

TRANSCRIPT_BLACKCAT_ISH2_SESSION1 _23092021

00:05

Good morning and welcome, everybody. It is exactly two minutes past 10. Apologies for the slight delay. I'm now starting the second issue specific hearing for the application made by highways England for the a four to eight blackcat to Caxton gibert Road improvement scheme. We will introduce ourselves fully in a minute. But we're before we do that, please bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters. Mr. Williams, can I just check that you can hear and see me?

00:39

Morning? Yes, I can confirm I can see all three of you.

00:42

Thank you. And could you also confirm that the meeting recordings and live streams have started?

00:46

Yes, I can confirm that the recordings are stored in the live stream is up and running.

00:52

Great. Any request for reasonable adjustments?

00:55

No. None were taken during the arrangements conference.

00:58

Okay. Thanks very much, Mr. Williams. Okay, on to introductions. My name is Monica Sahaj. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of the examining authority to carry out the examination of the above application. Today I will be leading on agenda items eight and parts of agenda item 11. I'll hand over to other members of the examining authority. Mr. Parkin, if you could start with you. Mr. Parkin, you might be your microphone might be off.

01:33

Should we use this by now? apologies. Good morning. My name is Andrew Parkin and I have also been appointed by the Secretary of State as member of the examining authority. I have queries today relating to item number three. on to my colleague Mr. Scriven.

01:48

The morning I'm Matthew Scriven, also appointed as member of this examining authority. Today I'll be leading on agenda items three to seven, nine and 10. And I also have some questions on item 11.

02:01

Thank you both. Also present today. Our three members of the case team case manager today is Mr. Emery Williams. The case officers covering today Mr. Edwin Maudsley, and Mr. Joseffer. I want to acknowledge and welcome those who are watching the live stream today. And finally, welcome to attendees in this virtual room today. Please, would you I'll move on to introductions and I suggest we do it this way that I call out the name of the organisation. And if everyone from that organisation could turn on your cameras and microphones, and in turn, state your name and your role within that organisation. We will remind you throughout this hearing to state your name and the organisation you represent before you start speaking this is for the benefit of the recording and parties viewing that recording later on. So for introductions, if I could start with the applicants team, please

03:01

do Good morning. My name is Scott Linus Queen's counsel for the applicant, as you might expect to have a cast of 1000s today and what I'll do as I've done on previous occasions is read out their names and ask them to introduce themselves and turn giving their position on the responsibilities part of the team. Can I start please with Terry Harrington.

03:24

Good morning. I'm Terry Harrington. I'm the sponsorship director for national highways and focusing on complex infrastructure projects.

03:35

Stephen would please

03:38

Good morning. I'm steam wood from a calm representing the applicant and dealing with strategic traffic modelling and economic issues.

03:50

Next, please Samuel gauche.

03:54

Hi, good morning, everybody. I'm Samir Ghosh and I'm from a calm and I'm representing on behalf of the applicant and covering the areas of local traffic impact, local junction modelling and impact on the local network for the scheme. Thank you.

04:17

Next please and recall

04:29

in respect to the local junction, modelling local traffic impacts of the scheme

04:39

Thank you. Quick Next please dead Ted Doherty.

04:46

Good morning, Ted doc team from a con representing the applicant and I'll be covering the highway design and nmu matters.

04:57

Thank you Next Julian. See, please

05:01

boarding, Julian see I'm an engineering manager for Skanska. I'm appearing on behalf of the applicant and dealing with the issues of the outline traffic management plan.

05:15

Thank you. Next john Rooney, please.

05:19

Good morning, john Rooney, on behalf of the applicants I'll be responding to it may say today on good design.

05:30

So I didn't quite catch Lucky's pick. repeat that please. Mr. Rooney.

05:36

Apologies. JOHN Rooney representing the applicant, and I'll be responding on item eight a on good design.

05:45

Thank you Next, Pamela Laurie, please.

05:48

Good morning. Pam Lowry from a con on behalf of the applicant and I will be dealing with item noise on noise issues.

06:04

Thank you, Alicia. Could snacks please.

06:08

Good morning Alicia coats from a calm on behalf of the applicant. Speaking on item 10 air quality.

06:17

Luray Henry, please.

06:20

The morning Laura Hendry, managing associate at Womble bond Dickinson on behalf of the applicant. And I'll be talking to Agenda point 11 today. Very much, ma'am.

06:33

Thank you very much, and welcome to everyone. Can I now move on to introductions from the team from Central Bedfordshire Council, please.

06:46

Hi, I'm Andrew Cohen, the principal planning officer. It's interesting to share drone state by Governor punter and also by Guy Quint. Definitely Georgie self.

06:59

Good morning. I'm just for controlling the highway traffic and traffic and transport issues.

07:09

Just to let you know that there was quite a lot of echo when you were just speaking. So we'll we'll tell you again if this happens again, but I just thought I'd give you a heads up.

07:22

Okay, why don't I quit as well going either.

07:27

Yes, good morning. My name is Guy quintile environmental health officer representing Central Africa Council and I will be launching or speaking on noise and air quality.

07:40

Thank you very much. And welcome to everyone. If we could now have all attendees from Cambridgeshire County Council, Huntingdon Shire District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.

07:55

Good morning, madam. My name is Francis Terrell. I'm a partner at Pinsent masons. We are representing the three councils you just mentioned. I'll call on the people that we have to speak from the various councils here today, one by one to introduce themselves. So if I could start off please with David alatt. Hi there.

08:15

I'm David Ellis. I'm Assistant Director for transport strategy and network management at the county council and I'll be responding on a number of issues particularly items four and seven.

