

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH2\_SESSION2\_A57LINKRO ADS\_09022022

00:05

Thank you. Good morning, everybody that time is now 1140. And this hearing is restarting. Please could remember the case to confirm that can be heard clearly. And that the live streaming and recording as we started. Yeah, I can hear you. Clearly, the large stream has started. Thank you. Thank you. So as before, please because I remind all parties to keep your microphone muted. Coming off until we voted to speak each term that we invite you to speak. Please give your name on and on whose behalf you are speaking. Thank you. So we're now moving on to Agenda Item three, and Mr. De will take us through transport networks, etc. Good morning. And

00:58

during this session, I'm aware of interest by from very various parties, including the CPRA Sharefest, my first journey to school Mr. Page shot, Mr. Wimberly. And to start with, I would like to invite them to outline their concerns regarding these issues. And in particular, and use two minutes, as we are pressed for time to outline their particular headline concerns. And identify where possible, where they are, in where those concerns have remaining disagreement or agreement between the parties, the applicant, the local authorities and the various interested parties. So to start with, I would like CPRA CPRE to speak for two minutes first. And as I say, if you could not identify headline concerns during this two minutes,

02:17

thank you very much. Indeed, there are still some unresolved issues on the traffic modelling, we have been meeting with national highways, we're still receiving information from them. And we've seen their response to our answers to the first written questions. So the key areas unresolved or the model area, which excludes Greater Manchester and the impact that's has on costs and benefits, the uncertainty and the uncertainty log, and key fukken, we'll be addressing those. And then as in our written read, so I don't need to go through it in any detail, there was concerns about more refinement and the impact that had on flows through the air pollution areas. That's page 23, I think of our written representation. So if I hand over to keep UK and now. Thank you.

03:09

Thank you. So I will try and be very brief and not repeat what is in our existing written submissions, but also in the written submissions that we plan to make by the 16th of February. And those, of course depend on the flow of information from national highways, which I'm not going to comment on at this stage, but is still ongoing, we have received the bulk of what we expect to receive. And the adequacy of that will be commented on in the written submission, to try and be very, very brief in terms of the question that you've asked here and addressing that, the scope and the detailing of the traffic model, just to say the traffic model breaks down into into several parts, the actual network construction, the

size, and the deep, and the detail of that network, the size and of the zones, which feed traffic onto that network. So basically, the finer the network, the smaller the zones have to be. And indeed, in their submission, the applicant have modified a small number of zones in their in their submission, and that's referred to and then as the question of the forecasts, which are applied to that zone and network model. And indeed, the impact that increasing levels of traffic or decreasing them has the way in which the network reacts to congestion. And it is those two matters, the question of the forecasting, and the and the question of the impact of the changes in traffic, which had been the two key focuses of of the work that I've been doing. So I haven't done a detailed model audit of the network or the zones, but I have done some detailed work on the issue of the forecasting and indeed The way in which changes in traffic impact on that network is quite simply simple to see. Comparing the area of detailed modelling and the network, there is a diagram in our submission, it's quite plain to see that the scheme is essentially basically within the Greater Manchester transportation area that the area of central Manchester, northern Manchester in southwest Manchester or outside your area, in

05:30

fact that is in your written submission. So we poked around the tune in it. So hopefully you'll have a chance to speak again later, when you heard what the applicants had to say.

05:43

I think and thank you for submitting a written response at the next deadline. That's that's most helpful. Thank you. I can't thank you.

05:52

And moving on to share first my journey to scold.

05:59

Hello, Carol Hallam from Sharefest my journey to school. Yes. Building on the concerns from CPRA about the flow through air pollution areas however, that may be addressed in the discussions yesterday about the DCO boundary and possible alternative arrangements, perhaps a site visit. May it may address that. And the other question, two other points really, what level of confidence does the applicant have in the junction operation and signalling to ease congestion and improve air quality and journey times around the zones within the area, the DCO boundary? So it's more about what level of confidence do they have, you know, how confident are they in the modelling? Just to get a feel for that and then the third point was on footpaths, cycleways and bridleways, we think there's really good provision included in the in the scheme, a bit more detail on design widths, and the bridle way to from the gun in and the cultural bridleway will be really helpful. And I'd just like just like to offer a suggestion really, that the provision that has been made certainly helps promote active travel in the community. And anything we can do to extend that as part of that that provision as part of the scheme is about is very welcome.

07:54

Okay. Could I hear from Steven Bagshaw now? If you wish to speak

08:06

Yes. I love that. Yes. Yeah. I have two concerns. The The first is the the issue of

08:18

the amount of rat running out there might be through backfield. denting, possibly Panfilo, Glossop? And what I'd like the projects that I might be sort of representing not owners and other residents who work in one way or the right to raise this issue themselves. But the the information regarding what's been is known as the alcohol alternative, there's never really been available for people to understand and we still don't really understand what the alternative is. And in the recent market documents, it's, it's named as route 1030. C is known as the ideal alternative, but there's no actual sort of definitive route that's that's mentioned. And what I would essentially say is that people, people in the area have been disenfranchised, really, because they should have known at the consultation stage. What what

09:24

could I keep up to headline concerns rather than putting a case where we have caught your written representations thus far, and we are aware of your concerns in that regard? So need to repeat them? Okay. Like I say, somewhere else in headlines,

09:45

yeah. Okay. That's 1/3 of the modelling. The it's difficult to determine whether the modelling encompasses the entire area, because we don't know what that alternative alternative is. For instance, it may need to include an IPL Road Type field or Glossop. For instance, My other concern is, is really I mean, I question whether this is really the actual correct solution to a problem and whether there are more simple, cheaper alternative theories, such as the geriatric closest,

10:30

thank you, hopefully in when we hear the responses to the questions that may provide clarity and prevent further discussion. So, thank you for your contribution. Okay, can I hear now from Daniel Wimberly?

