

TRANSCRIPT_YORKSHIREGREEN_ISH2_SESSION4_24052023

00:11

Okay, then it's four o'clock. And if we can resume please can I just check with a case to get the live recording started again, I'm seeing an order in their heads. That's good. And so we're now on to agenda item nine, C. One, which is the noise and vibration management plan. Firstly, question to Mr. Harper of North Yorkshire Council. I noted in the latest statement of common ground that in Section 5.7 point one, you raise some concerns about the noise and vibration management plan, which from now on I call the nvm. P to save time and wordage. Are those concerns Mr. Hopper? This basically the same as the methodological ones that we've just heard or do you have any specific concerns about the nvm P itself?

01:13

Jacopo has no special counsel, I don't have any additional concerns other than what we've already discussed, obviously, then the NP incorporates the car construction hours that were discussed on the operation on noise assessment that we discussed. But I guess we reached consensus on that on the conclusion of that. So I guess the only outstanding issue for me on that is the car construction working hours.

01:37

Thank you, Mr. Hopper. And I think we've we've already had a good in full discussion on that already. So I don't propose to talk about that anymore. I did, however, have a question to the applicant. And this is basically the the ENV MP, as it stands, is in theory, the final version, and is secured as such in requirement five of the draft DCO. I appreciate that requirement five does contain the title piece of unless otherwise agreed in writing with the relevant planning authority. However, bearing in mind that if my understanding is correct, the principal contractor hasn't yet been appointed by yourselves. And should the order be made clearly that that would that would happen at some point, therefore, on the grounds that on the one hand, you're saying this is a final nvm pay, but on the other hand, you haven't yet got a contract in place, and that contractor may wish to make changes to the that may affect the MV MP, and they may or may not be significant. Would it not be better either for the nvm P to be amongst the documents listed in requirements six, or for some additional wording to be put into requirement five, to the effect that it's an outline and VMP with the final version to be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authority, ie once the principal contractor has had the opportunity to input into it. Mr. Turney, you take that one

03:17

rich turn if the applicant Thank you. Yes, I think we're we're content that the noise and vibration management plan is appropriately framed, and that the contractor will be able to comply with the measures set out in it, which are, to a large extent, standard, and what we'd expect in respect of the

sound, construction of a development of this kind. You've noted so that there is a degree of flexibility in the sense that there's an unless otherwise approved, provision, one of the thrusts of taking the approach we have done here of having as much of as possible, finalize now, in this case for the nvm p, but also for, for example, the ctmp, the construction traffic management plan, the projects keen to progress, post development consent, should it be granted and dealing with issues in terms of these plans now, rather than having debates subsequently about their approval, is a is a clear objective of the project. So we contend that it doesn't unduly constrain a contractor, we don't think would be appropriate to deal with it by way of later approval. There is a degree of flexibility, but it's one which we don't expect to need to rely on. Again, if Mr. Vowel has got anything else to say about the contrast. I think that's, that's

04:41

Thank you, Mr. Tony, I will turn to the local authorities just for their view on that. I'll start with North Yorkshire on the grounds that we've got two of you in the room and a number of colleagues online who wishes to take that what what's your view on that? Are you content with that approach? It's a final one, but you might be seen some modifications come in potentially, maybe not. And you'd have to deal with them under the tail piece of unless otherwise approved in writing. Would you be comfortable with? Should it? Should there need to be more major modifications? Would you still be comfortable with that approach?

05:19

My Michael Reynolds NYC, I think that if first of all comfortable with that, it would we would just want a process setting out within the MPNP. That were so that we knew how changes were going to be made, and how they could be agreed.

05:36

Thank you. I'll leave I'll leave the applicant final right to reply. And I'll just see if, if any representatives from the other local authorities wish to add to what you've what you what you've said, Mr. Reynolds. So I'll go to Miss White from Leeds City first. Did you wish to add anything to that Miss White? added? And thank you. Okay, thank you. And Mr. Beaudry? From city of York?

06:01

No, there's nothing to add from us on that one.

06:03

Okay. In which case, I'll just revert to you there, Mr. Turney, just in terms of this, this is a reform of word and it could be added to the nvm P to to provide the comfort that is being sought by Mr. Reynolds.

06:23

Registered if the applicant I don't think there is and but it's just provide some explanation which might give Mr. Reynolds the answer he wants. I don't think the end VMP should itself contemplate its amendment. By agreement, I think that's done through the requirement, which says unless otherwise agreed. And then shedule, four of the development consent order is concerned with applications under requirements. And there's a process for that. And that includes where an application has been made or

relevant to authority for any consent, agreement or approval. So unless someone tells me otherwise, I think a change would be contemplated in that.

07:09

jail time for the Africans. There are also provisions in the in Section Five I believe, section 61 agreements such that were a significant amendment from what has been envisaged in the prediction of sound levels is determined by the contractor, then they can make an application via section 61 of the controlled Pollution Act to Amend the the nature of working and seek agreement with the local authority on how to progress those works.

07:46

Thank you, Mr. Hein. Mr. Reynolds, did you wish to come back on that?

07:51

Only to say that this these are the things that they set out at the sorts of things that we will be looking for? So we'll review that and ahead of Friday? I'm sure we'll be able to.

07:59

Okay, thank you. Yeah, I realized I've kind of strayed into DCO territory as well. So we might pick up on this again on Friday. I'm just trying to clear it clear it off. Now to save time on Friday, really? And then, Mr. Hopper, just before we move off, was there anything you wish to add on that? Or are you are you comfortable with what you've heard?

08:18

No, that's fine. Yeah, I'll just call the section 61 commitment. There is a caveat in the in the NDMP to submit a section 61 If there are significant impacts envisaged, so we'll have some scope to agree that with the contractor in case by case, task by task,

08:41

thank you very much, Mr. Harper. Now, next on the agenda is nine D, which is vibration. But in terms of nine D one, I propose to save time today that we actually is an action point, the applicant if you're prepared to provide that written summary of all of those different techniques, rather than talk us through them all today. So that's effectively all of the vibration technique, mitigation techniques in two point 2.21 of the VMP. I just think it's a bit pointless all sit, you know, sitting here today and having you just explained to us what they are, if we can get that in written form doesn't have to be, you know, huge reams of information, but just a brief summary of all of those will be appreciated. Just so I know my difference between my moding in and my rotary board piles. So thank you. In which case, we'll move to 92. Mr. Hopper, does your remit extend as far as vibration as well as noise? Yeah, okay. In which case, do you have any concerns over the vibration assessment methodology or the proposed mitigation measures from the applicant?

