

# TRANSCRIPT\_BLOFIELD\_ISH3\_SESSION1\_20082021

Fri, 8/20 11:56AM • 1:32:48

00:06

Good morning. The time is now 10am. And I'd like to welcome everybody to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by highways England, whomever whom I will refer to as the applicant for the a 47 Blofield north burlingham and projects that today's issue specific hearing, I'll be considering a range of environmental matters. Before I formally open this issue specific hearing and introduce myself, I will ask Miss Allen, the case manager for this project to confirm that you can see and hear me and that the recording and live streaming of this event has started. Yes, we can hear you and the live stream is ready and up and running. Thank you for that confirmation. This issue specific hearing for the a four to seven Bluefields North Berlin project is now open. My name is Alex Hutson. I'm a chartered town planner and the Chartered landscape planner and hold academic qualifications in these areas. I'm a planning inspector employed by the planning Inspectorate and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the examining authority to examine this application. I also have two colleagues from the panniers spectrum here today, you will all have spoken to miss Allen, the case manager for the project in the joint conference. I'd also like to introduce James Bunten from the case team. If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, can I ask that you please email these the case team who will be happy to help? I first like to deal with a few housekeeping matters which are specific to a virtual event as some of you here today may not have attended one of the previous virtual hearings. Firstly, Klaus are all audible notifications for electronic devices be switched off. And remember to make sure your camera's switched off, and microphones are switched to mute. Unless you're speaking. This helps reduce background noise and assists with bandwidth. No requests be made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this morning's hearing. But I was just like to confirm that this is correct. Yes, that is correct. Thank you. Please note the chat function in teams is not being used today. So please do not send any messages via it. If at any point in the meeting, you can't hear me or wish to speak. Curiosity you turn your camera on if it is turned off, and use the raised hand function in teams, there may sometimes be a delay before I can acknowledge this is Alan will have explained what to do if you lose your connection. And I'm able to join for a short period. If there are any more significant connection problems. I will adjourn for short breaks are convenient points usually no more than every hour or an hour and a half or so. For the purpose of identification and for the benefit of those who may listen to the digital recording later. Class have several points in which you speak. Could you please give your name and if you're representing an organisation or individual who it is that you represent? Does anybody have any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event?

03:24

Okay, I can see no hands being raised. So I'll take that as a no and move on. There's a digital recording being made of this hearing. This will be made available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. If you take part in the hearing, it is important that you understand that your comments will be recorded and the digital recording will be published and retained, usually for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. As such, the padding of spectrum is subject to the general data protection regulations, it is very likely that I will ask you to put sensitive personal information, such as email addresses an economic, financial, cultural or health related matters into the public domain. Indeed, I would actively encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason you feel that it's necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information. I would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance. The case they will then explore with you whether the information can be provided in a written format, which could then be appropriately redacted before being published. Please bear in mind that the only official recording of the proceedings is and that is the digital recording that we placed on the project page of the website. tweets blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence into the examination of this application. Today's issue specific hearing is being held for me to explore a number of matters orally in respect of the proposed development and environmental matters. I'd like to remind you that the examination is a predominantly written process. I've already asked a number of written questions on these matters in my written questions which parties have responded to. Furthermore, as you have seen from the examination timetable, there are further rounds of questions as proposed if required. The purpose of the examination is for me to examine the information submitted by both the applicant and also by interested parties and affected persons. As a result, I'd like to reassure you that I'm familiar with the documents that you have sent in. So when answering a question, you do not need to repeat a length something that has already been submitted. If you want to refer to information already submitted, I'd be grateful if you could reuse the appropriate pins examination Library Reference. Furthermore, can I please ask for the first time use an abbreviation or an acronym. They give the full title as a maybe people here today or listening to the digital recording that may not be as familiar with the application or the documents as you are? Well, so except the majority of the discussions will be undertaken by those parties that are requested to speak. This is a public examination. And therefore, if there is a point that you want to make peace, please feel free to raise your hand and switch on your camera at the relevant time that you wish to contribute. The hearing today will be a structured discussion which I shall lead based on the agenda that has already been published. The purpose of the discussion is for me to ask questions, and seek clarification on environmental matters related to the proposed development. To ensure that I have all the information that I need to make my report to the Secretary of State. The questions that I'm going to ask today will be focused on those areas where I need further information or where I think the issues will benefit from examination orally. So therefore, I'd say it's opportunity to reassure you that whilst they may not be asking a specific question or covering a particular topic that you're expecting, it is not necessarily that I view this matter as satisfactory in millions case, so I consider that I have all the information that I need on this topic. Finally, I'd like to remind everyone that this is not an inquiry. And therefore, unless I was specifically requested or agreed to it, there'll be no formal presentation of cases or cross examination. As such, any questions that you may have for the policies need to be asked through myself.

07:27

I'm conducting this hearing in accordance with sections 91 and 94, the Planning Act 2008 and the infrastructure planning examination procedure rules 2010. Specifically rule 14 relations procedure at hearings. Your reminder that the Planning Act 2008 allows that I may refuse to allow representations to be made at the hearing if it is considered that they are irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relate to the merits and policies set out in the national policy statement. Repeat other representations already made or related to compensation for compulsory acquisition of land or have an interest in or rights overland. Before it says the agenda I should state for the avoidance any doubt that we'll be using the most recent versions of documents submitted by the applicant and the key documents are likely to include the draft development consent order revision two, which is rep three dash 00 for environmental statements, or as state sorry, environmental chapter or as chapter seven landscape and visual effects, which is a PP dash oh four five s chapter 10 material assets and waste revision one rep one dash o two six as chapter 11 noise and vibration revision one rep one dash o two eight as chapter 12 population human health rev one which is rep one dash 030 the transport assessment revision one which is rep one dash 00 for the outline traffic management plan revision two which is rep one dash 050 as chapter 13 with road drainage and water environments revision one, which is rep one dash 032 and the environments management plan, which includes a record of environmental actions and commitments revision three which is rep three dash 04. I may also be referring to plans and plans throughout the hearing. The agenda for this hearing was placed on the project page of the national infrastructure website on the ninth of August 2021. And it'd be useful to have that to hand the main items for discussion today are environmental matters relating to landscape and visual effects, material assets and waste noise and vibration, population human health, transportation and traffic and the water environment. Please note that today's agenda is for guidance only. I may add other issues for consideration as we progress. I will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue each each issue to allow proper consideration of them. Should the consideration of the issues take longer than anticipated it may be necessary to prioritise matters and for others to further written questions. As I've mentioned, because this is a virtual event, I will adjourn for short breaks at convenient points. You can stay logged into your teams throughout the break, but please ensure that you switch your cameras off and mute your microphones. If you're watching the live streaming, you'll need to refresh the live stream webpage to continue watching the live stream after any break. If you do lose connection use the same link that you use to log on this morning and the case symbol endeavouring to reconnect to you as soon as possible. Should you experience any problems with the live streaming a digital recording of the event will be published on the national infrastructure web page as soon as practically possible after the event has ended. It for medical or other reasons anyone requires a break at a specific time. Could you please that the case team no and I can hopefully adjust the programme to meet your needs. Finally, it is important that I get the right answers to the questions that I'm going to ask. I reiterate this is predominantly a recent process. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require time to get the information requested, then rather giving a restricted or potentially incorrect answer. Can you please indicate the need to respond in writing. I can then further response either to an action point to be submitted that deadline for on the night of September 2021 or to the next round of written questions. So before we move on to deal with the items detailed in the agenda, are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearing or the agenda?