10:55

You can if this works, is that, alright, we actually want to get the camera things go on, but it doesn't. Right. Okay. So, um, well, I agree with what the last person said entirely. I want to question the entire model. So I don't come at this from sort of looking at details in in a sense, which is what Keith Buchan is doing, you know, saying, well, it should be this should be that I come at it from the point of view of an intelligent layman I caught that's what I call myself, or that I have some familiarity with issues such as this. And when you look at the various bits of information, it doesn't stack up. There are inconsistencies and there are puzzles, which point to something systemic, because they're actually big enough to make clear that there's something substantially wrong. There's a general lack of information. There's inconsistencies. And what I've done is to gather all the information which has been winkled out by various people, including the information that highways England have put on the table, or under the table and created bar charts, which will would show everybody how very odd the situation which the model is telling us to believe is and this has relevance to all the effects of traffic settlements, pollution, noise, the whole lot, and especially to the limits, which I was in often cite when they say we're not going to include Entwistle in the scoping because it's 950 vehicles now, instead of 1000. Well, maybe, maybe

it shouldn't be 950. Another 1000. So that's the the gist of it. And the overall context is, there are two points in the overall context. One is the general poverty of information at this, even at the examination stage, the consultation was already disgraceful. But at the examination, we have transport assessment report, which is not an assessment. And I can show that. And the other thing to bear in mind, you do all this is that in 2018, stroke 2019, the applicant switched consultants, and the effects have was to

13:35

change cannot Can I interrupt you? And you say you're, you're providing bar charts? And will you be able to submit those deadlines for on the 15th of February,

13:47

we'll be submitting those I've been advised by the advantage. I wanted to talk to them. But I will be talking to them without them being visible, hopefully. Because they really are absolutely critical. They show up how very bizarre, the traffic predictions

14:06

are. Thank you. So if you could set

14:13

the switch is really

14:14

worrying because because I can I interrupt you praise. Sorry. Thank you, if you could set out your concerns there. As I say we've had very limited time you've had well over the two limit, two minutes that we allocated. Hopefully there will be a chance to contribute later on in the discussion. But I would urge you to put the information that you've put together before the examining authority at the next deadline, which is deadline for on the 15th of February.

14:50

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wimberly. I think I think reflecting on the thank you for the contributions we've just had. Our expectation is that the applicant is That undertaken a reasonable assessment of effects. And we're very concerned to establish whether or not that is the case. So the matters that have been raised and material concerns for us, we don't expect that the modelling will be 100% accurate, because that's not practical and achievable. But we are very interested in the headline issues that may or may not cause us to doubt whether the traffic modelling represents a reasonable worst case. That's that's the that's the type of test we have to apply. So perhaps the parties could bear that in mind as they're putting the submissions together. Thank you. But we are taking we are taking these matters Seriously, just just to emphasise that point. Yeah.

15:49

Thank you, Miss Wemberly. Could I now hear from John Pacific? I see you've got your hand up. Hello, Mr. patristic. Hello, there. Hello. And so am I pronouncing your name correct? Yes, that's fine. That's fine. Thank you. And you haven't appeared before in the introductions. So could you introduce yourself now? And Mr. Wimberly? Could I remind you to switch your camera off please?

16:26

Thank you, so no, or the camera. Just me. I'll get my camera on till I answer. Anyway, Oh, hello. Yes, I'm just a member of the public. I live in Hatfield for most of my life. Willie bridge side of Hatfield. And I'm only going to speak for minutes have joined at this point between item three album three M because I'm a member of public, I'm not a member of any organisation. I am vehemently opposed to your plans. I've looked at the modelling. I'm aghast when I see the traffic levels increasing near me on Hatfield road, the snake pass and so on and so forth. Or, you know, for six decades, well, since the M 67, was completed the hypothesis then called the high bypass, that better plan to take a road to the east of 10 Twistle. Possibly in tunnels, but this it breaks down between the Northwest and the East Midlands involves three tiny villages, Hollingworth, Mottram in timber, so it hasn't been the political cloud. It cuts across the North West Regional area and the East Midlands regional area. It's not near the airport. And it's been on off on off we get a change of political representation in the high peak in December 2019. Things seem to be back on and I'm absolutely utterly aghast this road is finishing or starting halfway up Mottram more, much more is one of the busiest pinch points in this area, if not the northwest of England, and the road starts and finishes halfway up Mottram more. You've heard this lots of times, you people. What about Hollingworth? What about tinnitus? Or what about Hatfield? And the bit of loss of knee well the bridge I don't know what else to say. It's I called it people laughed when I said it's a how that sound like a tabloid journalist. I call it a half bait, half bypass a half bait half bypass and people smiled at sorry I sound a bit tabloid ish there but that's what I really then really believe it's a half baked half a bypass. I know you professionals have got a done hundreds and hundreds of reports on this. But that's my view as a member of the public in Hatfield living near Willie bridge that we're getting a partial Road in might help people in Mottram, it might well indeed help people in Tameside in Greater Manchester. But what about us in the northwest of Darby sheer size that's my full representation and I've written copiously to on this on this half baked half a biped sorry if that sounds rude to people to professionals there but that is my honest opinion living in Hatfield for half my life. So when when you say you've written Have you written to the examining authority with all of this correspondence? Or do you mean you've been writing to highways England national highways and the proverbial highways England it's this questionnaires is the questionnaires and either as a part of a full consultation, a physical conversation or an online when I have expressed my views as an Ambit body and I've read all the modelling the pollution effects and so on and so forth. I probably agree with the previous two callers so I have not joined you at 10 o'clock. My voice probably won't count for anything but that is the considered view of me and quite a few people in Hatfield when we looked at this proposal for this half a bypass between Motrin, Motrin, basically and a spur from Wally bridge. I think you'll make things because we do have to move on, personally emphasise the importance of your contacting the examining authority, because we may not have close access to correspondence that you've previously sent, the only representation that we had thus far is representation that deadline tune. So can you set out your concerns and put them before us? In writing? There is a deadline coming up on the 15th 16th 16th February. So could you would you be able to put your concerns in writing to a stain? Certainly. Thank you. Thank you for listening to me. Thank you. Thank you. Moving on to the questions written in the agenda. And as I some were interested to bottom out the actual degree of agreement, or otherwise and identify outstanding issues with the modelling. And so the first question really relates to that. And I'm asking the applicant, local highway authorities and any interested parties that have been involved in discussions over the modelling.

