

TEXT_A1iN_ISH2_Session2_25022021

Thu, 2/25 2:11PM • 1:33:40

00:01

Time is now 12 o'clock, and this hearing is resumed. Welcome back, everyone.

00:11

May I ask before we continue this pattern, could you please confirm that live streaming is now? Live and working, please? Yes. Mr. Pinto, the live stream is live as we speak. Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:29

I believe that before we had an adjournment, I mentioned that I would actually like to bring Northumberland county council to the discussions at this point. So I would actually turn to Ms. Robbie, please. And if I could bring you into discussions in terms of the point that we were making, before the atonement in relation to the landscape mitigation master plan, and also the mitigation measures proposed at Can I ask if

01:14

you are content with the detail and explanation that we heard from Mr. Williams earlier? Thank you. So I'm going to ask Mary Fisher to make a comment on that, if I might.

01:29

Thank you, Miss Robin. Miss Fisher?

01:33

Hello, Mr. Pinto? Thank you. Um,

01:37

I think initially, and you'll see this expressed in the landscape in the local impact report, we struggled a little bit to understand the design approach, and the mitigation measures

01:53

and the design intent

01:56

through the later processes and the submissions at the later deadlines, I think we've come to a better understanding of that approach. And also, obviously, some of the mitigation measures, for part A in particular have been revised as a result of or clarified as a result of that discussion. And I think through that process, we are now satisfied.

02:19

We just had some issues initially.

02:23

That's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Fisher. I'm obviously mindful as well, of the comments that Northumberland County Council has actually submitted before. And I believe that

02:40

turning to the local impact report, so that will be rap one dash seven one that is document that I'm referring to now, and also the applicants comments on that. So that would be rap three, dash zero to five. It appeared that the way, I believe, five broad matters, within this topic of visual and landscape impact, where there wasn't a clear agreement or agreement, it was not explicit between yourself between Northumberland county council and the applicant is well,

03:21

I believe that this war on certainty and clarity of designing mitigating measures, which I believe that Mr. Fisher, you have now explained your latest position on that. So thank you very much for that. But also adequacy of mitigation measures, lens cap character effect on viewpoint, a visual effect on communities.

03:41

If I presume you will be yourself again, Mr. Fisher, if you could actually explain perhaps

03:51

your position on dose other points, and perhaps I would suggest perhaps we start with the point number two that I have mentioned, which would be adequacy of mitigation measures.

04:05

Yes. But just before I deal with adequacy, and just popping back to certainty and clarity, one of the things that was being discussed

04:14

with Mr. Williams, earlier was this matter of the dmr documents that set out more about the design intent for the various landscape features or the mitigation plans.

04:28

And partly as part of the discussion we've been having ongoing,

04:33

we're hoping that they can be included somehow with the ongoing documentation because that document is now being withdrawn and isn't generally available

04:42

and help for implementation stages if they remain with the application material. Okay, that's very helpful. I would like to when the applicant announced this discussion,

04:55

Mr. Bassford, I believe that probably are going to refer to Mr. Williams again. Is that the case

05:00

I'm likely to refer out to Mr. Williams.

05:04

However, the particular point about including the references to dmr, we will check that the extent that they are superseded and withdrawn,

05:15

withdrawn documents, and if it is, then it can simply be appended for reference to the landscape mitigation master plan drawings so that they're all in one place and readily accessible. I'm sure that we can achieve that.

05:32

To make sure that that's available. Yes. Did you ever go any further? Did you wish to go any further? Was Fisher? No, thank you. That's actually your preference.

05:42

Great, great. May I say? Say how glad I am you have not blurred your background?

05:50

Thank you both.

05:53

In Depth case, would you be in a position now? Mr. PC in terms of talking about the comments that you have made in terms of perhaps explaining a little bit further on point two in terms of adequacy of mitigation measures?

06:09

Yes. Initially, as set out in the landscaping bank report, we have some quite specific concerns about the adequacy of mitigation measures, in relation to effects on

06:23

areas of settlement along the length of Part A and specific concerns relating to the use of hedgerows in Part B,

06:38

as a screening measure, and those have now been addressed. So in part B, that was addressed via the submission of the DML been material, we've clarified that the hedgerows would be big, bushy ones, not little trimmed ones, which makes a particular difference through that length.

06:59

And for part A, there have been some amendments submitted to the mitigation, specifically at Westmore, the Federal injunction and cosy Park bridge, which have addressed our concerns in relation to effects on those communities.

07:21

That's very helpful, Miss Fisher.

07:25

Since there is an agreement, Mr. Bassford, I would assume that you are happy with that position now.

07:39

Given those agreement and our submission, yes, we are content with that. And it's simply a matter of ensuring that it's recorded in the relevant documents. Perfect. Thank you very much. And I believe there was also some

07:56

need for further clarity and certainty regarding landscape character. And I believe that the key issue here has been can landscape suitability judgments be better explained, particularly how localised effects have been considered and shaped by the proposal?

08:20

Would you like to explain a little bit further on that to expand a little bit further on that insufficient?

08:27

Yes, certainly. So one of the initial concerns we raised was around how landscape

08:36

sensitivity and particularly sex susceptibility has been considered, which is more to do with the natural characteristics of the landscape than its value. And we felt that hadn't quite been given enough attention.

08:51

Having reviewed that, within the Li R, and worked through it, what we found was that some actually wasn't making much difference to the judgement of impacts. And so our concern centred more around how it was informing the mitigation. So effectively, although we differ slightly, in terms of what the sensitivity is, we don't feel that some material issue here

09:16

or academic.

09:19

When is the assessment of impacts

09:24

there are, I think, three particular judgments on which we differ out of all of the ones made, so it isn't very many.

09:34

And those were for the year one effects in the two landscape character areas in relation to part B.

09:44

Which are character areas, eight C and three C.

09:49

And there it's a minor difference of judgement as to

09:55

how

09:57

whether the effects at year one early completion

10:00

When it's a brand new road, and there's no mature vegetation around it, our judgement is that that would be more like the construction effects are slightly higher.

10:09

And

10:11

whereas

10:14

the WSP judgments are more like the finalised mitigating stage, so it's just a slight difference of opinion on what will it be more like?

10:26

Again, it's a temporary impact. So that's, that's very helpful Miss Fisher, I assume by what she was saying that she would be content to actually resolve that issue in continuing with dialogue with dialogue with the applicant. And it's likely that this would be an issue resolved between both parties as we go along. Mr. Bassford, anything else that you would like to add on that point? Or are you content with that position as well?

10:53

So we're very happy to continue discussions with Northumberland county council and Miss Fisher to ensure that these matters are closed out, it's been very helpful and efficient to acknowledge that the points between the parties are relatively narrow and almost entirely non substantive in terms of their effect on your judgments. And really welcome. That's a very constructive thing. That's very useful. Thank you very much, both. And finally, at Miss Fisher, I think that it might be helpful to just highlight if there is still any significant points or any distance and a significant distance between yourself and applicant, on the other two items that I believe are outstanding from the list that I have gone through earlier, which I'll take together, which will be effects on viewpoints and also visual effects on communities. And could you first of all, please confirm if

11:57

there are there are significant differences of position on any of these points? And if there are, could you please highlight those significant differences?

