

TEXT_ISH4_Session1_A428BlackCat_30112021

00:22

Good morning, contrary to Mr. Williams introduction, and I'll be leading today's agenda. So rather than my colleague, Mrs Sahai but good morning, and welcome, everybody, it's now just after 10 o'clock and I am starting the fourth specific issues public hearing for the application made by national highways for the a four to eight Blackcats to Caxton jibbitz road improvement scheme. The other members of the examining authority will introduce themselves shortly. But before we do that, please bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters. Miss Williams, can I just check with you that you that the case team can hear me okay.

01:03

Sorry about that, Andrew. Yes, I can confirm that I can see in year all three of you at the moment and that the recordings have started.

01:11

Excellent. So the recordings in the live stream have started. Excellent. Has there been any requests for reasonable adjustments or arrangements to enable participation in this issue specific hearing today? No, they

01:22

were then taken during the arrangements conference, Andrew.

01:25

Okay, thank you very much. Williams. Excellent. Okay, on to introductions. My name is Andrew Parkin. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State of the department for levelling up Housing and Communities as a member of the examining authority to carry out this examination of the above application, and I will be leading on the agenda items today. I'll hand over now to the other members of the examining authority to introduce themselves. Mrs Sahai. Could we start with you please.

01:54

Good morning. My name is Menaka Sahai, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of this examining authority.

02:05

Good morning, I'm Matthew Scriven, also appointed as member of this examining authority, Mrs Sahai and I will come in comments and questions as necessary. And I will also be recording today's action notes.

02:19

Thank you both. Also present today are three members of the case team. Case Manager today's Mr. Emery Williams, who will met also supported by Mr. Edwin Mawdsley and Mr. Joe Saffer from the case thing. I want to also acknowledge and welcome those who are watching the live stream version of today's proceedings. And finally, welcome to the attendees in this virtual room today. Please Would you introduce yourselves to manage this when I call your name or the name of your organisation, please turn your camera and microphone on. State your name your organisation and also your role within the organisation please. We will remind you throughout this hearing to state your name and the organisation you represent before you start speaking. This is just for the benefit of the recording and the parties viewing the recording later on. Can I start with the introductions from the applicants team please first.

03:15

Good morning, sir. Can you hear me?

03:18

Already Sir Lyness? Yes, I can eat perfectly. Thank you.

03:21

Thank you very much. Sir. My name is Scott Lyness Queen's counsel, I'm instructed by one bond Dickinson for national highways. So as you might expect, I have a team ready to contribute to the the hearing today and as per previous hearings, ethics acceptable to you I can ask them to introduce them cells. With me going through the list one by one.

03:46

That'd be great. Thank you very much.

03:47

Yes. Thank you very much. Can I ask Max Wade first of all to introduce himself please and give his qualifications, his role within the national highways team please.

04:02

So my name is Max Wade, representing the applicant. And my qualifications are the SE honours PhD and a fellow of the Chartered Institute of ecology and environmental management. And I'm an ecologist

04:14

like his word. Next, please Philip Smart

04:23

Good morning. My name is Philip Smart. I'm working with representing national highways for AECOM are hydrogeologist.

04:36

Thank you. Next please Grant Paxton.

04:42

Good morning. I'm Grant Paxton. I'm the drainage flood risk lead for AECOM on behalf of the applicant. Warning. Thank you. My name is Phil Wayles Good morning. My name is

05:05

Mr. Wayles. I can't actually hear you at the moment.

05:11

Sorry. Good morning. My name is Phil Wayles. Can you hear me now?

05:15

Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

05:16

Okay. I'm a chartered engineer and a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers. I'm a Technical Director at Air calm and on behalf of the applicant, and I'll be covering technical matters associated with the assessment of alternatives with Mr. Doherty

05:33

On that note, can I ask Mr. Doherty to introduce himself please?

05:38

Good morning, sir. Ted Doherty from AECOM representing the applicant's chartered civil engineer. And as Phil said, I am supporting on highways design matters.

05:52

Next please Amy Jones.

05:58

Hello, sir, yes. Amy Jones here I am working on behalf of the applicant and addressing matters to do with historic buildings particularly cottages.

06:09

Next please, Ian Davies

06:15

Good morning. Yes, my name's Ian Davies, technical director at AECOM. And I'll be providing input on climate change related matters on behalf of the applicant.

06:28

Next, please, Steven Wood

06:34

Good morning, Steven Wood appearing for the applicants. I'm a member of the Chartered Institute of logistics and transport and addressing transport and economics related issues. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

06:50

Thank you, Julian. See, please finally.

06:57

Good morning. I'm Julian See an engineering manager for Skanska and appearing on behalf of the applicant.

07:08

On sir we may also have Lorrae Hendry in relation to heritage matters can ask her to introduce herself as well please.

07:18

Good morning, Lorrae Hendry, managing associate at Womble bond Dickinson instructor by national highways the applicant.

07:28

Thank you very much, sir.

07:30

Thank you, Mr. Lyness. If we could move on now to Bedford Borough Council. Good morning, sir. My name is Alistair Wren, principal planner lead officer on this project. I'll introduce my colleagues. We have chat what kick Jack Watkins. Good morning. I'm Joe Watkins. I'm the Conservation Officer at Bedford Borough Council. Morning. I believe we should have Ollie Ewington

08:03

Good morning, sir. Investigation officer Bedford Borough Council. And we have Catherine Banham from the Wildlife Trust representing Bedford borough. Good morning. Yes. I'm Katharine Brennan. For Bedford Borough Council from the Wildlife

08:21

Trust. We have Bryn Hudson on standby. We're not sure if he will be required today or not.

08:30

That's your team's Mr Wren. Yes, it is. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wren. Oh, sorry. Melanie MacLeod highways has just appeared. Okay. Good morning. I'm Melanie MacLeod. I'm the manager for transport policy at Bedford Borough Council. Morning. Everyone, Mr. Wren. It is Thank you. Okay, thank you. Moving on to central Bedfordshire council if we can now please

08:59

come on in sir. Yeah. I'm Andrew Cundy, principal plan officer and lead officer for central Bedfordshire. CBC don't tend to speak today on the items on the agenda. She has listened really well Jenny questions.

