

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH3\_SESSION2\_A57LINKRO ADS\_05042022

00:05

Hello, everybody, the time is now 1130 Fine. And this hearing is now restarting could remember the case and confirm that it can be heard too, and that the live streaming and recording restarted.

00:16

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

00:22

Thank you. Just to remind all parties to please keep your microphones muted camera off and to invite you to speak each time you voted to speak. Please give your name on who's different speaking where appropriate. Thank you. We're getting we're carrying on we're making very good progress. And what I suggest is that after we've been through the hole of traffic and transport, we're likely to break for lunch chapter we've been through all of this will be reviewed as we go along. And during lunch, we'll just consider the timings and give some advice to parties on the timings for the day, how that's looking. I think it's likely we're going to continue beyond 5pm today. So if parties could bear that in mind, we may go on an hour or even two hours beyond that. So perhaps you could start to consider the implications of that. And as I say, we'll we'll come back to the timings after lunch and just have a short session time straight up to after after the lunch break, but I just wanted to flag that. In case that's helpful.

01:34

And moving on to the effects of the proposal on traffic outside the order limit and returning to the issue of gossip dial in London, Dale. We've heard how this has been treated within the model aid and the applicant in the transport assessment report, which is near examination rollerblade IPP slash 185 has identified the traffic is likely to increase on roads through residential areas that provide existing routes that gloss up in the surrounding areas. capacity issues have been identified at the junction of shoreline Brookfield and Denton Vale, beach orange junction. And in the case of the shoreline junction dogshit can cancel this by the by the desperation to address this with junction works. Could dogshit catechin So establish your county council satisfied with the applicants modelling of the alternative routes

02:45

serves Jeff Blissett from Derbyshire county council I think it's perhaps useful if we just take a moment just to think about the traffic modelling. Mr. Cates Mark provided a very useful summary of the traffic modelling and the traffic modelling he's he is undertaken. The county council doesn't really have any broad areas of disagreement with Mr. Cates Mark and I think looking at the traffic model itself I mean it seeks to replicate the movements of traffic in and around Glosser which by and large consists of two electoral divisions they are etheral and Glossop and Charlesworth, these places have between them a combined population of around you know 33,000 People living in about 14,000 households. Table one

of the transport assessment discusses the locations of these zoning and we see that it is split up into about nine nine zones. roughly on average, these are about you know, 1600 households or you know, just over three and a half 1000 People living living in those households. Those movements of those households are loaded onto the traffic model in from the Verizon centroid. So obviously, you can get quite a lot of variation in floor to ceiling simply looking at where those households are loaded onto loaded onto the model. I think at the end of the day, we you know, we probably satisfied with the level of a traffic modelling and its suitability for the purpose to which it's been put

04:59

on Obviously, these people will still, regardless of whether you choose to make the DC or surf, there will still be, you know, 33,000 people living in and around glossip. Looking at the changes in traffic flow in the area of interest, which I would describe as broadly been shown in Hatfield Road, Park Road and its environs, we see, you know, changes in the do something do minimum of the order of around about 1000 movements now, assuming, say, a 16 hour day when people are, you know, in and around and not not asleep, that that that equates to, you know, something like 60 An hour or one point a minute, which I don't feel in the overall scale of things is necessarily a large perceptible number. So you asked three questions. Question to you. Are we are we satisfied with the modelling of alternative routes? Well, I believe we asked, and I've indicated that do we consider the predictive flaws on these routes are reasonable unlikely? Well, it all depends on where people are currently going, and where they will choose to go. The scheme itself effectively provides a new connection between darbishire and the Greater Manchester area. And people will inevitably change their route depending upon where they live relative to where they're to where they're going. And those changes will, you know, largely occur as a result of existing people making slightly different journeys long, slightly, slightly different routes. In terms of, you know, the the effects, as I've said, is, you know, approximates to one one a minute, so I'm not, you know, convinced that that's, you know, necessarily problem, you know, so to put it, you know, to put it like that. Yeah, so, just just to summarise, you know, we put bodily satisfied with what we've been presented with, we don't think that the, you know, the changes, which are is a result of people changing their travel patterns as assessor, whether you met the DCO or not, that you know, that that's entirely down to you, and no doubt, you'll consider what's been said and what's been presented and what's been put in front of you. But, you know, those people will still will still be there. That's more or less, in summary, what the views of the county council, I don't know, whether you will have any supplementary questions you'd like to pop to me more than happy to try and answer them for you.

08:19

Thank you, Mr. Ellison. We make the recommendation suddenly, suddenly or happening? I'm not quite sure we don't we don't we don't make the decision. But just just to clarify that the people that the points are understood, can I just through through our visits yesterday, inspections, yesterday on Sunday, along Denton road and guess a school crossing along Denton road? So there are a large number of pupils. It isn't a it's an uncontrolled, an uncontrolled crossing. So that so the marks on the road, there's no zebra crossing or anything of that sort. So those, this is outside the scope of the scheme in some ways, but it's a it's a relevant question in so much is whether particularly an increase in traffic due to the scheme although slight, would would add potentially to safety concerns for school children. So it's in the vicinity or diluting rail station. On the section of road, it's quite a steep section of road vehicles travelling downhill there's a bend not far away, and large numbers of students crossing 40 mile per hour zone.

So, again, it'd be helpful for us for the purposes of our examination to understand whether the increases in traffic would be likely to lead Derbyshire county council to introduce a more formal crossing at that location if you're familiar with that location, Mr. Blissett.

10:04

Vaguely say I mean, I regularly visit class Apollo, I can't profess to have detailed knowledge of every, every single road and every single junction in a town. But yeah, I mean, I have a familiarity with the area that you're talking about, in terms of the crossing being on common controls, I mean, at the end of the day, there is a criteria that for the introduction of a formal, more formalised crossing that takes the form of p v squared, which is essentially looking at the number of pedestrians and multiplied by the number of movements squared, you know, that that's obviously something that we would perhaps concert that's constantly looking at in the, in the fullness of time, although, you know, our, our concerns are making sure that the highway network is functional, and it is safe, and that is an exercise that, you know, is conducted, irrespective of whether or not the scheme goes ahead. So it.

11:17

So I think it is relevant to our considerations, in some amateurs, the introduction of a crossing there may have a bearing on the model, and therefore may have a bearing on the use of that alternative route. And the use of that alternative route, we need to consider because of related environmental effects as well. So I think, if it were possible, Mr. Blissett, if that's possibly something that could be discussed with the applicant, in terms of the likelihood of the increase of flows, requiring or meriting a more controlled crossing at that point, it would be helpful maybe if that could be discussed between the county and the applicant, and maybe in writing at the next deadline or, or soon thereafter as possible, to give us an indication of the likelihood of a formal crossing, and the implications of that, for the modelling and the other environmental effects. I think that'll be very helpful, if possible, it's just that we were struck by the amount of movement over cut over over that road at that location with that speed limit, etc, etc. So it's, it's, we were wondering whether a fault, you know, the county might want to introduce a form of crossing and what the implications of that might be the likelihood to vote that

12:43

for any date any other engineering works to enhance the crossing and safety of the crossing?

12:55

I certainly said and we are happy to engage. And we are, you know, we do have continuing engagement with with the applicants. And that's certainly something that we might wasn't happy to look into, sir. But there's, there's nothing having looked at the looking looked at the modelling. And the changes in flows will not necessarily lead me to take the view that a form of crossing is necessary as a direct result of the scheme. I think this is, you know, we need to distinguish a bit between, you know, existing movements, existing traffic flows, existing environment, existing situation, and, you know, the direct contact consequences that can be attributed to the scheme, but it's certainly something that we're more than happy to engage with, with the applicant and give due consideration to in the fullness of time.