11:58

Okay, I'm seeing no hands raised. So I'll take that as a no and move on. And I would like to say the names of those who wish to speak at this hearing today. And if you are a representative please state whom you represent. So let's first start with the applicants.

12:30

Good morning Mark Murphy environmental impact assessment, which will be fantasy a coordinator representing the applicant for landscape responses. My colleague, Robin Meade, I'll tell you introduce himself. Okay, thank you.

12:52

Good morning, Robin Meade psycho landscape on behalf of highways England, representing landscape and visual matters. Okay, thank you. Okay. Anybody else from applicants? Today or what? Morning sir. second item swaco. Mr. Robson

13:20

is having a few technical issues, getting his camera on so if you need to leave and enjoy him again, but he will be speaking at some point today.

13:30

Okay, thank you. Is that everybody from the applicants who wishes to speak today. Mr. Doherty.

13:50

Good morning, sir Dan Doherty, here from swepco representing the applicant on the noise and vibration lead. Okay, thank you Mr. Doherty.

14:01

And Mark Murphy again, EIA coordinator. So apologies. I thought we were doing it as per the agenda yesterday, but we will bring forward the technical specialist as per the topic, but I can introduce them accordingly. So you've just heard from my colleague, Dan Doherty. noise and vibration, and then the next topic after that will be Mark Duckworth population human health and let them introduce themselves.

14:30

Good morning, sir. My name is Mark Duckworth from sweco. I am the WCAG lead for the project representing highways England. Thank you, Mr. duckworth. And then Next on the agenda is transportation and traffic. We have David. You don't get David. Good morning, David Battershill your

14:58

traffic Assessment lead working for sweet guy on the applicant. Thank you, Mr. battershill and Philip from Galford try Good morning Phillip Fouche from galliford. Try working on behalf of the applicant. Thank you Mr Fouche

15:29

and then water environment. Jason

15:33

like say Mr. Robson this covers things of Okay. Mr. Ball. You don't get Mr. Ball.

15:44

Apologies, sorry. My name is Jason ball underwater environment lead for sweco representing the applicant. Okay, thank you.

16:01

Good morning, Mr. Hutson. My name is Mary Creedon, I'm working with sweco the drainage lead on the scheme on behalf of the applicant. Okay, thank you.

16:11

And I'll hand back over to my colleague Mr. Robson. Okay, thank you very much.

16:17

Mr. handover. Morning, sir. Philip Robson on behalf of highways England. I'm sorry apologies for earlier. I was connected but my my camera and my video wouldn't turn on. And these things tend to happen. They do day five. They're not too bad.

16:33

Thank you. Thank you Mr. Robson. And career move to the to Norfolk County Council, please.

16:46

Good morning. It's David Cumming to tea to transport team manager for Norfolk County Council. This afternoon, I'll be joined by my colleague Sarah Lough. Who is the strategic flood risk planning officer from the lead local flood and water team. Okay. Thank you for coming. Brooklyn District Council.

17:12

Good morning, sir. Blanaid Skipper product District Council on this morning. I'm joined by David Humphrey and Robin Taylor and they will introduce themselves.

17:22

Okay. Thank you. Good morning. My name is David Humphrey. I I represent broad and District Council and I'm able to talk on the matters of noise and vibration. That water environment and human health. Thank you.

17:43

Thank you. Good morning. I'm Robin. Good morning. I'm Robin Taylor. I'm a landscape architect for broadland District Council and I'm available should you need me to talk about landscape matters.

18:03

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Taylor. And that was everything everyone for problem District Council, I believe. Okay, so moving on to any interested parties. Richard Bearman? Yes. I hope you could hear me and see me. I can hear you. Oh, yes, I can see you also.

18:34

Yes, thank you, Richard, Bearman and chair of Norwich cycling campaign. I should be speaking on the cycling issues for our campaign. Mr. Tony Clark, who's our lead on this project who sends apologies but he's on a train somewhere and can't get connected. Okay, thank you, Mr. Bearman. Shall we move on to Jonathan? Jonathan Cage. Good morning resourcing and K to

19:09

create consulting engineers. I'm acting this morning on behalf of Burlingame, cottage gardens Association and main focus is on the pedestrian cycling movements and are designed to zero in the past.

19:23

Okay, thanks. So could you while you're on Can you just confirm whether it's bowling and cottage gardens or gardeners? these gardens associations? Yeah. Okay, thank you, Mr. cage. Is there anybody else other any other interested parties here today who wish to speak?

19:56

Okay, I'm seeing no hands raised. So in that case, I'll move on. As you will have seen that I asked a number of written questions in relation to the topics on the agenda. And thank you to all those who responded. And I want to pick up on a few of those responses among some other matters in the other agenda items. So moving on to agenda item two, relating to landscape and visual effects. So a question for the, for the applicant. In response to my written questions 1.1 point 15. The applicant provides a summary table of significant residual effects at Appendix A, of its response to my written questions. And that's rep one dash 061.

