

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH1\_SESSION3\_M5JUNCTI ON10\_05062024

Wed, Jun 05, 2024 4:06PM • 47:02

00:06

Two o'clock and we're ready to resume. Can I just check that the teams and live stream are up and running again, please? Thank you very much. Okay, so I think we're moving on now into the Agenda Item number four, which is alternatives.

00:30

Thank you, Mr. Monk, I

00:35

suppose in the first instance, if I could turn to the applicant, and ask if you could please provide a summary of your approach with respect to the alternatives assessed in chapter three of the yes and how that aligns specifically with the requirements of both the national policy statement and also the environmental statement regulations. Please, thank you.

00:58

Sir Andrew, tip the applicant I'm going to turn if I may to Mr. Cartwright, the environmental lead.

01:07

Thank you, Colleen Cartwright for the applicant. So, yes, the consideration of alternatives that set out within within Chapter Three of the IES document and that sets out the process by which options were considered for the

01:28

for the development of scheme and the development of the scheme design options were considered for the

01:37

location of the

01:40

junction of the link roads and options for the A 4019

01:51

Okay, is it possible to share that figure

02:01

Chapter Three figure.

02:15

No, sorry the one of the if the options bigger 1.3

02:24

ever sign it and cute

02:28

can it can i Is it possible to make that full screen

02:36

thank you.

02:39

So, this is an extract of a figure from appendix 1.3 ap 077 of the s submissions. And this identifies the

02:52

options considered for the

02:57

at the motorway junction and the scheme as a whole. So we've got the

03:05

existing junction 10 instead of the coalescence of the red and blue lines in almost the middle of the of the screen, and then three other locations for a motorway junction we considered option

03:24

one which is the red one at the top, option five, the green and option three the blue to the south.

03:33

The point to make on this is that all of the options have a link road connector going down to the west childhood development in the south. So there is a link road within all of these options. That link road is within the Green Belt. And option three blue motorway junction is within the Greenbelt.

03:59

And the top end of the red junction is also within the Greenbelt. So there's an area of Greenbelt to the north of the safeguarded land and north of the a 4019.

04:11

There was a sifting exercise undertaken on those

04:16

junction locations that looked at various environmental factors including landscape

04:24

and also flood risk impacts on noise impacts on Air Quality Management Areas impacts on historic landfill.

04:34

As a first result of that, the option three the blue junction was sifted out of the process due to

04:41

to greater impact on flood risk. And subsequently, the two northern junctions were sifted out on the basis of cost primarily and the additional infrastructure required with the additional link roads down to the A 4019

05:05

With regards to the link road,

05:08

and if Doug if you could share the link road corridor figure

05:20

hopefully going to come through

05:24

so with regards to the

05:27

options for the link road, so four route corridors were considered for the link road. This is a figure that's within Chapter Three of the ES two shows the four route corridors numbered one to four from left to right. It also shows the area of

05:45

a flood risk within within that area

05:51

just to provide some some context so the existing with your bridge lane is the green corridor option two.

05:58

And then

06:01

the purple circled area to the right is the moat house sheduled monument at Parkington.

06:11

The sifting on those options removed option for in the first sift as a consequence of its proximity to note house and also the fact that it would require the longest connection from the motorway junction at junction 10 which was the identified option for

06:32

all movements, motorway junction, down to the west chart and development.

06:40

Of the three remaining options options one and two were identified as having a bigger impact on flood risks, you can see they go through more of the existing floodplain. They also had a bigger impact on

06:54

existing listed buildings at Milhouse farm and Butler's caught on with the pitch lane

07:00

and

07:02

record or three the yellow option was the option taken forward.

07:07

For the other scheme that we have, we have currently

07:13

with regard to be a 4019

07:20

as a consequence of impacts on land on existing property, and on the plan development areas, no alternative route corridors were considered for the A 4019 It was the consideration of the options appraisal was really around well, it was around the redevelopment of the existing alignment of the a 401 night

07:46

there was then further options appraisal undertaken on the A 4019 in terms of how that will be done, and how that would interact with existing properties throughout Kingston in particular.

08:00

So

08:02

in summary, on that point, an options appraisal was undertaken, presenting the main alternatives considered and the reasons for the selections made. And that process took account of the environmental effects of the different options.

08:17

That's my summary on environmental option on environmental assessment of the options and the alternatives, as set out in that chapter three.

