

TRANSCRIPT_ISH3_SESSION5_A57LINKRO ADS_05042022

00:05

Good afternoon again, everybody the time is now 1625. And this hearing is restarting, please could remember the case didn't confirm, clearly. And that the live streaming and recording restarted. Yeah, I can confirm you can be here clearly. And the livestream has started. Thank you food. So we're now resuming with item by quality. And let's proceed without delay. So the taken again, the points in the agenda in order. So the first points have stemmed from essentially comments made by high peak Borough Council and just to have an update on progress resolving these issues. So the first one of those is road gradient modelling. matters in just under discussion between napkins and paper accounts for around that, could the council please provide an update, and apologies questioning? The full name isn't provided to the council projects about? Could the council provide an update and set out their position which is yet to be agreed and the implications for the assessment on mitigation arising from road gradient modelling, please.

01:23

Thank you, Mark James hyper Council, I'd like to introduce my colleague, Dan Crary, who will lead on the air quality discussion.

01:34

Hello says yes, to give you an update on the road gradient modelling. And we met with Atkins and Suzy at Atkins to and ask them to do some sensitivity testing on the road gradients and the impacts on them if they were included in the assessment or if they were left out of the assessment. And so they duly obliged with that the data used. So they looked at the two worst case scenarios intent Wessel and applied it two and a half percent gradient on a 6% gradients and concluded that there was only an increase of 3% and 6%. And that those that that still would result in a below the acceptable limit of 40. I broadly agreed with that that approach. What has become slightly more apparent and Susie may be able to clarify this is I think that the the application previously didn't include roadie gradients, what it because the it's the emissions factor that you put on your model outcomes are essentially due to the speed bands that you apply to them, rather than the IQ ma sorry, the IQ guide technical guidance approach. So these were done with the the future factors of the IQ rather than the presented factors which have the dmr future factors apply to them. So So yeah, we were we are fairly happy now that the row gradient issue is not significant for the areas that they currently assessed. We'd like a bit of clarification on the way that the gradient was previously applied. Given that, I don't think that the speed band criteria allows you to apply a gradient full stop. So we'd like a little bit more clarification on that. The we, I let less confidence in the application in the gradients for the Denton Vale junction and should further work be done on the AQ Ma. And then we probably want to see that looked at a little closer, if as in if the assessments to wish to extend further into Glossop on that regard. But yeah, essentially, we're pretty much in agreement on the record now.

04:23

Okay, can I just ask for that for the air quality questions? Would it be account to be able to provide these responses in writing as well for the next deadline? Absolutely. Thank you. Thank you very much. So progress has been made some outstanding concerns around speed band criteria, etc. With the app can later comment on that and what are the applicances been the next steps please? So this question be

04:55

thank you so much turning on now for the article. And so much We understood that good progress to be made, as per the submissions made it deadline seven. And there are a couple of points just Mr. Curry, they're just referred to an interaction with my colleague, Mrs. Robinson. So I'll say she wants to join me on screen to just respond to always able to respond to those points. This is Robinson able to introduce yourself and learn any further commentary you wish to add.

05:29

Oh, yes. Hello says. So. Miss Robinson, the equity specialist for the applicant with regard to the broad gradients. So we've we set our position as it's just been set out by Mr. Solo in rep Seven, zero to eight. So just to clarify on, you know, what, what that position is that we've been, we've reached on that. So hopefully, Borough Council was just referring that to some further sensitivity tests that we'd undertaken. And that was some tests regarding looking at gradients that were below 6%. On roads, and we did a, we did a kind of a sensitivity test looking at particular location where there were gradients below to 6% on a section of the a six to eight, which falls within the high peak Borough Council area. Within the modelling that we we've done, which is included within the environmental statement, we had included a number of locations where we had a 6%, where there was a 6% gradient in the road. And what we've done there is because we were using speed band emission factors that are specifically for national highway schemes, we, we were made an adjustment to those to reflect a gradient which was in line with ephors, local air quality management, technical guidance. So we have actually applied 6% gradients already in the assessment as presented in the environmental statement. So, so that has that that has been and that was in that application was made up for another location in Denton Vale at the junction with BA six to six.

07:21

We seem to have lost to Basa Bray. So we've just lost a little little of what you said there just the last 20 seconds or so.