21:18

To what degree the applicant, regrowth, highway authorities, interest parties are in agreement regarding the scope and detail of the traffic model. And what are the remaining areas of dispute? So could I hear from the applicant first?

21:39

Thank you, Richard. feeling about the applicant. Sir. And just at this point. I'll respond broadly, to this initial question, but I thought it might be useful if I also just introduce my colleague, Mr. Cates Mark, who will be assisting on the more detailed questions, which will follow. So Mr. Cates, Mark, at this point, would you introduce yourself please?

22:11

Warning. Yes, my name is Steve Case, Mark. I'm the traffic and transport technical expert representing the applicant.

22:21

Thank you. So I'm turning them to just the first point in terms of the level of agreement, national highways understands that in terms of the local highway authorities, there's broad agreement on the scope of the traffic modelling. But there are some outstanding queries in relation to specific outputs, which are under discussion. In terms of the other parties, do you want me to respond to anything that we just heard because conscious, quite a bit of that was gestion, that there be some fellow representations made deadline for?

23:04

Yes. If we could deal with that, in writing, to bottom out the actual machines of dispute? With parties?

23:14

Yeah, I think I think in particular, we've heard some very clear concerns from interested parties. And it's very helpful to us that those are summarised in writing by deadline for, and then for the applicant to respond to those by deadline find would be particularly helpful. I think, for the remainder of this session, it would be particularly helpful to explore differences between the applicant and the local highways authorities. That's that's the focus that we'd like to have for the remainder of this session. But so yes. Does that clarify the point that

23:48

it does, thank you, sir, in terms of most of those responses received, like for us, but we'll be able to consider that as and respond properly. And I think a number of the points are probably going to be capable of being dealt with by signposting, which will endeavour to to essentially say in terms of the agreement of local authorities, we understand that we are broadly agreed with the highway authorities. And we are going to communicate with them in relation to those specific points that that they are raising. And some of the questions we do then come on to items Bita I it on the agenda? Is it appropriate for us to deal with them in that way?

24:35

I think we'll deal with those as they occur during the later parts of the agenda. This is basically setting the same in this question. If you see what I'm saying.

24:46

Yes. In terms of that, I think that that that's the scene as I understand it, we wanting to hear from the local authorities as well and then because in key to respond

25:00

Yes. Thank you. Keep so good. I got to hear from New Hampshire County Council first.

25:11

Oh, well, good. Good afternoon sir. My name is Jeff Blissett. I'm a transport planner for Derbyshire county council and has had considerable experience with this scheme and particularly the the its predecessor. Would you just pull up me a little bit to talk about traffic modelling? We are as Mr. Thurgood suggested in in broad agreement with national rules, but I think it's perhaps useful to understand a little bit more about how we have reached that point. Let's just explore a little bit about what the traffic model is. Traffic model seeks to provide an indication of future traffic effects. It's an extrapolation of observed traffic flows based upon a number on a number of subjects. It is not sir a put a perfect science, you know, we we acknowledge that the traffic model does have imperfections. However, we are broadly satisfied that in terms of the models suitability and fitness for purpose, given that the purpose of the model as far as the highway establishes concerns in regard to traffic impacts is consideration of the incremental effects of this scheme. So for that reason, sir, Dutchess County Council as local hiring authority for darbshire is satisfied in regard of the suitability of the model for the purpose to which it has been put. You asked, you asked a supplementary questions as regards the areas of dispute. I think there are three potential areas of disputes. One of them, which is quality, I understand. So you were taking air quality under rights and seven. So perhaps if we would do that, that's perhaps an opportunity for the council to explore that in a bit a bit more detail. Perhaps the second area of concern is the wider highway impacts and the implications for impacts or the snake pass? And I believe so it is your intention to examine the wider traffic implications. Item I perhaps. And I think they look the third area of I wouldn't use the word dispute, sir, I would say that there's something an opportunity perhaps for further examination, and that is mitigation. In particular, the traffic impacts around the junction of the 57 was Sharlyn. So that I think that perhaps sums up sums up what I want to say at this moment in Thompson, thank you for letting me express my my views.

