

# TEXT\_A1iN\_ISH5\_Session2\_15062021

Tue, 6/15 1:54PM • 1:37:14

00:03

Good afternoon again, welcome back to the hsh five on environmental matters. This hearing is now resumed. Before I start, can I ask Miss Patten has to live stream commenced. Please, if you could confirm I can confirm the live stream has commenced. Mr. Pinto. Thank you, Mr. Patten. As previously highlighted, now, we are going to move on to bullet point number three off the second item, which would be to consider the outstanding matters still under discussion between the applicant Environment Agency and natural England. So for this particular item in terms of outstanding matters, could I actually start by asking the Environment Agency Ms Mo, if you could, considering the representation that you have submitted on deadline aid, so that's rep eight, zero to nine, when I will library, if you could actually provide us an update in terms of any outstanding matters that still exist between you and the applicant? If you could talk us through any outstanding matters that might still be to be resolved, please. Ms. Mo

01:43

Ms Mo here from the Environment Agency, I can confirm that there are no outstanding matters between the EEA on the applicant.

01:52

There are no outstanding matters at the moment. Correct. Thank you very much Ms Mo. In that case, if we don't have any outstanding mentors at the moment, I do have a couple of questions linked with the outline camp. I'm looking particularly at the tract version a rep 80140 14. And I believe that some changes were actually made to the outline camp that obviously were actually submitted, as I mentioned, in deadline eight, so after the environmental agency has actually submitted their response to us, and I'm looking particularly at action, s w b two, which I will confirm which page of of the document it is. Just bear with me for one second.

04:01

So I think it's maybe page 184. So

04:07

bear with me for one second. My internet is still out trying to vote the document, absolutely. It's not coming through. Actually I am now looking at rep eight or 13 which is the clean version of the outline. No, pardon me, sorry. Apologies. Sorry, rep eight or 12. So the updated outline camp tract revision seven a apologies for this confusion. And I believe it's page Yes, I believe it's page 182 of 213 s w b two, which has changed following to remove off temporary river training measures riverbed will be restored to a pre works comparable condition where reasonably practicable. Further details provided in the bed resettlement following to pro works methods statement, which can be found at Appendix B of this outline camp. So can I just confirm with the environmental agency, first of all, if they are happy with

this change, I'm mindful that we said that we received this after you submitted your rap as I have mentioned in my question, Ms Mo

06:28

I will have to take an action and get back to the right this.

06:33

Get is fine. Thank you very much. I also noted changes in s w. w four which is page, what the change is in page 187 off 213. So that I'm quoting the page number on the bottom of the page itself of the document. And then s w w six, which is change is in page 189 of 2013. Would that be the same situation for those two other actions? mismo? That's correct. Fine, thank you very much for that. Also, there are two more actions that I would like us to check, which have are linked with the South access proposal. So is a W, W three in s a w. w five mismo? Would? Would you like to comment on that now? Or would you like to actually come back towards the next deadline? I'll come out. I'll submit written comments. Thank you. So if we could thank you very much. So if we could actually have an action for the Environment Agency to confirm the views on this following actions that would be beneficial. Thank you very much. And since Environment Agency has not confirmed that there are not tending matters, those are odd questions, but obviously, can I actually go back to Mr. Greig, if there is anything that you would like to protectors on in terms of outstanding matters in relation to change to in change? Three?

08:33

I do think so service, the VA has confirmed the position. My understanding is that there's this similar position with with natural England. But obviously, we can we can confirm it with anything in writing submissions.

08:53

Thank you very much. Before I move on from this topic, can I just ask that, Mr. Gleeson, if Are there any outstanding issues that you would like to comment is well, on this specific bullet point,

09:18

and the thing for me, thank you, Mr. Pinto.

09:22

Thank you very much. Are there any further questions or comments that anyone wishes to make in relation to request change to end three that we have not covered already in today's session?

09:43

I don't see any hands raised. So I will take that as a now in our will move on to the next substantial item of this agenda which is change request one. So in terms of change request, one This was described in the agenda as follows landscape visual effects of proposed change one, and then looking at combined cumulative effects of proposed change one as well. So, my first question would be for the applicant. So Mr. Greig, if you could actually provide us, again, similar to what we did to the previous change could provide us with an overview of the proposed change, and also a summary of the consultation

responses that would be very beneficial, particularly highlighting any issues that you have received in relation to change one?

10:46

Well, okay, I can deal with the summary. Quickly, I need to come back to you shortly on the consultation position. In relation to the reason for the change request, again, this comes about through the detailed design work that's been going on for the project, in line with the the examination. And what the consulting engineers have been doing is looking at the most effective way to manage the project and make the best use of the land that's that's available, and to also to minimise unnecessary traffic movements. So essentially, the existing application is submitted, obviously had an earth with artwork strategy associated with it with with various buttons and soil storage areas. And what this change request seeks to do is to try and make the use of soil as efficient as possible by maximum maximising the amount of on sale storage, and thereby minimising the need to take soil from elsewhere onto the site. And also to minimise the need to to dispose of soil off site. So there's more soil then used for the purposes of bonding, etc. so that that's it, that's the overall aim of all of the of the proposal. So essentially, what what you have then are a number of amendments to the earthworks strategy. There's some 61 areas of change, both in Part A and Part B of the scheme. And this C has the benefit of reducing the need to move soil on site and dispose it off soil or soil off site. There is also a benefit as compared to the scheme that was submitted that the this the increase in size, some of the buttons helps with screening of the one so there's there's there are some benefits compared to the compared to this method in the obviously, there wasn't as prepared and essentially, yes, addendum as found that there is no significant change to the assessed impacts as compared to the previous proposal. Now, you'd also asked me about consultation with consultation responses, and you'll have to bear with me, because I'm trying to find where there was actually where it was actually are. Not to be somebody else could point me to that within the team. My understanding was that the consultation responses that we received were in relation to the other change request once but I'm willing to be corrected on that point. If this information is not it, sir. Yeah, I'm just looking at the consultation statement. So that's the thing. I put a link to it, but I don't have it on my screen at present.

