

Continued cross-examination of Mr Ward

KP	Welcome back it's Day 20 of the inquiry - please confine questions to Heritage. Am concerned at time-estimates - total 5 hours but must finish Mr Ward today.
SN	I'm Stuart Natkus a chartered planner in Leeds with Barton Willmore. I act for the off-site land down Headingley Lane.
	I've made a point on discrepancies between the LBC applications and ES. Table 4.1 of heritage chapter of ES, p.43. Can you confirm what heritage assets the table looks at?
PW	LBs
SN	Yes -3rd line down - Ford House- wall demolished up to 5m back.
	"Minor adverse"- is that pre-mitigation?
PW	[pause]. [Flicks through and reads] I think it's probably post-mitigation.
SN	Para 4.75 p.54 that's where it starts to talk about mitigation after that table. We then turn to table 4.4 on mitigation. I think table 4.1 is pre-mitigation.
PW	Why do you think this?
SN	Table 4.4. clearly states "summary of mitigation and effects on heritage assets". I think it's quite clear that 4.1. is pre-mitigation.
PW	[Flicks through, reads.] I'm not sure it is clear. If it was, I wouldn't be taking so much time to answer the question.
SN	[Explains structure]
PW	That makes sense.
SN	So we're agreed that table is pre-mitigation.
PW	Yeah.
SN	If we turn to page 16 we see table 2.1 identifies assets as high, low, med value. And Grade II is medium value. Then 2.2. moderate is "noticeably different". Don't you agree rebuilding 5m further back is noticeably different?
PW	If you know the building before you'd probably notice it. It would be noticeable in the first instance.
SN	Okay so a medium impact with a moderate impact actually should have a moderate adverse impact. (table 2.3).
PW	Well I think the impact is slight.
SN	But we've agreed the methodology says "noticeably different".
PW	My judgment is, if I have to choose between low and moderate I say low. You're taking one tail out, one word, and pinning it on the donkey.
SN	We agree the asset is different and noticeably so. There isn't another test in there to apply. With your methodology.
PW	Well I think a slight change to baseline
SN	Not objectively using the methodology of the ES is it?
PW	I think all these judgments are subjective.
SN	LBC007- the application for LBC that applies to the same 60m stretch of wall. If we go through this, it's a template proforma?
PW	Well yes we've adopted the same methodology.
SN	I assume it was the same document typed over?
PW	No, that's not my understanding.
SN	Oh, bespoke? They all reference s72(1) and 80% of the text is the same. Unusual to make the same error over and over. And refs to para 128 but not 132-134 of the NPPF.
PW	I don't know.
SN	The errors in them are compounded throughout. Would you agree it's important to include those paras?
PW	Yes if relevant.
SN	Now we see application is for 100m removal of wall but the ES assesses removal of 60m. Can you confirm which one is correct?
KP	And curtilage so if you add it up it comes to 135m.
SN	So did the ES only assess part of it?
PW	It sounds like it only assessed the frontage.
SN	Refers to relocation back 5m-10m. Again a discrepancy from the ES. Quite important the difference between 5m and 10m. Do you know?
PW	I don't know.
SN	Table 1.1. we have "significance of effects" and the authors agreed it is a moderate effect and apply mitigation to it to minor adverse. I would put it to you that this is the correct document and it was assessed wrongly in the ES.
PW	Without further thought I can't.
SN	Were they written by the same person?
PW	I believe so.
SN	DO we know which was written first? Did they write the ES later?
PW	There's a discrepancy we need to get to the bottom of. I'm not sure we can do it here.
SN	Can you explain the mitigation for this wall please.
PW	I think it's explained in my rebuttal... Design and Access Statement, Heritage Statement and also in the LBC application where mitigation measures are mentioned. The controls are through LBC conditions, the code of construction practice and the planning direction.
SN	The way I read it, we aren't actually mitigating just rebuilding and moving it back. How is that position being improved?
PW	Well to be silly it could be built in blockwork. The intention is to survey the existing wall to see how it is, use as much salvage as possible and restore it to look as close as possible.
SN	If you move it back 5m and it looks identical, that's not mitigation. We've agreed even if you

	move it back 100% identical it's "Moderate".
KP	Mr Natkus we've covered this.
SN	My understanding is that this LBC is a stand-alone document and could be implemented separately so all the conditions need to be on this document.
MW	Would it be able to be done on its own?
PW	I think that's the case but very unlikely.
SN	You say unlikely but not confined to NGT - the landowner could do it himself once granted. Don't we need conditions.
PW	Don't think so. It needs a method statement and all the things you've described could be in the method statement.
SN	The mitigation you've described is retrospective.
PW	No - to make sure the new wall looks like it does now so we'll have to do some recording photographic and other before the wall is demolished.
SN	Move on to the Business Park. OBJ-1613 Now could we also have Cons Area 35a Headingley Lane CAC-010. Look at Table 4.3 in the Heritage Chapter (p.45). Unlisted building in a conservation area but does not appear in the ES.
PW	Not in the table.
SN	So a building has been omitted from assessment.
PW	[flicks through]. Yes it is but I know that elsewhere in the text the demolition of the wall is considered in its totality.
SN	No it's a building. You admit this in your rebuttal but say it's "relatively insignificant" - can you explain?
PW	Small buildings of little significance.
SN	Not positive?
PW	Oh it is but none of us would stake our mortgages on it - it's an outbuilding. It can be slightly positive can't it.
SN	Have you ever thought of doing an assessment of the building to update it?
PW	I didn't do the ES and I'm content it doesn't change my opinion. I suppose if that was the case I'd have considered it with more rigour.
SN	Ok. Table 1.1 in LBC application it is identified as a positive building in the cons area. We're demolishing it in a cons area?
PW	Yep partial demolition.
KP	I raised the issue whether you need LBC following Shimizu. Of course that doesn't diminish the effects on the CA but just in terms of whether the LBC application needs to be considered. Contrary to s.78 where the Inspectorate does go on to determine the application whether or not it is needed we don't do that for LBCs.
SN	The reason I raised it was because there was not discussion in the ES and the only discussion of impacts
GJ	Madam I think it's right that the promoters give their view in the first instance so it can be circulated to those with a concern.
KP	Can you circulate it before you see me again in July Mr Walton?
GJ	Could please have it in good time as you'll have to decide as a matter of fact whether the Shimizu test is met and we may need to put in evidence.
RW	Of course. Madam that goes without saying that we'll give everyone a reasonable time.
SN	Mr Ward, the table says without mitigation there's a significant effect and the mitigation means the harm to the heritage asset is less than without the mitigation?
PW	Yes. I think we went through it the other day.
SN	Can you tell me about the mitigation?
PW	We discussed it the other day- rebuilding it as close to the same.
SN	says the mitigation is a cycle lane. Does that reduce the har?
PW	No it does not.
SN	Then the table talks about making good the property. Can you confirm how that will be enforced?
PW	By condition.
SN	Is all of that covered in the method statement condition?
PW	I think it is.
SN	Should not it be explicitly stated?
PW	No.
SN	Wouldn't it give you comfort as the heritage officer?
PW	Well I'd look at the method statement.
SN	You agree the cycle lane isn't appropriate
PW	My concern is that the building is properly finished off- and I don't mean "Completely deolished"!
SN	Won't hold it against you.
SN	Then part of the former Girls' High School site. REB-2 OBJ 1608. The lodge building not assessed in NW corner? No amendment to Heritage Chapter?
PW	No the chapter's not been amended.
SN	So we have to look for the only mention to CAC-013. Here a "Moderate adverse" effect. Total demolition. It says residual effect would be neutral or beneficial after "possible landscaping". What is that?
PW	I think it's in the scheme. Not this application.
SN	No, that planning consent retains the building. It says to me that we are entirely demolishing the building with a moderate adverse effect and then there are "possible" landscaping will ameliorate that.
PW	That's what it says.
SN	Would you agree?
PW	I think the possibilities for mitigation here are slight or non-existent.