09:51

The only concern I have which was raised with the consultants on Monday is the fiber Question threshold criteria that's adopted within the MPNP 15. MMS, which, above the standard 10. MMS is

intolerable. One, MMS is just about tolerable with some pre warning to residents. Probably applicant can probably confirm, but I understand the criteria threshold was set, there's some structural damage rather than complaints. So ideally, that threshold we, we ideally would like one MMS, but that's quite difficult to achieve. But there isn't the sort of standard gives an example of one MMS and 10 MMS, why doesn't do is give you some context as to where to sit within that period within that threshold. But in any event, we don't have any vibration concerns. As far as for salby locality with North Yorkshire councils concerns, although the criteria in my opinion is not right, I don't feel that there are any significant vibration effects to to justify trying to get that

11:25

amended. Thank you, Mr. hoppin, just just for the benefit of us all in the room. Can you just briefly explain MMS and the various values and what they mean? Yeah, I'll give that one to the applicant Mr. ARP, unless you're willing to take it. Now he's gone. I don't blame him.

11:47

Just Just a point of order, table 14.19. Of a PP O eight six is our vibration criteria for construction vibration. and a high magnitude is greater than or equal to 10 millimeters per second, not 1515 millimeters per second specifically relates to the the riverbank of the Gratus in relation to the canal to trust River and crown trusts. Concerns about riverbank stability PPVs or peak particle velocities are a way of measuring instantaneous vibration. And the criterion referred to of one millimeters per second as being intolerable for a certain amount of time with not notwithstanding some form of pre warning is from British standard 5228. Part two. And it's important to realize that the vibration has been scoped out by nature of the location of any vibratory works such that the only receptors close enough to the works that could receive significant vibration would be the riverbank and receptors on fryston traveler site. And with regard to the monk fryston treble site, we've we've looked at the potential for vibration from piling works and determined that such vibratory piling works would not be suitable for that. So land condition, and so is avoided by that fashion, rather than having to institute any specific mitigation for vibration.

13:55

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd read all of that in your submitted submitted documents. I just thought for the benefit of people in the room sometimes PPV in vibration with can be quite an emotive subject, I thought it'd be useful to have that explained. I don't have any further questions on either noise or vibration. I'm looking around the room first. I see a general shaking or still have had some looking online, I don't see anything. In which case if we can move on to

14:24

I might just flag on the final point about the travelers and I know that there's been a conclusion we'll get into related effects and interrelating the effects noise and vibration on the traveler site just to flag that we might come back to that under item 12 tomorrow.

14:41

Yes other than with that was when there was potential for for vibration effects to occur in relation. So in combination with noise effects, with with the way things have moved on, such that vibration is now avoided at the trouble of sight that interrelation doesn't exist.

15:00

And is that is that secured through the nvm P

15:03

is secured through the MPNP such that were any changes that required a vibratory piling technique needed, then that would require a significant change to the words and undertaken through the section 61 process. Thank

15:19

you. Thanks.

15:22

Right agenda item 10. And I'm signed in slightly apprehensive because I'm not quite sure how we're going to get through this without falling foul of the data protection issue. So we need to be very careful in how we reference addresses and particularly any personal information. So really, it's it's questions to Mr. Stevenson on behalf of the people he's representing, but please Mr. Stevenson, if you can do your best I know it's difficult to so this won't take long, good all rolling, okay.

15:59

Roman one, we'll call them receptor one, a Roman two, we'll call them receptor two. Okay.

16:03

Yes. And if you can just just just have a second thought about not disclosing anything that's loads of information, if you need to do that, obviously, you can put that in writing, the whole issue is because if anything said in public today, then we've got to go and redacted off the tape. And it creates a heck of a lot of work for people to try and find out where it is and take it off the record and etc. Like so. Keeping that in mind. In rep 2131 It was just health concerns were raised is an issue, as I said whilst being very careful about avoiding specifics. Can you expand on on the health concerns? Was it particular? Was it well, first personal related issues? Or just general concerns about this could impact on how

16:49

the closest of the ceiling and compounds to the to the business? We'll call it like that? Yeah. Okay. However, we have national grid and ourselves are going to meet with health person equity person for discussion with receptor one.

17:09

Thanks, has taken place. That's very helpful. One thing, I think it would be useful for us all to have into the examination, which we might not have already, if we have please point me to where it is, is it so as an action point? Can you please provide the distance between the nearest if there are cables signal and then compounds? And the the farmhouse of, shall we say receptor one? If you know what I mean?
|

17:36

asked because I asked to have that. And also, to have it to the distance to the latest buildings,

17:43

Barry buildings that that was going to be my next part as well, also to the dairy buildings is one of receptor one. I know. I know, Mr. Fowler does is did his best on site yesterday to provide us with some measurements. But I think it'd be really useful if we could just have that into the examination just so we know what kind of distances we're dealing with.

18:00

The the house is quite a lot. It's further away than than the the most new buildings and that's where the actual the dairy is. Yes. Yeah. Well, the most important bit of the businesses is in that shed. So that's very important. Is that that distance? Thank you, Mr. Stevenson.

18:20

Mr. Jones, I wonder if we should just get an idea of the timing of that meeting. And when we might expect something into the examination. That records whether there's been agreement or not. Yeah, Mr. Fowler,

18:32

the finished grade. I think realistically, deadline five is going to be appropriate for that. I don't think we'll get a meeting set up with a short witness time and be able to provide an update by identifying but we will identify five. Thank you very much.

18:44

Thank you, Mr. Hunt. Mr. Stevenson, do you wish to add anything on that or in which case we'll move on against same caveats for 10? A two. This one might be easier because I'll take your traffic concerns in the next section is agenda Mr. Stevenson but again, in your rep. Rep. 2132 on behalf of your client, should we call them receptive to that there was mention of dust in relation to both dwellings and solar panels?

19:18

Yes, on on one of the one of the houses, they've got solar panels that are on the on the south side, which is the side that faces the road faces the access road, not the 19. So our concern is about just going into there and also bluntly, just getting into the houses, because one of them one of them, one of them is asthmatic.

19:41

And would that be if you can avoid health concerns please Mr. Stevenson, I know it's difficult. Obviously if you wish to put that in writing then do so. In terms of dust, I is your concern dust from construction traffic at Salford dust from the construction activities that aren't traffic related, ie any any piling that might go on and, you know, the work that we

20:09

fail on it. It's more than construction traffic and the closeness of it to the, to the properties. Having said that, though, we have referred to the concern and in our, our, our 132, we have we have expressed concern about piling etc. Yeah, we have gained. So it's a bit it's both but more, it's more the closest to the proposed construction traffic. Okay. Thank

20:34

you, Mr. Steam, isn't

20:35

it to be fair, it's, it's more of a practical on site issue, that national grid and ourselves will will will, will have a will have to talk about how that's going to be managed.

