

17 July 2014

17 July 2014

10:02

Insp	Wanted to ask Mr Jones the timescale to X-Ex Mr Chadwick on Tuesday
GJ	My questions may take most of the day
Insp	Don't think Prof Bonsall will take long
GJ	I think he had 1 point on which he had requested further info. Will try to meet with Prof Bonsall to avoid any duplication.
NC	Will be re-exam but completely unable to give an estimate- depends on questions.
Insp	Is he available the next day?
NC	Think so
Insp	Not an invitation to run over - would like to finish if possible
	Now Doc B13
GJ	Received only at end of inquiry day. Letter difficult to understand. Is it being said that this as an assessment already carried out [Insp: I was going to ask that]- if so we would like to inspect docs outside the inquiry or has it been carried out later- advertisement says it is, this seems to say it's not- very carefully worded. Said it's simply ES but hard copies only sent to X-examiners of Mr Ward and the alleged prejudice relates to X-examination of Mr Ward. And need to respond in writing. Until we have that info it's very difficult to respond. This is an application made to admit substantial quantities of additional evidence. And it seems to be said there's nothing wrong with the original info -either they fess up that it's highly defective or stand by it.
Insp	Yes and one of my questions was if the previous statement is adequate why would the SoS need the further info. I was looking to have a hearing on Monday afternoon.
GJ	I'm in High Ct on Monday so can't make it.
Insp	Didn't want to take Tuesday- need to hear Mr Chadwick.
NC	If clarification as opposed to argt, if we can have a short note within the next hour or so we can respond to them today, then you can make a ruling on it.
Insp	2 points I would like to be clarified myself - one is he one Mr Jones raised as to whether this is a new assesment or info that was previously available. The other one is what is, if the other doc is considered adequate for the purpose of this Inq, why is it necessary to submit this additional doc to SoS.
GJ	I made my points clear before- extraordinary. An application by Applicants for late evidence, have known about it fr weeks. Mr Walton came and said he wanted to respond in writing. I am entitled to ask now without committing it to writing whether this is just putting things together or new assessment. The doc was submitted yesterday in writing which purports to deal with these issues, if he didn't know how is he to-
Insp	He said he can tell us once he's got the questions.
GJ	He's go the questions now, I don't see why he doesn't know.
NC	Is this new info is in part what Mr Jones says Is this new info or an assessment. Answer is the assessment was carried out by the experts whose names were....
Insp	Mrs Pickering wants to put in 2 docs. I don't mind provided you don't ask questions on them. Unfair -no chance to look at them. Mr Cameron?
NC	He has seen them but I would ask him.
TW	I will do my best because I want to try to be helpful.
HP	Thank you very much Mr Walker.

	CAVAT tree assessment - doc H2. Was commissioned by Drummond and Churchwood RA in relation to destruction of trees outside St Chad's. I appreciate that trees in front of St Chad's Parish Hall have been saved because bus stop has been moved. Can I go through CAVAT process of valuing trees - are you familiar with it?
TW	Reasonably. Not a system I'm familiar with as it's intended for arboriculturalists.
HP	Comment's been made that CAVAT has no status in planning law and doesn't deal with maturation of trees. Did you know we chose CAVAT b/c that's what Leeds use?
	[?] [11:01]
HP	Includes amenity value?
TW	Yes
HP	There is a good, wide mix of trees ?
TW	Yes
HP	All but 16 are healthy?
TW	Correct. The U classification is 16.
HP	Could we look at paras 1.14 of Mr Turner's report- exec summary. He's used the data of Mott Macdonld and extrapolated a value of £14m for the trees lost along that route. Would you accept it?
TW	I don't think I can accept it. Don't want to be sucked into a debate whether 10m or 14m or 20m. Extrapolated from your area, a small area. It's one method for putting a value on trees. London has led the way on this because they have clay soils and calls to remove trees because of subsidence, being used in a novel way for an infrastructure scheme. Hasn't taken the size of replacement trees correctly. Hasn't taken the trees on the date it was done. A tool for coming up with a financial figure for tree loss. The BS is the standard that should be used in relation to development sites.
HP	He's used the BS as he used the Mott Macdonald data.
TW	Used a small sample - I think 21 trees -= and extrapolated from that.
HP	But this is unusually large - impossible to count them all. Assumption is the trees were planted at about the same time. I accept that they are extrapolated. Point 6.2 age 21 of his report.
Insp	"Ecosystem services"
HP	You can see he looked at other schemes but went with CAVAT which was the Leeds CC system. Makes the point that in fact if he'd used the ecosystem services approach the value would be exponentially higher. We took a conservative value.
TW	Nobody is denying that trees have many benefits. We've been transparent where we are losing trees, But replacement trees are important - NGT brings an opp to plant 1,700 large specimen replacement trees as well as 6ha of woodland and 3km of hedgerow. I think an opp to create a new tree resource for this corridor.
HP	Your conc is that after 15 years the effect will be neutral?
TW	I can't say across the whole route. Have done an assessment for each indiv character area but not reached a conclusion about the whole route.
HP	Not something that you recognise?
TW	In some areas net gains and some areas net losses but generally there are net gains in the no of trees that will be replanted.
HP	Much of the trees are at P&R sites?
TW	That's where the majority of the woodland is. We've simply tried to maximise the amount of planting along the street.
HP	In many cases tree replanting s one of your mitigating factors - can't mitigate in spaces where there were previously trees and grass verges and those spaces have been removed?
TW	No true but nearby opps.

HP	Can't mitigate where traffic sight lines are affected?
TW	No but took sight lines into acct.
HP	Can't mitigate where there are utilities and bus stops?
TW	We took into acct info from utilities
Hp	LCC policy is always to replace 3 for 1 is that true?
TW	I'm sorry I don't know LCC policies on replacement planting.
HP	Mr Turner's evidence is that 1 in [3/4? [11:11]] of all newly planted trees die. If we look at the Scottish report, average life expectancy of an urban tree is only 10-12yrs. Within 5 yrs, 40% dead - Forestr Comm paper. Growth of those left can be nil or negative. Many who manage urban trees are inadequately trained. And costs cut out. Would you agree that that accords with your experience?
TW	Well they quote recent studies that I haven't had a chance... This is a 1997 doc so not very recent...um I'm not denying there aren't difficulties in the way that trees are managed. I'm saying NGT provides an opp to refresh the tree stock and ad diversity of age ranges. The opps are significant both in planting the trees and making sure that they grow. Practice in the 90s, the weren't as familiar with the good conditions needed for urban tree growth. Technology has moved on. I don't want to get into the detail. If the contract's set up properly and if the tree panting is monitored properly as well, no reason to suggest that the majority of the trees won't survive.
HP	If you look at the other document makes the point Mr Jones makes that usually intensive maintenance for 3 yrs but when they fall back into the general local authority stock they die. Do you recognise the fears we have that we wil have a catastrophic loss of trees.
TW	NGT provides the resources and arrangements that ensures the trees do survive. The exact maintenance responsibilities haven't been... In my experience if most trees get through the first 5 years there's a good chance they will succeed if they've been planted correctly. If the doom-laden statistics were true, how is it that we have urban trees all over Britain?
HP	This is advice by the Coalition Govt. Are you saying you don't agree with it- that after maintenance period trees die?
TW	This says it's based on 1 study and not definitive/further study needed. Doesn't accord with my experience- first 5 years are important. These aren't ordinary small standard trees but quite mature trees with robust skirts. Not ordinary street tree planting.
Hp	A standard tree needs 6 gallons of water per eek - has anybody worked out how much water these wil need to survive?
TW	Important thing is to monitor within first 5 years so in exceptionally dry conditions we can water them. A lot of the time these things aren't done. And often standard or heavy standard trees are susceptible to vandalism. There is a school of thought that you don't over-water trees during their establishment period as can make their root systems lazy and undeveloped. Not a certain science. All I can reiterate is an opp for planting.
HP	Arboricltural plan 13 and Landscape Appdx Plan 113 and 114.
Isp	Can we have a short break. [11:26] - 15 minute break.
[11:40]	Far Headingley - starts as C18th rural village
Insp	Would prefer to have a qustion
HP	Wanted to identify the key landscape evidence
Insp	You can do that when you present your own evidence.
TW	Which character areas?
HP	N09, N10 and N11 and wll be concentrating on 10.
NC	Referring to A-08e and to assessment in Tab 1 of Tech Appdx, page 105 and 114.

