

TRANSCRIPT_ISH3_DAY2_SESSION2_A57L INKROADS_06042022

00:05

Good morning again, everybody, the time is now limited T and the series restarting these could remember the case team component early in the live stream and recording restarted.

00:17

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

00:24

we are resuming the hearing Under Item seven. And as indicated before the break before we go into the general points and other environmental matters, that has I understand been request from the applicant with respect to the timetable for the remainder of the examination.

00:47

Would the applicant like to set that out for us, please?

00:51

Thank you, Fowler on behalf of the applicant. Yes, so that that is the case. And I do apologise in advance for not raising this before. But what has become apparent during these examination hearings is there is going to be quite a weight of material that will need to be submitted for next Wednesday. The intention is that that will then be responded to by Wednesday, the 27th of April, that's, that's Wednesday, 25th of April, what we're conscious of is that will then get uploaded during the first day. And the Monday the second is a bank holiday. And all responses need to be in by Wednesday the theurge. So effectively, that's that's providing parties with one clear working day in terms of the preparation of those responses. So So in light of your comments, particularly regarding the statements of common ground, and if dB,

01:48

parties taking longer to ensure that you've got a full response, we did wonder if deadline 10 could be moved to provide a bit more time, maybe to Friday, the six or even Monday, the ninth, which is a week before the examination is due to close on the 16th. So as I say apologies for not considering that when we were programming the inquiry in the early days. But thank you. Okay, so thank you for that. And I understand,

02:19

particularly with respect to the bankable term made the second

02:25

one of the things that we've been anxious to build in is actually the potential for us to raise what's called a rule 17 request. So which which has a mechanism by which we can raise a request for information

02:39

as the examining authority.

02:42

And we were anxious to make sure there's time for us to do that, at the very end. So it's almost like a very short form of additional questions, if you like.

02:53

And I think it's given where we are now, it's likely that we're going to want to be able to do that.

03:00

Now.

03:03

So that's the first point, let me come back to the time you've that.

03:07

There is provision for us to close the examination early if we want to, I think it's probably fair to say that we're very unlikely to do that.

03:18

I think it's very likely the examination will run its full course.

03:23

So

03:26

that is one thing to bear in mind. And if we do a real 17 requests, then we would like I think to leave time for responses to that and comments on responses. So

03:39

it's a comment on responses wrong. So looking from the back from the end of the comments on the responses were at the 16th. And I think we should reasonably publish the responses on the 11th.

03:53

And, therefore make the request on the fifth, maybe the sixth.

04:00

So and that's, you know, that's to give reasonable turn around for the rule 17 requested it, there may be a number of items in that rule 17 request, it's a little bit unknown at the moment. So that we want to leave room for that at the end.

04:17

That does mean that we'll probably be creating a couple of deadlines at the end, additional deadlines beyond deadline 10. So I think we can do will be deadlines for responses, rule 17 comments on responses, and I feel sure that we'd be able to accept a certain number of other submissions at those times.

04:39

So that they'll give a little bit more flexibility. But having said that, yes. If there are comments that deadline nine then the turnaround.

04:50

On deadline nine submissions for deadline tend to look very tight.

04:56

But to keep the best for the rule 17 I'd like to try and suggest the

05:00

minimal

05:02

adjustment to the Third of May.

05:05

Other to just before we sort of decided to wait for Do it, do any of the parties want to contribute on this at this moment? Do any of the parties have a view on the applicants request?

05:22

Seeing any hands raised, there was a hand raised.

05:27

Mr. Booker, please, Mr. Buchan.

05:32

Hands. Sir, I do understand the the reasons for this, I think it's be a sensible adjustment. However, I must stress that from our side, we we do need responses to our requests, final requests for information to be treated with some sense of urgency. I've offered a meeting as well. I hope that will take place and use your good offices to ensure that happens. Thank you. Thank you.

06:02

Any other points on matters? Were discussing around the timetable?

06:08

Okay, so I think my suggestion would be

06:13

if we were to

06:17

make an adjustment, I think we could add the rule 17 request to the timetable. Now. I think I think I can be confident that will happen. So my suggestion is that we add in a rule 17 request, where we request actually slightly later than I was anticipating. So if we make our request on the sixth of May.

06:36

We would like a little time to review the deadline 10 responses ahead of that.

06:50

However, I think I would be willing for us to do that overnight, practically, I think we can.

06:58

So I'd like to suggest deadline 10 is delayed to the fifth of May.

07:04

And then we make our rule 17 request on the sixth

07:11

that

07:13

was the applicants response to that, please. Thank you fell on behalf the applicant. And thank you, sir, that that's very helpful.

07:20

So

07:22

deadline turn,

07:25

fifth May,

07:28

then,

07:30

by rule 17, will be the sixth

07:33

responses on the 11th comments on responses on the 16th. Okay, any thank you that says that SAP can respond to any of the responses to that change?

07:44

We'll we'll we'll update the timetable. In due course, it made us Dr. Robinson.

07:52

Really sorry, I was a bit cack handed getting my hand raised. And yes, I'd be we'd be really grateful actually, if you could just explain what the rule 17 Further information would encompass so that we can prepare for it. Oh, I'd love to have the crystal ball at this stage.

