

AUDIO_ISH6_SESSION3_29092023

Fri, Sep 29, 2023 3:10PM • 50:50

00:07

Okay, good afternoon, everyone. It's now 25 to two and time to resume this

00:15

info, issue specific here in six.

00:18

And the next item on the agenda is heritage.

00:23

Starting on the first item on this agenda item is the assessment of effects and harm on designated heritage assets with a focus on the assets where disagreement exists between parties, and two. The first one I'm going to touch on is Lewton. Who.

00:41

So it's a discussion of this site and could I ask the applicant to have examination library documents as one for one for viewpoints 17 and 17, a to hand and also as one for two to display viewpoints? 18 and 19 from appendix 14.7.

01:06

Miss Rebecca clutton for the applicants, I'm just going to allow Ms. Colder time to access the examination librarian get those documents and whilst she's able to do that, I will just introduce her. So this is Miss Annie colder. Ms. Colder is is an Associate Director for AECOM. She is our cultural heritage lead.

01:30

And so I'll also just take a moment to get with AES 141 and 142 Was it sir?

01:36

Yes, and I can see that actually the appropriate officials on the screen so thank you for that.

01:43

My first question is actually to central Bedfordshire. And I suppose in some ways a lot of this was touched upon before but will then allow you to invite

01:53

witness back

01:57

it states in your Statement of common ground that there's a lack of clarity in the visuals from Luton who so now that we've got the visuals on screen, which I appreciate we didn't have before, could you

02:09

talk me through those concerns with the visual that's shown and which works the most concerns with the hash line so it was the carpark was what was stated earlier, but now that the visuals on screen it will probably be useful to actually talk through those a bit more.

02:26

Thank you, Caroline Micronesia central Bedfordshire Council, as my colleague has discussed earlier, there are concerns from Luton who say it's probably best if I bring in Jonathan Prosser.

02:41

Jonathan Prosser Conservation Officers central Bedfordshire Council, we we have asked for clarity

02:49

with regards to missiles discussed earlier the use of wire lining and blocks in the visuals. And we also asked for

03:01

clarity with annotations pointing out the landscape features and the and the elements of the proposed new development and and the annotations have come through.

03:15

I don't know if we can scroll down through the scroll through the view that's currently being shared on screen to show those annotations specifically.

03:31

They have had they have they're not actually showing up on this.

03:36

But

03:38

that's that's the so that's a good example. So these these have helped us and would be of general assistance to anyone I think, in trying to assess quite a complicated development proposal in terms of the wider landscape.

03:58

The the lower of the two views that you see is is is a very interesting one to illustrate a point

04:10

what the view you're looking at now is from one of the upper rooms in the Mansion House.

04:17

The Ranch House is a great one this to building

04:21

the you can see the lakes mid frame.

04:27

The lakes were Capability Brown signature

04:32

and a very important part of his landscape design.

04:36

But I think it's also important to point out that

04:41

that capability capabilities brands scheme didn't stop

04:47

at the tree belt beyond the lake which is which is possibly what many people were considered to be

04:55

the tangible grounds of the Mansion House

05:00

which is now a hotel. In fact, we have evidence that Capability Brown enhanced views beyond

05:11

the lake.

05:13

On that on the rising ground beyond the lake, where you can see the fire training ground, annotated. And one of my concerns coming back to the point about mitigation in the landscape is that it is clear from what we know that the high ground was historically open, apart from deliberate

05:42

plantings that Capability Brown made to enhance the distant views on the high ground to the east. So George wood is an example of what we consider to be

05:56

an enhanced planting beyond the ground for the immediate house. So that raises the question, if you were to look at screen planting, to hide some of the proposed infrastructure that would in fact, compromise

06:15

the elements of openness that we think are part of the historic landscape to the east. So that is one of the considerations in terms of mitigation, that we will have to be looking at very carefully.

06:31

Upon apology surveys, straight off the advice straight off the question.