13:53

Well, if the fullness of time could possibly be an indication of the next deadline, or or the following deadline, that'd be really helpful. And then we could we can take it into account in our consideration for this exam,

14:06

and certainly say, I mean, I'm, I think it will perhaps be more somewhat optimistic to consider whether that can be done by the by the next deadline, but you know, it's certainly something that we are mindful of the timing of the inquiry and the need to respond to deadlines as in future deadlines. So but sitting on set certainly wasn't happy to.

14:30

It was I think, I think probably a week tomorrow is unreasonable. Given there would need to be discussion so at least over the end of the superior bit, if it was possible to get a view from the county from the applicants by the following deadline. And I think that's two or three weeks later, then then that will be very helpful.

14:51

Certainly, so that's, that's something we're happy to follow up quickly.

14:59

And it Moving on to the next question. Bearing in mind the previous responses from Daksha county council on mind need to take the response to that in writing depending upon how that or those discussions had progressed. And the present works at Shoreline or within the residential areas the which alternative routes pass lie outside, they draft bacio scheme proposals. what importance does Staffordshire county council place on their provision? And I think we've already had a response in regard to the wider residential areas. But I'm particularly thinking here of the shoreline junction. So could actually come to council explain what the importance in place on the shoreline junction and any improvements to that?

16:24

Yeah, I mean, we have had information from the applicant relating to the Capacity Assessment junction. And you know that there are reasons to believe that the junction would have additional traffic through a bit and, you know, quite quite quite clearly, there is a potential for additional queuing and potential congestion at that junction, so, I mean, I'm, I mean, to two lines about this. So I really need to think, you know, we need to care carefully carefully about this. Because, of course, once the scheme is in a suit, assuming that the Secretary set does does it make the DCO and the things builds, we'll obviously have a new junction art, I will bridge and, you know, that that will have a degree of capacity. So, you know, certainly we'll have more traffic actually coming into the, on the 57 corridor, you know, that that that is what the traffic traffic is telling us. That there are here that, you know, took two to basically took two schools of thought see that, you know, you look at improvements to the Charlene junction, and you know, that there are possible ways and means of increasing the capacity at that junction, which what happens after that they know that, that that probably brings traffic to the next junction, and, you know, do you improve, improve junctions at the next junction with with denting road? And where does that take you? You know, of course, that that that that brings potentially more traffic

through on the on the FFT seven. And, as we've alluded to, and we'll probably discuss later, you know, the implications for increased traffic across across the FFT seven. So, you know, there is a question as to how much capacity do you seek to provide on the, on the local highway network, given the consequences of getting more and more traffic flow? My view is, we would seek to, in the fullness of time as the design for the scheme emerges to, you know, to look again, at the potential impacts of on that junction, perhaps with a view to looking at some sort of link singles arrangement that seeks to manage the traffic rather than just provide capacity for more and more traffic to enter the town. And certainly, as I, as I have alluded to, previously, you know, we are in, in discussion with the applicant about, you know, impacts on local roads, and one of the things that we will be seeking to sort of explore with the applicant is how that can be managed as the scheme as the design for the scheme emerges.

19:37

So, at the moment, Mr. Blissett, is the county satisfied at the measures that have been taken so so that there isn't, isn't standing out that junction improvements would be intended as a consequence of the scheme at this moment in the applicants assumptions around it? injunctions appear reasonable on that basis.

20:03

I think I think that I think they are reasonable, sir. I mean, one of the questions that you've asked specifically is art, art, Charlene, to be included in the in the deep in the DCO limit. No doubt on your travels yesterday, you'd have gone through Charlene and you would have observed that it's it's proximity to gossip block and the stream and the structure, the road. Both go it goes, it goes off goes over the stream. So any engineering stiff engineering solution is likely to present challenges where, you know, people minded to look outside of the limits of the existing Highway, which is not something we would necessarily be advocating at this moment in time says, so your question relating to art this this included in the in the DC or limit in terms of the red line area? Probably, you know, probably probably not, we would see something if anything happening it should the shoreline junction being achieved within the limits of the existing highway highway boundary? My my, my view, and again, I'm not an expert traffic signal engineer, there are other people in the county who are more qualified than I would be to sort of look at managing traffic rather than just increasing capacity for the, for the, for the, for the sake of it to to address some potential perceived problem.

21:43

And your point about not generating a difference with traffic to the 857 corridor? Well, I think

21:50

I said about a balance that needs to be struck and you know, this is something that we would seek to discuss with the applicant as the as the design emerges. Thank you.

22:03

Just one supplementary question. In that regard, you touched on traffic, signal control and optimization, and possibly a corridor treatment. You may not know or be able to give me an answer to this at this particular time, and may need to talk to signal engineers, but could you clarify whether or not the

existing shoreline junction is on a controller that just optimises that individual junction, and just whether or not ETS already on a corridor system?

22:44

i My understanding is that the junction is operates on something that's called Moreover, it is it is a more of a control junction. I'm not aware that it is operates as a link a set of Link signals are what was one term termed as a scoop system. So again, that's perhaps something that could be considered in the fullness of time, but my understanding is that the the junction operates as a, as a standalone, single controller, and that's the you know, they the software in the controller seeks to optimise movements, so that for the junction as a standalone junction, but obviously, the scheme, as you, as you are aware, involves creation of a new traffic signal control junction, just upstream from the junction. And, you know, I think in the fullness of time, bingo, the developer opportunities for looking at link linking with in a more sort of coordinated manner.

23:48

Thank you. I think we've covered up to question why. Moving on to the beat, just like to hear the views of the applicant. on whether or not the junctions should be addressed within the dgcl.

24:19

Thank you so much and firming up on behalf of the applicant. I think we you know, having listened carefully there to what Mr. liscense had to say. I think essentially obviously the Africans position has been that they don't need to be further enhancements at that junction to realise the journey benefits for the scheme. And this is rather fairly I thought set out that they're not necessarily advocating improvements at this time. And don't believe it should be included in the line DCO boundary and you And I think, you know, the reasoning given that, you know, it's because they would want to look at this more carefully, rather than rushing to make improvements to that junction was it was a fair one. Unless there was anything, I did see him briefly, Mr. Cates Mark wanted to add courses. From a technical perspective. I think that's all we would have to say. So just joining me now,

25:30

we're just to guess the case, we'll come to half of the applicant and just confirm obviously, that, you know, an improvement at this junction isn't currently part of the scene. So, you know, any capacity enhancement at that junction beyond optimization, current signal settings is not included as part of the DCO submission. So and I think any capacity enhancements at that jianxin would have to because it is a future potential scheme and the the impact that that may have, we'd have to be considered at that time, if it was deemed appropriate and promoted by Darby county council. And I think the key question there is, you know, the, as alluded to by Doug's defence counsel, but the perhaps one of the less desirable impacts or outcomes of the scheme is this additional traffic using denting Lane stinting Road in shore lane, and there is a danger that if you increase the capacity at the shore lane, a 57, jianxin, you actually exacerbate that problem? And therefore, you know, any capacity and drugs and has to be considered very carefully? And that is why, you know, it's not included in submission.

26:51

I think we already covered my next question to double A, from Darby county councils vs. Tight Pete Borough Council. Any comment to make at this juncture and with regard to what's gone immediately before?

