

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH3\_SESSION1\_A57LINKRO ADS\_05042022

00:06

Good morning, everybody. The time is now 10am and this issue specifically in the equity seven liquids project is over. Thank you all for joining us today. This could a member of the case team confirm that I can you hear clearly and that the live streaming and recording has started.

00:22

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

00:30

To avoid disrupting the hearing, please Could everybody keep your microphone muted and camera off until we invite you to speak? Thank you. My name is to recalculate and an elite member of the panel of examining inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State the application made by highways England for an audit grant and development consent for the 57 inquiry project. While the application was submitted under the name of highways England, the applicants Duma since change to national highways.

01:00

Good morning. My name is Ian Dyer, and I'm the other member of the panel, as the examining authority will hold an examination into this application, and then write a report to the Secretary of State with a recommendation on whether or not consent should be given. A case team works alongside us throughout the process. With us today is every notary, who is the case manager teleports us in joseffer, or the case offices. I will now run through some housekeeping matters. And we'll repeat a couple of things that weren't covered in the arrangements conference. For those that are watching the live stream or the recording. As I have already mentioned, this event has been both live streamed and recording. As explained in our letter of the second took March 2022, the recordings will be retained and published. These recordings will form a public record and can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulations apply. The plumbing inspector its practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Therefore, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that he will be recorded and that you therefore consented to the retention and publication of the digital recording. We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record that is important relevant to the planning decision, which will only be in the rarest of circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of us would prefer to keep private or confidential. Therefore, to avoid the need to edit the recordings, what I would ask is that we try your best not to add information to the public record that you wish to be kept product or that is confidential. Basically, then you've got each of the teams minimise any background noise. This includes switching off or muting your mobile phone if you're not using it to join the hearing. Please also remember that the chat function on teams

will not be enabled or in use. So please don't try to use that for questions or comments. We will only use the raise your hand function in Microsoft teams at specific points in the agenda. When we invite general comments, we will invite people who do not have that feature to comment at the relevant time. If you're watching the live stream, then please be aware that live stream will be stopped when we adjourn the meeting. Sorry to hear it. You need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted hearing would remind you again when we return. You will find it useful to the agenda that was published on the 28th of March 2020 to attend. relevant parts of the agenda will be displayed on screen during the hearings for those who are watching. We're gonna highlight which parts of the agenda we are referring to for anybody that is not watching. Have now asked certain parties to introduce themselves. Please unmute your microphone. And if you're comfortable to switch on your camera. When I invite you to speak, please switch them off again. When I move to the next speaker. If there are a number of people representing a party, we would ask that the lead speaker only introduced themselves at this point with members of their team introducing themselves as when they join the hearing despite those representing and who will speak for the applicant plays Good morning, sir.

05:00

My name is Mrs. Vicki Fowler. I'm a partner and solicitor at Gowling WWL G, and we're legal advisors to the applicant, and I will be doing a double act with my colleague Richard Burling and also gallon W, WL G. So do us, Richard to introduce himself.

05:20

Thank you. Good morning says. I'm Richard Sterling. I'm also a solicitor again interview LG and a legal adviser to the African.

05:29

Thank you. Moving on to the representatives of local authorities, who will be acting on behalf of the Peak District as Leeds Baker. C'mon answers. Tim Nicholson. I'm the transport policy planner for the Peak District National Park Authority. And I'm accompanied today by Brian Taylor, who's the head of planning for the National Park Authority. Thank you. Thank you, Dale. Sure. County council.

06:12

Yes, good morning, sir.

06:13

I'm Steve Porphyry. I'm a team leader in planning policy and major projects at Dougherty county council, and I'm accompany this morning by my colleague Jeff Blissett. Who is the County Council's transport assessment officer.

06:27

So inside metrical Council

06:32

Good morning, says Mike Reed Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council head of major programmes I'm joined today by my colleague Esther young in our legal services team. Thank you.

06:46

And happy Borough Council

06:52

principal Planning Officer hyper Council I'm joined by Dan McCrory who will lead on the Robert Health Matters thank you

06:59

and moving on to interested parties first asked Mr. Schorr to introduce himself as he's got his camera on at the moment but respectful when you're not speaking to turn your camera off was okay.

07:27

Hello, I'm Mr. Bagshaw. I don't I cannot see you at the moment. But I can hear you. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Leopard. Good morning. I'm Peter leopard. I'm the clock to Bamford with on your parish council. Thank you Chuck Farrell. Morning, I'm Charlotte Farrell.

08:02

The moving turtle Hello. Hello morning Carol Hallam from scheffers My journey to school Mr. Wimberly.

08:32

Paulo Wimberly here but my camera's not ISIS is accurate. Took some time to come on. So yes, I'm here.

08:40

Okay. Thank you. Dr. Ken Robinson.

08:49

Yes, thank you very much from CPRA Peak District in South Yorkshire and today I'm accompanied by Keith Buchan from Mt. IU

09:00

and Dr. Andrew Boswell. Good morning. Yes. Dr. Andrew Boswell from climate Emergency Planning and Policy. Thank you. And we're also taught this morning by the Environment Agency. Mr. Davies.

09:23

Good morning. Andrew Davis, so a project manager and planning advisor and I'll be joined by my colleagues for agenda item for Carol bolt, who is our senior lawyer, Dr. Emoto, who is our groundwater specialist lead beverage or contaminate land specialists John Rockledge, our flood risk officer and Daniel Brook who is our London water environment officer. Apologies for the big mouthful there.

09:49

Thank you all for attending today.

