

TRANSCRIPT_BLOFIELD_ISH2_SESSION3_19082021

Thu, 8/19 3:13PM • 1:10:03

00:06

Good afternoon, it's 145 this issue specific hearing is resumed. Can I just check with Miss Allen that you can see and hear me clearly and that the live stream is commencing? Yes. Thank you. We can see hear you on the live stream is up. Thank you. Thank you very much. So moving on to agenda item five on cultural heritage. In the agenda, you can see, the first bullet point relates to the difference between ies chapter six, rev, one, Rev. Two, kind of check with the applicants. That the, the rev one submission tracks version, which is rep one, dash o two, three, and the rev two, deadline three submission, which was rep three, that Oberon three appear to have the same track changes. So similar to the environmental management plan. Can you just confirm why why that is? And whether whether the clean version is the correct version? Good afternoon. Welcome back. Mark Murphy, a coordinator representing the applicant? Yes, that is, so the track changes for rep Rev. One, were carried through and submitted in rev three and error. And so that it's just a simple, there is a change

01:53

with to do with a reference to old post office and a table, which was picked up. So there are different there is a small difference between the two. But we will we will take that we'll clean it up and and make the track changes accordingly.

02:10

Okay. Yeah. I mean, if the clean version is correct, that's correct, then. Yeah, that's, that's, that's okay. I think. Right. Thank you for confirming that. So. So I asked the written question 1.6. point nine, in respect of an inconsistency between reporting have an impact to the southeast and southwest corner of North Burlington Park, and I ask to which, to clarify whether it was a southeast or southwest corner. You confirmed the southwest corner and amended the structure accordingly. Can you confirm again, whether it is the southwest corner or the southeast corner? Because to me, it looks like the southeast corner. Having regard to figure 6.5 that you submitted? Yes.

03:05

I paused to not have that figure open in front of me. I believe that the way we updated it was correct. And I do have my colleague, Mr. Paul Bennett, on with me.

03:18

Okay, we can pull up figure 6.5 to share it. If one of my colleagues could do that. Please. Sorry, that's the that's not the correct

04:01

Paul Bennett heritage lead with RS k representing the applicant, if I might interject, is correct is the SE. I have a consistent error with Eastern West, but is se you okay.

04:16

So you you you have ended the as to say Southwest, so. You.

04:25

Yeah. Further amendment se. Now that will be corrected.

04:31

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. Whilst we're on this plan, if it's possible to bring it up, let me just find the reference number for my for my colleagues. So it's rep one dash 039 That's the one. Thank you very much. Are we able to zoom into the large hashed hatched bit at the top of to the north of the road, please? Yeah, brilliant. Thank you. Okay, that's great. Okay, perfect. So this shows the extent of both Birmingham Park. Is that correct?

05:37

Yes, we are currently producing a further historic map extract drawing empire in response to your questions. And also in response to representations and questions by Norfolk County Council regarding the clarity of certain maps in the appendix. So we've decided that we will just give a single drawing showing the extent of the park to make it clear for everyone, and we'll submit that at the next deadline.

06:11

I ask I thought I was going to ask those it was I thought it was broadland District Council who'd query Sorry?

06:17

Yes, no, sorry, Norfolk. advisor through board and yeah.

06:21

So do you. Can you give me an indication of or maybe broadland District Council could give me an indication of where, where the extent actually is? Or yourself? Mr. Bennett?

06:35

Yeah, the extent there is shown in the purple outline with the hatch across it. In the centre top of that, and it's labelled North Burlington Park MNF. 61984.

06:50

Yes. Sorry. I meant the when you come to amended Well, well, the new extent to be

06:57

the extent will be the same. It's more that the images presented in the appendix weren't terribly clear, the historic mapping extract that we provided cut off a part of the northern part of that

07:11

house. Right. I understand. So it's not the actual extent on this plan. That's incorrect. It's right. Okay. This plan, is this plan to show the correct extents of North Burlington park? Yes. Okay. Is that brought on district Council's opinion as well? as well for broadland District Council.

07:34

Chris Bennett surfing heritage and sign off surf board. And yeah, I think there's just some some disparity between what is in terms of heritage, the Historic Park was to the centre, the southeast corner, but we are aware that, you know, there's been significant change in that southeast corner and it's changed its character. So it's not a read as the story at Parkland, as of today. So there's just two, that's why has been sort of two different versions, to different extents. Okay, so

08:02

the extent on this plan that we're looking at is that that is the for as far as you're concerned, the correct extent of North Burlington Park.

