

# TEXT\_ISH3\_Part1\_A1iN\_Session3\_21042021

Wed, 4/21 4:15PM • 1:29:05

00:04

Hello.

00:12

We can hear Mr. Pinto. Good afternoon.

00:17

Thank you, Mr. Gleason.

00:20

Can Can Please someone confirm if they can see me if my camera is on it moment?

00:27

It doesn't appear to be from my end, but I'll just like a confirmation Please, Mr. Gleason, if you could, oh, we can't see you. moments.

00:37

Okay, thank you for that.

00:53

Apologies, I appear to have to be experiencing some technical difficulties with this call.

01:01

I am trying to reestablish my camera and microphone, but unfortunately, I'm not being able to

01:15

turn on my camera or turn off my microphone at the moment.

02:15

Perhaps while Mr. Pinto is sorting out technical issues, we should just make a start. So I'll resume the hearing. It's just after 230 and just say an introduction.

02:32

We're moving on now to the next item on the agenda, which is item five landscape and visual.

02:39

We aren't clear how long this will take.

02:43

When we get standard besides those who meets is this afternoon.

02:47

We need to decide what topics do next. I think knowing that the Council have issues with

02:57

witnesses.

03:00

Start Okay, can you hear me? Yes. Is the County Council have issues with at least one that witnesses not being able to attend this afternoon? I propose that we

03:14

move through transport topic back to tomorrow morning. First thing and if we're looking for another topic this afternoon, maybe we'll go straight on to

03:26

mitigation of construction impacts and make start on that. But let's see how we get on with landscaping visual first and what time it is when we finished that.

03:37

Okay. Mr. Pinto? Are you okay now to take over?

03:44

Yes, I believe so. Apologies. We can see now. Anyway, that's good. Thank you for the technical difficulties that I was experiencing earlier. Thank you very much. Can I just confirm apologies, Mr. Gleason. If you have covered this already, I'm not sure if we have started

04:05

the live stream. I didn't cover the live stream is running is running. Thank you very much. Miss patterned.

04:16

Sorry. What I have just said is that we will take a view on which topic comes next if we finish

04:24

landscaping visual

04:26

early this afternoon.

04:29

That's very helpful. Thank you. Yes, that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Gleason.

04:34

As Mr. Gleason has suggested, and now we would like to resume our next topic which would be landscape and visual impact.

04:45

Therefore, to start with the agenda this topic is described within the agenda is methodology used for the assessment of landscape in visual effects and how it has informed proposed development

05:00

The effectiveness of the applicant's landscape mitigation strategy and any outstanding issues related to tree protection in tree vegetation removal. So that is what I propose we cover within this specific item.

05:19

Mark, my first question is actually linked

05:26

with the statement of common ground that was produced between Northumberland county council

05:33

revision two, which is

05:38

rep five oh 15, a belief which states that in relation to landscaping visual impacts, that agreement still has not been reached between the applicants. And Northumberland county council in regards to the methodology used in this is also linked with an issue covered on the previous

05:57

on the previous set of hearings and landscape in visual impacts, I believe regarding the updated guidance from highways in and

06:09

Could I just start by confirming perhaps with the applicant, Mr. bassford?

06:16

If that is still deposition that we have at the moment in terms of some divergence between the applicant and Northumberland county cross in terms of the methodology? Actually, sir, I'm pleased to report that that is not the case. And there has been some convergence of Okay, so

06:40

my understanding is that methodology 135 oblique 10 has been agreed with Northumberland county council to be appropriate, and has identified the relevant significant effects. And this is going to be recorded in the drop state of common ground that is to be submitted to you at deadline six. And you'll

appreciate that that's not a fully agreed position, but it from this aspect, it will show the progress that we are making. It's also agreed we understand the mitigation measures are appropriate. And that will be recorded, also the fact that they are secured by the camp. And finally, it is agreed that tree protection measures on the British Standards 2012 trees have been has that has also been agreed to be the appropriate means of protecting trees. And so we've made some real progress there. And we're grateful to Northumberland county council for that.

07:43

for protecting trees. Thank you very much, Mr. Bass fruit.

08:00

Mr. Evans, I believe that you have raised your hand on this specific issue. But before I actually bring you into discussion,

08:13

can I just feel we quickly go to miss Robbie? And just check at Miss Robbie, on on this topic? Are you going to actually bring Mr. Mr. Evans to respond as I believe that he's acting on behalf of Northumberland county council is that case? That's correct, sir. Yeah, I was I was going to say,

08:38

Mr. butters comments out? Not exactly right. That's probably why Mr. Evans has put his hand up. But we are in agreement, we have come to a form of words that we're in agreement with now. And maybe Mr. Evans can just just clarify that.

08:53

Yes, please. I would like to actually the stand in terms of form of words and the agreement on which specific issue. So Mr. Evans, if you could actually provide some further information, more detailed information on that specific point, please. Thank you, sir. It was just to clarify on Mr. Buffett's first point in relation to the methodology and guidance by N 135, slash 10.

09:21

Our position remains that we would have preferred the applicant to have

09:27

undertaken our assessment in line with the more recent Ia 107. However, having said that, we are content that despite this kind of difference in opinion over methodology, we are content that effects have been or potentially significant effects have been correctly identified by the applicant and we don't think anything has been missed as a result.

09:55

Thank you for that clarification. Mr. Evans, can I also say

10:00

Check, just for sake of clarity on this specific topic that Mr. Evans, you are also aware in have reviewed the sensitivity test that has been done in relation to this that picks up on the changes from the updated dmrB guidance. Yes, I have. Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. bassford. Would like to come on this point?

10:29

I'm sorry. Could you Would you mind just repeating that last point there as I was in medical itch?

10:36

Certainly.

10:39

The last point that I have mentioned was actually just to confirm with Mr. Evans with Mr. Evans, that

10:50

the sensitivity test that has been done by yourself by the applicant has actually been picked up in the comments that Mr. Evans has made, do account for that sensitivity, testing having been carried out and reviewed. And Mr. Evans has very helpfully confirmed that that is the case.

11:10

In light of that, in light of what Mr. Evans has just mentioned, in terms of the preferred approach, I would like to give you as the applicant an opportunity to to actually come on that comment on that, if you wish.

11:26

Yes, my understanding is that the sensitivity test has all been has all been addressed. And the critical point, I think, that we will take from Mr. Evans's submission is that all of the

11:42

potentially significant updates have been identified, and nothing has been omitted. I'm going to ask Mr. Andy Williams to just comment in relation to this. And in particular, in relation to the sensitivity test, Mr. Williams.