HP	[Plan 114] The widening in Far Headingley village goes to effectively 6 lanes. Severance- Church and Parish hall on one side, other facilities on the other.
TW	Don't recognise 6 lanes- curenly 4 and will o to 5. At this point, new pedestrian crossings oppoite memorial and by the 3 Horseshoes Pub. Can't agree it wil sever the communities in the way it describes.
HP	[Plan 115] - if include the central reservation, width of 6 lanes.
TW	If you included the parking area- still 5.
Insp	Looks like 6 if you include parking area and right-turn hatching?
TW	If you combine those 2. The scheme is being widened here and we don't include the pedestrian crossings.
HP	Will come to mitigation in a minute. Not an attractive area- creating 6 lane highway through a historic C19th village centre.
TW	Well if you accept a parking bay is a lane, only the equivalent of 6 lane for a small area so don't accept it has the severance effect you are describing.
HP	Ending of dedicated cycle lane and development of shared bus and cycle space. This is a busy area for cyclists- won't want to use it as will look intimidating?
NC	Cyclists were areas Mr Smith dealt with.
Ins	Mr Walker have you taken these things into acct in terms of the character of the area?
TW	Of course- para 4.381 in LTVIA I do there recognise the extensive local widening of the carriageway.
HP	And it's C18th and C19th houses/village.
TW	We do recognise that- that's why all pavements will be paved with limestone paving which is a very expensive material.
HP	I'm going to come onto that - very easy to slip into what else you are doing without analysing what the impacts/effects are on our community.
Insp	If you can do that - have you taken full acct of effects prior to mitigation?
TW	Yes p.117 table 4.49 of LTVIA we clearly set that out, following the guidance in this respect.
HP	You concede high sensitivity and then medium adverse after construction- want to explore whether that's the right assessment.
	2 more sets of lights?
TW	Ys - would want to refer to Mott drawings to see whether these are pedestrian controlled lights. Mott Drawing 114- both those pedestrian crossings, one of which is new, are signalised pedestrian crossings. There's 1 at the mo and will be 2.
Insp	You're looking at street clutter -where? Pedestrian lights- other features?
HP	2 more sets of lights, pedestrian crossings with control railings etc, uknown quantity of poles and gantries. Wd you agree will be degrading character of area?
TW	If they were new features that might be the case but have to recognise there are already street lights and crossings. Moderate adverse.
HP	Doubling crossings, lights, and bus stops, poles.
TW	The appraisal has taken all of it into acct and I thik been trnsparent in saying a moderate adverse efect in Year 1 once the sheme has been brought out.
HP	A historic vista to the 3 Horseshoes Pub. Where the first horse-drawn omnibus in Leeds went -No1 omnibus and still today No1 bus. A beautiful boulevard - old Turnpike. Intro of that street furniture will destroy that historic vista?
TW	Would't agree with "destroy". There is adverse effect. Already street lights, one unfortunately positioned in front of 3 Horseshoes pub. A lot of the trees that create leafy character are located in gardens and they're not being affected.
HP	[N.B. No STOP shown on the montage]. You've located a huge bus stop right in front

	of the 3 Horseshoes. Would you not agree this is harming the view?
TW	Not a montage we produced- asked for by Metro to give broad impression of the scheme. Don't reflect the actual design. At this point it's one of the bespoke stops. Specific structure in Design and Access Statement [A-08a vol1] on bus stop design. Er no, sorry I'm not quite correct - shown as a standard or high-standard. Stop design set out at p.35. We set out the indicative stop design that would be used for the scheme. And that's a "visually quieter" design than the one shown on here. Pages 42, 43 and 41.
HP	Very often you are saying these are indicative designs -very hard for us to know what the design will look like. I've just shown you a design put out by Metro to advertise the scheme and it's not satisfactory to quiz you on visual impact when it's so vague.
Insp	That's indicative. Is it likely to be like that. What's shown on here isn't that dissimilar to it?
TW	It's not based on what we've submitted as part of TWAO.
Insp	What would be the restrictions on the design?
TW	Would have to broadly follow what is in the Design Statement. There is a condition tying the scheme to that document.
HP	Can I ask you where the wires are in that montage?
TW	Single-armed cantilever.
HP	Going to put it on Alan Bennet's old house
TW	Not suggesting they be building mounted - poles. All our montages have been reviewed by Motts to ensure that they are happy from an engineering perspective.
TW	We've assumed a conservative worst case scenario where poles would be around 20 or 25 metre centres.
HP	All indicative?
TW	No- not just landscape illustration, all the drawings been through Mott checking process to check they are technically robust.
HP	Will obstruct the view of a Grade II listed War Memorial and Grade II* Listed St Chad's Church.
TW	I can assure you the purple rectangle doesn't show the full extent of the canopy - shows the extent of the stop but not where the canopy is.
HP	You understand how frustrating it is that you are now mitigating what is shown on the plan?
Insp	Don't comment want to get through Mr Natkus before lunch.
HP	Trees - will grow to width that interferes with cables and narrow pavement so poor growing conditions.
TW	We'll try to establish them in grass verge - better conditions to grow in. And are super-replacement.
HP	A different species of trees- more suburban character aspect and elimination of trees that are 60-plus years old.
TW	Wouldn't agree- v imp't tree species be chosen appropriately. We've shown a suggestion of the tree species and will be imp't to choose tree species carefully. Montage shows there's enough space and they are in a verge. The pickup wires are over the carriageway not the kerb so plenty of clearance.
HP	By putting it like that it intrudes more into the skyline and high visibility of the wires from the large poles.
TW	Will be more visible than when viewed against buildings but I think that montage is an accurate representation of how it will look.
HP	"Weetwood Pocket Plaza" in front of the pub - who owns it? No evidence of CPO and owned by the pub, we understand.
Insp	Can you look at it Mr Cameron?

