

TRANSCRIPT_BLOFIELD_ISH3_SESSION_3_20082021

Fri, 8/20 3:45PM • 1:36:43

00:05

Good afternoon, it's two o'clock, and the issue specific hearing is resumed. Can I just check with my colleagues that you can see and hear me? Clearly? The hearings be recorded, and the live streaming has commenced. And yes, I can hear you and the livestream is up. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. So, yes, before, before we took a break, I provided a couple of questions to the applicant. So, first has to do with encouraging direct and indirect local employment. I was hoping you could expand on your answer and maybe suggest or show me where where that commitment is secured.

00:59

Philip Robson, highways England, I've taken my jacket off, if you don't mind. The commitment to local employment and local training is a commitment that isn't secured anywhere with any links to any particular scheme. It is the aim to employ people locally from the local local talent pool, but it will have cost dependence on skills available. I can put it no higher than seven then as a commitment as opposed to something that would be secured through the DCI. Okay. Mr. Cumming you you did you raise this I think as a Lofa county council raise this in one of its representations. is equivalent. Sufficient? Your views?

02:05

Excuse me? is David Cumming Norfolk County Council? Yes, I think we would be satisfied with a commitment to this. Yes.

02:16

Okay, Mr. Robson the commitment Where? Where is? Where is the commitment? Or

02:24

as I said, so it's not secured anywhere? It is a commitment a stated aim of the project. I can't put it any higher. I'll point you to anywhere where that's secured.

02:37

Whereas the state of aim in that case

02:48

it is it forms part of forms part of contracts between highways England and galliford try them of course, those contracts are subject to privity of contracts, of course, but they are it is a commitment and an objective of those contracts to where possible and appropriate to draw from local talent.

03:20

So you wouldn't call it you wouldn't consider or you wouldn't put that as a in the sort of em EMP

03:31

notion it begs the difficulty we have so is that it's not really appropriate within the decio we can't commit to numbers the project is less than two years it's not a long running projects comparatively for other construction projects.

03:52

And is there a general sort of commitments for highways England to do that on all these road projects anyway?

04:00

You'll have to bear with me so was my WhatsApp chat catches up that's not something the time familiar with one of my colleagues no doubt will update me. are you sir? I'm not able to say whether or not that's a commitment of highways England. Okay, so I said my I'm not trying to look suspicious because my eyes are casting left and right. And I have screens either side with

04:29

other screens also say, right, okay. Note your answer. I'll move on. So the last bullet point on the agenda item five. So in your in response to my recent questions, you you repeated a question rather than answering the actual question which is why I put this on here. So I was hoping you could So the actual question that was asked, or if you haven't prepared that, then look it up so that the subsequent deadline, this is one point 13 point. 16 That's right. So, one point 13 one point 13 point. 16 So you've, you've given me the same answer for one point. 13 and one point 13 point. 16 you've repeated the question, for one point, 13 point. 15. But the question for one point, 13 point 16 was not the same as one point 13 point. 15. Can you see that? Yes, I'm looking at those questions, I can see that it's the same response. You've repeated the same question as well, like, the question is not the same as well, one, though, for one point, 13 point. 16 you've repeated the question for one point. 13 point. 15. But I didn't ask the same question twice. One point 13 point 16 was a different question. Can you say your responses?

06:33

I can see my I can see the responses here. And I can see that they are the same. I'm just trying to see where the differences in the question between one point 13 and 1.1 point 13 point 15 and one point 13 point 16.

06:43

When you're talking about that the questions are exactly the same.

06:46

We've it's our it's our Yes. Sorry, I'm with you. I'm on the same page, as you know. So that must be digesting lunch. Yes, that's our ever said we will correct that. We've simply copied the question in and put the wrong question. You're the wrong question from you in our documents.

07:00

Yes. Can you answer the question that I suppose that one point 13 point 16. whether you'd like to that now or whether you'd like to do that by deadline for we will take that away for deadline? Forster. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

07:25

I suppose it goes back to this recurring issue about month 17. And the potential for a much higher level of track level of hgvs might be reported it that kind of crosses over a few boundaries that that issue, so perhaps you can address that issue. As Mr. Battershill he could convertor well, either now or as part of your answer, the deadline for but they've missed the Nationals here now. That'd be great to hear from him.

08:06

Hi, I just thought it's worth highlighting that as part of the modelling assessment of the scheme, we did a construction scenario assessment. And as part of that construction scenario, we took our base share and created the future prior to the scheme opening. And we took information on the construction network scenarios, such as lane closures, etc. And we undertook those model runs and included the outputs primarily in the economics assessment. So as part of the economics, there is a subcategory called construction delays. And yes, that information for you.

08:55

Okay, the question more relates to so the ies chapter 12 states the impacts from Congress will be minimum minimal. With traffic management measures aiming to reduce impacts from construction traffic. I paragraph 12.66 states of the 847 currently experienced congestion, the peak hours and those potential for up to 425 additional ATVs which is 850 movements per day, including more than 17. I asked if you could further justify the sort of the assumption that congestion impacts during construction would be minimal. But as I say, if you want to take that away and answer it by deadline before then, I'm happy for you to do so. Yes, we can take that away. Okay. Thank you. So in that case, there are all the questions I had on population human health did Because anybody who wants to raise anything or make any comments on that agenda item before I move on to transportation traffic

10:15

can say no hands raised. So in that case, I will move on. So agenda item six is transportation and traffic. on the agenda, they're the last three bullet points. I think we've covered those in previous hearings, so I don't intend to go over those again. today. The applicants and maybe, Mr. Cumming Do you agree with that? Yes, I will contend with that approach.

10:56

It's David Cumming Norfolk County Council, I can confirm that we're content with that as well.

11:00

Okay, thank you. Does anybody else have any issues? With me doing that? Okay, so, in my written question, one, point 14.3. I asked a written question about the lack of an assessment of the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network. Again, go back to those points of MONTH 17 where there's potentially 425 hcv's heavy goods vehicles per day and acknowledgment that the a 47 here already suffers from congestion that congestion at peak hours. So, the applicants response is fairly brief on this I will provide further justification.

12:03

Yes, I think I would be inviting Mr. Battershill again to comfortably say

12:15

yes, I think we need to provide a more robust response on the overall level PhD base I think Yeah, they'll have to come as a response in in writing

12:28

okay. I suppose it I suppose it in a way links back to my that the last question I asked on population human health in a way both those questions are I suppose interlinked? Both relates to construction traffic causing potential well, the potential for delays etc, when the highway network has already experienced delays, so perhaps you could answer them both. Together get further

13:06

Philip Robson highways England. Yes, sir.