09:53

I'm not going to take through the purpose of this hearing and how it will be conducted. The purpose of this issue specific hearings to provide an opportunity for the examining authority in an eye to examine specific issues related to the application, and to invite parties to make all representations about those issues. This hearing is held in accordance with section 91 of the Planning Act 2008. As such, this hearing is subject to our powers of control over its conduct, as established by the Act. This home provides an opportunity for all representations to be made during the examination, this film will not cover all of the issues that we're considering during the examination, many of which are being addressed in writing. We do not expect artists to treat this hearing as an opportunity to set out their full cases, or to divert their hearing from the specific matters at hand. We've structured the hearing today so that you may explain certain points when we invite you to speak at the relevant point on the agenda. Please keep your microphone muted in camera off until we invite you to speak each time that you speak. Please give your name and ID for appropriate organisation for the formal record. Please direct all comments, questions and answers through Veenai rather than directly to any other party. We will cover the points in the agenda that was published on the 28th of March 2022. And we won't show the agenda at the moment we'll share that a little bit later. For everyone's comfort, we'll be taking regular breaks. Normally this will be interesting for roughly an hour to an hour and a half. These will normally be relatively short breaks, however there will be a longer break for lunch. Shorter go into the main part of the hearing, where we'll take the hearing through each of the listed topics in turn. Our intention is to cover items to transport networks and traffic three Peak District National Park for the water environment drainage and flood risk assessment, five quality and six climate change today. Item seven other environmental matters will start no earlier than 10am Tomorrow, and we hope to conclude this meeting at hearing apologies tomorrow. However, that is subject to change depending on progress from any to move some items to tomorrow, and we may need to continue the hearing on Thursday. We'll provide updates on the timescales during the hearing Mr. Bagshaw your thanks for rejoining us Mr. X. Oh, you. You could you could tell what I was about to say thank you. We will be asking for responses to some questions to be provided in writing rather than during the hearing. So not every point in every question that's listed in the agenda will be taken orally today. There will be quite a number that we take in writing but will clearly flag those as as we go through. Please get all parties keep note of any requests for them to provide a written response. So please do try to keep track of where written responses is required from you. There is a very detailed agenda which will hopefully help you to identify the itemise points where with whether responsible will be required or requested, which should say, please could all written responses be provided for deadline note, which is the next deadline on Wednesday, the 13th of April. So that's next Wednesday week tomorrow. Unless another data grid during the Thank you. Please, could the applicant provide a written summary of all of it responses for deadline note on Wednesday the 13th of April. Could the applicant confirm that's acceptable, please? Mrs. Fowler on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that is acceptable. Thank you. Thank you. We're approaching agenda item one, but firstly, I'd just like to take a procedural point. In these deadlines seven solution which appears in the examination libraries. Rep Seven, zero 41. Mr. Wimberly make some suggestions on how the hearings this week should be conducted. And some issues which take hold and raised some issues which he can say to stakeholders needed reassurance about that are going he considers unaired and unresolved. So I just like to deal with those and give a little bit of context, which I hope will be helpful in terms of where we are in the process, and and how the examination process works, if you like, so I hope some of this explanation will be helpful.

14:49

These hearings provide an opportunity for us to gain clarity on matters related to the application by putting questions to various parties. The timescale for the examination is constrained by legislation. And therefore the process is of necessity, one of inquisitorial questioning by the examining authority rather than general debate. On that basis, we did not consider points of order process at the time suggested by Mr. Wimberly in his submission that I mentioned before as being necessary or appropriate. In our view, a point of order process would unnecessarily disturb the hearing and deflect us from the process of inquisitive inquisitorial questioning, Lead by Example Utility. That said, however, we will provide opportunities where we can, and for interested parties to make oral representations as appropriate. And that's what we've done through each of the hearings. During the examination, we're receiving evidence and testing that evidence. We're giving the applicant and parties an opportunity to put their case and to respond to the cases made by others. These hearings are part of that process. With similar principles apply to the mitten process. And as we said before, the examination process is principally a written process. We're not at this date determining the application. We're not making any conclusions or recommendations about the merits of the application. We're not making any conclusions or recommendations about the merits of any submissions that are made to us. We are gathering information. Our conclusions and recommendations will be made after the examination is finished. By writing our recommendation to the Secretary of State. We would reassure all parties that whilst This hearing will not cover all of the issues that we're considering during the examination on all facets of each issue. All representations received either orally or in writing will be considered by us. And each representation is considered equally valid, no matter its source no matter where it comes from. And we will consider each representation as we put together our recommendation to the Secretary of State. So I hope that's helpful. Are there any questions about the agenda or about how this hearing will be conducted? Okay, thank you will now proceed to the main part of the agenda commencing with item to the agenda be? We do have a hint 100 Mr. Wimberly?

17:57

Yes, thank you, sir, for that clarification. No, sir. clarification. Just trying to get the camera on. And I still wonder what happens if if someone have on on it from any quarter says something that is really difficult to stay with that it's so derails the conversation in a direction where it shouldn't go because it's just untrue, for instance, and then there's no way to come back to that until an hour later in one's overall rep. If you ask for reps. And then it's kind of lost because the whole discussion has been taken place been taking place on for half an hour or an hour on a false premise. So I just wondered how that can be dealt with.