07:33

I'm sorry, I'll just recap on that then. So we had actually applied in the environmental statement assessment that was presented in the environmental statement documents, we had included an adjustment of emissions to account for a 6% gradient already. It's key locations. Yeah. And that was based on you know, for our assessment reviews, national highway speed but and emission factors. But we've made an adjustment to those based on the Defra local air quality management technical guidance, and to account for a 6% gradient and that that was kind of an we ended up that on a proportional basis. And we applied that at key locations where there was a risk of air quality standards

been exceeded. And one of those locations it did include at the denting Vail junction. So we applied that 6% On the six to six Glossop road if that didn't in Vail already. So we have made, you know, we have we have looked at other locations other than where we undertook this further sensitivity testing already within our assessment. Okay. Yeah. So in terms of the next steps, I think it seems like we've agreed with hyper council with regard into our approach to gradient, but I think there is which I think we will, we're still having some ongoing discussions with them regarding speed use of speed band emission factors.

08:58

Okay, and what times girls are anticipated for further progress on the speed banding issues. We have

09:10

recently provided some more information topic for a council. So and I think we're looking we're looking to have an additional submission for the next deadline.

09:24

Will that be another coordinated submission? Was it for a council in the similar ways but deadlines?

09:33

That would be the intention. I'd have to confirm the exact form of that.

09:37

Okay, thank you. It would it would be helpful to try and get the position of both the Africans and Thai people a counsellor deadline at possible. Okay. It was very helpful to get a deadline seven in the way that was presented. And so, thank you, thank you for that summary. Coming Want to and thank you for the progress being made? Can we move on to model verification that is so very similar format question matters and it's into discussion as highlighted in these representations of deadlines seven, so could type it Council, again, give an update, good position, what's yet to be agreed and implications, please?

10:25

Yeah, I can't get my notes. So yeah, we we again asked the consultants to look at various different verification factors by looking at sensitivity tests, looking at different sets of data to come up with their verification factor. And, yeah, we were pretty much happy with the zones done for the A 57 and the six to eight alteration and using different data within those. We agreed didn't significantly affect effect interpretation. Yeah, sorry, my last point, or when I was on about the gradients was for this one, either, which is what I meant to say was that we were less the clarity with the around the dinner bell junction was, was less acceptable, we can certainly accept that based on the data that Suzy had available. That was the best approach that she could take, I believe, however, it was still fairly limited, we've only got one they couldn't do it against our own data because we we've only got one tube in the in the the area that they chose to use for to validate should the we get our wishes and we get the AQ ma assessed, then we would expect to see that extended down to the additional tubes that we've got there and I've got fairly good robust data for

12:01

Thank you. So what are the what are the residual concerns then? The high peak around model verification could could apologise if you're about to repeat yourself just

12:21

in terms of the model verification currently based on the zoning approach, and we would consider that that that is acceptable at this moment in time we would agree.

12:34

Okay, so we're happy to effectively sign off model verification. That's yeah, yeah. Okay, thank you. Let us look into traffic routing onto shore lane and dinging road. It's a topic that was discussed this morning. And perhaps even into early afternoon in the traffic's section. So hi, people are counsellors have been quite consistent in having concerns about that routing, and the implications of increase increases in traffic along that route and related matters in terms of the balance of traffic routing along shore lane and dinging road versus the balance of traffic routing along the 857. So could hyper account just provide an update on again, this is this is an area that was noted for deadline seven, where there would still be discussion, so could I pick Borough Council? Just give us an update on that?

13:37

Yeah, my wish to come in as well afterwards. But essentially, yeah, we still have considerable concerns regarding the routing of the traffic and the use of the routing of the traffic to screen out the the need to assess particularly the in Vale, AQa Ma, obviously within the the tin whistle a que ma, we would have given the numbers we would have anticipated that would have been done anyway, in terms of the numbers, but the the actual, essentially, the reapportionment and the the movement of the traffic in relation to the increase in the network traffic, not going on to the 57 is the reason that they that hasn't been assessed, and that has been a consistent response from the applicants. We did request things like speed band data, which we received some of that yesterday and some of that before. We would still say that, speaking as a layman, we can't we don't understand why the traffic would re apportion itself along shore road given if that is done based on congestion levels or based on flow of traffic, the speeds that have been apportioned to the the areas within the model that we can see now on that, why that would instigate a change? Because in some areas it would. From from my understanding, it does look like there is areas, say longshore road where you would be turning off to go onto shore road to go onto a worse looking road than the road, you're currently on the road if you're on the A 57. And you're thinking, Oh, I will go down shore lane to miss out the this horrendous traffic on the 57. Well, that's not backed up by the speed bands and the the congestion levels I don't believe, personally that have been presented. So I don't understand why you would do that. And so why you wouldn't stay on the 57. And therefore, why there wouldn't be 1000 new vehicles going along that bit of the road and not 1000 dogs and going down shore Lane instead.

