

TEXT_ISH3_PART1_A1iN_Session1_21042021

Wed, 4/21 11:49AM • 1:33:34

00:05

Good morning. Can I just confirm that people can hear me clearly please?

00:10

Yes, I can hear you clearly.

00:13

Thank you. Can I also confirm with Miss Patton that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:21

I can confirm that the live stream has commenced. Thank you very much.

00:27

Mr. Bass words you have your hand up.

00:32

Paul. Apologies, sir. That was an error. Okay, thank you.

00:38

So for those people watching the live stream, should we at any point to join proceedings this morning, we'd have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. Therefore the point at which we commence the meeting, and restart the live stream, you'll have to refresh your browser page to view the restarted stream.

00:58

I'll remind you of this again should we need to adjourn.

01:02

The time is now 10 o'clock and time for this hearing. To begin. I'd like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters in relation to the application made by highways England for the a one in Northumberland. More per swell engine.

01:20

The development proposed comprises two parts, with Part A being the widening of the existing single carriageway to dual carriageway for approximately 12.6 kilometres of the existing Awan between more person Felton

01:37

includes approximately 6.5 kilometres one line widening and 6.1 kilometres of new offline highway.

01:45

Papi involves the widening of existing single carriageway to dual carriageway for approximately eight kilometres of the existing Awan between hanneke and telogen.

01:58

Thank you for attending this virtual meeting.

02:01

My name is Kevin Gleason. I'm a chartered town planner. I'm a plumbing Inspector, employed by the planning Inspectorate. They've been appointed by the Secretary of State for housing Communities and Local governments to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application.

02:19

I'm now going to ask my fellow panel member to introduce himself.

02:25

Thank you, Mr. Gleason. My name is Andre Pinto and I am also a chartered on planner in planning Spectre employed by the planning Inspectorate. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel for the examination of this application.

02:45

Thank you. So, together we constitute the examining authority for this application. And we'll be reporting to the Secretary of State for Transport with a recommendation as to whether the developed consent order should be made.

03:04

You will already have spoken to her from Candice Patton, who's the case manager for this project. Miss Patton is being supported today by James Bunsen, and George Harold, Who are the members of the case team.

03:17

If you have any questions about the examination process, or the technology we're using for virtual events, patient be your first point of contact. The contact details can be found at the top of any letter you received from us, or on the project page of the national infrastructure website.

03:36

This meeting is being held on the Microsoft team's platform and is being live streamed. In order to minimise background noise, can you please make sure that your phone is switched off or turn to silent? And please stay muted with a camera off? Unless you're speaking?

03:55

As this is a virtual meeting, we structured it in such a way that questions or points that you may wish to raise can be done. So the relevant point in the proceedings when we get to those points is that if you want to speak use the Microsoft team's hands on function. There'll be advised there may be too late before we see it.

04:16

And please wait to be invited to speak at the appropriate time.

04:21

Can you also remind people that the chat function on Microsoft Teams won't work? So please don't try to use this to ask any questions or post comments.

04:32

If you don't manage to ask your question always your points at the relevant points in the in the hearing. There will be an opportunity later Under Item 10 on the agenda any other matters

04:49

because the digital recordings we make are retained and published. They form a public records that can contain your personal information and switch the general data protection regulation applies.

05:00

The planning inspectors practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision.

05:09

Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it's important that you understand that you will be live streamed and recorded,

05:18

and that the digital recording will be published. If you don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera.

05:26

If you feel it's necessary to submit personal information, please provide this in the written documents that we can redact before publication.

05:36

Does anyone have any questions with regards to this matter?

05:43

No, then I'll move on.

05:48

The purpose of this examination is for the examining authority to consider evidence submitted by the applicant, other interested parties and affected persons.

05:58

As a result, we'd like to reassure you that we are familiar with the documents that you've sent in. So when answering a question, you don't need to repeat a length, something that has already been submitted.

06:10

If you want to refer to information already submitted, we'd be grateful if you could give the appropriate pins examination Library Reference. Additionally, the first time you use an abbreviation or acronym, can you please give the full title as there will be people here today or listening on the audio that may not be as familiar with the application or the documents as you are?

06:32

Can you please ensure the benefits of the recording that each time you speak you give your name?

06:41

The hearing today will be a structured discussion which will be led by the examining authority based on the agenda that's always already been published. The purpose of the hearing is to enable you to answer any questions that we might have to ensure that we have all the information we need in order to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State.

07:02

I'd now like to turn to the agenda.

07:05

The agenda for these hearing was placed on the project page at the inspector websites on Tuesday of last week, the 13th of April.

07:18

Mr. Pinto could we have the agenda on the screen please? Thank you very much.

07:27

Having reflected further on the agenda, we've actually decided to reverse the items two and three. So item three, which covers the outstanding information associated with change requests submitted a

07:39

deadline for and unlike other substantive matters on the agenda will not be testing evidence, but will help us to understand more fully the applicant's proposed changes to the application and how they can be examined.

07:54

That will then be item two.

07:58

item three will then address the water environments, while item four covered by the biodiversity ecology the natural environment.

08:09

item five will consider landscape and visual impacts of the scheme.

08:13

With transport and traffic forming item six, the mitigation of construction impacts. item seven, and the final substantive topic is combined and cumulative effects arising from the proposed developments.

08:29

This agenda is for guidance only. We may add other issues for consideration as we progress

08:39

will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of them.

08:45

As with previous hearings, we propose that the table be split into three sessions, each of approximately an hour and a half. At the completion of this session at around 1130 we would have a break of half an hour before resuming at 12 and continuing until 130.

09:05

The final session of the day will take place between 230 and four

09:10

I set out in the agenda is not possible it's possible that not all matters on the agenda will be discussed today. However, it depends on progress there may be need to continue discussions tomorrow. Nevertheless, can participants therefore please make sure they're available for both days.

09:29

We're aware of the limited availability of some environments agency staff tomorrow. Until then terabits work around that so they can cover all government matters today. Similarly, we're aware of time constraints affecting the availability of one of the council transport officers. We'll do what we can to accommodate him

09:50

will conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant contributions have been made and all questions asked and responded to.

09:57

This may mean we don't need all the time table session.

10:01

But if discussions can be completed and are likely to take longer than anticipated, it may be necessary to prioritise matters and defer other matters to furthering questions.

10:14

Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions we ask. As I've mentioned, this is a predominantly written process. Therefore, if you can't answer the questions that are being asked, or require time to get the information requested, then rather than giving a restricted or potentially Wrong answer, for the smooth running of the examination, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing? We can then defer the questions next round of hearing next round of questions, or later hearing if necessary.

10:50

So now let's take the names of those who wish to speak at this hearing. Don't forget to state your name and who you represent. I'll begin with the applicants.