08:09

Yeah. In from the heritage as a Heritage Park. But the southeast corner has changed the extent that it's not really defined now as the heritage it just have the characteristics of the Parkland they once had.

08:21

Yeah, I understand. Okay, thank you for that. Okay, so moving on then to say as chapter six paragraph 6.8 point 12. Reports permanent construction effect permanent construction impacts on the settings of the grade one listed church and St. Andrew North burlingham, the green two lists and church and st patron off burlingham and the grade two listed Al's bond and helps the towers bomb. So, this will be due to the presence of the new road structures, which would add urbanising elements and which would remove parts of the existing rural landscape. Understand, It is reported that this would in a worst case significant this would result in a worst case significance effect of slight adverse Can you can the applicant please explain how even this as reported as a permanent impact to these designated heritage assets, the operational impacts in respect of the church St. Andrews and the church St. Peter reported to be beneficial. So how how can a permanent adverse impacts then not not have some long lasting negative effects? I guess he's also asking.

09:57

Hi again, Paul Bennett for the applicant The section that you're referring to 6.8 point 12 states that is a potential impact and that the mitigation effects, mitigation measures are not taken into account in that. And later on, when we do assess the final effect that is with mitigation.

10:29

So, potential permanent effects during construction does not last will not be take. I'm trying to understand why. So, if it's a permanent effect,

10:46

I say yes, the effect is permanent as it starts in construction. And it's a result of the construction works, the result of the road being built, it perhaps could easily go into operational impacts as it's the presence of the road. But it starts in construction. So.

11:09

Okay, so just trying to see if it's a permanent, permanent adverse effect. How? How does it if it's permanent, does it? Is it not been temporary? If it's if it's mitigated, if it can be mitigated? I see your point. Yes, I was trying to understand how permanent adverse effects can then not be calculated down the line. When you look at the long term effects, if this is permanent?

11:53

Yeah. So this is I think we're getting a bit caught up between impact, which is a magnitude of change in this case, and the effect, which is the significance of that after it's gone through that that matrix. The impact in this sense, is, as I said, Before mitigation. And so the effect is not one thing, and then another. The effect is not assessed at this point. The effect is assessed after the mitigation. So the effect hasn't changed, because only assessed at one point.

12:34

Okay, so yeah. I think I understand what you mean. But with the you're saying with mitigation, the impacts the effects? Well, you use Word impact and 6.8 point oh, but the the, it wouldn't be an impact would not last they would cease to be then then becomes permanent effects.

13:04

I so the what we're saying is that the impact, the magnitude of change will be ameliorated by mitigation. So that without mitigation, there is a higher impact. And with mitigation, there is a lower impact, which then produces the the final significance of the effect. So yes, we're saying we're saying that our mitigation is effective, in a sense, it's, it's perhaps a track of the format that we have to say what the potential impact could be and then mitigate, then reassess what the impact is for the significance of the fact. Okay, so that that is its worst case potential before mitigation.

13:58

Okay, so, in paragraph 6.8 point 1717. You talk about operational impacts.

14:13

In that paragraph, you do not mention the Church of St. Andrew in the Church of St. Peter. Yes.

14:29

When you do mention, houses, barns and houses house barn. So I'm just wondering what the reason for that is,

14:38

that is the proximity of owls barn and wholesales bond to the race junction. And the effects there. The impacts are is construction because it is the physical parts of the road. Operational impacts are taken as the effect of running that road. So the traffic movements on it and lighting. And in the case of the

churches and Andrew, the lighting would not be visible, as we've stated, and the traffic is not predicted to change dramatically in that area. And what we have said further down in the mitigating descriptions are that, because it's moving further away, that we can say that the effect is would have due to give you an insight to my thought process, the effects would have been neutral to have the same traffic on the road further away with no mitigating measures, but with mitigating measures of reinstating the hedge lines and vegetation that brought it down to beneficial effects in a beneficial Yeah, beneficial effect and beneficial impact.

15:57

Okay, so 6.8 point 17 operational impacts, you're saying the church, St. Andrew, and the church, St. Peter not reported there, because it's a neutral effect.

16:11

Yeah, there was no impact from that. That was relevant to the report. And

16:21

Okay, so then, in paragraph 6.9, point three, you say that planting would reduce predictable effect effects on the two churches? owls barn owls barn, so I'm just like to say what you mean by reduce the effect?

16:47

Yeah. Again, possibly we could reword that to be clearer. But the idea being to take it from neutral to beneficial. And again, this this impact.

17:01

Okay, but in terms of So, yeah, for the churches, I see that. But if you're saying there's a slight adverse effects for the house, say, if you're reduce the effect of hours by that house, that house barn, there must be an effect on it. But what was you reducing it to?