08:26

And then Loomis mostly.

08:29

Good morning. I'm Lou Mason Walsh. I'm the transport modelling manager for Cambridgeshire County Council, and we'll be responding on modelling issues.

08:37

And then come on the road, please.

08:40

Good morning. Yes. I'm Camilla Rhodes. I'm the asset information manager responsible for all the legal records of public rights of way and highway records. And I will be responding on points. six items six and

08:59

eight C and 11. Parts of 11.

09:05

m imagine please

09:08

think M is joining us today. Frances Sorry,

09:10

my mistake. That's correct. Sorry. Apologies. And then we have Claire Burton, please.

09:16

Good morning. I'm Claire Burton, from Huntingdon Shire District Council on the programme lead specialist here who will be responding to the actual questions.

09:26

And Cheng Ito Vanga, please.

09:29

Good morning. I'm from South Kane's District Council and I am the product the project lead. It'll be our specialists that will also be responding on specific items.

09:40

And then David Mitchell, please.

09:43

Good morning. I'm David Mitchell. I'm from Cambridgeshire County Council, infrastructure team leader and I'll be responding on item five highway layout and structures.

09:53

And then Nick Atkins, please.

09:56

You Hello, it's Nick Atkins from environmental health at South Cambridgeshire District Council, I'm an environmental health officer specialising in noise and will be replying specifically in request to any questions or updates on agenda nine B.

10:14

And I think that is for us unless we have a sorry unban elton john, as well please.

10:23

Thank you. Yeah, it's Good morning. Thank you. This is panels and I'm landscape architect the South Cambridgeshire District Council. Supporting on landscape matters.

10:38

Ma'am, I think that is all.

10:40

Thank you very much, everyone, and welcome to all of you. It could we have introductions from Bedford Borough Council, please.

10:50

Good morning.

10:51

My name is Alice Duran, Principal planner and Project Lead on the scheme. I'll read out my colleagues names and they can introduce their roles if that helps. Starting with Melanie McLeod.

11:03

Good morning. I'm Melanie McLeod from Bedford Borough Council. I'm the manager for transport policy. And we'll be listening to all the points today.

11:14

Andrew pragma Good morning. I'm Andrew Friedman. I'm the manager for Traffic Operations at Bedford Borough Council. Again, responding to the points at any points that are raised. Green Hudson morning.

11:28

My name is Brent Hudson. I'm an environmental health officer but bar Council. I'll be seeking to answer questions you might have over noise and dust in this issue. And David rhew Bridge

11:39

warning from Bedford Borough Council Environmental Health Department commenting on air quality.

11:46

That's our team. Thank you.

11:48

Thank you very much, and welcome to everyone. Could we now have introductions from the team representing the church commissioners of England.

12:05

Good morning, ma'am. I'm Lydia O'Hagan. I'm a solicitor at Charles Russell speechlys and I'm here on behalf of the church commissioners today just listening and I'm not anticipating making any specific submissions at this stage but but reserve the right to do so. Thank you. Thank you. And I think Paul Smith, who was attending on behalf of the church commissioners is no longer attending today. Okay, thank you Miss okay and welcome. And if we could now have all representatives from Avi developments.

12:40

Good morning, ma'am. And says My name is Andy brand B RA and D on the planning director of Avi developments Cambridgeshire limited and we own the Caxton services, Caxton gibbet services, so I'll be speaking on those matters.

12:54

Thank you. Thank you very much. And welcome, Mr. brand. And finally, I think we have representatives from National Farmers Union.

13:06

Good morning, Ana Charlotte from the National Farmers Union, rural surveyor working on infrastructure projects across England and Wales.

13:16

Charlotte, do you anticipate Miss Louis staples joining us at any point? Yes, Louise is due to join us later on. Okay, thank you very much. We'll take an introduction from her then. I believe that covers everyone who's present at the meeting today, if I haven't called. If you haven't introduced yourself, would you please raise your hand? Okay, good. We'll move on to agenda item to have four points to make here. First, just a few words to acknowledge the virtual event today. We examine authority I'm attending this meeting from the planning Inspectorate office in Bristol. We understand you might be attending from your homes and offices. Should there be any technical failures, which I think we've seen a few glitches this morning. Please try to join back using the same link. From our end technology is being a little iffy. But in case of a complete technology fail, which I don't anticipate. There is a date reserve for hearings on Tuesday the 28th of September in the examination timetable. But in all likelihood, of course, things will go smoothly today and tomorrow and we will not be using that reserve date. If we don't use that reserve date, there will only be a notification on our banner are a banner notification on the project page of the national infrastructure website. Unlike in a physical event today during during today's virtual event, you'll only be able to see our heads and shoulders. And equally we may be looking down looking at a different monitor. So and also to avoid visual and noise distraction only the panel member leading on a particular agenda item will turn their camera on But I just want to assure everyone despite all of this, you will you do have the fullest attention from all three members of

