

File Name: ISH8 18th June 2024 Part 4.mp3
File Length: 00:37:52

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:05 - 00:00:48:14

Okay. Thank you very much. 3:20. Thank you for your prompt attendance. I realize that's quite a short break. Um. Uh, hearing is resumed. Um, so if we start off, then with the second bullet point of agenda item five, which is about the linkage of the Das with other documents. Um, my first question on this to the applicant is, um, essentially, the Jlab have suggested combining design elements of design principles and the um outline landscape ecology management plan, and I think the code of construction practice as well into one document.

00:00:48:23 - 00:00:51:26

Um, have you thought about doing that? Um, but what's your response to that?

00:00:52:08 - 00:01:26:26

Uh, Scott Linos for the applicant. We don't think that's a good idea, sir. Um, mainly because these are documents prepared for different purposes. Um, the, uh, the Das. Um is effectively being prepared as a means of setting out what the context for development is and the design evolution behavior. Controls on the development are set out through the design principles, as we've been discussing, um, already.

00:01:27:06 - 00:02:04:08

And that document performs a different, uh, function to the OLAp and the the cusp of the construction practice and the, uh, landscape environmental management design principles effectively control the design of the permanent development, including building structures works and non highway drainage. Uh, details. The lamp controls the landscape spacing and management of the soft development. If I can summarize it that way, of the permanent development, that's part of the project that would be prepared by the landscape design team.

00:02:04:10 - 00:02:35:27

Um, the, the landscape management team, the code of construction practice and the appendices related to that control, um, how and where construction is carried out, including layout, siting of construction compounds and so on. So they, um, are prepared for different purposes. They've got different, uh, mechanisms, um, for securing, um, compliance. But fundamentally they're designed for different things.

00:02:35:29 - 00:02:47:07

And we think combining them into a single document would confuse those matters and, um, confuse rather than clarify, which is why they've been prepared separately.

00:02:49:09 - 00:03:03:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, would or should, um, key diagrams and indicative plans from the Das be taken over and, uh, copied into the appendix into the design principles appendix.

00:03:03:29 - 00:03:42:27

Uh, Scott Lyons for the applicants. Um, we don't think so, sir, because, um, the purpose of those indicative plans being in the Das was to explain both how the design evolved and how, in indicative terms, it could, um, look, if one brings those, uh, indicative drawings into the design principles and those design principles have to be effectively complied with under the DCO, that we start confusing

the purpose of the design principles with the purpose of the drawings, because the design principles are there to allow you to achieve an outcome.

00:03:43:18 - 00:03:57:08

If one put the indicative drawings and the design prints will just have to be complied with. It would risk, um, those drawings being treated as martyrs, which had to be complied with, which is not the purpose of the design principles. Those are only indicative plans.

00:03:59:08 - 00:04:11:11

Thank you. Um. Could you, uh, show me where the detail on kind of construction compounds, design and lighting and so on, uh, can be found in the in the Das or the appendix.

00:04:16:25 - 00:04:28:12

In Scotland for the applicant until it's in section eight of the Das, then control through the COC for the Code of Construction Practice. Um, sir, just wrapped 4007.

00:04:30:21 - 00:04:43:03

Okay. Thank you. Would that. On the face of it, that could seem, um, like quite useful thing to have within the design principles would be the design of construction compounds as well, and lighting and so on.

00:04:44:13 - 00:05:20:22

Um, Scotland. I think the difference there, sir, is that the design principles are there to deal with the permanent development, including the buildings and structures, whereas the code of construction practices how you get there through the construction process itself. I think the immediate reaction to that is, again, you risk confusing the purposes of those documents that. By putting in design matters which relate to the construction period, it begins to confuse what the purpose of the design principles are, which is to deal with the permanent developments that's granted consent.

00:05:21:07 - 00:05:27:02

I think, again, it's trying to avoid confusing what the purpose of these separate documents are.

00:05:28:08 - 00:05:43:12

I accept that point. Um, I think if you look at some of your construction compounds, they'd be there for quite a significant amount of time, and I'm sure it could be, um, made quite obvious within the design principles, but they're not permanent. But.

00:05:49:16 - 00:05:57:27

Um, sorry if the suggestion is we should bring that into the design principles themselves. I think we can take that away and recognition at that point. Okay.

00:05:57:29 - 00:06:02:11

Thank you, thank you. Okay. Mr. Bedford, did you have any points on this bullet point?

00:06:06:06 - 00:06:09:27

Oh, sorry. Sorry. Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities.

