

# TRANSCRIPT\_DAY2\_SESSION2\_A57LINKR OADS\_10022022

00:06

Good afternoon, everybody the time is now 1pm. And this hearing is restarting please put a member of the case in confirm I can be heard clearly that the live streaming and recording restarted. Yeah,

00:19

I can confirm you can be heard clearly on the live stream slash recording has now started. Thank you.

00:25

Thank you Please can I remind all parties to give you a microphone muted camera off until we vote you to speak. Each time that we invited speak, please give your name and on whose behalf you are speaking Thank you. So this is the resumption of the issue specific hearing too. And we are at item seven on the agenda quality. We are running to schedule and hope to complete their quality, then potentially have a short break depending on the on the progress we make and address for the specific issues and the item eight. So air quality. There has been quite a bit of interest in our quality number of submissions. We will, on this occasion be inviting any general comments from interested parties towards the end of this section. So the intention is to go through the agenda to get responses from the named parties in the agenda to the points of the two raised and then to take me to the contributions at the end of item seven. So if anybody wants to prepare to make a false statement, then there's there's a little time to do that. Those statements will on this occasion limited to two minutes. Quality so study area baseline conditions overall methodology. First question in relation to climate change implications for air quality. So the applicant of deadline to suggested that any adverse changes to air quality as a result of climate change would be outweighed by a beneficial shift to electric vehicles. With the local authorities like to comment on the applicant response, and can I start with Tameside this time, please

02:47

But Simon Eastwood 10 side um one thing to say is it's going to depend on the take up of electric vehicles, both private ones, goods, ones, passenger service vehicles, etc. And that's a bit of an unknown quality real. Thank you.

03:22

Yeah. Okay, thank you for that. That's helpful. Daksha. County council, please. Sorry, Steve have Radosh county council. So our colleagues at Hyde Park Council are going to cover Quality Matters for us this afternoon thinking fine. That's that's fair. Thank you very much. Hi, Pete. Borough Council, please.

03:53

Right, James happy Borough Council. I'll hand over to my colleague Dan McCrory,

03:57

who will lead on air quality.

03:59

Thank you. Yeah, pretty much. Sure. I would agree. For weeks that. Essentially, the effects on climate change in this context will entirely depend on the uptake of electric vehicles and whether it probably was a question that snuck in by the applicant to be fair to them. It was more like a comment. I think. That seemed to me when I read it, sort of an add on at the end, really, in terms of a bit significance.

04:34

So this isn't something that's a pressing concern to

04:37

when it comes into the whole holistic approach towards climate change, really, rather than perhaps specific to the air quality issues if you like.

04:45

Okay, that's fine. Thank you very much. Leave it at that. That was the moment So next two questions are in relation to the consideration of terrain.

05:18

And in response to a question, we have to consent that adjustments for terrain to be made in accordance with Defra guidance. And as a reference to adjustments been applied when the difference between modelling and monitoring was greater than 25%. So there have been right representations made about whether sufficient consideration be given to terrain example, if had been there, but imagine tension causes camera. I don't know who spoke there. Let me continue. So the there have been some concerns raised about allowances for heavy duty vehicles, for example, travelling uphill through tin Twistle, as one example, there are obviously the steep slopes in different parts of the study area and beyond. And so there's just an initial question as to could the applicant, perhaps explain a little bit more about the allowance made for terrain, there was a suggestion of if a 20, if there's 25% variance, then it was considered explicitly, I wonder if that could just be explained a little bit more. So that we can understand when allowances for terrain haven't haven't been made. So over to the African, please.

06:52

Thank you. So Richard furling on behalf of the applicant, and so just initially dealing with the first point about the 25% area and where that comes from, and that that that forms part, as you say, the Defra guidelines, which you just referred to, and in particular, the local air quality management technical guidance, 16, which identifies that a 25% variance between modelling and monitoring data is acceptable. Further details on that methodology, and they just want to provide it in the ies chapter five on air quality. And do also have an colleague, Miss Robinson, with me today in relation to air quality, this, at this point, defined by Miss Robinson to introduce herself, and then I think she'd be able to explain a little bit more about the approach in relation to gradients and vehicles, and then that might conveniently lead into the next question, sir.

07:54

Thank you. That's helpful.

07:58

Susie Robinson quality specialist for national highways in relation to the terrain, effectively, we did give it we did give a response previous in more detailed response to that previously, but just to summarise on on that. So effectively, what we did within the air quality modelling was we did an initial model without terrain, and we would have done a model verification process. And we found and as part of that, we look at ways that how we could improve that model verification prior to applying any sort of adjustment. So what what we found, though, is we've actually applied in specific locations in the model area where we found that there was a gradient in the road of greater than 6%. We applied. We, we did some further work on the emissions calculations to reflect the impact that you would have the gradient on the vehicle emissions. So that was vehicle emissions for both the heavy vehicles and, and other other types of vehicles such as cars and light commercial vehicles. And then we did a we. So we then took that as our core model run. So rerun that model re undertook the verification, we found that there was still some differences of over 25%. But how we've addressed that is we've applied a model adjustment and within local zones within that the whole air quality study area to reflect those local factors. Because we found there wasn't anything further that we could do in terms of the model setup to better reflect what was happening there in terms of the you know, potential terrain impacts. Okay. Sorry. No, that's all I was gonna say. Thank you, sir.

09:47

Okay, thank you. So just just to make sure that I've answered correctly, so the verification was at the model against mission measured data monitoring data or

10:01

That's right. Yes.

10:03

So there's an initial verification process that led to adjustments being made for gradients, more than 6% that those adjustments were applied. And then there were still discrepancies of over 25%. So that could have been due to gradient or any other discrepancies. I imagine. So there are model wide adjustments that were then carried out, have I broadly understood?

10:35

That's right. Yes.

10:37

Okay. Thank you. Okay. That's clear. With the local authorities comment, are there any concerns from the local authorities about the consideration of terrain, including heavy duty duty vehicles travelling the pillar? Could I start with high peak please?

10:56

Yes, there are. The the model that was just described is accurate, there is a quite a lengthy response by highways England, which shall be responding to but just to clarify a couple of points in that. Terrain does come into the initial model, setup, looking at meteorology and things like that. So that would look at you would set up your model and look at things like downwash effects of buildings and that sort of stuff. That's not as highways England correctly states that usually if that's less than 10%, on a road, it wouldn't particularly influence that. And so they haven't looked at that. The the issue for us really was looking at the emissions and the F T that they've used to apply to emissions for vehicles, when they're on a gradients. Now, the maximum gradient that you can input into that is 6%. However, you can put in a gradient from point one to 6%. And it's not clear why only a 6% gradient was applied at three locations, and no gradient at all was applied, which would have basically equated the translated, if you like the traffic makeup on a road to the emissions that are coming out, as in if it's a flat road, or the the emissions are different to if there's a gradient, the emissions will increase, particularly with regard to HTV vehicles and larger vehicles as as you'd expect, because they're bigger and take more energy to move. So that would be our concern there.

12:30

So So phone send that there's a feeling that the adjustment should be made for gradients of less than 6%. Because with regard

12:39

to the tea model, yes. Yeah. And emissions applicate, the applications of the emission factors that you use when you change your vehicle numbers, if you like. So the way it would work is that vehicle types have an emissions amount of emissions coming from them. And that change is dependent on speed, and also dependent on the gradient supplied. So we want a bit of clarity as to what gradient was applied with tin whistle, particularly, but but that would apply everywhere, I guess.

