

TEXT_M25J28_ISH1_Session2_03032021

Wed, 3/3 1:39PM • 1:17:55

00:01

So, um, can I just confirm that I can still be hurt?

00:07

Yeah, we can hear and see you both,

00:09

clearly.

00:10

Thank you very much. I trust everyone's had a welcome break. I will now move on to agenda item. The next agenda item is the extended into green signalling at brookstreet. And it's 1145. We are resuming now. For four before we get into the meat of the subject. Just a point of clarification. I'll go to my colleague, Mr. Allen, as a point of clarification on the brookstreet area specifically. Yes,

00:51

thank you, Mr. McArthur. Can I just clarify and I think it'd be helpful for the for all the parties here. The boundary between Essex and London runs up the brookstreet area and round the roundabout and so it I just want to be whether perhaps Transport for London or the applicant could just explain who owns and runs the brook street junction and the roundabout itself the brook street roundabout could you just someone just confirm that for me, please? Yes, Mr.

01:25

Weinberg?

01:27

Yes. Mr. Kay's heart please correct me if I'm if I'm wrong, but transport for London's responsibilities run on the a 12 main carriageway, up to the point underneath the eastern arm of a roundabout and also includes b a 12. eastbound off slip and westbound on slip. The roundabout itself is B applicants responsibility.

01:52

And john and that would include then where brookstreet approach is around about I'm sure I should get the outcome to confirm Just a moment. But where brookstreet Essex is road ends at that junction and on to that roundabout is highways England is your understanding.

02:12

Yes, the boundary will be between ethics and highways England on the roundabout and isn't a TfL responsibility.

02:19

That's very, that's very, very helpful. Is that something? Does the app Mr. Katesmark, you just want to confirm on Mr.

02:30

Challis hi rejected. Yes, sir. That that is the position we agree.

02:34

Okay, for. That's very helpful. Thank you. Thank you, Miss MacArthur.

02:40

Thank you. So moving on to the question of integration signalling at the brick streets at brick Street. The applicant has confirmed that it's their intention to introduce an extended into green signalling at the junction of the a 12 off slip junction 28 roundabout as part of the proposed development. In that deadline three a submission Transport for London has noted that without the proposed change to signal timings, the proposed development would present and what they describe as an unacceptable impact on bus journey times. Mr. reinberg, could you could you could you expand on this points in a little more detail please?

03:24

Yes, sir. So as we've just discussed, while the brookstreet approach junction 28 is not within London tfls interest is primarily associated with the bus TfL bus routes running along that corridor, particularly the route 498. What the transport assessment showed was but on the journey to journey time corridor between Brook Street and the westbound a 12. Seven through around about there is a substantial increase in journey time forecasts without to be integrating signals integrating signal phasing. And that was set out in the transport assessment that showed that the scheme would cause a worsening of journey times by nearly nine minutes in the morning peak in 2037. Future year without any changes. And that was a substantial concern for TfL. So in the transport assessment supplementary information report, which was subsequently submitted at procedural deadline be I think, with the changes to the integration timings, rather than that nine minute increase in journey time instead for scheme results in a four minute improvement in journey time. So that's quite a substantial difference, essentially a sort of 13 minute difference between the two. So we therefore feel it's critical to Transport for London and for our bus operation. But fat improvement and journey times is in some way secured through the DCO.

05:06

Thank you that leads on to my to my next point very, very nicely. They are the benefits do as you say, seem to be very clear, very apparent as they've been set up by the applicant. And equally the risks as you've just described, Mr. Weinberg. Given the benefits, can the applicant explain what barriers there are? It's understood that there is a commitment set out within the supplementary transport assessment to implement the integrating Works. Can the applicant just explain what barriers are remain at this

stage to securing this work within the DCO? Mr. Ovenden I see your hand is up I will come to you. But I just like Mr. Charles, to respond to this.

06:02

Yes, yes, of course. So it is our intention, as you rightly say, to implement this so called integration arrangement to make the junction operate in the best way can highways England is of course here to manage the strategic road network in an appropriate and responsible way. And organising the signals in the way that we propose. So I think falls comfortably within that responsibility to actually have a legal requirement in a development consent order for signals to operate in a particular way does strike us as rather excessive. And I think it's also fair to say so will be unusual to actually have traffic signals regulated by law. But we understand you know, the benefits. And of course, we do want to implement that arrangement, which is why we've put it forward.

07:03

Okay, I think, yeah, I will come back to you. I'll ask I'll ask the interested parties to respond to that point, specifically. And as your hand is raised, and has been for a while, Mr. Robinson, can I come to you first?

07:15

Thank you. I've got three very short queries, concerning the extension to the integration. We did discuss it at the preamp stage. But the question really is, what is that extension, presumably measured in seconds for the extension of the integration? I think at the preamp stage, it was suggested that that was probably an extension of the order of four seconds, something like that. The second point was when would that be introduced? Would that be prior to construction? Or would it more likely to be prior to first use of the amended junction? And then the related query is there is a reference to seeking extra funding for works to the next heads and maskull Lane junction? That wouldn't be separate to the decio scheme, and really seeking whether there was any further information on, on how that is going. So those are the three questions that I've got, I think responding, responding on the hoof as it were to, to what has just been said. And certainly we would like some assurance that the integration phase and would be extended, in short order to deal with the with the projected extension of time if that integrating phasing was not changed, because clearly, Brent would wouldn't want an extension of time. An extra time to join the brookstreet junction of nine minutes, and it would certainly prefer the more speedier way to join that junction. So that would be our view on that. Okay.

