

# TEXT\_A1iN\_ISH2\_Session3\_25022021

Thu, 2/25 4:26PM • 1:35:31

00:03

Well, good afternoon time is now 2:30 and time to resume the hearing. And before the break, I asked if parties could give some consideration to the issue of timetabling the remaining items on the agenda. Could we begin with you please? Mr. Bassford?

00:27

Do Forgive me, sir. The question is, as to the arrangements for the of the agenda as I understand it, we are able to deal with transport this afternoon or tomorrow morning. So it is what best suits you and I can certainly see the advantage in having the item fully heard in one session rather than splitting it into its it was much, much Yes. I think we're moving that way. Given that the highway, the Northumberland county Council's officers may not be able to attend to the latter part of this session. So let's have a clean break. Yeah, so my preference would not be to take things out of sequence, it would be better if it was acceptable to you to deal with it in a single session. Tomorrow morning. Okay. I'll just ask Council for their response. And then we can decide the way forward. Miss Robbie, is it? So you coming back to me on this or someone else as well? Yeah. So yes, ma'am. Yeah. Yes, our strong preference, because we can't be certain that we've got our officers are here for the latter part of this this session. So yeah, our strong preference is to take the item tomorrow morning.

01:44

I think because things are panning out, it's likely that we will finish the other items this afternoon.

01:52

But I don't think we'd finished transport today, even if we did started. So that doesn't assume any points in doing that. So on that basis, we'll continue now with biodiversity, then we'll move on to deal with

02:08

water matters. And stop at the end of that item. And then come back tomorrow morning to pick up transport and traffic and the remaining items. Good. Thank you.

02:24

So returning to the agenda, then

02:29

it's the third second part of the third bullet point on biodiversity, the effects of loss of watercourses on biodiversity.

02:41

And there will be some overlap between questions which I intend to ask. And the next item on the agenda, the water environment, which Mr. Pinto will lead on.

02:52

But let's make a start on this. Now, particularly from this biodiversity perspective. So the relevant rep from the Environment Agency, which is

03:06

number 204. That sets out a number of concerns about the effects of loss of watercourses on biodiversity, among other items, and

03:18

the applicant responded and rep one oh 65. And that entire document is probably I think 40 pages long. So certainly don't intend to going through that in any depth. But what I'd like to do to begin with is to ask the applicant to briefly outline this approach to this topic.

03:41

And what it considers are the issues in relation to loss of boards causes on biodiversity, then to ask the Environment Agency to respond. And in doing that, can parties advisors please have been any further consideration given to

04:01

to the response at rep one? Oh, 65? And are there ongoing discussions about the resolution of these issues? So again, can I start with you please, Mr. Bassford?

04:15

Thank you, Mr. Gleason. In relation to this topic. I'm going to call Mr. Andrew Smith, who is an expert from WSP in relation to roads, drainage from the water environment, and he will be able to talk about the consequences for the change in the environment as a result of the covering of some streams, which is necessitated by the

04:45

the duelling of the A1 for the scheme. Mr. Penick will also be on standby because he of course handles the biodiversity element, but that Mr. Mr. Smith will

05:00

deal in the first place in relation to the question or the

05:06

how we have approached the need for cold extension. Mr. Smith, perhaps you could introduce yourself to the question and then take this point forward. Okay.

05:23

A tentative director in WSP, a chartered member the water and environmental management.

05:30

we've approached well,

05:34

to start with our refer you to our document.

05:39

So I'm just trying to find his name.

05:45

Brett, one dash zero, C sits, which is a topic mitigation strategy. document.

05:55

Outline outlines our intentions on mitigating the impacts.

06:03

And the need for the culvert.

06:07

To be standard in the first place, we are largely

06:12

replicating what is already in place and they are holding needed to facilitate the widening of the road network.

06:23

In most instances, we are well, the some of the road network, we're extending what's already there. And some others we are constructing new culverts where there's a new bit with a new section of road has been constructed.

06:40

Overall

06:43

that was there is an increase in length of culvert. There are mitigation measures in place to help offset that as detailed in our COVID mitigation strategy.

06:58

So,

07:00

as an extra part of the question,

07:03

perhaps you can explain a bit more in depth about

07:09

the

07:12

the effects for each of the two parts of the scheme. So for instance, and

07:23

Part B results in a net loss of 57% watercourses, I think party to 5% so perhaps could explain the differences there. And also the quality of watercourses as well.

07:41

Okay.

07:46

Two Sessions

07:54

for part B

07:58

is the length of COVID within the designated wF D water bodies increasing by approximately 28 metres. But we're also offsetting that through removing step we're

08:17

introducing gravel beds in the COVID extensions and creating about half a hectare of woodland within the wider catchment.

08:28

The

08:30

within Part A

08:35

is an increase in COVID length by 20 metres and we are

08:42

increasing the gravel beds within the new culverts

08:48

creating woodland of about eight Hectors

08:52

within the catchment.

08:54

The quality of the water courses themselves.

09:01

Some of them are largely ephemeral, so they're only flowing during rainfall events. So,

09:08

not all of them have a permanent

09:11

water

09:15

aspect to them.

09:17

Okay, and while there are others like the river Lynn culvert, which can have fish in it, and we're introducing fish bass falls within the culvert to aid the fish passage through it. The ship it and Brooke shipped and burned however, we didn't have a gravel bed in the new section. And that's why we're having the removal of existence that were to aid the fish passage.

09:45

Okay, so, just go back to the

09:49

percentage loss is recorded in the

09:54

ies as points to be 57 points.

10:00

69% of water causes. But to be clear, that is the loss of the natural channel, which is effectively put into

10:10

a culvert. That's how you that loss is calculated, is it? Or is there another element to it?

10:22

So, it is not, for instance, that 50% of all water courses within the within the region are suddenly coveted. It relates very much to the, to the area within the order limits.

10:40

So, so it's probably better if Mr. Fewncik talks to you about this as he will have, because this is about habitats change. Yes, he speaks to you briefly in relation to this. Mr. Mr. Smith, if you would stand by Mr. Fenwick picks up this point, you see, there's a right on me.

10:59

The two disciplines, Mr. Fenwick.

11:06

Yes, just to pick up on the point of the 57% loss for part B, that has been revised with the biodiversity net loss assessment for the scheme that was submitted at deadline to and particularly Annex A that was supported that. And so there were, the values of water costs were loss were reviewed, as part of the biodiversity net loss for the scheme. There was a correction made to a digital error for part A. And we also had a look at refining the approach for part B. So previously, there was a just due to the nature of information that was available for that assessment. There was essentially a precautionary approach to that almost over assuming assuming kind of a greater amounts of water costs loss. We've looked to refine that and those values have come down, I haven't got in front of me the percentages, but I know the amount of the physical amount of channel loss has been reduced following that. So I can kind of correct that within a written representation. And when we talk about the proportions and the percentages, Mr. Finnick. Is that proportions or percentages within the order limits? Or in some other measurement? It is? Yeah, so the percentages have come by looking at the total length of watercourse within the order limits. The value of water cost that would be permanently or temporarily lost as part of the scheme, and also what's being afforded with regard to either reinstatement or creation of watercourse. And that's where that kind of percentage and percentages come out to look at what the overall loss would be or gain. So if we if we fix too much on the relevant percentages, if one four were, for instance, to draw the order limits against the highway boundary, as it currently is, then you end up having total loss because it's all safe. So we're mustn't over fixate on the percentages. And it's important to see what is happening in terms of absolute numbers, the type of the watercourse. So for instance, as Mr. Smith says, it's an ephemeral watercourse, it's very different from waterfalls, where, for instance, we might need to make provision for fish pass or gravel and we're in fact, we're improving the environment even though the carpeted length is is greater say, okay, that's

13:27

what I mean.