11:04

Good morning. My name is Howard bassford. I am a partner and solicitor at the law firm DLA Piper, UK LLP and I represent highways England which is the applicant for this development consent order. I have a large number of witnesses available to support today but I suggest that I introduce those as they're required rather than read your long list at present for NAFTA five suppliers so the time supported by Mr. David Morrow who is the project manager from the global consultancy w SP, who is advising Holmes, England and Mr. Mark Stone, who's the product manager from highways England, who is our responsible client for this matter.

11:50

Thank you very much Mr. passwords. We have got the list, which was provided earliest has been helpful, and I think it's appropriate that to introduce when this is as the call to thank you

12:03

could then move on to Northumberland county council please.

12:09

Thank you, sir. My name is Katherine Robbie, I'm Senior town planner with Northumberland county council. Today I've got four colleagues with me to support me and Gary Francis for any ecology matters. James Hitchin, from the local flood authority for the water environment. Mark Evans, from Stevenson holiday on landscape matters. Matthew Payne on traffic and transport matters. Thank you very much.

12:41

And from the Environment Agency, please.

12:48

Hi, my name is Casey mo and I'm representing the vironment agency. I've got five other colleagues to support me at the hearings, we've got Christoph dobrowski, who's a biodiversity officer Alistair laboratory is a Jima, Father Jays, Heather Harrison, a catchment coordinator, Jonathan Kalika, a flood risk officer, and Carol bolt who represents our legal services. Thank you very much.

13:13

I'd say anyone else please.

13:20

Mr. hos.

13:23

Yeah. Good morning. Yes. So I would like to reserve the option to speak of as possible.

13:28

My name is Mark Hawes, representing North Gate farm residents. Thank you very much, Mr. House.

13:36

Is there anyone else

13:39

in the meeting who wishes to speak?

13:44

I think that's all who's on my list. Anyway. So that's helpful. Thank you.

13:50

So as indicated in the agenda, the key documents which were likely to refer to throughout the hearing, are as follows. We have to draft your own consent order. The version will be the change request one rep five has 34 downline construction environmental management plan, which we'll refer to as the camp and that is rep 512.

14:15

Outline construction traffic management plan. Rep three oh 15.

14:22

Landscape mitigation master plans for Part A and Part B. Can the change request versions? So those are references rep four oh 60 as rep four oh 53.

14:35

The culvert mitigation strategy rep 522.

14:41

The water Framework Directive assessments Part A and Part B. That's a PP two five knots two to five which is in the agenda, then a pp 312.

14:55

stands for common grounds with the North Americans can

15:00

For five oh 15

15:03

stands for common ground to the Environment Agency. Rep five oh 17 unstamped common ground with natural England? Rep. 516.

15:15

The applicant has also suggested the following additional documents to be referenced during the hearing. So we have the applicants response to further written questions. Rep five oh 23

15:28

Yes, chapter seven Part A pppl 44 Part B aappr 45.

15:37

He has chapter nine biodiversity party, a PPO 48. And Part B. A PP o 49.

15:47

Yes, Chapter 10 drainage and environments, water environments. A PP o 50. For part A, and A PP o 51. for part B.

16:00

The proposed highway adoption and maintenance responsibility plans, rep four oh 42.

16:08

Ancient woodland strategy change request version report Oh 54.

16:14

Biodiversity now net loss assessment for the scheme for change requests, which is rep 538

16:22

trees to be removed and replaced coronation Avenue rep one oh 44.

16:28

The applicants response to local impacts reports, web three and 25

16:34

and the river coconuts geomorphology modelling assessments, which is rep three double oh nine.

16:44

I think based on that lengthy list, it's

16:48

quite likely we're going to get into a second day for this this hearing.

16:54

So that's addresses the first item on the agenda, the welcome introductions and arrangements for the hearing. Are there any questions of an introductory or preliminary nature? anyone wishes to raise at this point?

17:11

Come see me Hands up. So I'll take that as no issues to be raised. So we'll then move on to item two on the agenda.

17:26

Which, as we've said, changing the order will now be

17:32

the outstanding information from the change request.

17:37

So in the agenda, this is described as follows to confirm the scope of progress with the submission of his proposed hydraulic modelling, and geomorphological information associated with the change requests submitted deadline for

17:54

that to begin with, I'd just like to summarise how we see the current position from the examining authority his points of view. So deadline for the applicants submitted a formal change request to amend the DCR application.

18:09

The three proposed changes were accepted through examination by the examining authority on the ninth of April, and consultation on the proposed changes in the way.

18:20

provision has been made in the examination timetable for the examining authority to ask critical questions, and to undertake one or more hearings into the matters raised by the proposed changes, once comments have been received from interested parties.

18:37

The intention, therefore, is not considered the proposed changes themselves today. Let's clarify the scope of and progress with the submission of the proposed hydraulic modelling and geomorphological information associated with the change requests, which we've asked for by deadline seven.

18:56

We therefore going to seek to establish what further information is required to be submitted and why and to understand the process and timetable for the submission and review with that information, particularly by the Environment Agency.

19:12

In doing so, probably useful to have to hand the applicants response to the examining authorities will 17 letter, the 30th of March, that's rep five oh 32 the environment agency's response, which is rep five oh 44.

19:31

And subsequently, we also have the applicants comments on the environment agency's response to I will 17 letter, which is five a below two.

19:42

And there's also further response from the Environment Agency at deadline five a rep five A w three, as well as a response from natural England. So there are a couple of new documents there. The Tony just gone up on stage.

20:00

termination library, you may want to look at those during the course of this discussion.

20:08

Where they also say an introduction is that I would ask that as neither Mr. Pinto nor I have qualifications in hydrology or geomorphology, that you please respect this in your responses, helping us to understand the principles of this stage should ensure, and provide us with a greater understanding when we come to consider the evidence itself later in the examination.

20:35

So, I'm going to begin with a number of key questions. As I've said, this will help to understand the process, rather than the content of material.

20:45

But I'd like to begin, first of all, just to understand what is meant by those two phrases, which have been used in a number of documents recently, hydraulic modelling consume morphological information, and why such information is required?

21:02

So basically, are these two separate pieces of information and watched? What does each involve?

