

TEXT_ISH2_Day2_Session1_A47NorthTud_05112021

00:05

Good morning, everybody. Time is now 10am. And this issue specific hearing for the first A47 North Tuddenham to Easton project is now resumed just before I returned to the agenda. And can I just confirm it, Mr. Parker that the live stream and the recording has commenced.

00:25

Mr. Hunter? Yes. Live Streaming has commenced, and the closed captioning is working.

00:32

Brilliant. It's good to hear. Thank you very much for that, Mr. Parker. Thank you. Okay, so following on from where we were, when we adjourned yesterday, what analogies pick up back on the agenda, and we're on item six, which is heritage, if we could, please. And so just looking at the agenda on that there's two isn't so suitable bullet points are what I was thinking was, we may be able to take the first and the second bullet point together. And so that's sort of a case of just asking the applicant to outline their approach in relation to heritage matters, including archaeology as well. And then it sort of naturally follows on that, that'll be helpful to then sort of look at the the impact of the proposed developments upon the designated heritage assets. And I've identified sort of bury whole in particular there. But that's only in the fact that we've had representations from the owners there, but I'd be quite interested to sort of hear about all heritage assets under that, please. So perhaps, if I could go to the applicant first.

01:37

Good morning, Sir Michael fry for the applicant. 90s. Mr. Paul Bennett, pleased to assist you with this on behalf of the applicant.

01:52

Hello, Paul Bennett, for the applicant. Guide just start off by a quick apology in advance. I did have a medical condition that affects my operating memory. So if I ask people to repeat themselves, that's why it shouldn't be too much of an issue. But the medication I take for that gives me a dry mouth. So I might be clearing my throat a lot and taking steps and I appreciate that can be quite irritating, several hours. So

02:25

that's not probably you take your time, stuff you need either myself or people's repeat, by all means. Just ask No problem. Thanks. Thanks for letting me know that.

02:32

Okay. So in terms of summarising our approach, I don't think I can ever approach the fluency of rattling off the list of standards that my colleague Elana did yesterday for biodiversity, but the general approach and methodology is essentially split into two parts there is the approach in terms of relevant legislation

and the assessment process in the main chapter, the last chapter six. And there is in there the section on relevant legislations and policies that we've looked at, in terms of other guidance that we've looked at, to guide professional judgement and the evolution of the psychological works. Those are contained in the reference section in Appendix 6.1. To the Yes. So the references for those would be our EP three dash 012 for the amended appendix element of the emitted chapter, and EPP dash 085 for the appendix.

03:51

For those who may have read the chapter, but not necessarily the appendix, because the references section is easy to miss, and there's references in there, the standards are not referenced in particular lines within the text. So, again, easy to miss the general guides of how we approach things in heritage. And so those contain things like Sefa guide inside so that's an acronym. So that's the Chartered Institute for archaeology and historic England's guidance, like conservation principles, the Secretary of State's non statutory criteria for selection of listed buildings and scheduling of ancient monuments. There is also a lot of stuff we don't necessarily reference because we kind of take it as read and it is referenced in those documents and things like the IQ moss guidance, which is an international standard, and, you know, other kind of overarching professional standards, some of which we were signatories to at the time and aren't any more various European convention so, but the principles still apply some So also in that list of references, quite importantly, his reference to the Norfolk archaeological guide for development led archaeology, which was used in the development of all the written schemes investigation, I use that term quite a lot. So that's broken into WSI. And that is the document that controls the methodology for archaeological works, that methodology is then repeated in the reporting. So in appendices 6.2 6.3 That that will be repeated in there. So, the contents of the W size is in there the W size themselves are not published documents. So, there is nothing material is in those W size that is not in the methodology in the appendices. In terms of surveys to date, there was a walkover survey that was conducted in May of 2020. And the limitations for that have been noted in the environmental statements in the there was restriction due to COVID. We addition to not being able to access the archive, the county archives, we weren't taking any risks, because it was a two person team. So we didn't want to come into contact. So we weren't jumping over hedges and fences and things and trying to do things I was trying to stick to right away as much as we could. And we were knocking on people's doors. So I'm trying to try and minimise contact with anyone else's as much as possible. The methodologies and baseline and assessments that came out of those, both in terms of the fieldwork and the EAS have been agreed with the various authorities relevant authorities. I believe all of the authorities have now including Breckland, have now come back and say they agree with our baseline and our assessments. And we can evidence that the I'll jump into the archaeology just now because it has come up on other DCI different schemes is that there were there are gaps in the fieldwork. And those gaps are there. They are inevitable in all archaeology and they are down to access weather conditions, that sort of thing. And while we might have say we could have trenched this area, but But you know, we wanted to trench a certain area and then didn't. Because of those factors out of our control. The results of those surveys have been agreed. And what that means is that the my colleague, John Percival at Norfolk, County Council Environmental Services, which is the shared archaeological advisory service for all local authorities in the area. That between ourselves, we've come to the agreement that it is sufficient to inform the development of a WSI for mitigation works, as is outlined in the proposals in the environment statement and in the environment management plan.

08:51

And that, through discussion going forward from right now is the thing of discussions are actually happening now and into detailed design, that the WSI will be robust enough to deliver the mitigation and the reduction of impacts and thus the residual effects that we've identified in the environment statement. That document is very important to know and this will be important later as well that that document is a living document. It is not set in stone. And it by nature has to be adaptive to the information coming out of the ground, as it were. And so it will include in currently does include protocols for unexpected fines and for the development of preservation in situ, if that becomes appropriate. And, you know, for example, that was does, how we would principally deal with possible effects around say, St. Peter's where there might be burials outside of you know where we might expect them very low possible That's a, but we have methods of reacting to them that are appropriate. And also a very large element of oversight by the Norfolk County Council Environmental Services, in terms of monitoring and on site presence and development of that rinsing the investigation. So essentially, they would approve on the document, they would have a monitoring role throughout, and then any changes that would have to happen, or amendments to that WSI would be agreed with them. So, yeah, it's appreciate, didn't ask the question, I went to a detail that, but it has come a come. So

