

TEXT_M25J28_ISH2_Session2_05032021

Fri, 3/5 1:05PM • 46:07

00:02

Thank you. Let's welcome back. Let's, let's carry on. So if we could move on to what is three, six on the agenda and this is just a should be a short point. Because I want to, to just with I think I'll start pleased with, with Western Transport for London, I think one of the points you raised in your representations was that you wanted to be a co signatory if that's the best way to co console t on a number of the requirements. In the decio. I think you've identified requirements for 568 and 10. You're not currently there at the moment? Is that still the case? Is it could you Is that still the case you, as Transport for London feel that with regarding the Kemp landscaping, contaminated land and groundwater surface and water drainage, and while you are with traffic management, but in those 4456 and eight that the local Highway Authority ought to be a console t to the discharge of that those requirements?

01:20

Thank you, sir. Tony Weston on behalf of Transport for London. Yes, that's correct, insofar as those matters relate to our function, and then we should be consulted on those particular requirements. I should also add requirement free as well, I don't think that was on your list. But we would want to see ourselves included on that requirement as well. I do believe that in respect of requirement for we've already been added by the applicant and revised draft. Yep.

01:51

Yes, you are. I don't recall picking up from your representation. Do you want you wanted requirement three? That may well be me, but I've got down only four, but that's fine. And that's Mr. Mr. Challis. I think in your response to this point, you did not have any objections to that. But nonetheless, that the SEO remains as it is, is that something that will be updated at the next deadline?

02:24

Yes, you're breaking up rather badly on me. Am I Am I breaking up on you? Or can you hear me? Okay.

02:31

I think is your end, actually. Because I've just been Western and there was no break up. I'll ask the question again. And, and basically, I think in response to transport for London's request that they be added as a constant T. That the court they'd be a console t along with the load relevant plan planning authority for requirements 356 and eight, you said you did not have an objection to that you didn't see any reason why that wouldn't be why that'd be an issue. But yet the decio remains the same. Is it your intention to update those requirements to include the relevant Highway Authority, the local authority?

03:18

In short, yes, with one exception, but subject to discussion, plenty of TfL as functions in relation to the relevant requirement. I think it will be right that they be consulted. We don't have an issue with that. We did pause about requirements six, which is regarding contaminated land and groundwater, and wondered why TfL wanted to be a consultant in relation to contaminated land and groundwater. But if indeed there is something there within their functions, then we don't have a difficulty in consulting them, but we're not quite sure why they would want to be consulted about that.

04:01

Okay, well, let's put that to them then Ms Weston.

04:04

Tony Weston for TfL. I think our concern primarily here is obviously that we are being asked to take on responsibility for certain features and parts of the scheme including the off slip road, and also the attenuation pond and other features. So we would want to be aware of any contamination issues and be involved in any kind of remediation works are undertaken, if we were on to take on responsibility for those assets.

04:35

Mr. Challis,

04:36

so we don't have a problem with adding them and I thank Miss Weston for her explanation. The need to consult is on matters related to function. It says that in the requirement, we have no objection to TfL being added so that happens.

04:56

Thank you. And now if I missed the challenge, if I could take you to Part Two for the discharge of the requirements. Now a lots been made about whether Haverings, for example, had a concern with a with one of the documents that say the outline lemp for example that or the other, should we say that sorry, the lemp that you would you would forward their comments in full to the Secretary of State? Are you satisfied that that is that is set out in part two in the procedure for discharge of requirements. So, now, I

05:35

think we can improve upon requirements 17 it would, of course, be I was England's intention to send on the full version of the report. But what we propose is to adjust that at the next deadline properly to follow the similar version of this requirement in a recently made order in relation to the a 63. Just to make that clear that actually the a 63 Castle street order, we're happy to do that.

06:05

Thank you. I think that would certainly give comfort to the authorities that that if there was any, any objections? Whether it be the objection to the document as a whole or even or in or in part, that you would you would forward those comments in full to the Secretary of State who would then make his own mind up?

06:24

I think we should do so. Thank you.