21:09

I'm going to ask the applicant to set out their position, first of all, and then I'll come to the Environment Agency primarily and then any other interested parties who may wish to comment. So, could we begin with that please, Mr password

21:31

Thank you, sir. Now, you will be familiar with the term at Barrett crew lawyer and I will tread carefully because I do not wish to try to be a barrack room that hybrid geomorphologist or similar, and this is a very complicated field as you will have appreciated from your pre reading for this matter. So, this

21:55

So, these,

21:58

the way that these fit into the change request, and the application is broadly as follows. The change request relates to structures which will be built in the valley of the river coconut. And that would result in structures being in or close to the river environment in the

22:24

in the rubber co kit that presents

22:29

this is one remembers one some school days and the work you do in relation to oxbow lakes and things like that, and braiding all of that, those changes have a consequence for the way that the river performs in its environments, it will either erode or retreat

22:51

and the hydrology is to do with the performance of the water. And the geomorphology is about the consequence on the physical add the banks and bed of the river as a result of the changes in the way the water flows around the various objects. Now, there will be technical people who will tell me that that is not strictly accurate, but hopefully that will have captured for you why these things are important. Because changes of course, in a riverine system effect what is going on the beds, the habitats, the the way they perform, the way the river

23:25

carries things act,

23:28

it carries its load the way that it's turbulent or otherwise, the way it flows around obstacles and those those

23:37

those effects will have an impact not just at the immediate location, but they can affect the way that things take place, upstream or downstream, because an obstacle causes water to be held back upstream and it changes the way it flows downstream. So, that that is the

23:57

that is why we are looking at this. That is of course, one, one component only of the many assessments that are being undertaken. And it's important to note in the relationship of a coconut that you already have before you

24:17

solve these matters, which are supported by what are known as Manning's calculations, which are a, a more

24:25

a more straightforward modelling basis, but one can predict with greater comfort, growth certainty, using the the models that are used to assess change here. So the reason why this modelling is being undertaken is to support the assessment. This is already before you and all being well. And we expect this fully to be the case because we have experts who do this sort of thing all the time. It will simply confirm the assessments that you already have. And that is why you can begin to examine the question before you have the model.

25:01

So that that is what we're looking at.

25:06

The topics that we're considering are the performance of the geomorphology. And the hydrology is very much a pathway. So, one looks at what the consequences later are four habitats, for instance, for changes in the river ion system and the changes in the the sites that are hosts to the ribride system. And so that is why it is important. So, when the, it starts with the insertion of an obstacle into the river, and then you look at the change in the way the river performs, and then what is the consequence for other topics. So, that's why it all connects up and that's why we're looking at it.

25:48

I am going to ask Mr. Gryphon, who I think is here, and he is one of LA's he will introduce himself and the organisation that he is from, and hopefully he will just confirm what I have said.

26:03

Thank you, Mr. Spitz. Thank you,

26:06

sir. Yes, Dr. Ian Gryphon, I represent the applicant, I am a head of discipline for science, I drew morphology for Jacobs, and yes geomorphology, correct to Howard and river form and physical process the period of sediment and to understand the changes that the structures may have on the

behaviour of the river. And we need to understand the hydraulics of the reach the way that the water flows through the existing structure, which is the baseline scenario, and the proposed

26:49

permanent works, and also the temporary construction phase, all of which have slightly modifying the channel cross section and has the potential to also change sediment behaviour. So we are currently undertaking hydraulic modelling which will then inform those subsequent studies. That's just to explain that for the the inspectors a little further. So there, there are effect three states that you model. The first is the baseline direct second is the temporary work so that we know that fully impacts to verify the assessments we've undertaken. And the third is the permanent work so that we understand the changes that will happen when the permanent works are in situ. And so that's why there are three sets of problems. You've set up the model with the baseline. So it isn't something one can simply observe by watching the river you have to set up a model new look to see whether the model that you the mathematical model that you've constructed, performs in the same way as the natural environment and then you carry out the Freedmen's

28:06

correct. So the hydraulic model is a few kilometres upstream of the bridge crossing and a few kilometres downstream of the bedrosian. And it is a two dimensional model. And the river and the associated floodplain and banks are represented as a series of two metre cells. And each cell communicates with the other cells and the modelling is undertaken in that way. And it's using a two flow software product.

28:42

Thank you. That's the important point, which is to say that this is a discipline which is well understood and well known. And so, you are using an approach which is entirely normal in this sort of environment. Correct.

29:00

Thank you. So, can I just

29:03

be clear, the reason why this modelling was not done with the submitted scheme and why needs to be done as part of the change requests.

29:20

The submitted schemes that did not involve the

29:27

interventions in the river environment. And so when when we are looking at that proposed contain elements, such as the peers in the in very similar locations, same locations, but they were not actually in the river. They were at most in the

29:51

most narrow quarter and Deep River Valley. But they were not in the river. The changes that you asked

30:00

For you relate predominantly to the scour protection, we have identified a needed as a result of the work that carries on in any new drone engineering scheme on a continuous basis, they don't just make an application for DCM and then stop me keep looking at it. And the the work which the expert teams advising housing and have carried out has identified the need for the scam protections group provide longevity to the structure and to protect it from the natural behaviour of the river.

30:40

Right. Okay, thank you.

30:43

So it's about

30:45

the original scheme and why there was a change. Okay, thank you. Mr. Gryphon, to this extent, and you want to add to that content? I'm content with that. Yeah. Okay. So I think that provides

31:00

the basis for under situations where I am watched by the witness rather than

31:06

being watched by me.

31:08

Something like that? Yes. Okay.

31:12

That's a useful starting point for us then to understand

31:17

what we're considering at this point in the examination and will

31:23

be subject to the further consideration as the examination progresses.

31:31

Before looking at the

31:34

timetable for the further work, I'd like to bring in the Environment Agency to ask if they have any comments on what has been said by the applicants so far, in terms of the reasons for this, and

31:50

what exactly is required at this stage. In terms of

31:56

this this further work

31:59

mismo

32:02

pie it's facing away from the Environment Agency. And I

32:07

agree with what Ian Gryphon, and Howard Ambassador said about the hydraulic model and geomorphology issues. We're currently in the process of reviewing the baseline model and the supporting report that goes with it. And that will take up to four weeks to review. However, we will endeavour to respond and review the models as quickly as possible. Yeah, that we're going to come on to that.

32:30

What I wanted to be clear about First of all, is the explanation which the applicant has just given as to why this is

32:38

this work is needed. You're happy with that summary?

32:44

Yo, yo, guess you your time? Yes, that's correct. Okay, that's fine. That's the starting point then. Okay. So,

32:54

before we move on to the timetable, and I think probably going back

33:02

to the applicant first

33:06

just to run through

33:12

what is meant by the different terms. So

33:19

the hydro hydraulic modelling

33:23

which is

33:25

describes

33:29

the effects in terms of

33:34

water movements and puts it that way

33:37

and the jib croak geo morphological information. So we are looking at two separate pieces of information there. And how they've been produced in different timescales. Do they overlap? Are there different outputs? Could Stepan just clarify that for me please?

33:59

Sir, I'm here to ask Mr. Gryphon, just to answer is that my understanding is that there is that typically one presents hydrology and geomorphology together in a single report, but he will confirm Yes Okay. Thank you.

