

TEXT_A1iN_ISH2_Session1_25022021

Thu, 2/25 11:53AM • 1:34:59

00:04

Good morning. Can I just confirm that people can hear me clearly?

00:09

Yes. Thank you. Yes.

00:11

Can we also confirm with Miss Patten that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:21

The livestreams commenced. Thank

00:23

you.

00:24

Thank you very much. For those people watching the live stream, should we attend the points adjourn proceedings today, we'll have to stop the livestream in order to give us clear recording files. Therefore, at the point of which we commenced the meeting, and restart the 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 adjourn. The time is now 10 o'clock and time for this hearing. To begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters in relation to the application made by Highways England for the one in Northumberland, Morpeth to Ellingham. The development proposed comprises two parts, with Part A being the widening of the existing carriageway to a dual carriageway for approximately 12.6 kilometres and the existing one between more than Felton includes approximately 6.5 kilometres of online widening 6.1 kilometres of new offline highway. Part B involves the widening of existing single carriageway to dual carriageway for approximately eight kilometres of the existing A1 between Anneke Canal engine. Thanks, thank you for attending this virtual meeting. My name is Kevin Gleeson. I'm a chartered town planner. I'm a planning inspector employed by the planning Inspectorate and have been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing Communities and Local Government to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm not going to ask my fellow panel member to introduce himself.

02:16

Good morning. My name is Andre Pinto and I am also a chartered town planner and 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.

02:32

Thank you. Together we constitute the examining authority for this application. And we'll be reporting to the Secretary of State for Transport with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. You will have already spoken to and heard from Candice Patton, who's the case manager of the project. Miss Patten is being supported today by James Bunsen and George Harold, who are members of the case team you're likely to come into contact with during the course of the examination. If you have any questions about the examination process, or the technology we're using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. Their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you received from us on the project page at the national infrastructure websites. Next, I'd like to ask those of you that were with us for hearings earlier in the week just to be patient for next few minutes. While I'm going through a few housekeeping the introduction matters you will already have heard. Firstly, I'd like to deal with matters which is specific to a virtual event, as some of you here today may not have attended one of the previous virtual hearings. So this hearing is being held on the Microsoft team's platform and is being live streamed. In order to minimise background noise, can you please make sure your phone is switched off or turned to silence? And that you stay muted unless you're speaking? As this is a virtual meeting, we have structured it in a way the questions or points that you may wish to raise can be done so the relevant points in the proceedings. When we get to those points. I'd ask that if you want to speak use the Microsoft team's hands up function to be advised that may be too late before you can see it. And please wait to be invited to speak at the appropriate time. Can we also remind people that the chat function on Microsoft Teams won't work. So please don't try to use this to ask any questions or post any comments. If you don't manage to ask your question or raise your points at the relevant point in the hearing, there will be an opportunity later Under Item eight on the agenda. Any other matters because the digital recordings we make are retained and published. They form a public record I can contain your personal information and switch the general data protection regulations apply. The Planning Inspectorate's practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it's important that you understand that you will be live streamed and recorded, and that the answer that the digital recording will be published. If you don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera when speaking. If you feel it's necessary to submit personal information, please provide this in a written documents that we can redact before publication. Does anyone have any questions with regards to this matter of privacy? No, thank you move on. So today's issue specific hearing is being held at the request of the examining authority, who wish to export a number of matters orally in respect of a range of environmental matters. As you will have seen from the examination timetable, there are further rounds of questions and other opportunities for hearings. Therefore, we'd like to reassure you that whilst you may think that we haven't examined the subject as fully as you may wish at this hearing, this may be because we're intending to cover it again, from a different perspective another day, or two additional written questions. The purpose of this examination is for the examining authority to examine the information submitted, both by the applicant and other interested parties and affected persons. As a result, we'd like to reassure you that we are familiar with the documents that you've sent in. So when answering the question, you don't need to repeat at length, something that has already been submitted. If you want to refer to information already submitted, we'd be grateful if you could give an appropriate pins examination Library Reference. Additionally, the first time you use an abbreviation, or an acronym, can you give the full title as there will be people here today or listening on the audio that may not be as familiar with the application, or documents as you are? Also, as we're

likely to have more speakers today than we've had in previous hearings? Can you please ensure for the benefit of the recording, the next time you speak you give your name.

07:35

While we accepted the majority of discussions will be undertaken by those parties that have requested to speak. This is a public examination. And therefore even if you haven't indicated that you wish to speak, if there is a point that you wish to make, please feel free to indicate at the relevant time that you want to contribute. The hearing today will be a structured discussion which will be led by the examining authority. This is based on the agenda that has already been published. The purpose of the hearing is to enable you to answer any questions that we may have to ensure that we have all the information we need in order to make our recommendation to the Secretary of State. I'd like now to turn to the agenda and if we could have that projected on screen please.

08:36

So the examination procedure rules require that at the start of the hearing, the examining authority shall identify the matters to be considered at the hearing. The agenda for this hearing for this hearing was placed on the project page of the inspector websites on 16th of February 2021. The substantive items on the agenda as follows. item two addresses the design of the proposed development and also provides the context for item three, which covers the landscape and visual impact of the scheme. item four will cover biters biodiversity ecology the natural environment, while item five will cover the water environment. The final substantive topic is transport and traffic, which forms item six. The agenda is for guidance only. We may add other issues for consideration as we progress will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of them. As with the hearings earlier in the week, we propose that the day will be split into three sessions each have approximately an hour and a half. At the completion of this session at around 1130 we'd have a break of half an hour before resuming at 12 and continuing until 130. The final session of the day would take place between 230 and four. as set out in the agenda is possible that all matters on the agenda will be discussed today. However, depending on progress, there may be a need to continue discussions tomorrow, Friday the 26th of February. We can therefore provide a provisional assessment of the likelihood of needing to return tomorrow at the start of the third session today, if that is appropriate. Nevertheless, come participants please make sure that they are available for both days. We are also aware of time constraints playing to one of the highways officers from Northumberland County Council, and we will endeavor to work around that so that he can participate. We'll will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made. And all questions asked and responded to. This may mean that we don't need all the timetable sessions. But if the discussions can be completed, and are likely to say longer than I anticipated, it may be necessary to prioritise matters, and refer others to further questions. Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions we ask. As I've mentioned, this is predominantly a written process. Therefore, if you can't answer the question that's being asked, or require time to get the information requested, then rather than giving a restricted or potentially Wrong answer, for the smooth running of the examination, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing? And we can then defer the questions next round of written questions or relate to hearing. So I'd now like to take the names of those who wish to speak at this hearing. Don't forget to state your name and who you represent. It could take the agenda down now from the screen please. So I'd like to start with the applicants please. We have Mr. bus with

12:12

our Good morning sir struggling with him find the cursor with my mouse there. Good morning. My name is Howard Bassford. I am a partner in the law firm, DLA Piper, UK LLP. I represent Highways England. And I am supported today by Mr. Michael Greig GREIG, who is a legal director in our firm and will also from time to time address you it may be in addition to Mr. Greg, we also have in attendance Mr. Mark Stoneman, who is highways England's project manager and Mr. David Morrow, who is a trust engineer with the with the global engineering consultancy WSP, who advise How is England in relation to environmental assessment and engineering. There are a legion of other people who I can introduce to you as required to address particular specialist items. But if I leave it at that with our 14 an hour, hopefully that will

13:26

assist. That's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Bassford. And can I now move on to representatives from Northumberland county council please?