17:39

So the, we're over here, refer back to 6.8. point one, seven. So it's, again, it's the impact, not the effect. And so the impact on our bond and how Sayles Bond but it does have negligible significance. Rub net? Yeah, so that predicted to be negligible change. So which we have as minor magnitude? And with the, what we're saying is with the mitigation measures, that that is reduced from minor to negligible or no change? Actually, I'll have a look at the final assessment.

18:25

So that's what I was going to say Where are the operational effects on our spa and how sales are reported?

18:34

So our assessment is it it's taken it from minor to no change? And that is not carried through. to the table 6.3 house it was born, is there not there? Essentially changed it to No, no effect? no impact.

18:57

Okay, so does that does that? So yeah, so I can't see what the final effect on our valid hairstyles ban is, from the information you provided? I don't know what the changes to from the slight adverse effect.

19:12

I would be happy to amend that and add it to table 6.3. So that can be tracked through.

19:19

Okay, because without it I I don't know. I don't know what you're saying about this. Excellent. Yes, that's a good point. And I shall make a note. Okay. Thank you. Paragraph 6.9. Point three also refers to it refers to Linwood Lodge. Yes. I can't see anywhere else that Lynwood lodges referred to in this chapter. So I'm wondering if it's been missed somewhere or it's in that paragraph in error.

20:13

Yes, liquid large is actually referred to in the appendix is one of our responses to questions we did say that we included everything. All assessments impacts the appendix, and I'm looking at that now. That shows me that that is negligible neutral. So yes, that that shouldn't be in there.

20:38

Okay. So when it says it will reduce the effect on link with lodge link, rather than being there, because there was never an effect in the first place,

20:45

it would reduce the impact and it would reduce it from negligible to go change. So we have a assessment of an impact of negative negligible, we have mitigation, the mitigation reduces the impact to no change, and thus the significance of the fact is, is non is neutral.

21:08

Okay. So shuffling would large be specified in 6.8 point 17. In that case?

21:19

I think No, it's a fair point. We should take that out, because it's not something that we'd be we have tracked Previously, we have tracked things that aren't that don't turn out to be significant effects. For the purpose of transparency, however, that transparency is served by the appendix. So we'll, we'll take that up. Okay, thank you.

21:40

So can I just ask broadland District Council? Mr. Bennett, in your local impact report on paragraph 20, paragraph 26. You It is unclear as to whether you think there would be permanent impacts on on any heritage assets listed buildings particularly. Can you just clarify that please?

22:22

Yeah, I just have to try and find that because I haven't got it open on my computer.

22:26

Okay, the references wrapped to dash 066. So you can play a permanent impact is negligible to slight adverse. Right. So what was, which was the reference again, it's rep two dash 066.

23:12

Just trying to find this on the on the on the examination library. Okay. It's on. Actually hasn't got patient space. It's down the bottom near the bottom to 066. Rep. Play Rep. Welcome back to 066. Rep.

24:02

I don't know if it's an easier way for me to find it in the in the office. Oh, I've got it. My colleagues has sent it to me by email. So. So which paragraph again was

24:16

paragraph 2026 26? Yeah. You mentioned owls barn house house barn and the two churches, which I assume you mean, the ones in both burlingham. You permanent impact is negligible. negligible to slight. Yeah.

24:41

So I think Yeah, in terms of setting, I think because of the existing Yeah, we'll see as existing traffic in terms of charging the setting impact. Experiencing tend to sort of seize assets in terms of setting It'd be National Cyber s, because it's not actually affecting their significance in terms of how they appreciate it to any great extent. So that's why I wouldn't put it as a significant factor affecting their, their significance in terms of setting.

25:19

Okay, but so the the applicant says there'll be a beneficial long term effect on the two grade on the two listed churches.

25:35

You do? I'm not sure whether you're saying you agree with them or not here.

25:43

So the applicant is basically saying, because the road has shifted away from the two churches, due to planting in the longer term, there'd be a beneficial effect. However, here, you seem to be saying there might be slight adverse effects. I just wanted to clarify what in respect to that.

26:09

Yeah, yeah, I think this point, well, it's always quite difficult to tell from the experience, because you're looking ahead into the future in terms of, you know, the traffic use. But yeah, I mean, there's a potential to be beneficial and less traffic noise and there would be present because of the mitigation of landscaping, etc. And he's further away from the churches. So I can see that it could be beneficial. I mean, I was really sort of probably by putting legible tends to mean is, you know, if there is any impact, potentially in future adverse impact? It's it's not it's not significant enough.

