



Hearing Transcript

Project:	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Session 5
Date:	14 August 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

M5J10_ISH3_SESSION5_14082024

00:05

Good morning, everybody. Can I just check the live stream and the teams is up and running? Yeah, okay, thank you, and that everyone who's on teams attending virtually can see and hear us. Yeah, okay, I'll take Yeah. I'm reassured by the people at the back. Anyway, I don't think we've got anyone new here this morning, but I'm trying to avoid doing a whole duplication of the introductions. So if people are content with that, I'll just go straight into our agenda for this morning. I'd just like to reassure everyone there isn't a fire alarm intended. So if there is a siren, we all do need to actually get out, remind everyone to have their mobile phones switched off so that we don't have any undue interruptions, and obviously we can then progress with our agenda if that's Everyone's content with that. Okay, so we got to the end of the funding section yesterday, but, and I'm conscious that a number of people who were in attendance yesterday are not here this morning. So, but I just having reflected on a number of things that were said last night. I think I just need to put notice on the applicant. I think we are going to need to send up some follow follow up questions, particularly with regard to the potential consequences of inflation, and in light of your indication that you may delay commencement and what the consequential effects of inflation might be to the overall costing analysis and the ultimate funding for that, the alignment between the scheme design and what the NPS nn is seeking to do relative to the costing and the alignment for the individual applications, which seems to me to be coming from a slightly different position, so that we can try and Understand the interrelationship between what funding may legitimately come from planning applications relative to what your scheme design is. And so I'm hoping that's helpful in just giving you notice that those are elements with we I think we still need clarity on and I'm happy to hear if, if you have any concerns or issues that you would want to pose to us,

03:11

no so that's helpful to crystallize that. I think that indication was made yesterday, and it's helpful just to crystallize those points, and we'll respond to that. Thank you. Not now,

03:22

but that's obviously fine. Joint councilors have any thing that they would wish to put on national hires. I'll go to joint councils first.

03:35

So no, we don't have anything additional at the stage. Thank you. Thank you.

03:41

Likewise nothing from us. Thank you fine.

03:44

Thank you very much. Okay, so we'll move on. Then let me just get myself into the right pages. You

04:03

so environmental matters, which is Item six on the published agenda on design. Now, hopefully you've provided some quite detailed responses in the responses to written questions on on your design approach, but I would just like to understand a little bit more on what the design vision for the project was or is, and can you give us details of where that set out and how the design has been influenced by and then we've got a list of points. So if we can start off by the the initial question, then we can go through those sub points as supplementary elements. Thank you. Thank

04:52

you, sir. And that'll be the project environmentally. Colin Cartwright, who will deal with that.

04:59

Do. Thank you. Connie Carter, I for the applicant, yeah, so that was my intention to set out where the design vision was in the documentation, what that is, and then we'll go through each of those points in turn. So with regards to the design vision for the project, for the scheme that's described within section 2.5 of the project design report, that's reference rep 3047, and that project design vision is to is set out through the scheme objectives, which are listed in section 2.2, of ES, chapter two and other locations. Es chapter two is as oh one, oh so the design vision for the scheme aims to unlock the housing and employment opportunities within the West and North West China developments through the provision and future proofing of improved transport network connections to integrate the scheme into distinct and varying landscape characters present and manage the impacts on the flood zone locally, to provide enhancements for sustainable travel and for biodiversity, addressing the requirements for biodiversity net gain, and to produce a landscape design that contributes to the landscape character of the area and provides visual immunity and screening with the aim of embedding the junction 10, the widened day 4019, and the link road into the landscape.

06:27

I'm wondering if that actually sets out a vision, or whether that's just describing what you're doing.

06:38

Do you agree with with that?

06:43

Are they one on the same? I mean, the design, the design vision, sets out what the scheme is seeking to achieve with its design being taken through from the scheme objectives. So that's what we're looking to do.

07:02

Yeah, I I'm just trying to get a broader understanding of I um, how the vision plays out, environmentally, visually, what the influences were to

07:35

the scheme, design, what You were seeking to achieve in that respect. So it's a much sort of broader point. I was

07:47

going to ask Mr. Cartwright to go on to the to the design principles that have emerged from that in the PDR, and then indicate how those principles have been applied as the next

07:59

Thank you. Step.

08:02

Yeah. So in part of that, we've also got the various points that you're following on from that design vision question around in terms of how the design has been influenced by sustainability and carbon, landscape biodiversity requirements, flood management, etc. So they are the characteristics of the scheme area that have then fed into that design development. And then, as Andrew was saying, we have within that project design report that sets out the 10 design principles set out in national highways, is the road to good design. And there is further information there within that project design report on how the project design has addressed those principles, and conversely, how those principles have led the design. So the design has been developed as an iterative process. So there's there's a shape of the design, and then that has then developed to address the various factors that are relevant for the scheme.

09:18

And when you're saying relevant, you're talking about the sustainability to carbon, the meeting the objectives in facilitating the highway objective is that what you mean

09:30

Yes, and also Yeah, so things like the requirements of biodiversity, net gain, managing flood Risk, managing impacts on Historic Environment, on people, on landscape, on protected species. So so the various factors that are relevant to the scheme area and how the scheme will interact with that area and the design should be reflective of. Those and take those into account, and it has done that, and that's set out through how the design has evolved, and the design development alternatives that are being considered, adopted discarded to get us to where we have currently with the design,

10:20

and those details are set out in the project design report,

10:26

how the project is, how the project has addressed, the principles, the design principles in national highways, is road to good design. They are set out in the project design report.

10:38

And can you just remind me what the exam library references for that

10:43

The project design report is reference rep, 3047, okay, I

11:04

and in terms of the development of it, if you we can then go through then for the sustainability and carbon reduction side, I

11:23

I could do that. So Connie Carter for the applicant. So the so the need for consideration of sustainability and carbon reduction that's come through from the NPS, nn 2014, requiring national network projects to produce infrastructure that is sensitive to place and is sustainable and esthetically sensitive, durable, adaptable and resilient. So those requirements are then fit in, have had into or are aligned with the design vision aims of the scheme, with the aim of integrating the scheme into the landscape to provide enhancements for sustainable travel, for biodiversity and also to manage flood zone locally. So with regards to sustainability and carbon, sustainability has been a key consideration within the development of the design and the design decisions taken, there is a quite a strong provision for sustainable travel within the design. So the scheme will provide an active travel corridor along the a 4019 through the full length of the scheme. There's also the active travel corridor along the link road. Such infrastructure on the A 4019 is not present currently, and the scheme will also provide additional infrastructure for bus travel compared to what is present currently, with a new bus lane along an eastbound section of the a 4019, with regards to the influence of carbon reduction on the scheme design, which also has a component of sustainability. So the size of the layout of the scheme, see the amount of infrastructure there that has been sized so as to meet the scheme objectives, with regards to the provision of an improved transport network in west and north west Cheltenham. So the sizing has been determined through the traffic modeling undertaken the requirements for the materials and the embodied carbon within those materials has then been determined on this basis. The scheme design has therefore sought to minimize its embodied carbon footprint, and that at a more detailed level, the design for the individual structural elements of the scheme, for example, the river chelt Bridge and the withy bridge underpass that calculated the embodied carbon footprint of different design options considered, which is detailed within es chapter three, the alternatives chapter and that's enabled embodied carbon To be considered as part of the design development. So

14:03

and the details of how you've gone through that that's within es chapter three.

