



Hearing Transcript

Project:	A46 Newark Bypass
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Session 1
Date:	04 December 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.

AUDIO_A46_ISH3_SESSION1_2024-12-04

Wed, Dec 04, 2024 5:50PM • 1:21:38

Good afternoon. The time is now two o'clock, and time for this hearing to begin. Before we go any further, can I just confirm that everybody can hear me clearly? Thank you very much at the back there. And can I also confirm with the case team that live streaming and recording of this event has commenced. Thank you, Mr. Keats, I would like to welcome you all to this issue Pacific hearing on the water environment in relation to the application made by national highways for an order to grant development consent for the a 46 Newark bypass project. My name is David love and I am a chartered town planner with postgraduate for qualifications in ecology, and I'm a practitioner member of the Institute of Environmental Management and assessment. I am an examining inspector for nationally significant infrastructure proposals with the planning inspectorate, and I will be leading on this hearing today. I will now ask my colleagues to introduce themselves. Mr. Stone, please.

Hello. My name is Kenneth stone. I'm a chartered town planner, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of the panel to examine this application. Thank you. Good

afternoon. My name is Paul Burley. I'm a chartered town planner and examining inspector for nationally significant infrastructure projects. Thank you.

You will hear us referred to as the examining authority or x A Our role is to examine the application and to report to the Secretary of State for Transport with a recommendation as to whether or not the development consent order should be made. The application seeks consent for a scheme that comprises online widening of the a 46 to the north of the existing route for most of its length, between Farndon roundabout and the A one, followed by a new section of offline dual carriageway proposed between the A one and Winthorpe roundabout, where the new jewel carriageway ties into the existing a 46 to the west of the Winthorpe roundabout. The widening works include earthwork widening along the existing embankments and new structures where the route crosses the Nottingham to Lincoln and East Coast domain railway lines, the river Trent and the A one the roundabouts at Farndon and Winthorpe will be enlarged and partially signalized, while the cattle market roundabout will be grade separated by elevating the a 46 access to the a one to and from the 46 will also be improved by upgrading the brown Hill and friendly farmer roundabouts. The planning inspectorates case team here today is presented by Mr. Ewing Keats, who's a case manager, Tim Hall case officer, and they are being supported remotely online by Mr. Stephen Parker, please don't hesitate to talk to a member of the case team. Should you need help at today's event or with it or with the technology? Before I go any further, I'll now deal with a few housekeeping matters for those attending in person, can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent. The toilets closest to the Great Hall are down the ramp and

to the left in the event of the fire, there are four fire exits out of the Great Hall. Please familiarize yourself with your nearest exit. The fire evacuation assembly point is near the tennis courts on the front lawn. To get there, you'll need to walk through the car park and pass the Business Center. For anyone with any mobility issues that there is a ramp, there are no scheduled fire drills planned, I will now deal with the preliminary matters before I move on to the substance of today's agenda. Today's hearing is being undertaken in a hybrid way, meaning some of you are present with us at the hearing venue, and some of you are joining us virtually, using Microsoft Teams. We will make sure that, however, you have decided to attend today, you will be given a fair opportunity to participate. If you are participating virtually and you wish to speak at any point in the proceedings, please use the raise hand function and we will invite you to speak at the appropriate time. Alternatively, please turn on your camera if you are happy for your image to be seen and recorded, so that we can see that you wish to speak, the hearing is being both live streamed and recorded, and the recording will be available on the a 46 New York bypass page of the national infrastructure website shortly after this hearing, for the benefit of the recording, please, can those present ensure that you speak clearly into a microphone, stating your name, who you are representing each time before you speak. If you're not at a table with a microphone, there is a roving microphone, so please wait for one of these be brought to you before you speak, for those people observing or participating remotely in order to minimize background noise and distraction. Can you please make sure you stay muted and your camera remains off unless you are speaking. If anybody wishes to use social media report film or record during today's hearing or any subsequent hearing, then they are free to do so, but please do so responsibly and with proper consideration for other parties. This must not be disruptive and the material must not be misused. A link to the planning inspectorates privacy notice was provided in the. Notification for this hearing, I assume that everybody here has familiarized themselves with this document which establishes how other personal data of our customers is handled in accordance with the principles set out in data protection laws. Please speak to the case team. If you have any queries about this. Anyone who speaks at this hearing must must do their best not to give any information which should be kept private and confidential, such as health conditions or an address. If you submit information in writing or at hearings which is considered by the planning Inspectorate to be personal data, it will not be published or considered as part of the examination. If you have any questions about personal data, you may speak to the case team or access the nationally significant infrastructure projects, advice pages for submitting representations or comments, which is held on our website. In this vein, I would mention that if you want to tell us something about where you live today, because it is relevant to what you have to say, please just give a general location without mentioning a specific address. For those joining virtually, if you don't want your image to be recorded, you can keep your camera switched off. So moving on to the agenda. This hearing before the agenda published in the national infrastructure planning website on 25th of November, 2024 examination library, Ev, 2006, it would be helpful if you had a copy of this in front of you. Could I ask the applicant to display the agenda on screen at this point, focusing on the point of discussion and scrolling as we move through the agenda. Thank you. In terms of substantive matters, the agenda is split into various items to seek to examine the applicant's case. In relation to the water environment, we will be examining matters, including, but not limited to flood risk. The agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other considerations or issues. As we progress, we will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be concluded, then it may be necessary for us to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. Likewise, if you cannot answer the questions being asked of

you today or require time to get the information requested, then please indicate that you need to respond in writing. We plan to have a mid afternoon break around 3:30pm and hope to conclude the hearing by five o'clock when we take breaks, those of you are who are participating virtually will need to ensure your cameras and microphones are turned off during the break. I'm now going to turn to introductions. So those of you who are participating in today's hearing, I'm going to I will ask you to introduce yourselves. Could you introduce yourself, stating your name and any title you wish to be addressed by Mr. Ms, Mrs. Doctor, etc, who you represent, and let us know which gender item or items you wish to speak. If you're not representing an organization, please confirm your name title and summarize your interests and confirm the agenda items or items upon which you which you wish to speak. I will start with the applicant and the advice their advisors, if I can hear from whomever will lead the submissions today and any others who may make regular contributions. Thank you.

Good afternoon, sir. My name is Sarah Holmes. I'm a legal director at Womble bond Dickinson, and I will be leading for the applicant. This afternoon, I'm going to ask my team to introduce themselves to you. Thank you.

