

TEXT_ISH3_Session3_A47NorthTud_0601202

2

00:07

Good afternoon, everybody. It's two o'clock and this issue specific hearing is resumed. Thank you for all for coming back. And prior to lunch, we were going through cultural heritage. I'd like to carry on with those if I could. We'd hear from the applicant and I was thinking to sort of open the discussion to interested parties. So if I could go to Mr. Joslin, first

00:33

George Shultz in on behalf of Middlebury holders state. Thank you, sir. We heard before lunch from Mr. Paul Bennett are on heritage aspects for the applicant. And I noted in my on my clock that she spoke for 30 minutes. And I'm very conscious that you have a lot of your agenda to get through this afternoon. So I don't wish to spend really too long replying to it right now. But so I very much hope that we will have a written summary from Mr. Bennett. And I must say I found it quite challenging, distinguishing what one might turn the waffle from the meat of what Mr. Bennett was telling us before lunch. And so I think it'd be very helpful to have a summary which confines itself to the, to the points that he that he wished to make and reply to the reports of Mr. Thomas. And I think the only things I might just wish to say is that is that he comments from Reverend Duquesne, of course to Cain was the correct pronunciation for his name. And he was the grandson of a French admiral of being who'd lost the battle of Seoul Bay. But he was created Mark was to Kane and his his parents and grandparents emigrated to England after the Edict of Nantes and he was given he was he was a king scholar at Eton didn't have much money and was given the living by Charles Spanish towns and who was the owner of hunting them Hall at the time in 1754. And the benefits was joined that point Charles Townsend joined the benefits. So it became a joint parish then. And what's important from the historic point of view of the state, is that it was, of course a former ugly, the state like the old rectory, it's a former gleyber state. And what's important is that is that hunting Hall has been pulled down, and the park and similarly, a person woodfords hosts former rectory at Western Longville. And the land around it was destroyed in the Second World War for the building of battle bridge airfield. So Barry Hall is actually the most preserved of the 18th century assets in the area, which Parson Woodford was was was familiar with. And for that reason, it was actually made the setting of a film on Parson Woodford in the 1970s 1980s 1960s a film and they filmed a lot of it there because it was the best they could get. So there's there is historic interest. And Mr. Metal has a portrait of Reverend McCain's mother in his dining room because she's related to him. And there's a lot of that connections, wants to make that point there. And secondly, that I know that some Mr. Bennett has not visited the estate, other than from walking up and down Barry's lane and trespassing into the drive is short way. And you will remember so from the assist from the accompanied site inspection, how much of the estate needs to be seen from inside in order to understand the landscape and its context. And it's a pity that Mr. Bennett hasn't done that and didn't accompany us, but he's welcome to do so if he wishes to even at this late point. But I would mention that he did comment at one point that the northern woodland belt, he said, well, he wasn't sure how old it was, but he thought it might have been planted after the 1930s. Well, that six years ago, and in fact

the woodland belt was planted. In the early 1990s, as he's made very clear in all the arboricultural reports, and it's a pity that Mr. Bennett hadn't had the opportunity to read those to understand that.

05:12

So, I think we will reply when we've seen the written summary of BMA at the only other point on cultural heritage is that is that we will also be replying at D seven on the app pipkens D six replies to your, your x q three. And then that rep. 6018. And you asked a question at 10 Point 3.1, which dealt with the historical and cultural issues of the very whole estate in particular, and the landscape. And we will, we will see if we can get some Mr. Thomas, who reported on the heritage site to deal with the landscape at that point, that was I think it's important that that's in front of you. And I have one question on on those responses, which were given by the applicant rep 6013, Rep. 6018. And so at some annex one Annex A to that document, is a series of sections through the woodland junction. And it's unclear, because there are a lot of trees shown on the sections, some of which are stated to be existing trees, some of which I believe, are newly planted trees, and they're all are similar. Whoops, sorry, excuse me best you. The trees are all roughly have a similar height. So it's very difficult to tell what assumptions the applicant has made as to how many years of growth the new trees have, and the old trees have. Because I think when we when we all look at that, we need to know whether it's been assumed to be 15 years, 30 years or whatever, after the The highway is completed. So that was the only point on that. And I think if the, if the applicant can can tell us that either now or or later, then at least we will know what assumptions were made in relation to those sections.

07:45

thank us.

07:46

Thank you. Thank you for that. Interestingly, that was a quest. I had some questions on the sections as well for later on. So and that was going to be one of them as well under the landscape side of things. So perhaps we can the applicant will hear my sort of comment now. And maybe we can we can get some answers in advance of that. That's helpful. If I could go, if I go back to Mr. Barrett, please, if there's any response that you wish to make at this stage?

08:14

Yes, excuse me a moment I take this raised hand down. Is that done it? Yes. Yeah, well, thank you very much. To Mr. Johnston. i Sorry, Paul Bennett, for the the applicant. Thank you, Mr. Johnson, for the pronunciation that's always nervous to get people's names wrong. So for the information on the footpath visiting, I just happen to look at the maps and get the right names runs in describing where I went, which is imprecise. So if you look, it's, it's footpath three. So FP three, which is split into two and that goes on either side of Barry's lane. So there's a one on the east side, just to the north, one on the west Irish to the south. I'm trying to get my east and west right and I always get that wrong. So we walked the entire length of footpath three on the east side. And then on the west side, we're headed down to that and walked about halfway along it to look back towards essentially trying to get a view between the where the ice houses and where the houses and also seeing that there's an aspect to this, the South looking south and the landscape there. So let's have a quick look at that. It's about halfway along there. And then we obviously up and down berries Lane itself entirely until we got into the woods,

excuse me to the south, where we weren't seeing any things we turn around, and then try and get this display. Right. footpath five which is just along the side of the church that he's talking about. hopped over and had a walk up there to see if there was anything You know, between the two. But at that point, we were quite far out of study areas, you didn't go all the way along there. So that's the footpaths, address the point of visiting the site and getting in amongst the things. I would stand by the statement that the point I made, it's about proportionality and regulations that we must be the minimum to understand. And we've done that I stand by that, that we've been compliant with the process and the guidance and the responses of the relevant authorities are bound up. And yes, that will be in the written statement. As to the waffle. Yes, I absolutely agree with the way waffle. So I agree, I agree with this Dear Mr. Dawson, I do. Hopefully, it's entertaining at least, and the written summary will will be much more brief. And to the point.

11:03

As to the points of this being preserved at Century asset, we've commented on that before Mr. To go over again. And it's useful to and just to knock on the trees data doesn't realise I was doing archaeology thing again, I default to what we call Terminus post quem, which is the last map I looked at, that I could remember was dated 2013. It wasn't on that and so I didn't bother looking forward. So to me, it's saying the date after which this must be rather than this is what I know it to be. Because that's not coming to mind at the moment. I apologise beforehand for not knowing exact date. But that's that's the reason for that. It's odd archaeology construct that we use. But yes, I will personally respond in writing. I think all of those concerns will be taken care of.