SN	So the effect would not be beneficial would it?
PW	No.
SN	Didn't think it would be that easy - lost where we are now. Now the Coach House (also referred to as "stable block" or "gymnasium" in the docs). In your Rebuttal you say I'm wrong that the table in the ES doesn't include mitigation. It's worth looking at that. Table 4.3 at page 46 "gymnasium"- it says the building is "low value"?
PW	Yes.
SN	The conservation area appraisal says it's a positive building in the CA. Has someone reassessed it?
PW	No-one's been out and reassessed it.
SN	We've now an identification of the building as being low-value. Way I read that is that given that there's since been proposed development they've reassessed it?
PW	No I think that's not taken into account.
SN	Isn't there a contradiction then?
PW	No - some value, but low value.
SN	So Heritage Chapter Table 4.3 is pre-mitigation. We take the matrices in tables 2.1 to 2.3. If we look first at Table 2.1 is it high, med or low?
PW	It's low.
SN	No assessments of effects- unlisted buildings in Cons Areas. Table 2.1.
PW	Yeah well I think the magnitude of impact would be low.
SN	No, table 2.1.
PW	It values the heritage asset not the components. The asset is the CA not the component parts.
SN	No- table 4.3 has indiv element- former school building being assessed as adverse.
PW	It's not meant t look at individual buildings. You're pulling the methodology apart in the wrong way.
MW	Can Mr Ward say how Table 4.3 would be arrived at without going through the assessment? How was it arrived at? Arrived at using tables 2.1-2.2 or another method?
PW	What I think's happened here is an assessment's been arrived at in terms of impacts on the asset and the impact on the CA is low.
SN	Look - Table 4.3...
KP	I think we understand what you're saying Mr Natkus but Mr Ward isn;t
SN	It's quite important Madam. If we take Tab 14 the next application it says the effect is "significant adverse". I want to understand how the difference arises about the same building!
PW	I think knocking down 2 bays of a building is significant adverse. But on the wider conservation area it's slight.
SN	It says a building recording survey makes it go down to "slightly" adverse. But what's left is no longer a positive contribution to the CA?
PW	It's significance is reduced.
SN	I said Table 4.3 did not include mitigation and you said it corresponded with CAC14. But that's not the case because Table 4.3 is pre-mitigation and the CAC-14 post-mitigation say "slight adverse". SO the docs don't ad up?
PW	They don't.
SN	The Heritage Chapter lumps everything together. Can you point out where <i>this</i> building comes into the mix and is looked at?
PW	I think p.58, table 4.4 top row. "demolition of LBs that detract"
SN	Only "significant" and "Not significant" but no grading minor, moderate etc?
PW	That's what appears.
SN	Ford House and Rose Park Nursery - the 2 docs are wrong?
PW	Discrepancy yes.
SN	Business Park - whole building missing
PW	Yes
SN	Building missing on Lodge in School site. [Y] Stable block is wrong [Yes]
SN	You say, not significant individually. But cumulatively aren't all these significant?
PW	No.
SN	80% of the impacts are omitted on south of Headingley Lane. First site wall's wrong. Buildings missing Wall and piers potentially wrong. How can this be acceptable as an assessment of the harm on this part of the road? Is it still robust?
PW	It is. And it's evidence. It's still preferable to do it on the south side rather than the north side?
SN	Where?
PW	In the rebuttal.
SN	Rebuttals are very retrospective. The rebuttal on the Grils' High School at page 8. A lot of what's said, can't argue with the facts but there's actually no assessment in the ES of going o the north.
PW	No there's not. The ES considers the scheme not alternatives.
SN	The ES has a standalone chapter on alternatives and it doesn't assess the alternative of going to the northern side. Nothing in all the LBC and CA applications. It refers to a MottMacDonald report G-490 "Headingley Lane Options Summary Report". Did you have any input into that doc?
PW	No. I'd seen it some months ago.
SN	Mr Smith's evidence was that it was retrospective to justify and summarise how the route had been taken.
PW	I'd walked the line to look at it.
SN	All the things we've looked at today were not looked at only the cycle lane- from Rose Ct

