

# TEXT\_A1iN\_OFH2\_Session1\_22022021

Mon, 2/22 7:00PM • 24:46

00:03

Good evening. Can I just confirm that everybody can hear me please?

00:12

Thank you.

00:13

Can I also confirm with Miss Patterson that live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:20

The live streaming has commenced. Mr. Pinto. Thank you very much. For those people watching the live stream, can I also advise you that should we at any point adjourn proceedings this evening, we will have to stop the livestream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result, at the point at which we recommend to meeting in restart to livestream you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream. I'll remind you of this again should we need to return

00:53

the time is now 630. And it's time for this meeting. To begin. I would like to welcome you all to this open floor hearing for the application made by highways England for the a one in Northumberland, more Perth to Ellen gem. The development proposed comprises two parts, with Part A being the widening of the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway for approximately 12.6 kilometres of the existing one between more Perth and Felton. It includes approximately 6.5 kilometres of online widening in 6.1 kilometres of new offline highway. Part B involves the widening of the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway for approximately eight kilometres of the existing a one between Henrique and Ellington.

01:47

Thank you for attending this virtual meeting. My name is Andre Pinto. I'm a chartered town planner in planning inspector employed by the planning Inspectorate. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel for the examination of this application. I'm now going to ask my fellow panel member to introduce himself.

02:10

Good evening. My name is Kevin Gleason. I'm also a chartered town planner. I'm a plumbing inspector employed by the planning inspectors that been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing Communities and Local governments to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application.

02:29

Thank you, Mr. Gleason. Together we constitute the examining authority for this application. And we will be reporting to the Secretary of State for Transport with a recommendation as to whether development consent order should be made.

02:45

We will have all already spoke you have already spoken and heard from Candice Patton, who is the case manager for this project. Miss Patterson has been supported today by James Bunton and George Harold, who are members of the case team and who you are likely to come into contact with during the course of the examination. Before I continue, can I ask if we have anyone in attendance that was not present at the hearing this morning? I don't believe we do. But if we do, could you please confirm?

03:24

And I don't believe that that we do so since we were all present at this morning's hearing. And I would suggest that to be isn't a need for us to go through in great detail. And in great detail through the practical arrangements for the virtual meeting today. And I assume that we are all aware that the digital recording of this hearing is being made in that it will be retained and published is to form a public record of the hearing for a period of five years from Secretary of State's decision in debt to general data protection regulations applies.

04:04

Can I ask if anyone disagrees with us proceeding with a hearing on this basis?

04:16

Okay, we'll get out suggested that we in that case proceed on the spices. The formal purpose of the open for hearing is to discharge our duty as the examining authority to hear interested parties who requests to be heard. decrease.

04:35

ditties is an opportunity for us to hear firsthand about your thoughts about the application.

04:43

And like other hearings, we are not going to ask our people here to introduce themselves at this point, but we'll ask individuals who wish to speak to do so when they wish to address the hearing. If we proceed much beyond an hour, then we will schedule a brief

05:00

Conflict break.

05:02

So this address is the first item on the agenda, which is welcome introductions and arrangements for the hearing. Are there any questions of an introvert in introductory memory or preliminary nature before I move on to item two?

05:23

Okay, I'll move on to item two.

05:27

The examining authority may ask questions of the interested parties and the applicant about matters arising from written and oral submissions. Each interested party in attendance and wishing to speak will be invited to put on an oral submission in a time guide of 10 minutes per interested party will be applied to the submissions. Nevertheless, considering the number of people attending today's hearing, we are willing to be flexible on our timescales, the applicant will be provided with a summary with a summary right to reply, a time guide of three minutes will be applied to these submissions. And again, we are willing to be flexible under the circumstances.

06:16

In excess of our letter of the sixth of January provided notice of the hearings, invited requests to appear at hearings and asked for any interested parties wishing to participate in hearings to notify the planning Inspectorate by deadline one to 12 for January. As such determining authority has decided to conduct to open for hearings today.

06:39

This is the second open for hearing and this morning, we heard from Mr. Collymore and from Mr. Fell of Brookfield consultancy, can I please now ask if anyone wishes to speak today.

07:07

Mr. Horse, I believe? Yes. Good evening. I would like to make a short little response to your mind.

07:17

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Horse. Can I confirm if there are any other person that wish to speak today?

07:27

Oh, is it just Mr. Horton, Mr. Horse.

07:38

Our proceed on the basis that it will be just Mr. Horse wishing to speak today.

07:45

Therefore set out in the agenda. A timecard has been given for 10 minutes. We'll be flexible on these timings.

07:55

So this actually concludes item two on the agenda. And I will now hand over to Mr. Gleason.

08:07

So apologies. Apologies. Mr. Horse. Would you like to speak now on item two apologies.