Emma Holling Phillips from one bull bond Dickinson, also for the

applicant, Good afternoon, sir. Ollie Evans, Mark McDonald, on behalf of the applicant, leading on the flood risk specialist.

I'm Claire pass from McDonald's, on behalf of the applicant, I'm a water environment specialist.

Bose on behalf of the applicant. I'm looking at

flooding relating to pluvial rainfall, highway drainage. Good afternoon. Mark Sutton, Project technical director for Skanska, representing the applicant here today, and I'll be answering questions on items free C and free E.

Thank you. Can I now move on to organizations and individuals who have expressed expressed a wish to attend. And again, if you could introduce yourself and tell us which agenda items you wish to speak on, I will start with representatives of the local authority, then statutory parties, statutory undertakers, parish councils, and then other interested parties. So can I? Can I start with the host authorities? Please. I will come to Newark and Sherwood District Council first. Thank you.

Thank you, sir Lindsay Preston for Newark and Sherwood District Council, speaking mainly on the timing of the delivery in terms of flood compensation and the impact upon Tawny lane. Thank you.

Good afternoon, sir. Matthew Tubb, representing Newton Sherwood District Council, believe I'm going to be mainly contributing on Item 3f, around Tony lane.

Thank you. And can I now move on to Nottinghamshire County Council,

good afternoon, everyone. Sue Jakes, Nottinghamshire County Council,

flood risk manager,

good afternoon.

Ross Marshall, I'm here representing Nottinghamshire County Council as lead local flood authority.

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, the transport lead officer, and we'll be responding to items on, well throughout the agenda, but mainly on as lead local flood authority. Thank you. Item three,

thank you. If I now turn to statutory parties, I understand we have the Environment Agency with us online. Is that the case?

That's correct. Good afternoon, sir. My name is Alex Hazel. I'm a Planning Specialist in the environment agency's natural national infrastructure team. I am the project lead for the EAS involvement in this development consent order application. We also have in attendance flood risk specialists. Would you like them to introduce themselves now?

Yes, please. That would be helpful.

Okay, Sean, would you like to go ahead first? Please? Afternoon, sir. I'm Sian Holland. I'm a flood risk specialist in the environment

agency's national infrastructure team.

Phil, please

Good afternoon, sir. I'm Phillip sale. I'm a third year modeling specialist within the environment agencies, national infrastructure team.

Thank you. I don't have any parish councils pre registered to speak, but I'll just give an opportunity. Are there any parish councils in the room or online who wish to wish to speak today? I don't see anyone in the room or any hands up online. Thank you. I'll now move to interested parties. I will ask that you introduce yourself and briefly ask you to indicate on which agenda items you wish to speak? Pre registered. I have a Mr. Martin, apologies, I must pronounce this. Shapley,

yes. From think again, wind top action group, actually, I

don't wish to speak. There are no item agendas. Agenda items. Sorry that relate to our issues.

Thank you, Mr. Shapley, I don't have anyone else pre registered in the room. Is that but I'll jump online to cover the pre registered do I have Christopher cook from Peridot online,

Good afternoon, sir. Yes, you do. I represent Peridot solar and have an issue on agenda, Item three, a

thank you. And do I have a Mr. Hatton online,

seeing that, if I can now turn and do I have a no, that's fine. I did have representatives from London, but they are no longer attending. Do I have anyone in the room who I haven't mentioned who wishes to speak? No, online.

No, that's fine. Mr. Shapley, you are welcome to sit at a table with a microphone, if you so wish, there is a roving microphone to save you having to jump up and down.

So I believe that everyone who wishes to participate in today's hearing I would just like to reiterate the point to all our participants today, for the purposes of the recording, it will be enormously beneficial to us if each time you speak throughout the hearing, you could state your name and if who you're representing someone and who it is you represent. As I mentioned earlier, the event is being live streamed and recorded and will be available to view on the a 46 new bypass page of the planning inspectorates website. Anyone watching on live stream or at a later date has the opportunity to make any comments about the matters covered today in writing, preferably for deadline four, which is Friday 13th, December. Moving on to agenda item two, purpose of the issue specific hearing and the examining authority. Opening remarks. Let me briefly explain the purpose of today's hearing. Please. The application for the proposed development includes matters that will directly and indirectly impact on various elements of the water environment. This could be through potential flood risk, surface water management, interaction with existing flood defenses and so forth. Therefore, it is important to place these matters under examination via written questions and this hearing. This hearing is to enable examining authority to hear and probe the applicant's case in respect of the water environment. This hearing will help us to consider whether relevant tests, such as those identified in the national planning policy framework or NPPF have been met the adequacy of the highways England, water risk assessment tool, or hurat and Water Framework Directive or WFD assessments. The purpose of this hearing is consider the matters on the agenda, which was published on 25 November, 24 we have also set out documents that we may refer to. It is not appropriate to display documents that haven't previously been submitted as part of the examination. If you propose to refer to a new document, that document will need to be submitted along with your written summary of your oral submissions so that it is formally entered into the examination and other parties will have an opportunity to view and comment on it. If during the course of the hearing we need to refer to a document, we will use the document reference number in the planning Inspectorate examination library, the expectation is that we, as the XA, will lead on the questions, but there is provision for direct questioning by interested parties. Should this be necessary? At our discretion, I would remind participants that applications for development consent orders are examined principally through the written process. However, hearings can be held to examine matters where this is helpful to the examining authority, there is a subject matter controlled agenda. This means that the matters for discussion today are those matters identified on this agenda. Parties with an interest in this particular subject matter are known as interested parties, or IPS. We will seek comment from interested parties at the appropriate time, but the applicant will always have the right of reply. Today, we will be focusing on the technical matters of the water environment and will not be seeking to discuss other matters such as compensation, compulsory acquisition, etc. For the purposes of this hearing, we are assuming that the representatives of the applicant are reasonably familiar with the Legislative, policy and guidance framework and with the process that the examining authority and Secretary of State will go through. For those of you less used to issue specific hearings, we should explain that we may refer to a number of principal documents from the application today. Some of these are the environmental master plan, works, plans, general arrangement plans, drainage engineering plans, flood risk assessment and so forth. There are a number of them. So rather than list them all, now, I will refer to them at the relevant time with the examination library reference number, and provide a minute or two of people to access these documents together. These provide the bulk of what is relevant to this hearing. In preparing for this hearing, we have looked at the relevant material, including environmental, statement submissions at deadlines one, two and three, all of these are available via the examination library on the project web page of the planning inspectorates, national

