

TEXT_M25J28_ISH1_Session1_03032021

Wed, 3/3 11:57AM • 1:26:48

00:03

Good morning, everybody. It is now 10 o'clock. And this issue specific hearing in relation to the application made by highways England

00:12

for the proposed m 25 Junction 28 improvement scheme is now open. Can I just confirm with Mrs. Hanlon that I can be heard.

00:22

Yeah, I can hear and see you both fine. Thank you. And could you also confirm, please, that live streaming of this event has commenced? Yes, the live streaming started. Thank you. And for those people watching on the live stream, can I advise you that when we break for these proceedings, for morning break and lunch, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us good clear recording files. And as a result, the point at which we need to re commence the meeting and restart the live stream, you will need to refresh your browser page and view the restarted stream. And I'll remind you that of this again later. My name is Richard Allen. I'm a chartered town planner, and I am an examining inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application can ask my colleague to introduce himself, please.

01:20

Thank you, Mr. Allen. Good morning, everybody. My name is rod McArthur. I'm a chartered architect. And I've been appointed by the Secretary of State's the member of the panel of inspectors to examine this application. And together we constitute the examining authority for this application. In the arrangements conference, which preceded the start of this meeting, you will have already been introduced to played Hanlon.

01:45

And she is the case manager for this project. And she's also supported by Ed Maudsley from the case team at the planning Inspectorate.

01:54

Before we consider the items on the agenda, we will need to deal with a few housekeeping matters and general observations. And I'll try to get through these as quickly as possible. I make no apologies again, for those who have attended all the meetings about saying a few words again on the general data protection regulations, which I must do. You will note from the agenda from this hearing, which was published last week on Wednesday, the 24th of February

02:19

that this event is being recorded and live streamed to interested parties who have requested this, the digital recordings are retained and published, and they form a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the general data protection regulations apply. Planning inspectorates practice is to retain and publish these recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on this application. Consequently, if you're participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded, and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to the planning decision. And it will be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to keep private or confidential. Therefore to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, what we would ask is that you try your best not to give out information in the public record that you would wish to be kept private or confidential. Does anyone have any questions on that before I move on?

03:33

No. Please bear in mind that this is the only official recording of the proceedings today. That will be placed on the veterans websites, tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence into the examination. For the purpose of the identification and ease of reference, please could you every time you speak just say who you are and whom you represent.

03:58

The examining authorities decided to hold the issue specific hearing to ensure that any interested party has the opportunity to make all representation should they wish to do so on environmental matters. Throughout the next two days of hearings, certain issues may reoccurs. We examine them from different angles, or in relation to different elements of the scheme. I therefore ask you to bear this in mind today. When you give your evidence and asked you to focus on answering the question that's been asked of you. I would also like to remind you that the examination is a predominantly written process, and the examining authority is already asked a significant number of written questions on environmental matters. And as you will see from the examination times, although our further rounds of questions and opportunities for hearing was proposed. Therefore, I'd like to take this opportunity to reassure you that whilst you may not consider that we have examined a subject as fully as you may wish at this hearing, this is because we are intending to consider it again from a different perspective, or on another day or through additional written questions. The purpose of the examination is

05:00

For the examining authority to examine the information submitted by the applicant, and also by interested parties, other persons and affected persons result, I'd like to reassure you that while we are familiar with the documents that you have sent in, so when answering a question, you do not need to repeat at length, something that's already been already submitted. If you wish to refer to information already submitted, we'd be grateful if you could give the appropriate planning and spectrum examination Library Reference. Could I also please point out that the first time you use an abbreviation or acronym, it would be very helpful if you could spell that out for the first time. Thank you.

05:42

While I accept that the majority of the discussions will be undertaken by those parties that have requested to speak at this examination, and therefore even if you have not indicated you wish to speak, if there is a point you want to make a comment, please raise your hand in the Microsoft Teams function. And we'll come to you at the appropriate time.

06:02

The hearing today will be a structured discussion which the examiner authority will lead based on the agenda that's already been published.

06:10

The purpose of today's to enable you to answer any, any questions we may have to ensure that all the information that we have all the information that we need to make our recommendation to the Secretary of State have therefore right through my reminder that this is not an inquiry and therefore unless the examining authority specifically requests or agrees to it, there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross questioning

06:36

as any questions that you may have for other parties needs to be asked through the panel.

06:43

We're conducting this hearing in in accordance with section 94 of the Planning Act 2008. And the infrastructure planning examination procedure rules 2010. And you are reminded that the that the Act allows the examining authority to disregard representations it considers are irrelevant friends, vexatious or frivolous, relate to the merits of policy sets out in the national policy statement. Repeat other representations already made or relate to compensation for competence, compulsory acquisition of land, or for any interest or right overland.

07:21

I'd now like to turn to the agenda. And if you do not have a copy of this to hand, this can be found in the examination library, reference ev 009. And as previously mentioned, this was placed on the inspectors website on Wednesday, the 24th of February 2021.

07:40

We consider the main items to discuss today are

07:45

trapped, we're going to talk about traffic and transport where we have a number of matters to discuss. I won't read them all out on the agenda, but they cover a wide area from a number of concerned interested parties and questions from the examining authority. We would like to then move on to the historic environment and to talk about the adequacy assessment of Tyler's or farm largely raised by the lumbar of hiring. And we have a few questions to deal with on the second item on the archaeological management plan submitted a deadline? Three a, that shouldn't take too long, but just a few sort of tidy up questions on there. That's the point in which we will adjourn today's hearing. And we will carry on tomorrow. With the design and landscaping where you'll see we've got we wish to debate the design of

the scheme. And we also have a number of questions and concerns on the applicants approach to trees, which again, we will deal with tomorrow. We'll then move on to people in communities where the areas that the examining authority particularly wishes to discuss as the effect of the proposed development on the occupiers of growth farm and the operations of maylands golf course. And that doesn't preclude others raising matters that they wish to after that. But in terms of the questions that we wish to ask at this hearing, we wish to focus just on those two areas. And then we will deal with other matters for clarification on at this point. I must apologise for the numbering errors that occurred on the agenda for those of you who downloaded it, the moment it was published. For some reason it's item six, and then the numbering goes 7.1 7.2 onwards. Of course that should be six. I'm not entirely sure why that happened. Apologies for any confusion that's been caused. The agenda is for guidance only and we may add other issues for consideration as we progress. These are the matter. These are the matters as I say which the examining authority felt warranted for discussion. And just because there isn't not an item on the agenda does not mean it is in any way less important, or that the governing authority has already made up its mind.

10:00

On the issue, it may be, for example, that the examining authority considers those matters can be dealt with by written questions, or the applicant's written response does not render the need for an oral discussion on the matter.

10:14

We will seek to allocate sufficient time to allow each proper consideration of the items. We will take a short, mid-morning break, and we will break for lunch around one o'clock. Depending on where we are with the agenda.

