



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Norwich to Tilbury
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Day 2 - Part 2
Date:	29 April 2026

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.

00:00:05:02 - 00:00:39:24

It's 1052 and the hearing is resumed. And we'll move on to agenda item eight. Um, landscape and visual, but we have quite a lot to get through on two fairly big topics. Um, and there will be a degree of overlap between the matters. So we may well cover, um, many heritage items within the landscape topic area too. Um, I'd be grateful if we could all keep, uh, submissions fairly concise. And note that, obviously, as previously stated, this is primarily a written process, and we give equal weight to written responses as oral ones.

00:00:39:29 - 00:01:10:01

Um, as also previously stated, we've read all your submissions, so there's no need to repeat anything you've already said or you've already put in writing. And please don't be offended if I need to interject at any time to remind you of that. So we begin with item eight, landscape and visuals, specifically agenda item 8.1 methodology. I'll generally ask my questions for each gender point before opening the floor to others, as opposed to asking for views after each individual question. Um, there might be some differences as we go along, but we'll come to that.

00:01:10:07 - 00:01:42:05

Um, we'll come to discussions about the limits of deviation and the Holford rules in agenda item 8.2. Um, but I just have one question around methodology to start with. Um, and this is to the applicant, and it concerns our first written question, LV 1.21, which was which raised a question about the use of the Landscape Institute technical Guidance Note 0221 assessing landscape value outside national designations.

00:01:43:06 - 00:02:03:27

Your answer to that question confirmed that baseline landscape information was used and informed the routing of the alignment, and states that the guidance note was used as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report. Peer. Could you produce an example? Could you provide an example of where this has had an effect on the proposed route?

00:02:07:25 - 00:02:23:22

Um, I'm going to ask Mr. Reston to see if he can answer that question directly. If he can't, we will provide an example or maybe a series of examples, um, for you, um, in writing. But over to Mr. Easton.

00:02:24:17 - 00:02:56:27

Thank you. Sir. I think, um, despite Mr. Harris's confidence, I think what I might need to do is just have a few minutes to have a look in the document, and we'll come back in writing just to, um, because I think. Did you specifically ask about changes at here? Um, so if I can just check which particular changes were made there and what they were associated with. We'll come back with an example. That's fine. Yes. Um, the question, the original written question, LV 1.21 asked for examples, and there was a fulsome reply to that, but it didn't actually provide any examples at the end of it.

00:02:56:29 - 00:03:02:03

So I was just looking for clarity on that, but in writing would be ideal. Thank you.

00:03:05:04 - 00:03:16:07

Um, to the councils. Is there anything anyone wants just to raise about, um, that technical guidance note, specifically the Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 0221.

00:03:20:12 - 00:03:27:21

I'm not seeing any hands. So we'll move along and we'll move on to agenda item 8.2.

00:03:30:06 - 00:03:32:08

Two general issues. Um,

00:03:34:04 - 00:03:58:29

and we'll look at limits of deviation first. So could you explain the approach taken to assessments and the limits of deviation. Did the assessment for landscape and indeed heritage consider indicative fixed points for the pylons and overhead lines or fixed points of the full extent of the lateral and vertical movement permitted by the limits of deviation.

00:04:00:17 - 00:04:14:07

Russell Harris KC. The answer is the latter of those and I'll ask the teams. I'm going to ask Sam Moxley's team and also Laura Bishop's team to explain their approach to the limits of deviation. Thank you.

00:04:14:09 - 00:04:15:00

Thank you.

00:04:28:21 - 00:04:29:29

Do you need to turn your microphone on?

00:04:32:03 - 00:04:34:15

Is it not working? It should be a red light. There you go.

00:04:36:17 - 00:04:39:10

Good morning. Sam Oxley for the applicant. Is that better?

00:04:39:12 - 00:04:40:17

Thank you. Perfect.

00:04:40:24 - 00:05:17:11

Thank you. Um, so the assessment took the approach of assessing, um, the reasonable worst case scenario, essentially the Rochdale principle. Um, we assessed, um, The project as as it's most likely to come forward. So we did assess, um, particular positions of, uh, of pylons and the overhead line, but we also undertook sensitivity testing in relation to the limits of deviation.