09:10

Thank you, Mr. Robinson. Mr. McDonald from Essex County Council. Thank you,

09:18

sir. Just to just to say that Essex County Council also raised concerns on the traffic delays on brookstreet that TfL have raised. We fully support the TfL position. We're pleased to see the integration being raised and we would support that it is actually formally included within the DCO.

09:47

Thank you and I'll come to gfl both Mr. Weinberg and Mr. Smith regard have their have their hands up. I'll let you decide who takes them who takes centre stage.

10:00

Sorry, I was planning to introduce Mr. smeda. Guard. So I'll pass over to him. Thank you.

10:07

Yes, good afternoon. It's just coming back. And the point that Mark has raised on behalf of highways England earlier, was to understand perfectly well that they are under statutory duty to operate and manage their roads in a safe manner. And likewise, for TfL. Of course, we still think that there is an opportunity here to perhaps secure something for the signal timings in the decio, or in one of the plans there. And we're not, of course, proposing that you need to have a singular need to reach a certain result, because that will indeed better digest question, but it certainly is worth sitting out criteria or issues that debt to debt they could and should take into account when they exercise their powers of how do you manage the arrows. So we do believe there is an opportunity to put something into the decio.

11:01

Thank you. And Mr. Douglas.

11:06

Thank you, sir. I just wanted to support the partner, Mr. reinberg, made earlier in relation to the bus service that currently uses brookstreet, the 498. And it was really just to just to make the panel aware that the 498 bus service is a service that operates from Queens Hospital in how you bring out to Brentwood queens hospital has, has quite a wide catchment area. And people do use that hospital, from parts of Essex. So any improvement in journey time for that service, with this with the with the with the integrate proposal would obviously be very, very critical, not just for them, not just for patients who will use the hospital by that service, but also for the staff members, as well. So we would we support tfls position with regards to one to two securing that through the DCR. Thank you.

12:10

Thank you, Mr. Douglas. Mr. Chalice, this this is this is clearly an emotive subject. And one that appears to be a really easy when the issue really comes down to assurance and securing the commitment made. If you're of the view that it's excessive, as you say, to secure this type of provision within VCO. How else might the issues that have been raised and the assurances have been sweetheart, how else might that be dealt with? Well, I

12:58

think what we're really saying so is we're just asking the local authorities and TfL to accept that highways England will do what it says it will do and what it wants to do with regard to this junction, I'm going to repeat the point I made earlier to actually have legislation in the form of a DCA, which regulates the operation of a traffic signal will be unusual. So we say excessive, or better. You know, we'll leave, we'll leave the point there for you to decide how you would like to, to deal with that.

13:34

And we will we'll come on to this subject in a bit more detail shortly. But might it be something that that could be addressed within a traffic management plan?

13:47

Yes, I

13:48

think it could be dealt with in a traffic management plan, can we consider how that might work?

13:57

on lots of incoming on to the next agenda.

14:00

I mean, the traffic management plan is really regulates traffic management during construction rather than operation in the long term. So it will be rather an odd thing. So I think to put it within a traffic management plan.

14:19

That that's noted. But I think it would be it clearly would be welcome. If you could give some thought to how, how you might give some further assurance to the to the interested parties. It as I say, it's clearly an issue that has Well, it's changed the it's changed the mood of the room. Everybody is engaged with this. And as I say it appears to be fairly low hanging fruit.

14:52

Yes. So we're all on the same page as regards the benefits of the integration arrangement that highways England has booked Because it wishes to implement, I just repeat, I think to have in effect legislation in the DCA requiring traffic signals to be operated in a particular way strikes us as rather excessive. But if there is a another way that it can, we can give TfL and the local authorities some comfort on the point, we'll think about how we can best do that. Thank you. That's

15:26

welcome. I noticed. Mr. McDonald, you have your hand up and then it will come to you, Mr. Smith regard as well.

15:36

I apologise, sir, I think I failed to take down my hand from last time, but didn't

15:43

keep Miss Mrs. Smedegaard. With you then.

15:46

And thank you. And as an alternative, of course, there is also a draft legal agreement or at least draft heads of terms that we have suggested to hire with England, we are yet to receive a any response

under strata to terms with also mirror to some degree what we would expect to otherwise see in protected provisions. So perhaps, if inspector or how was England are very uncomfortable with incorporating this into dcl, which we still think it could be there. Maybe it could be something that's secured in a separate legal agreement.

16:22

Thank you, Mr. Challis. I am conscious that what I don't want us to do is to drift off into purely dcl territory as we will be dealing with that later in the week anyway, but is a suggestion made by Mr. smeda guy something that's worthy of further consideration.

16:44

Certainly search worthy of further consideration. And we'll discuss that further with TfL. To see where we get to thank you for that. Excellent.

16:54

Thank you very much. If there are no further comments on this issue. Mr. Robinson, your hand is up. Thank you.

17:04

I was just wondering whether the applicant was able just to come back on my three brief points about implementation duration and the other works indicated possibly related to Nags Head and mascus. Lane.

17:22

My apologies. I didn't mean to cover that. And it slipped my mind. Yes, please, please do come back on that, Mr. Chalice, or

17:30

Thank you so much. I asked Mr. Cates Mark if he will be kind enough to respond. Thank you. Thank you.

17:37

Thank you. Okay, so my car was England. Yes, just to say the extended integration, I believe the current plan is to a three second period for the additional integration to allow traffic to get out of brookstreet more easily. The implementation would be prior to first use, it wouldn't be during construction. In terms of the designated funding for the next head lane and Maspeth lane junction on Brook Street, that is progressing through the separate process within highways England, I don't have a current update for where that is precisely in the process. But I'm aware that the meetings when they decide how is England decide on these matters happen roughly once a month. And so that is moving forward through that process.

