

AUDIO_A66_ISH3_SESSION2_020323

Thu, Mar 02, 2023 3:14PM • 1:20:25

00:15

Thank you, everybody, it's now quarter to 12 going to resume this hearing, or move straight on to item 2.3. On the agenda, Mr. Roscoe,

00:27

item 2.3. On the agenda, then the agenda item is, the ESA wishes to understand the basis of the offline landscape integration with the purpose of protecting views. Now, the agenda item specifically refers to the extent of the physical proposals, and further details that have already been provided on the mitigation plans. And really the question centers on the areas of plots 060 114, and 060 316. So what I've basically got in front of me here is an extract of those in terms of the mitigation maps. And Mr. Owen, if the applicant could just advise in more detail, the the works that are proposed on those areas, the extent of those works, and the purpose of those works, referring to the notes that are actually attached to on the environmental mitigation maps. Mr. Rowan,

01:25

robins, the applicant? Thank you. So we will, we will do that. And can I suggest that my colleague, Carrie Wally, takes you through those two plots. But before doing so, very briefly, the assistance of the hearing just introduces the concept of environmental mitigation maps, so that what she says can be in context?

01:46

That's fine briefly.

01:49

Absolutely, yes. I think on that point, the only point I wanted to make was just as a reminder for the room that the violence mitigation maps are, are indicative. They're an illustration of how the project design principles and the environmental mitigation can be implemented in the in the area in saying that they're moving to these two specific plots. And the first one, which is oh, 601 14 is the area to the north of cafe 66. And this is the function of this is actually nature, Conservation and Biodiversity as opposed to landscape. So the intent of this area is twofold. Firstly, it is an area of replacement grassland habitat, and in particular acid grassland. So there's losses of acid grassland through the scheme in small parts. And this secondary purpose in terms of the note on the on the point is also that it's intended as a receptor translocation site and replacement habitat for reptiles. So

02:42

this is really just on that point, I'd taken the two notes, there are two notes relating to that area, there's the one one to the west and one to the east. And as you'll see from the agenda item, really, this concerns the notes to the west. Absolutely.

02:54

Yeah. So the note to the west is really a note, not regarding the primary purpose of the of the planting there, but a note to to reflect the fact that it's been done in cognisance of the landscape area. So this area is a huge drag on this area, it's a fairly open area opens up to up into the foothills of the hills in that area, we've got a structure which is in cutting. And so the design of the the physical poses is to take that that the landform back up into to fit in with the existing context. And I've already been identified the suitable for the habitat proposed, but he's been designed with the view that it also then doesn't it's not planted with large plants. It's not, it's not going to block those views up to the north, which are important views to the north.

03:40

This is why you mentioned the word then land form, does that mean that you're leading on to a change in land form within that area, it's not just the works that has to go ahead and in advance of species rich grassland planting that there's changes to the contours as well.

03:58

So not in that specific area. The area I'm referring to is shown actually in purple on the on the map, it's the cutting to the south. So the landform changes are restricted to that cutting. And the work that will be undertaken in that area that's not demarcated is purely planting works and is to build on what is already there and to encourage the mosaic of acid grassland and heathland building and what's already in that area.

04:20

Right, I can understand what you're saying. So far. The note to the west, as I've called it refers to the restriction of large, large swathes of planting, I wasn't sure what that meant.

04:30

So that's referring to large swathes of tall planting that will blog for us. So it's restricting it, it's the same as it'll be a natural mosaic rather than lucky planting or anything that's particularly large and looking views,

04:40

but that wouldn't happen on species rich grassland replacement anyway, now, okay. Okay, thank you onto the next plot now then please say then

04:48

the next box. Oh, 603 16 is is the small triangle of land along Morehouse lane. Is that correct?

04:57

Just within this Yes, I mentioned it The Agenda Item actually says in the area areas plots. And really I suppose I was in terms of this agenda item, it was 15 and 16. Because the the tail of the note actually goes down into 010 615. And again, the note that I'm specifically referring to is views as a specific landscape character maintained, absolutely, I couldn't really see how works were needed in that area to maintain those views

05:27

now. So again, for clarification there that note is not that those words are intended to maintain those views that those words have been designed in order that those views are maintained. So the works on that particular triangle are actually it's actually been included in the order limits, because there is a utility, that goes to Morehouse. And so the area of land is, is to allow for flexibility of how that utility will need to be diverted. So the only actual works planned in that area, in terms of planting is reinstatement. Following that work, so that it will actually only be a corridor that will be impacted during the works and that corridor will be will be reinstated to grassland.

06:07

Does that mean that in terms of the identification of this area, then in terms of the like, for like balance, if like, if I know that like for like replacement has been called before that in terms of any calculation that have might gone in might have gone into that replacement? Has all of this triangle of plots 615 And 16 been taken into account or just a corridor?

06:31

Like am I have to bring my colleague in on that? If that's okay, so is it possible to come to the table? And you're able to answer that question I can produce.

06:50

I'm Mr. Assignments, I'm the National ecology lead for Ami. On this project. I was the ecology design manager and the ecology design manager.

07:00

Thank you. So you've heard this specific question. It's really just to do with this plot. And just to do with this impact, if you like in terms of either the triangles or the corridor, on the overall balance in terms of like for like replacement in terms of this plot.

07:12

So this plot isn't needed for any biodiversity mitigation. So the size of the area of grassland wouldn't be determined by any calculations of biodiversity.

07:25

So does that does that mean then that there's no, there's no need for this to be colored yellow on the mitigation plan? Because that's not actually going to happen? Thank you.

07:37

Sorry. To be to be clear, I mean, the coloring, it shows us a landscape function rather than a biodiversity function.

07:42

So it's a yes, but it's the species rich grassland on and then it's a species rich grassland. Yeah. Yeah. And it has a landscape function in terms of EFB.

07:53

Absolutely, yeah. So so the coloration is that overlay of the of the coloration of the of the type of habitat versus the function code that I think is important in the interpretation of these plans? And we'll get onto that in the next gen. Absolutely. Yeah, absolutely. So for this particular case, not all of the land is required, the only the land that is required for the utility diversion will be taken. And only then the only planting that will happen is in that corridor. It's given the landscape function code, because he's being returned to the current landscape. There's no change on there. So it's a landscape function rather than a biodiversity function. So in terms of area calculations, it's simply it's simply been covered in grassland, because it will be returned to grassland.

08:31

Right? And so it won't ever look like it's shown on the mitigation plans, because there won't be that amount of species rich grassland there. And it won't have the landscape and impact because it's simply a return from payments. And, yeah, should it have had the EFB against it? Because it's not mitigation. It's just replacement.

