

AUDIO_A66_ISH3_SESSION1_020323

Thu, Mar 02, 2023 3:01PM • 1:28:43

00:37

Good morning, David. Which organization we with today, sir?

00:48

Was that to me?

00:49

Yes, sorry. Sorry. I've just got your full name. Good

00:52

morning, everybody. It's now 10 o'clock walk. First of all, just to check that everyone can hear me loud and clear. It's a good start. And can I just check that the live stream has commenced? Somebody give me a thumbs up. Yes. Okay. Good. Thank you. So welcome to this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by national highways for the proposed a 66 jewelring project, which is now open. My name is Richard Allen. I'm a chartered town planner. And I'm the examining inspector and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application. We could ask my colleagues on the panel here to introduce themselves, please.

01:40

Good morning. My name is Neil Humphrey. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel.

01:47

Good morning. My name is Steven Roscoe, a chartered civil engineer and I've been appointed to the panel in a similar manner.

01:54

And can I also just say that Mrs. Milliken, who is also a member of this panel has been unable to attend this hearing today. But together we constitute the examining authority for this application. So for those of you in the venue today, you will have met Bart Mike Kodiak, who is the case manager for this project. And he is supported by Katherine alone from the case team at the planning Inspectorate. And for those of you who have joined online this morning, in the arrangements conference, you will have been introduced to Steven Parker, and kinda napkins also from the case team. We will need to go through a few housekeeping matters as we always do before we get going with the agenda proper, mainly to do with the general data protection regulations. So this event is being recorded as well as being live streamed to interested parties who requested this, the digital digital recordings from a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the G DPR applies the planning Inspectorate

practices to retain and publish these records 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 will be recorded, and you therefore consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to this planning decision. It will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information to 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 that you try your best not to divulge information into public record that you would wish to keep private and confidential. Does anyone have any questions on that specific element? No, thank you. The XA has decided to hold this third issue specific hearing, because we wish to discuss environmental matters following submissions at deadlines one to four. And to ensure that all any interested parties the opportunity to make or representations should they wish to do so the purpose of today's for the examining authority to examine the information submitted by the applicant and also bind street parties and others. As we I'd like to reassure you that we are very familiar with the documents that you have submitted into the examination. So in answering a question, you do not need to refer to them again. And we'd be grateful if you could just add to what you have already submitted if there are new information. be very grateful if you could give the pins examination library reference to any document that you refer to. And if you use an abbreviation or acronym for the first time, again for the benefit of all parties if you could please Please say them in full first of all, thank you. The hearing today will be a structured discussion which which the examining authority will lead based on the agenda that has already been published. And for the purposes of identification and ease of reference, could I ask at each point that you speak that you do, give your name and, if applicable, who you represent. So I want to just remind everybody that we are conducting this meeting in accordance with sections 91 and 94 of the Planning Act 2008. And the infrastructure planning examination procedure rules 2010. Specifically, rule 14, you're reminded that the Planning Act allows the examining authority to refuse representations to be made at the hearing. If the examining authority considers the representations to be irrelevant, vexatious or frivolous, relates to the merits of policy set out in the national policy statement. Repeat other representations that have already been made, or relate to the compensation for compulsory acquisition of land, or an interest in the right Overland. As I stated, The hearing is being recorded. The only official record of the proceedings is the recording, which we uploaded to the inspectorates website as soon as practicable after the hearing. Any tweets, blogs or similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence into this examination. So now, I'd like to just turn to the agenda for today, please. The agenda was published on the inspectors website on the 22nd of February 2023. And this followed the publication of high level agendas on the 31st of January 2023. So we consider the items for discussion are we will deal with design and landscape first of all, and here I want to make a slight change to the order that's there, they will run to point one 2.2 and 2.3. But I would like to insert on 2.4, where I'd like to deal with some matters concerning Kirby Thor and 2.5 concerning skirt school Hall Park. This is following the accompanied site inspection that took place on Tuesday and then we will return to the item 2.4 as 2.6 will then run as planned biodiversity we will deal with next and some matters there. Then have two discussion of climate effects, flooding and drainage traffic and access heritage. A brief discussion on the progress on pads and then a discussion on the draft development consent order followed by any other business. We have a list of those parties who requested to speak under the above items and invite you to speak at the appropriate moment. However, should any interested party wish to raise a question the XA will on any other matter we will hear that at the end. The agenda is for

guidance on are we guidance only we may add other issues for consideration as we progress. Just on breaks, we will look to allocate sufficient time for everybody to to have a break. We will look to break around 1130 this morning. But if for medical or other reasons anyone requires a break at a specific time if you could let the case team know please and we can hopefully adjust the program to meet those needs. Depending on time we will look to have lunch around one o'clock again depending where we are on the agenda and this may be slightly before slightly after. And we will decide then how long we will take for lunch we normally take an hour and then we will look to take an afternoon break around half past three. Now should consideration if the issues take less time than anticipated we may conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant matters and contributions have been made and all questions are asked have been responded to. Equally if the discussions also take longer than anticipated today, the XA will adjourn this meeting. And we will resume tomorrow at 10 o'clock, where we have allocated a reserve date. But for the parties information we are looking on the agenda to hopefully conclude matters today. Finally, it is important that we get the right answers to the questions we're going to ask. Therefore if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require additional time to get the information requested. And to avoid giving a potentially wrong answer. Please could you indicate that you wish to submit that in writing and then we can defer that to the next deadline or If any matters arise, we can consider whether more questions or more hearings are needed. Are there any questions about the procedural side of things? No.

10:17

So as I've just said, the X Ray has an attendance list of those persons here today, as non our intention that everybody does fully introductions, because of course, you've introduced yourself. Many of you introduce yourself several times into these hearings. But I will just go through the through my attendance list, and just check everybody's here. So if we could start, please, as we always do with the applicant, Mr. Ryan.

10:49

Thank you. So good morning. My name is Robin from Princeton Mason's here representing the applicant national highways limited, also, along with a number of other colleagues who I suggest introduce themselves as and when they speak during the hearing.

11:03

Thank you very much. And then the local authorities please.

11:08

Good morning, Michelle spark from breadwinners, I'm representing Cumbria county council and Eden District Council today. And to my right, who will be held Assisting me today and helping is how Roberts and assistant director from WFP. Thank you.

11:31

Everyone, anyone else from local authorities?