10:48

there's also a, the approach there that, I think starts to touch on other things. So I might do that later. And that is that there is an addendum that we've added in the most recent update that was deadline three, which goes into some detail on a change in assessment of effect, or impact and effect on. Again, names escaping. This is the operating memory thing, remember names and places not both holding a formal Highland Park, as well as church farm and its associated barn. And so there was a revision there. That revision has has been discussed with authority hadn't agreed. We've gone into it might be confusing as to the effect on Huntington Park. And what why we mentioned in calling and park and saying that there's no difference, what we're saying is there's a difference in the quality of the impact. But as in terms of the matrix approach, the setup in dmr, it doesn't pretty, you know, it doesn't move the needle enough to go over into that. And so that's why that is there. But we did want to actually say that there is a slight difference. So in terms of the designated assets. Now, the again, because this has come up the wording of the question now that the bullet point that you'd made, which has impact. And it has, in other examples been an important distinction between impact and effect. And the impact is, there are no impacts, because all impacts are potential. And then we say what we're doing about them and what mitigations we're doing and what design things we've done to try to avoid those impacts. And then what is left at the end is the residual effect. And so that is the important thing is the effect. And so if I do get confused myself, because it's confusing, trying to use natural language in in technical things, that, that if I produce a impact, unless I'm specifically making a point of an unmitigated impact that could is a potential, I probably mean effect. So, of the residual effects that we have, we have the most serious one is St Andrew's church. And that this this is in a can be summarised in the it can be read in full in the in the chapter, we have nothing to add to it here. As well as in the two tables at the end of the chapter. The impact on St. Andrew's church or the the effect on sandals church is something that we've looked at a lot and we have developed a scheme, even though it's very constrained in that part of the the landscape. We've developed that part of the scheme as far as we can, as far as is practicable. And

that has, in fact, in as many words been agreed in our statement of common ground with Historic England. Then being the rental authority, as it said, a great to start building.

14:30

So those methods have been presented before and are in writing. I won't go over them again. In terms of the Church of St. Peter's the beneficial effects has been agreed again with authority and isn't the statement of common ground. In terms of the unknowns, I believe we have committed in our previous representations of unexplained in our previous representations that those things that are currently slightly unknown in terms of the precise design of the overbridge, for example, necklace and Peters that will be developed in consultation and with a mind to the setting of the church. There reasons we haven't gone into is there are other considerations that need to be put in. And we don't want to bog everyone down by talking about exactly what shade of paint we're going to use. So I which believe it or not, very large issue. So we'll, we're confident that we can, we can, again, through that WSI, and food through that agreed mitigation in the commitments that we'll have in the environmental management plan, the details will shake out there and detailed design. And that's been agreed, again, with the various parties. Church farm, again, part of the agenda of our submission, it's deadline three, excuse me. So that there is a change in that effect. And that is captured. Again, it's a very small and nuanced one. And is largely down to not having to remove the wall around it. The what we do have to say, though, is is that and again, very briefly come back to this, the effect on very whole is again set out as the effect of the setting. And it is spelled out in the in the chapter. We have no amendments that to make the the idea behind the scheme and my general approach, and my team's general approach to heritage impacts is that we are not here to help build roads. We're not here to get the scheme across that we're working, we're here to represent our clients, yes. But we do that by being truthful. And by not trying to be salesman, you know, if I were a better salesman, I wouldn't be doing this for a living, you making a lot more money, selling things. So where we have an effect, or residual effects that we can't do anything about, and we've left it there, and it is something that isn't desirable. We don't try and dress that up. We let the scheme rest on its benefits in other places. And it's for the decision makers for the Secretary of State in this case to make that balancing decision. You know that that is beyond our power to do and I wouldn't suggest it. And you know, the the case is made in the the case for the scheme. And so that's not something that I as a heritage person would do, you know, the economic benefits of the scheme. And the other benefits of scheme are not things that I'm qualified to comment on. But certainly we wouldn't take any of the slightly beneficial effects either of the scheme, because they are not sorry, we wouldn't take the beneficial effects of the scheme that we have which are small and are incidental, they weren't intended parts of the scheme. We weren't didn't set out to enhance the heritage of the scheme as as a key deliverable that we you know, we had a target for. And so we're not attempting to use that as those small beneficial effects as any sort of PR or the beneficial effects of the scheme wherever they are incidental, and they're they're good. But they're not the big selling points. And it would be disingenuous of us to try and put those over as fantastic things that we're doing. Having said that, we do have room within the Wi Fi to do some fantastic things if we find some fantastic things, if that makes sense. And that public outreach and dissemination of results is a very important part of archaeology. And if we do find interesting things, then then there's provision within the WSI for involving the community and putting the results out there in such a way that can be accessed later to provide more enhancement for the cultural heritage of the Oh generally.

19:31

So in terms of the effects and such, what I'd like to draw out, I suppose naturally leading on from that is that there have been comments about the consistency between various sites and specifically between Barry Hall and other places, although those specific other places aren't mentioned. So I want to go over very briefly, where there are similar types of assets that have been assessed or presented in different ways. And to clear up some of that. So the recent updates to dmr section, la 106, which covers heritage has fundamentally changed the approach to what you regard as an asset, and how you frame what you're saying. And it's done in order to be more focused on the effects that are actually happening. And then the potential impacts that might happen. So for example, the study area, it used to be a standard buffer of the footprint of the scheme. Now, it is the footprint of the scheme plus anything that could be affected. And so if you were to take that to its, you know, philosophically logical conclusion, that is the entire planet, you know, you start with the observable universe and work down, and not to be too facetious, that is kind of how you work, you do try and it's an exclusive process, not an inclusive process. And from experience, there are things that go in regardless, you know, if there are nearby and things that are useful to include, and so there's a lot of archaeological information that goes in from the Historic Environment record, and that will abbreviate to H ER, in future that you would have a lot of stuff in there that you would then assess no impact on. And the reason for that is that that's something that is included in the ATR becomes a material consideration and important material consideration from previous planning precedent, I suppose. And so. And then these things are mentioned in the NPPF, as well as sources to look at and what is and is not a designated asset, and what should be regarded as a heritage asset and etc. And something being included on the HDR is definitely one of those things. Now, in terms of let's take very Hall, and it's a state that there could be you could be forgiven for saying that there's an inconsistency in the approach between Barry Hall and its estate and Huntington Park, and the former Hall listed stables that still there. In that we make the park an asset and we come around the park and we actually leave out a building an unlisted building. That's just within the boundary a gate Lodge. That gate Lodge was brought up by broadland Council by my colleague, Chris Bennett. In their initial representations for that council as being wondering why we hadn't put in and I gather from discussions, it would have been a bit easier for Mr. Bennett's other duties and life if I had included here would have made life a little bit easier for him. But so I apologise for that. But the effect is that because the our study area is defined by what is affected, and we have a remit to be brief filter to have some brevity with what we're saying, and to not prove negatives, that are not good not to bog down a assessment in extraneous information that adds nothing, or might be interesting, or might capture very, very, very tiny effects and impacts. That might be very nuanced. But that is not the point of the exercise, the point of the exercise is to say what the effects are going to be and what significant effects are going to be. And so to go into exquisite detail on every last, you know, set of rocks and