NC	Mr Walker's not able to speak on those matters.
HP	If it does belong to the pub, will be covered with tables and students on the "Otlely run" -not sure it will function in the way you are suggesting in your report -more likely to become a vast pub space?
TW	We'll can't tell - would hope the pub would make some use of it; some controls Leeds Council could apply in the usual way to all fresco dining establishments.
HP	Will lose cobbles and steps and won't it degrade the quality and discourage people using it as a pedestrian way?
TW	No don't agree - Metro made decision to have high-cost natural stone paving down to Shore Lane. In effect NGT here is going to be repaving all of the pavements and moving kerb lines and can be a really good positive force for change here.
HP	Summary table 4.5 at p.119 of LTVIA. The question is under commercial properties- you designated the sensitivity of the commercial properties as low. But 7 four and five star restaurants and smart pubs who would depend for their clientele to be looking out on an attractive streetscape and may go under in the construction period. Suka Thai, Salvos one of top restos, New Inn, Giorgio's, Olive Tree, Sebby's Cafe, 3 Horseshoes, Brian's Fish Shop - double the traffic, Woody's. Outside seating. I personally find it incredible you've given low sensitivity.
TW	Follows our methodology- page 12, 2.25 onwards. We set out our kind of, rationale. Highest sensitivity are residential. Then moderate is "primary focus...not on views" then in low "transient nature, people travelling through or past".
HP	I've taken you up on the rigidity of the methodology earlier. Very busy high street, lots of students from the campus, restaurants decided to locate there because of attractive environment. Mistake to give low sensitivity - methodology doesn't cope with differences between character areas?
TW	You're telling us to change the sensitivity of receptors for different character areas - would be accused of inconsistency- extremely problematic.
Insp	Can you just explain for this area why it's not "moderate".
TW	Primary focus in commercial is not looking out of the window.
Insp	Does that include shops, restos, cafes?
TW	Yes
Insp	What about effect on customers?
TW	Focus on food not view.
HP	Large windows and outside seating for that reason?
Insp	He's sticking with "low sensitivity" and that's as far as he gets.
HP	You say at p.119, "slight adverse"?
TW	Commercial - slight adverse and where oblique views we say "slight beneficial" because of the new public space and pedestrians moderate adverse.
HP	By creating a highly visible trolleybus area, changing the character so much are putting the future of business at risk- federation of small businesses objected.
TW	In my experience small businesses are always extremely nervous about significant physical change but where you create a new stop and new public space, it's normally found to be beneficial. I've done an enormous number of schemes and invariably they oppose it and then after it's done they welcome it.
HP	You say these businesses don't know themselves what's good for their business?
TW	No their views are valid but there will be benefits from the public transport.
HP	Overall concerns on construction?
TW	Overall we say "high adverse effects"- vary from slight to moderate. [?? 12:27].

NC	Te works and land plans are at A-06. Parcel 09006 which includes the land on which it's proposed to locate the NGT stop - Book of Ref A-07 at p.83, that area is identified as public highway. You'll see the limits on the Order Plans. I'll make plain Sir that that is not the entire area in front of the 3 Horseshoes and it shows the limits where the highway is.
HP	Not sure you understood my question...
NC	I can't go off the Order land and tell you about land ownership elsewhere.
TW	It relates to Miss Pickering's X-Ex yesterday - I had some homework to do. First question was how trees' retention and removal should be shown. Ms Picketring struggled to point out where in BS. Page 38 of the Standard and Table B1.
HP	Para 5.2.1 in BS - I've looked it up. And 5.2.4 is the one about retaining large and mature trees for climate change.
TW	Can I point out 5.21 refers to proposed site layout plans and that is what the arboricultural survey does.
Insp	I wanted to know whether there was anything in the GVIA.
TW	In 2nd Edn that's set out on page 90 at 7.31 and 7.32. Key thing is first bullet point of 7.31.
Insp	Yes we looked at that. My question was whether there was something to say what you were suggesting...
TW	Methodolgy is in our LTVIA paras 2.19, 2.22 and 2.25. Whethet that answers it I'll leave you to judge. Wile we are just tidying up I don't know if it's appropriate for me to comment on Manual For Streets - from Mr Jones' comment. I've just picked out there where we talk about the user hierarchy and relative priorities of pedestrians - first on page 007 para 1.2.1, first bullet where it talks about applying user hierarchy. And the 10th bullet where it talks about moving away from hierarchies of standard road types. And then on page...para 2.9.6 first bullet sets out the functions of shared space. Mr Jones was saying I was out of my comfort zone but I'm pointing out the notion of shared space is broad and there isn't a hierarchy. And a scheme in Darlington I personally worked on for 5 years is one of the case studies at p.119.
Insp	Mr Natkus ('SN')
SN	I represent a number of landowners on the off-site section of Headingley Lane.
TW	Can you confirm which objection so I can get the right docs out.
SN	Headingley Land - OBJ1611 and 1608 - Morley House Trust.
TW	Thank you.
SN	And ES character areas N14 and N15. How long have you been involved with the project?
TW	Since 2007.
SN	Involved with Design Freeze 2 where the alignment was adjacent to Church car park and moved I'm told because of a large tree in the middle of the route that the designers wanted to remove. However in the meanime the tree has did or been removed and as a consequence the route moved again?
TW	It wasn't only because of the tree - I think it died before 2007. I think it ws also a result of discussions with S Columba's Church.
SN	Any other consultations?
TW	Can't remember and am not sure.
SN	Involved in the change in the alignment?
TW	I can't recall. In my view the change from DF2 to DF7 alignment doesn't have significant impact on Headingley Castle - slightly higher up in the view and was a result of having to accommodate St Columba's Church - original alignment they weren't happy with.
SN	Visited the area recently?

TW	I think I was there in April.
SN	Rebuttal OBJ1611, we made a statement about the diffs between DF2 and DF7. Argt no.6 on page 10. A difference-lower position and it's represented the change was from 58m to 66m. Then the level difference 0.44m to 0.75m. The assessment is either 44cm or 75cm, over a distance of 8m. Indicating a gradient of approximately 1 in 8?
TW	You're losing me.
SN	Difference 0.44m over an 8m horizontal distance?
TW	No I'm saying the level difference varies between those 2 figures - 0.44 or .75 over 58m. Not going to be readily visible so doesn't change the visual impact.
SN	Is that based on a full detailed topographical survey?
TW	Based on a doc from Mott Macdonald that says.
NC	I've been passed a note.
SN	Was that done contemporaneously when the decision was made or retrospectively?
TW	Done recently not back then.
SN	At the time no-one had looked at the difference in levels?
TW	I don't know- can't recall. But something had to have been done to accommodate St Columba's Church.
NC	Sir, page 7 of G-4-91.
Insp	Don't need to go it ?
SN	No. I understand the concern of the Church but purely from landscape and visual perspective, what are the main L/V issues as to where the route should go?
TW	Has to recognise residential views, views from Headingley castle, any houses near the route. I you go to N14, we've set out at length here the baseline assessment of character, components, landform and character. Tudor Gothic villa set within a park. So we acknowledge that in this location at Year 15 the effects are moderate adverse which are significant. This is one of the few areas in the scheme where the adverse effects are significant. All of this is set out at pp.164-165.
SN	Did you ever make any assessment of the difference in DF2 and DF7 on those receptors?
TW	Don't think we ever ddid a formal assessment, no. Have obviously been working with Mott Macdonalds all the time.
SN	Don't you agree the impacts on how the church operates has to be balanced with the adverse effects on visual impacts?
TW	Yes but that adverse efect would't change in DF2 and still wouldn't change - be moderate adverse.
SN	Hasn't been done -your general view?
TW	Yes.
SN	Objector 1611, argument 9. Was there a template for the ES that was provided to each person writing a chapter?
TW	No- we prduced the methodology, Gillespies did, then discussed tht with Motts. We agreed some changes and tweaks to it and that fed into their standard document with the logo and all the rest. No we were not given a template.
SN	Your chapter, terminology is different in terms of "Major" or "high", "Moderate" and "medium".
TW	Might be because we were responsible for it. The wording, we tried to be consistent with it. High Med Low for sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of effects and then the significance we use Major, Moderate, Slight. There is no standard terminology.
SN	As part of the baseline, how were consented but unimplemented schemes considered?
TW	They were taken into acct as we knere you're going here in terms of the existing