20:48

Okay, something else to discuss at your meeting? Yeah, certainly. Did you wish to come in on anything you've heard? Again, same caveat about avoiding sensitive personal information. It's really

20:57

rich to me for the applicant just to refer, I think the thrust of our answer is table 3.9 of the CCP, and the set of measures in there, which address dust. And in particular, the sections which deal with what's just described as track out. So dust coming from the site through the access roads. And there are measures which are numbered aq 31, through two aq 37, which include sweeping access roads and local roads if necessary, but also where appropriate installing wheel washing, if that's necessary, in particular locations, and inspecting roads to ensure that the structure of the road is not causing dust to be brought up by the vehicles using it. So there's a set of measures there, which we say, appropriate to minimize any adverse effect from from dust. There's also I think it's important to note process identified in the CSAP, for complaints and record of complaints for dust issues. And of course, if dust problems do occur, they should, those can be addressed to the contractor who obviously will, will seek to remedy them. So if that the specific point was, well, what if a cloud of dust covered some solos in residential solar panels, obviously, that's the kind of thing you'd expect to be recorded in a site complaint, and then lead to appropriate remedial remedial action to ensure that that problem was addressed as soon as possible.

22:45

And that would be directly to you rather than involving the EHR industry, environmental health officer from North Yorkshire for example, or that achieve your goal or ever

22:55

reached out if the applicant? That's certainly what would be hoped and expected that it would be through direct liaison with the site, first of all, and that the authority would only be troubled if there was some wider concern about compliance.

23:08

Okay, thank you. Unless anybody else has any questions, and they were quite site specific. Even when I mentioned in said site, I'm happy to move on to agenda item 11. I can't see anyone disagree. And so

I'll move on to that. And so 11 A one was really just just asking for an update on the easements and the framework agreement that are listed as matters outstanding in the latest statement of common ground with Network Rail. And that's a question to the applicant.

23:46

Bridge attorney for the African I'll deal with this just to keep things moving. I didn't mean that earlier attending, there is a and negotiation ongoing about securing an agreement. There's now focus on what's being described as an easement to provide for the crossing of the railway line. But essentially, we're in the process of settling in agreement to deal with the interface between our scheme and the operational railway on these case mainline. And obviously, we hope and expect that can be completed during the course of examination.

24:17

If that was going to be my next question. Do what is the likelihood of that being concluded so that we've got something in front of us by the close?

24:26

We hope, we hope we hope it's it's a it's a difficult interface. Obviously, there's operational concerns, but it's one that we have to deal with elsewhere in the country as well. So there's, there's a process in hand, it may be we can't give you a firm answer that there is an agreement in place by the end of the examination, but hopefully we'll be able to at least report progress.

24:47

I think the usual statement applies and if we haven't got it, we can't take it into account. And we'll probably be asking for final, final closing statements from both of you if it's unresolved or isn't going to be resolved. Okay, thank you

25:06

just move on to 11 a two then and this is basically just asking for an update. This might be a quick one, it might not in terms of a workshop that took the workshop is going to take place with North Yorkshire council regarding matters still to be agreed. Basically, what areas are still to be agreed and is the timing of this workshop such that a revised statement of common ground is likely to be available by or at deadline, five. Question to the app, I'll put that to the applicant.

25:51

I'll bring in Mr. Appleton who's our transport expert, who's joined at the end.

25:57

Afternoon, Chris Appleton traffic and transportation on behalf of the applicant. I'm pleased to report that national grid and its consultant team have continued to engage proactively with North Yorkshire up to and beyond deadline three. In total, there have been 15 points raised by North Yorkshire Council through development relevant representations the local impact report and the response to the examining authorities first written questions. National Grid has addressed all three of all of these points through our various written responses, and we consider that there are only now five of the 15 points

which are outstanding as it speaks. Although I must stress that this is simply because we've yet to receive a response from the council rather than being an express sticking point there. In order to progress these discussions around the various points, the parties have agreed to a specific traffic and transport workshop, which is currently programmed for Wednesday, the seventh of June. One of the outstanding points relates to the fact that the authority has previously stated that it sees the importance of further discussions with regard to the development of formulation of the production of the construction management plan. And through our various responses with advise the Council at the submitted ctmp, which is secured under requirement five of the draft DCO is in fact the final draft of the plan. However, we welcome consultation on the detailed design matters post grant of any consent in the future. Thank you.

27:22

Thank you, Mr. Appleton. I'll just if we've still got Mr. Roberts on the line from North Yorkshire highways, I presume you're the right person to be addressing this to Mr. Roberts. Is there anything you'd like to add based on what you've just heard?

27:39

No. Paul Roberts from North Yorkshire? No, I'm aware that this meeting has been set up and we need to discuss with the applicant the details. North Yorkshire is concerned that the details will be overrun in terms of the work and how the work is done on site. And we see that this meeting is a crucial thing. Before work starts anywhere. We are concerned about the process. And I suppose the devils in the detail.

28:13

And if you can briefly since we've got you, Mr. Roberts, if you can briefly expand on on some of your concerns, they more about practically implementation.

28:23

They're about implementation of the work of, for example, in the skeleton area where there's work being done to replace pylons and cabling. We're concerned about access and how that's going to be done. Your city may have a similar view, I don't know. The other points probably a monk fryston And how the traffic is managed from the 63. By the a one. We have concerns about that. So we wish to discuss that further. And then there's the individual accesses, which in our opinion, will need an assessment at each axis. We haven't seen that detail and that I think that's where we we see we must have a discussion with the applicant.

29:14

And what would be contained in these assessments for the for the accesses for all of the accesses.

29:21

Well, I am thinking of about particularly visibility, the existing local use obviously heard what was said today today about working times and time periods for each day and particularly at weekends. The authority is a rural authority and often the minor road network is said to be heavily used by traffic's tractors and things. So there's a commitment there that needs to be said, I think from the applicant and

how they're going to deal with that type of traffic. Obviously to do some of their work, they may need to close the roads. And that's partly stated in the DC DCO. So we have as an authority have concerns about how the the project will be managed.