11:59

Thank you, Mr. Bennett. Appreciate that. Mr. Joslin is nothing else final that you wish to to say.

12:05

Yes, just one thing. So I'm relating to Mr. Bennett's last comment and his understandable statement that he's not familiar with trees. If that's the case, is Mr. Bennett, the appropriate expert to be commenting upon the landscape qualities of the very Hall estates, which designated under the inheritance tax for fruits, land, scenic and landscape qualities? And if he doesn't know anything about trees? Well, it's a bit difficult to be able as a as an expert to be a pining on landscape. So I just make that point. And in relation to that, so in your x cubed three, you did ask a question of Historic England in relation to the IHT act designation. And they replied, sir, to say that they were not the correct people, because Natural England had, of course dealt with the designation to start with. And I just wondered whether Natural England should be asked the same question. Even though I appreciate normally your you've got no more time to ask questions. Thank you, sir.

13:35

Yes, in terms of the last one, naturally, were invited today. And I was hoping that then may well attend because there are they would have been helpful for other issues in other than this as well. Principally, the biodiversity at the start, they haven't. So it's something for me to consider how we I can get a response from them or what if we don't get a response from? Mr. Fry? I can, I can see you popped up presumably in response to the questions with regards to specialists and that side of things.

14:07

So absolutely. Just just to be very brief. Mr. Bennett is the cultural heritage expert and is qualified to discuss cultural heritage aspects of landscape and trees in the scenic value in that sense, but the examination we'll also hear from Mr. Meehan shortly, who is a landscape expert. So the two experts unsurprisingly talk to each other and it is a team effort in respect of assessment. So you will have both of those aspects dealt with, sir.

14:36

Thank you, Mr. Frey. Appreciate that. Thank you.

14:40

In terms of cultural heritage, I have no further questions, but I'm not sure is there anything else Mr. Joslin that you wish to add at this stage?

14:49

No said nothing, nothing I wish to add I think at the moment on this on this on this aspect of it. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

14:59

Just before then, Move off calculators just to check whether any other interested parties, you've got any comments that they wish to raise at this stage? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands up. So I'm guessing there's sorry, Mr. Haku. Is that something? Dope? Oh, yes, Mr. Volker? Nope, nope.

15:33

Sorry. Yeah. So no, just to confirm it. I have no questions.

15:38

That's fine. Thank you. I think I'd have a glitch there. Thank you very much for confirming that. Okay, well, if that's the case, I'd like to move on to flipping and flip compensation issues if I could. And, really, it's just a question of me seeking some clarifications on a couple of things if I could, please. And I see I've got a new face in front of me, which I'm guessing has been the applicants flood expert so I'll address my questions to you. It was really get an update with regards to the sense of common ground with the environmental agency in particular, I think there were some areas where agreement hadn't been reached yet in terms of flood compensation issues. And also I think there was also some issues to be agreed with regards to the river took crossing Now it may be that they are actions that need to be put in environmental management plans but just be helpful for me to get an update on where we are and where we expect to be with those discussions.

16:42

Okay, yes, my name is Jason ball on the flood risk and water environment lead for on behalf of the applicants in terms of the statement of common ground and the outstanding matters with the Environment Agency we are working with them to to resolve these issues and provide them with the necessary information that they require consulting quite heavily with an in contact with them regularly in the there's there's a number of issues in relation to flood risk standing couple of those and I think if I

refer to the statement of common ground where the wish was submitted Unbeliev at deadlines six let me just find the document

17:54

okay

18:11

bear with me Sorry, I just Yes, it's Yeah, so as soon as that deadline sex application ref R EP six dash zero to one refer to that one. There's a table which starts beginning on the PDF Page five

18:42

I just checked that references rights are EP 602102

18:47

No apologies to the agency reference sorry, yes. Rap for our EP four dash 002. Okay, yes, yes, that's right. Sorry. Yeah. So, yeah, so the documents in that document is in the matters, number of matters on discussion. matters relating to for flood risk. Concern. Reference number So on page seven of the PDF reference number r dash 06 6.28 And two, nine 3031 And there's one earlier slightly further down in the document on page eight six 6.5 for service, there's a number of matters relating to actions amendments, the EMP to add actions into them regarding and that's regarding on 28 regarding appropriate consultation on the design of the relative flood compensatory storage area. And on 33, the action on the EMP is again regarding that Miss say and. Regard regarding Yeah, again, really same principle and the agency to read or to review and comment on the matter regarding any flood compensation. That is agree that is required at that location. And 54. Again, it's similar with regards to

21:41

consultation with the agency in relation to their evidence, revenue crossing and the compensatory storage area, similar similar matter really.

21:54

Yeah, so those ones we have and met with Martinborough. Yesterday, we have some agreed wording on those for the EMP, and we are those readings will be sent to the EA hopefully, for review and acceptance. So that that covers those matters in relation to the t just go back up to sorry, nothing around this thing to come out.

22:38

Nice. So in terms of back on page seven, the PDF point 66 dot 29 With regards to Oak farm load conversation, the matter outstanding here was regard to the discussion around the acceptance that the land by the landowner that the land upstream of the proposed development will basically be an increase in the flood extent to that land. That land is arable arable field. We have been in discussion with the landowner there at record farm. And the the landowner has accepted that there is that land will flood. Water is displaced and land well, in the flood extent will flood into that area of land. And we have committed to work with them going going forward in order to maximise the impact on the land in relation to the fact that we're also having a number of habitat mitigation measures going on there as well. So

you know, looking at maximising the area that was flawed in terms of the habitat mitigation. So So and we can the agency, we're looking for confirmation of that. So we've, we will update the status of common ground with that matter for the agency to review and comment on that.

24:43

That's great.

24:46

So 6631 So, that relates to we've in the flood risk assessment, which is the application In ref a PP dash 124 and 125. We describe the flow modelling undertaken of the hunkering water costs the tributary to the river tour. And after some relevant reference stations from the agency and also early local food authority we and we've updated the flood modelling on that from a 1d one dimensional model to a two dimensional model. Because there was in in the interim, there was better LIDAR data better ground digital ground elevation data available. So we, we, we presented that the outcome of that in deadline three rep, rep three, dash zero to six. And that basically gave her a more accurate representation of the floodplain in the model. So, that, following that, we've received comments on on that submission. And we've also submitted the revised model and the updated modelling report to the Environment Agency and the local food authority for review and comments. So we're

26:48

waiting to hear back on that. But I believe it is relatively eminent. The, in terms of findings of that it's in the assessment really. That's the previous assessment we did in one day, but we just provided us with the ability to better map the the floodplain around that area. It's also allowed us to provide a slightly better estimate of the last floodplain storage, which I think we reduced to from that sort of about 27 cubic metres with a 20% uncertainty allowance down to 11 cubic metres, and most of that flooding is actually within the defined channel cross section. And so, that So, the agency has asked us to provide a bit more information on the results of that the basically the impact of the scheme was quite negligible immediately upstream recall that there was a slight reduction in flood levels and downstream a slight increase in relations. But that and similarly flows, where there was a negligible change in flows both upstream and downstream, compared to the when comparing the post development versus the baseline scenario. So, that that point was really think that point. Well, hopefully, provided at the Environment Agency. Agree with our findings, and satisfied with the information, we've provided that then hopefully, we can come to an agreement on that one. But yeah, that's still that's great waiting, come on by the environment as you can see at the moment. Okay. That's all the flood risk matters. In there,

29:07

yes, it is. Thank you. Yeah.