	consent on land beyond Headingley Castle. [w that they were there but what we didn't do was a cumulative assesement. I know wheRAISE WITH KATY]
SN	Knew there was a consented scheme for Leeds High School site that would overlook NGT.
TW	Yes but not included in the assessment.
SN	No acount of consented residential scheme?
TW	Correct. But we have to take the landscape as we find it and not always take into account a consented development because there is a big difference between what is consented and what is built on site. Knew they were there but we haven't assessed the potential impact on resi development as it wasn't there on site.
SN	Lumps together all the Leeds Girls High School buildings?
TW	Corect - would be dispoportionate to assess visual impac on every property so it is standard to group them.
SN	Rosecote Nursery is an operation school and it seems to have been grouped together with vacant buildings.
TW	Well we still recognise high sensitivity with moderate change so don't believe any dfference.
SN	One of the impacts on the school is not so much street scene or OLE but the boundary wall being moved closer.
TW	Yes we took hat into acct- moved 1.8 or 2m and we knew when we carried out the appraisal.
SN	The main school site buildings are high up and can see over the wall but the nursery is low and dominated by wall being moved far cloer.
TW	1.8m
SN	We don't know that yet- ot confirmed.
TW	Well there's been confusion -the drawings show 1.8 or 2m.
SN	Grops together large stone villas, offices, dry cleaners and city park. Why when there's 2 difft elements -the School and the development site consented for residential, are they not taken separately?
TW	Have to carry out these assessments in an expeditious manner [sic].
SN	Would you not agree that they are 2 separate user groups - school and resi site -should have been considered separately?
TW	Sorry, I'm checking back how we have arrived at each of these categories...Perhaps in an ideal world we should have separated them out but I go back to my point it's not possible to separate out every use along these categories - this document would have expanded enormously.
SN	Convenience is not a reason for not assessing?
TW	It's got to be proportionate.
SN	Is it identified in the methodology how you group buildings? There are individual buildings e.g. A dry cleaners. Was it grouped by land ownership.
TW	No -we set out methodology in the document and it's appropriate.
SN	We can agree there's nothings pecifically identifying the impacts on the school,
TW	We still assessed it and in a proportionate manner.
SN	You've averaged it out.
TW	I still think the results would be the same for the different users, the 2 different elements.
SN	N14 begins page 157. Tabkes 4.67 and 4.68 - at all 3 stages there will be high impact that results in major adverse?
TW	Yes prior to mitigation.

SN	Talk me through what the mitigation will be at each of the stages.
TW	Code of construction practice. Protecting trees. Minimising working hrs, hoardings or screen construction, dust suppression, standard things. At year one, native planting, hedgerow, clusters of trees rather than belts, wildflower meadow, amenity grass, grass track and replacement open space beyond the church, screening round the substantiation.
SN	At Year 15.
TW	The difference there is the planting will become more mature.
SN	You explain it to an extent there but doesn't explain it in the ES.
TW	I wouldn't agree - plenty of explanation at pages 160 and 161.
SN	We have 4.550- grass track section, tree planting but doesn't give details what that is. Mentions ecology but doesn't mitigate visual impact.
TW	No but it's becoming a public space so still relevant to character of the area.
SN	If necessary in first place. Appendix 1 to Rebuttal to Miss Lightbody's evidence. 0923, page 14 para 2.39. This application includes a number of applicns that need to be considered against planning policy - should stand on its own merits with regard to landscaping?
TW	You are asking a subtle planning question to a landscape witness. We have clearly defined landscape plans and the principle of the Design and Access Statement and the scheme has a clear landscaping scheme and can stand on those merits.
SN	Should mitigation just be "the bare minimum necessary to make this acceptable" or something over and above that?
TW	Not it should be reasonable and proportionate in relation to the nature of the scheme itself.
SN	The principles are proposed as the minimum necessary to make it compliant. We don't know what's going to happen to make it go from "high" to "Moderate" as we don't know and it'll be submitted later. How can you possibly say you know it will go from major to moderate?
TW	It will follow the landscape plans that's quite clear - that's why we've assumed what happens. Whether it's 20% holly, 20% hawthorn that won't affect our visual assessment.
SN	So what is shown on the plans needs to be conditions not a condition for a landscaping scheme?
TW	Well the condition says...
SN	From your perspective for your ES to be sound these plans have to be delivered otherwise your conclusions are potentially incorrect?
TW	Yes potentially incorrect. Condition 5... "in accordance with the approved design statement" - whether that's referring to the statement before the inquiry I don't know.
Insp	The conditions could be amended. Has that answered your question?
SN	Yes a matter for conditions - assessment relies on these plans?
TW	Hmm yes a condition would need to be tied in.
Insp	We'll have to look at that when we come to conditions.
SN	These are all generic - none relate to that site. For example, code of practice applies everywhere - not just this site?
TW	Um-hum. But we have been quite specific - identify where replacement stone walls should go, where there is scrub planting, hedgeways, grass track, all of these things have been defined on these drawings and I think that shows a level of certainty which we've taken on board in the assessment.
SN	These are just things you have to do anyway. You talk about grass planted between the rails. Where will you see that from other than in the site?
TW	High storeys in year 1 of other buildings, cycle track.

SN	It's to avoid impacts not to mitigate the impacts.
TW	Always difficult to define what's mitigation.
SN	Natural stone walls don't mitigate for OLEs?
TW	No but are a mitigation strategy.
CR	Excuse me Sir, how much longer will these Qs go on? Miss Vincent has known I couldn't make it for weeks.
SN	5 minutes but I'll nit be rushed
Insp	Don't interrupt.
SN	I raised southern as opposed to northern part. Rebuttal Argt to OBJ1608, page 12. If you could give me your view on discussions you were involved in as to whether north or south of the road?
TW	We were involved in disussions on 3 options -widening N, widening S or a bit of widening to oth. Presented to Members then we formally appraised that as part of the WebTAG process.
SN	Formal appraisal of the options
TW	Correct -I think more than 4 options. Sub options.
SN	Other witnesses said that was not contemporaneous but retrospective.
TW	Well, quite when it was released I don't know. There were discussions for years.
SN	Reb1. Page 12. Got to be balanced process?
TW	Yes.
Sn	Got to be thorough and reasoned?
TW	Yes,
SN	60 trees on southern as opposed to 100 on N. High quality walls N, varying S. Listd Buildings. 7 side roads N. N would be most damaging in envtl impacts. Given the diffs with the Heritage ES- we understood that virtually every building was omitted, incorrectly assessed or had incorrect mitigation. If that was the info, the balancing exercise could be different?
TW	I still think the outcome would be the same.
SN	From VIA perspective that would be your preference?
TW	That would be my preference.
SN	Design Freeze 6- dfference is down to the cycle lane?
TW	The highways aspects influenced the changes from DF6 and DF7.
SN	That affected the balancing exercise.
TW	Yes - not just the cycling - pedestian safety too and very narrow footways there.
SN	Mr Smith accepted it would be safe. From your perspective would you prefer to see no impacts on southern side or the current scheme.
TW	Well if you ignore safety of pedestrians and cyclists and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists I'd prefer no impacts. I'd be very surprised if that didn't need attention. If we weren't affecting any of the walls or the existing pavement it would have no impacts.
SN	Have no adverse effects?
TW	Less adverse impacts. Still some impacts- NGT still running up there and OLEs. But of course if no kerb changes less adverse impacts.
Insp	[13:33- Inq is adjourned till quarter past 2].
[2:17]	
CR	[What are the average ages a tree can live? [??]]