12:00

Thank you, Mr. basford. So yes, so we had a call with

12:05

Mr. Evans, and Miss Robbie on Monday. So we discussed the

12:11

use of the 135 10 methodology in relation to the LM 107. And yeah, I can confirm that the agreement was that whilst it, it is slightly different, it does provide a vehicle by which significant effects have been identified. I think there are, you know, there are minor differences in terms of how things might have been worded or described, but the principles of the assessments are, are broadly the same between the two sets of guidance, though, the

12:46

the assessment that's in chapter seven, for part A, and Part B, identifies those significant defects on landscape character and visual amenity.

12:59

Thank you, Mr. Williams, for that information. That's very helpful.

13:05

Mr. Evans, your hand is still raised are not 100% sure if it was left, or if you actually would like to intervene? At this point again? No, sorry. That's a up error.

13:19

Normally problem. Thank you very much, Mr. Evans.

13:23

I also know,

13:25

Mr. bassford, updates, in terms of this statement of common ground in depth, the latest position will actually be

13:39

correctly identified and explained within the next segment of common ground. So of note that

13:48

and if that is the case, in Northumberland county council are actually happy with that situation. And in broad terms with the methodology used.

14:02

Perhaps I would, in that case, suggested we actually move on to the next point, but before I do, can I just confirm, Miss Robbie, that you are happy with that? In that we can actually move on to the next bullet point within this item? Yeah. So satisfied. Yeah. We'll move on. Yeah. Thanks. Okay. Thank you very much. And the next item then is linked with the effectiveness of the applicants landscape mitigation strategy.

14:35

And as I understand, this was also another concern that was raised and something that was not completely totally agreed between the applicant and NCC. Mr. bassford. Again, the same question for us prod previous item. Do you have an update on the situation that perhaps you could share with us in terms of the effectiveness

15:00

Instructions are that the mitigation measures are agreed to be appropriate and are agreed.

15:08

And that this has to be recorded in the state of common ground. I say that with some trepidation, as it may well be that my instructions are a summary. And so there are some extra detail, which was Robbie can provide to you to put some flesh on the bones of that.

15:25

Thank you for that. Mr. basford. I believe that specific issue had to do with some agreement from the tree officer coming to a position regarding specific item, which I believe was s I 100. Included in at camp and Miss Robbie, would you be able to provide us an update on the specific situation?

15:52

Please?

15:54

Thanks.

15:56

I can't at the moment. I'm afraid I'm having difficulties speaking with the tree officer. And I'll endeavour to give you an update at the next the next deadline. But I think we may need to take a position a position on on this discussion with Mr. Evans.

16:16

Thank you. Thank you very much. I would observe, though, that we are narrowing the points here and there. There should be time to address this. But But I'm grateful to miss Robbie for that. Thank you. Thank you very much.

16:37

And I actually believe that that sort of concludes most of the overall questions that I had on this topic as well, in terms of the effectiveness. I think that that was the main identified issue

16:51

on the landscape integration strategy. So actually, I would perhaps suggest that we move on to the next topic in terms of outstanding issues regarding to protections in tree vegetation, we move on, unless anyone else has any comments to make regarding the effectiveness of the landscape strategy.

17:15

Sorry, I've tried my hand up some time now.

17:20

Apologies. I'm still hoarse. I didn't I did not notice that. And thank you very much for for bringing that to my attention. Would you like to comment on the effectiveness of the landscape strategy? In Austria? No, sorry. It was actually back to the methodology, your mind?

17:38

Yes, certainly.

17:41

very much aware, there's a slight

17:44

query or the timing of the visual effect assessment that took place in Northgate farm, I still maintain, obviously, and documented in detail that there is a significant effect. And it's possible, one of the reasons why hasn't been looked upon as significant is because the timing of the measurement, because the timing of the connection was done at a point when the noise barrier was not considered to be confirmed. Therefore, if you review the visual effect assessment at the time, there's no reference to a noise barrier at that point in time, because I hadn't been confirmed. It's only recently in February, that the noise barrier was confirmed. So, from my point of view is obviously a timing issue. And therefore, the assessment should be reevaluated based upon the current situation, in addition to that grid store is being placed upon the my current trees that I planted act as a means of a barrier to must be views. Unfortunately, those trees are growing and the quite laggy. And therefore the masking capability of history is diminished. Time that will continue before the road is completed.

19:05

Thank you, Mr. Horse. I actually had, I was actually going to raise the similar issue in the next item. But thank you very much for actually explaining it.

19:21

Now, I think that that's helpful.

19:24

And I believe that this is linked with the your response to the latest questions that we have to write to threaten questions that we have a post

19:36

where your question, and the assigned significance writing to your property, is that linked with that issue? Mr. Hawes, is that your concern? That's correct. Thank you very much.

19:53

Mr. bassford.

19:56

Would you like to comment on Mr. Marks representation

20:00

So, the first thing to say is that the assessment took account of the noise barrier when it was undertaken. So, the one before you has already taken that into account and it was included in the assessment as is of course, a visual item on a reasonable worst case basis. And so, therefore, it was

assumed to be present even though at the stage the assessment was undertaken, it was not confirmed over feature. So, we can reassure Mr. Hawes that that was already in contemplation

20:38

when the assessment was undertaken, the next thing to say is that the

20:46

general position in relation to the vegetation and so forth and change relating to that is that it is

20:56

it is the correct price to assess based upon the baseline conditions, which are look forward to the design year, obviously, and also look at the present. And so therefore, the, the assumption is that planting will mature. And so the degree of change is assessed

21:18

based upon the magnitude. Now, it is, of course, Mr. Horses own planting to achieve repairing. And so it's up to him if he would like to manage that, in order to consider whether it is or is not stance, but that that's to an extent for him to address that we work from the baseline and assess change. As it takes place. We look at how

21:43

how vegetation matures, in the assessments that are undertaken, we don't just assume something will be of any particular

21:52

standard, any given point. We work on the basis of change.

21:59

Thank you, Mr. bassford. for that. I do. I do have a question. Mr. point of clarification, as well.

22:11

You have mentioned just now that it has already been taken into consideration the noise barrier as part of the assessment and you have just confirmed that

22:23

Mr. Hawes has actually in his representation to us stated that de rating given to the visual impact of that barrier is not the same as compared to other locations within the scheme where noise barrier is proposed. So my first question would be, what is the rating given to a noise barrier and how that weighting was actually assessed? And please explain any sort of inconsistency is in terms of writing that am I get clearly perceived, but that might that might exist? So when you say rating, do you refer to its acoustic rating, or to the

23:13

assessment, cried the assessment descriptors that are used for it?