13:29

Yes. And

13:30

part of the reason for raising that figure was it was the figure which the Environment Agency highlighted as well in their rep will come on to their comments. So that that clarifies the point about percentage.

13:45

Understand that now, so

13:55

and Mr. Smith refer to the cola litigation summary, which has been produced, and

14:03

I'm in danger of stepping on Mr. Pintos toes here, but just ask this one question about that documents. And

14:12

should stats summary or who's actually described as a strategy? Should it be secured to the decio?

14:25

Or is it secured through the way? So the strategy currently describes what is proposed generally, as opposed necessarily to be it's designed to inform you what is taking place. Now, to the extent it doesn't

14:45

it doesn't contradict anything in the application documents, but to the extent it is a design element to which How is England this committing? Then we can look at it becoming a defined document so we can we can take that away. Okay.

15:00

Thank you. So I think that's all I wanted to ask.

15:07

To begin with.

15:10

Let me then ask the Environment Agency to summarise where they are. And then after that, we can identify whether there are major outstanding differences and how they might be resolved.

15:28

And who is going to speak on this for the Environment Agency to begin with, please?

15:34

Hi, sir, Christoph, I can make a comment on that. Thank you. So after the revised biodiversity, no net loss assessment came through the report. I've got in front of me shows

15:48

a river biodiversity unit loss of 11.69%. So obviously, that's greatly reduced from the, I think combined 60 to nearly 63%. That was submitted before.

16:02

There have shown that there's a 7.21% gain in area based units. And,

16:11

again, do you understand that

16:13

biodiversity, no, net gain is not kind of enforced yet. And one of the sort of guiding principles within that is that the type of habitat are our unit type is not transferable to another one. So if you have river based units, as part of the mitigation, it should be, again, improvements to river habitats elsewhere. So this shows that there is a, an increase in area based habitats, and then I think that is probably in the woodland habitat. So that's a different type of habitat creation. I think my concern is that we're losing water costs, the primary

16:58

mitigation appears to be woodland planting. And, and it's not necessarily, you know, any improvement to the water costs, especially if it's not connected, or if it doesn't interact or if it's not functional, and to that watercourse. And so it's

17:16

where the mitigation strategy describes, in a certain number of hectares of

17:26

woodland planet in our wet woodland planting,

17:29

I would argue that that is potentially riparian habitat. So that's just tree planting along the water's edge, as opposed to an area of low lying land where water accumulates and certain tree and plant species and create a kind of wetland habitat. And so I think that's one of the things I'm sort of aligns with one of my points earlier was that, you know, if they are going for wet woodland, how, when, and where would that create that which, maybe this is where the sort of difference in what it's called? Yeah, and within the documents comes up. And is also important that the, whatever is created is, is managed and protected? Well, and so, for example, you know, five minutes here, 10 minutes there of tree planting along the water costs must be protected and managed well, from pressures such as grazing pressures from livestock and so on. And so that, you know, it's, it's also the, you know, sort of questioning how much influence and by diversity of value that provides to the watercourse again, you know, 510 minutes here and there, and this and this plays into

18:52

geomorphology as well. So some of my colleagues may expand on this is, you know, what actual benefit that provides and also under wF D, what benefit that provides, I think, in previous discussions we have suggested, rather than having sort of small little pockets of, of woodland planting that is combined and used to create a very functional and

19:21

well designed habitats, and we're in a very specific area, which can overall lead to, you know, a much greater biodiversity influence and, you know, sort of, I guess, under many different



19:36

you know, Wi Fi and everything, what, what it could potentially do, and for sort of the local environment and the local ecology.

19:46

Thank you, Mr. Dabrowski. Are there any other of your colleagues who wish to comment at this stage?

19:57

No. Okay.

20:00

I'm going to ask the applicant to respond. But in doing so, can you also explain

20:07

the references to

20:12

the mitigation, which involves the introduction of 38 hectares, wet woodlands and 12 hectares of wetlands marginal planting, how that has been identified and where it's located. That'd be helpful, please.

20:29

Very good. So the first thing first, it just says that, as I understand it, the Environment Agency is not opposing the scheme. And so what they are putting to you is a difference of opinion, not a fully expressed difference of opinion, but nevertheless a difference of opinion as to the mitigation that needs to be secured. And they are effectively saying that they are that they consider that there should be

21:01

different and what they're actually referring to as compensation, different compensation, habitat provision, to the provision that the applicant proposes. And also, it's important to realise that the applicant is providing mitigation here, because as Mr. Smith and Mr. Pennock have indicated, the culverts once they may be longer are not necessarily going to be less hospitable. And there are some culverts, the ephemeral ones, to which Mr. Smith referred where there is not water in the culvert. For the majority of the time, it's only present for what rainfall events or it is a it is a proportion rather than the whole of the time. So from that, that point of view, it's important to see that there is mitigation taking place, it is not simply the provision of compensator II habitat

21:59

under the which missed, which, sorry, forgive me for not planting your surname. That was the gentleman on behalf of the Environment Agency States does not comply with BMG. So I'll hand over to Mr. Fenwick here who will be able to elaborate further and be able to explain the provision of the wet woodland and the wetland marginal party and why that is a suitable element of habitat improvement which has a benefit when one takes into account the overall

22:34

ecology of the aquatic environment in the context of the scheme. Thank you,

22:40

Mister

22:42

Thank you. And yeah, just to pick up on the point, I think,

22:46

with watercourses where we have a watercourse which in this case is due to the extensions of culverts. And it isn't it's not considered viable to recreate a watercourses or kind of a an indifference to something like a hedgerow or a grassland where generally readily you can recreate that habitat obviously, the creation of a watercourse would require a water source, which itself cannot be created. And so to create almost like a lake for Lake compensation is is not possible in this situation, an alternative that would be to divert an existing watercourse or increase the length of an existing water costs to try and almost provide that level of compensated habitat. But again, that has implications on the existing water cost, either by changing its hydrological function, its biodiversity and probably increases significantly the impact of a scheme

23:38

if we were to kind of explore those, those avenues. So in this instance, yes, it's not been possible to create a watercourse to compensate for that loss. And so what the strategy has been to look into is what are the complementary measures can we do so there are proposed improvements at one of those being a long party on long deck burn, where we have 35 metres of that particular water cost that's going to be lost due to a COVID extension. But we're proposing to improve various measures and look at improving around about 850 metres length of that particular watercourse. And the wet woodland that was referred to again is a is a complimentary measure. It's not intended to be compensation and because as the gentleman from the EA rightly points out, it's not possible to compensate for a habitat by putting something else in and that is acknowledged.

