

ISH1_BLOFIELD_17082021_SESSION2_TRANSCRIPT

Tue, 8/17 4:09PM • 1:07:11

00:05

Good morning, it's 1150 on the hearing of resumes, can I just check that people can see and hear me?

00:14

Yes, sir, we can.

00:16

Thank you very much.

00:19

Okay, so moving on to schedules, including requirements.

00:27

Mr. Dagg, you either

00:33

Okay, thank you.

00:35

So, in sheduled one

00:41

where we where it says work number two and work number 22

00:48

there's there's a thing there's extra space after the dot after number. And whilst it might seem a small thing, it makes searching the document difficult

00:57

without being consistent with the other

01:01

shedule the work numbers also work number 26 A

01:08

should have a dot after the no for number.

01:16

Yes,

01:17

yeah, we'll correct those errors that we just made searching the document easier for me or for anyone who's looking at it.

01:31

So in respect of my written question 1.8 point five eight

01:37

in central one, under further development at EA

01:46

I note that you took out reference to viaducts and watercourses

01:55

in the previous iteration

01:58

of the draft decio, but

02:02

you left it in pumping stations, cofferdams outfalls, and culverts.

02:09

So, I'm wondering what the justification is for including these as you know, saying that non as far as I'm aware are going to be included in the proposed development

02:25

we we run we run you

02:29

run this question

02:32

past

02:34

past

02:37

our

02:39

engineers as to the works that could be required. So, we deleted from the list what we

02:47

what we thought what sorry, what we knew certainly wouldn't nothing you know, obviously, there aren't any viaducts included in the including the scheme

02:59

some of some of the some of what is in ATP could be could refer to temporary works as well rather than rather than permanent ones.

03:12

pumping stations what in what circumstance might you require a pumping station or cofferdam

03:22

or outfalls because Landsat out there are no out there there are no outfalls to be

03:28

to be included

03:32

make up cofferdams

03:37

But thanks for structures built into rivers or lakes to hold back the water wells to work within the

03:43

mud.

03:45

I mean, these are these are I suppose, kind of engineering questions about the bad construction, but

03:52

I think the cofferdams could possibly be required in the construction of the soakaways

04:00

as part of the scheme.

04:06

So

04:10

if there are if there are specific terms like this search, you want a response on it, it it they're probably not legal questions are probably questions which need which needs to be reviewed by the by the team as a whole so that perhaps you can come back to me and just give maybe an example of why you might need a pumping station or cofferdam an outfall

04:33

or a culvert.

04:39

Okay, so thank you.

04:43

So moving on to schedule two and the requirements. I'd like to emphasise that should I not ask you a question about a specific requirement? It's not because I consider that all matters have been resolved in relation to the issues or the requirements deal with that in terms of risk.

05:00

Viewing the wording, I'm generally satisfied with them as they're currently worded.

05:08

So if we just have a look at requirements number three,

05:15

this relates to detailed design.

05:21

I suppose Firstly, could you please confirm that all commands completed for further this, as this requirement is written?

05:30

There's no necessity for any approval of detail design

05:36

by anyone, Secretary state or anyone?

05:56

Because you're effectively relying on the parameters of the scheme and the

06:03

well, the information which has already been submitted.

06:07

Yes, that's right. So so the the information that's been submitted sets out those parameters, and it's only it's only if there's a deviation from those parameters that we might have to go back to the Secretary of State.

06:20

Okay, and you mentioned in your response to my recent question.

06:26

Yeah, that's consultation on details, it is not needed, given the level of design detail in the application, which is effectively what you just said.

06:37

So requirement three refers to the

06:41

preliminary scheme design shown on the works plans, and

06:47

the engineering drawings and sections.

06:54

So I asked this specific question about the bridge, the bridges, that that was the response, as well as the bridges will be

07:02

probably one of the more notable features that can you show me where on these plans

07:13

refer to the required three, where bridges are shown?

07:17

And how detailed design has to accord with it with these plans? Because like,

07:23

I can't see on them while certainly all the works plans, any details of

07:31

you know, bridges, what they're going to look like?

07:38

Yeah, so the the Bridget, there are

07:43

detail detailed design for for the bridges.

07:48

Sorry, there are designs for the bridges, which which encompass a fair amount of detail,

07:54

which are included.

08:00

Think with the

08:03

so I've seen some bridges in the generation drones, but

08:09

the general arrangement plan is not referred to within this requirement. So I I'm wondering what you're having the detailed design or not not requiring any details, I have read just based on the plans.