23:22

Let me if I'm referring back to Mr. Horse representation, I believe it is appropriate to actually ask Mr. horse to clarify

23:33

the main issue that he has actually raised in his representation here. Mr. Hawes, would you like to actually clarify this issue for us, please? Yeah, certainly. So it's the visual impact that the noise barrier has on the visual effect.

23:53

And just

23:55

just going back to the point, the previous point was made, I can't find any reference when measuring the visual effect, any reference to the noise body as part of that

24:08

measurement. So some reassured that it was taken into account? I'm surprised there wasn't any reference to, to check, make specific explicit reference to it

24:21

at that point,

24:23

because

24:25

I suggest that

24:27

in relation to the treatment of the visual impact of noise barriers, the person to speak to that is Mr. Williams. And so he should just confirm the approach. And then there are, as you request any distinguishing features in the assessment at this location that cause it to perform differently to the assessments.

24:50

Mr. Williams?

24:52

Thank you, Mr. bassford. Yes, so just to sort of confirm a couple of those points from recollection, and I haven't got it in front.

25:00

To me at the moment, but for receptor 93, which is Northgate farm in the visual effects shedule, there was mentioned of the noise barrier in the features, I think.

25:14

So I think that, you know, it was taken into account. So we have assume that that barrier was was included.

25:21

And I think then it might be just worthwhile if I just explain how

25:26

all of those elements were sort of taken together in terms of the assessments. So, as Mr. bassford has explained, what we've looked at in terms of the degree of change or the magnitude of change, so and we have taken, obviously, we don't accept private land for that we've we've sort of taken it from the footpath on the one from outside of the property and don't undertake any assessment from that. Nevertheless, we have taken into account the fact that there is quite a strong block of planting that sits on the western boundary of the property, and that does actually does quite a good job of screening a lot of the views, the close quarter view of the one that sits immediately to the, to the west, on where we've looked at that, in terms of the noise barrier itself, what we've done is we said,

26:19

it's a slight balance a, you know, the barrier itself, is, it's a visual, new visual feature. But it also then provide some degree of visual screening to the scheme on the western side of that fence. So what we, what we came to the conclusion was that the combination of the fence and of the existing vegetation that sits along that that western boundary extends slightly onto the northern side of the of the boundary, the combined effect of that is that there would not be

26:55

particularly close quarter views from the front elevation of North Gate farm, whereby there would be obvious views and views of traffic etc, would be substantially screened by the by the presence of that noise barrier. So in itself, it has an impact, but it also has a secondary benefit in providing a visual screen, which reinforces the existing planting.

27:18

Thank you for the clarification as to Williams, I have checked in I believe that it is receptor 96, I believe 93, I believe,

27:29

from from deformation that I have just checked.

27:38

My question then would be in terms of considering the visual effects of the noise barrier, in clearly the representation that the horse has actually made on this specific issue.

27:53

What consideration was actually given to the length of the noise barrier?

28:01

And how debt has actually determined or not? its inclusion, ultimately, but also

28:10

the length of the noise, very itself. So how, how did you come to a position in terms of

28:19

the effectiveness of the noise barrier, and also its impact on landscape?

28:29

acoustic effect or its landscape effects? When you talk about it,

28:37

the length of the noise barrier? I'm now I'm now actually asking for clarification on both, I assume, perhaps, Mr. Williams, and perhaps you can explain this further, I assume that you have given some consideration in terms of what length the noise barrier should be, in how long as the noise barrier should actually be not as to be effective, from

29:03

a noise perspective and from a sound proofing perspective, correct.

29:10

I can't comment on its noise

29:14

on the attenuation that at the attenuation it gives to noise.

29:18

Somebody from the acoustics team would have to respond to that. But certainly from a visual perspective, in terms of when one standing if one was standing at the front sort of North elevation. And the noise barrier is following the sort of the western boundary to that property, in terms of how long and how far along that extends, as you get further along the planting, sort of takes over. So you're looking at it sort of obliquely, so the effect of the planting is to screen

29:51

is to have a better capacity to provide screening because you're looking at it obliquely as opposed to looking at it perpendicular. So if you sort of turned and look

30:00

Do West, you'd be looking through the planting and that would, you know, they would have less screening capacity. But when you're looking at something obliquely, you have more layers of vegetation

that you're sort of look trying to look through. So that's why the, the, the barrier itself, we did not expect, we did not ask for it to be extended beyond the noise, the degree to which it was providing noise attenuation.

30:26

Thank you, I accept that. And I also accept it, maybe you don't have your life specialist at hand at the moment. And this is something that perhaps we can pick up with greater deal of certainty within written raps. Nevertheless, I think that I would like to understand now just focusing on in that case, on the visual impacts,

30:47

what alternatives were considered into, I would also like to ask what sort of consultation has happened, particularly with Mr. Horse who is obviously going to be directly affected by the noise barrier on this on this particular issue, in perhaps Mr. basford, you can also comment on the consultation issues, I would expect, in addition to the visual impact by Mr. Williams.

31:09

So, so so just to

31:13

consider the approach to the noise barrier in this location, the barrier length is,

31:24

is established using two main considerations that matters.

31:30

It's effectiveness in attenuating noise. And that has been the subject of evidence, which was put before you at the last issue specific hearing, and value for money because I was thinking that doesn't provide

31:46

mitigation for effects that are not predicted.

31:51

And so therefore, you end up with a noise barrier with a certain physical characteristic.

31:58

As part of the scheme, having done that, we consider with Mr. Williams team, watch the visual consequences of the barrier are. So the starting point is the sound attenuation. And then you consider the visual impacts.

32:15

In terms of consultation, as you know, we have been consulting Mr. Horse for some considerable time, and that consultation took place in advance of the

32:27

application for development. conservativeness has continued since. And so we continue to speak to Mr. Horse about the visual impacts about the mitigation. And I understand that meetings have been undertaken with him relatively recently. And they continue.

32:46

Okay, thank you very much for that.

32:50

In Thank you very much, Mr. Williams, for your clarification in terms of visual impacts as well. Mr. Hawes Would you like to comment on this point?

33:01

Yeah, yes, we're delighted, just a couple of things that follow up. The first one, obviously, again, going back to the the fifth has been placed in the vegetation to provide the masking, unfortunately, I don't have the same level of confidence in its effectiveness. And certainly, as it as a tongue moves forward, the trees are growing

33:22

taller, and therefore the vegetation cover is less and older already today, I can see through those trees. And so you're obviously the one road going forward. And that means I'll be able to see the extended road and the layer by going forward.

