

# TRANSCRIPT\_ISH3\_DAY2\_SESSION1\_A57L INKROADS\_06042022

00:05

Good morning, everyone. The tongue is now 10am. And this issue specifically the equity seven linkless project is reconvened. Thank you all for joining us in today. Please could remember the case tinkle feminine attacking the pope clearly and that the live streaming and recording started.

00:22

Yeah, I can confirm you can be heard clearly on the live stream has now started. Thank you. Thank you. To avoid disrupting the hearing. Please Could everyone keep your microphone muted and camera off until we invite you to speak Thank you.

00:37

Will now remind you of some housekeeping matters. And we'll repeat a couple of things that were covered in the arrangements conference, those that are watching the live stream or the recording.

00:49

As we have already mentioned, this event has been both live streamed and recorded. As explained in our letter of the seven second March 2022.

01:00

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.

01:12

I covered this matter in the introduction to yesterday's session. And so I will not repeat yourself.

01:19

Please could anybody joining in teams minimise the background noise. This includes switching off or muting your mobile phone if you're not using it to join the hearing.

01:29

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.

01:39

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.

01:54

If you're watching the live stream, then please be aware that the live stream will be stopped when we're to adjourn the hearing.

02:02

You will need to refresh your browser page to view them being started hearing.

02:08

We will remind you again, when we adjourn

02:11

will find it useful to have the agenda that was published on 28 March 2020 to attend. relevant parts of the agenda will be displayed on the screen during this evenings. For those who are watching.

02:26

We will highlight which parts of the agenda we are referring to for anybody that is not watching.

02:33

Or remember, ask 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.

02:51

If there are a number of people representing a party, then please come to on the screen with governance altogether.

02:59

But I would ask that so many D lead

03:03

representative for that team introduce themselves.

03:08

who's representing will speak for the applicant please.

03:14

Good morning, sir Vicki Fowler. On behalf of the applicant. I'm a partner and solicitor Gowling W WL G and legal representative of the applicant. And I will also be joined today by Richard furling. Also of Gowling WL G there may be members of the applicants team that we need to call on but in the main we expect it to be a presentation by Richard I. Thank you. Thank you

03:46

moving on to the

03:50

local services

03:55

could I hear from

03:59

Peak District National Park Authority please?

04:03

Good morning says it's Tim Nicholson, who's the transport policy planner for the Peak District National Park Authority. Thank you.

04:11

Okay

04:12

Daksha county council.

04:17

Good morning, sir. I'm Steve buffering my team leader in planning policy and major projects. It's obviously county council and I'm accompanied this morning by my colleague Jeff Blissett, who's the County Council's transport assessment officer

04:32

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

04:36

Simon Eastwood Tameside.

04:39

I'm an engineer dealing with transport policy within the Council. Thank you

04:49

and Hi people Birkins.

04:55

Commodities we're planning office at hyper Council. I'm joined by Dan McCrory, our senior police

05:00

An officer. Okay.

05:03

Moving on to the interested parties. Can I hear from a lot of Glauben MP

05:15

Good morning. Rob. Log in here member of parliament IPIC

05:20

Okay.

05:22

Jonathan Reynolds MP

05:31

Good morning Jonathan Reynolds Member of Parliament for Staley bridge in Hyde building

05:40

Peter leopard of Bedford Thornhill parish council

05:47

to many people around the clock so the parish council

05:51

chair

05:53

short term

05:59

Good morning. Sorry, Charlotte Farrell. Good morning

06:05

Steven Bagshaw.

06:19

Hello, Mr. Bagshaw, can you hear me your microphones off mister

06:28

Hello. Hello?

06:33

Hello. Good morning dispatcher.

06:36

I can hear you but I can't see you.

06:40

Oh, I think I was fine. I can hear you.

06:44

Good

06:48

to be right.

06:52

No precedent

07:00

Dr. Robinson CPRE Peak District in

07:04

South Yorkshire

07:07

Good morning. Thank you very much. Yes, I'm from CPRA Peters from South Yorkshire and I'll be accompanied by Mr. Buchan from Mt. Ru.

07:16

Good morning. Good morning.

07:21

Dr. Andrew Boswell.

07:26

Good morning, Dr. Andrew possible climate Emergency Planning and Policy

07:32

with Murray

07:35

and Mr. Wimberly.

07:41

Good morning, Mr. Grayling. Can you hear us clearly?

07:46

Good morning. Good morning. Thank you. Thank you. Right. So we've received apologies from Carol Helen of share first, my journey to school. She won't be able to join us today. But thank you all for attending today.

08:03

Mr. Wimberly may want to switch your camera off for now. Oh, yes, I may. Thank you.

08:10

Okay, so let me just turn through the purpose of this hearing how it will be conducted. We do have a

08:17

small number of new people with us today. So just run through these points. This hearing is held in accordance with section 91 of the Planning Act 2008, and is subject to our positive control over its conduct as established by the act. I take this opportunity to remind you that we do not expect parties to treat this hearing as an opportunity to set up their cases or to divert the hearing from the specific matters at hand. With respect to the hearing today, so that you may explain certain points when we voted to speak at the relevant

08:47

item on the agenda. Please keep your microphone muted and camera off until we invite you to speak this time that you speak. Please give your name and if appropriate organisation for the formal record. Please direct your comments questions and answers to a in an eye rather than directly to any other party.