TW	Different for trees in fields and in urban areas. Sycamores or Limes on the right from Lawnswood Roundabout
Insp	Too much detail -have you got an idea of the sort of lifespan?
TW	Oak 100 to 300yrs in urban area. Beech less so. Sycamore, 100-150yrs old. Norway maple I'm not sure.
CR	Some superb ancient trees e.g. St Columba's field which was taken down was several hundred years old, in Becket's park. You'd agree that some of these species like Beech with careful management can have life extended into centuries?
TW	Wouldn't agree that in relation to beech.
CR	How can you say that when there are [???] beeches going back to the middle ages.
TW	I would imagine the ones in Becket's Park are 100 to 150 years old, Victorian.
CR	Even 4 or 5 ft thick?
TW	We can't answer about trees I don't know about.
Insp	You've established they potentially can live a long time.
CR	How old are the trees near the telephone exchange in the off-road section?
TW	Arboricultural survey - list the life stage the tree is at e.g. Sycamore 561 "semi-mature", the lime "mature 827 stem diameter" so a number of mature trees in that area. Without seeing them I'd be guessing but maybe 70, 80 years up to 120.
CR	Tail end of C19th?
TW	Yes.
CR	A lot are capable if well kept and in reasonable locations, capable of lasting longer than 120 years- I'm wondering how the lifespans fit into these categories A,B,C. If a tree capable of 120yrs then in 40 yrs time could still be category A.
TW	Correct. It's been assessed by an arborist. If it can live more than 40yrs and has other attributes, will be given Category A.
[...] CR	Mr Ray mentioned the large beech tree in front of No 6 Wood Lane - I was surprised Mr Ray asked you want to retain it and you said "absolutely" and isn't it in the direct line of the NGT? Directly where Wood Lane stop would be.
Insp	I think we looked at the trees and I thought the important ones were being retained.
CR	Large copper beech.
TW	Tree 516.
Insp	516 is a "tree at risk".
TW	516 is a beech, it's shown "at risk" and needs special consideration within the construction process.
CR	It's a tight squeeze- if you didn't take down the beech you couldn't take down No 6 Wood Lane.
Insp	You're suggesting the construction phase/or demolition stage?
CR	Yes- hard to see how you could take down the house and put the route through.
TW	It is only the footway/cycleway that is constructed under the canopy of the tree and that's 3 or 4m from the stem. Not the actual bus way. The demolition of the building needs to be handled so that the contractors don't get carried away.
CR	Doesn't the removal of mature trees radically change the character of an area that has evolved with them for many years?
TW	Yes but not cutting down the whole of the area near the Arndale- trees will be retained and the whole character of the area will not be changed.
CR	How long will it take for the character of the area to fully recover?
TW	We're not arguing having a busway behind the Arndale will have no effect. I'd suggest

	about 30 years it will broadly have retained the character of the area.
CR	We're lots of us over 50 and some of us will not see the character restored?
TW	Yes but some mature trees could die as living organisms and we're not cutting all the trees in the area; we're cutting a swathe.
CR	Sense of value of trees not limited to primitive culture but eco-spirituality and writings of Tolkien.
TW	All sorts of reasons why trees might be positive and spirituality might be one of them. NGT will increase the diversity of age ranges of the trees and create the Tolkien trees of the future.
CR	Would not the removal of the mature trees have adverse effect on people's sense of place and character? Ad taking them down before we are required to by damage, ill-health, danger etc is detrimental to feeling of sense of place?
TW	Yes- there are individual trees being replaced that I'm sure people feel very attached to. But Headingley still has a very verdant character and we're not cutting a swathe of trees through people's front gardens which is where many of the trees are.
CR	Is the sense of collective grief not something that should be taken into account?
TW	I don't think collective grief is something that can be built into any formal assessment process that considers trees. I can understand that people may feel...sad about these trees but may just focus views on other trees that are not going to be moved. Don't think there will be mass grief. People get over these things. I'm not a psychoanalyst.
CR	Shouldn't some kind of qualitative input be there?
TW	We obviously take into account in an objective unemotional way the loss of trees I think that's all we can do- all we can do is have a sensible replacement strategy.
CR	Would not the loss of these mature trees reduce the attractiveness of A660 for the cultural tourism that takes place around figures such as Alan Bennett and Prof Tolkien.
TW	As I said we're not removing every tree or a vast swathe of trees down the A660. I'm sure most of the trees Prof Tolkien's time will have been removed. Anyone coming to the A660 who didn't know it before will still be struck by its verdant character.
CR	Shouldn't apps and montages be clear, easy to understand and unbiased?
TW	Yes as far as they can be.
CR	GLVIA 2nd Edn p.103 and a few pages on. Imp't to know accurate locations and height. Technical accuracy and skill [para 8.20]. And 152- two-dimensional techniques. Says should require painstaking attention to detail. And Landscape Institute Advice Note <i>Photography and Photomontage in Landscape Impact Assessment</i> .
NC	I've only got it because Miss Randall gave it to Programme Officer.
CR	I think it's a core doc. Page 5 of this, "producing photomontages" - visual skill and judgment. And 5.2 second para viewing distance means small photos should be viewed closer up?
TW	Yes.
CR	So it's important something is put into making them easily interpretable and also the DF maps?
TW	Yes.
CR	People usually familiar with Google Maps, A-Z and maps with North at the top?
TW	Yes.
CR	Would you agree that maps which had North pointing downwards would be more difficult to understand at first glance for a layperson?
TW	Yes at first glance- I know what you mean for DF6- for efficiency the frames were rotated round but what we have done is match the frame so that 114 of engineering drawing is the same as 114 of the landscape drawing.
CR	Would you agree that they should be in a contiguous order so the numbers are easy to

