

transcript_ISH1_session1_30112022

01:04

Okay, good morning, everybody.

01:08

I assume as yesterday, everybody can hear me loud and clearly no problems. Good.

01:14

And can I also, before I begin, just confirm the live stream has commenced? Yes. Good. Thank you very much. So it's now 10 o'clock, we can now begin this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by national highways for the proposed a 66 drilling project.

01:33

My name is Richard Allen. I'm a charter town planner. I'm an examining inspector and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of this panel of inspectors to examine this application. And from left to right, if I can ask my colleagues to introduce themselves, please. Good morning. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel.

01:59

Good morning. My name is Mary Louise Milliken, and I'm a chartered time planner. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel. Good morning. My name is Steven Roscoe. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I've been appointed in a similar manner.

02:12

And together we constitute the examining authority for this application. For those joining online in the arrangements conference, and for those present in the room today, you will or may have already spoken to BART Bart Kodiak who is the case manager for this project. He is supported by Max Webb in the room today, and Steve Parker, on line and other members from the case team. Before we move to the agenda, there are a few housekeeping matters and general observations as always, that I will need to go through

02:47

just again the usual phones, please could you make sure they're on silence or

02:55

or switched off please. And there are no fire drills planned for today. So the if the fire alarm goes off, it will be the real thing. There are fire exits to either side of where we're sitting and behind you that will lead out to the outside area.

03:17

We will need to do some work few words on the general data protection regulations, you can bear with me.

03:26

You'll note from our rule six letter sent out on the 17th of October 2022

03:33

that this event is being recorded.

03:36

As well as being live streamed to interested parties who requested this, the digital recordings will form a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the gpdr applies.

03:50

The planning inspectorates practice is to retain and publish the recordings for a minute for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on this application. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you are that you will be recorded and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording.

04:14

We only have asked for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to the planning decision. It will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to keep private and confidential. Therefore to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, we would ask please that you try your best not to

04:39

provide information on the public record that you would wish to keep private or confidential. Does anybody have any specific questions on the gpdr?

04:50

Nope.

04:52

Okay, so this meeting will follow the agenda as set out in our rule six later of the 17th of October. The letter is on the

05:00

The planning inspector has website and can be found at examination Library Reference PD 006. And I hope that you all have had sight of that letter.

05:10

If you turn it to annex f this sets out the agenda for this meeting. And a supplementary agenda was published last week on the 22nd of November, in which further details are the areas we wish to discuss

with set out the XA has decided to hold this first issue specific hearing because we wish to discuss the matter of alternative route options and to ensure that any interested party has had the opportunity to make all representations should they wish to do so. The purpose for today is for the XA to examine the information submitted by the applicant and also by interested parties and others. As a result, I would like to reassure you that we are familiar with the documents that you have sent in to date. So when answering a question you do not need to repeat at length, something that you have already submitted. If you want to refer to information already submitted, we will be very grateful if you could give the appropriate pins examination reference. Could I please ask that for the if you use an abbreviation or acronym for the first time that you give the full name of it so that it doesn't disadvantage any people here today who may not be familiar with that term?

06:26

The hearing today will be a structured discussion which I and other members of the examining authority will lead based on the agenda that has already been published. Throughout the day certain issues will reoccur as we examine them from different angles or in relation to different elements of the scheme. I therefore ask you to bear with us out bear this in mind today. When you give your evidence and to focus on answering the question you have been asked for the purposes of identification and ease of reference. Please Could I ask that every time you speak you do give your name and whom you represent.

07:01

We are conducting this hearing in accordance with sections 91 and 94th Planning Act. And with rule 14 of the infrastructure planning examination procedurals, just wish to remind you

07:16

that the Planning Act allows the examining authority to refuse representations made at this hearing. If the examining authority considers them to be irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relate to the merits of policy set out in the National Policy Statement repeats other representations already made or relates to compensation for the compulsory acquisition of land, or of any interest in all right Overland.

07:44

I've previously stated that this hearing is being recorded. It is the only official record of these proceedings that will be uploaded to the inspectors website as soon as practicable after this meet hearing, tweets, blogs and other similar communications arising out of this hearing today will not be accepted as evidence into the examination.

08:11

So now I'd like to just turn to that agenda, and particularly the supplementary agenda. The rule 14 Two of the examination procedure rules requires at the start of the hearing that the examining authority identify the matters to be discussed.

08:27

Before I go through that, can I ask is Dr. Martin and Mrs. Thompson here today, Dr. Martin?

08:46

I was if you're if your mother was here, I was proposing to bring that item up first in courtesy of your your mother and obviously her age and but okay, so she's not going to be here until later. No, because we thought it'd be kinder to her not to sit through a little bit. I mean, we weren't aware that you were you had that idea in mind, or we could have got her here earlier. But my sister's gone to pick her up. So you know, they won't be here just yet. Okay. Thank you. If I could just pause for a moment there, please.

09:30

Well, in that case, as I said, we had talked about potentially moving a bit that bit of the agenda item up to just so that your mother could

09:40

say what she wants to say we could ask the questions we had and then obviously they you could go but what we will do then is we'll stick to the agenda as planned and that's that's absolutely fine. So.

09:51

So those agendas, the high level agenda was placed out with the rule six on the 17th of October, with the supplementary agenda as published.

10:00

Just last week on the 22nd

10:04

the main items for discussion today are as follows. We wish to discuss scheme eight scheme eight is cross lanes to Roque be a rugby sorry

10:19

and that would be in relation to traffic matters heritage in general noise

10:24

will then come on to talk about this is all in relation to alternative route options scheme six the attributes of roof section and then we will come on to talk about scheme of four and that would be interacting with the language layouts specifically and also just understanding about the roots and avoiding the AONB. They have outstanding natural beauty or stick to mind rules sorry, scheme, oh 405 in relation to temporal salby to Appleby.

10:56

And then we will have an opportunity to discuss other schemes if the parties here wish to do that.

11:07

But just reminding you that because of the room availability this meeting will need This hearing will need to finish by 330 this afternoon.