18:53

We're the process that we're about to go through Mr. fritch. each agenda item is that we're going to invite responses from the parties named in the agenda, so we're not going to open up to wider contributions at this stage, we're going to focus on the questions that we would like to have answered for, for example, for transport networks and traffic, we are going to go through and direct questions to the parties that are identified in the agenda. Other parties, we would suggest if they have points to raise on any of those points as we go through, please keep a note of those points. And at the end of for example, I tend to transport networks and traffic, and we will time permitting invite parties to make a

normal representation on that topic. So they'll then be an opportunity to raise on any of the items through item to transport networks and traffic for example, if There isn't time, then parties are invited to make a written submission. So the last there are still opportunities to make their submissions. And I understand them will expect there'll be differences, I Please may not be content with some of the responses that are being made. And so we want, we want to understand where there are any differences of opinion. And we do believe that either offering well offering both potentially an opera opportunity for all representations at the end of each agenda item, and most certainly an opportunity for written submissions, will be fair in terms of giving all parties an opportunity to step in a case. So as I said before, we're not taking points of border issues going through our failures that's unnecessary. And it will interrupt our inquisitorial approach. And so we won't be doing that. But we hope to allow or words annotations on each topic during this hearing, and certainly will accept written representations. Does that does that seem clear Mr. Wimberly?

21:13

It's certainly clear, the obvious caveat is Time permitting. And we have two days. And hopefully there will be time permitting that because after all, let's hope that we get as far as we can with some of these quite difficult issues.

21:31

Yes, absolutely. And we will certainly seek to make time to do that.

21:35

And we've made the time as well. You know, there's people here from all over the place without obviously they're sitting at home, who have given their time to contribute to this.

21:44

Absolutely. And we're very grateful for that. We've had some very good submissions into this examination. So thank you for raising that because it does give me an opportunity to thank everybody for all of the hard work they've done. Thank you, Mr. Wimberly. I don't think there are any other questions at this moment. So we'll move on Mr. Wimberly. Your camera's still on. Thank you. So agenda item. Two, could you just zoom in a little on the agenda please. So we are we are going to very much follow the agenda, and the detail questions.

22:32

We will now take the hearing through the topics. Item two onwards. As we go through each topic. We will invite responses on each point from the parties identified in the agenda. Time permitting, we will invite other parties to respond at the end of each agenda item. As we consider necessary when we're raising the bar responses to these issues and questions. Take further contributions and ask further questions and provide the country with an opportunity to reply. Each time that we invite you to speak, please give your name and don't include behalf your speaking. So, moving on to the agenda or to looking first at modelling the base model. questions raised regarding the data input into the traffic model. The examining authority is considering whether the baseline model is an appropriate reflection of baseline conditions. issues have been raised by amongst others CPRA Peak District and South Yorkshire and Daniel Wimberly regarding perceived discrepancies in the data used in the model.

Please with the applicant, explain the differences between the annual average daily traffic and annual average window traffic where each of these has been used to provide inputs and how this would affect modelling levels of traffic with reference to numbers of heavy commercial vehicles particularly. Thank you.

24:16

Thank you, says Richard turning on behalf of the applicant and says for the benefit of your note and interested parties watching the detailed response and covering some aspects of this question was provided at deadlines seven and that's response rep seven hyphen zero 25. And in particular, paragraph 9.6 9.114 which was a response to an item raised by Mr. Wimberly and but at this point, the focus of the hearing on invite Mr. Cates mark to come forward and explain how the average traffic data is an output from the model rather than an input? Search Mr. Cates mark would like to join me on screen and introduce himself and then provide a response.

25:11

Yes, good morning everyone SDK spoke on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I think it's important to make clear that no traffic data is entered into the baseline traffic model. The baseline traffic model only uses traffic data for calibration and validation of that model. Because the model is a reassignment model. If you input traffic data at that model, you would know where that traffic's origins and destinations was. So the purpose of the model that is developed is based on the matrices of demand between zones. And then those, that demand is applied to the road network or loaded onto the road network representation of the road network in the model. And then the traffic is assigned to the different routes on that road network, depending on the parameters that are set regarding the operation road networks, such as Link capacities, road types of roads, types of junctions, etc. And it goes through a number of iterations until you get what's called equilibrium. And then what you do is then you compare the outputs from that the traffic flows on screen lines and cordons around the model the area and scrutinise across the model area. And you compare that as recorded data to make sure that the model is accurately representing how the traffic is actually operating on the road network as necessary. So in a specific record, answer your questions. Average annual daily traffic flow is the average flow all traffic across every day of the week, average over the whole year. Whereas average annual weekly traffic is as it says week that it's basically weekday, it's the same thing every day for the whole year, but only the average of all the weekdays in the year. So they're often not that dissimilar, typically only around 10% difference in total, and the average, but the average annual weekly traffic flow will generally have a higher proportion of AC V's because there's more HGVs on the road during the week than there are weekends. Hopefully that answers that question.

28:01

Moving on to my second question, please Would the applicant comment on whether the use of one type of flow data of the other is more accurate in reflecting the environmental effects of the proposal? So anything with the annual average daily traffic, or the average weekday traffic provide different results? When you're assessing each of the environmental effects? What would those effects be? How would they be affected?

28:35

Thank you, sir. I can read you're planning on behalf of the applicant. It's mind that different traffic flow data is used to assess different environmental impacts and based upon which is most relevant to those impacts. So again, if I can invite Mr. Cates mark to join me and then he can take you through each of the different environmental effects and the data that is used for each

29:07

to get smoked on behalf of the applicant. Yes, as Richard said, the different traffic flows are used for different environmental impact assessments. So for air quality dmrB The design manual for roads and bridges specifies that you use annual average daily traffic for noise to dmrB specifies that you use 18 hour that's from six o'clock in the morning to midnight, every day and your weekly traffic flows. Taking out a proportion of hcvs an average speed sorry an air quality also takes the portion of bases into account as part of the annual average daily flow. For road safety, we do the analysis on rate safety We use a DSP programme called Cobra. And the inputs that you put into that are everage. And your daily traffic flows, forecast changes in traffic in accident rates. For severance, generally you take the average early flow during peak periods. And and the same is the same average hourly flows during peak periods to apologise for the fire alarm, I'll go and go on silent for a moment to apologise.