the examining authority. We do ask that you keep your cameras and microphones off as well until you're invited to a specific agenda item. We will pause at various points giving you opportunities to speak and of course, you should then use your raise your hand function to make a comment or point. Virtual events cause fatigue so we will ensure that each session in the meeting is approximately 90 minutes, noting that you may have already been in the arrangements conference for some time. This means that we will take the first 15 minute break at approximately 11am. We will resume again for session two at 1115 and go on until 12:45pm. session three will commence at 1:30pm after lunch. And again we will go on till about 3pm. At that point, we'll take the final break for 15 minutes resume at 315 and session four will finish at a maximum of 5pm. These timings of course are indicative we may opt to take slightly earlier or later breaks depending on progress. General if you do decide to leave the meeting during these breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. And of course, for people watching the live stream please refresh your browser drawers to meet subsequent session. The second point I wish to make is regarding general data protection or GDPR. I would like to make you all aware that this event is both being live streamed and recorded. The digital recording that we make are retained and published. They form public record that can contain your personal information and to which GDPR applies. The planning and spectris practice is to retain the publish and public recording for a period of five years from the date of the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's issue specific hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of digital recording. It is very unlikely that the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive personal information into the public domain. Indeed, we would encourage you not to do that. However, if for some reason you feel that it is necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information. We would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance. We would then explore with you whether the information could be provided in written format and therefore could be redacted before publication. Does anyone have questions regards to this matter? Please use the raise your hand function. Okay. Third point is about the substantive matter of today's issue specific hearing, which is titled highways and transport matters.

18:09

all interested parties which includes applicant and anyone who made a relevant representation within the specified period and on the form provided any affected persons in relationship in relation to compulsory acquisition. other persons and statue parties have been invited to this hearing. And agenda for this hearing was published on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure project webpage on Friday the 10th of September 2021. The main purpose of these this issue specific hearing is to clarify and get matters on highway and transport matters leading relating to one the need for the proposed development in light of the submissions received a deadline one to operational transport effects on local highways network, three proposed highway layouts and junction arrangements for effects on non motorised users. Five the proposed outline construction traffic management plan and matters relating to the different draft development consent order. To be clear, it's not in that intended to discuss all matters relating to highways and transport here today. Some matters may be pursued through further rounds of written questions, or at future hearings if we decide to hold them. We expect the representations at the hearings to provide further detail or clarifications following the submissions received to date. We don't need you to repeat the previously submitted material, we have read that material and have further specific questions or clarifications. This will be clear in the questions that the examining authority that in

the questions that we are asking you. It is a full an ambitious agenda. Mr. Scriven and I will keep under review our progress and we may request certain aspects to be held over and addressed as part of your responses to the next round of questions on 15th of October 4 and final point is regarding post hearing actions should they arise during this hearing. The assumption is that post hearing actions will be expected at the next deadline, in this case, deadline three on Tuesday, the fifth of October. However, acknowledging any resourcing constraints on your end, if you feel meeting that deadline will be difficult for you raise that at the hearing itself. So that if possible, we can accommodate that in the deadline set out in the Porsche shearing action list. If you have any questions to the points raised so far than please raise your hand. Okay, excellent. So that's all from me for now. We will turn to agenda item three and I will hand over to Mr. Scriven.

20:59

Thank you, Mr. High. So this is item item three, and it would be useful if the applicant could have their camera on for people who are intending on speaking on this one. Okay. So it is critical for the examiner authority to fully understand the need and rationale for the proposed development. And notwithstanding the scheme is included in the National Road investment strategy and to which is known as risk two, there are some additional points of clarification we consider necessary from the applicant. So if we go to a festival, clearly there was a significant amount of material submitted with the application. However, can the applicant confirm whether any additional evidence was provided beyond that which has been submitted for examination for the inclusion of the proposed development in res two?

21:51

Sorry, Scott liners for the applicant? Can I ask Terry Harrington, just to give us a summary response to that. And depending on whether or not that's sufficient, we can go on and provide a bit more detail on the risk process and further detail behind the commitment of the scheme within that sir.

22:09

Clyde, Terry Harrington for the applicant. And in relation to the question about Is there any additional nation and risks that isn't in risk to I don't believe there is. So this scheme was an initially committed in was one and it followed interest to during this one, we went through the outline business case approvals process. So the scheme was also approved up to ministers for continuation. So because of that, then the inclusion and risk two was was effectively follows on from this one. But I can give a bit more information about why it was included in this one if that's helpful.

22:48

No, it was it's really just to be sure that we have got effectively the same information. Well, same or better information than was provided for its inclusion in in the risk process.

23:00

Absolutely, yes. Okay, thank

23:02

you. That's helpful. That's, that's all we need to know about that.

23:09

Okay, so if we like surgeons, tend to tend to be so the applicant has submitted an economic sensitivity test technical notes, revision one, that's reference, rec, dash 2027. And the examiner 14, note that the benefit cost ratio for the scheme has fallen from 1.91 to 1.55. For the benefit of the rim, can you briefly explain why this is so?

23:40

Scott liners for the applicant? Sir, I'd asked Mr. Wood to explain the the nature of the changes that were that were carried out, please.

23:55

I guess just just to recap, the sensitivity test that was carried out was primarily to assess the impact of the revised projections of economic growth. And they were forecasts issued by the Office for budget responsibility in March 2020. And also, they were interim forecasts of revised economic growth as a result of the impact of COVID-19. These were all contained within a revised data book that was issued by the DFT in July 2020. And set out in the DFT route map, which was a route map for updating traffic guidance during uncertain times. So effectively, the sensitivity test took account of those revised economic parameters. And that was effectively a downgrading. All right, a revision downwards of both values of time and vehicle operating costs. And therefore, that resulted in a reduction of benefits of around about 19%. And as a result of that, the results seeing the CR benefits cost ratio reduced from 1.91. In the initial assessment to to 1.55. I should note that the scheme costs were were not changed between the original assessment that was contained within the combined modelling and appraisal report. That's, I think, a PPT 50. And the sensitivity test, so we did was primarily driven by those lower values of time, then vehicle operating costs as a result of the downgraded growth forecasts.

26:01

Okay, so yesterday's, yesterday's compulsory acquisition hearing. This was briefly touched on, and I think reference was made to the scope for that benefit cost ratio to I think the worst were to level up or maybe two so effectively to improve again, is that correct? Or, or not?

