

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH2\_SESSION3\_A57LINKRO ADS\_09022022

00:05

Hello everybody the time is now 2pm and this hearing is restarting please could remember the case to confirm that I can clearly and that the live streaming and recording restarted

00:18

yeah I can be confirm you can be her clearly seeing clearly on the live stream has now started. Thank you.

00:25

Thank you. Please can I remind all parties to get your microphone muted and camera off until we vote to speak each time that we voted to speak please give your name and on whose behalf you are speaking. Thank you. We are now restarting on what we're continuing on Item three, which is transport networks etc. And we had got item M. effects in tune to assault poly worth stroke Hatfield and which Mr. Donnelly will now take us through Thank you.

00:59

Good afternoon, and Dodge County Council in its representation raise concerns that traffic may divert off the six to eight through the residential areas south of the existing strategic road. All that traffic will increase on polyline vehicles turn left at the Ghanian junction rather than carry on to the much more junction at ultimate aim, what consideration has been given to the potential effects of such movements? Through the residential areas? Or on the junction of polyline? And will he breach? So with Bali Britain Hatfield ground? And can I take him item in at the same time of if it was considered necessary? How could such effects the addressed? So can I hear from the applicant please? Thank you, Sir Richard failing on behalf of the applicant. And I continue to have Mr. Cates mark with me who will explain the operation of the model. And its effects at this junction. Handing over to us to Kate smart.

02:17

Yes, stick case Mark representing national highways. Well, obviously the model that we've used as a reassignment model, it has the disjunction and representation of road network within within it. And therefore the model is forecasting the likely traffic that will choose different routes. And therefore the model we believe is that accurately representing the volume of traffic that will be turning left at that junction, you know, and diverting off. So based on, you know, the comparative benefits of using the different routes through through the network. So we don't believe or natural holes don't believe that there is going to be any further increase in that left turn traffic beyond what is indicated in the model. And in fact, the model indicates that the volume of traffic turning left at the gun junction actually reduces compared to the do minimum with the scheme. In terms of the residential streets, I was looking just looking at the map. And it doesn't look like there is much opportunity for traffic to route through

residential streets because they're the only street I could see that might offer a alternative to that left turn would be I think it's Taylor Street. And I'm pushing I can't answer the question now whether that is in our model or not, it may not be in our model because it is it is to smaller Street.

03:58

Thank you. Can I ask for comments from the local highway authority?

04:09

Oh, good. Good afternoon, sir. Jeff Blissett from Tabitha county council. I don't necessarily necessarily disagree with what we've just heard. I think it was. Obviously you'll appreciate that when you submit to the local authority. A lot of the questions that they get scattered around to various disciplines and I think it was it was a colleague of mine who picked this up I think his his saw concerns were were just to make sure sir that the treatments of the existing mini roundabout. That will be effectively bypass that's just just over the river their airflow into Darbyshire is such that traffic is attracted onto Willie lane and does in fact, look or go all the way around the proposed scheme, we refer to the to the gusset spur. I think I think it was just my my that particular point he was making. I don't think there's, you know, certainly at any fundamental disagreement between the local highway authority and the applicant, and I'm grateful to the comments that the applicants consulting engineer has just made.

05:31

There is one supplementary concern that I have in that. Would traffic be deterred from the traffic management measures on polyline? And divert to avoid those that may actually create a problem?

06:00

Is that a question you're asking of me or they

06:03

are not? Yeah, I'm asking you first. And then I'll give the applicant an opportunity to comment.

06:11

As they say, it's not something that we're that we're overly concerned. So it was just something that was, you know, raised by a particular colleague, and I think he's just making sure that the level of restraint on wooley lane is such that traffic isn't encouraged, isn't encouraged on Willow lane. And, you know, Lillian is is afforded the full traffic restraints so that you know, the benefits of the scheme app, I delivered in full. I also said that, you know, that there's no dispute between us and the was the applicant, I think, I think it's just dotting the I's and crossing the t's and making sure that they the restraint on what we learn is in fact, you know, is it delivered and actually works as as it is intended.

06:58

Thank you. And just to cover off this point before we return to the Yeah. Applicant. Has the has Tim side. Any comment?

07:10

Simon Eastwood term side? No, not really no. Taylor Street can't be used as an access to get to Willie Lane it was blocked off was a through route several years ago. You can get from Bully lane to Taylor Street. We can't do it in the other direction, because one streets been closed off to the others got one restrictions. The only lane and or the full length.

07:44

Oh, thank you. That's been very helpful.

07:46

And traffic, she can tell a LAN as well. So there's already traffic we'd already done that several years ago, because it was a problem then.