08:09

So

08:11

it'll essentially be

08:14

where we feel it would be beneficial for us to receive further information at that point.

08:21

So we won't know the content of that it'll effectively be a short set of written questions from us. That's that's the format that it will be.

08:34

But it will be very, very targeted. Because there's very limited time available for parties to respond to be very targeted to areas where we feel additional information would be helpful to us. So I I'm afraid I can't tell you what those will be it very much depends on what we receive that aren't eight, nine and 10.

08:55

Thank you very much. Okay, thank you. Any other comments on that?

09:00

No. Okay, thank you. We will

09:06

issue a procedural decision on that in the next few days. It may be very early next week, but I hope parties have made a note of those dates.

09:16

Okay, thank you. So let's return to the agenda.

09:22

And

09:24

as I indicated earlier, we are intended to take folks through the majority of items on the agenda in writing.

09:33

However, we'll be taking oral responses on some of them. So under general, please could we have responses A to E

09:43

from Team side in writing.

09:48

And I'll come back to the parties in a moment. And then F from teams signed and the applicant in writing

09:57

G and date and I from the applicant

10:00

In a routine

10:02

and j

10:04

and then K L from an applicant and from team site. So don't usually have an indication from the applicant,

10:15

that they're happy to provide those responses in writing.

10:19

Thank you federal behalf the applicant? Yes. We're happy to provide those in writing, sir. Thank you. And then Thameside. Please.

10:27

Simon nice with Thameside, that's fine, we have no issues with that. Thank you. So that's so response in writing, please, for deadline eight. So we've got up to two items and landscaping before we are going to cover some of those aspects. However, the first item and if and only if we could have ended in writing from the applicant, please.

10:54

Thank you fell on behalf Yep. Could Yes, that's fine, sir. Thank you. Thank you. And then oh, from team sites and dabish that in writing, please. Then signed your content with that.

11:09

Yes, we are. Thank you and darvish

11:13

comments on Oh, in writing, please speak with your doctor can counsel? Yes, I can feel more happy with that approach. Thank you. Thank you very much. So let's move on to mitigation. So over under the landscape of visual mitigation measures planting, there's been quite a number exchanges around the applicants planting proposals and concerns raised by TeamSite and high peak and one of our in particular.

11:42

And these concerns have included the type of planting the seed mixes that a proposed consideration given to the latest species consideration given to landscape character,

11:55

the applicant at deadline seven, Peter suggested these matters be resolved during detailed design.

12:04

It would from our point of view gives us more comfort if these matters could be resolved during the examination and the mitigation measures updated appropriately.

12:18

In order to assist with that, so in the question P. It would appear useful potentially for the applicant Tameside and Darbyshire.

12:28

And if appropriate, high peak. And to get together and discuss these, it's often a good way of reaching speedy agreements, which would be helpful at this stage of the examination.

12:42

Do the public with the parties be content to do that and to see whether the proposals could be developed in a way that's acceptable to all of those parties, and to update the outline landscape and ecological management and monitoring plan to reflect that over the next few days. Applicant? First, please. Vicky fell on behalf the applicant. So we believe it is some this is not a lot of small job. I think to be clear, the planting and seed mixes in the outline

13:13

length are indicative and they will be subject to further consultation and engagement. Obviously through the development of the lamp.

13:23

I think we are concerned it's not just a case of meeting we would expect to have workshops, etc. Effectively to work through what's what's appropriate. I think in some of the representations, some particular species have been identified, I think there was reference to daffodils.

13:41

And while they could be removed, the reality is that the planting and seed mixes are indicative. And we say that this should be for further further review and, and consultation and working together through those workshops.

13:55

Would it be do you think before I take the responses do you think it would be appropriate to

14:01

for those to indicate something slightly different and maybe give more emphasis on native species for example, in the indication that that may be a relatively straightforward adjustment. So without without reaching the final solution, but to

14:17

perhaps increase the emphasis change the emphasis a little to reflect the comments.

14:25

And Vicki fell on behalf of the applicant? So yes, I think we can certainly look look at that and respond to that scene. In our deadline eight submissions. Recognise there's a lot of work to finalise the landscape and the planting proposals to finalise those, but it's I suppose it's making sure they're starting on the right footing, if you like

14:48

and that 14 reflects the concerns and comments that have been made. Green Tech we take Tim side, please come into Tameside on that

15:04

That's, that seems to be a way forward.

15:08

Thank you. And then w please.

15:13

State Buffy Dodge County Council so we held some preliminary discussions with the applicants. Last week on this issue, we did agree that we would seek to try and organise a meeting between the county council of landscape architects and link the applicants landscape architect, as soon as we can really to certainly sort of agree some of the principles of the planting permit scheme. So we're happy to progress that if you think it's necessary, so I think that'll be able to do it, it'd be helpful to have the outline, lamp lamp landscape and ecological management monitoring plan, more reflective of

15:50

the expected direction of travel, if you like more reflective of the comments and concerns.

15:57

Do Hi Pete want to add anything

16:00

to that?