10:30

Should we take longer than anticipated it may be that we will have to sit for a little bit longer. Alternatively, delay matters the following day or two further with some questions at the end of the hearing if we've exhausted all our time. Finally, it's important that we get the right answers to the questions we are going to ask. As I've mentioned several times this morning, this is predominantly written process. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked of you today, or require time to get the information,

11:02

or we would rather you provide that in writing, as opposed to trying to answer something now and getting the answer wrong.

11:14

So before I move on to the participants and who's speaking, is there any questions today about the agenda?

11:22

Or it's running?

11:27

Now Hands up, right. Okay, fine. So Let's now move on to who's speaking. If I could start with the London Borough of Havering, Could I see there are five people here from the London Borough of Havering. Could someone advise me who will be who is the best person for questions to be directed to please on today's items?

11:48

On Sir, my name is Dan Douglas,

11:52

lead kind of officer from the Haven representatives today. I'll be the person to ask questions or first certainly forum for section two traffic and transport.

12:06

In terms of the historic environment, sections are

12:10

picked up with regards to point 3.2, the archaeological management plan any questions for hiring, if they could be directed to my colleague, Adam single, please.

12:22

Thank you.

12:25

For growth farm, I can see we've got three representatives again, Could someone advise me who will be answering questions, please.

12:35

On the items for today?

12:40

Yes, good water. Mr. Benson and Paul McLaughlin here. I'm

12:49

going to start with Mr. Bates. And then we'll move on to Mr. McLaughlin Mr. Bates, and I think you've got in first you want to study. Thank you. Yes. If today is specifically about the highways and traffic issues, then that will be Mr. McLaughlin today. I'm sorry for jumping in.

13:09

No, that's fine. I think Mr. McLaughlins screen is frozen. I don't know whether you can hear me or not. But I will take that that questions will be asked to Mr. McLaughlin. And presumably then tomorrow we will deal with the people in communities. aren't that be you? I think you mentioned that in the compulsory acquisition hearing as well, didn't you? Correct? Yes. Thank you, Mr. Allen yes. Okay. Right.

13:30

Then, can I just confirm, Mr. McDonald from Essex County Council, you are representing Essex and we'll be answering traffic questions. Is that correct?

13:49

Well, we'll come back to Essex. I don't know where they again. They can hear me though. I've got them as present on my list. I don't know.

13:58

Wait. Right. Okay. Again, can ask Mrs. Hanlon. Can you just find out what's happened to Mr. McDonald, please from Essex County Council.

14:09

We'll move on to Transport for London. Mr. Rheinberg. are you answering questions on behalf of Transport for London today? That's correct, sir. Yes, indeed.

14:19

Thank you.

14:28

Again.

14:31

Can I just clarify with Brentwood Borough Council? Mr. overdone it is as we're dealing with predominately traffic today. And heritage is that a county matters which the county will be dealing with or you'll be answering any questions from Brentwood if you know they would be dealt with by the county council. Okay, but you've been if there is any questions of yourself, you're the you're the person we go to IE. It would be with the exception of the

15:00

specialists matter concerning

15:03

air or noise. And one of my colleagues, David Carter, who is an environmental health officer, he would be the person to address those two, then sorry, noise. Yes. Right. And this is traffic related. We'll be probably coming on to that tomorrow, but Okay, thank you very much. And then finally, Mr. Chinese from the applicant is could you just confirm? Are you our go to for the questions?

15:31

Probably not. So this morning, as regards traffic and transport matters, Mr. Cates to mark case, mark for Atkins, we'll be dealing with those matters, except as regards quality when they'll be dealt with by Miss Sykes from Atkins. And when we get down to the access issues at Grove farm that will be for Mr. Harris.

15:55

When we come on to the historic environment, that will be for us noise net from Atkins.

16:02

And so I'll probably just chip in as appropriate as we go through.

16:07

So do you want us to direct the questions straight to the people that you've announced?

16:13

Yes, I think that will be better, if you would think. Okay.

16:18

Thank you.

16:22

Has London Borough of haven rejoined us.

16:26

Mr. Douglas, are you are you with us now? Yes. Yes, sir. I am. Oh, we dealt with new Oh, sorry. I was having connection issues, but I think that's been resolved. Yeah. Okay. resolved. Thank you. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Sorry. Thank you slightly confused there with all the What's going on? Right. I think that's everybody that has our Essex County Council. That's right. Mr. McDonald, can you hear me now?

16:53

I can indeed, yes. Okay. So would you be dealing with traffic matters today from se inherited from Essex County Council's point of view?

17:03

I will not be dealing with heritage matters. No, I'm not in a position but I can do with some traffic matters.

17:10

That's fine. Okay. I think it's mainly traffic that we're obviously dealing with today. The Heritage questions. Certainly 3.2 I think it's just a matter of clarification issue. So I'm sure as it's gonna put that in, in in writing, if they so wish. Thank you very much indeed.

17:31

Okay, so just before

17:35

we move on to the agenda, can I just say that, for the sake of everybody's

17:41

broad bandwidth? Mr. McDonald, we'll be taking.

17:46

Mrs. McCarthy, we'll be taking the

17:50

the first item two, I will switch my camera off, just as I say to save everybody's broadband. But I will, of course, be here in listening. So if there's no other matters to discuss, before we move on. We will move on to the next item that item two, traffic and transport. Mr. McArthur.

18:18

Thank you, Mr. Allen. I would just like to flag that most of my screens have frozen, including myself, can I still be heard?

18:29

Well, I can still hear me.

18:31

Okay, I'll soldier on.

18:35

If we could come first of all, and Mr. Chavez, please, please decide whether you want to take this or Mr. Cates market out. I'd like to ask the applicant to just give a very brief summary of the headline problems as they currently exist with the junction and the predicted improvements. So just to set the scene for this agenda item if you like. Yes, I will. If I may ask Mr. Cates mark to explain the current circumstances at the junction. So Mr. Reset time Thank you.

19:13

Morning, inspector Steve Case Mark highways England. And the common problems of the junction is that it's currently running over capacity with significant peak time. congestion delay experienced at the junction on several of the offsets from the a 12 and the 25. There are also delays on

19:38

the approach to the junction on Brook street from Brentwood. And those delays are forecast to get significantly worse in the future with forecast traffic growth, which will lead to extensive delays in queueing with queueing back from the junction on to the main lines of both the M 25.

20:00

And the a 12 during peak periods?

20:07

Not Thank you

20:10

is

20:12

I think that's a that's a good summary in terms of the improvements then it kind of be basic headline improvements, but presumably it's essentially what, what you're looking at is

20:27

a reduction in in journey times in queue times is that the most simplistic way of assessing it? Yes, that's probably correct. The additional loop probe proposed means that less traffic in the future will have to actually use the roundabout because it will be directed over the flyover on the 25 round the loop road to head east on the a 12, taking out one of the biggest movements currently through the roundabout, therefore, releasing additional capacity at the roundabout accommodate forecast traffic growth, and means that the operational of the performance of the junction in the future will operate within capacity and thereby reduce congestion and delay through the junction itself. Thank you.

