

TEXT_ISH3_PART2_A1iN_Session2_22042021

Thu, 4/22 1:55PM • 1:36:58

00:08

So the time is now 12 o'clock, welcome back time to resume this hearing.

00:14

So we are on item four as our item seven, mitigation of construction impacts. And the second bullet points, which is whether a landscape and ecological management plan is required to be provided as part of the examination.

00:32

We can start with the applicants response to

00:38

our second set of questions TCL 2.7. And that response is a five oh 23.

00:48

And the applicant

00:52

was asked about

00:54

putting reference to the limp within requirement five decio.

01:02

And responded to revision through quirements. Five in relation to submission of a limp have not been included and set out a number of possible approaches to the matter.

01:15

Finally, commented that's captain's a shows the examining authority, the matter will be addressed either in requirement five or elsewhere in decio, or Alpine camp before the close of the examination,

01:29

going to ask the applicant to provide an update on this position

01:33

to confirm why ferts position can't be

01:42

resolved at this point.

01:45

And I think to begin with, possibly just ask to clarify what

01:53

a lamp would encompass the term is

01:59

a standard term, but actually different gcos has quite a varied approach to what is provided in any event. So I think it'd be helpful if the applicant could confirm that. So Mr. bassford, over to you please.

02:18

Thank you, sir. The

02:21

so you have three items there that you wish me to cover which worthy why not Now, question.

02:29

The second was the water lamp would would encompass?

02:37

And I think the third was

02:43

roughly reflecting on a very different approach. Yes, yes. Thank you. So the reason why we we are looking at this is because we consider that the substantive things that are of importance to landscape and environmental mitigation, the design of the revisions, the landscape, within which the scheme will sit,

03:15

are already properly, properly addressed. So.

03:24

So we, we don't believe that there is necessarily an obligation to have a separate document.

03:34

However, we note that you wish to be satisfied that those environmental interventions mitigations are properly covered. And the reason why we have not come to a conclusion on that is that they are contained in a number of parts of the camp, we believe they're all ready in there, there's sufficient information in there. And so it's a question as to whether we provide a separate document that has the

lamp we provide the lamp should have certain should be the document finalised later, which covers particular obligations in the camp. And whether that's recorded as a requirement or a variation of the camps draw those particular obligations together. And so that is actually because there are there are a number of interventions which are relevant to that that's actually quite an extensive piece of work. And you'll appreciate that in the business of an examination. And we know it's it's tough for you as it is for us.

04:38

That that we have been responding to other substantive issues. So so the assurance to use areas that we believe that the substantive questions about environmental management, the landscape planning

04:55

are already secured by the camp. The question is how we should

05:00

present those best in order to satisfy your concern there.

05:05

Thank you.

05:08

So what would it include? We believe it's this is about the

05:15

the graphic representation of the measures that are to be included, but also about the

05:27

the methodology.

05:31

It may well be that it includes roles and responsibilities for parties that it has drafted objectives for relevant land parcels. And those are not necessarily the parcels which are in the book of reference,

05:45

prescriptions for Habitat creations, species monitoring approach, and effectively that would just be joined together provisions which are already in the camp. So that is, that is what we would envisage recovers obligations may also we think, emerge during detailed design that could change what was envisaged in the length. And we already have that flexibility in relation to the camp. So it's throwing together ecological landscape drainage items, the sorts of things we're discussing with the Environment Agency and ensuring they're in one place, although they already in one place in Leo camp.

06:24

In terms of the varied approach, you are correct, it is different schemes have approached this in different ways. And we've had a a we have undertaken a quick check of recent hires England decio decisions and the the position is patchy.

06:43

So some decisions, lamps are included, and some they are not. We would say that the we would say that you don't need to make a specific provision of this, as I've said before, provided that you are comfortable that lamp will the substantive issues or a lamp addressing substantive issues will be in place prior to implementation say that it's carried out during the implementation phase of the scheme.

07:13

Thank you. I think what I think what I would say is that the you you raise this, I think was really helpful to do so earlier. So the important and relevant consideration for you is whether the substantive points are addressed, rather than the vehicle for doing so.

07:31

Yes. But isn't there an issue

07:36

if the information is not easily

07:40

understandable, it's not helping parties to,

07:46

to find where the provisions are. And some of the camps that's been produced for the TCS outline, outline lamps that have been produced,

08:00

provide a narrative which is easy to follow, and

08:06

very straightforward in providing basic principles, which are then taken forward in the details lamp, which provides the site specific measures. Now, the way in which you're adopting mitigation is to have the camp headline camp and the riak. And everything is in within there.

08:29

And we've asked questions on this previously.

08:33

And it's possible to cross reference.

08:38

But start looking at the basic principles to react isn't the place to do it, it's very difficult to work out. What's the applicant's approach to mitigation and ecological matters is by looking through the various pages of the LEM riak. That's where I have some difficulty. I know it hasn't been raised by

09:09

other parties to any great degree. But given

09:15

the previous concepts I've looked at worked on, I think there is benefit for those parties if it were to be set out as more of a narrative. That's why I'm raising this issue.

09:29

So, the point that you need to be assured of I think, based on that is that the mitigation is secured now, and that at the point when those parties need to be able to

09:43

identify the measures

09:47

that the lamp which is produced at that stage would draw all of that together.

09:57

Because Because the the

10:00

operative document would be the lamp, not the Oh cam

10:06

Yes, that it would be the lamp that for instance, Northumberland county council enforced as the local planning authority, and it would be the lamp to which the Environment Agency referred when it was considering whether things had been undertaken that that is the document which is enforced against rather than the outcome, which sets out the recipe as it were for the, for the lamp.

10:38

So, yes, yes, so at this stage, we don't, if we were to, if we were to drop the lamp at this stage, so what we would have to do would be to eviscerate the old camp.

10:51

And we would have to take all of the measures that could potentially be in a lamp, and then move them into the lamp. And there are two then two approaches that we could take as a draughtsman there, you either remove them from the old camp, which would mean a rewrite of the old camp, and you'd have the lamp. So and the reason you do that is then you don't get any inconsistency issues. And sort of precedents between documents issues, or the alternative is that you put it in both places, in which case you have a constant double update to undertake. And those are risky things to do for people, lawyers

like me, because we're always concerned about there being an inconsistency between the two documents. So in terms of the procedural approach, we urge you to say, say, very well, there should be a lamp, please secure it through the decio and or the react to make sure it happens. But that's the matter for the for the details stage when prior to implementation rather than being needed. Now.

11:57

The

11:59

potential problem with that is that there are principles that an outline lamp would cover, which

12:10

interested parties might want to

12:15

discuss comments on at this stage before you get to the level of detail. The complexity of points was making yesterday about principles and detail.