20:59

Looking at the table in respect of landscape and visual effects, so it's on page 145. of that document. It's identifies a number of significant residual effects in respect of landscape character and visual effects from some of the representative viewpoints. However, looking at table seven to 10, and seven sorry, 710 and 711 vs. Chapter Seven. This suggests there would be no skip significant residual effects. Paragraph seven, point 12.7 of as chapter seven also concludes there be no significant residual effects or landscape and visual immunity? Can the applicants please explain? The table I've referred to on page 145. And why it suggests might be different to what's reported in the ies chapter.

22:04

Thank you for your question. So would you mind repeating the references that the paragraph and table references? Yes.

22:11

So the document I'm looking for looking at is so it's it's rep one, dash 061? Which was your response to my written questions? So it's Appendix E of that on page 145. Is the table that's what I'm looking at.

22:45

Okay, I will hand you over to my colleague, Robin Meade. And if he can turn on his camera and microphone.

23:02

Yes, Robin Meade sweco landscape on how is England? apologies in the first instance, I don't immediately have that document to hand so I'm going to struggle to immediately answer the point. I don't recognise why there would be different. Okay. Is it should be consistent.

23:22

Okay, is it? Is it possible for one of your colleagues to or to share it with you?

23:30

I believe my colleague, Mr. Murphy is in the process of locating that. To answer the question. I can't imagine why. Well, I don't want to speculate. So I need to wait to have that sound. Okay. It's just

23:47

Yes. But I just need some clarification.

23:53

Course. Is it possible, sir, that you have to hand yourself to be able to share?

24:03

Yeah, I do. I'm looking at it now. I asked one of my colleagues to share it. So it's so the document is rep one dash 061. And it's page 145. Do you do have the landscape yes chapter to hand. Mr. Meade

24:34

I do have the chapter itself.

24:36

Yes. Okay. So if you if you're looking at the chapter, can you go to chapter two tables 710 to 711. And also paragraph seven point 12.7. So what you're looking at on the screen was so I requested a table setting out the predicted Significant residual effects. This was presented at deadline one for a number of topics, including landscaping visual effects, and paragraph seven point 12.7 conclusive below significant residual effects on landscape. However, this table appears to be suggesting, suggesting otherwise.

25:34

Suppose the abstract that isn't referenced in the table that you're currently sharing is that it doesn't stay the timeframe with respect to residual effects, which is your 15, then it isn't clear whether this table that's currently being shared is representing that timeframe. It's potentially your assessment considers

construction year one and year 15. And out of context, I don't initially recognise this table in relation to the

26:15

perpetual

26:20

policies, I'm just trying to find its context in respect of what it's doing, I think, okay, so there are other tables in the main lvh chapter, which there seems to be construction effects. Yes, this table, I'm just cross referencing visually between what you have on the screen and what the main chapter I am at this end, and the table that we're looking at is actually construction effects. So for some reason, that's been extracted, it doesn't represent residual effects. So these are the construction effects. Okay, so.

27:07

Right. So there's there's tables from being this in the document on page 145? Because the last chapter is, in your view, correct, that there's no residual effects?

27:19

We're not there's no isn't that significant? And they're not the same effects as recorded here. So the tables you're looking at on screen at the moment, are in the ies chapter, but they are with reference to construction, if that's what you're missing in the consideration is the residual wealth the year one and the residual year 15, which go on to state the the actual operational effects of the scheme?

27:43

Yes. So in this in this document, Appendix A,

27:49

is it showing incorrect information at the moment? As you say, if the question was, please communicate the residual residual effects of the scheme or the operation effects? And yes, it is incorrect because it is relating communicating construction effects by Okay, so

28:08

that's okay. In that case, Can Can this be resubmitted? correctly? Absolutely. Yeah. Okay. Thank you, just while we're on this document, and have it open mazarin, could you just move up to pages? Thank you. So there's this is not a point specifically rating landscaping visual. But while we have the document open, I'll just address it. So it's this is talking about the residual effects from as chapters 678-911-1213 15. However, the tables which follow only go up to as chapter 12. So 13 and 15. Do not do not appear to be to have been included. So miss out, and if you could just scroll down to the bottom of Appendix D.

29:26

So if you just lay down, okay, if you just go up, up a bit. Keep going up. So the final table though, just stop there. So it is as chapter 12. If you're going to resubmit the table, correct and landscape parts. Can you please also address Why? Yes, Chapter 13 and chapter 15 have not been included.



29:59

So that'll do it. responded to in the broadest sense by my colleagues, but collectively, yes. Okay,

30:06

thank you very much. So, moving on to artificial lighting matters. So, I know that the lighting assessment indicates that there will be a major moderate adverse effects on for residential receptors along Yarmouth road as a result of artificial lighting. That's in paragraph 7.7 point nine of the lighting assessment paragraph 7.7 point seven also mentions an increase in skyglow due to a significant increase in lighting levels. It also mentions that the blofield parish neighbourhood plan has a policy of no use street lighting. And given all these factors, I was hoping you could further justify the provision of artificial lighting around the Yarmouth Road A 47 junction and also qualify the light in paragraph 4.8 point one of the scheme design report which is which just mentions that the lighting is required as road safety mitigation. But nowhere else can I see why lighting has to be provided for road safety. Can you can Is it possible to explain the reasons behind providing the the degree of lighting that is being provided, noting that there may be if there will, there would be effects on the lighting environment, including for some residential receptors.

31:45

And inherently the basis for the provision of lighting is a safety and operational matter associated with the highways design itself. So from a landscape and visual point of view, the recognition of the effects of the proposal are are noted and represented in the environmental statement as getting visual chapter as it stands as you as you observed, as observed that run concurrently. There's a specialist lighting assessment undertaken of the effect of the lighting, the landscape visual assessment considers it in relative terms to the landscape and visual sensitivities. And so we've got a the landscape assessment considers it in a qualitative sense, the lighting specialist assessment considers it in a quantitative sense, but the underlying question about why is it required to what extent is it required a need to pass that to my colleague, Sophie, who will hopefully be able to elaborate further? Okay, thank you.

32:49

Hi. So for me, so I came half the applicants and I'm almost I'm not able to elaborate too much further and as Robin did outline, it is a safety issue around the junction predominant terms of visibility. And the light is required to ensure obviously the safety of the junction. That's a I suppose a statement factor in according to to make sure that we are compliant with standards, if I suppose if any, if there was any way of improving the safety without having lighting, then that would be looked at during detailed design, but this is the current state that the proposed arrangement.