08:23

Reference requirement. I think that the the,

08:28

the bridge design should be within the engineering drawings

08:34

to be part of that suite of documents. Okay, but they're not from what I can say at the moment. Okay.

08:44

So, we we will move them and place them with the, with the engineering drawings for that line for

08:52

they should definitely be in with the engineering drawings.

08:58

Okay.

09:06

Well,

09:10

the District Council, Ms Skipper

09:16

like I, I asked her some questions as to whether

09:21

broadland District Council should be a console T.

09:25

You've heard the applicants response that they don't think it's necessary and

09:30

given the level of detail on the general range from plans, I think it's vital to

09:37

two pages which show the bridge design.

09:41

So I'm just to sort of get your view on that and the level of detail that's being provided.

09:49

Blanaid Skipper broadland District Council and the District Council would welcome the opportunity, you know, a requirement within the draft dcl for the detailed design of the proposed bridges in respect

10:00

Act of achieving a high quality of design. So we would welcome that opportunity. Okay. And in terms of the design that's been shown on the general range of plans, I mean, is that sufficient? Does that provide sufficient information to not need to go down the design detailed design requirement rooms? pilot? Yeah, I would have to respond later and right into that I'd have to confer with colleagues on that. Okay, fine. So, yeah, so the, from what I can see the detailed design of the bridges is shown

10:35

the last two pages of the general arrangement plans. But I understand the applicant saying that they're going to be moved over to the engineering drawings and sections.

10:49

Yeah, I appreciate your views on on whether that is whether those plans are sufficient, sufficiently detailed.

10:58

In order to not perhaps pursue the route of including within the requirements. Any further consultation on the design of the scheme. Certainly will confirm that in writing for you. Okay, thank you very much.

11:23

I mean, the CEOs is that is a fairly standard thing not to submit detailed designs.

11:32

This is a

11:34

this is a

11:36

fairly standard, standard requirements.

11:43

Okay.

11:45

Alright, thank you.

11:49

But if the

11:51

Beaufort County Council wanted to comment on that,

11:55

I don't think they had any other thing you had any views on? necessarily the design when I asked the question, but you'll need to remind me Yeah, no, it's David Cumming Norfolk County Council. No, we don't have any views on the design as such. Our concern would relate to the physical features that are incorporated on it in terms of things like carriageway width, cycle track footwear, etc. Okay. So perhaps you have you had look at the

12:22

the designs of them, as I shown on the general range from plans of the moment.

12:28

We

12:30

remain in discussion with highways England about some of the width of things like cycleways, I would again need to confer with colleagues about whether that applied to any thing over the bridges. Right. Okay. I mean, I've put on the agenda, talking about the design of cycleways and footpaths, I think on

12:52

Friday, so maybe we can address that then.

12:59

Okay, thank you.

13:03

In that case, moving on to

13:07

requirement five to

13:12

say this is the landscaping

13:15

requirement you've made some changes

13:20

to five two

13:24

I'm just wondering why

13:27

the very end of that sentence it's it refers to requirement five

13:37

me just read it sir.

13:54

Photo slightly superfluous but

13:59

I think that's right. I think the the reference to requirement five isn't is

14:05

shouldn't be that

14:11

Okay, can I leave that with you? Yes.

14:22

Sir requirements six.

14:25

So, you Yes, you added the Environment Agency into as a console T

14:32

and requirements six one.

14:35

Relating to ground sorry, contaminated land and groundwater.

14:47

Requirements six to

14:56

Sorry, sorry.

14:58

Sorry. Ignore me on that one.

15:01

Reading different ones. So

15:05

yes, requirement six to, say the Environment Agency at deadline to

15:12

suggested that.

15:16

Wherever from refers to all parties.

15:22

Sorry, were refers to the undertaker.

15:27

It should specify all parties rather than just the undertaker

15:34

given that in six one

15:37

of the other policies such as the Environment Agency are consultees.

15:42

So if you're consulting other policies, why is it then just The Undertaker who will decide

15:48

whether remediation of contaminated contaminated land is necessary

15:54

rather than

15:56

where all parties determine that remediation is necessary?

16:06

I just hope you could comment on that.

16:19

Let me just read the requirement again, sir.

16:46

So you're effectively you could be

16:49

carry out a risk assessment where the risk assessment says

16:55

there's a risk.