12:28

This is an approach that's been adopted quite widely elsewhere, the outline lamp similar to an outline camp, because it's not the finished document, it sets out the basic principles, then they're taken forward as the detailed design evolves. There's a dialogue going on with interested parties anyway. Why can't the information be shared, put into the public domain, considered as part of the examination at this stage and then finalised the work is going to have to be done in any events to get that level of detail, presumably with input from those parties, certainly with input from from parties like the local authority, and the Environment Agency, others.

13:17

I'm still not quite sure why.

13:21

highways England isn't prepared to look at that way forward, when so many other NC IPS have done that. And including some that are highways England schemes.

13:33

When we looked at this yesterday, you took me to the particular principles that were of concern to you. And then we looked at the camp and where they were in the camp. And this is the same situation here. This is the the general principles, there is no concern from Northumberland county council, there's no conservative advantageously on natural England, that items which belong in a lamp are not secured.

14:02

And you have not yet taken me, sir, to anything that is missing. And so the the critical point as a matter of law, is whether the environment is protected, and whether the relevant measures and of course we're debating the detail of the matters are secured. It is then simply a question of format as to whether

it is in the lamp and there is no law, which says that a lamp is required. There is likewise no policy written or evolved by the Secretary of State which lamp is required. It's

14:36

certainly not arguing that Mr. basford I'm saying it's could be more helpful to parties to have it set out in the narrative rather than the React which extends to how many pages 150 which is this whole series of, of lines which, let's face it, it's not these documents follow. I'm sure you agree on that.

15:00

I'm not saying he's not there. I'm certainly not questioning the legality of this approach. I'm saying it could be more helpful has been found on other cases. And I'm saying to you, so that what whilst I consider that as a draughtsman it performs its legal purpose entirely appropriately. If it is desirable to have a more narrative document the appropriate time to do that, rather than setting a a, an entirely duplicative task to the applicant in the middle of an examination, is that detailed design? Because Because I think

15:39

I think that's particularly fair to say that it is in the middle of the examination. This has been the point that we've raised from day one. Yes, sir. But there is no legal requirement to make the change and you have an dropping preference, we are the applicant, you have to consider our application as we have submitted it to you.

15:59

You are to recommend to the secretary of state that on the basis that there is no separate lamp, then there is a major problem with the application. But that is a matter obviously for you as the inspector. But our position is that the legal requirements to secure mitigation in concert with the Rochdale principle is secured to the riak. And if you're drafting preference is to be secured, rather than doing it in mid examination, and you may not have been in the position of an applicant, the first part of an examination is the most tolerated, then it's the appropriate time to do that is a detailed design because that means we don't have to change our drafting approach. As a matter of drafting preference, in the course of an examination, we can do it at an appropriate stage when documents have to be reviewed anyway, as you say, so it is a substantial document, it would involve a major rewrite, to do what you're proposing. Sir. I fully understand that and that's approach has been taken. Another n steps have been involved in but I understand your position.

17:10

I'll move on and ask

17:13

well perhaps Is it possible for highways England to explain their position with regard to the approach and other concepts please.

17:27

The position is that

17:30

the documents for individual n sips are produced by their professional teams. And it will vary from n sip to N sips housing that has certain standard documents which which are required as part of its applications in order to ensure that they are consistent. But a lamp is not a standard highways England document. So in some circumstances, the professional team will recommend them in other circumstances

17:57

they will not and this is one of those where the the environmental team did not consider it's appropriate to produce a lamp where I cannot recommend a rewrite of a substantial document which is legally compliant. And so therefore there is there is no reason that from hos England's point of view to have changed it pre application.

18:20

So does highways England have view on this as opposed to his professional advisors?

18:28

I am I'm happy to take that question at waste, but I i

18:34

I'm not certain as to whether there is a corporate view of highways England is

18:40

what is what like what I can say is that housing that does not have a standard application document which is a lamp and so therefore it does not prescribe them.

18:51

Could Mr. Stillman comment perhaps please.

18:56

Mr. Stone

19:01

Yeah, thank you, Mr. bassford. Mr. basford is correct in that we do not have a standard requirement. And therefore what we would call a product documents to be produced and titled The lamp it is covered under the other environmental products that we produce.

19:21

The scheme's I cannot comment upon the requirements for them to produce a lamp and the and the standardisation of that are currently within highways England is the body itself. It is not a required product and therefore does not form part of that project control framework which controls the delivery of the design parameters within the scheme. But it's possible well we've seen that on entrance five

junction 10 a lamp was produced. So some schemes marry to lamp some don't. It's down to each individual project. Project Manager

19:56

is it I believe that it would be done

20:00

To the potential complexities of the scheme, and the discussions that will have been held between the schemes and other statutory bodies, that will have been ongoing with regards to elements of the scheme, the design, complexities and discussions held. As I said, there is no internal requirement, no set product and no set framework for that product to be created within highways England, other schemes have produced a document of sorts that conform to the requirements that you've described set

20:37

up for this particular scheme. It is not a set requirement for us to do. And we I therefore, believe that we've covered the requirements that you've described, potentially that Im may include within the other documents that we've produced, albeit that they are substantive size documents.

20:56

You mentioned junction 10 A of the M 25. So it's

21:03

it's important to realise that Mr. Stone and drew decide that this is approached on a scheme by scheme basis, we'll check the corporate position but but our understanding is that is an individual scan basis, you then look at them 25 Junction 10 a scheme, and you recognise that it is of course it wisly which is well known as being the national headquarters of the Royal Horticultural Society. So in those circumstances and with a receptor nearby such as the Wisley gardens, one can well understand that this may be an area or topic of particular sensitivity, which was addressed in an individual basis.

21:42

So, we will take that away and we will aim to respond to you with a corporate position such as

21:50

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

21:52

Okay, let's move on then let's turn to the Cancer Council.

21:58

The paragraph 6.6 point six and following paragraphs of the local impact report, which is rep one oh 71.

22:10

States apart from lines, and there is on plans and brief descriptions in the ies chapters now like Kemp, very little information is provided regarding the landscape proposals in terms of design intent, or the proposed materials and approaches to achieve this. And that is where the references made to Hamptons five junction 10.

22:33

Now,

22:36

as I understand it,

22:39

the council

22:43

has changed his position with regards to lend. But like that's been clarified.

22:50

And

22:52

what it means, Rob, if you could outline for me what your current position is with regards to this matter, generally in terms of the need for a lamp.

23:02

Thank you, sir.

23:04

I think we

23:08

might need to bring them. Mr. Evans in just to clarify this. But I think our initial position was that we would have liked to have seen it at this stage for the reasons that you've you've sort of rehearsed ahead of me speaking there. But

23:25

I think discussions have progressed. And we've been, I suppose, persuaded that it would be appropriate to provide it later. But I think our position from the outset was we would have preferred to have seen it now. Again, for the for the reasons that you stated that it would brings everything up front and is a lot more clearer. And I think that retreats are points that we've made previously on on the requirements been kind of clear and unambiguous. Okay. But I don't know whether Mr. Evans wants to amplify on on that. asked him to speak.