15:48

Yeah. So so. So I think correctly bringing together the traffic routing issue and the traffic screening festivals. Yeah, there's that. So

15:59

we we have raised this stage, again, would be I think it was certainly touched on this morning. And obviously Mr. Webb, he's given a presentation on it is that we would like clarification on the actual numbers that were used in the transport assessment to start with, because obviously, the amount of traffic you've got on a given area of road will directly influence the congestion on that road, the ability for traffic to move across to decide to go down a different road, etc. And we haven't looked into this, we obviously are colleagues looking into this Dodge County Council. But certainly, I, I'm sure there's an explanation for it. But I couldn't understand why the figures were so low compared to the DFT figures, in terms of the amount of traffic coming on to the to the A 57 do seem to be about 800 to 1000, within a year difference, you know. So I didn't fully understand that. So I just need, we need confirmation that the numbers that are using and the numbers that are causing, you know, is accurate in that regard. And so that that's another area that we because it directly influences the speed banding, which then directly influences the emissions that are that are given to to to the traffic. And within the speed banding. For example, the other thing we noticed there was only two changes in speed bands as a result of the scheme from from Lux. And one of those being shoreline were no certain shoreline is consistently heavily congested in the junction. But then other than that there was only a couple of changes speed bands as a result. And for example, the 57 does not change speed band as a result of the scheme yet the traffic decides to change direction as a result of the scheme. So we need a bit of clarification on that, I think.

17:55

Yeah. So there are residual concerns actually around the modelling the traffic modelling. Yeah, that feed into this there are related concerns about the thresholds. So the increase in traffic being just below thresholds and the amount of consideration given to Air Quality Management area, so those have been scoped out. And is that appropriate given it's so close to the threshold level? Is that appropriate given the uncertainties or or some of the concerns around traffic modelling? So, so all of that is leading height people are counselled to have concerns as to whether the effects on their quality management areas have been adequately considered. Is that a fair very basic summary?

18:48

Yeah, I think that's a fair fair summary of what I've just said. Yeah.

18:51

Yeah. And to what degree have so obviously there are traffic modelling issues here. And Darby County Council's expertise is relevant, who has high peak liaison with Darby county council on those matters around the traffic modelling uncertainties etc.

19:16

Yes, we've liaised and some degree obviously, Mr. Bless it is the lead on the the traffic modelling and and and so yeah, we we perhaps don't fully agree in terms of the the diversion time short late, I don't know. Mr. Bassett directly on that one. But I would bow to to Mr. Blissett on in terms of the understanding of the model. It's just as from coming from a lay man, we still, despite the what's been said, don't really accept it. Yeah, so one of the things we did ask and sorry to talk over that We did ask was that if, um, if shoreline could be within the transport model of shoreline could be given a different speed curve or something like that. So that would be less desirable for the traffic model to apportion

traffic down it and to see what happens that because that assumption that the traffic will is made on something that's gone into the model that assumption has been put in. So if that assumption is made less desirable, then where does the traffic go? And does the traffic then stay on the 57? And then we get so those go over the criteria for an air quality assessment.

20:37

Thank you. So. So that's helpful. Thank you, it seems to me that it's recognised that absolute certainty and precision is not possible, not appropriate that this level, and it's not normal to expect that to be provided, obviously. So I think that's broadly accepted. What we're getting to trying to get to grips with is whether the applicants approach has been a reasonable worst case. So that's the type of question that they were struggling with to some degree. And I think we are concerned very much to see how these matches actually resolve themselves around the consideration of air quality management areas. Yes, the predictive traffic levels are just below the thresholds. And, yes, there are different thresholds used for the dmr to some of the different methods, we've explored that that has left him residual concerns about the difference in the level of risk threshold. So we're trying to get to grips with that. So I think it's probably fair, just in terms of painting a picture of where we sit at the moment. That due to some quite important matters here, still to be worked through. So I'm just trying to create a very general picture of where we are, this is an area of concern for us at the moment very much. So it's being convinced that a reasonable worst case scenario was being considered in terms of the assessment of effects on the deck or to mention the terrorist non compliance issues around those. So we have some hands raised at the moment, I'm going to invite Mr. Blissett, actually to a comment verse. So deputy county council, please.