16:58

But then, in the second part,

17:06

does that allow you to ignore that risk? I don't think the second part is about the risk assessment, I think it's about the need to the need to remediate the contaminated land.

17:18

if if if you follow me so.

17:24

So,

17:27

if the

17:29

if the

17:32

it could be the scheme can proceed without the remediation of the contaminated land, which we would have discovered.

17:43

It would only be if

17:46

if

17:49

if to carry out the works that that

17:54

remediation was necessary. The second part I don't think relates to the to the risk element

18:12

so it's the it's the under the undertaker carries out the risk carries out its risk assessment and contamination in consultation with the rather than planning authority and the Environment Agency

18:26

and

18:31

the undertaker who then determines whether the remediation is necessary. Okay, is it It

18:38

should be the undertaker who determines that I'll surely be The Undertaker

18:44

in consultation with

18:46

the Environment Agency for example and the relevant planning authority

18:53

because because does that does? Like the embarrassed he might think it's necessarily new. If it just says The Undertaker then

19:01

the undertaker can could be theoretically dismissive own agency's views on that.

19:08

Um, I

19:13

think it's

19:17

we, we

19:21

we consider the

19:24

requirement six two is a decision which you undertake should take.

19:32

But it's one that we're we're happy to take away and discuss with the Environment Agency.

19:37

Okay. Okay. So there are so that it raises an issue

19:45

that hasn't been

19:49

addressed or change I can see.

19:52

Yeah, we didn't we intended that. It should be as it as it still appears.

19:57

Yes.

19:59

So Pat

20:00

Environment Agency will comment on that. So the next deadline, maybe? Or perhaps you may want to get something from the Environment Agency to say that they are content with that. Yes, I will also consider your comment about consultation with the Environment Agency.

20:18

Yeah, but ignore that for that part because that they're already agricultural tea

20:24

in?

20:25

Oh, do you mean first six to? Yes. Thank you. Yeah.

20:30

Yes, so just to be just so that we're clear.

20:34

So Philip Robson highways England.

20:38

In 62, my understanding of your comments was that

20:43

it was one of two It was either

20:46

the determination that remediation was necessary would be a determination by all parties. And there may be clear issues with that in terms of who those parties are. And the more people that have to agree, the more complex it can be to reach a determination.

21:01

Your alternative that you floated was where the undertaker determines that remediation of the contaminated land is necessary in consultation with the Environment Agency, which would in effect be

21:15

moving the consultation with the Environment Agency up from

21:20

being a console t to the contents of the written scheme and programme for remedial measures to the stage before that, which would be a console T on the determination that remediation was itself necessary. Because six to him on my reading of it actually covers quite a bit of ground. It covers that first that initial determination that you need to remediate then it covers the written scheme and programme for remedial measures, which needed to be needs to be submitted and approved under consultation requirements on now those measures. There's a lot in that.

21:58

That that subsection six to

22:02

Mr. Dagg is absolutely right. It can be something that's discussed further, the position that was in the the response to your initial written question.

22:10

My understanding was that it needs a decision. And it needs a decision maker, and it needs a clear process and having the undertaker as that decision maker with consultation at the appropriate points would provide

22:25

a clear process but for everybody's voice to be heard.

22:31

Okay, I mean, I'm just picking up on a point where the Environment Agency, absolutely.

22:37

But just so we're clear on the question that we're going back to the Environment Agency on it's either satisfied as it is,

22:43

or, yeah, with an explanation of why with a destination plan, or whether

22:51

the various agencies saying that they want to be

22:55

part of the decision making as to whether remediation of land is necessary. Yes, on that first decision point. And I think I think while there was a console t rather than as a, as the determining body, because of course, the determination is itself a decision by a public body and would be open to legal challenge if there were issues of dispute about the appropriateness or otherwise of that decision.

23:20

And, but things could often get complicated where you are requiring the decisions. We made an agreement with multiple parties. Okay, I mean, they'd only be two parties even they're theoretically

23:33

planning, the relevant planning authority and the various agency and the undertaker, so three in total? Yeah. So only three, not numerous. Like, honestly.

23:46

I would use numerous to be more than a couple server, that's probably just a matter of dialect.

23:51

Take your Pite.

23:52

Okay, well, maybe you can take us away, and

23:57

maybe in the steams common ground with the Environment Agency,

24:03

potentially be address.

24:08

Oh, however you see fit.

24:10

So

24:12

thank you.