00:06:12:02 - 00:06:50:10

So yes, we consider that design should be integrated and holistic, and design means more than, uh, as it were, simply what does it look like? It also includes how does it function? How sustainable is it? Uh, there is a, um, as it were, an entire process. And what we are trying to achieve is that everything is thought through in a integrated and considered manner so that the, um, whole actually works.

00:06:50:12 - 00:07:31:24

And that's why we think it's important to bring, uh, as much as possible into one, um, uh, overarching thematic document, which will enable you to see how all the different parts of the jigsaw do actually integrate together. We don't think that there is a real risk of confusion that really lies at the doors of the authors of the document, but it's perfectly possible for an integrated document to make it very clear which of its principles or its components deal with temporary periods, and which deal with permanent periods.

00:07:32:09 - 00:08:15:25

We also think that and this is, um, to an extent quite marked, if you look at the applicant's approach to the Olympe and you look at requirements seven. You will see. The applicant is, uh, recognizing that that is something which should be the subject of further approval by the local authorities as you move from Olympe to detailed landscape planning. And uh, we see landscaping obviously is very important element of design, but we don't see, as it were, a fundamental difference between what is appropriate for using Mr.

00:08:15:27 - 00:08:59:02

Linus language, soft landscaping and what is hard built form. We think good design relates to both, and we consider that the points that we've been raising require an integrated, holistic and overarching approach, which is why we suggested bringing the documents together. Having said that, if the view was that simply in terms of workability or manageability, separate documents was the preferred approach, I think we could accept that so long as the documents themselves actually properly worked together and they were consistent with each other.

00:08:59:07 - 00:09:03:29

So, um, that's that's I think what we'd want to say about this item. Thank you.

00:09:04:27 - 00:09:06:14

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Mr. Lyness.

00:09:06:27 - 00:09:08:27

Um, Scotland for the applicant. Um.

00:09:12:06 - 00:09:46:10

I don't think anything that we've heard convinces us that there would be any substantive merit in combining what are currently three separate documents into into one. I haven't heard any substantive justification for that, and I don't think the JLA is appointed by us. Any particular inconsistency between the documents that somehow needs to be resolved by merging them into, uh, one? Obviously, if they do regard them as containing any inconsistencies, uh, we can listen to that and resolve them.

00:09:46:12 - 00:10:16:23

But resolving it doesn't mean preparing them as part of the single document. Fundamentally, they serve. They serve different purposes. As far as the approval is concerned with the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, um, uh, provides for, uh, there's a two stage approval process as one goes through the authorized development. But the reasons for those may relate to the fact one is providing landscaping and ecology, which may need to be informed at different stages of development of one goes as one goes through.

00:10:16:25 - 00:10:49:00

But we don't see that approach somehow requiring something which justifies a single, uh, a single, uh, a single document which covers cockpit, all lamp and design principles in one and one form. The idea of combining several different documents into 1st May sound superficially attractive, but when they

perform different functions, then there's just as much merit in separating them out and having discrete requirements applied to them.

00:10:49:03 - 00:10:54:16

But we just don't see any substantive merit in this, in this combined effort that the judge was suggesting.

00:10:57:04 - 00:10:58:07

Thank you, Mr. Bastard.

00:10:58:11 - 00:11:11:22

So can I. I do think I need to add anything further just to make a correction. When I said Olam requirement seven, I should have said Olam requirement eight. The CSP is requirement seven. Thank you.

00:11:14:12 - 00:11:20:16

Okay. Um. Does anybody else wish to make any comments on, uh, that third bullet point of agenda item five?

00:11:23:19 - 00:11:44:25

I'm not seeing any hands anywhere. So we'll move on to, um. Sorry. The third. That was the second one. The third bullet point. Now, um, this is external design review matters. Um, and I note in this respect that the latest iteration of Design Principles document includes a proposal for an independent design advisor. Um, could you explain to me and everyone else the purpose and responsibilities of that role, please?

00:11:50:01 - 00:12:27:09

I thank you, Tim Lord, for the applicant. Um, I think it's fair to say that this has generated quite a lot of, um, debate within Google. Uh, and, uh, hopefully we've made some very significant progress on producing, uh, annex A of rep 5031, which sets out the, uh, the role of the design advisor and the process by which we would, uh, go through as well. Um, and that has followed a helpful meeting that we had with the, uh, local authorities a few weeks ago.

