

TEXT_M25J28_ISH1_Session3_03032021

Wed, 3/3 4:05PM • 1:35:36

00:01

Welcome back, everybody. It's now two o'clock. And this issue specific hearing is now resumed. And before we go on to the next item on the agenda, which is access to negroes from grow farm

00:21

not aware of any housekeeping matters I need to deal with there is a

00:27

having reflect on matters over lunch. And no doubt you will have to.

00:32

There is just one, I think clarification question that I would like to ask in respect to the last item that we dealt with on the north non vehicular traffic and community severance. And I'd like to ask

00:46

Mr. Douglas, if he's there.

00:49

And back, Mr. Douglas, on Friday, we are going to discuss all things develop consent order, and you'll notice out that on the agenda, we're going to talk about the hearings, section 106 requirements. But I just wanted to know the item we were talking about the cycle path, and the proposed location and provision of it. Does that come under your sustainable travel agenda?

01:22

financial requirements you're seeking or is that something different? And just before you answer that, could you keep the I don't want to stray too much into Friday. But I do want to just have a almost a yes, no answer. Does the sustainable travel agenda that you're seeking?

01:39

cover this provision?

01:44

Thank you, sir. The Sustainable travel agenda that we're seeking does not include that. That proposal that whole was England set out this morning. So it doesn't include the soccer route that they're looking to progress through designated funds.

01:59

Right. So that that is that is something so whether that's provided or not you have your own requirements, which we'll discuss on Friday. Yes, sir. That's correct. Okay, thank you very much. That's all I had. That's right. That's helpful. And I just wanted to also for the discussion on Friday, and this is aimed at the applicants are not seeking your response. Now. We talked again, just before about the cycle path,

02:27

the examining authority has is leaning towards the view that this ought to be secured in this decio, particularly having regard to the national policy statement on securing improvements. And perhaps again, for a discussion on Friday, we could you could give some thoughts to how that might be

02:49

provided, whether it be via the travel plan or some other means, but perhaps we can. I'll leave that with you, for us to return to on the Friday. So with that in mind, I've that's all the matters I had. So we'll move across to the next item on the agenda. Mr. McArthur.

03:10

Thank you, Mr. Allen. So yes, moving on to access to an egress from Grove farm. And so the deadline to the owners of growth forms submitted via their representatives. So proposed amendments to the applicants proposals for access to an egress from growth, the growth on site.

03:31

I will come on and ask

03:34

the representatives of the owners of growth farms to go into a little bit more detail about those proposals. But in summary, it appears that the proposals suggest that the applicant close existing access to grow from the M 25. northbound on slip

03:51

that the applicant provide new dedicated auxiliary left turn lane access to grow and grow farm from the 25 northbound on slip. Under the applicant provide a new dedicated auxiliary left turn lane access to grow farm from the eastbound on slips to junction 28.

04:11

First of all, I will ask the grove farm representatives to correct me if I've misunderstood any of that. And then and then please briefly describe what they perceive as the benefits of their proposal and why they believe

04:28

it's a good solution.

04:34

Thank you so

04:36

can you hear me?

04:39

We can hear you you're a bit stop starts.

04:44

Paul McLaughlin, representing Mr. And Mrs. Jones, owners of growth on

04:52

thank you yeah, we can hear you if you if you get too jumpy. We will intervene and perhaps ask you to turn your camera off.

05:00

But please proceed with Okay.

05:03

Okay.

05:06

We've submitted representations to yourselves

05:11

with respect to alterations to the access

05:16

to grow farm from the M 25. On slip and the aid

05:21

of a spelled off slip.

05:25

The first and most important alteration is to the existing access to the farm from the 25. Slip.

05:36

I won't go through in, I won't repeat in detail

05:42

the full text of the benefits, but

05:49

just to refer you to section

05:52

three of the alterations to the clock, and I'm sorry to interrupt you, but you are breaking up quite a lot. So can we try with your camera off? And if you could just repeat the sort of last sentence that you just had, because I'm hazy

06:10

is better? I think so.

06:14

Sorry about that. Okay.

06:17

I'm just referring to the submission we made. And I want to talk Firstly, about the proposals for the alteration to the access to grow farm from the 25 on slip.

06:33

This is the benefits are discussed in Section 213 of our submission, and I'll briefly go through them, if you may.

06:45

Firstly, we would propose closing the existing access to the farm from the end 25.

06:57

I consider this would be an improvement to the to the access

07:02

looking at highways England's response to us ambition.

07:08

They do

07:11

mentioned in a number of places that their proposal or the scheme does not affect growth farm access, but

07:19

in my opinion, it does affect the access and

07:25

you can you can clearly see on my drawing 3396110 you can clearly

07:33

see the location of the existing a 12 piece bound off slip which I've coloured in here.

07:41

And I've also on that drawing superimpose the new alignment for the K 12 eastbound on slip.

07:54

Looking at the yellow they did in alignment. If you were turning left on the

08:04

proceed northbound on the M 25.

08:08

You have at least 40 metres of curb line once you depart from the age quo

08:16

on your left before to the slip lane entry to the farm with the realigned a 12 that 40 metre is

08:28

is cut back to it's difficult to save in the plans that have been published to the maximum 10 metres possibly down to five metres or zero even.

08:40

So, the issue with safety there is that

08:44

when you have left turning traffic from the 12th slip

08:49

turning left into the 25 there is inadequate time for left indicators and vehicles to switch off

08:57

for or you reach the current entrance to the farm.

09:05

And so this this in my opinion would cause a confusion where I motorists behind would either still consider indicators

09:15

of vehicles coming from the a 12 still be on confusing them with indicators for vehicles entering the farm. So, this this this distance between the new alignment for the a 12 pack and the existing entrance in my opinion is far too short and will

09:35

consist of a safety issue. So the proposal is to move the existing access to the farm north on the north side of the electric substation. laybuy provide a short admittedly is it substandard but a short deceleration lane into the farm in a new location. This

10:00

This tool, we combined the farm access with the maintenance pond access already

10:08

by highways England

10:12

it would actually replace that for that access, it would be an access only for the farm and it would provide benefits to the pond maintenance area.

10:23

Because would pull the gates to that pond maintenance the further and further away from the 25 slip into the side.

10:34

The second the second issue would be the second proposal was the provision of a new air to Grove farm.

10:47

From the a 12 eastbound slip the new alignment of the eastbound slip.

10:53

The benefit of this is that it will it will avoid heavy goods vehicles requiring to enter about

11:05

before entering the site from the M 25. And it removes

11:11

large vehicles, foreign vehicles accent accessing the existing uses on the site allows them to slip off

11:20

easily. And in my opinion within standard slip off

11:26

the a 12 slip.

11:30

Again without impacting on Brook Street and the roundabout.

11:36

Going back to one point going back to the access of the 25 moving the existing access

11:45

provides benefits to the dwellings

11:49

in that the noise from traffic entering the site will be moved further north. And therefore further away from the three dwellings which are on the on the site in that corner.