24:20

subsets of features is not useful. Perfect example is that, if you're assessing an archaeological sites and the effect of an ecological site, you would assess the effect on that entire site. If that entire site happens to be a Bronze Age settlement, you wouldn't effect assess the effect on every single posthole and ditch section and, you know, archaeological geophysical anomaly. You would assess it as a whole. As a professional, you'd actually you look at those details, to be able to assess it as a whole, but you wouldn't have to report upon that unless it was very material to the development itself. For example, if

the development was taking out a single possible ditch, out of 5000, that would be relevant. Or, you know, if it was taking 50% of that that site and that 50% included what could be the important parts of it, that would be relevant. And that's why you would bring that detail in. But it's not relevant, don't have to report now, if it's 200 metres away, isn't gonna be physically impacted, you wouldn't mention every little thing. And the same principle is true. In this extent, you would mention things to the extent to which they're being affected, or that they could be impacted. And so we didn't include the the gate Lodge, because the gate lodge would not have been affected or impacted in such a way that would be appreciably different from the impact and the effect on the park. And that that's due to a lot of things and a lot of details I won't go into but the park itself was assessed as being a piece of land with a particular value, because it's quite coherent. And it's it is entered on the ATR restyle. And so it's appropriate to to say what the effect on that is going to be. So that being a site which has at its heart, a listed building for the actual hall itself isn't ruined and no longer extant, but the there is a listed building, which is a stables in the middle of that, which has a landscape around it, which is functionally similar to that very home and its estate, have different contexts. And so for example, is much larger than the separation of that building at the core from the scheme is much larger. And so that's why we don't count that in itself. And it is mentioned in the appendix as a, you know, as an asset that could have been and we did look out, but could it could have been impacted. And we did look out, but it wasn't mentioned there, again, because it is on one of these lists. So the effect on the park is not an effect on the whole at its centre, there's there isn't a relationship between the effect that we could have the type of effect that we could have on the park versus the type of effects we could have on that, and so there isn't something to differentiate them. And so, you know, again, philosophically, if one wanted to chase that line of logic down, you could say that the effect on the park is ipso facto, a effect on the whole centre and the associations with a list of buildings at the centre. But it's not useful to do so because the scheme is not having a differential effect on those two things. So the wall as well as brought up as being a possible effect on the setting of church farm. Now that is an estate wall, it's not the wall for church farm, it's the state it's the wall for the estate that the wall is built in the estate style there is a fence as well of a wrought iron fence and that wall and fence is in the estate style. And we've counted that as an effect on this building. And that's because there is an abrupt change in the character there. And so, not to get too far into into the details the effect on the park and the effect on the house there had different slight different characters to have slightly different. The two settings are slightly different as well. And so there was a differential there was a there was distinctness between those two assets and then that's why there's two different effects

29:11

that park again I've gone into detail what I do awful again bit of a symptom of the condition so I apologise I'm getting getting messages I've told my colleagues to message me when I am waffling so this so the park itself, I've just got into wax lyrical about how great it is, but it's of low value. And the reason it is of low value is it's a posting closure landscape and posting closure landscapes. And this is important part of the context of what we're talking about very well. Posting closure landscapes posting closure agricultural landscapes, including arable and pasture farming. That's one of the most common landscape types in Britain. And we have placed that landscape type it into an assessment as far as the historic landscape goes. And we've assessed the impact on the entirety of those historic landscape types. Except where there is something drawn in well, you know, like Huntington Park, which is, seems distinct enough. And if you'd like, I can go into a lot of detail on why it seems to think it is distinct

enough. So the, again, I don't know if that'd be useful, because it's a low value asset with very little effect going on to present necessarily useful again, hence why we don't go into that kind of detail in the chapter. Because it's not useful to present to the Secretary of State in their decision. We don't have to talk about every last bit of planting in order for them to be informed about it, we have taken into account in our assessments in in our minds and therefore presented what's appropriate. In terms of the very whole estate, the approach there was that there have been questions on what is curtilage, and what is not, and whether and, and various arguments back and forth. And they're not terribly useful in this context, over interesting to have academically, but not terribly useful in this context, because we don't need to mention every single building, and every part of that curtilage. In order to assess the effect on the setting of Barry Hall, we assumed that the whole of it is part of the setting. And only those parts of that setting in that relationship that are affected are the things that we need to talk about. So for example, we're not putting a road through the courtyard, and so we're not going to have any impact on how those buildings within that curtilage relate to each other, or how they could be understood. And so it's not necessary to list out every single asset or every single separate item in the inventory have very whole intent to assess the effect on the listing itself. And in fact, you can very easily take the words Barry Hall and move that from understanding that to be the house and move that to be the understanding that is the listing which is certainly our approach. So in terms of landscape, and an estate, and the setting, and how those things are different and whether we've assessed it or not. And whether we can be said to be correctly informing the Secretary of State. It's important to place things in their context. So I'll make a couple of points I'll try I'll try and be brief as to why we've assessed it in the way we have, and why we haven't say drawn a line around the estate and called that an asset. Because that is partly an important distinction as it's not something we put a line around something and give it a number in you don't have to do that in order to have assess the effect on something. In fact, a narrative approach is quite preferred. By Historic England, certainly and I know a lot of people who work in the various authorities inherited aspect prefer a narrative approach over a box ticking and numbers approach. Good that's what heritage is heritage is stories that we tell each other and give value to. So in terms of the approach so far, my my approach is to look at the effect that we could be having, and this narrow what I'm going to talk about from that possible effect. If you see what I mean, we look at everything, and then break it down to what the effect is and then talk about those things and we don't have to talk about everything else. So for example, we don't mention the crinkle Frankel wall in the chapter at all because we have no effect upon it other than the setting. And the change to the setting of the critical Frankel wall is to change the setting of the listing, not the wall having a separate change associated with it or a distinct change associated with it that the house doesn't and that the other buildings in the in that listing.