28:34

Thank you. Good I hear from 10 side

28:43

says migrated TMBC and Thameside engaged in detailed discussions with national highways around the scope on the detailing of the traffic model and we do not have any remaining areas of dispute in respect of that if

29:02

they thank you and with regard to interested parties, and would you be kind enough to provide comments that deadline three, so for based upon the discussion this morning, and outlining remaining concerns at that point. So thank you very much for your future contributions. And we would like to hear from you in writing after this discussion,

29:48

part of the reason for wanting to address this is writing and we suspect some quite technical points will be raised and it's often difficult to address technical points. In hearings such as this, so there may be specific detailed points we want to pick up in the future. But it's helpful to actually have the initial concerns for that type point expressed in writing and to get a response to that in writing initially. So that's part of our reasoning for that approach. That Thank you. Thank you for will.

30:23

Can I can I make a

30:25

sorry, we'll take questions. Okay. After good discussion. Thank you.

30:33

Mr. Wimberly will take further contributions at the end of this topic. Thank you.

30:43

So moving on to the question. Three been and concerns have been raised about the level of detailing that is appropriate within the traffic model for Manchester in Sheffield. So taking B and C together, can I hear from the appellant and then the local highway authorities in regard to what level of detailed modelling is appropriate for Manchester and Sheffield, and whether or not they think more detailed modelling at Manchester, Sheffield would be appropriate? If so, why? And if not, why not? So, could we hear from the applicant first?

31:32

Thank you, sir. Richard, turning on behalf of the applicant. And so the the the model does cover both Manchester and Sheffield. But in terms of the detail that goes into that, if I invite Kate's Mark, just to speak to add to that.

31:56

Yes. Thank you. Yes, Steve Case Mark on behalf of the applicant. Yes, just to be clear, the traffic model does include both Sheffield and Manchester. In other words, the the road network within Manchester and Sheffield is represented in the model in the much wider area with the model and the origin destination, the zoning of trips are all broken down within those cities as they are across the strategic model. The difference is that the detailed area of modelling the the road network has been refined, it's a little bit more refined, it'd be coarser for Sheffield, and areas outside the detailed area of modelling as well the zones in terms of the breakdown geographical coverage and zoning of the origin destination of the trips. So the model does cover Sheffield and Manchester. And therefore it does pick up any rerouting of trips that you know as a result of the scheme within Manchester and Sheffield in

terms of the origin destinations, the zones of those trips, and that is all accounted for all it means is that the model is less detailed, and therefore there's less certainty over the the rerouting of traffic within those cities themselves within the model. Not regarding that the the trips between along the a 57 or across the Pennine is between those two cities. So so just to reassure everyone, the model does include those two areas, but because of the lower level of certainty and as a result of the model detail in those cities. The economic case was the benefits the scheme did not look at any impacts on changes of journey times within those cities as a result of the scheme. So they've been discounted, either the benefits or the DIS benefits from the economic assessment of the use or benefits of the scheme.

34:10

Okay. And only hear from Delphi county council.

34:22

Yes, yes, by all means, we are the highway authority for darbishire Not Manchester nor are we hiring authority for Sheffield. I will draw your attention to our representation, rec 20512 Which shows is your questions you put to us no answer to the question 3.5 It talks about the study area in which we say we consider the study area appropriate for the for the for the purpose of it.

34:59

Thank you and does some side Metropolitan Borough Council have anything to add? At this point?

35:17

My read TNBC from 10 sides perspective, we consider the dilemma level of detail in the modelling is appropriate. We don't consider that there's more detailed modelling required for the reason that's set out in the highways England response

35:38

okay

35:53

can we now move on to question D. And can I ask what extent is considered policies aimed at traffic restraint, including encouraging routes that avoid the National Park reducing reliance on motor vehicles and encouraging active traffic within the traffic model? And then he affects the introduction of the Greater Manchester cleaners and whether or not these are reflected in the model. Can I hear first from the applicant please?

36:27

Thank you, sir. Richard Sterling analysis the applicant. Again, sir, Mr. Cates mark will provide you with assistance in relation to what's been delivered in the model. And then if there's anything further I need to add will be defier hand over now to Mr. Cates mark

36:46

at Steelcase Mark on behalf of the applicant the with regard to the restraint of traffic across the Peak District the those few consideration of measures such as restricting ATVs crossed the Peak District

National Park was considered as part of the option appraisal process for for the during the gestation of this this scheme, and was rejected and we have provided written responses on that matter previously, of why it was rejected as being undeliverable and inappropriate. Therefore, the model has not taken account of any restraint of traffic across the Peak District, it does just apply between the origin destination trips, it applies the usual factors of journey time savings will use the benefits to decide which routes the traffic chooses to take with the scheme compared to without the scheme. So it doesn't take any account of that with regards the Greater Manchester clear, so it doesn't actually take any account of that either. The reason for that is that the clear grey zone is actually targeted at commercial vehicles only it doesn't cut in therefore only covers a small proportion of the traffic on the road network. And the main objective of that clear air zone is to increase the rate at which or increase the take up the speed of take up of cleaner vehicles. So the biggest impact of that clear ozone will be a faster transition from the two cleaner vehicles. We don't believe it would have we think it had very marginal effect on the distribution of traffic in the net across the road network, because a lot of the traffic is of that commercial traffic will be serving the needs of the local community. And therefore it has no alternative but to go into the clear. So regardless of whether it's a a meets the criteria or not, because it will be serving the needs of the local community. So the view is from our perspective that the clearzone would have a negligible impact on the assessment of the scheme. And just to add to that, we did see in the press recently, there is now some doubt over the implementation of that clear air zone and that it and they are looking actually to water it down. And instead of having fines people who who are in breach will just be notified and offered help of how they might be able to move to a cleaner vehicle rather than it being imposing fines and also the timing of that may also be pushback as well.