13:13

And that will, you will set that out in a written submission in more detail. Did you say? Yes, you can. Yes. Yes. Thank you. And could that be the deadline for that? Thank you. That Thank you, hopefully, cool, we'll leave the applicant to respond to that written submission. Thank you, Tim. Side anything to add these

13:40

semones with time side? No, nothing to add real.

13:44

Thank you. Okay, let's move on to the next points. Modelling and methodology and Hyper Growth Council raised a number of concerns and their deadlines to submission, about modelling and methodology. That included consideration of the Air Quality Management errors, which we'll come to later. So we couldn't leave that to later. There are questions about the accuracy of the traffic data used for screening that we are asking some questions on that around the Air Quality Management Areas later as well. There was a question of clarity of the data use model various verification concerns about the backhand analyse data and the potential for under prediction by the model. Questions about whether the model have been improved in line with Defra guidance, questions about the application of

various correction factors. We've had discussion about some of those and the potential for background concentrations to be under predict both to 30% Whether that was high, the applicant responded to those concerns that deadline three. And I won't summarise all of those responses have been reviewed the responses would I would hide peak for a council light to respond, I see be helpful if height people are cancelled, given overall response now, to the applicants responses, I suspect these are things that would also be useful to for the council to respond to in writing. But if an overall response could be given that would be helpful.

15:42

Yes, I can give an overall response I've had time to Well, I have had time to digest my computer's frozen. So yeah, it says it's helped with memory. And the, the, the issues that we currently raised and they have been addressed to a point I've obviously got to interrogate the, the what the applicant has stated. And some of the information that we requested has been stated to have occurred, but from I'm sorry, ma'am, to this remembering, but we haven't seen necessarily the evidence of that. And that is really regarding the initial model setup. And one of one of my concerns, and it's not. I certainly sympathise with the ability to set up a good model. But one of our clarities that we wanted was really what the applicant considered to be the baseline data that he was verifying his model against. And that comes to the point that I made previously, for the layman, if you like the issue there is with an ideal model, you would verify against data that you've collected yourself for a given year. And then you would set your model up to match that data as best you can by setting up a mimicking of that. And that was a step removed in this case, and the majority, or some of the data, or at least quite considerable amount of the data was not from year 2018. But it was back corrected in many cases from 2019, or even forward projected from 2015 60. This in invariably will introduce additional error in the accuracy of those measurements. I don't want to certainly housing have responded to that. And I haven't had a chance to fully digest the arguments that they've put forward for that. And what I would say as an overview is that in an ideal world, I think they would have looked at separate models set up slightly differently for the different terrains. What there's an overarching assumption is, is that the flow of air, the emissions and everything across the whole scheme with one model that you can then apply a correction factors for is the approach to take, or at least that's what it seemed with the initial submission. I know that highways England now gone on to say that they did look at the initial setup of the model. So basically, if you get your initial setup and model, and it's quite a bit out from the prediction to the first stage is to go hang on a minute, is our set is our imaginary picture of the scene that we are modelling accurate, because they're so wildly different. And it was that that I was seeking clarification that that is what had happened in the first instance. So for example, it would be, you know, does 10 whistle, which is quite high up represents the same as somewhere in Mottram that's really busy and low down. In an ideal world, I'm sure and I'm sure it's time constraints. And while you would perhaps look at individual areas, and certainly when you get close to areas that subject to small change may impact the quality more, you would perhaps expect that to be done in a more detailed fashion in those areas such as the AQ Ma's, which which weren't locked up in this instance.

18:55

Okay, thank you. There are some quite technical aspects to the discuss. And obviously, it's necessary to cover those technical aspects correctly. It would be helpful to us to include some plain English so that we can also help to follow the key issues. We have a technical mindset, but we're not air quality

specialists. So be helpful for us to have an understanding are you able to say at this stage, so there are questions later about air quality management areas, we've got some real concerns about those the types of the issues that you're looking to have clarity on could those have resulted in some of the assessments changing to a large degree or failing about that at all? Certainly,

19:50

what I would say is that they've done some sensitivity analysis and that was okay. It was pretty, you know, it gave some confidence that the results are not necessarily wildly wildly out. The difficult, it's a slight issue with the way that local air quality, for example, but the RM SM, factor in the 25% thing that you were doing before, what you might do is you, you would, when you're doing a prediction, the RMS will come up with a number, it'll be the number that's actually in the thing that you're the reason that they give a 10% error as the ideal is that equates to a four micron change error at either side, and form and when the the limit is 40, so it's a 10%. So it's four. And obviously, when you're in the range of 25%, then you're 10. Either way, like in terms of the difference. Now, that's not the overall difference. That's the proportion equated to a car. But it still obviously, ops that accuracy of your readings. And then when that is report done in a report, and this is certainly nothing to do with highways, England, that error factor is not necessarily noted. And they don't have to know that. But it is a consideration. So you always want a more robust model to get more accurate assessment of the impacts in that in that way. So I suppose from our point of view, it would be more of a coherent story as to why certain the way the model is set up in terms of, for example, there's a section on the what what data was used and what data was discarded. And in some instances, there's good arguments as to what the data was used and what was discarded. But the initial run of the model was so scattered. And as in, it was all over the place. And you got a line going through the middle of saying this should be the prediction, it did suggest that possibly the model wasn't applicable across the whole scheme in its initial phase. And so yeah, that there is some concerns on the accuracy or at least the way that that's been translated to me the way the robustness that they set the model up. But I don't want to I do know that they've some good or explanation may so I don't want to, to, to go in too hard on the mitten until I've read their responses.

22:19

Okay, that that that's helpful. There are issues that we are concerned about. And obviously, if there are underlying residual concerns about the accuracy of the modelling, then the this could be quite important. So look forward to seeing your responses, the applicant responses to those will be watching this very carefully. Thank you. Alright, let's move on from that into the construction phase. quantitative assessment of construction, traffic scoped out. Again, happy Borough Council raised concerns about screening and the concerns raised about whether additional construction vehicles have been considered. And traffic management measures included in the screening, the applicant responded to say that construction vehicle movements weren't included in the model. But for the screening was carried out that substantial traffic management was not expected and impact for short term. And there's reference to dmrB la one of five criteria. So having again seen that response, happy Borough Council apsis another one to take in writing, but any overall comments to add to what you've already said on this from these?

23:52

Well, the again, I do apologise, my screen is frozen. I think the main take home response that I read in that was that the the traffic impacts are not actually considered to be affecting high peak, I believe in that response that they gave when I glanced over it. So I'll caveat that we will respond at a later date on that just to clarify that. But this may be one more of our colleagues at Tameside as well.

24:21

Okay, that's a thank you and in fact, yes, the applicant did clarify that construction vehicles not proposed to use existing motors in height peak team side have any concerns about the modelling of construction vehicles in their area and the screening side they're

24:44

almost the construction is in Tameside. So yes, I presume we will have some concerns but I think we need to reply with It turned out.

25:01

Okay. Thank you. So if there's reference in the agenda to, to the applicants responses. So, yes, if we could have a submission from you, enlightening, that'd be very helpful. Thank you. Mr. Wimberly. I think your your cameras on. Thank you. Right. Let's move down. Would the applicant like to respond to any of those issues? Or is it happy to wait and respond to hightly borough Council's deadline for submissions at deadline five in writing?