30:16

Okay, thank you, Mr. Roberts. We're still it really sort of matters in this statement of common ground. I appreciate there might be some other traffic matters. So that we discuss in a minute, we can just keep it to the statement of common ground. I'll turn to the other two local authorities and their statements of common ground. First of all, city of York. are, you know, content?

30:42

The only comment I would offer at this stage is that the statement of common ground, we've agreed with colleagues and highways and that the draft that's with you is a reflection of the position currently, and I don't have access to any highways input immediately to Hunter.

31:05

That's okay. Mr. Boldre, wouldn't expect you to answer on behalf of highways, colleagues. And, Ms. White, I don't think there are any agreed matters in your latest statement of common ground on highways. That's correct. Thank you. No, and I thought that was the case. In which case I'll just returned to you the Mr. Appleton in terms of the workshop. Obviously, it's the day after our deadline for would that be with only North Yorkshire Council? Would that would you intend to invite to that city of York and Leeds as well? Was it really with North Yorkshire to hammer out for want of a better word the, you know, Matt is remaining.

31:50

Chris Appleton for the applicant, again, it's primarily intended for North Yorkshire counsel, city of York, are welcome to attend if they would find that beneficial. However, I spoke to the highway officer at city of York on Friday. And my understanding is that the matters are agreed and the statement of common ground is acceptable as far as they're concerned. So I think it will primarily be for North Yorkshire has benefits. And given that that's where the outstanding matters is your workshop,

32:16

so I'll leave you to invite whoever you you feel needs to be? I don't think I have anything else to add on. That, that that part two. So if we turn to nine a three. I don't think we've got Mr. Brown with us from national highways anymore. So I think I've only got really the question I was gonna ask for both of us just to yourselves. Okay, probably Mr. Apple turn I imagine.

32:50

Just to jump in. We've got a message from the case team helpfully saying that. Yes, Mr. Brown has left. But he said that the statement of common ground questions have been resolved and you can attend tomorrow morning, if we want to pick anything up then. Right. Okay, I want to cover it now. And then if there's if we can, if he's here, we can always,

33:07

always ask him tomorrow. Yes, in which case, if the applicant would just like to give us the latest position on the statement of common ground, it was about studies for abnormal indivisible loads aihl routes, wasn't it? I understand Mr. Appleton,

33:23

Chris Appleton for the applicant. Yes, there were there were 15 points raised by national highways on their consultant team within their most recent response. And we agreed yesterday afternoon with national highways that all points have now been addressed to their satisfaction, and they are happy for us to update the statement of common ground to say that we're in agreement on all matters. No further assessment. Okay. Thank you.

33:43

If Mr. Brown is there tomorrow, you might just ask for his comments on that as well. But

33:47

absolutely. If he was Mr. Brown, that email makes it right. Thank you.

33:55

Okay, in which case, if there are no other issues on sort of updates, our move to construction, traffic matters, which is nine b one is a bit of a catch all. I phrased it in terms of the temporary construction compounds, but it might stray beyond that as well to other elements of the proposed development, but my first question is to the applicant. And it's just really seeking some clarification and it's basically on the obviously we went on site yesterday on the ASI. And on the site inspection we were shown temporary construction compounds and where they were going to be. But both the high level CDM plans and the design drawings only show one temporary construction compound for monk fryston overturn and Shipton cable Sealand compound. Now I presume there's a reason a very Simple reason why simple explanation? If I could hear that would be great. Thanks,

35:06

Steve fell on our screen. Yeah, the plans at the back of the ctmp to cover the aihl movements. And the drawings are primarily to show the access arrangements for the ales not for the temporary construction compounds. The temporary construction compounds are indicated on the works plans are not in those drawings. That's not what they're intended for.

35:25

Okay. And I'm pretty sure I'm slightly straying away from traffic issues here. But since since we were talking about the CDM plans, they do show soil storage and drainage areas, as well that appear to be slightly different from the works plans his area, again, a reason for that.

35:44

Steve fires grid, the works plans don't show any drainage areas or soil storage areas on there. They only show the linear and nonlinear elements of the work and the limits deviation. So those drawings are only really identified for the ale movements.

36:04

Mr. Jones, I think the areas we were looking at for the drainage were on the project description plans.

36:11

Right. Okay, thank you Miss combs.

36:14

That's still, if there's a difference between project description plans and CDM plans would that again be a matter of aihl?

36:25

Steve, our national good. Yeah, that's one thing I'll take away and have a look at those plans just to see where the differences are. But the plans in the TCMP were never designed to show that kind of those kinds of elements of the work they were really just for the access arrangements. So what we'll see where the differences are on them and come back to you.

36:42

Thank you very much.

36:45

My next question is kind of getting down into into more sort of finer details. And it's one for North Yorkshire council. So presumably, it's the short straw has been you again, Mr. Roberts. On site yesterday, we were by the overturn. substation Overton road, the junction of Overton Road, which apparently leads into Overton road, if that makes sense. You've got the Overton road where the railway bridges the road. It's mainly used by cyclists. And then there's a very short stretch that leads to the 19 in one direction, the other direction takes you up towards the sidings and you can get into shipped and that way, it's almost like the second road into shipped. And I think it's access point 89. And just looking at that, clearly HGVs would come out of the temporary construction compounds, they need to do it a right turn at Overton road and very that very short stretch until you then hit the A 19. Did you have any concerns about the visibility there when looking to the left because you've got a reasonably sharp bend there that is your head towards the sidings head north towards the sidings there. And are you content with that visibility is? Is there any traffic management measures you'd wish to see put in place at that junction? You don't think you're on mute? Mr. Roberts?

38:23

Paul Roberts from North Yorkshire yes, there's there's concerns about the the location of the the the the substation in terms of access, the applicant has discussed with me actually actually widening the approach road to the, to the access to be fair to the substation, the junction that you allude to on to the 19. I think there is room for improvement, but it's, it works now. But obviously, with the uptake of HGVs. Using that to access the site, there is room to improve the vegetation or remove some of the vegetation. I think this is where we want to as officers of the highway authority, we want to discuss each individual access point. And it's crucial that we get it right so that there isn't an accident. So visibility will be one of those elements that to be viewed at each point of access, not just Overton so that I think

there's within the Construction Management Plan that these aspects need to be reviewed. This is where, as officers, we have concerns.

39:38

And in terms of the process of review, would that be something you'd be looking to do at the workshop? I'm just aware there are a number of access points. It sounds like quite a quite a large task.

39:51

This is our this is the problem we first see and it's how that's done and desktop. Assessment is not the way to do this. Is each on site assessment?

40:05

And is that something that you would be looking to do prior to the close of examination so that we could have your views on that into the examination?