24:31

The kind of the wet woodland habitat would be, as far as I'm aware of our kind of takeaway we can confirm in our written representation would be riparian, woodland, too, would be based along existing water courses to kind of strengthen that that corridor and it forms part of the mitigation and kind of compensation strategy for watercourses as part of a package and

24:57

so

24:59

330

25:00

Hector's wet woodland and 12

25:03

wetlands marginal planting, are these

25:08

numbers which relate to a number of different sites? Yes, I believe they do. Yes, it would be distributed across this scheme in various elements. Okay.

25:20

That's fine. Would we be able to supply a figure to the examination so that we can see the locations? Mr. I've sorry Mr. Dabrowski's

25:33

submission was that this all has to be in a single place where it would be optimal if it wasn't a single place. But of course, this is very long scheme. If we were able to show where this would take place, I think that would probably assist Mr. Gleason.

25:46

He certainly would, I think, just to understand the makeup of those figures would be helpful, I think, for the Environment Agency as well. Yes, I think we can have a look into that. And I'm aware that we've got a meeting scheduled with the Environment Agency. And this is one of the items that would be on the agenda, to kind of further that consultation, so we can look to have that kind of figure prepared so that we can discuss that further, though. Thank you. Mr. Dabrowski. You have your hand up?

26:13

Yep. Yeah.

26:15

I think it's something as well, that we did notice in the documents that we didn't agree with, saying that you can't create a watercourse. And our comments would never have said, create water costs that, you know, we understand that, you know,

26:35

you don't just find water in water costs is created. And what is often

26:42

done in our restoration projects or many conservation projects out there is, is where you have very strict canalised or sort of very strict and watercourses

26:56

and which can be quite poor for biodiversity value for their geomorphology value.

27:03

And we would often look to introduce features which will increase the gym off. But again, this is something my colleague, and I can

27:15

mention. But you know, we're, you know, there's a lot of projects out there which will look to realign and re meander watercourses, you are actually increasing the watercourse length. And I think that is something that is often used as a compensation measure. And that re meandering really does, you know, often improve the biodiversity of value. And, and, and, and yeah, lots of different is that that is definitely an option that is

27:43

we're suggesting. Thank you. Miss Harrison, you had your hand up, seems to have disappeared. Now. Did you want to come in at this point?

27:57

Miss Harrison.

28:00

Sorry. Hello. Yes. Yes. Can you hear me now? Sorry. Yes. Yeah, I was I think I was going to kind of reflect, repeat what Christophe had said in that it does suggest with it alludes to the fact that we've suggested the creation of board courses. That's not something that we have suggested. And if it came across in that way, then you know, that's incorrect. It was more about the mitigation being in the right place, and that we can provide opportunities to kind of help highways England identified more appropriate locations if they felt that was something they wanted to explore. Thank you. And

28:37

Mr. Lavery,

28:40

you would speak as well? Yes, thank you, sir.

28:45

The mitigation strategy that highways England provided for the covert Sachi is a really valuable and useful document.

28:53

The way it's set, I actually

28:57

makes it very clear what's happening each of the crossing points.

29:02

By my by my rough calculations, and I apologise I've made some errors and that is about 540 odd metres of water courses that are being lost through this scheme.

29:15

I do accept that that sort of a part and B, and some of those will be ephemeral workhorses.

29:21

Under the water Framework Directive, ephemeral watercourses is still classified as workhorses, and there will still be deemed habitat as well.

29:32

The measures that have been put forward in terms of improving those culverts are very welcome. Improving fish passage and trying to reinstate an unnatural bed in culverts. There was a you know, welcome actually, they are now best practice. They do not address the fact that the culvert will destroy the riparian habitat.

29:59

The only

30:00

benefit certain key species like fish, but they don't compensate or reflect the loss of habitat. I'm

30:07

interested in the proposals that have been put forward in terms of compensation for the loss of habitat. I think we just want to understand those details a bit more.

30:20

woodland planting along workhorses is very important. But again, it needs to be in the right place. So it's just having that conversation with highways England to understand what these mitigation measures mean, actually on the ground and understand what proposes are for a long date burned because again, it's kind of the uplift or the improvement has to reflect what's happening on the ground.

30:46

And that was all what to say, sir, thank you very much. I've hand up from Mr. Hitching.

30:54

Yes, hello. Hi. Yes, Sir James Hitching, Northumberland County Council. And I so from a flood risk perspective, I just wanted to add that if we were to start to rely on and to add me enters into watercourses, we would need to remodel them potentially from a flood risk perspective, because you are changing the

31:21

geomorphology and everything else at the hydrology in that aspect. So all I would like to add is that if these were to occur, we would very much like to be involved in that process just from an address scum angle.

31:35

Thank you for that.

31:43

I'll come back to you in just the past, which I think.

31:48

Is there anyone else who wants to add anything to this part of the discussion?

31:55

No, okay, so Mr. Bassford is perhaps if you can

31:59

respond to those comments. And also, I think, I'd like to understand what the way forward is on this and maybe does require the Environment Agency to comment again, I want to understand how far apart you are on

32:16

matters of principle, as opposed to matters of detail, and what potential there is for resolving these matters. And within the reasonable timescale.

32:29

Presumably, discussions are ongoing. As I say, I think if you could start on that maybe we need just Environment Agency to summarise where they are as well, or, basically to confirm your position is the best way.

32:45

Thank you. The position is that the development agency has not said

32:54

whether the changes are unacceptable.

32:58

And it hasn't said the scheme is unacceptable. What I understand it to be asking is to understand the extent to which there is repair and improvement and wet woodland provision, where it is and how it will function. So that's something we can take up with them offline.

33:17

The It is very unfortunate that there is a reference to the loss of water courses. Of course, that's not the case. What will be taking place is that there will be a reduction in the quality of some sections of

waterfalls. It's not the case that there's a tendency to Bandy about terms like destruction and removal of watercourses. There's absolutely no what's happening. And as I have said before, the works that are proposed that are set out in the mitigation strategy are works which will improve the existing position. So, the work the culverts, as they currently exist in most places,

33:58

do not have gravel beds, and where appropriate gravel beds are going to be insured installed which will improve the environment in those culverts. There is going to be the removal of a step where there will be mammal shells installed where those are probes as well. So, it so what has been described to you as it is a somewhat jaundiced position. And in fact, how is England is improving a number of the culverts notwithstanding their extension. Now, environmental agency has aspirations for the for the enhancement of the environment, generally mister

34:36

with the

34:38

library and Mr. Dabrowski have referred to the introduction of meanders into cannibalised water cause watercourses now. They haven't identified any of those to us that that are appropriate for improvement. They haven't

34:57

suggested where that should take place. And of course, we're concerned

35:00

By order limits, and we believe that balance is where it lies at present, which is to say that the environment, the environmental improvements that are proposed are sufficient to address the concerns in relation to the culvert extension. That is a necessary consequence of the implementation of this scheme. For reasons in the public interest.

35:24

Thank you.

35:26

What's the Environment Agency like to comment on? What Mr. Bassford has just said?