infrastructure website, you can read the application documents and provide us with your own opinion on such matters if you have not already done so in your own Written representations. These are due for receipt by deadline for 13th of December in the timetable. Finally, may we remind you that the focus of today's hearing is explicitly on the water environment and will not be taking any submissions or evidence on any other aspects of the post development itself, there will be other opportunities to write or speak to us on other aspects of examination. These are set out in the examination timetable, examination, Library Reference, PD, 006, if you have other issues you would wish to raise, you can address those in written submissions at the relevant deadlines or the other hearing sessions proposed in the timetable. If you make a verbal presentation today, we may request that you submit a follow up written summary of your oral submission after this hearing by deadline form written submissions should be based on your present representation today, rather than add new material, but they can include more detail and collaborate or supporting evidence. For those of you who haven't attended proceeding such as these, there is necessary formality, and we would ask you to refrain, from interruptions. These are most unhelpful to us, potentially disruptive to those who are speaking, and could, in some circumstances, lead to a mode of costs against the person responsible before I come to the substantive agenda items and the applicant's general case, is it anything of a more general, procedural nature that anyone wishes to raise before then not seeing anyone in the room, any hands up online. No, given the agenda was released prior to the deadline. Three submissions. I have read all of the deadline, three submissions, but there may be instances where I may have missed some detail if. Is the case that I am quite content for the applicant or a health party to direct me to the specific document and paragraph. If I have any further queries, I can follow this up in written questions. We will now turn to deal with matters of the water environment.

So turning first to the applicant, the potential for the increase in fluvial flood risk, considering positions of both the Environment Agency and the lead local flood authority, can the applicant provide an update on their discussions with the Environment Agency with respect to the hydraulic modeling technical notes submitted at deadline. Three, that's document, reference, R, A, p3, 034, thank you.

Sarah Holmes, the applicant, yes, sir. Ollie Evans will address this for you.

Yes. Olivia Evans, on behalf of the applicant, thank you. Yes. I'd like to give you an update in the latest position. So effectively, we have ongoing consultation with the Environment Agency. At this time, we would like to say that there's been obviously very positive collaboration today, and through that collaboration, thus far, as you just mentioned, we have submitted this updated hydraulic modeling technical note, which has been produced, rep 3034 and also related to this consultation, rep 3035 which relates to a Flood flood compensation areas. Technical note. Both of the products provide additional detail and context to the original flood risk assessment at 177 which was submitted to the original TCO submission stage. The information within both of these technical notes give just further context and details, and do not change the principles of what has been detailed in the original flood risk assessment. At this point in time, we have investigations are ongoing in relation specifically to the lower

return period flood events where there's been some queries raised by the Environment Agency, we anticipate to provide an update prior to Deadline five in relation to this.

Thank you. Before I move on, can I just ask the environment age, ask the Environment Agency to confirm agreement, or if there's any any differences, or any matters that you wish to comment on that you've just heard, please.

Alex Hazel from the Environment Agency said we're in agreement with what the applicant has said there. We're waiting for further information, and we expect to engage with them in due course. Before their submission for deadline five, I'd just also like to check whether my flood risk colleagues have anything else to add to that. Philip sale, would you like to elaborate on that at all

afternoon? Sir, Philip, so Environment Agency, I agree with the comments Alex made there. Yeah, we we have been in liaison with the applicant and reviewed the technical notes and had a couple of queries that we've raised with the applicant, and we'll continue to work with them to to work through those queries.

Okay. Thank you very much. Are these discussions, these discussions on the the FRA that the sorry, flood risk assessment and the technical notes, do they involve the host authorities? Sorry, that's for the applicant.

So I'll ask Ollie Edmonds to answer

that. Apologies. I didn't catch the end of the ollie Edmonds on behalf of the applicant, which other authorities? Apologies, that is sorry the host

authorities. I'm just wondering if the Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council have both been involved in those discussions.

I understand that today that's been predominantly with the Environment Agency. However, I do not see any concerns in relation to opening up further consultation if that hasn't been undertaken today.

Okay, thank you. Before I move on, I'll ask new show with district council first, and then I'll come to the county, county, county council. You haven't been involved in those discussions, or predominantly

haven't been involved in those discussions, from what I understand, with respect to your position, and referring back to your local impact report. Do you have any concern about that?

Lindsay Preston for Newark and Sherwood? I think it's quite clear from our local impact report that we are concerned about the flooding impact to Newark as an area and obviously the existing route. We would like to be involved, maybe not in the technical detail, but maybe as a summary conversation in terms of what those findings deliver, because our main concern is surface water. I think that was evident from the floods that we experienced through the through the storms of 2023 so I think from our position, we wouldn't want to be involved in the technical details, but to be kept involved in terms of those progressions would be useful.

Thank you and Nottinghamshire County Council, please.

Kevin Sharman, on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council, yes, we would like to be involved in the technical detail, and we have sent the technical note on to our consultants, and they are reviewing that as we speak. But fundamentally moving forward, we'll be very keen to work with the Environment Agency to make sure that the response is a consistent response you're getting from the lead local flood authority and the Environment Agency, and it covers both sides.

Thank you very much. I what I was going to ask a query, but I scratched it from my list, simply because, obviously, when we received your initial comments this sort of reference, yes, everything, no, if I was to say it referenced, everything was fine. That's a step too far, if I was to say it didn't raise any substantive concerns. And then we got the environment agency's response, and then we got an updated response from the Ifa. Consistency is obviously going to help us a lot. So what I'd like to say is say to the applicant, I mean, from what I've been reading from your submissions, there's a steering group which did involve all parties. And I do, I would like to see further collaboration, whether that's in the form that Newark and show would have identified, in terms of very much more of a an observing role. And I would like to see the I think it would be useful for the examining authority to see the lead local flood authority involved in those discussions, given their technical expertise,

Ollie and some bar for the applicant, absolutely. Yeah, we're more than happy to have that further, wider engagement and ensure that all of the key risk management authorities are on board, and part of that process

brilliant in terms of then capturing that the document you hope to submit prior to Deadline five, if that just has a summary, as you've been putting on your documents so far, if that just has a paragraph or aligned the effect of, you, know, suing those meetings that You've been having with the steering group. Perhaps that would be useful, and that just would capture that

Olivia and some half the applicant. Yes, absolutely perfect. Thank

you very much.

