

TEXT_OFH1_SESSION1_18112021

Thu, 11/18 11:12AM • 56:56

Good morning, everyone, the time is now 10am and this open floor hearing for the a 57 liquid project is open. Thank you all for joining us today. Please get a member of the case team confirm the talking to her clearly and the live streaming and recording have both started.

Yes, I can confirm you can be heard clearly on the live stream and recording has started. Thank you.

Thank you. To avoid disrupting the hearing please Could everyone keep your microphone muted and camera off until I invite you to speak. Thank you. My name is Stuart Cowperthwaite. And I'm the Lead member of the panel of examining inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State for the application made by highways England for an order granting development consent for the a 57 link road project. Whilst the application was submitted under the name of highways England the applicant's name has since changed to national highways. Our examination of the 857 encroach application started yesterday. Following the preliminary meeting on Tuesday. I was to be joined today by Ian Dyer who is the other member of the panel. Unfortunately, however, in has recently caught COVID and is unable to join us I'm pleased to report the in does appear to be improving camo a case team works alongside us throughout the process. With us today is Edwin Mody, who is our case manager James Benton and Max Baldwin other case officers. If you have any questions or queries about the examination process or the technology we're using it virtual events, or how those events are arranged, they should be your first point of contact. I will now run through some housekeeping matters. And we'll repeat a couple of things that were covered in the arrangements conference for those that are watching the live stream or the recording. As I've already mentioned, this event is being both live streamed and recorded. As explained in our letter of the 19th of October 2021. The recordings will be retained and published. These recordings will form a public record and can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulations apply. The planning spectris practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Therefore, if you participate in today's open for hearing, it is important that you understand that you'll be recorded and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to the planning decision. It will only be 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. Bearing that in mind, please could you try your best not to say anything that you would wish to be kept private or that is confidential? Please could anybody joining in teams minimise any background noise when they're speaking? This includes switching off or muting your mobile phone if you're not using it to join the hearing. These also remember that the chat function on teams will not be enabled or in use. So please don't try to use that for questions or comments. I will only use the raise a hand function in Microsoft teams at specific points in the agenda when I invite general comments. I'll also give people who did not

have that feature or do not wish to use it as an opportunity to comment at the relevant time. If you're watching the live stream, then please be aware that it will be stopped when I adjourn the hearing. If I adjourn the hearing, you will need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted hearing. I'll remind you of that, if I attend. You may find it useful to have our letter of the 19th of October 2021. And the agenda that was published on the ninth of November 2021 attend. relevant parts of those documents will be displayed on the screen during this meeting. For those who are watching. I will highlight which parts of those documents the tie I'm referring to for anybody that is not watching. The purpose of the OpenFlow hearing is for us to hear the views of those interested parties who request to be heard. It's an opportunity for us to hear your thoughts about the application and firsthand. I'm not going to ask all people here to introduce themselves at this point. However, I would like to know who is representing and will speak for the applicant please.

Good morning sir. That's myself. Mrs. Vicki Fowler solicitor and lead legal adviser from Gowling WL G. So I should say that we don't, we don't expect to, to speak or to respond to the representations today, but obviously to the extent you do need to hear from us, then that obviously I can I can assist where I can.

Okay, thank you, Mrs. I will, I will give you an opportunity to respond at the end, but it's for you to decide.

Thank you.

Thank you. I will not invite any of the introductions at this stage with excuse me, we structured the hearing today. So that you will have an opportunity to make your submission when I invite you to speak at the relevant point on the agenda. Please keep your microphone muted and camera off until I until I invite you to speak. Each time that you speak, please give your name and if appropriate organisation for the formal record. I will cover the points in the agenda that was published on the ninth of November 2021. Please, could the case team now share a copy of the agenda on the screen?