24:23

There's also the second part of that the virus he raised the query about to do with

24:29

adding to prevent any impacts on controlled waters. So maybe,

24:34

I mean, you did respond to that.

24:38

But maybe if you're addressing the other parts, you may also want to come to some agreement with the Environment Agency over that as well.

24:48

Yes, I will respond in the same light the same time. Okay. Thank you. Moving on to requirements eight

25:00

So I asked that my written question 1.8 point four for

25:07

whether the long term management and maintenance of surface and firewalls and drainage systems should form part of this requirement.

25:17

In response Applicant said that

25:20

this will happen in accordance with standard practices. And the court requirements is therefore not needed.

25:30

However, without a requirement specifying long term management and maintenance

25:37

How can I be certain of this? And how would it be? How is it secured?

25:42

without specifying it because I don't know what your what highways England's

25:49

standard practices are? And without some requirements specifying this, how can I be certain that it was

25:56

they would be a requirement for it to actually happen?

26:03

So, I can't at least part part of the question, which is the there isn't any tile water drainage beyond the construction stage.

26:13

So,

26:16

in the operational stage of the development,

26:21

there will only be, as I understand it, surface water drainage

26:28

from from the scheme

26:35

but the surface water drainage systems would need maintaining in order for them to

26:42

function effectively.

26:44

Yeah, over the long term and without any

26:49

required requirements securing that

26:53

maintenance management

26:58

How can I be certain they would happen?

27:13

Don't say it in the React either.

27:17

Yeah.

27:19

You're just relying on

27:21

the applicant is relying on

27:25

standard practices, which I don't know what they are.

27:33

I think I think one to one to respond to you on in writing. So.

27:42

Okay.

27:46

I mean, it could be as easy as adding

27:50

maintenance management to the requirement.

27:55

Possibly.

27:59

But I'll leave you to come back to me on that one.

28:05

Okay.

28:08

So let's move on to the

28:10

requirement eight one

28:13

save save also.

28:19

They are very latency required requested speed constants a and you added them as a console T and requirement h1

28:30

in the last iteration of the DTO. My question is either they should also be

28:39

specified as a consultation requirement as to

28:45

if the reconstitutes a requirement a one

28:58

I don't think we would have any any issue in consulting them on on day two.

29:14

So

29:17

we will we'll either include them, include them as a consultation in the next iteration.

29:25

Or give good reasons why that shouldn't be but i'd anticipate and governance consultant Okay.

29:32

Thank you.

29:35

requirement nine, relating to archaeological remains.

29:46

So my question was about

29:50

relates to my resume question 1.8 point four six.

29:56

So I said I asked why

30:00

Norfolk County Council,

30:03

I was going to ask why Norfolk County Council and historic England is specified as console T's in the rear.

30:11

Whereas I whereas my consultation with the LPA is specified in

30:17

required line.

30:20

You said Well, there's no need to

30:22

add Lofa county council or historic England into requirement nine because they were already specified in the riak.

30:34

But then you incorporated

30:37

the historic buildings and Monuments Commission for England into requirement nine, but not Norfolk County Council

30:45

who remained in the React. So I guess it comes back to my point before Why are certain things specified in requirements when other things

30:55

are specified in the rear?

31:00

And because of incorporate, because we put in the historic England into this, should you also puts Norfolk County Council into it as well.

31:15

Maybe Lofa county council could give their view on that, also. Mr. Cumming?

31:24

Yes, David Cumming, Norfolk County Council.

31:30

So in, I'm just looking at the questions that you have asked, and could you clarify which question this is? related to? So I've got here 1.8 point four, six.

31:49

Sorry, no, 1.8? point four.

31:53

Yeah, 1.8 point four, six.

31:57

Thank you.

32:00

So

32:02

we,

32:04

in response to one 1.8 point four, seven.

32:11

We have said that as as Norfolk County Council is the sort sole advisor to board and District Council in relation to below ground archaeology. It makes it all practical difference whether you know, we are named or brought in district are named in in that respect. Now, I appreciate that the answer to a different question. And I don't know if that answers the question that you're asking here.

32:39

Right.

32:41

If it helps us, also, my understanding the north county council effectively is the ecological adviser to the local planning authority.

32:52

And, and it will be felt that we should be consulting local planning authority here. But the they will effectively get the county Council's archaeological services involved in that decision?

33:08

I think it's correct that it's referring to the it's correct, that it's referring to the planning authority, or being that the console that they may well, while they will involve the county council in order to come to their determination.

33:24

Right.