00:05:17:29 - 00:05:56:00

Um, this is set out, uh, in section 13.9, sensitivity testing in s chapter 13 Landscape and Visual in app 226. So that considered both um the potential for longitudinal movement, lateral movement and uh

potential height increases of up to six meters and no change to the level of significance or of effects was identified.

00:05:56:18 - 00:06:04:13

accept at two viewpoints where the level was increased, but there would be no change to significance.

00:06:05:19 - 00:06:24:01

Okay. Thank you. So, um, if I just to make sure I've understood it correctly. So to summarize, the assessment took account of the likely position of the pylons and overhead lines. And then you applied the sensitivity testing to do the full extent of the limits of deviation. Is that correct?

00:06:24:03 - 00:06:24:24

That's correct.

00:06:24:26 - 00:06:39:03

Yes. Okay. Thank you. And the visualizations for landscape and heritage as well. Um, did they use the likely pylon positioning or uh, the potential.

00:06:41:07 - 00:06:54:02

Pylon positioning. Um, because obviously, uh, if there were to be movements, there would be an infinite number of positions they could move to. So it wouldn't have been possible to show those within visualizations.

00:06:55:04 - 00:07:27:16

Okay. Yeah. That's understood. I think the question I was leading to possibly is I understand about the almost infinite number of possibilities, but when you're talking about a particular landscape receptor or um, heritage asset, then would it be useful to provide visualizations of a pylon, say, for instance, 50m closer than the than the likely route, if you like, under the limits of deviation?

00:07:30:03 - 00:08:08:03

Same for the applicant. The key issue there is where where would you show it. Because um, one pylon may move up to 50m. The next one might move ten meters, the next one might move five. And clearly if you have few points on the other side looking from the other direction, then those things would be moving further away. So there might be a little bit of up and down. There might be a little bit of longitudinal movement. There might be some lateral movement. Um, the key thing within our assessment was to make sure that we had we had considered, um, what that might mean for the assessment.

00:08:08:15 - 00:08:13:24

Um, rather than to try and illustrate every possibility that could come forward.

00:08:15:01 - 00:08:40:01

Okay. Thank you. I think I guess what I, what I was thinking and I understand the sensitivity testing and so on that you've carried out, but um, without um, and this is probably more appropriate to, to a heritage asset, but without a visualisation showing a pylon at the edge of the limits of deviation, for instance, do you not need that to show the worst case scenario?

00:08:45:06 - 00:09:17:24

For the applicant? Um, when we undertake the impact assessment, we don't use the visualisation to tell us what the result is. So essentially we undertake a lot of field work and we do a lot of desk based research, look at evidence based reports and suchlike. And we have a number of tools available to us to use, um, including maps and plans, our fieldwork, the guidance, um, the zone of theoretical visibility maps.

00:09:18:03 - 00:09:51:12

Uh, while I'm visualisations, we often also use models within the office as well where we can test things live. Um, and then we have the visualizations which obviously help indicate the view, uh, or one possibility as to what the view could look like, um, in order to help inform the decision making process. But we don't rely on those visualizations in order to make our judgments. We make our judgments knowing that there is a possibility of some change and building that into into the making of the judgment.

00:09:51:18 - 00:10:33:13

Thank you. Yeah, but yeah, I understand that. And and the process that you go through. Obviously I think the advantage of visualizations is, is both for us. Obviously it's the examining authority. But also um, everybody else if you like the interested parties and so they can get a good indication of what the proposed development might look like. Um, so I understand your, your, your technical approach or, you know, your policy driven approach and so on, but it's weather visualizations showing potentially the worst case would be would be useful for this examination in a certain number of locations.

00:10:36:10 - 00:11:10:05

And that's certainly something that that could be prepared if it was possible to agree. What that what that change would be and also what those particular, um, locations were. I would suggest it would be a relatively small number of locations that should be selected because it, you know, again, it could be an infinite task otherwise. And I'm not sure that it would be proportionate in terms of helping you make decisions. I don't know if, um, a heritage witness would like to comment because you've raised this, particularly in terms of heritage assets.

00:11:10:25 - 00:11:12:23

Your own heritage witness. Sorry.

00:11:12:25 - 00:11:13:21

Our heritage.

00:11:13:24 - 00:11:14:09

Yes.

00:11:14:11 - 00:11:18:02

Witness Laura Bishop may want to wish to speak to this point.

