

# TEXT\_M25J28\_ISH1\_Day2\_Session1\_040320 21

Thu, 3/4 11:25AM • 1:02:21

00:01

Good morning, everybody. It's now 10 o'clock. And welcome back to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters on the application made by highways England for the proposed m 25. junction 28 improvement scheme.

00:17

Can I just ask Mrs. Hanlon, again to confirm that I can be heard and the live streaming is commenced?

00:26

Yes, can hear and see you fine in the live stream and started. Thank you. And just a reminder to those people watching on the live stream, or an instruction, if you're new, is that, when should we break at any point today for mid morning break or lunch, you will need to

00:47

restart your live stream at the point in which we break. And that's in order to give us clear recording files. And we'll try and remind you that at each time we take the break as well.

01:00

Yesterday, we the examining authority introduced ourselves. I'm Richard Allen, my colleague is rod MacArthur. And we are the examining authority for this project. And I'll just do a few reminders from the introductions yesterday. Just to remind you, please, under the GDPR regulations, please do not disclose any information that may be personal or confidential, that you would not want to be in the public domain. That this is the only official recording of the proceedings that will be permitted into the examination, we will not accept tweets, or blogs. And to remind you that section 94 of the Planning Act allows the examining authority to refuse representations made into this hearing if they're deemed to be irrelevant fixations frivolous relates to the merits of national policy, or repeat representations already made, or relates to the compensation of compulsory acquisition. Now, at yesterday's

02:05

hearing, we discussed items two and three on the agenda. And today, we will resume and deal with items four, five, and six and any other business.

02:19

So just before we do move on to those items, there were some matters from yesterday that required some clearing up and some updating.

02:34

I can start with Mr. Challis, your question to the examining authority about the change request response, you asked whether you could delay the necessary submissions of the documents such as the land plans, until such time as we made a decision on change requests two and three. And we are in agreement with you that that is the sensible option to take. So yes, if you, you we will issue a decision very shortly, I believe after deadline for I think we have to after 28 days. And yes, if you could then submit whatever documentation is needed for the next deadline. I think that's a sensible, social way forward. Thank you very much. And while you're there, Mr. Challis, we asked you yesterday For updates, please on the growth on plans,

03:30

which you alluded that may be more difficult than then than first thought. And also regarding the archaeology, trenching position to update the archaeological management plan. So if I could ask you please, just to give us an update on those two positions. Yes, sir. Thank you Mark Challis for highways England regarding the plans. So yes, we can provide some plans at a greater scale, but what they will be is really magnified or zoomed up copies of the works plans. At a similar scale to those that you looked at yesterday. As regards grow farm. What we were not clear about is whether you wanted those plans just for the area in relation to grow farm or a for a wider area, because as you can imagine, if those plans are sort of blown up, so to speak, then that does amount to I think quite a lot of plans. So

04:34

we thought we'd ask you what, what you would find helpful.

04:38

I'm gonna look at you, Mr. McArthur for this feat for a response because this was your request. I think we were looking just at the grove farm. Given that that's where the issue is particularly twice vote concerns firstly over this access, but I think there's

04:55

an issue of

04:58

living conditions as well so it

05:00

Probably be helpful just for that. But Mr MacArthur, I'll

05:03

I'll ask you whether that's sufficient. Thank you, Mr. Allen, I would say on balance, I would say that that I agree with you. I think that that is the area of our primary concern it is, when looking at the drawings at the scale, as submitted, it's quite a challenge to work out which line depicts what element of infrastructure or landscape etc. and a larger scale would be beneficial than

05:29

we certainly don't want to drip feed you requests for large scale drawings throughout the course of the examination. It may be that, that as we progress, another area might become apparent that we would like large scale, but it's not there now. And I think

05:45

I wouldn't either want to request the entirety of the scheme at that scale. So I think growth on for now is adequate for our needs. Okay, so thank you. That's very helpful. I emphasise, they will just be magnified versions of the works plans. But hopefully, you'll find that that helpful.

06:04

As regards the archaeology, we discussed the outline plan yesterday, our position on that is

06:14

we are going to endeavour to do some trial trenching.

06:19

Whilst the examination is still running, we will we'll need access to land in order to do that. But we think and hope that will be helpful in providing

06:31

a bit more certainty as to the position as regards archaeology. So that is our intention. And perhaps I can update you further at deadline for by which time there will have been a meeting with the local authority.

06:51

There were a couple of other things as well on my list of things to update you on. So would you like me to do with those as well? Yes, please, on the integration. And you remember, we had a discussion yesterday about whether the integration, phasing of the traffic signal should be dealt with by legislation. And I explained that our view is that that would be excessive, but it was helpfully suggested that it could be dealt with in an agreement. And so what we are proposing is to discuss that with TfL. And it could be a provision in an agreement with them. And that will be a means of securing the integration phase, which as I said yesterday, highways England fully intends to implement, but hopefully that will give comfort on that.