14:07

The ES chapter three sets out the different designs considered for those structures, yes,

14:16

in terms of the broader scheme, where, where will I find the references to inform how the the broader parts of the scheme have considered the sustainability and the the carbon elements.

14:37

So that's So ES, Chapter Three sets out the development of the scheme and the alternatives considered within that and then why particular aspects of the scheme design were taken forwards, and why particular aspects were the. Uh, not progressed?

15:04

Yes, I understand that. But what I'm trying to find is the referencing that I can go to in terms of where you've set out your sustainability justification conclusions and your carbon reduction conclusion. So are they still in chapter three? Are they in the climate chapter, for example? Or there's what can you point me to in particular parts of the submissions? So

15:33

there's information in the carbon chapter, the carbon chapter, sorry, in the climate chapter, with regards to embodied carbon calculations. There is also information in the sustainability statement, which we will be submitting into examination for deadline four, and that summarizes the sustainability assessments undertaken through the design to date.

16:02

So that'll be new information that we've not yet seen. Is, or is it bringing together various components that are across the ES, that's bringing together

16:15

information that that's yeah, across across other documents today, sus, that sustainability discussion.

16:23

Okay, so in pulling that together, can I ask that it makes clear cross references to the current es so that we can understand where each of the component parts are coming from? Yeah, we can do that.

16:42

The if I, if I can add in relation also to the project design report, there are specific principles, for example, six, that good road design is environmentally sustainable, and others, which are cross cutting, which deal with carbon, EMG, active travel, travel corridors. So we can weave that in as well, because those are the 10 design principles which go beyond principle six, environmental sustainability. There are others that also relate to this point as well. Thank you. Applause.

17:26

Before I ask you to carry on with the extra elements, can I just ask the joint Council's position in respect of the responses you gave during the consultation on the pre application and leading into the evolving design of the scheme and what your position is on that please.

17:54

Andy PADD for the joint councils, we are content with everything we've heard today and also the information has been provided throughout the examination, and we have nothing further to add

18:09

you so you have now, effectively, you have no concerns about how the design has evolved, that the design Correct, correct? That's not the right phraseology. A robust design approach has been taken to present the scheme to us so far. Yes,

18:27

we are content. Thank you. Applause.

18:46

Okay, so if we can then go on to the point B, I think in terms of changes that have occurred as a consequence of feedback in respect to the design input.

19:02

So referring back to the to the point I made about the development the design, and the design being an iterative process, so part of that process has been consultation with stakeholders on the design and then taking account of that feedback into the design development. So consultation has been undertaken at appropriate stages through the design. Those results are fed back that process, that consultation process through the design is set out within the consultation report, which is app 038 and it's appendices, app 0392058 and that consultation report that sets out the detail of the consultation undertaken through the development scheme. It covers the results of the consultation and it covers the key changes as. A response to the consultation and a summary of those key changes, a summary of the consultation undertaken in terms of what was undertaken and when, is set out within section 1.7 of ES chapter one, that's app 060, so as I said, the design process of the scheme has been iterative, and the developing understanding of the location the requirements of the scheme and the consultation feedback have all contributed through to the evolution of the scheme design. So there's quite a few examples of where we've had feedback that have led through to design changes. So three examples to present to you today. We have the selection of option two. So this is talking about the junction design, junction 10 design. So option two is the new gyratory centered around the existing a, 4019, over bridge. There were three options, options two, option two A and Option 2b that were considered for the design of junction 10. And these were presented as part of the non statutory consultation, and from the feedback received at that non statutory consultation, option two was the preferred option. Yeah, so option two, so that preferred option was also national highways. It's stated preferred option of those three options presented at non stack consultation, that was the option taken forward as the preferred route for the scheme. Another example of something that dropped out of the scheme design as a result of feedback received was the link road between cooks lane and moat lane. So this is not the West Cheltenham link road. This was a small road in King the existing cooks lane to the existing moat lane, which is just south of the a 4019 at arcington, that was removed from the design following feedback received from Historic England during the statutory consultation process because the design that was there required the widening and connection of these two rural single track roads, and that would have impacted on the rural character, which contributes to the significance of the moat house scheduled monument. That was feedback received from Historic England that link road was subsequently removed from the design. And then the final example is in relation to Whitley bridge lane. And feedback was requested during statutory consultation regarding possible changes to access for vehicles through wythybridge Lane. That feedback identified a preference to retain the current level of access through wythenbridge Lane, albeit with the junction with the a 4019 changing to left turn only onto the a 4019 and left turn in options considered were around closing the lane completely to motorized traffic or one way traffic, for example. But the feedback was to retain the current level of access.

23:38

You referred us in part of your response to section 1.7 of app 060 to changes or responses to now, just quickly looking at that, and that's obviously the summary of the consultation responses and how your scheme has responded to those consultation responses. Yes, yeah.

24:08

So to clarify section 1.7 of ES, chapter one summarizes the consultation process undertaken. It doesn't go into the detail on all of the changes. It just summarizes when the various consultation are undertaken.

24:29

So in terms of the changes and you've referenced to in the example, in terms the cook lane and Willie bridge lane, is there a separate document you can refer me to, that sets out that change process as a response to consultation or comments on design, concerns about design, whether it's effect on heritage or environment, landscape, whatever, so

24:57

that information presented within the. Consultation report, which summarizes the consultation undertaken and then the feedback received. So therefore the comments from those stakeholders with regards to particular aspects of the design, and then the details around what the design changes were that set out within the ES chapter three and alternatives, but that es, Chapter Three doesn't set out the detail of the basis for those changes. It is just documented the design development the basis of those changes is set out within the consultation report, because that contains all of the feedback received,

25:41

right? So that the various components aren't brought together in one place to say, these were the consultation responses, these were the changes that came about to respond to those. They're in separate documents.