12:10

Yes, I will. Before I do, can I just return to landscape character because I hadn't actually finished

12:18

that that was that was one off to

12:21

two character areas

12:24

is that there was a difference between us in relation to character area 38 be in part of which is host to the majority of part a route.

12:38

And that has been in part of direct and that has to do with the year 15 impacts?

12:45

That has been in part addressed to the additional mitigation measures around the junctions, and in particular, the more substantive replacement of coronation Avenue.

12:57

We haven't quite reached the position where we agree with

13:03

the applicant that impacts are negligible. But we're happy to agree that they're not significant.

13:12

Mr. Bassford like to come on that specific point. Yes, yes. Whilst the parties may be a part on that, the fact that it's not significant should enable you to afford it very limited Wait, subject, obviously, to the

necessary mitigation in your report to the Secretary of State and we are content with that also. And I think Miss Fisher, we should probably be recording these minor differences and are stating common ground with between the parties. So these few items can appear in that document. There's actually a Working Draft prepared yesterday, which I'm working from the moment and which Andy Williams also has a copy of

13:57

a very helpful element of progress. Thank you.

14:02

Thank you both.

14:05

Mr. Fisher, back to my original question.

14:09

Are there any substantive points on any of the other two items that were mentioned? Don't believe so? No, again, from the conversations that we have been having. I think the majority of our concerns have been addressed through the additional mitigation and further clarifications, particularly the submissions of deadlines, two and three. Okay, that's very helpful Adams to Bassford comments. Now I simply reflect that Ms. Robbie's intervention at the preliminary meeting encouraging the discussions between the parties are plainly bearing fruit and we're very grateful to Northumberland county council for engaging us on this basis. Perfect. Thank you very much. Thank you both.

14:55

Are there any further questions and comments that anyone has

15:00

would wish to make

15:03

on this specific topic before we move

15:09

on from landscape and visual impacts.

15:15

And I think I think that

15:20

we have a hand up.

15:26

I can't actually pick the name out from the list, but it's more like a horse. Yes. Yes, your mind, I wouldn't mind raising some concerns that I haven't have documented, documented to some extent. And I think it's been fair to it's been very useful and very reassuring. Listen to the listen to the thorough approach to landscaping and visual effects this morning and welcome that. However,

15:59

when you look at the reality of it and look at what's been applied in practice, I'm struggling to see that being applied in my situation,

16:09

just by way of example, is my primary view from my house is of a lovely rolling fields with the coronation, helping you with a single carriageway. And for me, that is a pleasant outlook that I've always enjoyed. That's not going to be replaced with seven lanes of tarmac, which include a live eye. And because of that, because the siting of the led by the mitigation that's possible, is very limited. So I would suggest to you that, unfortunately, the visual effect is much worse and very much

16:49

detrimental decremented by his current plans.

16:53

And thank you very much, Mr. Horse. Mr. Bassford.

17:01

Thank you, sir, I will turn to Mr. Williams, with who might discuss this in a few moments, but the

17:12

view of the applicant is that the concern expressed by Mr. Hall's is not well founded, that the that he will not be faced with a view of,

17:24

of seven lanes of tarmac. And in fact, they're the distances involved mean that the layby will not be in the very foreground of his views.

17:36

And also that, overall, the impacts are as assessed, bearing in mind that Mr. Hawes and his residence are a residential and hence relatively sensitive receptor. I'll turn to Mr. Williams now, who will be able to describe in more detail the impact on the horse residence. And he will explain that to you and why these matters to which you should afford limited wait.

18:05

Thank you, Mr. Basford. Mr. Williams. Thank you, sir. So to address Mr. Hall's concerns, and the approach, obviously, that we set out earlier on was very much that the visual receptors associated with residential

18:23

property are at the upper end of sensitivity. And that's sort of appropriate in terms of you know, that these are people's views that they experience on a day to day basis, and which obviously, are important to them. And the one thing that I just pointed I was making earlier on is in terms of where you have an existing view of

18:48

what you would describe as a visual detractor, and I would describe the a one as a visual detractor. And then we sort of take that into account in terms of the baseline. And, and also in terms of how the magnitude of impact would affect the occupants of the, of the of the, of the receptor. I mean, so in terms of there is an existing awareness of the a one. And in the case of Mr. Horton property, there's

19:21

the western boundary vegetation, which currently provides some screening to the ag one that's immediately adjacent to the property and would be retained. And indeed, the noise fence to be erected there as well, which would also screen his views of traffic much closer to the property immediately to the west. And

19:46

so that in effect, where there's a where the existing vegetation is of the most useful in its screening, would be retained on the northern boundary. It

20:00

The

20:03

access road that was that has been discussed with Mr. horse is put into place, then there would be a break in the in the planting that currently affords him quite substantial screening to the north would arise, and there would be a limited view to the north

20:23

towards the, towards the scheme.

20:27

And Mr. Hawes mentioned, the sort of the coronation Avenue and the trees,

20:33

we accept that, you know, some of those trees will come out, I think,

20:37

I think Mr. Hall's his

20:40

response, previous early responses, he's talked about sort of 13 trees coming out, in the immediate view. But nevertheless, what we've what we've sort of proposed now is a much more substantial and much more detailed strategy for the replacement of those trees. And accepting that, you know, in the immediate

21:00

aftermath of the construction, then these trees would be would be quite young trees, and they would take some time to mature. And so I think in terms of Mr. Hawes his property, and we don't, we don't go on to anybody's properties, when we them taking these assessments, it's sort of done from publicly accessible locations, looking back at properties, or looking at, you know, for most closest we can get in terms of public access. And but I would think that, you know, Mr. Horses property is actually quite well screened from the surrounding.

21:36

From the from the road, so in terms of, like I say, the western boundary is quite substantial, that would be reinforced with the, with the screen fence, the northern boundary would have a break in it to allow the access road, having said that, if the access road that's been discussed, is moved to the east, then that boundary vegetation to the north would, would remain in in situ, and the existing screening capacity of that planting would be retained. And I think in terms of our assessment of the effects, I think we've identified, the construction, that the effects would be large, you know, we've acknowledged that there is potentially quite a lot of construction work going on both to the west of the property in terms of the the road itself, the erection of the fence,

22:22

and probably to a slightly lesser degree to the north in terms of the access road, and some awareness to the east of the of the access road coming around on the perimeter of the, of the landholding. And we sort of come to the conclusion that, you know, ultimately,

22:38

a lot of that existing screening, vegetation would be retained. And as a result, the magnitude of change that would happen would not be significant. It would be, you know, relatively minor. And as a result, the significance of effects that we've drawn out of that is that it would be slight and adverse.

23:00

Thank you

23:02

very much, Mr. Williams, for that clarification. Mr. Hawes, I believe that your hand is still up. Would you like to come back on this point? Yes, if you don't mind, a couple of points there that I don't agree with. Surprise, surprise. So the first one were

23:20

suggested that we live by some distance away from the property? Well, that's not correct. First of all, the measurements that have been offered in the past are not certainly not consistent with my

measurement. And indeed, the road starts widening to facilitate the lip, I asked my property as part of slip road. So immediately on,

23:43

can see aspects of their bike from our property directly.