33:41

I'm also interested to know why there was only one visual effect measurement, because there's a whole sort of highlighted, there's a the impact on the household is this wide region, which includes the PMA road circling

34:00

property. And I've already documented them the impact of that house elsewhere in the property. So I've actually shown the impact it has on the north, northeast, Northwest, Southeast sort of outlooks on the west, the outlook.

34:18

So it's frustrating that there's only one single point of measurement when you have something significant, like a pyramid being constructed, which does have a visual effect.

34:34

Thank you very much for that. intervention, Mr. Horse. Mr. Boss, would you like to comment on

34:43

the visual effects and how these were considered?

34:48

The first thing is to say that to address the point in relation to trees, and I think Mr. Williams has already described

35:00

How one the the way that one looks through trees depends upon the angle of view and you take a visual impact assessment from a location cannot

35:13

a representative location can't do it for all possible locations. And that the

35:20

the assessment that Mr. Williams has undertaken looks at those trees and sees that one would one would look publicly through them, meaning that you don't just see them as if you were viewing perpendicular to the tree line.

35:34

The second point, though, is to discuss the representative view

35:42

approach, meaning that one doesn't take a view, in a view from all locations bearing in mind, of course, that it's not possible to access. Mr. Hall's government's private, here's a private residence, and therefore,

35:57

we don't assess views from garden spaces, we only assess from public locations, and that that's in accordance with the methodology. But I would invite Mr. Williams to describe why there is a single visual receptor is given a single impact rather than a range of impacts for different views from it was Mr. Williams, perhaps you would elaborate on that? Yes, certainly. So the the, the assessment of visual effects

36:25

is undertaken, as Mr. Buffett has said from public locations, and we don't assess from several locations, where a property might have sort of greater ownership, where all the locations may be visible. So the The important thing is we're looking from publicly accessible locations. So even though we have assessed all the private views, within the within the zone of visual influence, what we've done is, you know, we have had, we have to take a point at which it is the view that's orientated towards the scheme, and that's the primary view in terms of whether the most significant defects are likely to arise. And that's, that's how we come to the come to decide on in terms of, perhaps it's the north south north or south elevation that we would be, we would be assessing. So really, that's how

37:18

we've, we've come to the point where we've got a single location that we've that we've assessed for the for the visual assessment on that particular receptor and all the receptors as well.

37:32

Okay, thank you for that clarification. Mr. Williams,

37:36

you've mentioned that it was assessed from public cleanse. Considering that one of the main concerns from Mr. horse is actually

37:49

a view that from his we have published on our notes, following an accompanied site

37:58

inspection, which was carried out, I could confirm that actually was not very easily viewable from the public cloud into public domain.

38:08

How was how was that taken into consideration? And how can that be assessed and incorporated? So I think that's, that's maybe part of what the point that you've made is that where we are using footpaths, like either they roadside or their public footpaths, if it's the sort of the two way thing, if you can't see a property, then then they can't see you. So if you're looking back towards Northgate farm, perhaps from the north and the footpath to the north, and you've got the the boundary of vegetation that's surrounding the property, if you can't see the receptor, from where you're studying, and sort of making a professional judgement in terms of what's what they're likely to see, it's the two way thing in terms of, you know, if you can't see them, they can't see you type of thing. So that's the sort of the approach that we're taking. And, you know, in terms of the assessment that was undertaken, we it's the same approach that's taken for all receptors, in terms of visiting them individually. And I'm making sure that we've we've kind of assessed as the, we've assessed a worst case scenario in terms of being what what's visible and what isn't visible.

39:21

I understand that, Mr. Williams. But if I understand correctly,

39:27

I think that there is also the location of this receptor is actually very close to one of the access roads that are proposed for the a one and therefore obviously, that is going to significantly change the area as well.

39:46

And old Dell you can't actually see it at the moment because it's not within. It's on the other side. It faces da one if you would like

39:56

but there is a proposed access road going through

40:00

Do one part of the dcl. So, I am keen to actually understand how that was taken into consideration as part of the visual impact overall of the whole scheme. So what is access road?

40:16

To? Are you referring to the private means of access, which is to say the road which

40:23

precedes northwards from West view, and then serves the various Warner's house properties. Exactly, yes. It's the one that will pass to the east of Mr. Horse property. Meaning that Yes, exactly. Yes, that's and it is, it is, in fact, the road which is required in order to maintain access to Mr. Horse property. That is correct. Nevertheless, I would like to understand how that impact was evaluated. So that so Mr. horse has said that he is concerned about the impacts of that road, and the visual impact of that. And so it is about how having assessed the impacts of the a one trunk road improvements, the price of the new private means of access for Mr. Hawes is taken into account.

41:11

Yes, yes.

41:14

And so. So the way that we've looked at that, in terms of the visual receptor is that the property of the visual receptor, the, the occupants of the property are the visual receptors themselves. So as we said, we don't assess from from garden spaces, in terms of the because the, the majority of the garden sits off to the east. And as you rightly said, it's not you know, it's not visible from the, from the edge of the of from the edge of the a one. And so in terms of the view, we've taken it from that North elevation, so effectively, it's where that the PMA would come in, to the north boundary to North Gate farm. And that's been taken into account, in terms of the the impacts of the PMA, effectively, we've not really been able to assess that strictly because that's its garden space, we don't necessarily assess the views from the garden space, we're assessing the view from for the occupants of the of the property.

42:16

So important, it's important to say, Mr. Williams, isn't it that we, we rank different receptors, so they, they have different importance. So the most important receptors are going to be viewpoints that are publicly accessible, that are in particular locations, then you look at things like public rights of way,

42:38

major traffic routes, and then

42:42

then, towards the bottom of the importance of visual receptors, and this is not so they're not important at all, but it's a great read. So, so they do have some importance, our

42:56

residential properties, and then residential properties are afforded a certain importance, and then you look at the level of change to the views that would occur at the residential property. And because they

are relatively low in the, say, relatively low, in the order in which one carries out the assessment, you don't, for instance, look at the garden, the way the standard methodology, which experts acquire, is carried out is to use the

43:30

is to use the facade of the building, as the point from which assessments are taken. Now, that would perhaps be different if you had a residential property with particular characteristics that made it unique in some way, because it was listed structured afforded a particular view, but that is different. And that would be a setting inherited cultural heritage impact, but that is different to the assessment that we take for a normal private residence. But that's right, isn't it? Mr. Williams? It is correct. Even even with that sort of order of importance, the under the 135 guidance, the

44:05

the sensitivity of residential receptors, this is considered to be highly sensitive, ie the the occupants place great importance on the view that they are they recorded from their, from their residential,

44:19

from the from the property that they live in. But yeah, in terms of the the impacts on garden spaces, that, you know, does not come into necessarily come into unless that forms part of that front elevation in terms of people that I point that you're looking at.