25:57

I can confirm that. Yeah, my understanding is that the consultation report sets out the results of the consultation, the feedback received and the key changes as a result of that consultation.

26:15

Okay, but when you set out the consultation report, you made reference to app 038, and then a appendices, 8039, I think you said 2058, yes,

26:27

there's a number of appendices. So forgot consultation report,

26:33

19 appendices. It

26:35

sets out the whole consultation process. Yeah, yes. Is

26:38

it possible to have a one document with a summary of the the key changes that have resulted from the consultation that's demonstrating that iterative design process that you've gone through, so that it can be clear that the NPS test on design are appropriately addressed,

27:06

so a sort of signposting document that pulls all those bits yeah together, Yeah, that's possible. We can do that.

27:13

Thank you. Applause.

27:23

So we then go on, I think, to the local context and how that's influenced the design and how this is responded to the broader vision

27:42

that that's me again. So Connie cart for the applicant. So the context for that. MPs, nn 2014, requires national network projects to produce, to produce infrastructure that is sensitive to place. So ES, chapter nine, which is the landscape and visual impact assessment chapter reference, rep, 1016 that includes a review of the local landscape character, so that provides information to understand the local landscape context of the scheme area, and that's starting from paragraph nine point 7.8 of ES chapter nine. So that sets out that the local context was investigated and then understood so the landscape design of the scheme was developed subsequently with the understanding of that context, and that landscape design was developed using a number of landscape design principles. They are listed in paragraph nine, point 10.9, of ES, chapter nine. And the aim of these principles was to enable the scheme fit into the surrounding landscape and to align with the aims of the design vision, so namely, to integrate the scheme into the distinct and varying landscape characters present, and to manage impacts on the flood zone locally, and to produce a landscape design that contributes to the landscape character of the area and provides visual amenity and screening, with the aim of embedding the junction 10, the widened a 4019, and the link road into the landscape.

29:41

So in terms of the design principles that are relevant to the consideration of local context, they are the replacement of woodland and scrubble on the m5 and around the new junction to reinstate the screen effect and into. Great the junction design back into the landscape, to replace planting along the rear line sections of the a 4019 to help embed this route back into the landscape and to provide some buffer to the proposed site allocations north of the a 4019 as well as ensuring visual amenity for receptors and then the hedgerows along the link road to include supplementary, supplementary blocks of woodlands and individual trees, particularly around the river chelt bridge, to reflect the local character of the road infrastructure and to provide some screening for visual visual receptors, whilst creating an attractive route for all users.

30:59

So when you talk about all users. You're talking about users of the public rights of way, local highway network, as well as fixed points in terms of individual receptors at dwellings or other buildings in in the Eco area,

31:18

we're primarily talking about users of the road and the surrounding network, public rights of way, network that then crosses that crosses that road, but the visual amenity considerations would reflect the fixed receptors, so the houses so

31:51

when you're responding then to that the environmental barriers, for example, where which we've got in several locations, two locations, either side of the m5 and then along the A, 4019, in several positions. Is that what you're talking about in terms of responding to those individual residential properties, mainly

32:22

so when I'm referring to the residential properties, it's in relation to how the landscape design has sought to embed the road features back into the landscape, as per those landscape design principles. So

33:01

okay, thank you.

33:08

So if we go on then to point D, in terms of the controls in place to secure the quality of the design, you just talk us through how you see in practice the various component parts coming together through, I'm assuming, the embedded mitigation requirements react and so on. You just talk us through how you see that that will work in practice. Do

33:43

so we so calling card right for the applicant. So we provided some information on this topic in response to first written question, 7.0, point two, and to provide some further detail here. So if I, if I talk about the design and the basis of the design, and then the controls in place on the design from a sort of a wider context first, so the starting point for the design was to provide a quality of design which is in keeping With a local environment. It establishes biodiversity net gain. It meets climate change requirements, and it provides an improved transport network connections in west and north west Cheltenham with the resilience to meet future with the with the resilience to meet current and future needs. So the starting point was to produce a design of a level of quality to meet those meet those aspects. There are aspects in their biodiversity, net gain, for example, that is putting enhancements into the design above which i. Are needed to mitigate any impacts from the scheme. So the controls that are in place for the design are the process requirements that are in place for national projects, which the scheme has followed to date and will continue to follow through the development of the detailed design. So those control, those control process requirements the national projects are essentially through national highways, is Project

Control Framework, the PCF framework, and then also the detail set out in dmr, so the design manual for roads and bridges. So the project control framework, its purpose is to provide a clear, pragmatic approach to project management, covering the development of major road projects and then the what is required throughout each stage. And it defines the project control framework, defines the activities and projects for products for each stage, has reviews at the appropriate stages to ensure the scheme is on track and that the scheme, including the scheme design, takes account of all consideration and delivers against social, environmental and economic objectives. So then tying back in the project design report, which we talked about earlier, so that is part of the PCF process, and that project design report, as mentioned earlier, contains 10 design principles which are set for projects as prompts to those projects to challenge them to realize the wider benefits of good design and to help designers achieve national highways vision of designing an inclusive, resilient and sustainable road network.

36:56

So for this scheme, the PCF process has been completed to date, through to PCF stage three, and a suite of documents have been produced detailing the design and the environment and assessment. National Highways has provided technical reviews of these documents throughout the design process, with regards to the project design report, national highways signed off the completion of the requirements of that well national highway signed off the requirement, signed off the completion of the requirements, with its stage three assessment of the of the PCF in october 2023 and the project design report was part of that approval and further national highways confirmed in july 2023 that the project design report satisfied the PCF requirements with regards to this document. And then going forwards that review from national highways of the design and the Stage Gate process that will continue through Stage Gate Four, which is following Secretary of State decision. Stage Gate five, following acceptance of detailed design. So that's control of the design to date. What we're also proposing going forward, with regards to a control on the quality of the design which could be secured through the design process. Is the applicant is proposing to produce a design principles report, which will be submitted to examination at deadline four, and then the draft DCO requirement 11 would be updated to ensure that the detailed design is in accordance with this report. The purpose of that report, the design principles report, will be to bring together the design vision and the scheme objectives, and therefore design design, sorry, and therefore define the design principles that are to be incorporated, incorporated into the detailed design of the scheme. The Design Principles Document will capture the key principles that have shaped the preliminary design submitted and make a commitment that these will be maintained and developed in the future Detailed Design and Delivery phases of the scheme in accordance with the MPs requirements for kids design

39:24

Thank you. National highways in in responding through the various stages of the PCF process, presumably we're only responding in respect to the strategic road network. Is that correct?