27:11

Yes, thank you, Mark, James Hypro. Counsel. And obviously, we're not the hiring authority. I'm not highways engineer. But as appointed principal, I thought it would be prudent to make sure that the impacts of the scheme were fully considered as part of this process. And that would extend to junction impacts. And our primary concern here is that we're still trying to get to the bottom of the implications of the AQ Ma. And clearly traffic flows and shoreline, you know, we discussed those constraints, their potential pressure and crossings we've discussed previously as well, but could also have implications try flows on f7. And from our point of view, the moment that's still a bit of a question mark that needs to be resolved.

27:53

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. James. And we do we do have questions on that in the air quality part of the agenda. So yeah, we can focus on those at that time. I think that'd be definitely helpful. Thank you, but thanks for raising that.

28:13

Moving on, has their team considered whether or not there would be benefits in further reinforcing the message to drivers typically heavy goods, vehicles, drivers travelling between the end one inch Sheffield and Manchester to use the strategic road network for the journey in preference to 57 through glossip and snipe pass using an enhanced signage strategy.

28:44

Thank you service planning on the RPF first point to note is that the existing signage strategy between Sheffield and Manchester does encourage use of the strategic network and then perhaps invite Mr. Cates mark to come in on the benefits or just benefits immediately reinforcing that message.

29:08

I think he's the case Mark on behalf of the applicant. Yes, as my colleague just just said, The signposting from Sheffield to Manchester currently directs you to Manchester divided the a six to eight. The A 57 is signposted for Glossop from Sheffield is signposted for Glossop and not for reached to Manchester going in the other direction obviously the signage from Sheffield to put it from Manchester to Sheffield as part of the scheme we will ensure that the signage is part of the scheme willings will direct people to Sheffield along the a six to eight rather long the longest road network rather than the A 57. Having said all that, With the increased reliance of drivers, on their set satellite navigation systems, I think the effectiveness of signposting is become a direction signposting becomes question belong on to what degree it will in future particularly to influence people's route choice. But the other point I think to make is that, from a user reduce perspective, a road users do not see any distinction between a strategic road and other primary a roads which are subject to the primary route network, which he you know, suitable for travel between primary destinations around the UK, and the 857. Both the AP seven

and the a six to eight are both on the primary road network. So from a user perspective, there is there is no distinction between those two routes.

30:59

Okay. Do the local authorities or local highway authorities have any comment in massacre mode? Can I hit those from Tim side?

31:16

Thank you says might read Thameside Metropolitan Borough Council no further further comments from from Thameside other than to just endorse the the comments out by the applicant to him particularly in relation to the appropriateness of signage and the increasing reliance on satellite navigation devices. So it will be important to make sure that any commercial software is updated appropriately to reflect with like that. No further comments.

31:51

Not nothing specific. So I mean, you know, obviously Mr. Catch might make next event a good point that the public tend not to differentiate between, you know, who, who, what the road is, or who the highway authorities, you know, that they will choose their journey and the result of their journey accordingly. And that, you know, I would just like to agree with the or reflect the need for advanced directional signing that that would, you know, direct traffic in on onto the onto the most appropriate routes, but you know, we have to have to be mindful that, you know, we, our job my job is to is to support the needs of the travelling public who will, you know, have have the right to soften travel along the highway. But terms of the choosing It's

32:42

okay. That's high peak, or counsel have any comment?

32:52

Yes, thank you, Mark James, hi peak. And we'd certainly support any measures that were taken to encourage transparent traffic to stay on the strategic road network is defined for that purpose to carry regional movements. And I think that's the most appropriate route. So anything that can be done, as we cruise that we would certainly support.

33:14

Thank you. And finally, Peak District National Park Authority.

33:20

Thank you, sir. I just echo what's already been said. I think our preference will be for the strategic traffic to be on the strategic road network rather than on the snake pass. Thank you, sir.

33:31

Thank you. Just the supplementary matter. Could the applicant confirm whether or not there they are in discussion seeking agreement with the local highway authorities with regard to strategic signing in the wider area, not just within the scheme? Limits?

33:56

Thank you. So good turning on behalf of the can unless Mystic Kids Mark was aware, or we'd have to check with the team and see if I can get further details and broadly told that we are afraid Absolutely. We can include those details as to exactly what we're doing in our written response. If that seems reasonable.

34:23

That would be fine. Thank you then, and could the applicant clarify with the primary purpose of the 57 link is to take traffic off the strategic network onto local onto the local road networks and how if that was the case, that will be supported by policy, the only sort of risk to or good practice.

34:57

So just if I could expand on that side So, one thing that struck us is the da 57. Link. So to the south of the existing 857, the primary purpose of that, so that section is not part of going to be part of the strategic road network in the future. The primary purpose of that seems to be to take traffic off the strategic road network, so easterly bound traffic, and it would take traffic off the strategic road network on to the local roads onto onto the roads. So it's that that we're grappling with really? So how is how is that function of that link? Supported by policy? You know, in a broader sense, does that make sense?

35:51

Yes, I think you can have the point you made that in terms of the overarching point, which was the start of the question, if you like, I can deal with those matters. And I probably respond in the reverse if you like. So I can confirm that it is not the intended purpose of the scheme to take traffic off the strategic road network and onto the local road network. And and our data shows that the proportion of traffic using the strategic road network, compared to the rest of the road network is greater with the scheme plan without it insofar as you have been asking specifically about the e 57. Link. And I would have to check and see if at this point Mr. Cates Mark was able to comment further on that.

36:48

Case Mark, on behalf of the African. I can't give you a specific answer on the a 57 at the moment. But with regard to the earlier comment that we've done some analysis looking at total vehicle kilometres traffic is using the comparing the DO SOMETHING scenario to the do minimum scenario and looks at now that changes on the SRN relative to the rest of the road network, we will present that information at the next deadline which will quantify but there is, albeit it's not very large, there is a marginal proportional increase on the SRM with the scheme compared to without it. So in actual fact, and without being specific to individual roads, overall, the scheme certainly in 2025, results in a shift away from the road network on to the SRN by 2014. That has reduced it it's it's it's forecast to be more neutral in that respect.

37:54

Okay, thank you. So I think it's a it's an unusual point, in some ways, for highway schemes, and particularly around the 857 length, the effect of that on local roads. And I, you know, I it will be good to see the evidence to support the earliest statement about whether that link does or does not serve to

increase or to take traffic off the strategic road network onto local roads. And so to understand the evidence for whether or not it has that effect, and then if it does have that effect, how would that be supported by policy? Does that. So I think it's good to be quite clear on on those questions, I think. Yeah, I

38:54

can I respond to that just briefly, still able to now. But yeah, it was just to make the point I made earlier that the 857, when you're talking about local roads, the 57. You know, it's a primary part, the primary road network, just like the Asics away. So, you know, I think when you're talking about local roads, we have to be clear about what we're, we're talking about local roads.

39:17

Thank you. So yes. So thank you for that clarification. So it's understanding the existing effort to set them but then there is a knock on effect on the likes of shoreline and into work, for example, as well. So but yes, thank you. Thank you for that clarification. And again, if that those those issues could be included in the response, that will be very helpful. Thank you. Well,

39:41

we'll address that in a written response. Thank you.

39:45

Structure county council have any comment to make it in to start on that point?