40:16

I think it's something that we need to do with the applicant. Yes.

40:20

Because I can I'll just make the point that anything we don't see by close of examination, we can't take into account basically, it's as simple as that. The minute the minute the examination closes, where's the examining authority don't get to see anything else. So we can so if there's any comments you wish to make, we would need to see them before before, you know, the final day. Okay. I'll just turn to the applicants, obviously, you've heard about potential access points, I raised one where there could be the potential for some traffic management measures to be taken place. I know you've looked at the access points, you've looked at visibility splays. at them. Is there anything you wish to add based on what Mr. Roberts has said?

41:05

Chris Appleton for the applicant, again, just to emphasize that within the construction Traffic Management Plan and the the TNT chapter of the as we have looked at visibility and perform speed surveys, in consultation with the local highway authority to inform those discussions and presented that that detail at an early stage for the for the benefit of the national for their local highway authority. We will of course discuss it with them at the workshop, but the the details have been presented up to this point for the benefit of the authority.

41:35

And was that a deskpace? Exercise or from from your your obviously did whilst you might have gone out on site? Did you actually meet with representatives from the various councils at the access points? Or was it more of a question of yourselves going out on on site to do that work?

41:54

Chris Appleton for the applicant? No, we've not physically met on site with North Yorkshire county council, but we have engaged with them with regards to appropriate locations for speed surveys to be conducted. And the details have been presented back in two cars.

42:08

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Roberts. Did you have anything else to want based on what you've you've heard?

42:13

Well, yes. Sorry. Paul Roberts for North Yorkshire. Yes, it was involvement with the Highway Authority. But that was my opinion, but a desktop study. It wasn't viewed on site.

42:27

Okay, thank you. We probably given us a good air. And now if there's any final comments you wish wish to make a bank about this. And before we move on, Mr. Turney

42:38

rich, certainly for the applicant. I think we're at stage now where we've identified our access requirements, we have provided our assessment as to the suitability of those accesses. And we've carried out our own assessment. The specifics we've we've had some consideration of specifics from North Yorkshire Council in representations made to date. But we're now at the point where, really, if they think there's a problem, they need to tell us. So I don't think it's a question of them saying, well, we need to go out on site with the applicant to look at these things. We've identified our requirements, we've got our construction traffic management plan, which we're seeking approval for, we've made the application we've had the pre application consultation and engagement with North Yorkshire council. So the workshop hopefully will resolve the issues. But so far as Mr. Robertson suggesting there's some other pre consent or before the end of the examination, at least process of assessment to be done. We don't think there is, if they've got a point to make, they need to make it well already about the suitability of any particular access. And you should be able to make the determination based on the information, the application and any representations have been made to you about any particular issues.

43:57

Thank you, Mr. Tony, I would flag that we do require post hearing submissions is obviously different than the next stage in the process. In terms of information to come in. Mr. Roberts, is there anything else you wish to add based on what you've heard?

44:12

No, thank you.

44:14

Mr. Jones, can I just ask At what point did that list the the list of Apple access points is that how long has that been available to the council's is it for since the submission date? Is it since at some point in the pre application process?

44:29

The infamous sorry, Chris Appleton for the applicant. The the information was made as part of the application process. And the the information has been within those documents since that time.

44:38

Thank you. I think I would emphasize as well that if there are I know it's difficult from desk based assessments, but if there are particular areas being flagged them and we're flagging one of them, then it's then it would be helpful to prioritize getting out and looking at those even if it's without the applicant and giving us your views about them rather than waiting and possibly know not being able to bring those views into the examination at all. So we would we would really value North Yorkshire counsels opinion on the junction that we've flagged. But if there's any others that you think you've, you know, maybe worth having a closer look at, then we'd say prioritize that by, you know, I think given the timescales that we deadline five for you, but just to highlight that

45:24

we now move on to nine, b two, which is development of the construction traffic management plan. And it's largely similar question than what we heard about the noise and vibration management plan in the fact that this is in his final document in requirement five of the draft DCO. Again, I note your use of the caveat this time, unless otherwise agreed with relevant planning authority or highway authority. So I suspect a lot of the arguments are gonna be the ones that Mr. Turney has already made. I suppose it could be slightly different i Are you expecting to make any significant changes once a contract has been appointed Mr. Appleton,

46:12

Chris Appleton for the applicant, no, we are not the ctmp as submitted is intended as the final version of the document providing the management and mitigation strategy for the transport and traffic impacts of the project. And project generated traffic during the construction phase of development. We have outlined within paragraph one point 2.1 of the ctmp that an initial draft version was produced at Pier and subsequently developed into the final draft that you see today. And this was produced in consultation with the relevant local and national highway authorities at the time. details. Details of the engagement are provided in table 12.5 of that. However, within the ctmp, there are commitments set out for further engagement, although we're not expecting changes to the ctmp itself. This engagement is intended to be around detailed design and won't result in updates to the document. And to give you examples of that section 3.5 states that following the detailed design work, should it not be appropriate to provide visibility supplies at gated accesses, we will consult with the Highway Authority. Section 3.6 confirms that appropriate get engagement will be undertaken regarding abnormal load movements with the highway authorities and the programming of those movements and sections 7.1 through 7.3 set out that we will engage in discussions with the highway authority to inform details of traffic management works scheduled in and around the highways at the appropriate time. Now these are obviously future engagements that will relate to detailed site specific design aspects. And they cannot be agreed until the appropriate time which in essence will be once the contractor has a detailed program of works. This these wouldn't this they would not impact on the ctmp report in and of itself. And to provide further assurances regarding that process. It's stated within the ctmp then appointed transport coordination officer will update the ctmp as required. And for clarity, this relates to updates required once the ctmp is

established and operational during the construction works and when necessary that will be resulting from outcomes of the monitoring, monitoring and compliance strategy. Thank you.

48:25

Thank you, Mr. Robertson. Mr. Roberts. Was there anything you wish to add based on what you've heard about how the ctmp is going to progress? And the fact that it's a final is down is a final document at the moment?

48:39

Paul Roberts from North Yorkshire No,

48:41

no. Okay. Thank you. Are there any other comments from any of the other local authorities on this issue about the securing of it is in requirement five as a final document? Mr. Mr. bouldery,

48:57

there's nothing from city of York.

48:59

Okay. Ms. White.