13:39

Thank you, sir. My name is Katherine Robbie. I'm a chartered town planner with Northumberland County Council. And today I've got with me, dairy Francis, who is representing us for ecology. Mary Fisher from Stevenson holiday partnership representing us for landscape and visual impact issues. James Hitchin, from the lead local flood authority, Matthew pain from highways and David locks from highways.

14:13

Thank you very much. And from the Environment Agency, please. Hi,

14:24

I'm Lucy Mo. I'm a planner at the Environment Agency. I'm supported by five other people the hearing, they include Christoph Dobrowski, who is a biodiversity officer. Alister laboratory has a team of biologists Heather Harrison Cashman coordinator has a remit on the water Framework Directive on water quality. Don't think how the guy who's a flood risk officer and Carol bolt who is a solicitor in our legal team,

14:53

thank you very much. And ask anyone else who wishes to speak today. These Yes, so I can see. Mr. Hawes. Is it have your hand up? Yes. Good morning.

15:13

I certainly like to reserve the option to speak if you don't mind.

15:17

Yes, my name is Mark Hawes representing

15:20

North good foreign residents. And unfortunately, I'm

15:23

not supportive.

15:26

Okay. That's fine. Thank you very much, Mr. House. Anyone else who wishes to speak? As I've said, if you don't identify yourself now, there's still an opportunity later. If you do want to contribute to the hearing, that's fine. Mr. Horse, you still have your hand up and up function. If you could take that down, please. Thank you. So as indicated at the start of yesterday's hearing during today's arrangements, conference, details were provided for key documents, which were likely to be referred to throughout the hearing. The list isn't exclusive, but was provided to allow participants additional time to access documents. And now identify the general documents which we're likely to refer to at the start and at the start of each gender item will refer to further topic specific documents. So the general documents most likely to refer to our the traffic TCL which has a reference rep three double o five lands plans a PP double o six work plans. A PP double o seven general arrangement plans a PP double o eight count land construction environmental management plan or camp, which is rep three oh 14 the applicant's response to the examining authorities first in questions. We have one oh 32 the applicant's response to relevant representations. Rep one oh 64. The applicant's response to relevant representation double oh four, which is from the Environment Agency, and has a reference rep one. Oh, 65. Northampton County Council's local impacts report. Rep one Oh, 71. And the applicants' comments on that Rep. 325. And the applicant's comments on responses to the examining authorities. First written questions, which is rep two Oh 20. We will try and give notice when we are referring those documents so that people have time to get them on their own screens. So that addresses the first item on the agenda. Welcome introductions and arrangements for the hearing. Are there any questions of an introductory or preliminary nature? That's good, thank you. So let us move on to item two on the agenda, which is design. And as set out in the agenda, this is to consider how the proposed developments can deliver good design with a particular focus on structures. And for this item, I want to focus on the design of structures as set out within the structures engineering drawings and sections documents, which has an examination Library Reference of a PP o One, two. Now I'm going to begin by referencing the national networks national policy statement, and then NPS and section four deals with design, specifically section 4.28 4.29 4.32 and 4.33. So I want to refer to as 4.28 talks about design as being an integral consideration. 4.29 your first to visual appearance should be a key factor in considering the design of new infrastructure. 4.32 advises the secretary of state needs to be satisfied. The national network infrastructure projects are sustainable handed, aesthetically sensitive as they reasonably can be. And then I think the key section I want to focus on for now is paragraph 4.33, which says the use of professional independent advice on the design aspects of a proposal should be considered To ensure good design principles are embedded into infrastructure proposals. And there's a footnote which applies that statements for those 63 states that applicants can use the design council who can provide support for them for an encoding encouraged to design review for national significance schemes, and just check the wording that again,

20:35

yes, design council can encourage support and encourage design review nationally significant schemes, noting at this point that sound counsel doesn't exist. But the point is that design review is

recognised as an important consideration. So that provides some of the context. And I'd also like to refer back to some of the initial questions we asked in writing, particularly Gen 1.1. And, and Gen 1.2. And what we asked was, for the applicant demonstrates how the proposed developments incorporated the 10 principles of good design, and whether or not designed to take account of National Design Guide, the national infrastructure commission design principles, as in the applicants response, Rep. One Oh 32 comment was made. Design is not just about aesthetics, and set out a range of other considerations. And the compliance with these principles will ensure that the proposed development is beautiful or elegant, within the meaning of roads to good design. And the detailed response, demonstrating how the 10 principles of good design have been taken into account is set out in appendix Gen one. So, after that, somewhat lengthy introduction, apologies for that. And now, let's get to the key questions I want to raise. So how is England states design is not just about aesthetics. What I'd like is for demonstration that aesthetics have been addressed. Mr. Bassford, can you start on that, please? Thank you.

22:44

Thank you, sir. That Sorry, I'm just noting here. So the first thing to say is that in accordance with the National Policy Statement, highways England has complied with the enjoined to employ in line with 4.3, an independent professional advisor on good design and that advisor as the engineering consultancy, WSP, which includes among its many ranks of experts, the people who are here with me today, and the and the engineering designers, architects, bridge designers, and landscape architects who one would normally expect to support an application like this, it's important to realise that all of the professional advisors to an entity like highways England are independent. And all of us just like lawyers, such as myself, and engineering consultants, like WSP are independent. And so our professional representation, our professional representation here is, whilst we act in the best interests of our clients, we are also independent, and we give, give our expert views in that sense, and that's really important in the way that the English legal system works, because it means that inspectors such as yourself, can afford weight to the information that is being given. So that's the first point. Now there are two ways in which aesthetics are taken into account in relation to the design of this scheme. And they are first in relation to structures and second in relation to its performance as an asset within the landscape. In relation to the former. The design of structures is approached carefully. By the engineering team to ensure that the design is regressive within its environment, and appropriate for the locations in which it is being constructed. In relation to the latter, the matters that are taken into account are include the way that the landscaping for the project will take place in the too much hand in hand in relation to this scheme, in its environment, it's not appropriate to bring forward and my comic ski. And it is therefore appropriate that a more subtle, more nuanced approach has taken them to have statement architecture. And when one talks about beauty and the performance of the highway in its environment, one is considering about whether to our complimentary one to another, rather than having an eyecatcher or an element in the landscape, which is going to draw the eye to it. Now, I have I have said, a little there, but it is important that you hear from the experts. So the first person that I'm going to ask to speak to is Mr. David Morrow, who is the project management lead engineer in relation to this project for WSP, and He will speak to you in relation to the design of structures. I should then ask Mr. Williams to speak to you as the landscape architect has worked on this and many other schemes for highways England and is responsible for their performance in the landscape when he is advising. Mr.