35:35

Yeah, I'm happy to make a quick comment. Sorry, Mr. Dabrowski, isn't it? It is Yep, sir. And

35:43

I think

35:45

we were just trying to provide examples of, you know, what sort of mitigation can be done. Not saying that there is something specific that needs to be done out there each end, you know, right at a specific point on the scheme. And so the meandering, for example, as an example, is an example of an environment improvement. And not necessarily saying it needs to be done directly next to the scheme. And but that is just one way in is a mitigation or compensation measure for a loss of what it costs to sort of gain back an extra length. and elsewhere.

36:28

I think, sort of.

36:31

It's very good that we've seen lots of improvements,

36:38

to certain culverts, and some of the new culverts being very large, which is good for,

36:45

you know, mammals moving through.

36:50

I think I had provided comments earlier about Part B, where there is less of that, and there is more extensions of current culverts. And

37:02

comments of saying that, you know, these extensions aren't going to cause a difference and sort of assumptions that mumbles move through, or key already. So I think this was something as well mentioned by nothing, that kind of counts, like connectivity is, is very important to these culverts and to the roads. And I guess, where you've got the realignment off offline alignment, the existing road is still going to be in place, and you're going to have a whole new road. So that, you know, is potentially another barrier.

37:39

And, you know,

37:42

is in a big,

37:44

you know, built roading environment. And you can always trust wildlife to go where you want them to go.

37:55

Yeah, yeah. Okay. And thank you for that.



38:01

This person password?

38:04

Yes, sure. Mr. Dabrowski is wrong.

38:08

And he is putting a number of things very unhelpfully and not in line with the facts that are before you. The first thing to say is that this is not going to be the construction of a whole new additional road. And Mr. Dabrowski, his characterization of things in that manner is not helpful.

38:26

We are talking about the extension of culverts. And that's the same in Part A and Part B. And the fact that there is a duelling of the road or an offline construction, which is which is largely in part A those sorts of things are

38:44

are unhelpful. Now, where there is offline construction, there will be new culverts and permeability will be maintained. And that will be provided in accordance with best practice. And that is b that is designed into the scheme. The next thing to say is that the environmental agency says it is just providing helpful suggestions. That is not what it's supposed to do. What it is supposed to do is to engage with the individual interventions in the environments and tell us whether they're acceptable or not.

39:15

And that means going through them culvert by culvert with our engineers and establishing

39:23

whether they are acceptable or not. And if they're not looking at the environment to work out what what is but talking to us, but they have to engage on us covered by Calvert basis, not by saying, well, we're just coming up with a few ideas that we thought you could look at. That is not their job. They're a regulator. So they hear that they need to engage more fully. Now, I appreciate that. posing the we'll be talking to the Environment Agency. In due course I understand that was a meeting to take place on the 19th of March. But we need to engage with this and we need to come up with

40:00

as a means of understanding where they are apart from us on this because they I don't think they have provided a response to the culvert mitigation strategy, and where what we have today is not moving us on.

40:15

Thank you.

40:18

Good to hear that there is a meeting scheduled 19th of March is quite some way off.

40:24

Now for almost a month away.

40:30

What I would just highlight is that, by that point, we'll be almost halfway through the examination. And I'd like to

40:42

be assured that things are moving as quickly as they can. Clearly there are constraints, arranging meetings, current circumstances, but hopefully things can progress.

40:57

I think

40:59

there wasn't much from that discussion that was actually resolved. But I think that in any event, it's always useful to put positions on the table and for the parties to hear. So hopefully, that was some benefits, at least.

41:19

unless anyone wants to add anything further, I will move on to the next item. Can I just check with the Environment Agency First, if there's anything else you want to say, in relation to this matter, then I'll clarify with highways England as well. So the Environment Agency first, Mr. Lavery? Yeah, thank you, sir. Maybe it's just best progressiveness in the water. discussion that's gently come up, because there's quite a bit of overlap, and it's probably best to fish back to then. Yes. Okay. That's fine.

41:55

Mr. Bass was anything final before we move on?

41:59

No, sir. Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

42:03

Right. So the final Sorry, I should just check in. Are there any other interested parties, or Mr. Pinto as well? Anyone else wishing standing under this point on the agenda?

42:18

No. Mr. nakagami? Thank you. Right, so we'll move on to the final bullet points under biodiversity ecology in natural environments. And as set out, this is a discussion regarding the proposals to minimise the impacts of the a 1068 diversion on the Northumberland marine sspa.

42:42

Just paragraph 2.6, point 24.

42:47

of the

42:50

I think that is

42:54

so we don't have the reference for that document is and finds the moments

42:59

and whether these proposals constitute mitigation in the light of case law.

43:06

Mr. Bassford, I'm sure you can recognise where we're heading with this question in terms of case law and people over wind.

43:18

Could you clarify what the position is now as agreed with natural England's

43:26

in terms of the discussions about the rail diversion and its effects?

43:33

potential effects on the Northumberland marine sspa please.

43:40

Thank you, sir. The

43:45

what has been put to you is and has been described in the amendment to the construction transportation management plan is no more than the writing up of the Assumption as to how matters would take place anyway. So, mitigation in the people over the wind over wind sense relates to after applied mitigation, whereas this is a an inherent factor of the scheme. And so therefore, it's doesn't trigger the

44:21

the appropriate assessment approach, because the the the relevant activity conducted as it would be carried out, would not

44:31

work would not be likely to affect the adverse

44:36

cause an adverse effect on the integrity of the relevant, relevant site.

44:42

So that that's the starting position. What we have been asked to do, though, is to ensure that this is secured and to make sure that it's written up so that's why it appears and ctmp now in terms of dealing with natural England to appreciate it not here to talk to you today, natural England

45:00

confirmed that when we had explained to the way things would take place, they confirmed that they didn't think there was likely to be an adverse effect on the European sites. But we have an email exchange with them. And we'll write it up and

45:15

so that position without us applying any secured mitigation or or was that this was acceptable. So from that point of view, we would say that there is not, there's not people over wind issue. Having said that, we have looked at the point informally, we haven't done the full write up. But the consequences if we were to write stuff would be exactly the same. So whether or not we jumped through the hoops in a particular way, the result is likely to be to be the same and naturally didn't endorse that view.

45:55

As they are there, of course, the government's advisor, yes, understood. So

46:00

the reference those students find is from the construction traffic management plan.

46:07

And paragraph 2.6 point 24 states, proposals for diversions using the 10 810 68 shall be developed further in consultation with natural England to manage the number of days of diversions in any given week, month, season or year. So I suppose what I'm asking is confirmation that what these proposals are, and further clarification that without these proposals, the impacts on the spa won't be significant. Well, our view is that the impacts on the gateway be significant either way, but the key point is that were a diversion is needed, it will be it will be properly managed. That said, This is no more than housing that would do in any case, and one would say, as well that this is the diversionary route that applies to the a one. In any case, should there be an incident or there be roadworks on the main line as the road currently exists? So what is what's proposed here is no more than the status quo

47:16

recording that

47:21

Okay, let me just check.

47:36

And the diversion route how frequently would it be used

47:42

is it's similar to what would happen in current situation where perhaps

47:49

traffic accidents on day one means diversion takes place or is it going to be for the duration is when allocation could be given to the guests this this would be infrequent, the design of the scheme provides that the road will be open for the majority of the time during which the works carried out. So any, any diversion would be short in duration.