06:37

No, I think that's really helpful, because actually given me a bit more context, actually, to the concerns and talking to the visuals as well. And they'll be saying, you know, it's a historically open landscape, and particularly on the ridge. So that's actually really useful. Thank you. I suppose I should

06:55

say you were saying there about actually your screen planting wouldn't in terms of in front of the fire training ground wouldn't actually be a suitable mitigation in that sense, because it would, it wouldn't, wouldn't sort of relate to what was traditionally that that sort of form of the landscape. Is that correct? I have a I have a concern that it might compromise.

07:19

The what? What would be an historic openness, then then, counterpoint, if you like, with the with the plantations of George wood and Bush,

07:31

Bush pasture, but

07:36

I'm not I'm not ruling it out. I am not by professional and arboricultural. It's so I don't know if some lesser form of planting could maintain that sense of openness. But that is that that is something that we would need to look at.

07:55

But I think the point I would I would make is just acknowledging

08:00

that the historic landscape goes beyond what is effectively the registered park and garden,

08:09

which, which basically runs along the boundary on the east side runs along the lower Harpenden Road, which is beyond the lake in that lower view or in those views along that tree belt. So so the historic landscape is beyond the register park and garden, but it's still very much we are aware part of capability brands, grand vision

08:37

for his creation for the Mansion House, taking in land beyond the Mansion House grounds.

08:50

Thank you for that, obviously, at this stage, you're still considering what mitigation or the appropriateness of this is so on not push you any further on that on that particular point. So I think what I'll do at this time, I'll ask the applicant, whether you have any comments in response to that.

09:10

Yes, they're good afternoon and colder for the applicant. Just a just a couple of points in response. Firstly, we absolutely absolutely do acknowledge that the extent of the historic landscape

09:24

in the context of the designed landscape and the design principles of the registered Park does actually extend beyond the boundary of the registered Park. We do discuss this and then then in the baseline assessment.

09:38

Also, again, just to raise the point about mitigation planting. We're not actually proposing any mitigation planting within the park. We actually acknowledge in the EAS

09:53

that you can't introduce planting to mitigate the impact

10:00

visual impact within a designed landscape, because the introduction of that very planting would in itself results in a potential impact and compromise the design ethos of the park.

10:15

Thank you for that clarification. That's really that's really useful.

10:21

My next question is probably actually more feeding following on from the discussion we had first about the design principle, Design Principles Document. And this is the applicant so is with regard to historic England's response regarding concern

10:38

in order to provide the mitigation that they have suggested. So they've, they've have actually suggested about the choice of materials, color palettes and finishes

10:50

is something that you can take forward look at their response and actually incorporate into design principles. So for example, I note that design principle t 12. States, the court station, will adult muted and suitable architectural surface finishes with the responses that you're getting into the impacts on these heritage ones. Is this something which you can also use to feed more into your design principles

document? So Rebecca, and for the applicant? Absolutely, as we're happy to take that away? Perhaps, if there's a reason why we don't feel we can adopt it, we can always give you an indication as to why we've made that decision. But we're absolutely happy to take that away and try and incorporate something useful into those design principles.

11:33

Thank you. I'm going to move on to summaries customer now. And then I'm going to ask your central Bedfordshire council

11:41

was it was stated before that you were looking for more information on like the use of the fire training ground?

11:51

Do you need this to actually considered the assessment of what's been done with Sunrise castle? And do you actually think that the assessment that's been undertaken to date actually,

12:04

properly considers the impacts of bridge or brick erosion on the friar training ground to sunrise castle? Do you think the more work needed to be done and what I'm I know that you're suggesting that the cultural heritage management plan goes further in terms of sort of monitoring for that. But before getting to that stage, do you need to have some more information that actually the brick structure won't be affected? Or are you comfortable with the assessments that have been done so far?

12:35

Kerala macro decom central Bedfordshire Council, and we're still having some internal discussions with regards to the impact on somebody's castle. We've had a meeting with the applicant. And they've directed us to additional information in chapter seven of the Yes, relating to air quality. So we're having those discussions with our public protection team. So we'll be able to provide further feedback on that. I don't know from Jonathan Prosser wants to come in on any of those other points.