07:43

The fourth thing on my list with regards the timescales for the

07:50

nm non motorised users provision, which you'll recall is the subject of a designated funds process. And we were asked about timescales for the implementation of that work, where those designated funds to be approved.

08:06

The timing of those works and the timing of the main construction works will be aligned.

08:12

That's how that will work. But I'm afraid I can't give you an update overnight regarding the approval process, but we have escalated that within highways England, and if I may say I'll give you an updated deadline for

08:33

now, yes, that's fine. I mean, we may touch on it tomorrow, Mr. Challis, just in dealing with the decio and whether it needs securing somewhere just to it. I

08:45

will leave that till tomorrow. So we will end up on the decio. But I would like to discuss how that would be secured. Same with the integration as well. You talk about the TfL potentially having an agreement with them. I'll be asking you whether that will be in how that is being secured. Are you talking about a protective provisions for this purposes of this application? But we'll come on to that tomorrow.

09:11

Thank you.

09:13

Anything else? Mr. Chan is

09:16

just one thing on procedure today. So expect to want to go through this now anyway as to who is speaking against which items so you're clear.

09:25

In fact, would it help if I were to just let you have our list of speakers now?

09:33

Yes, you can do because I was about to just confirm who's here from my list just before we move on. But yes, as you'll hear, okay. Okay, thank you very much. I'll just go straight. I mean, a number of people because the agenda covers quite a wide range of things. today. on four one design and landscaping that will be Simon Harris

09:57

on 42 regarding tree

10:00

We'll be Thomas Dale.

10:04

When we move on to people and communities item five, one regarding grow farm

10:11

as regards visual matters will be Neil Hutchins.

10:16

Sorry, just need to just go a little bit slow. That's

10:20

where I'm asking the question. So what was that? Sorry? Can you repeat that on people in communities and grow farmers? Five one visual matters will be Neil Hutchins.

10:33

As regards noise, Adam Lawrence.

10:38

And as regards air quality,

10:42

Victoria Sykes.

10:48

Okay, item five two regarding the maylands golf course.

10:54

Dave Stengel

10:59

and also Mike Cox. Mike is a golf course design expert.

11:07

Five three obviously hard to predict it depends what people I want to say what questions Sir, you have our matters for clarification on six one and the construction environmental management plan that will be Evelina. Now.

11:26

on six to a ground conditions, Liz grey.

11:34

on six, three.

11:39

Sorry, are you ready for me? Yes, I'm ready. That's fine. Sorry, six to be Simon Harris. And possibly myself. It's about the works details.

11:51

6.4 Freya Crumden.

11:55

And can I mentioned that it will be very helpful if she could be dealt with or that item could be dealt with before 2pm. She has particular reasons for not being available after 2pm. So I just make the request in the hope that that can be accommodated that 6.4.

12:19

And then on mitigation measures regarding flooding around the brookstreet junction is Simon Harris.

12:34

Okay.

12:36

Thank you. Thank you very much.

12:41

Okay, so just before we move on to the next item, I'll just confirm who I see here. For the for the record, I can see that we have representatives of the London Borough of Havering. We have representatives from Grove farm, including Mr. or Mrs. Jones. We have Mr. Bodley from the Glebelands Estate, Mr. Woodruff, from Essex, we have Transport for London here. two episodes from Brentwood, the Met police.

13:14

Jane Allen, I can see is here and

13:17

representatives of the applicant as Mr. Challis has just set out.

13:23

So if there's no other points on the agenda itself,

13:29

we'll move on to item four, landscape and design. We're going to talk about design, first of all, and just before I hand over to Mr. MacArthur Can I just say that as yes as per yesterday, it just to save people's we've got a lot of people on here. And just to save on broad bandwidth.

13:47

Probably one or both of us who are not speaking will switch our cameras off. But we will be very much listening to the debate as it goes on. So with that, Mr. McArthur.

14:03

Thank you, Mr. Ron.

14:05

So moving on to item 4.1. The design of the proposed burn in in the examining authorities first written questions, we asked a series of questions 1.6 1.7 and 1.9, in which we asked the applicant to demonstrate how good design has been incorporated into the proposed development, and we made particular reference to the design of structures.

14:31

Within that question, or those questions,

14:34

the examining authority recognises that the applicant stands for does go some way to set up the landscape design methodology and the engineering principles which underpin the design methodology. However, the applicants response

14:47

questions they'll be 1.6 to 1.9 is still considered lacking in some detail when it comes to the description of the steps taken by the design team to secure that new structures within the proposed development constitute

15:00

Good design.

15:03

Equally, the drawings which accompany the application are considered fairly lacking in detail in terms of their ability to show the design quality of the of the proposed development.