39:55

Not Not, not, not, not nothing of any great significance. I mean, as I said in invite my opening, you know, we're looking at a town with, you know, 33,000 people living in it living in its environment and you know, a lot of them will have a legitimate reason for being on the air 57 You know, making journeys between their household and greater Greater Manchester

40:22

Thank you moving on to our safety issues within Peak District National Park, right at the present any works to manage driver behaviour and safety of highway users, including pedestrians crossing the road on the sixth grade would pass in the 57. State pass right outside the

40:52

order limits

40:54

what importance the Staffordshire county council place on the provision of any works on those two

41:04

routes and

41:11

what fairly the Essex to it and they will build the Woodhead passes forms part of the SRN, which is not not not not a county road. So at the factory remiss of me to express a view from the local highway authority about how the secretary of state ought to be managing is ought to be manages his roads. On the 57 snake pass, I mean, this perhaps one thing I'd perhaps like to touch upon. And this relates to Section seven, point 2.14 of the transport assessment, which refers to the snake passes and identified x isn't an issue. And it goes on to say that measures such should be pursued to minimise these negative impacts, and what the transport assessments are leaves hanging this is, you know, what are the measures? Who would be provided? And then where are the resources coming from to do that? It's one one that one thing I perhaps my you know, I'd bring to your attention. As I said, we, you know, we are in the process of having a number of discussions without with the applicant. And I would like to think that by the time that you come to make your recommendation so that we you know, we have a some indication as to what the answer to those particular questions are.

42:39

Thank you, Mr. Lister, and ready to receive that within the examination period. Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you.

42:56

I'm with the applicant. Comment on why if there's an effect on Highway Safety on these routes, it isn't addressed within the consent order.

43:13

Thank you, sir. Returning on balance as the applicant itself, I invite Steve Cain smart to set out on half the African position in relation to the existing highway safety and then the impact of the scheme. I think no clarity clarity looking for.

43:33

Thank you, Betsy case, Mark on behalf of the African. Yes, I mean, we've made previous written responses to this issue over safety. I mean, I think the key point is that the the scheme, that location, the snake Park Road is identified as having a higher than typical accident rate. There are specific circumstances relating to that, relating to the high number of motorcyclists that use it, possibly for leisure purposes. The the only reason the scheme results in a an increase in that location is simply because the way the accident rate is forecast is in proportion to the increase in traffic and because there's more traffic on the 57 due to the scheme, you get a forecast increase. But you know, I hasten to add that is a forecast, the scheme is doing nothing else to the a 57 which inherently makes it more dangerous than than it currently is, or less safe than it currently is. So it's purely a projection based on the increase in traffic. In terms of why the scheme considered it wasn't actually do anything was partly for that reason, but also because in that, in the round, it was made a judgement preference as it was made that the increase there wasn't considered significant. enough to work mitigation on the basis that when you look at the accidents cross, the impact of the scheme on accidents in totality, it only results in a very marginal increase, forecast increase in accidents point 3% over 60 years across the whole area. So whilst it might increase accidents in that location, it's reducing them in other locations. And you have to look at it have a balance as part of the whole and that is the reason why the accident didn't feel that it

was appropriate to actually put in place specific measures as part of the scheme safety measures about location

45:38

as that being subjected to a safety audit as well that aspect

45:43

no safety audits are only carried out on where you're making physical changes to the junction it's not normal practice to do safety audits where you change traffic volumes, simply changing traffic volumes but there's no other changes to the road network.

46:11

Okay, I've done Dr. Bashir county council and he comments on that approach and whether or not they consider it a reasonable approach

46:25

um, I don't think I have got anything to say that necessarily disagrees or contradicts the statement that Mr. Case Marcus just made. Okay, as I said those those questions are left hanging on section 7.2 1.5 of the transport assessment and obviously that's something that we could follow up with the applicant in the fullness of time

46:49

thank you so just bear with a second. Thank you,

47:53

thank you, um, in the applicants response that indicated that overall looked look at as a whole

48:06

the effect on accidents is not a significant effect. However, in specific regard to a very localised this

48:21

effect,

48:23

would they consider it to be a significant effect on that particular round?

48:35

Thank you for extending on behalf the applicant and I invite Mr. Cates mark to consider the further question based on his earlier response. In terms of significance of effect,

48:49

DK spoke on behalf of the applicant. There is no specific guidance or agreed way of making a judgement over the chain, whether it's changing traffic flow, and the impact that has on potential accident rates is is justice significant or not is purely based, professional judgement based approach.

And the basis here is that that professional judgement was made in this location for the reasons set for the state earlier that it wasn't significances significant enough and impact towards mitigation as part of the scheme

49:29

and in response to some other questions that if I recall correctly, and please correct me if I don't there's a potential for flows overstate pass some of the overly flows, I think it was the into peak flows to increase by up to 50%. On the face of it, it is like quite a substantial increase.

49:59

You Yes, but as I said accident are considered on average genuine daily flow not on the peak, there's because rate and accidents is a consideration of the overall increase based on average hourly flows as the statistical measure for accidents is, rates is, you know, number of accesses per billion kilometres of, of mass travelled. So, you know, the hourly flows don't give you that, that's an indication just because you have an hourly big increase in in an hourly flow doesn't mean that that will result in an increase in accident rates, you have to look at the broad and stress again, you know, this is, it's a relatively simplistic way of forecasting changes of accidents, just because you get an increase in traffic flow doesn't necessarily mean there is a resulting increase in an accident, the evidence says on average across the country, that is the case. And the way therefore, that the Cova software predicts accidents is based on, you know, on that that underlying assumption, and typically where you get an increase in, in flow, you get a proportional increase in an accident. That happens on every road in every location.

51:21

Okay, thank you. So, so your professional judgement. The variation in flows that we're seeing on an hourly basis are not inconsistent with the methodology being a best practice correct methodology

51:40

that we feel that that that it does quite right, it's not appropriate to look at the early flows in relation to risk of accidents, it's, you've got to look at it as the you know, the only agreed methodology of doing it is to use the the you know, that piece of analysis the Cobra analysis that forecast changes in traffic on average annual daily flow,

52:03

and you're professionally satisfied that the hourly variations that we've seen don't give you cause for concern that's tied outside that guidance you know.

52:27

In the applicants comments are EP seven zero to six on Tim Nicholson's response on behalf of the district National Parks Authority to the examination authorities, secondary questions are repeat slash 738 Question 3.11. The applicant identifies to speak camera based traffic management schemes and routes within Peak District National Park and the response the examination second written questions again, our EP 6038 the Peak District National Park Authority versus opposition to such a scheme on the a 57 snake acidly six to eight Woodhead powers, it Peak District National Park Authority have similar reservations on the two schemes cited for implementation. And if so, how were these

reservations addressed in those incidents? Put a similar approach be taken on the a 57 snake pass and the a six to eight t would hit us so can we hear from the National Park?

53:44

Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson on behalf of the Peak District National Park Authority. The applicants comments in their rep seven slash oh two six include reference to two proposed average speed cameras schemes. He's after the a five double oh four Brookston to Whaley bridge, Long Hill Road and this is an average speed cameras for a 50 mile an hour speed limit. And the second one is the on the a 501 to cromford to New Haven road. With average speed cameras on that road has got a mix of a 50 mile an hour speed limit and the National speed limit. To date, the Peak District National Park Authority has not been formally consulted on either of these schemes by the doggish county council. So without knowing the details, the authorities are able to provide comment on how they will be viewed. However, the principles established within the P District National Park transport design guide supplementary planning document and quota within our previous response. Our EP six dash oh three eight would equally apply to the schemes described both on a 5045 tableau for longhill and a 5012. Via jelly erode. In effect our starting point will be that whilst we recognise the traffic calming effects of average speed camera schemes We are concerned about the visual intrusion of such schemes. And given the visual impact average speed cameras and their associated infrastructure on the setting of the National Park, the authorities preferred approach will be to use other measures to address the enforcement of speeding vehicles. The delivery of further speed cameras schemes should only be considered acts in extremist and may be opposed by the authority without sufficient evidence to support their introduction. So So in answer to your other questions, the reservations I'm actually being addressed because we haven't been formally consulted, I'm afraid. Thank you.