34:12

Sir. Yes. So, the hydraulic modelling is the precursor for the other assessments,

34:20

the hydraulic modelling or support, flood risk, we are interested in aspects such as flow velocity,

34:29

depth, and the shear stress acting on the bed of the river. So, we get that information from the hydraulic model, which then informs the geomorphological assessment and also informs design and flood risk aspects.

34:50

For our purposes here, Dr. Gryphon, we will be the modelling that is carried out is not

35:00

Because

35:01

we will produce a model, we produce reports on that for the Environment Agency who then verify that concur with our modelling, there won't then be a set subsequent iteration where we carry out more work, which will then subsequently need to present be presented to the, to the examination, that work

has already been undertaken, what what the modelling is doing is verifying the work that we have already undertaken. Yes, that's correct.

35:36

So, so you need to build in more weeks into your programme critically, no. Okay. Thank you.

35:47

Okay, so let's then move on to timetable for the, the

35:55

submission of this further work. And

36:00

I think

36:02

there were indications that

36:08

some of that information was going to be produced immediately after the Easter break, and hasn't been submitted. I think the latest indication was it will be submitted

36:22

on Monday of this week, stage one modelling information, stage two, Monday 26th.

36:32

Can starting with the applicant, can we just confirm the timetable now for taking this forward, whether there has been any slippage how that can be taken on board and

36:45

how the process evolves from here onwards. Mr. password, please.

36:55

So, the position was originally stated that things would be available immediately after Easter, when models like this are set up, you have to check that they're actually performing correctly, it's it is

37:12

it is something that those of us who used to using computers don't, day by day for operations such as this, you don't wait very long with the circle running. But the the processing power required for these models means that they take a number of hours for each run of the model to proceed, and for the results to be produced. So the first thing one has to do is to establish that the model is stable and that it is performing as it should. There were a number of occasions where the model did not quite performed correctly. And those had to be those had to be addressed in order to then get the stable models which have now been, which we're now using. So that that is the reason why the timing slipped slightly, that

modelling has now caught up and as set out in the response at deadline five, a, the beginning of the provision of information to the Environment Agency took place on

38:19

think it was on Monday. So that is the baseline modelling. And that is information which which is that first run of the model without the additional

38:33

the additional information that is required for the temporary and permanent works. It's accompanied by a modelling report, which enables the Environment Agency to look at those, those data and check that they agree that the model is performing correctly, because the purpose of this, as I've said is to verify the assessments undertaken.

38:58

That first set of data is with them now, as as Moe has, has stated and the the balance of the information will be provided from the end of this week to the beginning of next, which is as Moe has said, they then take four weeks to review. The The

39:20

important thing to note here is just how helpful the Environment Agency is being they are allowing us to submit in tranches, which is extremely useful to us. And it means that we can keep up to date on how maps are progressing. And I I am told regularly, how matters are progressing and how Dr. Griffin's team is getting on with its work and liaising with the Environment Agency. So we're very grateful to them for facilitating that. What this means that the Environment Agency should be in a position where it's able to make representations at the relevant time. So the data will come into the examination ahead of the environment.

40:00

agency completing its work, meaning that all being well it should confirm the position to you at the point at which representations are due.

40:09

I suggest you verify this with with mezzmo. Of course, because Thank you, she she she will have a view on this no doubt. Yes, certainly.

40:22

So mismo Do you want to comment on the timetable now, from the environment agency's point of view

40:33

and your expectation as to

40:37

what is being provided and when, and then whether it meets your requirements timetable.

40:46

Thanks. So, as stated by Mr. bassford. We are currently reviewing the baseline model at the minute, and we are expecting the second stage modelling information to come in the week commencing the 25th of April. Again, that will take four weeks to review. However, we'll endeavour to review the model as quickly as possible and to meet the examination deadlines.

41:20

Thank you.

41:37

So I think what I've heard at the moment is that

41:43

given the constraints of the examination, the six month timetable we have, which is probably the main constraints on all this work.

41:54

Things are progressing,

41:57

both from the applicants point of view and from the rotations point of view,

42:02

as well as can be expected

42:06

given those constraints, and we asked for the information to be

42:15

submitted by deadline seven rather than deadline eight,

42:20

in order that parties can have an earlier opportunity to comments, and that comments can be made on those comments by examination.

42:34

So it's important that we set that timetable. We've seen the responses from both parties. To that suggestion. we're progressing on that basis.

42:49

I suppose at the heart of our

42:52

little 17 letter, which asks a whole series of questions about this process.

42:59

One thing we wanted to be clear about the examining authority was what happens if something doesn't go to plan and the information

43:12

that the model doesn't provides the answers

43:19

to verify the earlier results,

43:24

or that there are other requirements evolving from that. And I think certainly there's the question of whether or not further

43:36

such risk assessment would be required, for instance, that's something I think that the environments agency have highlighted. So again, just moving forward, looking ahead to

43:49

other scenarios. Mr. basswood, could you comment on what potential pitfalls there might be and how they might be dealt with further on in the examination, please?

44:02

Thank you.

44:04

So we understand that the other thing to bear in mind is that this is a scientific process and the mathematical process and this is something where highways England is advised by experts. The war to what the Environment Agency is doing is not looking at the assessments, but looking at the methodology of the assessments. And so we because the people who are doing this are experts, we have a high expectation of the likelihood of concurrence. And so that puts us in the same position you would be in in respect of any examination where matters are being considered

44:49

any of the topics before you now there could be new information that arises later in this system, we will have to deal with it. And so what we have done here through the work that dropped

45:00

Gryphon Stephens candidate through the work that the Environment Agency is carrying out his advanced this topic to a very similar one to everything else that is in the for you in the examination. So that's about the risk profile here. In terms of what would happen. There is even after the

45:20

hearing, I did have my habit, my fingertips the exact sheduled, for the hearings, towards the end of the examination, there is still some time where it would be possible to examine any changes, although with we're very confident that that is unlikely to be required in terms of things such as flood risk assessment, and so forth. That is something which is already before you were discussing it with the with the Environment Agency already as to where there are changes, but we don't believe that there are material changes in flood risk performance of the scheme that is likely to be identified as a result of the modelling. And so, so we don't think that those sorts of substantive, substantive heavy lifting examination are likely to be required later in the process.

46:12

Thank you.

46:14

Miss Mo, do you want to respond to that, please?

46:22

Hi, I'm fine. The review of the model, if there are problems with the model, we will work with the applicant to address the modelling to ensure those fit for purpose. And that assesses the flood flood with implications of the proposed scheme.

46:40

And if the model is going to be fit for practice, we would expect to flood risk assessment and the geomorphology assessment to be updated to reflect the outputs of the model and also propose changes that were accepted in April, then I

46:59

thank you. Can I clarify, are you then happy with the timetable, which has been set out for the remainder of the examination? As far as this issue is concerned? it's acceptable, acceptable? Okay. Thank you. So you, you think that you will be able to

47:22

address

47:24

the issues of relevance the Environment Agency provided that the applicants

47:32

meets the

47:36

timetable for providing the information? Correct. Yeah. Okay, thank you.