21:19

And I think your the traffic assessments also a highlight that highlight a number of

21:26

collisions as they as they currently are, and a predicted

21:31

predicted reduction in that in those over time, would you say that that's a significant issue at the moment, or just a good side effect, if you like of the planned improvements? Right, the actions there's two types of accidents that we've referred to in attributes for assessment and there are the nationally recorded districts on injury accidents, resulting in injury accidents, and then there are other accidents, which don't involve injury accidents, but do obviously have implications for the operation of the junction because when those incidents occur, they cause disruption to traffic flow and cause additional delay at the junction. So they do have an impact, but obviously, they don't involve injury accidents, the records show that the accidents at the roundabout, there are a very low number of injury accidents relative to other similar junctions on M 25. But there are a significant number of work for shunt accidents due to congestion, which result in non interaction, but do have an impact on the operation of the network at peak time. So, in terms of road safety, it is not a major concern for the junction improvement, but obviously, in terms of the operational performance at the junction, it is it is it also important to reduce the number of shunt accidents, because they have detrimental impact on the capacity and operation of the junction when those happen. So, a good side effect of the scheme is that it will also by reducing congestion and delay at the junction, it will is likely to reduce the number of shunt type accidents, which don't involve in injuries and therefore also reduce the number of times per year or incidents per year when there is congestion caused by those types of incidents. Okay, thank you. That's, that's very helpful. And I'll move on to the next agenda item if I may.

23:26

And specifically looking at once and I hope this is a matter of clarification, for the benefit of myself the examining authorities as much as anything else. And looking at the baseline data that you've used and

23:43

peak times essentially for the key the key journeys through the junction, which is I think you are right in saying you've identified as a 12 east to M 25, North and 25 north to 12 east and 25 south to a 12 east and a 12 East two and 25 South

24:02

now, the baseline data presented in your

24:07

transport assessment reports submitted with the application

24:12

presented in table four three gives some numbers for the am peak, a pm peak of those four journeys

24:24

that are described.

24:27

You then move on to describe the set the same journeys alongside a number of other journeys

24:36

against with a baseline against the do minimum and do something scenarios for the years 2022 and 2023. In tables Five, four and five, seven, and the base numbers used for those journey times are different to the base journey time numbers, the peak journey time numbers in table Four, Three

24:59

Can you

25:00

you clarify the data that's used and explain the difference in those baseline figures please.

25:06

Yes,

25:08

thank you are the differences because that, in the

25:14

with the scheme, we propose to optimise the traffic signal settings at the junction. That means that the that has an impact on the journey time through the junctions, and through the junction overall. To be sure, we do a fair comparison with the without scheme scenario, the do minimum scenario, the do

minimum scenario has then also included those optimization of traffic signals. So the traffic's have been optimised. Therefore, in the future, do minimum scenario, the journey times do change compared to the base. And that's because we've included the optimization of the traffic signals in both the do minimum and do something or be it the optimization will be different, because there's different demand of traffic between those two. And as you know, in the width scheme, we have the extended integration for brook street. So although the opposite the optimization is both the optimization is not the same in both the do minimum do something I understand that they do minimum scheme would necessarily have had different numbers. What I'm still not clear about is why the base numbers would be different if I take a 12, East two and 25 north as an example, and 10 438 12, Eastern 24, five North gives model journey times in the am peak, 271 seconds pm peak, 262 seconds, those same, that same journey as in the bass columns, in table Five, four times with 818 seconds, and 776 seconds.

26:59

As I say, again, that is due to the change in the optimization of the signals altering the journey times through the junction, in the minimum

27:09

is the do minimum not described in the do minimum column.

27:15

Sorry, can you refer to which table you referring again, table? If we look at if we look at table Four, three, which is your base year journey times?

27:25

There are a series of

27:28

the ANP PMP for those four journeys. If we then go to table Five, four,

27:34

on page 39.

27:48

Yes, yes, you have a column, you have a column, which is described as base, you have a column which is do minimum and a column which is something Yes, looking just at the base times for am a PM, and a Toby. So m 25. North for now. I don't necessarily go through all of them. You have an am peak of 818 and the pm peak of 776.

28:15

Yes, see that? Yep. And if you look at the end, but the base journey times given in table Four, Three for that same journey are not the same?

28:26

I think what that I think possibly what that is, is the journey time start and end points have been measured differently in those two situations over the base. So yes, there's no, I see that that's not helpful. I can confirm that to you later, I need to confer with my colleagues. But I suspect what has happened there is that the journey times that be measured for the base, have the start and end points or the measurement of that have been altered in for the, for the comparison with the

29:01

do minimum and do something because of the outcome of the modelling and what that showed in terms of the effects over the wider network. And so the start and end points, those journey times were changed. But I will confirm that with you. I'll come back to you and confirm that. If you could that would be very helpful I think was we all appreciate that that transport more modelling is a is a technical subject. And

29:28

it may be maybe straightforward for traffic and transport engineers to establish this. For the more lay members of examining authorities and generally taking part in this examination. I think it would be very helpful for baseline figures to be baseline figures and if there are differences in those for those to be clearly set out and unexplained. Yes, I've just had confirmation I should I can confirm that the table for three. That is purely the delay

30:00

Through the junction, the roundabout itself, where the numbers presented in table Five, four are over the journey, journey time routes that are described in the TA, which extend further. Yon, just the junction. Now see

30:18

that that is helpful. Thank you. I'll, I'll just that's a useful point to move on and ask if

30:28

if there are any comments on this specific subject from other interested parties. And I'd like to go through in sequence rather than just opening it up to the floor, if I could ask underbar of hearing, first of all, have any issue, any comments that they'd like to make?

30:48

Thank you very much, sir. Yes, the London Borough of Havering would like to make some comments on this on this particular topic area, on the section of traffic and transport.

31:00

In terms of the baseline data itself, we don't have particular issues with the baseline data, but we do have concerns that we would like to raise in relation to the extent that the traffic model, the micro simulation model covers,

31:25

it covers quite a localised area within the within around the M 24. junction.

31:31

We are concerned that it doesn't cover gallows corner. I know so you'll go on to that particular topic in

31:39

on the next item. But we do feel that the division model should be extended to cover gallows corner. We've also got concerns in relation to

31:52

whether or not there is a model that takes into account traffic signals along a section of the a 12 between gallows corner and jumping 28 to 25. Particularly with the junction of, of gubbins line,

32:06

the broader matter that that would like to raise in relation to the traffic modelling is to the extent to which it has or hasn't taken into account broader sub regional forecast growth.