34:40

Don't have and so when we talk about the effect on Barry Hall, we are talking about the entire site and it's entirely listing and if that's not clear, then I apologise it's sometimes we assume things that potentially that other people don't know Excuse me. And so why isn't the estate as a whole the farmland as a whole given a line around it? Well, firstly, is that I have to respectfully disagree with the statements that Mr. Mental and council have made. In that it's not rare. It is a posting closure landscape with 20th century, some 20th century farming elements to it. And as the Norfolk HGR is to start landscape assessments, but it's with wetland management, inland wetland, and our English, inland wetland management as a small step across, and if you look at the figures where that is, reproduced

that figure, just grab that, so I've got the right one 6.4. To the IES, that figure shows you that there's no differentiation across the landscape where Barry Hall is. And that that obviously is not the endpoint of our assessment, we do look a bit further afield. And looking at that estate doesn't show me as a heritage person any particular coherence or legibility as an historic estate, which would be a managed estates separate to something that is farmland and so and having conducted the walk over myself, that we did make reference to, to the to meadows, there adjacent to it, and that's in our assessment, which formerly listed as lawns. And those who say to formulas, there's lots clarify that they are stated as being Lorne on the 1838 type mapping the 8080 30 a tighter portion. They're currently meadow, although the distinction is not necessarily an important one, the difference between a meadow and a lawn is whether you have an animal on it or not. And you might have an animal on your lawn to keep the grass short, that's entirely period appropriate management. Now, the coherence of it, when you're approached, that you aren't you aren't given one is when he's given the sense of this is a managed piece of scenery, essentially, let's call it that, for the house and for the buildings they're in. And that impression, you know, is quite strong, you know, there is a very definite approach, there is a nice approach to it, there are some trees missing now. But the stumps are still there, and you can still kind of read in the landscape that there would have been a tree lined approach. And in fact, that is shown on the form of mapping, not the type but on other larger scale mapping is indicated that and that is very definitely there to frame the house to someone approaching. But also that there is a view out and there are two phases to the house and we get we go into those details, there's two phases, they look out into directions and um, so from that, and from our assessment of what else is there from the crinkle crackle garden balls from the layout of the farm, we can we can make our assessment of what the important parts of the design of that landscape are, and thus what kind of effect we might have on that. And we've gone into that detail in the chapter. As far as the farmland itself goes, the reason it's not given a line around it and

39:05

a marker is first again, it doesn't have that legibility. If you look at Huntington Park, for example, you zoom right out on the map, you can see that there are certain field boundaries actually go way beyond what is on the HTR that are sort of sweeping curving field boundaries that indicate there might be an older relationship there, there might be an older Embarkment there or something like that. And that in the layouts of the actual details of the field layouts and the planting layouts, there are other things at play. There are other considerations at play. And again, I can go into huge detail if you want we'll be here all day. Which but variable does not have these and that that is those born out in the data. We don't really have anything to add to that data. Now the fact of it being an estate that is managed from a listed building and goes to the care of that listed building and such now I don't want to play that down because cuz I actually want to say that what a lot of stuff we're probably going to hear it might be a little bit adversarial, it might be like, yes, but no. But I do want to make it clear that the, the very whole estate, Mr. Metal, and in particular seems to done a really good job, you know, being that there is a management plan there there is there's work going on, they're doing good work. And I enjoy that. I appreciate that as a heritage professional, it's quite rare. So for someone to actually have that kind of care in their in their approach, and there is obviously a legal requirement for those people in the state buildings to maintain those buildings, and the setting off, but it's good that these things are in place. But that relationship, established that the landscape type is not rare, and not particularly unique at all. The relationship between farmland, and the list of building is perhaps a complicated issue. In some ways, it

is in some ways, it isn't. The relationship is that's an almost universal relationship between farmland and the people who farm it, you know, the farm farmland is there to provide income is there to provide the ability to maintain properties as part of its function. And in terms of specifically posting photos, the landscape, the biggest landowners in in Britain, the Church of England, and the crown. And so you could make the argument of virtually all of that land is the land goes towards the care and upkeep of listed buildings. And if you were to do that, and say that, therefore has the value of the listed building, or could be seen to have that kind of value, then suddenly, all of the most common land in Britain jumps up in heritage value, and it wouldn't be appropriate to that sort of scale.

42:04

And after that, the point made yesterday, just a new point, and I hadn't picked that up. Previously, if it had been made previously, I apologise for not picking that one up, is that there's a small holding, and that that is a rare thing today. I agree that, you know, I'm not going to make a comment on the economic value of that, again, out of my bailiwick. But in terms of what that is, that is, if it were seen to be of Health Heritage value, I'm going to caveat a lot of things here because I'm, you know, winter laws that don't exist. That that would be intangible cultural heritage. Now should intangible cultural heritage be a thing we look up? I think it should. It really should. But that's my professional opinion, my personal opinion. There's not the opinion of the UK Government. The UK government has not signed the Ignace agreement on intangible cultural heritage, and is conspicuous for having done so it's the only country that hasn't. Now, Wales and Scotland, the devolved. Authorities there have actually added intangible cultural heritage into their own planning regimes. But England has not done so and has not done so on purpose. what that purpose is, we'll have to ask them. But it's also something that we don't not have in mind to as heritage professionals, would you ever mind to living practices, but because it stands on such weaker ground in England, it would have to be of a much higher calibre of association, if you see what I mean, not to say it's not an important Association, but it's, it can't add too much to our assessment of impacts and effects, because it doesn't have that standing. So potential funding for the Arts Council and the Council for traditional crafts, but not something we really take much notice of in planning. So what we're left with is a central question. And that is, is there something about the land around Barry hall that is distinct in its value, from its value is the setting of the listing, if that makes sense? Because that this is an important important concept to get. So it's, that doesn't necessarily mean it's separate. It doesn't have to have a completely separate value and context and meaning. But it must be distinct. In order to give us the excuse to add it into, make an assessment on it separately. And it does, it does have a distinct value and that value has been assessed. Now I'd like to explain why. Quite before I get to any discussion of the HMRC designations. Now, if you look at I'll take an example taken to the extreme because it illustrates the point quite well, I'm not trying to sort of use reductio ad absurdum to say Barry Hall is not important he is, is of high value. But if we take it to the extreme, let's talk about Chatsworth house,

45:52

which is a great one house surrounded by a grade one parking garden. And that parking garden was designed by Capability Brown. Obviously, the the park and garden which is a very, very large part of the state is not the entire state of