48:18

And it would be managed

48:21

on that basis. So so it is different to the current situation where it applies only in the case of incidents, because we know that there is going to be the

48:33

thing works, should the decio be made in the works? Go ahead. So it is different to that. But it would not be very, there would not be very many impacts, they would be very infrequent, they're likely to be overnight.

48:49

And so we will when we would not expect there to be large volumes of traffic, in any case as a result of this. So

48:59

is it something that has been categorised? Can it be categorised as significant or not significant? I think we would characterise it as not significant and potentially de minimis. But we'll write that up, obviously, in our written submission Following this, this

49:20

this hearing, thank you might hear but I'm instructed by the virtual post it note that closes would be very limited through the construction period. Unsurprisingly, how is Ingrid likes to keep its roads open as its doesn't look as good for it if they are closed? Thank you.

49:38

And then

49:40

just looking at in combination effects,

49:45

and given the identification of a potential pathway from the use of that road, as a diversion, is that justification? What is the justification for screening out in combination effects in terms of both

50:00

emissions and disturbance.

50:03

Maybe that's something that's

50:06

needs to be thought about, rather than responding immediately

50:11

when you refer to emission, so do you mean emissions from diverted traffic? Yes.

50:18

So,

50:20

so the

50:23

in terms of noise, I missed a Mr. Fenwick be able to address you on this. But I know from my own experience that

50:31

that

50:33

FPGAs are of course designated for bird. Yes. Use. birds don't like people, they're pretty ambivalent about vehicles. They, like large inanimate objects, even moving ones don't disturb them as much as people do a personal skyline is anathema to a bird.

50:55

The Having said that, when we think about emissions, they tend to be noise related here rather than vehicular exhaust emissions. And so you have to bear in mind that in terms of birds, it is the startle

51:12

rather than the emissions from a constant tone, which is more likely to be of importance. Mr. Fenwick? Perhaps, as I've just given a lot of ecological evidence you'd like to tell me if I'm right or not.

51:30

Yeah, I think you've summarised it quite well. And yeah, the main, the main impact or potential impacts and effects that we would look at from that diversion route would be, firstly, does it result in any habitat

loss from within the FPA. Obviously, in this, in this instance, we're using existing road. So how to factor either with the scoring scheme or in combination. And then we would look at the level of disturbance, like Mr. Buffett said to the bird species, which are the qualifying species of the SP, again, we're utilising an existing road, and we're expecting there to be very short durations of use of this road as a temporary diversion, the birds will already be acclimatized to use of that road. And therefore the likely temporary and short increases in traffic along that road aren't likely to give rise to an effect.

52:17

And, for example, air quality, I know would be another effect that we'd look at through that road. With it being such a short duration in time, air quality tends to take a long time to have an effect. And therefore again, this being short duration, it wouldn't give rise to impacts. And I'm kind of summarising from it an email very helpfully provided by Natural England as well. So yeah, so

52:42

sorry, the reference, I asked the question without giving the reference, and perhaps you can refer back to this when you provide the response in writing. So it was from table 2.3.

52:56

And the H Ra. We are point o 12.

53:02

concludes on emissions that impacts the European sites as a result of vehicle emissions in combination with the further 10 schemes can be screened out. Those the points? Yes, that's right. The justification for that.

53:17

Okay, good. I think that answers everything I had on that point.

53:22

If there is anything further, we can

53:26

pick that up in either written questions or further hearings, but that probably covers it. Just check.

53:47

Now, that's fine. Thank you. So I think that concludes item four on the agenda. I'll just check before I hand over to

53:57

Mr. Pinto, item five. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment on biodiversity, ecology and natural environment?

54:06

There is a hand up I think have been advised. Yes, Mr. Gleason, I was just going to advise you that I believe that there are two people that would like to participate. Now their hands are up. I can't see any names. And I believe that one of the people that would like to intervene would be Miss D re Francis. Okay, can we stop this? Thank you. Hello. Yes, I think I did see your hand up. I'm sorry. I missed that. Thank you. I think I shall lower it again as well, just to be polite. And there's a couple of things that I was looking through. I'm pleased First of all, that we're not the competent authority on this and we're not having to do the habitat assessment because we have to do a lot of them.

54:52

I noted in the HRA which is rep 1060, which I assume is the most up to date version.

55:01

There's a line in that that says diversions will not affect roads within 200 metres of the ASPCA, which doesn't seem to be correct in the context of what we're discussing. So I'm sure it's just something that needs a revision. I'm assuming that the a 1068 diversion is between amble and walk with, in which case, some of that is directly over the ASPCA, the marine SP. And some of it is within about 50 metres.

55:30

The one thing that's not been mentioned, and I'm prepared to be shot down in flames by natural England if I've got this wrong, but I'm going to have a punter anyway. And when we consider the marine SP in particular, its designated for an assemblage of birds, two of which are Gilly Martin Puffin, which will always be deep sea species, which leaves us with five species of turns. And the main reason for the designation is that it's the territory for them. So it's highly unlikely

56:05

that there is a credible risk of a likely significant effect. Because they aren't birds that are prone to disturbance, either by people or by vehicles or anything else, because they're out there out in the industry itself feeding.

56:23

We appreciate that there is the very small risk of there being some sort of major incident or accident. But again, whether that counts as a credible risk is to be questioned. So I don't think the people over wind question is,

56:39

is an issue here? Because if we've screened out the likely significant effect based on the interest features of the SBA been affected, if that screened out, then any mitigation that there is, isn't for that effect. It's other mitigation. So in this case, it's probably mitigation for the people of amble and what was not being woken up by big waggons. So that was the point that I wanted to make. And I don't know if that helps, and I hope it does. Thank you for that. I'll ask the applicant to respond in a moment.

57:12

Miss Robbie, I think your hand was up as well, although went down to do anything further.



57:17

No, it was just because Mr. Francis wanted to speak. And I wanted to make sure she was a she was a that was all that's fine. Thank you. So can I then ask

57:32

the applicant to just respond on that point, then please, if there's anything further you wish to say, Mr. password?

57:39

There are two things I'd like to say the first is in relation to the second point, which was dairy, Francis referred to and we welcome obviously, her summary as to why

57:52

screaming out for habitats regulation assessment can be undertaken here.

57:57

And I think we would largely agree with that. And she, of course, much better qualified to speak about the startle effect on birds than I am.

58:05

The second thing is in relation to the interaction with the SP a, and the a 1068. And its proximity, we will check that we'll take that away. And we'll see if the relevant documents need to be updated just to reflect that because obviously, we wish to be accurate. Notwithstanding that second helpful point, we'd rather the paperwork be correct. And presumably, you'll be talking to natural England as a result of this discussion, just to tie up any loose ends. Yes, that's correct, sir. Good. Thank you very much.

58:42

Good. I think that's 10 concludes item four.

58:46

I'll now pass it over to Mr. Pinto to deal with out and five water environments. Thank you.

58:59

Thank you very much. Mr. Gleason.

59:05

Is Mr. Police and has mentioned we shall move now to the topic, watch your environment.