00:11:20:18 - 00:11:22:18

Uh, Laura Bishop for the applicant.

00:11:22:23 - 00:12:04:17

Um, I mean, I would agree with my colleague's comments in regard to how we have approached the assessment for the limits of deviation and the way in which the visualizations are used to inform our assessment. And as part of our sensitivity testing, we identified, um, certain key locations along the route where we did feel that, um, movement of pylons within the limits of deviation may increase, um, the level of harm. And we have included commitments, um, in the ACP at a GGGG34 um, which restricts the limits of deviation in those specific locations where we feel that that change would be would cause an increase in harm.

00:12:04:26 - 00:12:20:20

Um, the conclusion was that in other locations, because setting is quite a wide consideration, um, a movement of a pylon within the limit of deviation would be unlikely to alter the conclusion that we had already arrived at.

00:12:21:09 - 00:12:33:08

I see, so those, uh, preclusion exclusions in GT 34 are the ones you have already considered. And you think the effect would be worse? Is that fair?

00:12:33:17 - 00:12:35:16

Uh, no. Yes. That's correct.

00:12:35:18 - 00:12:44:11

Okay. Thank you. Um, I can see a hand up online, so I'll go to, um, imaging, I believe. Essex.

00:12:49:00 - 00:13:25:02

Thank you sir. Yes, I'm addressing Essex County Council just wanted to, um, you know, reiterate support for the idea of some additional visualizations to show that worst case. So you'll be aware, it's a point that we raised in response to your questions. Um, written questions on heritage and the need for worst case or more clarity over a worst case position, particularly for heritage assets. Uh, as you alluded to, if it's if it's possible to show, um, a line or a pylon, you know, 50m closer to that asset, seems like that should be possible to do.

00:13:25:04 - 00:13:37:12

And we'll provide further clarity. And we can, um, work with the applicant if that would be helpful, to indicate specific locations where, you know, we think we think that might be helpful. So I wanted to support that idea.

00:13:38:17 - 00:13:43:08

Thank you. Thank you. Um, any other council's wish to speak on this point?

00:13:46:20 - 00:13:50:11

Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, sir, as you know, we did raise

00:13:51:27 - 00:14:09:25

the issue of how the applicant had gone about the process of dealing with the assessment within the parameters of the limits of deviation in our response to your question. Alt 1.9 in.

00:14:09:28 - 00:14:13:23

Mr.. Sorry. Could I could you just move your microphone a little bit closer, please? Sorry. Thank you.

00:14:13:25 - 00:14:53:12

We did provide, um, uh, our concerns about how the applicant had gone about this exercise in our response to alt 1.9 of your first written questions, that rep three oh, um, 86 and we gave an example, and it was only an example where we didn't see how it was a site at Roydon Hall, uh, in, uh, Suffolk. We didn't see how the assessed impact in terms of the heritage impact of the medium impact could realistically be said to be justified as a planning judgment.

00:14:53:14 - 00:15:27:00

If the applicant had done what is being asserted which had assumed that the pylons could be anywhere at the, as it were. Worst case parameters of the limits of deviation. We've heard what the applicant has said as to their approach, but we think that absolutely to be able to understand whether that is a credible exercise, we would realistically need to see visualizations to show that that is the process.

00:15:27:02 - 00:16:10:00

And it may then be that the position is simply that there's a disagreement between professionals about the planning judgment. But at the moment, we're not really sure how that exercise was adequately undertaken. We certainly take the point that it wouldn't be possible or proportionate to expect visualizations of every permutation, because it would be an infinite task. But it may be that outside of the examination process, a dialogue between the concerned local authorities and the applicant could highlight, as it were, some selected locations where that further work could be done.

00:16:10:02 - 00:16:42:18

But I say, certainly at the moment we're not really persuaded that the approach has been taken, has actually demonstrated what the worst case impacts will be. So that's the kind of the methodological point. And then there is a related point as to even if one accepts the approach, uh, because of the as it were, gradings that are used for the environmental impact assessments are fairly broad brush bands. It's quite coarse grained.