08:51

And the lemons, the EFB refers to landscape integration. So I mean, that's more of a landscape question, really. But it just shows that it will be integrated back in to the landscape. That's the right function code.

09:04

So any, any any replacement that takes into account landscaping, which almost all profiles have to do to a certain extent, would be EFB.

09:15

Yes, I mean, might it may help to explain what the function codes, the ultimate purpose of the function codes are?

09:20

I tell you what, let's actually finish this agenda item first. And then we'll come on to the function code fine. So I believe now that I've got an understanding of your intentions, if you like on both of these plots. And the difference between the intentions on both of these plots in terms of one being utility by diversion and the other being a replacement. I didn't have any other questions on that particular part of that agenda item. Just looking around quickly to see if there were other any other points that anybody wish to raise on that particular agenda item. Can't see any hands raised. Thank you. So on now to it's a lady to agenda item that really deals with this difference between FB and FD. Now, I think I'd probably

prefer to continue to put that on hold, because I've got an impression now of what you're intending on these two plots. I'll leave it at that for now, because I'll return to the subject of the difference between the two things when we actually talk about the mitigation areas a little bit later on. So Simon, thank you for your contribution so far, but and Mrs. Barley as well, but I'll leave that particular point until a later bit later on the agenda. We've now completed Genda, item 2.3. There aren't any other points that people wish to raise on that. And so therefore, Mr. Allen, we can move on to agenda item 2.4. Thank you.

10:49

Thank you very much. So as I indicated in my opening this is to do with Kirby Thor. And if I could, I'm going to start with some additional information that I think will be helpful. And then I'll ask her be thorough if they've got, they think that would be. So the parties will know that the examining authority visited Kirby thought and viewed the effects of the proposed development from a number of vantage points in the area, we were also able to better understand the concerns raised by the parish council in their written representations. The assignment considered the matter further and having looked at the engineering cross section drawings for this part of the scheme, oh 405. We think that the current section drawings do not adequately reflect reflect the views pointed out to us by the parish council. And we would like to ask the applicant to produce three additional cross sections, which show the levels of the road along along with any funding that would, which would assist both ourselves and the parish Council's understanding of the effect of the proposed development. per section drawing we would like is from the corner of Danville view at the high point. And where the road turns going in a northeasterly direction to the other side of the highway works. We would like another cross section of the priests Lane junction with Dunnville view going roughly westerly, along priests lane and a third cross section drawing of the private access from the existing a 66 to slice and how line in the northwesterly direction would the applicant be able to provide those into the examination?

12:59

Robbie over the applicant? I imagine we certainly can serve quite when I will need to have a discussion with the team and maybe confirm after lunch German to that will be acceptable.

13:14

That would be yes, thank you. Can I do that?

13:29

Sir, can I just also add a writers that are you able to say a little bit more about quite what you have in mind in referring to a cross section, what sort of cross section take that you want to it's an engineering type cross sectional.

13:44

I think what we've got now our engineering cross sections, but I mean, for those on the site visit, you'll be where we're at the high point at Denfeld view. So it's looking more or less than that line across downed unfill view and across one direction is a north. It was northeast, north easterly. And it's a cross section of it's not necessarily a cross section of the road on Fairview. It's the work, you know, once you get beyond the village, the works if you like, but that cross section on that view line. So give an

understanding of what you can actually see from that viewpoint of the works in a similar way at the junction of Dunfield view and priest laying in the west direction along priest lane. Showing it cutting through the works in effect.

14:32

Thank you. So thank you can I just defer to Mr. Carey just to ask him whether that is entirely clear or whether there are any additional questions purely to enable you to consider outside the hearing how long this will take

14:47

or poor carrier for the applicant. Obviously we submitted engineering cross sections I believe you're asking for more perhaps an annotated cross section that picks up the features along the lines, the visible lines that you're talking about the road existing roads for example, in foreground, looking at the scheme elevations, yeah, annotations and potentially

15:03

the school. But yeah, I mean, both would be useful, I suppose I suppose the easier thing for you to do is do the engineering cross sections of the work. So if that can be done

15:17

because that point Yeah, the point that's relatively simple engineering costs, I think you're looking to to extend back light moisture. And yeah, and then project forward, picking up the line of the road in the extent of that set goes

15:28

to be able to see what you can see from landfill view, basically. Yes. But and that was a particular concern to the parish council. I think that would be very helpful. If that could be

15:37

again, sorry, to to add more, one more question said, but in terms of a line and level rather than any sort of visual representation. Yeah. Line and level? Yes. Yeah. Thank you.

15:49

And the parish council also raised in in concerns about the road being at grade along with certain sections. And we asked whether the applicant could provide any additional information on the mitigation planting of these areas. Obviously, we've got the maps, we understand that but is there it is, this is one of the schemes where there is a completely new road. And I think it would be helpful if the applicant could provide some more information on the on the planting mitigation, just building on a little bit more from the what the maps actually show, if that could also be achieved.

16:32

So thank you, again, after the lunch of German, I'll come back and just give you a timescale for those as well.

16:44

Thank you, just turning to the parish council representatives there, you'll have now heard we've we've having listened to you. And we've requested additional information that I think will be very helpful to us both on just understanding the effects and the bundling. And of what is proposed here is Is there anything else that you wish to add? Other than other than what I've just asked, which I think is primarily what you were saying on the site visit as well. Again, just give you a name so that Alana Baker could be Thor

17:20

parish council, could we possibly add an additional section that goes through the compact junction and then on to Sandersons Croft, sort of the showing Sandersons Croft, relative to where the road is rising up in the compact junction. And then across the main road. Thank you.

17:43

Just for clarification, Sandersons crossed is a small housing estate at the top of the village to the north. Yeah. Could we do that too?

17:55

So I'll confer with with with the team over lunch and report back but we'll certainly consider it as the context of for cross sections.

18:05

Okay. Thank you very much. Yes. Did you want to ask a question?

18:10

Oh, sorry. I say Jackie Jacobi. Thor parish council. We Well, I'm not too sure. were you referring to on point three private access to sleaze to house load? Or is that the track going over the new road? Is that what you're referring to?

18:30

Yes, there is a private track, which is in I think Mrs. Nicholson's ownership which runs from but on the road? I didn't know whether it was the one from the A 66 Go into the existing ASICs you see, not not from Main Street, honestly, isn't how that late. Okay, sorry. Thank you very much. Thank you. Okay, if there's no other questions on on 2.4, as I say, I think that would resolve that issue if we can move then on to 2.5.