12:03

And you can see from my drawing 3396110 I have notated where the three dwellings are, there's obviously the main farmhouse and

12:19

accommodate to the north of the main barn house, which is a long rectangular building, which contains two separate dwellings.

12:31

So in our opinion, the proposals that we've made are proportionate and realistic, and certainly for the access to the M 25. would remove what would I consider as a safety hazard from the proposals as they stand?

12:49

Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Thank you. That's, that's very, very useful. I, before I move on, what I intend to do is I will ask

12:59

the other interested parties for their thoughts on the proposals as you've put forward and then come to the applicant for their thoughts Finally, but before I do that, excuse me, before I do that, Can I just ask why

13:15

what why it's believe necessary for there to be two points of access and exits from the site within effectively within such close proximity.

13:28

The proposals will not add any additional exit from the side the alterations to the entrance on the M 25 will be an entrance only. So, the exit at that point would be just for highways, England's maintenance vehicles. So, there will be no connection from the M 20 from the site directly to the end 25 northbound on slip. So from the from the grove farm site, yes. So, it looks as though there may be some possibility for a connection but no The intention is that that from the 25 it would it would remain as an access only noted thank you for that correction and the reasoning behind

14:20

setting aside exits or egress from the site then why two access points in such close proximity would be a benefit. I think the main the main benefit as I say would be to remove

14:35

HDTV turning movements or take them off completely any HDTV turning movements arriving at the grove farm site from the a 12 eastbound.

14:49

benefit of this access would be to take those hg movements off the brookstreet roundabout so they would come off before they before

20:00

For more than 25 and consequently, no modifications have been proposed.

20:06

The existing Ingress is sited close to the exit from the roundabout. Where vehicle speeds are slower.

20:14

There is an acceptable safety record in this location with this current layout. There are no recorded accidents at the Ingress

20:23

but relocating the ingressive further north along the 25 on slip road will place it where heavy vehicles are accelerating towards the merge with the 25 hour road safety and operational status specialists have raised concerns that such a relocation will be unsafe. Vehicles breaking into ground farm may cause collisions

20:47

with vehicles accelerating towards the end 25.

20:51

They've also raised concerns that vehicles could exit row form via the ingress and turn right into the slip road resulting in head on collisions. That's a problem apparently elsewhere on the I was in the network and they flagged that up for my attention.

21:09

If I turn my attention to the egress now this is the egress from Grove farm onto the a 12 eastbound carriageway. They just think egress will be affected by the realigned a 12 slip road, and it is proposed to reconnect the egress to the realigned slip road. On similar alignment and distance from the stoplight at the roundabout. It's reflecting as close as possible the existing inlet situation.

21:38

They just think egress is located close to the stop line where vehicles are slowing down. Again, there are no recorded accidents at this location on the current layout.

21:49

And even Gresham, the 12th will introduce an additional movement. This will create further hazards for through traffic as vehicles break for the diverged way, slip road traffic is travelling faster, being further away from the stop line is level of provision for private access could also be confused with the 25 on slip. And again, our road safety and operational safety specialists have raised concerns that such a provision will be unsafe

22:18

as picked up by Matthew Rheinberg evade taxes on slip roads are not permitted in the design standards. There will be departures from standards and operational safety will be material consideration in the departure approval review.

22:34

That's all I wanted to say at this time.

22:40

Thank you, Mr. Harris. And coming back to

22:44

one of your earlier points. Regarding

22:49

moving the revised access from the 25. Slip.

22:56

You mentioned that it's in its proposed position as proposed by Redwood partnership, it's less safe, because vehicles are accelerating and will therefore be braking. But is it not the case that vehicles will be braking to come to the existing access in its current location, the existing exit is quite close to the roundabout. So vehicles leaving the van but we're travelling slowly and travelling on into the access that's currently in place. So because it's closer to the roundabout, the vehicles following wouldn't yet be accelerating up onto the M 25. But relocating this

23:39

Ingress access from that employee was about further to the north. By this time, vehicles will be moving and increasing speed as they head north. And vehicles we leave in the 25 into the farm and braking and moving out of the way, but the vehicles behind will be looking to accelerate up to merge with the M 25. And so there's a potential conflict being created there which doesn't exist currently. So in in your view, and in coming back to my layman's terms that I'm quite fond of that the in the current scenario, the

24:15

traffic which is

24:18

using the existing access is effectively travelling at round about speed rather than coming up to motorway speed. And that's in a nutshell Yes. Then the travelling most of the leaving the roundabout anything much slower speed because of that close.

24:33

Okay, that's it. Thank you very much. I will I will come back to Mr. McLaughlin. Just to ask if he has any points and then I will come back to you again. Mr. Harris. In conclusion.

24:49

Oh, yes.

24:52

Are you

24:55

Hello, Yes, go ahead. Yes, sorry.

24:58

Yes.

25:00

You sir mentioned just now motorway speed when in fact the

25:06

the M 25 on slip

25:09

according to the highways England response

25:13

as a design speed of 70 kilometres per hour, which is just over 40 miles now, so it hasn't got a speed limit for motorway speed.

25:24

In its existing situation, the on slip, the intuitive Ibom slip, when you leave the roundabout, your once you pass the substation, you're essentially slipping onto the M 25. Pretty close to the farm. In the in the proposals, the actual on slip to the M 25. It has moved

25:50

three to 300 metres further north, so.

25:55

So in fact, the road the section of road that the past is the farm close to the roundabout is essentially a link road

26:05

to the on slip rather than on the snip itself. So In brief, we're looking at a 40 mile an hour speed limit, no motorway speed limit, and the actual on slips of the N two M 25 is much further north than it is at the present time. So I don't see an issue with what I would consider a marginal relocation of the exit. And I think

26:34

I think the idea that

26:37

vehicles would be accelerating and motors way to speed in this in this location is not correct, because that speed limit would wouldn't apply to this section of road.

26:49

Thank you.

26:52

Thank you, Miss McLaughlin. And I will speak on behalf of Mr. House believe that. It that that was my wording not his I don't think he suggested that. And, and I said approaching at motorway speed. But your point is well made and taken. Mr. Harris, do you have anything further to add? Yes, sir, welcome back.

27:15

This is often a point of confusion, but we have a speed limit on the road and the design speed. And they're not actually the same thing.

27:22

The design speeds are laid down and the standards and these are the standards that we use to define v i have curvature for visibility etc for designing the road alignment. But the speed limit is something sit down in in the law somewhere.

27:39

So, as Mr. McLaughlin was saying this speed, design speed, get my face my numbers, my name is what design speed for the slip road is 70 kilometres per hour. But the design, the actual speed limit is 70 miles per hour. And they are quite different figures. And I do appreciate that. But that is the fact that is the fact across the country.

28:02

Motorists when they are leaving the roundabout and looking to join the motorway are going to quite rightly assume that it can accelerate up to 70 miles an hour. And they were looking to do that as they do currently.