39:41

So the design provided for the scheme has been a scheme design. We have not provided separate designs for the SRN or the local roads. It's a single design. National Highways has commented on the design as a whole. So.

40:00

Okay, in terms of the control mechanism that you've talked about following through the stages four and five of the PCF process, again, is that something that would be controlling the whole scheme, or is that again, just linked to the strategic road network? Because I'm trying to understand the interrelationship between the responsibilities of national highways and the local authorities, and how that again, works in practice,

40:44

I'd have to confirm that item.

40:48

Okay, can I ask national highways then, in terms of the responses you've given today, whilst you've been presented with a holistic scheme, do

41:07

the

41:10

do you think? Do you differentiate between the non strategic and the local road network, or have you just given a response in full on the whole project.

41:25

Thank you, sir. Sophie Stuart for national highways. My understanding is that, obviously the scheme as a whole was presented to national highways as part of the PCF process. But national highways hasn't considered, for example, any departures in relation to the Irn and throughout the PCF process, has focused on the SRN element. But obviously it's, it's not possible to say they've only focused on that because it has been presented as a an entire scheme. But I think that there's, there's a couple of points, and I don't know whether you're going to come to us in due course around this, but national highways would not say that they've reviewed the scheme from an Irn perspective. And the second point is that national highways position in respect of how they've reviewed the scheme as part of the PCs PCF process, is a set out in the statement of common ground that was submitted for deadline, three, which is rep 3038, which doesn't align with the responses that the applicants provided to your written questions, particularly 0701 to 703, which implies that national highways has undertaken a degree of technical review and assessment and endorsement of the design, where whereas national highways position is that the purpose of the Stage Gate assessments and the PCF is to review that joint governance arrangements have been followed, and that the pre established management process for projects is in place. So for example, documents produced in accordance with document standards and contain content that is to be expected without reviewing the detail of the content itself. And national highways. Position is that at no point has the scheme design been reviewed on a technical basis, whether SRN or Irn as part of the PCF process, and that's set out in row 9.1 of the statement of common ground. We'd also say at this stage, if it's helpful to you that the design, the project, design report that's been produced by the applicant makes no reference to going to design panel or Design Council, which, if it was a national highways project, following the PCF process is a requirement for projects where land is to be required, number one, but also where projects are, there's a list of criteria

as to when design panel input may be required. And there's no, no reference in there to say that either design panel input was not required, you know, like, almost like a scoping exercise and it was a negative, or that design panel has been consulted, and national highways understanding is that that that hasn't, hasn't taken place, and that would be one of the stages ordinarily through PCF, where national highways would technically review design. Thank you. So.

45:05

Okay, can I come to the joint councils then, just to understand whether you have any concerns on what you've heard with regard to the design elements for the local road network, or the broader context of the road sitting into the local environment.

45:32

Andy PADD for the joint councils, we have reviewed the design and make comments back to the applicant on that design.

45:45

Most of the comments that we provided were dealt with and discussed via a specialist meeting between the two parties, and a lot of the issues that were raised by the Joint councils can and will be resolved at detailed design stage, with regards to how it sits in the environment we are content with the scheme as it sits at present.

46:20

Are you able to give me an indication of the sort of issues that you're anticipating would be resolved at detailed design stage? If you can't now, then perhaps it's something you could include in your written note following today, so that again, we can understand that the mechanisms within the DCO are going to ensure that those elements are covered and secured.

46:53

Yes, and we will take that away and respond to deadline for

46:56

Thank you. Applause.

47:14

Um, just at the moment, I think we've got two things slightly running side by side national highways, comments on the technical design, which I'd like to put to one side for the moment, and then try and understand the broader design approach that you've taken, because that was what I'm trying to Get to the bottom of at the moment. So if, if we can leave that technical design element on the on the highway to one side, having heard what you've heard from national highways, is there anything you would want to say at this stage in response to the the broader issue? I

48:05

so common car try for the applicant. So it was just to add that there has been, has been was discussion with national highways around the documentation produced, including the Environmental Assessment

and the landscape design. And comments were received from national highways, on those on those documents through the design process,

48:34

and those comments were favorable,

48:38

yes, those comments were Yeah, positive comments, and those comments were then addressed and acted on as as needed.

48:52

Okay, and in turn, to a certain extent, a link through to the final point II on the agenda in terms of the design review process. National highways have made reference to, if it was a project that they were presenting as a DCO, because it's acquiring land, they would have gone through a design panel process, which I think they're right in saying hasn't happened in this case. Is there a particular reason why that hasn't happened, and is there a justification for not doing that?

49:30

Tommy can't write for the applicant. You're correct. National Highways are correct. There was not a design panel review for this project. I don't have the reasons for that.

49:48

I can look to see if, if there were reasoning for that, would have been some time ago in the design process.

49:56

It'd be helpful to understand the thinking behind it. If. That was considered as part of a conscious decision not to do it, understand why you would choose to, because obviously there is, if not explicit, implicit expectation there would be an independent, independent review process of a project of this scale, which I don't think has happened. So be interested to hear your responses to that concern.

50:37

So we'll give you chapter and verse on that. But my understanding is that the PCF process was and following that, and using national highways as a critical friend for the project was regarded as a as an appropriate route here, and that was provided that degree of independence and critical judgment. But we'll give you chapter and verse on that.

51:08

May I ask national highways in your responses to the applicant through the PCF process, and in light of what you've said this morning about the approach national highways would have taken. Did you at any point in time indicate that you would expect a design panel consideration?

51:34

So I don't believe we did. We can double check and confirm, but the reference to the design design panel is in the guidance note to the PCF process. Sorry, sorry if I can pass to Rebecca Marshall, hi, yeah,

51:59

so in reference to the project design report, there's a page which details what's expected as part of that document. And one of the strategy and policy documents is design review at national highways, a guide November 2022, and that sets out what projects would be expected to go to design panel, reasons why, and the process of the design panel throughout the PCF process,

52:23

okay, in your written response today, can you give us clear indications as to where we can find that or we can provide a coffee? Yeah, okay, and so that's sort of front of center of that advice document saying to parties presenting cases that design review is expected. How strongly worded is it?