26:23

It is a possibility? it? It really depends. Apologies, I wasn't, I wasn't a party to the hearings yesterday. So I wasn't, I'm not sure what was discussed. All I can say, though, is that the Department of Transport in their route map are looking at changes to economic guidance, which might change the assessment year, so they're looking potentially to, to extend the the current 60 year assessment period. So that may very well change and also discount rates may may change, but this is all, this is all in the future. So we just don't know, at the moment how things are likely to pan out, we're awaiting further DFT guidance, and that's clearly going to be driven by the research, this is all set out in the the the the very useful DFT route map. So, there there there continues to be uncertainty, clearly, we are going to be preparing a full business case for for the scheme. And that will take account of the prevailing guidance at the time, which which may well change. So at the moment, I can't give any guarantees one way or the other. I think we just have to stick with the the guidance that that we currently have the best guidance that we have available, which is which is effectively the the July 2020 data book as as set out in the DFT root

28:18

app. Thank you, is there any indication and wherever that any of these changes might come in prior to the end of the examination period?

28:26

It's the latest intelligence from from the DFT. I mean, I am in fairly regular contact with the with with the key people at the DFT they never give any any guarantees in terms of future release. But I think the probably the latest best estimate is probably going to be early 2020. So whether that comes in before the end of the DCM on stage but it's sorry, early 2022. Yes. So that that's probably the best estimate I have available at the moment.

29:13

Okay, thank you. Mr. Parking. Did you have a query on this?

29:19

Yesterday Thank you Mr. Scriven. In the applicant responded to the examiner and authorities first written question and it's question one dot 15 dot 2.1 B and C which provided a written description for how both the construction and the operational maintenance costs were derived. This is contained in the environmental statements in the examination library, under reference, a PP dash 240 both the construction and the operational maintenance costs were based on the 2019 quarter one prices, then discount To 2010 prices. for construction costs, the 2019 q1 figure was 812 point 5 million pounds. And the discounted 2010 figure was 435 point 6 million pounds, which is around 53% of the 2019 figure. For the operational maintenance costs in 2019, q1 figure was 378 million pounds. And I've derived this from the annualised 6.3 million pounds over 60 years, which is set out in the environmental statement with a discounted 2010 figure being 27 point 6 million pounds, which this is only 7% of the 2019 figure. I'd be grateful if the applicant could please explain why there is such a substantial difference between the construction figure and the operational maintenance costs figures given they seem to have a very very similar methodology, and include an explanation for this difference in methodology.

31:10

The methodology is the same in terms of the inflating to outturn costs, both both sets of costs were prepared in in 2019 and are based on 2019 quarter one prices, they are then both inflated to outer and costs, ie when they are assumed to be incurred, and then they are converted to 2010 prices and and discounted to a 2010 price base. So effectively, because the construction costs are incurred at sooner than the the maintenance costs, the discount rate is clearly will be the impact of the discounting rate is clearly a lot less in terms of deflating that, that figure when you take the the maintenance costs which are clearly incurred over a 60 year period. So clearly, the bulk of the construction costs occur between 2023 and 22,025. The actual discount rate applied is is a lot less than if you've got costs in the future maintenance costs in the future, incurring in say 2060 which are subject to quite a significant discount rate. So so that that really explains the the difference in terms of the the final discounted values.

33:00

Thank you. I hear what you say, I'm just struggling to to sort of, to square it to square it really how you've got these these large figures at the end, which is based on the sunk costs for both construction

under the operation, the maintenance and not not withstanding that they were taking place at different times. You've arrived at an end figure and then you've deflated that figure. Could you perhaps just just explain a little bit, you know, in a bit more detail quite how you derive that.

33:42

Well, the thing The figures are all in the bear adjusted or deflated rather within the the tuber programmes. So they the tuber programme actually applies that discount rates from the years in which they are incurred. So that that is all a process that is contained within the the tuber cost benefit analysis programme. So, the costs that are inputs are are inputting within the years in which they are assumed to be incurred. And the discounting is done within the tuber

34:24

programme. So it's effectively sort of close a box that you put information into and it comes out with the answers is

34:35

yes, I mean, it is a you can do it as a manual process setting up a series of spreadsheets but the way that our cost benefit is done, the way that the majority of cost benefit analysis of a calculated e d e d is all performed within that tuber programme because of was laid out so that that calculates the benefits and the costs and and then provides your benefit to cost ratio. So so it is it is all contained within that, that one operation.

35:15

Okay. Thank you. I think Mr. Parkin and Mr. Well, I think with regard to food, we're gonna have to have a written question on some of this. And, and also, I'm just thinking with regard to be to I propose we we deal with that as a subsequent written question. I'm just mindful on the time and the discussions that are likely to come on modelling. Is that okay with with the both of you?

35:45

That's fine. Yes, sir. Scott liner.

35:54

So moving to item four, paragraph 5.211 of the national networks, NPS states the examining authority. And the Secretary of State should give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks. I'm particularly interested on this item on traffic modelling on the methodology. Before we discuss a couple of specific locations and kobish. County Council, are you on screen? No, you're not on screen if you could come up. So the applicant did adequately respond to the concerns raised in the deadline one submission through the junction modelling technical notes and that's the rep. Rep one dash 030. In in your, I guess high level concerns with regards the transport modelling that was undertaken with regard to local highway network.