39:48

Thank you. Do as the local highway authorities have comments. Tim side

40:01

My read TMBC had no we've noticed that the comments to add to that response

40:09

and dogshit likewise, no specific comments to add to that. Thank you.

40:16

Thank you. Questions ena, F relating to autonomous vehicles? I'm intending to take written responses to those comments with the applicant comment at the stage as to whether or not they consider that appropriate for have any objection.

40:50

And we have no objection in FRC intrinsically linked, writing if that suits

41:01

and do the local authorities consider that acceptable.

41:08

That's fine to I, I don't think dogs should come to counsel, but we'll be making any further representation on that particular subject.

41:18

Thank you, likewise, for

41:24

coming out, we're, we are interested in the effect of autonomous vehicles. And it'd be helpful for us to have an understanding of the time skills for vehicles being introduced the impacts of those on the traffic flows potentially, and then following from that on other related effects such as air quality and noise. And we haven't we haven't seen any assessment of that currently. So it would appear likely that the be some introduction of some degree of autonomy to vehicles within the relevant timescales that being considered in the assessment. So we welcome the applicant helping us to understand those issues, please, in really, quite broadly, in terms of how their introduction might affect the assessment.

42:22

Sir, could you provide some definition of what constitutes autonomous do? Do you mean self drive cars or electric?

42:32

Well, we welcome that being educated on these matters. We're looking to the applicant to do that for us. So yes, yeah, the full range of self drive, partially self drive, if there is such a thing, different degrees and types of autonomy, we'd welcome been educated on this week, as lay people were aware of the likelihood of some of these things being introduced in the near future, we just like to understand to what extent they may affect the assessment.

43:06

So a dice for so die. Okay.

43:10

So question G refers to the same issue of autonomous vehicles. So can the applicant and local authorities confirm that they'll include a response to question G in their written response on the matter of autonomous vehicles?

43:34

Thank you. So yeah, I put my camera on there was just about to mention that he also covered autonomous vehicle stereo, we have made a suitable note, we'll include that as well. So

43:46

thank you. Question. H. Is house worth or not? Any parties have comments? As I've said, I would like to take the interested parties comments in writing on those questions, and this matter, generally, to try and bottom out issues with modelling. I noticed that he fuckin has his hand up. Do you still wish to speak and similarly with Mr. Wimberly, so on here, first, from CPRE.

44:40

Thank you very much. I think it might be useful to tell you what we're what we're doing a little in advance of submitting it on the sixth on the 16th. I'll be very, very brief. Obviously, Mr. Cutler referred to the issue of whether Manchester was included in the model, that is, of course, not not an area of dispute. The question is the level, not just the level of detail, but what I said about the forecasting, which is applied in terms of Greater Manchester. And indeed, the costs which are applied on that network, which determine the outcomes of the traffic model. Now, those costs in Greater Manchester are what is known as the fixed cost network, plus masking. And those do have an impact, both on the economics and the whole picture. So to say that the Manchester is in the model, I'm afraid I slightly, slightly bristled at that, if you'll excuse me, obviously, we know it in the model, it's the question of how it is dealt with. So that is the key issue for us. And just to say that we have been extracting some data from national highways at the matrix level, looking at these actual places, to see where the costs are. And that is something that we will be including in our work on the 16th. But our view is that the change in costs, the level of cost changes, so close to Greater Manchester to exclude those is a mistake. So that's, you'll see, you'll see more from us on that. But I thought it would be only fair to point that out, not just to the to the panel, but also to to all participants in this in this hearing today. The second very brief point, I think it's clear from what the applicant has said that the active travel policies such as the Greater Manchester 5050, and indeed the decarbonisation strategy of DFT, the implications of those policies for major conurbations, like Greater Manchester, within which most of this scheme is located, that those policies are not in the modelling at the moment, we will be hopefully using what data we have been able to get on that we will make a written submission. So it's partly to flag it up and partly to clarify where we're coming from. So I hope that's been useful and hasn't taken up too much time. Thank you very much.

47:04

Thank you, Mr. Wimberly.

47:13

Yes, my main comment concerns paragraph T. You asked the applicant whether they had looked at capital restraint and policies to reduce reliance on motor vehicles and encourage active travel. And they went off into a riff on something completely different, which was HGV diversion from the National Park. They did not say a word about restraining motor vehicles in general, they didn't say a word about travel. They didn't say those words, because they haven't done any work on it. And if we look at the transport assessment report, the paragraphs on practically everything are devoid of information. So when you look at buses and trains, the bus, the bus map, because map is incorrect, the what there statement that buses will suffer no delay is contradicted by he themselves in other documents. And when you come to rail, there was no consideration of Hope Valley capacity, same is being done now on the impact of that on the monster Wimberly.