Barrow, I wonder if you would, you would introduce yourself in relation to this, and then explain how aesthetics have been taken into account in the design of structures for this scheme.

26:52

Certainly, thank you very much, Mr. Bassford.

26:53

Thank you.

26:56

Good morning. My name is David Morrow, chartered civil engineer with WSP, on behalf of the applicant. With regard to the structural design of the river Coquet Bridge, our first aspect that we were looking to take on board was really the constraints of where we were building within, and the existing bridge that already exists, that spans over the river Coquet. And the design that we had, therefore, was to complement the existing which was going to remain and form the northbound carriageway of the new jewel section. So in terms of its positioning, its location, and alignment, that was partially pre determined by the existing bridge. And then the environmental constraints, and those within the river valley itself, which I'm sure others will come on to talk about in more detail later on in other parts of the agenda, where they're needed to be built into how the structural form could be built. As an early stage of the design, the scheme, producers and options report to look at different structural forms, this is all part of the design process set out within the dmr for which I was England, ask all the designers to, to follow along to. And they are therefore reviewed by their own independent internal specialists for approval, a part of the team from the safety engineering and standards body or says we call them. So in each stage of the design iteration, the scheme is being assessed from its structural form, its performance and its aesthetics. Turn the lot of the drivers on this particular bridge is the is the span of the bridge over a very deep valley. And the looking to complement the structure that was already there, as I said before, so the number of options we looked at in terms of the spans of the bridge. And we looked at as part of the finalisation of the options report to go for the three span which complements of the two piers down into the valley floor that that the existing bridge already has as quite a driver for that. And it looks to bring in efficiency, then in terms of the deck span and there, we have some limits of deviation and parameters set within that to make sure that detailed design, we can refine that to get the most efficient span to deck ratio to allow the most efficient structural elements to be designed. So we've also got a to consider how the bridge would be built and the materials for that as well. And given the span and the need to try and minimise impact within the bridge within the river. We've looked at a launching system and therefore that has to form part of the structural calculations how the bridge to be built as height will be supported in the temporary condition. And so all of those were then taken on board and we produced at this point and I outlined approval in principle An AIP document, again, internal within I was England's and standard process for developing structures, where the all aspects of the structural design are sort of set out in principle for and general arrangements and typical plans prepared, which are of the type that have been included within the structural package for the dcl plans. The final development of that will take on from there but in terms of the aesthetic for the bridge has then been recorded within the options report and within the outline AIP in terms of it looking to match within the environment adjacent to the existing structure and trying to design it for safe future operation. And its maintenance and building on best practice. that's currently industry standards.

30:59

Okay, so, and just just to help, Mr. Gleason or Mr. Pinto a little further in relation to that Mr. Morrow, the there are some aesthetic benefits that flow from the construction method, the launch of the bridge, and that affects the structural form. And its simplicity, doesn't it?

31:26

Yes, it does. Yes, it does. We've, I think the existing bridge with the precast box, pre stressed box structure that is post tensioned boxer. To that it is we've switched to steel, and over constant depth. And that actually is in a lightweight driven by the launching technique that we will have to try and spin it over. And let's minimise the impact in the valley floor of having a lot more temporary works required.

31:50

Okay, and so that's a, that's a short term impact. Whereas, of course, in the longer term, it produces a simple and elegant structural form as opposed to the form of a more traditional ox structure, which would require lifting into place. Indeed,

32:13

okay, that's helpful with regard to that particular bridge of the river. The structures and engineering sections, documents, has designs for a number of other structures, its bridges and key interchanges junctions on the various parts of the scheme. These structures, presumably have greater flexibility in terms of the context is not set by an existing bridge as it is a river. So the river Coquet, thank you for your explanation, that's very helpful. That's what I would expect when you have to produce design a new bridge immediately adjacent to an existing bridge in a very sensitive location. So while that's the most sensitive location, accidents and the design of that, what I'm looking for is more explanation about the design of some of the other structures that are in that documents. And also, what level of design has been reached? Are these effectively detailed, are they? For instance, they showed the bridge parapets and the retaining walls is that was likely to be seen.

33:48

So yeah, certainly, the general process is still very much the same in terms of our work with this as a team in terms of having to do an options, report study, and then it will move into an AIP. But no, the bridges at the minute are not detailed design. And but the level of detail required to inform the DCO and the EIA assessment of it as certainly been moved on to the point at which we can do that. So with their bridges themselves, we've treated them as a family. So for the whole of the length of the scheme. So in an option study we've done as a single group, and obviously the spans do differ for each of the specific locations. But actually, they've been treated as a family of structures. So they'll have that continuity throughout both Part A and then Part B.

34:35

Okay, so again tomorrow, just Polly, I suppose because of the way the material is presented. So you've set out the structures in that document. What isn't clear from that document is the context and how that's been addressed through the design process. So we have various other documents And probably the most easy to understand would be the general arrangements plan, which show the structures in

some sort of context. But it's a form which doesn't actually demonstrate that there's that context has been taken account of in design terms or that that's the way the material is presented is not in a form, which demonstrates quality and I'd say it, it's very dry material, there's no indication of context and how the design has evolved. Would you like to comment on how those other structures have been designed in their local context?

35:52

Before going, going further with that, sir, if I could just interject, it's this is a point at which there is an interface between Mr. Morris discipline and Mr. Williams, because these are, the decision has been taken to have a family of structures which are regressive in the landscape, which provide wide counter leavers that there are single span structures to avoid visual clutter for a central pair. Those are the sorts of things that have been taken into account. Now, the finalisation the design is akin to any engineering process with a final aesthetic procedure is undertaken, having guarded the context, and that's secured by requirement three of the draft development consent orders, that's a process yet to be undertaken in terms of the finessing of the design. misfire, if you could talk about how you have taken account of each locations particular with it without necessarily running through all of the structures in the project. That's perhaps the last example to help Mr. Gleason, to understand how you have looked at those Lake locations and the way things are established before Mr. Williams then takes on the landscape aesthetic, and we reflect on the way that a subsequent approval process takes place.