49:06

Waste five Lisa, council did nothing for me. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, in which case, I'll move on to item nine, B three, which is a kind of all encompassing one about Bao Mo's and passing places and how their their layout is going to be considered and the num the number of them and issues of inter visibility now will come into play. In rep 2132, we had a number of concerns raised on behalf of the respondents about traffic and access now we saw the site yesterday. We heard a lot of that on the on the company's site inspection yesterday, but Mr. Stevenson on behalf of your clients, did you wish to expand on any of the traffic and access related concerns that were obviously you raised in the representation? Rep. 2132. But also, you know, based on anything you you heard yesterday, when we looked at site specific features,

50:15

yes, thank you very much. In the reps, unfortunately, I wasn't able to refer to the traffic movements, because those were supplied to us on the day that the reps had to be put in. So I wasn't able to, to put those we had had a meeting the month before, and we'd ask for them chase for them. And they weren't forthcoming. So there are going past, we'll call them, should we call them receptor one is okay. Chapter One, they're out? Yes, there's, I think, from this 13 149 HGV movements, and there's 940 or 50, light vehicles movements spread over the period of the of the contract. So yesterday, we walked the route, the proposed route. And when we got down to tower number five, I think SP wo five, which is the new one that's been built, it is just near the railway line. National Grid confirmed that they were putting in a road from SP seven, two sp six, and then from SP six to SP five, which means that they have to put a bridge over Hearn's gutter to get between six and five. So I would like to understand from them. If they have put a if they've already put a road in between six and five, and seven is on stripe lane. One one,

I'd like to know why we were only informed off this yesterday. And it has nowhere on the plans in here that have been submitted. And that has been confirmed to me this morning because I asked for a copy of the plan. And it was not submitted. It's nowhere to be seen and why we had a site meeting with them. And it's in the evidence on the 23rd of May. Why we were not told about it, then it may be that they hadn't decided to do it. I don't know. But it's the 23rd of May 23 of March sorry, we're now two months down the line. And we've just found out about that. So what I don't understand is why they need they are still insisting that they need to use the access road past receptor versus to one's houses and through the farm yard which doesn't belong to them. Yes. To install SPO five.

52:55

Okay, thank you. I'm obviously this discussion. Yes, this is part partly based on what we saw yesterday at the ASI as well, but Mr. Turney Is it Mr. Finally will answer this or

53:07

biologist to explain how access is to be taken between and the difficulty with the alternative that's been put forward by Mr. Stevenson.

53:20

Steef our National Grid just on the point of the access has been shown upon access routes are not shown on any of the plans that are provided within the DCO suite of plans. We apply for suitable flexibility to be able to look at access plans with flexibility within those orders and we assess it on that basis. The rights that we see allow for the axis tract to be kind of located within that the IRA and applied so you won't see access tracks anywhere with on the DCS we have plans. But for the purposes of assessment, we need to make a judgement of where the access point would be. From this we've assumed that that's just from SP five to SP six with the with an inclusion of a bridge of Hearn's Gazza would be used to get to SP six we have consideration for the access point for to SP seven with a long strike plan and we didn't consider that striping was going to be suitable to use construction traffic so which we allowed a separate access from SP five to SP six. Not for the of all construction traffic. It's pretty narrow lane with limited scope for passing places. So we assumed that the traffic from SP five will come down to row two sp six the HGTV and LGV movements were set out. There is 1309 Total hits TV moments and a total of 949 LGV movements of the 198 week construction program with a peak movements of 60 hertz up movement is on 44 movements giving a total of 104 Weekly movements at peak, which, over the construction program equates to less than one an hour. So on that basis the track past two sp five is a exists, there's an existing Bell mark off the 19. With a good track down to the to the pylon on that basis with limited or lower frequency vehicles, we believe it's manageable on site with banksman, kind of the moment of deliveries to access isn't hindered to the residence and to the farm. And that that is feasible to manage. But to the assess the worst case versus the fact that it doesn't become manageable. We have allowed for a bi directional Bell mouth, which we saw on the site visit yesterday and for widening of our land to allow pass in places which are typically spaced at 200 meters to allow suit, which can see all the row foreseeable visibility and for passing places. But in the first things, we think we would hope that the traffic levels would mean that is manageable without having to do that, well. We need to be able to have the flexibility to be able to deliver the project and wide and that if that isn't a manageable situation.

56:13

I suspect Mr. Stevenson might want to come back in but before he does, can you just explain for everybody how a banksman would work in practice, please,

56:21

the following code? Yes. So there would be the contractor would understand when the deliveries are going to be taking place and on site that we would have members of staff that would be there to be able to direct the traffic hold traffic while those vehicle movements take place. With them being let's say one, roughly one an hour, we could be able to manage that on site. So temporarily hold for a short period of time to allow the vehicle to pass rather than have to widen that that's in the first instance how we would feel that it's managed. If that's not possible, we would need to widen the bottom off and on the road to allow passing places.

56:59

And just so I'm aware when you say stopping the whole traffic, is that stopping hold traffic on the access track rather than on the main road? Yes. Okay. Mr. Simpson, did you wish to come back? Based on anything you've heard?

57:11

I'm sorry. So just before so Miss Stevenson come back at the end, can I just pick up a couple of other points that I think might be relevant, the fairly cammish detail first is Mr. Fowler said, we said striped Lane wasn't suitable, I wonder if he could just explain that in a little bit more detail. And the second point is just in terms of the works that will be required to accommodate the full internal access road. And the nature of the bridge required.

57:38

Follow on afterward. Yeah, so straight lane is a very narrow road that is with vivid, very limited area for passing places do to kind of there is a caravan park on that, that she's titled to the road. So it's a very narrow space with very limited areas to be able to extend and widen that road for that. So that's why they we've allowed for an additional route of putting the bridge in from SB six to SP seven, so the traffic can be managed. So some traffic can go down SB seven and be managed that way. But some can come from the bridge. That's why we've included that bridge and they're kind of a long line haul road from SP five down to SP six. So that gives us additional routes for the for the traffic to be managed in that way.

58:22

Thank you, Mr. farlan. Mr. Stevens introduced to come back on anything you've heard thus far. Yes, please.

58:28

Please, can you explain why you do will object to bringing the access road from the substation field across Herms gutter to SP five. And joining up with the current proposed road that goes to SB six and then SB seven, please.

58:54

State our National Grid. Yeah, we've we've set that will set out the will provide a full considered response to that deadline fall, we weren't unable to kind of provide that assessment of a deadline for you. But we will set that out for deadline for but on the basis that we feel that the traffic levels are manageable, that we don't feel an access point from SP four to SP five, including an additional bridge over hands on the additional access track there is required on the fact that we can manage the traffic we feel like the levels of module past SP five, but we will set out a full response and consider it fully for deadline for

59:31

deadline for Okay, obviously, that isn't almost don't need to say that's an action point because you're you're proposing to do that already. And clearly you would have the chance to respond to that deadline five Mr. Stevenson on behalf of your clients.