48:18

And would you be able to include these comments? In your written submissions for deadline for?

48:31

Well, yes, I would just hope that at this session, we have some live discussion with he seemed to be asserting things on different sightings of the network.

48:46

Yes, thank you.

48:47

I think Mr. Wimberly to be fair to the applicant. They did. They did mention the question of restraints of traffic, and they refer to some of their previous submissions, they considered that restraint of traffic across the Peak District was inappropriate. So then they did address the point of restraint. But I think perhaps I've certainly marked this as an area for us to look into a little bit more in terms of restraint and consistency with policy. So that's certainly an area that we'll be looking at a little bit more but to be fair, the African did address that did address the restraint point but we'll take as we said, We'll take your comments in writing. Definitely possible thank you for that.

49:41

Okay. Moving on, and with regard to the model, can the applicant explain or provide commentary on which roads traffic is moving from to provide increase in traffic volume on the A 57. Snake pass. So which areas of the existing network suffer sorry, experience transference to the snake pass. And I hear from the applicant on that place.

50:19

Thank you for returning I'm out gap can be against there, if I invite Mr. Cates mark will be able to assist you in terms of the increasing volume on the 87 states pass and how that results, Mr. Cates Smart

50:36

Stick case work on behalf of the applicant. The first thing I'd like to point out is the way the model works, it is not possible to be precise about exactly where traffic is transferring poem, in comparison to the do minimum scenario, because of the way the model works, it deals with the trips in a homogenous way. So you can't actually look at each individual trip and say in the do minimum it does this route. And in the do something it does this alternative route, you can't do that comparison because of the way the model operates. So we're in terms of trying to give you an answer on this, we have to look at the output plots from the model. And we do some further analysis on individual links, which gives an indication of what is happening. But it's not just to say it's not a definitive answer. But that analysis has indicated that the the transfer is predominantly is from journeys that are currently taking place to the self along along the a six and a 623. And we think that's accounting for approximately half of the that that that change. And the other part portion, and that, interestingly, that we think includes particularly journeys between Sheffield and Manchester Airport, a one of the the trips that are transferring, and then there is the other one is from the north, from the ASIC from the M 62. To the north, we think that's a kit that accounts for around 20%, approximately 20% of the uplift and the remaining sort of 25 to 30% of trips. So, you know, transferring from a whole range of different locations, and there's no, you know, looking at it, it's to disperse to identify the dominant aspect to that. Thank you

52:54

can just ask a question all innocent? Certainly. So the the boat development seems to be so these six to eight as part of the strategic road network, the 57 isn't the proposed development seems to be increasing traffic rather than more on the 57 than it does on the six to eight. Is that is that an unusual consequence of strategic road network projects? It seems slightly odd that the way that that is working through a strategic road network project is not increasing on the six to eight, as much as it is on the 57 is some The question may not take us anywhere. I'm just curious as to the applicants view of that really.

53:50

Thank you. So, we have to take instructions on that point less mistake case Mark was able to immediately address the point and

54:03

stick a mark representing national highways. I made some comments I how normal it is I can't comment. How typical it is. I mean, the rerouting is a factor in this case of the constraint on capacity through Hollingworth, which, which actually means that this scheme improves capacity on past Mottram more, but it doesn't, it doesn't do anything for Hollingworth, and therefore, the traffic does by its nature reroute along the A 57. Because it can't get through Hollingworth because of the capacity constraints. So that is the nature of the reason. But in terms of volumes, yes, the percentage increase on the A 57 looks larger, but that's because the 57 has a lower traffic flow. If you actually look at the absolute numbers, that the increase is not so dissimilar in terms of absolute numbers of vehicles on those two routes, it's around 1100 a day on the a six to eight and around 1450 on the 857. Thank you.

55:23

Thank you. Just a quick question, has an overall high level sense check have been undertaken on the traffic model? Could I hear from the applicant?

55:44

Thank you, sir. Richard filling out the application in terms of centre checks, or sorry, just clarify

55:53

oil level assessment of the results coming out whether or not in transport terms they make sense. You know, they're not, there aren't some unexpected results, or skewed results that you wouldn't anticipate to come from the scheme?

56:17

Thank you. That's helpful perhaps if I can invite Mr case, Malik to explain the governance process and the checks and balances that entails and to assist you on that pointer.

56:30

Case while representing national highways, yes, it sends techie since check is carried out and that the model process goes through has to go through a formal process of quality assurance and checking, both internally within the consultants own practice quality assurance route, it is then independent chaired by an independent team at national highways that do that much higher level sense check and

will question and challenge the outputs of the model. Before being confident that it's giving a sensible answer. And also, there are also the other the the actual validation, calibration, validation matrixes, that that, that are used to check the robustness of the model in terms of how well it's representing the the existing network, and therefore how well it's going to forecast the future situation, which are which are done and the module is subject to a number of these tests, which determine whether it is simply suitably validated, and therefore fit for purpose.

57:40

Thank you. That's helpful. Moving on to the effects of the proposal on traffic outside of the order limit.

58:02

Looking at gossip itself. Traffic on some links within glossy is predicted to increase as a result do something scheme when you compare it to the minimum what consideration is the applicant given to mitigating any effect of this increase on severance and public transport within got itself? So could I hear from the applicant?