22:44

Thank you, sir. I've I've listened to Mr. Curry's concerns I, I am minded to make his suggestion. And one thing I will suggest I mean, you know, clearly there are concerns concerns you've expressed yourself to this morning about Charlene, and Mr. Corey has these concerns, and it's not quite going to go away. My suggestion is perhaps that the applicant be invited to provide a selective link analysis. Now, what does that link analysis does is it looks at the traffic on shore lane. And it will tell you how many numbers are on shore lead, where they've come from and where they are going. And if you compare a select link analysis, without, with and without the scheme, that will provide us with an indication of what the differences are, and what it is people are actually doing. That is just a suggestion. I'll leave with you soon. I'll leave with the examiner the authority.

23:49

Thank you. Thank you. That's that sounds very helpful that that sounds as if that would be more detailed consideration that would appear appropriate at this stage. I don't know if the applicant has the highways Expert Online currently or if that could be taken away. Mr. Mr. Seven, you have your hand up as well. So perhaps you could also address that point along with any other points you wanted to raise.

24:13

Thank you. So I was just it was appropriate to come back in and as we moved on to traffic matters, and we've just heard from Mr. Blissett. do still have Mr. Cade spark believe with us, and so might be appropriate. He's able to join in just respond to that proposal.

24:34

Thank you.

24:42

Yes, sir, thank you to the case rock on behalf of the applicant. Your respond to that yes, we can do the Select link analysis as requested and that will provide some information on the comparison of where traffic is routing through from With the do something prepared to do minimum. But on the sort of general point about the confidence in the model, obviously, we're confident in the model is accurately redistributing traffic in the area or reassigning the traffic to the routes based on the parameters within the model. And, specifically relating to speed banding, the issue about the speed banding that was raised earlier is that the speed bands are actually quite wide, they're quite wide bands. So within those feed bands, even though the comparison between do something and do minimum, do something doesn't seem to change a great deal, or not at all, in terms of speed banding use for air quality, that's not to say the speed of the traffic, there be speeds along the the link in general have changed sufficiently for traffic to reroute to cause traffic to reroute as part of the changes in speed even if they're in within a speed band use for their quality. So I think the reason that help Kyle understand the that fact is simply the the the width of the speed bands, the speed difference they cover and allow for that and the speed bands taken directly from the model. So you know, the two are, are related so that the, you know, the reassignment is happening, and the outputs are giving us those feedbands. But the really assignment that's disguising what's happening in terms of reassignment because the speed bands quite wide.

26:44

Okay, so it seems to me, that has been very good progress made. We are left with these critical traffic related issues for air quality. And we'll come on to two pictures National Park in a moment. Would it be so useful progress has been made in meetings between applicants and high peak Borough Council? Could those meetings next meeting be extended to include Derbyshire county council so that the traffic related aspects of it can be considered at the same time? Could could the applicant comment on that?

27:23

So I think that sounds perfectly sensible from, from our perspective, it couldn't be done.

27:30

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Sutton. Thank you. What is with Deputy county council and Hi people the council be able to progress on that basis? Please, certainly say yes. Thank you Mr. Bisset and high peak?

27:49

Yes, no problem at all.

27:51

That's helpful. Thank you very much. And again, time is of the essence, I don't need to restate. And it's, you know, very anxious to see that the Air Quality Management Area issues are worked through

thoroughly. And we get a very good understanding of any remaining concerns around that. So thank you. And a hand raised. Mr. James, I think for Peak District National Park Authority.

28:18

It's more James. Hi.

28:21

Sorry. Hi, Mr. James. Sorry.