30:36

We missed a case Mark, we can hear you very clearly we're not picking you up. But if you do need to leave, please prioritise the alarm if it's if it's not a test, it's just

30:49

a test, but

30:53

we can't really hear the alarm, Mr. case not so if you're happy to continue we can do quite quite clearly.

31:02

I'll continue then. Yes. So for several traffic delay and non motorised use remain the same, but we use every fairly close during the peak periods and that that is basically just best practice. There is no if you like specific guidance or historic guidance going back which I think is quite old, which is based upon the message those approaches and reception.

31:37

Okay. Moving on would the applicant explain how peak hour flows are reflected in the model? And Mr. Wimberly is telling us that can't hear so. Would a member of case team contact him and try and resolve this issue please.

32:09

Christian Christians

32:10

returning question, can we recommit it? Christians see?

32:17

Yes, thank you, sir. Richard, turning on behalf of the applicant in terms of questions see, and the different peak flows subject to Mr. Cade smart fire alarm, having now been resolved satisfactorily. I was proposing to invite him to just explain the different peak of those and how they're reflected in the model. If not, try and walk you through that.

32:41

Yeah, thankfully, the test is now over. All's well. Steve Case Law calm for about half the applicant. Yesterday, traffic modelling uses the average hourly flows over three peak periods. So, the elite peak periods or the am peak between seven o'clock and 10 o'clock, the entity period between 10 and four and the PMP between four and 7pm.

33:11

Thank you. Proceeding to question de, with the applicant clarify to what extent data gathered from traffic counts during restrictions introduced in response to the COVID 19 pandemic has been used and what that data has been used for within the model.

33:46

Thank you so much for turning on behalf of the applicant a relatively short response sir, just to confirm that no data has been collected during the COVID 19 pandemic which has been used in the traffic modelling scheme.

34:22

Thank you for that. Was the applicant explain what influence? Ah, I think we've already covered a questioner is asking the applicant to clarify the relationship between the total vehicle trips within the transplant on South Regional Transport model, the detailed model and the local study in rear regional model. Simply please clarify the relationships of total vehicle kilometres within each

34:58

career take that response in Monitoring booths to

35:03

Okay, great, we can arrange. Okay.

35:07

Okay. The applicant is identified in the transport assessment report in the library. That's reference IPP dash 185. The traffic isn't likely to increase on existing roads residential aims that provided 20 fruits to Glossop than the surrounding area

35:34

can we can I just interject to start at that point we in I actually over the last two days have made an extensive an accompany site inspection through alternative routes that a number of parties have mentioned, the notes of that site inspection will be published either towards the end of three for next week. But I just wanted to make the point that we've experienced a lot of those alternative routes. In

fact, I think all of the ones that have been mentioned, particularly during the peak hours yesterday, but also between peak hours at points when schools have closed, drop off for school pick up from school. And we've we've actually done quite a lot of work yesterday in particular, around some of those alternative routes. So just wanted to make that clear, because I know that's of interest to a number of parties here. Thank you. Sorry.

36:34

And please clarify whether the links in these areas within the model reflect individual roads, or general permeability through layers of side streets.

36:47

Thanks so much for telling your mouth, the applicant, I can confirm on the applicants path that they the LinkedIn the traffic model, do reflect individual roads with permeability. And that's, I think that's the simple answer to your question. So if you wanted more detail on those roads, then we'd have to invite Mr. Cates mark to respond accordingly. But I think that covers the point you're asking,

37:14

Could we get mark?

37:17

Certainly, Mr. Cates might be able to join me I just explained the links in the individual relative permeability that are reflected in the monitor

37:29

coming just coming just add to that a little just from what we saw yesterday. So there are a number of routes where there is on street parking, where there are restrictions to traffic, only being possibly one direction on some of those routes, for example, because of the construction from on street parking. So that's that's one example.

37:53

So, if we could take my question, ah, our question ah, at the same time, so an explanation of how the characteristics of those routes are reflected in modelling.

38:07

Yep, yeah, I will say that's the case, but hopefully African Yeah. So, so, the model, the model has a representation the road network, and that network does so. So, that network represents actual roads on the network. So, individual links represent individual roads, and whether or not all roads are in the traffic model. Some roads generally those which are not residential roads, that are not generally used for the which are used for local access only rather than for the for through routes between the models zones, and not within in the model. So, those those just aren't in the model at all. So, those those roads, so, it you know, so, a proportional approach is taken to the way you build the model, the model network with regard to the parameters, the roads, the premises of the roads are based on a whole host of characteristics, whether urban rural, single or dual carriageway, number of traffic lanes, the speed limit, the typical average speed on those roads. So, the characteristics and and particularly the junctions are

all represented in the model in whether giveaway junction with a roundabout signal controlled if their signal control signal timings are input into the model to represent the operation of that young person and how the signals system operates. So, it is an accurate representation of the road network as possible as possibly can be. The typical every speeds for the different types of road applied so many links where the it's just the road type you have what are called Speed traffic speed curves which determine the speed on those links, but for longer links, where the link speed is going to be important. Sorry, on the longer links, the standard V flow relationships for input for the shorter links is just the assumed average speed. But what you need to remember here is that the, in a situation like this relatively congested road network, the overriding dominant factor on jianxin journey times is junction delay. So the actual the the speed average speed along the links has very little bearing on the overall journey time, it is all about Johnson delay. So that is the impact of any parking or such like on street parking where inhibits movements or traffic is not going to have a significant impact on the predicted journey times that are in the model. Because the overriding factor is the junction delay, and therefore, you know, delays for vehicles trying to get your way to one another isn't gonna have a big impact on the overall journey times.