28:14

So we mustn't mix up design speeds for design purposes and speed limits.

28:21

Okay, and thank you that that's, again, useful, useful information. And I want I want to move on, I think I think we've heard enough from all sides to weigh up the arguments from both sides. So I don't propose that we stay on this subject for too much longer. I have got a couple of

28:43

issues that I'd like to raise more around the drawings used by the red brick partnership. In particular, I would like to check these are the only drawings that the examining authority has before them at this scale for this area.

29:04

And they're really quite useful in terms of giving a level of detail over a particular area and a particular area which is a cause for concern for not just for this topic, but other issues within the examination.

29:20

First of all, are the drawings that they're using an accurate representation of what's been submitted as part of the application.

29:32

When our design isn't there design

29:36

drawings that they've used as a base so obviously your design is right Yes.

29:43

Go sorry. After say we did provide, I believe we provided based drawings to

29:50

to Mr. McLaughlin, somehow to use for this purpose. Can I assist in that one, sir, please?

29:58

Yes.

30:00

We requested

30:03

digital versions of the proposals on a base survey base, ideally, but all we got from highways England was the digital layout of the proposals but that they weren't located on an Ordnance Survey plan or a survey base. So the plan that you see in front of you 3396110

30:29

that is my best interpretation of where the proposals which are shown in brown, which I received from I was England, how they fit on an Ordnance Survey plan. Clearly, clearly we don't have we have asked, but we hadn't received, we don't have a digital copy of the topographical survey, or, or an accurate

30:52

digital version of the proposals on a accurate base plan. So the brown alignment is the digital alignment received from highways England, but it where it sits on the Ordnance Survey plan is my best guess as to where it sits on the ground.

31:12

But I agree, I think there's plans at this scale

31:17

hadn't been produced and would have would be helpful in certainly getting a picture of how the new alignment sits relative to the farmhouse into the dwellings, compared to the existing alignment. I think it does give a fuller picture and how the proposals affect the farm. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. The examining authority agrees with you, and not solely for the purpose of this topic. But for other topics that we wish to discuss and get further information on

31:54

around this area. We would like

31:59

to ask the applicant to provide us drawings at this scale for this area. And I wonder if that's something that could be provided to the examination.

32:09

I'll refer to Mark chellis for comment, if I may. Thank you. Yes.

32:21

Thank you. So I mark trellis for highways England, I need to take an instruction.

32:28

But I think we are likely to be able to provide those would you just leave that with me? And I'll deal with that request? Of course, how long do you need? Not very long at all.

32:41

To get something out by the end of the day, we'll have we'll have space in the agenda for any other business. So if we can come back to this, then we'll Thank you.

32:51

And then before we move on, I will go to my colleague, Mr. Allen, who also has a question.

32:59

Yes, thank you very much. I have one question for Mr. Harris and one for Miss Chalice. If I start with Mr. Harris, please. My question to you is you'll just take you back very quickly to the comments you made about the

33:15

speed and accelerating up towards the end 25. But will the vehicle have to slow anyway would they not to get to the highway to take care of highways England's construction vehicles because your access your proposed access onto the site is just north of where the Jones family are proposing their new access, if you like the cause of BAM does slow down anyway, within all right was the use of taxes be quite infrequent. It's going to be a national grid annually to inspect their pylons and taxes to the pond for checking out for decentralisation frequent use and use the access will be gained by trained maintenance personnel. In liveried vehicles with flashing amber lights are trained to pull off motorways for this very sort of function. at that location there'll be a hard shoulder so the maintenance vehicle driving along the slipper, always flashing lights on indicating and then pull off onto the hard shoulder before pulling in towards the gate to gain access to the maintenance track. There will not be a

34:25

normal vehicle type access at this location. It's not meant to be attracting vehicles to us it is purely there for occasional use by maintenance vehicles.

34:35

Those vehicles are they travelling in the opposite direction?

34:38

No and this is one way it's all from south to north. So the hard shoulder that you talked about that where these vehicles on with that would that also include the John the proposed access area

34:55

that is being advanced by the Jones family.

35:00

I believe that the deceleration lane that's been mentioned would sit in the same location as the hard shoulder.

35:09

So would it be fair to say then that the vehicle that that should the examining authority wants to or think this is a good idea that vehicles approaching, let's call it the proposed grow farm access, the new one would be on that same slow down lane, that the vehicles using the access road would also use? Is that is that fair, they would be off the slip road, wouldn't it they would be on this same slow down lane, is that our access is slightly further north and what's being proposed as I recall, so they can pull off and slow down in that in that in that term, hard shoulder just north of the substation.

35:52

But again, I must stress that the vehicles undertaking that maintenance stop, we'll be travelling with their flashing lights on, and making it very clear to follow it from the roundabout, keeping a lower speed from the roundabout to make it clear what their intention is, and indicating only once they're past existing growth form, current Ingress, so there's no confusion to following motorists.

36:15

Thank you very much, Mr. Harris. And my final question to Mr. Chalice. If the examining authority was minded to accept this drawing as, as the required solution, or we want you to advance as the Secretary of State as the that it should be provided? How would we how would we secure that in this in this decio?

36:41

I mean, just to be clear, we're not saying we will, or even if we were, if we were minded to say actually this should be provided, what would be our options? I suppose. So as a matter of process, we would have to consider whether

36:58

a change request is needed to deal with it and what the landowning implications would be, but I'm bound to say, so to echo what Mr. Harris said that, you know, highways England is opposed to doing this on safety grounds. And I think we will be therefore very loath to make any form of change requests to promote a scheme which we considered unsafe.

37:22

I understood it. And as I said, I'm not suggesting that that is, that is what we will ultimately come to, but I need to look at the options that are available. Wood

37:36

is another option. Again, Mr. Charlie's a require an additional requirement in the decio. Seeking a some form of agreement on access prior to Commencement is another option, even if they've you might not agree that that's necessary, or, or right.

37:55

I'm not sure do so. Because I think it does mean changing the rocks as described in the order. And I suspect that it would involve having to go through the change request. process. I don't think

38:10

a requirement can deal with it, because one can't, as it were, change the works by virtue of a requirement. So it doesn't sound to me, sir, that that is a viable option.

38:23

I see. Okay, that's that. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Janice. I understand it. So

38:29

we have a hand up. Mr. Bateson.

38:35

Thank you, sir.

38:38

Thank you. So just a quick point, I'm sticking my neck out a little bit. But I think you would find here that the owners of growth farm would happily make some more land available to accommodate the proposals, albeit that they are outside of the current dcn. I think negotiation by agreement would facilitate that. And I think the main point of Mr. McLaughlin's report is that his proposals are certainly no less safe than those proposed by Howard England.

39:15

So okay, just to be locked in this proposal is really less safe at all. So yeah, we would like them to give them proper full consideration. Thank you. Thank you, Miss McLaughlin.

39:27

Yes, I concur with that.

39:32

In particular, the access from the M 25.

39:37

There is a safety issue with the realignment of the a 12 eastbound being much closer to the existing access than it is at the moment.