33:36

So I mean, the only reference I can see with regard to lighting is row safeties in the schemes I suppose just simply says, is required for road safety. But I'm, I'm unclear where that comes from, or where.

33:53

So in respect to the design standard, so we obviously have to design according to the drB. And if we then if for any reason, we can't meet a standard. And I must admit, I will perhaps respond in writing falling to get the detail of this. If you then start stepping away from the absolute in the standard, you

have mitigation, that similar space to other matters. And in this instance, lighting is a mitigation for a part of scheme that may be on the limits of the standard or in that respect. It's ideally we wouldn't have lighting but in order to make sure that it is a safe junction, we do need to have the proposed lighting.

34:38

Okay, so perhaps you can, you can let me know, in writing. Yeah. What the what the dangers are, if there was if the lighting was reduced in scale or white why that lighting has to be there for safety, mitigation, and that I only asked because it's it's because it talks about having an effect. On some receptors nearby. And also, they don't just talk about general skyglow. So

35:10

yeah, I suppose design is consideration of all factors and safety is one of those say, yeah, take that away.

35:20

Okay. Thank you for that. So in terms of design of structures, so for example, bridges, I touched on this in the DCA hearing on Tuesday. And I just wondering whether broadland District Council has had the chance to review

35:41

the general arranger and plans where they show that bridge design. And whether whether whether that's sufficient in order to sort of alleviate any concerns about more detailed design coming out of requirement three

36:05

Blanaid Skipper broadland District Council, yes, I haven't had an opportunity to review this in detail with colleagues. But we will respond, we will respond to you in writing on that point.

36:15

Okay, thank you. Okay. So question for the applicant. Just following on from that. We talked about the the bridges hadn't been shown on either the works plans, or the engineering drawings. And I think I think there was a suggestion that you would move the plans from the engine from the generation plans to the engineering drawings. Having just having thought a bit, I just was wondering why the general arrangement plans are not specified under requirement three, because they seem to show more detail than either than both the land plans and the engineering drawings in respect of the sort of design of the whole proposal.

37:28

So just taking instructions on on that point. So I think that I think it may be more sensible for us to take that away. Also, you're on mute, Mr. Ops, no. day five, the technology is failing, and I'm putting myself on mute. I think there might be something that we could more sensibly takeaway and respond to you in writing, sir.

38:13

Okay. Thank you. So just wanted to move on to broaden District Council in MonaVie. In its response to one of my written questions suggested that IV and brambles were ideal species to be planted from the outset. And these are shown as it showed in the list of species. Towards the end of the master plan, document. Close broadland District Council what the console is there.

38:55

Hello, it's Robin Taylor broadland district counsel. I just had you cut out so I heard IBM brambles and then you disappeared again. Okay, sorry.

39:04

I lost. Okay. So my question was that so broadly, the District Council in its response to one of my recent questions suggested that I've improved brambles right ideal species we planted from the outset. And these this is shown in the planting mix specification on the last page of the master plan. I was just wondering what what what your concern is with that?

39:27

Yes, thank you. Yeah, I think the question you asked was about the general planting mix. So I picked up points up onto that general question. My just concern, I think it probably comes down to exactly how it's managed. But I just know from those two species that they are very keen to get going and they will climb and overwhelmed plants that perhaps are not as advanced in their growth, and I just put it out there as a thought that it's probably more to do with how it's managed and overseen but I just thought it'd be a shame to have A good quality scheme ruined perhaps by just Simson, very unfair, advantageous plants in the mix, which, in the fullness of time be very useful for for a range of reasons that could cover for wildlife there, obviously provide the fruits and pollen and nectar and things, but it's at what stage they're introduced into the mix might be more of an issue than whether they are used there at all.

40:23

Okay. Okay, so can the applicant just respond to that? Point, please?

40:36

Yes, course Robin Meade soccer landscape on path. How is England? Yeah, I fully recognise everything that Robin said the the basis of the species mix at the moment, were derived in part from habitats objectives. So the the mixes are informed by our ecologists to represent for exactly that reason, as mentioned, for the foraging of various species that that would benefit from the inclusion of them, or to recognise the timeliness of that and the need for management. So I'm very happy to have that sort of consideration of of the species mixes to adapt those to reach an agreeable outcome. So happy to take on board Robin's comments and to make appropriate amendment to to have a mutually agreeable outcome.

41:27

Okay, I think in your in one of in your response to Portland district Council's response, you you did indicate that that list is at this point indicative. But, but do you think is it worth? Is it worth sort of amending it to this point? Negative?

41:48

Yeah, I mean, that we send the invitation to the local authority to comment on the Nexus and apologies that just didn't pick that up in the sequence of consultation response. So very happy to receive those, those direct comments from Robin to represent that interest. And we can amend to court with that

42:07

was only it was a fairly recent comment. Okay, so Mike, might you? Okay, Mr. Taylor?

42:17

Yes, I was just going to suggest it, it might not be a case of amending the mix. But more but, Robin, we've got to Robins, this is good for you. Just Pepsi like a phasing plan or something, just when they're introduced more, might be certain years ahead that they actually then then brought in order or as a trigger point at which they're done. So it's, it's just a minor adjustment, but I generally support the mixes.

42:43

Okay. So it might just be a note on the plan to say when it may be produced. Really simple. Yeah, that's no problem. Okay, thank you. So yesterday, I talked a bit about the landscaping ecological management plan. That the applicants Well, as I said, the update hasn't faded, much, much detail in terms of long term maintenance management. And sort of what impact this might have on how certain I can be that establishment would would work for long term, you know, especially with regards to planting mature trees. And also, like translocating, important hedge rows. So it's my understanding the applicant won't be submitting any further information on this. But I wanted to ask broadland district counsel. Mr. Taylor, what whether you think what is proposed in terms of the landscape and ecology management plan is sufficient bear noting that the absolute would be intensive provide a much greater level of detail in the second iteration of the environmental management plan.

