

TRANSCRIPT_ISH2_SESSION4_A57LINKRO ADS_09022022

00:05

Good afternoon again the time is now. Quarter past three and the serving is restarting this could remember the case in confirm that I can get her clearly and the live streaming and recording have restarted.

00:18

Yeah, I can confirm you can be her clearly on the live stream and recording have now started again. Thank you.

00:24

Thank you. Once again, Can I remind all parties to get their microphone muted the camera off until we voted speak. And again, it's time that we invite you to speak, please give your name on and on whose behalf you're speaking thinking. So we're currently partway through item four on the agenda. The next topic being matters in relation to Peak District National Park. So there are a number of points to cover here. And I've got a number of supplementary points to the agenda, which essentially bring out some more detail that different submissions that have been made. So a number of parties, including the National Park Authority, have raised concerns about the applicants consideration receptors, baseline assessment methodology for the National Park, that are listed in the agenda, but they include the great weight to be given to conservative conservative national parks, and their highest states of protection in the national policy statement. And in the national planning, planning policy framework, the consideration given to the special qualities of the National Park, and then some more technical matters in relation to definitions of landscape receptors, perceptual issues, issues in relation to tranquillity the materiality of slight effects, and that relates to the sensitivity of the Peak District National Park when considering significant effects and the basis of professional judgement. So quite a wide range of issues raised can did respond to the deadline to comments, and there were some actually deadlines through by CPRE pig district, South Yorkshire. But the African replied to the deadline, three comments. And in particular reference to the responses to the Peak District National Park Authority concerns. The applicant referred to a number of consultations that it had had with the National Park facility, but the methodology. And the other statement that dmr le 104 methodology had been followed. And there was a suggestion by the applicant that the MBR dmr, la one and four may contradict the National Planning planning policy framework. Rather than go through all the different points, I'm going to take these one at a time before getting into question. Oh, so I'm going to raise a number of points before question. Oh, and apologies for not having included these in the agenda. But I think it'd be helpful to to get responses to these before we we re engage with those points. So first of all, could the applicant explain the point about dmr le 104 an hour following that would contradict the national planning policy framework? And I think, to reflect on the status of the dmr as guidance, the status as status of the

NPPF and how the applicant considers the that we should talk about the methodology potentially contradict the NPPF the article might respond to that please.

04:35

Sep FICKY found on behalf of the applicant I'm not sure so whether I've I've got the appropriate person in the room to to necessarily respond to that some great I will just call Greenwood to see if he is able to respond to that we may need to put that in writing. Grammar you able to

04:59

to do I think on that particular point, it may be more appropriate to call that one in.

05:09

Thank you. So if the app could could reflect on its response deadline through to the picture to National Park, and as I said, be very interested in understanding contradictions between the applicants methodology and the NPPF. If that could be set out in a little bit more detail. Obviously, the NPPF is an important and relevant matter for us. So any, any methodology that doesn't follow it, or that contradicts it, we need to give careful thought to that have to take that in writing thank you. Just bear with me, please. Could we have paragraph 176 of the MP PF on the screen please? I'm sorry to so to use the acronym. The NPP F is a national planning policy framework. And PPF is a commonly used acronym for this. So we'll be considering the weight given to the National Park. And this is one of the concerns that have been raised. So paragraph 176 of the NPPF seems particularly important here. So again, this may be one of the areas of conflict between the DML RP and NPPF. And I can understand that good wants to respond in writing. But if I could just set out some of the concerns here. So paragraph 176, which is on the screen, and I will read through it so that great weight should be applied to conserving and enhancing of landscape and scenic beauty in national parks, the broad and areas of outstanding natural beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The Conservation enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas and should be given great weight in national parks and abroad. The scale and extent of development was all within all these designated areas should be limited. While development within this sense settings should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas. The first two sentences of paragraph 176. We need to consider I think carefully the extent to which those apply to development within the national park or any other development that might have either within the setting or which might have an impact on the National Park and indirect impact in the National Park perhaps. So I think we'd like to invite the applicant to give careful consideration to it could sorry, could that be shared again? Sorry. Could we share? Thank you. Thank you, sorry. It seems to me. And I think we'd be currently minded to take the view that that paragraph suggests great way to should be given to effect on the National Park, whether the Devon development is within the national park within its setting or has an impact on the national park in indirect impact. So that that is the way that our thinking is going currently. But we would like to hear from the National Park on that matter. So this this this, this, I think is a key point for us to understand the weight that should be given to the National Park and how that's considered. Does the applicant want to respond to that initially or would that good like to consider that and respond to 90

09:43

Picky found on behalf of the applicant and said the only point I'd make is obviously the general point which is effectively if we if we we go to Power Five of the NPPF it's a matter for you where you where you go there but you will appreciate that the framework does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects. And they are determined in accordance with this decision making framework in the Planning Act 2008. And the relevant national planning policy statements for major infrastructure. And so, of course, the national networks policy statement does does make reference to designated assets, etc. So, and I think we have we have put this in our previous response, you know, effectively in terms of the appropriate assessment and the weight to be given to the NPPF.

10:40

And then, I think we've also made the point generally that the development is not within the National Park. But we have given consideration as to, you know, particularly in regards to design location to avoid or minimise effects on both designated and and designated us areas.