29:11

Okay, that's yeah, that's helpful. Thank you then in terms of the river took crossing, just as you're doing approved the detailed design presumably, that is for a later stage?

29:24

It is yeah, yes. I mean, the action the the amendment to the agency requested an amendment to the EMP, which gave the opportunity in one of the in the React table. threshold of environmental actions and concerns. Commitment sorry, to two review, the design of the rivets are crossing that actions updated in the in the MP which will be medica issued to be issued. I'm not sure that deadline.

30:08

That's great. Thank you for that.

30:12

Okay, that that's sort of a helpful update on that. So thank you. Um, another thing that will happen, will be just to sort of understand, briefly sort of this control in the exceptions test that that you've done, I've seen those, but again, it might just be helpful to so talk through very briefly through those.

30:30

Sure. Yeah. So in terms of the, we considered the sequential and the exception test in Section nine of the flood risk assessment. So that's ABB dash 124. In relation to in relation to the scheme, we can the sequential test is, you know, it looks at really for looking at development at an early stage at a planning stage. It The aim of the sequential test is basically to divert flooding, development away from areas of high risk of flooding. In the context of the the national policy statement for national networks, it really focuses on flood zone, one, two and three. So it's diverting, flood risk away away from the heist zone flooding, flood zone three. So, we may mentioned in the flood risk assessment that work was undertaken as part of route selection, that, that, that that, that, that this, you know, that flood risk would be considered within that as part as part of the route selection. I mean, just to elaborate on that, something that wasn't mentioned in the FRA is the scheme assessment report, which is completed at an earlier stage and looks at all the different routes being considered, and considers environmental options, which includes flood risk, as well as the engineering and economic and traffic options. That scheme assessment report, which is on national highways website, is goes through the rationale and the detail of how that how the current route is selected. And that does consider flood risk. So, I think in terms of that the conclusion really is what was in the FRA is that, you know, it the project, the scheme passes the sequential test. I mean, just to add to that, as well, the you know, as you know, you with a linear transportation scheme you're trying to get from A to B, and you're looking to get from north to known to east, Eastern, at some point you're going to have to cross the river toward, so each option would have crossed the river toward at some location. And there is a floodplain associated that. Wherever, yeah, all down the river. So, yeah. So that's, that's in terms of of the sequential test. If there's anything do you want me to elaborate on that further? No,

33:42

that's fine. That that that's helpful to sort of take me through step by step and in the rather than, and you actually answer the question, which was the half Lewis was taken in terms of sort of scheme designs, I thank you for

33:56

that. And I see stars appeared happy to help if you got sort of further additions to that.

34:08

Thank you, sorry about it off on behalf of the applicant. It's just to point out so that the, the topic that Jason just covered regards to schema assessment report is actually summarised in the case for the scheme under Section 2.2 of the options, identification and assessment. We touched on this at the IC h two sessions, we went through the qualitative and quantitative assessments that were based on the principles on the finger to one and that represents the assessment against the 14 options at that stage, which pick up environmental factors. And at the bottom of that, and the footnote is a reference back to the scheme assessment report that Mr. Boyle has touched on now. That was also

34:46

thank you. That's helpful to get that reference. Yep. Thank you.

34:55

Okay, that's helpful. So it's in terms of versus sequential test, and then the the exception test follows on.

35:02

Yes, that's right. So the exception test is required where development can't be avoided in flood zone three A in the higher flood risk area. So, basically it's looks at well, he asked that fra flood risk assessment be undertaken to demonstrate that the project is, is going to be safe for its lifetime does it increase flood risk elsewhere and also in? And excuse me. And yeah, and if possible reduce flood risk overall. It's it, if it if there is an issue with that, then you know, then the wider sustainability benefits for humanity must outweigh flood risks a balance is those two tests basically within the exception test. So for me in terms of the we've effectively looked at key, there's a number of key elements, I guess, really covered in the flood risk assessment. There's the river Toad crossing. There's a new gate house COVID Where the skin crosses the tributary conquering watercourse. Trips to the riverside bears the West Coast extension us COVID near the farm, Eric farm and the tributary of the river third, there's there's also highway drainage. It has the potential to increase flood risk and the interception and diversion of surface water flow pathways in other parts of the key key main flooding issues for for the scheme. In terms of the river toured. Without the flood risk compensation we've proposed there are a maximum of 70 millimetres predicted immediately upstream of the bridge and 72 millimetres increase downstream of the bridge, that's for a one year event with 65% climate change the design event we used impacts are negligible once you get up to hunting hunting him upstream or downstream towards sovereign road. But, so, whilst there are still changes and impacts with the pattern of flood risk due to the crossing, this is no sensitive receptors are impacted. Conversation compensation for the compensation is provided. And therefore for that aspect we consider the accident exception test has been met. I mean, we've considering it with climate change. So, we can say that as being out we consider it for being safe for its lifetime. Similarly, occurring tributary and this is this is the also part what's under discussion with the Environment Agency and statements Common Ground is around the impact of the culvert. So the culvert has been designed for a 100 year 65% Plus freeboard of 600 millimetres. On top of that, it's shown that the negligible changes in peak levels and flows immediately up down upstream and downstream of the culvert. The and therefore, we consider that that meets the exception test. Oak farm tributary is a little bit is a little earthworks associated with the foreign trip which is a little more complex. At that location, there's the widening of the existing a 47 and there's a new

access road just north of that, which cross a tributary and hence the need for the the culverts here, because there is an existing a 40 call that was associated with the existing a 47 that flood modelling has been demonstrated to basically throttle flow flows keep flow flows back upstream. So, it provides kind of a flood risk benefit to the properties downstream.