09:12

Okay, and it's just yourself. Is it today Mr. himself? Yeah. Okay, thank you. Okay. Moving on to Cambridgeshire county council Huntingdonshire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, if we could now

09:28

Sake, good morning. Francis Tyrell on behalf of Cambridgeshire county council, District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. I'm a partner at Pinsent Masons. If I could ask, I'll just go round the people we have available today. Are we seeking firstly, I think we should have David Alex. David, Pat's not available yet. I'll ask Deborah actually to introduce herself.

09:54

Good morning. I'm Debra Ahmad on the ecology officer at can she come out so in representing The council's on Item three, biodiversity.

10:04

Next we have Emma Davies. Good morning. I'm Emma Davies. I'm Principal sustainability officer for South Cambridgeshire here to represent the Cambridgeshire authorities on agenda item seven and climate change.

10:19

Thank you. So we also have in attendance, Gareth Blackett, Chenge Taruvunga, and Claire Burton, who won't be speaking unless you have specific questions they could answer but I'll ask them briefly to introduce themselves.

10:36

Good morning, I'm Chenge Taruvunga and I am the lead officer from South Cambridgeshire District Council.

10:50

Good morning sir. I'm Garrett Blackett, the interim consent team leader working for Cambridgeshire county council and coordinating the overall process on behalf of the three local authorities.

11:06

Good morning. So I'm Claire Burton. I'm the lead for Huntingdonshire District Council as far as till has just outlined I'm not anticipating speaking today, but we'll be here if needed.

11:18

Okay, thank you. So thank you. Those

11:20

are the the witnesses that we have today.

11:22

Thank you, Mr.Tyrell. Okay, moving on now to the Environment Agency, please.

11:31

Good morning, sir. This Neville Benn on the planning lead at the Environment Agency. I should have three colleagues with me. My flood risk lead Louise Foreman got him but she has been thrown out and is having trouble getting back in. So she'll be joining as soon as possible. And those two groundwater leads Graham Phillips, generate away or hydro to grow now.

12:00

Good morning, Graham Phillips. I'm a grad work on groundwater and team environment agency. time one of the groundwater leads with

12:12

us is Miss Gough. I don't don't recall you mentioning mentioning her name.

12:19

Yes. Apologies. Yes. Jenny Gough is also on the line.

12:23

Good morning, Jenny Goff on the BB agency, flood risk advisors any flood risk advisor. Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Moving on. If that's everyone, we'll move on to Historic England now please.

12:46

Slightly, dimly lit. Warning. I'm David Eve, from Historic England on historic buildings and areas inspector. And I'll be here to answer any questions on historic buildings. Could I just take a moment to say the whilst I noticed there are no other matters relating to archaeology on the agenda. Unfortunately, my colleague Angie Abbey Antrobus who was with me the last time we met has since gone on to greater things outside of organisation. Her post is currently vacant, should archaeology appear I can take questions and find another inspector with them. I'm bereft of archaeologists today.

13:20

Right now. Thank you mister Eve that's helpful, thank you. Okay, now if we could perhaps move on to Natural England please and their representatives.

13:34

Morning Janet, Nuttall Natural England, representing on biodiversity matters relevant to our remit. And I have a couple of colleagues with me if we start with Claire Storey

13:49

Hello, Claire Storey. I'm the senior wildlife licencing advisor for Natural England and be discussing the biodiversity if required.

14:00

Okay, thank you.

14:01

And also Justin Tilley

14:03

Good morning, Justin Tilley i I'm Manager with Natural England here at sport colleagues. Okay, thank you. That's great. Okay, if we could perhaps now move on to people that anyone here from transport action network

14:29

doesn't let anyone's hear from Tan at the moment. Okay, is there anybody here from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough? campaigned to protect rural England No, it doesn't like it. Okay. Right. Okay. Well, I think we've introduced everyone who's here. We can always revisit this matter if it needs to be people arrive late later on. Okay, before we move on to gender, it To on the published agenda. I'd like to hand over now to the panel lead Mrs Sahai to discuss a procedural matter related specifically to the applicant if I may.

15:12

Thank you Mr. Scriven. It is our understanding that on the eighth of September 2021, highways England Company Limited changed its name to national highways limited. This change does have a bearing on the examination for instance in terms of references to highways England and the draft development consent order, and potentially in other documents in the examination library, we do not the change of name that has been put forward in the book of reference. The applicant has recently returned to the examining authority for the ENSET nationally significant infrastructure project, a 47 North tuddenham to Eastern planning Inspectorate case reference number TR 010038. Examination Library Reference Number rep five dash 001 Regarding this matter, setting out the implications for that examination for that out, in what way the name change affects this examination for a four to eight blackout to Caxton Gibert improvement scheme, and indeed how that should be addressed. Mr. Lyness, I believe that you might be best place to answer that question.

16:36

Ma'am, perhaps this is something we can put down further. In writing for you. One of the main issues that has been concerning us is to minimise any change to the application documentation because as you'll be aware, the name highways England appears on substantial numbers of documents, including some plans. And obviously, we don't consider it should have a material effect on the substance of the of the case, it's simply a question of making sure that any changes to documentation can be dealt with most efficiently. We will review the the documentation that you have referred to, I know that there's going to be an update to the DCU unexplored remember random a deadline, six, perhaps when we do the other weekend, submit at the same time and note confirming what if any further changes, we

recommend being made any other applicant application documentation. As I say, We're doing that with a means to try and minimising changes. So it may be that we're looking at the most efficient way to employ a cross referencing device so that when anyone reads a particular application document that can be read as involving the name highways, England changing to national highways, rather than replacing the name on each individual document, what we're trying to figure out the most effective and efficient way of doing that.

18:05

Fair enough. That seems fine. How the DCO and explanatory memorandum change, that we'll look forward to a deadline six, just going back to the letter submitted for a 47. The the applicant their national high res has said that the applicant is considering whether the funding statement and statement of reasons should be updated as well. So would you take that away into consideration as well. And in your note to clarify, so I as the DCO explanatory memorandum, funding statement statement of reasons. And the book of reference, which you've already done. And then and then of course, the note, so if the node can clarify what documents you feel need to be updated with the name change, which don't, and with just just a brief reason for that, and that'd be helpful.

19:02

Yes, ma'am. We'll make sure that is done. And then a note can also explain the changes that have come through the documents. We are already committing to putting in a deadline six.

19:12

Yeah, that's great. Okay, thank you very much. That's fine with me. I will now hand back to Mr. Parkin.