44:36

I understand that Mr. Williams, and I understand what you have just mentioned there as well, Mr. basford in terms of the ER can how these issues are assessed. Nevertheless,

44:46

I'm I'm still not fully understanding

44:52

based on what on your explanation earlier.

44:59

How

45:00

This excess fraud was actually taking into consideration terms of this visual impact. And

45:06

my concern is not so much in terms of

45:13

what feature of the property is going to be affected it nevertheless, it remains the fact that some visual In fact, at effect is going to happen. And I want to understand how that specific visual effect was

actually taken into consideration in order to inform your mitigation for the landscape and for the visual impact, because the visual impact will still be there.

45:40

And I also note that these are identified

45:48

as part of group seven, I believe it's part of the noise sensitivity receptors. And, as I said, also, receptor 96 in terms of the visual, so I'm just not clear how

46:08

the impact is being looked at holistically, considering where the road is going to go, because this route is not going to be just a one. There is within the DC your powers, this your powers also construction of an access route, which clearly is going to have an impact.

46:28

So as to the first the first thing, the first thing to say, sir, is that that we mustn't conflate landscape effects, and visual effects, or landscape effects. Mr. Miss will doesn't need to stand at a particular location or particular view for landscape, that's the bed assessing the effects upon the landscape as a concept, not upon a particular view. So you refer to the landscape effects, but what we're talking about here is a visual effect, I believe are referred to a visual effect if I referred to a landscape effect that will apologise on visual effect. Oh, very good. Thank you. My node had landscape. So thank you for clarifying that. So Mr. Williams, if you would just say how the PMA is taken into account, in the assessment that we're undertaking in this location, and about how it is taken into account and the overall impression and the degree of change, the high watermark of the degree of change that is reported and the environment state.

47:35

So, as I've said, we are looking at the occupants of the property. So we're looking at the view from the property. And said, that does not include the view from the garden space, it's it's it is taking the view from the property. So if you were stood at the window of a property, how you how you experienced the view from that, from that property. So from the the assessment that we've undertaken on that particular receptor, we were looking at the north facing elevation, we've looked at what we as up as sort of assessors have looked at it in terms of how they currently have use of the a one,

48:21

and how that would change as a result of the scheme, which includes the noise barrier to the west, which includes the access for the PMA coming in from the north.

48:33

And the point at which there would be some vegetation loss to sort of afford that I know there's an existing sort of access gate through there, but we've assumed that there would be some vegetation removed in order to construct that in order to widen that. And effectively that was formed. The the main components of the change of the view from Northgate farm I, there's the the PMA is it runs down brown

to the east, effectively is impacting on the the garden space off to the north and east of the of the garden space, which is quite extensive, that has not necessarily formed part of the assessment itself, because it's not part of the view from the property from the occupants of the you know, like I say, if you were stood at the window looking out.

49:21

Yes. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. I think that that has clarified the situation. Thank you. Mr. Hawes. I'm mindful that you have had your hand up for a while. Would you like to comment?

49:36

It was very much about reaching a conclusion here. And I think Mr. Williams done that for me. In that confirming effect, you know, visual effects assessment has been taking place of the piano access, and bear in mind is wrapped around the property from the south to the east, to the north. It is quite a significant hazard quite a significant part.

50:00

On the property, and that includes views from the windows, particularly your windows upstairs.

50:09

That that is not actually what Mr. Williams said, of course.

50:17

Okay, thank you, Mr. Hawes.

50:22

Mr. Williams, would you like to clarify your position on this specific issue, if you believe that that is not actually what was meant. So, so just to sort of recap, the view is from the receptor we are looking at,

50:42

typically looking at ground floor views, that if you were stood, say at the doorway, or one of the windows of the of the property, and we we look, in terms of that is the view, we cannot possibly assess from every view from every angle,

51:00

or every sort of orientation of the view, we're looking at that as an overall impact on the occupants of the of that, of that receptor.

51:10

Thank you very much. The position is that, for a given receptor, you have a representative view, the greatest element of change in this particular location is going to be caused by elements to the north. And so if one were to if this were to be

51:31

assessed from every single aspect of the property, you would not get an impact that was more severe than the view to the north. And so any other assessment is academic, because it can be understood in the concept of the of the change in the view that Mr. Williams has described. The next question is the understanding of the property and the mitigation that is necessary, but it is not. So what Mr. Hawes is concerned about is what it is like to live in his property. It's not necessarily about having a piece of paper, which tells him how the change is going to happen. And the point of interest is, if there is a PMA to the east of the property, is there mitigation in place? Is there is that taken into account? Will it be behind a hedge, for instance, those types of questions that that follow on from this, you should not be faced with a an assumption that this receptor has not been has not been assessed, but that is not the case. Thank you, Mr. basford. I understand that and I understand, Mr. Williams position. And my question was to actually understand how that assessment has been carried out, which Mr. William has actually provide evidence on at the moment, from what angles that assessment was actually carried out in what is the level of appropriate screening, as you have mentioned yourself, Mr. basford, that is proposed. So those are our concerns, not just that mitigation is being proposed? Is it adequate or not? That is an issue that we would have as well.

53:28

Mr. Mr. Mr. House?

53:33

I, I assume that you are still your hand is still up? I think you have raised your hand up again. Now.

53:42

Am I right? Is it because you still have further questions on this, or that you actually disagree with the assessment in the way that the assessment has been carried out.

53:55

Of course, conscious of town and appreciate people are busy, and was keen to wrap this up as quickly as possible. And we just want to close off by highlighting that, unfortunately, by using a single point, visual receptor, which is outside the property, which doesn't really portray any real usage, or how we enjoy the property isn't necessarily the best option would appear. But my main concern is the note just that from my heart is that the impact on the visual is significant because it's the combined number of different choices. For example, I've got the widening of the one. I've got the live by that can now see I've got an access road that's been built across the road, which is going to serve as a swale. I've got an access road going up to the the woods or running alongside the gate one. I've gotten the new PMA which is going to service North Gate fun. Everywhere I look from the property. There's new construction, a new access roads and expansion of Tama and that together creates

55:00

A combined impact upon household which I don't believe it's been recognised by this single visual receptor lives outside of the property.

55:10

No.

55:12

Thank you. Thank you for that, Mr. Hawes. And I think I think that in relation to landscape and visual, my concern is to actually understand methodology and how these were evaluated. I believe that we got that information, it's more meant in a clarification is well, I, I see that this matter is probably going to be a matter where, again, there was going to be some

55:41

ground that is not going to be mutual any mutual position easily agreed within this.