39:58

So, for that location in the call centre, we've maintained that throttle. And, and also to protect the road and particularly the access road with airflow bond is required to keep to get the waters back hence, the waters a foot waters X displaced further further north and upstream in on that tributary. And so, through that we've demonstrated that well, what whilst vowed it as MC, there's a slight improvement to flows downstream service a slight reduction in the in the flood risk to those properties. The development itself is doesn't doesn't flood under the design event 600 year over 65% climate change. And but obviously it does cause more flooding to the arable land upstream, which is what have been the discussions with the landowner. And the we have for this scenario, considered the haitch plus plus climate change scenario, which is the 80%. Climate change uplift to the 100 year event, because obviously, there's a potential issue of if that if that bond overtopped or floodwater meant around the bond, that could potentially flood the road and properties downstream. So that's a sensitivity sensitivity test has been tested, and has been run with the flood models and showing that for that event, ah, plus plus the there's no downstream flooding. So I think, well, in conclusion really on that it's Unbeliev, the exception test is met on balance, because while there is an increase in flood risk, to the arable land, it does avoid for risk downstream and maintains that. And and it's yeah, it's a balancing maintain in basically maintaining that, that balance of risk for us away from the more sensitive receptors as defined by you know, the, the NPPF Gloversville vulnerability classifications. So, in terms of in terms of highway drainage, that's been designed with 100 year plus percent laws for climate change, so, to attenuate to the proposed range is attenuated to Greenfield runoff rates. So, therefore, not increasing flood risk downstream of that highway drainage. Therefore, we consider that aspect meets exception test. Similarly, the flow flow pathways the scheme where there's a flood flow pathway, modernised where the scheme interception day it'll be in consultation with the local foot flood authority with Avast that we size, the cross drains across the scheme, dry, dry call that's to maintain maintain the flow flow pathway across the scheme designed up to 100 year plus 65%. Climate change allowance event pathway diversions are minor and do not increase the forest of property and sensitive receptors. So yeah, again, we don't consider that. Well. So be considered that that meets the exception test as well. So I think that's the that's the I think the essence the main the main critical aspects of flood risk for the scheme.

44:19

Thank you. Yeah, I was just checking. I think that just sort of answered the questions that I had. And it was sort of picks up some of the climate change points that I wanted to raise as well, just in the clarification. So just wanted to speak in terms of the design approach that had been taken and the sensitivity testing that may well have been done around those. So yeah, that's helpful. Thank you for that. So I have no further questions on flooding, but I just want to see if there's any interested parties or if anybody else has any comments that they wish to raise at this stage on flooding matters or anything to do with water related issues. Okay, well then again I'm not seeing any hands up or anybody appear on screen so I'm I'm taking that but there's no other set of comments anybody wants to make on this issue. So so that's fine. So Mr. Joslin yes

45:18

Justin berry Hall estate, apologies sir I stuck a hand up and I think I'm not sure if it came up or not one point for Mr ball on the berry Hall estate drainage, which we discussed the CH three yesterday the options for the drainage from the junction coming such as it is, as Mr. Arthur explained to us coming south Woods done to join the river tag. And that drainage sir, as you will have seen the site in a day a complete site inspection needs to flow not into the river itself, but into the ditch immediately to the north of the river because the river is about a metre higher. And I think it's accepted by the applicant that it is into that ditch that the drainage will run. And currently as you know, sir, it runs down the eastern side the downstream side of Barry's bridge which which takes berries laying across the river from Mr. Boggs assistance. And the the option which the applicant has been considering to date is to bring that drain is down the western side, or barriers lane into the upstream side of the ditch west of the bridge. Through that it flows through it through it through a pipe a fairly narrow pipe underneath the lane. And the point which Mr. Mendell has been making in his written reps and subsequently is that we're the drainage to run down the western side into the upstream side of that ditch, that the impact of the drainage coming into the ditch would cause a will block the water coming downwards. And the ditch, as you recall, sir runs once the ditch on the south side of the river runs under a tunnel beneath the river tide. And there's another ditch which drains the north side of the river, the gardens for the house, etc. And the impact of water coming in 90 degrees to that above the bridge will cause a fallback flow back of the of build up with the water coming down. And it's the risk of that which is concerned Mr. Mandel. And from what we can see of the papers in the application. Mr. Ball has been explaining very carefully the risk assessments and the calculations data and so forth for the river Tod, crossing, etc. But there's there's nothing as far as I can see in there, and so the question I was going to ask is, is could could that be dealt with now in the safe the common ground with the Environment Agency so that at least that's covered as well as the North already as we don't have sight of the Environment Agency statement of common ground? Thank you. So as you bury Arthur's come up, so he's obviously going to want to say something and reply to it. Thank you, sir.

48:39

Thank you Mr. Joslin. Yeah, if I could go back to the applicant, either Mr. Ball or

48:43

Mr. Oliver. Thank Thank you, sir, by the offer on behalf of the applicant. I think I touched on this yesterday during the CA hearing so when I explained that there will be no surface water coming down Barry's Lane, the depths that we are proposing to connect and to is only going to be cut off that she's only going to be picking up limited areas of overland flow around the embankment from the Wheatland junction. So the flows are going to be significantly low. We will of course engage with the lead local fodder for in this area we will the relevant body for that connection. One of the reasons that we are not committing right now to changing that and the DC also is that we have to obviously review the topographical survey and then go through the process of looking at those flaws with the LL Fe and that is not something that we can achieve within a two to three week turnaround. So it will be something that we commit to as we communicate yesterday as part of our statement of common ground with Barry Hall to look at that as a priority for that option going forward. But it's not something we can absolutely commit to right now if that process is explained sir.

49:52

So, thank you for stopping adjusting.

49:55

It's not so much the position visa the sauce I think here But my point was that I think it's something that needs to be covered with the Environment Agency as well as the as as the body dealing with that water. And as I believe at the moment, I don't think that particular brain each run down towards the river Tod and into the river Tada and its associated waterways has been covered that it documents. Thank you. Thank you. Thank

50:29

you, Mister.

50:32

Thank you, sir. But it's not something that we would typically engage with the E on this matter. So it's our it's our cutoff that so that the floor was able becoming a lot very, very small. And in this area, we would engage with the lead local floater for a and the IDB, who maintained the ditch that runs parallel to watercourse. So it's not a matter for the Environment Agency to be engaged on or comment on. Because this the significance of is so small compared to what they deal with.

51:00

Okay, thank you, Mr. justly just does that help in terms of answering your question?

51:11

Sorry, I'm George Jocelyn variable to say, Mr. Metals, just remind me it's it's a matter actually, for the internal drainage board, the id be who are responsible for that waterway rather than the Environment Agency. So I think the matter needs to be needs to be confirmed with IDB and not the environmental agency. Thank you, Mr. Oh, yeah,

51:31

I think that's what Mr. Ross was saying. So yeah, I think that's fine. That's helpful. Thank you. Mr. Ball. Is there anything else that you wanted to to add at this stage?

51:41

No, I have nothing further to add, sir.

51:45

Thank you, Mr. Hawker.

51:51

Thank you. So Richard Hawker once in Valley Alliance. Very, very small point is my ignorance again, what is the cutoff grade? How does it differ from any other dream? It requires a guide. Then please forget this.

52:09

I'm here Mr. Author. Mr. Ball could deal with that quite quickly and succinctly I'm here.

52:14

Yes, sir, by the offer on behalf of the applicant I caught off to in simply, typically on a 600 mile deep ditch the side of your earthworks, but it's picks up any overland floor that that may pond at the bottom of your air forks, or at the top of your cutting rather than paper down or damage the earthworks. We pick it up and cut off jeans, and we transfer it to either the drainage network if possible, or receiving water coarser, we're not able to connect into our networks. Thank you.

52:43

Thank you, Mr. Arthur.