58:31

Thank you. So which turning on the health advocate. The third is understand essentially, the effects haven't been deemed sufficient to trigger a requirement for any education, per se. And we did explain that in some of the earlier written responses that can provide if you require a note for you now, or at least we'll include that in the written response with your benefit. Now it's an R 0751. And rep one hyphen 042. And that's the reason unless there's other things to case Mark wanted to our school, we can assist you further with this point. And

59:18

see cake on national highways, it would just point out that the issue environmental management and assessment guidelines suggest that a threshold of an increase of 30% in traffic to trigger is a significant effect on the road network. So you have in terms of deciding whether mitigation is required. You know that it's a fairly high threshold that is, is the guideline in Environmental Assessment guidelines. And I think the guideline is 30% to 60% is considered A minor adverse impact or 60 to 90% is considered a moderate and then over 90 is considered a major adverse impact.

1:00:13

Thank you can I ask you to also cover my question at point K of what consideration has been given by admin to the effects of current levels of traffic passing through the residential streets and here I'm looking for consideration of the effect of Route transference within God's itself from the 52nd to other residential streets. So, could the applicant address that

1:00:56

could I just add to that, there have been representations about rat runs the extent to which those have been modelled so if that point could be covered as well have the potential streets on which rat runs might develop be modelled?

1:01:14

Thank you, sir. If I invite Mr. Cates Mark, just respond to those points. At this time, Mr. Kitsis

1:01:24

Yes, DK smart net representing national highways. The model includes a relatively detailed representation of the road network but it doesn't include every single residential street within the area so it won't pick up absolutely every every street the model given its size, it wouldn't be practical to do that. It takes those those routes which are judged to carry you know, through traffic proportions of significant portions of through traffic and the view is that the model has picked up those key routes in Glossop Dale particularly the the route that is mentioned in some of the written representations you know, denting road and shore lane and that that that route is alternative to Glossop High Street, which is is known to be an existing alternative route the traffic uses to avoid congestion in Glossop and because this scheme does not do anything to relieve congestion in Glossop but attracts more traffic along the 857 some of that traffic inevitably ends up following that that rat run as you call it along tinting lane and shore. So, tinting road and shore lane. And that is what the model showing. So the model we believe is accurately representing those runs that people have have discussed.

1:03:02

So are you satisfied that the parameters used for modelling those routes are appropriate?

1:03:13

Yes, yes, we are satisfied that they are appropriate. Yep.

1:03:17

Have you? Have you given an indication of the changes in traffic levels? Anticipated on those routes? Are those those been set out for us?

1:03:26

Yes, in previous submissions. We have set that out. Yes. Thank you. Thank you. And I think at this

1:03:36

point, I'd like to hear from the local authorities to see if they have any comments particularly darbishire. County council. So could I hear from Daksha first?

1:03:49

Yes, sir. I don't think there's anything necessarily that I would just disagree with what Mr. Cates Mark has already said You know, I as I alluded to earlier, you know, that the what the model is isn't perfect. If, for example, you were looking at a scheming Glossop, you will probably look to develop a more defined model with more leaks in it and fewer zone centroids I guess it comes back to this issue of Fitness, fitness for purpose and as I stated before, so, you know, in terms of its fitness for purpose, where, you know, broadly broadly broadly satisfied with the model, you know, thinking filleth philosophically, it would be perfectly possible to spend another, you know, 40 or 50,000 pounds on a better a better, well defined traffic model, but you know, it the end of the day, that might give you more information about local traffic effects. implications for local movements on on local roads, but I don't think so that would necessarily also the decision that you are faced with. And your decision, if you

commit me to summarise is very selective to consider the benefits of a scheme versus versus the benefits of a scheme. And, you know, as I said before, the model is not perfect, but you know, I'm not convinced that spending another 50 60,000 pounds on a model is is going to make your life any, any better or any any easiest. Could I just come back to the, to the previous point we were discussing, if 57 Snake pass in your concerns counter intuitively about traffic on on the 57? Well, it, it doesn't come to any surprise to me says because when we looked at previous incarnations of the previous previous schemes, you know, certainly by including the the local road, that then local was an element, it does encourage traffic on to onto local roads, which, which, again, is is not a desirable, it's a it's a dis benefit, and it's something that we would we would need need to consider but mindful of the opportunities that we've been presented with, from national roads, you know, to to, to look at this in a bit more, a bit, a bit further and a bit more detailed. And I'd like to think that this perhaps was put in front of you at some point in the future. So in the form of pap statement of common ground. I don't think I've really got much to add, thank you.

1:06:44

That's a useful suggestion. And it's outside your area, but testinside Got any comment on that?

1:06:54

Thank you, sir. might read? TNBC No, there's no further comments from Tameside on that on that matter. Thank you.

1:07:03

Thank you. And I'm aware of issues raised by local people, and most particularly by Mr. Bagshaw so I just like to ask if Mr. Banks or has any comments to make, and I think this is an appropriate point to take those Mr. Bagshaw?