Thank you could we could we zoom in a little bit please. And perhaps lose the the pain on the left hand side. Okay. So if you can just go down to Agenda Item, there we go. Thank you very much. So we're just about to complete agenda item one. Just one final point under agenda item one. Prevalence can comfort if necessary, we'll take regular breaks. Normally these will be at intervals of roughly an hour. And then each of those breaks will be a relatively short break. However, should we extend into the afternoon there'll be a longer break for lunch. Are there any questions about the agenda or the arrangements for this hearing please? No, thank you. So let's move on to agenda item two. I've partly covered this already. But just to add a little bit more information. The purpose of purpose of this hearing is to give interested parties an opportunity to make oral representations about the application. This hearing is subject to our powers of control over its conduct as established by the Planning Act 2008. To

be clear, the purpose of this hearing is to assist our examination. This area is not to be used as a platform for the means in any attempt to do that will not be tolerated. Each interested party who's indicated to wish to speak will be invited in turn to speak at the appropriate time. These all submissions should be based on representations previously made in writing by the speaker. However, they should not simply repeat matters previously covered in written submissions, but rather provide further detail explanation, and corroborative evidence that will help to inform this. Set out in the agenda. We've suggested that each speaker completes their submission within 15 minutes. I will as I consider necessary, ask questions of the speaker. And as I've mentioned already provide the applicant with an opportunity to respond at the end of all of the other submissions. Please direct any comments questions and answers through me rather than through any other party? Are there any questions about the agenda or how This hearing will be conducted? Thank you. So let's move on to Agenda Item three, where I'm seeking confirmation of who will speak today. And there have been a number of changes to the agenda which I will go through changes in terms of who will speak today. So I'm not going to invite parties who provided notification of their wish to speak at this hearing to identify themselves in the order set out in agenda three with one or two exceptions. When I invite you to speak please unmute your microphone if you're comfortable to switch on your camera when I invite you to speak. Please switch them off again when I move to the next speaker. So firstly, I understand that Sophie Williams will be representing Seville's today and that Mr. Moe will not be joining us. Is that correct? Please. Is it Mrs. Williams?

Thank you, Chair. Thank you, sir. Yes, it's Miss Sophy Williams. Yes. Thank you.

Thank you. Could I invite Mr. Wimberly to introduce himself, please?

Yes, I'm here. I'm not seeing myself on cameras.

Thank you, Mr. Wimberly.

Yeah, I'm here.

Thank you. Haley Simpson and Michaela Bromley had originally asked to attend. But I understand that both now sent their apologies. And have submitted a written statement instead, which we've received. And we'll accept that into the examination. That statement will be published with the deadline once submissions on Wednesday, the first of December 2021. Next, release hype. Peaking Green New Deal. I believe that Linda Walker speaking and Peter Allen are not joining us today.

Yes, that's right. I'm here. I'm Linda Walker.

Thank you. How should I refer to Mrs. Walker Linda Walker, Linda. Okay. Thank you. And thank you for joining us today. Just to clarify, high peak green new deals request to speak at this hearing was received after the deadline for requests. However, we did decide to accept the submission and invite high peak Green New Deal to speak today. And next on to CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire. I understand that Dr. Owen Robinson is attending this hearing, but has not been joined in by colleagues and that Dr. Robinson does not wish to make an altar mission today. Is that correct, please?

That's correct, sir. Thank you very much.

Thank you. Is there anybody else who might wish to speak today? I think we've covered everybody. Now, thank you. So thank you all for attending today. Thank you for taking the time to prepare submissions. And I'm certainly very interested in what you have to say. So thank you for joining us. Let's move on to Agenda Item four, please. So I'm now going to invite the parties to speak in turn in your to set out in the agenda item out of four with the following except Except exceptions Excuse me. Firstly, Caleb Romney isn't joining us today as I advised early earlier. Secondly, there won't be no submission from CPRP district and South Yorkshire as we just heard. And there are one or two changes to the speakers, which would which have been through already. So whilst relatively few parties have indicated that they wish to speak, I would still ask that everyone keep your old statements to Satan to the point. And I would be grateful if you could take it to the 15 minutes indicated in the agenda. I may if you become repetitious, ask you to move on or conclude your old statement as I do wish to hear from difficulty. When I invite you to speak, please unmute your microphone. And if you're comfortable to switch on your camera, please switch them off again, when I move to the next speaker. Each time that you speak, please give your name and if appropriate organisation for the formal record. As I mentioned earlier, I'll give the applicant an opportunity to respond to all submissions at the end. And I will be taking notes while people speak. So please don't be put off by that. And please don't be put off if not always looking at the screen. So please could I now hear from Sophie Williams of civils