59:14

And

59:16

I guess it might be helpful for me to set out that, particularly in light of the conversation that we just had on the previous topic, that I'll be looking at what your environment, but obviously, I'll be looking mostly

that it issues other than the issues that Mr. Gleason has just covered. So I think it's useful to actually bear that in mind as I actually go through the main objectives of this session. So I would like to first of all, start by considering the design off to propose development

59:55

and its potential effects on watercourses.

1:00:00

Obviously, as I have highlighted with the caveat of what has just been covered in terms of biodiversity and but particularly the effects on watercourses with particular regard to the river, the river Coquet and

1:00:18

I would ask the applicant, if I if I may, to highlight the broad position in terms of how to impact on water courses, particularly in terms of flow river flow has actually been taken into consideration as part of the design of the whole of the proposed development

1:00:47

Maybe Mr boss foods

1:00:53

now, they said this is a matter where I assuredly am not the person to to address you in detail, because this is going to be a matter relating to

1:01:07

in relation to

1:01:10

hydrogen geomorphology, but both of which are highly technical matters, and where there is a great deal of

1:01:21

detailed

1:01:24

modelling that has been undertaken. There are two people who I think may well be discussing this with you there, Mr. Rob sharp and Dr. Helena Parsons, Dr. path, Dr. PARSONS is geomorphologist and Mr. Sharp is an expert in relation to drainage and the water environment. The

1:01:45

The first thing to say though, is that when the csio was drafted, and the design paired for application, the

1:01:58

siting of the bridge piers was very much taken into account having regard to the impacts on the water environment, and so what is before you currently has undoubtedly taken that into account. And that has subsequently been verified. And you have had before you recently submissions, in relation to the

1:02:19

submissions in relation to the way in which flow and the performance of the river regime take place. The first person, I'd like to talk to you about how that has been undertaken. And the way that the

1:02:35

the way that geomorphology and hydrology managed calculations to do modelling have been undertaken is Dr. PARSONS. So Dr. passes, if you would introduce yourself to the examination and then assist. Mr. Pinto with this point.

1:02:52

Thank you.

1:02:54

Okay. Yes, thank you, Mr. Bassford. I'm Dr. Helena Parsons, chartered geomorphologists. And my PhD is in geomorphology, as well. And my involvement with this scheme has been purely on the cat crossing. And I've not had any involvement with the other aspects of the scheme. So just so that you clear on that point. And we've recently undertaken, 2d modelling of the river co occurred to determine potential impacts of the proposed scheme. And for that, we looked at two alternative designs of the river crossing, one with the piers in alignment with the existing piers, and another with the piers out of alignment, which is called the parameter 10 assessment. So we've undertaken this 2d modelling, and that looks at velocity, stream power, shear stress and the fruit number as well. So that gives you an indication of whether there's any change in the river flows as a result of the proposed scheme for both of the bridge alignments that we've looked at. And also with Dr. Dr. PARSONS, this this very much was in response to the design that had been undertaken and assessed as part of the EA s. And so what this is providing is proof of concept in terms of the assessments that had been undertaken previously. Yes, that is correct. Thank you for Mr. Mr. Bass fish for clarifying.

1:04:24

Yes, thank you. And so the 2d modelling movement we have undertaken looks at any potential changes as a result of the proposed scheme in relation to river flows, the potential for changes and alteration to the sediment transport regime and the risk of any sediments being mobilised and transported or washed out as a result of the proposed scheme, and also any alteration in the distribution of river and habitats as a result of the scheme. The 2d modelling results report all aspects mentioned.

1:05:00

four key geomorphological drivers showed that there is no notable difference between any of the modelled returns. prior to doing the analysis, we did consult with the Environment Agency technical specialists in geomorphology. to agree the proposed methodology, and to ask the Environment Agency which flood return periods they wished us to

1:05:24

return to the model. So that was determined by the Environment Agency, including a 100 year plus climate change event, which is the worst case scenario which is a worst flood than the 200 year flood which we also modelled as well. And the for all of the aspects we looked at, there is no notable difference between baseline

1:05:46

Do you wish me to expand on any more?

1:05:50

I would, I would just like a clarification point. If I made a to Parsons, thank you very much for your intervention so far. Can I just clarify that the two options that you have mentioned just now are actually the options that are detailed within

1:06:10

annex B flood risk assessment?

1:06:16

addendum? Is that is that correct? Is that the two options that you are referring to at the moment?

1:06:25

And thank you, sir. I believe so. But if someone else has were familiar with the flood risk assessment, is that a comment on that that would be well, do you have is rep one slash dash 3067?

1:06:46

Well, the

1:06:50

the options are with the peers in alignment. And then there is a further worst reasonable worst case we use that term, of course in the EIA sense.

1:07:04

option, which is with the peers out of alignment to the maximum extent provided by the DCA.

1:07:13

Thank you, Mr. bustled, I, I understand that I am just trying to establish if the two options that we would need to consider and that I can ask questions on the options detailed within the document. I'm just trying to establish just confirmation of that. Because I would like to have a look at the questions on the modelling. That is correct. But it's important not to see them as options.

1:07:41

They're not the in terms of the DCO there is a power of deviation, which means it can be moved along a continuum. But that is the relevant reference is rep one dash o 677. Point 9.1. Point two annex B, flood risk assessment agenda, revision zero. Perfect.

1:08:05

Thank you very much for that.

1:08:08

I may be referred to them incorrectly in terms of two options, hence why the clarification was actually helpful. But thank you very much for that. It's two different scenarios. I should have attached to that website yet just two different scenarios that were actually tested. Dr. PARSONS, if you would like to continue that and explain a little bit further, if you can, the differences between those two scenarios, I noticed that you have said that there is no noticeable difference. Nevertheless,

1:08:39

this report that we have just mentioned, does provide a slightly different outcome on those two different scenarios. If you could just comment on dosta different scenarios, how they different how they differ one from the other? And why it is your opinion that there is no significant

1:09:01

variance between them in terms of doing packets. Thank you, sir. Can I just clarify, do you mean between the geomorphology assessment and the flood risk assessment there? differences?

1:09:17

I believe I believe that in my review of the document,

1:09:23

let me just check my notes very quickly.

1:09:28

There'll be a slightly different difference in terms of the flow of surface water along the river. And that is the issue that I would like to explore.

1:09:44

And is that between the geomorphology report and the flood risk report, sir.

1:09:50

Give me an all within the geomorphology report. Sorry, I've just got a little bit confused with the reference to the flood risk assessment. So it's flood risk. They're just interested in a flood level.

1:10:01

My interest is in the flow of your processes and the levels that have less significance for geomorphology assessment. Okay, I'll try and be a little bit more specific. I am interested in exploring a

little bit further how the proposed pier on the southern bank that we see, in figure one of the document that I have just mentioned, will affect or not the flow of water on the river.

1:10:31

So he says fake, fake upon at the geomorphology report

1:10:38

off of the document that I just mentioned before, which I believe is called NXP flood risk assessment addendum,

1:10:47

which is referenced that I have mentioned as well. Right. So I'm not familiar with that. And what we're trying to what we're trying to establish there is whether you are concerned in relation to flow in German morphological terms, or in terms of volume of water, in flood risk terms, what underpins your question, Dr. Parsons is geomorphologist. And so what she is talking about is the effect on the river regime, the way that it performs its ability to transport its bed and sediment loads. The way it carves through the landscape or doesn't car through the landscape mobilisation, those sorts of topics, whereas other experts are better to assist you in terms of flow in terms of flood risk. Is that right Dr. PARSONS? I think that's right. Thank you, Mr. Bassett? Yes, that is correct.