06:27

Thank you very much. Indeed. We've largely covered I think, three, seven, and where there is remainder on three, seven. With the 21 business days, I don't really have anything further to say I think the parties have made themselves clear on why they think they should be longer, the applicant has responded to that. And I think that is something that we are just going to have to take away and give some thought to. Towards next questions. Mr. Ovenden you, you have your hand up.

07:03

Yes,

07:04

Mike Ovenden on behalf of Brentwood's, I wanted to check that Brentwood would be consulted on requirements 345 and six. And I was also wondering what the procedure for notification was word, for example, the documents be held on the 25 websites and that consultees be consulted? Or would there be a general notification coming from the website, really a little bit more to know how and how consultation will be carried out?

07:44

I'm sure Mr. Challis can deal with that relatively quickly. Mr Challis?

07:48

Yes, there's no particular procedure around that we would have to consult you probably by writing you a letter, you will respond and we would send off all of the response is to the Secretary of State but the Secretary of State is the approving authority under highways England, DCs, or at least those made so far does have a web link. And I'm sure highways England will be very happy to let you know what that where you can find that.

08:19

It's just escaping the moment. But there is a I'm sure there is a requirement where you are required to maintain an online register. I know because I made you change it and you happily did. But it's escaped me at this precise moment where that is and you can perhaps

08:38

I can't see it either. But I do think it's there.

08:47

Is there an AR 15? There it is. Yes, well done. So hopefully that answers your questions that Mr. Ovenden. And before I come to Jane Mr Ovenden, are you are you content with that response?

09:07

And the response on the second part? Yes, but really just to confirm, as I said 345 and six, if Brent was on the list on quite content to leave it there

09:20

you are the relevant planning authority. So I would I as the examining authority, I would expect you as the relevant planning authority to be consulted. So and I don't see any reason why you wouldn't be good I thank you for that. Thank Okay, Jane.

09:39

Jane from Woodstock Avenue just going back into on the on the subjects of contamination and pollution which does seem to have cropped up a little bit in the last section. Then going it's just an observation from living on top of the a 12 driving up the slip boat regularly. We do intermittently See what looks potentially like pollution effluent contamination, a local, along the banks bit sort of along maintenance fields where and approaching growth farm I don't know where the where the sort of line fits, but there is definitely some sort of effluent discharge that comes along down onto the pathway. I mean, it's not flooding the a 12. But if you drive past regularly enough, you do notice this. So it's just a point of note, really. And it's something that I know we put on our original consultation forms way back, you know, so just to add, really, the potential for that is definitely real without all the building work going on.

10:48

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Challis, if I could I just ask you please to update me on sheduled. Nine and the protected provisions and the discussions where you are with cadent gas, the EPA and the electricity suppliers, please?

11:06

Yes, thank you. As regards the Environment Agency, we now have a settled set. have

11:16

you may have to turn your camera off, Mr. Challis? I've seen

11:25

You'll have to turn your camera off Mr. Challis and start all over again. I'm afraid you I think you said that you had

11:31

I'm so sorry.

11:32

No, no, no, no, it's fine. And you I think you said the protective provisions for the Environment Agency. Part Three. We're now agreed. That's correct. Okay, so that will be coming into me at the next deadline. Will it? Yeah.

11:45

So we'll put those in the next order. As regards cadent. There have been some very constructive discussions. There are one or two points to be discussed between, I think lawyers for both sides. And I'm sure Mr. garden can confirm that. That's where we are. discussions are ongoing with UK p n. And that is that is where we are. Okay.

12:28

Thank you. Mr. garden, you wanted to come in here?

12:34

Yeah, thank you, Rob garden for Cadent gas. Just to confirm the point. We've obviously submitted deadline to cadence preferred form of protective provisions. As Mr. Challis says those are subject to discussion, positive progress has been made. And there are a couple of points that we're still discussing, but we hope to address shortly on this.