55:49

I would perhaps suggest that actually, we continue this process via written representations. I'm not

55:55

wholly convinced that we can actually

55:59

go much further within the remit of this

56:05

of this hearing today on this specific issue.

56:10

But hopefully, this has actually clarified

56:17

the process and the methodology used in order to actually assess this and has certainly clarified the situation for as the examining authority in theory them. So thank you very much for that.

56:28

I would like to then move

56:31

on to any other outstanding issues related to protection in tree verse in vegetation removal. In addition to the one that we have just discussed, is there any other outstanding issues? Or any further comments or comments that anyone wishes to make?

57:00

by text answers now?

57:03

If there are no further questions, then I will hand over to Mr. Gleason, who will now leads on item six of the agenda, transport and traffic. Thank you.

57:16

Actually, Mr. Pinto.

57:19

I have some questions to follow upon. Trees.

57:24

interests. Hold on. Thank you,

57:30

dad. So anyway, Mr. Williams.

57:35

So let's just pick up a couple of final points.

57:42

Yes, the woodland trust submitted representation. Deadline five rep five oh 49.

57:51

outlining their concerns. I'm sure the applicant will be responding at the next deadline. But just picking up a couple of points they've raised since we're talking trees.

58:04

They note the number of ancient or veteran trees have been identified for removal within the arboricultural reports.

58:13

And ask why is it not impossible to avoid removing ancients, Fetterman notes, notable trees and what mitigation is proposed in each case such cases?

58:29

Mr. Williams is the one for you.

58:34

But that Mr. Williams is not the purpose of this unless you feel comfortable. Mr. Williams? I think

58:42

the I think the the arboricultural

58:46

team are the ones to answer those questions. I think specifically. Certainly in terms of mitigation, we've we've sort of within the mitigation strategy, we've obviously putting in a lot more.

58:58

We're putting in a lot of woodland to replace those areas of trees that are impacted and Woodlands that are impacted. Yes, so So Mr. Williams, landscape mitigation strategy and so on is going to provide the mitigation or more more accurately compensation for

59:20

for lost habitats. And so that that's where that comes in. That is of course already described for you in the various matters that are the various documents that have been for you already and you will have seen the landscape

59:38

strategies and landscape master plans that have been put before the examination already. In terms of how to avoid the

59:47

the relevant specimen trees and ancient wood lens. You'll recall that we have put before you explanations as to why

1:00:00

How the route alignments for the project were described and first identified at statutory consultation. And it is only by diverting the road to a very great extent that it would be possible to avoid the ancient woodland and other receptors altogether. And that would not be proportionate in the context of the of the scheme as it is before you. And this can be found in the alternatives sections of the various of the environmental statement relating to Part A and Part B.

1:00:44

Thank you. So,

1:00:46

we've spent some time the last hearing.

1:00:53

Yes, yes.

1:00:56

Looking at the

1:01:00

the ancient woodland.

1:01:02

So, contents they've got the answer need with regard to veteran and notable trees, what sorts of impacts we're looking at for those categories? I have, as the applicants

1:01:18

identified specific numbers of trees that would be

1:01:23

lost as a result of the scheme.

1:01:27

I think I've got to turn to Mr. Pennock to address this, but you will recall that you asked us to look at numbers of trees within woodland, whereas Yes, one normally only counts them outside woodland. So my suspicion is he's about to tell you that there are a number. I think it's a very low number of individual specimens that reflected Mr. Fennec who are able to assist Mr. Gleason with that further please. I will do my best to him as Mr. Williams raised, this was definitely a point for the arborists. So I'll I'll try and just keep it fairly factual as what I'm aware of, rather than me explaining anything that they would be able to summarise in more detail within the ritual representation. But with regards to the the trees that the woodland trust raised, I believe, from memory, and I haven't got it in front of me. So I apologise. But I believe there was six, six trees that they raised in a list. And one tree I have, I believe the arborist has confirmed that that actually would be retained. I think it was a false statement that that was going to be lost to the scheme it shown is retained on the vegetation clearance ponds. And then one other, I think it was a group of Hawthorn trees had, I can't remember the phrase, I think it was veteran qualities, but they aren't identified as veteran trees. And so it didn't qualify that as a veteran group of trees. And the way it's been classified by the arborist to eat what they weren't veteran trees. And the remaining trees,

1:02:54

I believe, would have been minimised where possible, obviously been avoided, where possible, and I think the the impacts are

1:03:03

from the scheme are as minimal as possible on veteran trees. And I think that's probably as factual as I can be without stepping on the arborist tours. And

1:03:14

that's fine. I think we will embellish that in our written submission to you sir, we'll make a note to to add a note from the arborist Stannis to find the risks, as I said, was a deadline five submission so I'm expecting you respond to it's a deadline six anyway. So that those are the questions I had which relates to that, that can be picked up. So couple of other things then

1:03:40

the applicants response to question Lv two point 12 states that an arboricultural method statement would be secured

1:03:50

Under Item s LG eight of the riak. Why can't a method statement be produced at this stage during the examination? Why do you have to wait

1:04:02

until

1:04:05

detailed design surely the principles of possibilities be sorted at this stage?

1:04:12

I would say sir, that the question is whether it is necessary rather than whether it whether one should

1:04:20

the React is perfectly capable of having that level of detail presented at a later stage. Our Bill arboriculturalism is approached on a fairly standard basis there are standards, which we referred in this examination earlier today. And so preparing the method statement can take place at a later stage, rather than having to descend into detail now. But descending into detail. Now that's my point. We're talking about items of principle, which are not particularly well can be nonsense.

1:05:00

specific comments this under the next item as well.

1:05:05

You're saying that was your face?

1:05:09

No, why can't be provided? But why should be provided? I think you said, correct me if I'm wrong.

1:05:15

The point is that

1:05:19

interested parties can be provided with reassurance it's an early stage, rather than waiting until the detail is available. So that applies equally to this is this is an immense infrastructure project, it's many miles long, we don't

1:05:35

have that

1:05:36

appetite. money goes to basford.

1:05:40

Sir, I'm addressing as you've just asked me to matters for members of the public, not for you, I am aware that you are an expert in Spectre, but you're asking me to address this for for for others.