19:20

Thank you. Now we can move on to Agenda Item two from the published agenda. I've got four points to make here. Firstly, a few words, acknowledge that. Today's a virtual event and examining authority attending this meeting from the plumbing inspectors office in Bristol. We understand that you might be attending from your offices or your homes or various other places. Should there be any technical failures? Please try to join back using the same link that you were originally provided with. So far today. The technology has been reasonably cooperative, but should there be a technology failure We do have one or two contingency plans in place. In case of a complete technology favourite failure, there is a date reserve the hearings on Tuesday the seventh of December in the examination timetable. However, in all likelihood, things will will run smoothly this week, and we will not have to use the reserve dates and the notification of the cancellation. In that case will be via a banner update on the project's web page on the national infrastructure websites. Unlike in a physical event, join today's events. Join today's virtual meeting, you will only be able to see the head and shoulders of the examining authority members and we may be referring to or taking notes at times, and so not looking directly towards the camera. I want to assure everyone that you do have our full attention at all times. In order to avoid visual and noise distractions, my panel colleagues will generally keep their cameras off until they wish to contribute but they may do at any point during during the proceedings. I will ask certain parties to join me for particular agenda items and it would be helpful for those not directly involved to keep their cameras and microphones switched off. For those participating please keep your microphone muted until invited to speak. And remember to introduce yourselves and your organisation if applicable. Each

time you speak. We will pause at various points and provide an opportunity for questions to be asked or comments made. Please wait for those opportunities and raise your hand on Microsoft teams to signal you wish to do so. Please do not use the team's chat function as no one is monitoring the chat today. virtual events cause fatigue and so we will ensure that each session of the meeting is approximately 90 minutes long. And certainly no more than two hours. Noting that you may have been in the arrangements conference for some time already. That means that we will take a 15 minute break at approximately 11 o'clock this morning. We will resume again for session two at 1115 and go on until 1245. When we break for lunch, we will resume session three at around 1:30pm and go on until 3pm. And we will then take another 15 minute break and resume for the final session at 3:15pm and go on until required up until five o'clock at the latest. If you decide to leave the meeting during the breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. If you're watching the live stream, then please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent sessions session. Secondly, let's talk about the general data protection regulation and live streaming. This event is being both live streamed and recorded. The digital recordings that we make are retained and published and they form public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation GDPR applies. Planning expatriates practice is to publish and retain recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Consequently, if you participate in today's meeting, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you therefore consents to the publication and retention of the digital recording. It is very unlikely that the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive personal information into the public domain. Indeed, we would encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason you feel that it is necessary to refer to sensitive personal information. We will encourage you first to speak to the case team. We will then explore with you whether the information that you refer to could be provided in a written format which might then be react redacted before published. Does anyone have any questions with regards to this matter? If so, please use the raise hand function on Microsoft Teams.

24:03

I can't see anything. Okay. Moving on to the third point, which is about the substantive matters of today's issues to be hearing itself, which is entitled social, economic and environmental matters. agenda for this hearing was published on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure projects webpage on the 22nd of November 2021. The main purpose of this issue specific hearing is to clarify and to get the views on strategic matters relating to biodiversity, including habitat regulations assessment, HRA for the use washes, special protection area, SBA, and the eviston. And when Paul Woods special area of conservation also flood risk including interactions between different sources of flooding and groundwater do groundwater dewatering and assessment of alternatives to the junction design and siting at blackcat roundabout following discussions issue specific hearing three and subsequent Relevant written submissions. Heritage matters in particular the effect of the proposed development on grade two listed building Brook cottages and sustainability effects, including climate change.

25:23

These matters have been covered to some extent in the examining authorities written questions and issues with hearing one and issues to the hearing three. At the hearing, we are looking for further details with respect to these issues and party's views on them. With respect to Brook cottages, it's

worth noting that there will be further discussions that compulsory acquisition hearing to on Thursday, the second of December, as per the published agenda for that hearing. For today, I'd be grateful if parties could focus on the heritage issues and also to be mindful of not introducing any sensitive or personal information concerning the owners or occupiers during the discussions. Does anyone have any particular questions at this stage on that point?

26:15

I can't see any hands raised. So I mean, today's agenda is a full on ambitious agenda, Mrs Sahai and I will keep on the review our progress. And we may request certain aspects to be held over and addressed as part of your responses to the next round of recent questions on 22nd December. Before I start the fourth point, just want to double check that everybody who had everyone who is here who wishes to speak has introduced themselves and just a few people have joined since we did the formal introductions. I'll just leave it at that. If anyone's got any anything, please raise your hand if you wish to to introduce yourself for the hearing. Oh, can see 100 Raise? Yes.

27:06

Good morning. It's Lydia O'Hagan here. I'm a solicitor at Charles Russell speechlys. And I am here on behalf of the church commissioners for England and not anticipating the need to speak but sitting in and may potentially raise points on biodiversity.

27:23

Thank you, so O'Hagan Thank you. There's further hand raised. If you could turn your your camera and microphone on and introduce yourself. I'll be very helpful. Hello, I'm Louise Foreman from the Environmental Agency, and I'll be

27:41

answering any questions in relation to flood risk issues.

27:46

Thank you Mrs Foreman. That's that's very helpful. Is that any one else? Anyone else who'd like to please follow the same format? Just wait your turn and switch your camera microphones on and introduce yourself? That'd be very helpful.

28:04

Wait a minute. Go away.

28:10

Hi, I'm Jenny Redway. I'm just salmon the other groundwater lead from the Environment Agency. I probably won't speak about Chrome's hide grand Phillips.

28:23

Thank you Mrs Redway. That's fine.

28:29

Hello, and I'm Kasia Gdaniec . Yes. From Cambridgeshire county council Historic Environment Team. I probably won't speak today, but I am here to answer any archaeology questions that might be raised, particularly with regard to Cambridge as archaeology.