32:21

So the transport assessment itself that the that the that the applicant submitted as part of their deadline, deadline be

32:34

deadline be submission date, this supplementary information report, and also the transport assessment that they submitted as part of their original application.

32:44

Within that document, there is an uncertainty log that they've set out whether it's provided additional

32:51

just interrupt you are you are touching on subjects, which we will come into in the next agenda item. So

33:00

I absolutely will come to you on all of these matters. I really wanted to just see if there were comments on this, this this item, the baseline data

33:10

just covered but we will definitely come back to you have no fear.

33:16

If I can then go to Transport for London, please. Mr. Rheinberg?

33:23

Yes, certainly, sir. We would regarding the journey times, the UCP pointed out did catch us out as well with the journey times from the brook street approach to the roundabout where we had failed to understand at one point the difference between the delays of a roundabout and the delays on the

through route. But in terms of the sort of the overall journey times through the junction, we kind of we don't have any particular issues with the way they've been modelled and reported. Beyond that, no.

33:55

And are you clear within Transport for London now? The reasons for those differences and you believe they've been living adequately set out? Yes, in that case, it's specifically the fitted for journey time route includes for junctions, I think it's next headline and Moscow's lane on brick Street. So where a lot of delays occur, so we do now understand that, yes. Okay.

34:20

Thank you. If you've got no other no other comments at this stage, I'll move on.

34:26

And I will ask, I'll ask if there are any other interested parties that would like to raise anything on the baseline data specifically. Before I come back to Mr. Katesmark.

34:39

I'm not seeing any hands. So if I can come back to you, Mr. Katesmark, can I just confirm it? Is it is that the difference in in how the baseline data is established? Is that set out within the transport Assessment Report. Sorry to interrupt Mr. McArthur. But I think

35:00

Ellen's got her hand up. She's got a baseline data. Yeah. My apologies. Jane, did you have something you wish? Rich Dad? Sorry. I'm just recently there's obviously a lay person. I know nothing at all about transport one thing. But the point that you raised about the issue between Jonathan 28 and gallows corner is massively relevant. And also, I feel that the issue between junction 28 and Duncan 29 on the 25, you know, even last Friday, there was an incident somewhere. I don't know what it was a junction 28 or 29. But, you know, we look at our back window, and it's completely gridlock. And I have kind of alluded to this before, that there is this triangle between junction 2829 and gallows corner, it says anything kind of incident breakdown, anywhere, the whole area seizes up quite quickly. And I just don't know if that can be taken into consideration. But you're talking about, you know, gallows corner, but maybe, you know, the impact on junction 29. Perhaps could be included, but not already. I think we will, we will move on, I'm trying to move on to this this next agenda item, which is essentially the assessment of the cumulative impacts and forecasting within the transport modelling specifically.

36:29

So I hope, I hope that there will be another opportunity to go through this.

36:36

I know that both hearing and TfL have issues that they would like to raise and wish to address. So if I can, because I would like to give the applicant the final say on each of the agenda points. I will come back to Mr. case right now, and then we will move on to this specific issue.

36:58

So to come in, coming back to you, Mr. Case, Mark, did you recall the question that I asked?

37:04

Or should I repeat it?

37:11

Can you repeat it, please? Yes, of course.

37:14

Coming back to the baseline data, and how it's the reasons for the differences essentially. Are those reasons. Are they set out within the transport assessment report at the moment?

37:28

Is it just something that that we, as the examining authority have missed or could it could it be more clear?

37:36

I think it possibly could be more clear, I think for the for the section five, it is clear about the

37:44

the journey time routes and the appendix to the transport assessment shows those journey time routes clearly, but it could be perhaps a bit clearer in the baseline chapter where it refers to the delays that those were only the delays at the junction and therefore a different from the journey Route

38:05

Route times that are quoted in the following sections of ta Thank you, can I ask them that for the for the next the next deadline

38:15

for deadline for that you can issue that clarification? Yes. Thank you very much.

38:31

Okay, I will I will move on to the next agenda item is such an assessment of cumulative impacts and forecasting and the transport model, beginning with gallows corner.

38:45

In in the supplementary information report submitted a procedural deadline be the applicant provided an assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on gallows corner specifically demonstrating that in their view, there will

39:01

there will be a negligible impact on girls corner can

39:08

kind of come to you Mr. Douglas and just ask whether you can now agree with the statement. Do you or do you continue to hold the view that further modelling is required? And if so, can you expand on your reasonings behind this view and after you I will come to Transport for London and ask the same question.

39:27

Thank you sir.

39:30

We London Borough of Havering, have reviewed the transport assessment supplementary information report and we maintain the view that we feel that the applicant needs to undertake additional modelling before we can be we can be satisfied that we fully understand the impacts that the scheme is going to have on Gallows Corner.

39:56

The main issue that we have with the traffic modelling

40:00

At the present time is to the extent to which the applicant has taken into account sub regional growth within their within their model.

40:10

We were aware

40:13

within the transport assessment reports that was submitted as part of the original application that they've set out forecast developments that they've taken into account. In figure 5.2. they've set out additional developments within their within their strategic model that they've that they've undertaken.

40:36

But hiring is concerned that that does not take into account broader sub regional growth. So, by sub regional growth, what we're referring to really is growth within the London plan, for example set out within the London plan,

40:54

haven zone.

40:57

Emerging local plan has a minimum housing target of

41:03

17 and a half 1000 homes to be delivered over a 15 year period.

41:08

We have a significant proportion of those being

41:12

earmarked for Ronda which is our main Metropolitan centre, which has which has

41:19

connectivity directly or via main road onto the a 12 by gallows corner.

41:27

And we feel

41:30

strategic growth across the sub region. So not just in hiring but in in Redbridge. In barking Dagenham, which also have has connectivity onto the a 12 really needs to be taken into account.

41:45

And for haven to be able to see the impact that junction 28 will have on the network.

41:54

Once that additional growth has been has been taken into account.

41:59

We note that the applicant has, as certainly made the point in in response to some of Haverings relevant representations that they're there. It's not their responsibility to mitigate the growth that haven delivers on our road network. And that's certainly not where, certainly what not what we are asking the applicant to do.

42:27

havens well aware of its own responsibilities in terms of the 2004 Traffic Management Act. And what we have to do in terms of mitigating the impact of our growth on our network. What we're simply asking for is for

42:42

some sensitivity testing to be taken to be undertaken on their model to take into account

42:48

the housing growth set out in the now adopted London plan to see

42:55

the cumulative impact of that and the junction 28 scheme on the on the on the a 12 on gallows corner, which is a particularly sensitive junction for Havering. gallows corner is a five arm junction consists of two arms of the a 12 but the a one to seven which are operated by Transport for London and to haven operated roads straight road, which provides connectivity to the Howard Hill part of our borough and

main road which are referred to earlier which provides connections into Rumford. It's already a heavily congested

43:33

junction, traffic quite often backs back all the way back into Rockford, certainly in the in the evening peak. And

43:43

whilst we note that, how was England's transport assessment is suggesting that there will be minimal changes to traffic on gallows corner as a result of this scheme.