16:04

Yes, James type of Borough Council would rely on the specialist advice from the county council on landscape matters. And I only comment on this was that we wanted the app in some regard to our own landscape character SPD, which does give some guidance on appropriate planting in the landscape character type. So that would be our early inputs. That's pretty much not much value and as attending any any workshops, or meetings, I think it's just a case for the counties architect to to take those comments on board along with applicant think I feel sure that that should take note of that. Thank you to the African content to

16:39

progress on that basis. Vicki fell on behalf of the applicant. Yes. So we are understand that the outline Lemp is due to be submitted at deadline eight, so not updated. So we'll we'll review that with the with the local authorities and make the points more prominent, for example, around native species. Thank you. That's helpful.

17:02

Okay, and then if TeamSite darbishire, and, if appropriate. Hi. Pete could then comment on the length updates for deadline nine. So this is question our team sign your content to do that.

17:17

Please.

17:20

Yes, and obviously please.

17:25

Yes, happy to do that, sir. Thank you. Thank you very much. Let's move on. These important

17:32

so so just bear with me.

17:38

So CTRP district in South Yorkshire branch, and Jeff Brown and the applicant have all commented on the merits of a site inspection proposed by CPRP distant South Yorkshire branch on private land in the

pasture South much North Hall to understand the impacts of the first development including the proposed Eastern portal and character

17:59

CPRA Peak District in South Yorkshire Bradford to the consideration of views from coachford increment proposed vital way along the top of the cutting between the new structure monitoring law and old holdings excuse me, the applicant said that the assessment and consider the impacts on views for existing receptors and views views of the proposed Park away, not because it's an applicant is there is no existing baseline to determine the magnitude of change.

18:30

We carried out in the complaint and accompanies aspects of Khosrow back in September and actually given the representation, Bones CPRE.

18:42

Under this we carried out further inspection of coach road and on Sunday

18:50

three days ago, and did actually spend some time not just the viewpoint when Coach through potentially along the length of coach road and actually had the benefit of

19:02

the hedges not been in leaf and which actually gave quite a few glimpses through there along coach road. And we had we had the applicants and visualisations photo montage is with us.

19:20

So, we have considered the submissions. We have given this further consideration in an unaccompanied inspection along coach road. And we have a look carefully at the information presented in the environmental statement.

19:36

Do CPRE Peak District South Yorkshire boatyard the applicant have anything to add to the submissions they've made on this point.

19:48

And Robinson on behalf of CPRA beaches in South Yorkshire, now we have nothing further to add to our written submission. Okay, and the applicant.

19:58

Vicki fell on behalf of the applicants so we

20:00

We have nothing further either. Okay, thank you. So, so having having considered all of that inflammation, we have concluded that we're content that we have enough understanding of the

landscape and Timescape in the vicinity of use and portal of the Motrin underpass. And we do not require a site inspection to the area suggested by CPR ri P district in South Yorkshire, thank you for the suggestion. It did prompt us to

20:30

to revisit the area and continue to carefully consider the points that have been raised. But as I've said, we do not feel that that site visit is necessary for us.

20:42

So that sounds good on that point. Let's move on then to to design and so lighting.

20:55

Can we quickly take this one submissions on this one? So

21:02

the lighting levels?

21:08

So that do seem to be various different thoughts about

21:16

what the lighting levels might be? So I think I think particularly, we're interested in understanding the issue, not at the junctions, but in the areas between the junctions

21:31

and what the intentions are for the lighting levels in those areas. So there have been different submissions from parties that there are competing concerns, I think in some ways here around safety on one hand and around visual impact,

21:49

impact on nighttime views, dark skies, etc. So they do seem to be competing interests.

21:56

We have been informed that been ongoing discussions.

22:02

Could parties given updates to respond where those discussions are

22:08

and whether they feel that a new adjustment should be made to secure the mitigation that's been secured? So could we start with

22:19

Tameside please any comments from Tameside?

22:29

I mean, our requirements especially on the new section that we're adopting, will be bridge too much and more

22:40

will require that to be at to an appropriate standard is the rod is in each carriage where

22:49

and we'll also need to do cater for cyclists pedestrians, equestrian users cetera. So lighting needs to be of a standard that is safe for them

23:02

as well as normal traffic.

23:05

Okay, thank you, Thomas Shipley's.

23:09

Steve prefer Dodge County councils are selling so well. detailed discussions on this matter took place largely last year between how street lighting officer the County Council and the the applicants, consultants and the sort of basic principles of

23:24

an agreed scheme was set out in correspondence between the County Council and the applicant on the 21st of July. Those recommendations very much based on the County Council's detailed, adopted street lighting specification document that was adopted by the county council in January 2021. And I think the key point to make on this, which I'll probably expand upon her in submission is those those specifications of the county council do take into consideration the the environmental sensitivity of a particular location regarding street lighting. And he does in terms of the specifications or ranges normally identified for a specific sort of location based on it's an urban, suburban or rural area. And Jason can, as I say, consideration of any environmental sensitivity in the local area. And that's certainly formed the basis of the County Council's recommendation in a specification last year, which certainly recognise the sensitivity the location of the new junction on the A 57 in its location adjacent to the river Heather and particularly so that was taken into account in identifying a range of illumination. And so from the County Council's point of view with the required illumination in terms of lumens is at the lower end of that, that scale at 2700 Kelvin, because it's has actually been recommended and say that is at the lower end of this range that is normally set for a specific location depending on its say, its environmental sensitivity. So we would say so that that balance has certainly been struck by the county council in its in its approach to this in terms of operational and safety requirements compared to the environmental impact considerations.