Thank you, sir. So yes, my name is Sophie Williams. I'm a chartered town planner at Sandals, and I act on behalf of two landowner clients. Firstly crossways commercial estates limited. And then second Mr. David Radford am conscious I do not want to repeat what is written within our previous representation to national highways and given we will still be submitting further written reps, I will therefore focus on the key points. Firstly, I would like to confirm our support in principle of eight to seven link road. My clients instead have specific comments on the root alignment of the road. I would like to reiterate concerns my clients have in respect to the road alignment in the interests of avoiding the sterilising of land which has development potential. It is worth pointing out at this juncture that as part of the places of people consultation steward the Greater Manchester we submitted land to this Also the pose link road as potential for development on the back of the new road infrastructure. My clients would also like to comment on particular aspects of the scheme. With specific consideration to crossways commercial land land registry reference GM 917343 We have a preference for moving the river smo crossing

further south woods as per the 2018 design in respect in respect of Mr. David Bradford's land land registry reference GM 0306567, which abuts carhouse lane, we raise issue with the location of the attenuation areas. And we kindly request that the attenuation areas are moved southwards to ensure these are outside my clients land. We would also like confirmation that access provision will be retained in my clients learned via care house lane, as mentioned previously, will be submitting written representations at the appropriate time and can therefore build on the points raised in today's open floor hearing. Thank you for your time.

Thank you. Mr. Williams. Can I Can I just ask for a couple of clarifications if possible. Are these are these all issues that you've raised previously? With? Yes, yeah.

They're in our written representations. Yes. We have written to them previously. Yeah.

Okay. And you'll be expanding on them. In your written representation. Yes. Very good. And will you be able to provide plans which clarify the areas of land that you're referring to in which clarify the proposals that you're making?

Yes, CATIA, we can submit title plans and everything within our written representations. Yes.

Yes. It's very helpful to see a drawing as well, that shows in visual form, the type of suggestion that you're making, yes, yeah, that's

fine. Yes, sir.

Okay, thank you very much, indeed. Thank you. Next, could we hear from Mr. Wimberly, please? There we go. Mr. Man,

yeah. Can you hear me? All right?

Yes, yes, perfectly. Well, thank you. Okay.

Well, there's a lot of states here, and I'm apprehensive. But this makes sense and goes well. I'm very pleased and heartened that two things you said yesterday. One was when you said that you're a stickler for facts. And I too, am a stickler for facts. And you use the phrase, data, methodology and

assumptions and are meant to that. And my mind went straight to my request for data, methodology and assumptions, which I made to highways England about traffic, both current network data and predicted network flows? And the answer was no, can't have the data, you can't have the methodology. And, and you can find the assumptions here buried in mountains of very technical stuff on the on the DFT, webs for transport website. So I think the that wasn't helpful at all. And the other thing that pleased me, and I'll return to that later about the nature of the consultation in general, and I was England's attitude in this matter. And the other thing you said was about how one person's view and lots of people's view basically has the same weight if lots of people said the same thing. And for the sake of argument, it was nonsense, in shorthand, and one person said something that made sense, then you would weigh that accordingly. And it didn't really the number of people saying something isn't what matters. It's not a voting exercise. And again, amen to that, and I do take comfort from that. And I think all of us who are taking part in this whole process, will be pleased to know that. So a few words about myself. And that will take me on to climate change. Then I will make a plea to yourself, sir. And then I will say something about the consultation process as carried out by highways England. And at the end, I think I would have hoped to say a few words about how this could have gone, how this should have happened, and how it still could happen. For the sake of all of us. I first heard about this scheme, from by chance, really from a local councillor, here in Bamford local district councillor, and she mentioned that this scheme was being looked at and proposed. And I didn't know about it. And so I took a look at the website. And I find myself, I found myself drawn in like a moth to a flame. I'm not over rejoice to have given up months in my life to this, and I will be giving up on my life to it. But anyway, I went to the website. And I struggled, I couldn't see what the road was trying to do. There was no clear statement of aims in terms which could be operationalized, in which you could measure the outcomes and say, yes or no, we've done that. I couldn't see any real evidence for the assertions being made. And especially it was clear that Motrin would gain. And eventually, I got hold of a map where you could see how many properties in Motrin again, and it was a very, very small number. And the effects on everywhere else in the area in the study area, are completely unknown and not spelled out. And when was the alternative? There was no, there was this stick. And after 50 years, you think they might have offered to the public. Alternative, and there was no traffic data at all. So I asked for traffic data. And I asked how many properties would experience