11:33

And we're not anticipating anyone else needing to speak but if they do, I'll introduce them as someone

11:38

Okay. And is anyone from North Yorkshire? Michael Reynolds I think you're online do you want to stay Reynolds

11:53

Good morning, Michael Reynolds North Orange County counseling and

11:55

Richmond District Council. Thank you

12:02

and from Durham we have a number of people I think they're all here virtually but just one person want to just confirm that please.

12:15

Pay Teasdale Durham County count. So yes as you say myself and other colleagues are here and will speak as and when necessary. Thank you

12:30

Thank you. Okay, and if I could then start with the other parties. I'll start with those the statutory environmental bodies. We have a number of people from the Environment Agency here today and I think one online again could ask them just to identify themselves please.

12:51

My name is Philip Carter. I'm from the Environment Agency on the planning lead for the project. And I'm supported by a number of colleagues which like to hear from them or when the if you want to

13:01

bring them in at the appropriate time if I if there are any questions then for the Environment Agency or you contend that they addressed to you first and you can bring your colleagues in as you need. I will bring

13:11

my colleagues and as I need them Yes,

13:12

thank you very much

13:20

i so I'm just gonna go down my list and just check your hair. So I've got Lorna Baker from Kobe Thor parish council. Thank you Dr. Boswell from the climate Emergency Planning and Policy you are are you I've got you down as impossibly your online. Morning, sir. Good morning. Thank you very much. Dr. Martin, you're yes I can see your hair can morning Dr. Martin.

13:56

A my Mrs. Joy Thompson sends her apologies. Just her husband's been out so she has can't be here but she would like to be.

14:04

Thank you. Mr. Walton. I can see you're here. Good morning to you. And Kate Wilshaw from friends Lake District you're there

14:23

Thank you. Mr. Parsons. Thank you

14:35

okay

14:42

I know it's there's no name but it is for Penrith properties is that Mr. Van der land is Mr. Van DeLand here two days or is there another representative of Henry's offices here today? Thank you

15:00

it I've got Abby, north, adviser to Mr. Welsh. Mr. Lloyd Thank you. Go to Mr. Duvall and a developer from Penrith Ramblers Thank you. And Ross Evans from the HTV Action Group. Yes, I'm here. Online Thank you Mr. Keatley from Walcott parish council are online I believe.

15:38

Yes, I'm here.

15:39

Thank you. So I've got a Mr. Roberts from ws P in attendance here is that are you got that already? Yes, of course. Right. Thank you.

15:55

Hey, understood? This is Nicholson. Yes, you're here. Good morning to you.

16:08

And Miss Caroline horn. You're online again this morning, I believe. Is that correct? Good morning. Good morning to you. I've got Councillor Henry's salt. Sorry cooks. And is that how you pronounce it? And you're from? Kobe Thor, aren't you? Yes. Thank you very much.

16:39

Just couple more. I've got Dan Patmore. I'm not sure I can see your online. Can I just who are you representing anybody? Particle? Zoom.

16:56

I'm here with Kirby saw parish council.

17:03

Sorry, who's speaking? Okay. So thank you. And Jackie York. Are you Kobe Thor is what your Kobe Thor as well. Yes. I've got my glasses on. I can. Good morning to you. Thank you. Okay, that's all the people I have on my list that have in attendance. Is there anyone who wants to introduce themselves are Mr. Salvin? You're not on my list is in attendance. But you are here. Good morning.

17:39

I'm here. Certainly. I'm here.

17:42

Thank you very much, sir. And

17:47

yes, my client Dr. Levy is here this morning and may wish to speak.

17:52

Good morning, Dr. Leeming and Kip. And I've got another hand up. Bill, Mr. Lloyd.

18:02

Yes. Hello, good morning. This is just to say, Mr. Welsh is intended to be there in person, I'm not sure if he's arrived. I am online. I'll be North who's our advisor is in support. But we will be here. If you have any questions for Mr. Welsh. And he is not yet there. Thank you.

18:18

I will just I can't see him in the room. But I'll just see if though. He's not here yet. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

18:36

Okay, just some final words for me before we get on to the agenda. Just to remind all parties that this is a hearing and not an inquiry. And therefore, if the unless the XA has specifically requested or agreed to it, there will be no formal presentation of cases. And there will be no cross questioning of other parties. Any such questions that you may have for other parties must be put through the examining authority. And this approach is set out in Section 94 of the Planning Act. But I must ask before we begin, does any party intend to cross question? Nope. Keep those persons joining

19:19

on apologies. I put my hand up to indicate that I do wish to cross question in due course.

19:28

Right. On what grounds? Are you considering cross questioning? Mr. Grant Mr. Salvin? On the attitude when you do so.

19:36

Well, I wasn't going to get into the legals unless you require me to do so I was merely wanting to put points direct to the applicant with regards to the process that they have followed to arrive at the application. Right on three specific issues. I'm not going to have a sort of Jen We'll wander around the houses, there are three specific issues that I wish to tease out some answers from them.

20:07

Right? Well, I think we'll deal with that through the examining authority, if you don't mind, Mr. Salvin. Okay, but I'm more than happy to if appeal the question is necessary, or requires an answer, I will certainly put that to the applicant. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. So for those persons joining online, may I just remind you, you may switch your cameras and microphones off if you're not participating specifically in the discussion. Although should you wish to raise a question please raise your Microsoft Teams hand functions Mr. Sammon has just done and when invited, please, can you switch on your microphone and your camera on? For those people watching the live stream? Can I advise you that should we break at any point this morning for lunch or afternoon. And in order to have clear recording files, when we do break, you will need to refresh your browser in order to continue with the live stream. Once the live stream that you're watching ends. It will not automatically restart. And I will try to remind you again, if we go to the break. I must confess I don't always remember but I will do my best to remember. Thank you. Any other matters before we move on to the agenda. Okay. So

21:24

sorry to interrupt again, I did indicate overnight that I wish to raise a matter of urgent business. Yes.

21:32

opportune time. No. Well, Mr. Salvin, I think this concerns an email that you may have sent in to the to the inspectorate yesterday, which I have had sight of concerning I think it's a visit or an unscheduled visit from the applicant. This I have to say is not a matter for this examination. This is a matter between yourself and the applicant. And if you wish to make written representations on that, of course, you can do that at the next deadline. But it's not a matter that I need to hear in this examination. It doesn't concern the examination, I find and should be a matter raised directly with I'm not sure you have any way with the applicant. So that there may not be the answer you want to hear but I don't think it's an examination matter. I'm sorry about that. Okay, if we could, if we could move on to the eyes of the soul first ai 2.1. These now, first question before I even begin is this interchange word when we talk about the trout Brett troutbeck crinkle back and more back crossings. The words bridges have been used the word viaduct has been used the document that you sent in a deadline three, used a bridge term for troutbeck and viaduct for the other two. The DCO still refers to them as viaduct. So can I just have a just some clarity, please? Just so that I'm clear is is there a specific words that I should be using for these three cross crossings please Miss Stone?