09:06

We will cover the points on each and the agenda from item seven. That agenda was published on the 28th of March.

09:19

We will take breaks if needed

09:24

this morning.

09:28

Typically, we would take a break after every hour or every hour and a half.

09:34

So we'll just do that as we progress through this session

09:39

will shortly return to the main part of the hearing. When we'll take the hearing through each of the listed topics in turn. We covered items to transport networks and traffic three Peak District National Park for the water environment drainage and flood risk assessment five air quality and six climate change yesterday and so this morning

10:00

We're going to presume from item seven other environmental matters. We hope to conclude this hearing by 1215. Today.

10:09

However, that's subject to change. Depending on the progress, we may need to move some items to tomorrow. We will provide any updates of changes to the timescales during the hearings should that be required.

10:22

Today, we will be that you will see that there are many items on the agenda for today. And under item seven, in practice, actually, we will be asking for responses to the majority of those questions to be provided in writing. And rather than taking oral submissions on them during the hearing,

10:43

will clearly like that in the way that we have previously.

10:47

And it would be very helpful if parties could keep note of any requests for them to provide a written response. And, in principle, please could all written responses be provided for the next deadline, which is deadline eight on Wednesday, the 13th of April and week today? Unless another date is agreed? Thank you.

11:08

Please, could the applicant confirm that they will provide a written summary of all of its responses for deadline eight on Wednesday, the 13th of April.

11:19

Vicki Fowler on behalf the applicant, yes. So we will do that. Thank you. Thank you. Are there any questions about the Denver about how the sphere will be conducted?

11:30

Next thing cute right, so let's move on to agenda item seven, the first Item and Item and

11:40

Item seven.

11:42

To express in the best way is general oral submissions. So we've created a slot here for parties who have asked to speak, to take up to five minutes and to cover essentially any topic that they would wish to cover. We have had

12:01

a number of requests to speak. And thank you for being clear on those and confirming those during the arrangements conference. So I have a list of parties or 123457 parties who have requested to speak.

And to give make sure we give everyone an equal opportunity to speak in the same way that we have yesterday, we're going to limit the time and we collect a limit of five minutes for these submissions.

12:29

Please do stick to that we are very keen that everyone has an opportunity to speak. And we do obviously have quite a lot to cover. And so we are going to time the five minutes.

12:41

After four and a half minutes, we will ask you to start to wrap up.

12:48

And then if you could complete it the five minutes as I said it that will give everyone an opportunity to speak. So I'm

12:57

going to invite our first speaker.

13:01

And I'm just going to go through the order on the list in front of me. So if we could start with Roberts to Largan. MP, please.

13:10

Mr. Larkin, join us.

13:18

Hello,

13:20

good morning. So, thank you for joining us. Because Daniel five minutes now please. Good morning. And thank you very much for allowing me to speak. Let me start by declaring an interest. I'm a resident of glossip. I live on the main road. And so I very much have a personal stake in the a 57 link road at the Mottram bypass being built. This is a road that we've been waiting for more than half a century to get built. And if anything the the last few days of underlying just how important that is. We've seen at the moment there is lane closures are much more, which is causing complete traffic chaos around Glossop and Tameside. And it's important to note that this scheme isn't just about addressing a local traffic problem, though it will certainly help with local traffic issues and in the loss of area, but it's also about addressing a strategic national road need. This is the key road between two of our major cities Manchester and Sheffield. And at the moment, journey times are far too long. They're far too unpredictable, which holds back economic growth, both in high peak but also in Greater Manchester and in Sheffield and South Yorkshire. And that's one of the reasons why that has been national support for this project. And locally there is overwhelming support.

14:44



Both we've seen in consultations throughout the last few decades. And in response to this DCO and also my own local petition, which has now been signed by 5000 local residents in the Glossop area

15:00

In support of the Mottram bypass and the cost of spur Road, of course, the proposal isn't perfect, but it will make very significant improvements to congestion and quality of life for a large number of people in the HYPEE content side area. It's going to make it significantly easier to get out of Glossop and Hatfield and onto the onto the empty 67 during rush hour. It's also going to reduce rat running through games Lee Charles worth in broad bottom, and it will lead to important improvements in air quality by

15:37

stopping the absolute gridlock on Willie lane, and on Mottram more and tailing back further into the town of Glossop. Yes, the projections show that there will be modest increases in vehicles coming through. That's only because we're removing the cork from the bottle. And Mater more and more the bridge when this is this road is built will no longer just be a complete car park during rush hour. So yes, there will be a slight increase in vehicles. But we're going to see that huge gain in air quality and much much improved journey times. And we also have to face the fact that there's always going to be a traffic need running between Manchester and Sheffield to our bigger cities to our most important economic cities. And from Glossop into Tameside and the rest of Greater Manchester, there will always be that traffic need with the differences if we build this the Glossop spur road and the Mottram bypass, then that traffic is going to be going through a purpose built dual carriageway, rather than going on single lane road through residential areas in the long run. Yes, I want to see a second phase around Tim whistle. But to get that we need to build this first phase now. So to conclude, this is a scheme which I fully support is going to make a huge difference to local traffic, air quality quality of life. And it has overwhelming support for local people. So we cannot afford to delay anymore. The people of high peak and Tameside deserve action now. Thank you.