	follow? Mr Haskins at this inquiry did admit that presentation of maps were in wrong order - reverse order like trying to assemble a jigsaw.
Insp	You raised this with Mr Haskins and he admitted this.
CR	Should there not have been training for those presenting it so that the maps were laid out in the best way?
TW	All the people presenting drawings are highly qualified. It's difficult...After DF6 we agreed a "drawing frame" presentation so it is easier to follow- could you point out where they are deficient.
CR	Would it not surprise you that it was presented so badly?
TW	I can't comment on what I don't know- all I can comment on is the plans that were put before the inquiry.
Insp	The question is whether it would be a good way to present the maps out of order?
TW	No of course not.
CR	Question of winter trees has come up a number of times. I have noticed that for instance if we take the view of Bodington Hall, Bodington Junction. B7 vol 3, page 5. First one, clearly taken between Nov and March?
Insp	It says, 3rd April.
CR	Leave not on the trees. Comparing the one immediately afterwards and 15 year one- two following photomontages are using the same base photo as they should but Photoshopped leaves onto the bare trees.
TW	Correct.
CR	Prejudicial - subliminal effect .
CR	Lawnswood a very good example. Again, bare trees and leaves photoshopped on. And first bare and next have lots of people. Next, Lawnswood Roundabout have gone from white sky to blue sky. Prejudicially photoshopped blue sky, people, leaves?
TW	Well we took the view that showing the montages in the summer wouldn't have a major view on the impact.
CR	Should you not apply a scientific method so the only changes are relevant ones?
TW	By showing the leaves it doesn't change the sense of the impact.
CR	You are avoiding my point.
Insp	You haven't stuck with the guidance?
TW	I this point I concede in this case we should have stuck with the winter view in the "after" photos.
CR	Same for most- Horseshoes- extremely cloudy and overcast sky and the next one has extremely blue and fluffy clouds in the distance. [AND THE CARS]
TW	Supposed to show the changes- that doesn't mean every detail has to stay the same. It does appear the colour of the sky has been enhanced but I don't think it affects visibility of OIs.
CR	You say you are not a psychologist. I am -something I have professional training in. Is it not the case that blue skies and people give a more favourable impression?
TW	We haven't tried to mislead. Tried to be consistent showing them in the summer but I don't believe it affects the impacts that NGT will have.
CR	I'm not asking about that- details that affect subconscious appreciation of these and the scientific method that only relevant details be changed. Have clearly changed irrelevant details.
Insp	The reverse hasn't happened- where a blue sky you haven't made it grey.
CR	Exactly. Moving on- Headingley Hill side turning where old bus stop is- page 17 in B7. Again -mostly cloudy, no people, bare trees. After, blue sky photoshopped leaves, sky, no traffic light. [RUBBISH BIN] In the pre-image, untidy rubbish bin and gentleman

	reading newspaper- bin photoshopped out.
TW	No deliberate attempt to mis-associate.
CR	So why have all these pictures been changed - all negative associations in old pictures and positive ones in the new.
TW	They all have to be changed on the computer.
CR	Much has been made about the cost of these montages- I would question why it was thought necessary to make these changes - not conform with scientific method.
TW	Well graphics person must have got carried away- not consistently and not a deliberate intention to mislead.
CR	You say that Sir but you are not willing to. If you look at the further Sir in the light of what I've just said.
Insp	I have and you can move on now.
CR	One more - Parkinson Building - not included in this but in the 2012 consultations there was one of the Parkinson Building. Not only had trees as bare but snow on the ground, and then spring or summer.
TW	They were produced for earlier presentation works based on earlier design freezes and redoing that montage wasn't instructed because it wasn't showing an area where NGT was making the most significant impacts.
CR	One last question. Strange remark. You mentioned when Mr Ray was asking you about the Wood Lane stop and the visual impact of that you said the site required extreme sensitivity because of a Ripper murder. You made it sound as though the Ripper murder took place on Wood Lane where that was.
TW	I didn't want to bring it up - mentioned the sensitivity and someone thought I meant townscape and one of the victims was abducted there.
CR	o-one was abducted there.
TW	Must have got that wrong then.
CR	Was actually on Alma Road where NGT crosses the road. And the body was found in the turnaround circle where the NGT is behind the Arndale Centre. So would you say that having a crossroads and turnaround on the spot her body was found conforms with "extreme sensitivity"?
TW	No the point I was making was for visibility so people waiting didn't feel isolated at the stop - it was a comment about making sure of the visibility of the stop because of sensitivity in this area- not about insensitivity where someone had met an untimely end.
CR	I would put this point back to you. Now understanding your point about the safety at Wood Lane, would it not be unsettling to people and insensitive to the memory of Jacqueline Hill to have a turnaround at the spot she met her end?
TW	Well this spot where it occurred hasn't been commemorated in any way and I can only assume that people don't want to be reminded. I think you're stretching a point to make your opposition to the scheme.
Insp	Thank you for making that clear- I'm not sure others would know. Much re-examination? I've a few questions of my own.
CR	Mrs Sleeman would have a few questions.
Insp	Thought you'd done.
CR	No - deliberately left that out.
Insp	Will have a 15min break. How much longer?
CR	A couple of pages/
Insp	Adjourn to twenty-five to. [15:21]

Ms Sleeman	[15:35] Qs to do with landscape- App10-3-1 drawing nos 121, 120 and 119. What's the diff in the levels between Headingley Lane and where Rose Ct curtilage meets the petrol station?
TW	Must be...afraid I don't know. I know where the old petrol station is the land then slopes own quite steeply towards Victoria Road which is falling away.
S	How high would the wall be relative to the road side and other side]
TW	On road side I would imagine we would try to replicate that to same height. On the other side, another a and a half to 2 metres so it's also a retaining wall at that point.
S	How many of the mature trees there would be lost?
TW	We can see those on landscape drawing...a significant no...to the south o Rose Ct you can see those and also a group shown on the plan -so thee are a no of trees that have to be removed to allow the road to be widened. [15? 50?]
S	Would pilings be required interfering with roots?
TW	I think it would be unlikely if you look at the retained trees there's a god distance- don't kno if you'd need to pile that wall or put in a strip foundation.
S	What would be the set-back of Rose Ct gate piers?
TW	Has been the subject of an advice note.
NC	APP151 probably.
Insp	APP149 probably.
TW	Thank you- a short advice note that tries to clarify what the setback is.
Insp	Says- outline appears to be set back 2m.
S	Is the change in distance of the wall recess part of the new environmental doc and if so why was the info sought to be revisd after X-Ex of Mr Ward?
TW	I think it was just to clarify -the plans have always been consistent in enabling the walls to be moved.
S	Would the ability to turn a horse-drawn vehicle not be impaired ?
TW	Difficult for me to answer without detailed knowledge of the gradient but I'd have though moving the wall wouldn't make it a too steep gradient and note the proposals for redevelopment of the school site propose landscaping -Technical Drawing No.20- a more formal oval is being created as part of the approved planning application for that site- changes in levels could be made up. Jnot partof the NGT proposal but could accommodate any difference.
S	Mr Ward said this building was of an unusual character being Janus-faced - isn't the portico frontage important in the character?
TW	Yes
S	Wouldn't moving the wal and closing the gate be detrimental?
TW	Not significant diff - still views of the portico., gate piers still 50m away.
S	Lessen the view from within the grounds to the north side.
TW	To a small degree if viewing the house from where the current wall is but only moved 2m.
S	Isn't the loss of proportion of a classical space a loss of the character of the space?
TW	I think it can be worked up at detailed design stage. And hey are already proposing to redesign the frontage to have a more formal oval and NGT isn't affecting those proposals. It may be, I can't be sure if the...already proposing to change it to a more formal layout rather than present layout which is random and at odds with the symmetry of the building.
S	What is the impact on the south side of Headingley Lane and wouldn't access be more difficult ecause of the gradients?
TW	Main one you are referring to is Buckingham Rd and it's already steep there. NGT is