24:02

Mr. Evans, yes, thank you. So

24:05

just to clarify the point of confusion and why we felt there was not enough information provided initially.

24:14

On the landscape mitigation plans, there is a document reference to

24:20

or a source document References dmr, volume 10, sections zero, part two and three, which

24:28

is not readily available to view online and was not provided as part of the application documents.

24:37

That document does contain significant information on design objectives,

24:44

and a lot more detail in terms of the landscape mitigation intentions.

24:51

The applicant has since provided that document to somebody I contend that

24:56

it is um

25:00

The information provided there is suitable. And it is referenced within the application. Although we would highlight there is still a hard document to come across.

25:11

Thank you.

25:16

Mr. Bassett. Could you confirm? What are the documents that document references please?

25:25

So I think the best person to speak to this is Mr. Andy Williams, who was responsible for the dmr volume 10

25:36

document. That is, of course available to you at

25:44

document Rep. I'm missing the initial suffix zero 22. So it's missing a first two dash 02. So you have that, that

25:59

document before you

26:03

could thank you.

26:06

And this is this has already been

26:11

appended to and referenced in manager s l 100. of the react in the old camp.

26:22

Yes.

26:23

That's the La 120 environmental management plan guidance talking about?

26:30

No, this is the this is the volume 10 document.

26:39

The dm posts are Yes, yes. Yes. And that add Measure S l so s isqi. Boyd L is landscape 100. Is the line number for the measure in the reaction the outcome?

26:55

Yeah. That that references to be inserted? I'm told Yes. Because

27:04

the reference I was

27:06

referring to is the La 120 environmental management plan. I did want to come on to that. So

27:15

has that documents been provided to the examination? Which is to say La 120? Yes, I think they 120 will be available publicly so that we can supply to it is not to hand.

27:33

Thank you. So

27:35

measures SL one hundreds to say the APA will prepare a landscape and ecological management plan for each of Part A and Part B prior to construction.

27:48

And that will follow highways England guidance la 120.

27:53

And will include there's a minimum of series of

27:57

issues of travelite there.

28:02

So

28:05

if you're providing that,

28:09

on the basis of your own guidance, will that cover everything that parties would expect to see in a lamp
Generally,

28:24

the point at what one would expect to see in a limb is that it is not a question of the general content, it is the scheme specific content. So the camp requires will require the that the particular substantive measures are delivered. The question is simply whether the document where they are outlined is called a lamp or not. And we're saying to us that if you would like it to be called a lamp, then we can do that. And that would be at the detailed design stage. Thank you.

29:04

But we will also make sure and this would of course then be read across into the lamp that the dmr volume 10 document is also available and referenced so that all documents are in one place. That would be helpful as well then thank you.

29:29

Does anyone else wish to comment on the issue of the lamp before we move on to landscape mitigation master plans?

29:43

not hearing anything, so we'll move on. Thank you.

29:50

So this final point under mitigation is whether the landscape mitigation master plans adequately

30:00

Trust matters previously included within environmental master plans.

30:07

And let's begin

30:12

by asking Cannes council about the current landscape mitigation master plans

30:20

to the address, and are they comparable with what the county was expecting? And referring back to that reference of fy 25 lamp

30:38

you will appreciate there is an overlap here between the issues of lamp and landscape mitigation master plans. And obviously the campus well, but I'd like to focus on what is currently being provided in those landscape mitigation master plans.

30:56

Miss Robbie, can I ask them Mr. Evans to answer SpaceX? Certainly.

31:03

Yes, so, um,

31:05

we are content that the level of information supplied in the landscape mitigation plans alongside the DNR becby volume 10 document are

31:18

sufficient and adequate detail at this stage and that

31:26

further detail on a site specific basis can be added at the detailed design stage.

31:34

We did raise some

31:38

localised issues with respect to the proposed landscape mitigation initially.

31:45

And through sort of ongoing dialogue with the applicant, we've we've seen revisions to the landscape mitigation plans that have addressed the issues that we we did raise. Okay, thank you. So

32:01

now, the

32:04

applicants response to our question decio 217. The responses that we have five oh 23 References environmental master plans for Part A and Part B. of applicants responded to say that environmental master plans have been deleted from decio and won't be prepared. Mr. pertinent information is shown in landscape mitigation plans.

32:34

requirement five to turn the state's landscaping scheme must reflect the mitigation measures set out in the React must be based on illustrative environmental master plan.

32:47

annex the environmental statement? Actually, that's the original documents rather than the current one.

32:53

So we've had various iterations of requirement five and that those environmental master plans been removed.

33:02

Can I ask the applicants why the invoke ecological master plans have been deleted

33:08

from the decio.

33:12

It is because the relevant measures are addressed in other documents. So it is simply to reflect the fact that that document is not not used.

33:25

Okay, thank you. So how to ecological mitigation plans, which was submitted only have the reference for part A, which is a pp. 106. I haven't got the reference. Haven't seen a plan for Poppy. But how do ecological mitigation plans relate to environmental master plans? And now the landscape mitigation master plans.

33:54

So the the reason why you only have one, sir, is because the two schemes which now form this one scheme had slightly different documentation. And so there was a reference to an ecological master plan for part A but not for part B. In order to provide that things were consistent. The two sets of documents have been unified to avoid confusion and to avoid inconsistency.

34:28

The reason why there was a separate ecological mitigation master plan Part A is that the Part A measures are considerably more complex than those four part B of A Part B, the measures could simply be accommodated on the landscape plan so it didn't require a separate document. And that's why the for consistency. The approach has been changed.

35:01

So there there is a landscape mitigation master plan for both Parts A and B, and ecological mitigation plan for part A, as I understand it,

35:13

Part B, included in the landscape mitigation master plan. Thank you. I will set this out much more clearly in the written summary for you, sir. Thank you.

35:30

Can I just tell you then to the riak, and this measure has been 19

35:38

is on page 88.

35:43

Bye bye.

35:56

So, we looked at the most recent this will take a while to open I'm afraid so because it sounds fine.

36:10

Recent camp

36:26

referring to rep five oh, well,

36:31

yes.

36:34

Typing quite quickly

36:38

that numbered page or the numbered page at the bottom.

36:46

So, the references s b 19. I have it before me sir. Thank you.

36:52

So there's reference to proposed ecological Stokes environmental management plan, which will be developed at detailed design

37:02

just so how does that fit into the lamp and the temp

37:09

wall. So this this is as I referred to, earlier, there are a number of matters which could find a home in a lamp.

37:18

And so, to the extent that a

37:24

measure ought to be in the lamp, then you would require the lamp to address item sp 19.

37:35

Right.

37:37

And that, that is the that is the importance of that

37:44

I'm not clear Is this a separates plant separate ecological or environmental management plan.