13:06

Jonathan Prosser Conservation Officers central Bedfordshire?

13:10

Yes, as my colleagues said, we are very much in the process of having discussions on their city. It's the proximity of the fire training ground, the frequency of it is used and well what's actually involved in its use is something that obviously has does cause me some concern in respect of the fabric, the delicate brick fabric

13:41

of summaries Castle,

13:44

just to clear clear it up it's called a castle it is in fact the remains of a of a gatehouse,

13:51

the building the building itself is incredibly there's significance in terms of the early use of brick in a prestigious context.

14:03

Detailing which firmly places this building in a in a known chronology of early brick building not just in Bedfordshire, but in Hartfordshire in Essex,

14:18

detailing which

14:20

we know seems to suggest that there is a highly skilled

14:25

band of craftsmen working

14:30

on behalf of

14:33

very wealthy people

14:36

to create designs of incredible complexity.

14:42

It is a concern that that detailing at sunrise Castle is literally crumbling and falling away.

14:50

We have evidence, photographic evidence

14:54

and indeed my own observations of having worked in central bed since 2007

15:00

I'm sure that this has accelerated in the last 40 years is to K.

15:06

And I think

15:10

the current development proposal has given an ideal opportunity for this to be looked at,

15:18

and, and assessed

15:22

as to why this is happening. And I welcome the monitoring, which is going to be set up as part of the cultural heritage management plan. What is not clear is that if if the results of that monitoring do show alarming levels of

15:46

airborne pollutants, which which could be associated with brick fabric decay.

15:56

I'm not quite sure what the mitigation of that would be.

16:02

And that is something that we need to look at it. There is a statement that

16:09

should the results

16:13

be high in terms of pollutants,

16:17

then there would be measures of mitigation, but they're not detailed what that could be. And I'm not sure what they could be. So we're having further internal discussions about the robustness of what's actually been put forward. But we have taken a huge step forward, I think, in in what the applicant has committed to up to this point.

16:40

Thank you. So it sounds like really, there's a stage to be done before you can actually agree to the mitigation measures within the cultural heritage management plan, and that you really need to establish in what the extent of decay is, but also actually, you know, on its sources, because of obviously, we can we can't really consider existing sources as part of this proposal element, we can only consider

17:04

whether whether the any additional impact from the proposed development is going to put it to a point where it really is going to substantially harm the scheduled monument. I'm going to bring the applicant in for some comments on this point. And yes, if you could just take over. Thank you, sir Eric Holder for the applicant. Yes, just again, a couple of points of clarification and to add more context.

17:32

With regards specifically to acid erosion, sulfur dioxide is actually scoped out that's that's what causes acid

17:42

potential erosion of brick fabric. This was actually scoped out at the scoping stage because it was agreed with pins on local authorities, including CBC, that it will not be a pollutant of concern, as it is not likely to cause exceedances. At the relevant standards, this is actually detailed in the quality section of the statement of common ground with central Bedfordshire. So I just like to just point out that it was actually scoped out. I'd also like to clarify that in terms of the potential impacts to the fabric

18:20

of summaries Castle, our assessment does include potential impacts from all operational activities, and that includes the use of the fire training ground. The air quality model data that we use in our assessment does predict a negligible change in the concentrations of airborne pollutants, which is why based on these data, we assess the would be no impact to the fabric of the castle from airborne pollutants.

18:50

The last point of clarification I wish to make is the content of the cultural heritage management plan

18:58

which is currently being updated in consultation with the host authorities and the current version is with them for comment. We have signposted in the cultural heritage management plan that

19:13

the monitoring that the applicant is committed to

19:17

is there so that we can we we can understand if the the air quality model

19:26

is lower than the actual amounts going to monitor it. So we will actually have real data and we have signposted to the operational air quality plan where the mitigation measures are set out so we have signposted to where mitigation is going to be dealt with.

19:43

Thank you.

19:46

Okay, thank you for that clarification. That's really useful.