1:07:31

Yeah, the see is quite unclear. It's been unclear from any documentation that NHS providers are either not provided exactly what the Abbeyfield alternative is, I mean, there are different there are different routes and as an expanded role, very, very difficult route. And but the Abbeyfield road isn't covered by the model at all. That would be one. One clear way was that people might take turning left at will the bridge. And if people chose that route, then it takes them up to the five ways junction. The tough new shell line from their Padfield mechanistic equation as well because there's two routes you have to add fuel. And then either the Denton lane roads which congested North Road, it would be like a 5050. For motorists heading towards a snake pass whether there was to head back down to the 57 the main set of lights are to carry just carry straight on through or Glossop and run through Glossop coordinates. Probably a chef feel real. So that's not covered by the model at all. And that information, obviously isn't available to local people to comment on and never has been. And I just wonder why that information hasn't been made available. Because it's only come out through CPRS published publishing the BPA documents, specifically the rooster market where where were these? Did this is not a specific road. It's called the appealed answered in this document is called the applet alternative. But it isn't a specific route. It's an area and so local people don't have never had any part of the any opportunity to comment because they've never had access to this data. And I think that's a real concern.

1:09:52

Can we can we just start to discuss something with this diet for a moment I'm just going to put ourselves on mute

1:10:39

Thank you. Mr. Batra in your written representation, Could you outline and identify potential rounds so that the applicant can provide further specific comment on that is?

1:10:56

Yes.

1:10:58

And can we extend that invitation to the other parties present? So if you're aware of potential alternative routes or reference, whichever the correct term is, if those could be set out, I think it'd be good to good, very valuable to have the benefit of your local knowledge on unlikely alternative routes. So if any parties could set those out for deadline for and then we'd invite the applicant just to respond on the consideration that's been given to those routes and whether or not they've been modelled. So we'll leave it at that point. Mr. Bagshaw thank you for your contribution that that I think we'd like to move on very much. Thank you.

1:11:50

Oh, and I note that Mr. McCrory from high peak, has his hand up. Could I hear any comments that you wish to make at this stage?

1:12:04

Hi, yes, Dan McCrory from hybrid Borough Council. Just regarding with the redistribution of traffic on the networks. We do consider this to be a significant clarification is needed, as that has been used to screen out the requirements to do air quality assessments and further assessments in certain areas. So the presumption of where the traffic's moving obviously is quite critical to that. I'll just make another comment over previous sorry that the traffic modeller from the applicant, I believe referred to the institute EP UK guidance in terms of significant effects. I don't believe I've seen that referred to before in terms of the screening criteria, which has been based on the Dr. MRB criteria, the screening criteria for effects or apparent effects for the EP UK guidance, an EMAC is quite substantially lower than the DM RB requirements, for example, that would require an air quality assessment with an increase of 25 A HGV vehicles within an air quality zone.

1:13:18

We aren't going to come to it. I appreciate that. Sorry, the face yeah, there is there is obviously a knock on effect of the modelling discussions. We have here another effect so we're aware of that. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

1:13:35

I have a hand up from Mark James. Could you introduce yourself and I also have Hi fake.

1:13:48

Thank you, Mr. James. Hebrew accounts just to add to Dan's point of clarity. But it does appear as though there is an outstanding issue in terms of mitigation on the local highway network in Glossop, as Dan alluded to, that has related effects on areas that we are interested in terms of our quality but also the economic impact on local businesses for example, and social sure we'll get that later in the agenda. But I just want to raise that now as a point of principle really. Thank you.

1:14:21

Mr. Windley. You popped up on camera

1:14:28

your microphone the microphone switched

1:14:29

off at the moment your microphone is still switched off. Mr. Window, your microphone is switched off. We can't hear what you're saying. Could you switch your microphones on

1:15:05

Sorry, Mr. Wimberly. We can't We can't leave we're going to carry on. Perhaps we'll ask a member of the case team just to get in touch with the to see whether whether they can handle if a member of the case King case team could do that, please. Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Wimberly. I'm not sure what's happened there, but we can't see.

1:15:25

And can I hear from the applicant with any comments they'd like to make with regard to what we've just heard from interested parties and heartbeat Borough Council?

1:15:43

So I went you're telling them now the applicant so unless there's anything in specific that Mr. Case marks able to address in relation to the gains that was referred to? I was just going to know that obviously, I quality is that item seven, and is coming up on the agenda, but what we dealt with tomorrow, and no doubt we can delve into those matters in more detail there. I can see Mr. Kate Spark has joined me on screen. And it's not just he wants to add something to the city's SDK smart

1:16:14

natural highway representing national highways. Just to clarify the point I made about the IEMA guidance is that guidance regarding traffic and transport impacts those those proportional changes in traffic flow do not apply to noise re quality, which have their own separate criteria. So just to clarify that point.

1:16:36

Okay, there was a moment please.

1:17:04

With regard to the points raised and that trafficking grace is the applicant content to respond to written comments that we will be receiving from

1:17:20

interested parties. So that includes alternative routes in Yes, including

1:17:25

the alternative routes

1:17:29

sandwich selling on their behalf, we can say yes, and obviously, we can respond to the comes down submitted. And deadline for we can respond to those in writing. The only other point I'd make is that some of those comments and came from high peak Borough Council, and may be capable of being recorded in the statement of common ground as well. So we can look at which the most appropriate route

1:17:59

would be useful decades. It's approaching one o'clock, and we've been sitting for some time now. So I'm intending to adjourn for lunch. I would like to reconvene at two o'clock be the live streaming. If you're watching the live stream stream, please be aware that Blosser will now stop. To view the restarted meeting, you will need to refresh your browser page when we really start at two o'clock. And so thank you for your participation this morning. And we look forward to the session this afternoon. And when the meeting is now adjourned, and brick Mensing 2pm. Thank you