00:16:42:20 - 00:17:27:18

So even if the label of the degree of impact wouldn't change. We do think that when one came down to the actual consideration of the detail, the degree of impact within that label could be greater or lesser, depending on precisely where the particular pylon was sited, for example. So, so we do think that there is a need for more to be done on this, partly on methodology, but more particularly we then come down to the issue of should there be more control on micro siting within the limits of deviation, because ultimately that's probably the more interesting topic, which is how do you control things rather than merely how have you assessed things? Thank you sir.

00:17:28:03 - 00:17:41:13

Thank you. I can see your hand up, Mr. McLean. I'll just go to the council's first, but I have. You can put your hand down. Thank you for waiting patiently. I will come to you in a second. Um. Yes. James from Colchester City Council.

00:17:41:18 - 00:17:43:26

Um, we'd welcome additional visualizations.

00:17:43:28 - 00:17:44:21

To show the absolute.

00:17:44:23 - 00:17:45:08

Worst case.

00:17:45:10 - 00:17:46:19

Scenario. I think it's.

00:17:46:21 - 00:17:47:06

Really important.

00:17:47:08 - 00:17:51:07

For the public to see, because the current visualizations are effectively the.

00:17:51:09 - 00:17:52:21

Pylons on their centerline.

00:17:52:23 - 00:18:03:08

And that is not necessarily what is going to be approved if approval is forthcoming. Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Wilde. Yes. Thank you. Matthew Wilde, branch district council.

00:18:03:13 - 00:18:13:15

I just want to echo my colleague's points, but I'd also pass over to our to my landscape consultant. Um, just to raise a point about residential visual amenity, please.

00:18:15:09 - 00:18:16:21

Thank you. Bobbi Brown.

00:18:17:02 - 00:18:17:26

Braintree district.

00:18:17:28 - 00:18:18:21

Council, landscape.

00:18:18:23 - 00:18:19:14

And visual.

00:18:19:16 - 00:18:20:06

Um, yeah, I.

00:18:20:08 - 00:18:20:23

Think.

00:18:20:25 - 00:18:22:02

This, although.

00:18:22:04 - 00:18:22:26

Residential visual.

00:18:22:28 - 00:18:47:18

Amenity, does sit slightly away from landscape and visual effects. I think the same applies to this, particularly with the limits of deviation. Um, and we've highlighted two particular properties where limits of deviation would actually considerably, in our opinion, change. Um, the conclusions on that threshold. So I think it links into this point of visualization might be useful, um, to come to a final conclusion on that. Thank you, Mr. Bell.

00:18:48:23 - 00:18:52:17

Thank you, sir. Simon Bell, counsel for Ardley and Little.

00:18:52:19 - 00:18:53:04

Bromley.

00:18:53:06 - 00:18:54:09

Parish councils.

00:18:54:15 - 00:19:25:29

Um, we agree with much of what Mr. Bedford has raised in respect of methodology and the need for more visualisations. Indeed, you will be aware from the submissions that the parish councils have made. One of the running themes throughout them has been the need for more visualisations to be able to understand what the impacts are. Um, and indeed, um, the parish councils would be more than happy to enter into a discussion outside of the examination of the particular areas within the Alba where they want to see the worst case scenario.

00:19:26:05 - 00:19:35:22

Thank you. Yes, we'll obviously come on to that area later on in the discussion as well. Um, just go to one hand online. I believe it's, uh, bronchitis for Beaver and Mid Suffolk.

00:19:36:10 - 00:20:08:16

Thank you sir. Brian Curtis, Mid Suffolk District Council and District Council, just to add weight to the comments of the colleagues who have spoken previously and refer you to our response to Q1 rep 3089, in which we raised similar concerns about the uncertainty that can be applied to visualizations, and the worst case scenario, and the concern that that then applies to limits of deviation. Just to make

clear that we have said in our other submissions that there is a high concentration of of heritage assets across both of our districts.

00:20:08:18 - 00:20:31:00

There are a number of properties that have uncertainty about the impact on setting. We've got examples of that across Mid Suffolk and Bay, including properties like hymnals, Horsham and Wenham Castle and many others as well as those. But with that degree of uncertainty, um, we can't really progress with the impact of the development in that sense. Thank you.

00:20:31:26 - 00:20:34:12

Thank you. Um, and one other hand on line. Um.

00:20:49:18 - 00:20:55:01

Hello. I can see a small video of you, but I can't hear anything.

00:20:56:19 - 00:21:00:17

Uh, we shall try to come back to you in a second. Sorry. Sorry.