37:52

So this would be drawn together into the lamp.

37:57

And you would say that the lamp, so if you if you're, we're endeavouring to address your concern that there should be a lamp

38:07

preferably without rewriting all of our documentation, mid examination. So, so we're looking to the detailed design stage. And what we would want to do is to say that a lamp should be provided and it should address the following and then we can reference the measures. And then you would say that this item would be addressed in a lamp, if that was the correct way to address it.

38:39

Okay.

38:42

Because what we will in order to get to a position where we prepare it, so the so that we have all of the substantive measures, and then we are looking forward to the detailed design the preparation of the various environmental management plans in accordance with

39:01

la 120.

39:03

And then we say that this is what is going to go into each environmental management plan or in particular waters to go into the LEM. And we would say, Item, SB 19, would go into the lamp may also because of its content go into other areas, but we would be flagging that to be recorded in the lamp.

39:29

That's sb 19. Doesn't say it's going into the limit as it know what we would have to do series would have to, as I said, your first question to me was why have you not done this yet, Mr. bassford. And that was because there are a number of items and what if there was to be a limp, we would have to draw the items together and say that these go into the lamp. We either do that now, in which case we would also need to cut them out of this document or duplicate them to the extent

40:00

They belong in other management plans and also in the lamp. So that's quite a big job. Or alternatively we can say, at detailed designer lamps should be produced and it should address the following matters. And we would put a new measure either into a requirement or into the riak. And it will say, a lamp has to be prepared, and it will address these particular items and list them. What I'm saying to you is, this does not say it goes to the lamp, you'd have a lamp, a new lamp provision, either in a requirement or in the riak. And that would say, a limp shall be prepared. This shall address and then you'd have the references.

40:43

Thank you. Can I ask the Khans Council and deeds?

40:48

environments agency if you're happy with the way in which all these documents will be set out and work together? Can I start with Mr. Robin, Mr. Evans, please?

41:01

Thank you, sir.

41:04

Can I be completely honest, I'm slightly slightly lost in the conversation. Not not having dealt with something as a scheme like this before. And I do find it to be extremely confused about what's going in where I think I need to take take advice and come back to you with a with a view on on the matter.

41:27

That that's fine. Thank you.

41:31

Environment agencies point of view,

41:34

to wish to comment.

41:37

Hi,

41:39

I'm in the same situation as Miss Roby. And I'm slightly confused and what the proposed approaches so I would welcome clarity, or a summary of what was proposed.

41:52

Thank you. Okay. Just to be to be completely clear, so there is no proposal before you were talking about it entirely in the in the, in the abstract. So it would not be surprising if Northumberland county council and Environment Agency would not had not followed this because we are discussing

42:13

a provision which has not yet been drafted.

42:19

Okay, but I think it goes beyond just the provision was draft, which is drafted, it goes to how these different documents all fit together. And if we look at requirement four, which sets out the principles for the camp,

42:36

there are a whole series of documents that need to be

42:39

included, as he says, to include the following management plans. And then we have

42:47

requirement five potentially including

42:51

the lamp provision

42:56

and the landscaping elements, landscaping master plans.

43:03

I don't think it's what I'm hearing from both Cannes Council and

43:11

Environment Agency.

43:14

They are not clear about what is being provided and how it all links together. They'll correct me if I'm wrong, I'm happy to be corrected. But I think that's the message I'm getting, perhaps the applicant should for the next deadline. And

43:29

I did put this down as an idea to show the interrelationship in diagrammatic form between these different documents. Maybe that's one possibility. I'm not suggesting you have to do it in that way. But I think there's a degree of

43:46

confusion at the moment about the different documents. And that that's why coming back to my last question about the environmental

43:57

ecological mitigation plans, I wasn't clear where they fit it in, I must admit, so thank you for clarifying that, as you did, but I still think there's work to be done on this.

44:12

matter before you is whether the rock style principle is met.

44:18

And that is as far as you need to apply your mind here. And the position which has been explained to you by Ms. Robbie, is that the county council is content that the environmental measures subject to agreeing the individual detailed measures are all achieved and most most position is is the same which is that the environmental agency continues to negotiate on the individual measures but the environment agencies is looking at the camp they have not said to you that the outcome is is not intelligible. It you would miss direct yourself sir if you thought that that was their submission. What me what Miss Robbie and Ms may have said is that they did not follow are just

45:00

Not that they don't follow the camp.

45:04

I'll ask both of them to make clear their positions then. Mr. basford?

45:14

Yes, let's do that first for think of anything else to say.

45:18

Is Robbie.

45:22

Thank you, sir. I think my words were confused, not content. I am. I think I'm becoming more confused. I thought I was content. I think I'm just becoming confused that, that I that it's not going to

45:38

that we're not going to be able to follow it as a an authority who's going to have to ensure that this scheme is

45:45

implemented in accordance with the details submitted,

45:50

that we're going to miss something along along the way, because of where, where docuware? How documents are presented, is just becoming more and more confused as I go along on farm. Sorry, sir.

46:07

No, please. Mr. buzzwords, can we smell to come in please? I'll come back to you.

46:17

High

46:19

in terms of the cemp it could be better signposted, but however, I'm not 100% clear in terms of hide the sun, and the lamp

46:30

works together and how it will be brought forward in the future. Thank you.

46:37

Can I

46:39

know can I just comment on that first before you reply to those comments and mine? Isn't the point was made by Miss Robbie. That's the local authority. And the Environment Agency and other agencies have a role in managing the implementation of this scheme.

47:00

Don't they need to be reassured that they understand what is being proposed and what actions are being taken?

47:08

You have the direct submission from as Robbie, that she has read the camp and that she understands its content. The things that are in it. You asked her earlier on whether the environment at the Northumberland county council was happy with the content in the camp? That is as far as we need to go. The next question is whether the that was her submission. Now, she said she thinks it is almost there. That was her wording.

47:44

And that that is what she said. Now the next question is, how does the camp go forward? And we do not need to say this.

47:55

Look, Mrs. Robbie is an expert local planning officer. They are entirely used to being presented with outlined documents and then checking whether they achieve the objectives at the detailed decision making stage. And it this is an entirely normal approach. Other hybrid signalling schemes take this approach. And all that Miss Robbie has to do is to require us at the detailed design stage not before you at the detailed design stage to show that

48:29

the relevant measures are incorporated in the series of detailed documents that are referred to in the order. We don't need a picture for that.

48:39

Thank you, Mr. Buffett.

48:42

Mr. Hawes, you have your hand up.

48:47

Yeah, thank you.

48:49

Just as an observation of general observation, from my point of view, but someone who has never been through this process before, I have found this extremely difficult to try and get a grip grip of the various documents as to what them The meaning is and the importance of them. And it's taken an inordinate amount of time for me to try to read all this detail, and anything that can help that process I've been very grateful for. Thank you.