00:12:28:09 - 00:12:58:06

Um, the approach, uh, taken by gal would be to, uh, appoint, um, really a qualified and experienced, um, design advisor, um, who would be, um, independent but would obviously report into, uh, the chief technical officer at Gal who sits on the board and is responsible for, um, development and design matters.

00:12:59:04 - 00:12:59:19

Um.

00:13:00:00 - 00:13:36:10

I'm pleased to say, and I have mentioned this to the local authorities, that, uh, we've approached a gentleman called Paul Finch. Um, and we'll provide his details of his CV at deadline six. Uh, Mr. Finch, um, has held various positions at, uh, Cabe, which is the Commission for architecture and the Built Environment, which is no longer, um, but, um, he was the chair of the commission's design review panel.

00:13:37:03 - 00:14:19:06

Uh, and then, uh, he oversaw the merger of Cabe with the, uh, Design Council and where he became deputy chair of the design council. And I understand that Mr. Finch has done a large number of chairs on design review panels. Uh, certainly he was, uh, between 2005 and 2012. He chaired Caleb's, uh,

London Olympics um, design review panel. Uh, and he's also, uh, sat on various architectural, uh, architect selection panels, including for the British Museum, uh, Jubilee Gardens, the South Bank and, uh, prominent buildings.

00:14:20:05 - 00:14:50:28

Um, so we've approached, uh, Mr. Finch and, uh, he is um, I think we're confident that he would perform the role of a design adviser. Um and, um, in discussion with him and with um, colleagues from the local authorities. Um, the role of the design adviser would be obviously to work with girls design and architectural and technical teams, um, throughout the process.

00:14:51:13 - 00:15:37:05

Um, but he would have the discretion to, uh, convene a panel, um, depending on which type of building he was reviewing. So, um. Maybe the best way to do this is by example. Um, if we are considering the design of, say, the highways elements, that may mean a slightly different type of composition of design review process to some thing when you're going to consider maybe, um, the hotel development, you might need different skill sets, but we would leave it up to the discretion of, um, the design advisor to select a small number.

00:15:37:18 - 00:16:09:09

Uh, and we've discussed that with the local authorities. 3 or 4 members who would then convene and to review the designs and that would, could take place, um, through what we call a design review meeting. Um, and uh, obviously, uh, the design advisor would, uh, invite other attendees. Uh, and we've set out, um, some of those attendees, uh, as part of the submission.

00:16:10:01 - 00:16:49:22

Um, and the design advisor would sort of convene and then chair that, uh, review process. Um. We would ask that the design adviser, um, prepare what we call a design report. Uh, there would be, um, three elements. Um or four elements to that design review report. That would be an executive summary. There would be a review of the design presented and its appropriateness, given the local context and the constraints and the other requirements placed on it by Google.

00:16:50:10 - 00:17:25:26

And having due regard to the constraints in an airport environment is extremely important, because there are a number of technical constraints that obviously do need to be taken into account in that design review process, especially things like the aerodrome safeguarding standards on landscaping, things like bird hazard and, um, uh, landscaping, you know, that would attract birds, which we obviously want to discourage. Uh, and then obviously things like building regulations, health and safety and accessibility requirements, um.

00:17:27:07 - 00:18:08:10

He would the the chair or the design advisor would also set out the views of the design review meeting and report back on those and then set out, uh, recommendations, uh, including areas for further consideration by gal's design team before the design is finalized and submitted under requirement for 5 or 6 to the uh, local authority for, uh, detailed discharge. So that's the type of process that would take place. Uh, and um, uh, the intention is, um, the goal to, um, if consent is granted to, uh, a point, uh, Mr.

00:18:08:12 - 00:18:14:05

Finch, and as I say, we can provide his CV, um, during one of the deadlines.

00:18:15:07 - 00:18:44:04

Thank you. That'll be useful. Thank you for that summary. I just had a few questions on, um. Role itself. So we have a list there at one point for one of the, uh, specified elements of the proposed

development that the design advisor will undertake an independent review of. And I kind of wondered how that list was arrived at and why certain works were weren't included. For instance, in North and South terminal, um, departure land extensions.

00:18:45:28 - 00:19:21:05

I think it's we've we've looked very carefully at the, at this list, uh, and we've put forward the, the buildings and the structures that, um, we believe are, are, are very readily visible, um, especially from, uh, public areas. So, um, under uh, 1.4.1, you see, uh, work 35, 36 and 37, all of the highway structures, we think they're particularly sensitive because of their relationship to, uh, Riverside Gardens and Horley.