11:17

So we have a list of those parties who wish whoever requested to speak under the items, and we will invite you to speak at the appropriate moment. However, should an interested party wish to raise a question on another scheme, the NSA will hear that as I say at the end, the agenda is for guidance only. And we may add issues for consideration as we progress. We will seek to allow sufficient time for each issue to have a proper consideration, we will look to take a break around 1130. If for medical or other reasons anyone requires a break at a specific time, could you please let the case team know the back of the room. And we can hopefully adjust the programme to suit your needs. Depending on time, we will look to have a lunch break at around one o'clock. And the XA will decide at that point. How long we should take. Given that we have to conclude matters by 330. And because of that reason, I will not propose that we will take an afternoon break.

12:17

Should consideration of the issues take less time than anticipated we will conclude the hearing as soon as the relevant contributions have been made and all questions are asked and responded to equally. If discussions take longer, we may have to defer to written questions. Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions we're going to ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer the question that you're being asked or required time to get the information requested, then rather given the restricted or potentially wrong answer, please indicate that you might need to respond in writing. And we can deal with it is written response.

12:56

For I'll come to just confirm which parties that the parties are here. Can Is there any questions about the procedural decide of this hearing today? What I've just said.

13:09

Okay, thank you.

13:11

So as I say, we have the attendance list in front of us.

13:18

Just as my Wi Fi has gone down. So what I will do is I'd like to go down that list and just just rather than Introduce yourselves as such, it's just if you can just acknowledge you are here and I'll start please with the applicant.

13:35

Yes, sir. Joel Semin, Kula counsel for the applicant.

13:42

Presumably the gentleman around you, your your team today. Yes, sir. So I assume that if you wanted to go down the list, I could read the list to you or take it whichever way you please.

13:53

I'm praying that perhaps the people at the table if you could just just introduce who the people at the table are, perhaps

14:00
guess.

14:03
So just working my way down the list.

14:06
We've got Matt Carpenter, solicitor for the applicant.

14:12
We've got Paul Kerry, who's the design and engineering lead.

14:19
For the project.

14:22
We've got Frank Malloy,

14:26
who's going to be speaking on schemes.

14:30
Seven to 11.

14:34
We've got Mark Smith,

14:37
is me speaking on policy.

14:41
Thank you very much.

14:44
So that's a good job. I've got written notes for this because my as I say, I can't my Wi Fi has gone down. So

14:52
if I could now see the council, please. And sparker you as you were yesterday.

15:00

Speaking for the full authorities. Good morning, Michelle spark Yes I am. I'm speaking for all of the four authorities. I'll repeat them just for the record. North Yorkshire county council, Eden District Council, Cumbria county council and richmondshire District Council and I have a representative of both Eden District Council and Cumbria county council with me today

15:26

and you will introduce them at the point they need to speak and almost an item Yeah. So as as with the applicant, if I direct my question to you, if I need to local authority and you can have the for you can bring in the person you need to Okay, thank you, and for Durham place.

15:50

Thank you, sir. Mark Jackson, I'm head of transport and contract services at Durham County Council joined by in the room by Phil Harrison, who's the Highway Development Manager, Claire Teasdale, who was the principal planning officer to embed Sue's design and conservation officer and then also have got some other representation online.

16:10

And again, Mr. Jackson, if I if I have questions or if the panel have questions, we'll direct them to you. And you can bring in the person that you feel you want to answer the question and you say

16:28

thank you, as I say, I'm gonna as soon as I can get my list back up. I think we're there we go.

16:35

We got so again, I'm gonna go down the list of the people that I have that registered to be here and just to sort of put their hand up I can see a few of them here from yesterday. Anyway, but Mr. Salvin, William Salvin. You

16:52

Miss Emma Nicholson.

16:54

Q

16:57

is

16:58

Felicity Nicholson here as well. Your is it? It's just you that will be okay. Thank you.

17:05

Dr. Wilshaw. Dr. Kate Walsh, you're here. Yes, I'm actually on online online. Thank you.

17:14

Miss Laura drew from Barna town cat Castle Town Council. Thank you.

17:22

It's Louise Taylor Kenyon.

17:25

She's got going to pick him up. Pick up my mother.

17:31

Okay.

17:33

And Dr. Martin, you're already introduce yourself. Thank you.

17:38

Is Miss Rosalind Evans here. Thank you. You're from the HDV Action Group is that correct?

17:46

button on the right one. Okay. I'm a resident and I'm also part of the band Castle HGV Action Group

17:58

thank you

18:06

I have

18:21

I have a David.

18:24

Monty. Monty. I think from historically on online is are you there now I got your surname pronounced correctly. Yes, sir. I'm here in line and my colleague Ling MacFarlane is in the room with you

18:36

thank you

18:45

sorry could you just give your name again sorry. I just Yes, my name is Lee McFarlane.

19:04

Thank you

19:13

Mr. Chairman pause for a second been just checking my list I've got everybody

19:18

that

19:26

is and miss the mark black ignored

19:30

your online I believe is that correct? Hello, I'm online Okay.

19:57

Thank you.

19:59

We also

20:00

have done a representative of the cross lines to rugby Community Liaison Group and are that's Do you want to just introduce yourself, please?

20:09

Yes, I'm Dr. Phil Ryan,

20:12

representative of the liaison group that was set up by the applicant.

20:18

Okay. Thank you. Now, I don't have anyone on my list or on the list who's who's pre registered to

20:28

tune in their attendance and speaking. So but does anyone else wants to introduce themselves at this stage into the examination? Oh, have I missed anybody that has registered? Yes. So you want to?

20:50

Thank you, Mr. Motion. And while you're here, I'll just ask you a question. Will you be here on Thursday for Thursday's hearings where we've got Brookfield fairs as a specific item on the agenda? That's tomorrow? Yes.

21:02

Thank you very much indeed.

21:08

Anyone else wants to introduce themselves.

21:13

Okay, thank you.

21:20

So, this is just some final remarks. Now, this is a hearing and not an inquiry. And therefore, unless the XA have specifically request, of course did agree to eight there will be no formal presentations of cases or cross questioning of other parties. As such, any questions that you have for other parties will need to be asked through the examining authority. And this approach is set out in Section 94 of the Planning Act. But I will ask Does any party wish to cross the question? And if so, why

21:52

not?

21:54

Finally, for those persons joining online, you may, you may switch as you've done cameras off, and microphone microphones off? If you're not participating. Specifically in the discussion? Should you raise a question please can you raise the Microsoft team's hand function and when invited please switch on your microphone and camera on so we can see you. Just a reminder the chat function is disabled. So we will you will not be able to use that. For those people watching on the live stream can I also advise you that should we take the break this morning or at lunch?