15:14

I'd like to ask and not by no means going into design review of the of the project as a whole, but concentrating on some specific and perhaps most visual aspects of the design,

15:30

which is with the bridges and specifically alderwood Bridge and growth Grove and maylands Bridge, which I think can be seen as one, one interlocking structure. That's not to say that duckweed bridge is not important. It is but for the purposes of time, I think we were best served looking at those. Those ones the bridges mentioned, can I ask the applicant has set out the design process to date

15:59

in broad terms, that has led to the submitted proposals for each of those structures. So for all the Woodbridge for growth rates for maylands, which

16:09

is the Harrison please.

16:14

Good morning. My name's Simon Harris. I represent highways England here today. As you've requested, Mr. MacArthur, I'll cover those points now and I'll come back to the structure stored into my description. So the scheme has been developed to achieve good design as required by the national policy statement for national networks. Key considerations have included visual appearance, functionality, fitness, purpose, sustainability and cost. Now highlight the approach taken to embrace the good design requirements describing examples of how this has been achieved.

16:50

visual appearance as a key consideration and much effort has been made to harmonise the scheme into the local landscape. The road has been designed to follow existing ground level where possible to minimise intrusion. Earth mounting and landscape planting has been designed to screen the road from adjacent properties and provide visual interest from the landscape and for motorists.

17:11

The adverse visual effects upon sensitive receptors such as Madden's cottage magic cottages, are mitigated by the planting of post wooden block that runs along the western periphery of the loop road.

17:23

Planting will enhance the existing landscape with existing woodland and shrubs retained as far as practicable within the scheme providing connectivity to the interval and Valley site of Metropolitan importance. This planting has been designed for the benefit of wildlife and biodiversity. respecting the local landscape character particularly in areas of existing woodland belongs

17:47

to significant watercourses passed through this landscape. A length of the inborn river will be diverted to follow a sinuous alignment with backwaters to slow the flow in COVID shows and support for spawning. tread modelling has informed the provision of flood compensation areas and water areas through structures with a button set back to the edge of the floodplain, and soffits have been set above the 100 year flood level. This allows the river floodplain to function in a predominantly natural manner in terms of flood.

18:19

The location of Fred compensation was selected to offset the impact as close as possible to the areas affected along Willow brook a flood area with that as a wetland and wet grass species have been specified to enhancing aquatic environment.

18:34

actions of Willow brook which are believed to have been artificially straightened and which currently follow a straight alignment is supposed to be modified into more seniors course. Ecological ponds be provided for great crested newts in mitigation for the works proposed.

18:50



The mitigation measures were developed in liaison with the local authorities the Environment Agency in natural England to ensure that they were considered appropriate and were supported.

19:00

consultations also undertaken with the landowners and other interested parties and their feedback was taken into consideration. This included optimising the size of the balancing pond in grow farm to reduce the size and impact on the landholding

19:15

you've laid with a major utility companies whose plant is affected by the scheme to understand the impacts and agreed evolutionary works. options for diversions were identified and assessed in order to identify the most appropriate solution.

19:29

There are many constraints imposed by these companies. much work has been undertaken to agree provisions which can be accommodated within the scheme constraints, objectives and timescales.

19:39

structures were developed by identifying a number of options and then assessing each before identifying the preferred design solutions. The design sought to reflect the construction of existing local structures to achieve harmony. Over bridge in supports and retaining walls have been designed using reinforced earth rather than concrete to reduce the use of high costs.

20:00

carbon intensive materials and allow revegetation and planting.

20:04

The assessments included design life requirements, settings, construction works and methodologies, maintenance and cost.

20:13

For the bridges the number of spans are optimised to reduce the elevation of the bridges and minimise deck thickness whilst achieving headroom requirements to achieve a balanced appearance. The spans were designed to accommodate the features cross including watercourses, utilities, plant and access routes. environmental considerations include accommodating wildlife and flood events in agreement with the Environment Agency.

20:39

proposals for the structures have been shared with interested parties including the local authorities, utility companies, landowners and environmental bodies during the development of the preliminary design.

20:50

Provisions made include Nam alleges in the COVID extensions and in the existing culverts, minimising hard banks in watercourses and ensuring continuity of bad foraging routes. Adjacent to the 12 a balance had to be achieved to accommodate the clearance to national grid, overhead power lines, the realignment of the confluence of the two watercourses, the realignment, a 12 eastbound off slip road and the merge of the loop road. This constraint location requires the provision of two new bridges and a retained embankment to minimise the impact on growth would and include an ecological mitigation area with the support of the Environment Agency.

21:31

extension to Grove COVID was adopted following an initial option to realign the fingerboard rhythm in an open channel. This work is located between growth arm and the realigned a 12 eastbound off slip road. space constraints meant that the channel was straight and hardened and unattractive biodiversity. This was considered to be undesirable and then extended COVID solution was negotiated with the Environment Agency. And given the net benefits supported. steepened earthworks will also be used to reduce construction impacts and disturbance on neighbouring farm.