08:17

Yes, I'm leaving myself off the video on the basis that my internet isn't great. So if you do lose you, I do apologise in advance. But hopefully we can get through this without any technical glitches. And just to reiterate, my name is Marcos. I'm attending this session on behalf of North Gate farm residents. My family and I have lived at that property for over 25 years and pride to this planning submission. I'd expected to make this our forever home. So we're just sending a bit of a context there behind why I feel so passionate and

08:55

revolt this forces

08:58

as part of deadline to we did submit a written representation as I suggested, which highlighted the scale and wide reaching impact the plans have on our property.

09:11

In simply following the advice Nortel wasn't expecting to speak to do hide intended for the written deadline submission to stand on its own feet as a statement of my concerns. However, I think it's fair to say I spent the best part of the weekend reading through the deadline through response from the applicant. And it's fair to say I felt compelled to at least hear something in response to that today, I'm afraid.

09:43

So, continue please, with that in mind. So um, so in reading the deadline three response. I was surprised by the extent to which the applicant had gone to defend the plans and counted each and every question

10:00

CRN realised in my submission.

10:03

Unfortunately, many of the responses were out of context, I'm getting clewd a number of inaccuracies. I certainly intend to follow up that by providing a written responses and deadline for to flag those to make sure that we have got consistency and correctness there.

10:22

But what I did find particularly disappointing in reading art, is that the majority of responses were very dismissive of my concerns of the concerns raised and 30 subjective in assessing the adverse impact.

10:37

The This is in stark contrast to the 30 positive onsite meeting, we got on the 11th of February, where we did agree some mitigation measures to minimise impact,

10:50

or Bay, that meeting did take 18 months to have that meeting and one room struggling to understand why there was such a marked difference between what I read over the weekend and the work deadline, three, response and the positive meeting we had on the ground on site. And it just doesn't tell you somehow there's something amiss there. But nonetheless, so my frustration is very much highlighted that in written form, my concerns have been dismissed too readily. But on the ground, when we have a meeting, they are being listened to. It just seemed rather strange,

11:28

just as a way of further illustration of that frustration, authority useful to maybe provide a couple of examples.

11:36

So the first example looks at current plans, which I've documented today, include provision to procure 300 square metres of permanent rights, and the construction of a new shared access road through part of our woodland garden, which is currently, which currently provides a peaceful private retreat with a very, very pleasant outlook. And this was actually recognised by one of the applicants in the recent visit I mentioned above.

12:06

However, with the introduction of the new access road, we will no longer be able to enjoy this part of the garden the same way. And that's something that we are adamant about. And unfortunately, in response, the article is written the following statement,

12:23

the loss of a limited number of trees anticipated to be less than 10 is not anticipated to significantly significantly reduce the enjoyment of the garden space. Now, I do not understand how the applicant is qualified to offer such a strong subjective opinion, as they have never had the opportunity to enjoy this or don't understand how we use it. So I'm just trying to put across the sense of frustration that that issue that concerns been so readily dismissed, without actually understanding why it has such a big impact. In looking at another example, which is very much simpler and clearer. We currently have the benefit of the x one five bus service to Newcastle, which stops right outside our house. This is no longer this is going to be removed as part of the new plans. This means that we now have to walk two kilometres through one lit fields across three neighbouring properties to cut to the same service. Now, for obvious reasons, this is not realistic, a realistic option for my family, especially on dark winter nights like tonight.

13:35

The applicant in response to this, as suggested

13:41

was it's recognised that there will be an increase in tuning length to residence, the African does not believe that this constitutes a significant adverse effect on the property. Now, again,

13:54

if this was the only issue, then I wouldn't be at this meeting. I would not even I would not have had to endure five years of stress and pain following the planning process. Unfortunately, there are a number, there are a number, another 50 these sorts of issues and concerns and when you're accurate, aggregate them together to form a significant adverse impact upon the property.

14:18

Now, on the 13th of January, the African did agree to have a meeting to explicitly look at these issues as a whole, which are very much welcomed. That meeting is yet to materialise, despite a number of efforts to set it up. I am optimistic that when the meeting does take place, I will be able to demonstrate that these are genuine issues and unfortunately do have an adverse effect upon the property. If the issues can be recognised by that as genuine, then I think there's a far greater chance of finding a solution together where we can mitigate this and make these plans better. I just feel we hadn't had the opportunity opportunity to do that. So we can

15:00

close now we'd like to just reissue one thing I did say in my original submission as part of the deadline to, in principle, we do not oppose the general aims of the scheme. But do not believe the current plans represent the optimum solution. Certainly not in respect to my own property.

15:23

Thank you, Mr. Horse. Thank you very much for that. And I'm now going to give the applicant an opportunity to briefly respond. Mr. bassford.

15:39

Good evening list, Anto? Thank you very much. Mr. Mr. Hawes provided a very full submission to the examination in writing and, and it's perhaps worth me explaining a little about how we're obliged to deal with that.