	Nursery to [] wouldn't need the demolitions.
SN	NPPF paras 133-134- "substantial public benefit" or "weighed against...inc optimu viable use"
	We all understand there will be harm and question is whether we need "substantial pbulic benefits". But we've heard from the highways engineer that the scheme could come forward without a cycle lane. That wouldn't need the demolitions in this area. We could omit the cycle lane and still have a scheme that was deliverable and safe. Shouldn't we weigh up the need for the cycle lane at that point against the buildings not he whole scheme?
PW	A contest between the cycle lane and the heritage.
SN	As heritage officer wouldn't you avoid the arm?
PW	Of course I would. It's for Mr Speake to assess public benefits.
SN	Who took the decision to move from design 36 to 37 with the cycle lane?
PW	Don't know.
KP [1049]	We'll come back at 11 o'clock.
RW[11: 00]	Will we have time for Mr Flesher or should I stand him down?
MW	I think it's looking unlikely much as I'd like to.
RW	I'll stand him down then.
KP	Mr McKinnon ('MK')
MK	Are you aware that Woodhouse Moor was purchased in 1857 and is one
PW	Yes - predates Roundhay Park by 20-odd years.
MK	Are you aware that one of the objectives of the Parks Movement was to give the urban poor the same experience as owners of stately homes?
PW	Yes
MK	We're told it's so dangerous that the trolleybus would need a bell. Are you aware of country parks where one of the attractions is a bell
PW	Some might enjoy the pleasant tinkle of a bell.
MK	Are you aware whether would be heard throughout the park?
PW	Not assessed it.
MK	Would destroy the peace and quiet
MK	Uncluttered road
PW	Not entirely uncluttered - some lighting
MK	Discreet
PW	Yes.
MK	Twice as many cables trolley than tram
PW	Yes
MK	By what factor is cables impact against sky worse than against buildings?
PW	Can't give a factor.
MK	Do you regret the impact on the view?
PW	Yes it is harmful and regret any harm.
MK	A-08e-1, ES vol II tech appdx, para 4.6.5.0, somewhere on from p.180. "the character area is mainly sided by open parkland...a number of high and moderately valuable characteristics...two listed monuments adjacent to Woodhouse Lane...moor relatively low quality". Then 4.664 - "these works would have medium adverse effects". Are you aware that in 2010 LCC threatened to withhold PP for Uni's St Mark's development if it didn't drop the demand for s106 contribn APPDX 16 to Woodhouse Moor PoE.
PW	No.
MK	Are you aware that NPPF says neglected or deteriorated state of assets should not be taken into account as a factor...
KP	That's a topic that will be dealt with by townscape and planning. I realise it's part of the conservation area but you are asking Mr Ward to comment on a landscaping assessment rather than a heritage one.
MK	Do you agree that harm to Woodhouse Moor should be revised from minor to moderate? [A-08c-7, table 4.4 p.58]
PW	No. I think if we use the methodology that's right. The CA is moderate importance and moderate impact that gives moderate adverse.
MK	You would say neglect of the park doesn't mean...
PW	You're asking me to agree the park has been neglected? I don't think the park has been neglected. I think Mr Flesher may have something to say on that.
MK	Are you aware that under the Parks for People Scheme the Heritage Lottery Fund provides grants to restore historic parks?
PW	Yes have been involved in 2 separate bids?
MK	I was told that a skate park presented an obstacle to a grant. Don't you agree that of a skate park was an obstacle a trolleybus route would do so.
PW	I couldn't put myself in the shoes
MK	The Victoria Memorial is damaged and a bronze effigy of "industry" is in a Council shed?
PW	Yes.
MK	On the EH at risk list
PW	yes.
MK	Cost of restoring it?
PW	Last estimate 1997 was £150,000
MK	Council plans to restore it?
PW	No [MK- are Metro planning to as part of the scheme?] [PW No].
MK	Aware that a bronze plaque is missing from statue of Henry Marsden?

PW	No
MK	No plans to improve it?
PW	No.
MK	It could be?
PW	Isn't any funding?
MK	A decision was made not to?
PW	Yes.
MK	Statue of Marsden was moved previously?
PW	Yes.
MK	Was likely to have been moved with intention that it wouldn't be moved again because of roadworks?
PW	I don't know- Queen Victoria was outside the Town Hall till 1930s.
MK	In a presentation to cyclists the
MK	In an interview with Richard Greenwood you said the Town Hall was one of the best in the country.
PW	I think so
MK	Car park was moved in front of Town Hall. Do you agree it spoils the view?
PW	Yes
MK	You'd prefer statue of Queen Vic outside?
PW	Yes
MK	In your Great George St and Woodhouse Lane - favourite view brick buildings a "endless deep vista into that Victorian city"
PW	Unspoilt views would be spoilt.
MK	We've had trolleybuses before in Leeds.
PW	Not that far back there.
MK	You say in respect of divorcing of Museum that impact is "Low".
PW	Has been revised since.
MK	Far from creating additional open space, Millennium Sq is the result of open space being built on to create a more enclosed area?
PW	Yes- encroachment on a former car park
MK	How many new buildings do you know>
PW	Broderick public house and then the replacement theatre.
MK	The Carriage Works. Net result is more built than there was before?
PW	Yes but more usable.
MK	The space between Museum and main square wasn't built on - deliberate?
PW	Y
MK	You said in your interview that the Museum was "icon" of Leeds?
PW	Y
MK	Who designed it?
PW	Broderick
MK	Designed the oriental Baths.
MK	Where located?
PW	In front of Museum
MK	If there now, no view. Do you know why demolished?
PW	No
KP	Your proofs were on Hyde Park. Could you confine your Qs to your Statement of case for people you were representing?
MK	I'm also representing myself and raised issues with the whole route. I did say I'd be cross-examining as North Hyde Park Friends of Woodhouse Moor and myself. And that's the majority of my objections. Do you agree that the demolition of the Oriental Baths shows that the city has a history of undervaluing its heritage?
PW	It's better preserved than other cities like Birmingham. If you wound back the years I'd like to keep that building.
MK	You gave a definition as "something approaching demolition" of substantial harm.
	Would you not say demolition of LBs for Victoria Gate shopping centre is substantial harm?
PW	The Circle [?] building has a certificate of immunity from listing
MK	Are you aware that Hammersons the developer of Victoria Gate were funding a full-time planning officer to work on the Victoria Gate development. Is Metro funding a conservation officer to work on the trolley bus application?
PW	Certainly I'm not funded by Metro. I have a day job that keeps me occupied apart from this.
MK	All statues on the Moor came from City Centre?
PW	Yes.
MK	When Marsden moved in 1954 the Yorkshire Post called it a Valhalla for statues?
PW	Yes
MK	Not a paradise for Leeds' best-loved mayor having a trolley-bus go past? [PW - a simile]
MK	What did he mean then, did he mean the statues had died?
PW	I don't know.
M	Didn't run trolleybuses through Woodhouse Moor in the past did they?
PW	No.
MK	Cannot be described as restoring the heritage of Woodhouse Moor?
PW	No
MK	BM-118 a black-and-white photo of trams on Woodhouse Lane. [11:36]