55:38

Then, moving on to metric alternatives. Paragraph 4.26 national policy statement for national networks requires that applicants should comply with all legal requirements in any policy requirements set out in that National Policy Statement on the assessment alternatives, the national policy statement for national networks draws attention to the requirements of the environmental impact assessment directive, other specific legal requirements for the consideration alternatives example and the habitats and Water Framework Directive and policy requirements in the national policy statement for national networks for example, the flood risk sequential test and the assessment alternatives so

56:45

the developments in national parks the broad areas of outstanding natural beauty if you bear with me a moment just just read for a second. Quality apologies, so, we just suffered a small technical problem there.

58:24

Can we member the case to confirm that can be seen and heard?

58:29

Yeah, I can confirm you can be seen and heard. Thank you. Thank

58:33

you. And we got to the other specific legal requirements consideration alternatives, for example in the habitat some Water Framework Directive, positive requirements and national policy statement for national networks. For example, for address sequence retest and the assessment of alternatives for developments in national parks, the broads in areas of outstanding natural beauty. Paragraph 4.27. The national policy statement for national networks requires that all projects should be subject to an options appraisal. And the approach we should consider Bible modal alternatives and may also consider other options. However, the national plan policy stands for national networks. states that were projects have been subject to follow growth option surprisingly achieving this status, the road or rail investment strategies, rather appropriate policies or investment plans option testing the NOC be considered by the examining authority decision maker. The national policy statement for national networks further states that from National Road schemes proportional option consideration alternatives will have been undertaken as part of the investment decision making process. And it's not necessary for the examining authority and decision maker to reconsider the process or they shouldn't be satisfied. This assessing sprint has been undertaken. Regarding the above please with the applicant explain how they have considered alternatives to the proposal at what stage and how that assessment complies with the requirements national policy statement for national networks

1:00:22

Vicki Fowler on behalf of the applicant, so I would take you in terms of the alternatives considered these are set out in section two of the case for the scheme. So that's reference rep two dash, zero 16 and chapter three of the environmental statements like and I would recommend paragraph 3.3 of Chapter Three to you in terms of the assessment of alternative that under the environmental impact assessment, directive and flood risk, etc, they are all dealt with within the environmental statement which the in terms of alternatives where the integrity of a European site is affected, of course, the HRA, the habitat regulations, assessments screened out and confirmed that there was no lightly significant effects, there wasn't a need to consider alternatives there. But But going back, particularly to the national networks, MPs, and the options appraisals, in autumn 2014, the Department for Transport Commission's six studies to look at problems and identify potential solutions to tackle some of the most notorious and long standing road hotspots in the country. And the study that was relevant to this scheme, and that we this scheme grew out of was the trans Pennine feasibility study. And that considered both road and rail routes. So again, in line with the NPS nn, which talks about viable modal alternatives. So, so effectively, that looked at the, the roads considered for the a six to eight ba 616, the A 61, the A 57, the a six to four, the A 6187, the a six, the a six to five, and the six to three, as well as the Hope Valley railway line. Effectively that study reviewed previous work to identify investment proposals that could address the issues and problems.

1:02:42

And that's it Sorry, can I just can we just pause for a second, we're seeing some rather strange behaviour on the screen. I don't know if. So, the our main window and screen appears to be was jumping between various notice it appears to settle down, let's continue Sorry, sorry.

1:03:04

So in terms of that, of that feasibility work back in 2014. So that considered some 23 options. It was decided that that option generation would focus on the rose based options, given the rail investment programme at the time, included the improvement to hope, Hope Valley line, and the network and Network Rail was leading its own review of that. But effectively that that option generation identified a long list of discrete highway and other transplant interventions, as I say there was there was some 23 options that were reviewed and discounted. And this is all explained in say that paragraph or rather section 3.3 of the environmental statement. So following that work, it then became a clear that there were a small number of better performing options that should be considered further. And they included three discrete investment options in the Mottram area, which included the Mottram link road and the the the bypass of much Hollingsworth and tint with Sol and also the A 57 Mottram one way system. So effectively with the identification of those three discrete options, they were there was also central packages that were looked at to go alongside those options. So those feasibility studies resulted in the long list of nine options effectively being presented to the applicant. And then there were the subsequent options studies that were undertaken by highways England to assess that those feasibility studies and they resulted in consultation events in April 2017. recommendations were published And then November 2017, saw the preferred route announcement. But as I say, all of that is set out. But in summary, the scheme has been subject to a full options appraisal prior to achieving its status in the road investment strategy. So, that was the 2014 2015 feasibility studies, and was further subject and was subject to further feasibility in auctioneering. Studies, posts the road road investment strategy announcement, and as you say, the the MPs and then notes where projects have been subject to full options appraisal, it's the examiner throat you do not need to consider the option testing or yes, it's not a requirement for you to consider that option testing.

1:06:03

Would you have any further comments with regard my question, Jay, as to whether since the assessment of alternative strategic objections to the scheme changed in response to policy or other factors, and whether with reasons the assessment the alternatives remains relevant.

1:06:21

So, in terms of the objectives, these are set out in the case for the scheme, so, that's rep two dash 00 16 Again, and deals with compliance with with those, those objectives have not changed. And as such the assessment of alternatives remains relevant. So, so So in terms of those objectives, they focus on so connectivity, so reducing congestion and improving the reliability of people's journeys through Mottram Hollingworth, sorry Hollingworth, and Tim whistle and also between the Manchester and Sheffield City regions, environmental so it's improving air quality and reducing noise levels in certain areas. And then there's a societal reconnecting local communities along the trans Pennine route and capacity reducing delays and queues that occur during busy periods and improving the performance of junctions on the route does say they are summarised in table 3.5 on page 40, in Section 3.6 of the case for the scheme. Branch

1:07:44

in the response to the question frequently to the examining authority settlement and questions PDS 01. The applicant states that scheme previously proposed and presented in the bank choice submission was not one of the potential alternative solutions identified through this process. Could I just have

clarification from the plan as to whether Mr. Bachus theme or similar scheme was considered and at which point within the assessment?

1:08:19

Vicki, Vicki fell on behalf of the applicant? Yes, sir. So, I think I mentioned before that during the 2014 2015 feasibility studies, one of the options that was considered was the A 57 Mottram one way gerrae tree system, which is similar effectively to to what Mr. Bagshaw has referenced. So, when when the nine options came to two, what was what was highways England, so effectively they that wasn't taken that wasn't taken forward. But it was certainly it was certainly considered and assessed. But that option was was was effectively just discarded as as not not not the preferred option

1:09:22

with regard to hardcore layout don't count. So in the local impact report, our EP 2046 Paragraph 7.35 Express reservations regarding design of the southbound merge extend the Woodbridge junction proofs responses as has been indicated, discussions have been taking place between the applicant and the council to address these concerns with the applicant and dog for county council provide an update on those discussions please Could I hear first from Dr. Kemp Council?

1:10:08

Oh, good afternoon, sir. Jeff Blissett Jabesh, the county council, I believe that's more or less closed out. My understanding is that Darby county council awards, eventually were the were the scheme to be caught, structured, adopted and would anticipate being engaged in the detailed design of the scheme as as as it emerges for the for the process. That would be something I suspect would be followed up in the third iteration of the environmental management plan properly.