08:35

In the national policy statement

08:40

was the

08:42

assessment of alternatives that you've just talked us through, as presented in chapter three, consistent with that which was submitted for her funding and resulted in the inclusion of the scheme within the risk to

08:59

button.

09:01

Sorry, can you just repeat the question? Yes. What was the assessment of alternatives that you've helpfully talked us through?

09:07

And as presented in the environmental statement, consistent with the assessment of alternatives that was submitted and supportive to have funding and inclusion of the scheme within risk to

09:21

I'll have to check in terms of what was presented in the funding submission.

09:39

There would have been some further development of that auctioneering host to have funding

09:45

around

09:48

the development of the A 4019 alignment

09:52

and then confirmation of the best Route corridor for the link road. Okay.

09:58

Thank you, I think it'd be helpful for us to

10:00

To understand

10:03

what were the differences were between the alternative submitted for her funding and what's before us now. And if I could also just signpost, what section 4.26 in the National Policy Statement

10:18

stipulates with with regards to assessment of alternatives. And again, if I could invite a response from you, once you have delved into that for us against the requirements of that paragraph, please.

10:40

Thank you.

10:46

And before we leave that point,

10:51

is there anything that you wish to add really with regards to the compliance of the alternative assessments that you've just talked us through, and compliance with the assessment of alternatives as required by the US regulations?

11:07

So we set out an options appraisal, and consider the options and the environmental effects of each of those options.

11:18

And then picking up the previous point, there's also been a consideration of flood risk and sequential test, which I think we're coming on to as a follow on item. And then there's also been a consideration of

11:32

HRA habitat regulation, assessment requirements and Water Framework Directive WSD. Requirements with both of those assessments have been undertaken on that

11:43

final option. And those assessments included that

11:49

the scheme design as the final option was compliant with the requirements of those two sets of regulations and that no alternatives were required.

12:01

Understood, thank you.

12:06

Can I please just take you to table 3.2 in chapter three.

12:15

Because my reading into what that actually does, as it takes seven different environmental receptors or factors, floodplain directness of Route properties, hedgerows and trees, buried archaeology, listed buildings and noise and air quality impacts. And then obviously, it applies a scoring system to the four different corridors that you've talked or three with regards to the west Cheltenham link road.

12:43

To following on from that.

12:50

Please, could I ask you to

12:53

let me know if those seven environmental factors are consistent with

13:02

with factors that would have been considered for other comparable risk two schemes?

13:09

So if I was to look at other DCO, risk two schemes, would I find a synergy between now seven environmental factors? Or would I find that then then varying on a

13:21

scheme by scheme basis?

13:26

We can look at that. I don't have that information to hand.

13:36

So I can't give an answer to that. But we will we will look into that.

13:41

Thank you. I was thinking I might have an answer. But I thought better of it. Yes. Thank you.

13:47

I suppose there's there's a there's a follow on question as part of of that information gathering place, which is

13:54

is it the case that the application of other differing factors rather than the seven that you've set out, could point to a different preferred solution?

14:05

So the first part of that question is, are those environmental topics consistent with similar round schemes? The second part of that question is, if it was differing factors, as you may find in other DCO schemes, could that point to a different outcome in terms of your assessment of alternatives?

14:29

So Colin Cartwright for the applicant.

14:33

So those seven factors in there were selected on the basis that they were the factors considered to be relevant for those floods for those root corridors within that area, if and the components of the of the environment within that area.

14:57

Understood, but presumably, that's it

15:00

as almost a, an engineering judgement has been made with regards to those seven factors.

15:08

A judgement has been made to select those seven factors. Yes, yes. So for example, if you included contaminated land, historic landfill sites, the information that we have is there's no landfill sites within those areas. So you will get the same score for though all four corridors against that factor. Yeah. So why include that factor within that process?

15:33

Yeah. And that's what's led to, though, do the identification of that and the selection of those seven characters of those seven items? Yes. And I think in answer to your earlier question, if you had different factors to consider, would you get a different answer? The answer would be yes.

16:02

So Greenbelt, for example, if Greenbelt was to come into play as as a, as a live consideration, would that have influenced the outcome to that alternative assessment?

16:16

It would have

16:19

it would have been a factor in that assessment. Yes, it could have been put into that assessment. But it's been considered within the landscape component.