22:33

We will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. As a result. When we recommence the meeting, you will need to refresh your browser page to restart the stream.

22:49

So if there's no other matters on in on the introduction, we will as the agenda we will move on to item 2.0 which is the alternative route options for scheme eight, cross lanes to rugby and I'll hand over to Mr. Humphrey.

23:07

Thank you Mr. Allen.

23:09

Right we'll start with scheme oh eight which is crossing into rugby as Mr. Allen has said which is item 2.1.

23:17

To begin with, I have a number of questions for the applicant concerning the traffic issues for the scheme. Once we have heard their responses, I'll ask the statutory bodies if they wish to comment. Following on we will ask the interested parties for any comments they have, and finally allowing the applicant any response they wish to make. At that point, we will move to the next topic Historic Environment and undertake a similar process and follow on to noise and any other matters under this agenda item.

23:44

At this point, I'd like to say Be assured that we have read all of the written submissions, so there's no need to reiterate any comments you've already made in writing. We would however, like to hear any new comments you may have following the discussions on the agenda items. So if we can start with the applicant, numerous relevant representations have raised concerns about the selection of proposed junction arrangements.

24:10

At rugby, leading to more traffic using a B six to seven seven and a consequential effects of traffic increases on the sills.

24:19

They generally indicate a preference for the blue option for rugby rugby junction, as it would result in less traffic on the sills. In some of the representations there are a number of differing percentage increases in traffic flows that I assume are based on earlier consultations and modelling.

24:37

They acknowledge in the statement of common ground with Durham County Council, which is app 278.

24:46

That Appendix A sets out the traffic flow differences relating to the two options for the rugby junction arrangement. This identifies there will be a 53% increase 524 vehicles per day

25:00

The increase in traffic on the sills as a result of the scheme, when comparing the do minimum and do something scenarios, in addition, that the proposed junction B would lead to an increase of 127 vehicles a day on the sales over the alternative blue option. Firstly, are those the correct predicted traffic increases?

25:29

Yes, so it says here from I'm able to pull up our traffic specialist. So we have Mr. Sinha here who is going to be assisting with the traffic matters. Starting first if we go to the statement of common ground,

25:45

down county council

25:49

you'll see there on in table 3.12. And I believe whatever you're looking at

25:57

you'll see the sales or do minimum do something numbers listed there first for the model in 2015.

26:06

And then you've got the latest model there.

26:10

Following refinement and responding to issues raised by interested parties, and that's listed in the final column there. And what I was gonna propose to do is to have Mr. Sinha just take us through the traffic modelling and confirm those numbers do mean and do something numbers in that in that should deal with a number of the issues that have been raised by the by interested parties? Yeah. I'm, I'm fairly happy for him to do that. But what I want to understand because I think the last number I mentioned 127 vehicles a day difference between the black and the blue is something I think I read in Durham's representation, but it's not clear in what's provided in that statement ground appendix. So that's where I wonder if you like along the bottom line I want to get to is 524 and 53%. The number and is 127 vehicles a day the difference between the blue and black option on the sales. But yes, by all means.

27:10

Do you want to take this?

27:14

Yes.

27:17

My name is Matthew Senate. I'm a transport planner with Arup. And I've been appraising and modelling road schemes or transport schemes for 25 years.

27:33

To answer the question,

27:37

firstly

27:48

the black option and the blue option

27:54

that were modelled using the 2015 model,

28:01

the 2015 base year model

28:05

were presented at statutory consultation

28:10

and

28:12

the statements of common ground

28:16

only contains

28:21

any contains the result of

28:28

the black option

28:31

whereas there is a very relevant representation from Doom number 73, which contains the results of the blue option as well, which is where the

28:44

comparison comes in.

28:51

If I can assist that just with some references for you, sir. So there are two places within the documents before you where we compare the blue and the black options.

29:02

The first place you'll see that

29:07

is in the route

29:09

Development Report.

29:14

And that's ap 247 Sorry, that's the project development Overview Report.

29:20

AP 247.

29:23

That's paragraph number five

29:26

point 8.53.

29:34

There you'll see a table by point 8.53, where you've got to do minimum

29:41

and you want to do something that compares the blue and the black option.

29:47

And the second place you then see the comparison take place between the blue and the black option is as you said in the statement of common ground.

29:57

The relevant reference there for the statement of common ground

30:00

ap 278

30:06

What do you see here is the black option modelled

30:09

in Table three one.

30:13

Now on the left, you see you see the refined model in 2015 in response to

30:20

interested parties representations.

30:23

And there you have in the second row

30:27

the sales to do minimum number

30:29

and then do something for the black option.

30:34

And then you look at the relevant representation 73 from Durham County Council.

30:44

And here we look at Appendix one at page two.

30:48

And it's not presented in the table but it is shown there.

30:52

With the blue comparison is

30:56

the number there

30:58

in the in the in the left of the two columns.

31:04

There Mr. Sen, if you can just confirm those numbers. Yes, yes. Okay, certainly.

31:15

So starting with

31:18

this statement of common ground application 284. Table 3.1 shows that the do minimum flow for the black option

31:30

is 1165 vehicles.

31:36

And then the DO SOMETHING flow

31:40

is 1645 vehicles.

31:48

To get the same, to get the flow in the blue option that corresponds to this,

31:57

we have to look at

32:00

the relevant representation relevant to representation 73.

32:06

So, page four of the PDF, the first paragraph, which I believe you've already referred to,

32:15

this says that the blue option would see an increase of 397 vehicles, which is a 34% increase over the due minimum scenario.

32:30

So this

32:32

this number

32:35

would give a blue

32:39

a total for the blue root of 1562 vehicles in the do something.

32:50

So therefore, the difference within this model

32:55

between black and blue is

33:00

83 vehicles.

33:07

This is vehicles per day to clarify

33:12

now

33:13

to understand where

33:17

this statement of this relevant representation, then suggests that the flow on the black option is an increase of 524 vehicles. That is from a second model that is from the the model.

33:41

Between statutory consultation and the DCO application, we updated the model to be based on more

33:51

up to date data. So moving from a 2015 base year to 2019 base year. And we improved, we

34:01

refined the representation of

34:06

the network within this area

34:09

to respond to concerns raised and this led to a new model or a refined model being developed.

34:26

Within this model, only the black option has been run.