1:10:50

And from the applicant.

1:10:54

Thank you. My understanding mirrors Mr. Blissett, insofar as the discussions have continued in have been positive, and understand that with some additional justification that have been provided, the matter has now been closed out to the satisfaction of both parties.

1:11:12

Could you just confirm that it's following the safety audit process? So

1:11:17

I believe it is it was in relation to I think it was extending the length of the merge, where two lanes merge into one, and also the provision of some additional information regarding vehicle path tracking into vehicles. And, and of course, that will be safety audited into that junction.

1:11:41

Thank you. I think that covers question. Double endless. Well, thank you.

1:11:47

Thank you. Thank you, everybody. For the helpful session for us, as I indicated, and thank you, all parties for bearing with us as we went through those points with the identified parties. Thank you that could I we do we do have time to take other submissions. And, again, thank you for bearing with that process. Could it? Could I see a raise of hands of parties who would like to raise points now? Could we just go to the people? Obviously. So if, if you could raise your hand if you would like to? So we have Mr. Book and Mr. Wimberly and Dr. Robinson is, is and Carol Hollom. Anybody else who is not sure how to raise a hand or might want to make a submission at this point? So I think we have four parties who would like to, to comment. Thank you. Right, let's produce go back to that list. We have five parties. So we have Charlotte peril as well. So I'm actually just going to go through in the orders that the hands were raised. Five parties, if we could have a maximum of five minutes for each party.

1:13:23

A real

1:13:25

there are now six parties. I'm going to reduce the time, I'd like us to get through the section and not much more than 20 minutes. So we'll have three minutes for each party. Please understand that we need we need to make it maintain progress. So it's we're trying to strike a balance here, between giving everyone a chance to raise their views or really. And for us to maintain good practice. We're now down to five artists. Let's say for Max, finding decision, five parties maximum of four minutes each. We will give you 30 seconds. Morning to wrap up. And then we'll be wanting to move on. So if you could follow that would be very grateful. Anything that you're not able to raise in that four minutes, please do raise it in writing. We give equal weight to submissions in writing and in many respects, more helpful way of assembling complex information. Please don't feel that you need to know what's in your written submissions. Please don't feel that that's essential. So let's just I'm just going to mute for just mute for a second. Yeah, we're just going to bear with me a second. Okay. Okay, so thank you, Mr. Buchan, you are the first to raise your hand according to the system. Forming that starting now, please. Right. Thank

1:15:41

you very much, sir. I have some brief comments, which would probably been more appropriate going through. But I've held them back, basically on the policy on the public transport. And finally, on the safety, I think on the policy question, what I'd like to say is, the real question here is, would Greater Manchester in terms of value for money with Greater Manchester spend the money allocated to this scheme in this way or another way? They are, of course, obliged to include planned schemes in their in their own plans, that would be wrong if they didn't. So inevitably, this theme is going to end up there. I think it's interesting that we haven't had Greater Manchester here to discuss some of the evidence, in particular, the new evidence that we've extracted from the matrices as to the relevance of Greater Manchester and the impacts on Greater Manchester. This has not been seen by them, nor indeed the other local authorities until we got the matrices and could do the analysis about in terms of trips and benefits. You've had some submissions on a so I'm not going to go through it again. But I would just reiterating comments on what was said that our position is that it is still clearly a problem in terms of fulfilling Greater Manchester and indeed, the transport, decarbonisation plans, targets. As I said, that evidence is new, and it was only extracted from the matrices supplied by national highways, eventually,

I'll be very brief. So public transport. I think this was a, frankly, I was a bit shocked sitting here listening to this, because we've been discussing public transport in all my emails and all my questions, and I've been given no indication that it was rail only in the model. Frankly, that only reinforces the comments I've made. And we will have to make further written submission to you on that. I think it is very clear that if public transport isn't as a whole in the model, then of course, public transport flows cannot be validated. So my understanding would be and this is subject, you don't have to go into for the statement of common ground, that public transport flows cannot be validated unless they're all in the model. So you will have a model which is validated for traffic flows and the base year, but not for public transport as a whole. We already know that walking in cycling isn't in the model. And one quick comments that the impression was given that there would be benefits all round for walkers and cyclists. In response to a specific question I asked on the form of the crossings of these this new road system, it is clear it is walk with traffic. In other words, there is no direct crossing or red face supplied or planned for this major junction that involves walkers and cyclists having to wait in the middle of the road in the middle of the traffic stream. I don't think this was clear. Before I asked the question. I think it is a very important one. And it is absolutely crucial to the benefit. So called for walkers and cyclists. I'm trying to speed along, sir, I've covered validation, asymmetry, just to say, well, this unless unless there's a difference here, the matrices supplied to me were not morning peak only. They were 24 hour matrices. Now there's bound to be, frankly, in any models, always ragged edges. And there's bound to be a little bit of asymmetry here and there. This is massive asymmetry over the 24 hour period. And I would I have asked for an explanation. I haven't received one yet. I think that Mr. Kitemark did his best to say well, we'd expect there to be some tides, but Well, of course, this tidal flow, but it comes back in the evening. And if my 24 hour matrices haven't got the evening in them, then he needs to tell me pretty quick. Thank you. Right. Okay. I've only lost a couple of points.

1:19:38

Thank you. Could I just Just as a quick follow up from from here, if you mentioned some new information and that there might be merit in having local authorities responded to that. If that could be highlighted in writing. That would be helpful. Thank you. And then the reasons Why you might consider it necessary for the local authorities to respond to I'll be really helpful. Thank you Mr. Woking. Let's move on. reset the clock. Mr. Wimberly. The four minutes is now available to you.

1:20:20

First, the matter of my presenting some of the slides and the bar chart presentation, is that going to come later in the agenda, please, because otherwise, I won't make these points. Now.

1:20:35

You can use this five minutes as you wish Mr. Wimberly. We can show this okay,

1:20:39

that. But is that separate to the charts? No, though, because I maintain that I will be presenting the chart in the five minutes slot.

1:20:50

If you want to split.

1:20:55

The

1:20:56

how long? Your four minute slot? Mr. Wimberly? Would you like to present the charts or not?

1:21:03

Oh, well, it's just been a chart and what I would like in the charts,

1:21:09

the charts, so if we could, please, let's just wait for now.

1:21:16

I would like I would like chart number one. minute chart number nine, please.

1:21:23

Let's go to slide number. We will add a little for this technical

1:21:28

Nahmanides the map? That's the one. Okay, that cannot be bigger. Now, that's simply an introduction to the actual bar charts, that is the 382 Ma's. Just to remind ourselves of where they are last of High Street, tinting, bail and interest, oh, could I have number 14, please. Now these bar charts have that's not 14, that's 13. Next one, the next one. Blue is 2015. According to the model, that's the baseline sorry, the red one is Department for Transport 2019 Automatic traffic count, that's the first 1,000,067. And the green one is 2000 to 25. To minimum as modelled. And you will notice that the 2025 is supposed to be the same as 2015. And I don't believe that I don't believe it's credible. You can see where the 2019 The red one is in relation to the other two, that's an automatic traffic count. So it's more or less correct. That invalidates the entire model, because that is the main flow that is density seven, coming in and out of the area. So next slide, please. And if you validate the hormones, you've invalidated all the impacts. This the awesome the new one, the purple is two is the 2014 opposed to the green one, which is dress 25. So again, just looking at the top line, which is 67. That's an increase of 10%. And I wonder how 10% increase in overall traffic predicted by the DFT printing with a 40% cut as mandated in the news a netzero strategy. Because it doesn't you can't do I don't think you can square the two even with wonderful quantities VBS next slide is 15 Is that is that was that 15 That was 21 piece.