16:33



But landscape isn't a component per se, in that alternative assessment, is it? That's not what table three two tells us?

16:47

Lipids, the hedgerows and trees in with the lat as a landscape component of that. Yes. By,

16:54

for example, impacts on Greenbelt that isn't something which is in capsulated in your alternatives, assessment.

17:02

Thank you.

17:18

Question,

17:21

just just confirm, we've got an action point there, which I think is now 15.

17:28

Environmental effects, and I just put in brackets, seven factors, consistency of assessment of alternative rather, risk to schemes. So hopefully, that's a reasonable explanation of what we've just now discussed.

17:47

Would you find it helpful to jump onto the fourth point about

17:53

whether that should have been affected that appreciate that you've just touched upon that in a sense? Would you find it helpful to hear Mr. Cartwright on whether that does make a difference or not? Yes, on this particular case, I'll be great. Thank you.

18:08

Scott, right. Could you pick up the sword where the Green Belt factor in in terms of the different alternatives considered how that plays in? Yeah, I can do that. Thank you. So Colin Cartwright for the applicant.

18:23

So as described earlier, around the considerations of the options and the options appraisal is then subsequently undertaken.

18:33

All of the options

18:36

require an interaction with the Green Belt

18:40

in order to deliver the scheme and therefore meet the requirements of the JCS. There has to be some

18:48

infrastructure constructed within the Green Belt.

18:52

It's not feasible.

18:55

Taking all factors into consideration, it's not feasible to do it without

19:02

construction in the Greenbelt.

19:05

Understood, but

19:08

should I draw any conclusions about the level of that impact? For example, out of the four different routes, would it be reasonable for decision maker to consider the level of harm or the impact on the Greenbelt is different for each of those four different route options we had

19:29

other factors

19:31

that were different between those root corridors

19:35

and were deemed to be significant

19:39

to impact on the sifting of those corridors, in particular impacts on boathouse on the shared with the sheduled monument of Mount house, and then the consequences of the length of the route

19:52

that wasn't followed through completely. But if we are selecting the Route corridor for the most

20:00

tastily route, we will be routing all of the traffic through crackington down that short Route corridor for then all the way down the b 4634, which would have almost certainly required additional infrastructure on both of those two roads, both of which are within the Green Belt. Yes, Hart. Yeah. But I think I think what you've almost demonstrated is that is the point that I'm kind of making in that if you were to applied those parameters, and those those receptors in a slightly different way, you may actually get a different outcome to the alternative success, and I don't think you can

20:39

list a person. So just to just to come in on that. I just think if we, as a hypothetical example, if we take the hedgerows and trees, row

20:51

of table 3.2 and replace that with Greenbelt

20:57

corridor four, which is the most easterly corridor, which Mr. Cartwright just alluded to, would still be ranked number one, that particular factor,

21:08

potentially with some variance between corridors one and two, tend to their ranking on that factor. But I still don't think you'd have a different outcome when considering all factors together. Yeah. Well, clearly, Greenbelt, as we've just been talking around, it is more than hedgerow and trees, it's again spins back into the openness of and the impact on the wider Greenbelt areas. But in terms of replacing one, contender to replace one factor with another concerning in the whole of the seven, yes, the cumulative outcome would still be the same.

21:46

We will come back and address the point as to whether it would make any difference. My understanding the position, corridor four doesn't perform the objective, because that's the one in the Far East.

21:58

And it's not sufficiently direct, and would have adverse impacts on the sheduled monument. Therefore, those that were left within the Greenbelt, one, two, and three, three that was selected actually has the least land take in the Green Belt.

22:15

One and two have more land take. But that's not the full picture. And we will come back to see whether it could make a difference if one, one went through that sieve, unless Mr. Cartwright wants to go through that now. Thank you.

22:34

I mean, I think that I think you understand the point we're making Greenbelt is obviously very important policy consideration, and yet, it hasn't been included in your matrices have an influencing factor? And that's what we're trying to understand. Why

22:50

can understand your explanation that each different scheme will have a slightly different context, which might lead to different factors for different schemes. But in this particular scheme, we've obviously got a Greenbelt element, but it doesn't appear to have been in your matrices for inclusion. So it's understanding why that might be the case. Yes. And whether that's appropriate, and whether it might make a difference. And we will address that indirectly. Thank you.

23:27

I think you've already touched on it, Mr. Cartwright, but it's it's the second sub point there, which is flood risk and the application of the sequential and assumption tests.