34:32

Just to be clear that that's the model that we see at table 3.1. But it's the same model that we see in the transport assessment. Yeah, a table eight six

34:45

I suppose.

34:48

I understand all of what you've just said. Now is what you're saying the most recent model only models are black. Whereas the previous models more more model the black and blue

35:00

seems Yeah, so there is no direct comparison on the current model to the blue option? Well, I suppose what I'm asking is, can that comparison be made by you? I mean, I've got the comparison made by Durham and those are the figures are read out 127. But that's based on the original modelling of the blue option, which is unchanged, whereas the black option has changed the black number on the seals. So I suppose what I'm asking is, could that be done? So I think all the IPS here and I would certainly benefit from understanding what is the difference between the black and the blue option on the seals in traffic number?

35:41

So I think it's right that within the transport within the transportation assessment, currently, we've only we only have the black model, we haven't modelled it against the black. That's correct.

35:53

We'll have to take take that back as to

35:57

whether we can, whether we we can do that for the latest model, or we can say sir, as

36:07

we have a response here from Durham County Council,

36:10

and the reference here is 73. That's the same page appendix one, page two, where they've considered the modelling on the black and the blue on the Blue Route. And they're also content that the revised modelling shows that the difference between the routes would be just 127. Vehicles. Yeah.

36:29

I understand. And so they can tell you that, but but we we've taken the point so that you on the comparison, well, on the latest model, I want to know whether your contempt for that

36:40

as being the number, which is the difference between the two. I know, they're saying that's what they consider it to be based on what they've done within if tickets available, which is exactly what I would have done. But I need to know that.

36:54

given it their opinion that what's in the statement of common ground, is that your view?

37:01

The 127

37:04

That's it. That's the first point.

37:10

What we'll do is we'll come back, come back to you on that point.

37:14

Okay, well,

37:17

either way, I think we accept that the the proposed scheme is a 53% increase in traffic on the seals. Yes, sir. Can I

37:28

I think in that case, can I refer you to Chapter Four the s AP a PP? O four seven, paragraph four point 4.25 It says there is no separate traffic and transport assessment required by dmr. There is no such chapter presented in Yes, as a road project with this chain. As a road project, the change in traffic is an objective of the project rather than an effective it assume you're not saying 53% increase in traffic on the seals is an objective of the project

38:05

that's not that's not what we're saying there. So let's let's pull up and go to that paragraph okay.

39:09

Sorry, we've got that up.

39:13

Yeah.

39:15

So in that paragraph, what we're saying is that changing

39:19

the

39:23

the traffic on on the seals, and is, is one of the

39:30

is one of the things we need to do in order to achieve the change that we want on the wider project. That's what that statement is saying. Right.

39:38

So it's an effect of the the increase in traffic on the sales as an effect of the changes that we need to make in order to achieve the scheme as a whole. Sorry, just to interject it just for the purposes of everybody in the room and those online. Could you just stay with document you're referring to you may have done so but just to be absolutely clear, the document that's now on screen, what it is and the

40:00

This reference number if you could just do that. So anyone at here or hang may want to, to load it up. Thank you. That's Chapter Four of the environmental statement. App. Oh, four seven.

40:17

Right. Okay, what? I understand that, but then that leads me on to another set of questions

40:24

that

40:27

it would be helpful if we'd have some more information so I can understand this more. One of the things is, what you've got is a do minimum and do something. But to do minimum, Am I incorrect in saying is actually do nothing?

40:44

From a national highways perspective?

40:48

Yes, I think that is

40:52

just a general point, I think it'd be clear if it actually said that. Because do minimum suggests something will happen. I know what you say the background development happens. But that's not something the project is doing.

41:04

But that's the general point. Is there a baseline traffic flow and existing traffic flow on the sales? Watch that.

41:13

So if we take you through the

41:16

baseline in the documents that have within before before the XA, the first place we can go is the PDR? Sorry, their product development Overview Report?

41:32

Again, here, we're apt 2475 point, Paragon five point five three.

41:48

Mistake a mistake. Can you confirm the baseline in that report? Yeah, the baseline in that report is 245 vehicles. It's the first row in this in the table under existing northbound is 121. Six band is 124. A two way flow of 245. On the seals in what period?

42:17

That is from the that is the modelled flow in the base year model in 2015.

42:26

And that is a daily flow.

42:29

And so of course, before you there's a there's an up, there's a refined model from 2019. And that's the model in the transport assessment.

42:41

In Table eight, six, and the question I that's coming is is there a baseline that in that model, latest baseline, if Mr. Sen. Can you confirm the baseline in the refined model? Yes, I apologise. It's not in the application document stated, but I can confirm that it is 767 vehicles.

43:04

As per day, again, per day, yes. Thank you.

43:11

And then whether any traffic counts done on the sales to verify in a modelling exercise?

43:19

Um, yes, in.

43:22

In 2017, there was a count undertaken on the B six to seven, seven

43:29

adjacent to the A 66.

43:35

Thank you.

43:38

And going back to the 53%. I understand that in a daily traffic numbers. I think you're considering that to be a small amount, but it's a potentially large increase when there's a large increase in percentage terms that may have some effects. Now from what I read in the years, it doesn't look like there isn't a fine grained examination of any environmental effect. On the seals itself. It's more of a project and Bonnard castle as a whole rather than particular effect on a street.

44:13

And this, I am wondering whether a more fine grained analysis would actually help understand any effects on the sills and thinking more. In other in other applications, you get.

44:28

Assessment guidelines for assessment of road traffic by the Institute of Environmental Management and assessment. Look at particular streets and the effect environmental effects of traffic on the streets. I was wondering whether that such an approach can be used to look at Israel does 53% equal any significant change on the sales and things like pedestrian intimidate, intimidation, fear, intimidation, severance, things like that? Could that be done to say

45:00

If I understand that you have your questions, you want an assessment, that's, that's more specific than what you've got currently got in the materials. And the question is, well, that's something we can we can produce and support the application. Can we take that matter away and come back to you after over lunchtime? Yes. In response to that.

45:18

Okay, well, that probably concludes what I need to ask. Just like the next as I said at the beginning, from if Durham County have anything they want to add.

45:30

See, so if we could get a more fine grain modelling to consider sales further, that'll be useful. Thank you.

45:40

Why with that is, alternative IPS going to start with a cross lanes to route could be Community Liaison Group, I think.

45:51

Dr. Ryan?