25:00

Well,

25:01

thank you, I you contend that those recommendations are being adopted by the applicant?

25:09

Yet we haven't seen the detail scheme yet, sir. But you know, I'm sure, we do. Consider this committee dealt with in the detail design stage. But as I say, we've got the base of a principles, principal's sort of set out in a written form with the applicant as of 21st of July last year. So we have an agreed set of principles to base the detailed design on.

25:30

That's helpful, good, good, the applicant, please.

25:38

Thank you, Sir Richard, turning on behalf of the African, sir. As we, as we've heard from the county council, they're they're doing a great set of principles. And I understand that there's this need to strike the right balance between my team for safety and indeed, impact on

25:55

location and the comments made by Pete District National Park is only dark skies. And we think that bounce has been struck in in this in the way with the counselling, that in our last written response, that is referred to in the question, we did explain how

26:12

the lighting was taken care of lower lighting, colon heights, takes into account the representations by their by the county council there, and then also incorporates the comments from Tayto Metropolitan Borough Council to request lighting. And I think it's in

26:30

the Peak District National Parks response, they also acknowledge that it was already in a well lit area.

26:38

And therefore, with the appropriate mitigation referred to in our written response,

26:44

to take into account the recommendations of the Bat Conservation Trust in the institution of lighting professionals, we can satisfy that there's been no significant impacts on the dark skies.

26:57

Thank you.

26:59

To National Park Authority want to commend

27:03

Thank Thank you says

27:06

we recognise that there's a balance that's needed between operational safety requirements and the need to minimise impact on dark skies. And therefore, we welcome the statement from national highways in rep 6017 that the lighting provision has been designed to lower Column Heights etc. So I don't think there's anything else that we really need to add to that. Thank you. Thank you. Let's move on to the design approach document.

27:30

The applicant has submitted design approach document.

27:35

Could the deadline seven to the local authorities and pages of national park have any initial comments on those? There are there are some bullet pointed matters which

27:47

are in the agenda which arise from comments made previously the examination

27:53

may act as a neutral prompt or not. But what does she come to counsel any initial comments on the design approach document?

28:03

Sympathy dog scanner Council Sir, our county council landscape architect has had the opportunity to to review the design approach document has been largely satisfied with what's being put forward in terms of the the principles, I think the only comment he would raise is that

28:22

he does cover a lot of national guidance about design criteria design Kosan perhaps a lack of cross referencing to local design criteria, particularly landscape character of Darbyshire, which which sets out quite sort of detailed recommendations of specifications for say planting and species mix. So we just feel probably, you know, perhaps a lack of cross referencing between the national and the local approach to design which may

28:48

perhaps should be sort of addressed in the in that document that particular document

28:53

should be able to provide detailed comments for deadline night, please. Yes, we probably do that. So yes. Okay. Thank you and from time to time, please.

29:03

And the initial comments

29:06

not at this stage will provide written written response.

29:11

Thank you very much.

29:13

Picked up should National Park. Do you have any comments?

29:17

Thank you, sir. Tim, the District National Park Authority. I'm awaiting feedback from our landscape architect on this but we will get written response in by deadline a thank you. Thank you.

29:31

Just to echo the point made by darbishire about the response to landscape local landscape, character, local townscape character.

29:43

I think that probably echoes some of the thoughts that we've been having as well.

29:49

And that's not just that's in terms of the planting that's been discussed already, but also in terms of some of the structures. So

29:59

it's

30:00

Some of the walls above the Mottram underpass the wing walls, the monument pass itself

30:07

the structure of the river crossing those matters of the heart landscaping.

30:16

So I think you're

30:20

just, it'll be interesting to see the other countries wants to those comments from adoption, the ones I've just set out any any any initial response from Dr. Woody. So, put the applicant go to

30:33

question W Have you received comments with a deadline date with the

30:41

response provided update deadline night please.

30:45

So, depending on that you have to convey Yes, confirm that we will respond to the

30:51

responses that are submitted the deadline a deadline nine and have made a written note with the additional points you just refer to there so about some of the hard structures as well as the planting and the guys given to local landscape character, townscape. Indeed, in that context of local references, it sounds as though this response was okay from the County Council. The assistance in that regard. Okay, that's helpful to cute. Let's move on to the green belts. The applicant at Devox four and six setup level differences post carriageway from existing ground level.

31:35

So differences up to eight metres for the carriageway level compared above existing ground level. And then additionally boons above the post carriageway up to five metres above the proposed carriageway and clarification sleep bands would be topped by 2.5 metre high environmental barriers.

31:57

So

31:59

quite a buildup

32:01

of banquet burnt and then a number of locations environment barriers.

32:11

So this is around the consideration of openness.

32:15

So the effect of the proposed development on openness whether it's any material harm to openness,

32:20

the applicant summarises consideration set deadlines six

32:26

and referred to the consideration in the s

32:32

for preceptors, which specifically mentioned views and openness. And it concluded that the proposed preserve of

32:41

the applicant further said that the person would align with localised landscape Character Arts, the locations, were screening using mitigating factors appropriate landscape design would be like to look at landscape character to reflect local planting patterns, vegetation types was created prior to preparing those views towards new highways was within it to appreciate the local landscape character on

33:09

Sunday.