39:48

I think that is that does introduce a safety issue. I don't believe speed will be high in the immediate stretch of carriageway on the 25 that we're talking

40:00

About an overall I think they would this would be a safer access in both locations for growth farm.

40:09

Thank you. Yes, I was going to cut Mr. Harris, I'm going to come back to you for the final word on this before I'll hand back to Mr. MacArthur.

40:24

Got me now? Sorry. Yes, that wasn't Yes. Yes, I think your question, I've got the answers, but I'm giving you the final word if you want it. Okay. I just want to make it absolutely clear that we do not agree. That's

40:38

the proposal by

40:41

Mr. McLaughlin, and T is no less safe than the maintenance acts as it were posing in our scheme. We're looking at quite different usage. Here. There's a big gap a big difference in terms of the numbers of traffic's and grow farm today, seeing the maintenance traffic, and we're not comparing like for like,

41:02

okay, thank you very much, indeed. All understood. Mr. McArthur.

41:09

Thank you, Mr. Allen. Thank you, Mr. Harris. And we will then move on from on transport matters on to the historic environment.

41:21

Mr. McArthur, I just wondered whether you should ask whether anybody's got anything any traffic matters they want to raise before we move on, there may be one of our parties that want to wants to raise a traffic issue. Or more generally,

41:36

by all means, Jane, gentlemen. Yes, yes. Did you guess?

41:42

I just, um, this is all new to me what we're talking about here and then what?

41:48

The business about another

41:51

entrance off of the a 12 onto the foam off? You know, we've got Woodstock Avenue, the petrol station bales go. We're gonna have potentially another growth form entrance, the slip road, and then I believe.

42:10

Obviously, the rest of the changes going on. It just worries me a little bit. It's another potential hotspot

42:19

at the bottom of our road, really, that? You know, it may not be an issue. I don't know. I don't know, the volumes that that but it's just another site potential hotspot,

42:30

because lorries are trying to get over to the left, this is dual carriageway, you know, to get off into the form.

42:40

Thank you.

42:42

Thank you. Thank you, Jane.

42:45

That, that's duly noted, your concerns are noted. And we will bear them in mind as we go through the examination.

42:54

Please, please, no thank you.

42:56

Keep asking people to put their hands down just as they put their hands down. And if there are no other issues around the topic of traffic and transports, we will then move on. Just looking for those looking for hands.

43:12

And we will move on to the historic environment. The first subject on the agenda under this topic

43:22

is based on data and assessment of Tyler's whole farm. In their local impact reports, the London Borough of Havering raised issues around the available evidence in the environmental statements to support the applicant's view that heritage assets at Tyler's whole farm and the grove would suffer no significant adverse effects. In their response that deadline three the applicant has set up locations within the environmental statement that they believe contain this evidence. Can I ask London Borough of Havering to confirm whether they are no satisfied at the applicants response provides the evidence that they seek.

44:00

Thank you, sir. Yes. Since some landmark hiring submitted its local impact report at deadline one. We've had further discussions with the applicant on both

44:11

the two lists of buildings at Tyler's whole farm and also the historic farm at the grove. And we're now satisfied with the applicant in terms of the information that it's provided on both those matters, with agreed wording on both matters in the statement of common ground and I understand the iteration of the statement of common ground with that agreed would and will be submitted by the applicant at deadline for Thank you.

44:45

Thanks very much, Mr. Douglas.

44:47

That's excellent news. Are there any other comments on this? On this agenda item before I again before I

45:00

I will just come to the applicants, just for the final words if there are any, if they have anything further to add.

45:09

Exactly. So

45:12

just to confirm that, that is my understanding and what has just been said will indeed be reflected in the statement of common ground we propose to submit at the next deadline.

45:24

Thank you very much, Mr. chalice.

45:27

In that case, I will pass back over to my colleague, Mr. Allen, who will deal with the next agenda item.

45:38

Thank you. I thought we were going to be slightly longer on that. But

45:43

but that's fine. It's all good news. So the next item I want to talk about is the archaeological management plan that that came in at deadline three a.

45:55

I don't have much to say on this, other than to

46:00

Firstly, ask the London Borough of Havering. I know Essex County Council are not here.

46:07

But to ask London borough of Havering if they've managed to look at the document and whether they have any views on it at this stage. And then I just have a few questions of my own to finish off. So if I could ask

46:23

the missus single review you have any views you want to make on it?

46:33

Mr. Singer, I think you were you have frozen.

46:41

Right? I yes. I think you're going to have to log out and log back in or

46:48

so I am going to

46:51

move on. I'm guessing it's not me that's frozen. Can everybody still hear me?

46:57

We can still hear Yes.

46:59

It is missing or not me. Okay, fine. All right. Um, what I want to if I just wait for I'll come back to the number of hearing. But I wanted to ask.

47:13

Obviously, this document is coming.

47:16

As a result of questions that we asked and concerns that this document needed to come in the outcomes Julie provided it. I have read it. And I think it has dealt with a lot of the questions I had. However, I

47:33

I want to be certain that pre commencement works are adequately secured.

47:42

As if I could ask the applicant please.

47:47

document the update the archaeological management plan does deal with pre commencement works. But they don't they're not they're not secured in in in the decio. And so I was wondering, this might deal with this matter very quickly. Does requirement nine

48:08

require amending? Let me to make sure that it that no development

48:15

takes place prior to commencement or pre commencement until the archaeological management plan has been approved.

48:31

Until every single historic England representing London borough paper, I procrastinate this thing goes, Mr. Single I have I have because you froze I had I've sort of moved on and I will come back to you. So

do you want to just hang on for a few moments. And I'll just deal with these other matters. And I'll come back to your view on it. So

48:53

thank you, Mr.

48:56

Mr. Chancellor, someone from the applicant to answer my question, please. Yes. Just to reiterate, your question is should the revised

49:05

requirement nine, also pick up pre commencement works as dealt with in the archaeological management plan and outline version?

49:14

is that if I understood your question correctly, you have indeed Yes. Okay. So?

49:21

Well,

49:23

it's, it's difficult because what we have tried to achieve with our definition of Commencement is that

49:31

relative relatively minor works, which don't, we're not likely to have significant environmental effects. Always England should be able to press on with without having to go through the approval process

49:45

set out in the requirements and you will have seen so that we've adjusted that definition as the in the latest version of the development consent order and that is where we would like to get to so if our

50:00

Outline plan

50:03

does cover pre commencement works, then I think so probably ought to be adjusted to make it clear that they should be outside the scope of the Secretary of State's approval process. So if there is a mismatch there, I think we would like to take the opportunity to try and correct that.

50:25

Yes, that that's going the other way from where I want to go Mr. Charlie's because my concern is this is that if you

50:34

how a pre commencement works controlled, if the contractor comes across archaeological remains, there is no control process, on what the applicant, what the contract or the applicant needs to do. And this document will essentially come after those pre commencement works have taken place and could fundamentally alter its contents. So my putting it back your way, like I like to know that joke of it was, I'm going to ask you again, please to consider how pre commencement works, how, how trial, trenching and discovery of potential archaeological remains is to be controlled.