19:53

Okay, my next question is,

19:56

is a is a brief form, really to Luton Council and it's

20:00

regarding the grade two listed Wigmore Hall farmhouse, obviously, the applicant has responded to your to your comments in the local impact reported. Have you seen those comments? And have you got anything to add to that?

20:20

David Gertler, Luton Borough Council. Now the comments, the comments are quite fair. And the reality is, again, if you look at the new sentry park planning application, there was a big hotel development, part of that application included a hotel. So we did consider that kind of thing. I think more we were pointing out that we didn't feel their assessments that actually accurately reflected

20:44

the impacts on that building. If you've been to the buildings, well, you will see it's been quite badly treated. So I think their comments are perfectly fair, we just were pointing out that we didn't think the impact assessment had properly considered it.

21:02

Thank you. I don't think I need to ask a follow up question on that. Thank you.

21:07

My, I have one query about

21:11

the assessment in Appendix D of the planning statement in respect of Wonderland house in London, and farmhouse where it states that construction activities will introduce change within their rural settings, which will affect the ability to appreciate their rural context and their relationship with the surrounding countryside. But the assessment considers that because the impact is temporary, it would result in no harm to the heritage significance of the assets. And it's not considered further in this statement. So the one what I want to understand is, given that construction operations could last around 20 years, can you justify why you consider that that's temporary.

21:56

And he called her for the applicant?

22:00

Yes, it's largely because these operations are not going to be a constant at all times. And when we're assessing the harm to the assets, heritage significance, we're looking at any change to its heritage values, which are architectural and historic interest,

22:22

there's going to be no physical impact to the buildings. So we are just looking at change from

22:30

new activity within its visual setting. And that's not going to impact that's not going to affect its heritage interest at all, it's not going to affect its historic interest, it's not going to affect the architectural interest.

22:47

And based on that there's going to be no no impact to us overall, how should significant events?

22:53

Yeah, okay. And is that the same in sort of views towards us towards experiencing towards those houses within the setting is that, you know, from different views in the landscape, how you would see those structures, I know that they're surrounded by different buildings as well. But I take it you that's what you've taken into account. So I think in phase one use most of it will be the landscape works that you're you're doing, then there's a break of five years, and then after that point, that's where you don't consider that will be any more harm, because maybe the construction activities are separated or there's a degree of separation between the two. So if you're looking at the asset from within the landscape, then that's

23:37

the construction activities won't be actually affecting his setting. Is that what he is?

23:43

And he calls her the applicant? Yes, I that that is basically it. We're not talking about day one, to the end of until all construction activities have finished not talking about constant activity that results in major change within the setting. We're talking about episodes of activity, which in themselves are temporary, and will not actually result in any impact to the assets, heritage interests, and that's what we need to focus on is Is there actually any change to the house interest that would result in harm?

24:20

Okay, thank you for that.

24:24

Moving on to is, uh, before I move on to the next item, does anybody want to raise anything on that subject?

24:31

I don't see anything online. So moving on to designating non designated heritage assets, where assessment of effects and harm are required. I do have a query firstly, with regarding the assessment of effects in the environmental statement and the assessment of harm. From a planning policy perspective. There are obviously two different things and it's important not to conflate the two. Can you explain more, the rationale for considering that no significant

25:00

Facts automatically results in less than substantial harm.

25:06

And he called it for the applicant. Yes, this is largely borne out of not wishing to conflate the EIA process

25:14

with

25:17

the assessment of heritage significance. However, we have discussed this with the host authorities. And we agreed that we needed more transparency in our assessment. So we have agreed with them, that the assessment of effects and harm for all assets, not just those where a significant effect has been identified. And that, yes, that will be articulated. So we have agreed to add,

25:44

please, additional content within the cultural heritage gathered here, which is currently at 073.