28:24

And it was just to add what on what Dan had said, really, in terms of our position. And just to link it back to the discussion earlier on today. Just thinking about the traffic forecasts on that particular route, which appears to be bypassing day seven. Just again, draw your attention to the uncertainty that appears to be around that particular issue. So there's reference given to the on street parking and potential need for a pedestrian crossing, given the the school. And yeah, so just just refer back to those those uncertainties and doubts that we have around this ticker issues, which, if you're thinking about what the worst case scenario is, well, we'll come into a judgement about what that might be. But we don't processes at the moment.

29:11

Yeah, thank you. Mr. agenda. I think I think it's coming across very clearly that we just need to try and pin some of these uncertainties down a little bit. And to you try and be very clear as to whether there's been a reasonable worst case that's been assessed or not. I think so certainly on the same page, I think with that, excuse me, thank you for that. The traffic screening, threshold questions G. H. And I so decide peak Borough Council want to say any more about those? Have we covered all of that? The counsellors point of view?

29:53

Yes, I think our positions fairly clear it's it's in our last representation as well in terms of the court So we still want to see the the air quality management areas assessed. And we've made the comments regarding the screening criteria.

30:11

Thank you. District National Park Authority. Thank you,

30:18

sir. As I counsel is the authority responsible responsibility for their quality management areas, we defer to their expertise in this matter.

30:27

Thank you. Thank you very much. So, applicants the assessment for air quality management areas. Would you comment on that, please? And I picked the council's concerns around that.

30:44

Thank you, sir. I mean, I think the the very short point is that the both opposition and type expert, borough Council's position is set out in the submission that was pretty headline seven and present. But given what we've just heard, I think the point is that here it relates to, again, competence in the modelling and that we're very confident, and others are asking for more information. And I think if we were able to set up the meeting that's been suggested, including dabish, County Council, who, of course, earlier on, certainly in relation to the Dinty. Road tour Lane point, were not disagreeing with us. And I think that might be the best way to move the matter forward.

31:33

That's helpful. Thank you. You know, obviously, we're in a position where there's a disagreement between potentially a dispute between the council and the applicant. So it would be helpful to try and move those things forward. Thank you very much. So I look forward to hearing the feedback from that meeting. And as early as that could be fed into the examination, obviously, we'd appreciate but timely to be taken to to move that forward, obviously, the practicalities of that. So let's move on to item J. Air quality standards regs 2010. So air quality directive compliance effectively. So these are obviously the considerations that we need to address in terms of complaint areas becoming non compliant in terms of any delays to non compliant areas becoming compliant. So what is how things work councils current position on those, these?

32:44

Our current position would be that the modelling indicates that there's going to be no compliance issues come 2025. And I'm not minded to disagree with that. I think that that's probably the case. However, the we're still waiting for I think the qualifying features. Identification were. So the assessment for the compliance, the way that it has been done by by the applicant is that they've compared it with the model that's used by nationally to predict exceedances. And they've taken a conservative approach of using our own their own data, as opposed to the models prescribed data, which are much lower than their data. The only issue I the only quirk that I would like to see is that that they've got some areas within the Brookfield area, which are not down as receptors within the human health standard assessment. And therefore they've been subjected, the ones where they've been subject where they are human health receptors done by the applicant, they've used the forward projections from the dmrB in order to to do the future projections. When you do it for compliance modelling, you use the out QM guidance, which is less concerned sorry, more considered less conservative. And so we'll give you a low number, generally speaking, so it's it's to be praised that they've used the dmrB initially in the human health. However, fairly reasonably high numbers during the qualifying features in the Brookfields areas, which obviously have been then presented not presented as human health receptors, although they must be because they've been identified as human health receptors within the compliance points assessments, but they've had the LTM the less conservative elements, the more conservative I'll cue now got the wrong way around. They they've had the That what basically what I want is the dmrB. Future factor applied to the receptors identified in the compliance points, which aren't shown on the map. And to ensure that those areas within the Brookfield area, which does show a large increase in traffic, are compliance. I think that they will be, but I think it needs to be shown. And otherwise, it's a bit confusing in terms of the way that that's outlined. As you can tell, by the way, I've just expressed it.

35:30

I'm glad I'm not the only is it so that if that approach was taken, that'll be considered a conservative? Yeah. Let me let me use the term that'll be that'll be the council be content with that being a worst case assessment,

35:49

essentially, qualifying locations within the Brookfield area that notch because they're not clear, you have to sort of put the grid references to find them. And for those to be calculated with the dmr. future forecasts?