17:12

Mr. Logan, thank you, and apologies if you

17:15

disrupted by the noise in this room. So we're hiring a conference room that was outside of their control. And over time, thank you for that submission. And thank you for being so timely with it as well.

17:27

Let's move on, please. So if we could take the next submission from Jonathan Reynolds and he please.

17:38

Good morning. And thank you very much for the chance to appear and make an oral presentation today. I'm Jonathan Reynolds, I've been the Member of Parliament for Staybridge in height for 12 years now. And before that I was the local councillor specifically for this area for the long term deal award from 2007. I've been a resident of much more directly on the project plan. I've also been a resident abroad bottom road, I now live in steady breaches where I'm speaking from you today. But I first went to a community meeting about this issue 19 years ago. And since that point, I've gotten five elections in

this area, one local for national, each time explicitly stating my support for a bypass solution to this problem. I'm very confident in saying I speak to the majority of people in my area in being in favour of this project. Well, I want to get across to you today is really what the current situation means for people in my area. Why that was change, and why therefore I support this particular project. Now the community group I went to 19 years ago, was called the London deal siege committee. And it was called that because, as is still the case today, residents are frequently besieged in their own homes by the level of traffic that comes through this area. Now, we don't need or particularly want a full history of this. But as Robert alluded to, this issue began in 1967, when the Department of Transport first sent surveyors out to the area. The plan then was for the M 62. And the M 67. Running from Manchester, to Sheffield, and obviously only one of those were built, we were left with a few junctions of the M 67. I tell you that because the core product of that is that the villages that absorb the traffic at the end of the M 67 was simply never intended to take that level of traffic and I honestly cannot find any comparable situation in the UK of an issue like this, in other words, an unresolved issue from the original planning and expansion of the motorway network. Now what does that mean for people in my area, but it means absolutely that they can't leave the house I'll get back to their homes. At certain times when I lived on what for more I've often have to abandon my car, mile or so away from home and go back and get it at night when the traffic was easier. It means terrible noise for residents it means terrible air quality. It means frequent accidents. And there is both a primary and a secondary school which should be aware of directly off market street in Holland within my constituency and of course

20:00

It means a lot of economic opportunity for residents because of the levels of traffic that are coming through and the limitations that puts on them. One thing I wanted to address directly and my colleague Robert Levin alluded to this is that what I've seen in the 20 years I've been active on this issue is that any modelling of a solution, whatever that might be for London bail, often suggest that that will result in more traffic coming through. And that's because, essentially, as Robert said, that the current levels of congestion operate like a, like a giant speed bump in a way and anything that models at a faster journey time through will make it look more attractive. But from the local point of view, from my point of view, what I must get across to us, it would be overwhelmingly preferable to us to have the levels of traffic we have or even a slight increase, going through a properly built dedicated highway built to national standards in the way frankly most other parts of the country get to enjoy that is clearly preferable for me and my residents to traffic coming directly outside of people's doors on local roads that again, were local village roads and never intended to take anything like this level of traffic. This project would enormously improve access on the M 67. It would improve journey times between Latrobe and state bridge, it would improve journey times between height and London deal, it would fundamentally benefit Motrin, which is essentially split in half by the levels of traffic we have it would make it a whole village. Again, it would hugely improve air quality noise, it would actually benefit all of Tameside so to come to my house way out here in the central Stalybridge, I would use junction 23 of the M 60. Because you can't use the F 67. Because it's always permanently a traffic jam at the end. So it'd be a benefit, not just for actually London deal in the height and gossip area, but actually for the whole of this part of Greater Manchester. And it would, in terms of the specific local roads make a massive improvement to hybrid to Stevie Bridge Road to broad bottom road to Mottram more. And to be frank, and nothing else I've ever seen proposed would offer this level of solution. And I acknowledge it's not my perfect scheme, we all have to compromise, I think look at the interest you've got to look and

consider today is Robert Levin said for the Hollywood bit of my constituency, this doesn't quite give the benefits of the original bypass 15 years ago.

22:17

So and it would facilitate further improvements if they were possible to do so. So to conclude, I would just say people in Miami have waited 55 years for this. This is a viable, detailed, realistic proposal to make a huge improvement to their lives. I think people want it, they need it. And I think they deserve it. I very much hope it will proceed out of the process today.

22:38

Mr. Ellis, thank you very much. And thank them. Thank you for timing it perfectly for the five minutes. Thank you. Thank you, actually to the two MPs for joining us today. Grateful for your contributions. Right let's move on to Bamford and Thornhill Press Council. Mr. leper today's

22:58

Hello, this is Peter Zeb. I'm the parish clerk at Stanford with John Hill parish council. We have three points we'd like to make please. The first one that concerns Robert Largan. You've just heard talking. Mr. Largan portrays or he said several times that there is overwhelming support from his constituents for this project. I'm very sorry to say we take the view that that is misleading you. There may well be support in this particular corner of the constituency. But there's a much larger part of his constituency, including down to disorder, parish council, parishes, and focus on the parish where we have strong views from our residents and even from surrounding areas as well, that really isn't support. So I just want to make clear that we believe that Robert Logan is misleading.