13:11

Okay, so moving on then to the Brundle roundabout so it's Brundle I think it's Brenda roundabout cucumber lane roundabout and I was hoping first of all the applicants could just explain

13:37

in your answers to my written questions you provide as an appendix g SAP just run me through that and explain to me what what what I'm what it is I'm looking at. Well, would it be useful to for me to share that

14:05

Philip Robson highways England? Yes. So perhaps if it could be put up on on screen.

14:09

Okay. So if one of my colleagues could pull up, sales rep one dash 061 and it's the very last page of that might just take a minute for that to happen.

14:34

No problem, sir. I think Mr. Battershill again will explain that the dataset

14:43

David Battershill from sweco for the applicant talking, I'm just waiting to see information.

14:52

So, yeah, so if you can explain what the what, what is I'm looking at and also what are stoplight seconds Um, what does IP mean? It's a very

15:09

Yeah. Okay. Yes. So, IP is interpeak. So interpeak interpeak. So, we talked about the am peak hour, the pm peak hour and the six hours in between is the interpeak. So, yes, congestion levels are higher in the a MP can PMP In summary, and then stop lying second. So this is traffic that is queuing to get over the stoplight. So delay directly related to the roundabouts and crossing over the gateway stoplight and

15:51

there's already a stoplight is the line.

15:55

Yes. The approach to go go down the roundabout. Yeah. So you drive up to the you drive up to the roundabout, the two dotted lines, right, I see across onto the roundabouts. Yes, fine.

16:10

Okay, so thanks for explaining that. So, can you just explain to me what what's being shown in this table? Okay.

16:22

So we have two scenarios, our do minimum scenario, and I'll do something so all right. So the do the minimum scenario is in 2014, we consider all of the development that we think is going to come forward in the future. We said all the background traffic great. And we consider all the other scheme network highway schemes in the area. And we create a scenario which is without our blofield scheme, which we benchmark the comparison for teams and they do minimum doesn't have the scheme and the do something has the scheme. So the comparison of the two indicates the impact of the scheme.

17:05

Okay. dm is do minimum and DSS do something. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Okay. And then the figures themselves.

17:15

Okay. So yes, if you take the a and peak To start off with, essentially we're saying on a 47 westbound approach, because this is going westbound going towards Northridge in the am peak, we're saying in the dominant and there's a B over C, so volume overcapacity ratio of 97% basically, when it gets to 100%, we're saying it's at capacity. So once you get over capacity, you start to have increases in delay. So yes, if you take the ANP you're looking at a 40 the big number to notice is the a 47 westbound goes from 97 to 109. However, the point to note as well is that the do minimum itself is already congested. So, if you take similarly if you go to the PMP you take the 47 eastbound, which is 108 and in the do something increases to 110. So we've got a scenario where the front door roundabout is, you know,

approaching capacity overall but at capacity on certain arms and the dominance laurio. When we have the scheme in place, we draw more traffic onto the roundabout. And there are some increases in delay on the approach arms as laid out in that table. And that's from our modelling assessment.

18:57

Okay. So, in response to the written question I asked which was one point 14 point 12 you said so, whilst the proposed development would marginally increased delays of the roundabout overall journey times would be improved. So, are you saying that if you take leaving say Great Yarmouth and travelling to Northridge, with the scheme would would take less time than it than it currently does however, they would be delays at this roundabout within that, within travelling that distance.

19:41

Um, so I put it slightly differently that if you look at in the transport assessment to flow redirect to to a section on journey times where we've got a route which goes From Brundle, Rand bell to at roundabout arkeil, roundabout, which is sort of like the duration scheme plus between the two roundabouts across that journey time routes, we get benefits from the scheme. So we would say yes, overall the journey times are beneficial from the scheme. On top of that, we've got network global network statistics for the model, which showed that there is a beneficial impact to the scheme. Shall I provide references to where I'm discussing?

20:47

Yeah, that would be handy for the paragraph number. Yeah, okey dokey. Just say transport says what was there was a river of revised. Yeah.

21:01

Called a reference of Rep. 1044. And if I look at the paragraph numbers I didn't want

21:23

I think the screen the image can be taken out, please download please. Because I want to thank you.

21:34

So we've got form paragraphs, input 6.7 Global statistics. And that carries down to the end of Section 7.7. And we have journey time results, which is 7.6 point free. And that, in fact, if you go from 7.6, point three, all the way down to 7.7. that highlights the journey time benefits and speed benefits.

22:08

Bryce. Okay, so just moving on, following on from that, what, what is the likelihood of improvements to this roundabout occurring? And timescales? So you're saying yes, it would be done separately. does how does does Applicant know? Or can you give any indication of, of when this might happen or any commitment for this to happen?

22:36

I'm afraid I'd have to pass that back to see if I respond.

23:00

Though, I suppose the reason I ask is because a this scheme causes some additional delays and Norfolk County Council has said in its local impact report that further commitment is needed. So before I just asked could offer county council anything I was wondering if if there is a commitment or if that is in the pipeline

23:30

so that there's no commitment that highways England can can give any such project would be independent to be entirely independent to this scheme.

23:42

Okay, so perhaps I ask the Mr Cumming phase views. So whilst Mr Cumming there would be a delay greater delay or congestion, this particular roundabout, overall journey times will be reduced? Is there any necessity for any commitment on that basis?

24:11

I think that Norfolk County Council David Cumming Norfolk County Council, the county council supports the scheme being it'd be a no doubt that we do support the duelling scheme. We note what has been presented here in terms of journey time benefits. But I guess, you know, one of the points of these journey time benefits is that they are averages across a length and what you would see at particular junctions, where the the traffic flow is reaching capacity of that junction as you would tend to see more unreliable journeys. So although you know, highways England are predicting delays and some of those delays set out in appendix g are quite substantial in effect, not just the trunk right, but also affect the county road network, you'll also see more unreliable journey times at that particular junction. So, sometimes you could be queuing for a long time sometimes, you know, you might get through with no queue. So, you know, I think our concern remains about this junction and its ability to accommodate not just the future traffic flows, but you know, what is already being experienced. So, we would want you know, I appreciate that is not going to be part of the scheme, I think we accept that, and I can see that the difficulty, you know, of highways England having in terms of committing to a scheme, but some commitment would be welcome, even at that work commitments simply to monitor the junction to assess, you know, whether these predicted effects actually came to pass, you know, with a view then reviewed they did, you know, to start work towards the scheme.