00:19:21:07 - 00:19:55:25

So, um, they've been included under the remit. Uh, and then we've also included, um, the hotels, um, that form essentially the, uh, a design feature towards the front, um, of the, of the building, uh, the front of the terminals. So as you're an arriving passenger, you would go through and you'd, you'd see these on your way into the terminal. Um. We did think very carefully about, um, buildings on the actual airfield.

00:19:56:19 - 00:20:03:08

Um, and whether they should be included in the design review process. Um, and I think, um.

00:20:05:00 - 00:20:41:24

A sort of, uh, conclusion was that, um, all of those buildings would only be seen from very large, um, sort of significant distances, really, and they wouldn't be, uh, readily visible. Um, in terms of, um, sort of visual impact from outside the um, parameter or the boundary of the airport. Um, what I did do is, um, I looked at, um, previous submissions that we've made to Crawley Borough Council for, um, developments on the airfield.

00:20:42:03 - 00:21:25:29

So, uh, two particular developments. One was the extension to, um, pier six, which I know you saw on your site visit. That was, uh, an application that was first submitted in June 2019. Um, and um, was two sentences in the officer's report, which basically said that the design details of the proposed development are considered acceptable. And the height and massing of the extension would not cause adverse visual impacts, as the development would be located within the center of the airport and would be at least partially screened and some distance from sensitive views.

00:21:26:09 - 00:22:01:14

And the proposal would also not fall within the long distance view splays under Crawley Borough Local Plan Policy eight. So it was clear to us that, um, there is some recognition that buildings that are located very much within the center of the airport, um, are not readily visible and are not viewed, um, easily, uh, from. Locations outside of the airport, and very much similar to the multi-storey car park number seven.

00:22:01:27 - 00:22:06:18

Submission that was made in 2020 2nd October 2022.

00:22:07:17 - 00:22:08:02

Um.

00:22:08:17 - 00:22:43:08

So it's submitted in. On the 26th of October, 2022 and, uh. Over four months later, on the 3rd of March 2023, again, we got, uh, a no objection. Um, and on page eight of the planning officers report. Um, again, it says that in terms of the visual impact of the multi-storey car park, the height and

massing of the building would appear to be consistent with other large scale buildings nearby, such as the Hampton by Hilton, the Premier Inn and MCP six.

00:22:43:24 - 00:23:22:24

And it's considered unlikely that the development would cause adverse visual impact, as it would be located well within the airport in the context of existing large buildings and screened from the closest residential dwelling dwellings located over 300m away to the east by woodland areas either side of the London Road. So we we see in this that although design has been considered, um, there are lots of other factors which, um, tend to indicate that when you're looking at these buildings, especially in the airfield environment, um, they are considered in the context of the existing airport buildings.

00:23:23:05 - 00:23:52:04

There are a large number of safeguarding and technical restrictions on the, um, the sort of the form of the building that can be allowed, uh, and they're not sort of readily visible. So we've taken that approach, sir, um, to, um, not include the airfield, um, a large number of the airfield buildings in the design review process. I hope that comprehensively sort of answers what was quite a straightforward question. Sorry. No.

00:23:52:06 - 00:24:26:16

No problem. That's useful. Thank you. Um, I guess what springs to mind from from your answer there is when you talked about visibility a lot. So the other potential structures I guess would be car park y. It's kind of on the northern boundary of the airport, almost possibly carpark X on the southern boundary. Uh, and also the proposed new hangar, um, due to the height of it and its visibility within the Elvia from northern various northern viewpoints. And I wondered if those three potential developments were looked at as well.

00:24:29:00 - 00:25:10:18

Yeah, we did look at them, sir. And especially when you look at the context of the airport. It's not unusual to see hangars, certainly the Boeing hangar, the Virgin hangar, the Easyjet hangars, the British Airways hangar, they're all a lot of the buildings on the airport are large scale, um, sort of quite, quite industrial style buildings. Um, and that's probably reflective of the car parks as well, where there's, you know, a large number of car park buildings. Um, but it's certainly something that I'm happy to take away and, um, discuss with, um, colleagues at the local authorities if, uh, um, if that would be acceptable.

00:25:11:02 - 00:25:33:18

Thank you. Yeah, that would be useful. Thank you. Um, another couple of questions, really on the on the specifics of this annex, a, um, one of the questions I had, um, was based on the design report. Um. And what is provided to the local authority. Um.

00:25:35:13 - 00:25:38:15

I'm just trying to find the right section, but.

00:25:40:09 - 00:25:55:00

It mentions? Uh, yeah, 1.6.5. The design review statement that you provide to the relevant authority, which includes a summary of the design report, and I wonder why it would be a summary rather than the design report itself.