Sorry, sir, could I just sorry I was

looking around the room? Yes. Sorry, please. Sorry.

Lindsay Preston, for Noah can show I did just want to make the point that is, if there is any substantial changes to any alleviation scheme, especially around maybe Kellam that area, or any additional compensation measures that are being proposed, or substantial changes in any runoff or degrees of impact, Then we would want to be involved in those conversations.

Yes, in case I wasn't clear, Mike, I suppose the expectation is that Newark and Sherwood would be involved, and given the opportunity to be involved, but that it may it may be just an observational role, but the opportunity would be there. That's just to be clear. That's my expectation.

Ollie Evans, on behalf of the applicant, just perhaps to provide a bit more context in the process where we are with newcasture District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council as well. The fundamentally we're planning on no fundamental changes to the outcomes of the flood risk assessment, any changes in requirements of the flood mitigation requirements in terms of the flood compensation areas, and ensuring that we anticipate there'll be no new significant effects, and ensuring that for the design event, we will still be looking to achieve that there's no increase beyond 10 millimeters for any increases for vulnerable receptors.

Thank you. Do either of the host authorities want to come in on that? No, that's fine. Yeah, that's reading the submissions to date. That was my understanding of the position. I. If you could, if to the applicant, please, if you could take a second to explain something to me so I understand. I just want this. This is about testing my understanding, partly testing my understanding, partly for the benefit of the room, and to do a bit of context setting, because it is a fairly complex subject. So you've agreed a watering a water level increase, a rise of 10 mill with the Environment Agency. My understanding is that comes from the design manual for roads and bridges. That figure, that sort of 10 millimeter increase figure. So that's viewed as an acceptable increase. And but when I look at the flood risk assessment document, a P, p1, 77, page 60, and I think that's a PDF. Page 60, it gives me a list of locations, and it gives me a details of the water the increases in water levels. For example, I've got locations one and

two, an increase of up to 50 millimeters. Location three, 616, millimeters. Location 426, location eight, up to 86 millimeters, and then location 11, increasing by 20 millimeters. Could you just, could you explain that to me, please?

Lee Evans, on behalf of the applicant, so I believe the section of the flood risk assessment at 177 we're referring to is the sort of a summary of the predicted changes in flood levels the we can confirm at this stage that there are no increases to vulnerable receptors greater than 10 millimeters for the design event, which is the 1% annual exceedance probability plus climate change, there may be increase in other areas to as vulnerable receptors. Or, for example, including the plane compensation areas that have been proposed, and finder and Arum find an east and fund and West and the hydraulic modeling technical note also provides a little bit more context and details in relation to some of the sensitivity testing that has been undertaken to demonstrate piece around the sort of modeling tolerance of up to the 10 millimeters. If that doesn't answer your question, we can also look at this in more detail and provide a written response if required. I

suppose it leads into a question. I think what I'll do is I'll bounce on to the Environment Agency, please, and ask them to perhaps summarize their position with respect to their concerns, and that might help to then formulate further questions going forward. So if I can turn to Mr. Alex Hazel, please, could you, with brevity, summarize the environment agency's concerns, because as I'm, as I say, I'm seeing it as increases in flood risk beyond the 10 millimeter increase. So it'd be, I'm keen to explore this matter further. Please.

Alex Hazel, for the Environment Agency. I'd like to bring in my flood risk colleagues to address that one. If that's okay, Phil, I think you're probably best placed for this one

Good afternoon. Philip sale, Environment Agency, so you have to summarize our key concerns in the design event, which is the one in 100 year plus climate change, we are happy that the scheme doesn't increase risk to receptors outside of the order limits for the development the 10 millimeter threshold quoted does relate to the design manual for roads and bridges, but also in relation to the precision or capability of the hydraulic model to forecast impacts, effectively as a result of the proposed development. So there's an aspect of related to the design manual for roads and bridges, but also, as the applicant mentioned, an aspect related to the precision of a hydraulic model as well, which is where that 10 millimeter figure comes from. Our key concerns are really with regards to more frequent events than the design events. So events which happen more frequently than the one in 100 year plus climate change. So for example, the one in 100 year present day scenario, and also the one in 20 and one in 30 year scenario. So there are some areas of concern there, in relation to off site impacts as a result of the scheme, the technical note which the applicant referenced, which we reviewed and provided some useful detail and extra context in relation to Flood Re. Skin The more frequent events. We have sought some further clarity, in particular in relation to the one in 100 year present day event, there's an area of concern which I won't go into detail, but the applicant presents the case that this is in relation to some

uncertainties and boundary conditions within the hydraulic model. So we're seeking further detail and evidence to support that case. And there are also some other off site increases, as I say, in the 20 year and 30 year event, which don't affect receptor vulnerable receptors, but do affect third party land. So we are just asking for further clarity on that, potentially further mitigation and or landowner engagement with respect, with respect to that.

Well, that's helpful. Thank you. Before I go any further, I'll just ask the host authorities, if perhaps the Ifa, if you want to come in on anything you've heard, please. No.

Kevin Sherman, Nottinghamshire County Council know where we're comfortable with the explanation that environment agency provided, and we're happy to support in that process.

Okay, great. Newark and Sherwood quite happy with what you've heard from the Environment

Agency, Linse Preston from New York and Sherrod, yeah. Okay. Thank negotiations are going on.

Okay, so, I mean, things seem to be moving. Would a fair summary be that? Yeah, it's a technical subject, but it's moving in the right direction in terms of discussions with the Environment Agency and the applicant. You're confident that sort of this submission, that deadline five will hopefully more likely than not, make significant headway in coming to an agreement. Is that fair comment at this stage?

Sarah Holmes, the applicant, yes, sir, that's the very first summary.

Mr. Hazel, Environment Agency. Are you? Would you agree with that that sort of by deadline five we're looking to have moved this, this issue on.