41:16

So if there's sorry, Mr. Case, man, can I just ask a question on that? So So if we look at shore lane and denting Road, for example, so it's quite clear that for the stretch of shore lane, from the a 57, for a distance of, I think, less than 100 metres, there's quite a lot of on street parking, the traffic flows are restricted to one direction for that 100 metres or so. So your advisor says that that restriction isn't specifically identified in the model. But for but when you take sure lane and denting road together, and the overall journey times through that alternative route, then that is modelled, you would suggest with a reasonable degree of accuracy. I'm understanding you correctly.

42:12

Yes, that is that's absolutely correct. The only thing I would add that is on the the more strategic links through the network. And the journey times that the model is is predicting are checked against actual recorded journey times. So journey time surveys are done, again as part of the calibration of the model. But that didn't cover didn't in road and shore lane. It covers the the key roots that are in Figure seven of the transport assessment 7.7 figure 7.7 of the transport assessment report. So obviously, where were the models being calibrated to those journey times, then that will have taken account of any delays on the links caused by any other factor, because that'd be calibrated. But the calibration journey isn't done on every single link, and it wasn't done for your lane and Dinty. Road.

43:12

You mentioned that junction types are modules in broad terms, giveaway lines, signals, roundabouts. And so there's a junction there that is controlled by stop lines is that a standard junction type within the input types,

43:41

it would still be it would be modelled as a standard giveway jianxin. Because the traffic still gives away and the ability for traffic to cross that stop line and join the other road is determined by the gaps in the traffic, which is the same as for give any other give way. The the purpose of the stop line is that there's

considered to be a safety issue with that jianxin Regarding visibility on everything and as you know, in the highway code with a stop line you you actually have to physically come to a stop and I think in HyperCard says you have to put your handbrake on before then checking whether it's safe to leave that jianxin And that that is a it's really a safety issue. It's not an issue about the way that the job operates in capacity terms.

44:29

So the restricted visibility wouldn't affect capacity in as far as it's modelled with within the baseline.

44:43

It could have a minor impact on capacity. Yes, yes.

44:47

Yes.

44:53

But again, the the way the model is calibrated. All of this good has will have been The outputs of the model in terms of journey times traffic flows on the links means that the models that accurately represent how the road network is operating. Overall, even if one specific Jonathan is exactly how it would operate in practice or hasn't been models, specifically as a standalone jianxin And then those is the result that modelling is fed back into the parameters of the model. Because to some junctures such as signal junctions, that's what we do we do stand alone junction modelling you using the traffic flows, and that informs the specific parameters that then have to be put back into the 3d model to make sure it accurately reflects the operation that but that isn't done typically for many give way junctions it's usually signal controlled or round about Johnson's not typically giveaway Johnson's

45:59

okay. I think to decree was already covered. Question I. But I would just ask the applicant if they had anything to add with regard to that. That's with the applicant explain what methods have been used to verify the model Outworld couplets in the baseline? I'd like you to reflect journey Thompson flouts, do you consider that you've adequately covered that to the satisfaction the applicant?

46:36

Yes, and in our written submission, will actually fight with the submits and plans going where the cordons and the screen lines were located, that we calibrated the model against so that they would ride in our written submission. And

47:02

I think we partly covered question J. But I just like to check that term. What effect if any increases in flow, particularly with regard to heavy goods, vehicles would have on journey to noise and air quality through residence, residential streets, and others is on the street RT?

47:34

Well, the important thing to recognise in the modelling is that the modelling is actually based on what's called the vehicle numbers are converted to what's called passenger car equivalent units, PCU, where heavy goods vehicles are given a value of 2.4. So to represent the greater impact they have on the operation of the road network in terms of their much depth, their physical size, road space, they take up, and the fact that they can't pull away from junctions as quickly, it cetera. And so the modelling takes account of the operation of the road network and accounts for those ATVs in that way, in terms of the the parking, I think my previous response would would, would stay the same. And that, you know, unless it's parking that actually prevents two way flow to a significant degree, it's not going to impact on the overall results of the modelling. And the other important thing to note as well is that in the modelling, the, the operational costs for commercial vehicles is much higher than it is for cars. So when the module is, is deciding which way traffic's going to choose in response to additional delay on different links. When it makes a choice about how it's going to reassign the traffic, the commercial vehicle traffic is much less likely to reassign as a result of that, because the overriding factor for commercial traffic is the operating costs they will always look for the shortest route rather than the quickest route necessarily, whereas car traffic is much more sensitive to changes in journey time. And therefore, will will re route in response to changes in journey time a lot more than commercial traffic. So with regard to the routing gloss at which we're talking about here, the side roads, it is much less likely that the commercial vehicles will choose to use those side rows to avoid can delay and congestion. If it involves a you know a greater distance because the operating cost is a far bigger factor in their determination of which route they choose to take.

50:00

And I think I think actually that aligns with what we experienced yesterday. In terms of the number of commercial vehicles we saw on shore lane and denting worked. It was a very low proportion, if any, actually,

50:13

definitely. But then

50:17

there was a very low proportion. Thank you can I just take that we have a little technical point that's been plugged around the live stream. So if you're watching on the live streaming standard, you may be seeing some shaking of the screen. We've been told that moving a mouse over the video window to moving your cursor over the video window of opening the video window to full screen should stop the shaking I've been told. So if you're experiencing shaking, please try to move your mouse over the video window or please try to maximise the video window to full screen. Apologies for those of you who have been experiencing some shaking, but hopefully that will help. Thank you.