33:12

So

33:15

three days ago, we carried out further

33:20

an accompany site inspection

33:23

to

33:25

areas in the facility of on footpaths in the vicinity of

33:32

the areas where there would be

33:35

the highest abutments. So there are footpaths

33:41

to the south of section four. So this is only engineering drawing section four, so the right foot paths and to the south of the the module bank, from the existing a 57 northwards. So there's one footpath there that we were able to take,

34:02

actually to very, very close to the alignment of the new carriageway. And then looking north from that, we're able to

34:14

consider the effect of an abandonment on views beyond the carriageway into the open Greenbelt land to the north of that. So we carried out that inspection last week. On Sunday we also

34:33

inspected on the dead 57 Lincoln Road near the river Ethera. So footpath from the A 57 Again, but heading more in the southwest direction

34:46

again, to a point next to the apartments of both the new carriageway

34:55

and the new carriageway would be between those footpaths and a large expense

35:00

Have Greenbelt beyond to the southwest. So we were able to consider the effects of the new embankments and environmental barriers on

35:13

restrictions in views at the locations that I've mentioned, Rob will provide more information on those locations in our report

35:21

that the site inspection.

35:24

So

35:26

that is, it was very apparent to us that

35:30

the views of the green belt from footpaths in the vicinity of the current ways in those locations would be altered somewhat. And the opportunities to experience

35:46

views

35:50

that meet medium range views would be quite significantly affected in those locations.

35:57

So against that background, the applicants previous responses are concentrated on planting, landscape design, etc.

36:09

Cook the applicants as question next, could the applicant clarify the consideration given to level differences, postcards away from existing brand level, the heights of the bundle of proposed

carriageway and carriageway levels, the effect of the environmental barriers and its consideration of openness, material harm to openness and the local landscape character. And in doing that, and also the consideration given to the introduction of structures

36:37

within those views, so the bridge

36:42

and and the other structures that would be apparent in those locations. So happy to take a certain amount of that in writing group be helpful just to have

36:52

the applicants initial response to that, and maybe their reflection on what I just outlined in terms of our recent site inspections. That is very sweet. Your camera's on? I'm not sure.

37:09

Could you just given the initial response to that, please?

37:13

Vicki fell on behalf of the applicants? Yes, of course. So I think I think in our response, just going starting with the general assessment of openness, I think obviously, we would start from the position of the case law, and not least the supreme court judgement so and that that was the the Smith Samuel Smith brewery case from salt shores says you're familiar with, but but the point being is that openness is not narrowly limited to the volumetric approach. So that so the fact that the development is is being introduced is not is not necessary, doesn't necessarily mean that the openness has to be affected.

37:53

And the fact that really openness and that assessment is multi, multi textured

37:59

in terms of whether bonds and environmental barriers have been considered so so yes, that assessment in chapter seven,

38:07

section 7.7 has considered those. And certainly in our response to rep six Dasho 17, I think we would say that it wasn't just limited to planting. So we do reference at section five point 11 various components of the scheme. And separate obviously, we have got your observations, I've no doubt but that we've we've had we've got visuals from that from the views that you reference. So I suggest that we come back further in writing on those unless Mr. wouldwould would like to say anything now. And I'll

38:44

just the locations that we visited the very limited,

38:51

very limited material in terms of any photo montage. So so the

39:00

there are photographs

39:03

from viewpoints, there's only an indication of the extent of the preferred development. And there are photo montages that similar cases and there is one photo montage that shows the river through a footbridge and breaks it quite a distance away and at a distance where you easily over the sea.

39:25

Look over the embankment to the land behind and it's looking

39:31

towards the the end of the Greenbelt EP like rather than looking towards the larger area of the Greenbelt. So,

39:39

there seems to be limited material in the photo montage that would address

39:46

the views that we've set out from those footpaths looking from reasonably close to the embankments towards the the larger area of the Greenbelt on the other side

39:59

but

40:00

that will hopefully become more apparent from from our notes. So if any further? Yes, I think if I could bring in Mr. Graham would would

40:12

thank you.

40:14

I'm would work through the applicant. You know, I think to fully understand the point you're making or the points you're making.

40:24

I think I'd have to see your nose fully. I get bored drift off of what you were saying. But I need to understand it, we do. You're right, there are about three first montage, he points out for rotation at 1114 and eight. There are other viewpoint locations in that area in which he didn't have to montage with them. So it might be

40:52

to respond in writing, we could explain more about the imperative. I think we just need to look at the, your, your notes for us. And

41:03

so we'll have those notes issued as soon as we can. We'll highlight the locations.

41:10

And then if the applicant was able to respond,

41:14

if we can get them.

41:16

I suspect it'll be early next week. So response by deadline, or deadline nine would be helpful, please.

41:26

Thank you fell on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I will do that. Thank you. Thank you. So moving on to comments raised by Well, Tameside didn't wish to comment too, on one of our earlier questions until it has seen the applicant response, the applicant has now responded with details of the heights of bonds and investments etc. Just just Tameside to have any comments of advertisement now or follow up in writing. So this is question why and said

41:57

we're responding writing? Thank you.

42:02

It would be very valuable to have 10 signs comments, actually.