26:09

Okay, thank you for coming Mr. Robson. We'd like to respond to that.

26:13

Philip Robson, highways England, were of course tasked to deliver a specific scheme, which is what's contained within the the application, I'm pleased to hear that the county council supports the scheme and understands what is included in the scheme and what what isn't as to any future commitments, so that that's way outside our remit. That's, that's a future decision.

26:40

Okay. I'm sorry. But how about you know, if you're if your scheme is having a knock on effect further down the network? What I mean is, could you not, could not carry out some monitoring, as per the council's suggestion. So what do we do? That's what do we do that anyway, was meitei suggested that we speak with our operations team, we continue to speak with NCC with a view to establishing future monitoring and provide an update to you deadline for okay. missus coming for a move on. there's anything else you'd like to say with regard to that.

27:32

David Cumming county council, no. So I think I'm I'm happy with that. Thank you.

27:36

Okay, so we'll see what comes to the deadline for and Mr Cumming. You could respond to anything. On that pieces?

27:46

Yes. Okay, thank you. So, moving on to footpath cycleways and their design. So the applicant is proposing shared footpaths and cycleways. In some instances can the applicant just explain the design of these briefly and comment on whether these are the you know, the use of shared services or promoted through policy or guidance?

28:35

And afternoon Mark Duckworth with sweco? Do we ch lead? Yes, we're proposing the use of shared use facilities. I think that's approaches is supported by Norfolk County Council as far as I'm aware. The key the key factors here are likely level of use shared use facilities in gardens for dmr standards can accommodate flows up to 200 users and our minimum width of two metres there. I think we're going to slightly larger than that, probably two and a half. But that's that's the standard of which we're applying. I think the key is very much ensuring that there's appropriate separation between the running carriageway and the facility. And we'll ensure that that separation is provided in accordance with the required standard to reflect the the speed of the road. Obviously, we were very mindful at that. So marriage there are three constraints and and the detailed design will reflect that. I mean, I think in terms of policy in the direction of travel. Everyone will be aware of gear change and the government's approach to cycling. And I think it's not he pointed out that gear change goes great pains to say that it's not a one size fits all. And, you know, he does advocate different levels of provision in different areas, you know, they'll ever provision in a in a city or a large county town will be would be expected to be different than in sort of a rural village, that sort of thing. And the the guidance note that came out with gear change, local transport, not one of 20 very much advocates the use of shared use facilities for a bridge, which notices local transport note one of 20 wasn't that it is sorry, it's a cycle infrastructure design. So it very much. advocates that shared use facilities are appropriate in rural areas and in areas where frontage activity is likely to be low pedestrian activity is likely to be low. So as I said, we're providing facilities shared use facilities to reflect the activity in the area. And this is very much within the spirit of the emerging guidance.

31:22

Okay, so this so gear change has as a full copy of that being submitted into the examination, this L tn 120. No.

31:38

I don't believe so. So we can do that.

31:44

Okay. Thank you. It might be worth asking. Richard Bearman if he has any comments on that. Well, Mr. Duckworth just mentioned.

32:04

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Hutson. Leave it here. Hear me. Richard Bearman Nord cycling campaign. I think it might be beneficial for Mr. Duckworth notice to hear what I want to say on behalf of Nora cycling campaign, perhaps as it refers to both of those government documents. I don't believe we have submitted them separately. But we were assuming they were I have in awesome that say referred to the specific sections of both gear change and ltn 120. So you can look them up? Yes. Yeah, I've seen those. Yes. Yes. might be easier. If I go through what I want to do fairly soon, then he can come back with any further questions. If that's okay. If you could well, sorry. If I could go through what I wanted to say about this particular cycle way that proposes to help and then he can ask for clarification, while others can at the time rather than repeat ourselves on small points. Is that perhaps an easier way for you to handle it?

33:08

Yes, sure. Yes, of course, please do.

33:12

Okay, for the benefit of those who didn't hear that Richard Bearman Norris cycling campaign. And also Mr. Clark has been submitting large cycling campaign he and I are the two people from the recycling campaign who have been working on schemes my my main focus is leading on urban and suburban schemes. Mr. Clarke is mainly on major highways schemes, particularly pertaining to the a 47, the norridge Western link, and previously the MDR. We each have about 30 years of practice of consulting with Norfolk County Council prior to that Norwich City Council, and also now with the greater norridge development area, because as you will appreciate this area is included in broadland District Council, which is part of that wider area. The key points I'd like to for you to have in front of you and maybe to address to the applicant is the question, the first question is of precedence. We have referred in our submissions to government and local authority policies. We asked the examining authority to consider to the order of precedence of these policies and the policies of the highways agency, as set out in the design manual for roads and bridges. And there are other documents. We do note that policies are not law, but we contend that government policies are paramount, and overall other policies. We offer the following as evidence. We've looked at the highways England licence dated 2015. And part of that says in exercising his role as a tree as a strategic highways company, and complying with the requirements in part for the licence holder must comply with or have due regard to relevant government policy, as advised by The Secretary of State with full regard to any implications for the licence holders ability to live a road investment strategy. For the purposes of this section it says revenue relevant government

policy means all current policies which relate to the activities of the licence holder and have been published on behalf of Her Majesty's Government or, or indicated by the Secretary of State. And understand that specification and guidance it says in carrying out his activities, the licence holder must have due regard to guidance standard or specifications in its statutory or other functions. This includes being mindful where new standards or specifications are developing and seeking to ensure that new projects are brought into line. And also it says that, if they've been published indicates that policies are effective and to be acted on immediately on publication, unless some other delay is brought in the two policies were referred to a lot is gear change, and local transport note one slash 20. These were published by the government in July 2020 gear changes a statement of policy on cycling nationally, simultaneously local transport note one slash 20 cycle infrastructure design was also published which sets out the details for implementation of the policy. The government has also published recently an update on gear change one year on and highways England seem to acknowledge gear change as government policy in their response to our initial submission. Not a document we refer to do is the greater norridge local cycling and walking infrastructure plan. Now this plan covers the greater nose Development Partnership area, which is all three councils broadland South north and North Ridge so includes these the area of these works at North Burlington. This document refers to gear change in page four and six key planning stages. It also refers to the active travel network design standards, and reprints the Department for Transport design principles from local transport note 120. So that plan which supersedes gear change incorporates the design principles.