37:38

Certainly, so to pick up on some of the aspects. You talk to Ryan in terms of minimising the regressive feature of them within the landscape, we've certainly been the overarching of having a grid separated junction at these locations, therefore, and the configuration of the merge and diverges on and off, the new dual carriageway will help us place the optimum position for where the bridge deck needs to be positioned. And we've not always looked to because of the existing conditions and the side roads coming in, and minimising how much amendments that would be needed to realign those to bring them up to the junction we have included for school bridges. So they're not always perpendicular to the main line, and to life for that, too. So the more natural context of the approach to them, remains as per the local road structure, though that was. The other main aspect obviously is the height and ensuring that that we have the headroom to design standards that we need under the bridges and part of the option stage. For the family of bridges we're talking about, particularly when these are these the over bridges. So where the local road will pass over the dual carriageway rather than an under bridge, that we have the clear headroom for the expected vehicles along there. Now, those are obviously to dmr standards. But there are also exceptions, and there are routes for which highways England as the strategic network operator will need to live for abnormal loads and high loads. And one of the aspects that we picked up on here was for the lowering, so not always going for the maximum height of headroom. So we've looked at where the typical vehicles that come down this part of the strategic network and not actually taking the maximum height. So that's part of the design development. So obviously, initial designers would have just gone in and made sure they had the full envelope that could be accommodated. That was challenged, pushed back and we've looked at the local network and as for what vehicles would be using this part and looked to lower the headroom so it does not have the maximum allowable. So I thought that was quite a good example there for you. And the other aspect in this design is yes, it is single span so no central piers. And with the wing walls, the abutments being

constructed in reinforced soil. So again, looking to that soften that on in terms of things Approaching statements to the bridge structure. Again, that would have come through the design iteration and the options through to the point at which they're shown on the DCR. Plans.

40:09

Okay, we can say that highly appropriate for rural standard roads such as this, as opposed to an urban type of road and respect in the aesthetic of the of the environment as well. I think Sir, if the if I could introduce Mr. Williams or, Mr Morrow do stand in ready in case, Mr. Gleeson would like to hear some more from Mr. Williams, who is a landscape architects and if you did introduce yourself, guess what it was and explain how your discipline works with Mr. Morow's discipline to ensure that aesthetic is taken into account in the design of the scheme and the way that structures perform, please?

40:52

Yes, no problem. Good morning. My name is Andy Williams. I'm a chartered landscape architect with WSP. And I think what we the approach that we've taken has been very much in line with similar schemes, whereby we've been fitting the fitting the scheme within the landform to reflect land form, and ensure things like embankment slopes, and cutting slopes are not overly long or overly high where we can and obviously, that's within sort of the engineering constraints that we've got. And I think also in terms of just sort of been talked about before, but in terms of the structures, we have tried to keep those low within the landscape. As somebody was saying, before, we've avoided the sort of the iconic bridges, we've avoided statement bridge is effectively within the landscape that reflects the fact that it's, you know, this is a rural landscape, it's a relatively static landscape, it's not one that's subject to significant change. And we've again, we've talked about the family of structures and the treatments and the design that's been taken to that. And I think one of the things that we probably would need to bring out is the fact that these junctions are generally very compact junctions, so the structures are short. And the approaches to the to the junction to the bridges, particularly are, are as small as possible, and we reduce the impact on the landscape features that surrounded the junctions that we're putting in. And on top of that, we've then applied a sort of a landscape strategy to those junctions. with the aim of, of the strategy being to integrate as best we can, the bridge structures and the junctions themselves within the wider landscape structure that exists in the in the surrounding area. And what we haven't done is tried to sort of necessarily hide everything. It's been difficult because it's not some of the locations where we've got structures and got junctions are not particularly overly wooded. So, we haven't necessarily applied you know, a dense woodland corridor throughout the throughout the scheme and around the junctions, but what we have done is tried to be quite specific in terms of screening, so particular views or nearby resident residential properties where we can

43:27

so, so, just to characterise things overall. So this is a scheme driven by its environment, which demands a series of structures which respect that environment that are compact and regressive in the locations and the to landscaped appropriately in their context. They respond to the traffic, and so they're the traffic that's expected to use them. So therefore, there are certain constraints. But again, they're trying to be compact, having regard to required head rooms, and having required to have in regards to engineering constraints. And then there was a final engineering stage to come, which is

secured by requirement three, which enables things such as finishes properly to be addressed, as the, as the scheme moves to delivery should be developed consent ought to be made.

44:35

Thank you, Mr. President. That's helpful. I think what I've just heard from Mr. Morrow, and Mr. Williams actually sets out in a clearer way than anything that has been submitted to date, the philosophy and approach to design and therefore certainly welcome that and hope that that can be confirmed. deadline for that's certainly what I was looking to, to see as part of the application. But I can see that that process at least has taken place now and has been well explained. So thank you for that. And can I just touch on a couple of other aspects about design shouldn't take too much longer? And so there was a reference in one of the answers to written questions about the applicants internal design panel. Did they say anything about the scheme itself, and in particular, about the structural engineers, engineering drawing sections?

45:50

In relation to the internal design panel? I am not sure if this is Mr. Morrow or Mr. Stoneman, who is best to respond. Mr. Stone is the project manager at housing assistance. So therefore, we'll have a full view of the overall process that has led us to this position today. Mr. Morrow, in the first instance, are you able to say your knowledge about how the internal design review has been undertaken? I think the design panel was undertaken at that very early stage in the scheme. So it may be that designs have not fully been worked up. But if you would elaborate a little further, that would be very helpful.

46:39

Certainly, sir. From the design panel perspective, yes, it was it was indeed taken at a very early stage, before preferred route announcement, indeed. And the scheme therefore had a pathway from which that steer to be taken from that early involvement from the panel. And the scheme overall was considered but they focused much on the river Coquet Bridge being the larger of the structures and appreciated that and the other over and under bridges structures that would be there would be designed in accordance with their dmr. And if the fallback was back to what the guidance would be from the dmr, rather than needing that particular stare from the panel. And the outcome of that panel review, I believe, was that the scheme should look to, as we actually already talked about earlier on the on the response for the river Coquet look to marry in with the existing structure as far as possible, but whilst taking on board the latest design requirements and looking to improve upon operational safety, and that the panel did not require the scheme to come back to them after that point for that particular structure

47:59

that that design panel wouldn't look at find out.

48:07

Oh, sorry, you just broke up a better for me. So,

48:09

I was asking, Is it unusual that the design panel wouldn't want to see finalised designs

48:16

there like I said, there is a body of structural specialists who will sort of take on board all of that to the says body is the technical branch within highways England that will then look to ensure that the main body of the dmr is followed and where departures etc are required that those are done and justified and signed off. So the panel would not necessarily come back to them.