MW	We've not put them in the photo.
MK	The trams are in centre of traffic and in no way impinge on Woodhouse Moor?
PW	Yes.
MK	Supertram was also to run down the centre of the Moor?
PW	Yes
MK	In your interview you said, "can do lots of things if clever enough" but "quick and cheap is not sustainable". The trolleybus is quick and cheap isn't it?
PW	Others would say it's slow and expensive.
MK	Supertram say so. But it runs along the edge and then through Woodhouse Moor. In your interview you claimed you were improving the distinctiveness of the area and not repeating mistakes of 1960s and 1970s. A substantial part of Hyde Park Corner was lost in 1960s for Headingley bypass?
PW	I guess.
MK	Isn't this a 1960s scheme you are proposing to carry out in 2010?
KP	Please confine your questioning to matters referred to in his PoE and rebuttals not introduce new matters to comment on. Ask a direct question not a preamble from interviews a few years ago. No harm asking a direct question.
MK	Okay - do you consider that the motorway - Hunslet Moor and []Moor were mistakes in 1960s?
PW	Yes
MK	They divided areas?
PW	Yes
MK	The trolleybus will create a fence dividing the Moor?
PW	Yes another barrier.
MK	No barrier at moment.
PW	I think were be some
MK	An underpass in Central Park to enable a link?
MK	The stops will be higher than the supertram stops.
PW	Don't know.
KP	This is a design detail.
MK	Any shelter built on top of the stop would be more intrusive than a stop for a tram and lots will be adjacent to LBs
KP	This is something you can bring out in your evidence. Mr Ward has said he can't give details on the design.
MK	Has Mr Ward been consulted on the height of the stops?
PW	All I've been shown is in the Design and Access Statement.
MK	Have you been consulted?
PW	No.
MK	ES states "from Hyde Park Corner the route continues....until the 1870s it was the only public space in Leeds and as such greatly valued". Was acquired 1857 not 1855?
PW	I'll defer to your knowledge?
MK	Enormous communal value today?
PW	Yes
MK	Visited by Vic & Albert?
PW	Yes
KP	You can make a statement but this is not a question for Mr Ward.
MK	I see what you are saying. Do you agree it would have been better if a route could have been found not to encroach on Woodhouse Moor?
PW	Yes from a heritage point f view.
MK	Part of a consultation 2012 to 2013
PW	Yes
MK	Were you consulted?
PW	I gave the same preference I've just given you.
MK	Loss of 336 sqm and impact on listed statue of Marsden and impact on trees- "moderate adverse impact on the CA". If it goes ahead n child would be able to fly a kite there again b/c of danger of being electrocuted?
PW	I don't know. It's a very large park even after the landtake.
MK	A tenth the size of Roundhay Park. A traditional place for Union Rallies isn't it?
PW	Yes
MK	Couldn't take place in that location?
PW	Don't know.
MK	Monument Moor would cease to be a park wouldn't it?
PW	No - part of a park and can still be appreciated.
MK	Going back to "something approaching demolition or destruction". Do you agree that b/c it couldn't be used as it was traditionally used as a park it would be substantial harm?
PW	No- the assessment you've got to make is on the CA not that part of the park.
MK	Would you have liked to have done a safety assessment?
PW	Would not carry out a survey
MK	Wouldn't you have liked to make an assessment.
PW	I have
MK	I thought you'd reviewed the ES
PW	There was an assessment in the EIA and then I made my own assessment.
MK	There will be holding areas to allow trolleybuses to go through pinch points at either end - a historic attribute. Will be breathing in fumes as traffic not free flowing?

PW	As you do now.
MK	Do you agree with CA Appraisal of Woodhouse Lane as a "tree-lined boulevard"?
PW	Yes
MK	Do you regret that the Council didn't replace the elms destroyed by Dutch Elm Disease?
PW	I don't remember the elms.
MK	This is an example of neglect.
PW	There may have been a sound arboricultural reason not to replace them. I was not involved in the decision-making.
MK	On the south side of Woodhouse Moor there's The Avenue- has remained unchanged for 100 years and it's proposed to place trolleybus poles.
PW	At the bottom where that avenue meets Woodhouse Moor.
MK	You're not aware that they have appropriated the land to erect poles so it's no longer part of the park and has been declassified as open space?
PW	Has it?
MW	Can we identify where this is on a plan?
MK	Design Frieze 7. Broad avenue of trees. Plan 123 and 122.
KP	Area to south of road, where red dashed line.
MK	Area to either side of the red line. Shown in 2 photos in Friends of Woodhouse Moor Proof - postcard from Edwardian times and a photo from today. Has all been "appropriated" by the Council to use their words. That's one of them and Monument Moor is another one. And no longer classed as open space.
KP	What do you want to ask?
MK	Does Mr Ward know about it? And will the trees be cut back?
PW	Well it was in your evidence that the land will be appropriated and that there will be poles.
MK	Will constitute substantial damage?
PW	No/
MK	The Avenue that's going to be directly affected and forms one half of the boulevard effect - effect on woodhouse Moor will be substantial?
PW	No- don't think it is. Not being felled only managed.
MK	Permanently managed - can't grow back or will interfere with cables. Not a dense canopy bordering Woodhouse Lane. Don't consider that substantial?
PW	No.
MK	Your Proof Para 5.3.0. You state removal of 30 yr old ornamental trees would be "beneficial" because it would open up views. You state tree loss would be mitigated through replanting. Are you saying that when the planting is 0yrs old it would be beneficial to cut the down?
PW	No there are trees and there are trees. Different places. Think these have been planted with little thought to views. I think in this case it's beneficial for views to be cleared.
MK	If beneficial to open up pleasant views at one point, also pleasant in other points..
PW	No.
MK	You're commenting that you don't like ornamental trees?
PW	Not commenting on the quality of the trees.
MK	
PW	Not there 100 years ago. An aspect of change.
MK	Do you agree that another conservation officer might have the opposite view?
PW	Yes.
MK	EH define "constructive conservation" as protecting places by managing change. You would agree with that?
PW	Yes
MK	Can you give examples of "constructive conservation" in the trolleybus scheme?
PW	It's where we harness change to give positive results. I would say improvements to statue of Marsden is a case. Or north to Hyde Park, creation of public realm where there are hoardings- would improve views of fine listed terrace. Those are 2 positive examples.
MK	Not what EH had in mind? You haven't sat down have you with the trolleybus people at Metro and say "I'd like these buildings demolishing to improve that view" - you're saying afterwards it's a good thing. Just accepting the consequences not managing?
PW	It is a good thing.
MK	What you say will be improved - most will be roadway, only a little left.
KP	Move on - not helping us terribly.
MK	Help me - don't know the answer - in Table 3.1. p.20 of A-08c-7, states that Woodhouse Moor is "Non-designated". What does that mean?
PW	It's part of the heritage asset that's the CA. Not designated in its own right as a designated listed park or garden.
MK	The territory of Woodhouse Moor is designated as it's part of the CA?
PW	That's right.
MK	The author didn't understand that it was - categorically says "non-designated"
KP	He didn't write it so we can't get to the bottom of it.
GJ	I asked who wrote it and we established - 2 archaeologists a landscape architect and Mr Smith.
MW	That was the LBC applications. I don't think there's a table in the ES.
GJ	That's right Sir so I asked Mr Ward and that was his understanding that they wrote both.
RW	Would it help to have a note - we'll put a note in.
GJ	It is quite important - I spent a lot of time with no interventions from my learned friend.
RW	I've no instructions on it but simply an attempt to help. If it causes a problem Mr Jones can raise it.
GJ	It's unsatisfactory as I cross-examined yesterday. If there was an issue and I know this has