22:07

That sums up my view of evolution of the design highlighting the considerations given to the environment options considered for the design elements and adjustments made to incorporate the feedback received to develop a good design.

22:27

Thank you, Mr. Harris. As, as I alluded to him in my question, and the responses that we've had to date,

22:36

do go a significant way to talk and to respond to the questions that we've raised regarding landscape design methodology and the engineering principles. And, and, and you've effectively repeated that now, we are specifically in this case, trying to establish or gain a little bit of a greater understanding of how, how you've arrived at the design, and particularly the aesthetics which the national which the MPs stresses is important, in, in any new project, how you how your design process has arrived at the aesthetic solution that you currently are presenting. And with specific reference to the brace designs at this stage.

23:25

You did you mentioned landscaping, landscaping, typically, and I think you mentioned it in the response that you've just given

23:34

appears to be used as a device to screen the road.

23:39

And the visuals that are presented, do demonstrate that there's an element of success in that landscape screening the road.

23:48

However, it can't, it can't be acceptable to simply try to hide the road with landscaping, and it may ultimately not be successful, there could be many reasons why the landscaping may fail to screen the road. And we would expect the landscaping is a more integrated consideration than that. And I think you've gotten some way to describe that in many places it is

24:14

you mentioned in your answer that aesthetics were considered. And so can you expand a little bit more on what that consideration was how that how that how that element of the design process evolved, particularly with regard to the aesthetics of the bridges.

24:34

For my engineering perspective, the choice of materials and the form of the structures that has been selected to try to harmonise with the existing structures in that vicinity, mindful that the existing structures are quite old and may not be as sympathetic as we would be today. But the choices have been made to achieve a balance between achieving it

25:00

solutions which can be constructed in terms of building ability, and cost effectiveness while being easy to maintain in the long term. But the finishes are important to make sure that they blend in with the with that environment as well.

25:16

Our landscaping team have given us advice in terms of the visual aspects of that, but

25:23

you're looking for more detail than I'm describing. And I somewhat in terms of the first point that you're raising, and the

25:35

the surrounding environment and the design cues, if you like that you've picked up from the existing structures,

25:42

I would, I would hope that the design of structures,

25:47

such as the ones we're talking about, has evolved somewhat from when, when the M 25. In that area was constructed, which was 1785. I think it opened five apologies. Nonetheless, some time ago, I would hope, and I would hope we could we could as a nation do better than that, not in the design of our new bridges. And I would hope that you would agree, but you go on to talk about finishes.

26:20

It's not it's not clear, but it's not very clear from the engineering drawings, and all the visuals,

26:28

what the finishes are intended to be, there's not a great deal of information about finishes to retaining structures.

26:38

It's assumed that that concrete supports for bridges will be concrete and retaining wall structures, etc. And yeah, it's, it's, it's about fairly grey mass on a visual and, and little detail on the drawings. So yeah, please, please do go into a little bit more detail about finishes, the discussions that you've had about finishes and how you intend to,

27:05

to finish those structures that are in some places really quite visual.

27:11

Yeah, okay. I think

27:15

this will start so we take is in terms of, of the engineering, whatever we design has to stand up clearly for the duration and, and fulfil its purpose, but it's very important that does fit within the local environment. Absolutely right.

27:28

And in terms of those finishes, they need to be sort of

27:31

self-maintaining,

27:33

generally speaking, but we'll use a concrete finish where access is difficult.

27:38

And then the actual treatment of that concrete finish will be subject to my choice about what we once believed to be appropriate for that local environment.

27:47

But the retaining structures for example,

27:51

it's not been locked down absolutely, what the finishes will be this is part of the detailed design process. But

27:58

the choices will be where we are able to do it, if we have limited space have two vertical walls, there will be a concrete panel finish.

28:07

If we're able to have a slightly sloped front face, they can be

28:11

exposed vegetated face, which can be planted to blend that rather, rather better into that environment.

28:19

That in certainly at the very end of the scheme, where space is very constrained, we do have vertical so I did retain structures there, which would be a concrete a concrete panelled finish.

28:34

And so I think what we're trying to do is what we're certainly not trying to do is take you into the design detail design phase at this stage where we recognise that there is there is a design stage to go through and that that is not

28:50

one that you typically go through when you get to the stage that we're at the moment.

28:55

Never nevertheless, take taking a concrete panel as an example.

29:01

there there's a world of difference between concrete panels at one end of the scale and the other.

29:08

I suppose what we're looking for, and what would give the examining authority some assurances is to know really what the aspirations are for the finished quality in the end results, whilst you may not have gone through the detailed design stage of this at this point, I would not expect it to be unreasonable to for there to be

29:35

a briefing document for want of a better word that sets out what the aspirations for the finished quality of these structures are. You do make reference to the good road design.