14:39

That is, that is fine. Mr. Greig, I was going to say that if this information is not at hand, and perhaps you can confirm this matter via your written submissions.

14:54

Yeah, there may be an easier way to do it. To be honest, sir. We can confirm those. Obviously there is a consultation statements before the before the examination. I just haven't reviewed it yet to see what to do to see what the relevant consultations are. And once those are in relation to this aspect of the proposal.

15:14

Okay, thank you very much. We will put an action to that effect, then.

15:20

I think so probably the difficulty, I think sometimes is the consultation, the consultation statement, necessarily, it says what the results of the consultation or another silly which fit at the proposal, at least do so we'd have to disaggregate, which would be difficult to do to do.

15:38

That is fine. Thank you, Mr. Greig. In that case, now, I would like us to look a little bit more into the detail of change request one and actually look, particularly at the impact of the proposed changes, particularly around landscape and visual effects of proposed change. So Kim, do applicant First of all, please confirm the number of topsoil storage areas in earth plans that were proposed within the original planning application? In how many additional ones if any other proposed as a result of the change?

16:23

That's not something I have to answer. Again, this may be something we have to come back to you in writing on. Okay. depth will be that's fine. But can in that case? Sorry?

16:48

For my sorry, Mr. Greig if don't know that, that surely there's someone in the team who can answer that question at the present time. It does lead on to the further questions which we have.

17:03

Well, we will be able to serve as just tracking information don't it's coming through in bits just now. I think

17:11

that that's it's pretty fundamental, isn't it to change requests is focused very much on topsoil storage and bands, and will not show whether you're proposing any more.

17:30

Well, I'm trying to find that information, though. Just No, sir. I just don't I don't have it to hand right now.

17:37

Well, perhaps one of your colleagues could help. I like you, Mr. Pinto.

17:43

Thank you, Mr. Gleeson. Mr. Greig, to help out this matters as well. If it is of any of any help in terms of change request letter, you do mention and change one earthwork amendment to dimension and a D, creation of new soil bands in Part B to maximise reuse of access site material. Hence, our question. So if we could just clarify that information.

18:25

But at the moment, I'm not able to give you the information, sir. Right. We don't have we haven't calculated it in those terms. Note that we can do so. But that's not how it's been done.

18:39

So okay. If that is the case, then can I ask in terms of evaluating the impacts of change requests? If you can provide us with information in terms of how many additional salts storage bands, salt storage, or bands you are proposing as part of the application? How were the visual impacts of the change? When compared to the original application? How would these assessed? Well, point is to a member of your team that will be able to answer that question for us, please.

19:17

I think in terms of the detail of how the landscape assessment was undertaken, it's probably best answered by the the people that did the assessment. And the initial person that we suggest to speak to that would be Kevin Paterson from from from cgp. So perhaps of which Mr. Paterson can can explain the approach that was taken in relation to the assessment.

19:47

Thank you, Mr. Greig. Mr. Paterson, would you be able to provide us with some information regarding this question, please?

19:55

Yes, sir. Good afternoon, Kevin Paterson. Representing CJP on behalf of the applicant, the approach which was followed, the methodology was the same as pair the environmental statement. In the preparation of the ies addendum, this was carried out through a desk based assessment, which involved the review of the landscape map mitigation master plans. And this was used together with Google streetview. And figures prepared for the yes to evaluate and analyse what the implications of the amended earthworks would be.

20:49

Thank you, Mr. Paterson, I understand that the same methodology was applied, but can you provide us with some information regarding regarding the the change, and how you actually went through each one of the resulting changes from change one, the earthworks amendments in terms of evaluating the impact and centre to apply the same methodology. But if, as per your change request letter, you are proposing creation of new soul bands, and extra maximising use of soul bands already specified in utilising Baroque painters in Part B to exchange and win additional material? How, how you identify these, and how you actually evaluated their impact in relation to landscape and visual impact for each one of the additional changes?

21:59

Yes, sir. So the process that we followed was based on information which costing provided us with there were a series of earthworks opportunities, which we were provided with a PDF document. That particular document no forums, let me check here is one of the appendices of the ESA addendum. It is an appendix A, that's the proposed amendment to temporary and permanent earthworks schedule. That's Appendix A to report four dash 061. And the this appendix details, the proposed amendment for both temporary and permanent earthworks, and this was used as the primary source of information for identifying where each of these amendments lie. It was then a case of referring back to the the relevant visual figures from the EAS to locate each of the visual receptors that would be affected. And as I

explained previously, it was a desk based assessment where Google streetview was utilised to evaluate what the implications would be in terms of visual effect.

23:41

Thank you, Mr. Paterson. I actually have Reb 4061. Open with me and I'm actually looking at the addendum amended earthworks, the landscape mitigation plans as submitted in looking at the key and the plans that have been submitted on I'm not finding it particularly easy to actually identify where the changes were. So I would you be able to actually explain explained to us how we can easily support those changes within the amendment.

24:23

Yes, sir. So it's also a good idea to look at the mitigation master plans, which are contained in a separate Appendix to the sin addendum. That's Appendix B.

24:40

And there if you bear with me one moment, I'm just having a look at it.

24:56

Yeah, sorry, sir. You helps to explain the location of F bonds. And also part of the key also indicates proposed amended earthwork contours. So the mitigation master plans in Appendix B. Also will help help you to locate where each of these proposed temporary and permanent earthworks amendments lie. Thank you. I'm actually looking at those drawings that you have just mentioned now, and I can see within the table what you have just referred us to in terms of proposed amended earthwork contours, I believe that that is the key that you are referring to, but how? So what is the key for new ones? Is it the same? Yes, sir. So as well as being shown in the yesterday end, and the mitigation drawings, the master plans for these are also and contained on report, eight a dash 003 for party and rep eight dash zero 10 for part B. And I'm just going to look at the part a one just now. And if you see on the legend, at the bottom left hand corner for these particular master plan drawings, the proposed amended earthwork contours, it's a light brown, yes, coloured symbol. And the essential mitigation mitigation Earth bonds are a it's a sort of a purple, magenta coloured line sheets to represent these.