	been relayed by microphone to the whole of the promoters' team n a back office. I'm objecting to a note going in. If the same, no note is needed; if different we need to come back and see what the position is.
RW	Right well then I'm not going to put a note in if my offer's been rejected.
MK	The ES says re: 6 Wood Lane "Low value" building, demolition will have minor adverse effect. Have we talked about it?
KP	Yes
MK	The document states it's unoccupied but it has several tenants and one has been resident here for 20 years. When her refers to predominantly stone Vitorian houses in actual fact they are red brick along Wood Lane.
MW and KP	Yes. [nod]
MK	In your Greenwood interview you say "first and foremost conservation is about keeping buildings in use". Are you aware the Council owns 15 Wood Lane 15BM-17 photo of sale particulars. In the particulars, the Council state that demolition of the property would be resisted. In your evidence you say "demolition" substantial harm, but you describe 6 Wood Lane as "minor adverse". Aware it was occupied?
PW	Yes - have seen curtains and lights going on and off.
MK	You are aware the other property is empty yet you would resist demoliion of that?
PW	Yes, unless there was justification.
Mk	In your evidence you said 6 Wood Lane was the last house to be put up on Wood Lane. Have you checked the deeds?
PW	No have checked OS plans appears about 1900.
MK	How do you explain that no.6 Wood Lane figures in Robinson's Comerical Directory 1901-1914 whereas nos 1-14 in different style (later style) don't appear- ones with mixture of brick and...
PW	Arts and Crafts houses.
MK	Also, no 6 was bought by Harry Snell in 1902 following death of previous owner. Sugests older than you thought?
PW	Not one of the earlier houses on Wood Lane but others there before.
MK	It's Late Victorian?
PW	Yes.
[12:31]	Dawn Carey-Jones (DCJ)
DCJ	Have you got a brief for the work you've carried out for this inquiry - given some criteria?
PW	No totally unfettered.
DCJ	How id you know what to look at?
PW	Hae give definition of "historic envt" in my proof and that's what I limited my evidence to.
DCJ	You said Hyde-Park Corner is a "tight retail junction". Won't be with removal of the shops?
PW	Yes it will - the tightness comes from tall buildings.
DCJ	Core Doc A2 plan N4921-121
PW	Yes gateway feel from The Crescent and the tall buildings on other side give a strong sense of enclosure.
DCJ	You don't agree that all the buildigs on the corners give the gateway feel?
PW	I do but demolition gives benefits. Less enclosure is a benefit.
DCJ	Why?
PW	Swapping enclosure for improved views of the trees across Woodhouse Lane - will read as a continuation of the boulevard on Woodhouse Moor.
DCJ	Won't be able to see that.
PW	The trees looking north along Headingley Lane on south side
DCJ	Not the boulevard on the Moor?
PW	No.
DCj	You mean the new trees that will be planted when they mature?
PW	Yes. Loss of enclosure. At the left, trees along Headingley Lane and to right on Woodhouse Moor, as you're stood on junction of Hyde Park Rd and Hyde Park Corner.
DCJ	Which part - pavement at top left or top right.
PW	Stood there - indicates.
DCJ	You won't see it because of Tahini's takeaway.
PW	Not with the new configuration.
DCJ	You can already see the trees from there.
PW	Looking towards Headingley.
DCJ	You say the demolition of shops in this tightly formed junction will improve because you can see trees?
PW	Yes
DCJ	But not shown that there will be any tree planting on the plans. How do you know that?
MW	It seems to be getting into landscaping but I can see why because Mr Ward... Perhaps it's hard for him to say.
DCJ	Ou rely on mitigation of the tightly formed retail junction being standing at a certain point at Hyde Park Corner you'll be able to see Headingley which replace them and will mature when?
PW	40-60yrs
DCJ	And some other tree planting not shown on plans?
PW	Yes
DCJ	You agree will change the character?
PW	Yes
DCJ	You say Hyde Park Corner is dominated by St Augustine's church - not quite right?
PW	A dominant feature and you'll see more of the body of the church once the horadings are