1:11:42

And thank you very much, Mr. Bassford. As you have mentioned before, this is a highly technical topic. And I apologise if my question was not clear. But I would like to explore the document that I have mentioned to you before. So that would be the flood risk assessment. And then I would leave it to your criterion. Of course, you have your team in terms of deciding who will be the best person to actually ask and answer some questions on that specific topic. So so the relevant experts in relation to that topic will be Mr.

1:12:22

Mr. Andrew Smith, who you have already spoken to who deals with very strange of the water environment. And Mr. Rob sharp, who deals with drainage. So ask them both to introduce themselves, and then the relevant expert will address you on that point. In fact, I think Mr. Smith has already addressed yourself Mr. Sharp would introduce himself, and then the relevant expert will confirm to you the position based on that document. Sharp.

1:12:53

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Rob sharp. I work with WSP, and I'm a chartered engineer, my specialism and this course, scheme is in the highway drainage. And I speak to you on that. And the effect of the runoff from the highway drainage books, quality and quantity. And in the height of the sea water courses. I think Andy Smith need to speak to you by the fra.

1:13:17

So, Mr. Smith, if you would now take that forward. And Mr. Pinto is interested in the consequences for flow of the debt, the two scenarios, which is what appears aligned to the piers offset

1:13:34

asset types in the flood risk assessment agenda?

1:13:43

Yes, thank you, Mr. Bassford. Mr. Smith.

1:13:48

I've just received a note from our teams to pass for that. I believe that Mr. Smith is not on to call it tomorrow. When you see it. He isn't. Yes, I have just noticed that, sir. I'm sorry about that. But I believe that he's about to join us now. Again, maybe there was some technical difficulties.

1:14:12

Mr. Smith is back.

1:14:16

Hello, sorry. My wife, I dropped out at the most inappropriate moment there.

1:14:23

Thank you for joining us, Mr. Smith. I am not 100% sure of how much you have heard of two previous conversations. But Mr. Bassford was suggesting the two might be the most appropriate contact from the applicant to actually answer some questions regarding the differences.

1:14:45

Real explained and dimensioned within NXP flood risk assessment and denim in how the different location of the pillars might actually affect

1:14:57

the flow of

1:15:00

For Swatantra Wi Fi.

1:15:03

Okay, the, the assessment we've undertaken has been undertaken through

1:15:09

Manning's calculations. So they haven't been undertaken within a computer model. And I believe that has been agreed with the Environment Agency due to the nature, the very incised nature of the river Corquet at this location.

1:15:25

So, the assessment finds that it will have no impact on the design flood flows.

1:15:34

As the in either location, there'll be a very minor change in water level, which will be for any location of the piers that we've considered, will still be within the inside nature of the channel and will not have any impact out of bank.

1:15:54

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Mr. Smith, just for clarification, because we have struggled a little bit on this point. And you are confirming that on the document that I have mentioned to you, paragraph 2.1 point six web documents states that an increase in water levels of zero point 25 metres is the slightly crease wanted previously estimated increase of 0.1 as presented in the fra in debt is the level that you are referring to that will have no significant impact. Yes. Perfect. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith.

1:16:35

I would like to now that we have established this, I would actually like for us to explore further the potential effects on watercourses of the proposed development as a whole. Mr. Buffett, again, I leave it to you in terms of sort of pointing us in the direction of the right experts to talk about more generally.

1:17:03

So, again, returning to your agenda,

1:17:09

and

1:17:11

the matters on which you wish to be addressed. This is

1:17:16

a matter that will be for Mr. Smith to discuss in respect of flood risk maps, I think what you wish to be addressed on.

1:17:30

Thank you very much, Mr. Buffett. Mr. Smith, could you explain a little bit more how the whole of proposed development has actually taken into consideration to potential effects on water courses, please. So we've modelled 10 water sources along the length. And to determine that there'd be no impact as a result of the additional culverts that are proposed.

1:18:05

Thank you very much in

1:18:07

debt was modelled as part of the development of the whole proposal

1:18:16



and taken into consideration, obviously, all of all of the impacts that potentially could happen along those water courses is that case, I'm just looking for confirmation on that, please. Yes. And that was

1:18:32

in Paris outside of the DCA boundary is covered in one of our submission documents. I'm just trying to find you the right reference now as we're talking.

1:18:46

So I've got the too many different bits open.

1:18:51

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

1:19:02

So that is in I believe in rep three, hyphens 007, which is the assessment of flood risk outside the order limits.

1:19:14

And that helps us set the size of the culverts to make sure there wasn't

1:19:19

impacts in terms of flood risk.

1:19:22

Okay, that's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. So

1:19:28

I'll move on then to flood risk, as you have mentioned it now as well.

1:19:37

I am particularly interested in exploring areas identified as medium in high risk for flooding.

1:19:48

And obviously, understanding a little bit more in more detail and how the proposal will end

1:20:00

actually seek to address existing levels of flood risk, and what sort of mitigation measures have actually been put in place in order to minimise increase in flood risk in those particular areas.

1:20:19

So when we've undertaken various assessments to make sure we're not having an adverse impact

1:20:27

along the length of the steam, and that's demonstrated in the

1:20:34

modelling appendices, which form part of the flood risk assessments.

1:20:40

Okay, but thank you very much for that.

1:20:47

Just let me go through my questions.

1:20:56

Just to make sure that there's still no surcharge and along the length of the stream as well.

1:21:03

And yes, that is another issue that I would like to actually explore, which is actually linked to the different phases of scheme in terms of construction of scheme in then obviously

1:21:19

solidifies the terms of use of scheme itself. If

1:21:26

I believe that detention basins are designed for the operational phase of scheme, as such, this should not be relied upon to deal with large volumes of contaminated water that is associated with construction activities. Could someone please talk through the measures that will actually be put in place in order to mitigate against flooding for both the operational phase but also for the construction phase.

1:21:56

I'd be happy to talk about the

1:22:00

not construction phase, the phase after construction operation, the operation I was about to call you Mr. Sharp in relation to that.

1:22:13

What we can say in relation to in relation to

1:22:20

flooding during the construction phase is that these are matters which are addressed through the react and that provides for the management of runoff and

1:22:35

water

1:22:38

as a result of the the work being carried out, and then the interruption of existing highway drainage. So that is probably not a point for Mr. Sharp who is engaged in the permanent drainage solution.

1:22:59

I can step in there. So we've designed the highways

1:23:04

to have to work effectively to drain the highway itself the time Iberia, and then the runoff is taken and discharged into watercourses nearby. we've retained these sub sub catchments as existing and we've taken water to what news water causes and discharged them in the poisonous discharging when we bring them into the detention basin and a detention basin then we can control and regulate the flows getting into the water courses. So we replicate the Greenfield runoff rate, which is the runoff which you would get in these areas if we unfound naturally and round or two of courses. So we've limited to that on the one in one year 130 and 100 year events. And we've discussed I agree that with NCC

1:23:53

So, the quality or the quantity of water and the runoff rate is controlled by the detention basins and the complex control devices we have at the end of these

1:24:03

the quality of the water discharging into our courses was assessed during portable works using the huret which is the de m RB document

1:24:14

and it looked into the treatment the flow of water and volume of water the size of the water courses and the treatment process as we go through before the water is discharged to the water course and the assessment was fine. It was all quite the flows comply with what's required. So so the levels of treatment in the filter drains or detention basins.