23:48

This talk there about

23:51

noise dense one that only covers a small portion of my property, living vast amount of exposure. So that was to is good from a noise purview, it really isn't gonna mask the view,

24:08

the

24:10

the coronation of you. And obviously, looking at maturity of those trees, it will take a long, long time to recover that situation. I mean, I do look upon a single carriage. We're lined by coronation of you as a pleasant outlook with Rodan and Fields as a backdrop, all of that will be lost going forward. You the point to note is that the obviously it is possible that things can be improved if the access rule is moved, but there's no guarantees in life. And at this moment, saying, as far as the access rule is concerned, my point of access into my property is directly overlooking the lead, right.

24:48

So from a curve point of view, point of view, that's all been lost from that outlook. And again, just to close I just remember the

24:57

the idea of overlooking seven

25:00

lanes of tarmac, which can't be disputed, is not in any way. Pleasant.

25:09

Thank you, Mr. Horse.

25:12

Mr. Williams, would you like to come back on this issue on behalf of the applicant?

25:21

Yeah, I mean, in terms of the, the nice fence, the nice fence that we've got proposed does extend substantially northwards,

25:29

to the, almost to the,

25:32

within several metres of the northern boundary of Mr. Hall's his property. And I think it's important to say, you know, we have identified that western boundary vegetation, which is quite substantial and includes evergreens within that,

25:47

which does provide, you know, the immediate,

25:51

immediate views of the of the scheme would remain substantially screened. And, and,

26:01

you know, the, the retention of the vegetation is, is critical to making sure that the views to the north are screened as much as possible, in terms of the views of the of the scheme and towards delay by, as I said, you know, we don't expect to be wholesale loss of Mr. Horses boundary vegetation as a result of the scheme, and the removal of the vegetation would be limited to the access point. And in which case, the views would be relatively narrow in terms of what can be seen, I think in terms of the access that he's currently afforded off the a one, and the labour just sit somewhere to the north. So it's not directly opposite, although, you know, there might be, there might be an element of of

26:50

some,

26:52

the winding starting to happen in terms of the slip road coming through

26:56

at the, towards the entrance of Mr. Horses property, but the layby certainly sets some distance to the, to the north of the of the property.

27:07

Okay, and thank you very much for that information.

27:12

So, just to just to expand on that. So if you turn up,

27:17

if you turn up works, the works plans, and it's when you go on site, you will see this, but Google streetview can assist you here,

27:27

because obviously we like you are restricted our ability to form site views as well. So we're used to

27:34

this, the Street View day is plainly a pleasant summer day. So you'll take your own view of that now, if you look at workspace, you'll be able to see the this is sheet one of 19 you can see the proposed private means of access, which currently is shown on those drawings and which enters Mr. Hall's his property, you can see there's a slight inset where that enters the property from the north. Now, the existing vegetation is between that private means that that proposed private means of access and the

28:10

and the road. The

28:14

The next thing to say is that the

28:18

is that as one looks from

28:22

from above, Mr. Horses property looks out across what he called yesterday, his front garden, which has vegetation on all sides. It's a horseshoe where the closed side of the horseshoe is the North which direction to which Mr. halls is referring. So, his property looks to the north and that

28:43

that view is looking away to the north and that is what he is seeing from the house itself. From the garden ground. The views to the north are again filtered by the trees and you can see this in satellite photographs, filtered by the trees and again point away towards the north, there is the bungalow north of Mr. Hall's property that is that intervenes between the garden ground and the existing a one the new carriageway and lay by

29:19

are to be sited north of Mr. Hawes property. And you can see that and the lay by itself is just the east of the label on the works plan that says work number one, a.

29:31

And we can confirm that the lay by and the

29:36

the new carriageway will be at a lower level than the existing carriageway and what that means for Mr. Hall's is that he won't be looking out on the level across acres of asphalt, he will be seeing us a view that is not terribly dissimilar to the one he has at present and as I've noted for you, Sir, it is of course, filtered by

30:00

The existing vegetation, which is standard dense. And so that will affect his his view, and obviously mitigate the impacts of the scheme. Bearing in mind, of course, that there is an existing road in that location anyway.

30:19

Thank you very much, Mr. Bassford, I would probably suggest that we probably have pursued as much as we possibly can at DESE. met today. But I believe there will be an expectation that both parties will continue to have a constructive dialogue on the specific point.

30:40

One point for you, sir, is just also to note that there is already a lay by to the north as well. So there is a there is a reduced level of change from that point of view.

30:51

Thank you very much.

30:55

Mr. Horse, your hand is still up. Can I just confirm the two we're happy for us to progress? As I have suggested?

31:06

Just

31:10

in terms of

31:13

being eleven.org.

31:18

Mr. Horse, your hand is still up. Sorry, I lost a lot of I don't know if it's my internet or your internet. But I can guess what you were saying. And clearly,

31:30

I think you're right, this could go on. And I'm still not content with that. All the mitigation has been completed for the sake of time, and I will continue to have discussions with the African African. But I would just like to highlight that my objections remain, and nothing has changed.

31:52

Thank you, Mr. Horse.

31:54

I believe that we also have

31:57

another hand up at moment. Mr. Moore, would you like to intervene as well on this point?

32:07

And, Mr. Horse, I'm afraid that your hand is still up. If there was a way that you could just lower it. Thank you.

32:18

Mr. Moore.

32:25

The hand is no longer up. I just assumed it. Mr. Moore.

32:30

You no longer want to intervene on this specific point.

32:37

You might be on mute.

32:43

Can you hear me now and see the hand? No. I can see the hand now. And I can hear now. Yes. Mr. Moore, please. Sorry about that. Um, I would like to refer us to the mitigation master plan. Should one of 19 please.

32:59

Yes.

33:01

And it's at the point where it joins West, the new proposed road joins Westview?

33:09

Yes, we have a pink coloured line. And when you look at the key, it's his

33:17

hedge rule by agreement. Can I ask Google agreement is with please.

33:24

Mr. Buffett,

33:30

I will turn to Mr. Williams here who will explain that to you.

33:36

So thank you. Thank you. So the hedgerows by agreement. And we provided some in some locations for hedgerows, which we didn't consider were essential to mitigate significant effects. But we felt we're still

33:55

appropriate to put forward within the DCO.

33:59

And it was very much in terms of the, if the landowners were subject to agreement of having the hedgerows put in, then we were you know, we were happy within the within the scheme to include those implant those up. So it's something to be taken forward at the detailed design and to be discussed with individual landowners.

34:22

Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. In that case, that would presume be Taylor Wimpey.

34:30

In the case of this section here, yes, it would be whoever the landowner. Okay. And on other parts of the key you have the federal rules, which you think are required by mitigation. Yeah. And

34:46

given that, along the one, there is already a Hawthorne hedge.

34:51

Wouldn't it be prudent at least to take that up from

34:56

where it stops on the existing land?

35:00

by Taylor Wimpey so that's on the other side of the road to the pink line and take that up there a certain distance, just to help with mitigation to noise. And visual, really, but to that the first house in Westview.

35:17

And so I think that there's no intention at the moment to take out any vegetation that's sitting within the highway boundary.