53:00

It's a 10 page document which sets out the design review at national highways. The reasons why we would do the design how design review can benefit the process throughout pcf. How does a design review work? How do they work? The fact it's proportionate, independent, independent, multi disciplinary, what schemes would typically go to design panel, and then the process that you would go through and the types of review that are carried out. It may include things such as site visits, the kinds of information they would request, how it works, such as a presentation, and any conclusions they may draw on advice and follow up that they may provide.

53:46

Okay, thank you. I think we just need to understand, as you've set out, the approach that's taken and the reasoning.

53:57

So we'll do that.

54:01

Thank you. There's clearly a

54:03

difference between NH and its own schemes and having someone independent and an external party asking for national highways to perform that role, but we'll explain that.

54:17

But I'm not sure that national highways have reviewed it in the way that you might expect a design panel to review it. They've been looking at it through the PCF process, which I don't think is necessarily directly aligned with what you might expect as a design review process, which I would think is looking at much broader things, rather than what the PCF might do. So we will leave it there, I think, to understand. Thank you. I suppose my follow up is in light of the stage that the scheme is at now,

whether there would be any benefit. It in undertaking a design review at this stage, or building that into some form of a requirement. I'm slightly tentative, because Design Review tends to have the greatest benefit when it's introduced very early on. But

55:30

I'll leave it there for something to consider. So perhaps you could reflect on that, because we need to be confident in saying to the secretary of state that the NPS tests on design are

55:50

are met, and I think part of that is the review process, so be interested To see what you say anyway. But thank you.

56:08

Now I parked your concerns national highways on the technical side

56:21

when you're saying that you have outstanding technical I don't know whether you have outstanding technical sense, but you haven't responded fully, or just just talk me through what the concern is, and is it a concern, or is it just something that you're you're putting A marker down because the detailed design that is likely to come through will need to resolve those, the technical design on Highway aspects. Just just explain to me what the situation is, please. Rebecca Marshall

56:54

for national highway, so it's not necessarily that we have outstanding technical issues. We don't feel addressed. We just wanted to make it known that we don't necessarily agree with the written question responses that we have provided that independent review. So I'm taking a section from our point in the statement of common ground, which was submitted at deadline three, which says the PCF review at Stage Three does not provide any level of technical assurance or endorsement of the scheme's viability or design, nor comment on the accuracy or acceptability of any substantive content. Simply, the content is there, the process is there to ensure documents meet governance standards. So we just, we haven't reviewed it. We don't therefore, we can't comment if we have technical concerns or not, that wasn't the purpose of our review, and that was submitted at deadline three.

57:48

And so if it assists without getting into too much of a level of granular detail, but for example, national highways raised a comment on the design report dated March 2023, relating to a pond access track following existing slip road earthworks. The question was, presumably, this embankment will be removed, graded into the landscape, could we explore a shorter access from Boddington? And the response that was received to that comment was, the existing embankment and slip road will not be removed. So in terms of the comment from the applicant that national highways throughout this process where comments have been provided, those comments have been addressed, national highways would say at this stage that that is is not necessarily the case, but yes, going forward, obviously, we are a consultee to design and um documentation that needs to be agreed, should the DCA be confirmed to enable construction, and we would expect that those are addressed going forwards.

59:00

So is it fair to say that whilst you're putting that marker down, that not everything has been signed off, that you're content that as drafted, the DCO gives you the appropriate assurances that your approvals are still required at the appropriate future design stages that the scheme is going to be able to progress positively.

59:37

Thank you, sir. Safety straight for national highways, subject to resolving the position with the protected provisions as well. Yes,

59:44

that's correct. That

59:47

was helpful. Thank you.

59:56

Yeah, no, that's fine in terms of the future. Stages, then of the PCF process, in light of what's been said so far, and the

1:00:17

focus that clearly national highways will have on the strategic road network, what is going to govern the broader scheme parameters in ensuring suitability of design. I

1:00:47

so just to kind of look back slightly to the PCI process that has gone through to date, I think there's a difference of opinion over the level of advice that's being given and received between ourselves and national highways. The term critical friend is appropriate that that has been their role all the way through the PCF process to date, whilst I take on board what's been stated in terms of what the PCF process set states that it does, the level of advice received has been far more substantive than that alludes to. And in terms of not all, not all, comments being addressed, I would say that most comments in the majority have been addressed to the positive in terms of responding to the review process that's gone on with national highways. And that, on that basis, we feel that there has been a form of an independent review undertaken by a separate body in national highways of the application and DCO design to date. And that will, that will continue,

1:02:02

I understand that, but I don't think that a PCF process is a design review process. I think, you know, they're looking at, I'm not sure they're looking at one and the same thing. And so whilst national highways are, I think you're quite right that they should be reviewing it because of this direct effect on the strategic road network. I don't know whether it is a design review per se, so by all by all means, tell me I'm wrong, but I'd be interested to understand. I

1:02:35

think we would need to look at it holistically and come back to your writing. So but certainly the comments received did not just relate to the strategic road network.

1:02:45

No, but were,

1:02:52

I understand that they were going to the broader looking at that because you'd submitted the whole scheme, there were comments beyond just the strategic road network, is my understanding, but it still doesn't take me into was this a design review, or was it a PCF review, and whether they are one and the same thing, and I'm and I'm In terms of stages moving forward, whether future PCF, stage reviews, stage four, stage five are the equivalent to design review. And also, would they be looking at the hold eco scheme, or would they be focused in on the strategic road network and

1:03:44

take your point on board. So I think we'll come back and write in and look to define that more specifically for you. Thank you.

1:03:59

Can I just come to the joint councils in terms of, do the joint councils have design review panels and

1:04:14

department for the Joint councils? No, we don't.

1:04:18

Okay, right. Fine, that's straightforward.

1:04:34

Yeah, I think we've probably got as far as we can on design. Have anybody got any additional points, either in the room or virtually before we move on to the next agenda item on landscape? Okay, so we'll move on then. And. Them. Now just one particular point, which I'm just trying to get clarity on in the joint Council's local impact report section 3.5 it makes reference to barn farm, the travelers, site and properties the south side of the a 4019,

1:05:25

I'm just trying to understand what it is you're seeking to achieve there. It's almost as if you're wanting a consultation process with

1:05:40

residents on the environmental barriers, if I understood that correctly.