28:43

Thank you. That's very helpful. Lots any other hands raised at the moment? No, that seems to everyone. Thank you now that it's just a case of, it's just helpful to tidy up for people who have arrived slightly late and missed the formal introductory session. So thank you for that. Okay, resuming my my speech regarding the main items for discussion today. The fourth point that I wanted to make was in regarding to post hearing actions should they arise during this hearing. The assumption is that post hearing actions will be submitted at the next deadline in this case deadlines six on Tuesday the 14th of December 2021. Full details of which contained Annex A of the examining authorities rule eight letter. However, acknowledging any resourcing constraints on your end, if you feel meeting that deadline will be difficult. Please do raise that at the hearing itself. So we can, if possible, accommodate that in the deadlines set out in the post hearing Action Lists. If there are any Other questions or anyone wishes to make any comments so far? Please raise your hand now. I

30:09

can't see any, any hands raised. So we move on. Okay, thank you. We're now on to Agenda Item three, which is biodiversity matters, including habitat regulations, assessments matters. I could ask the applicants Natural England and the various local authorities to switch on the cameras for this item, which will cover issues associated with the whose washes, special protection area and Ramsar sites and the Amazon and when Paul Woods special area of conservation first, followed by some more general biodiversity matters. So looking at the agenda, confirmation of the qualifying features of the whose washes special protection area and Remstar sites. If I could put this to the applicant, Mr. Lyness? Why have the US washes SBA ramps? are citations not been provided? And can they be I'm looking at examination Library Reference up to three three and Appendix B where the citations for European designated sites are listed.

31:24

Scott Lyness for the applicant, I can ask Mr. Wade to deal with that. But in principle, I don't see any issue at all in making sure that that citation is provided to the examination library. If you'd like Mr. Wade to go through the list of qualifying features, I'm sure he can today. But perhaps the easier way is just to make sure the information is provided to you at the next day like deadline, including the citation, but I can ask Mr. Wade, if he has anything to add to add to that.

32:00

Max Wade representing the applicant? No, of course, we can certainly do that.

32:06

Thank you, Mr. Wade just Just on that point, will be quiet won't be quite won't be very helpful would be to future just to confirm that all of the qualifying features for the whose washes, special protection area and ramsau site have been identified for the habitat regulations assessment, no significant effects

report, which again, is examination Library Reference app 233. Mr. Wade, if I could ask you that, please.

32:36

Max Wade representing the applicant? Yes, I can confirm that. An assessment has been taken with respect to the qualifying features of the who's washes, SBA and ramsau. site and also for the special area of conservation.

32:51

Thank you. Mr. Wade. Could you just point me that to where that is in the submitted evidence, please.

32:59

That would have been included in the biodiversity chapter. Chapter Eight.

33:07

I'm thinking particularly of the no significant effects report, which is the habitat regulations, assessment that you've undertaken.

33:18

So are you asking me where we're about in in that report? Yeah.

33:23

i Yes. That's basically what I'm asking you.

33:27

I don't have that in front of me. But I can certainly find it find that out and pass that information on.

33:37

What lights lights today?

33:41

Yes, if I can just come in there. So I'm sure we can do that today. Rather than have this as an action point. We can make sure that was done and get back to you. At some stage today with our references are

33:53

very helpful. Thank you. Natural England. There's no solid perhaps if I could come to you, do you have any any thoughts or comments on this matter in terms of whether all the qualifying features for the use washers sba ramsau site have been identified in the no significant effects report?

34:12

Janet Nuttall, Natural England. Yes, my understanding is that all of the SBA qualifying features and runs our criteria have been considered in the habitats, regulations assessment and that is reflected in our response to in our written representation response, which set out that we are satisfied with regard

to these washers, SBA s AC rams are designation that based on the information provided there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the user washes.

34:54

Thank you. It's not so that's that's useful. Does anyone else have any any comments on will not matter at this stage.

35:06

Okay, fine, we'll wait to hear back from the applicant later on in the day regarding that, as Mr. Lyness has kindly offered, what we're also interested in if again, Mr. Lyness who put this to you, or Mr. Wade, is why the US washes designations for the special area of conservation, the special protection area and the Ramsar site are grouped together for the screening purposes in tables one and two of the most significant effects report of the upset regulations assistant, given their inherent differences

35:46

because Mr. Scott Lyness style becoming asked was Mr Wade to to address that, sir, please.

35:52

Max Wade on behalf of the applicant. The species on which the ramsau and SBA sites are designated are almost identical in terms of the list that are that are included. So, for convenience sake, they were combined into into the tables, as you described.

36:22

Thank you, but the special area of conservation, obviously, that doesn't relate to two birds.

36:29

Now, and we did deal with the spine loach, which was so identified as a feature that needed what obviously needed our attention in terms of dealing with any potential significant effects in relation to this particular fish.

36:47

Yes, the question, as I say, that I asked originally is that the you're grouping the fish and the birds together in this despite them having separate designations and inherently different issues that go with them. I just like to understand a little bit more from you. Why took that approach, really, I couldn't stand it for the ramsau and USPA, both dealing with birds, but it's the the birds and the fish seemed quite different.

37:24

In terms of the fish, we undertook an assessment of the population of spine loach within the river graters and the surrounding area. And we would have included it in the sort of list of special features that we needed to take into account. But as natural in England reported, we were able to conclude with no effects on the spine ledge.

37:58

Sorry, I understand that. I just I'm just trying to understand why you screened them both together. You combine the screening exercise for the spined loach and the SPI and ramsau sites and tables one and two in no significant effects report. I think it's trying to understand the rationale.

38:19

I think he's just expedience in, in in collating the information in terms of listing all of the features that needed to be considered.

38:33

Mrs Nuttall, do you have any any comments on that approach? And whether that cause any difficulties in terms of the habitat regulations assessment?

38:44

Janet Nuttall Natural England? I have to say, I haven't picked up on that in reviewing the habitats regulations assessment. But yeah, I would suggest that for clarity, the two should be split out, given that they are separate designations with the different designated features and potential for different impact.

39:11

Thank you, Mr. Mr. Wade, if I put that back to you, then would that be possible something that you could pick up? Perhaps the deadline six and revisit that aspects?

39:20

Yes, certainly. So and just to point out as well, in terms of the the overall effect was in relation to the distance between these washes and the scheme, we're looking at a sort of 16 kilometre difference in terms of as the crow flies and sort of 43 kilometre distance in terms of the route that birds and spine lots of uptake. And again, that that does explain in part why we collated the information.

39:59

Thank you, Mr.Wade. Does anyone else have any any comments at all on this matter at this stage? Also, we are waiting to hear back from the applicant later. So we'll come back to this later in the process. No, I can't see anyone's hands raised. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. If we can now move on to the next points on the agenda, which concerns the additional Bob's or bat surveys, the updates and emerging findings. And again, this line is Mr. Wade, if the applicant could provide an update on on this work, and there's been undertaken as per the episode and when Paul Woods technical notes and the discussions at issue specific him through just an update, please

40:51

Scott Lyness, for the applicant, sir last Mr. Wade to provide an update. I know that the agenda item here has a number of sub questions on representative nature of the surveys, agreed scope of surveys and so on. But we anticipate that you simply wanted to cut to the chase update as to where we worried might avoid some extensive discussion on those matters. We can ask Mr. Wade to do that, if that's acceptable.