43:55

We would simply like to see further modelling done to take into account that strategic growth to see if that is still the case or not, once sub regional growth is taken into account.

44:07

Thank you. Thank you, before I come to Transport for London, the applicant in their response to your local impact report

44:16

do say that their modelling takes account of forecast changes in demographics. Is that Do you believe that the

44:26

the extent to which they take account of that is not adequate yet? Or does that go somewhere some way to deal with the issue that you've raised?

44:35

I think I think the difficulty with that is the napkins referring to ntm the national trip and model

44:45

data which takes into account things like population growth, demographical changes, employment and so forth.

44:52

But that's that data set gets updated periodically

44:57

and we don't feel that that would take

45:00

into account

45:02

the most recent growth assumptions that are set out within the within the London plan, which is what we would like to see.

45:08

Okay, that's clear. Thank you.

45:12

And coming to you,

45:15

Mr. reinberg. Now, please.

45:18

Yes, sir. So, we do share many of the same concerns. But London Borough of Havering do on this, I won't sort of repeat too much. The, we've reviewed the applicants forecasts in detail about the impacts on traffic flows at gallows corner. And it's, it's quite clear, but from the forecasts presented, particularly in the transport assessments,

45:45

traffic demand and returning movements at gallows corner, are not forecast to increase substantially. I think the maximum is about 75 additional vehicles on the a 12, East of gallows corner.

45:59

There are some scenarios that have been presented. Particularly and we're not entirely clear why but for the 2030 7pm Peak low growth assessment that's presented in the transport assessment supplementary information report, there is a more substantial increase on the a 12 approach and gallows corner about a 10% increase in traffic. So there are some scenarios it seems where the impacts on the gallows corner junction could be greater. And we do accept also that the overall even if there's more traffic on va 12, there may be less traffic on some of the other arms. So the overall demand at gallows corner, maybe less. But we do share the concerns about

46:45

the handling of growth. And we can understand that while the national trend model is

46:52

appropriate to an extent for assessing schemes of national significance and that does fit with transport appraisal guidance.

47:00

If TfL had been modelling this junction we would have used for London plan growth to get more

47:07

more robust and more accurate assessment of the growth within London.

47:13

So and as Mr. Douglas from London BB are of hovering, mentioned, with the uncertainty log, we are concerned but we've only developments for two within three kilometres of a DCF boundary being considered there. with NGOs corner being pretty much exactly three kilometres from the DCR boundary, anything just west of gallows corner wouldn't be included other than the background growth and the national trend model.

47:44

That said, we don't we don't see anything which would indicate there is that the impacts of a scheme are would be substantially different. So but all of a sudden, there'd be a fundamental change if an alternative methodology was used, but we do feel that it would be appropriate for more sensitivity testing to be undertaken. So that that's that can be we can be more certain on that rather than it just being supposition.

48:17

Thank you.

48:18

I just I would like to pick up on the point that Jane Ellen raised with you first miss that Mr. Rosenberg, and then I'll come back to Mr. Douglas. The idea that that there's been raised of there being an issue

48:34

around a triangle of nodes, if you like with junction 29 Junction 28, and gallows corner for forming the peaks of those triangles. Is that a is that a an area that you recognise as being particularly sensitive and prone to disruption?

48:54

I think the routing of traffic is sensitive because in the event of there being an incident on either va 12 or VA one to seven or in DPM 25, then it's relatively easy for traffic to use the alternative route and divert accordingly. All those roads are obviously

49:14

generally quite congested parts of a network. So incidents will happen more regularly, naturally, even on quieter parts of the network.

49:24

So yeah, but we do recognise that incidents certainly occur and there will be times when there are substantial delays on va 12 8127 and M 25. Indeed,

49:37

it's not an area but

49:42

it is sort of noted as being substantially different other sort of equivalent areas where there's high levels of traffic on the Transport for London road network, Navy, I'm 25

49:53

and are you happy that satisfied that the modelling

50:00

adequately takes account of that the issues around that triangle service strategic modelling? Yes, it does. It does include the network in in detail. And we do see from some of the outputs presented by the applicant that traffic does indeed divert, for example, the construction impact modelling shows, there is a sort of realistic diversion of traffic along those routes. So, we do feel that, notwithstanding the concerns we've got about whether the growth is appropriately, appropriately represented, which could result in some different impacts.

50:39

Okay, thank you. And back to you, Mr. Douglas, can you just comment on that, that that triangle, m 29 and 28 girls corner triangle and whether you believe that the modelling as it currently stands adequately represents

50:55

the issues around that area?

50:59

Thank you, sir. Yes, the triangle junction 28 of the of the M 25. gallows corner, the a one to seven, to junction 29 of the M 25.

51:12

As Mr. reinberg referred to just now, there are there are a number of instances where if there are situations where if there is an incident on one, one part of that network traffic will be diverted down the other.

51:28

In terms of the point about whether the modelling is taken into account that into account enough, I think I'd probably refer back to what I said earlier around the vision model. So the local the local micro SIM simulation model, and

51:46

the concern that we've got around

51:49

that it that it covers the junction of the M 25 itself and the a 12. But it doesn't really cover any of the local Barrow roads off it. So you know, for example, between the a 127 that Jane Ellen referred to, and the a 12. You've got, you've got squirrel six road and gubbins lane.

52:12

And those roads are often used

52:15

as a rat run, if you like between the two, between the two, two main roads or the a 127 and the a 12 when they when there is an incident.

52:25

And we'd like to have seen those roads, for example, included within that visit model so we can actually see the implications on our own network.

52:40

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Both of you. Coming back to Mr. Cates, Mark. Sorry, before I do any other interested parties,

52:53

anything that they would like to raise? In addition to what's been said?

53:04

Shane, I think your hand has gone up it went up and went down again. But Yep, it's still up. Yeah. Anything else you'd like to add?

53:13

Again, on the diversion options when this triangle does in it does gridlock I used to commute back and forth to South End regularly. And I on 20 years before I packed up work, but and I guarantee you if one road is congested at a standstill, the others follow very quickly the next headline, whenever you try to divert it, everybody's trying to divert. So I really think that needs to be on board. And also, again, flying the flag for Woodstock having you we because of where we are we don't have any alternative diversions. We can't divert because of the nature of where we are in relation to that junction. And I'm not going to go over that again. But which you're well aware of. So we do hope that that gets picked up and thrashed out properly. Thank you. Thank you. So well, let's come straight to that. That final point. If you like Mr. Mr. Cates market, if you could deal with the issue that in,

54:21

in residents, the residents views and the views of the London Borough of Havering that the impacts on the borough road network are not adequately covered. How would you respond?