46:15

Chatsworth house, transport house. In fact, it administers the all of the land that you can see from it, and more and around the country and not attached to the actual central holding. But the park and garden is that part of the landscape, which is the most legible and readable and where there is good evidence to show that the efforts that were put into its design and its development, were sort of tailed off after that. And if you took the house away from that landscape, in such a way that is never been there, that landscape would still have value, it would lose a lot of associations, it would lose a lot of context for not having the house and let's say all of the buildings are the list of buildings that some of the list of buildings allocated to the house, some maybe their parking garden, who knows what a statue or an eye catcher would be. That that's a debate for the ages. But if you took it away in such a way that it's never been there, that landscape would still have that value, because it would still have undergone this design process this association within historical personage, this the consideration of views and the curation of both very artificial views within the park itself and across the park itself, which don't include the house, and those views across the through and over the house, up to just an eye catches on various high points. And in fact, the decisions of land management within certain views, that's what we call the picturesque style, where you would frame a landscape within your formal grounds and that landscape beyond it is agricultural land that is kept in such a way. In fact, you can go to a lot of stately homes and castles nowadays and find big picture frames, which is the intended view that you look for. And so that value would be distinct. If that was simply a park that were put there for the enjoyment of someone, or for everyone, it would have that that distinct value, all right. Now, of the things that give very hold its value. The value of the land around it has a very limited, distinct about you in the if you took the buildings away from it, and it is in a way that they had never been there, you would have very little to go on to say that this is some sort of design going on. You might have let's still say that the pastor down the driveway still there and so that you'd have a path going through a landscape and okay, and that path had some tree lining on it. Great. Okay, there's some sort of element of design there. But perhaps it'd be very, very hard to read. And it's specifically as well, because those trees aren't there anymore. But you could get the information for your mapping as but it's, it would be a matter of interpretation, you'd be left with a meadow and not a lawn, for example. The fact of you know, the idea of being alone is given by the fact that there is a house there. So in terms of the responses that we've given it and I appreciate it that we might not have given a lot of detail in that response and I'd like to be prompted to give more detail, because I think that's valuable save everyone's time, rather than just give it. But I appreciate we didn't give the detail of my breakdown of what that value was, and how it's distinct. Because we felt that it was clear enough in our assessment that the value of the land outside of the value of the hall and its setting, as distinct from it, is the value of the historic landscape that it is. And that historic landscape is of, I believe, negligible value that we said in the adapter jackers. And so has been assessed as part of our historic landscape assessment where we've not assessed any significant effects. Excuse me, and if I had put a line around it and said, this is very old estate. And here are the impact upon it, I would then have to explain why we're not going to explain the impact on it because it would be double counting. Because there is no impact on the landscape that is not taken into consideration as part of this the overall historic landscape. And

51:14

that there is that the the effect on the whole and it's setting is sufficient enough. Now if you if you do want, I can hopefully very briefly go into what those values are just so it is clear. There are three that I

can talk about very just bullet points. So it's up to you if you want to if you want that detail, or if I've made the case,

51:50

I think probably this stage. I'm not sure we need to go in any further than that. That's helpful for me. And I see Miss cluttons to just pop your hand up. But before I come to you, Miss Clinton, if I could, there was just a few bits that just wanted to pick up. Right sort of early on, and it might well actually be rather than questions to yourself. It might actually be where I just want to bring in Norfolk County Council just to confirm if they have any sort of further comments that they wish to make understand that there's a lot of agreement between the parties but it is just to get an update from them if I could please Miss. Mr. Coming appreciate may not be yourself. No, David

52:27

coming for Norfolk County Council. Now I'm going to hand over to my colleague, Mr. Percival,

52:34

thank you.

52:44

Good morning, Mr. Spock, I can definitely see you.

52:47

Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, John, personal for soon Historic Environment officer for Norfolk County Council. Yeah, we'll start with the easy bit first, which is on designated heritage assets, primarily below ground archaeology. Yes, we we pretty much concur with everything that Mr. Bennett has said for the applicant. There's been a range of surveys database assessment, walkover survey, geophysical survey, child, trenching, and they have run their course as far as what they can do it the pre application stage. We're happy with the results of them. I we had I had a meeting with one of Mr. Bennett's colleagues earlier this week, where we agreed the sort of we agreed some broad terms into in terms of further mitigation and producing an outline WSI, which will cover off on further mitigation as far as it can go in relation to how far the designs got. Obviously, it's not going to be as mismatched. So it's not going to be a fixed thing because the design isn't finalised. So there might be a lot a lot of thinking about which particular areas get locked out for further archaeological work in in where all the boundaries of where the particular areas are, if you see what I mean, because balancing points might move minor roads and design minor roads might change in relation to what's being talked about, but designated heritage assets and Barry Hall. We don't really have any comments on that, because the matters related to listed buildings, in this case, very old is a grade two listed building. Therefore, it's the conservation officer Breckland council with conservation and landscape offices and council who primarily comment on that.

54:27

That's helpful. Thank you very much. I think that's probably all the question. Actually. No, there wasn't there was just one point. Mr. Bennett, if I could do it, there was reference to a standard of common

ground with Historic England. I'm not sure I've seen that as yet. Do you know where and when that is in the process.

54:53

Paul Bennett for the applicant. Bear with me. Our EP one dash 009 is a statement of common ground with Historic England. And the relevant sections I've just referred to is Page Six to eight. I believe in terms of statements of common ground, and I've stand to be corrected by my colleagues is that statements of common ground with all of the authorities are in the works at various stages. And Breckland have this morning responded that they're happy to go forward with a statement a common ground. Obviously, that's on many things, but on specifically on heritage that there are no issues with that. But obviously that will I wait for the official on that. Give them you give them the option to change the world.

55:55

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Miss Clinton, if I could come to you, please.

56:05

Rebecca Clinton for Mr. Metal. Good morning, sir. The reason why I intervened at the moment I did was because I know so you have said that you didn't think you needed to hear about the three values that Mr. Bennett was intending to refer to. But respectfully, we would like to hear what the applicant has to say about those if at all possible, because this is not information that we've been provided with before. And I have to express some surprise that the amount of new information that we've had about the approach to very Hall to date, obviously, this is appreciate we are in hearing. This is supposed to be a primarily written process, we've had very cursory information about their approach to date. And the reality is that we are now unable to respond on the hoof to the information that's presented with the consequence that we're really being deprived of our opportunity to actually be heard on this point by you, at least in this issue, specific hearing, which potentially means having to come back for another if this isn't a matter that can be completely articulated in writing. So I am a bit disappointed at the approach that the applicants taken but so that that was really wild, intervened at that moment. So obviously, we are in your hands. And this is your since you're hearing that. Whether you I mean, maybe it would be appropriate for the values to be included in a written piece of information, it'd be helpful to have what we've just had already, in writing so that we can we can consider it and deal with it properly.