41:18

Yeah. And we'll see what Mr. Wade has to say. And then we might need a few points on it. But yes, yeah.

41:23

Thank you, sir, allows us to wait to do that.

41:27

Max Wade for the applicant. Thank you. So yes, the sort of summary would be that the applicant has reported to Natural England, the outcomes of the investigations to date on the barber style at Everson. And when Paul Woods specialised in conservation, and the interim 2001 survey data about survey data. In discussion with Natural England, it is agreed that these data show no links between these bats and the Bay four to eight scheme, and that they strongly indicate no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAIC. Natural England will come to a final decision once data have been collected and analysed for the for the remaining weeks of the surveys. The final week for which would be the week commencing the 20th of December. Thank you.

42:36

Thank you, Mr. Wade. Mrs Nuttall. If I could perhaps come to you. Just just to get your your take on in the same similar sort of high level way to Mr. Wade has just done the

42:48

Yes, thank you, Janet Nuttall Natural England. Yeah, I won't reiterate everything Max has just said but yes, I I agree with everything he has just said. Natural England is broadly satisfied based on the information currently provided that it's it's appearing that Barbie doll Barbie dolls from the special area of conservation are not interacting with the scheme. And therefore it appears unlikely that there will be any adverse effect from the scheme on the sack. But that is subject to the completion and reporting of the outstanding surveys that are being undertaken.

43:29

Thank you. Um, so just just to clarify yourself, are you saying that there are likely significant effects? Or that this is just there are no likely significant effects? And is that what you say? Which one were you saying? Or was it just the effect on the integrity we're talking about?

43:48

Sorry, no likely significant effects. No adverse effects on the on the sidebar, but also no adverse effects on the integrity of the special area of conservation.

44:00

Yeah, no, I understand it. So no adverse effects on the integrity, but are there significant effects and the previous the case you were making before, what what is lighting effects? So from this, you're satisfied that this is this has demonstrated there are no likely significant effects? That is that what you're saying effectively? And

44:24

yes, pre pre with the previous habitats, regulations, assessment screening, there was some uncertainty based on the level of surveys that had been undertaken with regard to likely significant effect. And so we advise that further, further surveys were undertaken to substantiate at that conclusion, and those surveys have been are being carried out and have been completed for the SEC Barba still tracking. And those surveys pending the completion of the rest of the surveys that are still ongoing. appear to confirm that there will be no lightly significant effect on site barber stalls.

45:06

Thank you. That's that's very helpful.

45:09

Sorry, I'm sorry. Sorry, didn't drop service guidelines for the applicant, I understand exactly why you're asking the questions. And just to confirm our position has been very helpful intervention from from Natural England, the approach we intend to take is to indicate that through those survey results that the position that had been expressed, which was new, likely significant effect, would be would be confirmed, and we're grateful for the confirmation of that financial hang on today.

45:40

Thank you. Mr Lyness of so appreciate. It's a provisional comp compensation. And they are awaiting final surveys, but yes, yes.

45:46

Yes. But Scott Lyness felt we understand the distinction you were drawing, sir. And our position would be no likely significant effect, too. Thank you very much.

45:56

Thank you, Mr. Lyness. That's very helpful. Okay, well, that's, that's interesting. Perhaps, can we come back to Mr. Lyness and Mrs Nuttall. So if you could perhaps give us a brief update as to the two matters that were raised at deadline for by by Natural England in paragraph four point 2.7. And which were to be discussed at your meeting on the 23rd of November 2021. Firstly, the justification of the survey approaches undertaken at TranzAct locations 357 and eight and colour plantation. And secondly, the justification as to why natural England's recommendation to have 40 crossing points surveyed, was scoped out of the assessments. So perhaps if I could ask Mr. Lyness first to to provide an update from the applicants side as to what that what happened at that meeting on the 23rd of November

47:05

at Scott Lyness for the applicants for last Mr Wade to explain that for me.

47:13

Max Wade for the applicant. So points, one by one, again, providing a bit of an overview and I can certainly provide more detail if required. So the duration and time of year of these additional surveys, responding to these specific requests from Natural England are representative of the scale and spatial range of Bob style bats from ever cinnamon Paul Woods LSAC, as in which we have agreed with with Natural England. The two matters listed at paragraph four point 2.7 In our EP 404 for following the

applicant in any meeting on the 23rd. These are in relation to the 2018 surveys undertaken and are not directly relevant to the Bob style surveys undertaken in 2021. The scope of the additional surveys was fully agreed with Natural England. And that that's sort of an overview of those those points, and I would be more than happy to sort of go into more detail if if you wish.

48:34

Okay, now that that's fine. It's not a live stream that says something that Natural England would concur with.

48:42

Yes, yes. Thank you.

48:45

Thank you very much. Does anyone anyone else have any comments in particular on on the scoping works that we've just been talking about? All the other the interim findings, the dates from any of the parties? This stage? No. Okay. There's one question I'd like, like to ask. I think the governing authority is very pleased to note that the progress that's being made and and the agreement that seems to be emerging from these this latest round of surveys that are being conducted in relation to the barber school bats, a Tennyson Wimpole woods, special area of conservation. However, surveys are only taking place over a limited period of time during parts of the ultimate winter when bats may be less active or may behave perhaps in different way than they do at other times of the year. And given these limitations of this The survey works as a going on. How confident can the examining authority be that the surveys are representative of the the actual scale and spatial range of Bob store bats from the incident when Paul Woods especially conservation throughout the year, if a perhaps put that first to the applicant story.

50:26

Max Wade for the applicant? I think Sir, it's the reasons why the the surveys are episode is almost exactly what you described, we are providing information for a period of a year for which serve for which we hadn't undertaken surveys previously. And it was in response to natural England's recommendation that we undertook surveys at this time time of the year, despite it not being a time of year you'd expect that to be particularly active. So our scoping needed to cover the seasonal, seasonal aspect. And as I referred to before, we worked out with Natural England, an appropriate method to undertake in terms to provide that information, both in terms of the the SJC, but also with respect to the to the scheme. Thank you.

51:29

Thank you. So So effectively, this is a supplementary survey to the to the ones that you didn't commit to previously.