45:54

Thank you, sir. No, this time, I don't have any more questions. I think you've fully explored them. Thank you.

46:04

And then the HTV Action Group, which is Rosalind Evans.

46:10

I'm not quite sure I'm allowed us to ask the question is that I'm not quite sure what I'm allowed to do. You read it. There's something about the

46:23

from my understanding highways England have said that overall, that there's a little map which shows that there's going to be an overall reduction in

46:32

vehicles using

46:35

the road to and from the A 66 going through Barner Castle, either a 6867.

46:43

Directly or

46:46

across

46:48

Abbey bridge, particularly if they're an HGV, I was just wondering what that's based on.

46:56

I'm happy that you know, that national highways if they want to respond to that.

47:05

Okay, so

47:08

the reduction in flow in Barnard castle that you're referring to

47:16

is can be seen in the transport assessment in

47:23

AP 237.

47:26

And it will be in chapter eight

47:31

that the reduction in flow occurs on the AC 67. Because as the AC 66 has been improved,

47:41

the speeds on there or the journey times on the AC 66 become shorter. This

47:49

attract traffic that is currently travelling east west on the AC 67. And therefore moves on to the AC 66 leading to an overall reduction in traffic it within Barnard castle.

48:04

Can I just say that actually, people on the A 67? It's it's a north south movement we're talking about here.

48:14

It's not, I see that you can refer to figures. But at actually,

48:22

I live here. I know how people use the roads. We've got the connection with the ace 68 People really are not going to own Scotch corner

48:32

to go through the ACCA. It's it's an HGV problem as well.

48:37

So I'm just wondering, I mean, you can you can have this kind of figure which you use for I don't know nationally for if you improve a road, you expect usage of the trunk roads to be reduced. But actually specifically for here.

48:58

As I say the people that use the AES 67 through Viola Castle, they're not going east west, they're going north south in the main and there are long distance people who will carry on using that. So I don't know, what I'm asking for is is the local basis that you have, or whether I'm not interested, there's that sort of up here kind of the idea that if you improve a road, more people will use it for long distances. It's the specific for here that I'm interested in. Thank you. I think I would just say that's part of why we are here to look at that perspective and look at the bigger picture if you like and also the local picture, which is why I've just been through that exercise on the silver.

49:42

Thank you and it was very interesting what you said and yeah, I'm gonna followed it very closely. Thank you. Is there anyone else wants to speak on this issue? Yes, sir.

49:57

Could you state your name and if you're representing any

50:00

only please. My name is Howard Charles, local residents. I'm sorry. Could you just repeat that again? It just Howard Charlesworth, Wilkerson. Thank you, I fail to see how the scheme will reduce the number of

50:18

cars and traffic with inbound customer.

50:24

To get on to the 67, or up to the 66. Either way, you have to go through the centre buying castle.

50:32

And what I would say the last statement that they made was the traffic flow will be reduced in by a castle.

50:43

I don't see how

50:45

they got through the town to get onto either road.

50:49

Thank you.

50:52

So anyone else wants to under comment?

50:56

Yes.

50:58

Laura drew on behalf of Barnard Castle Town Council, I just want to pick up on the point that the traffic count has been done at the

51:06

end of the 66 ends of Morehouse lane, which excludes local traffic. So we would appreciate the more granular approach or count that's been proposed. And when we talk about the sales, it's not just the sales, once you get past the sales, you're onto the county bridge, and then you've got the bank, which is not suitable for extra traffic.

51:31

Thank you.

51:34

Anyone else want to make a comment? No, well, I'll go back to the applicant, whether they want to respond to any of those.

51:49

We're aware that what we're proposing is a 53% increase on on that section

51:56

of the sales which some interested parties

52:01

generally criticise us as pushing additional traffic down in appropriate route. And I think in terms of the purpose of our application,

52:12

we've had to

52:15

we're relying on

52:18

on the evidence that that we've put together in our transport assessment. And that assessment does show does show us that there's going to be reduced traffic at Barnard castle.

52:29

Also, when we're looking at the road, the sales in general Well, that is a road

52:37

where there's a low reporting of accidents.

52:41

And the general expectation of of the 53% increase we were talking about starting from a low base.

52:49

Now, when we say there's a low reporting of accidents, that's generally a safe road. We were here yesterday. And we heard there was a we understand there was a recent incident on that road. And of course, anytime

53:05

there's a an accident on a road, that's a matter for concern.

53:10

And of course, in development of this project for us,

53:14

you will have seen heard the improved road safety generally is a key objective of this project.

53:22

And when we're looking at reported collisions, particularly on on the A 66.

53:27

We are talking about a road that's currently more dangerous.

53:35

And so we do understand the concern and some of the constraints that occur on that on the sales.

53:44

When we look at the evidence base before us,

53:48

and the actual expected impact of the option that we've chosen with respect to to have

53:57

we say there are balancing benefits here that flow from this option.

54:02

And when you put that 53% increase in context

54:08

the impact isn't as great as that 53% suggests.

54:17

Thank you.

54:19

With that, I think that concludes there isn't another opportunity to come back at this point.

54:27

Anything you want to say you can put in writing and submit to the next deadline? That's absolutely what we'd expect.

54:34

That concludes it from me, but I will now hand on to Mrs. Milligan about heritage

55:05

Thank you.

55:07

Can we go back please? And just I would like the applicant to briefly summarise how they got to the black option

55:20

just for the benefit of everybody here and in

55:24

a short time as possible if that's okay, thank you.

55:29

And as it sorry, just to add on, as it says on the agenda supplementary agenda, it would perhaps help if you had those comparison drawings on the screen behind just just so that we can all as I say, briefly understand

55:43

why you did not pursue the blue option. Thank you.

55:56

Thank you.

55:59

Frank Malloy Mar up for the applicant.

56:03

And sorry, can I just ask you to speak up a little bit, thank you.

56:08

Frank Malloy, Mar up for the applicant.

56:14

The figures you see before you are contained in the route development report

56:21

that is referenced

56:26

247 Yes, after sorry, after divorce, Ivan Perez, five 835, a 32. And the block option. I'll start with that, that considers a

56:39

Western junction option across lanes, and a Western junction option to rugby. And the red option considered an Eastern junction option across lanes plus an Eastern junction option at Rugby. And the blue is a Western junction option across lanes and an Eastern junction option of rugby. And I should point out in all three figures, the the proposed a 66 dual carriageway is consistent between all figures. So the difference different

57:12

excuse me the differentiator or the junction locations.