11:02

I think I think we need to explore this quite carefully. I think this is a key area for us to understand. So it isn't, understand the President's given to the national policy statement. The NPPF is in is normally an important and relevant consideration for the examination of national infrastructure projects, it will be very rare for it not to be we certainly need to consider the extent to which this paragraph applies. And very carefully, and it doesn't appear to contradict other provisions in the en PS national policy statement.

11:52

That doesn't. So, yes, we need to consider how it fits alongside the MPs considerations. So that's that's certainly to have explanation of the applicants view on that is helpful. But I think also, the interpret if we were to consider the paragraph 176 is relevant, it would be helpful to have the applicant view about the great weight two point and whether that should apply to indirect effects, for example. So to have to have an understanding of the applicant's interpretation of that. Would would it be possible for you to set those things out in careful detail in writing?

12:41

Vicki fell about half the applicant? Yes, of course. Yes. Thank you.

12:45

Thank you. Let's leave that point for now. Has Has Well, further so so just the assessment. There's currently before as consider that great wait should be given to those matters to indirect effects, just do the assessment, currently consider that or not? If that comfort to take that in writing, they'll be fine.

13:18

Vicki fell on behalf the applicant. So I don't have instructions on that point. So again, we'll respond to that in our written submission.

13:26

Thank you. So it could be clarified whether great weight has been given to indirect effects or not, that would be helpful. There is a suggestion in the applicant responses that it hasn't the great weight set out in paragraph 176 doesn't apply, but I'm happy for the applicant to clarify that later. Then as part of that explanation, I think it'd be very helpful, too, if great weight hasn't been applied. So I'm sort of building in an assumption here, but if great weight hasn't been applied, please could the app can't clarify what sensitivity has been identified for these indirect effects in accordance with the dmr methodology, which I believe the applicant has applied. So sorry, applicant, Could you could you also at that point, identifying the sensitivity attributed to the National Park in terms of those indirect effects through the use of the dmr Could that be added to the written response please?

14:49

Yes, sir. That can

14:51

thank you. I think these those, those are all very important building blocks for But how we will need to consider the assessment of indirect effects. And the materiality of those they do in certain respects relate back to the special qualities. And they certainly refer back to some of the concerns raised about great weights that have been raised by a number of parties. And we are mindful that actually, when sensitive sensitivity is high or great weight shouldn't be applied, that actually slight effects, a different view may be taken up slight effects. So these are very key points for us. I'm going to come back to Peak District National Park Authority shortly for its views on that approach.

16:04

Sorry, bear with me. Okay. Can I correct. So now it's item, can I just ask the Peak District National Park Authority just to comment on the coyote clarifications that the applicant will be providing whether whether it agrees with the need for those clarifications, first of all, Peak District National Park Authority?

16:32

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson, Peter Street National Park Authority, we would welcome those clarifications. Yes. My colleague, Brian may have more to say on this matter. Brian,

16:43

would you? Yes, I think that's that's very important, because it it does strike at the heart of how regard has been had to national parks purposes. So sort of sitting alongside the NPPF as a separate requirement on the section 62 of the environment act 1995. For any public bodies to take account of have regard to National Park purposes in undertaking its actions. So obviously, there's a there's a planning policy regarding terms of development, but should actually have regard to the statutory purposes, not just a special qualities, but, you know, obviously, the pursuit of conservation enhancement, and also the ability for the public, the general public to enjoy those areas. So that then draws in the indirect effects piece. So I think, you know, in that context, the National Park is a place of national and international significance, you know, in terms of the Moreland areas and what we're trying to achieve for others wider landscapes. The authority took a view last week, at the full authority meeting in endorsed the local impact report that has been submitted. And obviously, we'll be adding to that with more details by the 16th various areas. So we'll help with that. But the authorities also stated it's

objection to the scheme. So I have to say that and that's really with regard to some of the previous questions about traffic growth, which is really the issue of indirect effects on the National Park. And the appropriateness of that growth on roads like the A 57 and the six to eight which cross those internationally important landscapes. It's got crossing points for national trails. So there's a severance issue in terms of people on the Pennine Way Pennine bridleway, another another works in those areas and your Purdue and etc. They're less resilient in the winter time. And they are have substance issues with regard to the A 57. And there's high recorded accident rates on the a 57 snake as well. So the interesting point there for us is that the National Park Authority has been engaged with the South pennons corridors work with transport for the North highways England, Sheffield and Manchester City regions over the last few years. With it was all about the aim of finding exemplar solutions to East West connectivity. We were at the table talking to everyone about that. And what we have now is just part of that thinking. So we're no longer looking at an exemplar scheme. Looking at East West connectivity. We're looking at the effect just on on the local road network in effect, and in in the process. Those impacts on the national park have been scoped out through traffic assessment. So it's therefore viewed as a local impact. You know, we've totally serves to pass negative impacts on from one area to another. And despite the 1000 car threshold, and the quite simplistic view that this is a low traffic area, so it's okay in that respect slight effects. We have serious concerns that National Park purposes and the impact on special qualities had not had proper regard. So coming back to the question, and that's the section 62 point. So it's not enough to just assume that this has been thought about through a traffic assessment, we just have to look at the impact on National Park purposes. And we do take issue with the issue there of what slight effect might mean when you look into those perceptual impacts of people's enjoyment of a wild landscape of those dark skies issues, which isn't just about the scheme that Graham's talked about on the actual design of the scheme, but it's actually traffic flows, lights, noise disturbance through right through those those wild landscapes as well. So there's a point in principle there about our aims at a national park to reduce traffic flows through the National Park and actually work with these bodies to find solutions that find alternatives to that or that reduced environmental impacts and not just simply to traffic growth in quite significant numbers on a road like the A 57. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for those comments. And thank you for the debt. A couple of things, if I may just follow up on that. So the section 62 Environmental act matters. Is that Peak District National Park Authority? Does it consider that the applicant has addressed those concerns sufficiently?