47:45

I'm aware that

47:50

Mr. Lavery, who's your

47:54

geomorphologists I understand you dropped out Mr. Lavery from the

48:01

hearing for a brief time so I'm not sure how long URL to what you missed that, as the environmental agencies, geomorphologist, do you have anything you wish to add to this general discussion at this point? Thank you, sir. Yeah, that's one of the benefits of living in rural Northumberland. Our internet isn't as hot as maybe elsewhere. And I'm comforted by what I've heard this morning. I, the previous geomorphological modelling that was done for the first iteration of the bridge crossing

48:36

was a good piece of work. So I'm confident that

48:40

what will be provided will be appropriate given the risks concerned.

48:46

Thank you. And that previous piece of work you're talking about that was

48:51

not sure I've got the references?

48:54

Yeah, I think it was a deadline. Three. It geomorphological reports. I think right, sir. It was a piece of modelling needed. Yeah, additional modelling needed. Yeah.

49:07

Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

49:10

So I think

49:14

you are content with the discussions you're having with the applicants and

49:19

particularly Dr. Gryphon, at this stage, attest to

49:24

the progress which is being made that that's the main thing. I'd like to hear this point. Yes, no, we're content with the way it's going at the minute. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

49:43

Sir, just just to confirm in relation to the additional assessments, which was nice. Lucy now referred. those assessments are already before you risk assessment and so on.

50:00

So any updating is likely to be within in terms of references and verification. The we do not expect the assessed outcomes to change.

50:17

Thank you

50:31

misspoke. Are you content with that position?

50:40

We will wait for the outcome review of the model to dictate whether that is the case or not. I need to be demonstrating that there are no adverse impacts by reviewing the model and again, the flood risk assessment. Okay. Clearly, you can't commit until you've seen the the outputs per understand the opposition. Yes. Good. Thank you. Yes, I think Miss Laverty documents,

51:06

we would refer to the river COVID to move geomorphology modelling assessments presumed documents grep, three double oh nine.

51:18

Yes, sir. That's the one I was preparing to. Yeah. And I think I would reiterate Miss muise point that at the minute we

51:28

were unclear whether any change proposals will lead to any ongoing issues or not.

51:34

Thank you.

51:38

Clearly, there's an element of crystal ball gazing in all of this, no one is quite sure where this will lead to. So instant depositions of both parties as a present. I don't think you can say that. So I think it's very important that you understand this is not crystal ball gazing. This is this is scientific process undertaken by scientists who are experts in their field, they are able to say in their expert view, what happens in a crystal ball they do

52:11

not see that not even that, sir.

52:14

The the the it's really important that you understand that there, there isn't a randomness here.

52:22

That what we're looking at is a is about more marginal matters, and that we are fully expecting a given outcome based upon the experts information before you. What we don't know is that is the extent of change. But we are expecting that change to be very minor. If there is any at all. We fully understand why the Environment Agency as a responsible regulator has reserved its position. But our position is that this is a matter of some have some confidence.

53:00

Okay, thank you for that. I take back the phrase crystal ball gazing then understand your position on that.

53:08

Good.

53:09

Are there any other comments anyone wishes to make in relation to the process involved here? As I've said, we will come on to the

53:18

the findings of

53:22

this further work and indeed, the

53:27

testing the evidence submitted as part of the change request that will come later in the examination. Is there anything further and the motion is to raise? And item two?

53:42

No, thank you.

53:46

So on that basis, then we will move on to item three on the agenda, which is the water environment. And Mr. Pinto will lead on this. Thank you.

54:04

Thank you, Mr. Gleason. Before I start item dewater. Environment item item three. Can I just please confirm? I believe that Jonathan keluarga has raised his hand. Do you have any question on the previous topic before we move on? Please?

54:27

Know that yeah, it wasn't so much a question. It was more about the expectation of an updated flood risk assessment attended. As we've seen on the previous discussions, the hydraulic modelling is very complex. So we just need that kind of slight update of that interpretation of what the outputs mean. In laymen terms, almost what we would expect.

54:51

Thank you.

54:54

Picking up on that port. Mr. bassford. Perhaps you would like to respond to Mr. Kellogg

55:05

Thank you, sir. And thank you, Mr. Kelleher. The assessments are already to be found in the

55:16

documents which were submitted at deadline three, which describe the impacts of the

55:24

of the assessments of the change requests that relate to the works at the river kokott. And what we are talking about here in terms of flood risk assessment is not about dramatic changes to the areas of land that are flooded, this is about very small increments in the or changes, it may not necessarily be an increment in the amount of water that is displaced by the project. It's this is not likely to result in extensive flooding or

56:06

on areas which are of particular concern.

56:14

That's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. bassford.

56:19

I would imagine that that probably covers Mr. calligaris question, in terms of of the evidence and what is expected to change as part of the assessment?

56:35

If I may, so I think Mr. Kelly is from the current agency, I would suggest that outside the hearing, if he would like to discuss it with colleagues, then he is welcome to contact us. And we will make sure that the necessary discussion, suppose I if he isn't from the inbound agency, then the same applies. If he is then obviously, even as mo can facilitate that, and we can facilitate that in order to provide the

assurance that he needs. Thank you for that. Mr. basford. Mr. Gallagher, could you just confirm your I believe it is the environmental agency, but could you please confirm your position in the organisation please? Yes, I am the flood risk advisor for the Environment Agency on this on this project? And yeah, that's fine. We've already been having these kind of discussions with the flood risk modellers from the applicant. Okay. Thank you, Mr. caligo. On Friday this week, so. So, thank you very much. Mr. Kellogg. We'll be seeing you later. Yes, thanks very much.

57:31

Right. Thank you both. And in that case, if there are no further questions on the previous topic, I'll morphus then to what environments

57:42

on the agenda this topic has been described as to consider outstanding matters of disagreement between the applicant and the Environment Agency in respect of the COVID mitigation strategy and water Framework Directive, also to consider whether the proposed development would have an effect on otters within the order limits or wider study area and consider any other outstanding matters still under discussion between the applicant and Environment Agency in obviously, in light of Mr. Gleason's previous item on the agenda, we are going to then restrict competition in terms of water environment on the application is previously submitted and not considered implications of change, because obviously this these are still being developed at the moment.

58:34

So,

58:37

moving on to then the first point in terms of considering knots tending methods of disagreements,

58:46

could perhaps I start by asking the applicant perhaps Mr. bassford, if I can,

58:57

in terms of

59:00

the purpose of the updated covered mitigation strategy,

59:05

could you please explain that with particular in particularly in relation to the types of environments that it relates to in how these have been identified in how they are expected to be part of the mitigation strategy?