23:12

Thank you. So Robin, for National Harbor as the applicant? I don't believe there are any particular technical differences between those three variations but I think perhaps Mr. Paul Carey down the end of the table would introduce himself and answer the question please.

23:31

in mind, or carry on behalf the applicant? Yes. viaduct would be the term in reference to our DCO submission. The word bridge may have been inadvertently used but please continue Kringle back Warbeck troutbeck. viaduct please

23:48

buy that. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. So, at the issue specific hearing, too, that was held last year. The examining authority asked for additional viewpoints and photo montages and specific locations were given to the applicant. The applicant responded orally at that event and confirmed in his post hearing notes that it would submit them a deadline for we don't get them. We get these a series of viaduct visualizations together with a supporting technical notes. The technical note provided by the applicant contains that the distances involved in some of the locations requested by the exci are within 70 liters of the relevant structures and therefore photo montages would be of limited usefulness. I must say I'm very surprised by this response I'm very surprised that the the alternate Let's see if submitted to us are these watercolors?

25:09

But I would now like to explore the answers that you've given to me in a little further. And as I say, I'll put my questions to you, Mr. Owen, I'm sure you'll bring in who you need to bring in. Can I ask first of all, why it further why you considered photo montages that we asked for to be of limited usefulness?

25:32

Robin for the applicant. So we can certainly explain all of that. It's quite a technical area. And in a moment, I'll ask Mr. Andrew timpani to introduce himself. And to answer the question. We do believe that what we submitted at deadline for was wholly in accordance with what we said in the post hearing notes that was submitted at deadline one. But be that as it may, I think, Mr. Temporary, if you could please answer the examining authorities question here as to why visualizations were provided rather than the traditional photo montages.

26:16

Stone Good morning. Andrew temporary for the applicant, chartered landscape architect and landscape design adviser to the project. In terms of the technical issues as to why the photo montages were not submitted and then we went with the visualisation route, there are a couple of key issues first of all, with proximity and distance, so, some of the viewpoint locations for instance, and more that viaduct are in the order of 25 to 30 meters. It presents a number of technical issues partly to do with representing various aspects of the design that that close proximity in terms of digital modeling and renders including things like joints, fixings junctions, and various other things that are either within the scope of the preliminary DCO design, or an appropriate level of detail for the state of the project is currently at, whilst they would clearly provide visual articulation in relation to these structures, it would, that kind of information will only come at detailed design so that the default position with a verifiable photo montage would necessarily be not to show such elements in their absence, which was creator, unrepresentative appearance of the structure. There is also another issue with regard to the type of projection photographic projection in respect of large linear infrastructure schemes, and particularly with close proximity, whereby cylindrical projection is necessary to show them which is absolutely fine for more

distant photo montages. And the sort of landscape scale ones that are valuably underpin the landscape and visual impact assessment within the DCO submission. But a close range, they can often create a slightly disconcerting kind of fisheye effect or exaggerated perception of the kind of arcing but the structure over and above what you perceive in reality. So there's sort of technical limitations with showing something that's representative and why we've essentially followed an approach that, although they're visualizations, they go some way beyond the visualizations as such, because they are based on verified and surveyed photography and wireframe renders that have been used to build that up. And all of that information, is this as part of the workflow for them? I trust that begins to answer the point.

28:42

Thank you for that. And I'll start with the point that, as you just identified that you said one of the more back crossing was, the photo montage we asked for was to close essentially. But not all of them were. Some of them, the ones we asked for were, like a troutbeck, I think we asked was well over 70 meters. So why didn't you provide one for that?

29:11

I think it's partly in the interest of the consistency of approach, but also in relation to that design information that I pointed out in terms of what exists to represent that digitally.

29:25

Meaning that you didn't have a wireframe for it.

29:28

Why frame but essentially, the wireframe, as you'll see from the example that's built up in the technical node is quite a crude, massive old block model, essentially, that sets out the kind of maximum parameters because that's essentially what was developed for preliminary design. And it doesn't have the required sort of subtleties of other junctions in design information that you may well still see as a more distant image.

29:53

But nevertheless, you you were asked to provide them and you didn't give any indication He either at the issue specific hearing or in the in the post hearing note that you couldn't provide them. So what I'm trying to ascertain is, at what point did you consider that you didn't have the information to do it? And in which case, why didn't you then go and get the information that the XA requires?

30:23

I believe we did actually provide an explanation in the post hearing note that we were going to provide provide visualization as opposed to photo montages.

30:37

seats so just to be clear, you consider the visualizations that you provided are in effect voter montages? Is that the answer that you're giving me?

30:57

So I wonder if it'll be helpful if we could just bring up the post hearing note, after the 2022 ich, to hearing because it sets out what we said we would do, which we have now done, and it might be helpful, if Mr. Temporary could talk us through that. Yes, please. I don't know whether someone can bring up the post hearing note.

31:37

Just today, Mr. Owens, just add something that I'd like to clarify. Are we saying then, that photo montages aren't an accurate representation of what the structures would look like?

31:52

So as ever tried to deal with that, it's rep one, Dash 009. Sorry, so would you just mind repeating?

32:02

I think what I had said was, photo montages can't be reliably relied upon to give you an accurate representation of what the structure might look like. So are all of Jota montages is thus flawed in that sense?

32:20

I think I need Mr. symphonies to comment on that is a very technical area that I'm not qualified to comment on.

32:35

That's absolutely my concern. That's not what we're suggesting until it's more about the limitations with representing the design at that sort of close proximity. Essentially, it's not it's certainly not to invalidate that that sort of process. It's more just suggesting the run but limitations with a cylindrical projection for close proximity images and the level of design information around junctions and details. I

33:07

think I understand that. But it does get back to the point Mr. Allen made about troutbeck. That's not close proximity, it's some distance away.

33:23

Then that that relates, again, to the sort of point about the consistency of information as part of the submission.

33:32

Only only surely the consistency of this particular said, when he taped the consistency of the whole application, this is inconsistent with the others.

33:42

But I think it's a different purpose in terms of showing design intent within the landscape as opposed to communicating the efficacy of mitigation in terms of the assessment photo montages.