1:05:52

So, so we don't descend to detail, it's at this stage. And this is a matter of detail, that in an outline planning permission, you would not necessarily have to have all of the detailed structures and all of the detailed design and the decision performs very, like an outline planning permission in that it does not require full detail at the application stage does not, of course, outline consent, but it does perform in that way. Now, the question is, whether there is that something so specific as to the effect upon any individual specimen or group of trees, that requires a different and unusual approach, which ought to be addressed now. And so, confidence has to be given to you and the Secretary of State, that the particular concerns of that receptor can be addressed? Now, in those circumstances I absolutely accept, it would be appropriate to say, this is a critical specimen, it needs particular protection is particularly awkward, and we will have a methodology for it. But it is simply a question of managing the arboricultural the

1:07:04

arboricultural environment in the same way that one would for any scheme? As you say, Sir, it is in this is not a unique scheme, then you would do that at a later stage in the same way that you produce detailed schemes at a later stage?

1:07:22

Well, I don't agree with that, I'd say because I think in other schemes

1:07:28

for principles of development of

1:07:33

methods, statements, for a whole range of topics have been provided during the examination. And

1:07:42

we're not looking at the specifics here, we're looking at something that's is a recognised approach across all national infrastructure projects. The cultural method statements for this scheme is probably no different from once it had been produced, for the 20 or 30, other NC IPS that highways England has developed in principle, and the other 60 odd schemes that other developers have promoted. So it's this level of detail, which I'm not understanding, per se, we will come on to this as a matter and

1:08:25

item seven on the agenda mitigation of construction impacts. So for now, let me know

1:08:31

that I need to respond. So you've, you've just made a finding. So either that is your finding, and we should now. Okay, proceed, please respond.

1:08:40

So, so the if one word, take your position, sir, then for every infrastructure project, one would need to provide all strategies in detail at the point of application. Now, I didn't say that. I didn't say that. I know that's not what you said. But that is the logical conclusion. Because what you say in this examination,

Sir, may be taken on by one of your brother or sister inspectors, and they say, Mr. Gleason recommended the Secretary of State this approach. In this examination, the Secretary state did not agree and that's the way it happens. The Secretary state does not agree, does not disagree. And then it gets written up into the the process and you end up with a creeping

1:09:27

particularization in the in what is supposed to be a flexible

1:09:33

decision making process where the burden on applicants is for immense projects. It's produced more and more and more detail and that that's a trend which is happening now. The question has to be whether you are satisfied that the impacts of the scheme are properly addressed and can be overcome and without knowing the full detail of

1:10:00

The of the arboricultural method statement, can you can you conceptually, this is not me saying it's

1:10:09

not me saying that it is impossible if you do that. What I'm saying is, is that is it possible for an inspector to come to that conclusion? If you are not comfortable that an inspector could come to the conclusion that there was enough information

1:10:25

so that that could not be remedied later, then you can say, I need to see this now. And I think it's appropriate. But if you are comfortable that this is the sort of information that can be provided later, then you do not need to examine it.

1:10:41

Okay, I hear what you say I'll reflect on that. Thank you. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to respond. Okay. So let's just then move on, as I said to

1:10:54

question lv 212,

1:10:58

which has the applicant to expand upon statements in paragraph 6.13 to six 110 as your employee cultural reports I made with having that to hand

1:11:16

that's Rep. So we have a pp 220 and 286.

1:11:26

Just give me a moments or as I turn these up to 2286 2286. So to set it to 86. I think they're both the same.

1:11:40

In terms of those paragraphs anyway, so we're not looking at any difference.

1:11:52

First, my version look just fine. That skin.

1:11:59

Computer is moving very slowly, so forgive me.

1:12:18

So 6.1 point six. Forgive me. So my question is for the opening. I I don't know what is happening today. But like Mr. Pinto, I had a great deal of computer difficulties over lunchtime. So it may be that there was a

1:12:33

bigger thing happening in it, sphere.

1:12:43

Keep it while it is loading, please, would you give me the paragraph number again, so 6.16 so it's the section

1:12:52

on tree protection which starts at 6.13 is page 41. of

1:13:03

first reference to a pp 220 Thank you It is just open give me a moment six point 13

1:13:24

page 41.

1:13:39

Ah numbering is slightly

1:13:42

different.

1:13:47

So this is the reference I have at 6.1 point 13 replacement planting is proposed as part of the landscape mitigation master plan. So you 6.1 point three

1:13:59

Yes, we have it. Yep, the paragraphs I'm particularly interested in or 6.1 point six to 6.1 point eight and six and 6.1 point nine. Now.

1:14:15

I mean, the first thing about this, so this is an arboricultural reports, which is

1:14:22

then the assessment of the trees that was undertaken

1:14:32

as part of the survey work which was done for the project. And

1:14:41

at this point, no particular issue to raise with that report in itself. But here you've got the section on tree protection.

1:14:50

I've actually this picks up my my last points because you're setting out here on the tree protection, a series of principles which could be

1:15:00

applied,

1:15:01

probably to any development site has trees on it.

1:15:06

Whether it's land support and the other application,

1:15:09

few people would argue with the basic principles there. And that that's really

1:15:16

reinforced my point earlier, why can't this type of thing? Peter more generally, put? Let's put that to one side, you've provided your answer on our lads. That that

1:15:29

the point that I think you're making, so I haven't answered, because what what I think I understand from you is that the you would like to see elements such as these addressed in the either in the old camp or in a specific strategy. Now we can check the extent to which these are already in the outline cap. I don't have that at my fingertips.

1:15:53

Yes,

1:15:56

there is, of course, References 6.1 point 10 to the camp. But these these are not the these are not the problems so much as the the issue that if you have a strategy, then it needs to be specific to a scheme, of course, but these are exactly as you rightly say. So these are generic measures, which could be included, I think, I think we may have been across purposes. So these are the sorts of things which one would expect to see in an account, but I, I accept that it's useful to have those there. But

1:16:30

okay, well, let's move on to the specific points. The reason I raise these particular paragraphs is to something different.

1:16:39

I think I asked the question

1:16:43

about providing greater precision

1:16:48

as to what these statements meant. And my concern is that if we take 6.16 it says excavations can be carried out using manual techniques. 6.17 says no deconstruction can be prescribed 6.18 working areas can be minimised by saying can means also means cannot, doesn't it?

1:17:17

So

1:17:19

it's always dangerous to engage a lawyer on grammatical points, but your right to do so, I would not worth this necessarily, as it is before you now would can means it is possible to do it, but it is not essential to it. So so it gives optionality. But the the important point is the purpose of the approach of protecting the trees. Now, the we have carried out a quick check of the O Chem. And these measures are already contained in there. And I think if we're able to turn that up, it is probably

1:17:54

as useful to see how it is worded there because it's the O camp, which of course gives the hard obligation rather than this document. And so I think

1:18:06

I will see if I can turn it off, I'm hoping so I'm just going to pass me a virtual post it notes Give me the exact references, but what we would want to do for you servers to see that the wording there is acceptable to you and to achieve the necessary protection. Okay, that's fine. I think

1:18:29

we can be set up in writing in our summary for you, sir, that's fine.