57:18

We in considering a junction to cross lanes first, if I may take that first.

57:25

The

57:27

considerations were the log on the location itself factored around safety factor on the impact of local business. And it looked at the sensitivity of the traffic on the local network.

57:41

And it took into account a lot of stakeholder feedback to our Community Liaison Group and through consultation with Durham and landowners.

57:51

That led us to develop the two options at crosslands.

57:56

We felt that the

58:00

the junction option which you see in red, which is the Eastern junction option.

58:06

We had feedback from local businesses that was quite impactful.

58:10

It didn't address the kind of larger local traffic movement in that location. And it didn't get rid of a key safety issue with Rutherford lane and the B 6277. Morehouse lane, which is a significant local movement. And that would have meant upgrade without option. So that led us to develop the Western junction optional cross lanes, which you see in both black and blue route options. That provides a more direct connection between Rutherford Lane, the South and the B 67. Seven more house lane and removes that obvious safety issue. It was favoured by the local businesses and I believe favourites also by Durham as a more direct connection for

58:59

local

59:02

communities to the south.

59:04

And if I may move to a rugby then

59:09

the preferred route announcement hubs indicated a junction location to the west of St. Mary's Church.

59:18

We receive significant feedback on the back of the preferred route announcement that we should be considering a junction option closer

59:26

to the existing ropey location and to our own analysis, we felt that it was prudent to properly research that and bring in a junction option there so we could sift it against a Western junction option at Rugby. And so we developed up that option and in consultation with stakeholders, residents, we that's how we came to have the junction options that we took to an information event at Barnet castle in all

1:00:00

was 2021.

1:00:03

Following that, we looked at sifting the junction locations and to to come to a preferred option for cross lanes and for rugby

1:00:13

crossings, we favoured the Western option on the safety benefits, the walking, cycling horse racing benefits, the reduced impact on local businesses

1:00:26

at Rugby, recognising that quite popular local opinion on on the junction, and there will pros and cons for both east and west.

1:00:38

But the principal consideration with the Eastern junction was the fragmentation of the grid to registered park and garden. And as such, we

1:00:50

discounted that and went with the Western option at Rafi. And that is what the blue or black option

1:01:00

is represented there.

1:01:04

Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. That actually leads nicely onto heritage, which I'd like a few questions. And I think I'm going to ask the applicant to comment, take us through and then I'll probably ask Historic England to make their comments following that. And then moving on to council to local authorities apologies and then

1:01:29

IPs.

1:01:30

So we've received a number of relevant representations as we're aware, related to the work be registered Parking Guard

1:01:40

principally relating to the heritage impacts of the black blue options.

1:01:47

I'd like the applicant to take us through for the benefit of everyone here. Why the blue option was not taken forward place. From a heritage perspective.

1:02:02

I think at the outset, it's important to stress that there's a variety of reasons why we chose the black route over the Blue Route. Heritage being one of those reasons. Yeah, I'm asking specifically for marriage. This is just to aid our understanding of the alternatives before us. Yep. So I think if we start first with our heritage expert

1:02:23

and what we'll address here is the the effect of the proposed development at Rugby Park to start

1:02:30

if I can just provide some references for you.

1:02:34

If we go to app oh five one

1:02:38

that's the environmental statement chapter eight,

1:02:42

Appendix eight point 10.

1:02:47

The Impact Assessment table

1:02:54

the second reference

1:02:57

is AP oh five one chapter eight

1:03:03

section 8.9.

1:03:08

The assessment of likely significant effects which is given eight point 9.38 to three nine.

1:03:14

If I could turn to Mr. Larkin.

1:03:20

Those two references highlight where you've assessed the impacts of the proposed development on the rugby

1:03:32

on the on the RPG Good morning mum David lakyn, Senior Consultant and heritage topic lead for the A 66 project.

1:03:43

Yes, that is that is correct. That is where the

1:03:47

effects from the black option taken forward to a EES are all laid out.

1:03:56

And what is your assessment of the effects of the proposed development on the RPG our assessment of the development is that there will be

1:04:08

minor

1:04:10

adverse effects on the setting of the registered parking garden from both the construction activity and the permanent placement of the new road or on the setting of the registered parking garden. In the case of the construction traffic that is as a result of introducing

1:04:36

increased busyness and plant during the construction process into what is

1:04:44

a relatively quiet rural character. Obviously, away from the existing a 66 carriageway.

1:04:53

The permanent effects again relate to

1:04:59

the

1:05:00

The changes to some of the views from the park have towards the state farmland, which forms, if you like,

1:05:12

a hinterland to the

1:05:15

design the state itself, it's an extension, if you like, of the formal park itself,

1:05:24

both of these effects are both of these things introduce change into the into the vicinity of the of the asset, but do not introduce or significantly affect the value of that asset. And we therefore assess to a less than significant effect.

1:05:50

So,

1:05:52

yes, so that's the black option. I assume you want to you want us to move on to the assessment of the blue option. Yes, please the context of this, to let you know where I'm going,

1:06:03

is presumably what we heard yesterday, blue versus black option.

1:06:11

There's clearly a history there. And

1:06:14

I know, you know, I'm well aware, the black option is before us, but in terms of understanding the alternatives, presumably an assessment of some kind,

1:06:26

in relation to

1:06:30

the national policy statement, and I'm not going to quote unquote, the paragraph and you can look at the test, paragraph 5.131

1:06:39

of the national policy statement for national networks.

1:06:43

Presumably, an assessment was undertaken

1:06:48

to look at that test. And I appreciate it's a matter of planning judgement. But I just want to understand for the benefit of everyone here,

1:06:56

that option earring process with regards to the blue option, please. Thank you. Yes, ma'am. So if we're going to move on to Mr. Smith, will be able to assist us with that policy element.

1:07:08

Before we get there, I'll just give you some references.

1:07:13

I mean, since the primary tool for comparison here between the blue and the black was in sifting assessment.

1:07:20

That comparison can be seen in appendix A six with AP 247, which is the route Development Report.

1:07:31

Mr. Smith will take us through these very shortly.

1:07:38

You've then also got

1:07:40

ap 244.

1:07:44

The project department Overview report.

1:07:48

And the relevant paragraphs are five point 7.33

1:07:53

to five, point three, five.

1:07:56

Key paragraph being five point 7.35.