19:00

And, again, this is in response to this has to do with scores go home park. And again, this is responding to our accompany site inspection on Tuesday, where we observed the alternative area for planting proposed by Dr. Leeming. We also observed the underpass that runs under the M six to the other side. We have obviously asked a question in lv 1.2, whether this Dr. Lehman's request could be carried out and we have a C had signed understanding of the response from the applicant to that to that. And I just wondered if the applicant wants you to update us of whether any discussions have moved on it was suggested that conversations would continue with Dr. Leeming. Mr. Walton of course suggested as

well, I think at the compulsory acquisition hearing yesterday that the land area as assumed by the applicant was incorrect. It was much larger than than it actually is. And I just wanted to give the applicant the chance to say whether discussions had moved on whether using the alternative site offered by Dr. Leeming would be a a better solution here. Right.

20:26

Robbie over the African. So I don't have any information about this right now at all. I don't know whether colleagues are able to comment we haven't. Obviously, we have no notice this. So again, maybe it's something that we can quickly just discuss over the lunch of Germans and I can come back at two o'clock, or whatever it might be. Just to indicate what the composition is, as I say, I'm not aware of any of any further progress over the last day or so.

20:54

Mr. Walden, or Dr. Lim, is there anything you'd like to add to this discussion?

21:01

Sir, I have provided to stone the plan this morning, showing the areas of land so there can be no doubt about the areas that we're dealing with and the sizes of them. So I hope they can consider those over lunch. I don't know whether you would be willing for me to admit to you copies of those plans by reference in order, it's easier to understand what is being said

21:26

they would have to be submitted at the deadline.

21:29

Post hearing notes?

21:32

If that's yes, of course, you can do that. What you can't do is unfortunately, we have to see what everybody else can see. So but if you're having private discussions with the applicant, of course, that's that's up to you. And perhaps I could encourage that discussion to take place over the lunch period with some progress to be made after lunch.

21:51

So we were delighted to have discussions with the applicant. We've asked for them many times.

21:57

Yes. And of course, that is the beauty of these hearings, these physical events is that we are all here and that discussions can take place. So I would hope that happens as well. And I look forward to perhaps a an update after after the lunch period. Focus. Thank you, Mr. Walton. Is there anything else you wish to say?

22:15

Not at this stage in relation to that item. So although my client may wish to speak on a later item,

22:21

okay, thank you. I'm now going to move on to what is 2.4 on the written agenda. But he's 2.6. And this is just really a an update really on the party's positions in respect to their written representations, and just try to ascertain what else they would like to see from the project design principles documents. I could start pleased with the Environment Agency, Mr. Carter, the EAA has made a number of points about the project design principles containing insufficient information. But as I read that, that that may now no longer be the case. Is that something that you could just confirm for me, please?

23:12

Part of the agency?

23:14

Yeah, we made a number of

23:16

comments regarding the PDP and some of the issues within that through the statement of common ground process. We are currently working through those queries. I think there are five, which are currently still to resolve, but I don't see why they can't be resolved. It's masters of wording. That's not a significant problem with anything within that. So I think on the whole, we see that that can be resolved.

23:43

Given that with with three months into the examination, is this something that you envisage being resolved relatively soon? Obviously, I'll come back to the applicant for a final answer on this. But

23:53

absolutely, yeah, these particular issues aren't. They're not going to take long to get through.

24:02

On hopefully deadline five then would be achievable, which is in two weeks time, I think that would be very helpful. Is there a representative from Natural England here? And are they able to confirm again, I don't think there is actually but they may have joined. Now, okay, thank you. If I can turn to the local authorities, particularly Cumbria, and Eden, and again, you've made a number of comments about the inadequacy of the project design principles document. Could you perhaps just pull out specifically what is of concern to you if indeed, you still have concerns, so that the applicant may be able to provide an answer to that and is there anything specific you want to raise

24:49

Michels bark on behalf of Cumbria county council in District Council? I'm going to pass to how will Robert from ws pizza answer that question

25:00

Good afternoon, sir how Roberts Associate Director of ws p on behalf of Cumbria county council and eat and District Council. I think similarly to colleagues at the Environment Agency that there is progress

being made with regard to the areas of disagreement. And I think it would probably be helpful at this point if I clarify the discussions that have been taking place between Cumbria county council and Eden District Council and the applicant with regard to reaching resolution on a number of points. If you do so briefly, yes, yes, this is in relation to the project design principles. But it's also in relation to a number of other topic areas that we will come on to later on in the day, so I can probably cover a lot of them now in a short period of time. In light of the responses that the applicant gave to the local impact report, the council's of Cumbria and Eden have suggested to the applicant that it would be helpful for all parties, if we were to submit to them a summary of the specific environmental issues that the council's are seeking resolution on this would be in the form of additional information. And it's noteworthy and encouraging actually, that some of this information actually included line and level drawings in the area of Kobe four, for example. This package of information is being prepared as expediently as possible, with the intention of moving towards a position of all matters being agreed, should the applicant be able to provide that information to us. The second form that would take is in the Suggested Wording to some of the existing information that is before the examination. Specifically with regard to the EMP, it's daughter annex documents, and also the project design principles. And I'd say the project design principles is probably one of the lesser concerns in that regard. The greater concerns probably relate to other areas in relation to specific environmental disciplines and assessments.

27:09

Just pressing really that as I have yesterday and today. We are also three months into the examination now. And time is going very quickly. Is this is this documents you're proposing to essentially summarize your concerns with wording? Is that something you'd be able to put in to Deadline five next, next deadline?

27:31

I would hope that it would be made available to the applicant in advance off that might share it with yourselves obviously a deadline five.

27:38

Okay. Thank you. That's all you wish to sound that that is what Okay, thank you very much. Same with North Yorkshire county council, Richmond should District Council again mentioned have a review of the principal project design principles document in your pads. Is this something you can just very briefly expand upon on what you're seeking at the project design principles document to do place, Mr. Reynolds?

28:13

I love animals and archer county council. Overall, the landscape architect was seeking more more detail. But I would like to ask our landscape architects on back in writing a deadline five if that's okay.

28:29

Yes. And again, I must press upon the time now, please. I think you know, we're looking to see or to have as much resolved before the close of the examination now. And so yes, if you could look to to get that in that deadline five, to give the applicant the opportunity to try and resolve those. Thank you very much indeed. And to Durham, I didn't pick up anything specifically from you on project design

principles, documents, but given that I've asked all the other authorities, I will give you the opportunity. Is there anything that you wish to say at this point?