52:46

Hopefully that answers your question, Mr. Volker.

52:54

I may have to do a little bit more research, but it gives me a start. I thank you very much. Thank you.

53:02

Are there any other comments with regards to the the issue of flooding before I before I move on?

53:13

Okay, well, I'm not seeing any hands or anything raised at this stage. So I think that that's, that's great. So thank you for that. So I think that that deals with everything under the flooding set of things that I wanted to ask. So thank you for your inputs on that everybody that's helpful to me. The next item on the agenda is geology and soils. And again, it's just a couple of very sort of minor sort of points that I just want to, to run through and just some clarification that that I think will be helpful to me. And what I just again, let us start the applicant. And it's just looking at the the NNPS, if I could at section 5.1 sense six, where it identifies that the decision makers should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. And it carries on to provide a bit more information there in terms of weights to be given. What I just wanted to to get an idea of his whereabouts within the application documents. Is this been demonstrated in terms of how the application is taken into this this into account?

54:22

So like fry for the applicant? I don't actually have my agriculture expert to handle that. But I do I do. I think I should be able to answer your question in Chapter Nine of the environmental statement deals with geology and soils and that application reference app 048 And that covers the assessment of the scheme on agricultural land according to dmr b la 109. And it explains that the delivery of the scheme results in the permanent and temporary land take of grade two and grade three agricultural land, which is considered to be the best and most versatile as well as grade three being great for agricultural land. And on top of that, there's the soils management plan, which is developed to preserve the land quality

on the temporary land take areas and to make effective use of the soils taken from the areas of permanent land take the mitigation and monitoring measures will ensure that the temporary lands restored back to its former condition. And so the long term residual effects on agricultural soils would be limited to the permanent loss of agricultural land. The assessment sets out that the permanent loss of grade two land is to consider to be of large adverse significance. The permanent loss of grade three agricultural land is considered to be a very large adverse significance, while the permanent loss of three B agricultural land is considered to be a moderate adverse significance. And the other document for you, sir is the NNPS accordance tables, which are at application reference app 141, which sets out compliance with the various MPs requirements for you, sir. That's it that I'm afraid there is as far as I can take it. But if there are further questions, we will obviously respond to you in writing.

56:13

Yeah, that's fine. That that's helpful. For me, there is one other further question which actually relates to a couple of the tables in that chapter. And perhaps what might be best is if I just to get the references, now I can get my team to share them, I can talk you through those. And then at least you can then sort of take those away with your expertise, just that questions of some of the numbers in there that I'm not quite sure add up and bits and pieces. So let me just find the references.

56:49

is

56:52

So we're discussing Captain nine.

56:55

We are? Yes, that's correct. Yeah. So I'm just gonna say to my support team, it's document a PP zero 48. If they're able to share that for me.

57:16

And the page we're looking at just Mr. Frey, if you've got that in front of you is page 19 of the actual document itself.

57:23

Also see if I get upset really. I have it up separately, sir. But appreciate others in the examination.

57:53

I gave my team a list of ones that may be needed. I'm sorry, we did. I may have missed this one off, we can easily be frantically running around trying to find it. And I do apologise. Yes, I think they just told me that was nonetheless. So I won't repeat the rest of the words that are in there. That yes, it's table 9.10. And read the questions I have is that you've got on page 19. That goes over onto page 20. So you've got the second column, which is the totaling hep tears there, says 299 But my maths make it two nine 7.5. And then when you add up the percentage in the final column that comes up to 140%. So I think there's some things gone slightly awry with that. And then the next one is table 9.11. Where the numbers themselves all seem to come through from table nine point 10, which is fine apart from the

grade four where there's a 46 under approximate temporary land take on degrade for the bottom there. And I'm not sure where that 46 comes from. Because that again isn't reflected in Table nine point 10 which is 8.9. So it was just to clarify that something seems to either gone awry or presence, my misunderstanding. But just to clarify, if we could come back to me on that, that'll be helpful too.

59:18

So we've taken notes, I won't come back to you now but we will write to you verify what the correct figures are if they need to be amended.

59:26

Thank you. That's great if we could well I have no further sort of questions on that other than to apologise to my team for throwing them a curveball and I do apologise and so that that's Jojen Tozer. Again I'll just check the does anybody got any the interested parties got any comments or questions on anything in relation to geology and soils?

59:56

Okay, I'm not again, I'm not seeing any hands up so I'll move on to to learn Landscaping and visual. And again, it's there's a couple of comments sort of struck points of clarification that I have on this, but others may have a sort of further comments that they want to raise. And one of the things we discussed that issue specific to or is highlighted by the Mr. Manual, and his and his team was some issues with regard to inaccuracies for the arboricultural survey. And I just wanted to know where we are in terms of the provisions of update of those because I think when we did the, the site visit there, who was clear that there was a number of sort of errors, errors are on there. And I think there was an indication to perhaps try and update that. And I just wanted to sort of get an indication of where we are with that, and what's likely to be for me, but in terms of that, is we get towards the end of the examination.

1:00:51

So join me in for the applicants. Yeah, so I'm, I'm happy to respond on that. The well as appendix 7.6, which you referred to earlier bar, a cultural impact assessment, which is a p p 094. And has been updated and will be issued again at deadline seven. So that's that's the main response. And some context behind that has been reviewed in light of comments received during the issue specific hearing, as you've mentioned there. And the report has been updated to correct errors relating to classifications of groups, which are referred to as G on the plans, hedges page, and individual trees T. And amending. Appendix seven has been amended that the list of arboricultural impacts to correctly reflects reflect appendix to the agricultural impact assessment plan. And there have been minor adjustments to appendix two of that report the abicor agricultural impact assessment plan to reflect responses during the examination, for example, altering the tree belt beside Mary wood house, not to show has failed. But while we would want to be clear on is, although some minor inconsistencies were identified, these changes are notable in the context of the assessment and do not change the conclusions of the environmental assessment. In particular, from my point of view, the landscape and visual assessment, chapter seven, which is a pp 046. And going back to the example at Marywood house, the assessment that assumed that they those those, that vegetation, in particular was to be retained in any case. So it was a sort of an inconsistency within the arboricultural assessment. So as I say, it's been updated in will that will be submitted to you imminently that the deadlines haven't.

1:02:58

Thank you. It's the meeting that that's helpful and actually, second guessed the number of other questions that I had in terms of whether it might change assessments and those sorts of things. And it was a point that was raised by Mr. Joslin in terms of the the sections that he referred to, and what level of sort of landscaping they show on there. Is it possible that we can get sort of an answer an indication of that at this stage?

1:03:31

Yeah, so I mean, sorry, sorry. Sorry. It's sorry, I'm not hearing good.

1:03:43

Was it sorry, George Dawson Barry Horta state was it Mr. Mian or me who replying to that particular question just now

1:03:52

missed? I was I was asking the applicant. Mr. Joslin, yeah, just pick up the point that you're sorry. You're raising a point as opposed to asking you to address it? No, that's fine. Apologies.