Yeah, I think that's fair, yes to say that. Alex Hale for the Environment Agency, by the way,

thank you, right. Okay, that's fine. I think let's let's move on. Then to Agenda Item, 3.2 thank you all for your comments and discussion around that issue. It was more of an update in establishing the position I'm comfortable with what I've heard. So 3.2 then how the proposal meets with the sequential and exception tests as laid out in the national planning policy framework. 2023, in the applicants submission document, the flood risk assessment a PP 177 sets out the position with respect to the sequential and exception tests collectively across the the submission, across the entire environmental statement, there's, there's quite a lot of information with respect to the sequential tests of the SATs

chapter, alternatives, for example, and biodiversity. There's a lot there, collectively spread out. So I'd like to focus this, this next point of discussion on the exception test, please. Now I'm assuming, going to assume that everyone's sort of familiar, reasonably familiar, with chapter 13 of the environmental statement document. That's a P, P, 057, and the associated flood risk assessment. What I would like to do, and also considering what we've heard in the previous question with respect to the increase in water levels and increase in flooding on land, as opposed to not perhaps vulnerable receptors, but certainly of land, what I'd like to focus this discussion on is the exception test. Can I ask the applicant, just to very briefly summarize how you feel, and by all means, refer me to documents as well you feel this submission meets the exception test.

So Sarah Holmes, for the applicants, we have anticipated that this would be a focus of your questioning, so Mr. Ollie Evans is going to deal with this.

Thank you for the question. Ollie Evans, on behalf of the applicant, first of all, I'd like to just cross reference to our response. Rep, 3036, to matters raised by the environment agencies and their written representations. Rep 243, specifically regard to flood risk elsewhere for the life of the scheme. And first of all, I'd like to detail that as part of the development. This process of the design, we have aimed to try and ensure that we minimize any floodplain compensation requirements by the scheme, by looking at implementing steeper embankments slopes to reduce the encroachment into the floodplain where it's all possible and the floodplain compensation areas have been designed, obviously in accordance with Syria c3, 62 terms of best practice, and the resulting flood, compensation areas provide more than the volume lost as a consequence of The scheme. The overall gain is approximately around 75% greater than the volume loss as a consequence of the scheme, and that that volume is obviously covered through the three flood compensation areas, mainly namely Kellum Arum Callum and Arum flood compensation, fondant east and fondant West, with the inclusion of those flood mitigation measures as what had been discussed earlier on, we've managed to ensure we can achieve for design fluvial event that there's no increases to vulnerable receptors beyond the 10 mil tolerance that we have been Engaging and discussing with the Environment Agency to date. So we therefore believe that we are achieving the exception test in relation to flood risk elsewhere as a consequence of the scheme. And we do obviously acknowledge the ongoing engagement with all risk management authorities in relation to these lower order return period fluvial events we're currently investigations are ongoing at this stage in relation to natural flood risks to the scheme itself. For the life of the scheme, we can confirm that the the nature of the a 46 bypass scheme, very nature is raised so ensures that they will not be impacted directly as a consequence of fluvial flood risk. We've also done a perform the check event on more of an exceedance time period to ensure that we can achieve what would be the impacts, and we can confirm for the 1% annual exceedance probability event, which we've used as a proxy for the standard 1.0 point 5% plus 62% Climate change event, that the main carriageway remains operational during such events. However, some of the ancillary roads and connections for the slip roads down into interconnecting with the existing road network will clearly, obviously not be raised up, and therefore they will be suffer local flooding consequences.

Thank you. So I'm just scribbling some notes as well. Sorry. Bear with me. You.

So mean, as I look at the exception test, paragraph 170, of the NPPF, it has sort of two, two matters with which to consider. The first one under paragraph, a a development would provide sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk. And I appreciate what you're saying with respect to, you know, there's no, there isn't an increase beyond 10 mil for vulnerable receptors. Quite happy with with what you're saying there. That's that's clear, but in terms of subsection A, then of paragraph 170 and the wider sustainability benefits, can you summarize those for me? Please?

Ollie Evans, on behalf of the applicant. I think what is obviously material here and related is the sort of assessment of alternatives, the principle of the the corridor that is was selected. That's Chapter Three of the environmental statement. 347, clearly at the original stage, there was a potential for five alignments, and whilst the preferred route that was selected did not perform as well from a flood risk perspective, it was the highest scoring in relation. Into the scheme objectives, following the national policy statement for national networks that that corridor C was then I understand, refined into two more sub, sub alignments and and those, there was no discernible difference from an impact of flood risk. We saw that taking into account the wider sustainability objectives, there were no other sort of reasonably available locations to align the scheme in an area of lower flood risk, and that's why the flood mitigation measures have been required to be in place to mitigate any impacts.

Okay, thank you. That's that that, for me, is more about setting out

the the sort of sequential approach to site selection. But if I were to sort of say, you know, in terms of benefits, the good benefits to the community. And I think about, yes, the roads investment strategy, too, sets out very clearly what this, what this proposal is, is set out to achieve. But equally, when applying the test within the NPPF, the exception test, it does quite clearly say benefits to the community. And I would think that community would be those road users, and, sorry, those users and residents, etc, in and around the road corridor, the development corridor itself. So I mean things we heard, there was a comment earlier about there'd be a benefit, unless I misunderstood, but I understood it to be, there'd be a benefit to public transport operators. For example, there would be, there was quite a lot of discussion on footpaths and bridle ways, etc, these sorts of things. Appreciate, I appreciate that there's this, this, you might want to come back in writing on this point, because it probably draws from a number of different aspects across the environmental statement. So I'm quite happy to sort of park the bus until deadline four, but I'm sort of looking at those sort of a very concise summary bullet points of the benefits that this will bring to help sort of status. Satisfy that that sort of Section A of paragraph 170

sir Sarah Holmes, for the applicant, the case for the scheme, which is Doc, ref, a double P, hyphen, 170 sets out the case for the scheme and the benefits that it will bring, and it does include reference to

the exception test and the factors within the case that support that. But we are happy to provide bullet points list as requested for the next deadline. Sorry,

can you give me that reference number again, the document reference please? Yes, it's

a PP. 170 case for the scheme. 170 sorry. 190 can't read my writing. 190190

Yes, yes, I have it here. Okay, great. Thank you for that. What I'll do is, if I have anything beyond, if I have any queries beyond, what's in here, I'll come back in writing to you. But thank you for that. I'll take a note and, like I say, if there's anything further on that point, I will include it in next round of written questions. Okay, so let's then move on to the second bullet point of both Section B, if you like, of the exception test, and for the benefit, benefits of the room. This reads the development will be safe for its lifetime, taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Now, as I as I read that, I feel that comes in three parts. Essentially, you can break it down into safer its lifetime, noting without increasing flood risk else, risk elsewhere, and where possible, I do accept where possible reduce flood risk overall. Can we focus in on the first part, then say for its lifetime, which I know you did touch on previously. But can you so give me a sort of a brief explanation, and again, happy to be referred to a document. But if you could just say, give me some commentary about being safe for its lifetime. Lifetime is 120 years, I understand. Thank you.