18:36

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Cates mark. Before just before we move on to the traffic management plan. I'll just ask my colleague, Mr. Allen, whether he had any, any further questions.

18:51

No questions. Mr. McArthur, but merely an observation, I think, in respect of the traffic management plan. And just to say that I have seen traffic management plans deal with operational issues as well as construction issues. It's not unusual, in my in my view for it to deal with operational issues, and it certainly I think, could be accommodated in the traffic management plan. If the applicant felt that was the best way for it to be to be secured. But again, I think Mr. Challis has said that that the outcome is going to be considering their view as to how this how this signalling can be secured. And we look forward to seeing that, hopefully, the next deadline

19:39

indeed, thank you very much. So that's very helpful.

19:44

Thank you. So again, this this all seems so very well, so we're very well timed. We'll move on to the traffic management plan. The African in their response to the examining authorities first written questions, questions, noted that, in their view, it is not necessary to submit a traffic management plan for examination. However, we were greatly encouraged by Mr. chalices, notes that during the open for hearing on Monday, March the first, that the applicant would now indeed be producing a traffic management plan in some form for the examination. That was a very welcome thing to him as a choice. It, it made us It made us quite happy, although it did force me to rewrite some of my questions, but for the better. Can I just ask the applicant at this stage and appreciate this this is probably still somewhat of a Moveable Feast, and perhaps in a fairly outline stage. But can I ask for a brief again, a brief outline some further detail on the topics that are proposed to be covered, and the level of detail that is intended to be included within the traffic management document at this stage.

21:14

Indeed, set mock trials for highways England, we are indeed going to submit an outline traffic management plan to you and I'm going to ask Mr. Cates mark, once again, if he will be kind enough to explain in outline its contents. Thank you.

21:30

Thank you.

21:32

Thank you. Yeah, in essence, it will include outlining the proposed temporary traffic management arrangements required to implement or construct the scheme. It will contain an outline programme, of when those traffic management plan those various elements of that traffic management plan, and the duration that they occur. So we'll set out the sequence in which those are anticipated take place, it will also contain information on the likely construction traffic generation over the period of the construction period. So people understand how that varies over time. So they're there the key elements of the traffic management plan that will be included in the document.

22:29

Okay, thank you. I will come to two other interested parties shortly. The issues that have been raised within both, either within written responses or in the hearings that we've had this week, so far, I have a list of issues that it would be useful to, to hear, hear your views on at this stage. And fundamentally the impact of construction traffic on London bar and head of hearing and TfL roads in general. And very specifically, you will have heard the concerns and will be aware of the concerns raised by residents on Woodstock Avenue in particular, that they clearly are impacted quite severely in, in the interim, during construction phase and up here keen clearly to learn how that impact is to be mitigated. And mitigation generally proposed to avoid an excessive detour along the a 12. If the spanned a 12 off slip, and excuse me, if I've confused on off slips and on slips, but the a 12 going east at joining the junction, if that's closed during construction and then specific measures to ensure that that emergency vehicle access is not compromised. That's a general list that has arisen from discussions this week or from hearings this week. Can you give some assurance that those topics are to be covered within the TMP

24:16

SDKs What are we seeing? Yes, they will be covered the proposed diversion routes during any closures will be identified in that document. It will also explain what the frequency and likely duration of any specific closures. As we have stated in our representations The intention is that the East bound or currently anticipated the off slip that you refer to junction 2018. We it is unavoidable that some overnight closures of that will be required which will mean The traffic is diverted down to the next junction along the a 12. At name of the junction now, and but given the even though that is a reasonable distance, it will be an overnight closure. So, obviously, there'll be very little traffic on the road network at that time. And so the diversion we estimate is only accounts for an additional 12 minutes in journey time for traffic wanting to head westbound on the a 12. And as a that we would be overnight. So having minimal impact on people in Woodstock having you so lost or

25:43

stolen that point, what was it? It might be, it may well be unavoidable, you know, and we can understand why that would be the case, it's it, it must be it must be manageable in the sense that one would have thought that at least liaison with the local residents could happen. So the notice is given in good time that that events such an event is like is going to occur on such a date and allow them to manage perhaps where they put their car that evening if they know that they're going to make a journey?

26:16

Yes, absolutely. That would be the case, they would be informed in advance and notified of the diversion. And generally more generally, highways England, would it use it use it make the usual information about advanced notice of works at the junction through their network of digital information along their road network to inform people and through the media and online etc, to so people who have advanced warning of you know, any changes and closures such as that.

26:54

Thank you. I did interrupt you. So did you have them? Do you have more to say?

27:01

No, I didn't have anything else.

27:03

I will have my colleague, Mr. Allen has a question. So I will now pass over to him. Yes, thank

27:10

you, Mr. Cates. Mark, I wanted to ask you that, in one of the in our written questions to you, we asked about the preparation of a code of construction practice, which is usually in most schemes which deals with the what it says on the tin so to speak, it is it is your commitment to constructing a neighbourly way, and to ensure that you will put construction hours in there, we are washing all the facilities that would minimise this, if you like the effect of the construction on the surrounding area. Could you just tell me is that going to form part of the traffic management plan as well?

27:59

My colleague Mark Chalice will answer that question.

28:03

Thank you,

28:03

sorry, just unmuting myself. I think as we've said in, in our response to which you refer, we're not proposing to produce a coding instruction practice, because we will be producing a construction environmental management plan the so called Camp. And so they really cover the same ground. So you know, we see no need to really produce the same thing twice. So all of those things that you mentioned, working hours working arrangements and all the things that you know, one would normally find, I suppose, in, in some form of construction practice will be covered in the camp, you know, we regard them as essentially the same thing.