27:13

So are the essential mitigation Earth bonds, new additional ones that you have proposed? Or what else also part of the original application?

27:25

So the essential mitigation bonds were part of the original application? And in some instances, it's been a case where the height of the use has been increased.

27:41

So if so, okay, so if you're telling me that the ones that are in magenta, and are essential mitigation Earth bonds, in that their height was increased? Then they are part of the change. So linking it back to your previous answer in terms of the change being highlighted in brown in being proposed, amended

earthwork contours? I can't really see how we can easily spot the change within the amendment. I think intermediate you were including the change in the original into different categories?

28:22

Yes, I think Appendix A, it's essential to refer to Appendix A. And also the mitigation master plans in conjunction to help you locate, quit each of the proposed changes are situated. Okay. If you were to look at each each of the proposed changes in Appendix C, initially, this will then help you to identify we're on the mitigation master plan, each of the proposed changes is located.

29:02

Okay. in in in order for us to actually be able to really assess that impacts of this change. In particularly considering Mr. Paterson Did you have actually referred us back quite rightly to the mitigation plan, you would be particularly useful for us to actually be able to support this within the mitigation plan because otherwise, in terms of evaluating and assessing the impacts of the original application as originally submitted and change, this becomes quite cumbersome if we have to actually refer to two different dependencies in order to identify it when actually the key in the master plan does not really reflect the changes easily. So I'm not finding this particularly straightforward in terms of as being able to actually assess what the impacts are of the proposed change one?

30:09

Yes, sir. So I think that the most simple way to locate where on the mitigation master plans, the changes are located would be to refer to the changes listed in Appendix A of the addendum. And to then, also simultaneously have the mitigation master plans for party and Part B. That's rep 80 dash 003 and red eight dash 00 tend to have the appendix II open, and then also these mitigation master plans open until have to go back and forth between these would be how I would suggest is the same as Mr. Paterson, could

31:03

you actually repeat again, please does the web page references that you have just quoted? apologies?

31:11

Yes, sir. So for part A, the current version of the landscape mitigation plan is red, eight, a, dash 003.

31:31

And four, five, Part B, it is rep eight, dash 00 10.

31:44

I'm going to actually try in load both of the references that you have just mentioned to me, I asked you to just bear with me for one second while these load on my computer. But what I would like to say in the intervening period, is that Mr. Paterson and SEO have highlighted in terms of us needing to actually have all of these documents open at the same time to actually be able to identify where two changes are is not really the easiest way that we could possibly go about this. So I would perhaps ask if it is possible to consider how we can more easily identify the changes that are proposed as part of change one in terms of earthworks in how these link with the mitigation master plan.

32:40

So it sounds like what you're perhaps suggesting is some kind of amalgamated document that shows where the changes are on more clearly on the on the master plan, the environmental master plan,

33:00

I would have expected to actually see a specific category within the within the master plan submitted as part of the of the environmental statement addendum, actually clearly showing within the master plan, where the changes were in what those changes. Were check what changes were in where those changes were catered.

33:28

I think there's I think there was a bit where the environment or masterplans introduce something slightly different because that's that setting out what the proposed environmental mitigation is no, no, how it's come to be there. They do. They do to do everything. So obviously, whereas Appendix A, as has been referred to is the document which is which which said, so what the war, the actual changes are the baby away, as I say, to tell multimeter to make it easier to read, so you don't need to go between the two documents.

34:06

I understand that they are serving different purposes, Mr. Greig, but if we are to evaluate, you'll have submitted appendix two in order to allow us and enable us as the examining authority to actually evaluate the impact of the proposed change one in light of the mitigating measures. Therefore, if we cannot identify the change easily within that plan, it makes the process of us being able to do that assessment particularly difficult. I don't understand this serve a different purpose. But the purpose is supposed to actually help the examining authority to be able to assess what the impacts of the proposed earthwork amendments are.

34:59

Well, I cannot And, again, that is what the landscape mitigation master plan is intended to be for that that that's that's a document, which is a document referred to within the decio itself and is then used to set out what the landscape mitigation requirements are that they need to be subject to further approval by the by the Secretary of State. So you know, that's, that that's what that's for. Obviously, all the documents are there to obviously, try and assist you and in understanding the proposals and forming a recommendation for the Secretary of State, but the primary purpose of that document is slightly different. That is specific purpose in terms of helping to frame the detailed landscape mitigation requirements that are needed to be approved in terms of ECU.

35:57

I understand that that's the purpose of the landscape mitigation master plan is to actually provide us with information in terms of the mitigation so that we can provide a recommendation for Secretary of State in terms of the mitigation being appropriate or not. But what I'm asking in terms of assessing the impact of the change is, how can I How can I easily see what the changes are in how it's going to be mitigated as part of your proposals included within the landscape mitigation master plan, I do



understand that the document is then referenced to within the dcl. And but the purpose considering that you are proposing the change does not change the to mitigation, the mitigation master plan needs to actually mitigating this change as well. So I'm really at a loss in terms of why you believe that the mitigation master plan is not required, show the changes that you are proposing clearly.

37:01

Well, as I say, so there are two documents here. And at the moment, we have to cross reference between the two, the one that said so that the nature of the proposed changes, and the other one that sets that out within the context of the the overall mitigation. If you thought it helpful, we seems clearly from what you're saying you would further document could be prepared, which showed the world clearly perhaps the the outline of the the additional changes that are proposed and change request one on the landscape mitigation master plan that would assist.

37:45

Mr. Greig, I think that that will be helpful, particularly because in terms of our first question, when we actually asked the differences between Yes, number of topics or storage areas in earth bonds that were proposed on the original, and the and the change yourself in your team, actually, at this point in time, we're not able to straightforward provides that evidence or the deformation, which is partially the situation that we have been finding ourselves in terms of examining authority. Therefore, I think it is it would be useful to actually have that information as well.