29:08

I Teasdale. Durham County Council know if there's anything that comes to us after this, then we'll put it in writing the deadline five.

29:17

Thank you. Are there any other comments on the project design principles document? Nope. Okay. Mr. Owen, is there anything that you would like to respond to what you just heard?

29:31

So thank you, Robin, for the applicant national highways. Just just one point really, which is not related to what we've just heard, but relates to the agenda item. It was just to ask Mr. tympani to come in and comment about one outstanding issue that was covered in our response to one of your written questions submitted a deadline for so your question I v 1.1. So that's the landscaping visual series of questions, which was in relation to the design of the troutbeck Bridge and the Kringle back and more back Biodex. We said in our response that we had noted the request for a materials palette, and that we were considering how this could be incorporated into the detailed design to provide some more certainty as to the visual appearance of the structures in question. And that we will provide an update on this at ISO h three. And this does relate to the project design principles, which is why I'm bringing it up now. And we just asked Mr. tympani to comment in terms of what National Harbor his position on this request now is please

30:49

Thank you, Mr. Owen. Boundary temporary for the applicant. Essentially, within the project design principles, it sets out a variety of design parameters around the appearance of structures, aspects of materiality are discussed, or the in terms of the range of potential materiality of structures within the supporting technical note that went in with the visualizations that were discussed in agenda item 2.1. But what we would propose is that we can provide a responsible waiver post hearing submission in terms of the palette, proposed.

31:32

Thank you very much for that completes item two on the agenda. So I'm now going to move on to item three.

31:47

And again, some 3.1 on turning again, primarily to Cumbria county council need District Council here on 3.1. So this is this is, obviously in your local impact reports. And in subsequent report representations you have made, you've stated that you are concerned that there is an insufficient information in the examination, and you go on to cite habitats, or where they were their habitats and species where there are where you say that there is insufficient information. The applicant has responded to that, saying that they feel there is but and your response to that, as I read it was your initial position is unchanged. So if I could just try to understand a little bit better, what is it in respect of

habitats, and we can start with your impacts on water courses, which was your first bullet points from your local impact what I believe? What more do you want to see from the applicants or this application?

33:02

Our Roberts DSP, on behalf of Cumbria County Council and the District Council, I think it's fair to say that progress has been made on a number of issues, particularly in light of representations made by the Environment Agency in Natural England as well that the council's have taken. You have as well, I'd probably prefer to refer back to my responsive five minutes ago in regard to the previous agenda item there, number of matters are decreasing in number. And we will be shortly submitting to the applicant. What these specific matters are, I can go into a couple of them if you'd like if that would be helpful. Although I believe we can probably reach agreement in offline discussions.

33:50

I've even got to put them in writing. I'm happy to leave it leave it there. I know they just have to assist the examining authority. Is it will these when you talk about your outstanding concerns, are we going to be quite specific on what it is you precisely want to happen. Because I think up until now, where we've had sorts of comments about there is insufficient information isn't really helpful, because we need to know what it is you want to see. So I can put it to the applicant as to whether it's reasonable for that to be asked for. And by when

34:25

I first suggested this, that we would be happy to prepare this if the applicant was happy to receive it a two or three weeks ago in a meeting and the reason it's taken this length of time is because we are being particularly specific in order to aid the applicant and yourselves of course in ensuring that the information that is provided is what the council's are requesting to see.

34:48

Okay, thank you very much. And just comments for Mr. Carter, please. If I could just ask you to broadly confirm you. You're now broadly content we If the Riak commitments in the EMP, and could you also confirm please your view on the applicant's conclusion of note and likely significant effects on more house opera Teasdale SAIC, please.

35:21

Philip Carter from the event actually, yes, I can confirm that English to the React, proposed react actions. We are largely content. Again, throughout we are working through the outstanding comments. There are some proposed changes, I think that were that were suggested, and we should clarify more of those with them with the applicant. And in relation to the impacts on the sack in a pretty stout Yes, we are content.

35:49

Thank you. Mr. Rosas, anything specific? The you want to come back on on that before I move on to three to

35:59

write Romeo into the applicant? I don't believe so. No, thank you.

36:02

Just really to again, press upon the applicant, if I may, that that we are looking at issues being resolved now. And to just press upon your your client, the applicant to really try to get these now resolved.

36:18

So very fair comment, we do totally understand that. And we are working hard to, to do that. And a lot of resources being put in to have meetings with all the local authorities, the EAA and Natural England.

36:32

Thank you very much, just due to.

36:52

Okay, thank you very much for that. Let's move on to item 3.2, please, Mr. Roscoe

36:57

agenda item 3.2, then the agenda item is the applicant to work through two of the following examples to explain how the individual mitigation environmental mitigation area sizes and locations have been decided upon. Now, this actually builds on if you like, the written question which we had a response to the response, obviously, the way the question was phrased, applied to the whole project. So we understand the principles that had been used. It's the application of those principles in a specific location so that we can see, and we've already heard today about the triangular area that I was talking about before, and how that isn't actually how that is really driven by a utilities diversion. So really, these 11 examples that are given in the agenda item, cover a range of possibilities, if you like in a range of locations, and a range also of concerns raised by people with an interest in the land concerned. We've left it until now to decide on the two because we wanted to build on what we saw on the site visit and obviously the discussion that took place in the compulsory acquisition hearing yesterday. So the way the agenda item is written is that we're requesting a post hearing note to cover all of these 11 areas. And we'd wish to work through two of those specifically now. Now, in terms of working through those. I think we're we're happy to have them work through either way, if you like, but it needs it's it's really has to get to from if you'd like as of written questions said from need to provision. So why is that area shown where it is in terms of location, and that location can be dependent on impacts on other schemes, it's already been said that this transfer of light for like replacements between schemes, and also why the particular size, so the two that we actually wish to focus on in this hearing, and I'll just give the plot numbers. The first one then is 030404. And that's woodland scrub. And that results from our site visit to areas were in which the window art estate, for instance, have an interest. And the second area then is plot 080 116. And that relates to an area which has woodland on which the mitigation is wetland. And that's an area in which the martham estate have an interest. So if we could start to work through those and the reason for working through them is because as a panel, we may well have questions as you actually work through them. And the those questions would help you help us in terms of your response to the other areas as well. So, Mr. Owen, does that give her a reasonable summary of what we're actually looking for?

39:58

Robbie, I'm for the applicant. Yeah, So I believe it does. We have prepared to relation to each of these plots. Deal with three questions. In essence, as I touched on yesterday. First, the need for the mitigation plot. Secondly, how the location of the plot was decided. And thirdly, how the size of the plot was decided. And I would like to suggest that Sarah Simon's who you heard from a short while ago, takes you through for each of the two plots, each of those three questions, and maybe pausing at the end of each question to see if you have any questions of your own. In just responding to what you were saying earlier about sort of working it through, but but if you don't, then obviously, we can we can carry on?