1:05:59

Oh, yeah. David Brown from the joint Council's representative landscape and visual impact, yeah, it's our understanding from the applicant that the environmental barrier design will be designed in collaboration with the local authority and interested parties and residents to achieve sort of vegetated design, they'll sort of have Additional landscape screening and esthetic qualities for the receptors,

1:06:44

and is that? How? How is that to be achieved? You know, I mean, if there are 20 residents, and they don't, they aren't in agreement, how, is this going to work in practice? Because that's the bit I'm really struggling to get my head around. If I can understand why you would want them to be involved in a in a consultation exercise, because they're going to be looking out onto it from their frontages. But I just trying to understand in practice how each of the parties and consider it's going to work, and is the DCO written in a way that facilitates a consultation exercise, and what happens if people aren't in agreement? So if I can come to the applicant to see if that's your understanding of the process you're contemplating happening, yes.

1:07:51

So two, two things. So we, having regard to the response to the Li, are in rep two, double, 09 we note there's agreement on this point, as detailed in item 95 of the SCG, and it's LV six of the React, which confirms that there will be consultation with the local planning authority and directly affected receptors. But that is that's consultation rather than determination. And so that process of involvement, of engagement, is embedded in LV six, in the React, and that doesn't present any difficulties in terms of if there is disagreement or divergence of use amongst individuals that be taken into account, obviously,

1:08:53

so. So in having that within the React, it facilitates the consultation. Yes, but it would be left to you as the applicant to be final arbiter. Is that right or

1:09:12

Well, the requirement these are noise mitigation proposals which would be subject to requirement 14, which requires submission to an approval by the county planning authority. So those proposals would fall within the ambit of requirement 14, I understand,

1:09:39

I think they would in terms of noise, but I think that there is the design obviously needs to respond to the noise concern. That's why they're there, principally. But the consultation, presumably, is going to be about the visual appearance of

1:09:57

barriers. It will be about all, yes, it. Will be about noise abatement, as well as visual immunity and or biodiversity values, as indicated in LV six. But those are intrinsic parts of the noise barriers and the inherent part of their what's what's proposed for approval, as I understand it,

1:10:24

okay, and there's Yes, local joint councils,

1:10:29

sir Katherine Knight, joint councils, if I may. My understanding is the concern arises, and I stand to be corrected by my friend, is that the concern arises is that currently trees, quite substantial trees, which are going to be cut down for the slip roads. The barrier is going up. The residents currently enjoy a view across farmland, and they're going to it's going to be replaced with an acoustic fence. Understand why the acoustic fence is going up and the reasoning, but the some sort of discussion with local residents would actually be appreciated, not just in terms of the noise barrier, but actually the visual impact, as you eloquently said, is that, how, with the local authority, we realize that the I understand this is what I stand to be corrected, that the applicant is actually going to be the determining person, but at least they would Have their views taken into account and considered properly.

1:11:22

Yeah, but your content as the requirement is written, and the React linking into that requirement gives you the comfort that the consultation would be undertaken, albeit it's the applicant that makes the final decision. So

1:11:39

if I may, I'd like to take that away so I can actually have a proper look at them and look at the wording requirement. I might request that word meaningful consultation be inserted, but that would be about it. Thank you. So if I could report back at deadline for be appreciated.

1:11:54

Okay, all right. Thank you. Thank you. Applause.

1:12:03

I think the only other clarification I was trying to understand with within the DCO itself, you make reference to, I think they're described as environmental barriers, but on the environmental management plan and within the noise chapter, is absorptive and reflective barriers are referenced. So firstly, can you explain to me what the if any, visual difference there might be between a reflective and an absorptive.

1:12:47

I mean card right for the applicant. I can start on that explanation, but I expect I will probably need to try and provide some further information later. The difference between the two, between absorptive and reflective barriers, is, as the name suggests, the reflective barrier reflects the noise back onto the road. The absorptive barrier absorbs the noise. So the difference for those is that if you have receptors on the opposite side of the road to the noise barrier, you need an absorptive barrier, otherwise you are just increasing the noise impact on those receptors on the other side of the road. So that has dictated in terms of why we have the two different types of noise barriers shown going back to the first point, in terms of how they are described, in terms of environmental barriers, or noise barriers, that their primary function is to provide noise abatement for affected receptors, which are in the noise, important noise, important areas, the NIA is behind those barriers to provide noise abatement to them In terms of impacts on visual perception that, as we've just discussed, that is identified as a detailed design

consideration and that will get identified through that consultation process that we were Talking about in the last item.

1:14:19

Um, I'm conscious that in the visualizations you've presented to us, some of them on the A 4019, include a visual representation of of a barrier, and so is that a reasonable representation of what might be expected to be seen, or is again, that something's going to be subject to detailed design, so there's a degree of artistic license within it.

1:14:56

So common cartwheel for the applicant. So the barriers. Shown on the visualizations are an example of what the barriers could be in terms of what is required to provide the noise abatement that's that's included within the ES assessment, it isn't what they will be, because that will be subject to detailed design and then consultation with stakeholders, it's showing what they could be in terms of their height and their position and and their construction. But it's not a it's not an absolute on that so i

1:15:46

Okay. Now I understand. Now, that's fine. Thank you.

1:15:53

Think the only other matter is to recall that in the statement of common ground with the joint councils rep 134 there's an item 9.5 which deals with the agreement of the joint councils with all the matters under this head, subject to detailed design and commitments made in The react, and the commitments have now come forward. So

1:16:30

I just see if anyone else would wish to make any comment on that agenda item before I move on. No, okay, thank you. So just coming then to item two, the visualizations and understanding the potential effects on local character areas and the Green Belt, can I just ask the applicant to explain the conclusions that you've reached in respect of effect on local landscape areas, the beneficial effects you describe for barn Farm and then the moderate adverse effects on Sheldon cotton?

1:17:24

So Colin Carter, of the applicant, I think what we need, we will need to provide that further information to respond to those particular questions. I wasn't aware that you had those particular Questions to explain landscape impacts to those receptors. I

1:18:04

If you can provide that as a written response. The reason I'm posing those questions is that I'm trying to understand how you've come to a conclusion there are beneficial effects in landscape, terms for barn farm and only moderate adverse effects on Sheldon cottages. Just trying to understand that, and then, more broadly, the conclusions on local landscape areas.

1:18:41

Are you able, at least at this stage, to give us your assessment in respect of the local landscape areas in the Green Belt, because that was obviously specifically identified in agenda item two.

1:18:58

So Colin Carter out for the applicant. So it's the question in terms of the results of explaining our assessment of the impacts on those local character areas, or how the visualizations show the interaction of the scheme in those landscape character areas. My understanding of the question for point two was, it's the latter point in terms of of the visualizations and how they represent the local character areas in the Green Belt, rather than our assessment on them, we can provide that information on our assessment on the local character areas, but I don't have that to hand.