33:57

The President funny we have on the screen here, one of the pages from the post hearing notes after issue specific hearing, where we set out the intention in terms of what we then produce the deadline for, would it would it assist the panel just to take us through what we then said, and the extent to which you believe what was then produced was compatible?

34:26

Absolutely, um, could that possibly be enlarged, because it's very difficult to see from here?

34:40

That's better. So essentially, what we've noted here is that they are verified. montages are a tool but a very valuable tool to aid impact assessment. And it's partly around distance that we respectfully submitted, but they were not an appropriate means to represent the design of that proximity. Um, so essentially, what we've devised is the visualisation approach. And we proposed in the post hearing submission here to show the structures in the landscape context to allow the NSA to better understand the design and appearance in the context of the structures. It's really about providing an appropriate degree of information based on the the available design reference information, but the preliminary design. And it's also sort of striking that balance between clearly translating and articulating what's in the project design principles unreflecting, the stage of the design that the project has currently at the process on the workflow in terms of measured photography, and so essentially, type three, type four was actually tight for visualizations is what we ended up doing, which is somewhat better in terms of more verified and accurate information to show the mass and scale. So it's essentially using photography, and then photo wise to provide the information that was overlaid to generate the illustrations.

36:16

Thank you. So let's, let's move. Let's pick up on that then. Of course, what the answer doesn't suggest is that that those structures, as we've talked about, that are over 70 meters would would would fall into this category either does it it just it's taken a general approach to say that while because summer, or one is within 70 meters, therefore all of them shouldn't, wouldn't be produced that that isn't said here. And I would argue that that isn't what we were expecting. But let's move on from from that, let's move on to then your interpretation about the visualizations that you have produced, in which you say, say quite clearly, we're not we won't produce photo montages, or visualizations. So talk me through then then, how you decided that those visualizations should be in the form of watercolors. And I want to talk me through the key differences, but please, is between for what was photo montage with show and these watercolors?

37:29

Yes, so in terms of the proposed approach,

37:33

because I just asked you to be a little closer to the microphone so that everyone can hear you. Thank you very much.

37:38

Can you hear me? Yes, yeah, thank you. So in terms of the proposed approach, that we adopted around the visualizations, this was developed through working with an experienced architectural illustrator who has wide experience of developing these sorts of exactly these sorts of visualizations for communities and stakeholders that are based on accurately grounded information. And he probably predominantly works in those sorts of media, either either watercolor or pencil essentially. So that was part of the process teller really, just to kind of also help illustrate the the nature of the design in its and its landscape context, but the reflecting the integrates and reflects the the level of design development we're currently currently at, I suppose. But that's the first.

38:31

So the the artists who prepared these, how did they prepare these? Did they go out and paint the non sites? Or did they? How did how did they know what to paint? Right?

38:43

I'll talk you through the process in terms of how that work, we had undertaken initial site visit to explore and understand the the landscape context that this project was was then there was then then a, a briefing meeting to work with them to essentially it was a couple of parallel processes, there was an exercise in gathering the measuring survey and verify photography, and then positioning the preliminary wireframe renders within those to create the base images to work with. So that was all provided in hardcopy and digital format for the artists along with all sort of supporting design information. Which are then essentially using the wireframe to work with on to trace on top of an overlay and using the various scalable references in that search things like parapets, guard rails, and so on. And the scalable references in the the general arrangement drawings, he's able to then generate an accurately sized and positioned interpretation of the structure alongside all of the other supporting design information that was provided as part of the DCO so things like environmental mitigation plans and so on, I'm just going

39:59

to have to Pause you there because apparently we've lost the live stream. So we are going to take a A, I'll just say a very short break we're not I don't suppose we take anything like a proper break but if we can just pause for maybe a few moments while we just try and get the live stream back so we'll adjourn for about five minutes or so?

43:29

resume for those persons on the live stream, though we were made aware that we'd lost the link. So we're now back. What I will do is if asked for that question to be answered again. So we will go back to the question that I asked was about the way you were you we got to the point where you showed us the post hearing note where you said that you didn't think that anything within 70 meters could should be a photo montage, you would then do a visualization. And then you were talking me through how you then translated that visualization into these watercolors? So if I could perhaps ask you to just return to those? The answer that you gave just almost repeat yourself. And then particularly if you could just list out clearly, the approach the illustrator took, I think I asked you that question in how the illustrator came up to do these. So it's almost revisiting perhaps a couple of the answers you gave previously. Just for those who may not have who may have missed that. Thank you.

44:37

No problem. So first of all, it's it was developed in collaboration with working with an architectural illustrator. And it is I will talk through the process but essentially, it is a technical process that goes beyond just watercolor illustrations and visualizations, and indeed, effectively the process But I'll outline is pretty much along the lines of what traditional photo montages were, how they were developed in pre digital times as well. Essentially, it started with the architecture illustrator undertaking his own site visit with some some briefing on what to look for in terms of initial finding and info gathering, visit to understand the landscape and context of the project and various the various schemes and elements within it. As I said, it was a parallel process that was undertaken by our photographic and assessment team. So exactly the same, same team and same process that did the viewpoint photography for the landscape and visual impact assessment. So developing, surveyed and measured and verified tight for photographs for each of the viewpoint locations for the illustrator to work from. That same team then also produced, essentially, fully verified and camera matched, model renders and wireframes are white wire lines, which were overlaid and positioned accurately within those photographs, and then provided to the architecture of the streets and Mr. Carmen, both in hardcopy and electronic form, as well as a large a large format. So these were essentially printed at an A zero format for him to work from in a very large scale. illustration, we had a briefing meeting with Mr. Kalman where all the other relevant design information and parameters were shared. So not just things like the project design principles and the environmental mitigation plans, but preliminary design information in terms of the general arrangement drawings and so on. The way the architectural illustrator Mr. Carmen works is essentially to overlay that all that information, and then use all the scalable reference points that are in the model. Things like guardrails, parapets that can then be measured and reliably extrapolated to create the rest of the structure and verifying that with what's in the general arrangement, elevations and sections, and that then creates a reliable and fair representation of what the structure is scale. And within its maximum parameters in terms of the height and everything else, and where were the piers are, where the landing points are, and so on. That's then combined with other information in terms of the environmental mitigation design, which we worked as the landscape team very closely with him on to make sure that was represented. And that's essentially a peer reviewed process with the scheme design leads. And the bridge engineers, as each visualization developed, first of all, was a preliminary sketch rough to determine that all of the elements were in the required places, and that they were showing things accurately from what we know about the viewpoints and those locations and how the scheme would look, then that's developed in a more resolved pencil sketch format, as you'll see within the technical note, and then finally, the watercolor illustration on top which was essentially chosen as a winter view to to match the the baseline photography that was done, but also to show the landscape mitigation and integration of the year 15, based on those sort of conservative growth estimates to give an idea of the legacy appearance of the scheme in the longer term. But that broadly is the process that was followed.