48:43

So it isn't so in answer to your questions or it isn't unusual for the design panel to engage with a scheme early in its life. And then to decide the level of involvement that it wishes to have now housing lenders, the largest customer of the of the planning Inspectorate, as you will know it has a very large number of DCA schemes, some of which are very sensitive locations such as the a three Stonehenge now in that instance, or the A14, which was another scheme promotion. Some of those schemes will require a great deal of input because of their profile because of their receiving environments because of particular technical matters that apply to them. Under those circumstances, highways England will exercise a greater degree of oversight. In others, it will say it is particularly interested in certain aspects such as the river Coquet Bridge and the rest of the scheme, it may very well say, well, that's the matter for the project managers who represent highways England, and who are themselves experts in delivering schemes and to act as an intelligent client and therefore, they're able to say they don't wish to be as involved or not involved at all, having regard to the nature of the scheme, so, so they have a range of responses. That's not a standard One size fits all, which is it reflects the needs of an individual scheme.

50:06

Okay understood. And that's helpful to explain different contexts. Appreciate that some roads are more sensitive than others. And I think part of the problem that Mr. Pinto and myself have at the moment is, we still haven't been on site. So we're reviewing all of this blind if you like. So I think that's helpful and probably as far as we can go on that topic for now. Just final point I wanted to ask then was the view of the local planning authority on the design so far, including that structures, engineering drawings and sections documents? A ppl? 12? I haven't seen any comments on it. In the local impact reports. Just the county council wish to comment on it.

50:58

Thank you. Thank you. So I haven't got any comments. I don't know whether my colleagues in from highways have got any, any comments, but we are come sessions with the applicant in the run up to the submission of the DCI, we were generally satisfied with the approach that was being taken.

51:16

Okay, that's helpful. Thank you very much. Are there any other comments from other people here today? That about design? No. Okay. So on that basis thing that brings to an end item to on the agenda. I'll now hand over to Mr. Pinto, who's going to deal with item three, which is landscape and visual impacts. Thank you.

51:51

Thank you very much. Mr. Gleason. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly please? Yes,

51:58

I can hear you. Thank you.

52:02

Thank you very much. I'm going to be leading now on let's Skype and visual impacts this item. So domain topics that I would like to focus on today is really to explore how areas of sensitivity have been developed, and how their significance has informed to propose development. I would also like to consider the visual effects of proposed development, particularly in relation to sad areas of sensitivity. And also explore the adequacy, the adequacy of proposed mitigation measures, including monitoring and evaluation. And so I will be referring, or I might have to refer to a series of different documents that have been submitted. But the key ones that I anticipate at the moment that will probably be referenced, in addition to the general ones that we have communicated earlier today is going to be document 6.2 of DS chapter seven, landscape individual assessment, but a that's a PP dash, dash 044 in 6.3, environmental assessment, chapter seven, one skipping visual part B, which would be a pp 045 also particularly interested in actually going through some of the detail within the landscape mitigation master plan, master plan for Part infopark be originally figure 7.8 that was a PDP dash 095 in figure seven point 10. A pp. Das 144. And I believe that part has been updated. And it's now the latest one is web three, dash 008. And also the vegetation clearance plans for Part A and in part two B, that's figure 7.98, pp dash 096 and figure 11, seven point 11 A PP dash 145. So to start our discussion on landscape and visual impacts, I would first like to actually set a context for this agenda before deciding the agenda in Could I please First of all, ask the applicant to explain their broad strategy to landscape, how they have approached it, in how this is linked with the requirements and the draft dcl particularly in relation to proposals and information included within the landscape mitigation master plan and plan individuation clearance plans in the applied camp, please.

54:53

Mr. Pinto, I am going to ask Mr. Williams, who is the Chartered landscape architect responsible for landscape design To address you in relation to this, Mr. Williams.

55:04

Thank you.

55:06

Good board. Mr. Pinto. I, as I said before, I'm the landscape architect for WSP, and acting on behalf of the applicant with respect to landscape and visual issues. And so the, the approach that we've taken has been very much in terms of the safeguarding vegetation where we can, where we are unable to safeguard vegetation, and retain vegetation on site, then we are looking to replace that which has been removed. And then look in terms of how that can be how that needs needed to mitigate impacts and effects from a landscape and visual perspective, but also in relation to other disciplines, particularly probably in terms of the biodiversity aspect, to ensure that we were sort of replaced habitats that are lost and replaced landscape features that are removed as a result of the scheme. And so the way that we have done that if we have looked in terms of the vegetation clearance, and we look in terms of how

we can tie landscape proposals into existing landscape features, so that effectively, what we're doing is we're sort of restoring very much what the landscape framework is of the wider landscape. This is a landscape, generally of open countryside, of a mixture of arable and pasture fields. And woodland is not particularly expansive. We don't have large, large, extensive areas of woodland, but there are quite distinct pockets of woodland, occurring through the through the corridor that we've been looking at. So very much in terms of where we can tie woodland into existing woodland, where we can link hedgerows back into existing hedgerows restore hedgerow boundaries, that run along the side scheme, and make sure that we are we're effectively putting something back in terms of whatever we've taken, we were putting something back in into in terms of replacing that, albeit that it might be to slightly in a in a slightly different location where we have identified significant effects on a landscape or visual basis, then we are looking in terms of providing perhaps some specific screening measures aimed at providing some mitigation to reduce the significance of the effects where they are significant than we have done what we can in terms of trying to reduce those down, although there are some locations which still have significant effects, and those have been noted in the in the response to the first written questions. And so, you know, throughout the corridor effect we have done, you know, I consider a very sufficient job in terms of putting those landscape features back in and putting sort of a,

58:13

a,

58:16

an approach that restores or replaces where we can mitigate, where, where appropriate. Just one last one last point I just like to make actually, is that we have not said this earlier on in terms of the design of the scheme, we have not tried to create a green tunnel, there's nothing, you know, there's nothing to be gained by doing that. We accept that there are, you know, there are locations where the road will be visible. We've tried to mitigate those where we think that the visual receptors nearby that need mitigating, but there are sections where we have not necessarily just tried to create a green tunnel to drive along and hide everything that's associated with the scheme.

58:56

That's, that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Mr. Williams, that is really useful in terms of setting up the broad context. I would like I would like now, to actually be capping a little bit more of the detail of some of the points that you have touched earlier, particularly in terms of you mentioned in your response, lens kit features quite frequently. That was actually one of the questions that I had, which is what exactly is it is meant balance kit features, how they have been identified and how they have actually been assessed in terms of their value to the landscape.