36:05

Yeah. Okay. So thank you. Could we can I encourage the council and the applicant to include this in their discussions? Because, you know, obviously, the compliance with the air quality standards regulations, is important to us, we're specifically guided to consider these matters by the national policy statement. So you know, having absolute clarity on this is important to us. So maybe if we could just quickly respond, if you would like to respond to the points that the council have made, and whether the principle of including this in the discussions is, is welcomed.

36:50

Having listened to the technical detail, I don't think it's going to be held masses if I try and go into this, but I'll invite Miss Miss Robinson to join me on the screen. If she's got any particular comments on that Maya, rushing pointed, this may sound like but we're not far away. It looks like this Robbins might just come back and confirm whether what's just been asked for is possible or practicable and appropriate.

37:20

Thank you. It's it is no work, be nice to dot the i's and cross the T's I think but yes, please.

37:27

Hello, yes, he's Robinson equity specialist for the applicant. Just to clarify on this, just what high peaks actually kind of requesting so they're requesting to have all of the qualifying features modelled under the more pessimistic dmr. calculations. Because in terms of just kind of going back to the detail on that, we have, we did include a more detailed map of those locate the locations that have been used in the compliance risk assessment in within our deadlines, seven submission that was made, which set out some of the points that we weren't a discussion and so on agreements that should have been at the end of that document, a more detailed map, showing that in terms of the qualifying features that we've looked at, in regard to the compliance risk assessment, it's included. Some, some of those qualifying features are things like residential, or residential properties, other beach locations are kind of public access. So it's things like pavements, where you might expect people to be present. The main difference between those types of receptors is in residential properties, you'd assume that people would be present for the at a period that's relevant to the annual mean air quality standard, where is it the public access locations, and you don't have to kind of expect people to be present, you know, much shorter period at those locations. And that's why those locations weren't included in the more pessimistic dmr.

39:09

Okay, thank the it's estimated with butters. Sorry, we lost you for a moment though. No, I think I probably spoke. But please, please carry on.

39:24

I'm sorry about that says so. Um, yeah. So we can, we can, you know, look at modelling those additional locations. But I just wanted to I was just pointing out that we wouldn't typically model them in the dmr assessment with the more pessimistic figures because there's short term x locations where people would only be exposed over a short term period.

39:47

Thank you that there seems to be a likelihood for make you've been able to make progress on so it just seems that some further technical discussions are needed. I think hyperbaric comes to refer to concerns around the Brookfield area in particular. I don't I don't think these matters have been wrapped into the previous discussions between the applicant and high people of council. So I think if there could be included, as I said before in the next set of discussions, and if it were then possible to get the respective positions of the applicant and high peak Borough Council, on the air quality standards, regulations, 2010 compliance, that'd be very useful.

40:34

Yes, understood. Thank you.

40:36

Thank you very much indeed. Right. So we're broadly to time. Are there any? I think we can maybe take one or two or submissions of any parties who would like to we've had quite a sort of working through. So I'm just going to leave a moment or so for and raising. And we have one hands Mr. Wimberly, please.

41:02

Thank you, sir. Oh, okay. A number of things on air quality, I did follow the case of Casey to brand her daughter who's now no longer with us. The first one first thing is adverse impact. adverse impact is what the FSA has to assess. Not whether something's below or above the guideline, it's whether it's how much pollution there is and how much harm it causes. And I feel that's getting lost when I hear these conversations. By the way, the word the way around, that is to say stringent, more stringent, less stringent. But anyway, Birmingham has estimated 900 deaths, I read that APR on the clean air zone, and other deaths a year to two average. And we know that loss of Dale is very high up the league tables, or down the league tables for high incidence of lung disease. pm 2.5. I think I've read somewhere in the documentation for this examination that they have not been assessed. But the government has just issued a new proposed guideline under the new environment act or 2.5. And the paper accompanying the consultation says that at any level 2.5 are harmful to health. And that the science shows this. So clearly, there is an adverse effect for poor poverty proportionally proportional to the amount of traffic. And we've just learned that there will be more traffic throughout the whole of blossom. So that's the first question PM 2.5. And the second is related to that is, when are we going to have a proper impact assessment of the additional traffic in Glossop because we haven't had it yet, which is why we're chasing our tails all the time in this exam. The third question is, are there any? Is it