12:56

Thank you, I think that there will be some point, Mr. garden that if those if you do end up in disagreement, you will need to submit your version of the productive protected provisions into the examination. So I can see where the differences lie with the current wording. And then obviously, the examining authority will have to make a decision as to as to whether to go with your wording or your changes or not. But I'm content to let this play out for the moment when you are in agreement. reach an agreement?

13:29

Absolutely. So that the version of deadline to his cadence preferred version, but we'll update those as any changes become necessary.

13:37

Thank you.

13:38

Great. Thank you.

13:39

Thank you. Mr. Ismail, you want to talk about protective provisions?

13:46

Yes, please. As laymen I can't rely on and get draw any comfort from standard drafting provisions or etc, etc, as the legal profession might fall back on, or indeed be or have things imposed on our charity with our development going ahead. The point that I'd like to make up for like as TfL earlier made up like in terms of protective provisions now at the last meeting on Monday, we just drew your attention to the fact that on the 25th of February, Cadent gas has had as yet to submit their final drawings if you'd like to highways, England for approval. So yes, whilst there were lots of productive and constructive discussions between Cadent gas and gardens of peace. There's been nothing forthcoming from highways England in terms of protected provisions or indeed any meaningful discussion if you'd like as

to how things are going to be mitigated if you like as we go forward. So I just like to put that on record to say that a lot of discussion yes has to be taken place because I know as of last Thursday, Caden guests have asked for a follow up meeting with cousins base to discuss the temporary compound the temporary road, the spoil, and really from highways England, we've had no confirmation that this approval, this Cadent drawing has been approved. So say for example, Mr. Allen sir, if highways England throw out this proposal from Cadent Gas if you'd like and say no, no, you've got to go back to the drawing board. Now here we are, we've come a long way we will have had our symmetry developed. And, and we will still be up in the air if you like as to what Cadent Gas are going to be doing on our site. That's where we're coming from in terms of protective provisions in terms of meaningful dialogue with highways England, and clarity. Thank you, sir.

16:00

Thank you. Mr. Challis, I'm not I'm not sure whether you have anything further to add on that. But I'll give you the opportunity to come back. Well,

16:14

perhaps briefly. So I mean, we discussed at the beginning of the week that there have been a lot of constructive discussions about how to carry out the works to the gardens apiece, causing the trustees the minimum disruption, which is what we want to do, having, I think, sorted out those details, it is a question of documenting them, and we will be progressing that as a matter of priority.

16:42

Thank you. I'm wanting to move on to i O. We've got another hand. Mr. Pittman. Is this about protective provisions? I want to keep it focused on protective provisions, please.

16:53

And it's just to clarify remark that marks just met made. It's not just about documenting these changes that have been that have been considered. It's about understanding how we're going to be impacted by the scheme. So we're not as far forward as Mark is suggesting.

17:15

Okay, that that I think I got that from earlier in the week, Mr. Pittman. And, and that is understood. But we've we have had those discussions on that. And I'm keen to keep it on what it what is the agenda for today. But do take rest assured we're fully aware of the issues that are stood at hand. And obviously, we will await with interest your further representations you wish to make. Thanks. Thank you. Any other comments on the decio? as it currently stands? No. Okay. Just before we move on, just to remind the applicant that they will obviously be looking at an additional requirement for perhaps a site specific plan for a growth farm. And for potentially mailings golf course. Although that may not be required if agreements are, are forthcoming on that, and you're going you are going to commit to a separate requirement for a bar CULTURAL MANAGEMENT mitigate merit management plan as a separate requirement. So and did we get any, and you're giving some thoughts, I think to how the integration and the cycle provision can be, can be included within the dceo. And presumably, a cycle link provision could be included without prejudicing its funding elsewhere? You're going to consider that and because of the how that can be included within this within this decio challenge.

18:59

So yeah, so if I may, we'll come back to you with a sort of considered response on that as regards the integration issue. And as we discussed earlier in the week, I've been highways, England's position is it doesn't necessarily need to be dealt with as a matter of statutory requirement in the DCA. And we are thinking in terms of having that in a side agreement with TfL as part of the other arrangements, but we will respond formally by deadline for if that's what you'd like us to do.