23:41

Are there any relevant considerations adopted within the alternatives assessment with regards to flood risk, and the application of the sequential and accept exception tests that you wish us to be aware of?

23:54

It'd be Mr. Mike Bourne, who's the FRA apology lead?

24:00

Let's get on thank Mike Vaughn for the applicants.

24:04

As you noted, the contract test is described in the MPs under paragraph 426. And that refers back to the MPP F which in turn, guide you to the flooding, flood risk and kissel change guidance.

24:21

Demonstration of that site selection process took place and Collins already described the process of looking at the amount of floodplain that was traversed by the different options. As part of that we considered the length of highway or the length of scheme in flood risk areas. So that's in the published environment agencies flood zones, both flood zones three and two.

24:47

And that gave us an indication of how much the schemes would impact on flood storage, ie the displacement of flood water rising from the scheme. We also did a numerical

25:00

count of the number of watercourse crossings that would take place for each option. And that gave us an indication of a likely impact on flood conveyance, and thus how much say additional bridges or culverts, we may need for each one of those options.

25:19

I note recently that the scheme is referred to now in the local plan in the recently adopted local plan. But that whilst it's named in there, it's not a policy as such. And furthermore, scheme was not tested through a strategic flood risk assessment in the local plan.

25:40

just clarify which local plan is that sorry, the Tewkesbury borough local plan 2011 to 2031. So that was adopted in June 2002.

25:53

So the flood risk assessment itself, as presented in as Oh 23. And part two, which is the maps is AP p 107.

26:06

Specifically, section 4.3. Then the first document concludes that the scheme does cross flood zones two and three, with the option three route and in fact, all those four link road routes would cross both flood zones two and three.

26:26

There are no reasonably alternative lower risk sites where the link road could go, they would all cross the same floodplain.

26:35

We consider the vulnerability of the scheme to be essential infrastructure as defined in the NPPF and annex three. So essential infrastructure is classed as essential transport infrastructure, including mass evacuation routes, which has to cross the area at risk.

26:54

And by cross reference to table two in paragraph 79, of the NPP G, the scheme vulnerability is compatible with the envisage flood risk.

27:08

That brings us to the exception test because that compatibility check flags that we need to look at the exception test.

27:19

So paragraph 5107 of the MPs and national networks notes the exception test is only appropriate to use where the sequential test alone cannot deliver a lower except an acceptable lower risk cite.

27:38

The scheme as it is satisfies both parts of the exception test in accordance with paragraph 31 to 37 of the NPPF in that it will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk. And that's by virtue of it encouraging growth in jobs and housing, or providing the improved transport network connections in western Northwest champion. And this is described by scheme objective one

which is in paragraph two to one of the environmental statement chapter two, which is document HPP, whose sixth one.

28:12

And secondly, the second part of the exception test is its demonstration through the flood risk assessment and the hydraulic modelling that supports it, that it manages flood risks satisfactorily over the lifetime of the development. So that's accounting for future climate change, with no material increase in flood risk elsewhere.

28:35

Thank you

28:38

Please gotta turn to the joint counsels at this point and ask if there's any, any,

28:45

any representations you'd like to make about what you've heard and the applicants approach with regards to flood risk in their findings with regards to the sequential and exception tests?

29:01

Don't want to join councils to speak to Mr. Brian confirms it's a reasonable interpretation. So no comments in that regard. Thank you. Thank you.

29:15

In your response, you made reference to the your conclusions This is regarded as essential infrastructure. I think you'll have seen the relevant representation from the Environment Agency that perhaps questions that so I just wonder

29:34

how you've come to that conclusion and and

29:38

whether you can understand why the environment HCR are questioning it.

29:44

Clearly, we'll see your response to their relevant representation in due course, but I just be interested to hear your your thoughts on that now.

29:54

I believe the EAS representation is is more a point that it's

30:00

Not for us or for them to decide if it's classified as essential infrastructure or not.

30:06

And they are, I think, pointing that towards yourself to make that decision. Be there's sort of flip point of that is if it was not classified as essential infrastructure, what would it be classified as none of the other classifications relay to this type of development. So we have

30:29

classifications on highly vulnerable, more vulnerable, less vulnerable, and these points to housing developments, retail, commercial hospitals, fire stations, and so on, not to transport infrastructure and such. So what we have is the essential transport infrastructure, which has to cross the areas at risk, and that's as set out in the NPPF. Or in the guide. That's the definition.