1:24:02

Here we lifted off the top of the game was 1067. The orange one at the bottom is 2014 do something as compared to one below average, which is a minimum in 2014. You can see the huge increases when there is a scheme. And the next two bars up the blue, the dark blue one is do something 20 to 25. And the green one is to minimum in Treasury five and again, it's a huge increase in traffic taxes some 1500 in 2025. We'll do something so that exposed the idea of this scheme does not bring more traffic into this area. And if you look at polling wasn't Entwistle on this slide, you will see that in general interest on all

of us is about 5000 and less vehicles per day than Hollingworth. And my question is where do those 5000 vehicles go? Can we have 24 PS

1:25:16

we have the same, this is going this is now the 57 route. So all the left hand side is going through the agent 70 Snake pass, we start again with the animal 67 is the same picture. But I'd like to draw your attention to Brookfield, which is the sixth one down. And the do minimum is almost the same as this two is the same as the 2015, the blue, the blue line, I could have, but if you look at the next one down, which is high street, West, and east, you see this massive difference between whites which is less than 2019. And is which is more. The next slide is 28.

1:26:00

This will relate to Mr. Wimberly so it gives me quite a bit of extra cognizing. The technical this is the, this is the last slide. Thank you.

1:26:10

This is the last slide, and it's shown to something on the stand compared to the ft 2000 1900 on victory. And what you'll see from this is, firstly, the Brookfield is 4000 More massively more with do something than it was with your minimum. So that's just increase that that's this channelling of traffic towards plus. And then again, we have the high street Western High Street East, and the High Street East figure there is 15,007. This 15,600 and the snake pass figure is 4200. So there are 11,400 vehicles in Gaza, High Street East, and I do not know where they go. It is simply not credible. But I won't go to summary because it's time, but I should give a rep for this. It's all on rep. Five, dash oh three, nine as the charts and rep. 5040 is the explanation of the chart in full.

1:27:20

Thank you, Mr. Wimberly. And thank you for brought this ticket within the time. Can I Can I just make a request when the app would be helpful to have the applicants response to the point that Mr. Wimberly has raised? I think we've seen a number of those points raised before and number, a number of responses before but it would be useful to have all of that signposted, in reference to this hearing. It would also be useful just to have confirmation from the applicant as to whether it considers that the figures that Mr. Wimberly has presented are accurate, and do faithfully represent what has been submitted. So if those could be included in the applicant response, that'd be helpful. All right, let's move on. Carol, sorry, Dr. Robinson posed next 100. Yes. Dr. Robinson, please.

1:28:17

Thank you very much. Indeed. Just two quick questions. First of all, national highway said that there was no data collected during the pandemic. But the case for the scheme has a list of data added during 2020 and 2021, para 4.3 point six. So I like we'd welcome some clarification on that. The second thing is that the objectives in 2018 consultation session included connectivity just for Manchester and Sheffield and also included reliability and safety objectives. The reliability and safety objectives were removed for the 2020 consultation and the connectivity objective was extended to include Mottram tint missile and Hollingworth. Two really quick points, safety it is really unacceptable to accept any increase in risk of crashes when all policy including the National Policy Network, and the highway national

highways licence. absolutely go for Best Practice safety reducing crashes. Greater Manchester has a net zero for 2040, I think. And finally, the options appraisal as addressed by the Stonehenge judgement that those paragraphs and P S and M that we were discussing are first of all, the options appraisal should be repeated if there's been changes in circumstances which there have been substantially has been a climate emergency declared. The Climate Change Act was amended for net zero emissions has been a COVID pandemic, and they've been radical changes to the national and regional targets to cut urban traffic and increase walking and cycling. And finally, options appraisal should be updated is expected by all relevant documents.

1:30:07

Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Robinson. Can we just bear with me a second, please? And to comment on Dr. Robinson solution that Dr. Robinson mentioned, these don't hinge judgement

1:30:34

decision and the implications for potential implications for the consideration of alternatives arising from that. It'd be helpful to have the applicants view on the applicability of of that. We're not familiar with where that might be contained. So it would be helpful to for us to have that set out in the response to this hearing, please. Can we move to Carol Helen, please?

1:31:08

Hello, Thank you, Carol, Hallam Sharefest. My journey to Paul Vicki Fowler, the applicant reminded us of the case for the scheme around improve connectivity and reduce congestion, improved air quality and reduce delays. And the applicant and the planning Inspectorate have been very responsive, I would say to the community requests with the unaccompanied site visit, and also the additional modelling that was carried out, which we heard about in hearing too, and which sort of interrogated a little bit more about where the traffic increases were coming from that had been predicted by the initial modelling and the applicant indicated. I think it was Mr. Cates mark, that the further analysis conducted in response to a question from the community was that the 87 link road would be an attractive road to road users and generally would draw traffic in from the a six and a six to three, that would be 50% of the traffic, improve access to 62 That'd be 20% of the predicted increases. And in terms of general sort of wider access and use make up about 30% of the increases. So you know, it's an IT is an attractive road scheme and volume increases are predicted. So it does seem I do feel a little bit confused, I think at the moment with and share the concern. Well, I share the concerns of Mark James from high peak Borough Council really that there's still perhaps an open question as to whether downstream of the Glossop spur road, the shoreline and denting road junction which the planning Inspectorate have taken a good deal of time to look at in detail, and we don't know the outcome of that inspection yet, of course. But given those predictive traffic increases, he says it does seem a little bit challenging, I would say from a community's perspective to consider the local impacts to schools in the area school crossings which the planning inspector have examined on denting road, you know, and junction signalling and operation at shore lane and denting road as well, downstream and outside the boundary. So, really, just to reiterate, eight, I think, the potential impacts to community use of the road network around the printing area. Thank you. And AMA's. Thank you.

1:34:05

Thank you. That was within times. Appreciate that. We have had a couple of extra hands appeared since setting for minutes. So I'm going to ask the remaining speakers to be brief isn't that I'm not going to impose a limit but to encourage you to be as brief as possible. So Dr. Boswell, please.

1:34:26

Hello, thank you, sir. Yeah, I'd like to talk on point two L. And I think it probably be helpful to have that up on the screen for a moment. If I could ask Edwin if it's possible also to look out rep fi though 26. And the chart on page 14 hours for a sort of slight change, so to speak in about a minute. So it to owl was about the Manchester Transport All strategy.

1:35:01

Okay, can we can we can i Sorry? Sorry, Mr. Bozo? Can I direct the case team to concentrate on the rep five document? And to find that, I think pointelle is relatively straightforward. So I'll just reread that these were the applicant explained with the scheme supports the ends of the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 under the government's transport, decarbonisation plan. So that was the question. Now we'll leave the case team to find the the documents.

1:35:31

Thank you very much. I'll just speak to two LSI may then. Obviously, this is sort of, you know, possibly predicting some of the stuff which would come out item six, on decarbonisation. I'm going to try to make sure it's not repetitive in that sense. But I think the key point in two L is what supports the aims means. And you're the African gave examples, it seemed to me, it's how the the plans the two plans mentioned, supported the scheme rather than how the scheme supported the aims of those plans. And if we can have that other slide up as soon as possible. Well, I wanted to talk to that the the aims of the net of the transport, decarbonisation plan

1:36:26

as well. Sorry, could you give us the name of that reference document again?