an increase in traffic usage? And how many properties would experience a decrease in traffic nuisance? Like for instance, people have Mottram itself. And, again, I got no facts in reply. And various reasons given which I won't go into now. But reasons, didn't stand up to examination. So I personally was denied information. And I will come to how the general public was provided for later on. So that was my first brush with this scheme. Why was I there looking at this? And there are two reasons really why I'm concerned with this road scheme and road schemes in general. And one is process. How have we reached this point? And how can it be that the scheme is still still alive or not, not dead, having been conceived or 50 years ago. And the other matter was not at that process. I've always had a life long concern with process, good process doesn't necessarily lead to good outcomes. But it is a necessary condition for good outcomes, bad process, bad outcomes. Outcomes that are not shared, that are not bought into by people, and just plain don't work. And the second driver for my being here is climate change. And a few words on climate change, I find it and sort of the overarching thing is I find it hard to conceive of why we are talking about the skin in the light of the imperative of facing climate change.

The evidence, the evidence is all about us. We've seen this year, wildfires all over the world, in places like Siberia. We've seen flooding in Europe, major flooding, where two of the richest countries in the world couldn't cope. And that is just the beginning because the science tells us this is not going to get better is going to get worse year on year. Where are the leaders at the leaders at COP 26 We have had them paraded in front of us we all know where they stand now. Where they stand a call subscribe to what I'm saying which is that this is a real emergency See, and we must act now. And this is all rooted in the science. I've looked at the IPCC, October 2017. Report enough to know what is at stake here. And we are in an emergency. And I'm frankly, frightened my screensaver on the other computer is a picture of my daughter and my granddaughter of an of another child actually. So it's her and her auntie running through a green field perfectly in sync and she's about six years old. And they are their legs and arms just happened to be in the in the photo perfectly synchronised and it tears me up every time I see it. And that's why I'm here. And all of us sitting in this room or not in this room, in everybody's home office, or whatever, has family and children and grandchild. Or close people who are close, and we are all in this boat. I won't go into the reasons which spell out that actually the situation is worse than we are being portrayed 1.5 degrees and the steps that we are being asked to take to get to 1.5 degrees. There are matters of probabilities in those calculations, which are frankly, we are being asked to go along with a two thirds chance of getting across the road safely. You wouldn't say to your child, you can cross this road with a one in three chance to be dead on the way. That is what we are subscribed to now. And why is the aggressor tunberg Wanting to be 50 I think you get it down to No the other way around. She wants it to be the highest chances are two thirds chance. So 5050

