



Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A38 Derby Junctions Scheme

Issue Specific Hearing 4: Wednesday 19th February 2020

Written Summary of Oral Contributions on Behalf of Derbyshire County Council

Little Eaton Junction Improvements

(Located within the Administrative Area of Derbyshire)

Item No.	DCC Response
3 Transport Networks and Traffic	
c) Modelling and queuing and junctions, adequacy of Saturn Model and need for LINSIG modelling for assessment of impacts arising from disruptions to local road network.	DCC considered that the use of the Saturn model was acceptable at this stage in the DCO process from the County Council's point of view. The modelling works using Saturn that had been undertaken so far were acceptable to the County Council and it had not raised any concerns to date. There were no signalised junctions on the DCC part of the network impacted by the scheme so use of the LINSIG model was not an issue for the County Council.
d) Updated Traffic Management Plan. Comments from the Local Highways Authorities. Construction uncertainties, stakeholder engagement and resources. The Community Relations Manager and liaison with DCC.	DCC confirmed that it had no further comments or concerns to make on the Traffic Management Plan at this stage. Impacts during the construction phase were still uncertain and so a coordinated and constructive approach was required between Highways England and the Local Highway Authorities to develop the TMP. From DCC's point of view, it was important that the TMP needed to consider weight limits and restrictions on local roads in Derbyshire to ensure HGVs avoided those roads as much as possible.
e) Impacts during operational phase of the scheme.	DCC confirmed that it had no further comments to make on the impacts of the scheme during the operational phase and need for monitoring.
4 Land Use Social and Economic Impact	
a) Footpath diversions at Little Eaton junction including the linkages between existing and proposed footpaths and the proposed diversion of FP3.	DCC indicated that the main outstanding issue with regard to the diversion of footpath diversion FP3 was in respect of the proposed provision of a new toucan crossing on the A61 to the south of where FP3 adjoined the A61 to the south of the new Little Eaton junction. A proposed detailed scheme had been designed by Highways England's consultants that had been submitted to DCC and was currently under consideration and assessment.

	<p>From the point where FP3 adjoined the A61 to where the new toucan crossing was proposed was currently just unsurfaced highway verge and so from DCC's point of view, there was a need to ensure that this stretch of verge was surfaced to encourage pedestrians using diverted FP3 to walk southwards and cross the A61 via the new crossing. This issue was under consideration and discussion with Highways England.</p> <p>DCC indicated that there would be a need for the County Council to monitor the new 50 mph speed limit proposed for the stretch of highway from the new junction improvements southwards on to the A61 towards the proposed new toucan crossing point when the scheme was complete and operational. If 50 mph limit was unsuccessful in reducing traffic speeds on the stretch of the A61 then it may not be appropriate on safety grounds to provide the crossing as proposed. A decision would be taken by DCC once monitoring had taken place, which would be likely to be around three months.</p>
d) Supreme Court Judgement on the approach to Green Belt openness	<p>The Panel of Inspectors raised this issue with Derby City Council and Erewash Borough Council at the hearing session but did not seek the views of DCC. However, for the record, DCC concurs with DCiC and EBC responses at the hearing that the judgement does not have any implications for how DCC considered the impacts of the scheme on the openness of the Green Belt. The case revolved around the issue of whether assessment of openness of Green Belt should include visual impacts. DCC's case submitted to the Examination was based on a detailed assessment of the potential visual impacts of the scheme on the openness of the Green Belt around the Little Eaton junction improvements as well as spatial impacts on the five main Green Belt purposes.</p>
7) Landscape and Visual Impact	
a) Landscape tree planting at Little Eaton Junction	<p>DCC confirmed that the details of the tree planting scheme that had been submitted by the applicants at this stage of the DCO process for the Little</p>

	<p>Eaton Junction part of the scheme were acceptable to the County Council. DCC was content that a greater level of detail would be submitted at the detailed design stage and that DCC would be consulted further at that stage in the DCO process for its comments.</p> <p>DCC emphasised that details of the tree planting scheme that had been submitted at this stage in the DCO process, particularly the photomontages that had been produced by Highways England's consultants, were very important in satisfactorily addressing DCC's concerns relating to the landscape and visual impacts of the scheme and in informing the Council's revised position that the impacts of the scheme on the openness of the Green Belt, Outstanding Universal Value of the Derwent Valley Mills World Heritage Site and landscape and landscape character of the area, were now considered to be acceptable with the tree planting mitigation proposals in place, particularly to the east of the Little Eaton junction.</p>
<p>10 The Water Environment</p>	
<p>e) Scope of hydraulic calculations for Dam Brook Diversion</p>	<p>DCC highlighted that it had expressed concerns in its written submission to the ExA's written questions regarding the physical extent of the flood risk modelling that had been undertaken by Highway England's consultants that had been set out in the applicant's Hydraulic Modelling Technical Note Supporting Evidence. In particular, there were two culverts to the east of the extent of the modelling works that had been undertaken where there have been previous occurrences of internal flooding to properties in Breadsall, in particular around where the Dam Brook is culverted under Brookside Road and where Boosemoor Brook is culverted under Rectory Lane. DCC raised the question of whether the modelling works could be extended to encompass the area around the two culverts. This would provide DCC with necessary assurance that the proposed scheme would not increase the risk of flooding upstream in Breadsall Village.</p>

	<p>Highways England's representative indicated that the modelling works that had been carried out were sufficient to demonstrate that there was no risk to flooding of properties further upstream. Further consultation would be carried out with DCC at the detailed design stage when it would have the opportunity to comment further on the detailed design of the Dam Brook diversion and that Highways England will consider extending the domain of the Dam Brook hydraulic model to include the two culverts and upstream areas within Breadsall village.</p> <p>DCC indicated that it was happy with the suggested approach by Highways England and on that basis, had no further comments. (Note: This approach has subsequently been discussed and agreed with Highways England's consultants (28th February 2020) and included in an updated version of the Statement of Common Ground between DCC and Highways England, which is to be submitted to the Examination).</p>
f) The need for water quality monitoring during the operation of the proposed development	DCC indicated that it had raised no concerns regarding the need for water monitoring during the operation of the scheme.