29:50

book I'm paraphrasing its name, but

29:54

your own document which sets out 1010 design principles

30:00

445 and six are particularly interesting in this case that fits in context is restrained, is environmentally sustainable.

30:09

Within that document, and on page 17 of that document, there's an exemplar image of a bridge. I don't know how familiar you have the document up, you may not know it.

30:21

There's an example of it, which is the green bridge over the a 21. You've got Newcastle and Kent. Yeah. That, that that

30:31

to be flippant, that looks like a very nice bridge. And I would hope, I think the examiner examining authority and I think interested parties would hope that your aspiration is to achieve that kind of quality in the design of the structures. Clearly, it's not exactly replication, you're not going to just take that bridge and put it into it, but to go through the process to arrive at the end of that process with a solution of that type of quality. And we're, I think we're looking for you at this stage today to say that, to agree that that is the type of the type of quality that you want to end up at.

31:13

Yeah, I think that that that bridge, shown in that document was in an area where there was some high, high quality local,

31:23

environmental area. And they were very connectivity between several parts of that. So there was a particular need there to deliver a solution, which was of the highest quality, I would suggest.

31:38

In the area that we're where we are, we aren't in that similar situation to that. We've also got some very, very significant space constraints. So we're trying to achieve this balance between achieving the

31:52

desired objective to make that connection for the highway schemes to fit them all together into the least space possible, given the adjacent land holdings and existing features, that roads etc. And the utilities trying to bring all these factors together to come up with a best compromise by adopting the highest standards that we can to achieve that, and to try and make this fit into that local environment. And that's what we hope we have achieved in our designs in the photo montage. So I hope give you an indication as to sort the sort of aspiration that we're trying to achieve in that particular location for this for this scheme.

32:33

And I

32:36

I don't take comfort from the photo montage is, I have to I have to say, at this stage, and I will come back to that to that image, again in

32:48

the VA 21 Bridge, I mean, this is this is your this is highways, England's good design, document, this is not this is not setting.

33:02

It's what is advanced as an example of good design not an exception,

33:09

but generally good design, it strikes me as it should be, of course, there are specific issues which influenced the design of that bridge, and some of them do not apply in in this case.

33:26

But many of them do. And the principles set out in that in the road to good design, surely do apply in this case, and in every case of

33:36

of design within highways England.

33:39

So I don't I don't necessarily accept that this is something I'm achievable. I think I think it should be achievable, whether it looks exactly the way it does.

33:54

In the road to good design booklet in the specific case of this project, of course is a matter for detailed design. But we as an examiner authority, and a number of interested parties are I think looking for some more,

34:11

some more certainty about what the what the aspirations for the end results are. And I've used the

34:20

principle which as an architect, I would be I would be generally using with it with a client, which would be to say, here are some precedent images. This is this is what we're trying to get for you. Of course, it won't look exactly like this. But this is the level of quality that we're going for that that that type of thing is not is not before the examining authority. So we really have, hence the questions ultimately we do. We are not sure really what level of quality you're going for and we aren't sure how that can be secured at this stage.

34:57

I think I would respond by saying that we've presented what we

35:00

believe is the appropriate design solution in this location that's been developed through liaison with highways England specialists, structures teams, it's been developed on the back of feedback from the local interested parties. We've taken into account the principles of good design, we believe in delivering those, those solutions. I wonder whether this is a matter of subjectivity. And, you know, we've, we do believe that we have delivered a solution which we think is appropriate for the project, in terms of balancing all these matters, dictator for good, good design. And I wonder whether

35:42

we didn't not seeing eye to eye in terms of what the end product should look like. It's a bit of theory or for me, and I don't think it's a matter of subjectivity in it. And it's not a case of us not seeing eye to eye. What I'm really saying is, I don't actually know, ultimately, what these what these structures will look like, to a large extent that I'm familiar enough with the project process of producing photomontages versus the reality to know that the structures will not look like the photo montage is that they're an abstract representation of ultimately what will be before us. But if we look at if we looked at viewpoints, see, for instance, in your photo montage, which is the view from Grove farm, looking back to the 12 offset?

36:34

I don't believe that it's a subjective opinion to say that that's, and that's quite a striking, fairly oppressive, pretty big retaining wall for a domestic property to be to be looking at. That's simply not a matter of subjectivity.

36:55

And I was I wasn't meaning that that was me in terms of this the Finish button. Yes. I understand. Yes. Yeah.

37:03

I don't want us to get into a subjective argument. You have you have made your case. You have you have set your point. And of course, I hope I've made mine as well. I will come back to the point that I thought it would it would help us to

37:23

to have more certainty about the aspirations behind this. I will I will come back there are a number of hands raised. So I will come back to you. I want I want to talk a little bit more about older Woodbridge in specifics.

37:38

But I will just open this up for now. Mr. Mr. Hutchins, you have your hand up.