37:15

Okay, sorry, before just before you Sorry to interrupt you. Okay. Could I just say you re you're reading out your radio reading something else? Because I was asked roughly, how long is 10 minutes perhaps? So would you like me to precis and summarise? i? Well, I think that'll be useful. But I suppose at the moment, it'd be useful for me to understand. So from what I understand the the the applicants has referred or taken via change and local transport No, 122. Come on, I suppose from your submissions. I'm, it'd be useful to know what where or why you think what what is being proposed is, is not compliant with those.

38:14

Okay. I'll get on to the lack of compliance. specifics if you if you prefer. I just wanted to make sure we are coming from the right sort of background and understanding why we're making these claims that we're making. Okay. I will move on to the specifics. And it really refers to cycleways, rather than, as proposed in the plans rather than potential cycleways or underpasses and over bridges. The the specifics are the B 1140 overbridge. Okay. And on this, I've made some comments which we will send this written submission and then call on time for your next deadline. Okay, refer to some of the points there by FSU numbers which are shown on the plan right away and access plans sheet showing the overbridge Yes. So the cycle track over the bridge is shown from su seven on to Cox Hill Road to be 142. South. This is referred to by the applicant as a route to be used by pedestrians and cyclists to access Lynwood and therefore should be referred to as a shared use path according to get change.

39:31

Okay. Sorry, sorry to interrupt you on what would be useful to bring up this the sheet which I think would be helpful for me.

39:39

Possibly not because there's a general point, even if about how cycleway should be designed, really. If people want to look at it, then again, feel free.

39:52

Okay, if you want to continue that case, sorry to interrupt you.

39:55

Okay. two metres wide, which is the minimum width described in cd 14195, which is one of the documents are referred to earlier. Is this an appropriate width for cycles to weigh buggies, electric delivery vehicles and disability scooters, not withstanding pedestrians? I'll just give you a little example. There is a current scheme in Northridge proposed by Norfolk County Council which provides 3.5 metres width for a two way cycle lane segregated from the footpath and the highway. Things have moved on since two metres was regarded as an adequate width for this type of use.

40:33

Okay, is that in a similar context? Is that in a rural context? Was that in a city urban context? Well,

40:40

I think the context doesn't matter. It's the mix of users. Okay, design criteria. We feel that design criteria for footbridges should apply as in the dmrB manual cd 353, which it doesn't there is mention of some kind of segregation. The design and purpose function is not clear. I heard your colleague earlier talk about segregation between the shared use facility and the carriageway. We'd like to see more details of how that might work and what kind of segregation but our contention is that the segregation has to be adequate and the width is inadequate for the type of use might be using it.

41:22

Okay, just just make clear, it wasn't my colleagues. So

41:26

sorry. Colleges, the applicants? Yeah, okay. Like was I believe that's right. The other thing we concern with the approach the bridge, we've not been given information to the gradient. Again, design criteria for cycling paths on foot bridges specifies one in 20 or less, the highway crossing, but su eight and nine, which is where the cycle path crosses the B 1140, or the approach road. No information is provided on the detail of this crossing, which I think is critical. And the highway crossing at su 10 and 11. Again, this is the B 1140. road leading off to cantley. This will be a major route for hgvs accessing and leaving the a 47 to the beer level 40 as well as local traffic. And we think this crossing needs some detailed design, we need to see that at su 12. There's an end of the shared use cycle on footway. Now I understand there's further work to be done extending that. But whatever happens at the end of a cycle and footway, when it's on for cyclists travelling southbound for example, on the wrong side, if you like the right hand side of the road, we need very clear guidance and gear changes very clear on how cyclists are integrated back into the carriageway at that point. In short, we think that the design of that particular overbridge breaches the five core design principles set out in local transport note 120, which require all

cycleways to be coherent, direct, safe. And in that document, it refers to not only be safe, but perceived to be safe by all users comfortable and attractive. We would submit that a shared use path on the side of the busy road connecting the A47 with a major heavy van transport route would not be attractive nor comfortable to users. And it's we have documentation via Linwood parish council estimating that during the sugar beet season, there will be up to 700 vehicles a day using this route just for the campy factory. Plus, we've heard earlier today that there will be other HGVs involved in the construction, admittedly, a short term period, I would say that getting over 1000 vehicles a day is not a comfortable or attractive environment to encourage people either to walk or cycle. Okay, thank you. I have a couple more points if I may. We also raised concern, and I will do it in writing about the walking cycling and horse riding assessment. We don't believe this assessment has been done in accordance with Highways England timetable. And we'll be submitting our reasoning behind that. Perhaps won't go into that now unless you wish me to. Finally I want to talk about the underpass or the overbridge proposal, which has been talked about earlier. We had some correspondence from Mr. Chris Gates High Beams representing the Berlin Cottage Garden Association. And we think that proposal has some merit, and it could certainly conform with gear change in cycling note I 120. For cycling and walking, perhaps not for horse riders as we've heard, but we would like the highway, the Highways England to explore that option fully. Whether it's an underpass or an oval bridge to certainly cost them out and give us reasons why that is not a viable alternative to what is essentially a substandard, shared you cycling and footpath facility on a busy bridge across the A47. Fire and also to mention that there's a view in submission that they take account of local opinion. We think more weight should be given to the Linwood and Burling and parish Council and the broaden District Council submissions in Highways England because they are representative of the local community. I hold my hand up so I'm not representing local community because I don't live in the area. But we do know that this the A47 presents a major barrier to many cycling routes between Northridge and Akele. And this is one of the opportunities to improve that situation for the benefit of both regular cyclists and tourism and long distance routes like the Sustrans route that has already been mentioned. Thank you.

46:02

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Bearman. Okay. Mr. Bearman? Can I just say if when you if you do when you do provide your submission, that deadline for if it is if it happens to be over? One and a half 1000 words, could you provide a summary statement with that as well, please? Yes, certainly. I

46:29

will make a note of that and make sure that happens.

46:32

Okay, thank you. Okay, so I'll revert back to Mr. Robson without making any comments, and whatnot.

46:44

Alright, so obviously the Philip Robson, how was England? There is a lot, we could save response to that, but but I fear we'd be putting our case which which I know, is not what one should do at a DCI examination. So some of the points I think have already been addressed. I suspect some of them will come up in your questions to us.