16:00

Because of the way the law works, if we don't address a point, we could be deemed to accept it even if we absolutely disagree with it. And that means if Mr. Hawes raises 50 points, we have to deal with all 50 points. And that that unfortunately, means my resources,

16:21

consulting engineers, resources, and highways, England's resources are all deployed in addressing lengthy submissions. And that, unfortunately, is one of the aspects of the English legal system the way it works. So so that is, sadly, a fact of life when there are long submissions made. The second second thing I would make is that Mr. Horse says that

16:44

asks what qualifications we have to make judgments about impacts on his property. Now,

16:51

it's always important to remember the difference between subjectivity and objectivity. Now, the views which are expressed by the applicants, experts are objective, which is to say they are the expert views of professional witnesses, which are not affected by the subjective enjoyment of the location. And so they are much more neutral than those would be for a resident and Mr. Hawes will obviously as this is his home, feel the impacts and the prospective impacts of a development to a greater extent, which is why it's very important that you pay attention as examining inspectors to the objective evidence that is before you.

17:37

The next thing to pick up though, reflecting on that is why things are different when we talk to Mr. Hall in private to how they may be before you. For the reasons I've explained, we have to address all of the points raised and we have to defend them properly. However, in private and what we call without prejudice discussions, we can have negotiations and discussions about how we can accommodate Mr. Hall, and that is why the appearance in a private discussion will be very different to the appearance before you. We are very hopeful that we can continue to have discussions with Mr. Hawes in relation to the impact of the scheme on his property, and to arrive at engineering solutions that are able to accommodate his concern so far as possible.

18:26

In relation to the couple of items he mentioned, the first one is about the impact upon trees, and the way that the access track will be developed. This is the private means of access that will serve Mr. Hall's property or being well. And

18:47

the final effects upon the trees that are in this location are yet to be decided. And the I can tell you that our experts have been at on site and looks at these sites. And we're hopeful that the access track can be micro sighted, which means we adjust it at a very sort of fine level so that as many of the trees as possible can be avoided. And so I don't think we're going to commit to a particular number of trees, but we can say that we hopefully will be able to minimise the impact on the existing trees and the environment around Mr. Hall's home as much as possible.

19:30

The next thing to say is that we are hoping to have the long awaited discussion with Mr. McKee and Mr. Hawes, Mr. Nikias, Mr. Hall's agent, with a view to looking at the overall impacts on the property and those matters obviously, which go to potentially to questions such as compensation which are obviously not for you. And then just the final point is in relation to the impacts of the scheme on the bus

20:00

Lay by and the bus stop that that has to be moved as a result of the scheme, because it cannot be located in the position that it was previously. Because simply if the change geometry resulting from the project, so

20:15

that that is noted and assessed as an adverse impact, and you will, in your recommendation for Secretary of State, no doubt, take that into account. So, we would say overall that we we hope very much to continue to discuss with Mr. Halls to address the points that the concern concern him, I am aware of some discussions which may be fruitful about the possible configuration of the access to accommodate him, we can take away the point in relation to impacts on trees. And we know that there are efforts being made to hold a meeting with Mr. Hawes and Mr. McKee

20:52

fairly soon, which the objective is to reach an accommodation on the conservative Mr. Horse in relation to all of these points so far as possible. Hopefully that assists you, sir.

21:04

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. basford. And,

21:10

Mr. Horse. And just real quickly, I think that you have mentioned previously, on your intervention that

21:21

you intend to actually submit, also a written representation following your oral presentation today? Can I just confirmed it that is to the retention. So I think it's necessary for completeness and for everyone to have a consistent view of things. Okay, that's, that's very helpful. Thank you very much.

21:46

We look forward to that sound, obviously, we will address it in our submissions. And it as it whatever length is required. Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Boss for

21:58

that is very helpful as well. Mr. Horse, can I just please ask you to lower your hand? I believe it's still up. Sorry. It's not easy to understand whether it's law or not. Is that gonna? Yes, it is. Thank you very much, Mr. Wallace. That's fine. And can I just confirm before I move on, that the situation has not changed, in terms of no one else wishes to actually intervene at moments

22:31

and present a case orally to us now at moment.

22:38

Perfect, thank you very much. And therefore, This now concludes item two on the agenda. I will now hand over to Mr. Gleason for the remaining items.

22:54

Thank you, Mr. Pinto. So just to review, issues and actions arising. I think from that discussion. There's effectively only one item arising or action points, which is that Mr. Hawes who submits representations at deadline for the applicants will respond to those. And in a related matter, further meeting with Mr. Hawes and Mr. McKee will take place soon.

23:31

Are there any other items which anyone wishes to raise?

23:36

On that point?

23:39

Nope. Okay, then.

23:41

So move on to item four next steps. Are there any other items of a general nature and or wishes to raise at this point?

23:54

I can no no hearing anything.

23:58

So on that basis, I think we're about to end today's hearing.

24:05

Thank you for attending the hearing and sharing your views on the proposed developments. We will of course take those into accounts in considering the application moving forward.

24:17

That concludes the upper floor hearings for today.

24:22

Just to say that the next hearing will be 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, which is issue specific hearing one dealing with the draft long consent order. So on that basis, I can now confirm that this open for hearing is closed at five to seven. Thank you very much.