51:11

Thank you. Moving on to question came increased traffic through these routes has potential to affect the number of accidents in the area with the applicant explain how the existing Accident history of those areas around the main routes has been assessed and reflected in the modelling.

51:39

Thank you sir major turning on behalf the applicant just mean by Miss TENCATE about to join us to explain how existing accident rates have been assessed

51:54

SDKs Mark Mr. Highways Yes, as I stated earlier that the way accidents are modelled in is using this DFT software called Koba and the the data entry into that is you enter either recorded accident data or you enter the road type and it applies an average typical accident rate for that type of road. So for many of the roads in the area where where there are very few recorded accidents. And the view is that the you wouldn't get any statistical pattern or representation from those few accidents where there's very few accidents on roads. So, the general rule is that you use the standard factor to it as the input where there are roads where the there are sufficient accidents that you can say that there is a statistically significant level to give you an indication that it's represented something different from typical you can use it as something rather than the typical data. For instance on snake row day 57 Then the actual recorded data over the most recent five year period is input into that model. And then what it does it applies the traffic growth, forecast traffic growth and proportionally increases those accidents in response to the increased number of traffic volumes on those those roads and those accidents are input by severity so by with this light, severe or fatal

54:03

Okay moving on to policy issues, both locally and nationally, there is an aspiration to change travel habits in favour of more sustainable travel policy reflects this. For instance, transport for Greater Manchester sets out an aim in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 for 50% on journeys in Greater Manchester to be made by walking, cycling or public transport by 2040. Government's transport decarbonisation plan seeks to deliver carbon reduction in transport. The scheme lies within Greater Manchester and many of the trips within year modelled our trips originating or arriving in Greater Manchester travelling to local settlements. Police with the applicant explain whether the scheme supports the aims of the Greater Manchester Transport System 2014 and or the government's transport, decarbonisation plan? If so, could you explain how this straight and if not why it does not achieve that.

55:15

Thank you Sir Richard failing on the behalf of the applicants survey, the applicants view is that the scheme does support the aims in the strategy and the decarbonisation plan. In particular, it starting with the Greater Manchester strategy, and it's expressly identified within that strategy on page 92 as part of the suite of investment in Greater Manchester strategic road network, which is described as critical to the delivery of a more reliable northern highways network, and it forms part of the measures to deliver improved city to City's highways connectivity. The strategy also identifies a memorandum of understanding, which was signed over time between highways England and transport for Greater Manchester to establish a complimentary highways network, and more closely align the operation of the strategic road on key route networks and deal with existing and potential bottlenecks on key highway links in relation to the decarbonisation plan, and, as is noted in the foreword to that plan, the plan is not about stopping people doing things, it's about doing the same things differently. And it observes that we will still drive on improve roads, but increasingly in zero emission cars. And it's further noted that it sets out makes reference to the government's ambitious road programme, which reflects and will continue to

reflect that in any imaginable circumstances, the clear majority of longer journeys, passenger and freight will be made by road. And that rural and remote areas will always depend more heavily on roads. And the government say that's why that plan to decarbonize motor transport is the most ambitious of any major country is so vital. The A57 link road says we say is part of that ambitious roads programme. And road transport remains a central focus of policy and will continue to require appropriate infrastructure. plan goes on to acknowledge that continued high investment in our roads is there for and will remain as necessary as ever to ensure the functioning of the nation and to reduce the congestion, which is a major source of carbon. In addition to those points that say the scheme also supports the aims of the Greater Manchester strategy and the decarbonisation plan in terms of creating opportunities for walking and cycling. The scheme will provide new and improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders throughout the route, which include improved pedestrian and cyclist crossing facilities at the end of junction for and all new junctions created by the scheme. The crossing at Mottram junction will be quicker and easier with the new Crossroads design. And we're also adding more cycling and pedestrian crossings. The replacement connections for the existing footpaths will be provided for those severed by the scheme. And come find footway and cycleway along the new A57 link road between Mater Moore and woody bridge, create a route to link Mottram to the trans Pennine Trail, which is National Cycle network route 62. In that way, the proposals have been integrated with other cycling schemes being delivered by in particular Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council and existing facilities. And the scheme is also expected to help public transport to be more reliable, where it currently gets delayed, making its use a more attractive option to the public. So it's in those key ways that we say we're consistent because plans and the references that I've quoted from there will include in the in the written response. Thank you. And

59:48

we in that regard to the local authorities, and local highway authorities have any comment to make at this point.

1:00:02

Thank you sir. McQuaid team that I'd Metropolitan Borough Council. Just to add to the the comments by the applicant. It's correct that this disc game specifically is identified within the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy. And in terms of delivering the right mix targets of 50% of all journeys within Greater Manchester being made with by public transport or active travel, it specifically noted within the strategy that the area with the biggest potential for that change is the local neighbourhood trips area where there are trips of two kilometres or less where there are large numbers of em short car journeys which could reasonably be switched to active travel. And this specific scheme does support that in terms of delivering that greater potential for cycling, walking journeys to be made from watch and once the A57. Three, the village has been de trumped and the associated traffic has been reduced. And it also will support those shorter journeys from the the Glossop area entertain side through provision of this segregated cycle and walk in facilities. I'd also the integration with existing and proposed walking and cycling routes in Mottram in the wider area of obtains

1:01:22

thank you that's it

1:01:32

all. Good morning, sir. I haven't really got anything original to add to that, although it's safe to say that, you know, currently the scheme that you know, it's a challenge for traffic public transport experiences. So you know, significant challenges in delivering a service, sustainable transport improvements there more than 10 You know, what helpfully wants to scheme in? Should you be mandated to allow it then you know, that that clearly opens opportunities for public transport and other non car model uses? Thank you, sir. Thank you. To people to

1:02:30

Dr. Boss. Well, we are not inviting comments from interested parties. But the moment we'll be taking comments at the end of this agenda item. Do any of the other local authorities have any comments made at this point in response? My specific question. Is smoke

1:03:01

Miss Jen James. So Mr. James.