35:25

The road would be constructed in the field. So whatever is along that boundary currently would be retained, or the other trees and other is currently there's a hedgerow behind the substation, which runs virtually right the way to the year one that's going to be lost.

35:44

If I may assist here, if Mr. Bassford Yes, if Mr. Moore refers to the

35:52

to sheet one of 19, the red line denotes the limit of the worst here. So yeah, and opposite West view. You can see there is a proposed amenity grassland, which is immediately in front of the homes there, then there's some white land, then the next thing you see is some double hash, double hatched land. And that is existing habitats to be retained. We then follow that along the boundary of the existing a one and the divergence to the county road, which is, which is to the north, you can see that that habitat, again, is all intended to be retained. And as Mr. Williams says, that is there's no intention to remove that. And that the new road would be constructed in the farmer's what is currently the farmer's field, and hence would not result in the removal of hydro save where it's necessary to cross the field boundary. That's very helpful. Thank you very much. Mr. Bassford.

37:01

Mr. Moore, is PUDs tuition before we can still horse, and I would suggest that perhaps we have explored this matter

37:12

as much as we possibly can now, I, I would perhaps encourage dialogue between an

37:21

applicant in yourself in the next deadlines through written representations to keep us updated on this specific point. If you are content with a position, please. Just that's fine. I haven't got an issue with that. Like I said, You're already prepared to do that. Just a comment on this pink line

37:46

that would help on other concerns I've got, if that was to be installed.

37:52

What are the other concerns that you would have? Well,

37:56

I've already expressed concerns in my written report that

38:01

there could be a change of use of these fields, perhaps to cattle or wildlife, or something like that. And that without this hedge would mean that they could travel down Westview there was no means of stopping them that I can see. So if I'd had was installed, or a fence was installed there, that would stop that possible. The concern was that if at some stage cattle were put into these fields, it would require a cattle grid. At that point, they're at the intersection between the two plots of land to stop the cattle getting out. So if the fence was there, there's no need for a couple of the noise associated with that.

38:42

Thank you very much, Mr. more depth, that that is helpful. I would perhaps suggest, as previously that perhaps dialogue with the applicant on this particular issue might be more useful than as getting into the detail.

39:01

The depth level of detail now at this at this hearing if you're happy with that, Mr. Moore, yes, that's

39:09

just I mean, there is a mitigation point there. So which we can simply clear off which is that we are expecting a stop proof pet fence to be to be provided there. So that is not

39:23

we would not have expected a unfenced area.

39:29

So

39:31

I'm sorry, um, I apologise but I, I believe that perhaps I do feel that we are getting into a lot of detail about this and I am mindful of the topics that we actually have to discuss on this agenda. I would strongly encourage that perhaps engagement between both parties on this very specific issue might be more useful in terms of moving on with the hearing if both parties agree

40:00

Please. Mr. Moore, would you be happy with that? Yes. Mr. Bassford.

40:07

Thank you very much. Thank you both.

40:11

Mr. Moore. Can I also ask you to please thank you very much for your hand. Thank you very much.

40:18

If no one else wants to actually intervene on this point, I'm going to now pass over to Mr. Gleason to lead on item four of the agenda, which is biodiversity ecology in the natural environment.

40:38

Thank you, Mr. Pinto.

40:41

So this item on the agenda, the key documents I'm going to be referring to,

40:49

will be the ancient woodland strategy

40:52

to refer to as AWS and that has reference a pp 247.

40:59

The arboricultural Report part a

41:02

reference a pp 2202 biodiversity, no net loss assessment for the scheme, which is rep two double o nine, and the culverts mitigation summary, Annex A, which is rep one Oh, 66.

41:23

So I'd like to begin with the issue of consideration whether the proposed development sorry, the proposed design and mitigation measures, to compensate for the proposed loss of ancient woodland are appropriate in terms of scale and extent, and whether they are adequately secured to the DCO.

41:45

So what I want to do is focus on the area within part A where proposed constructs the new bridge over the river Coquet parallel to the existing bridge. And we have the woodlands on the sudden embankments to expand woods, and northern embankments and cheese milk banks.

42:11

I'd like to begin by just confirming that

42:15

the discussion going to have will be focused on the scheme as submitted.

42:21

The applicant has indicated an intention to submit a change requests which could have implications for this area, we're not going to be considering those matters at this hearing.

42:33

So the ancient woodland strategy, talks about direct loss of naught point two, seven hectares of chips, plank wood.

42:44

And that's within the SSSI loss of naught point four hectares of the Felton Park, local wildlife sites. So together that makes up the area of nought point six, eight hectares, which is what I think the woodland trust cited in their relevant.

43:04

Can I clarify that that figure is correct, because I think the woodland trusts, possibly misinterpreted it. Mr. Buffett.

43:16

At this point, sir, I'm going to introduce Mr. Jacques Fenwick, who is the expert from WSP, who deals with biodiversity and ecology issues, and he will be able to

43:32

address you in relation to that. Mr. Pennick. Thank you.

43:36

Thank you, Mr. Buffett. And good afternoon. Yes, the values you outlined with the within both Deutsche Bank woodland and mill banks are correct. And they comprise the nought point six, eight in total. And then the compensation plan team proposed is it's a ratio of 12 to one. And that comes to an area of 8.16 hectares. So that's based on both areas, even though it's the only the southern side which is actually designated as ancient woodland. So correct. Yes, that is correct. Okay. Now,

44:12

it's done the reference standard somewhere within one of your answers. It says the area of nohr point six eight hectares

44:25

is an area that will be explored further detailed design stage. The implication being that that fear could be reduced. Is there any possibility that it could increase?

44:41

No, I wouldn't thought so. The design at present is it takes into account the order limits that's been designed which is considered sufficient to be able to build the scheme as it is designed. The aim to reduce would be just yet to pull in the limits essentially and reduce the habitat area of the area of habitat that's affected.

45:00

It, but no, it's not anticipated to increase. So if it's based on the order limits, it couldn't increase because you have to go outside the order limits and that would be permitted. Okay, that's correct. Yeah. And it's also been assumed that all woodland within that order limits at present would be lost. And that's kind of where that might be refined. Okay.

45:18

Good. And so the arbour cultural reports

45:23

refers to the two parcels as w 120. And w 121.

45:31

Towards degree of the trees within these areas have been assessed.

45:36

So, they've been assessed by an agricultural specialist who undertook fee for tree survey across the scheme. And so that looked at, and I can't confirm exactly, it wasn't myself who undertook the survey, but it would have looked at the woodland parcel as a whole, but also the trees that it contains, and they would have done a specialist survey. Okay, and

46:01

that Mr. Pennock, would that have been a survey on site? Or would that have been a desktop survey? So it would have been both a desk based and a site visit? Thank you, Mr. Buffett.

46:15

And

46:17

so within the board cultural reports, society just refers to two areas. Whereas for the remainder of that

46:28

report, details are provided about individual trees. So I just want to know, how many trees are likely to be lost within that area of naught point six hectares is a figure for that is an order of magnitude, if the entire area were to be

46:45

required, there isn't no so in this case, we haven't looked at a tree by tree basis. And because it is a designation of an ancient woodland, rather than individual trees, we've looked at it as a whole. And then the compensation value is based on the area of that habitat that's affected rather than individual trees. Is that normal practice not to look at individual trees in Woodland like that. And I think in this case, it is a suitable approach to look at the area affected rather than the individual trees, due to kind of the density can change within a woodland.