21:55

I'm reading from what has just been said it couldn't we couldn't stop sharing the NPPF if possible, means thank you. Thank you. Thank you. So the applicant has well, does the National Park Authority consider that mom's answers needed from the applicant on section 62? Just I think in very simple terms, you're probably saying yes. Yeah, the duty to have regard to National Park purposes means that people have actually got to demonstrate how they've had regard. As far I think, to say, you know, and that is about understanding those impacts. So I think just saying within the traffic assessment, it's come at this level, therefore, we've scoped out the impacts, I don't think really gets to grips with how that indirect effect has had regard to the purposes of the National Park. So I suppose the spent I would actually taking? Well, two different things, the statutory purposes of the National Parks are twofold starts to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of area. And the second one is to promote understanding and enjoyment and special qualities of National Park, by the

public. And so within that, within that terminology, we have special qualities, which we then define, and gives us things like the undeveloped character, the wildness, you know, the the dark skies and things like that. Thank you. That's very helpful. You referred to refer to working groups might be the wrong term. But there have been a number of discussions with cross multiple different partners, including national highways about exemplar projects, were there any were there any recommendations from that approach from that group on all the that could be fed in series? Well, the point of that is that in looking at options for East West connectivity, and this was all part of the levelling up agenda over the last few years, without even talking about what that means, now, this has been going on about the northern powerhouse, and the work of Northern authorities, transport for the North, leaving this, to think about how we connect the East West in a more complete sense. So you're looking at halter Liverpool. And the ability to cross the National Park in this kind of laddering effect was what was being looked at series of options looking across the south pines. And the route that they felt was the best route was the Woodhead pass. So this is this point that you you refer to earlier about whether or not it's actually sensible to have the greatest traffic growth on the on the A 57. So actually, that goes contrary to work that's been done over the last few years to say what's the most appropriate trunk roads to support east west connectivity So this was work that's been done to actually think about how even a dual carriageway standard route could be created across the Peak District. And until the last few years, they've been talking about a tunnel, and then a part tunnel. And then you know, whatever kind of design comes with that, that is what I mean by exemplar scheme to actually think about how we achieve that connectivity in ways that actually support our statue purposes. Where there was land taken, we were looking at offsetting so more, in terms of exemplar. Without any of that thinking, all we're left with now is one piece of the jigsaw. So first of any other discussion at the minute that helps us think so that that's the problem we face. Thank you. Some of those are matters that we can't deal with in this examination, because we have a project before is that we need to look at some of the more strategic options of routes are things which are essentially outside there. So within exemplar did that group get if there is a project, if there is, didn't go further into the detail of things that might be useful to us as we consider mitigation, for example,

26:17

when it when it was starting to think about the routing through the London Dale Valley, it did start to look at in buy land, and the amount of take that would go with that, and the kind of deposition of nitrates, and how that could be offset. So you're starting to get a discussion about biodiversity offsetting and contributions to landscape projects that could think about net gain. So the problem was that we're faced with a transport scheme there that was based on web tag, cost benefit analysis, which was largely economic driven. What we were trying to do was use the growing carbon debate and the biodiversity net gain debate, to push on with a scheme that could actually give net gains to National Park. So you've actually got a scheme here that doesn't allow us to do that. Okay, so if it was felt there was some valuable material for this examination around mitigation measures, if we'd welcome the District National Park Authority, giving us details of anything of that type that might be relevant to our considerations. Thank you. We'll take that away and have a think about that. Thank you. Thank you. Can I Can I ask, so we're onto onto item p now, would the applicant like to give an initial response to the matters that the National Park Authority have just raised is

27:53

so picky found on behalf of the applicant? So I'm just conscious that we seem to be straying into transport evidence, etc, etc. I mean, this this section is on landscape and visual. I would also make the point I think, again, in terms of the way the conversations are going, it is not the case that we have not assessed the the indirect effects on the national on the national park, we have that assessments been undertaken. We've noted the special qualities, you know, we've acknowledged it's of national importance. So I don't want anybody going away from here today, under the impression that we've not made those assessments we have we haven't taken those assessments, we have given the importance it's deserved, you know, the receptors aren't we're giving high sensitivity status, etc, etc. And effectively, we've concluded that the magnitude of change is low, and therefore, it's not significant. So so so we, you know, we have the representations and the relevant representations from the Peak District National Park, and we have responded to those at length, and indeed, in the various written questions and will respond to the various things you've asked for. But yeah, as I say, it's not it's not it's not. It's not a new and we have dealt with the with the National Park.

29:15

We are Thank you. We are in this session, actually considering some of the wider implications for the National Park. The section 62 matter in terms of regard to the statutory purposes as the applicant responded on on that point.

