23 - 01:10:27:27

And noise mitigation.

01:10:28:08 - 01:10:44:06

Obviously, as you have alluded to, there are other considerations that we might have to look into in terms of the noise barrier implications. But for the purpose of this item, I'm satisfied with that specific answer. Um, and I ask.

01:10:44:18 - 01:10:45:09

Now if.

01:10:45:11 - 01:10:52:22

Anyone else would like to intervene, I would like to invite, I believe, first of all.

01:10:53:00 - 01:10:53:15

Um.

01:10:54:13 - 01:11:04:06

Miss Wood Hendy from the Borough Council of Kingsland and West Norfolk believe that you have expressed earlier desire to intervene on noise.

01:11:05:21 - 01:11:36:02

Uh, thank you. Other than sorry. Hannah Wood handy for the council. Other than to confirm that, obviously our environmental health officers have been liaising with Fenland colleagues with regard to the outline construction, environmental management plan and concur with, you know, the response from the applicant today in terms of the amendments they are making to that document as they've responded to relevant comments from both authorities. So that's the only position I need to make clear today. Thank you.

01:11:36:19 - 01:11:39:06

Thank you. Thank you very much for that clarification.

01:11:42:24 - 01:11:46:27

Uh. And I asked the.

01:11:47:23 - 01:11:58:21

County Council if county council would like to come in now as well and make any comments in relation to noise.

01:12:01:20 - 01:12:03:08

Uh, Deborah Jenkins.

01:12:21:25 - 01:12:25:07

Hello. I had you for a second.

01:12:25:09 - 01:12:27:13

And then I'm afraid. Okay.

01:12:28:28 - 01:12:32:28

And I'm afraid that we lost connection with you. Mr. Jenkins.

01:12:41:10 - 01:12:42:15

But can I.

01:12:42:17 - 01:12:58:28

Ask if there is anyone else from Kempsey County Council that could provide a city update? Um, not or not. But. But. But in terms of if Ms.. Deborah Jenkins will be able to actually join us and submit a presentation on this specific topic.

01:13:01:22 - 01:13:02:18

Ms.. Hardwood.

01:13:04:11 - 01:13:35:15

Hello? Yes. Laura Hayward, senior environmental health officer for Fenland District Council. We have been looking at the noise reports. Um, I'll introduce myself in the absence of Cambridge. Um. Uh, we. Yes. So I'm. Yes. You're an environmental health officer. Um, referred to as Mrs. Harwood. I'm a member of and registered and have a postgraduate diploma in acoustics and noise Control and a master's in environmental Health.

01:13:36:04 - 01:14:07:00

Um, there was just a few points that I wanted to raise in relation to some of the documents that we've been discussing today. Um, in the outline operational noise management plan, which is rec one zero 13. Um, just wanted to raise that in .615. Um, it states that actions would be taken to mitigate complaints. Um, substantiated by the Environment Agency.

01:14:07:13 - 01:14:24:12

Um, I just wanted to raise that the local authority also have a duty to investigate noise complaints. Um, and would like to request that that's extended. Um, to complaints received by relevant authorities, which would include the local authority as well as the Environment Agency.

01:14:24:28 - 01:14:29:28

Thank you very much for that. Ms.. Hardwood. Can I ask the applicant to comment, please?

01:14:31:15 - 01:14:38:23

Yep. Two marks for the applicant comment Noted. And we're being more than happy to include reference to the environmental health officers.

01:14:41:17 - 01:14:42:12

And is that.

01:14:42:14 - 01:14:44:09

Acceptable? It's hardwood. Yes.

01:14:44:11 - 01:14:45:12

That's fine. Yeah.

01:14:45:26 - 01:14:46:27

Thank you very much.

01:14:47:14 - 01:14:52:01

Um, I. I think that's briefly.

01:14:52:14 - 01:14:57:13

I saw that Mr. Andrew Fraser turned his camera on.

01:14:57:15 - 01:15:03:08

Can I ask if you would like to intervene on behalf of.

01:15:03:10 - 01:15:04:16

Cambridgeshire County Council on this.

01:15:04:18 - 01:15:05:03

Point?

01:15:06:10 - 01:15:11:23

Give me. Sir. I don't know what dropped off there. Um, but no, we can't do.

01:15:12:06 - 01:15:13:22

Can I ask to turn your camera off?

01:15:13:24 - 01:15:18:19

If if that's acceptable. If you have finished your your submission to us. Thank you. Um.

01:15:19:18 - 01:15:21:29

But I do have a further point, but. Okay.

01:15:22:10 - 01:15:23:04

Apologies.

01:15:23:06 - 01:15:34:00

Apologies. In that case, apologies. Mr. Fraser. Can I just ask then? Ms.. Ms. Harwood. Ms.. HARWOOD to actually submit her final point then.

01:15:34:16 - 01:16:18:12

Thank you. Yes. So then I also wanted to raise some I've got two points with the outline construction, environmental management plan, which is reps zero 23 um, in chapter four of the which identifies the noise and vibrating monitoring. Um, it identifies noise measures that they will use, but they um, uh, measures that they will use to monitor noise should there be, um, the requirements do say in this

document they have stated that they will consider monitoring vibration, but chapter four doesn't go on to say, um, any methodologies that they will use to monitor vibration.