28:49

So things like management of vehicles arriving and leaving the site that's going to be in the camp. But everything else is in the traffic management plan.

29:02

What were precisely the dividing line is between the traffic management plan and the camp, I will have to defer to others, but they will be in one or the other.

29:14

Okay, that that that's fine. I think that's going to be a theme of some of the other questions, certainly in trees later tomorrow, about where the dividing lines are and where things can be found. And it's certainly something I'm going to be urging you to have a rethink about redefining those boundaries and perhaps having them in in one place. But I'll leave it there for the moment while you consider that Mr. Challenge. All right. I'm also interested to understand what why Jaime's England's changed their position on this given that the written response is not that. Not that many weeks ago, you were you were fairly adamant that a traffic management plan wasn't necessary at this stage.

29:58

Well, so are we up responsive to comments made by those participating in this examination and indeed yourself. And so although I was England doesn't always produce outline traffic management plans for it schemes we have heard, what do you add? Mr. McArthur have said, and we've decided that we will produce one to assist.

30:21

Thank you very much. And let's hope that spirit continues later in this, these examinations. Thank you, Mr. MacArthur.

30:31

Thank you, Mr. Allen. Before we move on to the next subjects, I will, I will just ask whether any other interested parties have any comment to make at this stage on what they've heard regarding proposed traffic management adline traffic management plan? Mr. reinberg, I think you just got in first with your hand. So I will come to you first. And then I'll come to Jane Ellen. And finally to Mr. Douglas. Thank you. So

31:00

it was really just a couple of points building on what you had said you would expect to see in the traffic management plan the outline traffic management plan. Some things we would like to see certainly disruption on the a 12 slip road and details of timing, duration and number of those closures but also on the main a 12 carriageway because we're aware of that the applicant is seeking rights over a 12 carriageway to divert utilities. So we assume there will be at least some lane closures required on the main carriageway, which we're not aware of at this stage. In terms of diversion routes, diversion route for buses would be we would need to understand as well. And the final point would be about whether the applicant's view is but the disruption caused at junction 28 during construction would place a constraint on any other works that might be necessary on the nearby road network. So for example, gallows corner is an obvious example. But really any of the junctions along the a 12 or the a 127 as well.

32:17

Thank you, Mr. reinberg. Jane, gentlemen, would you like to add something

32:23

just very briefly, actually, the, what I would classify as a fairly flippant comment about, you know, given us do notice about closure with a slip road and, and making provision to put our cars somewhere else when I'd like to know where we're supposed to put our cars when we live on the bottom of the you know, the a 12 is at the bottom of our road. And not everybody is fully abled for deeds to walk the length of our road, and then another road and along a busy a toll road. And what I've just heard there from the previous gentleman about closures of this part of the a 12 as well, that's going to add more problems for us. Not just the slip road being closed. But if there's issues along the a 12. either side, you know, this 12 minute estimate of getting backwards and forwards from the bottom of our road, one side of the hill to the other. I think it's grossly underestimated even overnight, potentially, if there's absolutely

nothing on the road. Yeah, but that's not always the case even at night times. So and not everybody works nine to five, Monday to Friday. It's is a different world now. So I just think it's, you know, we keep talking about diversions. But that is not a sensible. I think it's a fair diversion. For over talking years here, this construction phase, so it's not going to be like a six week job. So I just like to keep it into perspective, really. And we have to go in and out of our day in day out and along with other residents, and deliveries and all the rest of it. So anyway,

34:15

thank you. And I just I would like to reassure you that there's no intention in anything that I say of flippancy, we appreciate the issues and having been and walked around the area as a whole. We are we are mindful of the issues that that Woodstock Avenue residents in particular are faced with. So accept my apologies, if please

34:45

use that.

34:46

Okay. Moving on to Mr. Douglas, please.

34:53

Thank you, sir. Just a couple of issues from hiring. Building on from what Mr. Mr. Rosenberg said, as well. It's, it's very welcome. I'd say first of all that the applicants agreed to, to submit an outline traffic management plan. And we look forward to, to reviewing that at when it's submitted at deadline for and whilst on, don't want to stray into matters that yourself and Mr. Allen might want to pick up on Friday, or would just say that this is just an outline traffic management plan. And from London Borough of Havens perspective, we would want to agree a full traffic management plan with the applicants before it would go to the Secretary of State thought or approval. The matter that's been raised in relation to the to the a 12 eastbound off slip being closed, on occasions for nighttime works. That's, that's a real concern for how you bring and we've raised that in, in both our in both our local impact report and in our written representation. And the detail that local residents in Woodstock Avenue and, and kind of with Avenue would have to take I think it's about a 14 kilometre detour down to things junction 12 of the 12. So, certainly haven would probably suggest that the, the 12 minute diversion timeframe, even at night time with minimal traffic would be would be pushing it somewhat. We've we note the information that's set out in the applicants supplementary information reporting in regards to construction traffic, and particularly around what some the applicant has said is minimal rerouting off traffic during construction on to straight road and not kill road in the Barra and hiring and again, I don't Australian to matters that I know will be discussed on Friday, but just to mention it at this point in time havenwood would like to see mitigations secured to minimise the impact on those roads during the construction period. And the further points I'd like to make is within the construction traffic chapter of the supplementary information report the applicant has mentioned that some that some construction vehicle movements will need to perform a U turn at the junction of the a 12 with Petersfield Avenue, and we have requested that tracking be done by the applicant to ensure that vehicle movements can be safely made. At that junction. Thank you.

38:06

Thank you Mr. Douglas. Welcome Mr. Mr. Rolfe of the Metropolitan Police. I think you have your hand up.

38:13

Thank you Mr. McArthur. Can you hear me my team's is appalling today.