57:48

Thank you. And thank you for that. That's, and I do tend to agree because it was going to be something I was going to come on to a later point to make sure that you're absolutely right, there's been a lot of information provided there by the applicant. And it's something that I think it's important, not only for myself, but for everybody else to sort of understand that approach that's been outlined. So I think it is something that I was going to ask would be provided in a written form. And I look to the African just to confirm that, that that is the case.

58:24

Les Paul Bennett for the applicant, I'm I haven't had a pump from my colleagues, but I'm sure that we can do something writing for you. Yeah. I would like to make the point as well that in terms of new

information, I appreciate this, of going into the detail of the the inner thoughts of an archaeologist our new new things, but the way in which we put end representations was that we as experts have considered this and and that we do go into these thought processes and documenting those topics. As I said earlier, documenting that thought process for every last single thing in writing in an IES is exhaustive and not practicable and goes into the the elements of proving a negative and that's why that's that sort of consideration isn't isn't there, you know, we don't go into that granularity in writing. Or we would be the single longest chapter that no one read. And so I'm happy to go into the the values and such, just now. But I would make the point that none of the information that we would present in that representation or today, in fact, comes from information that the state has not had access to, in fact, the documents provided by this state have been very valuable. And that's what we base this on. I'll defer to Mr. Frey who's come up.

59:52

Mr. Price, okay. Yeah.

59:53

So am I correct. And just to really follow on from Mr. Bennett has just said this is simply expansion is we were required to do or ask to do on the methodology that has been set out in the Yes. So it's not fresh information, per se. It is simply you the question and the details we've been pressed for the working out of the assessment, which was set out and that in my respectful submission is exactly what Mr. Bennett has done. I appreciate it as a lot of information, but it is not new information, if I could characterise it in that way, sir.

1:00:29

Thank you very much. I think it enlightens Clinton's to respond, I think it would be helpful because what I was perhaps envisaging probably wrongly was the Miss clicks and may look and may have gone up to make some submissions at that point. Which would then mean that the points that you may well come back to in terms of those three points, but that's if we could go through those three now. And then I can go to miss Clinton and see what there's any comments that she wants to make having heard those.

1:01:05

Pull Bennett, for the applicant, I'm sorry, I wasn't clear whether you wanted to go back to Miss clutton foot for

1:01:09

her or sorry, my fault, I was quite a mouthful there was that now if I could come to you for those three elements and, and then we can go back to this clutton and see how she wants to where there's a submission that she wishes to make.

1:01:22

Now, of course, Paul, but if the applicant, the point I need to trail before this, though, is, is that I want to be very careful about what I talk about it in a public setting here, because as we've made the point in representation before this is, it does affect people's private financial issues and things and a full sort of breakdown and discussion and getting into the nitty gritty of arguments of historical aspects of things

could go into those more sensitive areas. So it might have to, you know, if we need to discuss further, I might have to pull the plug in and discuss with your team and about that, because we don't want to do anything that steps outside of this narrow context. So the information that I've seen, and I again, I have to thank Mr. Middle in the state for providing those documents and also for making the public, it's because we couldn't access the archives, that they can county archives, because of COVID controls, we didn't have access to some of this information. And that information has been intellectually very interesting to have, and the reports that were commissioned and presented as part of the submission of record reports. And I want to make clear as well, that if I if I'm seem to be contradicting the things that are in those reports, it's not that I'm suggesting that they are not fit for their purpose or that there was any negligence by the people putting them together. It's more than the people putting them together. We're not Historic Environment professionals, necessarily, certainly not evidence that they were members of the Chartered Institute for archaeology, which is the general it does say archaeology, just an interview for archaeologists sorry, which has been debated. It's not just for archaeologists, it is for all historical foreign professionals, but people like the word archaeologists better. So, that body has professional standards in it that apply to people like myself, but not to people like say, my colleague who might talk later on, based on a landscape they might use the term heritage and historic and ancient for example, ancient woodland, for example, being a thing

1:03:59

and heritage as being something that could apply to natural heritage for example, scenic heritage, things like that. I want to make it very clear that there is a distinction between those thoughts of heritage and those that that idea of heritage and that is being the inheritance of

1:04:23

the natural world and the built world by today's generation, and cultural heritage, which is slightly different, which is the appreciation and knowledge of the remains of the past. Okay. Now I have a different standards that I must adhere to as well and you can see that in the way I phrase things and the way that my colleagues would phrase things. For example, an ecologist might say that a piece of woodland might be ancient woodland, because it is likely to have existed as early as 1600, which is the criteria I would never say that, because I would have to have some sort of compelling evidence that showed me that that date range, or that that date occurred in the range that that would and could have existed as evidence. And so I have a professional duty not to misrepresent or allowed to be misrepresented the heritage and heritage values and the narrative of the past. Simply because that is, why am I professional exists. Otherwise, we're grave robbers, or antiquarians, which is potentially worth the, the effect of that is, truth is important. And we might get caught up on some very tricky, illogical things here. And I want to preface that because I am about to refute something, it's the only thing I'm going to refute today. Because it is important in terms of those standards, and that is important culturally, that we don't allow those things to go to go on, even though this is quite a small thing. Now, part of my professional standards is that I don't necessarily make the same assumptions that other people would, and that the people who wrote these reports have. It's important to note that these reports were done by people who were primarily landscape professionals, and had backgrounds in planning. It doesn't mean that their research was bad, the research actually quite good in terms of the the management plan has some very thorough notes on the the archive sources, it's quite good. But the conclusions they draw are not conclusions that I would draw. And the reason I don't want to go into