19:33

Yes, and particularly the cycling provision, I think needs to be included in here and I will look forward to how you're going to do that. Jane, I'm very keen to move this on. What, what else do you want?

19:45

You mentioned this word site specific plan you mentioned in relation to growth while maylands and obviously the all the other sort of burn issues that are relevant to local resistance. Is there a possibility that you could include specific plan for access issues for Woodstock Avenue in this decio, please.

20:06

Well certainly look at Sony take your comment on board and if we if we can ask the question at the next round of questions if the examining authority feels the need to do so. Thank you. Okay, so if we can move on to item four then which is consents and licences. Mr. Challis, could you just perhaps give the example 14 update on other consents and licences that you need and where you are with those?

20:32

Yes, sir. I'm pleased to say it's quite a short list. doesn't include the various consents that the contractor would get, in due course, because there are lots of other consents, which come later. But as regards the section 150 dis application, consents, as it were, the only one outstanding now is in relation to sections 2330 and 32 of the land drainage act. And we await Essex County Council confirming that they agree to that. There have been some good discussions, and are not aware that there are any issues about the application, but I don't think we've actually got confirmation of the dis application. The only other two consents to mention are a consent from natural England in relation to great crested newts. We've submitted that application that went in in October, natural England have helpfully provided some feedback. And we're expecting to hear late May, according to current timetable, current timetable. And so the other one worth mentioning, we touched upon this earlier in the week was a waste recovery permit in relation to controlled waste from grow farm. We're in discussions with the Environment Agency about that. We've submitted a waste recovery plan, which is a sort of form of pre application really, to them in December. And we're waiting to hear from the agency and expect and expect to do so next week, in fact, so quite a short list of outstanding consents, and all our I think the timetable is such that I think they will coming together such that we can provide you with a positive update next time.

22:26

Just very quickly, Mr. Challis, you're producing site waste information for the Environment Agency. What do you think there'd be any benefit in adding that to one of your plans for the camp?

22:43

I think the answer is probably no, because I think the camp covers what it needs to cover. And but as I mean, as regards the detail, there's my I can give you a bit of help on that if you if you would like it to respond briefly.

23:01

If there's a difference between the information you're giving to the training and the information that would be required for a camp then yes, I'd be happy to listen to that. But yes, but very, very high level.

23:11

Thank you. I think that will be helpful.

23:16

Hi, I'm Elena Meyer on behalf of I highways England, yes, we have made a pre application to the Environment Agency national permitting team as requested by the Environment Agency to ensure that the artwork strategy which we have drafted with being in line with the permitting requirements. So, once we have the response from the National permitting team, the principal contractor appointed to deliver the scheme would need to apply for a formal environmental permits for to undertake the works.

23:59

Now I understand that Miss Maier what the question was, was you Mr. Challis alluded that you've submitted waste site waste management to them for the environmental permit. Is there any difference between that and the information that would be required for a camp and In which case, it begs the question, why can't you put that in as part of the camp?

24:23

No, the information which we have produced is based on the data we received in the ground investigation report to inform the quality of the material likely to be generated by the scheme. So the way this activity would be managed would be either through a site waste management plan or other management plans which would need to be developed by the principal contractor.

24:58

I see. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, that's very helpful. Thank you miss Maier. Mr. Challis, do you want to come back or you content to move on?

25:10

I don't think so. So

25:13

thank you. Okay, so the next item I want to discuss is London borough Havering's requests for Section 106 agreements. And perhaps for the benefit of everybody here. Mr. Douglas, do you want to just very briefly outline why you say 106 agreements are needed.

25:37

Thank you, sir. Yes, just to briefly outline the rationale that we've that we've set out in our local impact report for why section 106 agreements are needed. There are, as it currently stands, there are a number of policies contained within our local development framework core strategy, our soon to be soon to be adopted local plan and our local implementation plan, which is our transport strategy, that we feel are not policy, that the scheme is not policy compliant with, for example, our employment policies and our sustainable transport policies, CP nine and cp 10, of our core strategy. And we feel that these obligations that we are seeking will, will help to, to bridge the gap, if you like, in terms of supporting in terms of terms of making the decio policy compliant with our scheme policy compliant with our policies. We also have this Can I

26:50

can I can I ask you to interject with a question there? Sure. The National infrastructure schemes have to be policy compliant with the local plan.