07:59

Thank you. And does the applicant have any final comment on this issue?

08:13

Listing case representing national highways, just to say that the the model does include the traffic calming proposed traffic calming measures on delay in that it assumes a lowest speed for the traffic, it assumes that there's a low speed of the traffic that that's the effect of the traffic calming and therefore, the rerouting of traffic reflects that.

08:38

Thank you. Just before we move on from traffic in 10, to a saw on Hollingworth Hatfield could ask Sharefest and Steven Bagshaw, if there are any issues that they haven't previously addressed, this concerns,

09:00

share first aren't with us.

09:01

Ah laccase Bagshawe I know you're preparing a written response. Can you cover any issues to include your knowledge of local streets?

09:18

Yeah, hello there. Yeah. Steven Beauchamp, local resident. Yeah, I was going to make the point that the representative from survegs Actually they live on Taylor Street. And it is a one way street so you can only access it from coming up towards the gun. You can't access it if you're coming from tinnitus or you can't take a left turn in. I was I was a bit I was going to ask through the spectrum, a question of clarification to Dougie regarding this left turn new role because I couldn't make any sense of it. And, and because why While I mean, presumably the whole point of the scheme is to get rid of the jams in some measure through Timberline. Oh, it was so there wouldn't really be an advantage to divert have a straight road to join the new proposed route roundabout heartfelt much remark. I mean, why why would you want to turn left and meander through all the bridge to get to a new roundabout at the thought of a Brookfield? Well, it wouldn't really make a lot of sense. Unless, of course. And I don't think this point

has been raised by sat nav, because obviously it's an increasing, it's an increasing thing, more and more vehicles are setting up. And probably Oh, HGVs often, though, so if there was some sort of issue in the villages, I imagine there would have been a worse of a lot earlier and would have diverted across the B six, one or five, three glossip. And what might be the I feel settings, if I say do know, when there's a Bakish on the more, so I, I don't really think there would be much advantage for most vehicles to go down the road, because it's quite a difficult route to kind of park cars and so forth, to get to get to the base of a new route. So yeah, so I kind of agree with the injury there. But I'm not to say dogs run around. But it doesn't seem to make more sense. From my point of view. I'm from I grew up in timber. So I know, we've been on with with an outfield, so I'm quite familiar with it.

11:41

Thank you. Are you happy to cover that in your written response? Yes, I'm back here. And I see I've got a hand up from and Robinson. So I'll take that now with to do with. Eric,

11:57

thank you very much. Indeed,

11:58

it was just a really quick question about the fact that if you used either of those two routes as diversions, you would avoid two sets of traffic lights. So I wondered what impact that might have. Because drivers are notorious for doing that sort of thing.

12:12

Okay. And then I hear from the applicant, and then hopefully, we'll be able to move on, from this issue, unhappy if you would respond to those issues in writing at a later date when you've seen the responses from interested parties. Thank you so much. with intent to respond, when you see those, those responses, as you say, I didn't detect that there was anything else at first to respond to the earlier comments. Just say that I noted Dr. Robertson's comment, just to go about voiding the traffic light. Unless Mr. Cates Mark has that information to hand now, which I'm sure you'll let me know, then we've got the note is to be coming into it to tell me just that. Thank you.

13:18

Just in case mark, the national highways just eat on that point. I mean, the traffic, the traffic signals and the delay at traffic signals, role models are all part of the model. So again, the rerouting of the traffic within the model and the forecast routing, the traffic will have it counted for those delays.

13:37

Thank you. Okay. With that, then I think that's, we have nothing further. Thank you. And the next issue that I've been intending to cover the effects within the National Park, given the time constraints that were under I'm minded to take responses to questions P, Q, and R and writing, three been writing. Does anyone have any objection to that?

14:11

Just to clarify for me, that those questions are specifically related to highway safety and severance for the National Park. So if those questions are asking to be taken in writing, in a few minutes time, we'll be looking at traffic effects in the national park in terms of effects on landscape and visual and that we'll go through that in some depth. So just wanted to clarify this is in relation to highway safety and severance at this time.

14:41

And I would also like to add that term. There are concerns raised that in previous responses. People have concentrated on the effect on snake pass. Could I ask that those responses include effect on the wooded paths as well. Is the African happy that they be taken? In righty. Thank you. So we understand the approach there. We have to know, including wood had passed as well, we'll deal with it. And are the local authorities and local authorities happy? Can I hear from Darbyshire? First? Yeah, we're

15:25

absolutely fine. I guess there's nothing we can really add to what was already said in writing. And we will perhaps confirm that. Obviously, we were happy to participate this afternoon and deal with questions of clarification that the inspectors minded to ask us and we haven't got a problem with dealing with it in, in, in writing, as I say, I think we've, you know, we our position is fairly clear. Thank you. We will continue to work with the applicant to resolve it. Thank you.