54:36

Well, we have done the as you say, we have done the strategic modelling. And that has indicated that the strategic model is a reassignment model. So that looks at the impact of the scheme in terms of what impact it might have on the redistribution of traffic across the broad network. And what that has shown is that there's minimal rerouting of traffic as a result of this scheme and other

55:00

by releasing or improving capacity at the junction, it doesn't actually suck in additional draft traffic from other routes on the road network and then that is shown on the figures in Section four of the transport assessment supplementary information report, which shows that the generally the, the changes in traffic flows on the surrounding road network are very small

55:26

and really not significant at all. And therefore, they don't warrant any further detailed modelling. In terms of

55:35

measuring their the impact of those, the visit model, or the operational model was built specifically to more accurately analyse the impact of the scheme at junction 28. Not to look at the impacts of the

55:51

scheme on the wider road network other than on brook street. So it didn't look at those wider aspects of it because there wasn't a need to because the traffic flows as a result of the change due to the schema, not significant enough to warrant that detailed level of modelling. Bearing in mind that this scheme is aimed at reducing congestion on the strategic road network. It is a highways England scheme. It's not looking to solve the problems of all the problems of the surrounding area.

56:24

So that would be point. Do you want me to move on to the point about forecast growth, dealing with forecasts?

56:30

Yes, and if you if you deal with the issue, specifically in terms of the view that further sensitivity testing would be would be beneficial when addressing

56:44

further future growth. And perhaps if it's appropriate to deal at the at the same time with the issue of the robustness in tfls view of the national trip and model for assessing roads in London, specifically.

57:01

By

57:02

separating your means if it's if it's more sensible to do that, right? Well, in terms of street road network, the DFT basically give very clear guidance of transport be very good clear guidance. And that's through the transport analysis guidance, which is guidance for the assessment of traffic impacts on the street road network. That is the methodology is to adopt the national trip and model as the basis forecasting. Given that the disjunction is on the strategic road network, it has taken account a much wider area, national level trips, it's covering national level trips in 25. And therefore, we feel it is a much more appropriate

57:50

forecasting tool than just to focus on any tool for London, which would be very London specific and only deal with those trips within the M 25. Realistically and not far beyond that. So

58:05

we're confident that the

58:08

approach that we've taken is the correct approach is fully in compliance with the transport appraisal guidance, transport analysis guidance that DFT provide. And in terms of dealing with the sub regional growth, there's very clear guidance, again, about the development of the uncertainty log and what is to be included and how those though, in that uncertainty log and how the future developments are to be categorised as

58:42

Nyssa and more than likely, foreseeable reasonably foreseeable or on or

58:50

hypothetical. So there's four categories that the future forecasts developments, and it's quite clear that emerging local plans such as Hey brings the regional growth would not would not be categorised as certain enough to be included within the core scenario. So they are excluded as is the approach to

59:17

recommended within the tag guidance, so

59:21

they are not I would agree that those that sub regional growth is not in the model, per se, because it is not confirmed the plan has not been adopted as yet. And therefore, it's not in the planning applications for those sites in the local plan. Should the local plan be adopted, though there's got to be the planning application for those sites as well. So that is quite reasonable to assume those developments and not considered certain enough to be included in the soft core scenario. And the way that the transform appraisal guidance

59:57

suggests approaching is this is to do

1:00:00

sensitivity tests for low and high growth,

1:00:05

just to check the robustness of the scheme under different scenarios. So we have done in accordance with a guidance a low and high growth scenarios, and tested those. Now the high growth scenario doesn't look at the development in the same way, it's more of a formula based approach, which just adds on a proportion of traffic to the to the level, again to estimate and forecast growth, assuming a

higher level, which doesn't specifically take account of the identified developments within havens emerging local plan, but indirectly it will do in terms of its generally high level of growth is assumed within the whole area, based on a formula that is calculated. So we would argue that we have done a

1:01:00

sensitivity test that effectively takes account of

1:01:05

a high growth scenario accounting for sub regional growth in hazing. And the results of that modelling are shown in Section four of the transport sector separation ration report, which clearly shows that even with that high growth, the

1:01:22

the resulting changes in traffic flow in the low on the local wider road network are still very small, and not significant, which shows the junction is not sensitive. The amount of released capacity by the scheme at the junction and under any of the scenarios doesn't have a significant impact on the rerouting of traffic over the wider, wider road network. So where we are comfortable that the scheme

1:01:55

has demonstrated that and therefore, you know, under any high low growth scenario, that, yes, it impacts on the junction itself, but it doesn't have a significant impact on the wider road network. And so that would be our answer to those questions. Okay, thank you. I will I will just come back on those two. I'm not I'm not convinced that we have a consensus yet. On that fine, that that last point you made. Can I just come back to you, Mr. Douglas, and the applicants view is clearly that the sensitivity testing that has been carried out so far is sufficient. And at the end, that the impacts

1:02:39

that results from this proposed development are very small or insert, insert, not significant, not insignificant. And

1:02:51

that does that. Does that answer the issues that you are addressed the issues that you that you've raised? They it appears that they believe that sufficiently sensitivity testing is adequate?

1:03:04

from Hayden's perspective, it doesn't we would still like to see, to see the model take into account sub regional growth. Does field

1:03:17

cat at this stage now? It's not it's not going to be helpful for the examination as a whole to, to,

1:03:26

for us to be saying? Well, we were one side to be saying where we don't agree and the other side saying Neither do we.

1:03:35

If you have if there are issues that you believe specifically need to be addressed,

1:03:42

Can you set those out and

1:03:47

yeah, be clear about what specifically is lacking.

1:03:54

So, from, from our perspective, we would like to see

1:04:01

the detailed modelling of the operation of gallows corner junction. So at the moment, the strategic model that's been used, takes into account traffic volumes across galleries corner but not the operation of the junction. So we'd like to see the visit model extended to include gallows corner.

1:04:25

And we would also like to see the model also, the mock simulation model also include the government's lane junction with the a 12 as well.

1:04:37

Okay,

1:04:38

the applicant, the applicant is saying essentially that the impacts the impact on traffic flow it along the front from gallows corner back to the junction is small, it's not significant. It is essentially what you're saying that you don't have the modelling data to handle

1:05:00

to agree that, yes, so what we're saying, sir, is we note what the applicant saying and we, and we've seen those figures in the in the report. And we're simply saying that we can't it those figures don't give us enough certainty that that is the case, because we don't, we don't feel that the sub regional growth

1:05:23

has been taken into account as part of their modelling. So we're not disputing the figures that are in the report, based on the forecasting that they've done. We're simply saying that we're not happy with what they've put into the forecasting in terms of sub regional growth, which could determine different outputs on those sections of road.

1:05:44

And that that comes back to the point you raised earlier about the sensitivity and the leverage. Yes, yes, Mr. Mr. Cates, Mark, how would you respond?