1:36:30

It is rep five Oh, 2614. There's a chart on page 14 of that.

1:36:41

Is this particularly a transport issue? Dr. Boswell there is or is it more of a tarpan

1:36:49

carbonisation carbonization and policy but I had some points to make beyond sort of decarbonisation. Rarely. It's more about how that question is answered or not answered, I think satisfactorily.

1:37:03

Please carry on. And if you if you could consider wrapping up, that'd be helpful.

1:37:08

Okay, well, I've hardly started but I will be very brief. In terms of what supporting the aims means it means in terms of decarbonisation plan, meeting that green line on the graph there, and there's a subsequent graph in the net zero strategy, which is now extend policy under the Climate Change Act, which actually has targets with it as well, which I've put in my submissions, and that wasn't addressed. And that hasn't actually been addressed. And we'll come to that, obviously, as item six. What I also wanted to point out on the on the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy is that these government policies may well have come out later than that. So I think we need to understand the date the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy came out, and the date that the netzero strategy, particularly last November came out, and consider you know, what weight is applied to each of those. And whether the Greater Manchester strategy, actually, you know, is being reviewed it following the transport, decarbonisation plan or wherever it should be nine. I know, we haven't got anybody from Greater Manchester here, as far as I'm aware to answer that question. But it would be useful to know whether they consider that that policy document there should now be updated because of the transport, decarbonisation plan and Net Zero strategy. And just very quickly, a pointer really to item six that the applicant has put out a TDP sensitivity test in this rep five oh 26 document, the one on the screen. And we haven't heard anything about that. We didn't hear anything about that, in answer the question too well about how what they've written in rec 526 might or might not support the aims of the transport, decarbonisation plan.

1:39:32

So it's understanding the outcomes from that sensitivity test. Dr. Bosman

1:39:37

Yeah. And we'll come on to item six, obviously, but whether that supports the aims of the TDP I think the key point Thank you very much.

1:39:45

Thank you. Thank you. Moving on. Mr. Bagshaw, please Mr. Beck show

1:39:58

Oh, can you yes slow work confusion. Yeah, there's three points I'd like to rate. The first is regarding the charity flow. I disagree with refute the idea that national highways have properly consider this as an alternative. And note that in their submission PMPA were concerned that the applicant doesn't appear to have undertaken a thorough assessment of alternatives to the scheme that are not based around increasing load capacity. And indeed, that was like the, one of the key points of my skin, which they say that they've rejected. The in the options appraisal at 15.6, the the MPs and states that all projects should be subjected to an options appraisal, which consider viable model alternatives, we generate free flow as only being considered in conjunction with further load schemes. They they added components of development, which which included one element, the charity for itself is completely missing the point the JRF workflow is designed to reduce and reduce the congestion and therefore automatically increase east west connection. And it could have public transport, public transport elements and other modes of transport built into it. Paragraphs 2.21 also advises that line similar alternatives such as divan management model shift isn't viable or desirable, as a means of managing me. But I think that the era before in conjunction with other more or the other modes and or the modes hasn't hasn't properly been

assessed. I also don't see any evidence of of what the what national highways is saying that they just say, Yes, it's been settled. Where where is that assessment? Because in the environmental statement, where where they do mention all the other schemes that were assessed the geometry flooding is actually included in that. So I really don't think that he has been considered.

1:42:33

Thinking about you. I think you mentioned three points. I think if that was the first point probably understand that.

1:42:40

That's fine. Yeah. The second, the second point I want to make is, I think it's I think it's become quite clear that we we do need some we do need some local modelling. During this morning's session, on page five, point you just dealt with the county council consider particular flaws on these routes are reasonable or rightly. Mr. polacek. So well, it depends on where people are going. Well, I think that sort of kind of suggests that we need to know where they're going. We need we need to have some detailed modelling on shoreway, identifying Hatfield, Portland Cemetery Road, Padfield glosses because it's quite clear that there's going to be a huge knock us sort of knock on knock on effects you need to know exactly. I'm not sure where this traffic's going. My final point, my final point is on the show range junction, and we haven't done any specific concrete proposals as to who would tackle that, and I think we need to ask them quickly because Mr. admits that he's not completely familiar with the area. I am. I've lived it over 50 years, I know that junction very well. There's there's no footpath on one side. There's a very small footpath on really, so there's no scope for road widening. It's also a porous Brook so it can't be widened. The, the gentleman was also subject to footwork develop some a lot of expensive footwork development, at some point around 2005, I think, and it's difficult to imagine how that junction could be improved in any way unless unless the Planning says or not, then that entire orthoses because the there's no sort of scope for Rome, shorten and footpaths, because they're quite short footpaths as well. So I think I think Mr. Bush it really needs to sort of be a bit more concrete about what can be done at showing junction because as a resident that is very familiar with Edge junction I don't see that there's anything I can see Okay, specimens sorry, Mr.

1:45:01

Bradshaw just a moment, if I may. What are your why do you why do you think it'd be beneficial to improve that junction?

1:45:11

Why would it be beneficial?

1:45:13

Yeah. Well, I don't

1:45:17

think it would be beneficial to him pretty junction, because it would just it would it would. It would simply encourage more traffic to not show anything to mine. And I don't think that's possible. But I think that's a viable route. I mean, we haven't said the word sustainability mentioned in conjunction with this. As you

know, I didn't make the point. In my submission, that's that route, which nhc would suggest most of the traffic is going to go on is going to be heavily built on over the next next five years, or longer. And, you know, that's that's going to be an almost entirely residential route. We don't really want traffic. We want it to remain on the 57th. Yeah, sorry.

1:45:59

Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Angus, Charlotte Tyrell, please.

1:46:05

Thank you. It was just a point about the applicants talk about the compliance with the government do carbon carbonization strategy, and public transport, which seems illogical. It's saying that public transport will flow better if the roads are better. But really, it needs to get people get people out of cars, and onto public transport. And by doing that, it doesn't need to improve improve the roads. But it's only going to happen with the investment which obviously, this scheme might if the money could be diverted into public transport. And again, I think it goes back to what Mr. Buchan said, if they're not accounting for bus travel, it's really difficult to know what you know what the improvements are in the scheme. And there was just another point I wanted to raise about road safety on snake paths. Whether the applicant had included, did the fact I didn't I wasn't sure if it was just car travel, it was talking about all that road is used extensively by cyclists and walkers who the footpath crossover, the snake path, and you also have to walk alongside it. So I just wondered whether they taken that into account in their assessment of safety. Thank you. Thank you.

1:47:34

That brings us to the end of the session. Thank you, everybody. And I really appreciate you condensing your thoughts. So much. And as I said before, please do feel free to add to what you said in writing or even to repeat what you said in writing. That would be helpful. I'm not intending to invite the applicant to respond other than to respond in writing is the content with that, please?

1:48:05

Thank you, Sir Richard, sending on behalf of the applicant had been furiously writing away, but we're content to respond in writing. So

1:48:13

thank you. Right, let's draw this part of the hearing to a close. We have completed item two on the agenda. Let me just double check that yes, item two. So we're going to break for lunch. And let's say after lunch, we'll we'll give our thoughts in terms of the timings for the rest of the day. I suggest that we reconvene at two o'clock so we'll take a break from now 124 Until two o'clock if you're watching the live stream then please be aware that the live stream on our stop to view the restarted meeting, you'll need to refresh your browser page when we restart. Thank you very much.