38:18

I can hear you perfectly well. Thank you lovely.

38:21

Yeah, my name is Matthew off. I'm a Serbian police officer for the Metropolitan Police Service currently employed by the traffic management road safety team. main role is to act as a statutory consultee responding on behalf of the Commissioner of match policy. And I've also registered myself as a registered interested party in this scheme and been listening with keen is regards to the commitment that Mr. Chalice has given for the traffic management plans to be published. And note concern from both council award. Jen Sargent and Jane Allen's comments regards to calls to service in both Kenilworth Avenue and Woodstock Avenue, both as you know are no three roads with access and egress by the a 12. We have called to service to all of those roads, and other areas within the build. not limited to such as maylands Golf Club gardens, a piece Muslim cemetery. We're a 24 hour service and we will like to be involved every step of the process. I have been informed by Eric Hill, Principal engineer at sweco limited that he's keen to involve me with discussion surrounding the features such as the observation platforms and hollow tire spike systems for the process. I am in deed keen and champing at the bit to be involved actively within the traffic management modelling for this scheme from the early onset. And just to reiterate, I am not a designer and will not be a designer for the actual plan itself. Were precluded from doing so under the health and safety legislation. But very interested to make sure that the traffic management plan is properly adhered to. And also for potentially a commitment for that to be put into the DCA. Thank you.

40:38

Thank you, Mr. Oh, can I come back to the applicant? I believe there are no other hands up from interested parties. Mr. Mr. Cates, Mark, a number of points raised. Can you can you can you honestly tell us as I see you you've joined us to respond please.

41:00

Yes, I'll respond to this the case while COVID England Firstly, the intention of the traffic management plan currently being visited is very much to absolutely minimise additional traffic delay construction wherever possible. So that that is the intention of the current plan. With regard to the closure overnight closures, the eastbound off slip to junk 28. My understanding is that because we are where the loop road comes in, we are effectively making fairly substantial amendments to that slip road as part of the works. And that means that there is a requirement for a deep, what's called a deep dig, to tie that back into the existing slip road at the junction, because the levels are different and everything else. So you know, and that can't be done other than by a foreclosure of that of that exit slip. So, that is why we are saying it's unavoidable. You know, this is it, the approach is to wherever possible, only have lane

closures rather than foreclosures. And where we have lane closures such as on the a 12. And on the 25. The intention is to use narrow lanes, so that we maintain the existing number of lanes through the junction as far as possible at all times. While most for as much as the time as possible. So, you know, it's just to provide the reassurance that the traffic management plan is aimed at minimising the disruption. As part of developing that management plan. When we get to the detailed design, the detailed traffic management plan that is secured through the decio there is already requirement to consult with the necessary stakeholders. And that is something very much that that would happen. And that would include the Metropolitan Police, that the buses for any bus diversions, bus operators as well as the local authorities. So those would be consultees and the traffic management would be discussed with those parties prior to finalisation of that plan.

43:21

And sorry, just sorry to interrupt that you're talking about the outline traffic management plan at this stage, that that will be considered during this examination or the final traffic management plan which will go to the Secretary of State.

43:34

The final one, the final one, I don't think the details on busto versions will be tied down as part of the outline traffic management plan that is something that would be dealt with at the at the detailed stage recognising that it is an issue that needs to be addressed.

43:50

And this the issue that that was raised by London Borough of hailing they have no doubt they will welcome consultation but they seek to go further and seek to have to agree before traffic management plan before it goes to the Secretary of State. How do you how do you respond to that?

44:15

And I'll ask my colleague Mike Chalice to answer that question.

44:28

Apologies I was on boot as regards the outline traffic management plan. We are aware that we will need to adjust requirement 10 in the draft decio to make provision for it. So we will do that when we next put forward a draft decio for you and it will provide for consultation with the relevant Highway Authority. So they will have a full say and the final version to go to the Secretary of State We'll be subject to that consultation, you'll be aware of the responses that we've already made that we are certainly not content to have to agree these documents with any other bodies, then the Secretary of State, the Secretary of State has that function under the decio, as we have drafted it, and we think that is appropriate, as is the case for I believe all other highways, England development consent orders, but there will be good and full consultation with the local authority, but we don't think it's appropriate that we should have to get multiple approvals from other highway or from the highway authorities and also from the Secretary of State. We say so that the Secretary of State is the appropriate organisation to give those approvals. And that's very firmly opposition.

46:01

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you as you allude to this, there will be further discussion on Friday, on the DCR specific issues as they relate to this. So I propose

46:18

if

46:19

there are no more hands up, which I don't see that we move on. My computer's slowed down incredibly. So can I just check that we know, we do

46:31

have a hand up? In this case,

46:38

Inspector? Yes, I just wanted to come back on the point about mitigation. As I as I said earlier on to mitigate the impacts during construction, I mean, that always England will do, you know, do what they do at all other locations where they implement schemes, as I said before, which will be about notifying the public as far as possible in advance of the works and road closures and such, with the aim of allowing people to return their journeys, prepare in advance for that, and make necessary alternative arrangements. And obviously, the modelling that we have undertaken takes no account of any suppression in in that it suppression of traffic demand during peak periods is a result of those mitigation measures. So you would expect there to be some impact from those measures in reducing the demand. So they're very much the modelling of the construction traffic impacts we presented in the transport settlement supplementary information report is a worst case scenario. And it also only reflects the short period of time when we have quite a lot of the temporary traffic management arrangements overlapping. They obviously do not overlap all of the, for the whole of the construction period. And we would anticipate less congestion delay at other times during construction period, other than for this, this this worse period when we anticipate over a couple of months when there will be an overlap quite a lot of the track temporary traffic management arrangements.