1:24:38

So the pantum cells are designed with

1:24:42

salt Manjula mind is Surya c 753. Typically a shallow pond DEP second.

1:24:53

Typically a shallow pond

1:24:55

which rises and falls when required and is essentially a dry pond.

1:25:00

With one area of wet

1:25:03

pond retained in Egypt, to provide for some immunity, some diversity and treatment of the incoming flows.

1:25:14

So I think that's it.

1:25:16

Thank you very much. for that. Mr. Sharp. I would now like to ask if the Environment Agency has any comments that you would like to make particularly light after representation that was submitted, I would ask them to,

1:25:35

to intervene now.

1:25:37

If there are any comments of substantive nature that they would like to make in terms of the increase of flooding, and mitigation measures that are being put in place.

1:25:53

Hi, cc mo from the environment agency. Unfortunately, my colleague, Jonathan caligra, the Federal officers had to leave the hearing. So I'm speaking on his behalf. And in summary, the proposed development will result in an increase in flood risk, as discussed in the flood risk assessment, but we acknowledged that this is not significant, and it will not increase flood risk to any third party receptors. And so from the flood risk perspective, it's acceptable. And I don't have any comments to make about the mitigation measures, but as there's no flood risks, it's not

1:26:31

mitigation measures proposed and fra are acceptable.

1:26:36

That's very helpful. Thank you, Miss Lu. Could I also ask Northumberland county council if they would like to intervene on disappoint as well please?

1:26:49

Miss Robbie, perhaps or now, Mr. Keating. Yes,

1:26:55

please. Thank you. And yes to certainly, we've looked at the issues which are related to the COVID River cocoa being a designated main river. And in that instance, the Environment Agency has particularly looked at that particular aspect. However, within our role as local federal authority, we have, we are essentially the Risk Management Authority for all of our water courses, which are defined as water and water courses. So as Mr. Sharp explained earlier 30 days to attend watercourses, and what we modelled and finding that modelling we have assessed that and we are satisfied with those

conclusions. So we, with the there was a very slight increase, but as we've been modelling, so there's no concerns, as far as we're concerned from that perspective. And C sharp also related to in terms of the surface water drainage from the actual highways themselves, again, they've been models with the attenuation in mind for the 100 year plus climate change event. And with those calculations, which have been submitted as part of that, again, we are satisfied with those proposals. One thing I would just add is that we would love to see additional corals just in relation to those attenuation basins. And so we ever asked for that to be a requirement of the VCO process.

1:28:27

Thank you very much for that. Mr. Hitchin, very helpful. Mr. Boss for to like to come back on that point.

1:28:38

I have someone on behalf of the applicant.

1:28:43

Yes, let's say so Mr. Hitchin's final point.

1:28:47

Neither I nor Mr. Gregg court I'm so sorry. Mr. hedging.

1:28:53

Mr. hitching? Would you mind repeating the last point that you have made? Of course, yes. No apologies. very much appreciate that. I'm so sorry. No, no, no, no worries at all. So now my last point was just in relation to the requirements, attenuation basins. And the we would like to see detailed drawings of those. So those details being cross sections just to show the slopes if there's any access required to maintain those features. At present, those details haven't been submitted. However, not all, I are happy for that to be a requirement of the DCM. So as long as they are submitted in due course, there I am content with that.

1:29:34

Thank you very much, Mr. Heatshrink. Is that clear enough now, Mr. Bassford? these are these are of course.

1:29:44

These are of course, flood attenuation basins, drainage basins, which are to be the applicants assets rather than North American Council.

1:30:00

Understand that the lead local flood authority will be interested in relationship but they're primarily matters for highways England. That said, we do of course have the detailed design provisions in the DCO. Under requirement three, and under

1:30:19

requirement eight, there is a requirement for the service and details of the surface and power water drain system reflecting mitigations in the wreck to be prepared a proven right by the Central State Farm in consultation with the relevant planning authority on matters related to its function now,

1:30:37

we can add

1:30:40

the relevant planning authority in reference to that function but also to the lead local flood authority. If that assists Mr. Hitchin

1:30:51

and thank you notes, he gets the paperwork.

1:30:54

Thank you very much, Mr. Bassford. That's very helpful.

1:31:00

Mr. hitching again, coming back to your would you be satisfied with that position?

1:31:06

Yes, absolutely. satisfied with that decision? Yes. And just to just have one clarification, and it's more just to make sure that your sizing is appropriate for the attenuation volumes or floodwaters. And I appreciate that will be pointing and assets. But that's just a clarification as to why we do want to make sure we do see the details about that, like it affects it affects runoff rates, and therefore the output into your, your channel. So

1:31:35

thank you both. Mr. Bassford and Mr. Keating.

1:31:45

I would just like to actually

1:31:49

go back to the Environment Agency,

1:31:54

Ms Mo, perhaps. And under this topic, in terms of dewater environment, I'm very mindful of the very detailed representation that you have made on this specific issue. Is there any point in terms of relation to the water environment that myself and my colleague, Mr. Gleason, have not covered that you would actually like to raise now, particularly with the issues that we have discussed earlier?

1:32:34

Hi, it's Lucy Mo here from the Environment Agency. And I would like to refer you to my colleague, Heather Harris, and regarding some water quality matters. Thank you very much.

1:32:51

Harrison. Yes. Hello, sir. Yes. And I think it was, it was just to go back again, to kind of highlight the need, I think we'll have these discussions outside of the meeting with highways England around discussion about the further mitigation in relation to water quality,

1:33:08

and the water Framework Directive. But I think that's something for discussion between ourselves and highways, England.

1:33:17

That's fine. Thank you very much. Mr. Bassford. I'm aware that there is a meeting up Coming, sir. And I think it's the 19th of March or thereabouts I've got the dates not quite correct. And that will enable those discussions to be advanced, as if I say that in relation to water quality, the work that Mr. Sharp and his team have been doing in relation to the outfalls. And the way they're established is all designed to address those types of matters. And there was a submission in relation to that which we will confirm in our written response at the last written questions.

1:33:58

Thank you very much, Mr. Bassford.

1:34:02

I believe that those are the main points that I wish to cover

1:34:07

under the water environment.

1:34:10

Are there any further questions or comments anyone wishes to make on this specific topic?

1:34:21

I can't see any hands up. So, I will assume that no one else wishes to make any points on this specific topic.

1:34:34

And if that is the case, I will actually conclude then

1:34:41

the water environment topic for today is Mr. Gleason has highlighted previously in the beginning of the session.

1:34:55

We will then

1:34:57

deal with transport and traffic

1:35:00

Tomorrow morning. It's the session tomorrow. Therefore, I now

1:35:08

would like to attend the hearing until tomorrow 10am. Thank you very much for attending.

1:35:17

Thank you, sir.