59:24

Thank you, sir. So, the

59:28

the culvert mitigation strategy is produced because the road in its where it is widened, will result in the lengthening of some existing culverts and where it will be in an offline situation. It will be necessary to create some new culverts The

59:57

objective of the culvert mitigation

1:00:00

The strategy is that there should be no worsening. And in some cases, improvements in the environment relating to those

1:00:13

passages beneath the new and existing alignments of the a one. And it is the position of highways England, that the approach in the culvert mitigation strategy achieves that.

1:00:33

Thank you very much, Mr. basford.

1:00:38

For that explanation,

1:00:40

I'm also would like to perhaps consider

1:00:46

the latest revision of strategy. I believe it's referenced in our library as rep 502 to COVID integration strategy, Rev. One, in queued up, please ask to explain the changes made in relation to the previous version of the strategy and how it has been included in this update, please. I'm going to ask Mr. Andrew Smith to assist you in relation to this, so that he could explain those changes he has been supporting that, to the extent this relates to ecological matters, then we call on soucek Bennett.

1:01:31

Mr. Smith, perhaps you would assist Mr. Pinto, with the reason for the changes in the most recent revisions COVID mitigation strategy, please. Hello. The reasons for the changes were to make it easier for the Environment Agency to understand and inform the discussions, which we've been having behind the scenes with the Environment Agency. So

1:01:58

there's mainly a couple of key changes. One is the tailoring within the

1:02:07

dock document, we've included the water Framework Directive assessment includes all water channels, and we've separated out the ones that are ephemeral or don't have permanent water flow.

1:02:22

These are shown in the yellow colouring because they're not identify not included within the biodiversity assessment, which focuses purely on most horses with running water. Sorry, the ones in yellow are not included. The ones in green, are included because they have the running water.

1:02:44

The ones in grey, there is no change to the baseline scenario.

1:02:51

The one in blue is where the only change is including baffles to improve fish passage through a culvert.

1:03:00

Whilst we were undertaking the updates, we have also included comment tree on the proposed natural bed, and the reasoning for the depth of the natural bed that were included. To enable the Environment Agency to have all the information in one place. The information on the natural bed was previously discussed with the Environment Agency prior to submission of the decio. However, I'm aware that some of the Environment Agency offices have changed and the ones we were originally discussed that with are no longer involved in the steam.

1:03:38

So we have provided that information in a consistent manner with all the other information.

1:03:46

We have also

1:03:48

remove reference to marginal planting, because the environment just to enhance the discussions with the Environment Agency.

1:04:00

And that help release that tool the changes

1:04:05

that may get into this this to aid with with interpretation and Mr. Smith, perhaps you would just explain very quickly, why some of this is very much a reminder for the examination why some of the water courses, use the term watercourse advisedly here why some of the

1:04:27

the elements are included in the biodiversity assessment and why some are not because that relates to that. It relates to the characteristics of the relevant watercourses, doesn't it? Yes, the characteristics of the water of course, the size of the upstream catchment. There are some water sources here that are fairly more substantial than the other water courses. Some of the water courses are essentially field boundary ditches where they only have flowing water, when it rains and so on.

1:05:00

Unable to sustain

1:05:02

by birth see or habitats to the same magnitude as a river or water source with a substantial flow in. So we've separated out the water sources into the manner of ones which are field drains, and perhaps maintained by a farmer without too much consideration to anything in it. And the ones were

1:05:24

actually observed as a significant water feature. And more important in terms of water Framework Directive or biodiversity. I won't say much about biodiversity, because that's Jack's area and not mine.

1:05:37

Thank you for that. Mr. Smith.

1:05:41

I would actually like to probe a little bit more on that specific issue, actually. And it's might as you have just indicated it might be also appropriate for another member of the team, I believe that Mr. Bus for to educate would be Mr. fantic, to actually intervene or disappointed as well. But can I also ask that I accept that the nature of biodiversity and diversity for biodiversity of courses is different? But can I please just probe a little bit more in terms of the assumptions made? And how the distinction was actually made in order to inform the classification that you have now used?

1:06:30

maybe perhaps,

1:06:35

Mr. Mr. basford, maybe Mr. Fenwick might be appropriate. I think, Mr. Smith, Mr. Pennock may both have something to say on this topic. But the important thing to realise is that the assessments that support the approach that the applicant has taken to culverts and biodiversity are supported by field surveys. So, the awareness of the more of the various

1:07:09

the various watercourses will come from actually visiting the site and knowing what is in situ.

1:07:18

Mr. Fennec perhaps you would say something about the biodiversity quality and Mr. Smith something about the assessments and why those classifications have been undertaken?

1:07:31

Yet no problem. And so it's Jacqueline here, and so on by diversity. channels are all kind of habitats across the scheme and the survey area identified as part of a phase one habitat survey. All habitats are classified in accordance with the joint nature conservation committee jncc phase one handbook. And

with regards to the specifics that we're discussing here with regards to channels, that includes running water habitat, which was termed watercourses for ease of discussion, but it also includes ditch habitat, and they are distinct separate habitats within the classification within the handbook.

1:08:11

And Smith, do you have anything to add to that?

1:08:15

No, other than we've picked out from both disciplines to inspect all the water courses.

1:08:23

That's helpful. Thank you both.

1:08:28

On this specific topic, perhaps I would also like to bring in the Environment Agency,

1:08:37

perhaps mismo.

1:08:39

Could you please comment on the information that we have just heard from the applicant? Mainly Mr. fenech, and Mr. Smith as well, in relation to biodiversity value, how these have been organised in a different category. And if you are content with the assessment in a way that

1:09:08

the way that these different COVID have been evaluated in terms of your bioversity value. Thank you, sir. I'm going to refer you to my colleague, Mr. Lafferty, the dermatologist to respond to this question. Thank you very much, Mr. Lavery.

1:09:26

Good morning, sir.

1:09:29

In terms of

1:09:32

presenting the information in a more user friendly fashion, the culvert mitigation strategy

1:09:39

is a really handy or useful document.

1:09:44

The breakdown of the water courses or the nature of the water courses into minor field drains

1:09:52

and water courses assessed under the phase one habitat survey. I think

1:10:00

We understand the reasoning by that.

1:10:04

If we were to look at them from a water Framework Directive point of view,

1:10:08

what Framework Directive assesses all water bodies as as, as a water bodies in trenches drains, are considered as water bodies under the water Framework Directive.

1:10:21

In terms of

1:10:25

the quality and the impact on the water bodies themselves, I think, very welcome of Mr. bassford.

1:10:34

statement that the objective isn't the worsening of the war avoid bodies and actually ideally improvements to them, we still feel that the mitigation proposals presented by the applicant do not

1:10:53

compensate for the impacts of the coilovers themselves. We're currently in discussions with highways England

1:11:02

about that. But we still feel that it actually falls short of what we would expect

1:11:09

an applicant to provide for courses or culverted.