It's it's just too low. And then there are the tipping points, which are not in the figures not included in the carbon budgets. But that all just goes to show how important this is and how every kilo and every tonne of carbon saved makes the world a safer place or rather a less unsafe place. This scheme was conceived 15 years ago. Climate change was not a thing. But it's certainly a thing now and here we are in front of a scheme where there is no low carbon alternative on offer. This scheme does not fit in a world where the Prime Minister says that got 26 that we are at one minute to midnight and the clock is ticking. It doesn't fit in a world where between I was going to say where we are witches in Glossop mentally. I'm in gossip, and my Hovind Bamford in between us is Kinder Scout, and millions of pounds of being spent on restoring the peak box on Kinder scout and Bleaklow. That is the world we're living in, we are crashing ourselves to try and get to a place of safety. And the government has set statutory targets and those targets increase in severity and strictness. Almost every year, you said yesterday, so that this scheme comes under the NPS, the national policy statement for roving rail, or to give it its official title for the net national networks. But that scheme was written that sort of that policy statement was written in 2014. Now seven years on and the scheme that the policy statement is under review, for the very reason that it is obsolete and does not take adequate account of climate change. Well, how could it it's seven years old, and the targets have shifted four times at least since then. So we have a scheme based on a national policy statement that is under review. And is comes up against an entirely different the scheme is set in a like a tower block of law and regulation and thts and all kinds of acronyms that support the scheme we have in front of us but on the other side of the hill, there is a completely different power bloc built up of climate change laws and regulations, which say something utterly different. And in the end, so you have to choose. And that is the question Oh, while the the the what I wish to put to you today really fundamental is that to choose between those two is something

that at the end of the day when you come to write your report you are going to have to do, and I suggest that it's a moral decision. It's about what is right. And I think I mentioned that on Tuesday. That's what you will be facing is, and then the questions really throughout the and I asked you to think about it throughout the hearings, and throughout reading the written submissions. is a question of, is this right? For the people of the area for the people who live in Yandi area as I do as I will be directly affected more traffic comes over snake pass down from Bamford the people of the whole country and the people of the whole world. Because the carbon budget which the scientists tell us we have is so many bigger tonnes and I won't go into detail, but it is a carbon budget. I prefer to think of it as a carbon bucket. And it has so many Giga tonnes in it already. And every million tonnes we add to the bucket is a million times near the absolute limit, which we can't go beyond. And that has to be weighed against the scheme, which has all this acronym soup behind it. And apparently it comes under a national policy. Actually, it contradicts bigger, overarching national policy and national effort. National prices, actually

was Mr. Wimberly. Thank you, could I I'm sorry. Pause you there. We are at the 15 minute period indicated. I do want to hear your remaining points, though. But if

if you could possibly. And that is all climate change. Yeah, if you could possibly

start to run through the others fairly efficiently.

I'm sorry, that restriping team is right, the public consultation in Brea was so flawed, that it fails that old principles, I think highways England did not comply with the known principles which they are subject to as a public body. And it is quite possibly, that they quite possible, they broke the law in that the consultation did not comply with their own agreed statement of consultation, what's it called SOCC statement of community consultation, there was no crappy data given to the public, there was no indication of the benefits and just benefits of the scheme. The number of properties, as I said mentioned earlier, the number of properties experiencing less nuisance from traffic and more news, and traffic was nowhere to be seen. The statements about noise in the consultation brochure are visible, they only concern the actual line of the road where they say there's going to be less noise Mottram Well, of course, and more noise on the lower bit with the other bits of the proposed scheme. So the public consultation was not valid. The public had no way of assessing this scheme. And another thing they failed to mention was the cost cost of the scheme. So the public had no trigger to think, wow. That's a lot of money. What else could we buy with that would improve our lives, improve our transport, improve our public spaces? So that's the public consultation and I'm deeply deeply disquieted by it. And it is failed the public did so I just find the effect. And for you, sir, there's a deeper issue here, which is the nature of the beast, the nature of highways England, they seem to be in a silo even though they are situated within the, as I understand it, within the regional infrastructure sort of set up. They don't see their role as part of the infrastructure sector. We are being given a road and nothing but a road ski. So where is the wider picture? And it seems to me, sir, that they are behaving in this matter more like a commercial developer than like a public body. They don't seem to be considering the public interest,

they seem to be pursuing some other interests. Like a commercial developer who wants to build 1000 houses on a greenfield site. And to get permission, they will do what it takes and say things in a certain way, in order to make the case as best as possible. I'm not sure that that is a legitimate way for our senior to proceed, it appears to be the way they have proceeded. And I question how they came to be in that position. And the way the bureaucracy is set up in order to produce outcomes like this. So that's a wider question for you to maybe consider, and I will obviously refer to it in my in my written submissions, I think that's probably all you're going to allow me to have time for. But if I could just say that how this could have gone is a genuine consultation, where NGOs and the public and highways income and transport planners could get round tables, and treated as a round table and find a way to make lots of Mottram, Holly wasn't interested in all these places better off. And I know that I could take that and conceive of a completely different and low carbon outcome that would benefit the people of that area, more than the scheme ever.