29:37

I believe we have but not necessarily in the context of sections, sections 62 But let's pick that up in the written response that we're going to provide.

29:50

So IQ now so peak to peak District National Park, as I say along with that, a number of the other parties have repeated some of the national past concerns not not and that they've raised matters as well, which, of course we're addressing. But if I could ask the pictures, its Peak District National Park Authority to respond to the responses made by the applicant. So in as the applicant just referred to, they have made some quite long and detailed responses to the purchase of National Park authorities concerns at deadline three, red three, zero 28. sets out the applicants views there with the National Park Authority be able to provide a written response to those? And if so, how quickly we made that be available, please.

30:48

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson pay District National Park Authority. Yes, we can respond to that our landscape architect has been putting together a response to the response from national highways. And we will submit it to the next deadline

31:02

deadline for on Wednesday the 16th. Yep. Yep. That's very correct. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. That was very helpful. I think I think we're starting to narrow on to some of the concerns, I'm going to have referenced National Trust campaigns for national parks and CPR EP district, South Yorkshire, no one to other parties have raised matters in this area. I'm going to take any other comments from other parties towards the end of this section on the National Park. So there will be an opportunity for the

parties to to to contribute, they're moving on to effects now Natural England are not not present. So we're hopeful that if they wish to comment, they can do that in writing, and perhaps the case team would prompt them to do that. Let's look at effects now. And we've touched on this already, but a number of the same parties. Again, the District National Park Authority is one of those in between them those those organisations have raised concerns about the levels of increasing traffic on the 857 snake paths. Whether they are as is mentioned in the landscaping visual impact assessment chapter a slight increase and in fact, whether that is a correct assessment and if it is incorrect, has it led to an underestimation of the effects and then has proper consideration been given to the effect on special qualities and effects on the appreciation of dark skies? So, some some some matters are partly related actually, not entirely. The applicant has responded to those matters. Deadline three. And if I may try to summarise the applicant response and if the applicant could correct me if necessary, so the applicant has suggested that there would be a slight increase in traffic numbers on the APG 79 TAs and that would result in no perceptible change. And and the applicant has suggested that even increased from neutral to slight adverse would not leaving material to decision making cording to the DMR de la one or four methodology. And we have the earlier points to explore on the use of that methodology alongside the NPPF that will play into this consideration. I just like to be following back to the parties to comment. So CPRE people are so few South Yorkshire have suggested that road traffic increases of 10% produce a point one decibel increasing noise, an increase of 40% in traffic with increased noise by 2.2 decibels and have suggested that humans can discriminate a change in about one decibel. So, CPRE Peak District and South Yorkshire have suggested that a change of about one decibel no sorry that suggested that the increased noise on the snake pass would be perceptible. I think because it's suggesting the changes will be above one decibel. The question that arises from those things and the applicant may well want to reflect or comment on CPRE Peak District, South Yorkshire's assessment of what is or isn't perceptible in nice terms. But could the applicant clarify the changes in traffic numbers and the percentage increase in traffic on snipped pass at the point where the pen anyway crosses it. And the reason for asking for it at that point is that from our site inspections site visits, as we viewed two of the few points close to the top of snake pass, it was quite apparent to us that a number of cars were parking in the sidings there. And actually, a number of people were didn't didn't move very far from the road, as they

36:00

enjoyed the views, shall we say, as they experienced the environment at that point. So there seem to be quite a number as well as the people using the Pennine Way, there seemed to be quite a number of people who were parking cars and experiencing the national park at that point. So I think it'd be helpful. We'd like to like to go into more detail in terms of the predicted changes in traffic, the consequences of that for changes in noise level, and the changes in noise level, at the viewpoints that have been suggested, and if those could be quantified, but also at the point of where the Pennine where it crosses the 8/52. And then to to get the input of relevant experts and noise as to the susceptibility of that of those quantified changes and noise. So, as far as possible, we've we have to, so if this is a process of trying to get into more detail beyond the terminology of slight increase, and in terms of that sort. So does he have to think it would be possible to provide some quantification of traffic and the noise and the perceptibility in the way that I've suggested please?

37:38

So I'm in difficulty, because I haven't I haven't got, for example, the traffic expert with me now. So I wouldn't, it would be helpful to have all of that sort of written down. And in terms of to make sure we've got the crossing points. I mean, obviously, yes, of course, of course, we will seek to respond to that. And I suggested is in writing, because as you say, it's broken up of many points. Certainly, in terms of the noise, that's not an issue. Either my assumption is that the traffic models had regard to, you know, behaviours on snake paths, etc. So, but yes, I wouldn't mind going over the particular points that you mentioned, again, just in terms of make sure I've got a detail to it, maybe others in the team have got that written down, but I must admit that there was a lot there and I was struggling to follow.

38:30

Let me go through it more, more slowly. And hopefully, I'll say the same things. So, could we have clarification of the changes in traffic numbers and on So, these, these are at the point where the a 57 and the Pennine Way intersect. So at the top of snake pass, what are the changes in traffic numbers? And I think perhaps not not as a daily average, but perhaps as an hourly average. So it in a timescale that is relevant to changes in noise

39:21

so, the changes in traffic numbers and the percentage increases in traffic at that point. And if it were possible to have those quantified Is that okay? And then the changes in noise levels, both of the few points, so as a few point either side of the 857 at the top of snake pass but also at on the road itself, immediately along side the road because there are a number of people that park in that location. So to the changes in noise levels at the viewpoints, and at the 57 itself, Snake pass itself and then having identified changes in noise levels to have a view as to whether or not those are perceptible.