36:56

sir Good morning, Francis Terrell from Pinsent masons on behalf of, in this case, Kingfisher county council, just for a deal with that specific point, obviously, just to confirm and clarify that, in terms of the

reasoning for the concern of the county council, in relation to the traffic modelling, that's broadly as set out in paragraphs, sections 2.1 to 2.5 of the written reps is rep 2003. In summary, those concerns were three threefold. Some of the traffic flow in the routing in based and forecast years is unrealistic and sufficient information has been supplied to the local housing authority to that to check the model traffic flows highlight areas of concern in relation to the local road network. Obviously, that's probably something we'll touch on in item B of this agenda. And Dzedzic model flows have been used directly to build local junction models. But those models aren't validated for that purpose. So those are the headline concerns, as you mentioned, a technical note has been produced by the applicant and are now invite David and Lou to set out why the concerns still stand, right information is still required. And those headline points that I've suggested still apply, obviously, the technical note all this, in fact, there's two technical notes, one deals with modelling as a general sense, and one deals with the junctions in particular. But I think David and new can explain why neither of those actually have changed the position.

38:26

Perhaps I'll kick off and and then hand over to Lou, for the technical matters.

38:32

So just to just to come in if we could focus on on this discussion it if we focus on the high level, before moving into the junction specific type, I think that'd be on the next topic on the next item

38:45

at a high level, and the answer is that we have not yet been satisfied that the local junction models and local junction assumptions are robust, because we do not have validated base models for the local junctions. And therefore, we cannot draw solid conclusions about what the impacts on our local network will be.

39:11

Okay. And so what some high level risks then this represents the local Highway Authority.

39:20

And the high level risk is that we wouldn't understand the the impacts of the four to eight scheme on our network, and therefore the risk of that network being appropriately designed and mitigated. modelling feeds into the whole cross section of areas concerning impacts, which relates to highway design mitigation, traffic management, noise, and so on and so forth. We have provided highways England with a range of data and pointed to a range of data that will exist in data that would allow for those base models to be validated. And so we feel that if He's in, in reach in scope to provide that added layer of robustness. So we can be confident, we've done some spot checks on those junctions, and we do find disparities there. So we're like live discussions with with the National Highways on this.

40:18

So in terms of some specific examples of risks, obviously, I could refer to Section 2.3 of the written representations, which set out concerns or problems that flow from the lack of validation essentially, on various locations.

40:36

Okay, the applicant wish to respond on this on this hot this high level point, first of all,

40:43

Scott liners for the applicant? Yes, sir, perhaps what we'll do is I'll introduce a quick summary of the position and I'll ask Mr. Gibbs to explain in more detail accepting, we're still at high level here. I think as the junction modelling technical note, rep 1030 explained, you need to look at this issue in terms of different categories of junction. The first one is junctions which don't actually exist in the base year, or where there's a fundamental in the lives of so we can call those scheming junctions. And the second category is junctions which do exist in the base year, which are not significantly changed by the scheme, but where there aren't any base models being developed. And there's a third category of junctions, again, sticking at a high level, where the ridge junctions which do exist, and this year, not significantly changed by the scheme. But where we have observed data where base models were developed. So that third category don't need to worry about because there were a couple of junctions, at least which were modelled in that way, but that they're not an issue. But as far as the scheme junctions are concerned that the basic point is that base models for those were not developed, because the change is so fundamental in the Traffic Operations, that existing flows aren't going to be particularly relevant in the in the forecast years. And when we're moves on to the second category of junctions, those which do exist, but which aren't significantly changed. There aren't any base models. The basic This is this that the scheme would result in either a significant capacity improvement at a junction with an existing capacity issue, or where the scheme increases traffic flows, the junctions decades operate under capacity by a large margin. So wasn't wouldn't be proportionate or necessary to assess the effectiveness of the scheme across the wide area with those with those junctions. And in any event, it wouldn't be possible to conduct that forum. Now, given traffic conditions that are being affected by the COVID restrictions or wind have been on issues raised by by the council's So for those reasons, at the very sort of high level, either the junctions were changing, so significantly, the base your model wasn't appropriate, or the results that we had showed that the differences were so significant that it wasn't necessary to conduct any base modelling because it wasn't going to fundamentally change the outcome of the forecast modelling. That's the sort of summary of the position I can ask Mr. gauche to expand a little bit further if that would help.

43:49

Yep. Mr. Parrish.

43:52

At high level, I think that's let's discord has explained the reasoning and then if there are any specifics, we need to go to I can elaborate on that on those but on high level that's that's the reason why, why we have followed that methodology. And what what couple of things I just want to additionally highlight that, in this particular scheme, we have not only prepared transport assessment, which is normally prepared for any schemes of this nature, but we have gone way and beyond to develop the TA which is transport assessment annex, and where we have actually gone on and developed junction assessment and modelling for a number of junctions in the wider network, where we could appreciate that there could be impact on the scheme. But while going through the screening process, which junctions to

select for modelling, it was always the junctions Of course which fall under scheme alignment, and all of those junctions have changed funding. Mentally, both in terms of its shape, its directional movements as number of years it has, like a fee on geometry has changed into a three or two or three tier junction. So there's significant change on disjunctions and the one feature on the wider network, where we have seen that the scheme is actually bringing in lots of improvements or even if it increasing traffic, it is likely to be on how the within capacity and the routing, the routing is changing significantly due to the scheme, we have gone on and use the satin or the strategic model flows, because that gives the best representation of the other focus here routing, and, and, and, and turning flows. And for certain junctions, we actually have developed the base year calibration and validation where we have found the junction, so significant, and the impact is potentially slightly adverse. And to demonstrate that, how, how adversities or whether it means any mitigation and whether it can fit in with the forecast for 2040 design year, we actually have done calibration and validation where we felt it was necessary. So I think our approach was quite robust in

46:24

that way. And I can I can sense obviously that COVID County Council fundamentally disagree with what's being said that do would it? Is this the time to move on to specific junction locations? Or is Do you want to come back on that? Kind of?