48:24

Thank you, Mr. Case, Mark. That's very informative. I do want to move on. I'm just checking for Hans Jane. Jane, Ellen, please go ahead.

48:41

Very briefly, I've listened. And I, I really would like the what you call out as the outline traffic management plan to be agreed before it gets a secretary of state. We mentioned this at the open forum hearing, purely and simply because of what hasn't been picked up over the last four plus five years. During consultation. There's been no effort to address the issues of local residents in Woodstock Avenue in Kenilworth avenue to date. So, certainly, from where I'm sitting, there's an element of trust issue here. I feel we need something more concrete and secure, signed, sealed and delivered before it gets to the end of the line and signed off. Please.

49:30

Thank you, Jane. That that that is noted. And I hope it's some reassurance that the essence of this this discussion that we're having at this stage is that the outline traffic management plan will be before the examination and there will be an opportunity for it to be to be examined before the examination closes. And for all comments to be made once that that is once that is prepared. So that is very much the purpose of have what we hope to achieve as well. And I will I will move on at this stage to our next agenda item, which is connectivity for non vehicular traffic and community severance in generally in general. In our written questions the examining authorities written questions, ta one point 11 and tier one point 12. We, we made some specific reference to the national networks national policy statements. And it's the objective set out within that calling for improvements on existing and or historic ins instances of suboptimal severance in the form of barriers to cycling and walking and a requirement to seek to deliver improvements that reduce community service respectively. The applicant in their responses, noted that has noted the proposed development would not affect routes for non motorised users about a new widened footway would be provided and that the proposed development would ensure that access to all surrounding properties is maintained. And can I just ask the applicant to go into a little more detail to expand somewhat on the proposals that they allude to in their response to ta one point 11 and explain perhaps how these proposals might address historic problems, how they might retrofit the latest solutions? And how they will ensure that it's easy and safe for cyclists to use junctions.

51:39

Thank you. So Mark Challis for highways England. Once again, I would like to ask Mr. Cates mark to respond to your question. Thank you.

51:52

Well, the scheme itself basically retains the current facilities and improves them in so much as improving the servicing widen some of the one of the footways, but it is it's it is pretty much a retaining the provision that exactly that is currently there, but making it more compliant with current standards. In terms of a wider approach, we have informed the issue around severance there's two aspects to this. There's the severance caused by the crossing the junction itself and then there's also some of the representations there was issues regarding severance along the a 12. If I first deal with the issue of severance along the a 12. Again we our position I was in your position is that the scheme results in insufficient changes in traffic flow along the a 12 to make a material difference to severance along the a 12. And therefore the issues of several insolently are 12 or a historic issue that is for TfL to address and not for highways England to address with regard to junction 28 itself. When you actually look at the location the junction it is the distance just it's not really on any significant desire line, current or desire line for pedestrian or cycle movement, Brentwood and hoovering are about two and a half kilometres apart. And there are no significant trip attractors between there, those two urban areas that would make a difference the different distance between them is also to realistically too far to walk equates to around a 14 minute walk time, I believe from memory. So and the issue of therefore the issue of severance at the junction causes. It's not just the junction as well it is that the severance is wider than that there are issues around psycho pedestrian facilities in the in the hinterland beyond the junction and therefore sold or upgrading provision at junction 28 wouldn't just a junction toward 28 doesn't solve any problem that that's there currently and the issue of severance currently. To do that you need to look at the wide area and look at how the network is connected further afield. And that is why highways England took

the view that it was better for any improvements for an amuse non motorised users at the junction to be incorporated into a wider scheme, which was separate to the DCA scheme. And as you're aware is separate to separate designated funding application.

54:59

Thank you Mr. case by case. So in essence, your view is that there is there is no meaningful usage of non motorised users around the junction and those and so therefore, to seek to improve the provision that's currently there would simply not be worth it.

55:21

Yes, without wider What? A look at the wider barriers to movement beyond junction 28.

55:30

Thank you. Can I can I ask interested parties whether they have any comments on that position at this stage?

55:44

Mr. Douglas. Thank you, sir. Yes, there are there are a couple of points that haven would like to raise in relation to specifically non motorised user navigation of the brookstreet roundabouts. I think that the first point I'd probably make making in response to what Mr. Cates Marcus has just said, regarding not being sufficiently usage of the, of the junction, by non motorised users at the moment to justify any further improvements being made. Without a broader look at the wider network, I think I think havenwood would say, That's because currently for a pedestrian and cyclist, it is, it is dangerous to safely navigate that junction. There are there are uncontrolled crossing points, particularly the M 25. southbound on slip, which, which is an uncontrolled crossing point and very dangerous for pedestrians and sort of VISTA to safely navigate it. So our view would be if improvements were made at that junction to allow pedestrians and cyclists to safely navigate it, suppressed demand would start using that that junction and you would get more people walking and cycling around the junction. The other point that I would make in terms of what you said at the start of this, this this item, sir, in terms of national network, national policy state policy statement, and whether or not the scheme takes that into account, I think in relation to pedestrians and cyclists havenwood saying it doesn't. Section three point 17 of the national policy statement says that the government expects applicants to use reasonable endeavours to address the needs of cyclists and pedestrians in the design of new schemes. Whilst we note what Mr. Cates markers has said in relation to the broader MMU scheme that's been looked at between Harold park in hiring and Brentwood via the brook street roundabout through the designated funds process, as the applicant has just mentioned, that is outside of this dcl. So we believe that that particular scheme that's been looked at outside of the decio process can't be used to as justification for how the scheme currently meets national network, national policy statements, particularly in relation to in relation to walking, walking and cycling. Thank you.