40:54

Yes, I won't. I can't say that I won't try to come in and interrupt in the nicest way.

40:59

I'm sure sir. It might also, by way of assistance to the room before Miss Simon's deals with those two plots for her very, very briefly, just to remind everybody about the overall approach has been adopted to these mitigation plots, because I think, whilst I really appreciate you are very familiar with that, others in the room may not be as familiar. So literally for a minute or two, I think it might assist. That'd be okay.

41:29

I'm comforted by the very briefly that you've just said, Yes, just one point returning to the three areas, if you like that you're going to deal with one of them. It doesn't actually I don't think apply to the plots, possibly that the two plots that we've identified, so use me. But one of one of the issues that may arise on other plots is the agricultural value of land that has been taken. And also the replacement in certain areas of either open grassland in terms of agriculture, or areas that are identified at the moment, and where they're shown as replacement open grassland on the mitigation maps. So that might apply to some of the plots that not that not, but not the two that we're actually working through.

42:20

So in those respects, we can certainly ensure we cover them off in our submission that after the hearing. Thank you. So if I can hand over to Miss Simons and ask just to take the room through the overall approach very briefly, and then turn to each of the two plots that the panel has asked us to deal with today.

42:45

Yes, there are assignments for the applicant. And I will need the plans as well for the plots we do have plans provided which will help the room understand the mitigation. If I can take you briefly through the process of getting to the point of choosing a location and the size of the ecology surveys are undertaken to establish a baseline boasts that they're spaced and feel based. The overlay of the scheme would have helped ecologist assess impacts, and initially use professional judgment to come up with a preliminary mitigation design. A cultural heritage landscape, experts would have given a high level review to see if there were any areas of constraints where the two didn't go together. And that preliminary mitigation design went to statutory consultation, where we were able to give a little guide to landowner feedback as well. And after that, when we got the actual temporary working areas and the

engineering boundaries, we were then able to apply the latest guidance from Natural England, which is the biodiversity metric tool 2.1 to 2.0, which helped us to rationalize the mitigation areas and ensure we were providing the size that replaced the habitat in accordance with that tool. And then that's how we got to the sizes and the ratios of some high value. Woodland, for example would have would could have been up to one to nine. So that's the kind of difference that the tool brings compared to where we used to use phase one data and have an sort of one to one replacement on occasion in terms of

44:29

slums, and that that is the table that I can find in the BS that comes out with that ratio and then goes to a figure at the end. Yes, in terms of area.

44:42

In terms of location, and we would always try to mitigate as close to the site of last as possible. If that wasn't possible, we would try and mitigate within the facility of the loss that any displaced species would be able to recolonize mitigation planting and I'm and if that wasn't possible, then it would be within the scheme. And if that wasn't possible, it would be within the county at least. And in terms of not being possible, it's often culture, heritage and landscape constraints as well as engineering constraints, which will help us decide the location. On top of that, we would also be maximizing opportunities for enhancement, and trying to achieve as many purposes of the mitigation as possible. So if it's possible to combine protected species benefits with Habitat replacement, then we would do that. So that's hopefully a brief summary of how we've got to so if I move on to plot, oh, 30404 Would you be able to bring the planet present one

45:47

says my just as much to explain these plans. We prepared these for the aid of the room today, I wanted to highlight that there is no new information on any of these plans. We've taken the information from the environmental mitigation maps from some of the baseline survey information, and we've put overlay them on a rough topography purely so Sarah can describe that we will submit these plans with the post hearing notes. So those are in front of Formula One to the examination, but there is no new information on these plans that isn't already in front of the examination.

46:16

Right. Okay. So in terms of me, in terms of us looking at it in terms of the panel, and I'm actually using plans that I've got in front of me, the AP zero 41 plans in terms of the consideration that I'm giving to it, I would need these plans to be put in at deadline five. But I'll be following what you're saying on the plans that have already been submitted to the examination.

46:41

Absolutely. And in the description that we provide. Alongside these plans will we're going to refer to some landscape features. That's all that helps I will refer to these in the writing so you have that in writing alongside the new plans to consider after we've submitted those other post hearing then thank you

46:57

Sauron. Okay, thank you. So, scheme on this scheme in scheme three, we had 4.48 hectares of broadleaf and coniferous woodland last. These include is some high value wet woodlands lowland mixed deciduous woodlands. In particular,

47:20

is that all then within I'm sorry, I'm interrupting, but is that all them within scheme? Oh, three? Yes. Yeah, thank you.

47:26

Um, so one of the, the areas of woodland losses where the road here is passing through between two woodlands, so that's sort of unavoidable woodland loss, and as well as having the direct habitat loss, that will also affect the species that are living within the woodland. So on this scheme, we had red squirrels. In particular, we had bats foraging across the road at that point. Otters using the watercourse that runs through the woodland at that point and goes into the road, and associated species such as breeding birds and other mammals. Just to point out as well, on this scheme, we've got windfall forests to the south, which is a county wildlife site for red squirrels, which is relevant to where we eventually put the mitigation location.

48:12

Just in the areas that you gave that and maybe you're going to cover this later, but part of what 04 is actually existing woodland.

48:23

Yes. So with the tool that we calculated, we helped inform ratios that you can use woodland enhancement as well as woodland creation, to mitigate woodland loss. And so on this occasion, we've just outside of the the plot, actually, there's a patch of enhancement as well, that we can use both using the tool.

48:48

Right. And so that would mean that the proposal that's before us is to go into that woodland and enhance it in terms of the replacement that you're talking about.

49:00

Well, because it's we need need the woodlands to be functional for red squirrels. It's an existing conifer plantation. So we need conifers because Red Square was eat cones. So it would be enhancing in terms of structure and maybe adding some native broadleaf species to mix to add to the woodland mix. But it is enhancement rather than replacement. And then the other section going north to south is new planting. Okay, so the location was chosen. When we did the initial field surveys, the ecologists were opportunity mapping as well they were noting down areas where we could maximize opportunities for enhancements such as adding connections between wetlands or extending plots of woodlands, or other habitats and offering associated protected species. As benefits, and this was a clear gap in the in the woodland corridor that leads down to windfall forest county wildlife site, which was highlighted in early stage of the project, as you know, would be a good benefit. Other woodland plots were identified for the statutory consultation process in the area,

50:23

this assignment just in terms of your reference to the woodland corridor, then I'm broadly aware of what you're talking about in terms of the longer north south leg, if you like of this plot, not to the block at the end of the southeasterly easterly and of this particular plot.