51:21

Well, sir, to return your thought your volley as it were,

51:27

the what we've now put in our definition of Commencement is archaeological surveys and evaluations, and these are intended to be

51:37

my minor worked, if I can put it that way that

51:41

are not likely to have significant effects, and therefore, so we're not suggesting that they do need to be controlled by virtue of the

51:50

approval process set out in in the requirements. So we are hoping to separate out those minor front end works, if I can put it that way. Because there's no need as a matter of process for them to go through the approval process. And as I say, if our outline plan doesn't clarify that

52:14

well enough, then then, so I think it should.

52:19

Thank you.

52:21

And just going on to the archaeological management plan itself and section 31233 of the report archaeon It states that the archaeological contractor is going to be responsible for including a summary in the final amss of known archaeological backgrounds, potential for as yet unknown archaeology and the research themes considered appropriate to guide your archaeological investigations. Are you content that that is secured in requirement nine is that going to happen? Well sir, definition of commenced to return to it is surveys and evaluations In other words, the you know, the front end minor works whereas I think what you are referring to is later on in the process, but may also defer to Kae Neustadt, who is the expert on that and the author of the plan and she can no doubt give you perhaps a

53:24

better answer than I can.

53:26

Thank you.

53:29

It's nice that

53:31

your microphone is off.

53:35

Of course, it is.

53:38

Okay to start representing highways England,

53:41

the archaeological management plan in outline form as it is now is designed to act as a overarching written scheme of investigation that would address the identification evaluation for significance and the mitigation of impacts to archaeological remains as a result of the scheme. The

54:05

It is designed to deal with both the pre commencement and the post commencement works in terms of setting up a framework by which the task specific written schemes of investigation for things like trial trenching, evaluation, trenching,

54:25

any area excavations,

54:29

modelling etc, would be done to

54:34

aid in the assessment of the

54:38

of the archaeological remains. The overarching written scheme of investigation, part of the archaeological management plan would be developed through consultation with the Greater London archaeological Advisory Service historic England, as represented here by Mr. Singhal as well as

54:59

the

55:01

If the if necessary the Conservation Officer, though I don't believe we have any built heritage impacts at the moment

55:08

or anticipate any the

55:11

works are controlled through the development and implementation of these tasks specific written schemes of investigation, which are, are required in advance of any archaeological field work, which would then be required in advance of any

55:30

development work, including the pre commencement works, if that makes sense. Yes, I still struggle a bit with the definition of commencement.

55:39

Yes, you might not be the only one. But if I could ask,

55:46

I've got two questions for you, please. And then I'll ask Mr. Single to come in at that point. If I could just take you to paragraph 6.2 of the document which our will, which states that geophysical surveys and is not anticipated to be as suitable is to be suitable for most of the scheme due to geology and vegetation cover. Are you able to expand on that a little bit what could you allow why not? Um, I can't expand on that a little bit and Mr. Single may be able to present additional information on that the geophysical survey that is most commonly done is magnetometry which is best suited for certain types of archaeology and is not always visible

56:38

does not actually show our show all archaeology in certain soil types, because of the different magnetic responses of the soils, the

56:49

vegetation cover is a little bit easier to address in terms of fact that you need

56:56

a fairly clear field in order to do this type of geophysics reliably, which includes things like being able to walk or drive clear transects with like a small four wheel drive with a kit mounted on the back of it.

57:14

So that the heavily overgrown brambles and various scrub vegetation would need to be completely removed in order to

57:24

make that a feasible option. In addition, the presence of things like services and farm equipment, any magnetic interference

57:36

from either field manoeuvring or underground disturbances, cabling

57:44

and such will come up as masking possible archaeology features, and we understand the area to be quite

57:53

heavily disrupted by various service lines and such making the potential for geophysical surveys to be of use in any substantial way to be to be relatively limited.

58:08

Okay, thank you, I shall give some thought to that answer.

58:13

It's also suggested that construction integrated recording would take place after trial trenching, the charging evaluation, should this not take place as a separate later phase in areas between known sites, which have already been investigated in more detail and on anything unexpected that may come to light during the construction phase.

58:36

The

58:39

the outline archaeological management plan identifies the approaches with regards to trial trenching, which is of course, an evaluation technique to identify and assess any subsurface remains that are encountered following the evaluation trenching. The next task in the

59:00

in the process would be identified based on that information, whether that is area excavation that's done to mitigate and record the archaeology that is in the ground, or construction integrated.

59:15

Recording frequently called trip mapping sample or strip map and record during the remaining construction activities

59:23

would be something that would have to be identified in an iterative process based on the evaluation trenching, which is one of the reasons the outline archaeological management plan sets itself up as an overarching written scheme of investigation that would then allow the development of tasks specific ones that can be dealt with too, that can be developed to deal with very specific impacts and the types

of archaeology that might be identified. So would it be so the construction integrated recording could be considered to be appropriate?

59:59

I think we may

1:00:00

have crossed each other there is so, so, are you saying that the that it would be a separate phase to the trial trenching evaluation, it's not done to me Yes After that he would it would be a separate phase the construction integrated recording would be a separate phase from the evaluation trenching, it would happen by definition as during the safe the construction soil stripping as part of the commencement works. The okay evaluation trenching would inform the need and locations to do that.

1:00:37

And a separate tasks specific written scheme of investigation for the construction integrated recording would be required.

1:00:46

Thank you. And then if we if I could ask you to look at six section 6.3 of the document, which states that trench plans would be used to identify sites?

1:00:58

Are you able now or If not, we'll the documents set out with a final document when it comes in actually set out? How many or how much of the site evaluating trenching would it would cover as well as the geographic geophysical surveying? And when would this occur in the pre commencement stage.

1:01:19

It's anticipated that the final archaeological management plan itself would specify the extent of trial trenching evaluations say the percentage of coverage which would be developed in consultation with

1:01:35

with the Greater London archaeological advisory service, and with the archaeological contractor working for the principal construction contractor,

1:01:45

it would then also be subject to a separate specific task specific written scheme of investigation identifying the locations of those trenches and things like the extent of the depth, what they're designed to test or not, or if they're random,

1:02:04

trenching patterns. And that would be developed by the archaeological consultant during the detailed design in advance of possibly during the examination period, but in advance of the commencement of the construction activities, and it would be designed by the archaeological contractor for the work who's

generally best suited to identify the very specifics that would be required for that attention. So, as they saw can logical management plan do to come in before after the detailed design is being done?

1:02:37

I believe it is

1:02:40

due to be developed in the overlapping with it.

1:02:46

The archaeological contractor is on board with the team that is doing the detailed design and is working with us to develop and then finalise that.

1:03:00

Because yes, I mean to, to my mind it surely the ecological management must come after or because how would you know which areas to survey it once you know the detailed design.