1:11:14

Thank you very much for that.

1:11:18

Thank you very much for that intervention celebrity. Can Can I please ask you to explain that last point further. So

1:11:28

why is there still some distance between you and the applicant on this specific issue? And can you also, please explain to us in perhaps talk a little bit in greater detail, in terms of what are specific natures of your concern in what you believe the applicant needs to carry out in order to address those

concerns. So what you're requesting is from the applicant? Thank you, sir. So, to date, the applicant has proposed

1:12:00

a number of measures to mitigate for the impact of the culverts themselves.

1:12:06

We will regard culverts or coverting, of water, of course, is actually quite a significant impact in that water, of course, loss of habitat, loss of riparian structure,

1:12:19

barriers to the movement of species.

1:12:23

Increased flood risk, changes to

1:12:27

channel processes, in terms of the mitigation that's been presented. So that kind of breaks down into several areas. So there's part one of the mitigation measures presented is to the formation of a natural bed within the culverts.

1:12:45

That basically, nobody's seen his best practice

1:12:50

and is fundamentally

1:12:53

there to allow the free movement of sediment and also movement efficient species through the culvert itself, it doesn't

1:13:01

compensate for the loss of structure and habitat that was part and parcel of that water body. The applicant is also put forward measures to improve fish passage through the culverts. So there was a couple of cases where the applicant has proposed to put in baffles within the culverts, thereby assisting fish passage through these structures. Again, we would feel that it is just targeting one element of the impact of a culvert. It's just facilitating fish movement, but doesn't address the loss of habitat. It doesn't address the changes in river processes.

1:13:40

And the final element that the applicant is presented as mitigation is riparian tree planting. I think we welcome that as we welcome all the other mitigation measures.

1:13:52

But the area of tree planting is is constrained by the very fact of the boundary of the the DCU boundary itself.

1:14:04

And in a number of cases, actually the water bodies that have been identified for tree planting already have tree cover along them. So the impact of the benefits and actually planting is is slightly reduced. We feel that in terms of compensation,

1:14:22

we still feel the need that the applicant needs to kind of deliver measures to compensate for the loss of those channels that go in are being lost to the culverts themselves. And while the mitigation measures are are appreciated, are welcome.

1:14:39

They kind of our best practice in this day and age rather than mitigation measures themselves. In terms of what we would like to see in for compensation. There's there's a number of ore bodies in within the ore that are being crossed by the road itself that are currently per

1:15:00

On moderate stages,

1:15:02

in terms of water Framework Directive, the applicant has identified a number of measures that could be

1:15:10

carried out on the long date burns. So there's resource protection measures is improve riparian habitat.

1:15:19

There's actually bank protection, we would like to see and we would like to discuss further with the applicant, and explore how we can actually roll those measures out into the wider catchment itself. I'm not sure if that's answered on poll J. So that was a bit convoluted competencies. Find the Thank you. That's, that's that's, I will add some clarification now.

1:15:45

Some on some of what you have just mentioned, yeah. So, in terms of compensation, I am still not 100% clear

1:15:56

in terms of

1:15:59

what you have just explained to us,

1:16:04

because you have mentioned it to compensation measures are have already been put forward by the applicant. Therefore, I am a little bit still not clear. In terms of if composition measures are there. What other additional issues would environmental agency like to see resolved by the applicant here to compensate for the environment? Yeah, no, sorry, sir. The there's a number of workhorses, as I say, within the road frontage road that are actually, for modern cities under the water Framework Directive. The applicant has identified reasons why these water bodies are in moderate upper status. And we would like to explore with the applicant, how we could actually roll those measures out into the wider catchment itself. So the two streams we're particularly interested in are the long de burn and the river line buffer actually failing to achieve good ecological status and good ecological potential onto the water Framework Directive.

1:17:12

We would like to work with highways England to see how we could put in place measures that would actually improve those water bodies and preferred Wi Fi status and trying to bring those water bodies up to high or I'm sorry, good status.

1:17:27

When I say the applicant has already identified compensation measures, What I meant is the applicant has already identified measures that actually would help in improving those water bodies.

1:17:39

And

1:17:41

yeah, that's, that's probably I'm going around in circles now. So

1:17:46

I think we would just like to work with applicants on those two water bodies to see if we could actually get improvements on these water bodies that would actually compensate for the loss of the existing water bodies under the road scheme.

1:17:58

That's very helpful to look at before I go back to the applicant on this point. Just one more point of clarification, for my benefit, if I may, yes. You've mentioned a wider area in the wider environment. Can I just confirm that you are looking within the limits of the dcl? Or are you looking at a wide area?

1:18:23

I think we appreciate that there's very limited opportunities within the decio boundary. And

1:18:33

to address the loss of water courses through the coverting, we feel that there's a need to actually look outside the boundary itself.

1:18:43

You probably be more appropriate, probably bills provide a more clear answer. If you provide that in written written representations.

1:18:51

Then feeling nervous this afternoon or this morning? That's that's absolutely fine. debt is not a problem celebrity, we would very much welcome any further information or any clarification in writing.

1:19:07

Expanding on your position, but thank you very much for your intervention, I think did clarify a couple of issues for me. So thank you.

1:19:18

Mr. basford.

1:19:20

In light of Mr. lavatories intervention, would you like to come in now which like to comment on what has just been said please? Well, that there's quite a lot there, sir. And I don't think we can necessarily leave it with Mr. Lavery, because he's made a number of statements which which are

1:19:42

which we are still and have been waiting for information on for a long time and you need to know why it is not why this information is not being provided to the applicants and why it is still outstanding. So the water Framework Directive assessment the applicant has undertaken

1:20:00

has concluded that we are not affecting the water framework status of any water body.

1:20:08

So there isn't a requirement for any compensation, the water Framework Directive, simply simply not the case.

1:20:18

What Mr. Lavery is asking you to do is to tell a public body to give money to another public body to do something the second public body should already be doing itself.

1:20:29

Because it is since we're not affecting water Framework Directive status, it is not for highways England to improve water bodies outside the order limits. What was supposed to be doing is mitigating the impacts of the scheme.

1:20:47

So we're not affecting will Framework Directive status. So we shouldn't be improving what Framework Directive status only elsewhere obviously, that his licence to run the strategic highway network, not to regulate the environment. But that is not our job.

1:21:05

Then that yes, please continue with the next thing then to say is that we have to look at the actual impact of the scheme as assessed and what is being undertaken. And the position of pirate England is quite simple, that it is already doing enough to mitigate and offset the impacts of the scheme and it is for the Environment Agency to put before you What more should be done in relation to all of the relevant water courses based upon the impact to those water courses. So, we know we do accept that there are some losses and there are impacts and our objective is to mitigate or where that is not possible to compensate. But it is this is not a this is not about or Framework Directive. So it is if there is an ecological change, we address the ecological trade change. In some instances, we are improving the water costs by for instance, the installation of baffles where there are not currently baffles. But it isn't the case that we have to carry out wholesale improvements to catchments.