26:45

That Yeah, I appreciate that. But the word slight. So in with the with the national networks national policy statement, even, it differentiates between substantial harm less and less than substantial harm, if there's slight harm, that could theoretically be fall into less substantial harm category and then from then there's a different than then we have to look at things slightly differently to what the applicant is saying. So I just like to understand whether you think I think generally, you agree with the applicants assessment that there would be better Well, basically no harm to any of the great any of the listed buildings in terms of this significance. And their setting?

27:36

I think it's always quite, it's quite difficult to quantify because at one hand, you are you moving the roadway and the traffic noise away with the landscaping. On the other hand, we're still building a dual carriageway very, quite close proximity to two churches, which is quite an urban and more urban road and single carriageway. So you do have still have that urbanising effect. So you know, in terms, you know, that is a slight, slight harm, but then, on balance, I can see there's a benefit of other benefits which might outweigh that.

28:11

Right. So again, Mr. Bennett, for the applicant would like to know.

28:15

Thank you. Yes. Sorry, I'm pretty sure I was trying to put in the small correction to make it is just the one beneficial impact on the the church, the other church, St. Peters has no effect, predictive, not beneficial, not negative, not adverse. The effect on St. Andrews is something that, as we were discussing these things with all the relevant consultations, particularly between myself and Chris, that, according to la 104, la 106, the magnitude of the of the of the impact was pretty clear. That led to applying that matrix approach in LA one in four to it being assigned moderate beneficial. And I believe that the nuance in this situation, as Chris is is pointing out is much more delicate than that. But that is the the effects we get from the relevant methodology. And we have actually included in our summary that although it's described as a significant effect in six point 12.7 of the ies chapter that the beneficial effects I'll quote, apologies, the beneficial effect of the church on the Church of St. Andrew is significant largely due to the high sensitivity of the asset. It's not that we're trying To over egg the pudding here and say, Look what a fantastic effects we're having. And so any discussion of that fact, is, is, in some way led by that matrix approach, but is mostly led by the narrative approach of describing what is actually happening, which is, you know, in many ways, the important thing that we heritage people focus on. But we don't wish to try and use that as a selling point of the scheme. It's always it's it's a beneficial effect, and we're happy with it. It's just that the matrix leads us to a higher significance in effect that,

30:37

yeah, obviously, from what I'm hearing is the the applicant is saying there's going to be no harm to any of the heritage asset designated heritage assets. Yes. Whereas the broadland District Council, I've unclear as to whether they think it's there's going to be any harm, because even slight harm could be

less than is, would be categorised as less than substantial harm. So I'm hoping Mr. Bennett of Rockland District Council could can just clarify that for me.

31:20

Yes, I mean, I think in terms of setting, I would say there's a degree of harm from the process that you're currently on St. Andrews? on just on St. Andrews. Yeah. Because see other churches, you've got intervening buildings. It's not seen within the context of the road of search, whereas St. Andrews is closer proximity. Okay. And housebound, and how sometimes about? Well, I would say a degree of degree of harm there are they it's quite different terms of setting up a church, you've, you're looking at it in a much wider perspective, because it's a more communal building, obviously, towers and wider setting, whereas there's a lot more localised setting to those two buildings. And there's already a degree of impact from existing dual carriageway, close to those assets. So I'll probably say that's probably neutral in respect to these two, actually. But I would say there's a degree of degree of at the low end to the Landry's.

32:29

Okay. Mr. Bennett from the applicant, do you want to respond to that?

32:35

Yes, I am slightly confused. Is this is different to the consultation responses that we've had. Where

32:46

the

32:51

though there was agreement with our assessment of a positive impact, or beneficial impact on St. Andrews. And I wonder if this is a case for clarification, as we do acknowledge that there is a potential adverse effect that is then balanced by the beneficial effects. And so in our assessments, we have put together those those impacts and those effects where there is a direct causal link, it's from the same, the same thing there is, the presence of the road and the mitigation for it. Whereas possibly point to discuss later, we've separated out impacts where there's a negative impact from one causal effect, and a positive impact, or beneficial impact from a different cause and effect. Physical impact versus enhancement. And so the, again, the nuance there is that we don't say that there's not going to be any potential negative effects, adverse effects on St. Andrew, is that that effect is balanced directly. And it produces a balanced impact in effect that is beneficial.

34:07

Okay, so Mr. Bennett from problem District Council, so my request written question 1.6. point four asked whether broader District Council was in agreement with the overall assessment of effects on on the on the heritage assets, the response was that you were but your local impact report. And what you're saying now, potentially suggests otherwise. So. I just want I just want to be really clear what your view is on the effect on St. Andrew's church?