00:26:05:06 - 00:26:42:09

That I think we. We were thinking there may be certain elements in the design report that would, um, potentially relate to, uh, things like cost, which we might not want to be put into the public arena. Um, certainly the cost of, uh, potentially different, uh, cladding options, uh, or the, um, or the, um,

effectiveness of different cladding options. We might want to, um, that might be a something that Google would want to consider very carefully, um, before making a decision.

00:26:42:21 - 00:27:13:00

So we, we weren't going to the report would be, uh, to Google. Um, I think the, the thinking was that the executive summary of the report, um, would be provided, um, as it is provided to gal. Um, but the actual the details, uh, some of that may be, um, confidential, sir. And so again, this is we haven't um. Gone into a huge amount of detail with this, with Mr.

00:27:13:02 - 00:27:22:19

Finch. Uh, and we're happy to do that with Mr. Finch. Um, so I guess it is something that we could we could certainly look at. Um, but, um.

00:27:25:09 - 00:27:29:01

One of the things that you know, it would. It would contain.

00:27:30:24 - 00:28:06:24

Details of the review, carried out a summary of the design report and the response to the recommendations. Gal's response to the recommendations. So. In with a sort of a submission that goes in for detailed design that would form part of the submission. There'll be other things in that submission as well, like a planning statement and and other aspects. So it was just making sure that we provide the right level of detail, I guess, to the local authority in order to be able to discharge. But if they've been involved in the design review and in the meeting and the panel, they'll be well aware of the design adviser's sort of thinking in any event.

00:28:07:24 - 00:28:35:03

Thank you. Yes. Um, I guess what sprung out really, was it that you mentioned there the executive summary? Um, which which would be useful? Um, because you I read 1.6.5 and he said a summary of its own report. And then what springs to my mind immediately is that summary. Would that be written by somebody who isn't Mr. Finch, for instance, whereas an executive summary, as part of his design report, you know, his his words, if you like, and is his independent words, I presume.

00:28:36:18 - 00:28:37:09

That makes sense.

00:28:40:16 - 00:29:06:04

Difficult for the applicant, as has been said. So I think we can take 165 away. Have a look at the drafting to cover that point, as well as the need to ensure that any confidential information is protected. We may be able to carve that out of a wider reference. The design report, for example. We'll have a look at that. We understand the point and we'll take it away, sir.

00:29:06:14 - 00:29:19:14

Thank you. Um, a similar point really. Odds on 1.6.3. Um, the design report will be advisory and non-binding. I wondered if you could elaborate on that. So it seems to be. It's quite stark.

00:29:23:03 - 00:30:15:12

That means Scott Landers for the for the applicant. I think that largely reflects the general principle by which design reviews operate, even in London. Plan policy, for example, where there's a requirement for design review panels to take place. It's quite clear there's not a they aren't binding in the sense that the recommendations of the Design review panel must be fed into the development, albeit that one can be can be expected to explain what the recommendations were and how they might have influenced the design. But what we're intending in one, six, three is to reflect that, just to make it absolutely clear that, um, there may be circumstances where, for whatever reason, the design report makes a

recommendation, but gull has a perfectly legitimate reason not to not to follow it, provided that's been the subject of discussion, and we're otherwise having to accord with the design principles.

00:30:15:14 - 00:30:20:17

We just wanted to make that clear in 16B to avoid any any confusion on that part.

00:30:22:04 - 00:30:22:19

Okay.

00:30:22:27 - 00:30:23:12

Thank you.

00:30:25:29 - 00:30:40:18

Yes. And, um, as a reminder, Scott, last applicant, as I said, fundamentally, we have to comply with the design principles. We want to make sure that there's nothing falling out of this process that puts us at risk of conflicting with the design principles on these two. Yeah.

00:30:40:29 - 00:30:41:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:30:43:10 - 00:30:43:27

Mr. Bedford.

00:30:47:05 - 00:31:20:20

Thank you, Sir Michael, for the joint local authorities there. Just on that last point, you'll know that the design reviewer at paragraph 1.5.1 is already enjoined to focus on a number of aspects, including adherence to the design principles. So that doesn't seem a very good reason why. If that has been done, the final report should only be advisory and non-binding on Google, because both of them should be marching in the same direction, which is to adhere to the design principles.