48:26

ologies obviously with one additional layer on that, of course, is that the artist then can put his artistic flair into that visualization, as opposed to being accurate and accurate photo montage, which would perhaps suggest what the how it would genuinely look, we've got a visualization of how the artist wants to put his own flair on it. For example, if we take the one at crinkle bag, we've got we've got, you know,

fairly dramatic sky in there, we've got a tractor. You know, it all looks idyllic. But the photo montage would of course, perhaps make it look perhaps more harsh than it really, really, really was that fair comment.

49:13

I think it's more about trying to provide that fair representation. So things like tractors and elements, and people are there to provide scale references and contexts to help understand the scale of the structures and contexts. And that's certainly a device and a tool that's often used in photo montages as well, in terms of the sky that's really kind of representing and trying to replicate as best as possible. The baseline photography, which was taken on a sort of fairly bleak January day, actually so it's kind of trying to move it that's I wouldn't I wouldn't necessarily say it's about artistic license for interpretation there. And indeed, with his structural, the representation of the structure and where it's painted, it's actually in quite a pared down, called a Form.

49:53

So they in your previous answer, you said that in order to form these artistic these watercolors, photography have been done wireframing me done it. So it seems to me that you don't you had undertaken all of the work necessary to produce photo montages. And so I asked the question, again, if you have done the baseline work in order to produce these, why couldn't you produce photo montages? And just like an answer on that specifically place? Well,

50:26

it's right that a lot of the work has been done in terms of the survey, the photography, the positioning of the wireline model. But then there's a whole other sort of phase of the process, which is dependent on various bits of design information and detail being available, particularly for closer proximity images. So where we've got things around the way various junctions or unions or fixings and things like that might appear on the structure and where that's absent. So there is a whole sort of level of other model information, excuse me. And then partly around, its around sort of projection kind of issue around the cylindrical projection that I referred to. And I think you can start to see that perhaps in one of the wild lines where there's this sort of issue around arcing and optical distortion that that tends to tends to create. So then there's a whole sort of process around kind of correcting that for large format, linear panoramic photo montages. So it's basically just a whole other another sort of dimension of work, really. And part of that isn't really feasible, given the level of design information that exists as well.

51:37

As it's been done before, have you undertaken in your experience watercolour work in lieu of photo montages for any other scheme that

51:49

have been undertaken before? And as I say, Richard common is kind of widely used for that, that sort of purpose in terms of explaining design intent, and

51:57

but any any SIP scheme that you're aware of, I

52:00

must admit, I must not aware of that line, check that.

52:04

And final question for me on this specific issue? Or is it your view, then, that the Secretary of State can look at these watercolors and get an accurate interpretation of how these bridges will sit within their landscape?

52:27

Well, I think based on the parameters that we've set around the design information that's been proposed, they provide an accurate and fair representation of the structures and that their mass and the scale on and the appearance based on the known information in the DCO. Design.

52:45

Just minutes, I think Mr. Gomez wants to come back on that. And then I'll pray.

52:51

Thank you, Robin. For Africa. I was just going to ask Mr. Tenpenny. If he could give us his view in terms of what the consequence would be of producing a photo montage where the kind of detailed design information that he referred to isn't available? I think it would assist us all, I think just to understand from simply what is your what the consequence of that would be, what would you what would you get as a result?

53:17

Absolutely. Thank you, Mr. Owen. I think really, when that information isn't available, you don't necessarily get a fair or accurate representation. It might be kind of quite a sort of Stark or quite blunt representation of it, which isn't really a helpful representation of, of the scheme, climatology, but

53:37

rubbish. Surely that could be leveled against the rest of your photo montages. Then if you feel that because the scheme hasn't gone to be subjected to detailed design, then you could use your argument surely would have been we're not producing any photo montages because they wouldn't be accurate.

54:01

Mr. Temporary, I wonder if you if you could just comment in terms of the extent to which you feel the visualizations produced? Toxic To what extent do they support or otherwise the conclusions of the ultimate assessment, which is what is what is it? Was it what matters here?

54:21

Absolutely. And I think having also discussed and reviewed this with the landscape assessment lead, we're comfortable, they do support the conclusions of the landscape and visual impact assessment in terms of these these visualizations as well were the as they had been done, but to respond to Mr. Allen's point, I think, there is essentially partly a difference in terms of the purpose with the assessment

version montages, which is also reflected very often in the distance, they often show a scheme in a much wider context, or a wholly different scale to these as well. So I think there's a there's a very sort of real difference in terms of how they're presented and represented.

55:00

And I think it's the case, isn't it that the the underlying assessment the underlying assessment has been undertaken based on data montages and that these visualizations support that assessment. Yes, absolutely. So I wonder, I wonder if, in terms of the question about whether this approach has been used before in relation to nationally significant infrastructure projects, we can certainly in the post hearing note, comment on that. I don't have information available right now. And for the record, I met Mr. Temporary, it may have been caught on the audio, but these visualizations were undertaken by Richard Richard Carmen. He's an experienced architectural illustrator, who originally qualified as an architect, and who has, over the last 35 years, developed and refined a workflow for producing accurately grounded visual images, which is what he's done here. So we can certainly in our, in our posterior note, come back to you on the precedent point.

56:08

Yes, thank you. Mr. Anna. Let me be clear, I'm not questioning the artists integrity or their ability to to draw. That is not what's what's at stake here. I'm questioning the value of these watercolors as rep as pulled out displaying a true or accurate representations, in lieu of photo montages, which was what we asked for. So I just want to make that clear. I'm not not suggesting the artist is, is, you know, their integrity is anyway, question. So.

56:36

So that's, that's very helpful. I think also, for the reasons Mr. Tampines said, it wouldn't be correct to regard them as or to refer to them as watercolors, that they are visualizations, and that they're not just simple watercolors if I can, if I can say that. I think it's important point, though.

56:53

Okay. Sam Frank,

56:55

could have just returned to troutbeck. Because, and I really can't think of the reference. Now there is one photo montage of troutbeck Bidet already before the examination. Now, here we have the visualizations. How do I hearing what you say about closer to but further away? These could be very similar. How do I compare the two? You know, once a photo montage, this is a visualization? What's the difference?