34:51

Well, again, it's just such a question of balance. And, you know, as I'm seeing the harm from the dual carriageway, I can see there's benefits as well. So it's just how you balance that up. So that's why I've said little slight adverse, but recognising that the mitigation is positive. And I, yeah, it's very difficult because, you know, the degree of you can when the degree of harm is so low, it's almost negligible that, you know, that's, I would classify that still as a harm. But I know that in previous appeals, etc. And then that's that's actually resulted in respect to saying that there's no harm, no resulting harm at all, and potentially, in this case, and benefit from the noise reduction, etc, in landscaping. So it's just, I suppose, depending what you're what you're what you're coming out at, at the end, on balance, it probably is. What we'll do come out of that. It's always very difficult, because we haven't got, you know, until it's actually built, you don't know how, you know, the noise levels, etc. And how much that's going to mitigate the actual impact from the from just the fact of putting a dual carriageway in that close proximity to the church. I mean, I would say, I think this is saying that statement is such an a degree of harm, that it's natural. And that's, you know, often regarded as being no harm, resulting no harm at all, if you look at the wider, I mean, the thing is, as well, when you're looking at the setting, you're looking at the setting in its entirety. This is just one aspect of the setting. So I think when you look at the setting the church in His entirety, then that's you know, such a small, low degree of harm that you could count it as negligible. even slightly beneficial, some respects from the landscaping, that is not it is not a factor factor to take into consideration. Right. Okay.

36:56

So when you look at the positive beneficial effects and the negative effects of building the dual carriageway, how do they balance out for you? Is, you say that, just so I'm clear there's, you think there's going to be an overall negative level of harm to the setting and therefore, to the significance of the heritage asset. But it would be negligible. But that is still? Yeah.

37:29

I think there's still a potential, there's a degree of harm, just from the point of view of having building that quite an urban infrastructure and your carriageway, there's always going to be a degree of harm to the setting.

37:41

Okay. Okay. And in terms of the just the overall effects of the overall benefits in the scheme as a whole, in your view of that outweigh the the very low level of harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset?

37:58

Yes. Because looking at the setting in its entirety, and, you know, how that part, how that part of the setting contributes to the the asset, significance of the asset and experiencing appreciating it as other means of appreciating experiencing? A wide, much wider setting. So, in terms of the building itself? Yes, I like to green farm.

38:22

Okay. And it, would you say the, the overall benefits of the scheme, as in the economy benefits, all of that, would that? Would they be public benefits or would outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset?

38:38

Well, normally, I mean, these cases is normally the planning officer who makes that decision judgement because I'm not, I'm a heritage expert, so I tend to not benefit.

38:51

Okay, if I could ask Ms skipper then what have you on that would be

39:00

your plan, Ms skipper brought the District Council? Yes. I think I'm taking everything to account the the, the overall conclusion of the council would be that the, the benefits do outweigh the the harm that's identified. Okay.

39:16

Okay, thank you. Okay, I'll move on in that case. So for the applicant in table 6.2 and 6.3 of ies chapter six. It says that these tables report significant effects and I asked the written question on this but on a better player when you when you say the report significant effects But the effects are slight, slight adverse for non designated heritage assets How? how that translates to being significant? Or doesn't it?

40:14

I say Yes, sorry, Paul Bennett's heritage for the applicant. I believe that we could address that by perhaps changing the title of the table as well, as, as we've said in our responses, we wish to present the impacts, as we discussed previously, as well. So you can track things through even when they become less and less than significant effects. So that people don't have to go back and read multiple documents and leave between parentheses. So I believe if we if we change this to the residual effects.

40:55

So why are the listen buildings not in this table and 6.2? The which listed buildings? Well, there's only there's there's the four lists, there's the two churches and the I was bothered how sales bomb. So you report slight beneficial effects for the old post office, but

41:27

they do not report what the adverse effects to the end of the fall is and buildings are in this table. I'm just unclear why that is.

41:40

I say yes. Let's see. just refresh my memory of what we said about the buildings.

41:56

Construction effects. Yes, those are effects that essentially go away from construction. Yes, we'll add those back in in order to stay but the the impacts do go down after mitigation and made that more transparent.

42:35

Social the same should all the same. Should table 6.2 and 6.3. have all the same heritage assets in it. So you can see the changes?

42:53

No, I don't believe so. Because 6.2 is the construction effects and 6.3 is the operational effects. But they should have the same assets that are listed above where we've said that there could be a potential effect, potentially impact sorry, rather than effect. We'll make sure that's that's done.