16:05

Tameside happy that we respond in writing. Yes. District National Park.

16:20

Hello, yes. Is Brian Taylor, I'm head of planning at the Peak District National Park. And are you happy if I give you just a couple of minutes context on the national park authorities?

16:32

This is we're on this very specific point of Highway Safety severance here. Is that something you wish to talk about?

16:38

I think it's in reference to the appropriateness of the growth on those routes through the National Park, which impacts on those things?

16:47

And could you make your response in writing in that regard? And you might wish to address issues that we discussed earlier with regard to traffic modelling, but at the same time, I think that will be a helpful way forward.

17:03

Okay. I think it does really relate to the the statutory requirements in the environment act to have regard to National Park purposes. And I concern as an authority is just by using a traffic assessment, that this kind of 1000 car level, doesn't really do that it doesn't really have regard to the purpose is to take

account of both the enjoyment of the national park as well as the impact on those technical things that we mentioned.

17:34

Yeah. Thank you. We are we are going to come back to that in the next item. Okay.

17:39

Thank you. Thank you, and hold people or counsel. Excuse me.

17:48

Not James Hi peak, probably nothing to add beyond what's in our local impact reports. So copy to deal with on that basis.

17:56

Thank you. And similarly, the next item connectivity within the order and area questions. Three s 221. U inclusive. And, in fact, the online, take those in writing as well. These refer to concerns from Tim side, Metropolitan Borough Council, with regard to connectivity within the order area, in terms of footpath, footway, links, and question, access. So is Tim side happy that we deal with that? Sorry, therefore, the applicant? Is the applicant happy to deal with those in writing. Thank you so much for filling on the application. I can confirm that we'll deal with those points in writing. So the only point I thought might be usefully mentioned now is in relation to question T. There is that was the question relating to details of the way connectivity and Mottram more those details and we expect to be provided in the form of updated plans. Deadline five, so it's just to advise the panel that they will be coming in. Thank you that's in that case, I'd like to move on to the wider effects on public transport. And question three W

20:00

We are interested in the applicant's thoughts on whether or not bus routes will divert on to the new route or off or sorry, or remain on existing roads. And how that may affect public transport journey times and passenger usage has the applicant given any consideration to differences in potential benefit to public transport roads between shorter and longer journeys by public transport resulting from rooting. Rich selling on behalf of the applicant. As you can see, I still have Mr. Kate smart with me who will address you on this pointer.

20:50

Just in case we're on national highways. This is something that we specifically modelled. We've looked at but in response to the question, we have put some thought to this matter. I think the working assumption is that the buses would continue to use their current route, principally because of the patronage they will they get from the communities in Mottram, only Mottram, and that if the bus is diverted along the link road, they might get improved journey times. We haven't checked that that would be the case. But even if they did, I think that would be outweighed by the loss in Patch pitch they'd likely get from effectively bypassing one of the communities and also meaning that the community would no longer have that public trench or conductivity. Because it would be bypassed by by the services. So our view, I mean, obviously national highways doesn't have any influence over bus

operations or network planning, that is a matter for other other parties. But you know, that that would be our informed view is that we think it is unlikely that the buses would switch to the new link road.

22:09

Can you see any difference in benefits to a long distance route? Over a more local road through diverting onto the bypass?

22:24

I think we'd have to look into see what the journey time savings might be for the buses? We don't We haven't actually modelled that specifically,

22:32

would you be able to provide an answer in that regard? In writing the next deadline, the consideration?

22:43

I think we could do something yes, we could provide some sort of indication,

22:47

as I've been any discussion with the operators about the impact of the scheme on public transport bus operators. And that's definitely it. Yeah, sorry. I do apologise this this would then link into the following question about potential impact on bus stops. And of caught in the non course of events would expect the bus operators to have views about such matters

23:22

which are turning on behalf of the African. Absolutely right in terms of it links into question X actually. So so. So the African has had discussions or discussions have have continued with their bus operators in that regard. And if I can deal with those points now. So that said there are actually two existing bus stops on Mottram more eastbound and westbound, which had to be removed as a result of the this scheme and following consultation with Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council transport for Greater Manchester and the bus operator agreement has been reaching up to replace those bus stops. And on the understanding that there's adequate provision, either side of this location or Mater more and more. In addition, there's there's a potential relocation of an existing bus stop early bridge. And in relation to that, once it's understood that the county council is intending to consult with the bus operator to assess the frequency and use and then whether that stock can be removed without replacement or whether it needs to be relocated, if it does need to be repositioned. That that that would be to a position that's been agreed with the County Council and the plus operator with the intention of ensuring that there's no adverse impact on junction capacity, delay and safety. And so I think that's the context within which the applicant is then had conversations with the bus operators Thank you. Ice. Also notice that

25:24

there was a moment.