33:27

Okay.

33:30

I'm just wondering whether because there seems to be a three stage approach, so you will consult

33:37

the relevant planning authority here then consults Norfolk County Council?

33:44

So I think that's a fairly normal practice, though, isn't it in terms of in terms of getting getting a local planning authorities view on something there, you know, be noisy, so they might be going off to the environment services team or highways where, you know, they might end up consulting the, you know, the highway function or the County Council. Okay.

34:09

Alright, as I would see this, okay. Well, if Mr. Cumming is satisfied with satisfied with that, then there's no point to me pursuing it further. Maybe

34:23

Ms Skipper? Is that?

34:26

Is that a fairly normal process? That's right. Yes. Advice in this respect broadland received from the historic environment service at Norfolk County Council, they would be our statutory consultee here.

34:39

Okay.

34:41

And you would you went as soon as you got received the consultation from highways England, you would immediately we would immediately

34:50

consult Norfolk County Council. That's right. Okay. All right. Thank you for that.

35:01

Okay, just one other thing that if there's full two full stops after the word England at the end.

35:10

So we will remove the offending full stops.

35:18

Also, in respect to

35:21

my recent question 1.8 point four,

35:26

six.

35:33

You said that reporting and publishing a data and archaeological findings in respect to the written scheme of investigation is specified in the riak.

35:49

Can you show me? I can't see where that is the case.

35:55

And should it should reporting and publishing data be specified within the requirements itself?

36:05

If it's not in the React I

36:09

think our response referred to being in table 6.1 of the EMP

36:15

line search one dash six. Yeah, I couldn't see it.

36:23

Let us let us have a look at that.

36:27

We will we will double double check it's there.

36:30

And if not, we'll we'll come back with something something suitable be an amendment to

36:36

nine

36:37

or all the text in the in the EMP that should be that.

36:43

Okay, I mean, do you have a Do you have the EMP to help? At the moment? It wasn't?

36:51

It's not. I haven't got it open in front of me now. But I can open it up very quickly.

37:19

I think it's rap 3014.

37:47

So do you say g one, though?

37:51

Which one do you say GS one?

38:04

Ch one dash six.

38:12

Ch 126.

38:32

I can see your hand up. Mark Murphy.

38:36

Yes. Thank you, Mark Murphy coordinator for the environmental impact assessment which is that is EIA after that. On behalf of sweco on behalf of house England. Yes. So sorry. I was a little bit confused. And now the CH refers to cultural heritage and the fascial reference, and you've got the information included in the WSI, which is ch four, CH five and C six in the first column. Sorry, for sure.

39:08

Chapter, but where does that talk about publishing data

39:15

is agreed included in the WSI. And then that is going to Norfolk County Council environmental services

39:27

WSI is

39:30

the reporting and the WSI be published.

39:35

Where does it say that

39:38

we have

39:45

says production of the WSI in ch one, but we could be able to take that away and update it to be more specific. I'm saying that will be published.

39:59

Yeah, so my point

40:00

Cuz I can't see anywhere that says

40:02

we can do it that way.

40:06

Yeah, so reporting and publishing of data and archaeological findings.

40:11

Okay, thank you.

40:14

I didn't know whether

40:16

Lofa county council was coming. You wanted to say anything about that.

40:22

David Cumming Norfolk County Council? No, I have no comments to make on that, sir. Okay, thank you.

40:29

Um, in that case, moving on to

40:33

requirement 10.

40:39

So, my recent question 1.8 point four, nine, I asked whether requirement 10 should refer to the outline traffic management plan.

40:52

And then response applicant said that the DCE the draft DCA was amended to do so.

40:59

However, I can't see any amendment to requirement 10.

41:06

Was that

41:08

an oversight or

41:11

or not? It will have been it will have been an oversight. So so my apologies for that. We'll come back with as amended tax deadline for

41:20

Okay, thank you.

41:24

Requirements 12 days after that, on the second line after timetable, there's a big there's a number three.

41:33

I'm not sure what that was there for. I think it may be an old footnote or something. So

41:40

we will delete that too.

41:45

Okay.

41:46

requirement 18.

41:50

you noted,

41:53

Mr. Dagg that the

41:56

period of time has changed in 10 working days to 10 business days to 28 days.

42:03

Can I just

42:05

confirm with

42:07

Norfolk county council broadland District Council that their consent with that because I know that you both raised

42:16

issues with regard to that as as part of your submissions.