Mr. Wimberly. Thank you. And thank you, and thank you for wrapping up. If you have, if there are more points you haven't made today, then please do include them in your written representation. Please, could I just raise a couple of theories. So you referred to some information being buried in a large number of application documents, I think if you could set out the information that you can't find, then that would be helpful, because we can ask the applicant to signpost that information for you. And in fact, we may be able to help find certain information as well. And so please, please, please do if you can take the time to signpost that. I think I just I just make a general reference to you refer to the NPS and to changes in legislation, if you like and changes in policy around climate change, we do have to refer to the latest policy guidance and the 2014 NPS is the is the latest version. So we have to give that the proper weight. And that we will take into account any any policy or legislation around climate change that has happened since then. And we have to base our decision on legislation and policy issues of compliance with with with legislation and policy in particular. And so that were very closely guided in that respect. Again, if there are examples of where you felt, and really encouraged you to set out any detail, very specific detail of the the arrows your disquieted about Iran consultation, so very, very specific examples of most helpful for us in that respect. So, so I appreciate your general statements, but it's really the specific examples which are the most helpful. Thank you. That's, that's otherwise, as I mentioned, please do try to include as much as you can in your written representation for the first December. Thank you. And thank you for taking the time today and actually for quite a heartfelt submission as well. Appreciate that. Could we move on then to high peak Green New Deal, please. And I believe that Linda Walker is going to speak for high peak Green New Deal, Mr. Wimberly. You might want to switch your camera, please. Linda Walker, please.

Hello. Yes, I'm Linda Walker. I'm the coordinator of high peak Green New Deal. And we are a climate action group affiliated to Friends of the Earth. We campaign for urgent and radical actions. locally and by the UK Government to cut carbon emissions, restore nature, protect our public services, and to create a society where no one's left behind. You face just hosted the cop 26 Climate Summit, where our prime minister lectured other world leaders about the need to get serious about urgently tackling climate change. This from the leader of the government, which is planning to allow new drilling for oil, new coal mines, reducing taxes on domestic flights, and has allocated 27 billion pounds to building new

roads. As a green New Deal group, we were always going to oppose the building of this new road. But we expected it to be a really uphill battle. Because we know so many people in the area have waited decades for something to happen to improve the traffic jams. But once we've seen the proposed route, we were convinced that it shouldn't be too difficult to get the majority of people on our side in opposing the plans. When we've talked to people on the street about the road, very often they haven't seen the actual plan. And they think on balance they like a new road. But when we show them the plans, they're amazed that it does absolutely nothing for the people intent, whistlin Hollingworth are blighted by such heavy traffic going through and it will actually funnel more traffic into Glossop and on up to the snake pass. Transport is the largest source of carbon emissions in the UK, it's responsible for about 27% of our total emissions. Between 1990 and 2018, the energy sector managed to reduce emissions by over 60%. But transport reduced by less than 5%. So cars became more efficient. But there was an increase in traffic of 29%. And the Department of Transport is predicting that traffic will increase again by up to 59%. By 2050. That simply cannot happen. We've got to make major cuts. Yes, we need electric cars. But we can't replace all the combustion engine cars we have with electric cars. This will create a serious problem with over use of scarce resources and cause exploitation and major health problems for the people in Chile and the other countries whether lithium is mined. So we've got to reduce the amount of traffic on our roads, and new roads always increased traffic. car ownership is embedded in our culture. But this is something we've just got to change. We need to promote car sharing and shared taxis in cities like Amsterdam, and Copenhagen, cycling seems a normal way of getting around. And the only way we're going to make that happen here is if we build wide safe spaces for people to cycle. We could encourage the use of E bikes and make some available for hire. Every pound invested in encouraging people to walk and cycle apparently saves 13 pounds in healthcare costs. We ought to adopt 20s Plenty slow the traffic in residential areas, making it safer for people to walk and cycle for children to play. And to create new safe cycleways and footpaths. We need to invest in frequent affordable buses. And as soon as possible make them electric or hydrogen powered. And we need to get people onto the trains for cheaper, more flexible fares are more regular trains. So I welcome what's being said today that the government is going to invest 96 billion in trains. Let's hope that's a reality and not just a smokescreen to cover up for the cancellation of the Northern high spin group. Think how much better life would be to people intend to so if they didn't have these huge lorries thundering past every day, creating noise and air pollution and danger for their children. There needs to be a ban on heavy lorries passing through the National Park. If they had to travel around the motorway system, they'd soon be a lot of pressure from companies to start to switch more freight onto the railways, which is what we really need to do.