Ollie Evans, on behalf of the applicant, yes, I can give some more details. So. I would refer to the focus assessment app 177 which does detail the impact to the scheme for the fluvial design event, the 1% annual exceeds probability plus climate change in that section, it details as may have touched on earlier, in relation to the main carriage way, not being impacted or being inundated by any form of alluvial flood risk. However, some of the ancillary roads, as it connects of the slip roads, but they connect in with the existing highway network. There are some areas where there would clearly already be under flu for flood risk, and therefore those, those elements of the scheme are at risk. However, in summary, the main carriageway itself is safe for the lifetime. The scheme may obviously use the appropriate climate change requirements for the scheme for that, which is 39% as agreed with the Environment Agency.

Thank you for that. Yeah. Can I come first of all to the Environment Agency? Are there any comments you would like to make and what you've just heard please.

Alex Hazel for the Environment Agency, I think we're in agreement with the applicant in relation to the first part that you referred to, so with the safety for the lifetime of the development principal concerns, or

with other parts of that which we'll come on to. I'll just check with my flood risk colleagues, if they have anything to add, Sean, do you have anything to add?

Sean, the Environment Agency, no, I'm happy with that last answer as well. Excellent. Thank you very much. I'm going to come now to the host authorities, but may come first of all to the Nottinghamshire County Council, we heard there from the applicant about potential pluvial impact on adjacent roads as result from the scheme. Do you have any comments you want to make, or are you quite happy with what you've heard? I'm quite keen to explore this issue with you. I

given Sherman Nottinghamshire County Council, we need to do a bit further investigation and understand some of those impacts wider but, but yes, we were keen to engage and work with the applicant.

Okay, and just perhaps for Can I ask Newark and Sherwood anything you would like to comment on what you've heard?

Lindsay question for Newark and Sherwood, obviously, we're concerned if roads in the area would be at risk as a result of the scheme, and we're just keen to understand a bit more on that.

Thank you. Great. I'm just,

I'm just going to come across you, sir, from what you've just heard. Will that form part what you just heard, with respect to impact on surrounding road network? Is that going to form part of your discussions, and will that form part of what I will hope to receive a deadline five.

Ollie Evans on behalf of the applicant, apology, stuff I wasn't clear earlier, but they there will be no discernible change in flood risk to the existing road network. We have the as per you alluded to earlier on, in relation to the flood risk assessment at 177 and some specific locations, I think we have one, one to eight or one to 11 that have been detailed. But in relation to the existing OA network, we know that there are no changes in, for example, the flood hazard rating, only those receptors and noticeable changes of or significant increases in flood depth for the design fluvial event.

Okay, thank you. It would be useful, I think to sorry, I'll come to you, yeah, it would be quite useful to have something on the statement of common ground to this effect between the parties. Just to I don't want to inadvertently lose sight of this issue, so be quite handy. Just add an extra section to be the socg please with both parties.

Sorry, bear with me one second. Oh, no, okay.

I had a hand up at the back of the room, right? I. Please. I don't have you down as registered to speak, but I'm, I'm quite happy to take comment.

I'm sorry. I was told I could speak if I put my hand up, Sue, right? Yes, I

know. I'm quite happy for you to please continue.

Oh, okay, thank you. I'd just like to know with the flooding, nobody mentioned anybody's owns or business. And you know what will be happening in three years time, when the flooding gets worse? Is that where you ought to be looking? Well,

that is exactly what the the questions are around. So the development has, I will come to the applicant, to it to explain in probably clearer terms than i But ultimately, the development has a lifespan of 120 years. So we're actually our years. So we're actually are looking over not just a three, five year period. 120 years is the sort of degree of what the the hydrologists and the examining authority, and ultimately the Secretary of State will be looking at. And that's why you have this 35 39% and that that's a figure that's been agreed, as I understand it, on a more with the applicant to correct me, but as I understand it, in terms of vulnerable receptors, there won't be an increase beyond 10 millimeters, which is viewed as an acceptable level of increase. I mean, it's one centimeter. But I will pass over to the applicant, please, to provide perhaps a clearer response.

Oli evidence on behalf of the applicant. Yes, that's correct. We based on the scale and the size of the catchment area and the development of the tool that we have used, this is a large scale tool that's being used to it to access to test extreme events. I The referred to here is the one in the 100 year plus climate change event. And give some context, we've been looking at recent events in the area, including storm Henk, which we predicted to be looking at environment HD case data to be around the one in 15 year flood event, which is obviously a much lower magnitude event. So the the hydraulic model with the which is a large scale model, has been developed which covers a significant section of this area, this route, which we're pleased to say, has been approved by the Environment Agency as a tool to use to assess impacts on any change to flood risk to any forms of receptors, including homes and businesses, and within that model, there's a accepted tolerance of term limits.

Thank you very much. It's just that when you spoke, you never mentioned homes or businesses. You said all the bits, but not them. Okay, yeah, so

just to give you, perhaps some some comfort when we talk about vulnerable receptors, that's what we're that's one of the things we're talking about. It's sort of an overall, encompassing term. Thank you. Thank you for thank you for your comments. Okay, right? Sorry, where was I right? Exception test. So that's the only fight. My only other question about this the requirements and this occurred to me the other day, so I'm polished. I don't have the requirement number, but in the requirements, or the one of the articles, there's a reference to limits of deviation, one meter, potentially one meter upwards, within the limits of deal. Just to double check the in terms of the design and the limits of deviation the the flood risk assessment considers worst case scenario in terms of heights of of the of the of the proposed development. Is that correct? I

Oh, yeah, thank

you for the question. So in short, yes, we have considered the limits deviations and the hydraulic model tool we've used looking at the worst case.

Thank you for that. I have a hand up on line. Mr. Christopher Cook, would you like to come in? Please, sir.