43:12

Right. Okay. Because otherwise, I can't tell from necessarily from the last chapter. It's not clear, I guess where what, from that table what the construction effects would be on some heritage assets?

43:38

Good. Yeah. It's good point. We'll take that away. And we'll make the amendment there. So that can be tracked. Okay. Although I just being pointed out to also refer to the appendix in that. There they are there. But the point the point of trying to include things in here is to be transparent. It's unlikely that that page turning requirement for people reading this so.

44:07

Okay, and also, yes, paragraph six. Point 10.4 suggests that appendix six I think it's going to be 6.1. Table five is all impacts before mitigation. Sorry, which say in paragraph six point 10.4 610. Four. Yeah. Says for all impacts before mitigation refer to appendix six table five things that are meant to be six point appendix 6.1. Yes, then in six point 10.6 sorry, 6.7 point five say For Non significant adverse effects was referred to table five. So one saying table five is for all impacts before mitigation. And the other one is saying that table five is just non significant adverse effects. I see. Yes. Yeah. That's that's an error. Yeah. So which is which one is it?

45:24

It is the second is all effects before mitigation.

45:29

Okay, so let's take so paragraph six. Point 10.4. Is is the correct one.

45:37

Yes. Save for the point one on the appendix reference. I've just made a note to

45:43

Yeah. Okay. six point 10 point. So then in that case, for all impacts before mitigation refers, it's table five, after mitigation.

46:09

Where are the effects for heritage assets reported in the table?

46:15

We don't have a table of all effects after mitigation, because we do not have a requirement to report on non significant effects. At the end of it, we have included non significant effects here purely for the sake of tracking through the the so that assets don't drop off that list that people looking at. But yes, where table five contains over 100 assets. So to assess the effects of mitigation, which for the vast majority would be no change to the the impacts and effects before mitigation would be exhaustive and isn't required.

46:59

Okay. But in terms of designated heritage assets, even the slight effect would be less than less than substantial harm. So all their all the non designated heritage assets should be reported somewhere. But as we said before, Al's Barton house owls bother not don't seem to be reported anywhere.

47:22

Yes, as I've just said, well, we'll make sure those are in the Yes. Again, we don't want to put another 20 pages of table into the appendix for people to read through where it's not required. But yes, we'll do that for the appendix. Sorry, for the chapter. Okay. Thank

47:37

you. And then just finally. So my recent question 1.6 point 17. It relates to archaeological remains, and how the recording of archaeological remains will reduce the significance effect on such heritage assets from moderate, large, to neutral.

48:09

And I think my understanding, you'll say, well, because there'll be recorded that, that then means they'll be neutral effects, because you'll have a written scheme of investigation. So my question is, would with the removal of buried archaeology, will there not be some effect on the significance even if recording took place? Because the national networks policy statement at paragraph 5.139 says that the documentary record of our past is not as valuable as retaining the heritage assets. So is there a risk for some archaeology to be lost or destroyed through construction? And that's not recorded? And? If so? Is it? Is it reasonable to have a neutral effect? After mitigation?

49:10

So to answer in two parts we have just so I understand correctly, please correct me if I'm wrong, if I'm wrong. So what's the possibility of unknown archaeology being missed?

49:28

or destroyed or lost? due to close? I mean, you're not going to be going through the earth with a fine tooth comb, I guess you're going to be using diggers and machinery to excavate so and potential that

there'll be some very dark energy which might be missed or destroyed. So how can there be a neutral effect

49:56

we have in the arts, or I'll get the Section. For mitigation, we in our construction mitigation measures section where we are talking about 6.9. point one eight is this section where we start, and there's a large number of bullets, and 6.9 point one nine. Now, we do want to make it clear that this is the starting point, the actual details of this will be discussed and agreed, as per requirement. And we will react to the changing archaeological results as we go on. That being an intrinsic part of the WSI process, essentially, the entirety of the project area that the red line boundary has some form of ecological mitigation in it. And those areas where we're saying that there shouldn't be or areas that can safely be considered to be ecologically sterile. In areas, I've listed out those areas in that chapter. Essentially, whether it's been previous building work, and that is not based on our assumption that it's based on the the character of the archaeology, we have found that the depth of the remains, which are pretty consistent, where we have found them. And we have noted that the results of the investigations thus far, what are they are good enough to characterise the likely archaeology, they don't provide a 100% prediction algorithm for it, they are essentially indicating that there will be things that haven't appeared on geophysical surveys that we might pick up. And that we can't discount the possibility of further archaeology. And so in our approach, our iterative approach to mitigation to political recording, we will be keeping in mind to not missing those things, as they occur, be that through construction, integrated recording, which I appreciate, it's that it's common practice to have watching briefs and things. I don't like watching briefs, I don't think I don't wish to speak for them. But for my conversations, I don't think Norfolk liked them either very much. And so construction integrated recording doesn't necessarily imply a watching brief, it implies that for organisational reasons, not least of which leaving the top sort of where it is, and not having breaks between construction episodes. That's it that can actually involve very detailed archaeological recording. For example, a topsoil strip is done, the archaeologist moves in and then hands the site over directly to the contractor once the the relevant consultees through their monitoring process have signed off. And so that control is very much a part of the whi process that monitoring. And in terms of our general approach to unexpected remains, and our approach to mitigation in that iterative process. We've received support in writing from both historic England and Portland, Norfolk through Portland.