that too much is because I don't want to destroy that too much. They're not bad assumptions. They're just not necessarily useful in the context that we need to talk about. So with all of that caveat, out of the way I apologise. What we have drawn out of the reports, is, as I refer to my notes, the states value that's not connected to the whole in any way, is the age rarity incoherence of the land use and field boundaries. And I believe I've addressed that the age is not of a status, it's, I mean, technically all land is as old as the geological strata from which it formed. But in terms of the use of information, this is a post enclosure landscape, as far as we can see, the evidence for that is the type mapping, which is 1838. That is the oldest mapping that exists as shown in the archive sources, a detailed one there that shows field boundaries, where you're actually expected to show them there is older mapping. But that mapping is at such a scale that you wouldn't expect field boundary to be shown and they are not. So that gives us what's called Terminus antiquated the date before which, okay, so there must be older than that. But how much older we can't tell. They could have been laid out. One month prior to survey in 1838. They may have been there since you know, people first appeared in this landscape, but it makes no it gives no value to that and guess as to how well they might be we know that they are this this enclosure, this this type of landscape. Now the reason we say it's a post enclosure, landscapers because the enclosure acts in this part of the world were dated 1804. So we have 18 for being enclosure X 1838 Being the first reliable mapping, and the field boundaries, don't show any morphology that would indicate an older origin. And so, and also the archaeological finds in that area don't bear that out necessarily. There are mediaeval finds in that area, but they are what we call a femoral surface finds. And so things that are very easy to be deposited or in fact be deposited from nearby cities as night soil as maturing.

1:09:24

And so we can't say too much about it. The the archaeological trenching that was undertaken that area didn't find any good features that could be actually dated and associated with those fines. And so the interpretation is that they're not to do with it and therefore that the field system there is, in fact what it appears to be very likely to be post enclosure, which as I've said, is the most common one of the most common forms of landscape. The most common form of agricultural landscape for the record is post enclosure landscape with 20th century boundary loss And so the post enclosure landscape becomes this is a huge revolution in land ownership in Britain, probably the biggest one. And it's shaped everything we think of as being the British or the English countryside today is mostly based on that. Now, what was it was as a result of that. So, the land use and the coherence of it again, as I said, the coherence is just not there, if you look at the HDR, is undifferentiated for the land around it. And I would agree with that. There's nothing to say that this particular piece of arable land is different from that particular piece of arable land because one is inside the state and one is out. In terms of the treatment of the boundaries, and such that I would maybe make the distinction about the entryway onto berry Hall. And that is part of our assessment of the setting that the driveway through the meadows, lawn slash Meadows might be a thing. And the boundary with various lane on those particular fields is a bit beefier and has a more of a more of a presence to it and is less permeable, that is the word we would use. And so it acts as a framing device for that for that land. But again, that's associated with the setting of the hall, not the landscape itself. I say if you were to approach that, without the hole, you would simply see a large, slightly larger bank. And it wouldn't necessarily lead you to the same conclusions without the context of the whole. The Yeti, you might even come to the conclusion that this is simply upcast from the excavation of the road, for example, to level the road. And so the context wouldn't lend

itself. In terms of the the rarity of the field boundaries and land use again, they're very, very common place. The field boundaries are the same sorts of field boundaries you get in this part of the world. So there's nothing to differentiate it. I have undertaken assessment for historic hedgerows, according to historic hedgerows criteria, and there are none. Anywhere in this game, there are a couple of edge cases up towards Eastern but they fail on some minor technicalities, possibly unfortunate for them. But then there is the fine spots that we've talked about, that have been identified and those are part of the land. But as I said that they are of negligible value. They're fine spots. They've already by having been found they've been destroyed. That site has been destroyed by it being found news is sat in topsoil. And the information that gives us that could give us is it might be an indication of older remains beneath. But we've tested for those and we found on the last is the potential age of the trackways running to the and I'll get my east and west run running to the west. And here is the thing I do have to review. I don't move too strongly about this. Because in the submission, ACM 3.2 Let's just get the right. Make sure I've got that right. Yeah, rep one, Dash 04 718 3.2. The problem report dated 2000 Excuse me. Mister problem note some some trackways that are shown, again on the oldest mapping, always reliable mapping. The point I want to make here is that the same as the posting closure landscape. We have a terminus and Tequipment date before which for those trackways and that is 1838.

1:14:17

And they must be able to the map could have been put there an hour before, can we put there 20,000 years before, but it does us no good to speculate without evidence. And Mr. Popper, perhaps understandably speculates that could be mediaeval. And now, that is the difference in ethical standards between myself and a landscape professional. Is that without other information that is presented in a conclusive way, if I said that that feature was possibly mediaeval. What we'll be doing is drawing attention to one particular possibility and thus giving it too much weight and misrepresenting the past so I couldn't do that. And I can't allow that to stand at the moment. And the reason is because it is, again, strictly philosophically true. They could be mediaeval. If you said that they could be mediaeval. That is true, but you've drawn attention to one particular date, which has no value, no additional information to make that more likely. So there's no particular morphology of the track, there's no Artifactory information to back that up. And there's no other landscape features that would back that up. So you know, the remains of mediaeval tufts or headland. So features like that, I'd be happy to go and put a trench through it. But it's not on the scheme. And it's not worth discussing that and making a point of that in the reports, because the scheme wouldn't affect it. Either way, so even if it were true, you know, even if there were Bronze Age, wouldn't have an effect because the scheme wouldn't affect them. And so in terms of that, which the scheme can affect, so that which can be considered part of the study area. The value that remains is the age rarity in terms of the land use and fill boundaries. And that's it. Now I can I do have a list of the things or the other parts of the historic value of the estate that are mentioned in those reports. And that might get into some more of those sensitive areas if we go too far down that rabbit hole. But it's a posting closure landscape. We've talked about that. We've assessed it, it is in the chapter. And so as distinct from the setting of the house, we have assessed it, the Secretary of State is informed.

1:16:53

So to make sure that I've got some things there. Oh, yeah, sorry, I missed out that the areas of woodland are also in the AGR for that area. Another important point is towards the coherence, I did miss out is that as we can see from the plans provided by the estate of the current extent of the estate, in terms of coherence, there hasn't been much loss in the estate. That's that's that's good. But there have been additions. So for example, we can see from cheating. We can see from the apportionment that's attached to the 1838 tide, which shows who owns what land and what and who is renting that land. That all of the land to the west, don't totally get it wrong to the east of Barry's lane. That being the the parish boundary was actually owned by a different person at that time.

1:18:07

The name escapes me at the moment but another major landowner, Lord someone and so there have been changes to the layout of the estate.