40:32

Thank you, sir. Yes, that's that's all clear. Thank you.

40:34

Thank you. Thank you very much. Pete, did District National Park Authority have anything to add to that in terms of further exploration? Indirect effects, please?

40:50

Thank you, sir. Well, welcome the questions that you've asked Sarah for an assessment of noise levels. As someone who uses the national park at weekends around the 57 and the exits to A, the sound of traffic is definitely perceptible at some distance from the road. So walking along the edge of Kinder Scout above the snake pass, you can definitely hear the traffic. So it's hard to imagine that an increase in traffic would not be noticeable there.

41:21

Brian gets Thank you. Sorry, I just so that's that's a very helpful clarification. So although there is perceptibility Now it's whether the change is perceptible. So that's, that's a particular thing. Sorry, applicant to start into your consideration. It's that the change in noise, whether that's perceptible or not. Thank you.

41:43

Thank you, Brian. Is there anything you'd like to add to that?

41:48

No, just wanted to clarify, if there's a thought on visual change, as well, I mean, people's experience of the National Park is very much about those Wilder characteristics at that point. So your observation about people parking in those lay bys, the additional lines of cars potentially, in that change process as well, is also a relevance to us, actually, the the presence of the cars themselves actually creates a different perception of the place. So if if visual counts of some calendars is part of that also, that'll be appreciated. Thanks, that I think that's a helpful addition. So applicants if and I think we need to, then look at the appropriate time period, during this consider for changes in traffic level. So it may be an hourly, hourly, maybe correct for that? I'm not sure. But to have, then the landscape, your landscape advisor and comment on the number of changes of vehicles and how that affects perception that that will be helpful. Does that appear? sensible?

43:08

Vicki fan on behalf national house? Yes. So I believe that we've actually we've actually got that. So one of the baseline views is at the park cars. So

43:16

yeah. And if that if that could clarify the podcast point, but also changes in the number of vehicles as well, and how that would affect perception, and tranquillity matters, etc. So, considering those special qualities in particular. Yes, sir. Thank you very much. Let's, I think we're approaching the end of the session for Peter to National Park. Are there any other parties? I haven't mentioned one or two other parties that have mentioned one to the other responses means is there anything that another party would like to add? To those considerations for the National Park, please? I'm looking for hands up at this point. And we have a answer from Dr. Robinson, please.

44:20

Thank you very much. Indeed. There is one thing that we would agree with national highways about and that is that the special qualities are already being impaired in this area. And national parks statutory purposes are not only about conserving, but they are about enhancing the special qualities and that is absolutely essential which will be negated by increasing traffic. And it's not just around the Pennine Way Of course it's in access land all along the snake pass. So there was just two things I just wanted to mention, which we will put in writing. The first is that the approach towards dark skies misses. National Highways has kind of missed the point because they're looking at sites Whereas according to our light pollution maps, the area alongside the snake is one of the darkest places in the National Park. So it's darker than actually in surprise view. So the night is really, really important along here. And noise is important, which is why we actually challenged national highways on it. But it's only one element of tranquillity as the National Park Authority was saying, it's a very multi layered element tranquillity which you brought up in terms of the aesthetics and perceptual qualities, which, of course, you get very strongly around here, which is solitude, inspiration, or of the astonishing beauty and threat from the terrain or weather. And the most important detracted from tranquillity according to the CPRE

assessment is road traffic. So any increase is going to destroy any tranquillity that we get here. Thank you very much. I'll put something in writing.

46:01

That's helpful. Thank you. Any other any other party electrical events at this stage? Before we move on from the pizzas, Peak District National Park? Your hand is to miss Dr. Robinson. Sorry, I assume that's a legacy from before. Thank you. Okay, thank you. That was very helpful. And then a number of quite important written submissions there. So look forward to seeing those the next deadlines, thank you. Let's move on to design. actually considering whether to take a very short break now, it has been it's not been an hour actually. Let's see. Let's carry on.

46:48

Let's carry on. So design. Key elements, the applicant has responded to some of the first written questions. And I do apologise, I do apologise, I think I maybe have simplified the applicants response but

47:10

the applicant set up principles of its approach for the design key elements and what suggested in the agendas and simplified terms a secured mitigations for the detailed design to be consulted on with the local authorities does the applicant wish to expand on that very simplified summary of its response

47:31

Vicki fell on behalf of the applicant and up ops political on Graham Woodward where the grain would like to respond further on that.