59:42

So lots of good features are really anything that is that contributes to the perception of landscape character. So they are quite wide range in terms of hedgerows of it. individual trees, woodland areas of perhaps arable fields or pasture fields. See, you know, it is that sort of wide range. And within that there's variations in terms of the nature of those features as well. So quite often on roadsides, you'll have quite outgrown hedgerows. So when I say outgrown What I mean is that not been heavily managed, if not been heavily trimmed to create a very dense, manicured appearance, they've actually

been allowed to grow out. And there's quite a lot of that evident within the existing landscape where hedgerows have been allowed to grow out, where hedgerows have been, sort of gone into decline a little bit in terms of the there's areas where there's gaps in hedgerows. And, sorry,

1:00:51

did that slide please continue? Yeah,

1:00:53

I was just gonna say in terms of then in terms of woodland, generally speaking, woodland is typically broadleaf woodland through the, through the corridor, there are instances where there's sort of more coniferous coniferous trees appearing, but typically, it's quite a deciduous Lee, deciduous, deciduous focus on the woodland that's in the in the broader landscape.

1:01:19

That's fine, thank you very much. I was hoping that you would provide me with a clearer picture and a clear idea, in terms of how these features have been assessed and evaluated, ie not all features are the same, some of them are more valuable to the landscape than others is you have mentioned within your response, some, some shrubs and for example, areas of woodland will actually have a value added to the landscape that can be quite significantly different. So how was that distinguished how that distinction included as part of your assessment?

1:02:04

And so primarily, that's been something that's been led by the arboricultural lists. And they've approached that in terms of the tree surveys that have been done through the corridor, and that group that provides a grade in terms of a categorising, sorry, really, in terms of the, the age of the tree, the condition of the tree, but also there's an element within that, which is, you know, how what does that contribute to the, to the landscape and to the humanity. So there's a grading within the those trees, it sort of runs from ABC to you. And within that, there's lots of terms of hedgerows and, and how those hatcheries are, are graded as well. So in terms of the how the value has been placed against those, then that's certainly been informed by the tree surveys that have been carried out. And also then in terms of some of the locations where we have areas of ancient woodland as well. Primarily sated with the river Coquet, where there's a, there's a quite an extensive area of ancient woodland as well, that runs through the south side of the, of the of the valley. And again, that's, you know, that obviously, is not only from its contribution that it makes to the landscape, but also the contribution that it makes from a biodiversity level in terms of the, the nature of the habitat that that is.

1:03:34

So, so Mr. Williams, there's these assets in the landscape, the landscape features can perform individually as assets to the landscape, and they have a sensitivity that you take into account when you're performing your assessments. Is it not also the case, though, that the, the, the way that they perform together affects the landscape character, and you also take that into your into account when you reflect upon the landscape character at a slightly higher level than the individual asset level?

1:04:10

Yeah, indeed, the way that we are assessed on set character is that we look at the quality of the landscape and the value that's associated with that landscape and a lot of what can be perceived comes from the vegetation. So you know, if you're looking at a sort of a heavily treed landscape, then you know, it has a different appearance to something that's very dominated by open fields and predominantly large arable fields. We don't have like I said, we don't have huge amounts of extensive woodland. So actually the blocks of woodland that do occur through the corridor are quite you know, are important features, you know, they contribute to the sense of enclosure, they contribute to the nature It feeling like it's got an age to it, and it's got a depth to it in terms of the landscape.

1:05:07

And that's, that's helpful. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Thank you, Mr. Buffett as well. And I would like us to perhaps move on, again to a little bit tomorrow of detail in terms of the assessment process for visual effects of the proposal, which includes, obviously, and you have submitted a lot of information on this specific topic, in terms of the need to understand the sensitivity of the identified receptors, and how they would actually be affected. And these include landscape sensitivity and visual sensitivity, which you have submitted some evidence in some information as well. Could you please explain how sensitivity has informed the development of proposal as well in more detail? So how you have actually taken it from that broad branch, and actually applied the sensitivity tests and sensitivity matrix that you have developed? how you came to score? And how that excellent again, informed development proposal?

1:06:20

Mr. Williams, Mr. Williams, you might want also to refer to the, the approach and its basis in in guidance as well here, no professional guidance to assessment.

1:06:34

Sure. And so I was going to start Yeah, in terms of the approach that we've taken was in line with an interim advice, note 135 10. And along with the guidelines for landscape, and visual impact assessment, which was the third edition, and that's a publication by the landscape Institute. And so if I take landscape first, and then I'll take visual, because although they're related, they're quite separate. They're quite independent assessments. And so in terms of the landscape character, the approach that we've taken, has focused on quality and value. And although it's not identified within in 135 10, it is identified in the glba. Three guidance is also the element of susceptibility, or the subject of susceptibility within that as well. So with the way that we've taken that is the landscape character assessments that have been undertaken on behalf of Northumberland county council, we've used those and how we we've taken that is we've taken it in terms of the quality in the value that's associated with that. So that might be how robust a landscape is, how cared for it looks, how much you know, how it's managed. And then in terms of how the, the, the, you know, what values might be placed on that in terms of maybe local designations, but it might also be a perceived value from a local community, as opposed to just something that's that sort of open countryside, but might not necessarily be designated. And then we take that to determine an overall sensitivity. And then, and then the important thing is that that is the sensitivity to the type of development being proposed. It's not to any development we're looking at in terms of how sensitive is this to the introduction of a substantial road corridor. So that in terms of how we have a how we've done that, then in terms of how we taken that forward, so having identified the

sensitivity, we then look at the magnitude of impact. So against each of those character areas. How significant effectively, how, how big is the magnitude of impact, how big is the magnitude of change that would arise through the introduction of the of the corridor of the scheme. And in in chapter seven, I think in we just find the table reference, we've provided an indication of the, of the landscape sensitivity within that, to to look at, so we've provided ratings on landscape quality, and value, we don't necessarily our approach is necessarily about making criteria for value because that can be somewhat simple, somewhat more subjective. And then in terms of then we've identified that with a sensitivity to change. So we've identified why a landscape might be of high sensitivity or why a landscape might be of low sensitivity. Mr. Williams,

1:09:49

are you trying to point us to in direction of, I believe, probably around to table seven DASH a trees Visual sensitivity, no. Age? No,

1:10:04

no. Can you just go back to pages? If you go back to table seven, five, there's a table on landscape quality on landscape sensitivity?

1:10:14

Page 25? Yes.

1:10:17

Yes. Super? Yes. I'm 26. Yeah.

1:10:22

Thank you, please continue. No problem.