49:19

Unless you wish to come back on that point, Mr. Bassett, I propose to move on to the next item.

49:27

Thank you, so that's fine. Thank you.

49:32

So I think that concludes all I had to raise and two items seven. Is there anything else anyone wishes to raise under this matter?

49:45

No, in that case, let's then move on to item eight on the agenda, which is combines and cumulative effects, and Mr. Pinto is going to lead on this matter. Thank you.

50:05

Thank you, Mr. Gleason.

50:16

In terms of the combined and cumulative effects

50:22

in the agenda, there were two key bullet points that four identified earlier. In this art consider the combined effects of the proposed development occurring due to impact from different environmental topics combining to cause multiple effects on a single receptor, and also to consider the likely significant community of environmental effects associated with the proposed development.

50:47

So, I would like us to start with the first bullet point of the at least in terms of the combined effects of proposed developments in how these can combine in to cause multiple effects on a single receptor.

51:07

And to start the composition on this issue, which obviously requires us to fully understand how combined in cumulative effects were assessed. And the difference between both of these, perhaps, if I could ask the applicant to actually talk us through the approach to both combined and cumulative effects in how the interaction between these was assessed, and how it has actually influenced the development of the proposal. Mr. bassford, perhaps

51:53

try jumped the gun, apologies.

51:57

The manner in which combined effects which are the effects of the project

52:06

within itself, so adding noise and air quality together, and their impacts on given receptor receptors are addressed in the environmental statement, that's a that's an in combinational combined effect. A cumulative effect is where you have the project acting alongside another project, and you add their

52:31

their impacts together in order to

52:35

in order to

52:37

identify what the two will cause together to check that those both are going to be acceptable. And so those are set out in the environmental segment, I'm going to ask Mr. Kevin stop Stubbs, who is the environmental experts advising How is England to elaborate a little further in relation to this, Mr. Stubbs has prepared numerous environmental statements on behalf of England parties, and has coordinated the preparation of this particular environmental statement. Mr. Stubbs, introduce yourself. Good afternoon, sir.

53:13

Yeah, I'll start by just Can you hear me? Okay. We can now Thank you. Thank you very much.

53:20

Right. So, in terms of the methodology we've used, we followed

53:26

dmrb, volume 11, Section two, Part Five, and then carried out a sensitivity test against la 104, which is the updated guidance. We've also followed the planning Inspectorate advice note 70

53:42

in terms of the way the structure of combined and cumulative effects is set out,

53:48

we have carried out a combined effects assessment for parts a part B individually.

53:58

That covers cross topic effects, cumulative effects.

54:03

And then we have carried out for the scheme which was set out in chapter 16, which is ap 062.

54:13

A combined assessment of within topic effects and a combined assessment of cross topic effects. And the reason we carried out within topic, combined effects assessments was because the two parts of the scheme are 15 kilometres apart. And we wanted to ensure that any cumulative effects crossing both parts were captured within the assessment. So, we're reporting the effects of the scheme.

54:43

We then separately carried out a cumulative assessment which relates to other developments and that was carried out for the scheme as a whole.

54:54

In terms of the method for combined effects

54:59

which

55:00

As the impacts of more than one topic on a receptor for construction and operation, we have combined common receptors. So we've grouped them together. For example, residents are combiners was one receptor, as is agricultural land, and then there are others within the assessments are we've included all minor above effects within the assessment to make sure that any multiple minor effects can't result in a cumulative effect or where they do that they are reported

55:34

that the assessment considers a worst case for each

55:39

topic area. So for example, we have considered the worst landscape effect on on residents

55:46

to take that forward to give a worst case

55:50

effect on on residents as an example.

55:54

Sorry, Mr. Step, sorry to interrupt you. Can I just clarify the points? And terms of the worst case scenario? Did you have mentioned in your response, that worst case scenario was would be based on two groups that have been identified? So see, you've mentioned several receptors that were

56:16

that were grouped into a specific group so that you can evaluate it more easily. And within those within that group, you would pick the receptor that had the worst?

56:29

That would be more affected? Yes. scenario. And that would be what would be determined, will be determined the assessment of the whole group? Can you just confirm that? Yes, that's correct. Yeah. So we report that the worst effects? So in any any resident that you you would pick with that would be that the worst case now, obviously, to work back from there to understand what the effects actually would be on that receptor? So yeah, that's correct. We've reported the worst effects on that group of receptors.

56:58

Yes, sorry. to interrupt you, I believe that you will continue with your response. If you would like to continue, please. Yep.

57:08

We then compare those and matrix together, which is presented in the chapter and use the table in

57:18

Excel table in 15, three, which is in AP 06260, sorry, table 53 in up 060, to determine the significance.

57:30

So the overall we aim to provide a portion of seven providing a worst case for combined defects.

57:40

Okay, in terms of

57:44

cumulative assessment,

57:46

I just leave my notes down. And we follow the methodology set out in the planning of spectra advice notes, which sets out a four stage process,

57:56

identifying the zone of influence, for with a long list of developments. We then identified a shorter list of those developments

58:07

for q1 two effects assessment, and then the information gathering part of that of those developments and what information is available to help us assess the effects that those developers might have in combination with the scheme.

58:20

And that gives us an assessment of cumulative effects, which are then reported.

58:26

Just for your information.

58:30

The additional projects that we we've included were first

58:37

search for in 2018 for part A 2019. for part B.

58:43

The long list was then checked and updated for the scheme in February 2020.

58:49

And we've also done an update for the change request in January 21, which has also been submitted.

58:57

Thank you very much for that. Mr. Stubbs. If I could just ask you to just hold for one second. I would just like to very quickly go to the council and actually ask Miss Robbie, if you are content with the list as it has been updated.

59:20

of the projects that was mentioned just now by Mr. steps.

59:25

Thank you, sir.

59:27

Yes, yes.

59:30

I am not aware of any any of the other projects that need that should be on that list. From the last time I checked, I must admit I've only I've only looked at it when scheme submission. I haven't I haven't really checked it recently.

59:46

Okay, thank you very much. That's fine for the time being Mr. Stubbs. If you'd like to continue then please. Thank you.

59:54

I think I think that's everything I wanted to say at present. Is there anything else you want me to go over and

1:00:00

Well,

1:00:02

thank you very much for that, that was actually very useful to understand. And I would like to understand a little bit more the table that you have mentioned, I believe that you mentioned on your representation table 15.3 I believe I have 15.4 and I am looking at

1:00:30

chapter 15 assessment of combined effects for part A enta phi i am particularly interested in us

1:00:42

having probing a little bit more detail on table 15.4 matrix last bind effect iterator stress, yeah, let me just go to that.

1:00:55

Okay.