25:26

Mr. Buchan has his hand raised, they have a point with regard to make with regard to public transport. Just a very quick one. So as a matter of clarification on this, the, as I've discovered, by requesting various items of information, the current model does not include the totality of public transport in the area. It is focused on public transport users, basically who have a car. So the totality of public transport users might is my understanding at the moment is not included in the traffic model. And that makes it rather difficult to get an overview of what the impact of this would be. I'm referring particular to your question on passenger usage, which I think is very relevant in that context. I just wanted to add that in and that, again, will be hopefully, I haven't received the final information yet. But hopefully it will be received in time for our written submission next week. Thank you. Thank you. And as the applicant got a comment to make in response to that, or will you be responding in writing, when you see the concerns expressed in a written form? Thank you, sir. As you can see, literally on the applicant that I'm joined by Steve Case, Mark, will just come back to you in relation to that point. So

26:58

you can stick smoking, always, just to I think we will provide more information in responses, but just just to clarify that the model has taken account of public transport in that there is a separate model, that look multi modal model that was used at the initial stages. And the that does look at the public transport improvements in the area at the top at the time. And it does where it were appropriately, we'll assign some of those the car trips to the public transport. So some assignment of, of trips to public transport as a result of planned improvements to public transport have been accounted for in the model. And the highways model that we've used is is an iterative model with that public transport model, that other multi modal model. So it does take account of them to some degree. It doesn't deal with buses in a specific detail, but in broad terms, it does take account of public transport.

28:15

Thank you. Just to wrap up, Mr. Wimberly did try to speak to us earlier but had it problems. Mr. Wimberly? Would you'd like to impress the examining authority at this stage? To sum up any remaining concerns or comments that you wish to make?

28:59

Mr. Wimberly, are you able to connect to those days?

29:07

I think Mr. Wimberly may have left the call. Also, I'll send them an email just to thank you.

29:16

If he would ask him in the email to send in any comments that he hasn't been able to make when he makes these next week my presentation Thank you. And on we have received requests from two interested parties for a site visit in the area of denting gains, and seminary and with those parties in their next written representation, deadline for like to suggest locations for the examining authority to visit and areas of concern such as, for instance, I'm aware of a school in the area that is identified for potential red running. So we'd like any details that you have in regard to that, if you could possibly mark up a plan, showing the location of areas of concern, that will be useful when we consider whether or not a site visit, or site inspections would be a benefit. Thank you.



30:39

So just to add to that, to show the locations of concern to show the time of day it possible, we'll look at those alongside there's going to be an exchange of written submission around alternative routes or rat runs. So we'll take on board, the thoughts about location through visit will take on board the comments made by interested parties about alternative routes were taken by the applicant responses to those and then we'll consider the need to visit and whether that needs to be accompanied or an accompany so we are we are revisiting the visit. Issue, if you will. Thank you. We're wrapping up now.

31:29

We're wrapping up on hop

31:30

on transport. Okay, so so that that, that completes the traffic and transport items. Three, we were intending to have a break now. And that we're proposing to carry on seamlessly, and we'll take a break during item four. I hope is the applicant and renew the parties happy to shuffles seats without a break. Are there any problems with needing to wait for the parties to join?

32:07

Fowler on behalf the applicant? So we're happy to continue all of our expert witnesses here. Yes.

32:14

Thank you. Did anybody else have any issues if we if we carry on? not hearing any is right. So we will carry on to item four. Thank you. We will take we'll take a break during this item. And then we'll review progress after that. We are running slightly late. We're about half an hour later than we'd hoped to be. Which is close by ourselves without it, I'm afraid. Hopefully we can still cover items for and item five today to shedule. So but let's see how we get on. So let's get visual and green belt. So number of issues to address here. Let's start with the national planning policy framework. And we raised the question about the consideration given to the National Planning Policy Statement update in July 2021, which the applicant responded to have the local authorities had an opportunity to review the applicants explanation of its consideration of the update? And do they have any any concerns about the explanation? So come and I'm going to include the National Park in this as well. So can we go through the let's start with the National Park actually please pick District National Park any concerns about the consideration given to the updates to the NPPF it's this man.

34:01

Thank Thank you sir. I'm afraid that our expert on landscape isn't available today but what we will be doing is submitting a written representation that is prepared for us which we should answer that question.