30:57

Sorry, in your written summary of today, then are you going to be able to point out within the IES where you set out

31:07

your interpretation of this being essential infrastructure?

31:12

Yes, that's should already be find within the flood risk assessment.

31:18

It Yeah, be really helpful if you can point out which paragraphs where we'll be able to find it.

31:28

I haven't got that to handle Yes, we can come back to you on that. Thank you. Could I just add to that, please? I think it would also be helpful in our consideration of essential infrastructure and its implications on that sequential test. If you were able to signpost down a similar road schemes, which have been considered in the same way and deemed to be essential infrastructure, please. Absolutely. Thank you.

32:03

Moving on to the next point, I think we've been jumping around a bit and I suspect that we've

32:09

all we have already talked about

32:12

the options appraisal through risk too. And I know that you've committed to Lucky for us, so thank you.

32:23

If I can just add that, as you noted,

32:27

refers to refers to the scheme M five and link road

32:35

and the processes, the governance processes, which have been adopted. PCF essentially,

32:45

with DFT being on the delivery board replicate, what would be the position if it was a

32:53

promoted other than through this process?

32:57

Thank you.

32:59

We'll set that up in response.

33:07

And, and we've also dumped around the agenda and covered sub point four, which was the Green Belt discussion that we've had with regards to alternatives.

33:19

There's only one more question for me, I think before we open up to other parties and see if there's anything anyone else who wishes to

33:27

wishes to identify with regards to alternatives. And it's with regards to

33:34

oh six two vs. Chapter Three.

33:38

In the version that we were submitted with didn't seem to have fingers 3.2 and fingers 3.3 included within it,

33:48

which purports to show the various options considered as part of the assessments of alternatives. So, please, could I ask that you double check that and if you can go with our findings, provide them or alternatively signpost where they are in the submitted application. Thank you. So Colin Cartwright for the applicant. They are in Appendix 1.3.

34:16

Then have the examination library.



34:27

App 077

34:30

Hup zero says already seven.

34:34

Yeah, abs 077

34:38

scheme figures

35:02

You have quite right. Apologies. I see those. Thank you.

35:07

So just for clarification, so Colin kartra from the applicant, where we have the large set of scheme wide figures, they weren't included within the chapter documents they've been put into a separate appendix in order to provide better clarity

35:24

of the figure. Because they're not that's why they're not embedded within that chapter. So apologies. I think that's one of the confusion. I would rather if they were in those chapters, but we weren't getting very clear figures readability figures when you printed them or blew them up. So therefore, we put them into a separate appendix constructed them as PDFs Understood, thank you.

36:08

Can I just invite any other parties to make any points or comments with regards to alternatives?

36:17

Joe Wooldridge from PJ just got three of comments on the alternatives elements.

36:25

Those all stem from a single point which is that the applicant submits the scheme which at the moment it can't afford to pay for within its funding envelope. So my point would be that whether any alternative should have been considered which would be deliverable than the funding, it's got available, those could have been a scheme which would be sufficient to deliver the site's allocated in the JCS but not the additional unallocated land, which doesn't have any planning status at the moment, or whether there would be a scheme that can be delivered to deliver

37:01

development infrastructure. So I vote infrastructure, but removing the elements that development could be expected to deliver. So there's some elements of the scheme which are related more specifically to development, some of those could have funded those elements themselves. So you could better

separate the half funding elements from what's happening, my clients or other developers could deliver. And the third, the third item is the access to the safeguarded land.

37:37

We'll have to put this in in interested representation. But the the consultation scheme from 2021, when the scheme was originally put forward consultation included an access road up to the boundary of our clients land into blog home sites, but then it later submitted versions that was that was removed.

38:02

That has quite a significant effect in the ability of my clients to develop its land, whilst providing a commercial Lance opportunity for the county council whose land the road goes through.

38:16

That, in turn has an effect on the affordability of the scheme. Because if contributions are needed, from the safeguarded land developer to deliver the scheme, the availability of unfettered access into their land is something that's going to determine your ability to pay that so that those were the three comments video on what alternatives we think sort of should have been considered.

38:42

Thank you.

38:44

And kind of give the applicant opportunity to respond.