00:21:00:19 - 00:21:01:12

I'm here. Sorry.

00:21:01:14 - 00:21:02:01

Slight technical.

00:21:02:03 - 00:21:02:28

Problem. Descend.

00:21:03:04 - 00:21:03:19

Um. Yeah.

00:21:03:21 - 00:21:19:19

Robin Taylor, South Norfolk District Council, having heard the discussion and the the debate there. I think we'd lend our voice to support if there's, um, additional information that can provide to to illustrate the worse situation than we would. We would we would welcome it.

00:21:20:05 - 00:21:48:12

Thank you. Um, we should just go. Okay. Um, I've got a few more hands. I'll just, uh, just to, um, stay. Obviously, quite a few of the comments have said we agree with the comments and we don't that, you know, we understand that a lot of you will agree with the comments already made by some of the council. So if that's what you're going to say, then that's fine. We don't hear that. But if, um, we could go to, uh, Mister McLean, please. Good. Thank you for waiting patiently.

00:21:54:08 - 00:21:59:17

Hi. Charlie McLean from Langley's estate. I just want to reiterate, with the, um, visualizations.

00:21:59:20 - 00:22:33:02

Being an interested party and members of public, they rely quite heavily on these visualizations. Uh, indeed. In some of the consultation documents sent out, National Grid have included visualizations on them in great Wolfram area. Um, just want to stay in the limits of deviation five. Be one. It does stay the pylons. TB 140 to 142, which are in Great Waltham, may not exceed upwards of six meters. Currently, we're not actually sure whether there are 40 meter pylons. So that means they could go to six meters. Whether they're 50 meter pylons, that means 56m.

00:22:33:04 - 00:22:55:01

That is hugely like if it is the 50 meter to 56 that is 16m different in their visualizations. That is not a gradual amount that no trees will cover that, and that is a significant effect. And that's from their photos from Langley's house, which I know you guys, in your written questions, did request different angles from. Thank you.

00:22:55:09 - 00:23:01:12

Thank you, Mr. McLean. We will obviously come on to Waltham next. And then the gentleman there, please. And thank you.

00:23:02:12 - 00:23:03:18

John Stacy.

00:23:03:20 - 00:23:08:19

Um, I referenced yesterday speaking, um, one where one of the properties Braintree.

00:23:08:21 - 00:23:39:03

City Council mentioned about the VA. That assessment was carried out. Apologies, methodology or any methodology of an RVI should be an on site, ideally in house inspection. This is only a desktop study. Their findings are actually factually incorrect. It has been referenced in the latest document. And again factually these quotes are solar panel farm a kilometre away to actually have effect on our property and reduce the visualisation effect on the part on the proposed pylon.

00:23:39:17 - 00:24:13:26

And so therefore we are asking the question who done? Who did these surveys? Was it in-house or was it independent? And also could we have a methodology to demonstrate to effective parties like us who are severely impacted? And so therefore, please, can we have a response? Secondly, to give you an idea, we are 165m from pylon by moving it to the edge of a limit. It now moves to 90m. The claim for national grid. That movement has no effect, but moving it 30m 50m away reduces the magnitude from high to medium.

00:24:13:28 - 00:24:21:08

So we do question the judgment raised and we would like to have clarification on how and who did that judgment, please.

00:24:21:10 - 00:24:33:29

Okay. Thank you. We will um, come on to AA later on in this topic item. So we'll deal with that. Um, we've got em. Um, if we could, just as a gentleman over here, we'd like to speak. Thank you.

00:24:40:28 - 00:24:52:07

Thank you. Chair. Um, Andrew Buxton, representing the Wenham Farm partnership. Um, I've got a I've got here.

00:24:52:26 - 00:24:53:19

Okay. Everybody here.

00:24:56:03 - 00:25:27:19

Sorry. Okay. Um, Andrew Buxton recommended, uh, representing the Wenham Farm Partnership. McAdam. Um, I've actually got here a visualisation which, um, I've taken from, uh, National Grid's, um, evidence, and it's extremely useful. Um, because it shows up when you look at it closely. The, the actual photograph provided by National Grid is quite small.