25:36

Thank you, sir. Richard telling on behalf the applicant in terms of responding to hi peak. We're happy to respond in writing once, once they've had the opportunity to digest and access the information if the screens are not working in the moment and respond accordingly. All I was going to say, Sir, was just in relation to the benefit of time side. And that there are references in the agenda to where responses have been provided. But actually, the response about the construction vehicles is actually a response that national highways gave to the local impact report. Yes, by dog show and high peak. And that's actually library reference our EP three hyphen 018. And it's, I believe it's on page 20. And it's in response two point 8.35. Yes. I just noted that that wasn't in the appearing in the question, although I think it is referenced later on, sir.

26:41

It is. And thank you for that. That's and I have the same references. There's notes to myself that, so thank you. Thank you for pointing that out. Then let's move on to pre commencement. I think we dealt with pre commencement earlier in the week. But let's, let's just double check. So

27:08

the local authorities were generally not concerned about pre commencement activities and the mitigation of those, apart from archaeology in particular. So that's been addressed separately. In its response to one of the written questions, the applicant did say, though, that the complaint response, that complaint response procedures, and the Community Engagement Plan would be prepared and implemented prior to construction. I wonder is that, indeed the applicants intent? I don't believe that secured anywhere. But is is that plan intended to be produced at that time? And is that a necessary

mitigation that's needed during the pre commencement stage? Could the applicant comment on that, please? Turn side, Mr. Eastwood, your cameras turned on. Sorry. Thank you.

28:07

Thank you, sir. Richard, failing on Mount the applicant. So I can confirm that that plan is to be bad new fact. The outline plan was submitted a deadline bring, I believe it's included in the news, the outline nuisance management plan, which I think you'll recall was submitted deadline three, and it actually forms the next set of questions.

28:34

So I don't think there is a mechanism currently within the DCR to secure that pre commencement.

28:46

precleanse. Yeah, said I think we, we've given the responses you say in relation to pre commencement mitigation measures, I think that point there was that all the effects are within the normal realms of what you would expect and and as per the discussion on Tuesday, the local authorities agreed with that approach. And I think the point is that it was reversible. Such Yes.

29:21

So is the applicants position is that the complete response procedures that communicate Community Engagement Plan mitigation, prior to construction is not necessary.

29:36

And to have that plan secured and in place prior to construction, is that necessary mitigation or not?

29:46

No, sir. I don't believe that is necessary medications prior to construction.

29:51

Okay, thank you, then could the local authorities contend with that and let's let's just concentrate on Hi pique. First please.

30:06

Yes, I think we we probably are.

30:08

Yeah, thank you and Tim side, please.

30:13

Simon Eastwood Tameside? Yes, I think I think so. Yes. Thank you.

30:18

Thank you. Just mitigation and monitoring, the applicants submitted netline Nuisance mitigation plan deadline three. And thank you for that. Question Why the applicant has noted that DMR B Ia one and

five does not follow that Institute of air quality management guidance to the local and I think that the applicant is particularly suggested that DMR B La 105 is designed more appropriately for the type of mitigation required for this type of project being a highways project to the local authorities have a view on whether DM RP La 105 Just mitigation measures appropriate or whether the mitigation should be in accordance with IA QM guidance. Should any other recognised guidance be included in the plan? High people accountable first, please.

31:32

I mean, the guidance is broadly similar in many regards, we would probably prefer it if it was done in line with IQ. Give me guidance, but it's it's not a deal breaker if you like

31:49

because preferred but not essential. Yeah. And anything to add from time safety's? No. Okay. Could the could, yep. Couldn't comment further on that? Perhaps how likely? Is it possible to highlight the differences of the IQ and guidance to the dmrB guidance might be something in writing, but just so that we can understand the differences?

32:23

Yes, I think I can go one better than that, hopefully. So insofar as, although the just assessment has been undertaking using the DMR by dmrB assessment methodology, because a high risk of just potential was identified, and just mitigation measures for that high dust risk potential were identified from the IA QM guidance, and they have been included in the nuisance nuisance management plan, which we provided a deadline three.

32:56

So the the IQ M guidance will be used for the high risk areas.

33:01

And it's the the the mitigation measures arising from there to get as high dose risk potential areas has been incorporated.

33:10

Okay. Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Let's move on to Zed. Do the local authorities have any general comments or concerns on provisions for dust mitigation and monitoring in the nuisance mitigation plan? As I'm assuming that there's been enough time to consider that plan? Or the local authorities to comment on on at this stage? Or would they prefer more time to examine that planned high peak, please?

33:42

I will send written confirmation but I'm in broadly in agreement with the plan.

33:47

Thank you. And Tim, side please

33:53

will send written confirmation.

33:56

Thank you. And if those could be provided, well, if possible by deadline for they'll be helpful. And then there's an opportunity for the applicant responded deadline five before we produce the questions. The deadline call would be helpful. But if more time is needed, then don't private suggestions in the agenda. That's point A. So let's move on to monitoring please. High Peak Borough Council raised some concerns about monitoring and high risk areas at high risk sites. Just to observe that the environmental statement paragraph 5.81 and refers to monitoring suggests that monitoring would be carried out however, section 511 suggested there'll be no monitoring. And then there's reference to monitoring high risk sites being discussed with the local authority. And the traditional mitigation measures should be consulted on with the local authority and agreed for high risk areas. The applicant responded to high P counsels observations at deadline three.

35:28

So that this there seems to be some difference between different parts of the s as to the extent of the monitoring the Riak aq 3.1 states that if necessary, monitoring parameters and the programme will be established and the effectiveness of mitigation will be evaluated in line with dmrB Ello 105 to 2.10 8.1. The react aq 2.1 mentioned consultation with local authorities. Let me this is a matter that I think Borough Council raised initially having seen the applicant responses and having perhaps reflected on what's in the rear currently, does it Borough Council have any outstanding concerns about monitoring during construction? Please?

36:25

We'd like to send a written submission on this one like I can't get it up on my thing at the minutes. Initially, it did seem acceptable, but I would like to dig into it a bit. Thank

36:36

you. Let's move on to the operational phase. So first, first question in relation to the assessment for the designing of 2040. And African said that there have been in response to a question the applicant said that the opening year of 2025 is expected to be a worst case rather than 2040. Because entries increasingly traffic between 2025 and 2040 would be more than offset by shift to electric vehicles. That seemed to be an assertion which I'm not aware of any quantification that supported that statement. Perhaps the local authorities could comment initially. So hi, Pete again, please.

37:43

And yeah, that that will be true for natural Darkside. In, in essence, nitric oxide is reducing year on year from vehicle emissions due to from low emission vehicles, not only electric vehicles, but other other vehicles too.

37:59

So evidence that has been seen already. Yeah, evidence

38:02

of that has been seen, and it wouldn't necessarily transfer over to particular matter, though.

38:08

Okay. And so, so, hopefully Borough Council would be content with the applicant's assertion that the shift to electric vehicles more than offset increases in emission between 2025 and 2040.

38:33

Yeah, wherever that that's what they are assessing, really, does it just the increase in traffic? It compensate for the for the improvement in vehicle emissions?