Thank you, sir. Chris Cook, representing Peridot solar. I have a hard stop, so I'm afraid I needed to interject, but it's related to the potential road flooding. So Peridot solar is has got a scheme for a solar farm west of the A 617, south of Kellam. And I'd like to ask the applicant to address the environment agency's question or concern, because they put in a holding objection on our scheme that the modeling allows for a sufficient COVID. Size, size under the access track for the solar farm to allow for the model flood flows. So that was the reason for my my question. So I think there was a concern that the EA has that potentially there could be some road flooding in that area if the culvert isn't of a sufficient size. Thank you, sir.

Oh, thank you. That is actually something I'm going to be coming on to just shortly. Mr. Cook, so if you don't mind, I won't ask the applicant to respond to that just now, because we will come on to something of A similar vein shortly.

Okay, thank you. Sir,

right, okay, thank you for that. So if I move on to the second part of the exception test, subsection, paragraph B, which is about without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Now, as I understand it, correct me if I'm wrong, there will be an increase in water levels. There will be an increase in flood, flooding, but not to vulnerable receptors beyond the 10 millimeters. Is that have I summarized that correctly?

Olivia from bar for the applicant, to a degree, but I'd just like to give a bit more, perhaps context in detail, if I may. So we are first point I'd like to mention is obviously in reference to the fluvial design event scheme. We've looked at the potential impacts, the consequence of the scheme, which is focused around the volume lost in the floodplain. That volume lost has been fully mitigated with an additional 75% on top in the form of three floodplain compensation areas, which is, which is the standard practice in terms of flood mitigation when we're looking at displacing, particularly fluvial flood water. So we have ensured that we have more than accommodated the flood impacts as a consequence through the three flood compensation areas. The tool is, as I say, quite a large covering a large area, and is being stress tested for extreme fluvial flood events in this catchment. And we deem that the from the zero to 10 millimeter change that's predicted within the hydraulic model to be a modeling tolerance matter, not to say that in actual, real life, there would be a change in 10 millimeters increase in flood risk. The part of the reason for this, there's two parts. First is in relation to the the model certainty, which relates to the input data that we put into these large scale hydraulic models include survey data, LIDAR information. And secondly, in relation to the what's referred to as the solver behavior of the industry standard hydraulic modeling tools that are used, namely flood modeler Pro and to flow I both flood modeler Pro has a tolerance of 10 millimeters within the modeling solver and to flow has a tolerance I understand between 10 millimeters and 50 millimeters. So in summary, the predicted increases up to 10 millimeters is not a reality, and we see that as modeling tolerance not an actual change in blood risk. Thank you.

Not Understood. Thank you. When I refer back to the flood risk assessment, I can refer back to page, pages 60, PDF, page 6061, of the actual document itself through to 62 we have those locations I mentioned them earlier. Location six, straight north road that refers to instabilities with modeling. And there's, there's a of some detailed air paragraphs, eight point 2.7 to 8.2, point nine, but that doesn't sort of say about that for the other areas where there's going to be an increase in flooding. Now, I appreciate it's not going to be for vulnerable, vulnerable receptors, but there is going to be an increase risk in flooding. As I understand it, because that's how, that's how I'm interpreting the flood risk assessment, even allowing for some of those instabilities. And I wonder to move, to move this on, it might be and I will come around to other parties. I wonder if we might just need something in writing, possibly with deadline four, it might be a bigger piece of work than that deadline five, but the moment, as I'm reading it, there is an increased risk of flooding, and I'm struggling to reconcile what I have in front of me, and it might simply be that I haven't picked up on some of the detail on deadline three submissions, but I'm struggling to reconcile the second part of the exception test on its face, without, sort of going into a without, without giving sort of plenty of evidence. So yes, there's an increase in flood risk, but it's acceptable because you follow only

evidence on behalf of the applicant, we understand your queries and concerns raised, and we're happy to take those ways written responses.

No. Thank you very much. Before I close on that matter, I'll just go around the other the other parties, Environment Agency and the host authorities, if I come to the Environment Agency, first Mr. Hazel, considering what you've just heard is anything you'd like to add beyond what you've already put in writing, please.

Alex Hazel for the Environment Agency, please, can I ask Philip sale to address that the Environment Agency?

Environment Agency. I don't have anything further to add to that. Our position, as it stands at the moment is that we are not satisfied that the second part of the exception test is met, but we are in continued dialog with the applicant, and I believe they're going to provide a response to our recent comments on the hydraulic moving to flood risk impacts to third parties. Okay, thank

you. And could I ask any comments from the lead local flood authority please?

Kevin Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, no, we've got nothing further to add to that. Thank you New York and Sherwood.

Lindsay Preston for Newark and Sherwood, can I just add ask a probably a note of clarification, really, the applicant has said that the flood tolerance model has got a, well, the flood model has got a tolerance of 10 mil, and the effect to vulnerable receptors would be 10 mil. Is that on top of the tolerance, or is that including the tolerance?

I'm happy for the applicant to answer that directly.

Please only oven some of the applicant that's within the tolerance, not on top of the tolerance. I

in terms of taking that away, can I expect something at deadline four, or by sounds of things, it might be something at deadline five, given the concerns raised by the environment, age deadline, five. No, I'm happy with that. Thank you, sir. Now moving on to the third point of the exception test, and that's about reducing flood risk overall. And I do notice as where possible to reduce flood risk overall. And this is a big catchment area, I know that there's more in the PPG about referring to strategic, strategic

assessments undertaken by the lead local flood authority and things. However, I do note your response to written questions, but what I'm not seeing is something, and again, I might, I may, might have missed it, so I'm happy for you to direct me to a document, but what I haven't seen is something which says, This is what we considered, or this is what could be possible in a perfect scenario, but we can't deliver it because of a commentary to that effect. But stepping aside from the big sort of overall flood risk. I wondered if there were things, and this is where I was getting to with Mr. Cook's comment, are there more local matters, or making existing culverts bigger, open channels deeper, wider, these sorts of things which could be done, which or which could be looked at as part of the scheme which might help alleviate some localized areas of flooding as part of the proposal.