47:05

Okay. So in that case, I mean, I look, I've got to look at the plants as they've been submitted. And notwithstanding that you're proposing your your you might you may be proposing some changes. But if if one of my colleagues could just say can I'll just share the rights away that says platens? sheets? Six, I think possibly sheet eight? rep three, Dutch there was only two sir. Thank you. It's not that one. Sorry. It's if you can, sorry, if you couldn't move to sheets, seven. Yes. And if you could, is it possible to zoom in to the lower third of the screen? Okay, yeah, thank you. So if we're just looking at the shared cycle path pulseway which then joins what's shown is shown to be the footpath which goes east to west. Yes. So can you just explain once the cyclist and at that point, the moment on the planet they can't cyclists can't go down the footpath because it's just a footpath. Can you just explain to me how the cyclists would then travelled to say, Linwood, what

49:25

sorry Mark Duckworth this area is now that we we've we've locked out again and the scheme is being changed to increase and extend the shared use facility into a call road round the band. And bearing in mind this is preliminary design at this stage, and the detail hasn't been worked through but we recognise the need to to to keep cycles away from the mixture of hgvs It's even though it's a 30 mile an hour road there and we are intending to provide appropriate separation from the carriageway. We do recognise that was a weakness there. And so the schema will be changed to extend the cycle track into a call road, as this default path will become a cycle track also to provide an alternative route.

50:21

Okay, thank you. But bear in mind, I haven't seen those plans. Just if you could just take me through on this plan here. What so what what would a cyclist do to get onto the road to go towards his goal? I don't know what the road is. Is it a road? thankful road? Yes.

50:44

Well, I saw a site a cyclists would obviously use the cycle track and turn into a call road, and then it would be made to rejoin the carriageway. I dropped the filters. I say the detail hasn't been worked through as yet.

51:00

Okay, so the story of the road which goes on this planet, it's heading. There's like a crossroads. Isn't that? So the black hatch was a road and then to the south west of that there's a road which which travels to Lynwood? Yes. So from the cycle path, a cyclist would walk stop there and then cross the road, it would

51:27

rejoin the carriageway via a drop facility to progress into liquid run 50 metres

51:33

before that in turning right into the road, which heads towards Lynwood? Yes. Okay. But you're proposing in your, in your what you're proposing in the future is for that to continue around the corner into that particular road?

51:52

That's right, because we recognise that was a an oversight there, we recognise the the issue of the ATVs at seasonal times.

52:02

And in that case, can you just explain a little bit what what you do how you do think the cycle path will be segregated from the road?

52:13

The it won't be physically segregated, it will be a separation distance, which may also take account of any strips hard strips that upright on the carriageway recommend recommended separation very much relates to the prevailing speed limit. And as you are aware, the speed limit over the bridge can be reduced to 30 mile an hour. Okay, high speed road.

52:38

So would effectively be the same at the same level as the road, but it would be there what it would have a different type of service thing, or would there be a barrier between it or how would it work?

52:53

It'll be there'll be kerbed. EBIT, you know, won't be at the same on be flush with the carriageway. But the obviously the sort of separation will be a distance to a curb. And then your cycle facility.

53:13

Okay, sorry, I don't really understand. So you have the you'd have the road. And then where the cycle path is, there'd be a curve, and then you'd have a cycle path. So there would be some something to synchronise. Yes. Okay, is it might be useful to provide some, I don't know, like, example type of section or something. To show you how that how that might work. I suppose I'm struggling my mind see how that's that's how that would be dealt with.

53:55

I think it would be easier if we provide you with a section.

54:00

Okay, I mean, there is a section for the bridge anyway. Does that not show like some kind of physical separation?

54:14

The days that there's a separation distance, but there is no when you mean by physical I thinking of a barrier or something. There's no barrier.

54:26

There's not though. Okay. I think it might be useful just to just to show what the was, you know, what potentially. The road might look like there in order to separate cyclists and walkers from the road. Yes.

Okay, thank you. Before we move on, is there anybody else would like to mention anything about the design of cycleways and footpaths? Mr. Gates?

55:22

Good afternoon, sir. Thank you. I don't know if this might be more appropriate later. But it seems to be appropriate just at this level before we move on. And it says, I've listened to this, these proceedings this week. And of course, I've been involved from the very beginning with the consultation. And no mention has been made so far, in respect of demand, to the petition, that the community was able to raise and present to highways England, which had 1035 signatures to the effect, the different crossing and the APR path were provided, they would use it. At one time, at a meeting here in Burlington, with new hires admin team came to me, I did ask them, since they weren't evidently considering that to be the proof they were looking for, because they were continuing to refuse to give these things. How many signatures would we have had to have gathered, in order for them to take notice? They weren't able to answer that question. But I think it has a relevance to these proceedings, and indeed to other proceedings in other communities, if we're to be asked our opinion, if we're to be asked to contribute, and then our contributions are so similarly dismissed. It's disappointing to say the least. Can I ask through Newser, the highways England addresses expression? Because I think there are lots of communities would like to know, just how many signatures Do you have to get on a petition to get some notice taken? Thank you.

57:03

Thank you, Mr. Gates. So perhaps the applicant could just address whether there has looked at, you know, potential demand for crossing in the cetera scheme, rather than just looking at how people currently use the network. Sorry, can I could my colleague or my colleagues, please take down the plan? I think we finished with that for now. Thank you.

57:40

So there was a number of points in in that. Firstly, the design of the scheme is evidence led in terms of the in terms of the use of the crossing. And we've been through that already at earlier sessions today. So I don't intend to repeat myself, unless that would help. You know, in terms of Mr. Gates, his question of how many signatures would it take? There is no answer to that. It's a it's a matter of judgement, evidence and design. Again, sir, as I get as I raised it, an earlier answer to you to your questions this morning. But I think so in the interest of inquiry, sorry, if examination time. I think I've already answered the questions earlier today in terms of the considerations taken into account.

58:38

Okay. Yeah, but can you say so, can you just expand on perhaps, like future demand, how that might have been taken into account or latent demand, I guess, for people who perhaps might want I want to use the crossing here, rather than the people stay at the moment.

58:59

It's a consideration that would feed into decision making but of course it requires evidence. And the petition was before highways England It was a consideration as were many other factors and crossings have been provided at blofield and the B one one, b 1140. Which we say provide suitable connection.

59:25

Okay, and what I mean how do you deal with petitions what weight Do you give to a petition?

59:33

Weight of course, though, is a matter of judgement. It is a material consideration. There is not an amount of weight that is prescribed by policy or by statute. I can put in a higher than say it is a material consideration. The weight is a matter for you. There are other we say more weighty factors, as set out earlier, which would include the evidence of use which would include cost which would include potential impact of solutions such as landscape heritage, drainage, etc, etc.