38:24

I think what we're probably talking about then serves, perhaps a standalone set of plans, because I think what might be helpful is if there was plans, were accompanied by an introduction which set Oh, you're essentially your first question. So that it was clear to you what was what what was proposed by way of the earth work strategy in the original scheme? Then what is proposed for each of the different types of change? For interchange question, what are the differences between the two? And that you then have the plans accompanying, which which clearly set out was changes and that way, you've got everything in the same place? So I suppose what I'm thinking is not it's not it's not we wouldn't necessarily be changing the the landscape mitigation strategy itself, which is your certified document, but we another another document, I suppose, which brings those drawings together shows the changes, but also text along with it, which which makes it clear to you what the nature of the changes are. So you're quite clear about that.

39:31

That is a possibility or in terms of not changing the document, which I agree that there are specific reasons for that because of the impact on other documents that you have mentioned, Mr. Greig, but update in terms of the key of the landscape mitigation master plan that actually identified specific categories linked with change one would be particularly beneficial.

39:54

Yeah. I'm also conscious of that. The landscape irrigation plans. I was got quite a lot of detail on it, as it stands, and quite Lucky's and what I don't think we want to do is to, to overload the plan with with levels of detail and make it frankly, more even more difficult to understand, as well. That's why I was gonna

suggesting that if you want this, then maybe it'd be better to have it as a separate document so that we're not, we're not changing the input, the environmental masterplanning was supposed to be emceeing it is that looking forward on the assumption that the decio was granted As it stands, then I'm not sure wouldn't necessarily matter. We're the the elements on the on the landscape match plan came from, it's just a, you know, you got to provide them. Whereas what we're talking about here is you need to understand for your purposes of your examination, you need to understand the details of where those new elements come from. But the way I'm seeing it, I don't think unless you tell me you think I'm wrong about the server? I don't think you need that in the approved landscape master plan, because it see it, I don't quite see where that would be relevant to that document when it when it came to the approval of the details.

41:14

I I understand, but in terms of our function. Now, in terms of as being able to assess the impact of the change one, we would need to be able to actually identify those more clearly. And I don't think that these are particularly clear within the agenda, I'm taking it as a whole. So I'm obviously taking into consideration. I'm obviously taking into consideration appendix one in appendix two as well. So not just not just the mitigation master plan. Nevertheless, it does not, it does not seem to me to be particularly straightforward in our dimension in terms of members of the public, trying to actually find the plan in terms to assess what changes are going to be in terms of proposal to participate as part of the examination process would actually find it particularly not particularly straightforward, either.

42:20

But the point is understood. All I'm suggesting is that we have a single document that deals with that.

42:27

I would leave that within you and your team, in terms of the best way to to be able to actually highlight that situation. Right. One of the questions that I had, which actually goes to disappoint as well, was to actually, if you're if Mr. Greig, or perhaps a member of your team can actually explain the differences in the landscape edition master plan between the original submission in the latest versions that was submitted in web eight in terms of dual earthwork amendments. Which goes back to this point in terms of being able to identify the differences.

43:15

Yeah, I think that will be one of my team is best placed to do that. Just trying to identify who that might be. I think it's probably Andy Williams. Oh, he's already here comes Mr. Williams, welcome. Hello, my

43:44

name is Andy Williams. I'm from Toby SPM, representing the applicant. So the original landscape master plan that was submitted, identified a number of bonds that were proposed as part of the application, these were separated into ones that we considered would be essential, and they formed a specific mitigation purpose, primarily relating to screening of junctions. And the others were ones that were not considered essential, but would would work considered to be have some benefits in terms of helping to integrate and just reflecting local landforms. And the some of the other landscape bonds were also picked up specifically for mitigation measures relating to biodiversity. And there are several

which relate to barn owl mitigation. With the aim being to lift sort of hunting barn owls open over the road rather than allowing them to cross the road at sort of street level, traffic level. The other thing that is worth bearing in mind that These bonds are also proposed to be planted as well. So the longer term effect of these would be that they would become sort of wooded bonds. So in the wider landscape, they'd be sort of perceived as blocks of woodland as opposed to be the significant engineered or profiled earthworks. And so the original application identified these ones that were essential, and they're identified in the sort of the pink magenta line on the master plans. And the change control effectively considered or scoped in those worth works that we considered wouldn't give rise to a significant for additional impacts that would be would be significant. So there was an exercise that was done early on, to scope these mitigation, these earthworks down and tie those into the ones that a were sort of originally identified as essential. And obviously, those were kept and were looked at in terms of how that the profiles might be modified, to sort of improve integration with local landscape and landform. And all those were looking at in terms of, say, extending the toe of embankment sounds within the order limit. So again, it just helps to integrate the scheme, but obviously, it has a it has a benefit of of disposing of some of the material on site as well. So that process was sort of gone through in terms of integrating the two designs together. And that's effectively what we've ended up showing on the landscape mitigation master plan would be those those bonds that we considered essential, and the additional ones arising out of the change request between the two.

46:53

Thank you Mr Williams to confirm when you say it's essential, do you actually mean two bands that were proposed within the original application? Correct. So this then means that going back to some of the debates that we were having earlier, does this mean then that ones that are marked with the magenta colour, as you have mentioned, on your evidence, just now are actually the ones that were part of the original planning application? And the brown ones or the brown colour are actually trying to highlight changes in the additions? Correct? Correct. Okay. And do we know how many, if any, are absolutely new? We still want

47:45

off the top of my head, I couldn't tell you. How many of the bonds if there were new bonds, how many of them were new? Because what we've looked at is, is we've looked at what's been proposed previously, and then looked into in terms of saying, Well, you know, actually, can we modify what we've said, is essential, into something that maybe works slightly better with the land form, or, you know, this the scope to lift that by, say, a metre in its overall height, or change the profile of it to tie into the landscape. So it's a little bit more nuanced than just sort of saying, well, that bonds that bonds in that bonds out, that's going to be four metres, that's not going to be for you, it's a little bit more refined, I suppose in a nuanced way, rather than just sort of saying it's an exam type of thing.