46:42

So thank you. I think before we get into specifics might be useful. Obviously, we've heard from Mr. Lyonesse, the sort of the threefold approach to the junctions. I think we have just at a high level as well, some concerns about that, and the logic behind that. So I think if I can just ask perhaps Lou or David Alex to address that as an high level basis before we move on, in terms of particularly the questions whether or not the second category is always we can be comfortable, there's always a significant capacity improvement or an increase, which is is not going to cause problems. I think whether we can cancel that we can know that without the validation that we require. And I think even Firstly, in relation to the notion that something changes is so fundamental, it's not worth doing. I think I think we have some concerns about that as well. So firstly, I could also do to to address those issues.

47:42

Good morning, Lou Mason Walsh, representing Kenosha County Council, we have issues with the way in which this modelling has been done because we can't assess the impact on the local road network, it isn't sufficient to say somewhere sees a benefit, or forearms of a five arm junction see a benefit when one arm sees a disc benefit. And we don't know the impact on the adjacent junctions that have not been assessed.

48:17

Okay, thank you. Was there anything Sterling was going to come back on there as well.

48:27

And just on the point Mr. Ghosh made where it he said that validation has been carried out where we felt it was necessary. And I think it's important to consider where where the county council thinks is

necessary in terms of its local assets, particularly given just to reiterate what I said earlier, the the data that is available to allow us to validate those junctions.

48:56

And presumably, you have date count data in some of these local existing locations.

49:06

Yes, secondary sources planning applications data account data. Yes.

49:11

So that's, is that something that you could potentially help with?

49:19

Yeah, well, we've, we've, we've we've been in discussion with national highways on this and provided and provided that data links to that data to find it. So we've we've we've set out how the concerns of the county council could be could be addressed.

49:36

Okay, thank you. So just returning to the applicant, if has, can you just confirm whether any of this local affect, I'll call it local data, so data from the local highways authorities, has not been used at all at this stage. In the modelling that's been undertaken on the validates the validation

50:02

Last semester goes to deal with me.

50:09

Yeah. I just say I just wanted to say that. Yes, we have used it, I'll tell them specifically I'll pass it on to and you too did tell specifics where we are muted. But most of the junctions where Cambridgeshire has been asking us to do the calibration validation, the data is available of 2016 2017, which were collected by highway national highways during that time as part of our study. And that's pretty close to the 2015, which is satin bass here. And not only that, from those years, the routing and the type of traffic movements have changed significantly because of the implementation of a 14 scheme, which is very close to that location. and thereafter, of course, due to the pandemic. So if we want to look at most on regenerative the agenda, the data available is

51:07

might tell you

51:12

Sorry, could whoever's joined Miss Rhodes? Can you turn your mic off, please?

51:18

Yeah, for majority of those junctions, it is available for 2016 and 2017. But I'll pass on to Andrew now to tell which which engines you have use the local authority data access and

51:36

well, the local Hi there, Andrew Caspar on behalf of the applicant, the local data, which was available has been used for the buckden and M 11 Junction 13 micro simulation models where a full base shear model was built and validation calibration was carried out at the other junctions, where local data was available, generally speaking, it was only in the form of tourney movement counts and not queue length or delay data. And therefore, a formal validation of the base model to observe traffic conditions wouldn't have been possible there was there was data available at a number of locations, some of it was available for perhaps just a single day, we had output from the Saturn model. And as Mr. Gosha said, we we considered that certainly for the the scheme junctions themselves, the the format, the form of the junction is totally different from what's there at the moment and therefore, for example, that blackcat Caxton Schubert's Cambridge road, it wouldn't serve any useful purpose to assess the performance of the the existing junction. In that way. This would also be true of locations such as the the local junctions at elss li which when the scheme opens for to be replaced by a pair of roundabouts and other locations, for example, the Abbott's the road tows them road crossroads, where although the form of the junction remains the same, its operation will be totally different from how it is today, because all the a four to eight through traffic will be removed and therefore, one would not expect drivers on the side road to encounter the same traffic conditions as they would do in when the base data was collected. There are a couple of junctions where we are considering Cambridge has point predominantly at why Boston and at Barford road, where we acknowledge that whilst the impact of the scheme is to substantially reduce the traffic flow along I should say that the the junctions are still fairly well traffic towards the scheme opens. But the the gist of the the arguments is that in those cases, the the models that we've built and run quite conclusively show that the the benefit of the scheme is substantial at those locations. If there are individual arms, which because of the rerouting of traffic away from Sydney, its Town Centre causes an increase in flow on On one or other arms, if those junctions, we consider that the the case has been made using the using the models that we've already built.

55:10

Okay, so we're getting into we're getting into detail on some of the detail locations we're going to discuss, I think it'd be useful if we discussed use some of those as examples of some of the issues here that are being faced. And I propose we moved to point B.