59:43

Yeah. Come Can I comment a bit on that now?

59:48

You can you can we'll see where we go with it. But what carry on is just

59:53

that I've been looking at yesterday at the same meeting. There was a A lot of confusion about whether a hedge was going to get taken out or not. At our site meeting on the 23rd of March, it was confirmed two receptors, one that no hedge would be taken out. It now turns out that NASA grid have applied to take out approximately, I don't know, 150 meters hedge all the way down to the, to the, to the farm buildings, which is on I think plan to one. I don't know what planet is. Trees, two dot two trees and hedgerows potentially affected plan section B. On that plan, it shows that the small, very new woodland in the substation field which is right in the southern corner of ABS, yeah, that there is a T section in there that is due to be taken out. Because that is I assume that's underneath the that is underneath the white the overhead wires and you can't grow trees underneath it. Yes. So the pylon is just sp three is just on the edge of that. So the so there already is a route taken through the small young cops. So National Grid have confirmed that they don't want to do that they don't want to put a bridge over homes gutter. They don't want to put the new a new section of road in I would suggest that the new section road that we're suggesting, yes, is very similar in length to the section of road that they are suggesting runs from the end of the farm track down across the fields to join up with SPO. Five. If they don't Okay. Yeah. It was confirmed yesterday that one of the reasons that they had to have the bell mouth in was to to remove the Northern Powergrid overhead line. And I think I do believe it was asked yesterday, or I think it was asked yesterday that if you if your honor, if you didn't have to have if you weren't using this route for construction, then would you need to take down the overhead line? And the answer to that was no. So that was answered this morning. I support thank you belong day. That was right. They want it was a no. Yeah, Mr. Farmer answered that question. I asked this this morning. So so which is obviously a lot less disturbance for my clients. And I we can't see why there is any need for them to come and have construction traffic coming down past my class. Because as they've confirmed as 13 109, ATVs 947 or 949 light vehicles coming down that road. In order to get to the proposed access

track. National bridge provides access to all that traffic has to come down the a 19. The route that Mike might that we have suggested, coming from the substation field over Hearn's, gutter, run into SPO. Five takes all that traffic off the 19. Big and because it can come back, because it can come back up the same road back to the compound.

1:03:58

i Miss, can I make a couple of points, Mr. Jones. So we will return to this tomorrow afternoon under CEA just so that everybody's clear. This is not just a traffic and transport matter. It's a land matter as well. And it does seem to me that if we're talking about certain access points where a bit of on site, joint collaboration between the Council could take place then this is another that could be looked at on site. And I think added to that we heard from two other APS I think yesterday about the potential for flytipping at the Bell mouths that were being increased and Mr. Fowler told us about the one at the Tadcaster tea that there was some discussion going on and some excuse me Some sort of design ideas in terms of how could that could be dealt with because obviously it says within national grids benefit as well as the landowners to resolve that. So again, I'm just sort of suggesting if you're going to look, if you're going to go out on site and have a day when you can look at some access points, then we've mentioned overturn. I think this one that we're talking about with Mr. Steven, there's another one. And I think at least one where you've got potential flytipping problems would be another one. Because, you know, if some kind of sketch arrangement for dealing with flytipping problems can be incorporated somewhere, then that that would be helpful to us. And it will be helpful to the council's I would just add on that as well. The other one that came up yesterday was the precise location of the access point at Newlands farm and some discussion about flooding in the corner of the field that might Mr. Stevenson. And his client pointed out so again, it that might be another one where it's pertinent to go and see him. Could I just check? Mr. Stevenson pointed out this, the plan with a T shaped purple tea, which is the it's AP p 051. Maybe if we could get that up on the screen. If it's possible. It's the trees and hedgerows potentially affected plan and it's it's page three or five exactly there. So we've got the purple tea. And that's presumably where the light the line is proposed to get crossed across. So could you just explain that we saw that small copse of new trees there, can you just explain the shape of that remove removal there and the width of it?

1:06:38

The following group? Yeah, that's not a problem. So you can see at the top of the kind of page there's a like a square kind of half a square rectangle, which is for the the work in area for the new proposed pylon. And the swear that comes out of it is for the swing and the sweat of the conductors. Underneath the proposed line, the blue area surrounding it is down as effective manager which is for the the stringing and pulling position at that which we can look at the equipment. So that's why it's done has affected my is not fully removed, because there is opportunity within there to kind of microsite where that equipment or the site site, but within the working area and underneath the conductor, the swing for construction, we've put that down as removed.

1:07:22

Thank you. And do you know why those trees plants did in that in that position? And what does the landowner think about their removal?

1:07:31

The forest good to have that don't know, on that, but we can ask our nation on that one, and we can come back to you on

1:07:39

that. Thank you. If we can hear that tomorrow afternoon, that would be helpful.

1:07:48

Okay, thank we Mr. Turney. Just before I move on,

1:07:52

registering for the applicant, I just wanted to pick up a couple of the points that Mr. Stevenson raised there and respond to them. Just to be absolutely clear, we're going to come back, as we've already said at the next deadline, providing detail as to why or the assessment that we make of providing an alternative means of access to this area. So that's where we need to come back on, it's not just certainly not just a question of the trees that he refers to because there's an issue about constructing another bridge overhangs gutter. So that's quite a substantial undertaking. And that's something we're looking at. I just want to be clear, though, he referred to removing 150 meters of hedge along the access road. The point there is we've taken powers to include the hedge. And that would be in respect to the construction of passing places if required. So it's certainly not the proposal that the whole of that hedge would be removed as a as part of the scheme. I think the that's the length of edge along the access road, in terms of the bell mouth, there's an area that needs to be that's within the area that's for visibility's plays, and also in respect to the work that we need to carry out at that bell mouth. So I think if he was referring to the edge that runs right the way down the access road, then that's not all for removal is identified as being within limits for that for that purpose. And part of it could be removed. I think the other point to emphasize is that whilst there's reference to 1000 1200 1300 movements across the project period, we are looking at a relatively low daily flow. And I think that's the important measure in terms of the impact that the use of that road will have. It's not the fact that it will be used for a prolonged period. It's that day to day, the levels are relatively low, week to week the levels are relatively low, and it is otherwise a suitable and appropriate means of X So there's no sort of technical concern raised about that as a as a suitable means of access. It's really just that Mr. Simpson says, understandably that his clients don't want the vehicles to go past their house. And I think the final point just to make is that the suggestion that the alternative, avoid some use of the A 19 is only right to the extent that a few, few 100 meters of the 19 wouldn't be used. Because the because the where the vehicles are going to be taken into an internal site route, construction traffic is still going to be using the AC 19 to get to and from the main Overton compound. So it's not right to say that there's an avoidance of construction traffic effects on the 19. It's still use the A 90 And it's just they'd be coming off in a different location if Mr. Stevenson's proposal went forward. But what we've said we'll do is we'll we'll take all of that away. And we'll come back at the next deadline to make clear whether or not there's something we can accommodate within the project.