1:08:04

Summary of that matrix have a comparison between the Western alternative nice and alternative with the blue and the black is providing the route Development Report.

1:08:16

Paragraph

1:08:27

five point 8.75 point 8.9225 point 8.93. That's a repeat of what's in the PDR. I'll end the project development Overview report.

1:08:44

So if those are the relevant references, and now if we turn to Mr. Smith.

1:08:56

Mr. Smith, can you explain how we assessed the harm?

1:09:02

How we assessed the difference in the impact between the blue option and the black option?

1:09:13

In in our assessment, we had a regard to the national policies and

1:09:23

particularly

1:09:25

paragraph 5131 and 5132.

1:09:31

Were when we assess

1:09:35

the relative harm of the Blue

1:09:40

Route against the black kid. Can I just pause you that man? Would it be helpful for us to pull up the policies or?

1:09:49

Or

1:09:52

I guess?

1:09:54

Potentially Yes, let's let's pull up paragraph 5.131 of the

1:10:00

MPs

1:10:08

so I think they're being pulled up.

1:10:16

So

1:10:23

because the policy is up on the screen, I'm just going to draw your attention to the 10th line, which

1:10:30

I'll just quote it for ease, substantial harm to or loss of a grade two listed building or grade two registered park and garden should be exceptional. And let's just go down to the next paragraph.

1:10:44

any harmful impact on the significance of the designated heritage site should be weighed against the public Bellefonte development. So I just want you to walk me through the assessment, how in depth the assessment was. And with regards to the test, which is substantial harm to or loss, thank you.

1:11:05

We clearly drew from the conclusions from from David and the environmental team. In terms of their assessment of the

1:11:18

effect the impact on the RPG,

1:11:23

the conclusion in relation to the Blue Route, is that it would have a significant effect on the RPG. And this will be due to a direct physical loss from the designated heritage asset

1:11:43

compared with the impact of the black route on the RPG,

1:11:51

which would be a setting related effect or impact. So not a loss, not a physical loss from the asset kick goes pause you there. So what we have is an assessment where, from Heritage where both the blue and the black, the assessment is that there'll be likely significant effects of both of those routes.

1:12:16

Where we compare the harm,

1:12:19

harm was the Blue Route would lead to greater harm and black roots.

1:12:26

But is there a finding of substantial harm?

1:12:32

I guess that's that's my question. Would was the assessment, its conclusion that the impact would be substantial.

1:12:44

We didn't draw that conclusion. We drew a conclusion which I believed reported in the preliminary environmental information report that there will be a significant effect on the RPG and just explained

1:13:02

in comparison with the black route, it would be a greater harm.

1:13:09

Quoting from Route Development Report, paragraph 5887.

1:13:16

The Eastern alternative junction result result in the fragmentation of the park and introduce traffic to a nationally designated heritage asset leading to harm of our effort

1:13:31

at engaging in that comparative exercise, you received consultation responses from Historic England.

1:13:40

And those Historic England responses are provided at AP 271 annex N.

1:13:48

The relevant ID references are 112311 to one

1:13:59

and 1120.

1:14:03

Yes, thank you.

1:14:07

What role did what regard did you have to the responses of Historic England in terms of assessing the difference in impact between the Blue Route and the black route?

1:14:24

We had regard clearly to Historic England

1:14:31

representatives representations feedback at the statutory consultation as we had regard to all parties, as set out in the consultation report and as detailed in Annex 10 of the consultation report. As a statutory body relay we replaced a lot of importance

1:14:53

on their on their comments and their conclusion that

1:14:59

a black or

1:15:00

It would result in a greater level of harm to the designated assets than the blue. If we that's understood. Thank you. We're going to hear from Historic England and no doubt they will have something to add. Before we do that, Mr. Chairman, I just want Can I just clarify what you've just said? So that I'm just clear.

1:15:24

Just it's just really a yes or no, really. So in respect of the comparing the blue and the black route, the black route being the proposal before us in respect of heritage harm. You said, I think I think you said Mr. Samad cooler, that you ignore the both schemes had a likely significant effect on the setting of the register park and garden. You. I think that's what you said, correct me if I got that wrong, but you have that you concluded that the black option, or the rather, the blue option amounted to harm because it would have aligned through the registered park and garden as opposed to black option which avoids its boundaries. But what you're not able to say, is whether we were amounted to the substantial harm or loss as required by the policy. Is that correct? I understood that to be correct. Yes. We've never made a finding. Our view is not that it's either though this substantial harm. Thank you.

1:16:27

Can I just

1:16:31

I think in terms of the significance of the effect on the setting, I don't believe that conclusions in the environmental statement, are there is a significant effect on the setting associated with our proposed promoted route. Isn't that correct? If you could clarify that. I was understanding that that's what Mr. Semicolon told us a few moments ago. If the environment statement concludes that the black options one taking forward does not have significant setting effects on the park. The blue option would is your reaction blue option would have a direct physical direct fit. Yeah, but understood. Okay. Thank you for the clarification. Can I just give an Yes, I apologise. That was my I slightly misspoke there. Actually, the if we look at the reference for the black option, it's given

1:17:23

chapter eight.

1:17:25

The conclusion does provide 8.9 point 388 point 9.39. The view was always that the back option would not lead to likely significant effects in the yes terms.

1:17:36

Whereas the blue option would if I could just correct that. My apologies if I confuse matters, they're slightly I'm grateful for the clarification thinking. But with that, I think it's important for us to clarify so having determined that there'd be a harm.

1:17:56

But not that either would cause substantial harm, if we return back to the policy to see how that that was applied. So

1:18:05

we agree we're not in substantial harm territory.

1:18:10

Then, Mr. Smith, and

1:18:13

where we're faced with two options,

1:18:16

one which causes

1:18:19

a greater direct physical harm to great two star

1:18:24

assets.

1:18:31

And the other which causes minor adverse effects, but that less harm.

1:18:38

And we've got a statutory consultee

1:18:43

which, which aligns with our with our own assessment

1:18:49

that

1:18:51

one route will lead to greater harm to that grade two star asset

1:18:57

than the other route. How then does that align with

1:19:03

a 5.131 and 5.132? In your assessment, they're

1:19:10

taking

1:19:12

paragraph 5131. And

1:19:16

looking at the

1:19:19

final sentence, without paragraph,

1:19:24

which reads given that heritage assets are irreplaceable harm or loss affecting any designate inherited should require clear and convincing justification.