47:19

So yeah, it's suitable to look at the woodland as a as a whole. And, and its function. Okay.

47:29

My next question really was for natural England, but they aren't here today. So we can pick the point up with them specifically. But it may be what I'll do is I'll identify now and maybe an ongoing discussions with them anyway, that the matter can be addressed. So

47:52

what I was looking for was further explanation as to why the loss of ancient woodland had been determined to be acceptable. I think it's fairly clear that Natural England has agreed with the applicants this 12 to one ratio, and therefore the principle is established, they've confirmed the size is that of replacement,

48:17

panting would be acceptable. And what I was wanting to ask Natural England, so

48:25

yes, Natural England. And, and maybe it's something that's you have evidence of yourselves? Is there any evidence for loss of ancient woodland elsewhere, where similar sort of ratio is applied? As we say here, there's

48:41

agreements on 12 to one, I think.

48:44

Northumberland County Council was suggesting four to one.

48:48

And

48:50

the woodland trust was suggesting 30 to one. So it's quite a wide range variation. How did it come to being 12 to one? So just on the specifics, you mentioned about the fourth one from Northumberland County Council, and I'm sure they're able to confirm I believe that was specifically in relation to the Coquet River Felton local wildlife site, rather than the ancient woodland habitats. And there is no defined ratio or compensation ratio for ancient woodland. It is very much on a bespoke basis, I believe the 30 to one ratio that the woodland trust, referred to as stems from much larger schemes, things like high speed to, I believe I've implemented such a ratio of 31, acknowledging the quite large impacts that they're having on the habitat. And the one to 12 in this instance, was derived through negotiations and kind of discussions with natural England. And based on the limited extent of the impact of this scheme, which is quite restricted to quite a small area adjacent to an existing road. The measures that were proposed to mitigate those impacts and therefore the resulting kind of compensation and so on.

50:00

Very much just looking at this individual case and determining that we did start to kind of lower ratio as well and kind of work to settle up to, to kind of one point 12, one to 12. Okay, thank you.

50:14

And then the stems common grounds with natural England moments.

50:21

Table 3.2

50:24

has items eight to 19, showing the number of matters under the heading of ancient woodland strategy. That's page 39. For reference, they all seem to be very specific agreed matters.

50:40

Are there going to be other aspects of the strategy included within the statement of common grounds?
And I suppose what I was expecting comes back to the questions natural England,

50:52

it would be helpful to see a statement

50:57

generally within the statements of common ground that natural England confirms that that statement is acceptable.

51:05

Can you be thinking of doing something a high level that says that is acceptable? This seems to be such a key document. Yeah, I can definitely pick that up with our with our consultation with natural England and request that we will look at that statement specifically. And all the ancient wood strategy, which has been discussed throughout the kind of progression of the scheme and capture within the statement of common ground as those iterations of progress or natural England have reviewed, and both an early very skeleton document. And to that, and then through consultation and kind of discussions with specialists and experts, we've kind of managed to develop that strategy. And the detail that I believe is in table 3.2, of the statement of common ground, actually was agreed some time ago as well, when the two parts of the scheme were being considered as separate schemes. And that's when the danger wooden structure was developed. And we had at that point, a statement of common ground between both the applicant and natural England that was signed by both parties. And once both parts of the scheme were pulled together as a single scheme. And that essentially, what we've termed as an interim statement of Common Ground has been used to inform the current iteration. And so I believe, I think I could be correct in saying that they are in agreement with the strategy as it stands. But yeah, we can definitely look to explore a statement that's really clear on that, yes.

52:23

That they are in agreement, but it's tense of reading between the lines rather than it being set out?
Absolutely. Normally. Okay, that's helpful. Thank you.

52:35

At this point, can I just ask Northumberland County Council

52:39

for their view on the proposed mitigation, and I think in the Li confirms that council's content with proposed mitigation assesses the impacts as negative on the basis of time delay. Do you want to add anything further to that?

52:57

It's Mr. Francis, is that for you?

53:01

Hello. And yes, my name is Andrew Francis. I'm an ecologist at Northumberland county council. And we are happy with the compensation strategy. And we think it's in line with both government standing advice on ancient woodland emerging policy in our local plan, which is q o. p four, and guidance in the NPPF. We think this does, this does count as exceptional circumstances. And we think that the compensation is suitable. So it's in line with that policy. Okay, that's very helpful. Thank you.

53:42

I don't think there's anything else we can count on interest there. So that's fine. Let me just move on with my notes.

54:03

Yes, the woodland strategy itself

54:10

talks about a woodland, an ancient Woodlands management and monitoring plan.

54:18

And

54:20

again, that seems to be quite an important document that emerges out of the woodland strategy.

54:31

And

54:33

the woodlands strategy doesn't appear to be directly addressed in the dcl. So we've got article 40, which covers felling lovely trees 41 covers trees of Genesis tpos requirements for covers the camp and hence

54:53

the requirement five is landscaping

54:56

somewhere within all of those one might expect

55:00

To see some reference the ancient Woodlands strategy given its importance overall, Mr. Buffett and not surprised to see

55:09

that this points

55:12

that you're way ahead of us when we looked at this, in preparation for today's hearing, Mr. Williams and Mr. Greg, and the team identified that the ancient woodland strategy isn't referred to in the document, it does appear in schedule 12.

55:35

It doesn't appear in the requirements and we believe that there should be an express for reference. So what we are going to do in order to address that is to pick up at the next deadline when the DCO is reissued, and express reference to it, thereby securing it and ensuring it is it's developed, as you have just indicated, and that the document can be identified. So we agree with you on that, sir. Thank you. And then I suppose, building on that the management plan that goes with it will that needs to be specifically referred to or the

56:14

different by the general

56:17

I would expect the management plan to spring forth from the strategy. And so we will do, one follows from the other. And so therefore, the way that the requirement whether we include it in requirements four or five, which is the landscaping one or its own,

56:39

its own requirements. Either way, obviously, it needs to lead to the management plans. Okay, that's helpful to hear that.

56:48

So, the strategy says final details of the strategy shall be developed at detailed design stage brackets identified within this document, with any deviation from the strategy to be further discussed and agreed with natural England and other appropriate statutory consultees.

57:09

What further changes are envisaged? And why can't they be included now?

57:19

I think the primaries are hot. Sorry, Mr. Buffett, if you want to continue, I was gonna say I was made in hand again, to you, Mr. Bennett. Thank you very much. And yet, the main reason for a high level strategy at this instance, is that there are several proposed actions that would inform that. And so there are some investigations required into the soil type, where we're proposing to provide compensator II planting, which therefore may inform the detail of how we go about management. And, and so it was deemed that at this stage, the best way forward would be to undertake those prior to kind of developing the more detailed or having a better understanding. And so that's why the detail strategy isn't yet developed and would be detailed at a later stage once we've kind of been able to undertake those investigations. Okay, thank you. So, if, if it's subject to further review, then

58:20

could the TCL requirements address that? And should that then

58:26

refer to consulting with natural England's and urban planning authority? For three commission? I don't know. Yes, that that's easy. It will have a very similar structure to the other requirements, with a view to avoiding duplication, but yes, it's in the same way as written skimp investigation would be prepared in consultation with historic England. So the watering strategy should be

58:58

prepared in consultation with the county ecologist and with

59:03

Natural England and so forth. Thank you.