01:16:18:26 - 01:16:45:26

Um, they do say in that document as well in paragraph 2.3, point two, that receptor two which we've just been discussing, um, could potentially be impacted by the vibratory rollers that the proposing to use. So I'd like to request that that chapter four is extended from just monitoring noise, but to also monitor vibration in line with 5.28 part B.

01:16:47:04 - 01:16:52:11

Probably going to kill you. Thank you. If I may ask the applicant to reply on Ms.. Harwood's point.

01:16:54:00 - 01:17:14:03

Yes, Tim Marks for the applicant. So the document referred to is the outline construction Environmental Management plan. And this is secured through a requirement where we'll be preparing a detailed construction environmental management plan. So I'm sure those matters would have been picked up, but we'd be more than happy just to update the outline document to make it clear.

01:17:17:02 - 01:17:17:17

How, Howard?

01:17:18:17 - 01:17:22:06

Lovely. Thank you very much. That's that's all my points. Thank you.

01:17:22:15 - 01:17:24:01

Thank you. Thank you very much.

01:17:26:23 - 01:17:27:29

Now, can I just ask if.

01:17:28:01 - 01:17:30:17

We are ready for County Council?

01:17:33:24 - 01:17:39:11

Sir. Good afternoon, sir. Don't know what happened there. We had a slight technical glitch. No, we have nothing further. I think some of.

01:17:39:13 - 01:17:41:18

Those today, I'm afraid. Please continue.

01:17:41:20 - 01:17:51:13

Those. No, as Cambridge, we don't have anything as the County Council to contribute. I had intended to introduce Ms.. Harwood, but she did that herself. So no, we have nothing further to add.

01:17:52:04 - 01:17:59:17

Right. Thank you very much. May I ask if anyone else would like to?

01:18:00:11 - 01:18:03:09

Comment on this specific point.

01:18:08:03 - 01:18:11:01

I don't see any hands raised.

01:18:11:11 - 01:18:18:19

Um. So, um, I. Would then actually like to.

01:18:18:21 - 01:18:32:29

Finish this specific item. And then the next item is item five, which is water environment. I am mindful of the time and am mindful that we did aim to have a break for lunch.

01:18:33:07 - 01:18:34:09

Um, at.

01:18:34:11 - 01:18:35:20

Approximately.

01:18:35:28 - 01:18:36:13

Um.

01:18:36:18 - 01:18:47:23

1:30. But considering that we have finished this item, I believe that this might be an appropriate time to actually adjourn this meeting.

01:18:49:08 - 01:18:57:15

If everyone agrees with that. Can I ask, particularly Mrs. Morgenson, son, if you are in agreement with that.

01:19:00:02 - 01:19:11:08

Yes, Mr. Pinto. Thank you. Yes. I'm happy to adjourn for lunch if everyone else is happy with that now. And to recommence with item five water environment following that break.

01:19:12:22 - 01:19:25:28

And and if I'm asked. Mr.. MADISON Considering that you'll be leading on to next item, would you be so kind as to actually set the time for when the hearing will resume then?

01:19:26:13 - 01:19:40:23

Yes, I can do that. I have noticed that we've got a couple of hands raised at the moment. We've got, um, Mr. Fraser Urquhart and Mr. Sarkozy. So if we could just take, um, comments from those two parties before we break please,

01:19:43:02 - 01:19:45:09

and go to Mr. Fraser At first, please.

01:19:45:12 - 01:19:58:13

Yes. I'm just wondering, given that we've got one only one agenda item to deal with, whether it might be appropriate to take a slightly shorter lunch break, um, so as to possibly allow for a slightly earlier finish.

01:19:59:23 - 01:20:00:10

Okay.

01:20:00:27 - 01:20:03:27

Thank you for that. Mr. Schakowsky.

01:20:04:24 - 01:20:16:05

Yeah, just. Just. Andrew Schakowsky, Norfolk County Council. Just to let you know so that my colleague Ralph Cox will be attending this afternoon in my place. So thank you. Won't be here, but he will. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

01:20:18:21 - 01:20:47:21

Okay. Can I just ask the applicant in terms of the length of the break, it's, it's 120 now, um, to give a slightly, if we could have taken an hour and returned it sort of 215 to 20 or we could if we did want to start earlier, we could recommence it at 2 p.m.. Can I just ask if the applicant has any preferences before put it to the wider participants?

01:20:49:15 - 01:20:55:17

Gary McGovern For the applicant and we'd certainly be happy to start earlier at 2:00 if that suits the other parties. Thank you.

01:20:56:19 - 01:21:07:04

Can I just check with Mr. Pinto and also with all the other participants, if anybody would like to make a comment. Um, on 2 p.m. reconvene.

01:21:07:14 - 01:21:12:17

I'm happy with it too. I'm happy with the 2 p.m. to reconvene at that time. Yes, please.

01:21:13:20 - 01:21:29:14

I can't see any more hands raised at the moment, so I'm assuming that everyone is happy with that. If that's the case, um, if it's now 121, we'll close this hearing and reopen at 2 p.m.. Thank you very much.