34:13

Okay. Okay, thank you and darbishire Anything to add?

34:24

plastik Buffy dog she kind of counsel Sarah. Yes. I've had the opportunity to read the the applicant's assessment of this issue and I've got no sort of further concerns or issues. I'd like to write ranges. I think it's an acceptable response to that point you've raised.

34:39

Thank you and then Tameside please

34:48

satisfied with the applicants explanation, but I'm still awaiting some more detailed comments from my planning colleagues on this issue. Okay,

34:59

so So you're responding in writing, if you need new to add anything to that, thank you. Yes. Thank you and then high peak Borough Council please.

35:13

Yeah, Mark James hyper account. So, again, broadly satisfied with the answer the design is the clear, overarching update. Or you could argue that there's a subtle shift in the approach to climate change as well, but certainly not as significant as the the overarching approach to design with design codes, etc, which the applicant has

35:35

addressed. And we will come to design later on.

35:38

Thank you.

35:42

TeamSite, also addressed and, sorry, identified a number of documents that it suggests that the applicant should consider in its assessment. So just to highlight, There was reference to the Luc landscape character and sensitivity assessment, the Greater Manchester urban historic landscape characterization project. The applicant responded to those concerns at deadline three, given a commentary on the LDC landscape character and sensitivity assessment and carry out a comparison of some of the type politics which it's suggested we're not dissimilar. That Contoso stated that the Greater Manchester urban historic landscape characterization project didn't form part of the LTN TCA assessments and said that it wasn't raised jewellery concept consultation, so the applicants response actually did refer to landscape specific assessments by Peak District National Park Authority deputy county council and high peak Borough Council being referred to but that doesn't seem to be similar consideration of the local policy and other documents for that team side Metropolitan Borough Council area TeamSite Well, let me let me ask Tameside first of its position on this. So having reviewed the applicants response there to the concerns raised by teams, they've got what's the team size, current position,

37:49

his. Current Position is basically, I'm still awaiting detailed comments back on that point from from the planners team signed GJ planners,

38:13

okay, so if we could so the time side raised concerns in epicentres responded, so for good time sides, responses to the applicant responses in writing. That would be if we could have it in writing. Very helpful, please,

38:30

yes, endeavour to do that as quickly as we can.

38:33

Thank you very much. We may be having a similar response to some of the following questions. I'm not sure if let's see how we get

38:42

them. It might be true, actually.

38:46

So So item B. So a general point of identification of relevant local policy we can take, I think we can take the same response to that. So it'd be helpful just to have feedback from Tim site about the two specific documents we've just talked about, but also other any other consideration of local policy concerns that Tameside have. So if those could please be addressed in team sites written response let's move okay, so Tim site raised some concerns about the appropriateness of the use of the term dense urban.

39:39

which the applicant responded to? Is that another one that Tameside would like to take in writing?

39:49

Yes, please.

39:50

Thank you. Okay, and then, again, landscape task eight characteristics, series of concerns raised by Team side about the descriptions of SSL ca three SL TCA five SL TCA seven, which the applicant responded to with time. So I'd like to respond to the applicant responses in writing again, on those.

40:23

Yes,

40:24

thank you. Viewpoints so we're moving down through question he Tameside originally raised some concerns about viewpoint for nighttime assessments, and concerns about the two kilometre study area emitting some key theoretical viewing points. Excuse me, I can't respond to those. And I wonder details

I want to comment on this today or in writing. Well, currently in writing, writing, thank you. The team site, there are quite a number of points in our team site able to get an indication of when we might be able to expect a response. We have the next deadline is on Wednesday, the 16th. Next Wednesday, and then the deadline after that is Wednesday, the 23rd.

41:37

It'd be more likely to be the 23rd.

41:41

Okay, it would be very helpful to have the responses by then if possible. I'm mindful of Tameside having highlighted some quite well some concerns that we would just like to chase through they seem to be valid concerns, the applicant has provided a response that it would be very valuable to obtain sites input by the 23rd at the very latest if possible.

42:11

We will endeavour to do that.

42:14

grateful to you Thank you. Item item F during its second than a company tax inspection. We the XA noticed the views of the area of the proposed development from the B 6015. North of the junction with Padfield Road, where there's a lay by adjacent to public access land. That point appear to actually have the proposed development seemed to have reasonable visibility from that point. And our thoughts were the touchy the nighttime effects from that point might be interesting to understand. However, the the point is not on a major footpath, for example. And although it is near an area of public access land, we didn't see very much usage of the Public Access land while we were there, but we'd be grateful for views of parties about the value of views from that point. Because the applicants comment on that initially please.