23:50

And the second point is about the A 57.

23:54

Mark, you said yesterday about increased traffic on the 857. And it would be pointless for us to go over that ground again. But we would like to support various points which were made yesterday about why that isn't a good idea. The only issue of which we would add to what the city has to say about the 857 is to question the stability of the road. In the last several weeks there have been three separate landslips on the 857. And you might say well, those are one off events irrelevance to a long term inquiry such as this. However, they're not one off events. If you were to ask Dr. County hallways to give you have a list of all the works they have done over many decades to shore up landslips. It would be a very long list. It might be worth you asking for that list because it would display how unstable the ACC seven is. There are closures nearly every year the HST seven or some days at a time to shore up landslips. The idea therefore, a 38% increase in traffic is a good idea over a road which seems to be structurally unsound seems to make no sense at all to us. We just like to add

25:00

that point to what was said yesterday about traffic or near 57. And ask you to raise that point of dogshit. By way too short could give you some information.

25:09

But the third point and perhaps the most important Danford granted, of course, is the first settlements that you've come to, after you leave lots of on the a 57, it may well be a long way from possibility to for a second we could come to. So we do feel a direct impact from from this scheme. And the first opportunity to turn south off ea 57, after leaving lots of is the A 6013 Junction just north of Stanford.

25:35

And if you stand on that junction, you'll see the traffic coming over from crossing probably a 57 significant proportion of it turns right to go through boundary village, not because it wants to go down to village but because it wants to go to places further south. And it is the only opportunity to leave the 857 to do so. So that's that is a key informant people. So the increase is 38% traffic on the aged 57, which was predicated yesterday, a reasonable proportion of that will go through planted seeds only off 57. And indeed, previous hearing several weeks ago, one of the witnesses said is all with evidence, he explained where that traffic was likely to be going. And the influence seemed to be that about 50% of that

26:20

beat on the ATT seven is likely to come from dancing. The reason why that is concerned is although it is an A rating down when it would be very short why it's in a way because in the middle of the village, there is a narrow and torturous section where if you get to ATVs, approaching in opposite directions at the same time, which of course happens not infrequently. And you often end up with a standoff with one of them has to revert to this Tokyo's a narrow section and it really is not a road which is suitable for a significant increase in traffic. It goes without saying that you'd have wanted that and increased because we live there. But it's more than that it's it's to do is to do with the fact that the road in the village, because of its design is unsuitable. We do accept that this inquiry cannot expand its tentacles across the entire UK as to the traffic effects that we do think that this is a sufficient the large element of the of the 38% increase coming through bands. And that is something that you should give your consideration to, because it really doesn't seem at all workable. So those are our three points. Thank you very much for listening. Thank you, Mr. Leopard. And thank you for keeping within the time.

27:30

We can now hear from Charlotte Farrell, please

27:41

thank you. Um, I also live in Bamford.

27:45

And so I want to address some of the same issues which I can't just ask. But

27:51

also some other things. As Pete has just said

27:58

this purported to be 38% increase of traffic over snake pass but

28:06

highways England have on national highways have said there'll be a 1% decrease of traffic in 2025 going through Bamford. And this just calls into question their whole traffic flow

28:22

arguments it it just doesn't make sense. As Peters just said it's totally illogical because most traffic coming over the snake pass will turn left to go through Bamford to get to the wider Peak District to get to places like Casselton and Bakewell Chatsworth. And the applicant said yesterday that most car drivers use Sat Navs and will follow the quickest route. Well, this will be the quickest route from Manchester into the Peak District. So we will see a significant increase. I suspect there

29:04

1% decrease comes because they've taken they've looked at

29:09

the traffic to Manchester Airport and conclude that with the road, new road there, it will decline. And they haven't looked at the increase the numbers of visitors to the peak Park, which is just growing exponentially since the pandemic. So

29:31

that's the point I also in answer to what Robert Logan said. Again, I'd reiterate that there are many people in high peak who are not supportive. And whilst there are a lot of supporters registered on this on the website, and none of those have actually come to this hearing. None. Nobody has expressed their support. And I'm wondering

30:00

That's because they've they've actually been misled into thinking that it's going to improve things, that this increase in traffic

30:10

isn't really what they want. And there will be induced traffic that happens every single time and you wrote this bill. I just find it unbelievable that with climate change as it is, with the IPCC reporting only this week about the steps, we need to urgently take that we're thinking about building a road, when there's much better options which, such as public transport, because the vast majority of those journeys, as we've heard are commuting journeys, which could easily be made by public transport, and take the pressure off the road that way without building another.

30:52

Electric vehicles are not the answer. We know that we're not, at the moment, self sufficient in electricity. It doesn't all come from renewables. So we're still be emitting carbon electric vehicles themselves emit pollutants just by their tar tread.