42:23

Yet Ms Skipper Blanaid Skipper broadland District Council Yes. Working 10 to 20 it as. Okay

42:32

28 days as opposed to 28 business days?

42:36

No 20? Well, 28 days is what my colleagues have advised me. Yeah. So okay, I'm coming.

42:46

Yes, we will endeavour to provide a response within 28 days. I think that is a reasonable timescale. Okay, thank you.

42:57

So in terms of my requirement in terms of my questions on requirements,

43:03

and shedule two,

43:06

they're all the questions I had. Does anybody else? wish to comment or

43:12

have any questions on requirements? Mr. Cumming?

43:19

Yes, thank you. So just click all the buttons so I'm on camera is David Cumming Norfolk County Council. I apologise if it perhaps we should have made some of these comments previously, but but the the these comments have just been brought to my attention. And they relate really to requirement eight, which is on

43:43

I think page 45. So on on requirement eight, the

43:52

decio application set out the requirements to surface and foul water drainage. And the lead local flood and water team are part of Norfolk County Council considered there's an issue regarding requirements for surface and found water drainage. And again, there's a number of these which I'll go through briefly.

44:16

So on on requirement eight, the llf, a lead local flood and water team, consider that this could usefully include naming the appropriate organisations rather than the planning authority. And so the question is, could the requirements include consultation by the undertaker with Norfolk County Council as lead local flood authority on matters related to its function as a statutory consul t?

44:46

Would you like me to go through all of them or should I pause after each one? Yeah, I think it might be useful to pause after each one and

44:55

Yes, Miss dag would he be able to come back on that?

45:01

I don't see.

45:04

Sorry. Too many buttons.

45:08

I don't see a problem with that. And including that text in the requirement. Could I just ask, though?

45:20

So previously with regard to the

45:24

heritage bit, you said that a lot of accounts council be automatically consulted by the local authority without they'll be the same here.

45:39

I think that's I think that's, I think that's right.

45:42

Well, it's Mr. Cumming Really?

45:46

Well, I don't know the answer to that one, I'm afraid said I'm reporting comments from from colleagues who have asked that we are directly consulted as the llf ll.

46:02

Okay.

46:04

How about

46:08

Ms Skipper? What's the normal process for if the local authorities consulted isn't similar to the heritage where local county council be automatically consulted? Yes. So the same applies, we would automatically consult the Norfolk County Council as the lead local flood authority.

46:29

Okay, thank you.

46:39

So, Mr. Cumming

46:43

Maybe you can discuss this story in yourself and the applicant

46:48

as to whether it's necessary or not, yes. So, we can do that.

46:55

The second one relates to

47:00

the lack of

47:04

water cause consenting processes and I can provide if you would, like I can provide more more detailed comments to set out what what we would like to see as a requirement separately, but um, what we would like to see is additional wording in in the decio, essentially, to the effect that the requirements include that no works commence until Norfolk County Council as the lead local flood authority has been consulted.

47:36

This is still in respect of requirement eight. Yes.

47:47

Does not does requirement eight one not already say that?

47:55

No part of the authorised volunteers to commence.

48:04

It does, except that it doesn't include consultation with Norfolk County Council as the LFA. Okay, so your first point and the second points are kind of the same point.

48:19

Okay, it's ipsi. Except that yes. Okay.

48:24

Mr. Dagg, and you want to

48:26

say anything?

48:30

Given that it's the same point, I guess our responses are responses the same? I think we we think consultation with the LPS sufficient.

48:42

But if if Norfolk wants to provide us with a,

48:49

with a kind of a list of the requirements or the changes to the requirements that it thinks it would like to be to be made, then we can we can kind of take on those discussions.

49:04

Okay. All right. Thank you, Mrs. Cumming in at some more points. Yes. The final point I'd like to make

49:14

is that there's no mention of the need to involve the LFA in relation to the review of the temporary surface water drainage plan as part of the environmental management plan. So the question is, again, could a requirement be added essentially to the effect that the need to involve the LFA in relation to the review of the temporary surface water drainage plan as part of the EMP?

49:43

I say I'm happy more than happy to put these points in in writing and

49:48

you know, make make those clearer. Okay, so,

49:57

loss management plan falls under the

50:00

required for Is that right? Mr Dagg

50:12

there's well

50:19

or does it take temporary one fall under requirement eight

50:24

I think asked this question actually

50:27

what the difference is between the water management plans and requirement for and requirement eight

50:38

so what are we what what monitoring and management is there under, under for too?