58:49

Thank you, Mr. Douglas. I share some of the views that you having walked around the roundabouts that there does appear to be on the face of it very obvious reasons why, why pedestrians would not want to use the roundabout to the extent that they currently do or do not. I don't think it's an enormous

understatement to say that you take your life in your hands crossing that road at various points. Mr. McDonnell, I'll come to you and then to Mr. reinberg. Food for your thoughts please.

59:29

Thank you very much. So yeah, just serving the treatment of mnu users on in this scheme has been quite disappointing. We totally agree with the statements made by favouring that the, you know, if it were central to the scheme, there could well be take up of cyclists and walkers and other forms of transport through the junction. It's disappointing. From Essex's perspective where we're looking hard at trying to improve conditions throughout the county, and to encourage active travel where possible that this scheme has specifically not included that as a central part. It's noted that the there is the designated funds scheme that we're working with the applicant on. But it would have been much more preferable to have that as a central part of the of the of the overall scheme.

1:00:37

Thank you. Noted. Mr. reinberg.

1:00:44

Yeah, I, we trust funded also fully agrees with what Mr. Douglas and Mr. McDonald have said about the pedestrian route. And particularly, whilst we recognise it does need a sort of a whole corridor looking at and that's the purpose of a designated funds scheme. The roundabout sits right in the middle of that corridor, and is this the main the main blockage. So that's where the critical issue is, which is probably reducing the number of people using fat route at the moment. The for one extra thing I wanted to add is that if TfL is to take on responsibility for the new a 12 eastbound off slip, we definitely need it to be demonstrated to Transport for London, but the pedestrian and cycle crossing that will be provided at the top of that of slip is adequately safe. It is designed in such a way. And we've also been seeking assurance that the design of a proposed development is consistent with the design of that separate scheme for which funds are being sought. And the applicant has stated in response to our query there, but the two schemes are not inconsistent, which I guess provides us some assurance on that matter.

1:02:06

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. reinberg. Coming back to you, at this point, Mr. Case, Mark. It. It is the views of it seems of interested parties that you could be doing more to meet the objectives of the MPs.

1:02:27

I think two points I think we towers in the stand up by their view that improving facilities in isolation at junction 28 would not result in any significant change in nmu usage through there because of the wider barriers to movement beyond junction 28. And therefore the approach to looking at a corridor approach was the more appropriate approach. And obviously that links in with that value for money issues around the scheme itself and whether incorporating improve pedestrian disease and isolation is part of the decio scheme would offer value for money. And I think that the view is why highways England that it didn't without that look at the wider the wider corridor or issues associated with that. So that would be the two points that that I'd make on that.

1:03:23

Okay, thank you. I will I will ask Jane Ellen to come in, she has a hand up. And before we close out

1:03:31

just as somebody who has walked the walk and, and dived. You know, you take your knife in your hands literally you're not. It's absolutely deadly up there. And we what we've been told, what we've read is that these schemes are supposed to prove accessibility on all modes of transport, not just car, walking, cycling, people with mobility, scooters, access to public transport. And I can guarantee there are many, I think you called them trip attractors or something like that. I'm not totally sure. But there are many places we would like to be able to get. By alternative means if it was safer, if there were barriers if they were proper traffic light, sort of signalling, you know, underpasses is actually probably a better system for the deer going under the 25 than there is for you know, for, for us humans beings trying to navigate that crossing. You've got people that go running. I know people, certainly our road that love cycling and they love you get out to Brentwood and it's countryside, but to get across that junction, it is horrendous. And so, again, I think we're not on the same hymn sheet here. We're not singing on the same page. It it's something that you know, while you're going to great lengths and great up Hazel, why not fix a problem that is already there? And it could improve everything for everybody, potentially.

1:05:11

Thank you, Jason.

1:05:12

My colleague, Mr. Allen has a question. And I'll pass it over to him. Yes, thank

1:05:21

you, Mr. McArthur. And if I could ask, if I could ask Mr. Cates, Mark B, I was intrigued by what the answer you gave just a few moments ago about looking at value for money and looking at whether such a improving connectivity was worthwhile. Could you just perhaps clarify for me? Did you actually go through an exercise of looking at improvement works? And if you did, what, what sorts of improvement works? Were you considering?

1:05:59

Yes, I mean, the as part of the standard procedure, a audit, if you like, of the existing junction was done for cyclists, horse riders, etc. Non motorised users. And that looked at that, and that did identify that some of the shortcomings in the in the junction arrangement, but it did also look at the wide area wasn't focused purely on the junction itself. So that did look at the wider corridor issue. And, and it was a result of that, that study that that led highways England to the conclusion that the appropriate approach was to deal with this as a corridor approach, not as a as part of the scheme and to be subject to a separate designated funding application process.

1:06:47

And just I suppose for the benefit of everybody here, could you just briefly explain what you mean by a corridor

1:06:53

approach? Well, that's looking at the connectivity between basically between Harold Howard's Hill and Brentwood and looking at what facilities and the adequacy of those facilities between junction 28 east and west between those two urban areas and looking at what further needs to be done along those corridors to remove barriers, existing barriers for pedestrians, cyclists, along those along those routes.

1:07:27

And what is your solution to that?

1:07:30

Well, the solution is the designated funds scheme, which you know, is not part of its sdcl I need to make that absolutely clear. involves upgrading pedestrian cycle facilities between house Hill and Brentwood, including improvements at junction 28. So it's a combination of on road and off road cycle facilities and a junction 28 it ribbon bowls, all the crossings cross junction 828 being under signal control. So the crossing, if I can explain it a little difficult paths without a plan but the crossing from Brook Street, there would be a shared pedestrian cycle route along the north side foot way of Brook street, and then pedestrians would cross in front of the stop line for the off slip from the a 12 under signal control, then they would cross again under signal control to the centre the roundabout itself in the centre, then they would be shepherded shared pedestrian socceroo around the southern perimeter of the roundabout, the inside Island, the roundabout, and then on the other side, they would cross under signal control across the stop line on the circulatory carriageway, and then cross again on under signal controller on this on slip from the end 25.