37:47

Surgeons for Hi, Miss England. Yeah. On the landscape lead. So I just like to sort of help Simon.

37:57



So in terms of landscape design, it's performing two functions.

38:02

as you rightly said before, part of the function is to screen the new road, proposed road. And we've also responded to the local landscape character as well. So the local landscape character, and it's partly defined by woodland blocks. It's got a number of small and large wooden blocks within the wider area. So our woodland areas that we've proposed, although we are constrained by space, and we are trying to reflect the Eco landscape character from that perspective, as well as screening the road and

38:32

we're also responding to, we're also proposing quite large areas of low nutrient grasslands, which is a response to highways England's one of their major project instructions as well, which came out in October last year about new projects and maximising areas of species rich grassland or in the trunk restaurants.

38:57

Thank you very much for

39:04

coming back. Mr. Mr. Harris,

39:08

older Woodbridge,

39:10

in in the in the answer to your question, there'll be 1.9

39:17

provided by the applicant, you discuss that that that has gone through a design iteration and at an earlier stage. There was a different design solution proposed and then you go on it goes on to say the answer goes on to say that as the design progressed and topographical information was collected, it became evident that a different approach could provide a leaner, more efficient design and

39:46

a that sounds like a fairly polite way of saying we chose a cheaper option. And is that a case of cost? It's a very important consideration I have to say to the public purse isn't infinitely deep.

40:00

And that is something we always have to include in our assessment of the of these projects. But that's one part of the assessment,

40:08

or the Woodbridge. The problem we have with old Woodbridge is we have the end to end, the

40:15

the new loop road a new link road leaves the m25 and it crosses into the areas that Northern swings back around again, but he has to cross over the

40:26

the northbound on slip for the m25. And you've got two roads that are running in a very, very similar alignment. So have a very, very good askew crossing,

40:38

the ideal crossing of a road over another road over a railway over a river is to have it perpendicular, we can keep the British short as possible

40:48

to minimise

40:51

any obstructions, any effects is the neatest solution. But here, we can't, we can't possibly do that. And so we have got this very long skew crossing. And that gives us a quite a long length over which the road above has to cross over the road beneath. And that does limit very much what we can achieve in terms of

41:12

an engineering constructible solution. So one of the solutions we did look at mindful that the woman ended up with can be a look a bit heavy, shall we say, was to put in a conventional bridge viaduct essentially carrying the road across the slip road beneath. But this became

41:33

quite complex in terms of design.

41:38

And it would have involved

41:40

compromises to design which detracted from its visual appearance.

41:46

And it was it was a much more expensive solution. It wasn't hard to maintain, there were several factors which were considered which led us to this decision that that was not going to be a favourite option for the final solution. What we've ended up with, it's a bit like a

42:05

bridge over the pros with the with the M 25. LinkedIn crossing over it. So it looks unusual, but it's quite a commonly used

42:16

structure. For situations which have arisen elsewhere and projects in the country. It's not the first time that sort of solution has been used.

42:28

Thank you, I, of course, we're all very conscious that particularly having just listened to a budget. And the day before that the cost is cost is always a factor. And I will come back to Section 4.29 of the NPS, which starts by saying that visually impaired visual appearance should be a key factor. And

42:51

do you believe that visual appearance is a key factor in this case,

42:56

we've got a lot to consider what the viewpoints are to the structure, we've got the non slip approach in the structure in a cutting the loop protruding 25 is passing across

43:12

at a level of slightly above ground level. So it's quite depressed in the in the in the landscape, I was just

43:20

and then we're looking at them. So that's a bit of viewpoint from land side, there aren't any footpath in the area which overlook the route. So the people who were looking at your people who would live on growth, I will walk within their land.

43:34

And then of course, the travelling public. So the people who are going to have the most immediate impression of that structure are going to be people travelling northbound on the 25 on slip. And when you're driving straight towards the structure, you will be seeing a rectangular opening, maybe passing through it at high speed, and you'll be on your way. But so

43:59

it's a question of this is not going to be an iconic structure in this location. And we believe that the structure is a Is it a good balance between the various constraints that we have to balance and will deliver serviceable, and it's not to be hideous

44:17

depression or getting it maybe not very attractive structure, but it's going to be awfully a visible structure. And we will use finishes to make sure it appears as a structure in that location. It's a clear it's clear what it is and it doesn't pretend to be something else.

44:35

Okay, I

44:40

I will. I noticed Matthew Rheinberg has his hand up. So I will I will ask him to come in now if that's okay.

44:49

Mr. Rheinberg.

44:51

Thank you sir. It's just a very brief point really, that's both transport bonds and

44:58

good design. We do

45:00

It needs to be balanced against construction costs and ongoing maintenance costs. And maintenance costs something but TfL doesn't currently have any assurance over the DCO. And we are starting to cover our costs which will be discussed at the hearing tomorrow. But it's just really to briefly make paper that point that we appreciate varies a balance between cost and the parents as well.