00:25:27:22 - 00:26:16:17

And in the distance you see the, the pylons, when you, when you actually look at it, close more closely. It's very useful because it shows these pylons, which are huge, over the very flat Suffolk farmland, which is of course a disadvantage for National Grid. But I just wanted to say they are. This one is for me extremely useful. Um, because it's it simply shows how these 200 foot pylons stand out on, uh, on flat Suffolk farmland and how much they impact the view to to many, I believe, of the photographs National grid of supplied are actually from ground level, quite low.

00:26:17:12 - 00:26:47:04

Um, and then vegetation shows up more when you look at them from a high level. And in this case we're looking at it from the top of the castle, which is what, um, Historic England recommend. You look at the whole complex and the setting is very important. Um, and the impact is huge. I'd very much like. Maybe we'll get on to the detail of heritage later on. Um, and I'd very much like you to have a look at this, because I think it's very telling.

00:26:48:12 - 00:27:26:01

Uh, thank you, Mr. Buxton. I have seen that visualization because it's in the evidence, so thank you for that. Um, we will come on to, um, I do have a question later on in the heritage section about, uh, little Wenham specifically. So we will come on to that as well. But thank you for that. Um, if I could go to the applicant, please, um, I guess to try and summarize what what I'd like to see. There's a number of councils, obviously, in IPS have, um, said that they would appreciate additional visualizations where possible and again, appreciating that, uh, you couldn't do them for every location.

00:27:26:03 - 00:27:32:08

But if if an agreement could be reached in terms of the most sensitive locations, I'm not sure if that could work.

00:27:32:10 - 00:27:33:15

Yes. Um,

00:27:35:01 - 00:28:02:08

Russell. Harris. Casey, um, can I frame my response in this way? First, we stand by our position that a credible professional judgment looking at the limit of deviation as they're understood, is the most appropriate way of doing this. Visualizations are only one tool to be employed by an expert tribunal an expert, independent witness. Um,

00:28:04:05 - 00:28:49:18

the first point to note is that the visualizations have been modeled on the most likely positions, having regard to information from all disciplines, including, uh, engineering. Um, if you were to model the worst case limit of deviation in every case, you'd end up fundamentally with a simple, simply unrealistic estimation of the project because limits of deviation are only used where there are individual, technical or safety reasons to move from the position identified in the environmental statement.

00:28:49:20 - 00:29:25:15

This issue was considered quite thoroughly in Yorkshire Green, where the panel agreed that the use of worst cases as a blanket would provide an unrealistic picture which couldn't have been relied on either by the panel or by anyone else. In other words, if you take the worst limit of deviation at each stage at each pylon, you'll end up with an unbelievable and wholly unrealistic position. Having said that, and in answer to your question directly, um, if the if, um, Mr.

00:29:25:17 - 00:29:59:05

Ring, Mr. Bedford and others are keen to identify specific views with specific limits of deviation altered as opposed to just saying take everything to the extreme, which is simply not a case that could ever happen, then we will certainly, sir, with your encouragement, I think, consider how a proportionate exercise of providing the most sensitive areas of visualizations. We take that away and consider whether that's proportionate.

00:29:59:07 - 00:30:03:23

And if it is, we will present those to the examination at the appropriate time.

00:30:03:29 - 00:30:41:01

Thank you. I think that would be useful. Thank you for that. Okay. Um, I have another limited deviation. I'll just mention as well that, um, um, gentleman in the room held up, uh, images from the, um, a visualization of little William Castle. Uh, just for those online who I believe couldn't see the images properly. If you wish to see those images so you can find them under app 350. Okay. Um, so the next question, I'd just like to know how the limits of deviation for this project compare to that in the DCO for the Bradford to twin said project.

00:30:41:28 - 00:30:42:13

Um.

00:30:44:17 - 00:31:09:24

Russell Harris. Casey I know that they are not exactly the same, but they're in the same broad order. I think Mr. Easton is probably the closest to the, uh, technical person that we need to know. Um, we'll need to take that away. You'll remember on, um, issue one, we did have a limited deviation expert. He was here yesterday. He's not here today. Um, it's a matter of fact. And we'll present that in writing.

00:31:11:28 - 00:31:30:15

Thank you. Um, that's the end of my limits deviation question. But I will come on to other sections in this. I think it's probably a good time for a break now. Um, a proper comfort break. So we will adjourn now until 1140. Thank you.