57:30

I think it comes back to the purpose. So the photo montage is very much about showing the efficacy of the mitigation and how that that works and how the integration works as a tool to aid the fight of the assessment judgments and so on the making of the judgments within the other BIA. Whereas these are more about communicating the design intent and the principles which essentially the approach to kind of underpins them. So that's that I would say is that is the fundamental difference.

57:59

So the photo montages aren't used for communicating design intent and the principles.

58:07

My, my understanding in my in my view is that they're more about communicating the design mitigation and that side of things around the environmental design rather than the intent here within the PDP. Thank you.

58:25

Thank you. Just one final question for me, then, before I ask any with interested party wants to comment on this matter? I just want to ask the question, so that it is it is out there. If you haven't done the detailed designs of these bridges, and they are or sorry, five dots, I apologize. That's the term you want me to use the viaduct. And given their importance within the landscape? Can the applicant is the applicant be assured that it can know the landscape and visual impacts of the scheme on the on the area? Because considering that these, the two of them are in close proximity to the Airbnb, if they haven't carried out that detailed design

59:10

reviews of the applicant? So I think I think we can be assured of that. And I mean, this approach is is entirely standard for our schemes. In England, it's been adopted on countless schemes where developed consent orders have been applied for before detailed design. And I think the key point is that you mentioned what the central state can rely on what the central state we would invite you to recommend can rely on is the assessment made as to visual impact, an impact on the landscape of the scheme set out in chapter 10, or the environmental statement? That assessment was undertaken with reference to, amongst other things, photo montages. And you've, you've heard the expert view from Mr. tympani. Just now that the visualizations produced In his view support the conclusions regarding the assessment of landscape and visual impact. So it's it's it's the vital statement that is the key document here and the visualizations that were produced at your request will be at you were wanting photo montages. We say just entirely support the work that's been done in overall terms.

1:00:28

Thank you stone. Does any interested party? Want to make a comment on this on this specific agenda item? Thank you, Mr. Warshaw.

1:00:42

I'm Dr. Kate Wilshaw, friends of the Lake District.

1:00:45

Sure, apologies.

1:00:47

I would have thought that the whole point of actually preparing the EIA and the environmental statement and doing the assessment is actually to enable the point of view of the applicant to be

challenged by the examining authority and other consultees because their conclusions actually need to be investigated thoroughly. Now if all we have to rely on is the fact that they don't have to design yet but it's all going to be fine. That doesn't actually give me much confidence that the Protected Landscape is actually going to be protected. Because if you don't actually know what the design of the viaducts are yet, how do you actually know what the impact of their construction and implementation in the landscape is going to be?

1:01:43

Thank you very much. I'm gonna had a hand up at the back there. Yes. exist again, remind the hero you are

1:01:50

Lorna Baker, Kirby Thor parish council. Just like say the one counselor that's missing today. Susana is a qualified chartered landscape architect. And she did have some very technical points to put across about the way the visualisation had been developed for, specifically for the troutbeck viaduct which is a distance that suitable for photo montage. So I don't want to say incorrectly at this point. So could we put this forward in our submission? It's all about proportionality within the landscape and type for visualization. So if we can put that in as a written submission that posts Absolutely,

1:02:31

yes. Thank you. The next deadline, of course, is deadline five, I think is the 14th of March. So yes. Yes. listening for some.

1:02:43

And Mr. Nicholson, I have the fortune or the country misfortune to live above the what will be what's proposed to be Detroit back, viaduct. I've just quickly had an opportunity to look at the notes submitted it refers to pencil drawing watercolor several times, not visualization. So that is what has been presented. The reference to this is to communicate design intent. Well, I question how you communicate design intent when there isn't a design. And I do specifically remember that being an issue at the last hearing the need for the actual bridge to be designed. More generally, from a personal perspective, having the experience of living 70 meters above this for 20 years. This is an idealized version of what this bridge will actually look like. These watercolors are not to scale. This does not look like a 400 meter viaduct, it makes it look much further away from the viewpoint. It makes it look much less intrusive than it will be and much more integrated into the landscape.

1:04:06

This isn't just to give Mr. Owen the opportunity to respond specifically can you just refer to which visualization you are using? Are you referring to this one, which is the one I think this is?

1:04:18

This is one that is further away?

1:04:21

Can you just so that that one's going on? Okay.

1:04:29

It's the one that has a good standing. Yes,

1:04:31

yes. It's that one. Okay.

1:04:35

If it was going to look like that, it wouldn't be acceptable, but it would be better than the reality. It is not content integrate into the landscape arm to look like that. And I would suggest the watercolor has been purposefully chosen to soften the presentation. It's not going to look like that from CSUN. Hi. And I would question why they have gone to all of the effort to avoid It's the admitting the photo montages, they could have submitted those as well. They said very clearly that they have them. Why didn't they submit those as well, and then the examining authority would have had both and they could have considered which they preferred. To remove this information from the examining authority does reduce your capacity to properly examining the visual impact on what is one of the largest structures on this entire route. It's a structure that cuts through an SEC. It's a structure that is on the edge of the AONB. And I am extremely surprised that having specifically asked for that viewpoint, which is not just something enjoyed by our sales residents that at least in Ohio, it is enjoyed by the entire village. It is enjoyed by walkers on the Lydian way that we know I have this idealized tie like and it's using their own words, watercolor pencil drawing.

1:06:06

Thank you, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Salvin.

1:06:11

Thank you. I just wanted to make the general point about the lack of photo montages and visualizations as it affects the section eight cross lanes to rugby. From memory, we only have one photo montage of the proposed underpass to the west of rugby Church, which shows it in year 20 from memory, but you can't actually see it, because the photo montage assumes that the trees are going to be planted and wouldn't have grown up to screen it. So it's a general point about the lack of effective visualizations or photo montages as it affects our sex.

1:06:56

Thank you. I'll, I think on you also put your hand up, I'd like to then get the applicants response and then to move on to the next item on the agenda. So Miss Song,

1:07:07

just general comment on the scheme as a whole. What are your salads obviously just mentioned it there. I agree that we haven't had the visualizations, the reality of what the structures are going to look like. So I would request that we have that detail provided.

1:07:29

Thank you. One other hand up, yes.

1:07:42

This is David on my screen, but

1:07:44

yeah, it's David Keithley, I'm chair of Walcott parish council,

1:07:48

Mr. Keatley? Thank you.