	taking into acct a change of the levels - Mott have produced a note - a raising of levels of 400mm to bring it up to an adoptable standard.
S	Other entrances too.
TW	Yes in the development site- would imagine they can be accommodated in the design of the site and there are ongoing discussions with the developer.
S	On Buckingham Rd the drawings show there are 2 trees to be taken out at the top - on 119. Why?
TW	I think as a consequence of the fact that the level of the road needs to be changed- therefore retaining wals needed at the back of the pavements and construction of the retaining walls will require loss of the trees.
S	Mr Ward passed on the appearance of Rose Ct playground
TW	The play nursery?
S	Yes the little school at the top of the road. The road level is 2.5m above the playground and the wall an extra 2m above that?
TW	You are stretching my detaild knowledge of this part of the scheme- not familiar with the levels to answer your question -again the wall is being moved by approx 2m and will impinge on the playground.
S	Width?
TW	At closest point 11m and further away 12 or 13m.
S	Small and dark space?
Insp	I think t's a bit down the side not the actual playground. I don't think 11 to 12m is a narrow space but I think it's covered
NC	Dealt with in the rebutal to Mr Natkus.
Insp	Mr Walker may not be the person to answer.
NC	How long do you expect the disruption to take place and would you have to close Headingley Lane?
TW	I'm not the right person to ask- pure guesswork.
NC	Mr Smith was asked. Not that precise question but about Rose Ct Nursery and the length of the playground.
S	The question is how long the closure of the whole Lane would last.
Insp	Not the right witness- relates to the construction programme.
S	Who else should I ask?
Insp	Perhaps it would be helpful for this to e dealt with outside the inquiry.
NC	I'm not going to say, "Mr Smith should have been asked, it's too late". I'll volunteer to ask Mr Smith. In a break we'll talk to you and find out what your questions are and answer them.
Insp	I've a few Qs- follow up Qs. 2nd Edn of GVIA: says (p.18) consultation is important. 7.3: where practicable local residents should be taken into acct. And 9.1. Bearing that in mind, is there anything that shows how you consulted with the public in preparing this LVIA and in the design of the landscaping?
TW	We haven't set out the consultation process. We were fed info from Metro staff from the consultation process that was going on.
Insp	No doc that shows how that's been input into the VI assessment process under this guidance?
TW	No/
Insp	Reason I'm asking is there are lots of people here asking about matters that people might have been aware of had hey been onsulted. Not evident t me how the sensitivities and other maters have been arrived at.
TW	Methodologies set out in the doc.

Insp	Does that include consultatin?
TW	No it doesn't
	Was an officer consultation group.
Insp	On that basis, it appears to me that landscape plans weren't even available at these consulattion exercises?
TW	Not all of them no.
Insp	So how were they arried at- was it consulted on after you had a;lready arrived at them? [16:02]
TW	Well it was probably the latter. But some have been changed to try to take account of objectors' view.
Insp	Yes I can see the Church Hall and College of Art...but you've answered that.
	So do you hink you followed the GVIA in terms of the consultation?
TW	Well I think we have as much as we can within the parameters of this partic project which of course is a long route that affects a lot of people.
Insp	Do you think you have followed the guidelines?
Tw	Well it doesn't say [???
Insp	No but it does say it's important.
TW	Have met with various amenity groups like the Civic Trust and the Plans Panel with the structure and content of the landscape and design and access statements.
Insp	LCC [GVIA 9.8!!] .
	You mentioned St Columba's Church- a signiicant no of ojections s a result of effects on St Columba's Church- none withdrawn- do you think the alterations have not been communicated to them, or they still think St Columba's Church is badly affected or what?
TW	Well that's one of the reasons the alignment was moved away from them to accommodate that- I've not seen the objections.
Insp	There's a lot of them -people attending the Church and the Church itself. Do you know if they've been communicated with the Church or not?
TW	Changes didn't take place recenly and I do know Mott Macdonald have met with the Church and had discussions. Sb from Mott could answer better than me.
Insp	Do you think the changes meet the objections?
TW	Sorry, I'm not aware what the objections say.
Insp	Then why were you involved in changing the alignment?
TW	I was involved in changing the layout.
Insp	To meet the objections presumably.
TW	I personally haven;t been involed in the discussions. I know Metro have been involved and there's been discussions about noise barriers and about the barrier that would be suitable at the car park. I've been aare of the discussions and we've been working on the scheme to adress that which I think revolve around noise, visual impact, the fence and circulation relating to how the Church operates- which largely is as it is now - a result of DF7 which makes the circulation...
Insp	DF7 was available at the time of public consultation?
TW	I can't answer that.
Insp	I'm puzzled. Couple of other things. I think you were going to look...you were saying that the sensitivity goes down if they are in an urban evt?
TW	This is for RoW and footpaths next to roads.
Insp	Don't think you said that.
TW	In an urban envt a footpath next to a road is different to one in a rural environment.

Insp	You were going to state where in the GVIA.
TW	It leaves it to professional judgment - 7.31- dependent on the locations and context - I think the location of a urban pedestrian is different.
Insp	Yes I understand it's your judgment but I can't see anywhere in the methodology where you justify that judgment and I can't see anywhere where they've been consulted on to make that judgment. It's important to them n that area.
TW	The guidelines say it is down to the expert's judgment.
Insp	I dont see where it's come in.
TW	No we haven't explained in that doc that we think an urban footpath is less sensitive.
Insp	This is general. Nothing in GVIA saying urban footpaths' sensitivy is generally less?
TW	No.
Insp	You say you used your judgment but where does it say hat?
TW	On that speific point we don't explicitly set that out in our methodology.
Insp	Bearing in mind it is a route for many difft people DCJ said there are other routes
TW	A series of trails start on the Moor. But I stand by what I said but because they are urban they are not as sensitive.
Insp	You're changing your view now- before you said "beside a road"," beside a carriageway" to "an urban area" generally. I just want to know because I dopn't want to be completely confused on this how you justify it?
TW	Well amenity users and pavement users are assessed as medium sensitivity.
Insp	In 7.32: "users of all outdoor facilities...whose atten would be focused on the landscape...mayinclude" - most sensitive receptors.
TW	These are not prescriptive - should be some flexibility to take int acct the scheme and the envt.
Insp	Not spelt out the scheme and the particular circumstances of that area?
TW	Not that partic area.
Insp	You are looking at indv character areas but you've not indicated where you deviated from the guidance in that area.
TW	We've classed users the ame way across all character areas.
Insp	All as moderate?
TW	Medium.
Insp	This is your judgment?
TW	Yes- my team's.
Insp	The landscape Institute advice note on continued use of GVIA2- can that be provided to look at what it says?
TW	I hope somebody, I personally haven' been speaking to anybody but...
NC	Sir I'll deal with it in re-exam
TW	I don't refer to the actual document as a core document but that was the reason for sticking with the second edition.
GJ	On Landscape Institute website forum.
Insp	They are all my questions- any re-exam?
NC	I have Sir. Some, not much passed on to me by Mr Walton. You were asked the very point the Insp was askin about - whether to use 3rd or 2nd edn by Mrs Pickering. PoE para 5.5 second sentence you say "...in force at the time...no be retrospectively applied" - what approach did you use?
TW	We have followed the 2nd Edn and e took the advice not to start again and use the new guidance.