44:18

Right. Yes, Robin said protan discounsel. I wasn't sitting in on yesterday's session. So I didn't hear that that that discussion, then. I must admit, I just had a moment of not deja vu. But there's a there's a similar process happening the other ends of knowledge on the a 47. And I'm just confusing in my head, whether I made some comments on that steam or this scheme, and I'm trying to find where they are about. Concerns about that. I think this might be a case of you've set a question there specifically about the provenance of landscaping, the grocery management plan and whether I just review that again and come back with some written comments to you on it on this appropriateness? I think it's, it's fair to say. And just following on from the last point that we made about the mix is that the management of the landscape features and and it is, is critical not only in their establishment, but the long term. And certainly, certainly with real review of stray species and animal woody species and things that their long term success does depend on on a good robust, robust management plan being in place beyond the establishment phase. So I'm happy to go away and just review that and give you some clearer and more informed points based on that, because I'm not entirely sure that I've reviewed this one as fully as you would like us to have done.

45:53

Well, I suppose the point more is that the applicant intends to submit detail of management and maintenance subsequent to the making of any decision

46:06

Ah, right. Yes, sorry. Sorry about that again. And that's probably why we haven't commented because it's not there.

46:13

saying is, you know, should the speech or the be some information upfront, and how can I research some of the long term maintenance if that if that, if that information is lacking at this point, or okay to rely on detail later that the applicant intends to provide on that matter?

46:33

I think it would be very useful, from our point of view, to have certainly at least, a full outline document of the aspirations. I mean, mentioned documents can be very lengthy sometimes, which sometimes is their undoing, because there's so much text to wade through before you actually get to what you should and shouldn't do. But I think it's very clear, good to have some goals and aspirations. So for examples, when he talks about hetero being translocated, it will be translocated and successfully established to be the same size and form as the original one removed or something and give perhaps, parameters for Hydros. What they're going to allow to grow up to be whether it's whether it's a relative short one, two metres, or something that's much bigger three, four metres in height, trays, if the aspiration is that they're going to be grown to their expected, mature size and can form or whether they're going to be porosity, for example, coppiced. So those sort of general parameters will be very useful to understand at this point. I'm happy to happy to sort of nail down the detail afterwards. That's a more efficient way of doing things. Okay. So in the in the environmental management plan at the moment. I can give you a reference number for that. Yeah. So the most current version is wrapped three dashes. 01 4.3. Dash 014. Yeah. And what are the dependencies is an outline landscape and culture management plan? Well, it's what the applicant has submitted as a landscape and ecology management plan. Perhaps you can review that and let me know your thoughts. Certainly fine. abstain. Okay. Thank you very much. Mr Murphy.

48:46

Um, yes. Mark Murphy, your coordinator represent applicant I was just going to add a little bit more information. But I think I think all the points were covered, as you see in that outline, landscaping ecology management plan included in the EMP set. So those aspirations and those commitments, which is covered and requirement for

49:07

Okay, thank you. So, in that case, I'll move on. Yes, so section 7.4 vs chapter seven relates to the assessment methodology. It states so the assessment complies with the dmr design manual for roads and bridges guidance and takes into account all the guidance including the landscape industry and Institute of Environmental Management and assessment publication. guidelines for landscaping visual impact assessment third edition. As open the applicant could explain how this has been taken into

account. It does not appear to be mentioned in appendix 7.2 the landscape conditional assessment criteria, or elsewhere in the, chapter seven. So I was just hoping for a bit of clarity on that, please. Mr Murphy

50:18

Yep. Robin meade, striker landscape on behalf How is England the the basis of the assessment takes primary reference from Le 107. So manual frozen bridges as the as defining the landscape and visual effects basis for assessment. And inherently within that it itself cross refers to the guidelines landscape visual impact assessment is informing process. One of the defining criteria of that approach is that it advocates professional judgement, it advocates proportionality in assessment. The context for design, many of roads and bridges more generally, is an evolving methodology. It's its origin preceded by an interim advice note that served its purpose for many years before the current standard came into play. So, you know, historically, landscape vision assessments for Harris schemes have have asserted a sort of fairly familiar path to inform decision making. That has become defined in explicit terms for the purposes of this and subsequent assessment in relation to the current dmrbr terminal for roads and bridges, and we want to seven. So this is a sort of subtleties of the whole process of assessment, there's that there's that which is explicitly defined, which is the dmrbr standard. And then there's the the approach that one adopts from professional approaches, judgement making cetera, so that the result of that the outcome of it is that you get to the residual effect, and that the consideration of that for decision making is that you're able to identify the relativity, the significance effect says a significant effect is not significant effect for the decision maker. And so those various tiers of consideration whether it's evolution methodology over time, whether it's professional judgement in the decision making, they're all reflection it so it's a little bit more subtle than that, which may be explicitly declared. In terms of what's directly referenced, I'm just trying to cite where we have been clear on defining criteria. I can cite the examples. I've got reference here to paragraph 747 of chapter seven months getting visual effects. It to say there that been done been undertaken to account of the year one winter year 15 similar scenarios, which is which is what as reported residual effects, and that this accorded dmrbr, le 107, paragraph 2.6. Like unquote, all these specifics of it helps for the record, or what you heard enough to sort

53:14

of, yeah, it was mostly with the guidelines, landscaping visual impact assessment, which said, the assessment have been done in accordance with but I couldn't find any other reference. But if you're saying the dmrbr guidance takes that anyway, within it,

53:33

it does. And there is the issue of explicitness because the guidelines for visual impact imply a particular aspect of interpretation. Whereas dmrbr is a standard and asserts and very clear lines. So the two don't necessarily operate comfortably. But as a landscape professional in undertaking these sorts of assessments, then, with familiarity of having undertaken many such similar assessments over many years, then I inherently apply the elements of judgement. So it's harder than to sort of prescribe those against the absolute criteria of dmrbr. It is a juxtaposition, but it's the two are finding their way I think in terms of mutual compatibility and, and relevance, so it will come down to them professional judgement, ultimately.

54:23

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Meade for that. Okay. So I just want to move on to the so there were some changes made to the master plan. We discussed that yesterday, I think. And I said there was a bit unclear as to why certain changes would be made and I think the outcome is going to come back to me at deadline for on that. So and there is also some inconsistencies with fencing being shown on the master plan. The general arrangements plans. I think it there's also other changes to plans, including access and rights away plans. I think No, I mean, often it's good practice to when you change when you amend the plan or make any changes, have some kind of revision notes on it to say what changes have been made. So rather than saying rev, a rugby, or rev, one, Rev. Two, there's a section on the plan, the same notes on revisions, but there are no known. So I'm sometimes finding it slightly difficult to know exactly what changes are made to the plans. And it'd be useful on any plans, including master plan to maybe specify on each revision what the revisions have been.