1:04:04

Thank you. So So John, me and for the applicant. Regarding the cross sections, I think probably best if we do respond in writing with a, you know, brief methodology that might sort of put this to bed. However, just to reassure that the cross sections are produced in alignment with all the up to date information, including topographic data, arboricultural survey data and the environmental master plan, and they are intended to illustrate the scheme planting gets a reasonable level of maturity, they're illustrative they will have been produced post assessment and they are there to sort of give some context to to the position in particular have banks have existing and proposed planting in relation to the proposed scheme, and, you know, the junction. And as I say, it's probably best if we do you know, we would respond in following this hearing in any case, but probably with a little bit more context on that And then the methodology there. I mean, one key point there is I understand and I'd have to sort of, you know, the CAD team that produced them would be, we'd work with them and producing the sort of text in response to this. However, the the existing trees are shown using information from the arboricultural survey, for example. So as you know, as soon as all these skip these illustrative pieces of information, we do our best to, you know, make them as accurate as possible. And so that would be one bedrock of the cross sections that they use that accurate information from the other borrower cultural assessment or surveys.

1:05:36

Okay, yeah, that skews me I think that will be helpful to sort of get a little bit of a lay you say so understanding of just sort of what was going to produce those that will be helpful one slightly cheeky question for me, which I was going to ask later on and transport and and it might be something you can include within that is whether there any lighting columns within the cross sections. And I was going to pick that up into the transport with scene as we've now sort of here now it might just be a centre and I'm

not expecting an answer to that but terms of your consideration that that'd be helpful and it seems Mr. Offers appeared in email to excuse the pun shed some light on that. I'll not

1:06:20

comment on your sense of humour by the offer on behalf of the applicant. There are none that directly say at any of those lanes, but what we can do so as from the reissue we can't include an indicative column position for the purpose of our visual understanding

1:06:35

that that'd be fine if there aren't any, so be it but yeah, at least if it gives us a high in relation to everything that would be helpful that'd be great. Thank you

1:06:42

no problem Mr. Joslin

1:06:52

Jocelyn, very holder state Thank you. So that that's very, I'm very grateful to Mr. Arthur and and the applicants team for saying they will be able to update these sections as they've suggested, in relation to the trees, possibly, they would be able to delineate the existing trees from the or distinguish the existing trees from the proposed ones by some kind of subtle change in the colouring or other so that one can see immediately, which is which did the other point I think it would be helpful in in revising, the sections would be for a line to be drawn to show the limit of permanent acquisition of the highway. But the moment the sections in in particular, you will see Section F has one, it shows a red line where the DCO boundary is but but no red line where the permanent acquisition finishes. So one can't be quite certain whether they planted trees on land, which is not to be taken or land it is to be taken permanently. And I think the the limits of the permanent acquisition should would be useful to be shown on those plans as well. So everyone can see where the the permanent acquisition boundary is. Those were the only two comments I had on on these sections. Thank you, sir.

1:08:23

Thank you, Mr. Joslin.

1:08:26

Mr. Arthur, I'll come back to that. But I'm conscious of the comments that were made in terms of them being indicative and and that side of things. But if I, if I come back to you about how, and whether those sort of suggestions can be can be incorporated on those?

1:08:39

Yes, sir, by the offer on behalf of applicants for one week was the limit of permanent acquisition is actually showing on the drones by reference to the highway boundary fence. So I appreciate it's not called out any higher than that. And it's probably a lack of shooting further I understand that I should have made it clear for for others, so apologies on that front. The existing vegetation is also annotated as well without without not demonstrating the width of the existing vegetation. But again, we can look at potentially putting in some linear bars to make that somewhat clear offshore.

1:09:17

Yes, I think I think that might not just be helpful to to a understanding of it. So yeah, that'd be that'd be useful if that can be done. Thank you. Mr. Joslin, I'm seeing so not of your head and think about mobile. So

1:09:30

I thought that covers it. I didn't thank you. So I ended up liking columns as well. We will be rich, which you pointed out will be useful too. Thank you, sir.

1:09:43

Okay, well, in terms of landscape, the visual side of things that that is the end of my sort of questions that I have, but just before I started, move on, are there any questions or comments from any of the interested party, Mr. Hawker.

1:10:00

Thank you, Sir Richard Hawker Winston Valley Alliance. That's our company site inspection, particularly at the old gypsy Lane in hunkering near where the Riveter flows. I asked a specific question as to whether we had been provided with with sections or or landscape visualisations of what the road would look like and and its height and so forth at that particular location. I am not aware that those have been provided. If that is the case, could could I be given references to them? Or if they haven't been provided? Could that be arranged?

1:10:49

Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Hawker. And, Mr. Arthur,

1:11:00

thank you so very for on behalf of the applicant, the applicant has not provided those cross sections because we do not believe that the required there are no affected receptors in that area. So, and it's also not been a question asked by the examiner that we would require to provide that information for so the sections that we have provided are in response to stakeholders who have a concern around their property and the impact on the assessment on their actual land. And in this case, Mr. Hawker does not have any interest in application. So thank you.

1:11:32

Thank you for that, Miss Mr. Hawker.

1:11:37

Yes, I'm rather perplexed by that comment, because landscape, surely is for everybody to appreciate and hopefully enjoy, especially in this case, where public footpaths go close close by. And I don't see that owning land in a particular area has any relevance whatsoever. Not only that, during that site inspection, I was promised that I would be provided with that sort of information. Thank you.

1:12:24

I can go back to the Africa see Mr. offers. popped up. So if I can come to you.

1:12:31

Just to confirm so that we've no follow up comment on our motto?

1:12:38

I suspect in terms of the answer to that. The environmental statement includes an assessment from there. So therefore, from a professional point of view, there's evidence in terms of the environmental statement that deals with that as a viewpoint. But if I can just confirm that with the applicant.

1:13:00

Yes, yes. Jumping in for the applicant. Just to reiterate your comments and which is what I was going to the point I was going to make, the entire study area has been considered from a landscape point of view and individual points of view. I will have to check I'm pretty sure we've responded regarding the information already provided. I don't have that to hand back to the response. But I can refer you to figure 7.4, visual context of which relates to Chapter Seven LDA. So app 046, I think the actual figure may come under ap 6.2. And crap, but either it's figure 7.4 visual context. And in the location, Mr. Hawk is referring to, you know, we have included a visualisation from viewpoint C, which directly to the south of the scheme, the south of parking. And baseline photo photographs were included from a few points three. I mean, the point they're being you know, as I say, we've considered all visual effects, you know, within the study area, however, in that location, in agreement with the postal authorities, we selected a couple of representative positions. So, yes, just to reiterate your comments that the you know, the last visual effects have been considered in this location. And we we did actually provide some illustrative material to support that in the vicinity of that location. So, perhaps the key point being you know, Mr. hawkers reference to the river, you know, there and, and the footpath network, south of hockey rink.