1:19:35

Okay. Well, if you can do the latter now and then we see where that takes us. Thank you.

1:19:45

Okay, I can do that. Thank you. So Connie Carter of the applicant, so with regards to the visualizations and how they represent the potential effects on landscape character areas and the Green Belt, so the. The visualizations have been produced for six locations across the scheme with the purpose of providing the visual depiction of the scheme at those locations. So the locations for those visualizations were selected in consultation with an agreement with the joint councils, and for each of those viewpoints, of which there are six, the locations of which are just being shared on the screen. For each viewpoint, three images have been produced. So the existing view, the verified view of year one, opening year, and the verified you verified view for year 15, which is when the proposed planting will be taking effect. So the the icons on the screen there, these are the location plans that are in each of the visualization submissions. So those show the locations of the of the viewpoints, and then the two little lines coming off those circles, they show the orientation of those viewpoints. For people not familiar with viewpoint location plans, so they are typically facing east or west along those locations. So viewpoint one that's looking east from stanbro lane, adjacent to Sheldon cottages, towards the junction 10, northbound entry slip road. So that will that is showing what will become at the end of stanbro lane, showing the new embankment the northbound on slip so

1:21:53

yeah, so in terms of of how these I was going to go through each of the visualizations and what they're showing, but in terms of how those visualizations link through into the local character areas, to just demonstrate we are covering each of those areas, thank you.

1:22:13

That's useful.

1:22:15

So the the viewpoint locations, as I've said, have been selected to show the different aspects of the scheme and their visual appearance. Whilst the viewpoints have not been selected specifically with regards to local character areas or the Green Belt, they are representative of the local character areas that the scheme is located with, and also include locations that are within or on the edge of the green

belt. So with regard to the local character areas as set out within the ES chapter nine, the landscape and visual impact assessment chapter landscape character areas are described from paragraph nine, point 7.8 onwards. So the scheme is wholly within landscape character area SV, 6b which is the veil of Gloucester. But within within that wider area, we then have the landscape character areas which are set out in the Gloucester, Cheltenham, dukesbury, joint core strategy, landscape characterization, sensitivity analysis, 2013 So with regards to those areas which are smaller areas within the so we've got a number of those, those areas within the scheme. So landscape character, Area C, which covers the area between Shelton south of the A, 4019, and east of the link road that we have viewpoints two and three within that area, and then also viewpoints four, five and six sit on the boundary of that area and landscape area E. Landscape area E is Swindon village to stoke orchard, so that covers the area north of the a 4019, and east of the m5 and we also have landscape character D, which is west of the m5 and that includes viewpoint one, which sits on the boundary between that landscape Area D and An uncharacterized area which is essentially west of the m5 and north of the a 4019, so the landscape character areas which are defined within Chapter Nine of the ES are represented across those visualizations, with regards to. The view with regards to the Green Belt. Viewpoint two is wholly within the Green Belt, and this shows the main item of the scheme infrastructure that's wholly within the Green Belt, namely the river chelt bridge. The other viewpoints are on the edge of the green belt land. So the viewpoints along the a 4019, and the viewpoint at the southern end of the link road,

1:25:29

that's just just the South. It's just not showing on the screen at the moment, isn't it? That the Yeah, yeah, thank you. I

1:25:47

what we don't have, though, and I know you went out to consultation with the Joint Council to agree the visual locations is anything from the slightly raised land near Hayden Hill Farm and the public rights of way that run from the back of that looking north northwest so you would see a new link road going through the Greenbelt at a slur a greater distance away from each of the viewpoints that you've chosen, which seems to me would give a better context of understanding the degree of effect on both the local landscape area and the Greenbelt. So I appreciate you agreed these viewpoints, but was that location considered at all as a way of looking at one of the big, biggest pieces of new infrastructure you're proposing?

1:26:56

So Colin Cartwright, for the applicant, we did have a longer list of possible viewpoint locations, we can provide some further information on that. But going back to the point was that the purpose of the visualizations was to show how the elements of the scheme could look at year one and year 15. It was not intended to show all of the scheme. The visualizations are one part of the of the assessment undertaken So

1:27:55

thank you, as you've agreed the locations, you don't have any comments you'd wish to make.

1:28:05

So we understand, we do have some comments. David, do you have comments on this? Thank you. Sorry. Catherine Knight for the joint councils, I understand, sir, we do have comments.

1:28:19

Yeah. David Brown from the joint councils, we were sent locations of few points that we did make comment on. We weren't sent a big, long list of everyone that was to be considered in terms of how it represents the visuals represent the effects, I think we are we are happy that they present the scheme quite well and the impacts of the scheme. But I'd just like to make the couple of points. One particularly the visualization, which is number five, I think five or six that show the the environmental barrier in front of the houses. Obviously, that barrier is shown at the moment as just a plain timber treatment, which doesn't represent the conclusions reached in the landscape and visual impact assessment that that is going to be a vegetated barrier, which is going to be esthetically more acceptable to residents and the receptors. I would note as well, that in year 50, and I think potentially, some of the vegetation growth from the page. Planting may be a little bit optimistic. We think that that will be achievable in time. But yeah, it's quite optimistic. What it shows achieved by year 15. And the final point was on the visualization of the link roads it crosses the river chart, I think that does illustrate the effects on the Greenbelt quite well, and in terms of some slight reduction in openness, but it also demonstrates that it's not a fully reduction in openness by the nature of the way the road can be integrated into the landscape and store preserve views through and over the raised section and how it well integrates into the landscape and character.

1:30:59

And those were all my poems. Thank you.

1:31:09

Thank you for that. I'll come back to applicant, give the opportunity to respond to a joint Council's concerns.

1:31:16

Thank you so

1:31:19

Colin kartra for the applicant. So my colleague, Penny Taylor, who is our landscape lead for the project, is available on the team's call. And I'd like to ask Penny if she can reply to the to the points made from the joint councils.

1:31:40

Can you hear me?