1:00:11

Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Gates. Was there anything else you wanted to say? Well, I

1:00:21

very briefly about Mesa, and it says, since the petition specifically referred to a burlingham crossing and the April path to say that the blofield and White House crossings answer the point is convenient, rather misleading. The petition was specifically about our local conductivity, and 1035 sS 1035 Plus is just the latest edition sedco hieros, England was 1000 3035 people would have used a blofield a Berlin crossing, if one were provided by highways England. Now, this might have some relevance here in the lead to continue to collection. But there would seem to be very little point if patos England really give no weight, to my point would be at the risk of sounding good. If I had to put in 2000 signatures or 5000 signatures or 10,000 signatures. what point would these people who have relatively little local knowledge we're in the I think the fourth iteration of a chain there, Jonathan, on living, that we're headed, the first team was a good deal more across from anybody else I've met since. But since local knowledge doesn't seem to be tremendously strong, and I provide local knowledge in the form of mass signatures asking for caution. At what point did you get listened? I don't understand the glib dismissal.

1:02:02

Okay, well, I think the applicants, Mr Robson probably answer that as it is one factor of the number of factors that highways England has taken into account. But Mr. Gates, I would just like to ask you also so the proposal to upgrade the east to west path to a cycle path as well as a footpath would that alleviate some of your concerns.

1:02:32

It would certainly make it more suitable for cycling. Yes, okay. Can't deny it and make it more suitable recycling, whether anybody uses it. But that from burning remains to be seen. You won't get kids cycling all the way up to blofield. And all the way back down to get to Lynwood road to go to school. That's not going to happen. But I do accept it'll be useful for cycling. Okay, thank you, Mr. Gates. Thank you, sir. Okay, so before just before we move on, is there anybody else? Richard Bearman has got his hand up?

1:03:19

Yes, please, sir. Thank you very much. Uh, just to comment on Mr. Duckworth's view on the shared use facility at the south end that you so kindly put the plan up for? I pleased to hear that. I was in the thinking of extending that to link correctly with the April road for cyclists to both directions. But I would point out that the beginning and start of cycleways shared use are not shared use both at that point. And on the north side where they cross the slip roads of the a 47 particularly at su 11 on that diagram. There's some good practice and some very poor practice I would just offer from our cycling campaign to highways England who was adopted who owns our, our experience that looking at these things to say what will work and what won't work before he gets to the stage. It was having to have another discussion of the future. For one inspection, so I just make that offer to help help them get the design right in the first place. Okay, well, it'd

1:04:25

be useful. Mr Robson, if you could liaised with Norwich cycling campaign. I believe there was some I believe they have tried to liaise of the past. Is that right? Mr. Robson, you were intending to formulator sales of common ground at one point?

1:04:50

They Yes. So that's That's my understanding. There's been my understanding is that there's been no response from the the group to Meeting invitations. The invitation remains there. And we'd be happy to liaise with her. Sorry, the point that I would make, and I think this applies to Mr. Gates's earlier point is that the point of consultation is not to do precisely what every console t asks. The point of consultation is to take views at an earlier stage and there are legal requirements of it. We have met the requirements of consultation and considered considered the views of consultees I don't think there's evidence that we have not considered them. But the fact that something has not

1:05:44

been taken forward is if you can make the process smoother by liaising with relevant groups. We can do that. So with with it, so Mr. Bearman? Yes. Mr. Robson said that they will liaise with you over this matter. Can I be happy for me to leave that with you? Because we knew the applicant for the time being?

1:06:09

Yes, that's fine. For the time being. We have a fairly long history of informal consultation with Norfolk County Council. But as I apologise if we didn't get back to Mr. Robson's team, at the right time, but it's specifically about cycle lane design and cycle lane aspects. We don't take a view on the wider consultation that they conducted. And unfortunately, we're not local residents. So just make that clear that we we weren't ignoring him. We just perhaps it passed us by because it was outside our usual area.

1:06:44

Okay, thank you. And if I could just go to Mr. Cumming. I mean, in terms of cycle path design, does it does it meet the Norfolk County Council guidance or standards? Or? I mean, are you satisfied with that shared cycle paths?

1:07:07

This is David Cumming Norfolk County Council did the only comment that we have raised in in respect of this is that we would like to see a three metre width as as has been discussed previously, that that was additional policy and guidance that came out during the development of this scheme. And that should be taken into account. Now Norfolk County Council is currently not just us, but working with others to understand exactly how that might best be applied in a rural area, because it does have a lot of urban focus to it. So as I say, in terms of the provision, our one request is that three metres is considered as a width instead of 2.5 metres, but otherwise, we are content with it.

1:08:06

So the moment all the other side cycleways at footpaths to be 2.5 metres, is that right? That's the proposal as I understand it, sir. Okay, is that is that not that the applicant understands? That That is correct. Okay, you were talking about two metres earlier though.

1:08:27

Sorry, sorry. And that there is some constraints along the D trunk section of the a4 to somewhere there are some mature trees arrived. Okay, with that there may be pinch points that we have to deal with.

1:08:41

Okay, and okay. So will you be continuing to liaise or is it feasible to to increase the width by half metre or not?

1:08:53

Then we need to look at that was part of the detailed design

1:08:56

as part of the detailed design. Okay, yeah. You've got your microphone off mister coming. So,

1:09:05

thank you. Yes, I wanted to raise one further point, if I may, which was in connection to what Mr. Bearman had to say on the greater than average local cycling and walking infrastructure plan. That is a document that the county council LED on in producing an a draft of that went out for consultation earlier in the spring stroke early summer. So if you would find it useful. I'm more than happy to submit that into the examination.

1:09:37

Well, that's I suppose up to you so sorry, just as a consultation state alone was not adopted document.

1:09:44

That that's correct. So they think the consultation status has passed, but I don't understand that it has been adopted yet.

1:09:53

Okay. Thank you. So Okay, before we move on any final comments on this agenda item? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands up. So I'm going to move on. So, then on to the fourth bullet point there was I think we might have picked up on this potentially at the compulsory acquisition acquisition hearing possibly. But there was a mention from some interested parties of the potentials prior to foot path link from high new lane to the proposed blofield overbridge as well as gating the access and understand from the applicants response there was intending to respond to these to this matter as a as future deadline as applicants as applicant consider this any further.

1:11:05

Philip Robson, highways England. So I wonder if I might invite Mr. Duckworth.

1:11:11

I can bring up a plan if that were us. Well, I think it would be sheets. I think it'd be sheet one of the access plans, please. Sorry, I misspoke. We'll just take a fast okay. Okay, so, apologies. It'll be sheet two.