50:43

And with the the area of the plot area where it started duck legs, ponds, yep, there's an opportunity as well at this site, because there's great crested newts in the ponds. There's also a connection to common lizard habitat in the west Wenbo forest to use the same area of mitigation or reptile receptor sites, put opportunities for enhancements in and that will link up although it's not exactly the same kind of habitat, its habitat that would link that other plot to the woodland as well. So it'd be a scrub mosaic. So it does connect in actually the three, three plot right,

51:25

because of the connection to the corridor that you were talking about. Yes. Right. And then so you've talked about great crested newts is that let me just call it like for like replacement of great crested habitat loss elsewhere on the scheme or is that?

51:40

Yeah, they're great crested newts is an opportunity to enhance at that point, that's not the driver for mitigation, it's an opportunity to enhance and adds to the reason for the location choice. Okay. The main location choice as well is where we go where we actually crossed the road. At that point, just north of the plot we're talking about. That's the key crossing point for several species, including otter this using the brook that runs through that area. And it's also by now crossing point it and will be where Red Squirrels cross the road where they can, and badger as well. So there's a crossing point there, which enables the whole of that corridor is of benefit then to be joined up further by that, by that woodland planting. The effect of the road widening is that that crossing point becomes more dangerous to the animals crossing the road, there's a higher chance of mortality in that population effects. Adding a crossing point for large mammals such as badgers not as is a fairly secure way of getting them into the road because they can be directed by fencing but red squirrel, you know that they're just going to go to the ground and want to go A to B across the road and avoid predators as quickly as possible. And unless they're going to look for a crossing point that we provide for them doesn't work like that. So there is a an impact on red squirrels at that location, which we need to mitigate for in terms of population, possible population effects.

53:15

Our methodology, just in terms of the location, then, and you talked about if you'd like a comparative exercise across scheme, three, to look at other sites. And it sounds from what you've been saying that this was this is obviously the favorite site because it's appeared within the order land. In terms of comparisons, then how did that comparator exercise take place? You talked about the different specialists being involved, and you did use words that I the mitigation design with constraint to take taken into account in terms of the various specialisms, but in terms of the ecological value, the differing ecological value of various areas, how was that done?

54:01

And the different woodland blocks that were identified at actually consultation phase, where we're mainly kind of they weren't they were connecting to the county wildlife site at winfields. Forest. When was the option was the other side of info forest. There was one that we actually had linear woodland going along the 66 and down to info forest, which took off quite a lot of the affected numerous agricultural fields, right. We also had a triangle of land towards the Eastern extent of the scheme. And they were mainly taken off the plans, because once we run the tool to understand how much woodland we needed, we didn't need all of them. Certainly it was more a choice between them. And we also had at that stage, a much wider block of of habitat connection at the site we've chosen. So one thing we had to reduce the amount of woodland on the scheme so it was more proportional to the loss and I'm also taking on board landowner feedback. Well, the lot of very high value agricultural land in that area, and some of the areas we chosen were particularly asked to be removed. And in terms of the linear idea of a linear woodland linking down to when for Boris, because that had that had two constraints. One was the agricultural land because it affected numerous fields, but also, with our landscape colleagues, the the preference in this area due to the open nature of farmland and the views is not to have linear woodlands along the road, it's to have blocks of wood. And

55:38

I understand that particular point that you're making, just like just another question. Was there a constraint in terms of the location of the future a 66, the a 66 proposal in terms of the crossing point, in other words, were you looking for replacement generally to the south of the proposed a 66, rather to the north, and in asking that I'm leading it to the status, if you like that you may or may not have given to the recently planted Adrian's word to the north, the a 66.

56:07

And we did focus on improvements to red squirrel habitat in particular to the south where it is connecting to the existing county wildlife site. With making the barrier across the road, sort of harder for red squirrel, if we put all the mitigation to the north, it may take longer for them to use that and disperse into it. So there was a preference to use this southern areas mitigation. There's also this connects up three woodland blocks. If we put a woodland block to the north of that crossing, there's no woodland block within a decent distance to, to connect to so you've got connections would be then sort of hedgerows and things like that which which are used, but aren't, you know, aren't going to be as valuable a corridor as what we've provided.

56:55

Right? Hey, was there anything else that you wish to say in respect of lat 04?

57:01

Um, I think there's also the other mitigation it provides is where we've got extended culvert over the brook at that location, the the watercourse actually runs down the side of that woodland. So it's also providing enhanced riparian habitat to a national important watercourse feature. So there's, there's there's multiple reasons why it was chosen.

57:29

Okay. At this point, then, if that's all that you wanted to say about this particular plot in the hearing, obviously, within the post hearing note, the opportunity is available for you to provide other things that you may not have actually covered. But also, it's given the panel the opportunity to ask questions, and hopefully, we'll be able to take a lead off that as the kind of information that we're actually looking to receive in the post hearing note. Right. So I believe that we've dealt with in terms of the applicant, this particular plot in terms of scheme. Oh three, just as we come to that point, was there anything anybody else wish to raise on what we've heard? Just looking around the room? Mr. Parsons?

58:14

Yes, yes, I think it's probably an appropriate point. For me as Tim Parsons representing Windows settled estate and the trustees there off. I'd prepared a statement but slightly altered. Now, in view of what I've just heard. I think the point I would like to make on behalf of the clients is that we've been raising the issue of the location of this mitigation for ever since consultation one, we've objected to it for a number of reasons. This is the first real detail we've had about how the thought process has gone about how it was selected, and the location and the areas. Without being brutally honest, the responses we've had today have been slightly woolly. It's, it'd be useful to see the post hearing note exactly and the detail in there. What I was going to do in my presentation was just to talk a bit about the shooting interest in that part of the estate and so on, we're not against conservation, we're not against the environment, we've planted Woods across the estate over the years, Adrian's wouldn't as an example of that. I just wanted in view of the site visit you did the other day just to explain the shooting impact and potential effect on road safety potentially, and all the shooting commercial interests. So and again, I'll introduce something in a post hearing note with a map and so on and so forth. But just to explain the shooting in this part, I think, Mr.