45:34

Thank you, Mr. Rheinberg.

45:38

I am before I move on to what I hope is that the final points in this subject, I will just I will ask my

45:46

colleague, Mr. Allen, if he has any, any further comments on this specific item related to or to Woodbridge?

46:03

I think you you've

46:08

I'll leave it with you, Mr. McCarthy, because i heard what Mr. Hann had to say about the way the new loop road crosses the nonslip I'm still not entirely sure as to why it has to be this big concrete block or even how that concrete block is going to look out outside of the road.

46:32

Once the you know what's what is going to comprise either side of it.

46:37

But I think you've asked the questions that needs to be asked at this stage. So I don't actually have anything further other than to

46:47

express again, some concerns that if this if this bridge doesn't follow the highways, England's good design guides, I'll call it that. It could look, I think it will be quite visually

47:02

visually exposed and

47:05

and quite harmful. But that you know, I will certainly allow highways England if they're going to put any response to this to review that before we make any final decision on it. But no, I've no, no actual questions, more observations.

47:24

Thank

47:32

you.

47:34

I am struggling with the speed of my computer at the moment. It takes a while to unmute. Thank you, Mr. Allen.

47:41

Before I come to Mr. Douglas to see his hand up, I would just make one final point on Grove farm that that there are there are a number of employment uses there on the grove farm property and some of which are actually very close to the location of the proposed old wood bridge. So it's not only a case of road users and residents that would be affected. But Mr. Douglas, I will I will come to you now please.

48:11

Just I'll just briefly make

48:14

one point, sir, thank you.

48:16

Just to say that from a flavourings perspective, we obviously want the want to be able to secure the best designed for our for our local residents, particularly residency in in the nearby residential roads,

48:31

who will have kind of first visual sight if you like of the of the new loop of the new loop road.

48:38

And we would expect from our local authority perspective to

48:44

be engaging with the appointed contractor. As their detailed design process progresses, post consent is granted for the scheme. And the other point I'll just briefly make and it we

49:01

just refer the panel to paragraph

49:06

11 point 2.9 all payer brings local impact report where we've where we've recommended that

49:13

the proposed vegetation that the applicant is setting out that will be planted to help mitigate the visual impact that that is planted at the earliest possible opportunity to ensure that adequate screening is provided in the long term. Thank you.

49:34

Thank you, Mr. Douglas.

49:37

I am

49:39

I want to we've touched we've touched briefly on

49:44

on the area around reform, the grove bridge maylands Bridge area. I don't I don't think we can productively move much, much beyond what we talked about already.

50:00

Mr. Harris, I will come back to another responsive response in in to our to our written question IB 1.7. It within that response, the advocate notes that it was agreed that the proposed development is not required to be reviewed by highways, England's independent design panel. Can you talk me through how that process of agreement works? Please?

50:33

I'm afraid I can't I'm sorry. I'll refer back to Mr. Challis and then have to come back to you with an answer on that one. I'm sorry.

50:39

Okay. I think we would be interested in learning a little bit more information about what why is specifically it was agreed that this this development is not required to be reviewed.

50:57

Mr. Challenge, did you want to say thank you, so only to say that

51:02

Ms. Meier is able to help us with this? So

51:05

perhaps,

51:07

if you'd like to hear from her, sir, she's ready to deal with it. Thank you, yeah. Hi, um, in our

51:17

development of the design, we have put our

51:22

design

51:24

proposal through the highways England design panel, and it was decided that this

51:33

project is not warranting

51:37

proper review or an independent design panel.

51:43

As we know, this scheme is not in an area, which is, you know, locally sensitive, you know, either or triple si or area of outstanding natural beauty. So when the review has taken place, it was decided that we don't have to go through the independent design panel. So I think it

52:09

because highways England is dealing with numerous projects, they have taken a view that this project doesn't need to go through that, but saying that, we had to go through various

52:23

design reviews with various technical specialists, including

52:29

us internally, the principal designer appointed by highways England,

52:34

we had to go through rigorous processes, which would warrant a similar approach as the independent design panel, set up my height with England.

52:48

Thank you, Miss America. Can you just clarify the design panel that that the proposed developments went to and was reviewed by is that the design panel which is referenced in the roads to good design? Yes, yes. So there is a submission being made. And then there is

53:10

a decision made by whoever is

53:14

leading or coordinating the independent review. And the feedback from them was that this scheme would not need to go through the independent design panel.

53:26

But so the design panel, just to be absolutely clear, the design referred to in the road to good design, they have they have reviewed this project and decided that it meets the standards. Yeah, yeah. Yes. Good. Design us in that book. Yeah. Yeah. Thank you. I wonder in that case, and this is not a question for you, specifically, but perhaps Mr. Challis, may be better, so better place to answer this with the applicant be happy to submit the road to good design book to the to the examining authority as part of this examination.