42:07

Because I think

42:09

we do have concerns about the effect on happiness as as we stand. So I think it'd be very helpful to Team sides considered comments on that.

42:22

I think therefore, it's appropriate if we can take A and B be

42:28

together in writing.

42:33

And I think it's appropriate to take those following

42:37

the applicants review of our notes of site visit.

42:44

Let's I think we should try very hard to actually to get those comments that the notes of that site visit published this week.

42:53

So if we can do that, then hopefully we can then get the applicant response, the deadline eight and then comments from other parties by deadline and nine.

43:06

So let's let's take a deadline night and then BB at deadline is content with that picky fellow on behalf the applicant. Yes. So we are content. Thank you. Thank you, and actually Tameside if you prefer to wait until deadline nine and then provide your comments

43:25

in response to the applicants further comments that deadline notes that may be more appropriate time side.

43:33

I think so. Yeah. Yeah. So if you could respond at deadline nine, that would be helpful.

43:40

And darvish.

43:42

Also at deadline knowing please

43:47

Yes, thank you Josh kind of counsel. So I guess happy to do that. Thank you. Thank you I think just National Park curious to comment deadline nine please as well.

43:56

Yes, sir. Thank you, Tim. The s&p Different National Parks Authority. Yes, we'll send in our response for deadline nine as well. Thank you. Thank you. Right let's move on to other noise vibration a nuisance. Could we take

44:11

items see see in writing please. HYPEE Borough Council

44:22

Well, James hybrid Council, just to confirm will also respond in writing to BB.

44:29

Thank you. I'd say see as well. That'd be fine. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

44:35

And then could take DD in writing from the applicant please.

44:43

Pick you fell on behalf of the applicant? Yes, yes. So we can do that. I'm just conscious whether you need a response to us regarding the requirement for your version of the DCO. If you do then I can confirm that the applicant is content

45:00

With with that with such a requirement.

45:03

Well, that's helpful. So if

45:06

if the current would like to suggest wording for that for deadline eight, perhaps

45:13

FICKY pharma health gap concert, I haven't seen a requirement

45:17

dealing with that. So I have to say the use of sex section 61 Is is also in the outline noise and vibration management plan. But but but we were happy to, to look at what to look at whatever you wanted to offer, but some I'll take that away, sir. Thank you. So I'm certainly open to as creating requirements or if the applicant wanted to suggest one ahead of that, and happy to consider that as well.

45:40

Thank you.

45:43

Night works. Again, applicant, could we take your response to that in writing, please? He

45:50

think he fell on behalf of the applicant? Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

45:55

Because if piling

45:57

so we've asked whether restricting the use of percussive piling to when rotary board piling is not feasible should be secured as necessary mitigation. So, this is reflecting on the higher noise levels predicted from the use of percussive piling compared with Rotary board piling

46:17

Tameside Metropolitan Council help Borough Council at deadline six,

46:22

they agreed that that would be preferable to restrict the use of because of piling the applicant deadlines six and said that it wish to retain the flexibility to use because of piling

46:36

for various reasons and to take a balanced approach, that there are issues as well as noise. In fact,

46:43

I think we are minded to

46:48

restrict the use of because of piling because of the noise impact and noting there have been significant effects noted of that. So, before doing that I just under question F just like to ask the applicant to comment on

47:06

the effect of a striction such as that, and whether that will cause it difficulty.

47:17

Vicki fell on behalf of the applicant. And so I think the question was regarding what what the potential impacts of that would be where there could be other issues. So my instructions are that some say for example, on materials and waste, there may be a need to reduce the cut material or quantities of new material. For example, concrete that's brought on to site

47:43

other issues and potential sort of effects ground conditions. So where clay soil was required, because he parley methods are where settlement issues are identified, due to weak conditions that that may also affect the piling method.

48:01

Got a no carbon management that's linked with materials and waste, as well as the past 28 2080 commitment to select the most appropriate low carbon solution. And then also landscape design.

48:18

Again, that could put effect because

48:23

just a sort of need for reducing the retaining walls etc.

48:28

And then there's also groundwater and de watering management. So as I think I think there is a sort of concern about the general sort of knock on effects of, of the piling method and hence.

48:39

So thank you, I think I think

48:43

the wording would be along the lines of restricting the use to where report piling is not feasible. So I think my feeling is that some of the things that just been outlined, potentially pointing towards whatever dream board piling would not be feasible.

49:01

So I think the requirement that we have in mind would deal with a number of those points. And having said that, if I think probably the best way is if we could have a response at deadline aids, please if that could do include the consideration of significant impact on one hand, but also on

49:22

whether

49:24

the introduction of such a requirement would cause the applicant any difficulty.

49:30

So if this could be set out to be helpful for us to consider those before drafting a requirement. Is that acceptable? Vicki fell on behalf the applicant. Yes, sir. That is acceptable. Thank you.

49:43

Could we take so noise intallation temporary rehousing

49:51

we've

49:52

we're making slow progress on this in some ways.

49:57

We've asked for a little bit more

50:00

Till

50:01

on that, I'm happy to take that when you're writing in applicant GG in writing, please

50:09

pick up on behalf of the applicant. Yes, we'll come back in writing. But I can confirm that the outline in VMP will be updated. Thank you.