59:13

And final point, I think on the strategy,

59:20

it says, under the reference to the management monitoring plan, it's anticipated that the applicant shall be responsible for implementing the plan.

59:31

Although may appoint a third party to fulfil the requirements referenced as the overseeing organisation

59:40

Where is that referenced? And who would be the overseeing organisation? What do you have in mind there? So this was merely a way to capture the fact that

59:50

the applicant may or

59:52

may appoint a almost like a specialist, landscape contractor to manage this area. And so it was just a way of capturing that

1:00:00

I'm providing a narrative to it. And yeah, it was just to secure who would be responsible for that area, which would largely sit with the applicant unless they appointed a third party to manage it on their behalf. And what we can do, I think is we can just look at that text to make that clearer for Mr. Gleason and successors to him who may look at this.

1:00:22

Thank you. That's helpful.

1:00:27

So I have no further comments on the ancient woodland strategy to any other artists wish to comment on this issue.

1:00:40

Know, okay, thank you very much, Mr. Fenwick.

1:00:46

I don't know if you're staying on or. And now let's move to the issue of biodiversity net gain and biodiversity. No net loss. Don't go anywhere. Mr. Pinnock.

1:00:57

Thank you, are you looking forward to this one?

1:01:00

Okay.

1:01:04

The key documents here is the biodiversity no net loss assessment, the scheme as a whole, which was submitted that deadline to and is wrapped to double m nine

1:01:20

and has a very helpful, sensitive summary with it, as well.

1:01:26

And

1:01:32

can I begin by asking the applicant just to outline the main issues regarding biodiversity net gain and biodiversity no net loss as they applied the scheme and outline where there are differences between highways England's and interested parties. And I'm, I think the reason I'm asking this in this way is because I think there's possibly a lack of understanding and some interested parties about the basis as the print this principle applies to national infrastructure projects.

1:02:07

Go ahead and do

1:02:09

so for national infrastructure projects and sips there is no legal requirement to meet a by diversity net gain or a no net loss. And the reason for producing diversity, no net loss report for this specific theme has been in response to the applicant's own internal kind of guidance. So there's the highways, England biodiversity plan, and also in response to statements within the broad improvement strategy too. And the National Planning policy statement, the national policy statement for national networks, which alludes to a neural net loss, and so the applicant has produced a biodiversity loss report to look

at this for their own internal kind of requirements. And the applicant looks at by adverse changes in biodiversity across their network. So they look at it at a national scale rather than a scheme by scheme. And so the report that's been produced for this scheme would also be used to inform and the changes in biodiversity across a national level.

1:03:11

Thank you, Mr. Fenwick. But just as you will be aware, sir, the law in relation to biodiversity net gain by diversity, no net loss is evolving at present. And there is legislation currently on the stocks but not yet in force passing through Parliament, which will require Town and Country Planning Act 1990 schemes to comply with a biodiversity net gain requirement. And so, ordinary planning projects will lead to look at that secure, relevant mitigation now, that does not apply to national,

1:03:55

nationally significant infrastructure projects, because they are not brought within that particular

1:04:04

regime not intended to be within that regime.

1:04:07

That set the policy objectives such as in the in the national policy statement on national networks, which Mr. Bennett has just referred. Those mean that biodiversity net loss has to be looked at as part of preparations for projects like this. And as an organisation highways England has a stretch goal of looking for looking to achieve net game, but it is currently working to a biodiversity no net loss standard, because obviously its aspiration is forward looking. And its objective is to be in a place where BMG is being achieved in the future. But that is not the obligation that sits upon it at present.

1:04:50

Thank you.

1:04:58

So the

1:05:01

Part of the

1:05:03

report identifies that the scheme only passes four out of the 10 good practice principles is that a concern for this scheme, recognising lots of humans defending guns is the best fit of said, notice. its relevance.

1:05:23

It's it's not necessarily concerned for the scheme. It's an open and honest account of against the policies. And largely the scheme falls down because of the unavoidable impacts to irreplaceable

habitats being ancient woodland. And so immediately in accordance with the biodiversity net gain process and the policies, and the scheme was unable to achieve no net loss or net gain on that basis.

1:05:46

And quite a few of the policies recognise that.

1:05:51

So if the woodland affected were not ancient, the performance would be better. It's that particular parameter which is

1:06:00

which is affected by this scheme. And that's a function of the place that the scheme is we we could not build the a one except the place where the aid one is.

1:06:15

Thank you. Can I ask Northumberland county council and then Environment Agency if they wish to respond to anything that's been said so far about the applicants position in respect of biodiversity net gain? The stones, this will be

1:06:36

I just asked Mr. Francis, if he or she wants this comment.

1:06:43

Hello again. And we as an authority don't have mandatory net gain.

1:06:52

Because of the environment will not be made lawyer. We do have a variety of policies. But we don't apply it as a mandatory net gain of a certain percentage. I think that in the context of the current road corridor, we do understand that

1:07:08

the baseline is probably not

1:07:11

brilliant at the moment because it is a busy road corridor. We are happy with the approach that's been taken. And we particularly welcome that there's been a proportion of the precautionary principles been applied to the loss of certain habitats. We do agree with the ecological assessment that some design amendments at later stages are desirable. We particularly like to see hedging water costs loss offset, either through amendments to design or

1:07:43

them some sort of new hedge planting. But I do note that it was mentioned earlier about the landscape, the landowner's agreements for those. So I think we're happy at the moment, we would like to see the

net loss brought down if at all possible. But we do accept that there are some things that wouldn't necessarily be in a biodiversity net gain assessments such as new road crossings for wildlife.

1:08:09

The road is it is a it is a significant barrier for wildlife at the moment. So and that, in turn, has a knock on effect on things like hedgerows and watercourses, which we would normally consider as connectivity features, which maybe aren't so much here because of the fact that the road is in the way. So overall, we're happy, although it's possible for the design to be tweaked as time goes on to to reduce that net loss, we would be far happier.

1:08:38

Thank you very much.

1:08:41

There's no wish to come back on that for ask the environment agencies comment. I don't think we missed a fabrication. So we have nothing to add to that. That's the That's for you. At No, I would agree. Yeah. No, nothing to add to that one. And thank you, sir. Thank you. With the Environment Agency like to comment on this principle, please.

1:09:07

No, no one willing to

1:09:11

feel that they need to comment.

1:09:15

That's fine. Oh, sorry. Is this

1:09:18

so if Carol bolts I was just confirming that is not something that we wanted to comment on. We agree with what Mr. Bass lizard said in terms of the law on biodiversity net gain or lack thereof, the moments Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. Hi, it's I'm Christoph Dobrowski Sorry, I was double muted. They're a bit of an error.