1:11:05

Can I just come back on the hedgerows? Because I think, to your point, Mr. Turney goes to the heart of what Ms. White was saying earlier today about having something that shows where something might or

might not be removed. And in this situation, then, if there were a need to be passing, passing places, then you in design terms at this stage could make a best stab at where they might be. And then the limits of hedgerow removal could be reduced from what is in the audit at the moment. I'm not saying that the audit net on the land plans would necessarily be changed. But if we could have a sample drawing that would show that, then I think that would give some sort of, well, it would help in terms of the receptors that receptor number one in terms of their understanding of what might happen. And also it would just be an example of this is the sort of thing that might happen. And that's the sort of thing that might go into the dossier. Or it might go into some other document. But I think what we're looking for in some of these reinstatement things, it is not, we understand you can't tell us, you know, me, so for me, so what needs doing were, but just some design principles. So if that could be, it doesn't need to be a detailed engineering drawing. Again, it can be a sort of landscape architect's type sketch, if you like. But I just think that would help this situation and it might help other situations.

1:12:45

The file and national grid will take that into consideration. Is that possible to submit a deadline five rather than deadline for

1:12:53

Miss Jones? Do you? I would say deadline five is time for that.

1:12:59

I think deadline finally, as long as we've got that would give deadlines six for people to comment on and deadline seven for you to comment on the comments. So that should be sufficient. Okay, I've got a few more questions on 993. I'm kind of in your hands on whether you wish to soldier on for a little bit longer, or it's quarter past five in, you want to call it a day and will resume tomorrow. I'll look around the room for general nodding of heads or shaking of heads. What's the what's the general consensus? I mean, we're not going to finish traffic and transport today but we might be able to get part three out of the way if I soldier on alternatively. It's not a huge amount. We can pick it up tomorrow morning. What's What's the general view from the applicants side of things

1:13:53

registered if the African in your hands but we're happy to stop there if we're not going to finish traffic and transport today, but

1:13:58

I don't I don't think we will. The only issue is you will be dealing with me via the medium of the internet tomorrow rather than in person, which I'm sure you'll be very grateful for. In which case, I will have a few questions to come back to tomorrow. Just just mopping up questions on nine, nine B three. And then yes, we can finish off the rest of that first thing tomorrow morning.

1:14:22

1010 B three, hopefully 1111 B three. That's perfect. Thank you. And so that means that what we have left on our agenda is the rest of traffic and transport. We will then return to biodiversity that we skipped over earlier and which will hopefully fit with the timescales for your representative from North Yorkshire

Council will then go into cumulative and then complete the hearing and we hope that that would be before the natural lunch break tomorrow all being well. One other point I wanted to quickly pick up before we stop for today which was just appointed the North Yorkshire Council couple of times today your submissions have had a geographical kind of limits. So it's the points where, where it's been this is this is a view on behalf of Selby district councils form a planning area. And that's particularly come up under greenbelt and noise. I just wanted to flag that. It would be very helpful if we had a view for the rest of the North Yorkshire council area or a single view on behalf of the entire council area, and particularly where it relates to points of principle. For example, in terms of noise methodology, we talked about a little ball. So on the Greenbelt points, it would, I think, strengthen your case, if you were applying the principles that you're applying consistently across the whole of the North North Yorkshire Council boundary, we appreciate appreciate this is a very new reorganization that haven't owned just before we start, actually after we started this examination, but is there any scope to move towards that you think before we close this examination?

1:15:55

Yes, Michael Reynolds NYC will be able to get some wording together to explain how, how we've approached this and what when we've said from salby, how that expands into

1:16:08

Thank you. In terms of green belts coming back to that, if nothing else, just to consider how what you've said in terms of monk fryston substation may or may not apply to the Overton substation, that would be one particular area, right. I like Mr. Jones, you like you want to come in just to

1:16:25

say I've had a message from our ever on the ball case team. Just remind people that are joined in virtually that they were sent two links, apparently one for today, and one for tomorrow. So obviously for tomorrow, if they could join us in tomorrow's link. And not today's link had always said they might find themselves in a room of one. That's all I wanted to say on that. What could possibly

1:16:46

go wrong? Mr. Fletcher just wanted to come in before we close.

1:16:51

Sorry, yeah, just an observation because I can't be here tomorrow. Okay. Traffic, going into the construction compound at Raw who comes off a D restricted Road, which is the A 63. They've been too serious crashes there already. And here, ambulances are getting fed up with come in there. You need to seriously consider how the traffic is going to get in and out of that construction compound.

1:17:18

Thank you very much. I don't think I'm going to ask for a response. But what I'll do is put that on on our list of things we pick up. Yeah, thank you. And we saw that on and we walked as you were there, we walked around that junction yesterday. So we know exactly where you're talking about, unless the applicants got a burning desire to come back on that now. I think we'll we'll hold over till tomorrow.

1:17:35

The only thing I'd say is, I think it's really for North Yorkshire council to address that point, because we raised with them earlier consultation rounds, whether there should be a change in speed limit on that road. So I think we've sort of said, well, we can about that. It's out with our control, they would not support a reduction in speed limit.

1:17:54

Maybe about that one overnight. And because we've lost this, this is the location of the left hand left out, isn't it? So maybe just to consider that and we'll come back to that first thing when we return tomorrow. As I think there's anything else we need to cover off before we finish to the day I would just flag for if it helps people in terms of planning for Friday, just to let you know that we aren't planning to go late at the until late on Friday. We're actually hoping to be done by around 230 On Friday, worst case kind of three. So if that helps with planning on with travel arrangements, but to know that now then I'm just letting you know that as well. Okay. And if there's nothing else then we will. We will close for today and we will reopen at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I miss Paris. I think we're journeying not closing garbage anymore. Sorry. Wishful thinking. It's 518 Thank you