1:18:36

The danger of a document like this is then that it is assumed to have

1:18:43

a significance which shouldn't be attached to it.

1:18:48

And I think that those methods, those

1:18:54

principles of tree protection

1:18:57

within an arboricultural report may be taken to

1:19:03

have a certain amount of weight which clearly the apple cultural report isn't going to be a certified documents the camp is so hopefully the camp will have picked up those measures. Okay, that's fine. Our objective is the camp trumps everything else? Yes. Yes.

1:19:23

Yeah.

1:19:24

Okay.

1:19:29

So yes, I think

1:19:32

because Mr. fenichel

1:19:36

Mr. Williams earlier was talking about numbers of trees things Mr. fenech. We did ask the question about the numbers of trees. And

1:19:44

the answer we got was

1:19:49

and this was in relation to each woodland area.

1:19:53

It indicates approximately 3900 trees to be lost on woodlands.

1:20:01

What I haven't seen anywhere is the total number of trees that this project is going to impact upon.

1:20:11

Is that something that you have or you can provide?

1:20:15

regressively? Sir, I do not have that number at my fingertips. I suggest we respond to you on that.

1:20:23

With that with the relevant figures and analysis, that's fine. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

1:20:31

So those are the only other questions sorry, that took a bit longer than I expected. Who relations trees. Mr. Pinto?

1:20:39

Do you have anything further on this item? Are we moving on?

1:20:46

No, I think I think perhaps we can we can move on to the next item. Thank you very much, Mr. Gleason. fairuza hanza. From

1:20:56

I got initially the idea I'm afraid of can't see who that is. I believe that that is true, Francis.

1:21:04

Hello, go ahead. Good afternoon, sir. I just wanted to flag up something about veteran trees, which is the subject to the same standing advice as ancient woodland, they're within the same category of standing advice. So the holy exceptional circumstances from a nsep would probably still be the case.

1:21:26

But I think the ancient woodland strategy is quite robustly argued. And I haven't

1:21:34

studied the the equivalent for the veteran trees in detail, but I would imagine that it's it's quite an easy resolution of just

1:21:44

showing you working in the same way that that's been done very well for the ancient woodland strategy. Thank you, Mr. password to the ones come back on that. centre. Sir, I think so two points as I'm having post it notes past to me virtually. The first thing is in relation to this theory, Francis's comment,

1:22:04

the way that we have treated veteran trees is indeed consistent with the way that we have treated ancient woodland, we will check the relevant reference and give that to you in the summary. The second point is to give you a reference to turn up when you are reflecting on our earlier conversation about trees, the oak camp and the wording of the ancient of the woodland ancient of the arboricultural assessment. If you turn to the camp at five,

1:22:39

the most recent version of Camp which was at rep five

1:22:45

dash zero 12, then refer to measure in the riak S dash I eight, you will find some what what I hope you and I will agree is better phrased obligation obligations in relation to woodland. And that is all that is

1:23:07

that that is bad as the design and mitigation measures prescribed to protect our border cover features will be implemented measures, including its tape to the one that we referred to excavations will be carried out using manual techniques to reduce soil disturbance. So

1:23:24

yeah, yes, that's helpful, how we'll look at that separately. Good. Thank you.

1:23:30

So the time is now five to four. So adjudication for anyway. But I think

1:23:37

that doesn't seem to be any point in starting a new agenda item at this point.

1:23:44

Shocking, churn, and then we'll return tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and we will then move on to item six, transport and traffic, seven, mitigation of construction impacts and then the third

1:24:01

substantive item for tomorrow will be combined and cumulative effects, although that will be fairly short. I think. So.

1:24:11

Thoughts is all.

1:24:15

Actually, let's just return to the the item that was raised as any other business yesterday.

1:24:25

Mr. Boss was done if you're in the position yet to respond to whether you were told about the matter that I raised yesterday regarding

1:24:40

the accompanied sites inspection now.

1:24:45

Let me just turn to my notes.

1:24:52

Yes. So yesterday, I indicated that we were considering conducting

1:25:00

Further, unaccompanied site inspection following on that Mr. Pinto held a few weeks ago. And since we've only had one requests for,

1:25:13

to visit private property, that being Mr. Horse property,

1:25:18

I post the idea that perhaps this could be done on an access required basis, which is

1:25:25

an approach which is very familiar for Section 78. Planning appeals

1:25:35

can only be done on that basis that's

1:25:39

in attending Mr. Horse property, he wouldn't be able to make any representations. To me, the intention is just for him to let me onto his property. And on that basis, and to address ongoing COVID restrictions.

1:25:57

There'll be no need for anyone from the applicants or other interested parties to attend.

1:26:06

That's it.

1:26:09

If you had thoughts on

1:26:12

my, my instructions are that we do not particularly object to that approach, we think it's a good thing for you to see the location that you should be properly informed the matters that are before you. And so we fully understand that, which said, of course, we remind you and Mr. Pinto, and I assume it would be both of you who attended Mr. Hall's property, observing all appropriate restrictions. With which said, we would just reiterate our view as to the weights that can and should be afforded to the assessments that we we have undertaken, and of course, Mr. Hall's views of his own his own property, which knows that there's no one else that Warren has, has, who has raised the concerns that he has. So you will apply your mind to those in the normal way, sir, fully in the comments.

1:27:07

If this visitors take place, it would just be me. Mr. Pintos already carried out a site's inspection

1:27:16

without going on to Mr. Hall's property. So that was totally unaccompanied inspection. I haven't been to the site yet. Looking at the potential

1:27:26

week during May be it would just be me.

1:27:30

But as you say, would be carried out to normal procedures for access required safety inspections, and all the the principles presented with be adhere to. So I say nothing is he's

1:27:48

certainly from that perspective at the moment anyway, but we wanted to take part his views on that before deciding. So that's helpful. Thank you. That's great. We did we assume new therefore do not require us to submit anything formal in terms of the company's site inspection proposal, we understand that you may not undertake such thing anyway. But we understand our paperwork stands as it as it stands. It isn't it was helpful anyway for Mr. Pinto, Inc, and taking his visits, as was the

1:28:21

input from Cannes Council. And if I do undertake a visit myself, I will have regard to both those inputs and anything else. So certainly, has has been

1:28:35

useful to have that input anyway. Thank you.

1:28:38

Good. So that completes that item. So actually, we are now bang on four o'clock. So unless there's anything else anyone wants to raise, if people use opportunity,

1:28:52

though, on that basis, then we'll adjourn the hearing until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. Thank you very much. Thank you, sir.