1:19:39

From our assessments and heritage assessments, we didn't believe that there was there is a clear and convincing justification given the direct physical and significant effect associated with a blue route. Thank you. I understand the test. Again

1:20:00

Yes, my question is what was the driving force to pursue the black route? If there were no if no substantial harm was identified in relation to the registered POC and garden?

1:20:12

I mean, it was principally our

1:20:16

conclusions we reached out. I mean, as reported in the development report

1:20:22

that we couldn't find a clear and convincing justification, given the harm with the blank route.

1:20:33

Given that there was an alternative, we didn't result in that level, or significance of harm.

1:20:41

Understood, thank you. And I think there's also a reference in the policy to the loss of the designated areas, areas. GSM. Part of that assessment was here, we're talking about partial loss by going through that asset. So that's, that's I understand I understand the policy thing.

1:20:57

I'm not going to ask Historic England to make comment, please. Mr. Monty?

1:21:05

I believe it'll be myself Lee mcfar. Apologies. That's okay.

1:21:10

What I'm not entirely sure what you would like us to comment specifically on? Is it with regards to the advice that we gave to national highways? Or, you know, is it why we prefer one route over the other? Could you clarify, please? I think both if you could, if you could take us through briefly through both that would be helpful, I think for everyone. Thank you. Okay. Historic England, for those who are not aware are the government's advisors on the Historic Environment, and we are a national statutory body that

are engaged with nationally, nationally significant infrastructure projects. So we've been involved with national highways from very early on and giving advice. We've had lots of discussions about the options around Rocque. B, over the last few years leading up to their preferred route announcement, and ongoing discussions after the public consultations.

1:22:08

It has always been our view that any option at rote V of the ones presented to us all of them cause harm in one way or another. And our advice to national highways has always been quite clear that they should seek to try to find the option that causes the least amount of harm to these highly designated assets. But I just asked the outcome to put back the the the visuals of the options, just as sorry to interrupt but I think it'd be helped if the map was back on Thank you.

1:22:40

So

1:22:42

the highly designated assets that we have in this area, the grey two star Church, which is on the heritage at risk register is on the heritage at risk register because of previous vandalism, but also because of the relentlessness of the a 66. So it impinges on its sense of tranquillity and its setting.

1:23:01

We also have the great two star park and garden, which is quite unusual in that we have a long finger of woodland, where we used to have a long finger of woodland that led to the park to the church, the church sits on a hill, it's deliberately designed to be seen on this hill. And then we have the long finger of the park leading to the main park and the grade one hole. So all highly designated. We also have grade two gate piers at the junction of the sea road with the ace 66 at the moment.

1:23:36

Because of

1:23:39

the various options, you know, looking at the various options, we had a junction to the west, we had a junction to the east, we had an online option we had an offline option. National Highways as shown on these three options here went for the offline route to the south, which we supported because that takes the bulk of the traffic and the noise away from the grade to star church and also from the the parking garden. We supported the Western junction to the west of the church, because that would cause the least amount of harm direct harm to heritage assets.

1:24:17

We event the national highways eventually went for an underpass junction at that location to reduce the amount of harm to the to the grade to star church so that the traffic is not so dominant in views of the church.

1:24:34

The Eastern option of the junction closer to the existing location preferred by

1:24:40

many other interested parties.

1:24:43

That causes the most direct harm to the registered park and garden. It severs the link out through church plantation, that very long finger of woodland

1:24:54

and it's there's a direct severance through the registered parking garden which is great

1:25:00

To start, it's deliberately designed to have that that route going there. Yes, there is a road at the sea road. But that was always, you know, there has always been a road junction at that point. And the way the parking garden is designed with the park wall going down that sea road,

1:25:17

it's contained apart from where you come out and go to the church. So in our discussions with national highways, we have always said that in order to meet

1:25:32

the necessary policies of the of the national statement,

1:25:38

national statement of policy for national networks, and in particular, the paragraphs that you were looking at it would any of these options cause less than substantial harm in our view, but there is far less harm at that has to be clearly and convincingly justified if they went for the black option with with the Western junction.

1:26:04

Thank you.

1:26:09

I'd like to ask Durham County Council if they have any comments at this time to make.

1:26:19

Morning, Tom Bates, designing conservation officer DCC

1:26:23

opposition was set out in the response that was provided originally. So there's nothing really additional further to add the impacts have uncovered through that. That's fine, thank you.

1:26:36

I'd like to ask if there are any interested parties present who'd like to speak on this matter if you could just show by raise of hands?

1:26:47

I think if we start here, thank you.

1:26:52

Okay, I'll try and keep it.

1:26:56

Just need to say your name. Sorry, Phil Ryan, from cross lines in rugby Community Liaison Group.

1:27:03

I think sometimes words being used that there is with regard to the heritage asset.

1:27:14

severing links is fairly emotive when there is a sea 165 100 metres to the east of the proposed Road, which is also an underpass the trees either side there is still room on either side for the trees to regrow. And essentially, that would be covered. And actually, I personally as I drive a 66 would have far less of an in visual impact on St. Mary's Church coming eastbound on here 66 If you went for the Blue Route,

1:27:49

but you're obviously teasing out the issues of substantial harm, which is more than we managed to do as Liaison Group.

1:27:58

Thank you. Any questions from the panel?

1:28:04

Thank you, Ross Evans resident and Barney Castle HGTV Action Group? Yes, I think it's the first we've heard that it's

1:28:15

it's not identified as substantial harm. And I think it's interesting that in the previous discussion, we were told that the harm to residents on the sales was something that we needed to put up with local people have been saying about the harms to the sales and as, as has been said, county bridge,

1:28:37

the bank, but that's something that we need to put up with. But this, this bit of harm is something that everything has to change for. And it's very difficult to think for local people to understand why why that is.

1:28:52

I also find it difficult to understand why this physical harm has such a, you know, as I say the emotive language severing destroying all the rest of it. But you know, of a visual setting harm is surely I don't know why that is sort of put to second class. And finally,

1:29:17

my understanding anyway, which probably isn't that great, considering all the documents that are around was that the reason for the black route being chosen was because of this historic aspect. But the gentleman there said that there were a variety of reasons for the black roof being chosen. And I don't know about those variety of reasons. Perhaps they're in the documents, but I don't know. I assume I can ask this question.