38:45

Well, sorry, the applicant is assessed 2025. Yeah. And it's explained it hasn't assessed 2040. I'm sorry, yes. Because because it's assumed that between 2025 and 2040, other traffic levels would increase the emissions that would be more than offset by a switch to electric vehicles. Does that seem reasonable?

39:09

It's reasonable for natural Darkside, I wouldn't necessarily say that it's entirely reasonable from a particulate matter which is less influenced by the emissions from a vehicle and more, you know, things like particles from your from your tires and brake. They would increase with increasing vehicle numbers currently.

39:32

Okay, thank you. That's helpful. Anything to add from time side, please.

39:39

I'm not really but I suppose the assumption depends on the ticket with electric vehicles over time.

39:47

Okay, thank you. Would the applicant like to respond to that please? So I think particularly on the point of particulates,

40:03

Thank you, Sir Richard curling on behalf the applicant. And obviously we had was setting welcome the agreement in relation to nitrogen dioxide. In terms of particulates, what was said in relation to be related to other matters such as brake and tire wear and things frayed that's the point we need to just secure some instructions on. So perhaps, if that was the comment that was going to come back in writing from high peak, I think they alluded to that consider deadline for the naturally, of course we can, we can reply to that deadline, Pfizer

40:45

isn't raised behind big deadline for if it could be covered. That's good. Make sure that's covered. In any case, that will be helpful.

40:54

So understood, and it does sound like a matter that insofar as released already half agreed. It could be something that may even flow into the statement of common ground.

41:08

It could it could it could die rather than wait for the high peak response. I think in providing the written summary a deadline for if it were possible just to cover the particular tissue. I'm not sure whether the the particulate emissions have been close to threshold in any way. So it may be quite a straightforward response. I'm not sure that if it could be made by deadline for in any case that that might be helpful. Yes,

41:39

understood, and we will arrange for that to become.

41:50

Thank you, let's move on to our quality management areas. Start with a twist of quality management area. No receptors have been assessed in the Tim Twistle Air Quality Management Area. And in response to a question the applicant explained. The reason for that was a screening out in accordance with dmrba one and five. And the applicant highlight that the predicted changes in traffic of 960 ADT were below the threshold of 1000 ADT.

42:34

I think it also been clarified that the thresholds of 1000 vehicles and 200 HD TVs represent the lowest threshold above which the traffic model can represent changes in traffic level with any degree of confidence. And it was explained that below that level, and it could not, there could not be confidence that there would be a change. So against that background, could the applicant set out the level of confidence. So this is Didi, the level of competence in 960 ADT level of competence in the accuracy of that, and the potential for change to traffic to exceed threshold of 1000 ADT applicants, please.

43:31

Thank you, Sir Richard curling on behalf the applicant. And say it as you say, and we did include, in the written response, the narrative explaining that those thresholds are in DP, the lowest possible thresholds have been set to ensure that the traffic model can accurately represent traffic conditions with an appropriate level of confidence. And so I think an important point to make about these these thresholds are that they're not something that that's new. They've been around for a long time. And they've consistently applied not only to this scheme, but to other schemes and advised have been near those thresholds in existence for many, many years. So there is a point about consistency there. And that if you start to expand their town, and you start to expand the assessment incrementally, and obviously that's that thresholds are there for a purpose. And unfortunately, they are absolute. And I do as you know, have Miss Robinson with me today. And because there was also a point raised yesterday in relation to AI QM thresholds by Hi Pete Borough Council. So at this point, if I just invite Miss Robinson to join me on screen and she can perhaps add anything further that you might want to add to

that initial response. And just clarify the point in relation to the IQ M before you bring in responses from the other party. So it's Robinson.

45:11

Thank you, Susie Robinson, air quality specialist for national highways. Yeah, just want to acknowledge Yes, there are other thresholds that exist, such as those are given in the Institute of air quality management guidance. It's their land use and development control guidance. So those those those thresholds are in existence, which are, they do have different thresholds from those that we've used in this assessment. But within that, ie QM guidance, it does state that those thresholds are specifically intended for residential and mixed use developments. And that, and that highway schemes have, you know, have their own set of criteria and thresholds that are used

45:57

those? Are those thresholds lower than yellow qualify thresholds? Typically?

46:06

They are lower Yes.

46:09

Say what the?

46:11

I don't have I don't have those to the hand. I'm afraid right now. We'd have to respond in in writing on those. But they're typically used for land use planning.

46:21

Yeah, yeah. Okay. Thank you. Let's, let's continue through E. FF, the questions are very related. So.

46:42

One of the one of the things we're trying to get to grips with is the consideration of air quality management areas, and the provisions in the act in particular, and non compliance issues around the air quality directives, the air quality standards, regs, 2010. And within those, there are specific things that we need to consider in terms of whether there could be new exceedances. So new, new non compliances within those areas, and that and that that could that could result from an error has been just below the threshold currently to just exceeding the threshold, which suggests that the changes could be rather small. And potentially, and then obviously, there's the test of so no new exceedances. But then there's also the the time scale to four planned measures to take below the exceedance level not to be extended. That was bad wording. I hope you understand what what was I mean, in either case, the compliance considerations and the quality director considerations actually may hinge around rather small changes in in concentrations. And I'm wondering the extent to which the DMR B guidance, which which is looking at the the 1000 ADT? Is that is that has that been designed more around a percentage increases considered? Potential potentially significant, as opposed to, in this case, it's a complaint if you are a small change is the relevant thing. So does the dmrB guidance and approach is

that designed for the consideration of Air Quality Management terrorists air quality directive? Could the applicant does that make sense first of all, and if so, could the applicant comment on that, please?

49:03

Thank you. So Richard, turning on the health of the applicant. And I believe we we follow that reasoning and approach and believe Miss Robinson will be able to join me and then explain in greater detail the interrelationship between dmr and the considerations in the director. Thank you.

49:28

Susie Robinson, air quality specialist for national highways. I wanted to give a little bit of background just initially on the air quality directive, and what Defra did work that Defra does in terms of assessing compliance against that against that in relation to what is within the dmr guidance in the 105 guidance. So within our within the dmr 105 guidance. It is There's a number of different parts to the assessment, the quality assessment that's undertaken. And there's an assessments where we look at the overall kind of significance as a scheme based on changes and concentrations on human health and ecological sites. And also, there's this core compliance risk assessment, which is in relation to compliance with the equity directives. And for these different elements, there's effectively two different two sets of future year concentrations that we calculations that we make that we consider in relation to these two parts of the assessment. So in terms of the compliance risk, we calculate future risks at future year concentrations based on the Defra local air quality management, technical guidance 16 methodology, and this uses a projection of the future year. concentrations, which is more optimistic. So effectively, you get lower concentrations predicted with that typically. And as part of our consideration of significance, we use something which is called and it's the national highways have developed, it's a long term trends and Calculation Method method. And effectively, it's less optimistic. So typically, as that part of the assessment on where we're considering significance, we have a lower sorry, we have a higher, we're typically predicting kind of higher absolute concentrations. And so in relation to the air quality directive, coming back to that, where we're assessing that item, we are looking at these left more optimistic future year concentrations. And so effectively is that an element of the assessment where we've assessed it within our schema in our schema where we assess that where we have an overlap between locations that Defra consider in their national level model for compliance, and whether or whether there is an overlap with our affected road network? We assess compliance for those locations. So within our study area, it might be useful if we could bring up

52:16

thank you. Can I just break in? Yes. Are those coke calculations carried out independently of the screening? Or does the screening results in those calculations not being carried out in some locations?