1:14:42

Thank you. Okay, thank you. And that was done from professional opinion and site visits. Because, yeah, right. Okay. That's how

1:14:51

Yeah, so I mean, in practice, the preparation of that viewpoint list is, is you know, it's separate producing with professional experience and agreed with the host authorities and we have that as a point of agreement you know that less that was prepared that that is representative of views of of the proposed scheme from within the study area. And as I say in that in this particular location, we you know, there are a couple of years which are of use that I think in this discussion

1:15:27

Thank you miss me, Mr. HawKer.

1:15:31

Thank you sir. Can I just ask is the meeting to reiterate those references please because I I am aware of the viewpoints and the positions which I've duly marked on my own Ordnance Survey map, but I don't recall seeing any visualisations or any any cross sections or anything from those viewpoints. Yes.

1:16:00

Yes, of course, and so, so, so, it would be few point I've actually realised I made an error previously in terms of the, this the referencing regarding visualisations and baseline photography. So, view points see is actually just baseline photography, whereas, viewpoint three is a is a photo visualisation. So, that shows the proposed scheme at opening year and year 15 When mitigation is reasonable level of maturity. So, I would the probably the best location for Miss Hawk to refer to is as I say that figure 7.4 visual context plant, which I believe is AP p 6.2. What that is then hopefully a gateway to the photo visualisations that are available on the pins website for the scheme. I don't have the exact references for those visualisations but as I say that should hopefully be a gateway to so that was

1:17:10

can I circle it? Could I ask that do you have the the pins reference for that?

1:17:18

Uh, yeah, what I was going to do is I was going to go to Mr. Joslin and perhaps ask Miss Mr. Me and if he's able to wherever his team at some point just to to get those references before before we finished at least they can be passed on to you. So you've got so you go away from the end of today with those references, I think not expecting them instantly. But yeah, that can be just be found and then then passed on before the end of the day that will be helpful. Yes, sir.

1:17:42

Mr. Joslin

1:17:46

George Justin on path for Bo Hall estate, yes, certainly we can assist in any way with that aspect we will do so I just want to add in relation to the sections that one was not concerned solely about the private aspects of the very whole estate there was considering to have the sections and to understand the point of view from the public viewpoints more than anything else. And in particular, Section G of the sections in that document covers the embankment of the hunting link road coming up inside of the roundabout. And that shows a completely open area going down to the new public cycleway. And of course overlooking hunting and village. So one's concerned for hunting and village as much as concerned to the very whole estate with those sections. Thank you. So that's all I wants to add comment and say we can help with any references that are necessary there. Thanks.

1:18:50

Thank you. Thank you very much.

1:18:53

Sorry, I can provide those references now if it's less linked. So a jahmene for the applicant. And so for location three, I understand that a PP data or six two, and for location C, that would be a p P dash 067. Yes, and but there would be multiple sheets with each of those, as you'll recall that, you know, there are different views and different pages for each of those, but those are the references and there are views in that location can also just confirm again is pretty much what Mr. Botha says. So there are no

sections in that location. I'm talking about photog photographic information, illustrative information, but there are no sections in that that location. We wouldn't, you know, typically provide that within the main chapter unless absolutely necessary. Well, you know, if, you know a specific point was required to be supported, but that you know, that we have done that in the case of Barry hold as Mr. Mr. Arthas stated

1:20:02

Thank you, and myself. And thank you for providing those references. So quickly. I think that's, that's useful. Thank you. Are there any other questions or comments with regards to landscape or visual issues before I move on? Now, again, I'm not seeing any hands or any comments. So Mr. Walker

1:20:28

Thank you, sir. Richard Hawker from when some value lines, I just taking the point Mr. Meehan is just made about no sections being provided. Because there is no landowner nearby, and that would only be done if that was the case. But there is new gatehouse, very, very close to the the route of the road, surely that would be a requirement in his criteria and to provide such.

1:21:05

So if I can respond to that, I think. I think I don't know if Mr. Arthur is absolutely correct in what he referred to in terms of the, you know, the production of the cross sections, but the comments might be taking being taken too, literally in the respect that, you know, the in a direct from an LVH perspective that would only be in with respect to a landowner. And did you know it to sort of support Mr. Arthur's comments, these cross sections have been provided in one location, that's been a point of disappointing discussion, it was, you know, point of discussion in the last set of hearings. And so it was considered that they were, you know, very helpful in that location. The production of an LV a has to consider proportionality in, in supporting illustrative information, we don't consider in this location that that's necessary to provide that information. As I say they're there for photographic information that Mr. Harker can refer to that, you know, we've identified here, there's the Master Plan, which is, I can refer to our EP three dash 016, which provides more information in plan view. And so I would, sort of in smart summary, I'd say there is sufficient information already to be able to draw the conclusions we have within the assessment. And we wouldn't be clear that sections in this location would add anything to the assessment in the chapter, the main chapter, which is as a chapter seven, the LDA a PP dash 046.

1:22:49

And just for my own information, in terms of picking those locations for viewpoints, or that was agreed with the local authority, or the local authorities, prior to the preparation of the actual assessment, and they were because they were particularly sensitive locations or sensitive receptors.

1:23:10

Yeah, I mean, it's so gentlemen for the applicant, sir. So, I think we will be able to respond in writing to previous responses on viewpoints book but first to say, yes, the viewpoint local representative viewpoint locations have been agreed with the host authorities that is a point of agreement. And they are there primarily to provide snapshots not the right term, but a range of key views within the visual assessment, which support the overall assessment of receptors. So as a starting point, I'd refer to appendix 7.4 Which is the visual receptors table that's a p P dash 092. That's quite a wordy

document that goes through all the receptors identified within the study area. And then, that it's typical following good practice LV Ay. Ay rain range of representative viewpoints are then selected. And as I say, agreed with the host authority, which at a man it's sort of hard to explain in a way but you know, provide colour to that to that very thorough assessment of all receptors and lead then to illustrative photographic information which are supported. So, I would also refer to appendix 7.5 which is a p P dash 093. And that is the text information which links to the planner referred to which is figure 7.4 as a recall, and the location of those representative viewpoints. So, so yes. In summary, viewpoints are agreed with the hairstyle authority and they are intended to be representative of the range of views that one would experience within the study area.

1:25:08

Thank you Mr. Angus. Mr. Hawk, I've got your hand.

1:25:17

Thank you. So hi. Richard Hawker Winston Valley Alliance. Thank you for that. Mr. Meehan, I've made a note of the plan view is available on rep three dash one six. Which is, which is helpful, of course, but what about if sections aren't available, then where can I find detail of the height of the road above sea level, so I can get some idea of the, of the effect.

1:25:53

Okay, so jump in for the applicant. I would also refer you in response to the height and I'll find the figure we do have a contour plan, which we included if you can just give me one second, I think it may be figure 7.2 But just do want to check that and I don't know if colleague can provide me with the reference with it is figure 7.2. So yeah, 7.2 landscape context. And as I said, yeah, thank you, um, a PP data 060 And that figure has contour information. It also shows the footpath locations and and the scheme. So, perspective can be p preserved perspective is provided on the topographic variation, particularly within the Tod valley there and the location Mr. Hawk is referring to

1:26:59

thank you very much.