43:30

Vicki Fowler on behalf of the applicant, Sir Yes, the applicants responses that although the receptor location is sensitive, as stated within the methodology, it is located beyond two kilometres from the scheme. So our view is that it would not be readily perceptible. So therefore, we discounted from the assessment. Certainly viewpoints at a similar distance outside of the study area within the PDMP were assessed so that so that was viewpoint 1518 and 28. And the predicted changes to the view were found to be almost non distinguishable from the view against the baseline. And so the reference for that is as appendix 7.1 table 1.2 And that's the result of the distance, topography and intervening vegetation. And also nighttime photo montage in this location would would also be discounted for the same reason

44:31

could get any comment from I peek bullet Council in Italy on that point.

44:44

My James hyper Council not able to comment in detail at this stage. However, I'm conscious that our joint responses to date in terms of impact reports are written representations have been informed by feedback from the County Council's landscape At. So I don't know if the County Council's landscape architects has had any views on this particular points so far.

45:06

Yes. Thank you. Thank you. That's very good. who like to comment is

45:13

Steve Murphy Dodge County Council? Sorry, I think this is one, I'll have to take that for the consideration. And we can provide a response to respond to the Borough Council on this matter around for the next deadline, if that's okay.

45:24

Thank you. It was remiss of me not to include Dougherty county council on the agenda on the site. And so taking that away. He did took National Park Authority and he in the comments, please.

45:37

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson from the Peak District National Park Authority. I have received feedback on this from our landscape architect. And we do see this as quite an important and important view to kind of get the change in character from the from the edge of the national park down into the urban hinterland. And we would welcome some assessment of the the impact of the scheme on the night sky, dusk, dark skies are placed one of our named special qualities that were associated with national parks. So it will be we will be useful to just understand a bit better.

46:12

Thank you, sir. Thank you, I think that's helpful. And we'll wait to hear from Derbyshire county council, I think, I think, grateful to the applicants to now give a further response. So I think we, we have visited all of the viewpoints that the applicant has suggested. And for many of those points, the topography of vegetation do screen that proposed development in the manner that the applicant has suggested. So we are mindful of that from many of the viewpoints. We understand what the applicant is saying that this one viewpoint, however, did rather stand out to us in that it isn't as distant from the proposed development as a number of the other viewpoints. So it may be outside the two kilometres, but it certainly wasn't as distant as a number of the others, and that the particular relationship of that point from the proposed development actually meant that the interruption by topography and vegetation certainly wasn't to the same degree as other viewpoints. And there seem to be the potential for the alignment of the proposed development to actually be distinguishable from urban areas and from existing street lighting, for example. So could the applicant just reflect on those points, if possible, and consider whether this is potentially different from some of the viewpoints that have been considered

47:58

picky fair on behalf of the applicant. So I wonder if this point, I could possibly introduce Graham wouldwould, who was dealing with this particular topic in terms of our expert witness on this topic? Graham, thank Thank you. Thank you,

48:15

great. Of the applicant. So obviously, listen to what has just been said. It's likely I think that the viewpoint potential viewpoint that you're talking about, it's about at least three kilometres away from the the the application side. But, and therefore, I would say that it's pretty unlikely that you'll be able to get distinct views. But we can we can consider it, undoubtedly, and get back in writing. But um, and the other interesting point, I would say is that this point, this viewpoint wasn't raised as a few point which consider by the Peter Schiff National Park. Yes.

49:12

Yes, ma'am. Thank you. If I could suggest that we Derbyshire county council will provide a written response at deadline for Peak District National Park Authority said they're considered to be an important view of the District National Park wanted to add to that for the written response the deadline for that will be welcomed. And then perhaps the applicant could give a considered response following those submissions that deadline by does that seem acceptable applicant?

49:47

Vicki Fowler on behalf the applicant? Yes, yes, sir. That seems a very sensible way forward. Thank you.

49:52

Thank you. Okay, so next two questions are in relief. Well, let's take one at a time. So question g, in relation to changes to existing ground level, and the effects of those of the, for example, the courage way levels being different to existing ground levels. And then the second question is about the height of plant and equipment above ground and, for example, that equipment could be operating on the top of sport heaps or or, or not at existing ground level. I'd like to take those two points in writing, please. I think in asking for that this relates to an issue that was raised yesterday about the definition of levels of the proposed development. So there's a relationship there between the definition of the project that's provided through the DCO and the possible heights of the carriageways in relation to existing ground level, but I think fundamentally, we'd like to take those two points in writing, is the applicants able to do that, please?