51:36

Yes, it completes the picture.

51:45

Mrs Nuttall, is that your understanding as well? And if so, perhaps could go back to the the points about the 2018 survey and that you raised and whether those were ever satisfactorily resolved, or whether they affect the veracity of those surveys at all?

52:06

Janet Nuttall Natural England? Yes, I agree with with what Max has said the ongoing surveys will help to provide a more complete suite of bat surveys. But just to note that discussions between Natural England and national highways are ongoing with regard to bat survey and mitigation and monitoring measures in relation to the 2008 teen surveys.

52:37

tool to read the two points out again for you.

52:41

Yes, please. And I might or might have to bring in my colleague, I'm just referring to my notes just to pick out on the 2018. But if he could just reiterate the points that were made, that would be helpful.

52:54

So let's Yes, the first one was the justification of the survey approaches undertaken it transact locations 357 and eight under pillar plantation. And the second is the justification as to why natural England's recommendation to survey 40 crossing points was scoped out of the of this, of that assessment, the 2018 assessment.

53:19

Okay, thank you. Yes. Yeah, on that point, I would say that Natural England and national highways, we're still in discussion regarding the location of the crossing structures associated with the transact the static detector and crossing point surveys and the associated mitigation and monitoring measures. But we had we were working together on that. So we have a timeframe for further discussions, and to come to an agreement on the approach that has been taken.

53:50

I suppose the point I would I would ask you is, from the examination, examining authorities perspective, is the confidence that we can have in those survey findings? If, if, if, for instance, at the end of your discussions, you're unable to reach an agreement on it. And you basically you have to you have to You're left with so is that the Applicant is undertaken at those those locations, but you're the ones that you're not, you're not comfortable with? I mean, this is slightly looking into the future. But I would, I'd like to understand what your view on how this affects the veracity of these, those surveys and also whether that has any bearing on the the impact of like, no likely significant effects or adverse effects.

54:40

I would say that, you know, Natural England is reasonably confident that we can reach agreement with with national highways through the ongoing discussions that we're having, and I would reiterate that this is outside of the barber still special area of conservation issue. This is just in relation to wider bat species and and the potential for for any adverse impacts on those bats given that they are European

protected species protected under the conservation of habitats and species regulations. So that that is the nature of the ongoing discussions.

55:18

I appreciate that there may be other bat species involved but similarly, the Bob store bat species are also involved in this

55:31

but Max Wade for the for the applicant, no, there are bad Estelle bats are present within the a four to eight the scheme area. But these are not bats that are related to the special area of conservation. So that having concluded that there is no lightly significant effects subject to the remaining data coming in from the surveys, there is no need to provide specifically mitigation for upstyle bats that originate from the have a connection to the to the essayessay. So as follows, as explained, we are in relation to the points that you raised on the transects, for example, we are in discussions to work out the overall mitigation for bats across the scheme. And that is doesn't doesn't include because there is no need to deal with the bats from the SAIC. I hope that helps to verify that. That's a

56:43

lot. Mr. Wade. Thank you. Just Just going back to the point that you didn't actually do any surveys of the SEC bats, other than the current 2021 surveys. So it comes back to the point that I made about the throughout the calendar year. Whether there is any evidence that suggests that Bob still bats from the special area of conservation don't travel Ireland towards and through and past the, the Motherland orderliness because what from what I understood you previously said, you haven't done any any survey work of those bats, other than the current Autumn Winter ones, which as you said, are for a very limited period of time.

57:29

Max Wade for the applicant. There are quite significant data relating to Bob style bats and then their movement at the DSA see that have been undertaken by other parties, including the Cambridge the bat group, the work that was done and to establish the zones around the US GSAC and other surveys that have been undertaken in relation to proposed developments. So there is significant data available for those those times of the year. However, nobody had undertaken any surveys about the stealth over the sort of late autumn, the period that we've just undertaken surveys for I think it should also be pointed out that given the sensitivity of the of this species, it unless there's a real necessity to undertake trapping and tagging surveys, we wouldn't do it and undertaken those in the light of that there was already existing information that was part of the decision making process. Thank you.

58:52

Thank you story. There's no sort of props come back to you on that. Natural England, a content that these these surveys that Mr. Wade has referred to do provide a satisfactory picture of the bats from the special area of conservation.

59:11

Yes, but based on the based on the information we've seen, we are reasonably satisfied that they provide a comprehensive picture of the use of the wider area by site barber stalls. And that's unless, if I could ask my colleague Claire Storey just to confirm that that is the case. And so to add anything anything else that might be of use

59:37

it so Claire Storey Natural England wildlife licencing Senior Advisor. Yeah, so we did we did we looked mostly looked at the tracking and trapping surveys undertaken by national highways. We also compared that to the surveys that were undertaken for East West Rail and you know, take on board, they are the information provided in the reports from natural national highways with regard to what had happened, you know what type of surveys have occurred within the sack. But the two most important things here is that the tracking and trapping surveys undertaken by national highways are comparable to those that were undertaken by East West Rail. the only the only that there is one particular Well, I think there were two different bats that were trapped under east west rail that actually came within two kilometres of the the a four to eight scheme. But that was as far as it got to towards the scheme, whereas the national highways tracking and trapping didn't actually record any bats go in that close to the scheme, however, but from this information, we're reasonably confident that the the tracking and trapping that were done for East West Rail and fun by national highways were actually they were comparable. And it didn't show that there was any interaction from Bob style bots to the actual scheme. Therefore to eight scheme.

1:01:12

Thank you Mrs Storey, that's helpful. There's a couple of points if I may, obviously, national highways haven't done any any tracking and tracking of that other than this awesome and Winston winter survey round. And as far as I'm aware,

1:01:28

no, I think they've actually undertaken some tracking and tracking we gateway issued licence, I think it was in 2020 when the tracking and trapping occurred. So they had a licence for doing that. So they have actually done some tracking and trapping, but that was in 2020. The 2021 surveys are two to extend the original surveys that were undertaken because they didn't they didn't extend far enough into the year to get a bigger an overall picture of what the bat activity was like across the scheme.

1:02:00

Yeah, that's does sound really, that seems to contradict what the applicants previously said when they said they didn't do any surveys relating to the deficit and when Paul Woods special area of conservation bats. So for the applicant, they did do some surveys, Mr. Wade, is that you would be best placed to answer that.