	removed.
DCJ	Deliberately built to face the other way. Do you know why? [PW - no]
	It's Rangthorne Church because it was part of hamlet of Raghorn.
KP	Is it relevant?
MW	I see where this is going but can we go quicker?
DCJ	You said overlooked by the spire but can we agree it is not dominated by the church.
PW	No we can't.
DCJ	Instead of being called St Augustine's Hyde Park Corner it was built to deliberately turn its back on Hyde-Park Corner. Why would we want to open up a view of a church that was never intended to be seen from that point.
PW	Most people would want to open up views of a listed church.
DCJ	Do you know who owns the land?
PW	No
DCJ	Metro. If the hoardings were so bad why haven't they been taken down?
PW	Can't answer that.
DCJ	The shops are unique in the character of Hyde Park Corner- characterised by contrast?
PW	Yes
DCJ	Why are you saying they are negative?
PW	Perfunctory ad thrown up quickly to gather passing trade. Has always been a prosperous retail destination and they cramp the setting of no 2 Victoria Road.
DCJ	So you say thrown up quickly and obstruct the view of 2 Victoria Road. So why is Metro wanting to demolish 2 Victoria Road?
PW	To accommodate trolley bus and cycle lane.
DCJ	Why negative if No2 will be demolished?
PW	Are rather plain and quite ugly.
DCJ	Can we look at photographs I've submitted behind Tab20. You say "plain and ugly" -just your personal point of view?
PW	My opinion but was enshrined in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
DCJ	We can see the advertising hoarding onto the last 5. Were thrown up specifically to house that advertising hoarding?
PW	Looks like it.
DCJ	Deliberately designed to have the billboard fronting onto the junction?
PW	Yeah.
DCJ	So some thought's gone into it.
PW	Not given architectural distinction as a support for hoardings.
DCJ	The land Metro owns on the other side of St Augustine's church - used to be even tighter-formed behind tab 22.
PW	Yes a revelation to me - I knew a crescent of shops there but hadn't realised how splendid they were.
DCJ	Built out of marmo -invented in Leeds in 1908. And demolished for another transport scheme that never got the go-ahead.
PW	Yes
DCJ	Why was it not replaced when Leeds City Council and Metro owned the land?
PW	Don't know.
DCJ	Doesn't this show that anything will be knocked down for transport schemes regardless of architectural merit?
PW	No not necessarily.
DCJ	Built 1892. You say the church dominates the corner now?
PW	Yes
DCJ	Aren't you saying the church dominates the square only because that justifies removal of things blocking the view?
PW	I agree its enclosure on 3 corners defines its character but the Church is added spice.
DCJ	That's different to saying it dominates?
PW	It's much bigger physically and you see the spire.
KP	It's ...could we leave it to a site visit?
PW	I think the photographs make the case.
DCJ	Diff btween the spire and the whole church.
MW	Diff opinions. We can make the judgment.
DCJ	D-5-3 Headingley Hill Hyde Park and Woodhouse Moor Cons Area Apraisal: you say it says "neutral to negative" but where does it say that?
PW	I'm not sure it does but the plans don't highlight it as positive so we can infer either neutral or negative.
DCJ	You say you deduce that from not being coloured positive.
PW	At best neutral but in my view slightly negative.
DCJ	The ones you say are perfunctory lock-ups doesn't describe as neutral or negative. Does mention them though. Page 22. It says, "in need of sympathetic redevelopment in order to restore the streetscape". To restore the streetscape not demolish and replace with trees that will mature in 60 years. What does it mean?
PW	To improve it. It was a garden before so could mean that.
DCJ	Says streetscape not restore a garden. Closer to "make the shops better" than "put a garden and trees there". To do with it being a small retail centre?
PW	I don't think those shops add greatly.
DCJ	I'm talking about the streetscape not garden scape. What does "sympathetic" mean?
PW	I think something that will at least preserve or enhance the Cons Area.

DCJ	Page 20 of that doc on the key characteristics - "heart of the area is...good group of original shop fronts". Character is shop fronts not gardens?
PW	It is but if you go back far enough it was a garden.
DCJ	If g back far enough we were all amoebas.
KP	You've made your point. Getting into an argument.
MW	You've shown us what it says.
DCJ	Says where the marmo was is an area for redevelopment according to the sandy-colour key. The shops you described as perfunctory- what colour?
PW	Blue, v light blue.
DCJ	What does blue mean?
PW	Means "positive". But not what was intended. Because I did the shading so it's been misapplied.
DCJ	You consulted on this didn't you?
PW	Yes
DCJ	If you hadn't had that shading there'd have been an outcry.
PW	There wouldn't have been that para there about redevelopment otherwise.
DCJ	Only if that meant what you say it means and not restoring the street scape. Doesn't have to be demolition but could be enhancement. You say ugly but isn't that because allowed to fall into disrepair by Mero?
PW	No. Just not the quality.
DCJ	But that's how it was- if you look at Tab 20 that's how it was before the Marmo was - may actually be the oldest shops at Hyde ParkCorner?
PW	Don't think so.
DCJ	Even though a letter I've included mentioning the billboard in 1892?
PW	Other side of the road are older
DCJ	Maybe but older than the 4 corners.
PW	I don't know about that - about the same age.
DCJ	Well the pub was built in 1930. So tell me again why you don't think they are positive?
PW	Simple and unadorned nature- contrast it with the elaborate shops on the other corner.
DCJ	You agreed the CAA shows it as positive.
PW	That is what it shows on the plan.
KP	We need to finish - how long have I been? I'm on second page out of 17 but...
MW	We'll not finish today - can you try to condense it?
KP	Can I say less than an hour?
RW	At the moment I'd hope to deal with things inside
KP	Come back in half an hour.
m[13:16]	
[13:47]	4.2.1. of your proof you say removal of hoardings will lead to more attractive green space but there would be very little space?
DCJ	
PW	I think the majority will survive
DCJ	Half of it has a road going through it
PW	I think more than half surviving
DCJ	You agree Hyde Park Corner is a shopping centre
PW	Predominantly- are other uses - offices.
DCJ	Yes or no?
PW	Shopping centre not quite the right word- a district centre.
DCJ	What's the diff?
PW	"shopping centre" would be a modern mall.
DCJ	So an outdoor shopping centre
PW	Not the city centre
DCJ	Do you know the origin was to rebrand like London - also the Regents and Kensingtons. Tab 16 of my docs. The hoardings that have been there since pre-1892. Give a bit of a feel like Piccadilly Circus - do you agree?
PW	No. I was fascinated by the things being advertised. Piccadilly Circus is different as hoardings incorporated into facades of buildings this ne thrown up on the corner.
DCJ	They advertise local things.
PW	Yes. Also multinationals. Advertising is useful
DCJ	Did you know this ward has the lowest access to vehicles of any ward in Leeds?
PW	Yes
DCJ	Most people experiencing these assets from the wad do it on foot?
PW	Yes but there are 10s of thousands of cars passing every day.
DCJ	Experience of the community is important.
PW	Yes
DCJ	People locally experiencing the corner at different speeds - walkers to car drivers?
PW	Yes
DCJ	Gives a different experience of the heritage asset. What do you think they are?
PW	Faster in the car. Walkers more 360 degree experience and experiencing noises and smells.
DCJ	Walkers will really experience the contrast between open and enclosed area?
PW	And cars as well.
DCJ	Reason for demolition will make the road twice as wide. Will damage the character of the area.
PW	I'm not sure widening the road in itself would be damaging- the consequences might be

Could demolish Big Ben an say it was marshland!