1:27:04

Okay, thank you both for those and that that's helpful.

1:27:10

Mr. Rucker, I think your hand is still up, Mr. Hawker. I'm not sure that's just left up from that previous point.

1:27:15

I do beg your pardon?

1:27:17

No problem. Thank you very much. And

1:27:20

are there any other final questions on landscape and visual before I move on to the next item under this agenda? Okay, again, I'm not seeing anything. So I'll move on to the next one if I could. And again, the next one relates to noise. And as with previous matters, that we sort of picked up since lunch, it's just sort of a couple of points of clarification that I had that I was seeking, if possible. And in terms of noise, the E environmental statement identifies that there are a number of properties that were subject to significant effects that lie within link. And this is identified because of a change in road use behaviour. And as a result, it can't be mitigated. So really, I just wanted to understand, actually, what that meant, what sort of change in road behaviour and what mitigation had been considered to, for example, add sort of road signs, alternative directions and bits and pieces like that being considered to avoid this road behaviour taking place if you'd like and directing them on a more suitable route.

1:28:31

Good afternoon, sir. It's Dan Doherty here noise and vibration specialist representing the applicant. Can you hear me okay?

1:28:38

I can't find Thank you very much. Great.

1:28:41

Thanks. So, the, the the query about link road relates to operational noise effects that's changes in road traffic noise that are expected to occur due to the scheme on Ling road itself and the the noise change occurs due to changes in traffic volume. These these values originate from the traffic model that we have been supplied with us as part of the environmental statements and mitigation in such location in terms of physical measures is difficult. And we acknowledge that because obviously, barriers in front of pupils access is would be difficult or impractical, sorry. And low noise surfaces would not be particularly effective where the speed is low. Plus you've got the fact that those roads are maintained by different highways authority. And perhaps the transport specialist if there is on the coast could comment on routing options considered for the junctions?

1:30:12

I do about a shell on behalf of the applicant. Um, I don't feel I can add anything particularly at this point on approved. I can't quite work out on specifically anything about routing the link road at this point in time. So I'd have to respond in writing, I'm afraid

1:30:33

that that's fine, I'm happy if that can be taken away and just looked at I think I it, it's for me just a little bit more understanding of what and then like I say what mitigation, whether there are other mitigations whether mitigation has been looked at and can't be done for reasons A, B and C, whatever it might be. And I think it would just be helpful for my understanding of the matter. Thank you, Mr. diety

1:31:02

thank you to Dandora T on behalf of the applicant, I just wanted to add one additional piece of information to that query is obviously we are talking about changes in road traffic noise at the moment,

we have also looked at what the expected level of road traffic noise would be properties adjacent to that road in the completion year, and they are below what we call the significant observed adverse effect level. So that is another indication that the effect although would be perceived as a noise change is not enough to cause significant effects on on health or quality of life.

1:31:54

Thank you that's that's helpful. Okay, that's

1:32:03

the question again, which which may be something that you wish to come back in writing on was a matter that came up at the hearing yesterday, with regards to a couple of properties on the very whole estate in particular things very old cottages and Wisteria cottage with regards to that proximity to the temporary compound and potential noise impacts on the residents there. I think it was highlighted to me yesterday that within the cottages, I think there's a nurse who works evenings nights and I think within Wisteria cottage, there's also a local resident with with particularly sort of sensitive issues. So again, you may not know the answer to it, but I'll pose the question and see, see what your response is.

1:32:51

Thank you, sir. Dan Doherty on behalf of the applicants. Yes, certainly happy to respond in writing, we have presented an assessment of construction noise and vibration within the IES chapter 11. That's a p p 050. That has included consideration of the effects in the vicinity of of receptors in that in that location. So very, very whole, for example. I'd also like to refer you to the Environmental Management Plan, which is a pp 143, which identifies particular mitigation like noise or vibration controls in that location, as well. So it has been considered. Thank you, Mr. Arthur. Thank you. So

1:33:53

by the offer on behalf of the applicant, I just like to confirm on the component layer as well. The component that is proposing allocation is not our construction compound where there's going to be heavy plant or materials or construction practices being undertaken, as a welfare component of our storage facilities as well. The planned layout will obviously take into account the properties nearby and the cattle shed and the intention is that there will be a screen bonding on the western extent on the southern extent of that component, which will provide visual screening and noise mitigations as well, the car parking layout and the cabins will also be set as close to the 47 aspect as possible so that we have the minimal impact on the residential receptors followed to the south. So I just wanted to make that clarification. So thank you.

1:34:40

Thank you for that clarification. That's helpful. Thank you. And,

1:34:46

again, I know the questions with regards to noise, but are there any issues anybody else would like to raise?

1:34:56

Mr. Hawker.

1:35:01

Thank you, sir. Richard Hawker Winston Valley Alliance. One thing which I want to aspect regarding noise, particularly from construction is not just the, the level of noise, but the duration of it. And I noticed that the the anticipated working hours are extremely long, including the whole of Saturday is is there scope for limiting those hours? So that the the exposure to noise for everybody is limited?

1:35:36

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Okay. And Mr. Berger, the applicant?

1:35:44

Thank you, sir, Mr. Alpha for the applicants.

1:35:46

I do apologise.

1:35:47

Your name confuses me the way it comes up. I do apologise.

1:35:50

I'm sorry, sorry, it's been a long day. In response to that question, the the applicant has received a question from Mr. Hawker at the last deadline in which we will be providing a written response to the working hours have to take into account the timeline to deliver the scheme and make sure that the benefits of that scheme can be realised as early as possible. So that's why that the working hours have been set to what they are. But we will provide a full written response our deadline seven. So

1:36:18

thank you that we have an in terms of just how the work is going to do is it going to happen along the whole site all in one go? Or is it in stages,

1:36:27

it will be in stages. Also, as we touched on yesterday, this year hearing the outline traffic management plan indicates the potential of sort of the proposed construction phasing for the scheme. And that gives you an idea of the locations for what will be happening. Obviously, with it being an offline scheme, the intent is to build as much as we can offline without impacting on the existing a 47. Before we then flip the traffic on to the new road tell I was to get access into the additional areas to continue construction. So as a phased approach.

1:36:57

Thank you that Thank you. Thank you. Has anybody else

1:37:05

got any further comments with regards to noise at this stage? Okay, I'm not seeing any in hands or comments. So I think that's all on that one. And I think as Mr. Arthur pointed out, it's been quite a long, a long day so far. So I might suggest that we perhaps have a short break at this point as well. It may allow me to get people's names, right. For the for the last session. And so what I suggest is it is now 3:38 On my clock, so perhaps if we just take a short break and come back at 10 to 4 if that's okay, sort of just over 10 minutes or so. So yeah, 10 to 4. Okay. Thanks very much for this this hearing adjourned till the 10 to 4 Thank you