47:40

Thank you. So groundwood on behalf the applicant I think the the aesthetic appearance of clothes development schemes is is extremely important in the context of this visibility. The elements of the landscape design compromise comprise principally of land form and planting which have been carefully designed ensure that the scheme is both screened from sensitive receptors and integrated into local landscape character both open and enclosed sessions. As I mentioned previously, this will deliver a blend of screen time where on our open views, the landforms enclosing the road is largely largely as a false cutting. And this combined with the undulating nature of the wider landscape means of use the route will be limited and also seen within the context of wider landscape setting of rising hills to the east and north mainly and also partly to the south and Moreland slopes. The design is a combination of various influences visibility, landscape, character, biodiversity and habitat creation, as well as drainage considerations. Green green belts and of course, if you want me, sir to mentioned green belts, I think part of your question at V. Was in relation to Greenbelt, wasn't it? Yep. Yes, it's possible to carry on Thank you, sir. greenbelts is, of course not a visual, all landscape designation and does not imply any particular visual or landscape quality requirement. The key to Greenbelt is Cross's openness and need to prevent urban sprawl. Thank you. However, I'm sorry if I may just carry on. However, aside from this, the design approach has been to ensure that receptors whether they are residential or any others are not unduly affected by the scheme. This has been achieved through a combination of in bedingt

mitigation, and this is referred to in the HEA as Chapter Seven, seven, point 8.3. And essential mitigation as chapter 7.8. Point four. Thank you.

50:16

Thank you. And thank you for the confirmation belts issues. With the local authorities like to comment on the importance of the aesthetic appearance of the proposed development, please can we start with damn sure County Council?

50:39

Thank you, sir. staple for Derby County Council? Yes, I think the county council would confirm and I do have settings. The design of the scheme are very important. In this particular location, as we're aware, it is a Greenbelt location. So a landscape and visual impact is very important. Other aspects of the scheme other than the road itself or, you know, sort of infrastructure, additional infrastructure, such as signage and street lighting, again, they're all part of a, you know, sort of an overall approach, which impacts on the the the impact on the scheme on the openness of the Greenbelt in this location, I think at the county council is, you know, we've made comments on the landscape, you know, the landscape proposals of the other scheme, which we set out before, and we have some concerns about though those but yes, certainly, I think the the design and aspects of the scheme are very important in this location.

51:32

And what time side like to comment, please.

51:39

I think we pretty much echo darbishire is said the aesthetics are important to the area, especially the sections in green belt.

51:54

And you do Hi, pick up anything to add?

52:01

Yes, thank you so much. I'm signing out. So yeah, I agree. I think design is a very important aspects of the scheme given its location. And by the bottom, it's very prominent. It's very by large hills. In terms of receptors, you refer to residential areas, which is correct. There's also the Londra Castle, HD monument, which is another important feature in the landscape above the the scheme itself. So yes, Baca views is very important in terms of design.

52:32

features at National Park authorities like the command

52:36

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson leadership National Park Authority, I would just echo the comments of the previous speakers. emphasise that our perspective is is is on the views of the scheme from within the National Park rather than from the local environment. Thank you.

52:52

That's helpful. Thank you. Could the look so wrote question W. Now, are there any any general points before we get into some of the mitigation that was raised and first written questions, responses to those to the local authorities have any comments on the mitigation that's currently secured? So in general terms to the parties that sorry, did little authorities feel that there's been enough detail provided of mitigation in relation to design at the moment? Enhancement has been mentioned, CPRE PDS, peak districts of Yorkshire raised enhancement in a slightly different context, actually to do with the National Park, but there are some overlaps here has got enough condition consideration being given to enhancements as well. So is there enough data on mitigation? Has there been enough consideration given to opportunities for enhancement? So again, could we go round from Dougherty county council first please?

54:06

Thank you, sir. See Buffy Dodge County Council? Yes, I think generally, I think there's sufficient detail being provided on on many aspects of heavily schemas, particularly sort of security mitigation. Again, I just come back to the comments we've raised on some of the sort of landscaping back to the schema suggestions that the county council will be making in due course of how we feel the the linear nature of the of the the sort of rather broad scheme can be can be mitigated by sort of further enhancement or improvement.

54:35

Okay, thank you and Tameside, please

54:41

yeah, there's seems to be sufficient information provided from which we can provide additional comments.

54:55

Thank you helpful. Hi. It please

55:01

Mark James Hi peak. Again, we would differ in terms of landscape mitigation, particularly to the County Council's landscape architects on those models.

55:11

Thank you. And the District National Park Authority, please.

55:19

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson pay additional National Park Authority that the majority of the mitigation is being delivered, kind of in the immediate environment environment to the scheme. So from from our perspective, that's, that's fine. We don't really have any comment on it. I guess what we would, would say based on the earlier conversations, that if there was an opportunity to offset any of the indirect impacts on the National Park, and that will also be welcomed.

55:46

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Let's move on to item x. So there were questions raised about the measures to secure the design of details of finishes, street furniture, the hard landscaping,

56:08

for areas that would be adopted by local authorities, and that article 12, the DCO establishes a process for those to be finalised during detailed design and consultation with the local authorities at that point. Are the local authorities satisfied that there are suitable revisions at the moment in relation to those design matters? So details of finished systems came straight from the hard landscaping for those elements that they will be adopting?

56:47

So so there was just one moment? Yes. So so if we can take that point? Which authorities? Is this relevant to curriculum? darbishire. Is this relevant to this point? I

57:10

guess, in some way, sir. But yeah, I think from Canon counsellors point of view, we're satisfied with the the applicants approach. Yeah. Sort of further comments or issues to raise on that point?

57:21

Yeah. Thank you. And then highkey. Any concerns raised here?

57:28

Not James happy No,

57:29

no, sir. Yep, thank you. TeamSite. DS

57:35

salmon nice with Tameside. You're satisfied with the applicants current approach and lotteries issues we don't further in the detail design.