48:35

Okay, that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Williams. I want to actually get into further discussion comes off the height of two proposed bands as well. But looking at, again, the change request letter in H, your dimension, creating new, temporarily temporary soil storage areas in both Part A and Part B. So based on what you have provided, as is the examining authority in terms of your attentions for change one, I would have assumed that some of them would be new. But you know, obviously, looking at looking at

the latest versions of landscape mitigation plan, as well as the addendum to the environmental statement, I could not easily spot new hence why I was asking the questions earlier than I was, but I'm happy for the applicant to actually come back to us on this in return at a later stage. So

49:44

sorry to interrupt Is that why are you looking for where there's new temporary topsoil as opposed to the permanent? Because there seems to be a bit of confusion maybe between what's temporary topsoil storage and what's permanent sort of essential bonds.

50:00

I am I am looking to subjecting the evidence that you have provided just now Mr. Williams, I can see that from the latest versions of landscape integration master plan, change between the original application and and change one is actually displayed within the different colours, which is acceptable. And I will ask some further questions in terms of the height and how that was assessed later on. But nevertheless, I just wanted confirmation if there are new completely new ones or not proposed that but but as I think that we have agreed that that will be in writing at a later stage. So I would just like us to back that for the time being so that we can continue.

51:04

In terms you've mentioned, the height in depth has in there have been some changes in terms of the proposed height for

51:25

feeling slopes, I believe, and soil bands that you were proposing to include in authorising levels of junction balls. So, would you please confirm to us, and this actually links to your answer to the latest, the fourth round of questions from the examining authority? links with your answer to question I v. Point two and also Lv point 4.3. Within your answer to the question, you actually do state that the maximum, I'm trying to find the specific reference in Lv point 1.4. Point three you do start at maximum height of proposed slopes adjacent to propose structures for part B would be zero metres above the road level of the edges of the Edison's a one northbound carriage in 7.3 metres above the adjoining proposed current level. So could you actually confirm to us if 7.3 metres is going to be the maximum height of the F work amendments that you are proposing that that are part of the change? So what is the maximum height? I'm not sure if this question will be for Mr. Williams, or for Mr. Greig, if Mr. Greig could pointers into iteration if it's not Mr. Williams?

53:24

Sorry, I was I was on mute. I think I think it may actually be Mr. Stubbs is just trying to find a piece of information just now. I think Mr. Paterson, was Mr. Paterson, my mistake, I misread my best read my notes on one behind sounds like it's Mr. Paterson after all.

53:47

Yes, sir. So to respond to the fourth written questions. We were provided with cross sections from costing which illustrate the maximum height of the proposed temporary and permanent earthworks and the cross section has confirmed that the highest the maximum height for part B, as you said there was

7.3 metres above the adjoining proposed ground level that it would be zero metres above the road level of the adjacent a one northbound carriageway. And that would be for the permanent knowledge correct? That's correct. Yes, that's a permanent.

54:45

So indenfor down yield stated proposed maximum height of the proposed junction box for part B would be 7.3 metres above the road level of an adjacent access road in 3.4 metres above the joint Proposed ground level. So could someone talk us through this specific point in terms of what these heights actually mean? Um we I'm struggling to actually be able to fully understand and be MB certain in terms of what the overall impact is going to be of these bands. junction balls Pardon?

55:31

Yes, sir. So we provided two heights. The original information provided by costing provided us with height of the amended earthworks in relation to the nearest adjacent road level. But information didn't contain height above the adjoining proposed grind level. So we liaised with costing to ask them to prepare cross sections. These cross sections are an appendix to our written response. That's document 7.3 0.1. If you if you wish to refer to this appendix, and we felt that it give more detail and more clarity to provide height not only from adjacent root level, but also from the adjacent proposed ground level.

56:37

Thank you for that. And I'm struggling in another question that I am actually struggling to understand is that on your change, you mentioned maximising slubs for reuse of excess materials in parts B, you mentioned junction balls, you mentioned temporary source storage areas. So there are a series of different designations, which obviously I do understand that are linked with different parts of scheme in different purposes. But in terms of the particularly in terms of in terms of the of, of the operation, face in in terms of the more permanent effects of these changes. How, where can we actually find information in terms of what the impact is going to be visually of these proposed changes, but all of them together?

57:47

Yes, sir. So if you refer to Section five, that's landscaping visual of Yes, addendum, that's rep four dash 061. We have tabulated in tables 5.35 dash 2325 dash five, the findings of our assessment of the visual effects of these proposed earthworks amendments. And what we've done in these tables is we've assessed the change in comparison with the skin as assessed in the US,

58:31

is assessed in the US. And again, reflected within appendix one of the s and eiendom. Where you detail the changes, is that case, Mr. Paterson? That's correct. Yes. Again, I think I think that probably because of the slight difficulty that we are experiencing, in terms of rendering appendix one and appendix two together to actually fully understand the impact, I think, probably I would ask these to be reviewed, because it's, I don't think it's as straightforward as it could be in terms of being able to fully comprehend what the impact is going to be of all of these changes cumulative, cumulatively, on the landscape, particularly.

59:41

Yes, sir. So again, referring back to the Yes, at the end, and one. The the overall conclusions, we state sorry, if you bear with me, I'll find Relevant paragraphs, yes to paragraphs five point 10.43 to five point 10 point 12 present the implications of the proposed earthworks amendments for all of the receptors. And this same conclusion is also presented in the non technical summary. That's report for dash 062. Again, in the landscape and visual section of this report, we present our overall findings. landscape was scoped out of the agenda. And the justification for this is set out in paragraph 2.1, point six of Appendix C of the yes addendum. And as it states there, the changes to the temporary and permanent earthworks would not change the assessment of significant effects on landscape character. This is because the nature and form of the earthworks would support integration of the scheme into the local landscape character.

1:01:15

Thank you, Mr. Paterson. For that information, I do understand it, you have scoped out landscape as part of that. Can I just very quickly ask Ms Robbie from Northumberland county council, if you aren't happy with the changes that have been made, particularly in terms of how defects is have now been explained, one landscape has been assessed and effectively has been scoped out if you are happy with that situation, and you agree with justification and reasoning for that.