25:52

So, that is what we have agreed with the statutory authorities, the Gadgeteer is being updated currently. And it will contain a summary of the effect and also the level of harm, and that's where all parish should ask for. And we're aiming to submit that deadline for

26:13

that's, that's actually welcomed here. Because I was going to suggest, depending on how this discussion went, would there be a mechanism because obviously, at the minute, the appendix D of the planning statement really only assesses harm from two assets. And that's not going to be enough for us to actually look at the asset. So one of the things I was thinking of suggesting was actually having like a table or something that splits out the differences between the two. So it's actually very welcome that you, you've said that, so I don't need to ask any more on that. So thank you for clarifying that.

26:47

Turn to Luton Borough Council the you've raised Hart House, which is a grade two listed building on Clinton road.

26:55

Are you looking for this to also be assessed?

27:00

Within within the appendix as well? Yes. And I sorry, I can't remember what their response was to that in the in the assignment. It's basically that the minute obviously, the appendix D in the planning statement is only got an assessment of harm to assets.

27:19

It's going to be expanded. So that's actually focused on assessment of harm. You've you've raised Hart, house grade two listed building, and is that something that you would wish to be included?

27:33

Yes, we think he should be assessed. If

27:38

it was subject to a planning application, that planning application is expired. But we were surprised that it wasn't considered in the DCI itself, because it there is clearly development taking place, nearest art house, and we thought that that was an asset that should have been should have been taken into account.

27:58

Is that something that you would want to include in the assessment, and he called for the applicant is actually included in the assessment within the database assessment. And as I think confusion has arose, because, you know, it just has house, but Historic England who maintain the database of designated heritage assets under the National Heritage list for England. In the database, it's actually referred to as Boxall. Motors Building. So it is actually included in the baseline. And it's also in the Gadgeteer as well.

28:33

I just wanted to clarify that point. Thank you.

28:37

Sorry, sir, can I I will look back at it. And I will give you a response by deadline three on one.

28:46

I'm sorry, I completely missed that. Twice. All right.

28:53

Just making a note of that, thank you.

29:02

Okay, thank you. Right. The next

29:07

part I want to move on to is the assessment approach undertaken to impacts on the setting a designated heritage assets from noise and whether this is sufficient now I've seen within the cultural heritage chapter.

29:22

The minute the assessment has been done on the changing noise contours in decibels and that's actually shown in figures 10.6 to 10.8 over the over three periods. What I want to explore here is whether the assessment on designated assets and particularly when assessing the impacts on harm

should go further and actually consider the implications of increased frequency of flights over assets and what

29:53

my main assets of concern here I'm more than registered parks and gardens of samples Walden Berry and green one

30:00

To listed buildings, so when

30:04

I asked the applicant for some comments on that

30:09

and he called for the applicant.

30:12

Yes, we

30:13

our methodology for assessing

30:16

impacts arising from noise change within setting is based on the testing of heritage therapy, setting up heritage assets guidance, by Historic England that is the principal guidance document. It's also supplemented by aviation noise metrics guidance produced by English heritage. And the methodology we agree we have adopted NES was agreed with the battery capacities, including Historic England. And that agreement is documented in the ES chapter, which is a SAR seven, seven. What we're looking at, we have actually,

30:57

we have actually considered impact from the frequency and increased frequency of aviation noise. And I know you mentioned St. Paul's, but again, just to go back to loon who the the significant effect we identified that is through the frequency and increased frequency and aviation noise.

31:20

With St. Paul's, we had considered that the change levels from the change levels are assessed to be negligible from the noise data, and wouldn't really introduce the level of change that was noticeable within the setting of the park, which is why significant effect was not recorded in the assessment of St. Paul's.

31:48

We are, we did adopt a holistic approach to looking at impact within a design space. So again, all the assets within St. Paul's would be were assessed as one.

32:04

This, again is the methodology that we agreed at scoping. Because Historic England were concerned that if only part of a registered Park fell within the noise change contours, that we wouldn't actually fully assess all impact from any heritage assets that actually fell outside of that noise change. So we have assessed all the impacts of insect. So all of the potential impacts to all the heritage assets within St. Paul's RPG, but it does come down to the level of noticeable change in in, in noise levels.