55:57

And yet, second, half the applicant just works, we always have a colouring page that goes in front of the drawings. And rather than, obviously, the amount of text that it may take us to describe a note within a note box on a drawing, it may be better for us to put a short summary in that text box at the front of the sets of plans. Okay, that's why the changes. Yeah, we can

56:20

certainly identify these changes. Okay, that'd be useful. Thank you. And then just one more question on landscape of visual as well want to say Norfolk County Council mentioned they had not had not had sight of the arboricultural report. And I wasn't sure whether it was raising any concerns, but I just wanted to check this coming has Lofa county Council's seen the arboricultural report now? Cuz I think in your lie, in your local impact reports, you also made this point? have you managed to review it? And are you are you satisfied with it?

57:03

David cumming Norfolk County Council apology? So I don't know the answer to that question. I'll have to take that one away.

57:11

Okay. Okay, thank you very much. Before we move on, are there any other comments or questions anyone has in respect of landscape, and visual matters?

57:32

Okay, I'm saying no hands raised. So in that case, I'm going to move on to material assets and waste.

57:49

So it's just a question about the most recent document which was submitted for that. And I think it was in response to one of our written questions to do with the degree of unbound aggregates that have been shown. And that was then reduced from around half a million tonnes to about 20,000 tonnes. Yeah, I just wanted to just



58:26

outline where that comes from. Yes, absolutely. My feet EIA coordinator, representing the applicant. And so we, in response to that question, were identified, there was double counting of material. So it was an inclusion of unburned aggregates with topsoil and other materials. And so I was speaking with the contractor and understanding what was actually the correct figure. And we were able to update that, and that's been updated in the report, and there is no change to the significance. So it remains a non significant effect. It remains slight.

59:02

Yeah. But it also is reduced from what what you were showing before. Yeah. So then, just following on from that, in paragraph 10 point 10.5

59:16

which is just below the table that reports waste amounts be excavations. So, General soil and state excavations effectively, has doubled. What can you just explain the reason for that, please?

59:43

So that is a combination of aggregates and top soils?

59:48

Yes, yes. So in the previous version, it was 54,000 metres cubed, and it's went up to 108,000 metres cubed. So I'm just wondering what the

1:00:01

So the way that the figures are calculated them is the first went to the carbon team understand the carbon emissions. And the way the numbers were carried over from the carbon team to the materials assessment. And there was just an error in the way that the numbers will come up and grouped. And so we we've basically updated that and ended discussions for the contractor. And while we were reviewing those figures, and we we felt was a better representation of what the what the expected amount should be. So we increase the the idea gets adopted.

1:00:39

Okay, but that increase does still does not change the outcome of the assessment. Okay, thank you. That was all I had to ask on that point. Does anybody else have any comments to make on material assets and waste?

1:01:01

No. Okay. In that case, I'll move on to to noise and vibration. So, my recent question one point 12 point 21. So, yes, Chapter 11 11.5 point paragraph 11 point 5.6 sets out the maximum number of lorry trips per day for any phase would be 150. And table four indicates a crossover phases and what appears to be on that basis a potential for 425 lorry trips which might be a onion, which could be 150 movements. Is that is that am I reading that accurately?

1:01:50



Good morning Dan Doherty here from swepeco representing the applicant noise and vibration leads. The table referred to in chapter two of the environmental statement presents maximum number of lorry trips per day for each phase that is the maximum across the duration of each phase, which could be a period of 12 months for example. So therefore, in representing the construction effect, construction traffic noise effect, we consider two orders more typical, which is 150 trips across the sitewide. four foot for the West face.

1:02:38

Okay, but the worst case is the worst case not where you have a crossover phases where there potentially be, you know, a lot more lorry trips than that. Is that what why is it? Why is 150 the worst case when you're able suggests, for example, in Madden 17, there might be there might be whether there's crossover phases for 425 lorry trips,

1:03:04

I think the likelihood of that happening and affecting the same road is quite low. So we took a view on on what value to use in the assessment. The conclusion of the assessment is that where traffic is routed and only a 47, the change in road traffic noise is negligible. And we don't think that would change even if those months 17 numbers did align. So that's still the case.

1:03:34

Okay, have you ever said every time every service anywhere in writing,

1:03:41

I would have to check the response. And bear with me. We can add that to the response. It's not currently chain, as described.

1:03:59

So I suppose my question here is, you know, in light of what you're showing me on the table, there is a potential for a crossover phases and there is a potential for a greater number of lorries and what you've based your assessment on. You know, I'd like I'd like to understand should that occur? Should that be taken into account in the noise assessment?

1:04:26

So one factor, we're considering construction noise effects is the duration over which the effect a case. So that is another factor that goes into the judgement of significance. And that is typically a two week period that we'd look at, and therefore we judge that it is unlikely for that to occur even in month 17 where we we don't view that the numbers reaching those maximums of adding them up in that way.

1:05:01

Okay, but in terms of environmental assessment, you're meant to look at the worst case scenario and hear the worst case scenario looks to me like 117. I mean, if you want, if you want to go away and think about this, and put something in writing just to address this point, I think that'd be, that'd be helpful for me.

1:05:27

Okay, we can respond in writing.

1:05:34

Unless Unless you want to respond orally to that point. Now, I think you've

1:05:41

been the basis of the response, which is to consider duration, likelihood of these trips aligning, and the route on which these vehicles would be going. So we'll we'll put more tidy responses together for you in writing.

1:06:01

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Doherty. So, in that case, moving on to effective effectiveness of mitigation. So, hi, my written question 1.11 point 12.3. So, it refers to table 1111 sets out the specification for noise barriers, I was hoping you could explain to me why noise barrier for is two metres in height, whereas the other noise areas are three metres in height. And to what extent it would be effective, noting the concerns of an interested party. And I also note that broadland District Council seem to support those concerns of the interested party in response to follow by written questions.