50:20

Historic Environment.

50:24

So we had to take some of these orally, but I'd like to take the first

50:29

two in writing please. So H H.

50:34

and I.

50:37

So, so one is around level of harm and PPF test one is around enhancement. And could I just ask high peak? Would you be content to respond to this and writing please?

50:51

James hope rowCount. So yes, we'd be happy to respond in writing. Thank you. And then TeamSite, please.

50:59

We're happy to respond in writing. Thank you very much in Peak District National Park Authority, please. Thank you, sir. Tim Nicholson, Peter Schmidt National Park Authority. Yes, we'd be happy to respond in writing to those. Thank you. Thank you. I don't know whether darbishire would want to respond.

51:17

Yes, thanks. So yeah, we're happy to respond in writing as well. So thank you. Thank you very much, indeed. Let's move on to much. And we'll call

51:24

TeamSite raised concerns regarding hand too much a mouth hole? Could the applicant comments on the concerns raised by TeamSite? Please?

51:35

Thank you, sir. Richard, turning on now for the applicant. And so I think the first thing to know is we've seen Tim sites, comments, proxy interview, referring to substantial harm, there's a difference between is there in terms of

51:52

that level of harm. But even so they do state that they consider the public benefits then outweigh that harm. Whilst Of course, we welcome the endorsement of the public benefits, we do disagree that substantial harm is caused, because that's a very high test, and usually only applies where development results in total loss of significance of the assets or something very close to it. And national holidays, it

52:21

will show I should say we we've prepared a further detailed written response. And to go through and set out exactly why we do disagree with that. As I said, it is quite detailed. So I wasn't going to propose to run you through it. Now. It probably is better once submitted in writing. But we do in there set out why we consider the impact to be minor adverse with the harm at the lower end of the lesson and substantial scale. Okay. It sounds sounds to be useful to see that in writing, would that be submitted deadline act? Yes. So, we have prepared that response, they will be making that deadline. Thank you. Tameside suggested to comment in detail that deadline nine do would you like to make any other comments now?

53:12

No, no, I think you need to see what the responses

53:18

Thank you. So if you could respond the deadline nine please.

53:33

Okay to a soil conservation area. The National Park Authority says that conservation areas or non designated non designated assets of national importance should be of high value. Their specific Lee said that great weight should be given to the conservation of interest or conservation area.

53:54

Just pick District National Park Authority have any remaining concerns about the consideration given to conservation areas and non designated upsets of national importance please?

54:05

Thank you, sir Timothy foster the P District National Park Authority. I can confirm that we have no remaining concerns about non designated assets of national importance. However, we still have concerns that increased traffic flows through templates or conservation they do not help to conserve this designated asset.

54:24

In Chapter Six of the environmental statement, there are quite a few references to traffic impact within within the conservation area, particularly

54:38

for the Motrin, Motrin in longdale Conservation Area, which we will provide in writing, but we're concerned that in comparison to Mottram in Longdendale insufficient attention has been paid to the indirect increased traffic flow impacts of the scheme on Tim whistle Conservation Area. Thank you. And you'll set that out. Again, deadline

55:01

That's That's correct, sir. Yes, we will do that. Thank you. Would the applicant then respond to that deadline please?

55:10

Yes, sir. Would you thinning them out? Yeah, come on, we can respond to that deadline. I want to review those comments. Thank you.

55:19

Okay, so that takes us through the Historic Environment on our fustian sticks to land use social and economic and human health.

55:46

I still have some queries with regard to

55:51

the sterilisation of land and separately, however, I'm going to take the remaining questions. Bevin with regard to sterilisation of developed land and in

56:07

with regard to severance in writing.

56:17

Tim Sykes Metropolitan Borough Council be able to provide comments

56:23

question me in writing by deadline.

56:30

Sirenis with Tameside will report will reply by deadline. And

56:38

with regards to the severance Could I have

56:43

the African docs you can cancel some Hi, Pete borough Council's

56:49

responses is in writing for that same deadline deadline rate is there consider that they're able to do so now and

57:00

thank you if you're planning on that the applicant

57:03

can respond in writing to that sir.

57:09

Daksha county council

57:12

StringBuffer Dodge County Council's right Yes to confirm that we are happy to address that issue in writing to

57:19

inform or counsel

57:23

James Hi Pete Yes that's absolutely fine. Okay.

57:32

We will now move on to Agenda Item eight

57:43

other matters

57:51

at this stage, I would like to invite any other comments on anything

57:58

that has come before

58:03

this hearing

58:07

if I could see a call for hence

58:10

then we can decide how long

58:14

need to allocate to speaking.

58:37

discussion that's gone on before. I'd like to take these final comments as brief comments. And if you would take a total of three minutes

58:52

I'll take the comments in the order in which faith has come up. So I'd like to hear first from Steven Bagshaw sorry to three minutes

59:14

can we hear from you?

59:17

Account?

59:20

No. We can meet

59:24

anyway. Sorry. Thank you. Yeah, I couldn't I couldn't find it. Yeah, just just

59:31

the point on that last last section there on seven so he says reference has been made to the Glossop gateway master quorum.

59:41

Just just want to sort of ask about that really, because

59:46

as the I've never heard of it.