54:08

mock trials for highways England, so yes, I yes, we would, and then we will.

54:14

Thank you. Thank you very much.

54:19

That that really concludes the questions that I have on landscaping and design, what are the design section? And

54:28

I will just ask if there are any, any further comments from interested parties before we before we move on any further

54:41

and it seems that there are no hands coming up. So I think we will move on.

54:49

I think correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Allen, but we may we may be moving, moving the agenda around a little bit. You've you're now complete with this.

55:00

process. Mr. McArthur?

55:04



Yes, I'm proposing that we just deal with item six for now.

55:11

And your questions and the questions we have on the fourth carbon budget for Miss Crumden. So that will leave her for this hearing, as requested by Mr. Chalice.

55:23

That may be a good point to deal with it before we move on to trees. Is that? Would that be helpful? Mr. Challis? Thank you. So that'd be very much appreciated. Okay. We'd be very happy to do that. Thank you. Right. So we'll just deal with six, four, and they will return to four two entrees.

55:44

Thank you.

55:46

So moving on to item 6.4.

55:51

I think these are these are matters for clarification, as much as anything else, I believe, because the proposed development was submitted. And originally, as I understand it was intended to be complete within the third carbon budget, but that that clearly is no longer the case will not be the case. And

56:16

we said within the response to our written question, one point 13. It's noted that traffic modelling and air quality assessment has not been carried out for the opening year, which will be at this stage, we believe 2024. And therefore, a quantitative assessment of operational emissions in the context of the fourth carbon budget is not possible. And Can you expand in a bit more detail on the reasons for this and explain why, why it's believed that it's a reason it is reasonable that this information is not before the examination?

56:54

Yes, so we have now updated that assessment. So we carried out that assessment, based on the opening year being in the fourth carbon budget.

57:05

So that was looking at an opening year of 2024. So just, I guess, just to run through what the results of that work for you. And that moves, obviously, the construction and operational period were previously in the third carbon budget, now the construction period is split between the third and fourth budget period, and operation will fall in the fourth budget period onwards. So the contribution of construction to the third carbon budget has reduced, obviously, because some of it moved into the fourth budget period. So that that is now 0.0005% of the budget. That's the contribution I'm gonna get going. How many zeros after the decimal point three zeros and then a 5% of them that's towards the third carbon budget. And then the latter half of the construction phase and also, Operation throughout the fourth budget, will contribute 0.001% to the fourth budget. So that's 0.001% to the fourth budget.

58:15

And that is in obviously only in the operational phase, and includes 50% of the construction emissions, because construction now falls kind of 5050 between the two budget periods.

58:28

Yeah.

58:31

And this, has this been as this information being submitted at this stage, or do we have it before us?

58:39

I'll need to clarify that perhaps with Mr. Chalice.

58:50

Mr. Chalice, are you able to have that has that information been submitted? Sorry, I think we did. March on this signature deadline winner one, I think we explained the position.

59:03

I don't think we've put in the revised calculation.

59:08

And if it would help for us to do that, and I suspect it would, then we're happy to do that. Yes. Yes. Yes, please, if you if you can. Is it reasonable for that to come in at deadline for?

59:22

Yes, I think the work has been done. It's been completed. It can be done. Yes. Good. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

59:31

And then I want to move on. That's been very helpful, thank you, and actually deals with deals with some of the questions that I had which is which is always good.

59:43

The

59:45

it really in terms of, I suppose calculations of all the carbon budget and the levels and the figures, the tiny percentages that you cite,

59:57

can you can you clarify whether

1:00:00

This. So these estimations on the affected road are the assessed on the affected road network. So the proposed development

1:00:10

was either on the affected road network or early on the proposed development or the effect the operational emissions of the affected road network.

1:00:20

Yeah. Okay. Has there been an assessment of the cumulative effects of the roads investment strategy programme, that this development is a part of, and its contribution to the carbon budget? And not that I'm aware of, however, the NPS and just state that all of the road kind of building

1:00:49

contributes less than naught point 1%.

1:00:53

of

1:00:54

us of the fourth budget period. So,

1:00:59

yeah, that's so all the words proposed within the roads funded by the roads investment strategy, absolutely contribute less than 4.1% of the fourth budget period.

1:01:12

Thank you.

1:01:16

I think i think that's really all of my questions, then. I'll just ask whether interested parties have any anything further that they would like to ask at this stage of misconduct?

1:01:35

And it seems not. So with that, so I'll let you go. Thank you very much. It's been very healthy.

1:01:50

Thank you. So

1:01:54

I'm going to propose we take a slightly earlier comfort break now, before we get stuck into trees. So it's just gone. 11 o'clock. Can we take just slightly shy of 20 minutes and we'll resume this hearing at 20 past 11