1:31:43

Yes, we can. Thank you. Hi,

1:31:45

yeah, if I just go through David's point on the noise barrier, first think he raised that we showed the noise barrier as a worst case in this because, you know, we can't, we can't assume what might be decided through this consultation, it might be that a preference is that it's just a wooden barrier. So the idea is, it's just there, that's that's the height of it, that it will be and as a worst case, it will be just a brown noise barrier. So that's why that's presented like that. If we'd have planted it up, we think we would have been misrepresenting how it might possibly look, and trying to disguise it in some way. The visualizations themselves, they've been produced, focusing on the the earthworks and the structures and the extent of the existing vegetation that's lost, the proposals for the landscape are more indicative. It's not really possible to predict exactly how the scheme will look at year 15, because plant growth is dependent on various number of factors, such as species and spacing and planting and management. So the 3d visualization team used generic 3d models, and that represented the vegetation at the assumed heights that the assessment had assumed. So at year one, the heights were between point six meters and point eight meters, and then by year 15, the assessment had assumed heights of five to 11 meters. The models of the trees, I do agree they are. The trees themselves look a bit over mature for that age, but the heights are actually correct in terms of those the assessment and how they met. They may grow to that height. The models don't show the variety of species. I think they're all They're all birch. But as I say, when we were doing them, we just focused on the earthworks, the structure, sort of the built elements of the scheme, and the extent of existing vegetation that was lost. And I think reworking these visuals to try and reflect how slightly more accuracy, wouldn't really, I think, change the overall effect of that visual, and wouldn't really give you as a viewer, a better idea of how that planting could provide some sort of filtered screening by year 15. And I'm sorry, I think I missed your last point, David, on

1:34:24

Yeah, you made reference to the potential concern on openness of the Green Belt, which I think was probably the final point.

1:34:35

So I'm not visual of the chelt bridge. I think the openness is still there. You can still see across the landscape to the to the higher Hills beyond, like you can at the moment. You can see under the bridge there, I think the veg. On the embankments across filters that the view of of the actual roadscape. And it's, you can still have a feeling of openness within that space. The sense of openness, it's, it doesn't create an overdeveloped feeling, in my opinion.

1:35:27

Thank you. Can I just clarify with you when, when you were looking at the visualizations, the and you're putting it through the models that you're using to project 15 years on

1:35:48

it. It isn't directly reflective of the landscape proposals. It's an, as you said, it's an assumed Silver birch population, and it's got, I don't think that's necessarily the scheme that's before us. So no, so what degree of health warning does it need to have in terms of, is it still a reasonably fair reflection of what might well be seen in 15 years time?

1:36:32

Yeah, I think the difference would be that in 15 years time, those trees would the girth of the trees, the girth of the trunk, the width of the trunks, wouldn't be as big as they are shown. The heights could be expected. I mean, you don't know, because of how the whole thing, how different things grow in the climate and things like that, but it could be expected, and that's what's been assessed. The variety of trees will be different. There be there'll be more different. Native species will be planted as per so, so like, there'd be more oaks, and there'll be some evergreens we put, put in there as well some Polly or some pine. But the native species and a variety, and a different, perhaps more variety in height, will be there, and some of the, some of the shrub species, I think, on the viewpoint one that they're little too maintained, they they would probably be left to be much more wild rather than maintained. So I think that sort of data and that refining of those visualizations, it hasn't been done because when we did it, we just focused on trying to make sure that the fundamentals were there so that the how close the bridge, how close the earth works, were, how high they were, whether the vegetation that or is already there, whether it would be there or not. I think that they were sort of focused on fundamentals. And as I say, we we could rework it, which would take a lot of times to get that finer detail into it. But wouldn't really give you any diff apart from, you know, wouldn't be all white bark. It would be a different colored barks in there, and different a few greens, few Ivy going up the trees as existing at the moment for the mature trees. It wouldn't really, though, give you any better indication of how the proposed scheme would look in terms of the planting,

1:38:29

so you're still confident that despite those

1:38:39

that is still a reasonable representation for us to to help inform us of what the likely outcome would be at year 15.

1:38:49

Yes, I'm confident that that. Yeah, thank

1:38:52

you. And in terms of your assessment of the height in year 15. How that? How has that been come to in light of your comments there about the degree of influence that will be

1:39:17

so many factors that go into play in influencing how trees will grow over the future.

1:39:26

Sorry, that's that's why we sort of, we're pursuit with between five and 11 meters. It's not used. There's the standard sort of way of how plants, generally, would grow if they're left to their own devices. They're given the the the climate and the water they need, how, how much they would grow, how are they expected to grow? And so you'll give an alignment within that, just to you know, if there's too many plants and they get crowded, they can't grow as much, or if they're not looked after. But the it's a

standard, it's a standard way of looking at things that it will that will grow. Between three and six and 10 meters over those years, different species.

1:40:10

So what have you used to inform the representations? What's the logic behind what you've done to project forward 15 years and how the appearance might be a reasonable representation.

1:40:32

They the trees that are used the way they are. They were just been used. They're just the models of a birch, mature birch tree, and they have been stretched, made to, made to be at either 11 meters high or five meters high. And unfortunately, we just, we just focus. We just left it as being the birch trees being used to represent an idea of how that those trees would create a filtering effect. In retrospect, different species would have been better to been used as narrower girth would have been better to have been used, but the height and the sort of The fullness of the canopy is a reasonable assessment.

1:41:22

Okay? Can I come back to the Councils then, and having heard what you've heard, would you be, are you still confident that we've got reasonable representations before us? Or would you be looking for something more from the applicants to help inform the examination

1:41:46

by David Brown from joint councils, yes, hearing the applicants response there, quite happy with The Pledge that's being set out there as representing taking an interview, the the heights that they're showing at year 15, but maybe not the girth of the actual trees. I think that sounds reasonable. My only query, I suppose, was I haven't seen anywhere that sort of lists out, kind of a method for how the growth rate of the trees have been judged in the visual

1:42:33

we've we did put that in the assessment, yeah, in the LVA, in the assessment That's set out as to what has been assumed, the planting assumption and initial planting size and the size that we would assume they would grow to by year 15.

1:42:53

I think it would be helpful for us and for the joint councils, if you can provide the references to where that is set out so that we can revisit that after, afterwards, make sure that we all understand it, and then see whether we content with it or not.

1:43:16

I can do that. That's fine. Thank you. Thank you. You okay,

1:43:25

so I'll come back to the applicant. Then is there any more you would wish to add in in light of that conversation,

1:43:36

Connie, cart off the applicant. No, nothing. Nothing further to add on that.

1:43:41

Okay? Thank you very much.

1:43:49

I'm conscious of the term. It's just coming up to 10 to 12. We've been going for quite a while, so I think it's probably sensible for us to take a break now, if we can return it five past 12, and hopefully that gives everyone time for a comfort break. So again, I just remind anyone who's on the live stream that you'll need to restart your browser page. So we will adjourn for the moment and return it five past 12.

1:44:19

Thank you. Applause.