51:18

So yes, we are able to do that. And I think I would just make the point, I think the response to question 5.5 was in was actually incorrect. And certainly there are a number of criss cross sections that that show the deviation. So yes, if we set that in writing as to where whether that's dealt with. Thank

51:37

you. I think it's this is an important point, because I think there are some deviations of the carriageway by several metres from existing ground level. And if if the visibility of the scheme has only been based on existing ground level, that could be quite a different, different things. So it'd be very helpful to be particularly clear about that, please. Thank you. Let's move on to mitigation planting. So, again, in response to questions, the applicant said that the height and maturity of planting screening during winter months and details of replacement trees to fill voids will be identified during detailed design.

Could the applicant clarify what's been assumed in this assessment and how the mitigation that's meant mentioned is secured please. And as a follow up to that, should the mitigation include commitments in relation to the mix of species size, density and maintenance in relation to the master plan? Applicant please?

52:44

Piggy Fowler on behalf of the applicant? Yes, sir, I can deal with this matter. So for the purpose of the assessment, it was assumed that at year one plant he would generally range from stock size of 45 to 90 centimetres high for mass understory shrub planting, typically planted at 1.5 metre centres, and then with feather trees, typically 1.8 to 2.5 metres high, typically planted at three metre, centres, and then with occasional standard standard and the heavy standard trees, ranging from 3.5 to six metres in height. And then by year 15. Obviously, we'll summarise these in our summary of the hearing sir, year 15, it was assumed that the smallest of the planting stock would be 45 to 90 centimetres high. Sorry, the smallest smallest planting stock would have achieved a height of at least 7.5 metres and potentially more. But that is dependent on species selection. Obviously, different growth rates apply for different species. So Willow, Birch, Sycamore and Alder obviously faster growing, but less long lived. And then the oak and Beech are slower in terms of the commitments in relation to mix of species size, density and maintenance, they're set out in the outline landscape and ecology management plan, submitted it deadline three. And so that plan, obviously is part of the environmental management plan, and we'll move forward into the second iteration. Environmental Management Plan.

54:28

Thank you. Yeah, to the outline landscape and ecology management plan has become an important document for us to consider during the examination. Thank you to the applicant for submitting that could ask the local authorities to comment on that outline landscape and the quality management plan and I think a reasonable timescale for that will be deadline five, on the 23rd of February. Could we just Around the local authorities, would you be happy to comment on that plan by the 23rd of February MCs? Can we start with Dodge County Council?

55:11

Steve Murphy Dodge County Council so you're not my landscape architect colleague has actually reviewed the landscape and environment management plan provided me the comments already, which I can clearly relate to you by that deadline, sir.

55:23

And if you're able to make them earlier by deadline for that, that would be gratefully received. Thank you case. Yeah. And tie peak, commenting, or would you be lying on Dutch County Council's comments?

55:39

What James? Hi, Pete. Yes, we would defer to the County Council's landscape architect.

55:44

Thank you, and then Tameside please,

55:48

Simon Eastwood, Tameside will respond by deadline five.

55:54

Thank you. And then can I include Peak District National Park Authority as well please?

56:01

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson P dition. National Park Authority. We we will respond by that deadline. Yes, thank you, sir.

56:09

Thank you. I think that deals with the item J item K. Dodge County Council Landscape Architecture suggested that the funding could have the effect of drawing attention to the route rather than mitigating any adverse effects was starting to move towards good design here perhaps but could could the applicant respond to those comments?

56:38

Picky foul on behalf of the applicant? Sir, if I may call him Graham wouldwould pleased to to deal with this particular question.

56:52

I am here Yes. Thank you. So I've considered this point. And I said my answer is the pros of planting consists a range of functions for both landscape and integration and screening and seeks to achieve a careful balance between openness and protection of views for certain receptors. The roadside planting will have sections of woodland to screen and enclose as well as have more open sessions comprising grasslands scrub, and hedgerows, reflecting the local patterns of vegetation. The photo montage is for the scheme illustrate how the room will appear in the landscape on completion and the year 15 providing a good indication of the range of visibility, the open and closed sessions and how it be blended into the local topography. And the planting will appear as another part of the wider planting in the area. Now it did for the purposes of this hearing today, I put a slide deck together and there is an I would refer you to Sir Yes. Winter photo montage viewpoint eight in year 15. Because this demonstrates that point.

58:17

Can we can we? We have Platts documents, so perhaps we could share that on the screen if possible. I'm not seeing my colleagues is to

58:28

apologies. I was just sending an email. Could you repeat the document please?

58:34

Yes, I can. It's he has figures 7.9 Roman numeral V. Winter photo montage viewpoint paid in year 15.



58:54

This this is one of the this is part of the application documents I think yes.