1:07:01

So, in summary, that noise barriers are incorporated into our assessment, they are embedded mitigation with they have been specified to avoid significant noise changes due to the proposed scheme at each receptor. So the the specification of the barrier is influenced by parameters such as the distance of the receptor from the road, and the the road geometry in that location. So in this particular instance, we were able to avoid significant effects due to changes in road traffic noise through through the provision of a two metre barrier.

1:07:53

Okay. So I suppose what I'm trying to understand this, where the three metre barriers are, the two, whether were the two metre barrier is that the property doesn't appear to be particularly further away from where the three metre barrier would be. So say the, say you specified about I don't really understand how, how is less vital, how it would be effective.

1:08:18

Okay. The other variable that goes into this consideration is the current level of road traffic noise. And I believe that the property at noise barrier for location is close to an existing a dual carriageway section, whereas the other locations are close to the single characters section at which existing speeds would be lower. And therefore, the baseline is lower. That said, My argument is then it's you need more of a barrier to prevent significant nice changes. Does that make sense?

1:09:05

I see. I see that. Perhaps I could ask David Humpphrey Mr. Humphrey, from broadland District Council. So in response, one of the list of questions that was that didn't seem to be a suggestion that you were

you had a concern as well about the noise barrier for you know, listening to Mr. Doherty saying and having a because of it further, is it still a concern of yours?

1:09:37

Yeah, David Humphrey for broadland. Yes, we are. I mean, I picked up on the fact that the residents were concerned that the barrier wasn't three metres. And so my take on it is, if you can improve matters further by putting it up at three metres and that if both parties both cottages are in agreement, They seemed a good opportunity to do to do that. And I quite understand the difference between the dual carriageway and the the existing part of of the road. But it's, it's an opportunity to do something with that noise important area.

1:10:18

Okay, so you're saying rather than just doing the minimum, the minimum mitigation, you could go slightly further in this area? Yes,

1:10:28

yeah. If if the calculations show that there's a material improvement in doing it, because you know, that you say that the position of source and receiver may or may not make that possible, but I think it would be worth exploring at this stage to see whether or not there was benefit in just increasing the height for the residents at that point.

1:10:59

Okay, this Thursday, we'd like to comment on that.

1:11:03

Sure. Thank you, Dan Doherty vibration lead for the applicants, I I, we can certainly investigate the benefits of different barrier parameters and communicate them to the gentlemen.

1:11:24

Okay, so you're saying it's potentially feasible, if there's a significant difference between the two or the three meats of area, that it might be feasible that you might incorporate a three metre barrier subject to the views of the property, so we're aware adjacent to it.

1:11:45

Indeed, the visual effects would be another consideration that would have to be weighed against noise benefit.

1:11:54

It will be already installing three other quite sick. Well, one of which is very is well, all the others would be much longer than this. So yes, it might be a visual consideration also. Yeah, maybe you could indicate to what degree though, that might that might be?

1:12:19

I think we'll need to take that away and respond in writing. That's okay.

1:12:24

Okay. Yeah, so virus in question one, point 12.3. This relates to. So there's noise important area 5206. So my question is, what weights Can I give to mitigation, which is not to be secured through the decio through the draft development, consent order, or the environmental management plan. So this, say, the factory, you're, you're telling me the highways England are due to resurface this area road? I think you said in August, so this month. This is to mitigate, mitigate a significant effect, but it's not secured through the decio. Or the EMP. So at this point in time, what Wait, what weights? Can I give to that? Do you have any updates on whether it's going to happen? Because it sounds like it may occur before the end of the examination.

1:13:43

Perhaps this is best for one of my colleagues to answer.

1:13:57

Yeah, your coordinates are on baffle of the applicant? Yes, I think it'd be best to get the details right. If we take that away and respond to the right thing. Just know we are stuck with highways England are still planning to make those improvements and the most important area and you can add that it's it's not secured in the EMP. So we'll give you an update into course.

1:14:20

Okay. So I think your response that it was going to happen in August, September. So theoretically, it would happen before the end of the examination. Maybe you can just provide me with an update on where we're at where you're at with that.

1:14:41

Yes, we are expecting it is happening soon and we'll give you giving an update

1:14:45

because then that then will not need that will not lead to any longer. Thank you. My written question one point 12.8 So I understand that the paragraph 11 point 10.7. previous chapter 11 says that there'll be multiple diversion routes for temporary traffic diversions during the construction, the order, the reason for this was to limit noise effects. The applicant, then suggests that the outline traffic management plan was amended to reflect this. As I highlight the only one alternative route shown, but I can't see in the outline traffic management plan where where it was amended to reflect this, it looks like there's still just one diversion route. So I guess, is there is there just one diversion route? Or are there going to be multiple diversion routes? due to you saying that there, there shouldn't be to MIT to minimise noise in person?

1:16:06

I note the inconsistency between those two, and we shall respond to make sure they are consistent.

1:16:28

Okay, john, any more time to look at that? Or?

1:16:33

I think we'll respond to that in writing, if that's okay.

1:16:37

Okay. So significant effects, relating to noise have been identified for some receptors along both Yarmouth road and the B, one 140, high road. So these these are properties away from the proposed development. And it's due to redirection of traffic effectively. Can you just clarify what the increased traffic on these roads would be? numerically, or percentage wise, or?

1:17:21

I don't have those numbers to hand at the moment. But I can certainly provide those. If that's if that's helpful for you.

1:17:31

That's the other maybe the documents already. But either if you could point point me to that, or perhaps

1:17:41

I don't believe that changes are within the documents, these would have originated the noise changes are assessed in a road traffic noise model. And that is what has been judged as significant change. Right? We can certainly provide the the traffic numbers on which that has been based.

1:18:06

Yeah. So you, it's just that you say that noise levels will be comparable to other local v roads in the area. What are you basing that on?

1:18:19

Say, we we have used the model to predict the very traffic noise level and in the future scenario with the scheme. We can then compare receptors adjacent to these two important roads with receptors adjacent to existing B roads in the do minimum scenario. And so although there is a significant change in road traffic noise, a perceptible change, the predicted road traffic noise levels with this scheme are comparable to what is exist, what is present adjacent to existing v roads. And also it is below the threshold at which you would provide secondary installation. So that's the significant observable adverse effect level within our guidance.