55:26

So just before we we do so I've asked you on half the applicant, I think just in terms of on the favourable principle, I think are set out in the local impact report. The paragraph seven to 19 have that the local authorities point is that we've had some of the changes are so fundamental, that effectively it's not worth bothering with looking at local information is kind of the gist of it. I think we agree with that in the sense that none of the new junctions in Cambridge are providing for any movements that are not currently possible. But instead, they're separating out the local strategic traffic. So the disregarding entirely the local information. It's not as though we're creating or the applicant is seeking to create something which is an entirely new and innovative and non existent. So there is sort of a utility and value in in, in having that validation carried out by reference to existing information on all junctions, because, as I said, none of them are entirely new. I think what we've also heard is that what has happened is an assertion relation to the other functions, as we just heard, that we're taking a certain

model, which was not conceived for the local roads, but was conceived for the strategic roads and applied that down, and that predicts the effects of good and therefore, on that basis, we're not double checking it. But I see that you're building assumption on assumption there, you're not in terms of you have no real understanding of whether that is reflecting the reality of the position

56:53

yet. So where where I am on this at the high level is that we've got quite differing positions on it. And I don't think we're going to get to consensus on it today. And therefore, I'd suggest we talk about some of the individual examples on this because I think it does show some of the issues that are being talked about. And by me moving on, certainly doesn't mean I agree with what has been said. Okay, so if we move on to Item b, so if we can talk about the Great North Road, Sydney OS and that's the why beston roundabout. So chaos, Cambridge county council, what do you consider the potential impact to be of the modelling undertaken and riously? What would this look like? So I'm trying to understand whether you think the difference would be a few cars, let's say in a peak time queue, or the fundamental function of the junction or the or that section of highway?

58:01

Two do Shall I take that one? David Francis Lu Mesa Marsh on behalf of Cambria county council the the issue is specifically at why Boston roundabout that the the Great North Road is shown to perform worse it is predicted to have 200 PCU increase in traffic flows in both the am and pm peak periods. That junction or that arm of that junction historically saw very long queues that regularly backed past the adjacent junctions. And as such Cambridge accounts Council have asked for the adjacent junctions between Nelson road and why Boston road on the Great North Road to be assessed because the rerouting as a result of the scheme is directly a result of the scheme and without confidence that the junk intermediate junctions can work. There is a danger that that rerouting might not be secured away from the town centre because the several of the junctions are fairly small mini mini roundabouts, and they struggle to accommodate the level of traffic prior to any additional traffic as a result of the scheme. So, we have asked for the wide Boston roundabout to be modelled using the best practice methodology because account does exist for that which would give us greater confidence in the performance of the the actual why Boston roundabout and then subsequently we have asked for the intermediate junctions to be assessed so that we have confidence that great North Road can accommodate the additional traffic that the model strategic model is suggesting will reroute away from Sydney its Town Centre.

59:56

So just so I'm correct then so at this point in time, it It's a view that you are you're requiring more confidence in in the information that's before you, rather than necessarily coming straight to the conclusion that this is going to cause a lot of difficulty with that arm of the junction.

1:00:18

That's correct. Yes.

1:00:22

Okay, did the applicant wish to respond on that? And also, wherever we're not there's going to be is there going to be any additional modelling undertaken at this location?

1:00:34

snotlout. The applicants are asked Mr. Ghosh to cover that bearing in mind, we're still at the stage as you've identified in your question as to the nature of the information that's available to assess performance, not the actual conclusion about the performance of that junction. Perhaps I can ask Mr. Ghosh to explain why the the console's assertion about base flows doesn't necessarily need to lead to a need to provide separate base models for that junction please.

1:01:12

Hi, this is Samir Akash on behalf of national highways, I think there are two things two parts to the question. One was about the TCC assets that are 2515 base flows are lower than 2016 columns of data and models do not represent the current levels of giving. And also it had raised a query which included mentioned right now, but that whether we have returned the geometry of this junction in the model property, which we have visited and I wanted to inform that we could find nothing wrong in the way we have coded the junction. So, it all sort of the right geometry. Now, on the flows, it is evident from the strategic model outputs and from the arkadi model results tabulated in RTA table 3.45 and two 3.48 that the scheme results in a substantial decrease in traffic flows along the existing a four to eight to this junction. And this results in a substantial improvement of the capacity of the junction overall, this improvement will take place which was set of base flows are used because there is so much traffic taken away from the junction. We have technology that with this modelling undertaken by 2014 this junction will have reached its design capacity once again. So which is reflected in its RFC 2.85 in our modelling and the high level of base flows would probably result in the capacity threshold being exceeded. Still, we need to remember the impact of the scheme will continue to be better in comparison to the without skin scenario. This is quite important to establish. Now why do we acknowledge that the modelling shows an increase in closer and the Great North Road which is not that approach, which CCC has mentioned in the local impact report para 7.2 point six. But the CCC also acknowledges that this is an effect of traffic rerouting within certain yards to access the wider road network via the why Boston junction and is linked with the predicted significant reduction in traffic using the B one foot to a town bridge and other roads in the town centre, which are bringing in significant benefits to that local town in the LIRR the council's of act in fact welcomed this reduction. We also need to remember the scheme will bring an increased route choice for local drivers who will inevitably find their optimal route through the local area once the scheme opens in response to conditions on the local network once a four to eight to traffic has been removed. Now this could result in more result in more or in less traffic using Great North Road north than what is currently predicted in the strategy model. So we think it would not be appropriate for national highways to carry out further more detailed modelling to assess a specific deterioration in traffic conditions on one on off of junction when the overall impact is beneficial. And when the specific deterioration concern is acknowledged by the local council itself to be an effect of refinement of traffic,

1:04:41

and then to come in. So if I'm sorry, if I'm stuck in a queue on a in a long queue, does that not affect me on that on that particular junction on I'm worried about the other junction I worried about the other rounds at that junction as as a member of the travelling public. I would I do want to get through that queue as quickly as quick as I And then the concerns I'm hearing are from Cambridge county council

saying that they've got concerned about the potential for queue lengths on this particular arm to worsen. And they're looking for increased confidence in in that it won't. And you're saying you won't do any additional modelling because the wider junction is working better.