31:12

We really need to think of the bigger picture. And, you know, for all the reasons that were said yesterday, this this roadbuilding isn't appropriate. I'm, I'm not been a NIMBY, just talking about Bamford is the whole global

31:30

concern. We call it look at pictures of people dying from drought in East Africa, and think we've got to shave a few minutes off journeys. It's just, it's just not appropriate.

31:45

Those My Submissions, thank you for listening. Thank you. Thank you for that.

31:51

We have a hand raised, I think by Mr. Mr. Light. Now I'm going to invite you very briefly to comment. And before I do,

32:01

I just like to say that we have had indeed indications from different parties about the level of support for and

32:11

for the parties giving you

32:13

an alternative view. For up, I just want to make the point that for our purposes, and perhaps

32:20

it's interesting to hear of those levels of support, but actually those are not really material to the process we're going through. And we're we're assessing the application in terms of our supported by policy and legislation, etc. So I can imagine why your hands raised please if you want to respond briefly to but I just want to make the point about

32:43

the consideration would give to the level of support. So

32:48

I appreciate you allowing me just to very quickly common just because the last two speakers both said that I misleading you. I'd first of all point out that

32:57

the entire population of Bamford is many, many times smaller than just the number of people who've signed the petition in support of the a 57 link road project. And I'd secondly point out that Councillor Farrell in her argument just then said that

33:14

the 57 would be with this would be the fastest route to the Peak District, which is incorrect. If you're coming over Glossop the fastest way to get to places like Casselton and Bakewell is to go over the Asics to fall through Hayfield. So the extra traffic going through Bamford as a result of the Mottram bypass and Glossop spur road would be very small indeed.

33:38

Allow me to clarify that point. Thank you, Mr. Logan. Right let's move on please. So if you could hear from

33:48

Mr. Wimberly please

33:57

Is that okay? Can Can you hear me and see me? Yes, yes, we can.

34:04

Okay.

34:07

While we faced with what on the face of it is a nonsensical scheme.

34:13

At fantastic expense. We get first zero relief for the residents of Hollingworth and Entwistle in spite of what our MP says. Secondly, we get more traffic through our closets. And we've discovered that even though the applicant did not tell the public consultation about this, sadly, we get all the negative impacts of the first two things I said. Firstly, we get impacts on the national park about which we've heard a lot. And that part was fought for by the workers of Sheffield and Manchester, some of whom went to prison for it. And fifth, we get the destruction of the Greenbelt.

35:00

Between in this area and 60, we get two years of construction hell. And I say that from experience. I want a quote from a campaigner. It's a good quote. So excuse me if I'm just going to read it out.

35:17

We cannot simply believe that zero emission cars and lorries will meet all our climate goals or solve all our problems. They will not particularly in reaching the medium term 6000 budget targets. By its mid year 2035. That's the mid to six carbon budget. The industry body the smmt, as the motor manufacturers estimates that only 45% of cars on the roads could be zero emissions. Under a central scenario, percentages for goods vehicles will be lower.

35:57

And of course, zero emission vehicles do not reduce the harms such as congestion, or road danger at all.

36:06

Therefore, we must increase the share of trips taken by public transport, cycling and walking. We want to make these modes the natural first choice for all who can take them. We want less motor traffic in urban areas.

36:21

improvements to public transport, walking and cycling along with the changes in commuting shopping and business travel accelerated by pandemic also offer the opportunity for a reduction in traffic more widely and you may be recognising this quote

36:37

increasing car occupancy and encouraging public transit use of two measures that can immediately cut transport carbon emissions, they will help tackle chronic road congestion, which is what we're facing preying up road space for those with no alternative but to drive. And as more of our short journeys. Four to 3% of all urban and town journeys are under two miles and I don't doubt that is the same here, our cycle or warped. So the carbon air quality noise and congestion benefits will be complemented by significant improvements in public health and well being. And the product then goes on to talk about the percentage of UK adults who are obese to 60%. And results resulting in direct costs to the NHS of over 6 billion and overall cost of over 27 billion.

37:33

Many more people are walking cycling following COVID and we aim to make active travel up to at least half of all journeys in towns and cities. That quotation comes from the government in the form of decarbonizing transport plan.

37:54

So, what are we doing here and that is repeated in the net zero strategy almost word for word.

38:04

Five policies from the Department for Transport in the last two years point in one direction. And those policies are July 2020 do change, which is about cycling and walking. Mass trips 21 bus back better. July 2021. The DTP is just purchased from October 2021. Next year, its strategy November 2021, integrated rail plan, which has an investment in rail six times greater than the loan investment strategy.

38:36

Strategy and the s&p SNN are the odd ones out just to emulate. Yes, yes, sorry, we're having slight difficulty hearing you just to the last few seconds. I don't know if you may put something over your microphone or

38:52

microphones built into the laptop, but I can switch it on off and on.

38:57

It now seems better. You're fast forward a bit then I'll lean forward thinking okay.



39:06

Now what I've just gone through the five instead of the six policies, the NPS nn which is the only policy which like leans towards roadbuilding and the IAS as well on top of it under it. Those that policy is under review. So we have five policies going one way, one policy going the other, which is under review.