Since these road proposals were first considered preventing climate breakdown has become much more widely acknowledged as the urgent task that it is. And the other great changes that during COVID Many people have worked at home and a lot of them watch continue to do that at least part of the time. There is just no need for this road. It doesn't have any significant problems. And it adds to our carbon emissions in a totally unacceptable way. So we must try the alternatives first, and create a cleaner, safer and healthier future locally. That's going to contribute to the sort of world we're all want to see. Thank you.

Thank you very much. And thank you for doing that so succinctly. Could I just ask a couple of things, please. So firstly, you actually a general point, first of all, so does does Hi, Pete Green New Deal represent other interested parties? At all? Are you linked with other parties who have submitted to the application, the examination rather?

Well, we support, we've supported CPRE in the information that they've put in and they give us some help and guidance.

Thank you very much. So if I, if I could just Where's a couple of things? So you referred I think, to the 59% increase in traffic by 2050. Is that correct?

That that is apparently a prediction by the Department of Transport, that that is how much traffic is expected to increase by the middle of the century? Okay,

if possible, could you provide a reference to that? In your written submission? So I wouldn't be interested in seeing, seeing that figure. And where that is from the source of that figure, please. That would be very helpful. Will you be submitting a written representation? And would you include the matters you've raised today? And the facts and or the corroborating evidence for that in your submission? Yes, yes, that would be very helpful. Thank you very much. Indeed, I was going to let me make a general point, which I know that CPR and speaking, but it's a point that I made at the preliminary meeting. And it made me apply to, to hopefully Green New Deal to some extent as well. So we are encouraging people who have the same views to coordinate submissions. So if parties are in contact with each other, or CPRE, or high peak Green New Deal are representing the interested artists, potentially, then I would encourage you or CPRE, to have other interested parties confirmed to us that you're speaking for them. And I would very much encourage you CPRE AND, and OR high peak Green New Deal to coordinate submissions on behalf of others, if you feel that you're able to, it is most helpful for us to receive. To avoid having repetition on and number of points by an artist for the reason I said earlier, and to actually have the highest quality of submissions possible is particularly helpful. And ones that really get to the heart of the things that we need to consider in our recommendation. So just a general plea, the parties to work together, and you may feel it appropriate to to work with other interested parties, have them confirm to us that that you're representing them going forward, that will be very helpful. Thank you very much. Right. So I believe that completes all of the submissions from parties that have asked to speak today. Is there anybody else who would like to speak? Who hasn't spoken already? No. So as I as I mentioned, Mrs. Robinson, sorry. But Dr. Robinson,

it's okay. You can call me and I was just interested by your last comment about encouraging us all to work together. And we really appreciate that. That's what we try to do. Are you suggesting that we draw one being written representation together from all the people that might share the same views? Is that what you're suggesting?