32:42

Yes, but at the same time in asset, there could be up to 150 Extra flights a day, if you look at the busy timetable that's in the new Kasich, it could go up to 560 flights of an increase from the current baseline is that not going to result in a change to hold that asset is appreciated from people that are visiting it.

33:08

And he called for the applicant, the change may indeed be perceptible and may be noticeable. But we have to look at how that change is actually impacting, again, the heritage significance of that asset. And with our methodology, you have to understand we have to understand if a specific noise environment is important or makes an important contribution to the setting is it actually essential for appreciating and understanding the heritage interest of that space.

33:44

And because the house your interest has to do with

33:48

its its architectural value, its design landscape, the fact that aviation noise is already a component of its setting, if you experience that when you go there, there, there absolutely will be a change. But it's the level of that change. It's not introducing something new.

34:09

And so again, we would stand by the assessment there.

34:18

Thank you. I'm going to pass over to Dr. Hunt, who's got a question. Follow up question to that. So I just have one quick question. You mentioned that all the acids, symbols Walden had been aggregated together. If they were disaggregated, would there be a different conclusion in terms of significance?

34:38

And he called for the applicant. No is the is a simple is as simple as that we did look at as well. This is part of the methodology that we did work out at scoping in terms of how we're going to approach these assets where they are partially within study area or partially within the nose contour change.

34:59

Project

35:00

example that the buildings, the list structures were within the park, their setting is actually defined by the park.

35:09

So to actually look at the whole as look at impact on the whole doesn't diminish the assessment of impact anyway and also difficult we are actually articulating the impact assessment for each individual household asset within the Gazetteer, which is currently being updated.

35:28

Thank you. And just on your point about the aircraft already being within the context of the setting, I mean, obviously, if you had a road going past a property, and you then jeweled it, it would still be the asset would have had road noise. But obviously, you're changing the scale of that road noise. Do you not think there is a comparison there? If you're substantially increasing the the flights that actually that that does begin to have a bearing on your appreciate of assessing?

36:00

And he called for the applicant?

36:04

Again, it would be noticeable, but again, would it actually we have to look at what it actually result in an impact to the heritage interest, wouldn't actually be able would actually interfere with your ability to appreciate the architectural interest and historic interest

36:26

of the park, and we don't believe that it would be.

36:31

Okay, thank you.

36:36

Okay, thank you.

36:40

The final

36:42

item on the heritage was actually is suitability mitigation measures. And I was going to ask what the current position was regarding air quality and mitigation measures in the cultural heritage punishment plan. But you've already answered that question. So I don't need to, to ask any more on that. And that brings me to the end of the heritage.

37:05

Item. Before we move on to the next one, is there any points that anybody wants to raise on this?

37:12

I asked her the Hartfordshire authorities that the arbiter authorities, I think we share the concern that Dr. Hunt has raised around the setting of the Heritage assets and the

37:24

importance of tranquility as a component there has been sort of downplayed in the context of the assessment and the environmental statement, particularly around those registered parks and guidance. Apologies I don't have a subject matter expert online due to illness. And we can expand further in our post hearing submission. If that's helpful. Yes, that that will be helpful. Thank you. Okay. Is there anybody else who wants to raise any comments on this item?

37:52

No. Okay. I'll move on to number seven, which is the solar photovoltaic take generation equipment. I only have one question on this really and looking through the glinting glare study that has been

38:06

sent in that there are some uncertainties about the

38:11

impacts on carpark p one and P two.

38:15

Given these uncertainties of impact, because a further assessment needs to be made. How can the examining authority conclude that the impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level considering that these works are included in the draft can DCO.

38:41

Mark has given to the applicant, the applicant

38:46

the Glarus systems glare assessment has been provided document as one for six it is, as you say, based on outline, design, I think invasion, that specific question if we could take that one away and but already responsive? Yeah, that's fine. We could put that as an action point for what deadline? Three or four?

39:08

The applicant I'm being told for sport. That's fine. Thank you very much. Okay, that brings me to the end of my agenda item. So I'm now going to hand over to Miss Davies, who has some any other business to discuss.