50:44

Small is no

50:47

water monitoring and management plan.

50:54

So, can you add Lofa county councils or console t within the E MP for that?

51:02

Yes, I'm not. I'm sure we can choose it will be a

51:05

problem with that.

51:11

Okay. Can I leave that with you? The napkins?

51:17

Yes.

51:21

Okay, thank you.

51:26

This company was not only Oh, do you have to say on this point? It was Thank you. Yes. No. Can I can I just ask is that in for the MP? Is that as local

51:38

with the county council or the county Council's local Highway Authority or something else?

51:43

It would be with Norfolk County Council as the lead local flooding authority.

52:04

Okay, thank you for that. Does that. Did anybody else have any questions or just make any comments on refinements of the draft? decio?

52:20

Okay, I'm seeing no hands up. So I'm going to move on to other schedules.

52:32

This might be a question

52:36

from traffic and transport hearing on Friday, but Bedworth raising it here as well.

52:45

So in the traffic regulations, plans,

52:50

sheets, six and sheet one.

52:53

Both identify 30 mile per hour zones, and tie in points.

53:01

My question is do the tie in points need references like other time points do

53:08

and should.

53:11

And were in the D draft decio is the 30 mile per hour limit

53:16

of these parts of the road set out? In schedule three, Part Four.

53:25

Just bring up the plans as you're speaking is there is there a particular length of road we could look at that I might be able to explain? Yeah, so

53:36

sheets on sheet one.

53:39

I think it's the first length of 30 mile per hour road on Yarmouth road.

53:46

In sheet on sheet six, it's the third mile per hour

53:50

townhouses the plans to load so sorry, yeah, okay. Some sheep

54:02

sheep one

54:14

okay.

54:16

Yeah, this is between between the tie endpoint and a

54:22

zap right on on Yarmouth road.

54:29

So bear with me a second.

54:40

So,

54:44

yeah. So on Yarmouth road, it says tie in points.

54:51

There's no reference for that particular time point as there are for others.

55:00

So therefore in the

55:02

in federal three, part four of the draft decio.

55:07

Where,

55:09

where is it specified that that's going to be a 30 mile per hour. So

55:14

the shading on the traffic regulation plan for certain lengths of 30 mile an hour limits

55:22

is to aid the overall understanding of the scheme, the decio it, the DCR itself doesn't make traffic regulation order, making that section of road a 30 mile an hour zone, the 30 mile an hour speed limit will apply because that is an area where streetlighting will be installed.

55:45

So the 30 mile an hour

55:49

limit will apply automatically as a result of the road traffic Regulation Act.

55:59

But elsewhere, you specify where in the DCA where roads will be 30 mph.

56:07

But I don't I don't understand why not here. And why not? Also,

56:14

it was sheet six as well over the bridge

56:21

that I leave all of the all that well, some of the time points, they have a reference number, they saying this one doesn't need one. Because

56:30

Because it's automatically 30 miles per hour anyway.

56:34

Yes, so the the 30 mile an hour restriction in that location would apply? automatically because there is street lighting in certain other locations.

56:47

You You may need, you may need to make a 30 mile an hour speed limit if there isn't three lightning on that road.

57:00

Okay, so on sheet six

57:04

of the traffic regulation plans, yes.

57:12

Again, there are some

57:15

some of the roads across the bridges on either side, across the bridge on either side,

57:21

are shown estates a mile per hour.

57:24

But again, there's no tie in points, say for example, to the one

57:29

going north, along the B. One 140.

57:36

So the the reference to a tie in point, as I understand it is a tie in of any physical works that might be carried out as opposed to anything to do with with speed limits per se.

57:50

So, I mean, what what we could do, what we could do is to take that Walsh off, you know the trunk think what colour it is it's it's somewhere between yellow and orange isn't it

58:04

would be to take that colouring off the plan.

58:08

Because it's useful, it's useful to see where the third small prowess. But in the decio it specifies between this point and this point will be 30 miles per hour.

58:20

But it specifies that for certain 30 mile per hour zones and not all of it. So why doesn't it show it for all of those small profit zones in the DC? Oh, yeah. And the the answer to that I guess is is that this plan has to be Cross has to be read across with the general arrangement drawings. The

58:42

the general arrangement drawings show where the street lighting is to be provided through the scheme.

58:50

So if you overlay effectively, the the general arrangement drawings for these drawings, you will find that where there's a 30 mile an hour zone. So why does the 30 mile an hour speed limit? And streetlighting?