1:03:15

And well, the areas for survey can be identified at relatively early stages in the detailed design, because the archaeological investigations do cover more than just the exact specific areas of ground disturbance. So the trenching would have to be

1:03:37

located kind of across the site across the decio boundary site

1:03:43

in order to address the full potential, because there's while there are some areas that might have more potential than others to result in archaeological remains, the overall the site as a whole still needs to be examined as such.

1:04:04

It can be done it at the

1:04:08

at the same time as the design is developing. In addition, while the detailed design is being developed, any archaeological evaluations being conducted can then help aid in informing the detailed design.

1:04:24

Right. Understood. Thank you very much. Indeed, Mr. Singhal, you've been quite patient I'll return you've had the answers given to my questions. But the question I put to you was your view on the outline archaeological management plan that's been submitted into the examination, your view on that and the responses that I received from Mr. nostos.

1:04:49

Thank you very much, sir. I am concerned at both the content and the theoretical approach of the archaeological mountain

1:05:00

Plan.

1:05:02

The archaeological management is not important formed by field work. It does not show why the proposed approach has been adopted in favour of other management techniques.

1:05:13

And it currently admits any undertakings on public benefits that might be factored into a balanced

1:05:21

decision.

1:05:23

Mr. Chalice earlier described archaeology as a minor environmental matter.

1:05:29

Anyways, England's position on this as a minor environmental matter is based on their assessment thus far, which largely comprises a four year old archaeological desk based assessment and which emits the key discovery in 2018. At the gardens a piece site immediately to the south of the application scheme of a Saxon occupation, or activity site.

1:05:57

gardens a piece is separated from the scheme by the a 12, of course, and the a 12. In this location follows the line of the Roman road, from London to Colchester, and at this particular location, it's also where the Roman road crosses over the river fingerboard.

1:06:11

At the northern end of the gardens, a piece site close to the main road was found an early to middle Saxon site dating at 450 to 650.

1:06:20

Although the insertion of a major gas main along the northern edge of the gardens a piece of damaged it historically, visible features still indicated possible structures. And interestingly, that work also recovered a small sample of earlier a Roman pottery from the Saxon features. So in East London, Roman and Saxon, later sex seven sites are often located at Roman river crossings. So you've got your Rumford, you've got Stratford you've got old Ford in Tower Hamlets. And there's a testable hypothesis here that there's a possible Saxon and possibly even earlier Roman settlements site, straddling the old Roman road at this location, which extends North onto the north side of the a 12, into the application site.

1:07:03

Now, in terms of significance, historic England's scheduling selection criteria, which are the secondary guidance that we follow when establishing whether or not national importance is going to be a criterion in making a decision, advise that all early Saxon settlements are candidates for scheduling. They're all they're all potentially nationally important archaeological sites.

1:07:24

And it also strongly implies that sites that transition from Roman to Saxon periods are even more important because you can then start to look for evidence of continuity, evidence of change. The old sort of historical tale of the rampaging geomorphics getting off their boats on the Essex coast and driving the amount of British off into Wales and the West Country in the north country is increasingly seen as much more complicated picture of integration and interrelationships. So

1:07:57

looking at thinking about the policy here, the NPS nn has its has a particular paragraph about on designated archaeological heritage assets that are of demonstrable significance to federal monuments. And it says that they should be treated as though they are designated assets,

1:08:12

when in decision making, so the harm from the centre scheme really does have to be exceptional. Um, and it's my advice that the applicants have not assessed this potential

1:08:23

or any other archaeological potential at the site,

1:08:26

using the appropriate methods that can inform a decision, um, and that we seem to have jumped ahead logically to a belief that

1:08:39

a consent on the current design will be granted which will leave very little flexibility for design changes to preserve any very important archaeological remains without going through the assessment and field evaluation process that the MPs and n enshrines shrines.

1:09:00

Thank you single and quite, quite alarming to hear that.

1:09:08

It was that picked up largely in the local impact report.

1:09:13

That is included in the local impact report. So yes, along with the Roman road, the archaeological priority area around the river Confluence. Thank you, and could you so as you as you got the applicant here, what would you be expecting the archaeological management plan to include if you could

perhaps, advise the examining authority, while the Atkinson is the what, what should we be asking the applicant now to, to have another go at this

1:09:43

plan?

1:09:45

As per my advice in August when the application was lodged, what I would like the archaeological management plan to be informed by is the results first of some geo archaeological modelling of the site based on the DGI work that's already taken place to try and

1:10:00

identify areas of modern disturbance, areas of higher archaeological potential. And then for archive dedicated archaeological trenches targeting probably mostly the southern edge of the site, because that's where the key archaeology is. The evidence of the key archaeology is likely to be for that work to be to inform a management plan to inform the design, especially and salary features, such as the service road and so forth, perhaps not that great big sweep of the cloverleaf itself. I appreciate, that might be a harder thing to redesign, but so that if there are key remains along the south of the site, we can we can identify them, we can preserve them, and we can try to create some sort of public benefit as part of the scheme I see that there's a cycle lay now being produced, it would be great if we could have some public interpretation of the Heritage Site along that cycle lane, for example.

1:10:49

Is this something that the Secretary of State could grant consent for? And these work be done before the production of the final LMS? Or are you suggesting that this work needs to be done during the life of this examination?

1:11:04

I would suggest that a positive decision based on the current amount of archaeological information would not be a policy compliance decision.

1:11:16

So I can I just pause I just make a note of that.

1:11:27

So is it your advice? I'm going to push you here, Mr. Single is your advice currently, that if the applicant was to disagree and say, No, this is perfectly fine. On your opinion, would should the examining authority be

1:11:44

recommending refusal of this scheme based on the archaeological information before it?

1:11:49

The risk here is that naturally important remains could be found in parts of the site, and that their preservation could not be secured and harm to other designated archaeological assets of demonstrable significance to a scheduled archaeological monuments. harm to them should be wholly exceptional.

1:12:13

Mr. Singhal, thank you very much. I'm

1:12:17

so I'm going to return to the to I've got a hand up. I can see is that Miss knows that I was going to come back to you anyway. But do you want to?

1:12:27

Yes, I'll come to you unless Mr. Charles wants to come in as well. But I'll come to you in the instance for a response.

1:12:38

Yes, I don't know Mark, if it, Mr. Charles, if you if you had anything on it. But I will say that what Mr. Singhal is has said about the baseline for the archaeology is slightly misleading, as we have actually taken into consideration more than just the information that was done for the depth based assessment that was produced initially at the preliminary environmental impact report stage. that it does include updated information from the historic environment record at the time of the environmental statement, and has incorporated the

1:13:13

discoveries that at

1:13:15

at the oak farm cemetery, the Saxon site that Mr. Siegel refer to

1:13:20

as much as we possibly can, it should be noted that I only received the information that confirmed the dating on the pottery from that site about two weeks ago.