1:09:44

I think Yeah, I'd put in some comments regarding the biodiversity and no net loss. And I think it's, you know, we understand that it's sort of, you know, different with this level of project, but also that

1:10:00

We recognise that it's not been applied across planning.

1:10:05

I think it was sort of the early

1:10:10

reports submitted said very large numbers of net loss, I think was it what our courses were 57, around 57%, and then another 5% on subpart. B, then Part A, which have now been reviewed since we made those comments. And so it's, I guess it's good that,

1:10:30

you know, the these have been flagged and we've seen sort of a reevaluation.

1:10:36

I think, early days, as well, we didn't have any sort of clear understanding of what any of the mitigation would be, and which again, has I think, changed in the updated documents. And so yeah, I think overall, we will kind of, you know, even though it's not required to get

1:10:56

to achieve a net gain, you know, we are seeing a bit of a

1:11:01

net loss, and it was just sort of, you know, sort of having the ambitions to do as much as we can where we can. So, we have seen that there has been additional mitigation suggested. So, these are certain things like 30 areas of wet woodland. So, hectares and 12 hectares of wet marginal planting, which is, is quite considerable. And, again, something we weren't aware of earlier. And it's not something that we, I don't think we have in a plan or anything, you know, existing and I understand that probably will be developed over time. And there are, I guess, a lot of difficulties with, with Korea and things like wet woodland, there's not always that necessarily a great deal of sites, it just seemed like quite a large amount. So it would be good to understand if these, if this area, you know, has has, is it? Is it just planting along

1:12:02

the edge of the watercourse there for riparian or is it actual, low lying areas that I've identified that are suitable that can be? You know, I'll have, you know, have discussions been hard with landowners for how feasible that is, and so on.

1:12:19

Okay, thank you for that. I think some of those points I'll pick up

1:12:24

in the next gender it

1:12:30

get the impact of loss of water costs on biodiversity, so I won't ask the applicant to respond immediately. But maybe they can address that later. Mr. Laverty, your camera's on. Did you wish to speak?

1:12:47

Sorry, sir. No, no, I just switched it on this time. Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

1:12:59

So much love to the cameras still on. You're, you're now on mute.

1:13:05

Sorry, sir. Switch it off here. Nice. All right. Thank you.

1:13:10

Okay, let's move on.

1:13:43

I think that's all I had in relation to the topic of biodiversity net came by those three, no net loss. So it makes good headway on that one. And to that, thank you.

1:13:58

And are there any other comments from parties? Someone else wish to say anything on this topic before we move on.

1:14:10

Now, okay, let's then move to the next topic, which is on the agenda as to explore the effects of loss of hedgerows, other habitats of principal importance, the loss of watercourses and biodiversity. What I'm going to do is split this. So that's a deal first of all with hedgerows and other habitats, Principal importance, and then we'll come back to watercourses.

1:14:41

You'll need best authentic for hedgerows. And then when we get to watercourses I shall introduce sir Mr. Sharp. Thank you.

1:14:54

So just

1:14:58

Hello

1:15:00

It might be helpful. Just to just summarise the position, particularly of hedgerows to know that has come up in number of comments. If you can take us through the

1:15:17

measures of existing hedgerows, the amount to be lost, and then the amounts create of new habitat creation through hedgerows and explain

1:15:30

why that is the situation please.

1:15:34

Yes, no problem, sir.

1:15:37

So, head roles are largely lost to the scheme as they fall under the alignment of the scheme. So there's physical loss of the hedgerow. And particularly as either widening given the the kind of the rural setting of the scheme, there are hedgerows aligning the existing one and therefore widening resulting in loss of those habitats. Similarly, the offline section of party would pass through separate sections of hedgerow and therefore lose that habitat. And the function of the hedgerow as a habitat provides a connective function for wildlife

1:16:17

through the landscape. So that's been considered when implementing or kind of creating this habitat or reinstating the hedgerow habitat within the landscape strategy and the landscape plan.

1:16:28

So hedgerows have been either reinstated, which is where there's been a kind of a temporary loss due to construction, but can be reinstated within December alignment or has been have been created. And largely hedgerows have been created parallel to the scheme to encourage wildlife to move up and down the scheme open along the scheme rather than across the road, and have also been used as a tool to guide wildlife to designed crossing points, those being wildlife, culverts, or the culverts wet which are suitable for wildlife to pass beneath the scheme.

1:17:00

Because of the nature of the length of the skin, particularly on the offline section of party, whilst we may lose sections of hedge rule, as the scheme passes through a section of hedge, we're also creating hedgerows parallel to the road, and therefore increasing the kind of the length of the headroom in comparison to those lost in that locality.

1:17:20

And in terms of length of each category,

1:17:25

if you could explain that, please.

1:17:28

And could you just confirm.

1:17:31

So with the existing length of hedgerow, across the scheme,

1:17:37

the length of hedgerow to be lost, and then the length of head show to be created.

1:17:45

So I don't have the values to hand. But I'm aware from a quick review that I believe that whilst we are losing

1:17:57

several 10s of kilometres of hedgerow, we're creating more than being lost. And as I've said, that comes down to the design of this game, particularly in the offline section of party, which contributes to the greater increase of creation of habitat hedgerow habitat in comparison to that last, and due to taking out shorter sections, but creating those parallel.

1:18:22

So as I understand it, the intro creation is

1:18:28

should have got the figures here. So you're you're losing in the order of

1:18:36

23,000

1:18:42

metres, and you're creating 32,000 metres. So it's quite a significant increase that you're providing.

1:18:53

How did you come up with that sort of the exact figure but that codes of magnitude? Why is it so much greater than one to one new provision. So from a biodiversity perspective, we would look to put in what we replace. And however, hedgerows have more than just a diversity function as a proxy explained that their habitat and provide connectivity and therefore the length to reinstate or to create may need to be more than that removed so that we can direct wildlife to appropriate crossing points. And hedgerows also form a screening function within kind of a landscape assessment that Mr. Williams referred to earlier. And so that it's been used as tools for many different artists or for several different functions rather than just on its biodiversity value. And which therefore has resulted in an excess of a one to one ratio and would be captured through the landscape mitigation plan. It is the app so that the the amount of petrol back in is captured in the landscape plumber. That's where the measurements would come from. Yes, yes. Okay. Thank you.

1:20:10

and other related matters, I suppose, paragraph 9.9 point five of the s pop be

1:20:19

tops spouts created habitats would be managed. So they develop into their respective HPI quality and condition in accordance with the diversity known that loss calculations. The management and monitoring of habitats would be completed as details within chapter seven of the Yes.

1:20:40

Handle documented in the proposed ecological stroke environmental management plan, which relates back into the

1:20:49

real thing

1:20:52

that's been developed in detail design.

1:20:56

We touched on this to hearing the other day.

1:21:00

Where do these ecological or environmental management plans fit into the wider camp and react position? And why are they provided as part of

1:21:16

this examination alongside the landscape master plan, for instance, most end tips I've looked at would have this, it would be called a lamp will be landscape and environmental management plan. In this scheme says Be you've got a landscape master plan at this stage, and you're leaving all the environmental matters until detailed design, I wonder why that is the case?