1:10:24

Um, so in terms of how we've then identified landscape sensitivity, we've then looked at the magnitude of change, and we rate that in terms of how significant the the magnitude of impact would be. And we provide some criteria to work on that in table seven, seven on page 27, and 28. So then we look in terms of how that how that matrix works. So again, sorry, I'm gonna pretend to another table now, in terms of the and it's table 710, on page 33. Yes, we then look at sensitivity of high, moderate or low. And then we look in terms of the magnitude of the, of the impact in terms of it being negligible minor, moderate, and major. And that gives, these are not sort of set in stone, but they give an idea of how the significance of effect is derived.

1:11:25

That's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. I wanted to actually ask some further questions further on as well, in terms of mitigation measures. But since we are now focusing on this, I actually think this might be an appropriate time to actually touch on that as well. One of the questions that I had as well, is that, obviously, in your overall assessment, you do in your overall assessment in terms of just get to reference, Bendix 7.3, as residential visual effects schedule Part A directly reference of this specific document? Or just bear with me for one second, please? I believe it's a PP slash 216. So if I

could refer back to that specific document? And actually, if we could pick an example, here, I would suggest it for example, receptor reference number are nine. If you could just give me a nod. Mr. Williams, once you have a document with you.

1:12:49

Yeah, just is that Longfield cottage?

1:12:57

yet? is the one Yes, for example? Yes. So could you actually explain that within a practical example? So for example, taking our nine is receptor where this matrix has actually been applied?

1:13:17

Yeah. I mean, what I would just say is that the up just sort of run through quickly the landscape effects. Yeah, this, we don't we have sort of jumping slightly onto visual effects. Yeah, effectively, the approach is very similar. In terms of the how we how we do that is from a residential perspective, it's, you know, who is going to be impacted. So who's the nature of that and that helps to determine the sensitivity. So. So for example, people living in their homes would be considered to be of high sensitivity, whereas somebody at work where the focus is not necessarily on the view or the landscape, we will consider them to be to be low sensitivity. And again, we then apply a similar sort of approach in terms of the magnitude of impact, and how that then is applied to, to the sensitivity and again, the matrix, then there's another matrix sort of provided for the lab for the visual effects as well. And in terms of how that that's how that's approached. So if we took Longfield cottage, it's a residential property. So we would suggest that it's of a high of the higher end of sensitivity. And then, in terms of what there exists, we also look into the what their existing outlook is. So for example, Longfield cottage we've made a note in terms of the baseline view. There are some existing views of the a one and that's really important to note because if there is an existing awareness and then within the baseline view, Might be existing views have some sort of element of detracting feature, then we look at that in terms of how the magnitude of impact relates to that. And then I'm just reading the so. So then so Okay, so then in terms of the, in terms of the sensitivity, and the magnitude of impact, so we're looking at something that's probably of high sensitivity, but is subject to a minor magnitude of impact. So in the first column, where it says minor, that's the magnitude of impact. And if we sort of keep with the matrix in terms of that, that would give rise to a moderate adverse effect. And then we look in terms of then that's during construction, then we look in terms of year one, in the winter of year one, which is the next two columns, in terms of the magnitude of impact, and the significance of effect. And then the final two columns, look in terms of the summer of the design year 15. So that takes into account, particularly when relation to planting, it takes account of there being a maturity to the planting by that stage. So the functions and the function of screening that we've requested from that planting, not the right word requesting but that we've, you know, surpassed that planting in terms of providing screening has provided that element of the of the mitigation, so that we can avoid from this case, we you know, we have a significant identify significant effect during construction, but then that reduces to dislike adverse.

1:16:47

Thank you. It's that point, Mr. Williams, that I was hoping to touch on in terms of mitigation. I would like to confirm with you that in terms of what we see from magnitude of change, insignificance of defects. That is after mitigation is in place,

1:17:10

yes. Great. Yeah.

1:17:13

Thank you. That is that is really what I wanted to confirm at this point, because we were talking about mitigation before. And I just think it's really useful to actually clarify this point, that on both these tables in both on the significance of visual effects and landscape, they both take into consideration the mitigation measures, once they are actually evaluated, I believe, correct? Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Yes. So I think that we, you were talking through sensitivity issues, and in how the magnitude of impact has actually been taken into consideration as part of the development of sensitivity.

1:17:59

And so I've sort of gone through the landscape. I will, I'll sort of touch again, I'll just sort of go through quickly in terms of the visual, the visual approach. So again, as I said before, the approach is very similar as we determine sensitivity. And that's informed by the nature of the receptor and what their expectation of that view might be. And then we look in terms of the magnitude of impact. So if there is an existing view of the road, and effectively, we're modifying the existing view, so particularly relevant, perhaps, to part B, and sections of Part A, where it's an online widening, there is an existing awareness of the of the a one albeit, you know, it's a slightly of a different scale. And then we look in terms of the introduction of the scheme, an introduction, so the junctions in terms of how that magnitude of impact would ultimately change the perception of the occupants, or the visitors or the, the, the workers at particular locations. And again, you know, we just sort of work through that example. And we look in terms of the baseline view, the magnitude of impact, what's going to arise as a result of the scheme. And then we look in terms of the magnitude of impact and the significance of effect that construction went to year one, and design year 15. And those periods are set out in, in the guidance that we've used.

1:19:24

Okay, that's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. And I would actually continue on this example. And with sort of this broad location in mind, and I would like us to excuse me, I would like us to turn to 6.5 over the years figure 7.9, vegetation clearance plants, Part II. If we can, I'll just confirm the reference. That is a PP dash 096 that should be referenced to I believe, within the library. And I was, I was wondering if you could actually continue to talking about an example here in how some of these issues are addressed within the proposal. I believe that our nine location is actually covered within sheet two of 18 of the document that I have mentioned to you just now, which obviously is an area that significant amount of trees are marked potentially in terms of loss to the skin. And we also have woodland last to the scheme as well within this area. So working on this specific example, where actually some adverse effects has already been identified. And how will the proposal actually minimise the loss of trees in particularly, also woodland because of the value of woodland that you have actually highlighted as well within your response to Williams.

1:21:31

So in terms of the scheme, design, we have tried to avoid vegetation loss where we can, and for engineering purposes, there may be a need to take some of that woodland down, take some of the trees down. If you just give me one sec. Can you just bear with me just a minute, and I'm just going to just make sure that I'm just know exactly which receptor This is talking about. And I just want to just make sure I know which one.

1:22:25

Also to assist to Mr. Williams, if it is helpful. I, I believe that in figure 5.2 human and ecological receptors assessed for part A, I don't have the reference with me at the moment, really, but I can check that I also believe that depth shells declare location have are not got it yet.

1:22:48

I've located myself it's just to the south side of parkwood.

1:22:52

Exactly. It's the beginning of of scheme. Within that location, yes.