1:19:14

Okay, so you said that you can't mitigate the significant effects through noise barriers or research thing because you don't control the roads effectively. And those barriers wouldn't work because several people have to have driveways. So that you do mention double width double glazing. I mean, is that not something that you won't do you if you're if, if there's a way of mitigating an adverse effect, why would you not seek to go down that route

1:19:57

and so just secondary grazing would be appropriate. If we were expecting high levels of noise indoors without it. We're not in an act scenario in these locations, the effect is at the perception effect of the noise change due to the additional road traffic. It is not an effect on on internal immunity

1:20:31

even though it's speed, but you say a significant significant effect.

1:20:35

Significant, perceptible change in noise. Correct.

1:20:41

So, maybe for the people who live there, it's so I know you're saying it's loss of of the soul.

1:20:54

But it's a significant effect. And you say that there's literally no way to mitigate that or

1:21:03

so, it is difficult provision of low noise surface could be investigated by the highways body for that for those roads. The benefit of such a road surface is limited when traffic speed is is low. Sure. It's, you get a much better benefit on trunk road speed when their speed is high, and there's a lot more tire noise. Okay. And as as, as mentioned, barriers are impractical because of the need for access. Yes, and secondary glazing, and secondary glazing could be considered where this is where necessary. But that's not right, that you haven't mentioned that in today. There's no, there's no statutory obligation to provide it.

1:22:14

Yeah, I know, there's no statutory obligations provided. But if there's a significant effect, which is a detriment, isn't it? Would you not seek to provide that despite the most statutory or is that not normally?

1:22:36

not normally the case for redistribution effects such as this.

1:22:45

Okay. Will you though, take it away and think, think about that. We will, we will respond in writing. Okay.

1:23:03

But it's also moved on to working hours. So my recent question 1.8 point two, I asked whether workout should be specified in the draft development consent order? The answer was the workout restrictions are not necessary. And unrestricted working hours are needed as disruption would be significantly worse were to be carried out during normal working hours. But Gee, one of the register environment selection and commitment stays that works would mainly be during daytime. So they'll say you can explain when you say if works during daytime, there will be significant disruption. But conversely, we're going to be carried out works during the daytime. That's hopefully explain that it seems like a slight contradiction to me.

1:24:01

Indeed, my my understanding is that the works needed for building the proposed scheme are predominantly offline, there will be elements where roads need to be closed to tie in, which would be done outside of normal working hours. We don't feel that working hours constraints in the decio is necessary because there are other methods of limiting construction noise effects from hour to hour works. So section 61 agreements under the control of Pollution Act, can be put forward to the local authority for prior approval of works outside of normal working hours. And those can Describe how significant construction noise effects will be avoided.

1:25:07

Okay, yes, I understand that. It's just why you say that disruption will be significant if works were carried out during normal working hours. But then the React says works will be carried out mainly during normal working hours.

1:25:30

I think that those documents can be updated to be consistent. And the my reading of the test draft ACI response, is that primarily relating to impacts on road users. So right, can't close the road during the day because the traffic effects of doing say,

1:25:56

okay, rather than noise effects. Indeed, right. I see. Okay, maybe maybe because they're clearer somehow. Thank you. And then I just have one further question on noise and vibrant noise and vibration. So broadland, this council made the point that on page 16, of a pp 106, the baseline noise summary document? The there's some data missing? Please six data summary.

1:26:45

Ah, yes, I remember that data has now been obtained and we can provide an update.

1:26:53

Okay, so can I just go to the district council? Mr. Humphrey. Sorry, David Humphrey broadened. Thank you. So Mr. Doherty said that the data summary has been will be available the deadline for could could I ask that you you review that? And make comments that you think necessary? Yes, I'll do that. Thank you very much. Thank you, or if the applicant wishes to share that with problem District Council for broadland District Council to comment on that by deadline for that would be also helpful. We We are happy to share that before deadline for Thank you. Okay, thank you. Does anybody have any other comments on noise and vibration at this point? Okay, Mr. Meade

1:28:04

Hello, Tim Knight's resident at the White House. I've had some meetings with the project team over the effect of the low noise road surface incorporated into the scheme. And I have been informed that there will be a statutory requirement to maintain that low noise road service because that will be critical to providing the noise predictions at our receptor location. But I've been unable to get a confirmation in writing or reference to the relevant statute that would make that compulsory for the road operator after

handover of the project to maintain that surface. Can you confirm that that would need to be maintained according to the specification of the project extends at the moment?

1:29:02

Okay, Mr. Humphrey, is that any is that written anywhere within the Clery? If I can ask the applicant is that is the maintenance of the low road no such thing written into the EMP and the react at all. But I'll go with Mr. Humphrey. He hasn't he has a question. He has his hand up at the moment.

1:29:35

Yeah, David Humphrey brought on I have looked at the decio. And I can't find that requirement is embodied. And it was something that I was going to mention, because it was embodied in the decio for for the Northern distributor road.

1:29:51

So this is about long term maintenance of low ROI, low road noise surfaces. Okay.

1:29:58

It's something that I want The dimension so I'm sorry, I brought it in, but it seemed a convenient time just to suggest that it should be incorporated somewhere for future maintenance.

1:30:11

Okay. Okay, Mr. Doherty,

1:30:15

and there is a represent in the applicant noise and vibration leads at the environment management plan does include and seven, which is the provision of low noise road surface, we can amend the wording of that action to include a clause about maintaining that provision throughout the lifetime of this scheme.

1:30:44

Okay, let me just go to N seven. Okay. Mr. Knights and Mr. Humphrey, if that was in cope, included within the environmental management plan, because that would have been secured through the development consent order, if that commitment was included in that with that,

1:31:31

that was made me very happy indeed. Yeah. Something that I was concerned about. And I've been unable to obtain definitive formal answer up until now.

1:31:42

Okay. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. With that alleviate your concern as well. Yes, yes, it would. Thank you. Okay. Okay. In that case with applicate could do that for the next deadline, please. We were responding to the next deadline. No, it Okay. Thank you very much. Because check if anybody else has any comments or questions on noise and vibration. Okay, I'm seeing no hands raised. So it's half 11. I think we should, we'll take a 15 minute break. Or maybe slightly longer. So it's 1132. And I'm going to adjourn the hearing until 1150. So I'll see everybody back then. Thank you.