1:03:03

Thank you, Mr. James Hypro counsel, and nothing original to add, but just to confirm that we acknowledge the fact that the scheme is identified in the greater monster stretchy scheme that will be delivered. So just to confirm that point really? Okay.

1:03:38

Very good amount of views.

1:03:45

And, again, I'll point out Mr. Buchan that we'll be taking comments from interested parties. At a later time we're dealing with the specific questions addressed to identified parties at this point.

1:04:04

I did have a factual or factual comment on the walking and cycling but I'll leave it till the end if that's more convenient,

1:04:09

but totally

1:04:11

helpful. Please don't lose sight of your comment. Thank you. Okay.

1:04:19

Moving on to public transport, specifically, in their representation at deadline seven in the examination library, that is our EP 7034. Paragraphs three and four. CPRE peak districts in South Yorkshire perceive anomalous figures in the public transport trip notice see matrices used in the model with the applicant please explain how existing public transport services have been modelled with particular regard to whether the totality of existing public transport usage is represented and Potential modal

transfer France to offer on buses and train services as a result of changes on the road network resulting from schema reflected.

1:05:12

Thank you so much you're failing on behalf of the African. I'll invite Mr. Cates mark to join me to explain how public transport has been considered within the model

1:05:26

security SDKs Mark on behalf of the applicant. So, model legals has included a use of a regional mode choice transport model, to forecast the potential mode 52 or four from our base trip due to forecast changes, specifically in rail services, it doesn't model bus services, so it's only represents the rail services in this mode choice selection, and the purpose of valleys so that that mode, any mode shift that occurs can be reflected in the traffic forecasts that used in the traffic modelling too. So, and the model basically, this model contains matrices of travelling demand between zones within the modelled area generated by people in households with access to a car. And within the model is a representation of both the rail network and the road network. And the reputation of road network reflects the certain or near certain planned improvements rail services, as we presented in the national highways response to the second examining authority second written questions, that's rep six, zero 17 Answer the question 3.4. The demand for travel between zones by the road or rail is determined in the model by the relative costs for users of choosing one or other mode of transport. And then the the so that takes account of fares, you know, operating costs, and in terms of the traffic's the user costs of using their car, and the cost of tie, ply to value of time for travel. So all those things are taken into consideration.

1:07:40

So in specific answer to the question about why there were some zeros, this is a very specific modelling point in the matrices is because in that model, clearly some journeys between different zones within the model simply aren't feasible by rail, or the number of people who would make them would be so tiny as to be not represented and that is why there are zeros shown in the in the maitre C's for some trips, because it's basically saying that those those trips cannot be made really realistically by rail, because there is an appropriate service. And the traffic model used for the, for the modelling to assess the scheme has, there's been an iteration with that mode choice model. So that as the outputs from the from the rate from that mode shift that feeds back into the traffic model that obviously alters the traffic flows, which then alters the user cost. So you have to go, then put that back into the model again. And actually, I think there was I was told there were seven iterations of the model done to get to a point where we were satisfied that the traffic forecasts were actually accurately representing the, the, you know, the moat, any potential mode shift as a result of that analysis. So the reason that the options are fill souls without only hillsides with access to a car we used was because those without access to a car household without access to call, those people cannot easily switch from using public transport using a car instead. So it would have no bearing on traffic forecasts, and B, whether those people are already using public transport. You know that that likewise, we'll have no impact on the traffic forecasts. So it's perfectly reasonable excuse that exclude them from the from the modelling for the assessment of the scheme. The reason the reasonable motorist model doesn't take account of any potential for motif from car based trips to do to forecast changes in buses is because the number of bus trips across the modelled area is very small in comparison the number of vehicle based trips and when the modelling

was done, there were no identified certain or near certain planned improvements to bus services that would materially alter the you know, the that decision and that, you know, that is particularly the case outside of you know, the centre of Manchester in the area of where the scheme is being implemented. So, is you know, is national highways desert proportionate to exclude that aspect of particular motif from from buses to from cars to buses from the forecast, as it would have a negligible effect on traffic on the traffic forecasts used to assess the scheme

1:11:16

first, so, to decree I think you've already answered my question Oh. Is there anything that the applicant would wish to add to amplify your existing answer with regard to question as to how the model reflects future public transport usage and allows for or reflects any future growth in public transport sector?

1:11:55

Well, it is the interaction with the the regional motorised transport model that predicts that which looks at the the say the potential motorists to corral base trips the otherwise the traffic forecast used in the model are based on the department transport traffic forecast which you know is projected forward and takes account of a host of demographic information but my understanding is that the the that doesn't have a generalised reduction in forecast traffic to take account of mode shift to as a result of if you like objectives and policy so that there that's not included in those forecasts.

1:13:04

There was a second.

1:13:51

Thank you Thank you for being there. And regarding concerns raised by CPRD Peak District in South Yorkshire, the applicant of clarify had figures and matrices were derived and perceived lack of correlation between trips to and from some sectors with particular regard to how commuter trips has been modelled.

1:14:24

Thank you. So, turning on balance in relation to the accounting concerns raised by CPRA by Mr. Case, Martin just to address what was described as asymmetry in the modelling.