1:02:19

Yes, I'm happy to answer that. Yes, we we did undertake trapping and tagging surveys. But these were all bats that were caught within the scheme area or the area around the scheme with a view to determining whether those bats then moved south east down to the to the SAIC and be found that they

didn't. They weren't so local, local to the to the scheme. So that was the the tracking that the Claire was referring to.

1:02:51

Thank you, Mr. Wade. That's helpful. This story. So who put that back to you that there hasn't been any tracking and track track track tracking and tracking of SAIC bats other than the current autumn and winter surveys that are ongoing? Does that have any bearing on your effects on? On what we've just said? It doesn't seem to be consistent? Really?

1:03:15

I'm actually not quite sure what you're asking if you could repeat that that would be great, please.

1:03:19

You seem to be saying that you're satisfied that the the applicant has already taken undertaken strapping and tracking surveys of the Everson And when Paul Woods barber store bats, and you refer to the 2020 survey licence that have been granted, Mr. Wade has just informed you that that serve I didn't look at the barbers or bats from this special area of conservation. It was looking at bats, generally within the order limits.

1:03:49

And I said, Well, it was from the information that I've seen it, they actually did record bats come in from the sack, they did actually get a licence to trap bats in the sack itself. And they obviously that they I think they were part of them. They also trapped, sorry, trapped and trapped and trapped bats from other areas, but they are these bats were coming from the sack that they were they were serving. If I'm wrong, then I apologise. But that was my understanding from the information that I've seen that those bats did actually come from the the sack.

1:04:26

Well, thank you for starting out. That's, that's very interesting, because if that's the case, that does tend to suggest that if the 2020 survey works were undertaken within the order limits, and you're saying that bats from the special area of conservation were present in those surveys within the order limits, that there is an interaction functionally between the special area of conservation and the lower order limits.

1:04:47

I'm not saying that there is an interaction I'm saying that the tracking and shopping that was done by national highways and compared with East West Rail, that the bus that were tracked and tracked did not go any Were near, or did not go within the limits of the a four to eight. So therefore the there was no interaction between the bats from the sack to the a four to eight.

1:05:11

I'm sorry, I don't follow that. Really? I can't I can't understand what were you saying? You just You just said that the survey did actually help bats from the special area of conservation, that those surveys were only undertaken within the order limits. So explain that perhaps for me.

1:05:29

So Max, Max Wade from the from the applicant, and maybe I can so clarify. The Applicants undertaken two sets of trapping and tagging with respect to barber style bats. The first which was unfairly shows 2018 2019 was in relation to barber style, living in the area around the the scheme. And the purpose of that was, as I said before, to determine whether those bats had any link to the SAIC, and they didn't. The the second licence that that we have an I should have said that. The reason at that stage, why we didn't undertake any didn't apply for a light. We didn't apply for a licence. And we didn't undertake any trapping and tracking in the SAIC, is because there are already data that show where bat Bob Estelle bats move to during the sort of spring summer period. And that to have undertaken, well, it would have been dubious as to whether we would have been given a licence to produce further information in relation to existing knowledge. So the second licence application to Natural England was whether it was in 2021, and this year, and that was for the the trapping and target tagging that you referred to previously, over the autumn early early winter period. And that was specifically to fill the gap in terms of data for the SAIC, for Bob Estelle, should they have changed their behaviour and be moving further afield? differently to the data that had been produced by East West Rail, Cambridge back group, the study is in relation to South South Cambridge, a district council and work that they've also carried out. But in the the the outcome was, as Claire's described, the movements were very similar over the late autumn, early winter, compared with the existing dataset for movements or BB style, to and from the SAIC. I hope that sort of clarifies things.

1:08:08

Mister. A quick question for Mr. Wade, if I may interrupt at this point. Yeah, by all means. Mr. Wade, you've talked about an existing data set, done over the spring and summer is that in the examination

1:08:25

we have referred to the data generated by South South Cambridge District Council and the Cambridge shirt, back group. Or if you like the the data that are within the public domain, East West Rail, I think kindly shared that information with with Natural England, we haven't been able to refer to that within the examination, partly because of the time that it was undertaken. It's relatively recent data. And also partly because it wasn't our data to refer to.

1:09:04

But if that is data that you are Natural England are relying on in order to make sure that you have a complete picture in terms of the timing of the survey and the behaviour of the bats during the entire year, then I think that that information would need to be before the examining authority, any information that you're relying on to draw a conclusion. And indeed, mystory is relying on to draw that conclusion for Natural England, we would need to, we would just need to be satisfied that that's before us. I understand what you're saying about East West Rail, but you are engaging with them on other matters. So is that perhaps something that you could have a conversation about again, I I think this is something that perhaps can be done over the course of the day to see if that information can be submitted into examination.

1:09:58

Mam Scott Lyness for the applicant is going to suggest the same thing perhaps is something we can raise with naturally decides the hearings and come back to you before the close of the hearing. Today, we understand the point that's being made.

1:10:13

Yeah. And I think there's there's just a point of clarification, which Mr. Parkin an eye and then the, you know, we're kind of struggling with is, is that the what Natural England are saying in terms of what they're reading of the findings is and what the applicant is saying what you're reading of the findings is, do you concur? And and if you if you don't, then we just need to know what that point of divergences

1:10:40

Scott Lyness after helping us understand why we don't think there's any difference in substance between the parties, it may be that we just need to have a little bit of clarification on when licences were issued to whom or understanding is that the licence that was being mentioned earlier issued in 2020? Was eastwest. Real not awesome. Mr. Wade has described the licence issuing position correctly. But again, perhaps we can raise this was not drilling. And as we're discussing the information, leading these worst readouts of the hearing, come back to before there was a play today.

1:11:12

That's brilliant. I just wanted to sorry, to apologise and say, Yes, it was the 2021 surveys that we issued a licence for, that I'm aware of. And that's what we've been comparing with the East West Rail surveys. So that was only 2021. So issued licencing in 2021, for national highways to undertake some tracking and trapping of bats from the sack. Okay. And then, so that we've got that data, and we've compared that with what each West Rail found, and they were very comparable with the exception of wombat that went to bats that went within two kilometres of the scheme.

1:11:55

Got it, and the East West Rail survey was done in 2020. And it was done over the spring and summer period.

1:12:01

Is that correct? I would have to check that. Okay.

1:12:05

All right. Okay, so we'll come back to this point. That's all from me, Mr. Parkin. Okay.