39:23

Thank you. We've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that's relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I ask if there are any other matters that any party which is to raise?

39:36

Rebecca and for the applicant? Madam, it just goes back to the point I was raising earlier about we had identified some discrepancies in few deadlines. Having now seen the list it's slightly longer than I think is sensible for us to go through. Now. What I did just want to flag though, was the reasons why we were asking to change things from deadline three to deadline for principally obviously deadline for is next Thursday. There

40:00

are not many working days between now and then.

40:05

Three, yes, deadline three is next Thursday, not deadline for deadline three is next Thursday, there are a few working days between now and then, where we're asking to have a deadline shifted from three to four. It's because we either we don't have the work already, and we need to do it or it requires engagement with a third party that we can't get. So we're, we're not looking to push much, you know, lots of things into four, but it's just where it is not going to be practicable to to achieve that. And we'd rather get the we'd rather get you the right answers, complete answers, we'll put in something that's incomplete and subject to change. That's absolutely fine. That's the approach we've taken when we haven't had deadlines. It's to put what we think probably fairly administrative tasks in deadline three, and then everything else we've put on deadline for, which isn't to say that we don't need everything in as quickly as we can, of course, and because obviously, we have a great deal of time for the examination. We want to get prepared for first written questions. But yes, we'll take your comments on board with that. Are you prepared to send those to the case team? That's our plan is to send those to the case team, I think later today, yet so that hopefully we can get a response pretty quickly at the beginning. Right. We'll get back to you certainly by the beginning of next week on those fantastic thank you, Adam.

41:39

Was there anything else you wanted to add to that Miss clutton Rebecca clutton for the applicant? Sorry, madam, we're looking just there were a few. There were a few items of any other business on the agenda. And we'll just, we do have a point to raise in relation to one of those. We weren't sure whether you're about to come to it or not. Tell me which one it is. And I'll tell you when it comes to just about the November hearings. Yes, but that is on my list. Great. We should wait to hear what you say first then.

42:05

So firstly, can I asked Luton Borough Council for an update on when the decision to increase the passenger cap to 19 million passengers per annum is expected. At the preliminary meeting you indicated that a decision was due on the 22nd of August, but this was then subsequently delayed. Have you had any indication of when the decision may be issued? And if this is currently on track?

42:26

Yes, David Gertler, Luton Borough Council the

42:31

planning casework unit wrote to us and said the decision would be issued on or before the 13th of October.

42:39

I will find the letter and forwarded it on to to your colleagues that case worked off I don't think we particularly need the last year it was to see if you had any updates. And thank you for that 13th of October.

42:52

And can I then turn to North Hertfordshire and Luton Borough Council to provide an update on whether the application for solar park at wandern end has been determined.

43:05

Generosity the three Hertfordshire authorities I'm afraid I need to take that on away and confirm with my client.

43:19

It's probably best if we send you that in writing after this meeting, thank you.

43:29

By deadline one, the examining authority received a number of suggestions for locations that it should visit on an accompanied site inspection or an ASI. A deadline to wrap to 031. The applicant submitted in light of the suggestions or suggested itinerary for an ASI. We've reviewed the list of suggested locations and it appears that we've already visited the majority of those suggested. Furthermore, the locations that remain are all either visible from the public domain or publicly accessible.

44:04

As an ASI is only required when we need to access private land, we decided that it does not need we don't need to conduct another asi. But we will endeavor to ensure that all the outstanding locations including those that were suggested by interested parties have visited.

44:21

As you'll see from the timetable, the week commencing the 27th of November 2023 is scheduled for another set of hearings if required. I can confirm that we will be holding hearings during that week.

44:33

I wanted to take the opportunity to advise you though unfortunately this venue is not available. So we'll be holding the hearings at the Hilton Garden Inn at Luton North Adyen does and further details

regarding the new venue will be placed on the project page of the national infrastructure website closer to the time. Miss Clinton was there something you wanted to add to that

44:57

Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, Madam it was really just

45:00

about the timing of our notification of what those of what those hearings will be just so that we can make sure our notices etc go out at the correct time, we just hope to have those are sufficiently in sufficiently in advance to enable us to do that's understood and it would certainly be in everyone's interest to get them out as soon as possible. We'll need some time to absorb all of the new information that's coming in, but we will publish them as soon as we can.