1:11:52

I think. Okay. Is it slightly to the left hand side? Yes. So it's not it's not totally clear from this plan. But I think

1:12:28

that's worth the inset. Be. I think that's high that's going up towards fight that's high noon lane. And so from that point there to the closer field overbridge, which is on the right hand side. There was there's been some few some requests, whether a footpath could be incorporated, between hi new lane and of blofield overbridge. or some kind of footway. Yes. comments.

1:13:05

Yes. I understand the request for a footwear came in from Mr.Randlesome. It was it was in that area. Apparently, currently in walks down the verge of the the geocache re a 47 nips across through the geocache berry section into Yarmouth road where there are no crossing footway facilities on it on his way to blofield. And I think the request has come through from Mr Randlesome We don't really anticipate pedestrian flows our activity to be significant in and the two way new two way road that's going in there. Already trunk 10 a 47. And so we were not intending to provide a full way in by comparison to existing practice, the flows will be extremely low, and they'll be suffered is there as well. So for the for the numbers of pedestrians, we're likely to anticipate that we will not proposing to provide a full week.

1:14:17

Okay. Right, perhaps you can put that you can respond, you can put that in. Explain that. The next deadline. As you as you did say you were going to one of the deadlines you might as well if possible, do that. So the next deadline, the cancer, thank you. Okay, so in that case, can we move on to the water environment? Please? And I just had two questions here. So there was relevant representation raised a concern over flood risk to a property long water though. The local authority in response to my

first written questions suggested in support of this concern and is asked broadland District Council the scope of what as to why you will also have concerns about this latter.

1:15:27

Blanaid Skipper broadland District Council, I understand from my, from my colleagues notes that we had expressed concern I would have to confer on this and give you give you a written response. I don't have the detail to hand. Okay. And so if I could just ask the the county, the county council Miss Luff Oh, yeah. Miss Luff. Hello.

1:16:00

Um, could you name which property is present? I don't know which one we're talking about this several in the Waterloo area.

1:16:06

It's the one to the very self, I think.

1:16:10

Okay, I've currently got the surface water flood map up, but we work from and this is one that is publicly available and as a dataset, but it's held from the Environment Agency at present various a one in 1000 year flow path that already runs through that property.

1:16:34

Yeah, so, in terms of the proposed scheme,

1:16:38

in terms of the proposed scheme, we have requested that the applicant maintain and improve upon the management to surface water on that flow path for which they have done that they are currently providing a clean water soak away to manage flows along that flow path. This is designed, I believe, to a one in 10 year standard, which we acknowledge is not the same as the one in 1000 year flow path. However, it will see some betterment for the lower flow periods, and will ultimately provide some relief, all these lower potential flood routes come through.

1:17:31

Okay, so it'll be an improvement over what's, what's the current situation is,

1:17:36

at the moment, it's not a significant improvement, but an improvement.

1:17:41

Okay, thank you very much for that. Can I just get caught some comments from the applicants? In response to that question also.

1:17:57

Sorry, if one of my colleagues could take down the footpath Plan B. That'd be good. Thank you. Mr. Humphrey. I can see you've got your hand up Welcome to in just a second. Mr. Ball. Hello,

1:18:13

Jason ball watering environment lead on sweco on behalf of the applicants, and yes, there is we recognise that there is existing surface water flooding problem in the vicinity of Waterlow properties. If I refer to the there's a plan which is part of the flood risk assessment, ap 110, annex B sheet two and that shows the existing surface water flow pathways not the surface water flow risk map. So Sara love referred to but the the the surface water flow pathways with the proposed scheme super imposed upon that figure was that it's it's in annex B, sheet two of the flood risk assessment. Okay. Okay, and MFIs assessed as part of the for risk assessment is we've looked at the upstream catchment to that point, pre and post with a ski with and without the scheme in place, and lots and there's no change in the upstream catchment draining to that point. So, what has been so and we have obviously the scheme does cross across across those existing surface water flow pathways. The And we've, as part of this scheme, there's a number of cross drains or dry culverts, which are designed to accommodate 100 year plus allowance for climate change to allow flow to continue and the flow paths are maintained through the scheme as closely to existing as we as we possibly can. And the downstream points near close to the water flow properties, the the as I've just mentioned, the upstream catchment is no different between the proposed and the existing and scenarios. So, where we have the the Clean Water soakaways they, as Sarah love rightly, rightly said, they will provide some benefit to in you know over an existing Greenfield runoff scenario and will help dissipate flows in her area. The other thing to point out is that the one of the Clean Water circle ways, one closest to the water flow property is does extend down and beyond the property. And that will encourage flows to go past effectively and into the soakaway itself. So, we hope and overall been, you know, with the intention of scheme as we've we've not intending to increase the risk and making making confirm that is the case. With that. With that with the proposed scheme in place.

1:21:52

Okay, thank you for that Mr. Ball. Mr. Humphrey, you've got your hand up.

1:22:00

Yes, David Humphrey, for broad Industry Council have dealt with flooding issues here in the past. And that was why I, after seeing the comments from one of the residents raise the pawn. Well, my concern is the proximity of SC five to the boundary. One thing that I'm not aware of is whether or not these properties benefit from mine sewerage. I'm not sure. And I wondered whether the the engineers who prepared the drawings have ascertained that situation, because my concern was I can see that it's quite possible that the introduction of these large soakaways will improve matters there. Whether or not it will affect the groundwater level and impede the soakage from the septic tank if indeed they do exist because they may be on mains sewerage, and I haven't checked.

1:23:17

Okay, does the applicant know the answer to that question? Mr vole, perhaps Miss Creedon? Hi, I'm Mary Creedon sweco. Drainage lead. So there's there was two aspects, I think to Mr. Allen press question. And one of them was, you know, a potential impact to the water table. And groundwater

monitoring was undertaken for four seasons, from 2018 to 2019. And we can confirm from that, that the Unsaturated Zone, which is the depth under the soakaways is substantial. And it's greater than the 1.2 metres that would be required to for soakaways. And, and it is therefore unlikely that it would be an impact on the groundwater table. So I think that was the first question.

1:24:34

Mr. Humphrey, does that. Does that answer your particular question on that?

1:24:38

Yes, yes, yes, it does. I mean, it's a natural dip. But if, as you say, you can maintain the groundwater level below, below the ground, as you state in your calculations on the plan, but but but but from what you say we lower than that as well and that what is happening is And improvement, it just seemed very close to the, to the by

1:25:03

Yeah. So that was the second aspect. So the final location then of the drainage elements such as soakaways will be subject to detailed design due to the topographical and hydrogeological positioning, but they will be set back by 10 metres from the edge of the development and any properties. So, I appreciate what you're looking at is it's not it's not so much an indicator of outline. I mean, size wise it it's it is, you know, similar to what it is will be in detailed design, but it will be set back the boundary or from the, the actual from the boundary

1:25:42

of the property boundary by both did you say 30 metres?