still the case that there are no air quality monitors in high peak? Or councils area? It was the case halfway through the exam? I don't know if it still is. And the last question is about the model. And I'm getting more and more steamed up. Because I hear from Mr. Sterling. But he is confident that it is sound. But we have never had this explain the things that I pointed out about the seven and a half 1000 Extra vehicles in the do something we've never had it explained why the 2025 two minimum is the same as the 2015 baseline and how that can possibly be credited. And we've never had it explained where 11,000 vehicles simply disappear on lots of High Street East 15,000 vehicles to weigh on snake. It's 4000 Where did the other 11,000 come and go? I know nobody knows. And it should be pleased with in a way that we can thrash it out now not pushed off to the next deadline. I don't want the next deadline.

44:27

Mr. Wimberly. Mr. Wimberly. Thank you. Mr. Wimberly. Definitely. Thank you very much. Can we move on to Carol Hahn, please?

44:40

Hello, yes. Hi. Thanks. Again. I've just got two questions. Really. One is, please Can the applicant advise? What adjustments investigations and additional measures have been identified as part of the link if to seven link road scheme proposals to help address the traffic flow distribution concerns, and the potential for predicted traffic flow increases via the new A 57 Glossop spring Road, we've heard about the onward implications for surrounding areas the denoting a q&a zone, almost towards Glossop and Snake pass. And well, slightly related to the tint muscles naked OMA area as well, and potentially improved public health outcomes that might be possible if there are additional measures that can be added maybe junction operation and signalling to help with the management of the increased traffic predicted. And really, I guess it's today we've just heard reiterate, you know, it's been heard about and reiterated today about the importance of the snake pass and potential cumulative effects perhaps for the enjoyment of the Peak District National Park and onwards towards new use of the snake pattern, and perhaps to Bamford as well. And then secondly, was just about the measures that in the planning that might have been put in place, which I don't think has been discussed, but I'm sure there's perhaps future plans. And I don't know if this is relevant, but really just to enhance sort of continued integration really with the potential future Glossop transport hub, and continued encouragement and participation in active travel and sustainable travel and, again, improve public health outcomes.

47:00

Thank you. Thank you for that. And Dr. Robinson, please.

47:05

Thank you very much. Indeed,

47:07

we would just like to endorse what Daniel Wimberly said on what Hi, Pete borough Councillor said, there are uncertainties in the traffic model, which remain unexplained. And the thresholds have not been met as a result of that for the air quality management assessment. So we would urge the examining authority to ask for an assessment of air quality management areas, this select link analysis

is not going to give you the answer that you really need, which is if traffic is on the a 57, or not on shore lane and denting Road, then what happens to the air quality? That is a really, really important question which the Secretary of State will have to address. And it's a requirement of the National Planning statement.

47:51

Thank you, Dr. Oz, and that there are a number of issues that come together here. And I think it's hopefully expressed earlier, the concerns that we have about the relationship as a traffic modelling to the air quality management areas in particular, but I think I think probably it's fair to say more generally to the air quality assessments. So has has a proper worst case. Assessment being carried out. So I have expressed that a number of times. And we are anxious to see that to that being worked through. And so I'm very grateful for, for what's been raised. And I do believe we are making progress. But yes, there are some significant outstanding questions that we have. So ultimately, it is for the applicant to make their submissions, and it is for the council and others to comment on those and to make their submissions. And this may be an area where we and during our report writing have to sit back and look at differences in how these matters are dealt with. And we will do that in the most balanced way that that we can. So a lot of material has been submitted, we are getting quite a bit of repetition of things, but I understand some of the frustration behind that. I think the point was well made there that actually looking at the more detailed traffic and data for shoreline, we do need to relate that into the air quality assessment. So I think I certainly welcome the applicant. And considering that further. We do have concerns about the consideration given to Air Quality Management Paris as I expressed previously. So it is an area that we intend to look at very closely indeed. So thank you for those comments. And we will take another break that brings their quality to a close. And that item on the agenda. So that was Item five, we have item six remaining, but for now we'll take another 10 minute break. So it's now 1715. We'll resume at 1725. Again, if you're watching the live stream, then please be aware that the live stream will now stop. To view the restarted meeting, you'll need to refresh your browser browser page excuse me when we restart at 1725. Thank you