1:07:50

Yeah. Could I just support the view that these watercolor visualizations are not very helpful or realistic? They're rather to idealized, in my opinion. And also, I'd like to ask going back to your question about when is a viaduct a bridge, because looking at the cringle BEC, structure as an enormous structure, which to me is a bridge. And then the more back is a much lower structure, it would have been much better to have a photo montage so that people could see the reality of what these structures will be like in the landscape.

1:08:29

Thank you. I think the short answer is we're not going to get it but I will give Mr. Owen, please. Do you want to come back on the points that you've had? And then we'll move on.

1:08:39

Thank you. So Robbie Owen for the applicant, just a few things to respond to. And I'm afraid we don't accept for a moment what doctor will show or indeed Mrs. Nicholson was saying here and that we said very clearly, after the first hearing at deadline one what we were going to produce and we produced it. We haven't produced watercolors as we say that is not the correct way to regard these. But the key point is not that the key point is that the expert assessment undertaken of the impact of the scheme was undertaken with reference to a number of sources including some photo montages, these visualizations support that assessment in the expert view of those concerned but even more important point is that and this responds to particularly what Dr. Wilshaw was saying the most important point is that we whilst we do not have a detailed design, we have been very clear and there is a lot of detail before the examination on this that there are there is a set I should say of project design principles, which will essentially form the design brief for the detailed design of the project. Compliance with the project design principles is secured through the development consent order And those project design principles have been arrived at, through a very careful process, entirely standard set out by the design manual for roads and bridges. And that includes something called an aesthetic appraisal document. And it may be of assistance briefly, if Mr. Tenpenny could just talk about how the product design principles have been developed and informed by consideration of aesthetic qualities and similar such things, because I'm concerned that at the moment, the wrong impression may be being given by this agenda discussion, because as I say, we have a very developed set of project design principles, which will inform the detailed design. And, and also, in addition to that, the Environmental Management Plan sets out a lot of detail in terms of how the detailed design should be prepared as well. So there is

a lot there that is entirely standard, and has for some time delivered very good results for the national highway network. And this is going to be the case here as well.

1:11:09

If you feel that it's necessary, Mr. Ryan, I will do but if he could just be as brief as you can place

1:11:15

somebody, could you just

1:11:15

do that, please? Supportive the project design principles? Yes, absolutely. So the way they have been developed is a very sort of iterative process between the development of the design principles and the landscape and visual impact assessment and working with other environmental design disciplines across the project. But also, with working closely with scheme design leads and the engineering design leads. So particularly, as Mr. Owen mentioned, with the static overview document as well. So essentially a very coordinated and comprehensive set of really very detailed design principles that set quite precise parameters in terms of what needs to be achieved in many, many respects. Actually, I think the product design principles, do they go into some significantly more detail than other other DCO schemes that I've seen for the highways? Actually, there are, they are very comprehensive.

1:12:10

Thank you for that. I mean, I, I will leave with a parting shot to say that if you've gone to all this work, I think given the size of the structures that are a little bit more work, I think would have been of great assistance thinks only to the policies and the examining authority. It's not something we've asked for every single crossing or every single bridge, but I think these three and maybe one or two others, but these three in particular, will be sizable structures in the landscape. And I have to say, I feel some more, a greater level of information, and particularly even the detailed designs would have been very helpful, but I accept your position. And I will move on then. In fact, some of the points that Australia made does lead us I think it's an agenda item 2.2. Now I would like to ask Mr. Owen, is there to be an approvals process for the three viaducts in question is are they will will they be specifically approved? And where is this set out?

1:13:17

But Robin for the applicant? So before I answer that, can I just also deal with a matter that I emitted to deal with shortly when I was speaking, which is that? I think Mrs. Nicholson suggested that we had the photo montages for these three structures, these three bikes, but I have chosen not to produce them. I think it's clear that we don't have the photo montages. We, you asked for them. And we, for the reasons we've said, produce visualizations. So we don't we're not holding anything back here. I'm keen to make that very clear, indeed. Thank you. So the position relation to design approvals, is that the draft voting consent order includes at article 54, a very clear requirement that detailed design has to comply, both with the project design principles, which are before the examination, and have already been resubmitted with some changes, as it has to also comply with the works plans and the engineering section drawings.mr. And

1:14:17

can I just before you move on, can I just add that's one of my questions, actually. And as you just touched on it 54 One A of article 54 just calls it the design principles. And I just wanted to be clear that that was referring to the project design principles document because then the wording is inconsistent and I just wanted to check that design principles means the project design principles.

1:14:47

So I don't think there is an inconsistency there because Article Two of the draft DCO defines design principles as follows the set of design principles means the Project Design Principles Document listed and sheduled 10 and certified by the Secretary State under Article 49 as the design principles for the purposes of this order, so the reference in article 54 to the design principles is a clear reference to that document. Thank you. So there is no intended requirements for any external approval of detailed designs as long as they are compatible with the project design principles, the works plans, and the engineering section drawings. This is this is entirely consistent with a large number of of developed consent orders for highway schemes that have been approved in recent years by the Secretary of State. So this approach is in no way novel, and I'm very keen to point that out so that there is no intention for there to be a separate design approval process for these viaducts.

1:15:59

Yes, that's that's, that's how I read it as well. And indeed,

1:16:06

indeed, I should say that this applies to the detailed design as a whole, all structures. And, yeah, that overall approach is consistent, as I say, with lots of recent decisions, including the most recent one issued by the Department for Transport just a few months ago.

1:16:25

So you accept that there is no specific requirement for the applicant to seek the approval of these three via ducks. They are so long as they are and I have to use the words compatible with the project design principles. That's that I've got that right and untie? Yes, sir. Thank you. And indeed, the only the only way in which the Secretary of State can get involved is in set out in 54, two of the third draft DCO. And that is where the applicant would wish to depart from anything within the project design principles document the works plans, or I won't go through the whole thing. But the engineering drawings are set out in see that I've got that right as well. Is that right?

1:17:24

Yes, sir, it may be helpful just to explain that, whilst the base position is, as I've said that a national highways is obliged to design the detail of the scheme. So it is compatible with the design principles, and there's other documents, there is the facility. If national highways wishes to progress with a detailed design that differs in any way from the project design principles or those plans, then under paragraph two of article 54, the DCO national highways would be would be able to apply for approval of the detailed design to the Secretary of State and that process that article 54. Two lays down includes a requirement for consultation with the relevant planning authority and provision of evidence to demonstrate the the effect that the detailed design for which approval is being sought is not it's not a

worse outcome than the detailed design put before the rather than the outline design put before the examination. So it's not normally not abundantly worse than test.