DCJ	Twice as far to go to cross the road
PW	Might be straying into traffic management
DCJ	You agree one of major things of character is a gateway from Headingley and City?
PW	Yes
DCJ	And tightly-knit landscape?
PW	Yes
DCJ	The Conservation Area Appraisal says street clutter should be removed but you are adding the cables and posts - goes against?
PW	Will be some rationalisation - net effect may be more.
DCJ	Definitely be wires?
PW	Yes
DCJ	When Mr Smith was being X-examined Mr White had asked Qs about extent of demolition at Hyde Park Corner and he responded that it was necessary as it was all 1 property. Can you set the record straight to let us know how many properties.
PW	I do't know - do you mean the parade?
MW	Do you mean is Mr Smith right, is it more than 1 property?
Claire Randall	I asked this yesterday and we agreed at least 3 discrete properties.
MW	I think it was more than 1 property?
PW	More than 3 distinct 'footprints'.
DCJ	Where in your proof does it mention demolition of 23-29 Headingley Lane?
PW	5.28 - I talk of junction. Don't mention 2 Victoria Road but list petrol station and 'perfunctory pick-up shop'.
DCJ	Named ones you consider negative but not positive one.
PW	Not behind - not fronting. There are hundreds of properties on the route I can't name them all [NOT ALL BEING DEMOLISHED THOUGH!]
MW	Can we move on.
DCJ	Historic Env't Technical Appendix - para 4.12 - which demolitions is it referring to?
PW	All of the ones we were just talking about.
DCJ	Well are you saying they are all negative contributions?
PW	No.
MW	Aren't you?
PW	It doesn't say they are all negative.
DCJ	Where does it say the petrol station is negative.
PW	Based on my experience. I'm putting my experience together with that sentence.
DCJ	5a Headingley Lane and 2 Victoria Road - why are they assigned low value?
PW	We went through other discussions about buildings that were positive but low value. If neutral
DCJ	Why is no. 27 assigned "low" value - is it because poor state of repair?
PW	No - should assess buildings without regard to state of repair.
DCJ	One asks why it's there then. Who owns it?
PW	Don't know.
DCJ	Metro.
	4.24 to 4.27
MW	If you say there are inconsistencies can you just point them out?
DCJ	4.12 talks about demolitions of negative contributions to Cns Area. 4.27 is table assigning low value to 2 vic Rd and nil value to 27 and 29 Headingley Lane. Then 4.24 says impacts both positive and negative. "minor adverse effect". Doesn't all add up does it?
PW	I'm not sure that there's a contradiction.
DCJ	Para 3.63 of the same Core Doc it says, on S side of Vic Lane is "row of dilapidated red brick shops". Would you agree?
PW	We've been through several times.
DCJ	Para 4.27 same shops described as "early C20th terraced houses, now shops" - which is correct?
PW	You've established, were built as shops.
DCJ	So wrong - saying substantial modern alterations but photos from 1930s.
PW	Yeah. I'm not going to argue black is white.
DCJ	If positive contribution, of that whole block of buildings, doesn't it mean it's substantial harm?
PW	In terms of NPPF, no.
DCJ	But you agree the character is a tightly-knit district centre?
PW	We're not talking about removal of all 3 corners - that would be substantial harm.
MW	We've had this argument.
KP	We have had discussions and Mr Jones is going to put in submissions on the authority that says substantial harm means total destruction. It doesn't take away from the fact that there might not be significant harm. Maybe talk about major harm or serious impacts - it's a matter of semantics.
DCJ	If it's substantial harm doesn't it trigger Leeds UDP policies N1&A and B and N19 and NPPF?
PW	They're relevant anyway - doesn't trigger those.
DCJ	Para 4.15 - presumption against demolition of building or part of building that make a positive contribution.
PW	Can I comment that presumption means needs proof to the contrary which aligns with NPPF.
MW	You accept Mr Ward that there is conflict?
PW	Yes but qualified with presumption or "in most cases"?
DCJ	So are they "pick and choose"?

PW	Carefully selected.
DCJ	On the big plan says "potential redevelopment to restore urban grain". To do what?
PW	Don't think any secret it could be redeveloped?
DCJ	Could be sold to Sainsbury's
PW	Don't know.
DCJ	That ties in with Appraisal about sympathetic restoration of streetscape.
PW	You could read it like that.
DCJ	Would the replacement building have to fit in?
PW	Course it would.
DCJ	Used to be a more thriving centre than it is now?
PW	Well photos but not been thriving for 20 years.
DCJ	Are you saying not thriving now?
PW	Better than it was 25 years ago- I think the quality has improved.
DCJ	Did you ever go into Jill Crowther's flower shop?
PW	Yeah.
DCJ	The nice wall with a round coping-stone used to be use as memorial flowerbed?
PW	I did know that.
DCJ	D you have any views of that wall>?
PW	I've no strong impression of it.
DCJ	Small but nicely made and a lot of historical value to local people.
	Demolition of the imposing shops may have had a negative effect?
PW	Yes.
DCJ	Further demolition can only have a negative effect?
PW	Not only. I can see it might if people wanted to make multiple purchases as less choice.
DCJ	As surrounded by a Conservation Area, no-where to relocate them is there?
PW	Well there's that corner.
DCJ	The same corner.
PW	And the corner of Victoria Road.
DCJ	But you said he view would be improved with nothing. Which is it?
PW	You have to have a balance -I don't have a proposal in front of me.
DCJ	Planting trees - alters setting of terraced houses fronting onto the street.
	Does the view from a heritage asset count for anything?
PW	A little bit but I would argue less than views to the asset as private views.
DCJ	Instead of looking at a Victorian roadscape will be looking at a really doubly wide busy road that doesn't have hoardings.
PW	I think it would be beneficial to the terraces which were there before.
DCJ	Depends whether you think a busy road or a historical hoarding is more attractive.
PW	Public realm
DCJ	What does that mean. Will there be a building there to prevent them looking at the busy road? What will the view be?
PW	Will be over the widened pavement with some form of soft planting, of a road. You do see a road from there.
DCJ	Depends which terrace- Victoria Road not Headingley Lane now, would have to look across at an angle for Headingley Lane.
MW	A difference of opinion we can assess on site.
DCJ	Report by (Caroline Hardy SHCA-APPDX2, p.14-15) I'll read out she says "removal of the row of shops on Hyde Park Corner...lose enclosure and funnelling. DO you agree?
PW	We've been over it several times. There's less enclosure but I think there's a benefit - a opening up of views of Headingley Lane.
DCJ	She's saying there's a funnel <i>before</i> we open up.
MW	We have explored it a bit.
DCJ	Hyde Park Corner's an urban setting.
PW	Yes
DCJ	Important to view it from urban eyes rather than suburban eyes
PW	Can you explain?
DCJ	The ads and tight streetscape is urban isn't it?
PW	Contrasts with Headingley.
DCJ	NGT would take away the urban feel and make it feel more suburban?
PW	I think I know what you mean - comes back to enclosure again - same point - see what you mean.
DCJ	One of the strong points is that Woodhouse Moor and Hyde Park Corner works perfectly as a contrast- can walk from shops to park, special with low car ownership?
PW	It is special and the other pole is the University with enclosure and the park between. The best of both worlds.
DCJ	The wall - Victoria Road tiny triangular wall not in your statement and the ES. Has it been assessed?
PW	I don't know.
DCJ	Can't be assessed?
KP	It's down to us now to look at
KP	I've got a few Qs for Mr Ward - some may be Qs of fact you'll need to go away to produce docs: -designation statements for Cons Areas that don't have appraisals?
PW	Some of earliest ones are a few lines in a Committee Report in 1970s