1:00:58

So, I would like to, if it is possible, I would like to actually understand, so for example, peeking,

1:01:08

taking the first example that we have there in terms of construction residents, is obviously, this is obviously trying to illustrate the point that will be

1:01:20

valid and will be applicable to other receptors as well. So,

1:01:26

looking at the stable and looking at the impacts that you have evaluated in considering what you have said on groups, if I was an individual, if I was an individual resident actually wanted to understand how the assessment of the impact of the proposal on my specific property has been carried out. Could you please tell us how would be able to actually identify and find a deformation easily?

1:01:55

Well, we haven't assembled for reasons of proportionality we have we've grouped residents together, so we don't have I don't have information on a specific

1:02:07

property. I think what I can say is we've assessed, as I said, a group and the effects reported are the worst effects that would be

1:02:19

felt by a resident.

1:02:23

But in your response, you have mentioned that actually, you'll have taken a worst case scenario for each one of the individual receptors within that group. Therefore, how that assessment carried out? I don't think that's what I said. I think what I said if we've taken that also is saying,

1:02:42

Yes, we have we have looked at the effects across the scheme, and all part of the scheme in this case, and looked at what is the worst case with the cross with those receptors? Yes.

1:02:57

Why don't have a table that shows each of those to show you.

1:03:02

Okay.

1:03:04

Putting that issue to one side now, for the moment,

1:03:09

if we actually wanted to look at how individual groups of residents

1:03:16

were actually assessed in terms of community impacts, could you please point us to the document that you have submitted that gives us that information?

1:03:26

suitcase or carry pizza? Yeah.

1:03:29

So you mentioned that you have

1:03:33

combined individual receptors into groups. And that's how you have made the assessment. If I want to find a specific group, where can I actually find it group within the documents that you have, that that information? Isn't within the information submitted?

1:03:59

Is there a particular reason why that information has not been submitted?

1:04:08

No, it's just the approach we've taken is that that we didn't feel that level of detail was required for this assessment.

1:04:16

It so

1:04:18

it's important to recognise that the

1:04:22

that assessment is undertaken at different scales for different types of reception different topics. And so, for instance, there is not a full suite of assessments for every single residential receptor. Similarly, there is not a

1:04:42

there is not a

1:04:46

this a drawing together of that information, but where there are interactions, those are identified, and that is discussed in the documentation of this

1:05:00

It is perhaps easier to say what is provided. So that Mr. Pinto can understand, just reflect on that, again.

1:05:10

What is provided is essentially what's in the matrix within table 15. Four. So that sets out the the types of effects that the residents might be subject to the topics that they use arise from, and then a conclusion description of what those effects might be. Okay, and

1:05:33

that

1:05:35

thank you suffered, and that is helpful. But for example, so I'm going into table 15 four, which has dimetric sub combined effects interactions, first point construction residents, you'll have within that within that table under impacts. last bullet point, you have impacted residents from permanent loss of profit property within practice Northgate house, yes. So clearly, there has there has been an assessment looking at individual receptors. Yes. My question is,

1:06:13

are we we've seen

1:06:15

these reports, trails to only part A, but within Part A, there are several different residents in several different properties that are within the vicinity or in within the boundaries of TCL, and will be affected by proposal, but they are at different distances and will be affected differently. I want to understand how those properties were assessed in how

1:06:44

I am trying to understand. And I'm trying to differentiate how a property that is going to be affected quite severely by, say, noise and vibration in landscaping, visual issues, because it's not proposed to have a lot of planting around it. And it's going to be quite close to the eye one route, how that was evaluated against a property that is not going to suffer the same kind of impact, or is there is no sense of impact. Yeah. So I guess, I guess what we've done is reported the worst case, which is why Northgate house is perhaps listed there is that that is the the where the greatest effect is, and we haven't reported on the ones that are less than that. So we've we've taken that as the worst case, and then reported against that. We have we do show all the receptors on I believe on finger 16, three, which is up 186.

1:07:48

So that this all the receptors, but what we tried to do is try and be passionate about it, run this have a big long list of all the receptors that may be affected to different extents. And to try to pick the worst one

and say, Well, this is this is the most effective property. And this is the worst the effect could be to those properties. I ended up ended up missing and stabbed. But can I please ask how that choice was made in order for me to actually be confident? Okay, so that is based on process reflects the way we like the methodology that you have explained. Yeah, so that is based on the individual assessment. So each of the assessments, air quality noise landscape will have reported the effects on various properties. And we've used that information from those chapters to pull out into this assessment, those worst properties, there's more detail in those assessments for each of those topic areas.

1:08:47

And we've just pulled out the worst ones to give you a proportionate worst effect if you like in terms of combined effects.

1:08:55

Okay, thank you for that. Mr. steps. And Mr. bassford. Pardon? Is it Mr. bassford? I have now It's Mr. Mark hos apologies, Mr. Mica cause Would you like to intervene on this topic? Yes, please. This is pretty close to my heart and what are my biggest frustrations in that? I can now understand why there's been law. recognition of the combined operational impact upon Northgate farm based upon the current approach described there and the criteria described there. I have no doubt given the wide reaching sort of impact that this scheme has on the household, which include visual effect, additional noise, vibration, degradation of air quality, impact upon the environment, particularly the loss of trees, the additional loss of public transport, and infected loss of unfettered access from public highway highway and the coming landlocked to the west of the property. All of this

1:10:00

is effectively a combined impact upon the household. And if it was playing environmental impact bingo, unfortunately be doing very well in this. This dude.

1:10:12

Thank you for that, Mr. horse? And would the applicant like to come back to beat the horse on his point? Perhaps Mr. Bass put on Mr. Stubbs.

1:10:27

Yeah, I think the issue is we've said we've reported the worst effects, so it would be no worse, the effect on Mr. Horse property would be no worse than that we've reported in this assessments. So,

1:10:41

this was a freshman residence. So, the combined effect would be lost be of moderate to large, large adverse significant, so it would be no worse than large.

1:10:52

And so, so that, so, so, Mr. Hawes is saying that he

1:11:00

stayed at a full house is his position he is a full house in environmental adverse effects, or at least the line

1:11:09

the point that we would say is that that is reflected by the combined effect being of a moderate to large adverse significant. The next question then, of course, is whether we are taking appropriate steps to mitigate the impact upon Mr. Hall's property, and we would say we are and that that is that is taken into account into account also,

1:11:37

it is accepted that there are impacts that will be no worse than moderate to large add

1:11:45

on Mr. Hall's property.

1:11:49

Thank you, Mr. Bass.

1:11:52

Yeah, the question that is, what is the response to having identified that, and that is the mitigation? And how does it affect the scheme? Could we put the scheme somewhere else? For instance, the answer to that is no scheme has to be here, because it has to connect with the existing one which is adjacent to this causes headaches, I understand that, I understand that there is then a series of questions in terms of what you can do to mitigate or to compensate for the impact. Nevertheless, I'm trying to actually understand at this point how that impact was assessed overall.