00:31:21:17 - 00:31:50:15

But so I think we welcome the further work that the applicant has done on this matter. And we certainly welcome the principle of bringing in an independent external design, uh, role. And if, Mr. Finch, and obviously we'll see his detailed CV in due course, Mr. Finch is the appropriate person, then? No doubt that's a good thing, but.

00:31:52:13 - 00:32:32:26

There are some issues on this document obviously will respond fully in our comments on it at deadline. Um, six but, uh, we are particularly concerned, uh, at paragraph 1.4.1, the limited scope of the works, which aren't the subject of the task of the design adviser. Uh, we also notice in 1.5.3. The exclusion effectively because of the way it's worded of sustainability, um, which we see is integral to good design.

00:32:33:01 - 00:33:08:24

And we don't see we can understand that there may be operational reasons why certain things. Don't need to be the subject of scrutiny by the design adviser. And we can understand, for example, internal layout. We can understand phasing project requirements, but we don't really see the sustainability, which I say is a fundamental of good design. It should be treated in the same way. 1.6.3 we've already noted we're not content that the design adviser's role is as limited.

00:33:09:03 - 00:33:39:15

There may be mechanisms, and I'm sure there are mechanisms in which one could draft, um, uh, the role. So the design advisor has effectively the last word, unless there are good operational reasons for

the operator to disagree with that. So we quite accept operational independence really lies with the applicant. And there are safety and other matters clearly need to, um, have priority.

00:33:39:17 - 00:33:55:12

But we don't think that, uh, um, the way that it's currently word is, is strict enough to ensure that a good design outcome would be achieved. So so I say we're encouraging, but we think the applicant could do a lot more to move in the right direction.

00:33:57:13 - 00:33:58:12

Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

00:33:58:26 - 00:34:38:06

Mr. Linus. For the applicant. As for the scope of the works, um, as we've indicated, uh, already in response to questions from you, sir, prepared to look at, uh, look at that again, at the risk of repeating what I've said before, if there are any specific comments that the glass had, we'd expect to see them rather than just say, we need this to be broader. Uh, but we've said, we'll take that away and we will. Um, as for paragraph 1.5.3, I think there's been a misinterpretation there that relates to not sustainability generally, but there's deniability strategy, which is a separate strategy prepared under a separate remit.

00:34:38:08 - 00:35:15:05

So the purpose of 153 was just to make that clear, that there is not intended to be a movement from the design advice into that strategy. Sustainability would be covered because if the design advisor is to review on aspects including adherence to design principles, and obviously that would be included within those. So we don't accept that, um, semantic criticism of the way this document's been, uh, been drafted. Similarly, um, as for what I assume as a reference to 163 design report will be advisory, uh, a non-binding.

00:35:15:26 - 00:35:46:10

We do resist any suggestion that it should be nothing more than advisory for the reasons we've, uh, given it's not, um, that usual for design reviews such as this to go beyond that. And as I've said, we have to adhere to design principles anyway that subject to receiving the advice from fundamentally a design advisor. And that was the that was the role of this person. And that shouldn't fundamentally change.

00:35:48:09 - 00:35:56:08

Thank you, Mr. Linus. Before we move on and close this gender item. So anything anyone else wishes to raise about good design.

00:35:58:07 - 00:36:03:25

Okay. I'm not seeing any hands anyway, so thank you. I'll just pass over to Mr. Humphrey now. Thank you.

00:36:07:06 - 00:36:09:10

Thank you, Mr. Oakley. Um.

00:36:16:23 - 00:36:27:01

Um, just before we, um, close this hearing, uh, I want to ask if there's any other business anyone wants to raise about anything that happened to any issue items today.

00:36:30:06 - 00:36:30:26

Yes.

00:36:33:07 - 00:36:50:12

Thank you, sir. Sally Pavey for Cagney. Um, it's probably a bit of a miss of us, but we wanted to, um, to tackle 3.2 and the Transport Steering Group, Transport Forum, steering Group and Transport Mitigation Fund decision group. And if we may, we'll put something in writing to that as we we obviously missed the opportunity earlier.

00:36:50:14 - 00:36:51:21

Yeah, absolutely.

00:36:51:23 - 00:36:52:27

Thank you very much. Um.

00:36:57:10 - 00:37:19:11

Um, as per the agenda and our comments earlier, we will now adjourn the hearing until tomorrow. I will hear item 6 to 11 on the published agenda. Action points from today will be carried forward into a combined list for tomorrow under item nine of the agenda. Before I do that, is there anyone, anything anyone else wishes to raise based on today's agenda?

00:37:23:05 - 00:37:28:03

No thank you. Then the hearing is adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.