59:50

Done a little search. So the as the gossip gateway master plan ever been made finally available for public scrutiny or consultation

1:00:00

is it currently available for public scrutiny or consultation? Or is there a draft copy available to view? Because I've done a search on the website, and I can't bring anything up for it. And I was just wondering whether it's, you know, in an embryonic form? And if so

1:00:20

that's why that's relevant document.

1:00:23

If that's your only query,

1:00:27

ask I think Borough Council just to respond to that briefly.

1:00:35

Yes, Mark James hugging her account. So yes, the the masculine is in any draft form at the moment. So it's not fully domain. We did submit an extract of it's in response, I think the first 15 questions. And so there is a an extract of the the green arc patients reference and the questions presumably variable on the planning spectris website. Yes.

1:00:59

Thank you, Mr. Vaxjo. A member case team good help you to find that if you have difficulty.

1:01:05

Okay.

1:01:10

Dr. Robinson,

1:01:13

yes, thank you very much. Indeed, under f. Item seven F, the statement of common ground with Greater Manchester Combined Authority was mentioned. The statement of common ground was

1:01:26

dated, I think, at a deadline to and at 1015. The very final

1:01:33

issue, it states that there was a 12th of January 2022, email exchange from transport for Greater Manchester, raising strategic planning issues. Now, in view of the fact that several of us have raised issues about the impact of the scheme on Greater Manchester's transport strategy, would it be possible for us to see what the contents of that email are? Because it is a strategic planning issue?

1:02:07

And who do you think that email was between?

1:02:12

Dr. Robinson?

1:02:20

Dr. Robinson, could you give some more information on that email so that we know who

1:02:27

to actually query that with?

1:02:39

Dr. Robinson is still with us.

1:02:42

The microphone is off.

1:02:45

Pot. Apologies in the statement of common ground, it's the very final row in the statement of common ground from rep from the deadline to and it's 1015.

1:02:59

Thank you.

1:03:02

Thank you. We'll have a look at that further. Thank you and

1:03:06

perhaps the applicant could consider that as well. Thank you. Thank you

1:03:16

and finally, can we hear from Mr. Wimberly?

1:03:35

Hello,

1:03:37

yes, we are just a quick question, first of all, and that is a question adverse to the world to you. And then the applicant has the list of flexible policies. And I'm talking about chapter 14, the climate change, people policies been dated, there is a process of updating and tracking things in this examination. I do all the latest policies in the ies as much as an introductory question. And maybe before we get I go on to say the other things and

1:04:11

just carry on all your comments, snail. Okay, just carry on. Okay. Now, the rest of my comments. were triggered by what Mr. Buchan said yesterday, and I thought it was very profound point about the conundrum we face, which is and he was talking about the fact that there's some Mr. Wimberly. So we're not taking comments on the matters covered this morning rather than yesterday. Bah, bah. This morning. Yes, this one. Okay. Um, well, the only comment I would make is about the the openness of the Greenbelt. But I think

1:04:47

I think that's probably being covered that my viewers are just amazed. We're still talking about eight metre embankments, not affecting the openness of the Greenbelt. But I realised that's been well covered.

1:05:00

But in what annual fact visit and in the ensuing discussion, so I look forward to seeing the comments with the applicant on that.

1:05:08

Thank you, Mr. Chamberlain. If you want to wait for the comments on matters raised yesterday, please do that and ranking. Thank you

1:05:22

and

1:05:25

can the applicant address Mr. Wimberly these concerns regarding the updating of applicable policies? In writing, please?

1:05:36

Can I hear from the applicant? Vicki fan on behalf the applicant? Yes, sir. We will respond to that.

1:05:43

Thank you.

1:05:56

I would

1:05:58

remind all parties that we

1:06:02

would

1:06:04

require

1:06:08

your next set of written submissions and answers to questions by deadline eight on witness slide 13 to April 2022. Apart from where we have identified deadline nine earlier.

1:06:28

So, we're moving on to agenda item nine, the transcript and video recording of the hearing will be published on our website as soon as practicable after the hearing. And is there any final comment on matters I think we've probably done that already. And item eight. So let's carry on. I believe that we've now covered all of the items on the agenda issues specifically in three. Having done that, I can confirm that this hearing does not need to run into tomorrow we had identified tomorrow as a potential backup date. And if it was needed, we do not need tomorrow. So this issue specific hearing will not continue into tomorrow. And we'll confirm that on the website. As soon as practicable. However, we do have further instead compulsory acquisition hearing to will start at 130. Today as programmed and the arrangements conference for that will start at one o'clock. And then later this afternoon issue specific hearing for and will be held that will very much focus on the draft development consent order and and the technical issues contained within that. That will start at 330. Today, an arrangement conference for that will start at 3pm today. So thank you for all of your legal assistance at this hearing yesterday. And today.

1:07:54

If you're not joining us this afternoon, these will be our final hearings on this examination. So this may be my final or our final opportunity to thank you in person for all of your contributions to date and any further contributions you're going to make.

1:08:13

We do really value and appreciate particularly the local

1:08:18

knowledge that's being brought to bear for our benefit. So thank you for that.

1:08:24

For those who joined this afternoon, we look forward to seeing you then.

1:08:29

In the meantime, this issue specific hearing three is now closed. Thank you. Okay.