1:12:29

And

1:12:32

I'm from from the information that you have supplied in picking the example of residents.

1:12:40

And I'm familiar with the

1:12:45

maps and figures that you have also submitted, did actually identify the different receptors and the groups which you have assessed.

1:12:58

I'm still not 100% clear in terms of how such an approach to all of the residents, as detailed within the table is appropriate considering that the impacts will vary so wildly across the whole of the project in the length of the project.

1:13:30

So

1:13:31

sorry, I lost you there. Yes, not sure. I follow your question, sir.

1:13:36

I think

1:13:39

my question is,

1:13:44

how can I be reassured that the assessment carried out for all of the different areas that are included within table 15 and 14, and I would like you to point me to the document and send the information that you have submitted as part of the application so as the examining authority, how can we actually be assured that defects that are here are actually reflective of all of the assessments that have been done for part A of skin for every single receptor within the for every group made out of receptors? I think we need to respond to you on something as complex as that in writing. So but what I'm understanding you to say is that you wish to be informed where the impact is less severe than the one we have reported, because the

1:14:45

the impact that is reported that Mr. That you have taken Mr. Stubbs to ambit to in the first line of table 15 dash four is

1:15:00

moderate to large adverse. So just imagining that Mr. Hawes did not in fact experience a moderate to large adverse effects you would wish us to point out point out to you that the effect is more benign.

1:15:18

Because

1:15:19

I don't believe

1:15:22

Mr. Botsford, I don't believe that that is what I am requiring at the moment. What I am requiring at moment is actually a clearer understanding of how you have arrived to the conclusions that you have arrived within that table.

1:15:37

I'm not questioning to conclusions that you have arrived, I am asking for some of the information and some of the evidence and the process that you had to go through in order to produce the table. into give you another example.

1:15:57

Picking grow juices, for example, which is on the next page of that table, where you say the combined effects are potential for local temporary combined adverse effects reconstruction, combined effect for part A would be moderate to large adverse significant Well, that's all good. But that is for the whole of part A. And as part of our process, we need to actually understand what are the areas that are going to be moderate in water, the areas that are going to be large at first, it's that detail that I am after its moments. And if you would rather submit a written response to that, that's perfectly fine. That's absolutely acceptable. I am just trying to actually at the moment understand how we can actually move that issue forward. And for me to be able to do that. I just had to understand the process that you were claiming that there are two elements. I think, then to your question. The first is what I call the maths GCSE point, which is you have to show the working how you go from the individual elements to the overall cumulative impact the combination impact, which is reported here in table 15.4. That's the first thing. And the second thing is that where that is that there is a more granular approach. So where we are pointing to hotspots, you would like to know where the hotspots are.

1:17:26

Yes, yes.

1:17:30

information. Thank you.

1:17:33

Yeah, understood. I think I think that's Yeah, I think I have it's right, this something Mr. Bass was correct. That's something we need to take away. And

1:17:41

we will, right. Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Thank you

1:17:58

picking up on this issue, and Mr. basford, if this is something that actually you would like to also pick up as part of your written submission, then I am happy to accept that.

1:18:10

But I would also like to ask,

1:18:15

considering the combined effects that you have identifies within diapers that you have provided, we were looking at their table 15.4 as an example.

1:18:30

And considering the way that these combined effects have actually been reported, so taking the approach in terms of the whole of Part A or Part B.

1:18:41

Can the applicant please comment on how

1:18:48

those effects have been influenced the mitigation strategy and what you are proposing to do to mitigate and compensate for those impacts?

1:19:01

I suggest that we add that to the written work that we are undertaking for you, sir.

1:19:08

Okay.

1:19:10

Thank you.

1:19:20

I think that in that case, that probably concludes most of the points that I wanted to actually cover and combined effects. But I would also like to ask

1:19:37

it combined cumulative impacts in terms of how so basically bullet point one, so I would perhaps if there were no further questions on this bullet point one, I would like to actually move us to bullet point to consider the likely significant quality of environmental effects associated with the proposed development.

1:19:56

So in light of this

1:20:00

Could we just start just for the benefit of everyone? And I know that this is covered as part of your submission? But could we just start for a quick recap in terms of how you have defined cumulative effects, please?

1:20:20

So, I again defer to Mr. Stubbs, what cumulative effects are essentially those with those effects caused by interactions with other schemes. Mr. Stubbs, perhaps you would elaborate further on how we approach those? Yeah. So,

1:20:38

we've identified other developments. So that's that's the key point for cumulative effects, isn't it and how we've picked up those. So we've spoken to

1:20:47

not on my county council, and they provide us with relevant planning applications that we've then considered.

1:20:55

Now, let's develop the list for those and filter those down to the ones that are relevant. The process we used is set out in table 63. I don't have the reference for that. I'm sorry.

1:21:11

Just check.

1:21:14

Save

1:21:23

me things.

1:21:26

To 062 I think.

1:21:31

Yes, up 062.

1:21:34

Thank you, I was trying to actually find it to myself as well, at 062. Yep, thank you.

1:21:44

And that sets out various tiers for projects and how we

1:21:49

filter them down. So projects under construction projects with permission, and then to to his projects on the planning inspectors programme, or other insects.

1:22:00

And then tier three projects on the planning sports programme project where scope has not been submitted. So there's various level tiers of projects

1:22:09

with decreasing levels of information likely to be available for those

1:22:14

so that we then review that that's stage two and three is to review that information, understand the certainty for development, and then develop a shortlist.

1:22:26

And then stage four is to assess that short list

1:22:32

cumulative effects across all the different topic areas.

1:22:38

Thank you for that in how would them dose effects, how have those effects actually then influence and being built in within the proposal. So the traffic effects are built into the traffic model.

1:22:54

So any increase in traffic are built into the traffic model, which we then use to assess things such as air quality and noise.

1:23:04

And particularly for need to speak to the transport specialist as to how they actually do that. But those those factors are figured into the way they build the model. And then air quality noise assessment.

1:23:17

professionals use that information to build their own air quality and noise models, which then generate the effects that we report in their various chapters.

1:23:28

So those develops in inherent in their assessment for those particular traffic related topics.

1:23:35

And that's very helpful. Thank you very much.

1:23:38

If I could then in that case, take us to

1:23:47

ippf 060 I believe chapter 15 assessment of combining the facts. I think it is in paragraph 15 point 4.5 of that document. That's the paragraph that I'm going to refer to now. So which opposite sorry 060 is my previous document which we referring a moment okay. Climate in relation to related to in combination as opposed to cumulative effect Yeah.

1:24:20

That only relates to combined effects for part a cumulative effects are dealt with in 062. Yes, but this is where I found this reference and I just wanted to clarification on the reference. And then perhaps you can actually explain how that that was then being an effect, how that was then translated as part of

community. environmental effects, which is what I will be after, but within that paragraph, paragraph 15 point 4.5

1:24:54

you state.