Oli Evans, on behalf of the applicant, thanks for the question, and I agree whilst blood was abducted. Section is a desirable component of the exception test. It's not a mandatory requirement. However, I would add that you know, we as detailed in Appendix G of the flood risk assessment. At 177 we detail out looking at multiple flood compensation area sites, a total of 29 sites we looked at identifying screening down to the final three selected sites that the actual screening process is detailed more in chapter three of the assessment of alternatives at zero or seven. So there was extensive effort to try and optimize the locality of any required the required flood mitigation deemed both scheme. Now I'd also refer back to the the flood risk assessment, the recent hydraulic mining technical note, where we have looked at oversizing the flood compensation areas, we undertook a sensitivity test in through the engagement with the Environment Agency, where we actually tried, I think, standards fund and West with 20% oversized to see what additional benefit that would achieve. And the outcomes for the 1% annual exceedance probability event was there was negligible betterment, and the betterment it did achieve was to an area where Betterment was already being seen in the design event, ie the 1% annual exceedance probability plus climate change, we have looked to ensure that we identified and assessed and provided mitigation measures in regards to the impact of the scheme. But what I would also add is that we have been looking at what other aspects of in terms of warmer betterment. We would like to draw your attention to the wetland habitat creation that detailed in the form of the wetland grazing marshes that's located within find and West and also in find and east, the proposed ground water fed pond and those are both detailed in the environmental master plan at 065, that provides some form of biodiversity net gain, benefit and credits, as I understand, and also, I think, is worth just drawing your attention to figure 8.1 in the flood risk assessment, at 177 where there are areas where we do show some form of betterment, to understand even some more vulnerable receptors, both majorly upstream and downstream of windmill viaduct, which is only a byproduct of the proposals of the scheme.

You know. Thank you for that. Applause.

I'm sorry, I'm just raising my next question.

Is it reasonable, or is it within the gift of the scheme to consider existing flooding problems, or is this no facile just leave the question there, is it reasonable for the scheme to and considering the wording of of the exception test to reduce blood risk overall? So just exploring that, that phrase, that phraseology in the in the NPPF, so reduce flood risk overall, where you know, where possible will reduce flood risk overall. Now I appreciate what you've said, the 75% volume increase in and there's, there's, and you looked at oversizing culverts and things. Is it reasonable to expect the scheme to sort of take existing infrastructure? And its existing problems. Where you're you're not exasperating problems, you're the scheme is essentially washing its own face.

So Sarah Holmes, for the applicants, I think that's probably a quite a detailed question, because it calls in quite a number of different facets, in terms of what is capable of being a material consideration in the determination of the DCO application for the Secretary of State, the role of national highways as a public authority spending public money and its own remit, I think probably to be fair, we would need to take that away and come back to you, because I wouldn't want to miss something that was relevance. But the. The interpretation of the NPS is about what we can do with the proposed scheme and not what the scheme is able to do, or if indeed it would be lawful for it to do so off lawful for the Secretary of State to take into account

those matters. You're absolutely right. It is, as you might imagine, it was a question which sort of just evolved organically through the discussions. And then, yes, there are quite a lot of elements to that. Could I ask for a response on that point a deadline form will take as an action point? Is that? Or do you feel you might need more time? Because it is. There's quite a lot of layers to that,

sir. Sarah Holmes, the applicant, deadline five would be more appropriate. I think

yes. So we'll take an action point for deadline five, but if we could just to clarify the meaning of reduced blood risk overall and the role of the role of national highways as the applicant, within the sense that project to address existing blood risk issues, yes, thank you, sir, yes. Thank you very much. That would be very helpful, and that would Yeah, okay, before I move on. And I think that sort of covers that point, just looking at the time as well. Sorry, bear with me. I'll just read through my notes to make sure we've covered everything that I would like to cover off on that point. Yeah, I was just going to come back to Mr. Cooper short, yeah. Oh, Mr. Cook, apologies, I didn't pick up that you were on time constraint. Would you like to come back on that point?

Perhaps Mr. Cook has has listed disappeared. We shall, we shall move on. Then on that right? So I've just okay, you've got that point that

I would like to ask. There's an increase in water levels at the railway line Lincoln Nottingham to Lincoln railway line. Has there been any concern raised by Network Rail in that point paragraph 8.213, of the flood risk assessment. Wait. One, yes. Sorry. Page, let me give you the page number, page 63 it's actually under Location 11, Castle market. It reads an increase in water levels is observed up to 20 millimeters between the Bund and Nottingham to Lincoln railway line. Does that have any impact on the operation of the railway itself?

So Sarah Holmes for the applicant, we don't have an immediate answer to that, so we'll take it away and get back to you on that.

Could we take it as an action point for deadline four? That's just, and that's a bit more straightforward, impact on water levels in the railway, on the ability of the railway line. So perfect. Thank you very much. We've covered the part about flood risk overall, which, yeah, if we need to revisit that, following your submission to Deadline five, we will do so, right? I'll come round to other parties. Can I ask? Oh, sorry, this will I'll come round. I'll come to you first, then we'll come to the other parties. Miss, please. Do we have a microphone?

Mr. Keats, you

sue. Hello. It's Sue right again, speaking to well with you what you were saying about the flooding area, if you ask the fire brigade, and anybody who's lived on Tony lane where they've had the fire brigade had to go in on bones to get them out. And I've also seen the Trent flood all the wharf, and it came right up to the mulch of all where the traffic lights are, and the swamp pub seen all that flooded. And it does not often, I admit, but it does burst its banks quite, quite nicely when it does it, and very irrationally occasionally, for. So if you check with the fire brigade and place where they've had to divert everybody, they'll be able to give you answers, no,

absolutely. And this is one of the the matters I've asked the local authorities, the host authorities, York and Sherwood and Nottinghamshire, to discuss directly with the applicant is about the impact on the existing road network, the those roads that feed into the a 46 project, and you mentioned Tony lane. I've got a query about Tony Lane later in the agenda. So, but again, flood risk. This is why we that's why we're discussing. No, absolutely. That's very helpful. Thank you. I'll come round now to I'll ask New York and show with District Council. Is there anything you'd like to to comment on, from what you've heard before I move on the on with the agenda.

Linda Preston, for Newark and Sherwood, not at this stage. Thank you.

Nottinghamshire. Kevin

Sharman, Nottinghamshire County Council, nothing from us at this stage, ayat I thank

you. Thank you, right? No one online, not seeing anyone online, okay, right, we will. We'll move on then with the agenda. In fact, let's take a short adjournment. We'll take a short adjournment until 340 for 20 minutes. Brilliant. Thank you very much. This issue specific hearing is currently adjourned until 340
Thank you. Applause.