If you're able to do that, that will be very helpful. We typically have too and one of the reasons for this is actually very selfish, because we have to we have to deal with often a very, very large volume of information. So if if there is a coordination between different submissions and those were to come to us in one document, then that is the most helpful for us. But at the same time, we don't want to stop people from giving their views if their views are different, and they, you know, they, they prefer to provide those individually, then some people will prefer to do that. But I am heartened by your suggestion. And if you are able to help corral and guide people on their submissions, that would be very helpful indeed. But please do. Yes, thank you, but sorry to cut across you. But as I suggest, if you can have the parties that you will be representing on behalf of letters know that they're happy for you to do that, then then that will be very helpful. Does that make sense?

Yeah, that's really helpful. Thank you.

Thank you. Thank you very much, indeed. Anybody else? Where the point to raise at the moment? I think there's an Robinson his hand is still up. I think that's a legacy one. And the other points? No, thank you. Right. So as I mentioned earlier, I'm going to give the applicant an opportunity to respond if they would like to.

Thank you, sir. Mrs. picchi Fowler on behalf of the applicant, sir. I'd also like to thank the speakers for taking the time today on behalf of the applicant. And it is helpful to have the comments that they provided today, by WAV or submission. We obviously have relevant representations from all of the speakers today. And we will be responding to those by deadline one, which is currently programme for Wednesday, first December. I noticed also that the speakers have agreed to set out their comments further in, by way of written representations. And again, the intention is that we would respond to those by deadline three sides. So I don't propose to say anything more today. Thank you.

Okay, thank you very much indeed. So I let me give one final opportunity. Anything else anyone? Anyone wishes to raise within the scope of this hearing? Now, thank you. So we're moving on to Agenda Item five. As I mentioned earlier, and very grateful for the speakers to indicate that they would submit summaries of the and potentially more detail of the matters mentioned in their oral submissions in their written representations. And the date for those to be submitted is the Friday the 14th of January. That's that was the draft timetable. And that date will be confirmed in the final timetable. So Friday, the 14th of January as the date for written representations. The recording of the hearing will be published on our website as soon as practicable. The examination timetable, which will which will will be set out in what is known as the rule eight letter, as I described on Tuesday. I'm hoping that the roulette letter will be completed by tomorrow. The website, however, will be updated in the next few days with the details of the next steps in the examination. So please do refer to the website to keep up to date with with the timetable. I believe that we have now covered all items on the agenda. We've made very good progress

today. Thank you, I can now confirm that this meeting does not. There's a hand for Mr. Wimberly. Sorry. Okay, thank you. Thank you. Mr. Wimberly. Did you want to make a final point?

Yes, sorry, I, you you've went you should have come earlier, but I couldn't get the hand to go up on my screen. No, it's just Wednesday, the first of December seems to be a deadline of some sort. Because the fall from he referred to it. And I'm not clear what I'm supposed to do by December the first if anything.

Wednesday, the first of December is an opportunity for notes from today's event to be published. So if you wish to submit your notes for today, by Wednesday, the first of December then please feel free to do so. The next opportunity to do that is the date of time mentioned which is deadline to on the 14th of January which is for written representations. So, there is in fact not If you want to submit your notes from today, then Wednesday, the first of December, if you'd prefer to wait until you include those with your written representations, then the date for that is Friday the 14th of January. Does that clarify Mr. Wimberly? Yep. Okay. Okay, thank you very much indeed. So let me go back to the examination timetable, I'll just repeat. The timetable will be set out in the roulette letter that is very nearly complete. And the website will be updated in the next few days with the details of the next steps in the examination. So please do follow the website. And that will set out the detail of the deadlines in fact that I've just run through in response to Mr. wimble, his request for clarification. So I believe that we have now covered all of the items on the agenda, and I can confirm that this meeting does not need to run into tomorrow. And that therefore, the reserve time for tomorrow is not required. And we'll confirm that on the website as soon as possible. So all that remains is for me to thank you for all of your assistance today. And I look forward to seeing the written versions of submissions in due course whether it's by deadline one or deadline to 18 and I in the other members of the examining authority, who couldn't be with us today and the case team, some of whom you've seen today, very much look forward to working with you all during this examination. This open floor hearing is now closed. Please keep take care. And thank you again for today.