39:33

And services. I wonder whether this road is not actually taking us backwards.

39:40

The one that is under review is under review because it is obsolete. And if you look at page 103 of the DTP, you will see the reasons given there for why it has been reviewed.

39:53

So the question for users is which way are you going to jump

39:59

in

40:00

To the future with five out of six of the DFTs own policies issued in the last two years, or into the past.

40:13

And the past will take us to a place which shut off our think said what he feels like, which is, I remember the Ugandan delegation, I watched a video pretty well randomly from cop 26. And they were doing, could you start to wrap up, please? Thank you. Yes, this is the wrap up. They were doing a press conference at COP 26. And their appeal for the strength to the camera to the crest of the gather there was we want you guys I in the rich world, to play your part in helping us.

40:51

And that is actually underlying this whole debate about climate change. And I note that the applicant is unwilling to do a proper carbon assessment. And I deal with that elsewhere in documents which Ritu had sent. But really, we're facing the wrong way with this. And it's 50 years old, and it shows it. And it's time that we just moved on, unfortunately, for the

41:19

people on the age of 17, nothing else to be asked to do.

41:24

Mr. Grindley, thank you very much.

41:28

If we can now hear from Keith booking please.

41:39

So I'm going to try and reflect

41:44

on the hearing yesterday and some of the issues that it raised

41:49

and have previously been the subject of written submission. Before I do so. So I have to refer to the almost the revelation yesterday that there is no bus public transport in the model. This is an extraordinary

42:07

as I say, revelations are the only word I can think. And I will be making a submission to you in writing on this particular topic. Well, I failed to mention that, you know, it will encroach on my time exiting, because it cannot be the case that such a very late, significant and relevant fact, can appear so late in the day.

42:30

And it not to be

42:33

fully recognised in your decision making. Indeed, if this were to be permitted to go unchecked, in my view, it would create a dangerous precedent. So as you know, I've been asking these sorts of questions for over a year now. And I really think that this particular point, at this particular point in time to understand this when we have been talking about public transport for months, and so I will refer you to minutes and emails in which that is perfectly clear, then for that to come out yesterday was astonishing. As I say, I will make a submission in writing on that particular point

43:11

to attend to the to what I thought might be useful I was trying to go through last night to tease out perhaps some of the key issues from what was a very interesting and sometimes very detailed session yesterday. And it seems to me there are three issues that were emerging yesterday. One was whether the scheme is compatible with national and local government policies to promote sustainable travel in towns and cities.

43:38

It seems to me that we really have established that this scheme is highly relevant to the Greater Manchester area, in terms of traffic in terms of location in all terms. The second question is whether the scheme is compatible with national and local policies on producing carbon. And the third is whether there are alternatives possible, which would be compatible with those policies and would offer significant benefits to all travellers. Some travellers may not get the benefits of this scheme, but the benefits of such alternatives would be more widespread. So I think that is a consideration. And I will run through what I think might be in our statement of common ground

44:24

and the five basic headings and I'll try and do it very quickly within five minutes. The first is the failure to update the strategic case assessment and reflect the relevant guidance in the green book and website. The strategic case should be reviewed at each business case level.

44:43

We will make further submissions in writing to you we went into some detail yesterday. That is one element. This reminded me of the original question of the uncertainty log. The uncertainty log should contain uncertainty and forecasting parameters and future

45:00

parameters is a list in my evidence is a direct quote from the uncertainty.

45:05

And it strikes me this scheme has not complied and still has not complied with the complete the completion of a viable uncertainty log. So failure to update the strategic case and reflect guidance. Second importance of Greater Manchester I've touched on this before, we will go back to this in writing, a majority of the trips

45:26

are

45:27

related to Greater Manchester a majority of the benefits, and the modelling of the Travelling great in Greater Manchester has been deliberately masked and included in a fixed cost network. We've been through this a lot of times, but it is not the case that the Greater Manchester dimension has been considered.

45:45

Thirdly, and this returns to the point I made to begin with the admission of walking, cycling and public transport from the modelling and appraisal. We now know that there has been no direct modelling of these three elements walking, cycling, and bus use, and the rail element. It's not clear to me from what was said yesterday, but it may be that it's only been done at a very high regional level and not at the local level. I will be asking a clarification question on that too. And, ah, this morning, as soon as I finish this.