53:37

Okay, so there's there's pretty much no chance you're saying that any, any buried archaeology would be missed would not be recorded?

53:50

I don't think that there is that chance, I don't think that's a significant chance at all. They're the only remaining question is an academic one of whether future domains, sorry, future techniques might be applied here. But from the remains that we are getting, getting in the archaeology, that it's not believed that I don't believe that that's a risk here that the remains are not of a character word. That would be a question. The programme does allow for an expansion to the archaeological scope as well. Okay, close ask Mr. Percival from Norfolk County Council.

54:41

Hello, sir. Yes, I've Yeah, I mean, I we're more or less on the same page as the applicants with this. This scheme, the sort of standard range of geophysical survey and trial tension has been undertaken on this scheme in in an extensive ways it can be and you know, within the limitations In the sort of limitations of those techniques, we're happy with what's with what's in the results of that. And we're also in very broad agreement with the applicants about areas to be targeted for post considered mitigation in relation to below ground archaeology. And yes, we've talked about we've all we've talked about unexpected, unexpected remains that might turn up outside those areas already. And yeah, when when we get to detail WSI stage, where there will there will be that will have, you know, steps into take to take into account of that.

55:31

Okay, so you're satisfied that with the applicants assessment that they'll be without mitigation, there could be a significant effect without mitigation, or sorry, with mitigation, the effect will be neutral, because because of the WSI

55:47

record, yes, yes. Yes. The Yeah. I think that the mitigate the mitigation is sufficient to, in relation to the significance of the archaeological remains. Okay. So far, no. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Bennett from Africans. I don't know if you've lost, he's still there. I am, yes. You're frozen for a bit, I think. Okay. Thank you, then for that answer.

56:19

Could I just add as well that we have said that in the event that there is a significant find, then we will discuss and consider preservation in situ as well? Should we find that results, three feet to the left of the trench we dug would are quite different than then we will consider preservation in situ.

56:44

Okay. Okay. Thank you. Before we move on, does anybody else wish to comment or have any questions on heritage issues?

56:59

Okay, I'm saying no hands up. So I'll move on to geology and soils. So, my written question 1.9 point one, related to an agricultural land classification survey and assessment. The applicant responded This is secured under GS three of the registering of environmental actions and commitments part of the environmental management plan, which at the time was referenced as oh nine there is no GS three in ASR nine that I can see though it does appear relates to reiterations of the environmental management plan, capacity applicant for this form part of the soil management plan or would it be a standalone documents

58:01

more multi EA coordinator representing the applicant, so the survey would inform the soil management plan.

58:09

So the survey would form part of the soil management plan,

58:12

it would inform yet so please, the soil management plan would be based off of it.

58:19

Okay. So if you just have a look at GS three in the EMP, the environmental management in the riak.

58:41

So where essays and action, agricultural land classification survey and assessments come to be completed prior to construction and then essays, achievement criteria reporting, it says detailed in the SMP soil management plan is that yes, that's good. So the agricultural land classification surveyed assessment would be within the soil management plan. Yeah, I can confirm that. Yes. Okay. And just moving across the second to last column when it says when. So I think it's the means construction. So the for the agricultural land classification surveying assessment, what should there be something uncertain that would say, pre construction?

59:40

Yes, that that I can confirm that as an error. We are underway in organising the surface. So the table should have a P and therefore pre construction.

59:50

Okay, thank you. So would you update that for the next deadline? So, so I've got Paul Bennett frozen on the screen. I don't know whether I do not. But maybe it's my computer. So in that case, could you go on to explain what as far as practicable means in respect to replacing soils, their baseline condition, which is stated in GS three of the riak. So what are the, as far as practicable mean?