59:06

They won't be restriction The decio was why does the 30 mile an hour speed limit and no streetlighting they will have there will be referenced to the 30 mile an hour speed speed limit in the decio. So

59:20

what the road traffic Regulation Act says is that where you have a system of street lighting on a on a road, which is

59:29

less than a certain distance apart,

59:32

then the speed limit on that stretch of road is automatically 30 miles an hour.

59:38

I see.

59:40

Okay,

59:42

thank you for that explanation.

59:46

I'll go back and check in the DCA though just to check that that correlates with what you said. Okay, thank you.

59:56

So he federal three parts 123

1:00:00

relates to trunk roads.

1:00:06

So there's no point G specified in the table. Although there is a point G on sheet two of the classification of roads plans, there's a reason for that.

1:00:21

And I was just wondering whether it's worth checking consistency between all the central three tables

1:00:29

and the relevant plans and vice versa?

1:00:33

Or maybe you can tell me why.

1:00:39

There's no point G on sheet two of the way there's a point G on the sheet to the classification of rows plans below in the table.

1:00:48

I can't tell you that. I can't tell you that off.

1:00:54

The obviously the only the only references that should be shown are all the references that are shown on the on all of the plans should have corresponding

1:01:07

corresponding references

1:01:10

in in the shady walls, otherwise, they're you know, they are they are superfluous, the, the J i suppose wouldn't make any any difference.

1:01:20

You know, in terms of it wouldn't do anything, but obviously, if it's there, and it's not referenced in the shadows, it shouldn't be there. But we can we can check that. Okay, maybe check that and maybe just double check.

1:01:35

others as well.

1:01:38

Yes. Okay. Thank you.

1:01:44

shedule three,

1:01:47

Part Six.

1:01:54

Sorry, I'll just come on to it.

1:02:13

Sorry, it's difficult, difficult to find.

1:02:18

Okay, Part three or four.

1:02:24

Okay, yes.

1:02:28

So central three, Part Six.

1:02:31

You added

1:02:34

f nine f 10.

1:02:40

This is on sheet six. Yes.

1:02:43

Yes. Oh five. Actually five? I think it's it's gonna cheat five. So

1:02:51

yeah.

1:02:53

Reference f nine and F 10.

1:02:59

f and f nine f 10. Was

1:03:03

I think the reference points shown in the plans submitted. But there wasn't a corresponding shedule entry.

1:03:11

Yes, my point here right though is it should be f p nine f p 10.

1:03:18

I think

1:03:24

all the footpath points are FP I think they're specified as FP on the rights away and access plans.

1:03:33

I think the the F

1:03:40

bear with me one moment please.

1:03:48

So the the the FP designation

1:03:52

denotes a footpath and the F designation denotes a footway.

1:03:59

Right. So in this location the the what we're providing between f nine f 10

1:04:08

is

1:04:10

is what you would normally refer to as pavement

1:04:14

it's not it's part it's kind of part of the coverage way but it has been you know raised and set aside for pedestrians rather than a footpath which is free standing public right of way for the factory for pedestrians only.

1:04:33

So the reference the reference at ref nine to F 10 because it's next to the carriageway should be footway and an F reference and is

1:04:44

the key. Okay dirt sheet that is on the roads where the access plans. I'm currently looking at sheet.

1:04:56

I was looking at sheet seven but she

1:05:00

Key in sheet six.

1:05:04

Okay in sheet six

1:05:08

which is in the bottom left hand side of the plan. And if you go down on the right hand side of that under the under the error excluded from all the limits as the key to referencing, referred shade will three and that that has the SU F and FP designations. Right.

1:05:30

Okay.

1:05:40

Okay. Okay, thank you. I think that explains that.

1:05:51

I'm conscious that it's one. Well, getting onto one o'clock.

1:06:01

I, I've still got about 10 other questions

1:06:08

on this, but then we've also got some other sections. So I think it's probably worth us

1:06:14

taking a lunch break now and resuming afterwards.

1:06:21

Is everybody happy with that?

1:06:24

Yes.

1:06:27

Okay, so

1:06:30

that case when we come back, I'm going to

1:06:34

be looking at scheduled three, I'm schedule five that scheduled 10.

1:06:43

So I'm going to adjourn the hearing now. And we'll take an hour's break.

1:06:49

And I'll resume the hearing at two o'clock.

1:06:54

Okay, thank you.