1:18:19

There was not to give myself a lie, there was a small parcel of land on the east side of berries lane that is shown as being part of the the Vickery estate. But it's a very small trying, I assume a triangle of land. The mapping shows a single field boundary that doesn't enclose an area of land, directly opposite the driveway where that driveway intersects berry lane. But yeah, it's a, it seems to be a very small parcel of land. And if you look very hard at the the online mapping provided by North County Council, there's a crease that might join it up that might be a rubbed outline. So we were talking about a very, very small parcel of land some something about the size of a single carriage. And make sure I'm not missing anything there. Yes, the age of the landers relating to the vicarage and such there are references to land that has been given over for a vicarage that dates quite early. But there's nothing to say that that is necessarily that building and those exact parcels of land if you follow up, so it's not necessarily a bad assumption to make broadly. But it's you wouldn't stand up in court and say it in front of a judge. And that's the standard I have to adhere to. Which is why when you ask an archaeologist any question, you should get two answers. Both of which are mutually contradictory. See, and it it does bear repeating that whether we have assessed adequately and included enough things to inform the Secretary State need to inform decision making that Breckland Council in our EP two dash 016 have agreed in response to your question today that the

1:20:33

that they agree with our baseline and our assessments and as I said before, isn't forthcoming stimulate common ground on effects? You Yes, I think I've made all those points. So yes, that's that's my I'll leave that there.

1:21:00

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Bennett, thank you misquoted at this point, is there anything that you wish to, to say? Or have you got a submission that you wish to make? Or are you thinking that awaiting the written response from the written information in terms of presentation that we've had now is a better way for you to sort of proceed in terms of the information you your clients wanted to present?

1:21:34

Yes, so Well, I think I'm compelled to that position, rather than it being on a choice. I mean, I said, we won't get into the debate about whether this is new information or not. So you I'm sure have your own view on that, too. There is a lot of information for us to process and to consider. And I think that I can't effectively respond to that now and and give you any useful submissions on it. But noting obviously, that this is a principally written process, there is a qualitatively different mate, being able to have the opportunity to make oral submissions is qualitatively different to written submissions, because one is able to emphasise certain points and, and obviously, add, clarify and expand upon things as we've heard this morning. So I just put a marker down now as to whether in future this may be something that we invite you just to come back to briefly, but that is just a marker rather than saying, you know, obviously, we've definitely need to come back and, and make all submissions about something. But I think if that's okay, we will we are compelled to leave that here as a result of what we've heard this morning and our inability to respond to that usefully on the hoof.

1:22:57

That's fine, that that's helpful. And, again, you sort of beat me to what I was going to say following up from that is that there are there is an opportunity, and that there's further hearing dates reserved in the examination timetable. Remember, rightly, that this started the new year, last week of January. So again, they are reserved for instances like this, that may be a case that we need to come back if between now and then the written exchanges between yourselves and the applicant don't necessarily answer all the questions. So. So yeah, if I can give you and your clients that assurance, absolutely. There is that that that opportunity that?

1:23:36

Yeah, I'm very grateful. Thank you, sir.

1:23:38

Thank you. Thank you for that, that Mr. Bennett, I can see you have your hand up.

1:23:54

Yes, Mr. Bennett, for the applicant, or I'll put my hand down. Sorry, I really appreciate this as a lot of words coming out. So and So responding writing is actually fine. I said, I've got notes here. We've we've kind of had that ready to go. Now if we could get some guidance on exactly what it is you want to hear out of that or whether the additional information that I have which might be sensitive perhaps we can put it in a way that we can be happy isn't sensitive. I think and you know, if you can give us some some notes on what you would want in that written notes, that'd be

1:24:41

I think, Mr. Frey, maybe that to step in, so,

1:24:45

so absolutely. The applicant will take Mr. Profit applicant. We will take it away and I'll discuss with my expert and we will make our submissions in the usual way. So it will be controlled in that manner. And you will get a note and a summary of the information that's been presented today, sir

1:25:00

That's helpful. And then in terms of the additional point that was being made about potentially sensitive information, again, that can either be through my case team or alternatively, direct discussions with the owners are very whole if need be to understand that it whatever, but I'll leave that with you, as the applicant to sort of take that on board and decide how best to deal with that.

1:25:23

Absolutely. So to extend this required, I'll, of course, discuss matters with my with my learned friend, and we will we'll reach a view and explain that to the examination due course.

1:25:31

Yeah, that's great. Thank you very much. Thank you for that. One, what I'd now like to do is just move on to the final bullet point under the heritage side of things, which is just to look at the reference to the national policy statement for national networks. And actually, I wasn't expecting to spend too much on that he was just really to clarify a few responses that I received from the applicant. And let me just turn up my, my various bits and pieces. So it was in regard to St. Andrew's church in particular. And one of my written questions, which is in document our EP 2014. And it was Question Nine, nine dot 0.20, where I asked just about the the wording in the NPPs with regards to substantial harm and less than substantial harm. And just for the significance that's in the ies chapter to be sort of put in those terms that sort of helped me. In terms of St. Andrew's church, what I noted in the response to that question was that it was identified as being substantial harm to to St. Andrew's church, and however, Historic England in their response, which let me give you that that references are EP one, Dash 030. And they actually said that it's less than substantial harm. And although the changes, the setting would be profound, might be considered very well. So it might be considered quite high level of harm within that category. So it was just really that to understand the actual position, because I'm seeing to be getting substantial on one side and less than substantial from another side.

1:27:42

Pull benefit up again. Yeah. As you can see, it's difficult when you have three categories of harm, and yeah. But our response was that we respectfully kind of step back from that responsibility of establishing the harm, because that is very much the decision makers purview the what we would do is merely suggest that the various grades of significance of effect be mapped across to those things based on previous experience. But historically in England are entirely right, it is a matter of judging the precise nuance of things rather than crudely mapping across significant effect in EIA terms across two, three environmental impact assessment terms to that those categories of harm. And so because it is the decision makers prerogative, we would entirely step aside for that and allow that to step aside in terms of their judgement as they would inform the Secretary of State.

1:28:54

Okay, thank you. So anything that's helpful. Thank you very much that clarifies that. That deals with every point in question that I had with regards to sort of heritage matters, but is there anything that anybody else wishes to raise at this point on the heritage? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands up. So that's fine. So thank you for that. I'm just looking at the time I'm thinking it's 1130. And I'm wondering whether now might be an appropriate time just for perhaps a sort of a 15 minute break, just conscious of staring

at the screen for that period of time has to take its toll. So perhaps if we can suggest a 15 minute break if I could, and then we come back at 1145. So again, thanks for your sort of input this morning so far. This hearings adjourned till 1145. Thank you