38:49

And certain PSM Can I think, just to state very clearly, it's the applicants position that the entirety of the scheme is required to support the facilitation of the allocated sites.

39:02

We will be responding to

39:06

all interested parties on in terms of other representations submitted, including those of the developers.

39:13

There is a juxtaposition between the points being made about

39:19

producing the scale, the scheme

39:23

and also providing additional access opportunities and I'm not quite sure at the moment how that plays out in my head. But we will be coming back on all those questions in writing a deadline one.

39:36

Thank you Mr. Pace.

39:40

I think that concludes

39:43

Agenda Item five, which leaves us moving on just to

39:49

sorry for getting ahead of myself, which moves us on to Agenda Item five, which is reviewing of issues and actions arising

39:58

so apps

40:00

First thing to check.

40:04

I think my actual blog is still catching up Edwin.

40:08

But if I, if I go through from the start, I think there are 16 that we've got listed. So hopefully, by the end of this, we'll have agreed that but

40:18

the first one for the applicant and update policy tracker, including reference to inf seven.

40:26

I think the second one is for national highways, which was

40:32

confirmation of an assessment relative to the national policy statement.

40:39

We have a slightly different recollection at the top end of the table as to how far that was extending. So can you clarify for me what you believe you committed to and will? Because I'd got noted it was in respect of the new national policy statement for 2024.

40:59

And my colleague thought it was going further than that.

41:04

Thank you. So my understanding is we committed to providing commentary where there are additional requirements under the 2024 FPS, where we consider they ought to be addressed by the applicant in terms of this scheme.

41:23

Just bear with us a moment

41:31

that's fine. Thank you. Next poem, point number three signposting document for scheme objectives, and how it aligns to the national policy statement for national networks from the applicant.

41:46

Action Point number four climate response to be included as part of the local impact report so that's obviously from the joint Council's

41:55

action point five. Again, the applicant provide examples of road schemes not considered

42:03

inappropriate ever considered not inappropriate development in the Greenbelt?

42:10

I just have to adjust my get the knot in the right place.

42:20

Number six applicants confirm what part of the scheme is not engineering operations.

42:27

Number seven applicant confirm the respective areas of land for the three main elements of the proposal

42:40

number eight, again, the applicant confirmation of the quantum of of highway land, particularly relative to the

42:50

strategic road network, I think but

42:55

number nine, for Boren persimmon, regarding the Greenbelt policy position.

43:03

Number 10. Again, from the applicant note on proposals and openness of the Greenbelt, including overall impacts.

43:14

And number 11, again, from the applicant. And this was the HIF submission document, which I rolled into also to be providing and signposting document for capacity and the national policy statement

43:28

or not providing unconstrained traffic growth. So

43:33

honestly, don't mind whether that comes as two separate elements, but as long as both points are covered.

43:40

Number 12. It was the capacity issues and how that's

43:48

been assessed.

43:53

And I think that was actually for national highways.

44:02

Number 12, sir, a yes.

44:06

You said I think you believe you said you would return in writing with regard to your understanding of Yeah, Yeah, certainly. And if it would help, sir, as well. We're also seeing at the moment where the national highways put in a response in respect of

44:23

the application on the west Cheltenham site as well. Okay, thank you.

44:31

So I think 13 Again, the applicant Capacity Assessment per site, including the safeguarded land, dead weight development, and the assumptions made in the mechanics supporting the appraisal.

44:44

14 alternatives for her funding and consistency or differences between the two and alignment with the national policy statement, and particular section 4.26.

44:59

Number 50

45:00

stain, the consideration of environmental factors next to the seven the seven factors that

45:08

you applied in looking at

45:15

assessing your your different alternatives, and whether there's consistency of assessment for other his two schemes. And obviously, there's reference there to the Greenbelt element as well. And then I think the final one is the flood risk assessment, where infrastructure, essential infrastructure has been identified

45:37

and within other road schemes, and how and where you've set that out in the

45:45

ES.

45:59

Did we get everything

46:05

that

46:13

that tallies with us? Yes.

46:16

Thank you.

46:22

So I'll just clarify then.

46:26

If there's any other matters anyone would wish to raise? Following on from today's discussions and the information that we've all heard.

46:40

Okay, so on that basis, I would just like to thank everyone for their contributions. We look forward to receiving your submissions are deadline one, and I can formally close the meeting and it's now quarter to three. So thank you very much, everybody.