1:22:24

And I think Mr. Labs he needs to take you through the measures and why he says they are not sufficient in each case for the specific impacts.

1:22:35

Thank you, Mr. bassford. Mr. Laverty also mentioned in his intervention, that there is an ongoing dialogue with how with agency do applicant on this specific issue.

1:22:48

I assumed that that dialogue is continuing that you're happy to continue with that dialogue. Absolutely. So we're very happy to continue that dialogue. We have been asking Mr. Mt to justify the request for us to pay public money to the Environment Agency to improve watercourses that we're not affecting as to wF D status. And we do await that from him. And we need to understand that because at present, we don't understand why it is high was England's job to address that. But we're we've been asking that for a while in our discussions.

1:23:25

Thank you for that point, Mr. Buffett. I think that Mr. Laverty has mentioned in his intervention earlier as well, that he will submit some further detail in some way to confirmation on that, and perhaps that will assist on the point to have just very helpfully made. And I think I think it would have been useful to have had that in the discussions that we've been undertaking rather than simply launching it into the examination.

1:23:54

So so perhaps if it's up to you would speak to us offline, that would be very helpful.

1:24:01

That's, that's helpful. Thank you, Mr. bassford.

1:24:05

mismo, I believe that you have raised your hand would you like to intervene at this point?

1:24:15

Hi, just for clarity, I've just like to clarify that. We feel that the applicant needs to provide appropriate MC compensation for the loss of natural riverbank and Bankside habitats within the de sel boundary. We acknowledge that there's limited scope for appropriate compensation within the DCR boundary. So therefore, potentially, the applicant may need to consider providing offsite compensation. In terms of the water Framework Directive assessment,

1:24:45

we consider the water Framework Directive assessment to be compliant with the objectives of the directive. However, the proposed scheme will result in local impacts. There'll be significant impacts

1:25:00

On the water environment resulting from both the temporary works, the permanent loss of habitats due to the collaborating head walls and the scar protection measures. So where there is going to be a deterioration to a water body, there must be mitigation or compensation for those impacts. So that's why we raised the issue about compensation needing compensation.

1:25:25

Thank you very much for that intervention. Ms. Mel.

1:25:35

On this specific point,

1:25:39

I am questioning if we can actually progress this any further within this hearing on this specific point. It appears to me from the interventions made so far by both parties, that there is still some

1:25:58

there is still some ground that needs to be covered until enrichment till until we can reach an agreement on the specific issue. But

1:26:08

I believe that ongoing conversations will still help in between the Environment Agency and how was England on this specific issue. And perhaps what I would request at this point is that by next deadline, we could actually have

1:26:26

perhaps an action to have a clear statement in terms of an update of the latest position on this specific issue.

1:26:36

Because, you know, obviously, we are continuing discussing this issue. And it seems to me that we are still some way until we actually find an agreement between both parties. So can I please ask for an

action to be made in that direction if all parties agree, Mr. bassford? Yes, yes, of course, we continue to discuss an Environment Agency. And we note that they just how helpful they're being in relation in particular to an episode of cake it but on this week, we are a little apart.

1:27:08

Before moving on, though, so there was a point that I have to just correct on the record there, which is that we are that many have said that there are significant effects. I think it's the impacts are minor not significant. we're identifying. And so that's perhaps loose, loose wording.

1:27:27

and

1:27:30

Mrs. Smith will diversify, Miss speaking, but my understanding is that we are predicting not significant effects.

1:27:40

Thank you for that Miss basford. You know,

1:27:44

following

1:27:46

following from miss most intervention, I believe that there'll be some room for discussion in terms of their if I understood mismos position correctly, it does appear that there was some

1:28:01

lack of agreement at the moment in terms of of what is the loss in the nature of that clause, if I understood it correctly, but as I have said, I think that perhaps, if we could have an action in terms of a position statement on this specific issue, in terms of the mitigation for the COVID that might be very helpful for next deadline, please.

1:28:25

Mr. basford, your hand is still up, would you like to intervene? No, sir, forgive me, I had left my cursor over it and forgotten to click OK. Thank you very much for that intervention.

1:28:46

And I would also like to clarify

1:28:51

an issue get was actually mentioned on environment agencies latest representation, I believe,

1:29:00

rep 5044

1:29:05

where

1:29:08

the Environment Agency mentions following industry best practice, which I think that was part of what Mr. Deputy has actually covered, but there was also reference to the ideas presented on the river restoration centre design manual. Could I please ask perhaps Miss Padme direct direction if she got asked this question in terms of the nature of the specific manual

1:29:47

mismo

1:29:51

Hello, Sir, I am going to refer you to Mr. Lavery celebrity. Thank you very much, Mr. Lavery. Thank you

1:30:00

To start at the

1:30:03

the reference to the river restoration

1:30:06

Center's manual is to do with the to realign water bodies that are proposed in the scheme.

1:30:14

The manual itself

1:30:16

demonstrates measures that are examples of measures that could be incorporated into the realignment of the channel actually increase it. It's by its ecological value.

1:30:30

We would request that highways England are ambitious in the in the design of those realigning channels to maximise the opportunities. So the reference to the river restoration centre, and their manual is just just a neat way of saying or pointing towards ideas that would be beneficial in those in that situation, we would welcome the opportunity to work with highways England to actually

1:30:58

work with them in the design of these two new channels or realigned channels.

1:31:03

Okay, that clarifies that point. Thank you, Mr. Lavery.

1:31:10

I'm also Mr. basford. Yes. Before before leaving that, sir, of course, the water Framework Directive assessment indicates how housing is already ambitiously looking to improve water courses over and above their current position. So, housing that is already doing this. And the other thing is to say that the restoration manual which references native looks at

1:31:42

looks at works which really are beyond the scope of this scheme. It looks at inserting meandering which is not possible within the limits of deviation, the order limits and it looks at

1:31:59

things looks at existing straight watercourses. So this is again seeking improvements over and above the impacts of the scheme.

1:32:12

And housing This is not here for that purpose.

1:32:23

Okay, thank you for that Mr. bassford. I am at the moment mindful that

1:32:33

we have been rolling grow. We have been on this session for quite some time. So the session has actually been going for over an hour and a half. So perhaps I would propose that we tend to meeting at moment until I would suggest 12 o'clock if everyone is in agreement so that we can have a comfort break.

1:33:02

Therefore, if if no one objects to resuming the session at 12 o'clock, I will now adjourn session until 12. Thank you In May I actually remind before, before we drop off max to remind you all to please keep logged in in the call. But please mute yourself and turn off your cameras. Thank you