1:24:57

It is regarding impact of green

1:25:00

House gas. In that paragraph, you stated it is combined effects of all greenhouse greenhouse gas emitting human activities that cause climate change in the for the assessment

1:25:17

resulting from Part A implicitly assess to combined effects of greenhouse gas emissions.

1:25:29

You continue by saying default quantification of emissions from parts, I, in the assessment of significance of effects inherently assessed combined impacts, no further assessment has therefore been undertaken in this chapter.

1:25:43

I'm still not 100% clear in terms of what is actually meant by that statement, and I was wondering if someone could actually clarify that for me, please.

1:25:54

Okay, so what we're saying is that the greenhouse gas emissions are reported on a regional or national basis

1:26:03

and therefore are not or are reported for the scheme.

1:26:11

Elsewhere, I was gonna say, I'm just checking my notes on that sorry.

1:26:39

I think what was saying there is that the the assessment is is regional or national, and therefore,

1:26:48

is not reported here.

1:26:51

And the other way of looking at it, sir reserve. First of all, of course, you look at the

1:26:57

chapter 14, which is a PP zero 58 and a PP zero 59, which immediately proceed the chapter two, which you're referring. Now, when you look at greenhouse gas emissions, you're looking at the greenhouse gas emissions for each of the activities in relation to the scheme. And so they are already

1:27:24

agglomerated, when you carry out the greenhouse gas emission assessment, which is, which is assessed in chapter 14, it means you then don't have to do an additional cue, cue an additional in combination effect of all of the individual activities on greenhouse gases.

1:27:47

That's already taken place when you do the first greenhouse gas emissions assessment. You don't have to do it twice.

1:27:57

Okay, accepting that, and actually moving on to paragraph 16. Point 4.5, I believe, have now

1:28:11

document regarding the assessment of cumulative effects.

1:28:15

So that is the document that we were referring to previously, I believe it is ap 06 1.7206262. With these extra cific paragraph that I have just mentioned, we have a similar statements.

1:28:35

Were actually it does stay to debt as such, it is a cumulative effect of all greenhouse gas emitting human activities that causes climate change. And therefore the assessment of greenhouse gas due to the schemes implicitly implicitly assess the cumulative effect of green house gas emissions. I am still not clear how

1:29:04

that can actually how that can actually be the case. And how assessing document the

1:29:17

utilities and combined effects of the proposal

1:29:22

can just

1:29:25

can therefore not be undertaken. I'm confused by the justification of why you don't need to actually undertake that.

1:29:36

I it's not my area of expertise. I would suggest that we respond to get the relevant expert to respond to that. If that's okay. In writing.

1:29:48

That's fine by me Mr. Hawes.

1:29:51

Pardon? Mr. Botsford?

1:29:55

Are you happy with a position

1:29:59

on it? Of course

1:30:00

To be confused with Mr. Hawes. The

1:30:04

The point is very similar, which is that when you carry out the greenhouse gas emissions assessment, that all that involves looking at the way that gas is the atmosphere change as a result of the scheme. And so it is automatically looking at other developments at that stage. We will confirm that though in writing to so it's already taken into account by you don't need to then do it the same time the the initial assessment, the original assessment or is looking at the existing environment, which includes the other developments. Of course, a non existent development does not have an emission. What what we will do those will confirm this in writing to a student put some more flesh on the bones of 16 point 4.5 minutes twin in chapter 15.

1:30:58

Thank you, Mr. bassford. Yes, I would like to extend the standard, particularly in light

1:31:05

of the requirements in the objectives to reduce carbon emissions.

1:31:12

So if we could actually link that into the response, that would actually be very beneficial as well. Thank you.

1:31:26

Are there any further questions that

1:31:31

anyone would like to ask in relation to cumulative environmental effects?

1:31:47

I can't see any hands up at the moment. I am also mindful of the time now, which is 130. So instead of us moving to our next the next topic, I actually propose that we

1:32:11

that we perhaps stop here now and join this meeting at this hearing and then come back at I believe your would be

1:32:22

Mr. basford. could could I say something that could we consider just carrying on because all we have left I think is items 910 and 11. Which reviewing issues any other matters? And

1:32:40

closure of the hearing?

1:32:42

Oh, yes. Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Gleason for bringing that up. Okay.

1:32:49

Yes, in light of that, then we'll continue. So if no one else has any questions and combining commodity facts, I asked that point again, if there are no hands raised under this topic, then this concludes the substantive item on the agenda. Mr. Gleason will now address item nine, which is review of issues and actions. Thank you.

1:33:15

Thank you, Mr. Pinto. So hopefully we can get through this quickly unless there are any substantive other matters.

1:33:22

So item nine. First of all, if you have issues and actions arising, As with previous hearings will circulate any actions required by the applicant, or any other interested party, and how these are met and addressed, including if necessary for the hearings.

1:33:41

These actions will be circulated as soon as possible in the next couple of days.

1:33:48

Moving on then to item 10. We haven't been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other matters that are relevant to this hearing. Does anyone

1:34:00

the only point I have service that you addressed me just before you spoke to Mr. Pinto just then and I was checking you did not actually want me to say or do anything?

1:34:10

Anything at all? No, I I wasn't expecting anything. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

1:34:21

So if there are no other matters, I have just want to raise actually, which is.

1:34:30

So in addition to the actions, actions arising from these two hearings, we're going to be publishing a sheduled of outstanding matters in respect of the draft decio. These are matters which didn't merit consideration and to hearing and largely matters just for clarification.

1:34:49

With we tell us that the applicants know the party's response these by deadlines six, as I say they're very minor drafting matters. I would like clarification on

1:35:00

And then any comments on those can be incorporated into the examine authorities proposed sheduled changes to the TCR, which will be published on the 11th of may if required. Mr. pessoa does your area of expertise. So are you concerned with that?

1:35:19

Very much so stir, your keener eyes will doubtless pick up inevitably missed items which fringe to discover.

1:35:28

Tell me if there's anything significant in any way there, but matters for clarification things, probably the best way of putting it. So thank you.

1:35:39

So if there are no other relevant matters to be discussed, can I remind you again, timetable for the examination requires the parties provide any post hearing documents on or before Tuesday, the fourth of May, which is deadline six on the timetable? Can I also remind you that video recording and transcripts of this hearing will be placed on the inspectors websites?

1:36:05

And so I should just say as well, we did have tomorrow the 23rd of April, on the timetable as reserved a confirm we don't need that day now.

1:36:22

So on that basis, I'd like to thank everyone for attending today and over the last couple of days, and for your participation which has been very helpful to us as the examining authority. We will of course, consider all responses carefully. And they will inform our discussions regarding further written questions and hearings. Once consent. Thank you. The time is now 136. And this issue specific hearing on environmental matters is closed. Thank you very much.