1:02:02

Thank you, sir. Haven't got Mark Evans with me who's who's looked at this in detail for us. But I think we're broadly broadly happy with it, we didn't make any objections to it, on the basis that there was no chair change from the original position. In terms of the assessment assessment, there are references to slight beneficial visual effects. But those don't change didn't those then don't translate to a changing magnitude of of impact? So I can't go into detail because often Mark has looked at him more in more detail than me. But overall, we don't have any major issues in that there is no change to the overall impact of each of the each of the changes, if that makes sense.

1:03:02

That's fine. Ms Robbie, I understand from your representation. That that is your position as well. We actually confirm now that you are happy with the justification in the evidence that we have just heard. Mr. Paterson, I noticed that you have your hand raised now at moment, would you like to intervene?

1:03:24

Yes, sir. So it was in response to something which Katherine picked up on there to do with the statement of slight beneficial visual effect, which we stayed in numerous instances in this yesterday. And it was to bring both to your attention, sir, and also to Katherine's attention that we have prepared a note, an errata note, which is to be submitted as part of the deadline today, that's dead line nine. which seeks to clarify where we've stated slight beneficial visual effects, there's going to be a note which helps to explain what we're trying to say there.

1:04:13

Okay, thank you very much for that Mr. Paterson. will be looking forward to receiving get explanatory notes as well.

1:04:26

I would like to ask another question, which is actually very specifically regarding the height so Mr. Greig, could you please answer or pointer since right direction, if not yourself, considering that there is a significant increase in the maximum height of some of these raised earthwork amendments that you are proposing as part of part one? Could Could someone please talk me through While the applicants position is that, considering the difference in height between what wasn't the original proposal and to change, that no significant visual effects will actually come from this proposal and this change.

1:05:18

I see Mr. Paterson has his hand up. So as I suspect, whether it's deliberately or whether that's from the last time I suspect has gone down, though, so I suspect he wasn't literally putting up but

1:05:29

I think it might have been Yes, just left up.

1:05:36

I think at any event is probably Mr. Paterson, is probably best to, to deal with the question of why we've come to the conclusion there is no that we can do changes to the to the impacts, given that there are increases to the heights of some of the bonds. So Mr. Paterson, could you pgb deal with that?

1:05:58

Yes, sir. So the EAS addendum, section five, that's landscaping visual in the tabulated assessment findings, we explain quite clearly, the reasoning why there wouldn't be an increase in significance official effect. In some instances, it is because the increase in height would improve the visual screening function of earthworks that were previously proposed. And in other instances, slackening of slopes would help to improve landscape integration, which in turn, would have a positive influence on visual effect. those locations where there is an increase in impact, the increase is not sufficient that the magnitude or sorry that the significance of effect would increase. And again, that's set out in our findings in cables, five dash 225 dash five, and also the text which follows in paragraphs five, point 10.4 to five point 10. Point 12.

1:07:23

Yes, thank you for that information, Mr. Paterson. And I can see that the paragraphs that you have mentioned actually referred to specific identified specifically identified receptors off of off have such an impact. Nevertheless, considering that I believe that within the original application I believe in please correct me if I'm wrong, as Mr Greig, but I believe that the maximum height of of the band's instructions that you will propose was going to be two metres in this one is we have established is around seven metres. It seems to me that that is quite significant increase.

1:08:10

I think there were also other parameters that were assessed as part of the Yes. For slightly different for increases in the bonds the two metres that I think you're referring to, as I understand it was in relation to temporary topsoil as opposed to the bonds themselves.



1:08:38

This is partially, I think, I think that what would be beneficial, Mr. Greig, is that actually, if we could get clarification in terms of the maximum height of all the changes listed within the change letter, if you could actually, if we could actually have that in if they are temporary? Or if they are going to be part of the operational of the operational phase for each one of the earthwork amendments to ones that obviously will be raised above ground level? That would be beneficial, because it is becoming increasingly confusing in terms of keeping track of the soil bands, then junction balls and then do each end temporary results, storage materials. So actually, if we could actually have detailed information in terms of maximum height for each one of those categories, that would be beneficial.

1:09:41

Yeah, I think so. That was what it was suggesting with the additional document that were part of the introductory text that would set all clearly so you've got everything in the same place. Yeah, definitely be beneficial. Thank you very much, Mr. Greig. I Have

1:10:09

I have a final question which is linked with authored change with quest, which is linked with this. So the associated changes with the change request, one must be secured through the dcl. Should DS agenda for change request one into three be certified documents and a scheduled 12? Mr. Greig, if you could actually provide us an answer in terms of your position on that.

1:10:40

I missed the first part of your question. Sorry. Could you repeat the first part?

1:10:46

And can can the applicant please explain how it expects the changes to be secured through the dcl?

1:10:55

The changes in change equipment and this change request that they? Well, they are all within the boundaries of the of the order limits as they stand. And the are subject to the assessment parameters of the Yes. So the general powers under the DC or gives us powers to undertake the works which are required, in accordance with the assessment parameters in the ies. So as they're all set out in the years, and as it's all within the order limits. The dcl would give us powers to do what's required in terms of the in terms of change request one.

1:11:47

But should it be a certified document and the schedule 12? If I understand correct me if I'm wrong. So Greig and the designers tend it's not it's not a certified document at the moment?

1:12:01

I don't think it is at the moment. No, sir. Be? I think it perhaps should be. I think what we should probably do is reflect on that and confirm that and put you in submission.



1:12:18

Thank you. So if we could actually have an Nether action on that. In terms of confirming if the agenda for change request one to enflame should be solidified documents in the schedule 12. That will be helpful. Thank you.

1:12:36

I suspect there may be some but not everything. I suppose as the answer. It's just trying to reflect which ones are the actual ones that should be

1:12:49

just bear with me for one second, just through reading my notes to check that I have covered all of the points that I was looking to cover. Mr. Greig, can I just ask a very simple question. And this has got to do with cumulative impacts of combined cumulative effects of the proposed of proposed change one, so a probably going to move to the second bullet point. But before I do actually cannot just ask if anyone else has any comments or questions regarding landscaping visual effects of the proposed change one before I move into bullet point two combined commodity effects of the proposed change one.