52:35

The screening is is with still for both of those levels of calculations, you would still undertake the same screening, so it still uses that 1080 Ti.

52:44

So you wouldn't be carrying out the calculations, you just said if it has been screened out for the compliance?

52:49

That's right. But effectively, what I was trying to say is that we're as part of the compliance risk assessment, if we were to, to undertake those calculations at other locations, it would just be to note that the concentrations that we would model at those locations would be more optimistic. And and so where we have undertaken those calculations, very close to the tent whistle a q&a on the a six to eight through Hollingworth, we're not showing an exceedance of limit values.

53:25

Yeah. That isn't in the Air Quality Management Area. That's

53:29

yeah. But for another section of road there, it's in terms of we show we'll show it, we're not showing exceedances when we look at it in terms of the LA QM differently QM TG 16 Productions. So we're not we're not showing there's a risk of compliance in that adjacent section of road, whereas we have had to consider that in the significance, overall significance of the scheme. Because when we're looking at less optimistic projections of future concentrations, we are showing exceedances

54:01

does the screening out deafer recognise screening out at all is that part of the methodology definitely applies.

54:10

And I mean, the methodology that definitely applies if they don't, they don't, they're only actually looking at it in certain locations. They have a national level model and of road links, and that is very much focused on urban areas. So they only consider they consider it mainly and they're looking at kind of, they split the UK into zones and agglomerations. So the nearest agglomeration for this will be the Greater Manchester area.

54:35

So there's no guidance within the DEKRA methodology around assessment or screening out in the way the applicants applied it here. There's no direct analogy there. And

54:48

that's right. No, there isn't. Yeah,

54:50

okay. Before anybody By peeking particular to comment and if they wish Peak District National Park. So what we're grappling with here is we have a need to consider compliance with the air quality directive. And the National Policy Statement is very clear about that. There is evidence of increases in traffic flows, albeit at a level the applicant is suggested. Can cannot be confidently taken as an indication of change. However, it does appear to be generally accepted that there'll be an increase in traffic as a result of the proposed development. So I think we need to be mindful of that background of there being likely to be an increase. The increase in traffic would appear likely to lead to an increase in

emissions. And some of those increase in traffic do appear to go through the tint Russell, Air Quality Management Area. So we seem to be in a position where the national policy statement is directing us to be satisfied in the respect I set out earlier, and I think we have reason to suspect there might be an increase in emissions in those areas. So we're left in the position of being required to consider it but not having the information available to reach a firmer conclusion. Because points haven't been identified in the Air Quality Management Area intend to So could the African just comment on that little dilemma and difficulty and whether it's able to help us in that in any way, please.

57:01

Thank you, returning on behalf of the African spelling, still with us might be able to just tackle that last point you're you're asking and I know from what she was explaining alone to care that the Defra certainly doesn't identify as a compliance risk, we intend to assume that Miss Robinson may be able to assist you further just in relation to potential for increased traffic, I think he was saying to and that that thing likely to lead to an increase in emissions? I think that's the point you're

57:39

asking. So I'm using very simple bugs. That, yes, so are you able to help us with that tool, who's

57:50

CS Robinson, air quality specialist for national highways, I can give a further few further points of clarification on that, yes, acknowledge that, you know, an increase in traffic, it could result in an increase in emissions and associated increase in concentrations. But typically, what we would do is we need to look at that increase in the context of what the current you know, the exists, you know, the existing or the forecast kind of without scheme. Concentration is, is, you know, we look at it that in that context. Defra doesn't hasn't currently identified that tin whistle is an area where they, they there is a compliance risk. And as I said earlier, it's a national level model. And effectively, what they're predicting within their national level model at that location is that we're already well below the limit value in that location.

58:42

Okay, so that's helpful to be helpful, helpful to set that out, if possible.

58:51

Is it too late to have a to identify some points within the 10 Twistle. area and to update the assessment to include those that the suggestion has been made there? I think that the 10 Twistle current levels are sufficiently far below the threshold that the proposed development is unlikely to take them above the threshold. That seems to be the suggestion, I think, I think it would give us more comfort to know that there have been some quantitative analysis of that. Do we think that's possible within the timeframes that we have?

59:33

Suzie Robinson, equity specialist national highways, I think we have to just take that away and look at the timescales for that. But just noting if we were to, if we will, we will be going beyond the kind of the screening criteria for that within dmrB That would be going outside of that got that, you know, there's

the standard that we have used for the assessment and we need to maintain, you know, consistent See?

1:00:00

Yeah, and I understand that so we get that tension between following the dmr. And as having been satisfied about following the national policy statement. So I hope that the applicant would be mindful of our dilemma in that respect. So if that could be considered. And well, we'll wait for your response on that, I think before taking that

1:00:31

said, Thank you, Richard, early on. I was just gonna say I think we're back to the point where we discussing earlier about the thresholds, and we open up the appropriateness of pants, it might be that the collider with further initiating response from that,

1:00:52

that'd be helpful. I think we need for help on this point. If I think that there will be, that'll be good. So with respect to 10, twists, in particular would would Hi, Peak District Council like to comment? Other concerns that I've raised, but just just just hoping to cancel and have any view of the concerns that I've raised, and just hopefully, District Council have any return concerns about the air quality management areas Entwistle or the appropriate way forwards?

1:01:27

Yeah, I'll just a couple of points, the compliance point assessment and screening out of air quality management are slightly different one, compliance points assessments are set by central government based on model data, and they identify areas where there's high levels. And so it's a separate thing. I don't think as they mentioned, the ACE would have road is on the compliance point bit. However, the the key thing for us, I think, and it was a question was, how confident are we that the 960 cars, which is 40, below the screening criteria? And what is the wiggle room there? How accurate is that? It seems to be? I wouldn't say churlish, but the argument it would seem as a precautionary principle would be to assess the an identified area of of the Air Quality Management zone where it's we are known to have issues or be it we are very much improved in that area.

1:02:25

But particularly given it is an Air Quality Management Area.

1:02:29

Yes, particularly given and as I say 1000 to nine, it's the the screening out is very reliant on the accuracy of the the forecast model. And obviously, the how accurate the forecast model is. I my colleagues at DCC answered that those questions, but the as a layman, I would have concerns along the a 57 as well, that that is only going to lead to an increase of 300 cars, you

1:02:57

know, what comes? We'll come to that one. Thank you. That's helpful, thank you, but perhaps the app can could take that on board as it responds. So would it would it actually have been helpful? Or is it

would it still be full tap or more precautionary view of the 960 and the carrying out an assessment? Not screening at that area?

1:03:24

Could I just add one more thing? Sorry, just one thing I would say is that the even if the the air quality assessment in the modelling had extended into the air quality management areas and found no effect, etc, that would have still been extremely beneficial to high peak Borough Council because it would have provided us with an updated and accurate screening model assessment to help enable us to inform our action plans in the future will give us an updated screening assessment to help us to target measures.

1:03:59

Okay, thank you. I'm sure the applicant will take that on board. Thank you. Let's look at now. The denting Ville and Glossop. Their call to management terrorists are moving out today 57. Oh, sorry, to Peak District National Park Authority want to comment at all on to a soil quality management area.