1:14:44

Yes, the caseworker on behalf of the applicant. Yes, this was we believe a comment related to the asymmetry in the in the data that we we provided and this is quite simply the way in which the data is entered. Add into the the mode choice model, in that you only input the outward effect of the journeys. And then the model inherently assumes that those journeys return, there is a return for it using the same mode, some point later in the day. So it's just the way the data is entered. And why you get this is a symmetry with that is because in the larger conurbation, such as Manchester, they provide porterie more jobs than the smaller towns, which are outside the core area. And so trip patterns reflect the more dormitory nature of those smaller towns. And hence, the menses will report a higher residential title component away from the poor area. Thank you. But as I said, there will be returned trips later in the day which are accounted for in the model. So it's a fairly technical modelling point. This is perhaps quite

difficult to explain, but we will make sure that's clear in the written submission deadline, the next deadline.

1:16:35

There are concerns that if there are unrepresented trips by public transport, and this would include the trips from people really using public transport, if there are improvements or dis benefits to journey times, then those unrepresented trips

1:16:57

would experience associated time costs. Would you comment on that and its effect on the case for the scheme?

1:17:15

That yes, the case home for half of the applicant to oversee the trips, you know, that are on public transit rail networks, it has no impact on rail services whatsoever. So you know, they're not considered in the modelling. So the only aspect that would be relevant to the benefit scheme are the impact on bus journey times and on the passengers. They're using those buses in represent response to the exam through secondary questions. Rep. 617. To question 317. We provide information on for the bus we forecast the bus journey time changes. And so while some journeys, for some routes improved for other work were slightly longer journey times but on balance, it was, you know, probably worse neutral, if not slightly beneficial, in terms of overall impacts. But the those delays haven't been modelled in terms of passenger numbers on the buses and again is because proportionally the number of bus per bus passengers, given the frequency of the bus services is such a small proportion of the overall number of trips that are being considered fastest assessment, that any change marginal change in the number of passengers on those bus services would have a negligible impact on the cost benefit analysis that has been done for the scheme.

1:18:55

Thank you in the response to the examination, so examining authority secondary questions rep. 602. For question 3.3 And question frequent for CPRE Peak District in South Yorkshire refer to preparation of a statement of common ground that they are seeking with the applicant with the applicant comment on whether such a statement is being pursued? And if it is, how's it progressing? And would CPR repeat districts in South Yorkshire also provide comments on any progress?

1:19:39

Thank you, sir. Richard, turning on behalf of the applicant. So I think it's fair to record firstly, that there's been a little bit moving on this in relation to some email correspondence just prior to the hearing. But if I've read the overall summary, the the draft statement of common ground was initially provided back in December 2021. A copy was was shared with see Korea that time. But at that time, I think and obviously CPRA will come in and come into the moment. It's fair to record that they indicated they wanted to wait until after the first round of hearings. And they'd had the opportunity to consider further information before they were able to come further. The applicants, mindful of the limited time now available. And indeed, I think deadline nine is the is the deadline has been selected for the submission of sort of final statements of common ground. But CPRA, as I say, in that email exchange that I think

was had, prior to these hearings, have indicated that they believe there might be some issues concerning alternatives, and the appraisal of technical work that might merit inclusion in the statement of common ground, being of course, mindful that we don't want to repeat matters that have already been put into the examination and have moved on. And so in that context, national highways is of course willing and will continue to engage with CPRE to progress the statement of common ground. And insofar as it's going to be beneficial, and help identify areas of agreement or narrow any remaining areas of disputes. We would, I think, be looking to CBRE to provide their comments or revisions to a draft so that we can then take that forward. But I know members of our team are in touch with theirs. And I would like to progress to further meetings and discussions as required.

1:21:46

Lucky, Dr. Robinson,

1:21:49

oh, no, it'll be Dutch Robinson. Thank you very much. Indeed. I think Richard Burling probably summarise pretty much what I'm going to say. But to point out that we have kept the examination informed of the fact that been waiting for all the information from national highways in order to complete the work on the alternatives, the forecasting and the modelling. And identify from that areas where there might be agreement. And of course, we didn't get the final work done until deadline seven. But we are now working towards a statement of common ground on those issues that would apply to area of alternatives and the appraisal and the technical work supporting that, as covered by our two meetings and all the correspondence that we've had with highways, England national highways. So we'll we'll hopefully be able to come up with something well before deadline nine so that you can have it.

1:22:47

Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Rollins and coaches thank the applicant and care could be just as as you're progressing the stem to come grant that we do find them helpful, and particularly when there are complex issues, and particularly where there are standing matters that have not been agreed to many ways as tenants of common ground are most helpful where there is a common ground. So care and peace pictures to South Yorkshire have raised a large number of issues across a large number of topic areas. And so it is very helpful to have that summarised and crystallised within a statement of common ground. So thank you for that. I think, Mr. furling, you refer to Deadline nine, we could certainly be receptive to allowing more time for for the reasons given for the sense of comma grant to be put together and indeed if it was submitted very late in the examination at deadline 10 grievance slightly beyond that. It would still be very helpful to us. So please take a little bit more time if that's helpful. And again, thank you for the efforts being made. We appreciate that.

1:24:06

All indications noted and and helpful.

1:24:11

Thank you very much indeed.

1:24:24

But there was a second Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for bearing and bearing with us. We're just coordinating as we go along. We have actually been running for approaching an hour and a half and a number of parties were in arrangements conference before that. So I think it's now a good time for us to take a short break. And before we recommend to go through traffic outside the ordinary Summit, so just a short break this one it's 1125. I suggest that we well, if we could please reconvene recommence at 1135 If you're watching the live stream, please be aware that the live stream will now stop. To review the restarted meeting you'll need to refresh your browser page when we restart at 1135. So recommits in 10 minutes. Thank you