1:13:59

I don't see any hands raised. So move on to that. So in terms of combined with cumulative effects of proposed change one cigarette, could you please talk us through how these were assessed? Or by pointers into right direction?

1:14:15

Yeah, I think this one it probably is one for Mr. Stubbs spoke about cumulative hypex before.

1:14:24

Thank you, Mr. Stubbs, if you could just set out how combined commodity effects were evaluated as part of proposed change one,

1:14:36

Kevin Stubbs from tbps Yes. So we within change on the earthworks addendum, we scoped out combined and cumulative effects and that is because we only consider residual effects on receptors and only them when there is more than one residual effect on a receptor. And as there was no Change in effects reported within this addendum, there is no change therefore, to the combined effects, or cute effects for construction or operation. And therefore the combined and cumin effects reported in chapter 15 for part A up oh six, zero, and chapter 15. for part B, up oh six one, Chapter 16, Kim to the effects, up 062 are still applicable. Also to note that we did update the find my notes here, we did update the long list of other developments for the attendance, the change requests. And that was done in January 21, I believe. And there were no additional changes as a result of that, or no new of that no new developments, which changed the original conclusion of our assessment on cumulative effects.

1:16:07

Thank you for that answer, Mr. Stubbs. So I understand your answer in the methodology that you have just set out and how have actually come to that conclusion. In terms of some of the receptors, can I just clarify that? And that includes the full list of two receptors. So not just residential, but also commercial and biodiversity as well?

1:16:34

Yes, it will include all topic areas. So we've looked at all topic areas where there is potential for change we've assessed those are set out in the in the denden report, where we scope topics out that was because there was no change in effect. And we've done further work on some because we thought there might be and that has proven that there. There are no changes in effect. And that's the conclusion of the report, therefore,

1:17:01

in relation to change one that relates to change one, that's correct, yes. That's helpful. Thank you very much. I think that this probably covers most of the questions that I wanted to ask in terms of combining cumulative effects of proposed change one. So can I just ask if there are any further questions that anyone would like to ask or comments anyone would like to make in relation to bullet point to to combined income relative effects of proposed change one?

1:17:52

Oh, I can't see any hands raised. So well. We'll take that as no further questions. So are there any further questions generally that anyone would like to make in terms of change request, one that we have not covered? In this specific session? Mr. Gleeson?

1:18:11

Thank you, Mr. Pinto have a couple of issues. I'd like to raise the applicant, please. So let's return to the point that Mr. Pinto is making about the securing the changes through sheduled 12 certified documents. Mr. Pinto asked in particular about the asset under for change request one. Mr. Greig, would the same issue apply to change requests? Two and Three? Should they be certified documents as well?

1:18:47

Yeah, at the same point, we refer to all three if one's a certified document, they would all be and I think they are reflected on that they are they are all amendments to the Yes. So it does seem to be they should they should probably be included within sheduled 12.

1:19:03

I think that's right, every other Appendix to the US has been included. And that would therefore give those documents some status. I'd like to take you back now to the landscape mitigation master plan, just want to pick up a couple of examples. So if we look at the original master plan, as submitted, and so once you look initially it's sheet three of 19.

1:19:44

Could you give me the reference Please, sir.

1:19:50

It is to know PP reference

1:20:06

Mr. Gleeson, if I may cycle, I believe is a pp 095 GT, wetlands cap mitigation master plan must find for part A,

1:20:19

like you. And then it's rep at a tableau three for the latest version chance compare with. Thank you Mr. Pinto. So if we look at sheet three, which is essentially focused on the halos junction, so I think it was Mr. Williams talking about this earlier. So we have planned one and two, and one three around that junction. So I think plan one and plan two are categorised as essential. mitigation, coloured coloured in the magenta, sorry, I'm looking at on one.

1:21:19

Yes. The version as submitted is point two, well identified as essential mitigation. Fun three is here, a yellow outline, which I think that refers to post OpenStack and of slope, or disposal of excess sites material that's submitted, then if we go to hands on, none of those are console shown. Then if we go to the latest version repaints, we have contours for those contours aren't set out in any with any reference points, the contours don't exist elsewhere. On the plan that just shown for within the red line, which I've asked whether that is adequate. There is a number, I think, for one of the bowls, clearly, they need to reference something. So wonder if someone could explain how the changes there have been made? And then move on to another example.

1:22:56

I think it's probably Mr. Williams, it's suspect best place to to talk about this. Thank you.

1:23:05

Hello, yes, Andy Williams from W. Sp on behalf the applicant. So if we take the original application drawing, what was provided there was obviously the two bonds one and two are identified in the magenta colour. And we identified those as being essential in terms of providing some screening to the to the west, and the yellow bond, which is bond three, which was shown as an opportunity there in terms of where grande exists that through slackening of the slopes or through additional Earth bonding, we could get some additional soil material disposed within that area and, and sort of provide some better integration. What what has happened is that that's been taken forward in terms of the the current landscape mitigation proposal. So effectively, what's happened with bond one and two, is this that because of the level of detail that has now gone in, in terms of what castagne has been able to do is look at the contouring of the the contours of the existing ground and tie the proposed contours of the proposed bonds rather, into the contours that exists on the ground. And that's what sort of shown in bond one and two as part of the brown lines. What's then shown in bond three is effectively it's a it's a refinement of what we had at that at the original and the original submission. And effectively, what we're showing is that that toe of that embankment slope would then be eased out so that there would be a slightly flatter profile to the embankment slope as it as it ascends to go up and over on the high loss junction. So it's, it's It's a refinements of what was provided at at the original submission. And it's,

it's, it's adding the detail that the delivery partners are able to do in terms of, they've done the additional modelling now that he, you know, they've developed the detailed design to tie that into, you know, the sort of contours that are known on the ground.

1:25:19

So, to consoles, then how to how do they relate to this plan?