1:09:04

I'm gonna ask you to explain that all over again. If you would mind. At this time, I'd like to just have the work plan in front of me so I can just follow your description it would that be Would that be okay. Yeah, he said he said it. You said that the designated fund scheme would fund a cycleway starting on the north side of Brook Street. Is that correct? Yes. Okay, could you now take me Take me from there, please.

1:09:32

Okay, so it would be a shared pedestrian cycle route approaching the junction 28 on Brook Street. So it would be on the north side of Brook Street. And then there would be a crossing across the exit slip from the a 12 which would be under signal control. You

1:09:55

Yes, I'm following you. Yeah.

1:09:57

And then there'd be another crossing across the circulatory carriageway, again, under signal control, taking pedestrian cyclists to the central Island, if you like the middle of the roundabout, yeah. Then on the middle of the roundabout along the southern perimeter, there'd be a shared pedestrian cycle route going under the M 25. Yeah. And then there would be two further crossings, one across the circulator carriage way, or the, if you like the Southwest node of the roundabout, and then a crossing across the exit slip from the 25. And both those crossings would be under signal control. And then there'll be a

share pedestrian cycle route going down the on slip on to the westbound a 12 connecting up with an enhanced cycle routes to Harold Hill. And that's why we can say that the scheme does not preclude that that scheme. There's nothing in the decio scheme that would preclude the introduction of that scheme at junction 28. Okay,

1:11:11

thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Carter.

1:11:21

Thank you, Mr. Allen. Just to close off this point, I'm slightly conscious of time, but it's noted. Thank you for that explanation. Mr. Case, Mike. It's noted that the scheme as it stands doesn't preclude it. I suppose I'll come back to the original question, which if looked at, in within the framework of the NPS objectives, why given that what you've just described, is focused precisely on the junction and therefore related to the works that are part of this proposal. Why you wouldn't seek to implement them as part of this application. If the MPs calls for free to, to essentially to do that.

1:12:15

I think it's quite simply that the way highways England the designated funding is, within highways England is specifically aimed at providing these, if you like, additional benefits sit alongside their regular requirements for the maintenance upgrade of the strategic road network. And, and it was, it was for that reason that I'm always eager and chose to use the designated funds route. Because that is, if you like where the pot of money sits for, for improving this sort of dressing these sorts of issues, rather than specifically in this case, including it within the dcl application.

1:13:01

And what might the timeframe be for implementing the type of solution that you've just described? Is this something that would be able to be brought online? alongside the construction works that form part of the proposed developments? Or is this something which is a 510 year issue further down the line?

1:13:26

Well, firstly, I can say that the scheme has been designed up in detail and is currently going being considered so it's past the first step of being approved, in principle, it is now going forward for approval for funding highways England, for detailed instruction for implementation, that that approval has not been granted as yet. But it will be considered within the next few months, I believe, in terms of that, and then that the hope is that it will you know, that the investment is there, it's been designed to detail level, and therefore there would be subject to approval. You know, the anticipation is it would be implemented fairly imminently after that.

1:14:15

And

1:14:17

I'm afraid I don't know the full details, because it's it is a separate scheme.

1:14:22

Of course, that's understood. It's just a question of perception, then imminent to one person may be very different to eminent in highways, England terms. Again, coming back to the question asked, Is this something that could conceivably realistically be implemented as part of the proposed development? Or is it something that the worst case scenario you can imagine is that the proposed development, if it's granted, approval goes ahead is constructed. And then this work follows on and causes further disruption?

1:14:58

Yeah, I understand that. Can I come back to you and clarify? I think the best thing is we go back to highways England and ask them where they are in the process and their anticipated timescales for delivery of that scheme. Subject to it being approved. We will confirm that, you know, as soon as we have that information, that would be very helpful.

1:15:21

Thank you very much, Mr. Case, Mark. Jane, Jane, Ellen has a hand raised again, can I come back to you, Jane,

1:15:29

I've just picked up one of the consultation brochures that we've been sent many over the last four or five years, this is from December 2018. And under pedestrians, cyclists, horse riding walkers, it says very clearly that the scheme design will aim to improve the permanent routes by installing safer crossing points, which will link the existing public rights of way I, to me that I thought that was the intention all along. And not just to, you know, or not. And again, the more I'm listening, the more I kind of worried I become that unless this stuff doesn't get signed, sealed and delivered and what I believe you call a decio. It may not happen. It may be someone else's problem. So I'm very appreciative that this has been brought up.

1:16:34

Thanks, Jane and Mr. Cates, Mark, do you?

1:16:39

Do you have a response?

1:16:42

I'm not sure I can add much more to what I've already said other than I think the fact that the scheme is being taken forward as detailed design, you know, shows that there is true commitment from highways England to deliver that designated fund scheme and subject to it being formally approved. And I think not sure I can say any more on the matter.

1:17:06

Okay. Well, as you said, you will get that information to us. As soon as you can. We I'm sure I'm not alone in saying that we, as examining authority, look forward to seeing the information contained in that. I will I will close this point now, and it is just after one o'clock. So I propose that we now break for

lunch, we will break for lunch for an hour or so. Just under an hour. we'll resume at two o'clock. And I'll remind again, anybody who's tuned in on the live stream, that they will need to refresh the browsers when we return. Thank you all and we will see when we resume