1:25:46

No. 1010. Yep. And that that is greater than the five metre setback recommended by Barry digest 365 soakaway design, do you?

1:25:58

Okay, well, thank you very much for that reassurance. Okay.

1:26:01

So does that say whether or not they have mains connection that you say that that's not an issue anymore? Well, I

1:26:11

think so. Because I've just received a reassurance that you know, the groundwater level will not will be at least 1.2 metres below the surface and will not meet the surface. You know, the design is such So, yes, that that reassures me.

1:26:30

Okay, thank you, Mr. Humphrey. And say it could I was asked Ms Luff as well. Does that. You happy with?

1:26:48

That? I've just double checked on our system barriers, no records on our information that there is a mains surface water or foul drainage network in that area.

1:27:06

Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. Actually, while you're well, while you're, there's love here. We we had a conversation about the draft decio. And there's a requirement for detail, design of drainage systems and the Mr. Cumming was suggesting that the LFA, local lead flood authority was a console T. Yes, please. But however, the question was raised, and I think this coming was going to go back to you that because the local authority is already a console T and you're you would be consulted anyway, is there actually a requirement to is there actually a necessity to include you specifically as a as a console t

1:27:55

in context, we put this request together for all of the a 47 schemes were to the other two schemes within consideration at the moment, actually connect were watercourses, whereas this scheme does not. And we were looking to retain our role in ordinary watercourse consenting, that was where our concern and consideration was when we requested this however, the email but this discussion was happening in it was talking across the board across all three schemes, the one at blofield was included in that package be discussed.

1:28:41

Okay. So. So in terms of the requirements in the draft development, consent order, which I think was requirement,

1:28:55

bear with me, requirement 830 with surf and foul water drainage. It is my understanding from Mr. Cumming that the local lead flood authority requested to be a specific console t although, so my question is, Is that necessary yet, given that the local planning authorities already consulted and they automatically consult you in any case,

1:29:19

they may automatically consult us. But we just wanted to ensure that we continue to have oversight of what was going on in the local area.

1:29:28

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, sir. And then just one last question on on the water environment. So I understand that the environment agency's peak river flow, climate change allowances were updated in July, can I just ask the applicant, whether this has any bearing on the flood risk assessment or if anybody else would like to comment on that as well but our last applicant first

1:29:56

Jason ball speaker on behalf of the applicants Yes, sir your eyes There are some new climate change allowances for people that have low. And because we're not considering fluvial flood risk or we are considering fluvial flood risk, but there's no interaction with any flooville river systems within the scheme area. There's business, there's no need for consideration of the updated allowances.

1:30:27

Okay, thank you. So that was, so your number was a problem? Yeah. I beg your pardon. Sorry. Sorry. A simple. Thank you. Mr. Humphrey Joo, would you call her?

1:30:46

Hi, Sarah Luff from the LFA. Yes, I concur with that conclusion.

1:30:50

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Humphrey.

1:30:53

Yes, it's just to prove your flow that has caused issues in the past.

1:30:58

Okay, thank you. So before we move on to agenda item eight. Does anybody else have any thing they wish to? mentioned or any comments on the water environment? Okay, I'm seeing no hands raised. So I'll move on. So agenda estimates is review of issues and actions rising, similar to other hearings. My suggest I put the list together. I also understand that the applicant has been taking notes, so you should be aware of all the points has been made that correct. Mr. Robson? Mr. Dagg? Yes, that's correct. We are making notes like that. So I intend to publish all the action points for all the hearings in one place at the same time, shortly after today. In that case, I'll move on to any other matters. Hello,

1:32:19

associates. Mr. Robson? might my camera my microphone when turning on? Okay. Did you get an answer to your question, sir, about notes?

1:32:27

Yes, I did. Thank you. Thank you, sir. So before I move on to close the hearing, are there any other matters relating to the environmental matters discussed today, which haven't been covered that anyone has any concerns about?

1:32:49

Okay, I'm saying no hands raised. So in that case, I'll move on to agenda item nine. I just like to thank you very much for your participation in the hearing today. And it's been extremely helpful and useful for me. And I really appreciate everybody's patience. So there's some people have been sort of hanging around till the end of the day. But it has been really useful to me. And thank you for that. A digital recording of the proceedings will be made available as soon as possible on the project page of the national infrastructure website. Mr. Robson?

1:33:28

So I don't know if I missed any other matters. I'm having some, some technical difficulties that may end.

1:33:34

I Well, I asked if there are any other matters, and there were no hands raised.

1:33:39

So I think I must have missed it. So So one other matter from from the applicants. We have three days reserved in September for my understanding was that they were for potential overflow hearings if needed, if matters weren't completed during the sessions this week. So forgive me if you've already covered this. It's just started raining very heavily here and it seems to have found my Wi Fi into disarray. But it certainly significant progress has been made. So we hope we've assisted you in reaching that getting the necessary information for your report. And we'd welcome your direction as to whether or not those additional days for the first second or third of September will or will not be needed. So just so that diaries etc can be managed.

1:34:39

Yes. Okay. So, what what I intend to do is to inform everybody on the website whether that will or will not happen. And I intend to do that either. Shortly after this hearing or it We'll be on probably on Monday or Tuesday. So rather than making a decision on that now, yes. But I'm, you know, I'm happy with the way there is we've gotten this week. And I just need to reflect, just take some time to reflect. And I will update the project page in the national infrastructure websites, as soon as practical.

1:35:26

Thank you. Thank you, sir, in that case, and so can I just thank you on behalf of the applicant for the way that you've run these sessions. It's always helpful when it's done in a inquisitorial way, and we think it's been done that way. We hope we've provided the answers and the information that you need, of course, we've undertaken to reply in writing, we will of course, do so by the deadlines. Thank you very much, sir. From the applicant. Okay,

1:35:54

thank you, Mr. Robson. So I'll move on to close to the hearing again.

1:36:01

I was talking about that a digital recording of the proceedings will be made available on the website. And in addition, I request that you submit in writing the points that you have made here today for publication on the website. The deadline for these written submissions is deadline for on Thursday, the ninth of September 2021. The time is now 336. And I can confirm that this issue specific hearing into environmental matters for the a 47 Bluefields North burning project is now closed.