57:46

Thank you. That's helpful. Let's move on to Item why. So in the first written questions, there were some suggestions in terms of potential mitigation measures, and ongoing processes and roles around design. The applicant responded to set out the process that led to the development of the current design. The involvement of a chartered landscape architects consultation sessions with the Design Council, the involvement of national highways design panel, various consultations with stakeholders quite actually quite a lot. If I may say of activity that had got to this point. There were some suggestions raised in the first written questions that the local authorities responded to the doubts. The value of having a design champion the value of establishing a design review panel, the value of having an agreed design code or design approach document, the value of having a timeline for the design process set up various consultation activities. So the applicant has provided evidence that that what has been carried out to

date which has been very helpful and actually actually, in many respects, addresses a number of those points that I've just been through so it has previously it would appear had a chartered landscape architect as a design champion. It has previously undertaken design reviews with the Design Council design panels and diverse I'm not necessarily aware of design code that has been consultation. So there have been a number of activities which are close to those matters in the past. But there doesn't seem to be a commitment to moving forward with those. And I'm mindful of that being detail design, still to follow, construction operation still to follow. But during detailed design, it would appear, there will be some important decisions made during that process that would impact on the quality of design. And from the contributions and comments made by the local authorities in particular, there seems to be support to the idea of those bullet pointed matters. And to maybe formalise on those a little further going forwards. Would the applicant like to comment on that, and whether it, his response to the local authorities, source of those things would be useful.

1:01:06

50 file on behalf of the applicant. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Yes, I think we would echo our previous response. And I think as you've acknowledged, you know, we we, we have done all those things, and the intention would be to continue. And certainly, the Riak example, could be updated to, to make that commitment clear, but effectively, that that that work is happening, and that work will continue. Suddenly, national highways has agreed to a further Design Review Panel by the Design Council. So again, that could be clear. I think we sort of stand by the fact that we've had an environmental lead, basically coordinating a multidisciplinary team of specialists and design champions across the project. So again, the ideas that would continue with, we could potentially identify a single design champion to take on that role. So I think I think that's that's, that's, that's mainly the and, and if dB, to sort of to have take on the sort of lead author responsibility of that delivery and design approach document. I think certainly we, we weren't, we weren't convinced about the use of committed to design codes, but in terms of a design approach, that is something we could drive forward.

1:02:37

Okay, so, so well, the is the applicant and attending to expand on that response, and perhaps suggest how some of that some of those measures might be secured and the wording? Because, exactly,

1:02:54

yes, yes. That's the tension through the through the reacts if we if we come back on what's proposed

1:02:59

overview. Okay, that's helpful. Thank you. Could we just have a discussion about the difference between the design code and the design approach document, so my reading would be a design document would be a higher level document, perhaps that would establish some of the principles whereas the design code may go into more detail and more specifics. Is that is that saying that correctly?

1:03:26

That FICKY fell on behalf of the applicant? So that that would be my understanding. But I'm happy to call on Graham would would if, if, if I've got that wrong?

1:03:37

Yeah, Graham would would have to count? Yes, I think you're absolutely right. design codes. Typically, you have them to build form development that has been developments and the like, I have to say, in my professional life, I haven't heard of the design code for for a highway scheme. However, I'm particularly aware of design approach documents that are for for highway schemes, and I know of a number of in other work that I do for national highways where they've been produced. So they are high level, they set out the design principles, the design version, and then all the elements that don't stem from that deliver high quality, sustainable design.

1:04:22

Okay. Thank you. Clarification, what did design documents go as far as to specifying materials for example? So So, there are a number of locations here where these materials might be important. So the flank walls to the underpass there are there are bridge structures at the bottom of the value that could be quite visible. And there are hard landscaping materials that could be quite visible. So why would a design document go that far or

1:04:59

go I'm on wood for the applicant. I think they would indicate materials. But I think the the most appropriate use materials, but the final choice would be in the detailed design stage. Maybe we should, you know, give it a little bit more consideration and getting cartoon writing on that particular one.

1:05:23

That will be helpful. So in response, it may be helpful to to provide a little bit more information on what will be included in a design approach document if possible. Yes. And perhaps that can be set out in the React or to design approach document might include. Does that sound reasonable? Thank you would with the local phone on? Could I have comments from the local authorities, please on whether a design approach document developed in the way that we've just discussed and perhaps including consideration materials, is that the right level? Should we be considering a design code because of the particular visibility of the scheme of the proposed development? This particular case is? Does that merit going to the extent of the design code? So firstly, comments on which of those documents would be appropriate? And then comments on whether should we be what level of detail we'll be seeing during the examination? So should we be seeing the react to set up the contents of those documents? Or should it be looking for an outline version of those documents? Whichever document feels is the right one of the stage. So I'm confused things. Should it be a design approach document? Should it be a design code? Should we see the contents in that we should or should we see an outline document now? So with dogs county council like to come into matches?