46:18

So it's missing, we know it's missing. And as I said yesterday, there will be impediments to walking and cycling, because of the major junction because of the major nature of the scheme. And the plan walk with traffic system walk with traffic is not really suitable in terms of facilitating pedestrian and cycling use. Because there is no direct or read phase for people to cross, they have to wait in the middle of the road. That does lead to safety implications as well. Because if people have to wait, then they will risk running across the road. This is a well known phenomenon. And I, you know, I draw your attention to it. And we have done and will do again in our written submission. My fourth point has been a failure to

analyse the problem correctly. And this is partly what has led to a single solution, which doesn't really solve very much at all. A failure to analyse the problem in terms of the heavy goods vehicle, the preponderance of the largest heavy goods vehicles, why is that? What can we do about it? What is the future of that this problem has not been analysed? And that is, of course, why alternatives. And indeed, if you were going to promote this scheme, promoting it without any supplementary measures, which would work at all is astonishing. So to wrap up to specifically thanks. I'm on my fifth and final point, fortunately sir, which is the failure to assess the carbon impacts of the scheme. As I've said before, the important thing here is the future. The alternative futures, one future has this sort of scheme, more traffic represented by the Central Traffic forecasts used for the appraisal. The other future has a scenario with traffic demand management, sustainable transport encouraged and less traffic in it. And those are the two that should be compared and you will find they are better for carbon for air quality and for everything else. Finally, we must have details of this latest bit of modelling, which we know has been done and details have not yet been released. If it has been done, the documentation will be there. And I must ask that it is presented before the show, otherwise, you will not be fully informed. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Kuhn. And if we could finally hear from Dr. Possible please.

48:42

Good morning, Dr. Andrew paws world climate Emergency Planning and Policy.

48:48

I too want to

48:51

look back at some of the things from yesterday's item six.

48:57

And to start with the discussion on local and regional policies and targets. I'm concerned there was a potential confusion introduced yesterday in the discussion on the i e ma guidance. The confusion was between the environmental impacts themselves and the measurement of them against budgets and thresholds.

49:27

And the confusion arose because

49:30

it was said that the greenhouse gas emissions the environmental receptors the global atmosphere. Well, I absolutely agree with that. That's quite correct. And it was said there's no local receptor in that sense and that's correct. But that does not mean that quantified budgets targets and threshold at the local regional levels are not important, especially as local authorities are now starting to set them up

50:00

In fact, the i e ma document itself at page 15, actually says this quantitative approach and they're referring to quantifying the Carbon Project there. This concept of approach provides a good indicator of significance and could be used in EIA, to calculate a project's carbon budget. And then it says this

budget can then be compared against an existing carbon budget, global national sectorial regional or local as available

50:35

to identify the percentage impact the project will contribute to climate change. So out of all those, we have seen a national one, and not even the right national one, as I'll come on to the next comment. And we're not seeing regional or local and that's the i e, ma guidance itself. All of this course I will put in a summary to you.

51:00

Just at this point to say, of course, we're still not seeing cumulative carbon assessment done at all. That's my central point is you know, and as has been said, you know, the, the model hasn't even got public transport and bus buses in it.

51:17

And I want to move on to 60 and the de minimus. And switch to the NPPs. On the screen, please.

51:27

This is the carbon emissions bit 1516 1718. And the top sentence is just an introduction to carbon emissions, but it's very important one

51:42

as it, it basically refers to footnote 69 as saying, we have a system of five year carbon budgets. And down at the bottom.

51:55

If we can see footnote 69 That actually refers to 11 year out of date,

52:02

policy,

52:05

the carbon plan at the time, but critically that footnote 69 says and successor documents.

52:14

So what is the successor document? Well, the successor document under Section 13 of the Climate Change Act is the net zero strategy published last November.

52:28

And then if we go back to 518, that's great.

52:37

That's great. Yeah, that last sentence of 518. On the screen, it finishes with saying that the the assessment of significance is against the material impact on the ability of the government to meet its

carbon reduction targets. Now, what we've seen in the assessment is a comparison against carbon budgets. And I'm not saying that's not a helpful comparison, if you get all the quantities right, which, as I said aren't right. But if you were to get right, it's helpful, but we haven't seen the assessment against carbon reduction targets. Now, what are those carbon reduction targets? Well, they are the 68% reduction by 2030, under the UK nationally determined contribution at a national level, and the 78% carbon emissions reduction act 2035. And the six carbon budget now that those are both from a 1990 baseline, it's important to point out, but if we go to the net zero strategy, we also had a transport sector specific target since November of last year. And that is between 34 45% by 2030 and 65 to 76% by 2035.

54:06

I've laid those figures out elsewhere, I think for you, but we'll do again.

54:11

Okay,

54:13

so we

54:17

yeah, we

54:20

we basically had no idea what a robust comparison against the net zero strategy would be, and therefore also against the NP PS to the MPs

54:33

518 carbon reduction targets, because that just hasn't been done.

54:41

I would have moved on to a third point is the same point that Mr. Backhand just made about the, I believe anyway about the transport. So the TDP sensitivity test, we've had a completely new set of figures introduced

54:57

in the latest car

55:00

In the document from the applicant, and he had a set of 10 questions, but obviously I'll put them in into you.

55:09

But basically, we know nothing about what that is. And as a Mr. Buchan said, you know, this, this DCO can't go forward really to any viable conclusions without that being put forward for full scrutiny. We

need the assumptions, the data, how that analysis is done, what it means we need that all laid out and none of us none of that has been all laid out. We've had a single row of figures or two two rows of figures the upper bound and the lower bound laid out in that table one in the document and we must have that please thank you very much for your time. Thank you

55:51

Instructables Well that completes

55:57

the general goals missions apart from I will give the applicant Mr. Bagshaw.

56:09

Houses hundreds I will just take Mr. Vaxjo. You have your hands raised.