27:00

Well, from London borough of Havering's point of view, we would we would expect the scheme to be to be in accordance with our with our own policies, yes. Okay.

27:13

Thank you, please continue.

27:15

And so there are a number of local policies that we'd like to see that we'd like to see these obligations support. There are also broader sub regional policies. So our so there's the mayor's transport strategy, which is the strategic transport strategy for the London haven has obligations within that strategy that it has to meet, particularly in relation to sustainable transport. So that's getting more people walking, cycling and use of public transport. There's the maze, Healthy Streets programme and his vision zero agenda around reducing accident rates. And we also have obligations in relation to, to air quality, in particular, reducing particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide rates within our within our or authority. So we are seeking a series of obligations to support to support those policies. And to also ensure that that, as we see it that the scheme is compliant with those particular policies that we've raised concerns about.

28:27

Thank you, yes, you put them into three categories is I think the contributions is for local training and skills, air quality monitoring, and the sustainable travel agenda,

28:37

a structure

28:40

in respect of the local trading and skills, why does this need to be met by a financial contribution? What Why could it not be a commitment in the camp to recruit locally for examples and time to take skills and training? Why must this be only a legal requirement?

28:59

So the, the financial contribution that we're seeking there is for an officer to monitor the delivery of a local training skills and job brokerage strategy, which our employment policy state needs to be produced, or we would expect to be produced through any kind of major development proposals. So the policies that were cited there particularly local plan policies, 22 skills and training. We what we what we're saying is for the scheme to be compliant with that policy, the applicant would need to prepare a local training skills and brokerage strategy and the financial contribution that we are seeking for that is, is for the haven to support the applicant on that and to obviously to monitor it.

30:03

And have you got a figure in mind?

30:06

Yes. So we're what we're seeking is funding for a part time officer over a three year period, which would total 107,389 and eight pence?

30:20

107,000 pounds,

30:22

correct? Yes. Over 3107389 and 80 pence.

30:30

That's playing a part time officer over 30,000 a year.

30:35

That's over, over a period. Yes. Yes.

30:41

Yeah. And perhaps you can you can take tell me how that complies with the framework, and the testing the framework regarding paragraph 56. How do you say that they meet those three tests?

31:01

With regards to Sorry, sir,

31:03

that well, all part all financial contributions must meet the paragraph 56 framework tests mustn't they, in that they must be developed them to be acceptable in planning terms directly and relate to the development and be fairly unreasonable related in scaling kind? Could you just offer some comments as to how the that contribution would meet all three tests?

31:26

Well, we would, we would feel that having that contribution, and being able to recruit that resource to be able to monitor the strategy that gets produced by the applicant. would be Arby's that would be, that would be adequate.

31:49

Thank you. And just on air quality, the monitoring that you contribution you seek? And what how would you respond? The applicant, I imagine will say to you, but the environmental statement says there's no significant adverse effects of air quality either during construction or operation. So they may respond by saying, Well, why should Why is there a necessity for us to pay for air quality monitoring? What would what would you How would you respond to that?

32:16

I think I think from hirings perspective, we would say that we have we have obligations, contained in our own local plan, and in our local implementation plan. With regards to air quality, we've certainly got regional or regional obligations from the mayor, in terms of in terms of improving air quality in the borough, and whilst noting what the applicant has said, we would still want to waste we would still want to monitor the effects of the scheme ourselves on the on our on our on our bearer,

32:52

and what and how much she what's your figures for that?

32:56

So we're seeking a contribution of 59,376 pounds for that.

33:05

And in terms of sustainable travel agenda, what's your what's your what's your contribution figure you're seeking for that?