45:28

At the preliminary meeting, Mr. Lamborn from NASA can requested that when documents were revised, the clean and track change version of the document be submitted to enable readers to quickly and easily identify what changes have been made.

45:41

We declined this request in our rule six letter, which is Annex II of PD 007, because

45:49

we'd requested that a guide to the application be submitted at each deadline which would track changes to the documents, and would include a column outlining the main changes.

46:00

While the applicant has submitted a document tracker, the latest version of which is at rep 28003. The summary of changes column is not being filled in. And rather than each document having a single entry with various versions listed each new version has a separate entry.

46:18

As a result, this document is not providing us and others with the ability to identify the amendments to where and which is the latest version, using the draft compensation policies, measures and community first document as an example. So far, there have been four versions of this documents submitted into the examination

46:36

APB 2d Six as 050 as one to eight and rep 2005. The document tracker guide to the application provides no details of the differences between each of the versions and neither to the front sheets or the documents themselves.

46:54

As a result, the only way for the XA and any other reader to be able to identify changes to the document is to read it through and spend time comparing it with the previous version.

47:05

Given the volume of documentation submitted, this is taking up a significant amount of time. At the preliminary meeting. The XA agreed with the applicant that to provide track change copies of all documents can be quite onerous, but it also agreed with Mr. Lamborn to keep the matter under review. Having reviewed the matter unless the applicant can begin to provide a way in which changes or documents can be easily identified. The XA may need to request the submission of clean and track change versions of documents to the applicant want to respond or make a suggestion on how we can address this issue.

47:43

Becker clapping for the applicant. Firstly, can I just apologize on behalf of the applicant that that information hasn't been provided in a form that's useful? We quite understand the point that you're making. What Mr. Henderson's just said to me is that we will liaise with the case officer and see if we can find the most suitable way of getting that information recorded in a useful way for you and for other people who want to review the application documents. So apologies noted and we will try better.

48:15

Thank you Miss Clinton.

48:18

In addition, YECs wish to express his concern regarding the significant number of errors that are still appearing in the documents. This is an issue that we've previously highlighted. And again, to reduce the burden on the applicant, we agreed to accepting an errata sheet and that going forward when a document was being updated or revise the whole document will be reviewed and any errors corrected. Please can you ensure that going forward documents are checked for both accuracy and previous errors.

48:47

Finally, I'd like to emphasize the need for documents to be submitted in a timely fashion. It's important for all parties that wherever possible deadlines are adhered to. Late submissions are problematic for all parties. And you need to bear in mind that the acceptance of late documents is at the discretion of the act they

49:06

given the number of action points rather than go through these in detail. Now they'll be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two.

49:16

Hopefully by the end of the day, and a recording of this hearing will be placed on the project page as soon as practicable.

49:24

This is the final issue specific hearing of this week. And I'd like to take this opportunity to thank not only all of today's participants for their time and assistance. But all those who have been involved with the hearings this week. We found these events incredibly useful. And the evidence that we've heard or the will be submitted as a result of the numerous action points will be invaluable in helping us to make our recommendation to the Secretary of State. I'd also like to take the opportunity to extend our thanks to the case team which is made up of Sean Evans and Emil Bernie, who have been supported this week by Jennifer Savage, without whose support we could not have held these events. I

50:00

also like to thank production 78 for their patience and assistance this week.

50:05

I'll take this opportunity to remind you that the timetable for this examination requires the parties to provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline three, which is Thursday, the fifth of October,

50:16

except where otherwise noted in the action points, and the XA will be issuing its first written questions on Tuesday the 10th of October with responses do a deadline for which is the first of November

50:34

The time is now 25 minutes past two and this six issue specific hearing for the proposed London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now closed