1:13:34

And that the previous reports, it was not on the historic environment record data that we requested either for the space assessment because it hadn't been discovered as yet. Or for the environmental statement, though, in consultation with glass for the archaeological watching brief that was done for the ground investigation work. We

1:13:57

did discuss

1:14:00

the fines that had been made at Oak farm cemetery and their possible significance. I've just as I said recently seen the post excavation analysis that Adam kindly sent through to me a couple weeks ago on the excavations for that site at Oak farm, which were recorded through excavation at the sites and in process and development was not stopped, nor do I believe any preservation in situ was identified as appropriate for that location. Our assessment of the archaeological potential of the area based on the known historic environment record the archaeological priority areas and priority zones, which include the Roman road and some geological deposits that are thought to possibly relate to early prehistoric settlements or early prehistoric deposits.

1:14:53

We have consulted those and believe that while there may be

1:15:00

Significant nationally significant archaeological remains that the likelihood of this is relatively low. As there's been little information to suggest from the previous investigations done for everything from various gas pipelines, the oak, Oak farm cemetery, the M 25. Anything reported from the portable antiquities scheme to suggest that there's any intensive Roman settlement at this location.

1:15:30

And if there if there is,

1:15:33

early mediaeval or Saxon remains there, that while they may need to be considered in terms of their schedulable quality, Once identified, we have not identified any we've not

1:15:46

uncovered anything that has yet to identify them within our project area. In part, this is yes, because we've not been able to do the evaluation trenching, which under ideal circumstances, would have been done in advance of the decio design, there were other issues that related to how that was able to be undertaken or not, as the case may be,

1:16:13

including the land access. But the NPS nn specifies that that the

1:16:22

that the baseline be

1:16:26

the evidence be baseline on the historic environment record additional information from such things as consultation, the ground investigation, monitoring from the archaeological watching brief, which did develop a

1:16:41

a depositional model and has been submitted to glass by the by ourselves as well as the company that produced it,

1:16:51

that we feel we've been compliant with it with the npsm. And due to the fact that we've considered all of the

1:16:58

all of the sources that are noted in in that document in the NPSM

1:17:05

as required to aid in the decision. And whereas it does note that field investigations

1:17:13

shouldn't be taken into consideration. If required, it also implies that they are not always required and also there are other issues regarding the field investigations, the evaluation trenching, that may have prohibited it from happening again, with such things as land access the evaluation trenches to identify and assess the significance of any as yet unknown archaeological remains, we feel can be done during the examination period and in the pre commencement periods, in order to meet the requirements to consider the historic environment by the MPs. And then as well as being required through the register of environmental actions and commitments. And requirement nine of the dceu following those documents that were outlined in the management plan.

1:18:13

The

1:18:14

the main point that we have is regarding the

1:18:19

potential for the nationally significant archaeological remains the potential for Roman or Saxon remains is that the regulations and the NPS nn do specify that they should be treated as scheduled sheduled remains if they are of that quality. We do not currently have any information that suggests such remains are

1:18:42

likely or would be

1:18:47

would be there. Obviously, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. I'm going to interrupt that viewpoint you acknowledge has been reached on a desktop survey as opposed to be as opposed to actual trial, trenching or de psychological testing. Correct. Okay. And you also acknowledge that you say that the NPS n and requires you to take the baseline from the Environmental record. But you acknowledge that that may have been out of date, because he didn't take into account the fines on

what he's now the guns a piece of land. Our environmental statement, and the further archaeological watching brief for the ground investigations did take into account the fines at the

1:19:38

cemetery that were identified. The reason and that reason is because we were able to consult with glass and get the information from them regarding the most up to date information coming out of those excavations. Obviously, the nature of archaeology is we don't know what we know until

1:20:00

We find it and therefore, it would not be possible to really predict that there would be a nationally significant

1:20:10

Anglo Saxon site south of there prior to it, it actually being recovered. And in the first instance in there in the trial trenching for that specific site, it was actually identified as a Mesolithic or not a Mesolithic an Iron Age, I believe,

1:20:25

an Iron Age selection of pottery, it wasn't until it was excavated, removed from the site sent for carbon 14 dating that it was identified as,

1:20:34

as Anglo Saxon. It. So in that case, it may be an issue of whether or not preservation in situ was appropriate for that site, but it wouldn't have been identified as a an Anglo Saxon site until

1:20:52

quite some time after it was first identified and had already been excavated.

1:20:58

Okay,

1:20:59

Miss single, do you want to respond to what you've heard? and I do mean, respond rather than repeat what you've previously said Is there anything that that Miss Neustadt has said that you want to come back on? Um, well, to be to be brief, it's some it's not an unusual I think a concept in environmental management generally that one needs to understand what's one deed what one is dealing with before one comes up with a management plan for it.

1:21:28

I've been involved intimately in the project for some years now and Miss Neustadt and I discussed field evaluation, I unfortunately, highways England have taken the decision not to progress that

1:21:44

and I had been hopeful in the in recent months that that we would get some access to the site and that that trenching could take place. But um,

1:21:53

we now found to find ourselves in a position where I am concerned that

1:22:00

management plan has been put together that itself is a is a very bare bones approach. I'm concerned that construction integrated recording is specifically defined as not being something that could possibly affect the timetable for the developments, which, when you find important archaeology, starts to send set alarm bells ringing, as I say, the absence of public benefit as well in the scheme. Um, I would really like highways England to take this back and revise their approach extensively.

1:22:34

And if they were to if a user suggesting that if they were to go and do further modelling and further testing, could that be achieved within the timescale of the examination?

1:22:50

The work ahead of them? I would, I would say, I mean, that they will have to negotiate access with the landowners, which I understand is it's something that they would they would have to add to ensure like they do a targeted trial, trenching programme would take a few weeks, reporting on that a few weeks more.

1:23:11

And I think it would, it would provide the necessary level of comfort. If there is if there are no remains of a potential national significance there for me to be able to support the scheme with some updates to the ecological management plan, which again, I think could be done within the examination period. timeframe.

1:23:31

Thank you, Mr. Singhal. Miss nice day. could Is that something that you're prepared to do?

1:23:39

We are currently working with housings currently working with the detailed design team and with Atkins to prepare any documents I believe and Mr. Charles may be able to speak more on behalf of land access, as I'm not dealing directly with that

1:24:02

there is an archaeological contractor on board with the detailed design team that should be able to

1:24:09

progress with the evaluation trenching,

1:24:13

that however, is something that would need to be instructed to them I believe

1:24:18

it alternatively it could be instructed to the DCO team and again, I would I would have to defer to Michelle's and to the highways, England

1:24:31

procurements and such team to, to arrange exactly how that would happen. The timescales as it were, do not suggest that it is not possible. The timescales in question. Should we have should access be allowed and arranged is certainly doable. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't put you on the spot. Is this something that you could perhaps provide an update tomorrow morning, but

1:25:00

When we resume the hearing, before we move on to landscape design, this is something that perhaps you could come back to us on. Yes. So thank you for not putting me on the spot, because it is quite difficult to just give you an instant answer. As you will appreciate, it's not necessarily just a question of doing the work, but then producing the documents as a result of that work and getting any land access that might be needed. So I think it will be helpful for you to be aware that I believe there is a meeting arranged on the 10th of March between highways England, and glass, which I hope that we could make some more progress and this decision was mind

1:25:43

at rest.