1:04:23

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson pay district and National Park Authority. I would I would echo the comments made by the representative from high pay per counsel. As you'll be aware, half of Tim whistle lies within the P tissue National Park and the park with airport management area is within the National Park. So we do have some concerns about potential impact of increasing traffic, and particularly the given the relatively small number of vehicles between the threshold and the predicted level that this wasn't just covered as in the precautionary way. Thank you, sir.

1:04:58

Thank you. That's helpful. Thank you very All right, let's move into denting Belen Glosser. The applicant ID considered a single receptor in the dental belt gloss Air Quality Management area and that was assessed as having a worsening inequality due to the proposed development. Could the applicant please so this is question H. H. Could the applicant please set out with the worsening inequality in case of the proposed development would affect the ability of a non compliant area to achieve compliance within the most recently reported timescales, which is one of the tests that we need to consider. Applicant please.

1:05:40

Thank you, Sir Richard failing on behalf of the applicant, and again a fine Hi, Miss Robinson, she'll be able to just explain the implications for compliance. In areas first, Miss Robinson joined us on screen she's

1:05:58

Susie Robinson, air quality specialist for national highways. I just wanted to declare a fire point initially in regard to the reference to a single receptor within the Glossop AQ EMA, and at the dinton val, gossip, ma como location. So we've considered as a single assessment in terms of a single receptor in terms of assessing looking at significance because we have a single receptor there, which exceeds the air quality, the government Air Quality Strategy objective for annually nitrogen dioxide, we have considered additional receptors in our modelling within that within that location, and that's not the only

receptor, we've considered that that at that location. So I can make reference to it said document reference a P. P 076. Sorry, a PP Oh, seven, eight. And that shows all of the receptors that we have considered in that location.

1:06:58

And that's where it compliance assessment

1:07:02

that so that the ones that we've considered in the compliance assessment actually are shown in just just I can just get this a moment, it's shown in one of the subsequent figures. I can just give that to you now. It's the receptors considered within the compliance risk assessment specifically are in a PPS 08?

1:07:29

Is there more than one of those? And that's a call to management area for the company. Yes,

1:07:35

that's right. Yes.

1:07:36

My apologies if I got that wrong in the question forges, sorry, which document was that again?

1:07:43

A PPE 080. So that's the figure that shows the receptors that we've considered within the Comply EU compliance risk assessment. Oh, air quality directive? I mean,

1:07:55

are you saying how many receptors were considered there for the compliance assessment in the headquarter conference?

1:08:02

I don't have that information to hand right now. I think we can come back to you on that. Thank you, thank you. But in relation to this area, again, similar to what I discussed in relation to the tint with the Lakeya May, when we're considering the compliance risk assessment at this location. And we're looking at that in terms of the Defra la QM TG 16. Projections for the future year concentrations. So in that context, with those projections, we're not finding that we've got an exceedance at that location. So we concluded that we don't have a compliance risk assess a risk of compliant non compliance.

1:08:48

has, has there been a predicted worsening of quality due to the proposed development at any of the receptors in that quality management area?

1:09:04

I believe in that area, we do have, we do have increases in concentrations in that compliance risk assessment, but not to the extent that it would affect compliance complying with the the air quality limit values. And if we want any specifics, I think we might need to come back on

1:09:26

once

1:09:28

we do have the results tabulated in the environmental statement, but I think it might be that we need to come back to you in terms of a written submission with that information. Thank you that will be effectively.

1:09:39

So I think from the from the environmental statement from the main chapter. I picked up the suggestion that the proposed development will decrease emissions at one of the receptors in that air quality management area and if the proposed development was Increase the concentrations in that area, then would that not lead to a delay in a non compliant area achieving compliance? That that was that was the train of logic. So if if the applicant was able to clarify around that point, so is, I guess the questions or have any receptors in the Air Quality Management area being assessed as having worse in their quality due to the proposed development? And if if there are, and those are above the threshold, or would become above the threshold, is there a compliance risk? And could there be delay in non compliant areas, achieving compliance within the timescales? Does that make reasonable sense?

1:10:56

I'm Susie Robinson, quality specialist for national highways I'll I'll take that one. So, in this particular area, that isn't currently considered to be a compliance risk, a risk for non compliance at this location in relation to the forecasts based on the Defra la QM TG 16 concentrations that we predicted for 2025. So we do have, we do find have some increases in concentrations, but they are not to the to the level, it would result in exceeding the limit value threshold.

1:11:36

There are still below the limit values with

1:11:39

when we when we look at it in terms of the Defra la QM TG 16 Concentration predictions. So again, just just to stress there is a difference from what we've the concentrations that we use when we look at the more precautionary approach for the significance overall of the scheme.

1:12:01

So the dmr assessment would be more precautionary, might show some issues that the deaths based assessment, there isn't a compliance. That's right. Yes. Right. I think it would be helpful just to just set that out, if possible. MIT, thank you. Do hyperbaric counsellor then comments on that, please?

1:12:28

Yes, I do have some comments on that. And, again, just to reiterate there's a slight difference between the AQ Ma's and the European directive. And it was slightly difficult looking at the compliance points in the report initially, I think we raised that they weren't particularly labelled very well, when we put the GIS in, I didn't see. So looking at the compliance issue. I didn't see any of those it extended into the AQ Ma. And they were north of the, the, the junction and the glass of Dale junction. And which is the area I believe that's that's highlighted in the government's monitoring, we don't have a great deal of actual our own receptors there if you like, because it's done on roads. So there's not a great deal of housing actually, there were these exceedances were the AQ Ma. As far as I'm aware, they no assessment has been done past the corner junction with didn't involve loss of junction. So we perhaps want a little bit of clarification on that, again, that is screened out because it is perceived to be only 300 vehicle car increase in the vehicle increase. And, and also below the 200 change in HGV use cars, which was another issue that we change. Just to note, I do have the EP UK values and they are around 10% less than 10% Lower. So it will be a change in the dmr. It's a change of 200 HDV vehicles in the Institute of Air Quality Management is change of 25 vehicles in and around an Air Quality Management zone HTV. They're quite different. It's quite a big difference. Okay.

1:14:20

I'm now feeling slightly confused, because on one hand, I had I think the applicants say it's considered several receptors in the Air Quality Management Area, whereas high peak have given a slightly different view.

1:14:34

Yes, it's because there's two separate assessments that's been conducted? Well, it's actually three if you look at deposition, but there's two separate assessments that's been conducted. One is looking essentially at your traditional air quality assessment, which was regarding the comments that I made earlier and the way that that model is set up. And then the second one is to do with compliance assessment, which is the legislation you're referring to. And that was based on It essentially came about because the UK breached the older EU measures in terms of improvement. So the government model the areas where it considered nationally were, quite rightly, what consultants said, nationally, Suzy, sorry, consultants, nationally. And so they've identified conglomerations, very similar in concept to the noise mapping exercise where the government identifies areas likely to be exceeding or proven to be exceeding, there's certainly cases of that. And I know locally, where I'm based, where local air quality management, as indicated no exceedance, but the government modelling has indicated experience and so the government has been under direction, which is exactly why the majestic clean air zone came about the government was under direction to do that. But it was based on the modelling not a collection of the local local authorities data that they don't it's a slightly separate thing. I'm not confused by this more.