56:14

Follow Spectre I did put myself down to speak. I'm terribly sorry. i You are on the list. I do apologise. Mr. Botha. That's my error. Please, please, please go ahead. Thank you for reminding me. Okay. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. Thank you, Inspector, much of what I wish to add to the inquiry referred back to item two, which was on the agenda yesterday. It's on the current agenda, but he was spoken about just today. Specifically question Alpha Lima, under the heading of policy on page four of the agenda, and also to question JJ, under the heading of alternatives page seven. Consequently, I will defer that for now and comment further on those points in my written submission. I will I will sort of limit myself today to making some sort of

57:01

comments regarding

57:04

either our terrible MP Jonathan Reynolds for service denied on the Right Honourable MP for Hi, Pete Robert logon.

57:13

I know they began by giving that credential so I shall do the same thing. My name is Steven Bagshaw, I'm a local resident and I've been for almost six decades and a rate payer for four decades.

57:26

I've also been an opponent of the Washington Post and bypass for 30 years. Although I do understand, I realised that this is not about materialism cypass was there for I was a bit confused at first when Mr. Wang spoke because he talked about the margin bypass and the process of which this is neither this is just for clarification, this is the 857 Lynx road. And it's such a standalone scheme, it has to be judged on its own merits. And

57:53

for Mr. Wilders benefit, and because I obviously doesn't be present at the hearing so far. The evidence so far concerning his own residents and I peak is that this scheme is extremely detrimental to residents. If I'd feel possibly Australian villages, it's going to bring no benefits other than

58:13

not not no benefits at all, really, there's going to be extra traffic, there's going to be rain, as we've seen through that field shall land into lane and there's going to be divis air quality on the 857 Particularly in Vail. And

58:29

so

58:30

and the the next point I would like to terrain which the inspectors may reference, you know, this isn't a vote. It's about evidence, it's an evidence based inquiry. But just for the record, we do need to sort of treat what the MPs are saying here with a pinch of salt

58:48

in the run up to the 22,007 2008 public inquiry. The local MP for I pick at the time was Tom Levitt and he was forever telling people in the local press and wherever he could that there was no uncheck percent support for the bypass

59:04

the motion to bypass as it was at the time

59:08

when it all came out there were 4000 4000 representations of the inquiry 1600 in support 2400 against

59:19

and the the forum to this scheme which was the transparent grade counsellor Wilcox he was adopted constantly. He did a survey across the whole of teams for some

59:32

to see what level of support was for the GPU when it came to 11% That report is available inspectors were to see it I could send you some

59:42

the the next thing I would pick out is the journey times that was mentioned and the journey times well see in the in the transport assessor report it's 7.17 there's no meaningful journey times with the scheme provided the only parts of the journey which don't actually affect reality. You

1:00:00

using partial journeys made grossly overestimate time savings and any economic benefits, for instance by omitting avoiding substantial congestion in Greater Manchester and Sheffield.



1:00:14

The the next point I would like to make is one that is to pick up on Mr. Reynolds, he quite correctly states that this scheme has its roots in the 1960s.

1:00:29

I mean, that's an evidence of what it's tired dated scheme. This is it's, you know, it harks back to the 60s 70s and 80s rather than looking forward to the future in which motor transport is planning to ever have a reduced role. For instance, in Mr. Brown's own constituency nine and I get this figure from the the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 69% of journeys that come out of Tameside

1:00:59

are made by by cars and bones which surprised me because Tameside is just absolutely thrilled with it. I just must be one of the most row dense places on earth. And then just

1:01:12

thinking, okay, yeah, I will thank you inspector. So you This is even going to be satisfied with this one. He wants another order for that you wonder, you know what this road but he never end. So I will drop off just by saying as as Mr. Randles itself said he admitted this isn't a perfect scheme. And I'll just reiterate what other people have said that there are there are better solutions more sustainable, integrated and inclusive schemes such as for instance, a geriatric programme bottom that could have root restraint, public transport and active travel measures built into it. And indeed that will be the meat and drink of my next submission which you will find next Wednesday. Thank you very much.

1:01:54

Thank you Mr. Bagshaw and apologies again for

1:01:59

my slip earlier.

1:02:02

Thank you.

1:02:05

Thank you and thank you for those

1:02:09

submissions which we have noted carefully.

1:02:13

We are good so that takes us to the end towards the end of general submissions I will provide the applicant with an opportunity to reply orally if they wish to

1:02:25

picchi filed on behalf of the applicant so they were happy to respond in writing to the extent that there's any new points Thank you. Okay.

1:02:35

We are going to take a short break now it's we've had an hour in this session and Socrates had

1:02:46

photo will be a second

1:02:59

Yes, so we are going to vote for 10 minutes now when we come back which is going to induce next right in my own stand that this proposal to adjust the time table

1:03:11

for the end of the examination from the applicant so we'll take that when we return from the break.

1:03:17

It is

1:03:19

was me

1:03:24

right so going to jail for a short break now. And recommence at 1115 If you're watching live stream, please be aware that the live stream will now stop to view the restarted meeting you'll need to refresh your browser page when we start at 1115. Thank you very much