33:13

So there are there are three, three separate contributions that we that we were seeking for that Sir, we, we were seeking a contribution of, of forging 50,000 pounds over a five year period to support our smarter travel agenda. So that's the work that we do across the bar to encourage walking, cycling and sustainable travel, particularly the work that we do with the with the local school community around travel planning and school travel planning. We're also seeking a contribution of 100,000 pounds per annum over a three year period for the delivery of free cycle training in the bearer that we offer to all, all school pupils, and also adults and families within the borough. And we're also seeking a contribution of 200,000 pounds per annum over a three year period to support active and road safety education, particularly in the areas of the bearer, where it's been indicated that there'll be traffic rerouting during construction.

34:31

So just so I'm clear, you want 450,000 pounds plus 100 plus 600,000.

34:38

That's correct. Yes,

34:40

that is correct. Okay. Thank you. And underpinning all of these requirements is your local plan policy. This is why you say you need it because of the demands the local plan.

34:51

It's making

34:52

policy compliance

34:54

is both Yeah, is policy compliant with both our existing Local Development Framework policies. are emerging local plan and local implementation plan.

35:03

Thank you. One final question, Mr. Douglas, if the applicant when I when asked me to challenge to responding in one moment, if they say no, absolutely not, we're not we're not paying for any of that. What is your advice? The examining authority? What how do we what do we do? What do we say to the Secretary of State?

35:24

I think, well, from London Borough of Havering's perspective, if the applicant wants to say, no, we're not gonna, we're not gonna, we're not going to, to, to go down that road. Our view would be that the scheme isn't policy compliant, isn't compliant with the policies that are set out in the local impact report? So that's in particular the employment policies and our transport policies.

35:49

So are you would you be recommending the scheme be refused, then?

35:55

I think I think the London Borough of Havering's view would be that it's certainly not compliant with those policies.

36:05

Right. That's not necessarily the you're saying we should move you're just inviting the secretary state to approve it subject to those that subject to a section 106 agreement to be agreed that that's what you're inviting, not necessary that it need be refused. Okay, thank you very much. That's very helpful. It's Douglas. Mr. Challis.

36:31

Thank you, sir. Our position is that a section 106 agreement for the reasons that Mr. Douglas has mentioned is not needed here. And we are not proposing to enter into a section 106 agreements, as

suggested by Mr. Douglas, do you think it's fair to point out also that of all the discussions there's been with favouring the need for a section 106 agreement, has not been mentioned before it was mentioned in the local impact report. So that took us rather by surprise. As regards the policies

37:09

range, why Could you explain why you're not doing that?

37:12

Yes, sir. Because we don't work. Just looking at the purpose of a section 106 agreement in general terms, it is to make a development, which is unacceptable in planning terms become acceptable. And so we say our proposed development is acceptable. And there is no just as no justification to enter into a section 106 agreement against the test, which you mentioned. I mean, apart from that general point, if one looks at the particular policies that Mr. Douglas has mentioned, in DME, there's a there's a mixture there of policies from the hiring local plan of 2008. And a number of yet to be adopted policies, as well as I think, if I've understood correctly and emerging strategy or possibly policy in relation to electric vehicle charging points, it seems to us so that none of these policies require or suggest that highways England should make any contribution along the lines. That has been suggested. I mean, if one takes policy 22, for example, which is the local skills and training policy, I think that's a draft policy or anything that's adopted policy. That refers that that that applies to major commercial mixed use developments. You know, these are policies aimed at commercial developers, is not a policy aimed at a provider of infrastructure such as highways, England. I mean, as regards air quality, so you anticipated what I would say we've done our assessment work, and we don't think there is an issue. And therefore, on the terms of the policy itself, there is no basis for any future monitoring to be carried out or for highways England to a the local authority for a monitor monitoring off officer to deal with that. So we just don't see any justification in these policies, or generally, for there to be a section 106 obligation at all.