1:16:02

I think I need to read through some of the submissions carefully. I think it would be helpful so if the applicant could respond on the duty Bill Glossop their quality management area and on the air quality directive considerations in that area? So because of that response, and then perhaps, if I peak, could then comment on the applicant responses, because it does seem acceptable. So would they have to be able to provide a submission by deadline for on that?

1:16:36

There? Yes. Richard early on malefactor can we can provide that clarity and people

1:16:45

would hyphy please be able to comment on the applicant submitted and then set out any residual concerns on the air quality directive and the Air Quality Management Area issues, compliance issues, as

1:16:58

I would say, just we've got less concern over the air quality directive compliance, we maintain our concern that no air quality assessment has been undertaken within the AQ MA and that the lack of air quality assessment has been completely based on the screening and the assumptions made within that and the transport model.

1:17:22

Thank you. Thank you. That's that is helpful. Thank you. I'm not going to go into J. J. Perhaps that could be addressed in the written responses. We've taken a response from High Peak District Council to this issue to Peak District National Park on to raise anything in relation to the duty and bail costs of quality management area and the air quality directive considerations. District National Park anything to add please? I'll take that as Mr. Nicholson there's just

1:18:10

thank you may have jumped out the meeting.

1:18:12

So I'll just had him back in. Thank you. Mr. Nicholson. I think you've perhaps just rejoined us you may have missed some of this question we've just had discussing the denting Bill Glossop air quality and Management Area. High Peak District Council do have some concerns, particularly in relation to the Air Quality Management area the applicants going to set out a clarification. Board has a deadline for and hoping for a council are going to respond to that deadline five. Are there any particular concerns at the Peak District National Park Authority has about the denting Bill costs of Air Quality Management area and about the air quality directive compliance issues in that area?

1:19:00

Thank you, Sir Tim Nicholson P District National Park Authority and this particular Air Quality Management error is outside the national park boundary. So I will proceed to my colleague at IP borough Council's opinions on this. Thank you.

1:19:16

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for that right. We are approaching the end of this item. I earlier suggested that we give other parties the opportunity to comment just bear with the moment please. These two two minutes each parties would like to comment. As always, there are opportunities to

submit in writing. But I'll give that as an opportunity. So Carol, Helen, please. And on my part but you have made a written submission on quality But if there's anything else you'd like to raise, please do.

1:20:04

Thank you. Yes, Carol Hallam, volunteer from the community group scheffers My journey to school. And really it was just an offer of continued engagement on air quality. And I just wanted with the discussions on denting Vale and Glossop that we had, I think, particularly in hearing one on Tuesday, and the openness you know, of the applicant to explore issues perhaps with another arrangement, whether air quality, if there are any outstanding issues on air quality that that that needs to be looked at. Perhaps that could be it could be included there just as a as a suggestion. And we may be able to help with other suggestions for mitigation, which I'm happy to put in writing.

1:21:01

Okay, let's see how the good responds. I'm not sure that any specific mitigations being proposed by the applicant at this stage, but perhaps they can come in at the end here. But thank you, thank you for that contribution. Dr. Robinson, anything that let's see Gary would like to raise?

1:21:24

Yes, please, we don't seem to have had a response to our concerns about the model refinement, that was supposed to address the three areas of air pollution that might have stopped the DCO proceeding and the the to tint whistle and denting Air Quality Management Area. And in those two air quality management areas, the traffic flows are substantially lower in 2025 model by NH compared with the flows that we were seeing 2015 and 2019 as observed. So we don't I mean, it's 35% lower on High Street West, that's 6000 Less vehicles modelled in 2025 compared with what we've been seeing over the last five or six years, so that doesn't make sense to us. And there's a similar drop with the tint was the one as a 13% drop. I just wondered if somebody could address this lack of understanding. Thank you.

1:22:30

Thank you, I'll invite the applicant to respond shortly Mr. Bagshaw anything that you'd like to raise in relation to air quality please.

1:22:46

And now there's nothing more I want to add himself or not know that thank you and Mr. Wimberly, please. Hello, is that Mr. Wimberly? We can do.

1:23:10

Yeah, you can't see me, but I've never okay. Yes. Well, I'll as Dr. Robinson has started on that tack, that was going to be the last thing I'd said. And then I'll be the first thing I say. And I do hope that maybe the two minutes can be stretched it because I do have important things to say about this matter that prepared by carefully on the matter of the screening out. The screening out is dependent on the forecasting model, we heard from one of the participants in the discussion. And, as Dr. Robinson says, interested in printing have been excluded on the basis of the modelling Entwistle. I've done the charts showing what she said, which is that the drop in traffic through Pinterest was quite extraordinary. The

measured 2019 fingers are completely different from the 2025 model, which goes back to 2015 triggers. So I dropped the 75,000, I think is roughly and that is quite frankly, incredible. And so there is a real question mark about know people are talking about 960 being just under 1000. But talking about a seven and a half 1000 difference in the baseline, which is the 2025 model effectively. So there is a real problem. And the problem in deep thinking is the same problem when you do. I sat in a bus outside entering school, I didn't realise that that's what I was when I was and the tracking was completely solid. I went on the bus now later on, there was no track. And the difference is, of course, that the annual basis the point that the annual meet is not the point. You don't experience the annual member experience. The traffic that is going into your nose at the moment. The nearest proxy is the owl in me, we keep talking about the annual mean. So that's better in the sense of citation. The interesting problem is solved by the Hatfield alternative and the shore lane. Tinting road bypass, apparently. But it's all been created. In order to I would suggest in order to avoid this issue, there is a real sensitivity about not monitoring leaking remains not doing the assessment from he and I call it zinc. And I wonder why that is. And I have here the the actual words of the and I think it's important to put them on the record here in the hearings as well. The statements coming out of the 790 page document was finally handed over in November. And it says 7.3 point one need for modelling refinement, initial air quality modelling undertaken by Arcadis. That's the previous consultant,

1:26:16

Mr. Lee, Mr. Wimberly is that we're very familiar with that. That document has been provided in your written representation, you refer to that same quotation. So I've seen both original documents, we've seen your written reference to that. So there's no need to go through that again, right.

1:26:37

Fair enough. Fair enough. It would jeopardise the development consent application, this is big stuff. And what we find is that the consultant change at that moment. And we now have traffic forecasts, which effectively scope out the to a QMS. So I would put it to you that that is a very serious matter. And we

1:27:02

are going to I'm going to ask you to if you could start to wrap up, I realised that you produce some material, and that you were submitted material, and I think some bar charts. And the you were intending to submit we very much welcome I'm sorry about the timescales before this hearing. There was a time for that to be submitted. We need things in the examination lab before they're shown in the hearing. But but please do submit those at the next deadline. And if new matters to raise, then please do raise those. We are going through every written submission. But if I could now ask you to start to conclude your oral submission. Now if you start to conclude that please.