1:00:38

I think that's just a real world reference, obviously, with the we are building a road there and sort of be returning to a suitable condition that our standards referenced now don't make part of the soil management plan as well.

1:00:59

Okay, so if it so as far as practicable bites suggests that it's not reinstated to its baseline condition. Is that is that is that accounted for somewhere in the environmental assessment?

1:01:16

And I think that's just trying to think of the wording in the assessment. And I think what's easiest is to respond in writing to that. I don't think that's necessarily a hard and fast rule. I think we could rework the wording of that. And the way that the assessment set out, the way the soil management plan will be set out, is that as per the EMP, which, as I mentioned before, is this principle, let's target. And then there's the second iteration brings more detail. And certainly the, the, what is done has to reflect what's been assessed.

1:01:54

Okay. And following on from that. My written question 1.9, point three relates to monitoring and any and any necessary remedial remediation measures of restored agricultural land, which was specified in Section 911 9.11 of as chapter nine, I was just wondering where in the EMP and riak is a secure monitoring and remediation. And GS three, as per your response.

1:02:32

Saw the do not, it would take me out apologies, but Tim wanted to track how the monitoring is captured through this, but this, this comes down to the detail coming later. So it's informed by the survey, which then moves into the zone management plan, and part of that soil management plan. Includes for monitoring.

1:02:56

Okay, so the you you see is that it was it was included in GS three.

1:03:05

And I've made the incorrect reference, I'm just having maybe fair look at GS one. So the principal contracts will prepare us our management plan. And that includes best practice.

1:03:29

Okay, so in GS one, the third paragraph up, that's where it's that's where it's secured, I think. Is that right? Just looking for the direct reference to monitoring? Yes, so in GS one, the third paragraph talks about a programme of monitoring to identify if there are any soil programme problems, which needs to be remediated. So, okay. So it's GS one, not GS three, that's fine. Is that how you understand it? a? Yes, I'm sorry. Apologies. I was I was waiting on yourself. Yes, that sounds Sorry. I'm on my screen. I've just got Paul Bennett from the applicant as a big click picture, so I can't see. I can't see yourself at the moment, I'm afraid. But that was that was the last question I had on geology and soils. So, before I move on, does anybody wish to comment on any matters relating to geology and soils?

1:05:08

Before I turn to agenda item seven? Okay. I can see no hands up. So I'm going to say that as a no.

1:05:25

So moving on to agenda item seven. Understand that you have someone who's taking notes for any actions arising to the applicant. Yes, sir. Okay, but I intend to publish some action points as well, if that would be helpful. That would be very helpful. So yes, please. Okay, thank you. In that case, I'll move on to agenda item eight, any other matters? Are there any other matters relating to the environmental matters discussed today? which haven't been covered on which anybody would like to comment on?

1:06:14

Okay, again, I can see no hands raised. So I'll just move on. I just wanted to address a couple of points here, actually. So the National Planning policy framework was revised on the 25th of July 21. Does the applicant wish his comments on this at all? Or is this something you might address in the next

submission? I think for the next submissions. Okay. And I just wanted to highlight a couple of other minor inconsistencies. So the front page of the most recent guide to the application, which is rep three dash 017 suggests that the document is revision three. Is this correct? Because the page 12 within it suggests is revision two, and it looks like revision two to me also. Yes, that should be revision two. Be essential, the guide to the application is always correct. Because I need to incorporate the correct revision numbers into my final report. So check No, sorry, these reason three. It's been a while each deadline. So I confused myself as well, because I think it was first submitted a deadline one. So that was,

1:07:54

yeah, yes. Our second, our second page is incorrect. And for I suppose the point is that we should probably read the latest one to a later revision. So there's a bit of confusion.

1:08:11

Okay. And also, just one other small inconsistency. In chapter two. The paragraph numbering after 2.5, point six, reverse to 2.5. point one. There was, there was somebody referred to some paragraphs within that in there. Then one of those submissions, took me a while to find it because the paragraph numbers were incorrect. And that's the page number on which they were referring to it was incorrect. So could you start to look at that as well, please? Y'all can see us? Yes. Thank you. So that was all I had on that. So I'll now move on to agenda item nine, which is the close of the hearing. I just like to thank you all very much for your participation in the hearing today, which has been extremely helpful and useful for me. Additional recording of the proceedings today will be made available as soon as possible on the project page of the national infrastructure website. In addition, I request that you submit in writing the points you've made here today for publication on the website. The deadline for these written submissions is deadline for those a date of September 2021. The time is now 254. And I can confirm this issue specific hearing into environmental matters. For the a 47 Bluefields North Birmingham project is now closed. Thank you