1:12:10

Mam, if I could, Max Wade on behalf of the applicant. I think in terms of just being clear on the way we have approached this, and also specifically with with respect to the East West Rail data, this is where real data actually didn't exist when we made the decision that there was no need for us to be trapping and tagging in the SEC in the 2018. Period. And that was because of the already substantial amount of data that was present. And I can't speak for for Natural England, but certainly the view that we've taken regarding East West Rail was it was reassuring that they they described similar patterns to those that already existed, and I mentioned is partly as a sort of matter of record, but also, with respect to

managing expectations. I would be surprised if East West Rail were able within the day to be to be able to get agreement to release those data to put in in the public domain. And I I've had that indications that should it be necessary, they would certainly be willing to do that. But I don't honestly think it would be today. Thank you,

1:13:35

ma'am. Scott Lyness for the applicant. Whether or not the information itself can be released. I'm sure we can update you on the process that could be followed and I know the questions been asked, then obviously that will be something which he and others will need to take into account, given us a request has been made by yourselves with the examining authority,

1:13:57

for sure, Mr. Lyness, but equally, I think, should that not be possible? Should it not be possible, then the data that you relied on when you did your survey in 2018. In order to arrive at the conclusion, which you say is available in the public domain, you may want to tell the examining authority about you and natural England's position on the you know, the the validity of that data in order to draw the conclusions that you did and how that relates to the survey that you've done in 2021. So I think there's, there's two routes here to satisfy us. And to make sure that the information is before the examination is an examination.

1:14:40

That's on Tuesday, the provisional basis upon which the earlier data will be presented. I accept that and we take that on board, Mam, I'm grateful. Okay, thank you Mr.

1:14:57

stager.

1:15:00

Yeah, I just wanted to confirm the East West Rail surveys were undertaken in August 2020. And the national highways tracking had a licence between September the 17th of September and the 22nd of October 21.

1:15:20

Okay, Mrs Storey

1:15:22

Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Parkin.

1:15:24

Thank you. Thanks. Thanks all for the contribution. I think we're a bit further on now than we were earlier on. So thank you all for that. Just looking at the the agenda. We've not heard from everyone potentially, who's got an interest and thinking of the local authorities, perhaps or the other groups, if anyone has anything they want to say, is anything you wish to, to add to the to the discussions at this stage? Please raise your hand if if not, we can move on from that. That was not all. Yes. Thank you.

1:16:07

Janet Nuttall All Natural England. Yeah, I hope you don't mind me just taking the opportunity just to go back to a previous agenda item regarding the habitats regulations assessment. We didn't get my hand up in time before you moved on to the next agenda item. But I just wanted to clarify that with regard to the previous HRA screening, and no lightly significant effects. In our view, with regard to the site barber style issue, there was insufficient information, or that, you know, there was uncertainty with regard to the no lightly significant effect conclusion. So in our view, that aspects of the habitats regulations assessment should progress to the appropriate assessment stage. Should progress it should, yes. The information through the additional ongoing surveys that have been undertaken should then be used to inform that assessment.

1:17:05

Thank you. I did understand by it's helpful just to get it clarified like that. Thank you.

1:17:10

Thank you. Sir, Scott Lyness, for the applicant, sorry to interrupt. I think we just need to reiterate our position, potentially something we're going to have to pick up with naturalism in due course, but we're not sure we quite follow the logic of nurturing and saying, Well, we can't screen out on the basis of insufficient information, then receiving information and then not saying, well, we die can screen out because the information is satisfied. As I said, our position is that we don't see any reason to alter the conclusions that were reached in the original report, ie that there weren't any lighting effects, because the latest information is confirmed that position, we don't at this stage see a reason for that to be done by way of appropriate assessment because the information has allowed lately significant effects to be screened out. Obviously, this may be something which we need to discuss further with. Matt was not triggering, but I didn't want this agenda item to be left. With that potential uncertainty over the position, Sir, our position is we would still be in a new ladies nificant effects position.

1:18:28

Okay, and the slides? Yeah, I think there's a it'd be it'd be helpful. If you naturally noted, perhaps have a discussion about this and come forward with it. I do understand what Natural England is saying, though, is is a sequential approach. And so at that stage, when they were not satisfied that there were no likely significant effects, their worst wasn't evidence to justify that. And so that triggers, therefore, the appropriate assessment. And it's my understanding. And then obviously, the appropriate assessment has produced the survey data, which, from the interim findings seems to suggest that there are no locally significant effects, and certainly no adverse effects on the integrity of especially conservation. But again, it's something that if you perhaps can discuss with Natural England, I think that will be helpful.

1:19:14

Yes. May I bear in mind Scott Lyness? Bear in mind, sir, when one thinks about the practicalities of this, the nature of the reporting that's been that's been done. We we still reiterate our position that if you look at the information is not available in the context of the work has been done. It is used to then reinforce the conclusions that were already presented in the report rather than actually preparing a complete new

appropriate assessments. But also we can discuss that with with Natural England reserve our position in the meantime, sir.

1:19:52

Yeah, no, that's fine. Yeah, I'll leave that with you to to discuss and but yeah, give me like a response sooner rather than later.

1:20:01

Yes, Scott Lyness. That's what that's Understood, sir. Obviously, substantive V there isn't actually a difference between the parties as far as the effects of the scheme are concerned, it's really about the manner in which that agreed possession that agreed positions properly recorded the documentation.

1:20:18

Thank you, Mrs Ahmad, I see you've got your hand raised at the moment is something you'd like to say,

1:20:25

yes, Deborah Ahmad from the game show authorities. I'm not too sure if you're going on to this point or not, but just to raise that we have concerns about the detail off the bat mitigation for the widest game. So not necessarily the BB STELs. Dependent on the survey results, but on the wider scheme, and the details of those crossing points. And that's something we'd like to see further information with regards to that.

1:20:53

Thank you. So we are going to come on to that. I mean, we have slightly overrun the the agenda. But at this stage, I think I was I was I was intending to see if we could we could try and deal with bats and impact mitigation issues. But we have been going for quite a while now. And I'm inclined that we should have a break now. That's 20 past 11. And then come on, where we will discuss the bats and potential mitigation measures associated with this. And other biodiversity matters as well. But I say we have been going on for a reasonable amount of time now. So I think now would be an appropriate time to have off mid morning break. So the time is now 1123. If I can suggest we return at 1140 and we'll we'll continue from there. Thank you everyone for your contribution so far.