59:31

PARSONS that that that would be the better place to put your explanation of the shooting in place and what you've just spoken about would be best put in a post hearing note and then you get the opportunity without any without sort of, you know, having to think about it in the hearing or whatever or just read read through a statement. Yeah, we've we've got it in writing then. Okay, and we've got it in writing then at the same time, as we have the applicants justification if you like, you know, choice of these particular plots. So at that stage, then we've got the both things in front of us at the same time. But we've also got you then would have the opportunity to make comments on what you've actually seen come in a deadline five. Yeah. So but I've taken on board, the point that you the first point that you made about this being the the first time as you're saying that this level of detail has actually been provided to you.

1:00:27

Yes. And, and again, you've touched on Adrian's wouldn't be the only other point I would make and the rationale why, just because it was north of the age 66. Does it not provide the connectivity that's talked about? There are substantial areas of woods to the north there and leads to the river Eden? So again, I can cover that in the post hearing note,

1:00:44

I think that would be probably the best way of actually of actually dealing with that. And in terms of in terms of the panel, we've understood the area we can we have to take it in stages. Yeah, we've understood the area that you were talking about from the site visit on Tuesday, we've had the compulsory acquisition hearing yesterday. And we now get the practical detail. This actually covers that if you like, it's, it's it covers quite a lot in those three days. So I think the best place for yours would be in a post hearing. But if there is anything that you particularly want us to want to say in the hearing, then then please do so now.

1:01:17

No, I think I can make most of the points in the post hearing note and provide a plan and so on as well. To better explain. Yes, right. Okay. Thank you.

1:01:25

Thank you very much. Just if you just give me a moment, I'll just turn to the panel to see if there's anything that they would wish to raise.

1:01:40

This is Simon's then, Simon, if you could go to the second plot, then which was on scheme. 08. And it was plot 080 116?

1:01:53

That, sir? Before Misamis? Does Robin from the applicant. Just Just finishing off on that last point on what Mr. PARSONS has just said, If I can just briefly come back on. On that,

1:02:04

of course, yes.

1:02:07

The impression you might have been given is that there's been no discussion between the applicant and the widow other state on this issue. That there's been a lot of discussion for a long period of time on on this proposal. recollections may vary as to quite what was said. But all I do know is that there's been a lot of discussion so I wouldn't want that allegation of willingness to go completely unchallenged.

1:02:35

Australian, I took Mr. Passes point as being in relation to the level of detail and that's what I've actually actually noted. Yep. Thank you. silence

1:02:49

Thank you. So can we have the planet for plot Oh, eight to 116 Thank you. And so this is obviously a large area of woodland on, you make crossings to Rugby Park. The need for mitigation land on this scheme is linked to the loss of 2.58 hectares of woodland. In this scheme includes high and medium value woodland including wood pasture and parkland, lowland mixed deciduous woodland and other broadleaf woodland. So there's quite a lot of high value wetlands on the scheme. And using the guidance from Natural England that would require quite a high ratio of replacement habitat to as a

potential mitigation. As was mentioned earlier, on scheme seven, those bypassed there was an awful lot of culture heritage constraints in particular and landscape constraints on that scheme, which meant that a woodland loss of 4.5 hectares could not be fully mitigated within the scheme boundary. So that ratio of replacement planting is also now on scheme eight

1:04:06

Simas I've just lost your little bit there because you mentioned scheme seven I thought on the way through there Yes. And could you just run through that again for me please. Okay.

1:04:17

There's a woodland loss in scheme seven of 4.5 hectares, but there were so many constraints put my heritage This is the chance that we mentioned earlier. So this woodland planting on scheme eight is really accounting or partially accounting for a total loss of 6.73 hectares across both schemes. In terms of the location, there were also a lot of cultural heritage and landscape constraints on on this scheme. A lot at the woodland loss on ski meet actually occurs at cross lanes junction and at Rugby Park. And from an ecology point of view, it would have been preferable to have more woodland plan thing to the eastern end where the loss where path that loss occurs. But due to the Parkland setting, it wasn't suitable to put blocks of woodland planting around that area. So really, it was decided to create one large wooden block to the west of the scheme to cover both sides. They there's other advantages to having the woodland at this end of the scheme. One is really if you create a large woodland instead of doing lots of small patches, you're going to create a more resilient woodland to sort of survive weather, extreme weather events, climate change, that kind of thing. And also because there was this bat foraging areas and we had to try and get bats across the junction, we've got quite a lot of woodland planting on the junction, we've got that foraging areas being lost at the Rugby Park and in particular under long the scheme and as I said, not much opportunities to replant those woodland linear woodlands. So this provides back foraging habitat. And also, we've added enhancements for bat roosting within the woodlands. So we've got permission of that boxes, as well as the trees themselves, eventually providing roosting habitat. They also allowed us to extend around an existing valuable woodland that woodland in the center is lowland mixed deciduous woodlands. So we're also backing an existing priority habitat, which is another opportunity to enhance as the other species that is benefiting from this is otters really there's otter underpasses all through the junction to enable artists to move and that does give them additional resting habitat. Building other main reasons on the size was really dictated by the amount of replacement woodland, we needed to achieve essential mitigation.

1:06:57

Including the transfer. I thought that you were referring to a previous reference to scheme oh seven, which is why I lost my track there through. I remember the transfer point. You talked about the constraints in terms of other specialist disciplines, if you like on locational choices. And you mentioned the Parkland to the east of this particular plot of land. What were the cultural constraints in terms of this particular plot

1:07:32

that we've chosen? Yes. There were no cultural heritage constraints. And it was one of the few areas of the schemes where there was no landscape constraint to plant a big block of wood. And that was why it was chosen really

1:07:47

think that's that's another I mean, you'd obviously be going through the the record of this discussion and picking up the things that were particularly but particularly interested in, but it's those constraints that have led to these choices, as well as its pluses and the minuses that have gone into these particular choices. Right. I don't think I at the present time had anything further on this if you just give me a moment?

1:08:34

Right, Miss Simons, we didn't have anything in terms of the panel, but I see that Mr. Salvin has his hand raised. So Mr. Salvin? Is there anything that you would wish to say at this point?