1:23:02

Yes, so in terms of, for that particular receptor, the way we have probably looked at that in terms of the, there's an existing awareness of the of the a one and, and although the new road is going to be built on the other side, this the existing view, whereby the a one and would remain in the in the foreground of the view and the scheme, the you know, the whitening scheme effectively would be happening on the opposite side of that. So obviously, that would be an awareness for that, for the occupants of that of that cottage, in terms of being visible, the a one is an existing element within the view, during construction, that would obviously be changes occurring as a result of plant and machinery and an activity on the road and, you know, sort of elements of additional traffic movement. And but importantly, you know, the, the actual scheme would occur on the eastern side. So once the scheme is, is constructed, in terms of the elevation and the relative view that that can be seen. And we felt then that the scheme would be on the on the opposite side and the foreground of the view of the existing a one would be substantially unchanged. And it would be so that's kind of how we've come to the conclusion that okay, that would be noticeable, there would be perceptible changes, but they wouldn't be so. So noticeable that we felt that though the moderate adverse effect would remain. And I'm just going to have a look at mitigation on that as well just so we can talk through that.

1:24:55

So if we look at the page sheet 17 of 18 of the landscape mitigation master plan for part A, which is figure 7.8. I think you referred to it earlier on it was rep 3008. In terms of the document reference.

1:25:22

I'll have to ask you now to bear with me for one second. Oh,

1:25:24

that's fine.

1:25:32

You mentioned sheets, sorry, sheet

1:25:36

17 of 1979.

1:25:36

tene. Okay, that is figure 7.8. Landscape mitigation master plan part a, I believe, I would just like to confirm all sorts of the reference within the library, if I can very quickly, should be rep

1:25:58

3008. I think

1:26:02

version? Rep. 300. Right. Yes. Yes, please continue. Mr. Williams. Thank you.

1:26:12

So in looking at taking that as an example to work through. And what we've what we're the approach that we've taken there is that, you know, the existing woodland, we've tried to retain as much of that on the on the western side. So effectively, that sits in the foreground of the view digs, the existing one sits just beyond that, on the widening has gone. You know, the other side of that as well, in terms of to the north of the bridge. Beyond that, then we have looked in terms of well, this is actually one of the areas of the landscape that is quite heavily wooded. There's quite an extensive network of woodland runs through this, the northern end of Part A. So the approach that we've taken is very much about, you know, this is an appropriate place where more extensive woodland is, is appropriate. And, and that's the way that we've taken in terms of planting up the cutting slopes and some of the other areas around the underpass and on the drainage features, and that way, we've tried to tie the new scheme into the existing landscape framework that this area is, like I say, is quite heavily wooded.

1:27:23

And that's very helpful. Thank you very much. Mr. Williams. Actually, that also links with another question that I had. And in terms in terms of detail with some of these, and I believe that all so this probably links with one of the issues raised by Northumberland county council as well, in terms of landscape and visual impacts in relation to the level of detail that is actually provided at the moment on planting. Could you actually expand a little bit more on that? And also, perhaps reflect on why we do not we do not appear tend to readily have a lot of detail in terms of what sort of plantings proposed.

1:28:18

Sure. And so the approach that we've taken in identifying the landscape mitigation measures, that's been the approach that we've taken from the dmr. So the dmr, at the time, we were preparing this, this was prior to us giving up an update to the dmr. But this was reflected in the dmr. I think it's volume 10, section zero, part three, and four, which we have provided art, think deadline one, we

provided some dmrB guidance and asked me for the references, and I haven't got it in front of me. But we can provide that in terms of when we when we sort of provide the responses. But what that does is it sets out sort of a structure in terms of identifying the landscape mitigation measures. So the first the first thing you do is you identify what the function of a, an environmental or landscape feature would be. So why are you adding it in so that might be because of screening, it might be because of landscape integration, it might be because of biodiversity, so that there's a rating that the code provided to that. So I think FFA is is screening eFb is integration. So, we can see there in terms of we provided an environmental function in the coding against some of these landscape features that we put in. So for lots of Those we put in eFb. And then it's followed them by an N le number. And the Le number is landscape elements. And that's outlined in part four of the dmrB guidance I mentioned before. And that provides a little bit more information in terms of what form does this landscape feature that you have, that we've decided is needed? And what form does that take so that that's quite a broad range. So it covers grassland, it covers hedgerows, and it covers woodland. So. So if it starts with an alley one, one number, it's to do with grassland. If it starts with the two, it's effectively it's to do with woodland planting. So this is something then that we we've sort of used to identify that and the dmrB guidance provides a little bit more information in terms of what that should look like in terms of should it be a trimmed hedge? Should it be a hedge row? And should it have should? Or should it be a hedge row with trees? Or, you know, should it be 2.1, for example, is woodland or 2.4, with linear belts and shrubs and trees? So it provides a little bit more information in terms of actually what form that planting should take. And that's the sort of the level of information that we've taken that to and that's, you know, a sort of industry standard in terms of taking that to, to a landscape element to be taken forward, then into the into the more detailed landscape design stages.

1:31:40

It's, it's fair to say, Mr. Williams, isn't it that if one was in a particularly hypersensitive location, one might go further than this, but the standard for ordinary design of this nature in an environment, akin to this is to rely on dmrB, reference and landscape plans. And so therefore, this is in line with the Secretary of State's policy as expressed in dmrB, as to how one would carry out this function.

1:32:13

Thank you very much, Mr. basford. And I was actually going to ask, as well, Mr. Williams, if that information could actually be confirmed, perhaps the deadline for that would be really useful as well.

1:32:29

Just in terms of the dmrB guidance, exactly, yes. So the dmrB guidance was appended to, I think, to the written questions. I think it was Appendix B, in response to the written questions, and

1:32:51

if you rep to

1:32:53

rep two, dash zero to two.

1:32:59

And furthermore, serve the dmr guidance is noted on the face of the of the landscape mitigation master plan. And you'll see the in the legend there. On each drawing, there is the reference the environmental function, the environmental elements, landscape elements, and in small type beneath the, the heading there is the reference to DLR to verify. Yeah,

1:33:32

thank you. Thank you, Graham.

1:33:34

What about in terms of the last page of the mitigation strategy does have some indicative species as well, in terms of against some of those landscape elements just to sort of give an extra level of of information that would be useful to the design team that takes it forward.

1:33:53

That's really useful. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. I would actually also like to bring perhaps on this point, Northumberland county council as well. But I am mindful of time at moment in we did say that we will have probably a break around one hour and a half into the proceedings. So I will now schedule and adjourn the meeting until 12 o'clock. Is that is that the anticipated time? If? If Miss Patten, could you actually confirm that that is dissipated? Time for break?

1:34:42

Yes, I can confirm that. 12 o'clock seems fine, thanks.

1:34:46

Okay. Thank you very much. We'll resume this meeting at 12 o'clock. It's the hearings adjourned. Thank you.