NC	Scoping Report- A-08b- main ES at the back. Then page 62 para 5.9.5.4 - this was produced on 3rd April before the guidelines came out. Which set did you say you'd use?
TW	2nd
NC	Then scoping opinion from DfT. 16th May 2013. Any indication from DfT that 2nd Edn guidelines inappropriate?
TW	No- and focusing photomontages on where residual impacts from tree loss would be significant.
NC	And we do have the copy of the Landscape Institute website. First sentence did you follow that or not?
TW	Yes. It clarifies that in general terms the approaches are the same. The main changes are 3rd Edn places more emphasis on judgment.
Nc	In your Proof at 5.22, 5.27, 5.31 have you considered the results of applying the new guidance?
TW	Absolutely - my Proof sets out where I have done that.
NC	Asked what happens if the planting proposals are not successful and the trees and other vegetation dies. Particularly by Mrs Pickering who suggested there could be "catastrophic decline". Turn to planning conditions, appdx 5 to Mr Speak. Is 5 yrs normal?
TW	Yes it is?
NC	Reason why?
TW	First 5 yrs are the period when failures most likely to occur. I don't think I've ever seen a planning condition extending beyond 5 yrs [Why no assessment at 5 yrs?]
NC	You said it was an indicative stop design. Condition 6(c) - what does that make provision for?
TW	Design, external appearance and landscaping of the trolley bus stops.
NC	Submitted to and approved by the LPA?
TW	Correct.
NC	Asked about extent to which the mitigation would be secured. Look at definitions on page 1 of the conditions please. Is ES defined?
TW	Yes.
NC	Condition 22. Is there a condition that seeks to secure the mitigation measures specified in the ES?
TW	Yes there is- ties the ES back to a planning condition. [NOT RIGHT- SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY LPA]
NC	Doc - alignment G-4-91. Asked by Insp about DF2 and DF7 and you said DF7 took it further away and he asked why they are still objecting.
Insp	Why no record of them withdrawing their objection.
NC	Page 3 -date of DF2?
TW	Predated 2009.
NC	Was this before the period for objections arose?
TW	Oh yes.
NC	Is there an explanation here?
TW	Yes. It ws from DF3 onwards that the views of the Church were taken on board.
NC	Mr Natkus asked you about a beech tree and you can see there?
TW	The photo in 2006 shows large tree and shows it removed in 2009. Shows that constraint basically went so it enabled the design team to look at moing the alignment further away from St Columba's Church to try to alleviate their concerns.

NC	Asked about St Columba's High School. Asked about cumulative assessment. Ou said you didn't do a cumulative assessment. Were you referring to you personally, ES as a whole or team or what?
TW	I think cumulative effect has been picked up in ES generally but in visual assessment it means effects of a number of similar developments such as more than 1 win turbine.
NC	Can we go to page 180 in A-08b? What's it headed?
TW	Cumulative effects. [Q??]
NC	Description of the High School as part of the cumulative effects.
	A-08e Tab 1 page 170. Were asked about this section N15. Amongst the items I'd were Leed's High School now vacant and Ford Prep school. And A-11 highways drawing. It's marked on there Ford House Prep School- where's the nursery?
TW	I think where North House is marked.
NC	It's got "nursery play area". What I'd like to know is in carrying out LVIA did you or not take into acct the Nursery?
TW	Yes we did because it was part of the cluster of buildings on that site.
NC	Asked by Mr Natkus abt DF6 and it was put to you DF6 didn't move the wall. Could you go to Reb-2-1608 Para 2.4. Is it right that DF6 didn't require moving the wall?
TW	I'll read -required moving back the wall by between 0.5 and 2.2m which increased 1.25 to 2.75m for the DF7 proposals. So it did require some setting back of retaining walls which I'd forgotten about.
NC	Second edition of GVIA. And their advice on consultation. Para 2.35 on page 18 - at the top, "carry out consultations to identify, where possible, the value laced on the landscape and its effects". Can it be on the proposal or the proposal ingeneral?
TW	Has to be on the proposal in general - I've never carried out specific landscape consultations.
NC	From your experience if you consult on the proosal in general would people who had concerns raise them?
TW	Yes they always ome up - Friends of Woodhouse Moor wee very vocal and that was one of the specific drivers at Monument Moor.
NC	A-01, tab 3. Your opinion as landscape professional as to whether the encouragement of consultation in GVIA was complied with?
TW	Yes it was- sets out the consultation process and confirms that landscape plans were available at that session so it has complied with the guidance.
NC	Go to 7.32 in the 2002 GVIA on page 90. Most sensitive receptors may include "all outdoor recreational facilities inc ROW whose attn or facilities may be focused on the landscape. When considering whether their attention may be focused on the landscape is it relevant whether an urban area?
TW	Yes totally relevant and that's why I thought I was making clear that's the reason for placing them in moderate not high category - completely diff context- busy road corridors rather than countryside.
NC	That's it.
Insp	Mr FitzSimmons.
FtzSimmons	A few weeks ago I asked sme Qs to Mr Cameron. He askd me to put the Qs in writing. I understood at the time it wouldn't affect the procedures at this inquiry. I understood there would be a verbal response but I now understand they'll do written answers. If going to be in writing I'd like to raise another couple of points.
Insp	Difficulty with your eyesight?
Ftzs	Yes but also the answers are vital and I think the answers are so impt that the ansers should be a verbal report to the Inquiry.
NC	Sir, the Qs were in relation to land stability in Stourton- were going to be raised with

	Mr Smith and he was the right witness- the right time. I'm not sure if it was me or you Sir who asked them to be put in writing. I've just been passed the questions but not been answered but we need to get Mr Smith to answer them.
Ftz	I do believe Sir the Qs I raised could have a dramatic effect in the use of the land at Stourton and shouldn't be the subject of corresp between me and NGT but be the subject of evidence at the Inq.
Insp	For purposes of SoS it's probably handier to have it in writing.
Fiz	I'll accept the suggestion Sir.
Insp	The SoS will be able to look at the Qs and the answers in writing. Whoever it is will be able to consider it.
NC	Will ask Mr Smith to answer it asap.
	I've been passed a note asking if Mr McKinnon can come on Monday to X-ex.
GJ	Prog Officer approached me with dffs from other people getting here on Weds. Some are only available on Friday - I'm more than happy to accommodate that.
	I can't be here on Monday but Mr Graham's available and we're not actively participating in Mr McKinnon's X-ex.
Insp	He's saying 2hrs. I'm looking at 3 o'clock resumption on Monday.
NC	Mr Speak can be available Monday.
Insp	Speak will be tomorrow and Monday. Monday will be the deadline for responses to your submission and I'm hoping to discuss them on Weds.
GJ	Yes Tues I'm cross-examining Chadwick. Weds fine so far as I'm concerned.
Insp	I'm not sure how long it will take but am hoping to make a decision on Thursday,
NC	Hopefully you'll have most of it in writing but am sure it won't stop some f us making a contribn.
Insp	It'll be 9.30 tomorrow. Inq adjourned.