1:05:58

And well, I'd respond by accepting the fact that there is a possibility that the sub regional growth in haven will have an impact on gallows corner. But what we're assessing here is the impact of the scheme on Ghana's corner and whether there is any, any requirement for us to do any further modelling there to address that issue. Clearly it is for hovering to identify the impacts of their local plan on the local road network and transport for London's road network and indeed, highways England road network as part of their transport assessment for their local plan, and to identify mitigation measures, for any adverse impacts that that local plan has, and to deliver those through their infrastructure delivery plan as part of their local plan. And it is not for highways, England to be resolving those issues that gallows corner on behalf of the council's local authorities.

1:06:54

Okay.

1:06:56

Thank you. We'll move on to the second. The second

1:07:01

point that you raised more to transport the London if I can, regarding the trip and the National trip and model.

1:07:11

Mr. reinberg, the African views the view of the applicant rather is that it is it is appropriate and right to use the national trip end model.

1:07:22

And they are satisfied essentially, they have done enough in that regard.

1:07:27

Can you just respond?

1:07:30

Yes, certainly, sir. Be

1:07:33

TfL does also use a national trip and model data for trip for movement outside London. So we're not sort of disputing but it's the most appropriate tool to use or set of data to use outside London, it's more of an inside London, we feel that the London plan data, which is the adopted London plan at the time is his policy. But that would be more appropriate. So it's not that it's not that the national Japan model isn't appropriate to us at all. We recognise that it's more that within London.

1:08:10

And if TfL had been modelling this scheme, we would be using London plan data within London and national Japan model data outside London.

1:08:21

Okay, yep. Is there Mr. Case, Mark? Is this is there a specific reason why London plan data was not used? Or is it simply the case that it's general practice within highways England to only use national trip end model data?

1:08:39

Yes, that's correct, we just follow the recommended guidance, which is to use the natural trip and model. And I think it is worth making the point that we are talking about differences of view of how we derive forecast future traffic growth on the road network more generally.

1:09:00

What I'm saying here is that our sensitivity tests, the low and high growth have shown that the scheme itself under any under those different scenarios, the purpose of those low and high growth tests is to test to show whether there are any significant effects in terms of wider rerouting of traffic as a result of the scheme. And then as shown, that's not to be the case, had it shown that to be the case, then there may have been a case for looking at looking at the forecast in a bit more detail and doing some analysis and taking account of maybe looking at some merging of data with the London local plan. But that would have only been the case. If the scheme had under either the high or low scenario. we're suggesting that it was very sensitive

1:09:48

to reroute it to the required rerouting of traffic. What the sensitivity testing we've done with the high and low growth has shown that it's not sensitive to that so much regardless of what the forecasts are. The impact

1:10:00

scheme is likely to be very, very similar, ie very minimal on the wider reading ride road network.

1:10:07

So it without wishing to put words in your mouth it would it be reasonable to say that it's the view of highways England in this case that had London plan data have been used? The results would be generally the same, not different. Yes, that's correct. I mean, when we're talking small changes, where if you look, we're talking, you know, one 2% changes in flows on the a 12.

1:10:35

And it's,

1:10:38

you know, within the accuracy of traffic modelling, that is not significant. It's not a significant change, and to do local, more detailed modelling, I don't believe would

1:10:49

would tell us anything useful, useful, anything more useful about the operation, the road network, then then we already have available at our hands through the assessment that's been done. Okay. And it is worth the

1:11:05

the uncertainty lock, which was developed did take account of the London plan. so absurd, the uncertainty log dictate counter that in forecasting.

1:11:18

Thank you. I do I do want to move on. I'm conscious of the time. But before I do, can I just ask my colleague, Mr. Allen, whether he has anything you'd like to add to this specific topic?

1:11:35

Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. No, I've, I think the questions that were formulating in my head you dealt with during the, during the discussion? So no, I don't have anything further to add at this stage.

1:11:50

Thank you very much. In that case, I will I will move on to

1:11:58

the with Mr. McCartney, do you ever hand up and

1:12:03

kiss my cousin's hand up? Yeah.

1:12:08

Is better. I just like to come back to the point that was raised earlier about the incidents that were raised and the impact it has on this triangle, just to make the point that clearly the highways England scheme, and the improvements at junction today will reduce the likelihood that incidents at junction 28 and queueing back onto the main line at the end 25 is result of any incidents and thereby should reduce the frequency of incidents which result in the problems that were outlined on that triangle. So highways England recognise that that happens. And clearly, one of the objectives of this scheme is to try and reduce the number of incidents, the result in that sort of gridlock in the local area. Thank you. Thank you. That's, that's, that's helpful.

1:12:56

Moving on, then.

1:12:58

I

1:13:00

and Mr. keesmaat, can you put your hand down Thank you.

1:13:04

Lower Thames crossing, or other forecast impacts of the development in combination with the lower Thames crossing.

1:13:12

In Section six of the transport assessment, supplementary information reports. The applicant states that there is no intention for roads other than m 25, a 12 and a 127 to be used by construction traffic.

1:13:27

In in Section 6.3, further states that modelling carried out of temporary traffic management measures required during construction of the proposed development has demonstrated that these measures would not result in any significant diversion of traffic onto local roads.

1:13:43

It also notes that estimated construction traffic resulting from the proposed lower Thames crossing are not currently available, but the nevertheless the proposed development is not anticipated to significantly contribute to any traffic being displaced onto local roads.

1:14:00

In the absence of

1:14:03

information available for the lower Thames crossing, what information has been used in the assessment of the cumulative impacts with and without the LTC and development scheme as the case might

1:14:21

do? Well, it obviously in the operational scenario, LTC is included in both the do minimum and do something scenarios. So it's assumed to lower Thames crossing is assumed to have happened for the 2037 future year modelling, for both to do minimum do something. So it's included in that for the construction impacts because we didn't have any information from the lower Thames crossing scheme. We have not been able to do a cumulative assessment of construction, traffic impacts or with the lower Thames crossing, we have assessed the impact of asking

1:15:00

With the temporary traffic management measures proposed to construct the scheme, and put those into the traffic model to see what happens. And what that has demonstrated is that again, that there is very little displacement of traffic onto the wider road network as a result of those temporary traffic management arrangements, recognising that they will inevitably cause some additional congestion or delay, temporary congestion and delay when they're in place.

1:15:31

But what it shows us is there's very little displacement. So what I'm saying is that if, if, if the

1:15:38

if the lower Thames crossing scheme did was to result construction, the road Thames processing was to result in some displacement of traffic on the ride road network, the junction 28 scheme wouldn't be adding to anything to on top of that.

1:15:55

Thank you that that that was going to be my next question. So thank you, for summarising. And can I again, I'll come to Mr. Douglas first, and then to Mr. reinberg.

1:16:06

And ask whether you have any comments on that assessment?