1:21:49

Well,

1:21:51

I let Mr. heric put some of the flesh on the bones. But if we were to have produced the master plans to which you refer, they would have contained as much as the React does. So the React provides the same as one would simply put it in a different document. And in this case, you have as you've indicated, a very lengthy set of measures in the camp and react, going to help you with some navigation tools for future readers.

1:22:28

The point, though, is that it doesn't particularly matter what you call the documents, the critical thing is whether the mitigation is secured and we would say that the mitigation is sufficiently secured by the by the cap.

1:22:44

Okay, that's

1:22:48

the document is saying that the proposed ecological environmental management plan would be developed detailed design. My question is why hasn't that been prepared yet when it would be for most other insects, because there is no need to do so big. So, that is it this is a matter of drafting convenience. So in some cases, the draughtsman will say, here is a draft,

1:23:17

a draft, LEM, a draft biodiversity master plan, draft archaeological master plan and so on and so on and so on. And they produce those separate documents, the way that highways England proceeds in its DCA is to provide that the content of future plans is identified in the back and then those plans are born out of the campus later stage. So that that is why the structure is as you have that, as as you have seen here. It doesn't mean that you don't have before you've double negative This means that you already have before you the data which will tell you that the future master plans will be

1:24:05

will be sufficient to protect the environment and the headlines, the content and so forth is already captured.

1:24:16

Okay, but

1:24:19

there are highways and schemes to include landscaping, environment can management plans as part of the examination. And it's that it's the environmental sides which to say I think

1:24:34

you've said it will be produced as a detailed stage, which is often what happens because the length is outlined and then develops in detail. what's lacking appears at the moment is the outline length.

1:24:49

How applying ecological elements, we've got the outline landscape, and

1:24:56

unless you're telling me is somewhere else, it's in the rear

1:25:00

There's a very detailed riak. So what you have, what's your concern is, is that the, the essay plan, as it were for the environmental ecological master plan doesn't exist as an essay plan. But what I am seeking to reassure you is that if you turn to the relevant provisions in the rack, then you will find exactly what you would otherwise see in a draft, an outline plan, and so you don't need another document to do that it can all be in a sub subset or one document.

1:25:39

Okay. So the critical point is not what we call the documents or how they're divided up, the critical point is whether there is a provision expressed, that secures the necessary mitigation. And there will be a

master plan produced that is that mitigation? So to do that here, we say, is the mitigation expressed and I'm saying yes, that's in the react, will that be developed further answer? Yes. Because we know we're going to have to produce the

1:26:09

future management plans. And we know that they're going to have to capture what's in the reacts. So we know that those are going to be delivered. We don't have to have the specific outline plan to get us there.

1:26:21

Thank you for that, I would say as well. One of the key issues is being able to find the information, which is discussed in the days. That's the element that I think needs greater navigation and you've undertaken to do that. So I think, I think that we we've already had some, some discussions with the team about how we're going to drop that introductory part and perhaps and just subdivides those tables to assist the reader.

1:26:53

What we can also usefully do is explain that, for instance, the archaeological. Actually, let's not refer to that one.

1:27:06

The environmental control plan, colon general ecology will include the elements expressed in and then give the references that we discussed and the s, a and b references that we expressed yesterday when we were talking to you, whichever day it was when we were talking to you about the

1:27:29

the way that you read across between the s and the React. Yes. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you.

1:27:37

Okay.

1:27:41

Just a couple more questions, I think on this show, I should say, I've just answered that one. There's a

1:27:49

panic wanted to add anything in relation to that he hasn't sent me a virtual post it note. And so. So I think that that's

1:27:58

the thing, and you're welcome to jump in. If you want to say add anything to that? No, I think I have nothing to add to that one. And guess what I have received as a virtual post it note from Mr. Williams, who says that the ecological strategy will inform the landscape plan. So we'll look at the way those two, those two requirements are addressed as well to provide the clarity that you're seeking. Thank you.

1:28:22

And my next question was really for natural England. And, again, if there are ongoing discussions with natural England, perhaps the applicant could relay this point to them. And we can also pick it up in further hearings on written questions, but it relates to

1:28:44

their written record, so irrelevant rep, Tableau eight, and it says the main issues raised by the application are 2.4. Point two, the proposal will results in the permanent loss of HPI.

1:28:59

And goes on to talk about that in a bit more depth. What I wanted to hear from natural England was his the matter expanded upon in other representations and for the applicant, what progress has been made to address the matter. And will it be dressed in the stems of common ground?

1:29:19

Mr. bus? Is that something you deal with please? Mr. Fenwick, if you

1:29:26

all pops out to the scam and off it goes to Mr. Fenwick. Yet no problem.

1:29:32

Yes, it i don't i don't believe that's been expanded in other representations. And but it is something that we continue to discuss with natural England to see if we can come to a kind of agreement to progressing that forward. So that is still on the agenda for us to consult with natural England. Thank you.

1:29:48

And just for a break for lunch, the local impacts with port

1:29:57

one oh 71 says the scheme would resolve

1:30:00

And some loss of habitats within landscape that currently provides connectivity and dispersal routes to species.

1:30:08

And just to us, as the county council wish to comment on those comments on the loss of habitats are set out in its local impacts report.

1:30:20

Is there anyone who wishes to identity that's where you can sense that is moving forward? Was there Francis, I think you mentioned this earlier anyway. But if you were to send him further, thank you. So now with there's nothing further to add other than the comments earlier. Thank you. Thank you.

1:30:42

So other Any other comments from any other interested party in relation to the effects of loss of hedgerows or other habitats principal importance?

1:30:56

No.

1:30:58

Okay, so

1:31:01

after the break, we'll then deal with the loss of watercourses on biodiversity.

1:31:08

And then, one further matter under the heading of biodiversity, before we move on to water, and transport, just consciousness, we'll be reconvening it. Two o'clock.

1:31:23

Sorry, 230. And going through to four o'clock, so got an hour and a half left.

1:31:30

I wouldn't want to start transports are given we have some constraints anyway, from Ken's councils, transports representatives, I wouldn't want to start up and not completed today. So could ask parties over lunch to take a view as to whether or not we complete water environment today and then come back to our tomorrow morning just to deal with transport and traffic.

1:31:59

I'll leave that floating for now.

1:32:02

And I'll

1:32:05

just say sorry, sir, I was just going to ask my team to update me on that. And obviously northenden will consider that also. But my one question for you, sir, as you have cryptically referred to the water environment. And one other subject. As

1:32:24

a side note, whether I could let my experts go a lot

1:32:28

better. And it was under biodiversity, the ecology in natural environments, we've got the loss of hedge of water courses on biodiversity. Then the final bullet point is discussion regarding proposals to

minimise impacts on the a 1068 diversion on the North London marine spa. So that was the final element biodiversity to cover after lunch.

1:32:57

Okay, that that is that's very helpful, but that makes complete sense to panic and I will be able to assist you in relation to that one. That means that I can really some other ones of my experts, that's really helpful. Thank you. Okay, so the time is now just after 130. We'll adjourn now until two o'clock. And as before, can I ask the people

1:33:22

who remain locked into the examination, switch off microphones and cameras and who is him again to thank you very much