1:25:46

Beyond that, so do you mind if I come back to you as to the practicability of doing any more field work?

1:25:55

Yeah, well, I'll this examination. I'll ask you again in the morning, then just in case in case you have an update. And if you don't, you I mean, deadline for of the 17th of March calls, post dates, your meeting on the 10th. So you always have you have that deadline, certainly to update us of what you intend to do in respect to this. Okay. Is there any other points anybody wants to make on archaeological matters? Yes. So if I may, whilst I'm still on camera, Mr. Singhal, I think said that I said, that we or I said the archaeological works were minor works.

1:26:38

I don't think I said

1:26:41

that. But I was talking about where those elements of the archaeological works that we seek to exclude from the definition of commence, and not indeed the entirety of the works. covered by the plan. So just just so there's no misunderstanding of that.

1:26:59

Mr. Singer, your hand is up. Yeah, thank you very much for clarifying that, Mr. Chalice, I apologise, I didn't need to cause any offence

1:27:07

there. Just to also say I agree with this notion that on the geophysical prospection issue, the geology, inhaling is indeed extremely unwilling to give up its secrets. There is one particular kind of rig called a cesium vapour magnetometer which has had results out that way. But it needs to be done in combination with another technique such as Earth resistivity. And even then it's I don't think in a site like this with a lot of alluvium, a lot of made ground involved, it's going to be particularly useful compared to trial trenching, which I think is really the way to go here.

1:27:40

Thank you.

1:27:42

Well, I'll just conclude then on this matter to say that that that was

1:27:48

a little bit of an eye opener. I of course, knew there was some concerns, but I wasn't I was I've been slightly taken aback say to say the least on, on this issue. And the fact that we've heard from the Mr. Singh was said what he said, so I think I should certainly be and I know the Mr. MacArthur as well, we'll certainly be looking for some progress with this. And some resolution, I'll be looking to the applicant, certainly to,

1:28:18

to do any target, trenching that they're able to do and update the ATMs accordingly. And I look forward to an update tomorrow, and if not tomorrow, certainly at deadline for following your meeting.

1:28:35

Okay, that brings us

1:28:38

almost to the end for today. Today's meeting.

1:28:43

So just before I look to

1:28:47

Mr. Owen, I'm sorry.

1:28:50

I didn't see your hand. Sorry. But thank you. So I just wanted to put my hand up before you close things, as it were. This is just on a process point, if I can raise this matter with you regarding the change requests, and particularly your letter of the 26th of February, for which thanks, and

1:29:10

you have accepted two of the changes. And as regard to the other two, you're asking for the views of those involved by the 17th of March. And of course, we understand that. So in the same letter, you've asked if by the 17th of March, we would update the decio land plans and other documents. And what I would like to suggest to you, so is that that that that is quite an undertaking. And of course, we can do that. But then, if you were to accept one or both of the other changes, and we hope you will accept the both, then I think we'd be putting in yet another set of plans, because those you've asked for by the 17th will be out of date. And I suggest that that's a bit of a recipe for confusion. And it might be better if we wait until you and Mr. MacArthur

1:30:00

Come to your decision on the change requests as a whole, and then put in a set of amended documents. It's also relevant to that issue that all this issue that, of course changes one and two are, are linked. And you have accepted change one, but not yet changed to pending comments.

1:30:20

So that's my suggestion so that we put in a set of amended documents when you've made your decision on all four changes.

1:30:28

But if you if you do if you do want an updated set of blends by the by deadline for just those you've accepted, we can do that. But as I say, so I think that

1:30:39

could get rather off plans involved and probably unnecessarily.

1:30:45

I will talk to Mr. McArthur on that during the

1:30:51

following during the German break. I will come back to you on that tomorrow. But I my initial thought, is I think that's sensible, your suggestions, but I but I will just check my chat with my colleague Casey's vehemently against that, and persuades me that, that that shouldn't happen, but I will certainly perhaps during the resumption, and tomorrow and before we move on to item four, we will I will come back to you on that one. Thank you. So I've got one more point of if I may, I promised to come back to Mr. MacArthur about the provision of plans. And I'm not able to because I've obviously been listening to the discussion. And it does seem to be a bit more complex than

1:31:36

It first appeared. So would you would you would you bear with me on that. And I shall give you a response. As soon as soon as I can.

1:31:45

Yeah, absolutely. I mean, again, I think tomorrow morning, before we get into the hearing might be a good opportunity to update us again, if you've been any further progress, but Well, yeah, update us anyway. I think whether you have made progress or not, I think Yes, indeed. Thank you. Thank you.

1:32:03

Thank you. If I could ask Mrs. Hanlon, please to

1:32:08

if you could go through the action points. For today, please.

1:32:15

Yes, sir, I captured several action points. The first one is that the app can issue a clarification on the transport assessment baseline data chapter.

1:32:27

The second one is on foot between the applicant and Transport for London to fight for to have a look into whether they can secure

1:32:37

something outside the DC area within the DC area in regards to providing more assurance on the integration. Second thing at brookstreet. And the third action point is an

1:32:50

outline traffic management plan to be submitted into the app into the examination.

1:32:56

And the next one would be to the applicant to clarify anticipated timescales subjected to being approved to when they could incorporate or if they can say cycle and walkway routes. And next that the app can Oh, well, the next one was about the plan. So I'll leave that that's been discussed for tomorrow morning. And then also, the outcome is already timetabled. But I just made note that they will need to submit a update a statement of common ground between London borough paper and in themselves regarding the historic matters on agenda item 3.2. And then the applicant to look into

1:33:39

for providing the words in the document and what documentation that they can consider to doing some trenching regarding historic and environmental impact after that meeting with brass.

1:33:53

And I'll make sure that they have the right and deadline dates for when we published the actions later on this evening or tomorrow morning.

1:34:03

Thank you, Mr. Chalice, anything you want to add before I adjourn the meeting?

1:34:14

Thank you, sir. No, we think that captures everything that's really very helpful indeed. Thank you.

1:34:20

And no doubt there may be more action points first thing in the morning and when we when we deal with the updates that we're asking for. So with that, it's just a thank you all for today's participation. If you're not joining us tomorrow, we hope you've gained and you've heard the matter you want to hear and satisfied that the issue has been debated. And again, we thank you for your participation. So we will resume this hearing tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock where we will discuss landscape design and landscaping people in communities in any

1:35:00

matters for clarification as set out on the agenda, reminding you that there is another you will have to attend the arrangements conference and that will commence at 930. So with that in mind,

1:35:18

okay, so I'm just reading a comment now. I'll deal with that in a minute. And so, with that in mind, it is now 25 to four. And we will. This hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.