1:07:07

Thank you, so Derbyshire county council. I have firms sort of us sort of wise on this on the county council of landscape architects who deals with design matters as well, I should say as well. But in his opinion, you know, a design code and a design process document will be very beneficial for the scheme. As we said, you know, the design of the scheme mitigates these impacts on the on the openness of the Greenbelt, the wider areas is very important. So from his point of view, he feels both of

those, the design code and the design approach document would be certainly beneficial. Okay, thinking in terms of what's desirable at this stage, I'm making an outline, an outline of the documents I think, I will say a lot of the design details have been considered at the sort of detailed stage so certainly an outline at this stage again would be beneficial. I think

1:07:54

that Thank you. Hi pick anything to add to Darby county councillors comments?

1:08:04

Not James I peek at Echo the County Council's comments really also add that the the NPPF does provide extra support for the use of design codes for developments.

1:08:17

Thank you. And then Tim scientists,

1:08:25

Simon Eastwood Tameside way we'd echo the Darwish in Hopi comments.

1:08:31

Thank you. I think I think possibly the devil is in the detail of how either design code or design approach document is clarified in the applicants response. So can I can I suggest that the applicant provided a response on what should be included in the React perhaps provide some information on what should be included in a design code and design approach documents and then we can review at that point. The applicants approach appears to be preference VSP for a design approach document maybe if we start with that documents, establish the content of that document and then different parties can can comment on whether that goes far enough. Does that appear satisfactory to them?

1:09:24

Thank you for on behalf the applicant? Yes, that's fine, sir. Thank you.

1:09:27

Thank you. That's very helpful. So I think we've recovered we've covered items said we've covered item A and thank you for those comments we covered item B. So we look forward to seeing the applicants response on those. Will it does the applicant feel and be able to respond by deadline for So

1:10:03

I'm thinking that I'm off the applicant or taking structions. I would have thought we need deadline five, but because I'm just conscious deadline falls next week, next Wednesday. I'm being told deadline five that I'm fine. Yes, potentially we might be Friday outline on the plan. We'll do our best to see what we can provide. But certainly by deadline five, sir.

1:10:29

Thank you. I don't think that's unreasonable. Thank you. Let's move on to the green belts. Thank you for those contributions, inappropriate development. Again, response to the first written questions

applicant set out its consideration of whether the temporal works can be considered inappropriate. And with reference to planning policy guidance assessors at the second house is consideration of the impact of those on the openness of the Greenbelt. I'm hoping the local authorities have had an opportunity to review the applicants submission let's deadline to do the local authorities have any comments on the applicants consideration temporary works of the nature or whether the proposed development would constitute inappropriate development? And can we start with Derbyshire county council please?

1:11:27

Thank you, sir steeple for adoption county council. I think it's probably set out in the applicant state and the starting point for consideration of this issue is paragraph 150 of the National Planning Policy Framework. That sounds so it sets out details of certain forms of development that are appropriate or inappropriate Greenbelt. And he does sort of clearly indicate there that engineering operations, transport infrastructure, particularly are not inappropriate. And put it that way. Obviously, in the national planning policy framework doesn't actually define in any detail what engineering operations are or what transport infrastructure is, but so are considered temporary works to enable the construction highway scheme would certainly fall within those two definitions of what is not inappropriately language in the Greenbelt should say, from the County Council's point of view, I have an experience of dealing with another developed consent order for highway scheme elsewhere in Derbyshire, which you'll be familiar with, were quite a substantial part of that scheme was within the Greenbelt. You know, in terms of the assessment of that scheme scheme was considered to be appropriately violent in the Greenbelt has one of the the pre commencement works on the construction works. So I think we can draw on that, that sort of precedent, if you'd like, parallels with this particular scheme, mostly, in that particular instance, because the Greenbelt location, you know, sort of landscape and visual impact mitigation was obviously a major concern, which, which obviously, we discussed in in terms of the scheme as well. So, certainly, I think society applicants explanation or is consideration, I think he's right and robust from my point of view.

1:13:07

Thank you. That's very helpful. Hi, Pete, do you have anything to add?

1:13:14

That's like, say, Mr. James IP. Yeah, I would agree with the County Council and the applicant overall. And I was just down in terms of the applicants response back, they've referenced the same side UDP as being a point of support in terms of why the developer needs to be in the green belts. And I'd also highlight that the the alignment of the scheme is also identified in the hyper local on policies map, and at that point, it is also in the Greenbelt. So it's just another factor to to take on board I think, but overall, I agree with the with the approach and conclusions.

1:13:48

Thank you. That's helpful and Tameside, please

1:13:55

think we probably agree with what Darwish in high peak who said whatever still awaiting some comments from the planners, so I can provide a written response on those come in.

1:14:10

That's helpful. Thank you very much. Appreciate those responses. I think I think we may want to come back to the openness matter a little bit when we have a better understanding of the height than banknotes. So let's just leave that comment for now, I think but thank you for those contributions. We're approaching the end of item four. Now, are there any other comments that parties would like to make in respect to landscape? visual impacts or the Greenbelt? Please before we move on?

1:14:54

This is a hands up moment if anybody would like to Okay, thank you very much. I think we will take a very short break now.

1:15:12

Yeah, let's let's take it's now 1630. Let's let's just take a 10 minute break if we made a comfort break as much as anything else. So let's resume again at 1640. Again, if you're watching the live stream, please be aware that the live stream will now stop to view the restarted meeting, you will need to refresh your browser page when we start. We're not visiting that item five will take very long but do feel an equal rate. So we'll reconvene at 1614 Please thank you