1:27:54

Yes, fair enough. Well, I suppose there's some important things. One is the air pollution kills. Now I revised my knowledge of air pollution overnight. And my goodness, this is this is a critical issue. And I would like to draw your attention to a relevant representation comment someone made, and to my knowledge been followed up. This man, I think, was a gentleman mentioned with inshore research into lung disease in this area. And he said that we were in the top 20, top bottom 23 areas for lung

diseases. And of course, that's related to air pollution as well as other factors. But I see nothing in the ears, population health, relating to quantity to teasing out of how much this team will affect those figures and what the figures are now, we don't have a baseline even in the environmental statements, so called we don't have a baseline for the actual deaths due to all the diseases that we know are associated with air pollution. There's nothing there. There's quite a bit on deprivation and Indices of Deprivation and how were different wards certainly wards. I figure on those charts, but nothing on nothing on health had it in relation to air pollution. Photography, which which I'll have to put in my written submission, but the the gist is we are working to far too low thresholds and limits and that is covered by the legal position which you have to follow, which is to assess the adverse impacts against the benefits of the scheme. And the adverse impacts do not depend on what the government says it's safe. It depends on what is safe. That is a good thing.

1:29:54

Thank you, Mr. Member. You have set out some of those things. So we are actually Both yourself now and Dr. Robinson have setups and matters around differences between observed and modelled traffic. And so we are very interested in seeing those and seeing the applicants responses to those because actually, a lot of the other assessments depend on the traffic modelling. So it is it is important that we're satisfied that traffic modelling has been reasonable. And that's in comparison with observed traffic is is, is an aspect of that, that we'd like to see. So look forward to seeing the figures on that. Thank you. The health issues we had raised in first written questions, health issues. So if there are, if there is evidence and facts in the locality that could link of the do link health issues with air pollution in the locality, then we'd be certainly interested in seeing that. I'm sorry to cut you short. We do need to move on. And as I've said a number of times, the written submissions are equally important. And in some cases, when we're into highly technical areas, such as this actually, often more useful. So thank you.

1:31:22

One final key on the very far off. Yes, you're asking me to do some kind of assessment of the health issues raised revolution in the study area, frankly, that is over the environmental statement that should be in front of you and me. At this time. It shouldn't be me having to go and do something which frankly, I'm not qualified to do, like I have looked for this stage, and it's very, they are no, it's there any one source is it, but it's not really my job.

1:31:53

Let me think that I'll let the applicant come back on that there have been some considerations of health within the environmental statement that we've looked at. It is a valid point. So let me let me ask the applicant, whether they can respond to that now. So thank you, Mr. Wimberly. Would would the applicant like to respond on the point just made by Mr. Wimberly about the consideration of health implications of air pollution changes caused by the proposed development? So is it able to respond on that now to signpost? Any parts of the EIS? And would the applicant like to respond to any of the other submissions that we've just heard?

1:32:43

Thank you, sir. Richard, turning on on behalf of the applicant. So be dealing with him in that that sort of ordinance, as you say that the African contented or appropriate assessments are included in the

environmental statement and the relevant chapters. And his point about air quality, of course, that we make this time is the air quality is actually improved. scheme in place. That's one of the key deliverables and been told that the, you know, the health assessment within the environmental statement has been collected in accordance with the appropriate guidance, which for that chapter, is La 112. Insofar as Mr. Wimberly is referring to a further piece of research, I think he said he was going to include that in writing. And then obviously, when we see that we can consider that and respond appropriately. And in terms of There was reference to traffic flows, and not having received response initially made by Dr. Robinson CPRA. I think that was a point that was being echoed by Mr. Wimberly. As I understand it, so that relates to an assessment that predated the assessment was undertaken for the scheme that's before you. And then of course, the assessment that has been done for this scheme reflects the proper changes to the design and etc, that were bought, roll forward in that intervening period. Insofar as responding to the point they're only there. I think the point is, on the timetable, we were looking to provide that response by deadline for I think you'll recall, you kindly gave us the option to respond by deadline tree or deadline for because there was quite a bit of material coming in at that point in the examination. So that is one of the responses. We'll be dealing with a deadline for

1:34:44

will particularly address the points that suit Gary and Mr. Wimberly have raised around modelling. Yes,

1:34:52

we will. We will explain this as I say in essence in short form now, understand this because it relates to in your setting. Well, there referring to relates to assessment that was prior to this scheme coming forward. Thank you. And then finally, sir, sorry, there was one more that was obviously Mrs. Helen, just to share my first journey to school had asked about mitigation and I think has started to pick up on so in this instance, because the in the applicants assessments concluded that there is no significant effect that there is no mitigation proposed.

1:35:31

Okay. So Miss Hallam, you may want to reflect on that. And perhaps making a submission on that basis. So if it's felt that some mitigation is required, perhaps that that could be spelt out a little more. We are going to we have

1:35:52

with respect the previous speakers, excuse me, my high six told me that I'd said something and I didn't say it. He said that I said that I would do a study on the health implications in relation to air pollution and put it in the next step. I did not say that I suggested that how is England to do that?

1:36:13

Mr. Wimberly, I let me just be clear about what you're offering to do. So you're Are you intending or not intending to look at to make a submission on the relationship between air pollution and health locally?

1:36:35

I have looked for the wisdom short study, and I can't find it. But I know there are other sources, such as Mahmad and the ONS and Public Health England, but it is not a job to trawl through all that. And

frankly, I have lots of other things to write about as well, which, which are more sort of not pertinent that I'm more capable of writing about. And I do think that it should be the yes and Sterling claim that they were and yes, I do not believe they are I will cover that aspect of the inadequacy of the information.

1:37:08

Thank you. Mr. Wimberly. Thank you, that's very clear. Can Can Can I just just pick up that point, if the applicant and its response at deadline five, so having reviewed Mr. Wimberly is submitted submission deadline for other responses, that deadline for if the applicant could please consider the point and maybe maybe it could be signposting, but could set out how it is considered effect of the proposed development on pollution and health related to changes to air pollution, if that could be addressed that deadline five days by the applicant.

1:37:54

Thank you, sir. That's understood, we can can do that. Great clear on what my note was. Thank you.

1:38:05

Okay. Thank you. Let's, let's take that as a way forward. Thank you. And thanks, Emily. Right, I think we're now going to wrap up on quality. Thank you for that. Some quite tricky issues for us to work through. I think I was I was earlier suggesting that and just share with you moments. scheffers my journey to school. There has been some discussion during the speak about the concerns that have been raised by Carol, Helen about potential issues in the errors that she's mentioned. And I think related to that was an invitation for an accompanied site inspection, I just wanted to reiterate a request we made earlier in the week. So if there are parties considering that it would be beneficial for us to visit a location, then these could both be set out in terms of the location, the reasons for his visit to a location and the time of day, whether that visit would be most appropriate in the view of different parties. And I think I think two or three perhaps parties have raised some suggestions around that, but if we could have those focused on specific location, specific reason for visiting and specific time of day, and then if those could be provided a deadline for please we will consider those and we will consider or the need for us to visit. And whether that should be an accompanied inspection or something that we feel could be carried out and accompany and that we, we have considered visits before, we're very happy to go back and reconsider the need to visit again. But to be helpful to have those points specifically set out by parties, and if that could be provided at deadline for that would be very helpful. So that's we made that offer in the week and that request for assistance with earlier in the week. So I just wanted to reiterate that point. So thank you for the contributions to that session. And we look forward to further contributions. And I'm very grateful for the time that people are taking to help us with these matters. The time is now 1440. We are going to take a short break. And that will just be let's let's say until it's 1441. Now, let's reconvene at five to three, so just 14 minute break. So reconvene at 1455 If you're watching the live stream, please be aware that the last stream will now stop to view the restarted meeting you will need to refresh your browser page when we start. Thank you very much