1:16:13

Thank you, sir. As a general point, I'd say the kind of cumulative impact of both LTC and junction 28 is something that we have, we have raised with both with both with the applicant in terms of both teams that are working on the respective projects. It is it is a general concern that we have in relation to both schemes in terms of the impact that the construction could have on our on our own road network. Notwithstanding the comments that the applicants already made in relation to

1:16:51

construction traffic, and I know that I'm aware, that's certainly in the in the, in the outline camp for the M 25 Junction 28 scheme, there's a commitment that that construction traffic will, will, will, will be maintained on the 25. And

1:17:10

on the a 12 that, you know, the strategic wrote on that and they won't go on to on to the borrower, the borrower network.

1:17:19

So it's a general concern that we've got, but we do except that because of where lower Thames crossing, he's in terms of their own DCO process.

1:17:31

And, and the fact that they are undertaking additional construction traffic modelling at the moment,

1:17:39

the applicants done as much as the applicant can in terms of assessing the cumulative impacts of both schemes, we will obviously be working will continue to work with them with the applicants for both jumping 28 and lower temps crossing over the coming months to try and to try and make sure that any cumulative impacts are minimised, but some, whilst we are waiting for the lower Thames crossing construction traffic work to be to be to be carried out.

1:18:15

We accept the position that the applicant stated at the present time. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Weinberg.

1:18:24

Yes, we also appreciate the difficulty of looking at the cumulative construction impacts and transport for London's concerns are more associated with the cumulative operational impacts. And the concern that we've raised with the applicant previously is that the published model data for the lower Thames crossing which dates from the 2018 statutory consultation does have significantly higher modelled future year flows on the M 25 through junction 28 than the modelling for junction 28 scheme does. And in fact, and it is quite difficult to compare light for light because they have different peak periods or peak hours

1:19:07

and that sort of thing, but it the lower Thames crossing published modelling does show Vm 25 approaching capacity by 2041 through junction 28. So the concerns we have raised is but we would like it to be demonstrated that that doesn't have any fundamental impact on the performance of the junction 28 scheme that would mean that something different should be done for junction 28 rather than the current proposed development. So we would seek a sensitivity test again to show that if the lower Thames crossing does result in higher flows on bm 25. So but bm 25 is approaching capacity. Then we would like to see that for junction 28 scheme still works. And we did note we did welcome a point made by the applicant and it's really

1:20:00

response to TfL was written representation, which was documented exam 9.36 that there has been some level of future proofing considered in the design for junction 28. For example, if additional lanes were required on the M 25 through v junction, so that does provide some reassurance. But we would still

1:20:22

be keen to see that traffic impacts aren't substantially different if the lower Thames crossing does result in higher flows on the 25.

1:20:32

Thank you, Mr. Weinberg. I will ask the applicant to respond on that. But first of all, can I come to Mr. McDonald of Essex County Council please?

1:20:43

Thank you very much. So yeah, I just really wanted to say from Essex County Council's perspective that we fully concur with the views that both favouring and Transport for London have put forward. Essex County Council Essex network is on the periphery of the lower Thames crossing. We know the concerns that have been raised, we understand the position of the applicant in terms of where lower Thames crossing is being

1:21:16

being sort of behind in terms of, you know, doing the modelling and construction traffic, but we do we do, we do

1:21:27

concur with the with the concerns that have been raised on this matter.

1:21:32

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. McDonald.

1:21:35

Coming back to you, Mr. Case, Mark.

1:21:40

The points the points made,

1:21:45

seem to generally agree with the assessment that you've made and

1:21:53

the view that in terms of construction traffic impacts the junction 28 scheme is a minimal

1:22:00

in cumulative terms impact when taken alongside that the Thames crossing. Can you just address the point raised by Mr.

1:22:09

Rosenberg

1:22:11

on the differences in the operational modelling flows between the LTC, the modelling data used for the LTC and the data used for junction 28. And are you are you confident that you have demonstrated

1:22:25

success sufficient data sufficient to have demonstrated sufficiently that the work that you've done takes account of

1:22:36

the LTC project, obviously work to go ahead.

1:22:40

Right? Yes,

1:22:42

we use the, in our modelling we use the latest available data from our modelling data from LTC when we commenced our assessments for this scheme, obviously, you recognise there is a lead in time, because most of the environmental assessment noise, air quality etc. all right on the back of the traffic data to the modelling, there's a long lead in time from when we do the modelling to them preparing all the subsequent assessments that sit on top of that, therefore, we have to when preparing the submissions, we are always going to have to draw a line in the sand. Say right, this is the data we are using, it's the most up to date, we can't keep waiting for further updates modelling. So the modelling that we undertook was based on the latest available information from loadings crossing time, we recognise that the modelling for loadings crossing has subsequently been updated. And we have not explicitly modelled that as part of our scheme.

1:23:40

But will gain I would argue that we have done a sensitivity test with a high growth scenario, which will have more traffic on the 25 in it, and therefore and that that has demonstrated, as I've said before, minimal rerouting of traffic on the wide road network. But more importantly it also shows that this junction still performs well under that scenario, and if anything before provides a higher

1:24:06

value for money in terms of benefit cost ratio, because the congestion of the junction in the future without the scheme is forecast to be even worse, and therefore the benefits you get from the scheme are greater.

1:24:19

And do you recognise the numbers that Mr. omak

1:24:24

the scenario there is Mr. Ryan Mark described and I forget the exact date but the early 2014 of the 25 being forecast to be at capacity and are you confident that the junction as proposed will cope with that? Yes, I mean, the modelling in the course scenario does show for the 37 that the 25 mainline over the viaduct is over the junction is approaching capacity. So the modelling does reflect that. But because of the journey time savings that the loop road provides, even with the additional delay on the model

1:25:00

Line carriageway, it still provides the benefit benefits in terms of journey times for the traffic and reduces the amount traffic using the roundabout itself.

1:25:12

Clearly, I think in our representation, I mean highways England are aware of this wider issue relating to the lower Thames crossing over is wider impacts on M 25, between junction 27 and junction 29. And they are currently looking into that issue.

1:25:31

But they haven't identified any specific measures or mitigation or what interventions might be required. But it is something that they are separately looking into.

1:25:41

You know, we recognise that this scheme chunks 28 doesn't solve necessarily completely solve the issues around the capacity of the 25 in the, you know, from 2037 onwards.

1:25:56

Okay.

1:25:57

Thank you that that's, that's very helpful. It is no

1:26:02

1126 I propose that before we move on to the next agenda item we move. We have a quick, a brief break comfort break time stretch legs, rest eyes, get away from the screen. I propose in that case that we come back at quarter to 12. Quarter to what yeah, of course 12 1145.

1:26:29

Can I remind live streamers anybody watching via the live stream that when we do return, we need to refresh your browsers after the break. But we will

1:26:40

pause briefly and return 1145