1:18:32

understood that but But what I'm two final questions really on this the project design principles. It works on the scheme as a whole, and works and assumes if you like that the landscape is the same. And what I would what I would ask you this, though, is weak here, we have three crossings that will have a considerable impact on not necessarily an unacceptable impact. I'm not suggesting that that's a that's something that the XA will need to consider in due course. But it will have a considerable effect on the landscape. And visual impacts of this area, there are three very sizeable structures. Now given their importance, and given that their their effect, should not the Secretary of State approve the final designs of these three structures, and some people will talk to you a little bit about few others, but just just concentrating on these three for the moment. Given their importance, should the Secretary of State not approve the designs of these three structures.

1:19:47

Robin for the Africans. So we don't think that is necessary or warranted in this case. And for the reasons I've I've said in terms of the whole architecture that we put together, centered around centered around the project design principles. But in addition, and it may be helpful briefly for Carrie Wally from Arup, to comment on this in a moment the environmental management plan. Also recognizing what you've said that the project design principles can't be overly specific. The Environmental Management Plan does recognize the characteristics of certainly some of those crossings and contain some more precise commitments. I don't know whether whether this is whether you can comment on that, because I think we'll we'll assume

1:20:42

it's Molly. Yeah, certainly. Yeah. Carrie Wally, THE ENVIRONMENT LEAD on behalf of the applicant. I think the first point I would make is just going back to the project design principles, I would I would counter the view that they are generic across the project. And the project design principles document is set up in a number of sections. There are a series of design principles that do apply to the entire project. But then there are scheme specific principles. And indeed, in some cases, structure or location specific principles were those have been deemed necessary because of the surrounding environment and the sensitivity of the environment. So in particular, in relation to a number of these structures, there are principles, specifically relating to, to the the appearance of these structures, where the environmental management plan builds on that is where there are potentially other aspects of these viaducts that are incredibly important from a design perspective. And in particular, that's in relation to the effect of those structures on watercourses. So, there are a number of specific commitments. I'd reference DBD oh four in particular, that relate to the piers, again, which run D BD oh four, which is one of the registered register of environmental actions and commitments references within table three, two of the environmental management plan. And that relates specifically to the design of the pier. So. So there are there are specifics for the structures themselves, but there are also specific product design principles in that document to each skin.

1:22:11

Thank you for that. leading on from that, then and just my final question on this matter. If the examining authority, Australian, or, and or the secretary of state were to disagree with the outcome, and we're to conclude that the design of the three buybacks in this case should be approved, so they can be checked against your EMP and product design principle document? And indeed, to look at the design itself. How would the draft and this is I accept this may be non prejudicial from your point of view, but how should the draft DCO be amended? I should article 54 be amended in such a way? Or would you support an insertion of a requirement? I'm just getting to the point, Mr. Owen, that if the XA were to find itself in a position disagreeing with your position, and wanting to recommend to the secretary state that he approve the final designs of these, how would we go about amending the DCO? accordingly.

1:23:17

Thank you. So Robin, for the applicant? Very happy to comment on that. Because I'm sure it would assist. I think the first thing it doesn't matter at all, as we discussed the issue specific hearing to it doesn't matter whether it's a requirement or any other provision of the of the DCO. It has the same effect. I think in the situation, you're contemplating the possibility arising, the easiest way to provide for central state approval of the detailed design of these Biodex would be to amend article 54. That would neatly do it in in a few in a few lines. If that was to be your recommendation. And if the Department for Transport were to accept that, as I say, we really don't think that's necessarily for all the reasons you've heard. But if you were to want to recommend a different position, that's what I would suggest you would do.

1:24:09

Would you be able to provide a post hearing notes of the wording that you would suggest that article 54 could be amended in the event and I stress that the XA word might find itself disagreeing with the applicants position. And I want to stress that very clearly. And, indeed, if the Secretary State should the XA disagree with the Secretary State agrees with the examining authorities position. In that circumstance, of course, the examining authority would report to the secretary state that the applicant disagreed with that and the need for it. But to give the Secretary State the options available, would you be able to provide perhaps a post hearing notes I'm not suggesting you update necessarily the DCO but provide the wording that you would consider suitable

1:25:01

Robbie over the applicant? Yes. So we can certainly include that in our post hearing. Note the wording that you would include in that situation. We're perfectly happy to do that on the sort of the basis that we are agreed. We wouldn't put it in the revised draft of the DCA itself, which, incidentally, is the next draft is due at deadline five, because it's not what we will be promoting, but we can certainly provide the wording. Yes.

1:25:25

Thank that's, that's very helpful. Thank you. And of course, if the XA finds itself in a position that it did want to to insert such wording or similar wording, we would let that not be known when the exci issues it's draft Decio for your comments. Thank you, Mr. Stan pray,

1:25:42

just very briefly turning to bridges now rather than viaduct there are a number of bridges over the proposal, some are in more sensitive locations than others. And I think you may have covered this to some degree, but the ones I can think of using photo montages is the broom accommodation bridge must be fairly close proximity to broom, Castle, Countess pillar and quite sensitive landscape is on photo more montage 3.1 Walk up village overbridge young photo montage 6.8. So are those examples of where the project design principles are more rigid? So we say are the landscape sensitivity?

1:26:32

Probably the applicant. So it may be that Carrie Wally or or Paul Carey can comment on that. Or equally might be we need to take those away and just comment in the post hearing note, because then there may be specific provisions in the project design principles that relate to their structures. And indeed, there may be something in the environmental management plan I'm fed, I don't know, without checking. I think the indication given to me is that we will have a look at this. And if we can comment in the post hearing note on that on that issue with you, sir. Okay, thank

1:27:05

you. I mean, I'm just quoting to then because they have photo montages. But I mean, if I was mentioned another one, I'd say Collier Lane overbridge was that Collier Lane Collier Lane overbridge. And scheme nine, that's quite a significant structure it looks like so there are, you know, it's maybe a review of the strip, what project design principles cover which structures might be very useful?

1:27:30

We can certainly do that. So thank you. And equally, I suggest that might by extension, help you if we could also extend that to the EMP. If we could also say which structures are covered by specific project design principles and or specific provisions in the environmental management plan.

1:27:59

Does any party wants to come back on item 2.2? No, no hands off online or in the room. In which case I think we're almost bang on half past 11 So it's probably a suitable time for us to adjourn. Just to remind people on the livestream and I have remembered please, you will need to refresh your browser's when we go into the break. It's just shy of Half past 11. So should we take 15 minutes and let's resume this hearing at quarter to 12 Please quarter to 12