KP	Where we haven't got a CAA can we have copies of designation statements such as they are?
PW	Yes
KP	Do we have any information as yet on extent of OLE fixings to unlisted buildings in CAs?
PW	No
KP	Point made that it would be akin to an outline application for PP but is it your experience that there is ever an outline applic for LBC?
PW	No doesn't exist.
KP	There is a listed bridge but presumably it will need poles on it - no LBC application for that?
PW	I think so but I think poles on the abutments not the span?
KP	Can you check please if that's the case.
MW	Will you have enough detail on that if don't know where the poles are?
GJ	I'm surprised by that answer as he indicated he didn't know where <i>any</i> of the poles were.
KP	The LPAs issue a list of required docs for LBC applications - part from national and part from local lists - could we please have a copy of that list required for LBC applications.
PW	Yes
KP	Then when talking about Rose Ct piers - we looked at a plan submitted with the applicn that shows the piers in a partic place. The application didn't say how far they were to e moved and only the heritage statement did. How far did you rely on the plan and does it have ny relevance to the application.
PW	I don't think it's definitive.
KP	The heritage statement wouldn't be tied into the consent -looking at application form and plans that come with it (unless incorporated by condition) - does that plan not have some relevance to any consent that was granted? The only thing we look at is the plan- in a normal LBC application wouldn't you consider it was what's shown on the plan that was granted?
PW	Yes.
RW	Thank you Madam. Short points in re-examination. Please take up G-4-52 - info paper on overhead line fixings. Turn to page 2. What have we go there at figs 1 and 2?
PW	Pic of a church and a fixing to buttress. Er actually a wall just above a stepped buttress.
RW	How does that tie into the extent to which these things are likely o be visible?
PW	Quite discreet and not obvious where it lands. {N.B. A TRAMLINE not a Trolley bus}
RW	Rose Ct applicn Tab 9 page 4, heading "impacts" asked about methodology of the table. The second paragraph says full assessment found in technical appendices. Does it cross-refer to the methodology of the ES?
PW	It does and they should be read together.
RW	On the application itself. Can you deal with conditions and "approval of details". How is hat going to work in practice?
PW	Well before anything starts will have t be a survey of the wall which will include drawings and photos so a record of how the wall is now. And there'll be a report on the structural condition o the wall which will give us a clue how to demolish the wall to minimise harm to salvage as much as we can. We'll get a method statement for the demolition and rebuilding and finish of facing stone, alignment, finish and repointing as well as confirmaton of consultation with building owner. Does probably exceed what we normally get with applications of this sort.
RW	On the Museum you said it's part of the City and "can't set these buildings apart from modernity" -what did you mean?
PW	Well they have t accept change going on around them otherwise become functionally obsolescent and if no maintenance carried out would eventually fall down. Buildings have got to earn their keep.
RW	ES Technical appendix- point about trees.
Pw	It does say tree-lined streets are key elements of 3 conservation areas.
RW	You'll come back to us on measurements o Abtech House?
PW	Yes
RW	Archaeology- rebuttal of 1719 with Yorks Archaeological Service letter at the back of it. What's their position on need for fieldwork along the route?
PW	Worth reading the first paragraph -Para 128 of NPPF "where necessary a field evaluation" and Policy D11: "expected to demonstrate a full understanding", however pars 2-26 and 2-29 acknowledge no fieldwork has taken place despite having been referred to as significant by WYAS. There's an explanation- 3rd para: "due to the nature...linear...mainly making use of existing ghghays- confirmed e-mail..all required arch investign could be carried out after determination by condition due to the likely significance"[BUT NOT ALL IS ON HIGHWAY AND CAN'T PREDICT].
RW	I want to go to D-6-1, assessor's report on Supertram.
RW	G-4-91 diagram, changes between 2 design friezes. You gave your evidence as to marginal nature of the difference. Looking at the diagram can you please explain the conclusions?
PW	Yeah I think it's covered in 2.6 of the Rebuttal proof OBJ-461. I'll read the whole para: "in visual terms Headingley Castle was assessed as..moderate/slight effects at year 15 of operation. In my opinion..difference in alignment not that great- 57m or 66m distance at closest point and level difference between 44cm and 75cm -barely perceptible. And trees and landscaping will filter effects.
RW	D-6-1- report on Supertram para [18.28] on internal p.36. Does it fly in the face o your own assessment?
PW	No- says minor encroachment but does not believe it to be of significance in relation to overall site area.
RW	D-5-3 CAA we looked at with DCJ. Page 22. Put to ou that "sympathetic redevelopment" might mean enhancement. Does his draw distinction between redevelopment and enhancement?
PW	No.
RW	Is there a distinction about the approach beng taken?
PW	Well, both bullet points talk about redevelopment/enhancement of areas.
RW	Specific refs to NGT scheme - what does it ask it to do?

PW	"respect the particular character of the streetscape of Hyde Park Corner"-does it say "no NGT or it can be accommodated"?
GJ	Leading question- can be a matter of submission.
MW	Thank you Mr Ward. We're looking to resume on Tuesday at 10 o'clock.
GJ	Just some housekeeping - FWY-124 which we've put in, the promoters raised points with us about various figures and Mr Cheek answered and provided an updated version of one of his tables. We'll put that in although the first is produced by Mr Hanson -the first docs explain the background. They could conceivably be relevant to what Mr Hanson will speak about.