39:25

And I think it'd be helpful, Mr. Challis if, if it then you talked about looking at the policies that Mr. Douglas has cited to, to E knowledge is that the contribution sought are underpinned by the local policies. I think it would help the examining authority to get your full response on your on those policies that he's citing. You just use policy 22 there, I think it'd be helpful to have a written response from you on, on that. The policies he's citing and why you say they don't apply. I mean, 22 you say it because it's for commercial developers, and it's a draft policy. In any event, if you could look, if you could issue a written response to the remainder policies, I think that would be certainly helpful. Certainly, and allow Mr. Douglas to respond to those. But for my benefit, I think that would be quite helpful,

40:25

isn't it, but perfectly happy to do that?

40:28

Thank you. I don't have any further questions. I think I think I've listened to everything that's been said. The only thing that Mr. Douglas, you want to add anything further? I'm not sure there's much you can you've made the request, the applicant says he says what they said. And I think it's just a matter that we need to give some thought to. But is there anything? Do you want that to come back or anything?

40:58

Thank you. So the only thing that I will just add, and I'm aware that this was mentioned in previous hearings, is just to remind the panel really of the if of the national networks, national policy, state policy statement, paragraph three point 17 where it says that the government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. So it's just to, to, to remind, remind the pilot that broader policy context. Thank you.

41:27

Thank you that three point 17? You said,

41:30

Yes. Paragraph three point. 17.

41:32

Yeah, just thank you. Okay. Mr. Challis, final word.

41:39

So on that, we are, of course, going to come back to you about the nmu nonmotorized user use. And we'll do that. beyond that. So I don't think I have anything else to say on section 106 or any other aspects of the decio.

41:55

Thank you very much, indeed. Thank you. Thank you. Is there any other matters that anybody wishes to raise on the DCO or consents and licences before I look to draw this meeting to a close? Nothing at all. Okay. Right. Mrs. Hanlon, could I ask you to just outline the I don't think there's many action points. But if you would just outline the action points, please. That would be very helpful.

42:26

The first one is for transport port for London to submit a draft version of the productive provisions they seek into the examination. And second one is applicant to consider or provide comment on removing article 18 to see in relation to parking on any road, that relevant local authority and to be included as a consultation or requirements 357 note sorry, 3568 and 10. And that was on behalf of Transport for London, scheduled to part two procedures are discharged for requirements to be drafted to include consultees full comments to the Secretary of State. Number five protective provisions update between the applicant and the environments and Environment Agency to be submitted at deadline for And lastly, the applicant to review the policy cited by the London Borough of Haven and provide a formal response as to why they didn't reply. And all those action points have been given a deadline on to be submitted by deadline for

43:30

it is And can I just check that with Transport for London? I think I think it was I think it was at 1.3. I think they what they need to be added to 3356 and eight only. And they're already number four, and they're

already intend. So I think that's right. But could you just make sure that's crossed out? It's three. It's 356. And eight, I believe Mr. Mr. Challis, so I'm sure we'll confirm. But just to point that out.

44:05

Yeah. That's correct, sir.

44:07

anything further to add Mr. Mr. Challis on the action points.

44:13

So would you bear with me for a moment. Thank you. Thank you very much. It's a very good list. Much appreciated.

44:24

Thank you. So there's no other relevant business, I can remind you that the examination requires all parties provide any post hearing documents all before deadline for which is Wednesday, the 17th of March 2021. Just to remind you, that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectors website as soon as practically possible after this meeting. And it's just to say to you all thank you very much for attending not only today, but to for those of you who've been here all week and I and I forgive particular thanks to Jane who and others who are here on their own time who are not salaried or being paid to be here, they're here because they care about their areas and care about the scheme and that is not lost on this on this on us in considering this scheme so you the fact you've given up your time is noted and we thank you for it. And to thank the applicants and everybody else or other interested parties for attending, and for answering our questions. as informative as informally as they've been able to do so. We shall consider all of your responses carefully. And it will inform the examining authorities decision as whether further written questions and or further round of hearings will be necessary. So thank you all again. It's just gone half past 12. Enjoy your weekend and this issue specific hearing on the draft event consent order is now closed. Thank you