1:08:44

Yes, sir. I would echo Mr. PARSONS comment that this is really the first time we have been led through the reasoning behind the thinking behind this mitigation proposal. I have a number of observations, which again, rather like Mr. PARSONS are probably best can contain within a post hearing note. But I would just question the overall principle of transferring the loss of woodland habitat in scheme. Seven

1:09:27

before you do that, Mr. Silva and Mr. Savin if I could just come in at this point. Because I think yes, I I agree with you that it would be very useful to us as a panel to have a note from you at deadline five on what you've heard. But it will be also useful for us at the moment to have if you like the, the headings almost if you like as you see them now because I mean, obviously that wouldn't be a constraint on you putting anything into the examination, but the headings of the issues that are in your mind at the moment

1:10:00

Okay, well on transfer. Obviously, Woodland at Bo's is a rarer beast than woodland at Rugby just because of the character of the landscape. So in terms of environmental gain or loss, shifting four and a half hectares from scheme seven to scheme age will actually lead to a considerable loss to my mind. In scheme seven, I have a plan of the woodland on the estate, which I can probably bring up if I was able to, and that shows how the blocks of timber on the Northam estate are spread fairly uniformly both landscaping, environmental and shooting purposes and expanding Princess Charlotte will actually cause harm rather than achieved gain. And I would wish to explore that in more detail to explain why but it's, it's you know, it's going to become a deer habitat immediately next to a dual carriageway, we already have a deer crossing problem with the 66. And this is going to exacerbate it.

1:11:31

Right. So why don't why don't I just want to keep keep tabs on it so that I can follow what you're saying. So the first issue that you've raised, if you like is the transfer from the Bose area. And you've talked

about the value of woodland. And the next item that you've raised is the uniformity of the blocks of woodland that you see at the moment in that locality. And their value is as you've just said, Yes.

1:11:54

The Woodlands fund them often mistake rather than the wind wealth estate are managed on a statewide basis. And there are some blocks that are managed for commercial timber production. There are other blocks that are managed for other priorities such as landscape or immunity for national highways to come along and say, Well, we're going to give you another nearly seven hectares of woodland is sort of running through our Pina woodland plan without really taking on board what our estate priorities are. And we're more than happy to engage to identify other more appropriate sites for for the woodland planting.

1:12:48

Right. So we need to have interaction with the plan in connection with the plan then, Mr. Salvin, that use that you spoke about Yes, it would be useful if that was if that was described in the note that you're going to that you're going to put into the examination I understand. So that would come over to us better in the note in exactly the same way. As I was saying to Mr. Mr. Parsons, that we then have the positions in front of us that we can do a comparative exercise, if you like, against them in terms of the report that we have to do.

1:13:15

Yes, but I again, I emphasize the greater importance of maintaining the woodland in Section seven up and Bo's made a note of that we've got any any amount of timber in comparison, you know, those and nice and shelter down at Rugby.

1:13:32

Yeah. Okay, so those are, those are the points. But were there any other issue points that you wanted to raise at this stage?

1:13:41

I don't think so. I think the post hearing note will will be the way forward as

1:13:48

you suggest. Yes, I think I think it is it is proving to be a useful exercise, in terms of all parties involved has been said so far. So thank you very much for your contribution. And we look forward to receiving the post hearing note and any plans that you may wish to put with that. And we obviously spoke about the plans relating to the estate that were mentioned at the site visit that we attended on Tuesday. Okay, was there anything else? Mr. Salvin? Okay, thank you very much.

1:14:24

Right, so that gets through the two plots that we wanted to identify. I've mentioned some subsidiary aspects that might come in on other plots. I should also say that if there are if you get to a stage working through these plots that we have chosen, if you think oh, there's another plot that explains a particular useful thing that we've used to get to these these choices, these pluses and minuses, then,

by all means, include that as well. Our intention is to take if you like a sampling exercise, which is bias towards the representations that we've received, but also has a broad sample over the particular sort of types. Hopefully, we've avoided any construction areas. Dr. Leeming, I've just been had my attention is just been drawn to your hands being raised that thank you. But can I can I just complete this particular bit, and then I'll come to you then. So in terms of the, the posterior note, yes, it can be expanded, if you feel that that would be useful to us. But we aren't looking to have a complete list if you like. It's a sampling exercise. That's a sampling exercise covering all the different types. I'll just give Dr. Levy the opportunity to speak and then I'll come back to you Mr. Owen for any winding up comments. And we should be just after one o'clock at that stage, Dr. Leeming

1:15:46

pretty much been a query the methodology associated with these mitigation procedures. Yesterday, it was about the how one assesses or increases by logic by a device biodiversity net gain. Today, in respect to the species choice, which all these areas we've been talking about, will be relevant. It would seem that the species choice is heavily dependent, heavily skewed by current ideologies. In other words, rodef good, conifers bad. The planting list in the applicant's environmental management plan, Annex B one dot 10 is wholly a broadleaf one and could have been drawn up by somebody in the Deep South. However, in the north, conifers are really important, as you can see anywhere in Cumbria, or Garam. Because wind speeds are higher and temperatures lower, conifers provide sheltered areas, and a food source in harsh winter environments for a wide variety of mammals, birds, insects, etc. And additionally tender plants. To give an example, the Penrice area has one of the largest red squirrel populations remaining in the country. They are particularly secure here because pine cones gives them winter food, and conifers are ideal trees in which to build that raise in which they shelter and raise their young. There is no acknowledgment of this in the planting requirements, in spite of the visitors to our premises of numerous small mammal experts. And I cannot find the mention of a single coniferous tree in the hole of the b1 annex. I find this deeply depressing.

1:18:07

Dr. layman, thank you, Mr. Owen or others if if we could have a relatively detailed response to that, obviously, you've only just heard those particular points. And so I would suspect that you may prefer to do that in a post hearing note, maybe appended to the the species, the plot note, which is coming out as well. But anything you wish to say in the meantime?

1:18:36

Robbie over the applicant? No, I don't think so. Sir. We've obviously heard that term by Dr. Leeming. And we will learn respond to it in our in our posts every note in one way or another. Thank you.

1:18:48

I don't Yes, I wasn't really saying one way or another. I was almost saying that I would like a specific response to the points made. It's not like and yeah, I wasn't

1:18:59

meaning to indicate otherwise. I was really saying that whether it's an appendix or whatever, we will give a specific response to it a discrete section of February. So it could be discrete section and may not

be an appendix. But leave that to us. But we will certainly what I was mean to say was that we will certainly respond to it in detail.

1:19:16

Right. Thank you very much. Just looking now then I believe that in terms of the panel gets us to the end of gender, age of 3.2. Just looking around to see if there's anything else that anybody would wish to say on agenda 3.2 Can't see any hands raised in the room and can't see any hands raised on the line. Mr. Allen?

1:19:37

Thank you. We will. It's just gone one o'clock now. So I propose we adjourn for lunch at this point. We do still have quite a lot to get through. I am proposing that we perhaps take a shorter than an hour lunch break if people are okay with that. I'm proposing maybe 40 minutes is that long enough if we were to resume at quarter to two Who would that be suitable for everyone to have lunch and yes, I think that's been well received. Okay then so five past one we'll adjourn for lunch and we'll be back here at 145 to two please