58:58

That's correct. Okay.

59:03

So Vicki feller Mahaffey. Abecassis. Got it. Great.

59:08

And that's a nighttime view.

59:10

No, I should ask the incorrect that's not the right one. Okay. That's not the one we're often afraid. It's probably the next next one or the next one after there's a year one which might be the one I'm looking at. Quite so. This year 15. It should be noted on the title bloggy a 15. C Yeah, that is the f 15. Unfortunate someone waiting in the lobby which blocks and master the image. So going back to the point of the dog shoot catching Council, landscape architect. I can reiterate that we're not trying to draw attention to the scheme and have can absolutely continue your corridor of planting of mitigation planting alongside the scheme. As I mentioned in my sort of introductory remarks, it's a combination of blocks sort of planting was for some screening, but then creating openness in other areas. And to the right of the image, you can see some more linear forms of planting along the road. So that there it does take on that effect. But in other areas to the left of the image, it's it's more image. As the, as the scheme carves through the hillside, it's a lot more open in in character. And this is also reflected in the landscape mitigate or environmental mitigation drawings. And if you looked at those, piece by piece, you can actually see how the, the arrangement of planting is done in a way that creates a sort of a combination of different elements of woodland and hydro. So I don't really agree with the point that adoption counsellor making I'm afraid,

1:01:21

could we thank you. Thank you. Could we have a look at the environmental master penalties, which is up zero 74? Well, in truly going off piece two is what we plan to share here. So it's a little bit unfair to colleagues that

1:01:43

this should also be on the slide deck that I think was submitted on Monday.

1:01:48

So it's the master the environmental master plan. I just like to have a quick look. Yeah, there

1:01:53

is there is a version of it. In the non technical summary. Yeah. Yeah. Which is into two elements. And I think if we were able to zoom in

1:02:10

well done case team, well done add that from a plan point of view, which obviously isn't a view that any person would be likely to see. It just suggests that the planting is lastly following the linear route.

1:02:35

Well, if you want me to reply, yeah. Well, for example, if you if you go from the six to seven junction for roundabout, there isn't a continual array of woodland planting, it is broken up. There's some attenuation on this. It's quite open there. And then there are there are blocks of planting that become more pronounced are the numbers, seven, six, and nine and eight. And that's where the scheme is in cutting. But then, as you pass through underneath the Motrin underpass, that then becomes more open as it seemed cutting going down towards 15, which is much on junction. And then as we moved on to the other.

1:03:31

Yeah. Okay.

1:03:34

Again, you end up you end up with a combination. As you know, as far as I said, that there is more concentrating, planting, yes, as much on junction. But then, then again, and then it breaks up a bit. It's heading eastwards to some river as throne bridge. So I think if you look at the there are detailed keys for these drawings as well about junction landscape functions and landscape elements. And you will see that this mitigation takes on many forms. It's not just not just woodland, as long as there's a whole hierarchy of different landscape mitigation elements. So clearly, there's mitigation and long scheme, but it's very low and moderate in the form that it actually is. So I think, yeah, that's what I've made.

1:04:33

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that response. I think we're in the interesting area of perhaps slightly different opinions of different professionals, which in the field of design is always possible. Thank you for that response. I think perhaps Derbyshire county council if it would be possible to have from you so There's been an effectively critique of the applicants approach there. I think if that, could we put the emphasis on the council to suggest any changes that might be made to the applicants proposals? If it's any suggestions of changes that might mitigate those concerns?

1:05:23

Yes, Steve Jobs kind of counsel. So yeah, happy to take that away and discuss that further with counsels expert on these matters. And if it would help you, or help the applicant, and, you know, maybe put our, our architecting in touch with the, the applicants architect, as well as further discussions, but certainly happy to provide that in terms of a written response. And, as you say, you know, suggestions of how we think the scheme might be improved to to overcome this is concerned, we raised

1:05:51

thank you that would that would be helpful. Thomas, this is an area that could be explored through the statements of common ground as well. Thank you. That was helpful. Let's move on. The landscape and environmental management plan. I think we've discussed already, and we've are going to have

comments on that. So got ahead of ourselves out a little, which is good. So um, and then we'll be reformed, responds to lighting. Thank you. How we put time 1507. I'm going to actually just we've been running for an hour now, I think the next topic is potentially quite a lengthy one, as we look at Peak District National Park, and I wouldn't want to break during that topic. So I'm going to suggest that we now take a break. Let's break for 1507 by five o'clock here. So I suggest we regroup at quarter past 315. Then the usual way the live stream or nap stop. So if you're following the live stream, you'll need to refresh your browser when we start. And as I say we will restart at quarter three. Thank you