1:25:30

The latest plan? Yes. So effectively, what they're doing is they're showing if you if you say, look at button three, you can see where the, the tadpoles of the, the embankment slope for the road that goes up and over on time or junction. Yeah, so effectively, it's sort of adding that detail in and all it's showing really there is that that slope would be pulled out the toe, that slope would be pulled out, and you would end up with a slightly just a slightly rounded mound associated with the bottom of that slope. So effectively, it would just be lifted up slightly. I mean, we're looking at say, effectively, the top of the, the embankment slope as it goes about three about halfway up the the slip road would effectively that would almost be levelled out, and then just profile gently down to the access truck.

1:26:27

Okay. Okay. I think one of the issues here is that, although you've provided cross sections, I think it said line eight. So cross sections of earthwork amendments was Appendix A documents, missed deadline, at documents 730 point one. Those cross sections don't actually tie in very easily with the landscape mitigation plan. And in addition, that, again, is not a certified document. So it's tying everything together to make sure that the full impact is understood. And also that the the proposals can be secured. So perhaps that could be taken away as well. Let me just move on to the last main points, and no times getting on there will be quick. The last example I just wanted to deal with. This is not a mound abundance issue, this is topsoil storage issue things sheet 15 which is high more junction. Sorry Westmore junction. So landscape mitigation plan A PP double o nine, and the latest version, yep, eight to below three. So sheets 15.

1:28:09

Sorry, yes, I'm looking at the PDF document number rather than the sheet number Sorry, just one second sheet 17 of the PDF.

1:28:31

So in both the original application and revised version, we've got the top self storage location number 10 800 square metre cubic metres hands, I think we've heard that that would be no greater than two metres in height, correct standard approach for topsoil storage, that location is shown quite the square location. And in one part of that's part of the order limits. So the order is extend quite widely. And you can see that it says return to agriculture and all that is shown is white. Now other just wants to check was that on talk to documents, which is the as earthwork change? requests. So page 231 vs. Attendance. This is rep four Oh, 61 polisi Peters taking some time to get that document is right. What behave sorry, what

1:29:39

page was that of the PDF of that?

1:29:43

I don't Well, no. Actually, I think it's it will be 231 of the PDF, I think. Okay, let me look at that.

1:29:55

So this series of maps, there's three of them. Yeah, show general location indicative isn't active and except that Yeah, executive earthwork change location, page three of five. So shows that Westmore junction Have you got that? Yes, yes, that is Yeah. Okay. So on that showing on both sides of the junction, in the main compound area, you've got a small area of temporary storage, because on the west, the western side, immediately north of Westmore house, you've got temporary storage, which covers the whole of that site. So how does that compare with what we've just seen in the landscape mitigation master plan?

1:30:50

And I think it's I may be corrected by others on this. But I think the original outline for the for the boundary there was that it gave us scope to include that within the storage or storage area. But I think through the design process, and through reviewing that, I think we've sort of brought that down in terms of we probably just wouldn't need that full area to be available for for topsoil storage. And I think, you know, there's a long term intention would be that that would be as impacted as little as possible in terms of that area.

1:31:29

So in terms of that, we can say, we won't exceed the height that was originally submitted. That's two metres. Yeah. And you're suggesting you won't be larger areas and what's shown on the master plan? Correct. So it could go lower and wider, potentially.

1:31:52

And it probably, I mean, in theory, it could, but I think in practice, they probably would probably be avoided, because I think in terms of, obviously impacting on the agricultural land through there, that would be best avoided, and just in terms of them, working the soil and keeping that in one place that that means that vehicles aren't tracking over it, it's much more sensible to keep that as a sort of a low two metre bond, that can be sort of used to be used more efficiently.

1:32:25

And just kind of come through the rest of that site, then, which is quite large. He's given us site number nine, slash one he in through the lens plans. It is for temporary construct construction purposes.

1:32:46

Correct. I think, like I say, I think the original design was that it, it might have been taken for for construction purposes. But I think through sort of design iterations, I think we've we've sort of brought that down, and we probably would just wouldn't need that big as big an area is that to say, want to take the construction operations.

1:33:05

Okay, that's fine. Thank you. So those were all my questions, then I think, virtually finished now. What I would just say, though, during the discussion was earlier with Mr. Pinto, I do think that documents, which explains the context for some of these changes, the number of changes, if any, to us funds, and also to sell storage areas. And the, the way in which these changes can be secured, that would be most helpful. So Mr. Greig, if can leave that with you, please. Yes, of course. Okay. Anything else on item three, then? Not for me. Thank you, Mr. Gleeson. I think it's now 25. To we could break planned norms we looked into I think these next three items will be very quick. So I'd suggest we continue on take more than five minutes, evidence or thought starts okay with everyone. It's okay with me. Thank you very much, Mr. Gleeson. You're not getting any of the hands up. So let's continue. So item four all representations from interested parties who may be affected. Exactly the title invites any additional IP to make all the representations on matters, addressed the previous hearings relating to the proposed development as a whole. So we haven't had any additional interested parties identify those results of the change requests. Therefore, I will just ask if there is anyone else who wishes to comment on the effects of the proposed changes on their interests.

1:35:04

Okay, no hands up. I think we can move on from that then item five, review of issues deductions arising, there have been a number of actions from this morning's hearing. So we'll put those together in the list and published that in the next day or two. I think most of the actions are for the applicant, but there may be a few for interested parties as well, including the Environment Agency. So moving on to item six, any other matters, haven't been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other matters? Does anyone wish to at this stage?

1:35:49

Can no indication so if there are no other relevant matters, can I remind you, that's the timetable for the examination requires the parties provide any post hearing documents on or before Tuesday 29th June, just deadlines hang on the timetable. I like to note that today is deadline nine to look forward to the submissions being submitted for deadline nine. Also to remind you that video recordings and transcripts, the hearing will be placed on the inspectors websites. And finally, item seven closure of the hearing. So thank you very much everyone for attending today for your participation, which has been helpful. So that concludes the hearings for this examination. If we identify any further issues we need to address that will be done through rule 17 of the infrastructure planning, examination procedure rules, 2010. So we would just like to take this opportunity to thank all participants who've contributed sheets to the hearing, examination and submitted written representations. Thank you for your contributions. And so with the time now at 137, this issue specific hearing is closed. Thank you very much.