1:05:28

We did say that we are not planning to do any additional modelling because the overall junction performance is better due to the scheme. But I also take your point, for one, if you are a passenger, and sitting in that queue, you would, of course be worried about your own queue, and you wouldn't be bothered about what other benefits other programmes have got. But at the same time, you might be one of those passengers who was stuck in another part of the local network before for much longer time. And you are reassigned on to this approach toward that's one thing. And and the other point is that any scheme of this nature, when it brings in substantial benefit to the local network, local villages and towns, it cannot bring in benefit on every approach arm of every junction of every local junction, there will be certain approach arms on certain junctions due to the recent reassignment would face a bit of longer queue. And that that is a kind of established facts from any scheme that has been implemented in the past. So

1:06:35

what we're not clear on at this point in time is the confidence around just how bad suppose that key might realistically be. And that's what Cambridge county council are looking for.

1:06:49

Okay. Yeah,

1:06:51

I think that point, but I want to still re emphasise that because of all the route rerouting and other things that will happen. One implementation of the scheme will depend elsewhere. Yeah, no, no, I'm saying the rerouting of the scheme directing you to the scheme would result in that the traffic which is coming on to that particular approach, and we have more confidence on that from the strategic model. That's what our strength is, thank you. On Can Can I go to the second part of the question where it was asked that, that whether the further junctions into the local network needs to be also looked into not just this junction, I think there was a there was a difference like that. So, that So, my point is that while we acknowledge that the predicted increase in flows on Great North Road will happen, but it is not National Highway standard practice to go in and and in want of better words chase out impacts of traffic flow increases on every little every local road network away from the scheme not to provide junction capacity models or bring forward any mitigation measures for individual junctions within an urban area. So, when the overall impact of the scheme is beneficial, and it reduces traffic within sent nodes as a whole, we know that and that has been accepted. The local junctions along the Great North Road road are well away from the scheme. the limitations of the strategic models are such that some of the minor roads within the urban area are not explicitly represented. So, the scheme will bring an increased load choice for local drivers who will inevitably find their optimal route through the local area once a scheme opens and it is not part of the remit of the scheme to provide mitigation at specific locations from the scheme itself. While localised traffic flow increases are predicted.

1:08:53

Now there is a desert duty to ensure that the the traffic flows on have a look at the highway authorities networks functions expeditiously. Isn't that

1:09:06

Yeah, yeah, that's true. Okay,

1:09:09

so I would propose when I'm just looking at time, and we've had promise breaks, so I just like to briefly discuss cotton. So that's B to

1:09:22

now, yep, yep. Sure.

1:09:25

I will go to Cambridgeshire County Council, first of all, so how is how is England divided? The technical notes? Rep. One dash 2028. Around routine impacts that coding, and that's revision one. This deal with your concerns? If not, why not?

1:09:47

Yes, sir. Lou Mason Walsh for Cambria county council. The note says that the model is wrong.

1:09:53

That was my take on on the note. Which is

1:09:57

is that's the conclusion we'd come to So, yes, we agree on that point that the strategic model is incorrect. And as such, the predicted changes in flows around that area are not necessarily as shown.

1:10:17

Okay, thank you. So that kind of opens up a wider question to me, and if they forget the applicants up as well, if the model sort of updates, Mr. Lyons, if if the model is wrong there, how can we have confidence that the model is right elsewhere?

1:10:37

So last Mr. Goes to date with that, as I understand that the the issue that's been identified in relation to coding is more likely to be a model coding rather than a real world issue for the reasons that allows me to go to explain.

1:10:59

Hi, yeah, so, there there has been we have been made aware of this fact and we have acknowledged it that there has been some some model coding issues in that particular part of the network. And as if I may, just emphasise that strategic model is quite a big model covering a large area and, and uncertain parts of the network. If there's a coding error, that doesn't necessarily mean that it would be like

erroneous in other parts of the network as well, because the model validates and well, within following the webtech criteria across screen lines and columns and other parts of the network. So, yes, but for this particular part, there is a coding issue. Now, our point is this that this section, which is a 1303 is quite a volatile part of the data and just m 11 Junction 13. And we as as national highways have already been looking into it that there is a lack of traffic capacity of irrelevant junction 13 and along this a 1303 further into Cambridge. So, National Highways is already looking at the potential to bring forward and roads investment strategy scheme to resolve this issue through the pipeline of potential skills being considered for mystery. And the question of drivers that running through the coating to avoid implement junction 13 will be considered as part of development of that scheme. So, while the model shows the strategic model, that a large amount of traffic goes through cotton to avoid going to MLM and junction 13 As of now, which is partly due to the coding error, and partly potentially due to the congestion upstream at the mill and junction 13 is not likely to materialise in real life, because risk three is already looking into it. And there'll be improvement done in that area, which would facilitate better traffic movement on May 13.

1:13:13

Okay, so. So I'm just, I'm just thinking about that response. Okay, so, I propose we move on to talk about the Caxton tibbett modelling that has been undertaken.

1:13:38

And again, to Cambridge accounts Council is this. What is this similar to the the western roundabout where you're looking for confidence? Or have you got fundamental, more fundamental concerns in terms of what the cues scenarios might look like?

1:13:56

is Lou Mason Walford, CCC? Yes, sir. We're looking for confidence because we've done a comparison of the turning proportions at the junctions within the model compared to the count data, and whilst the proportion of traffic on each arm is correct, or within reasonable parameters, where that traffic goes, is not correct. So it's the turning proportions that are vital for the operational junction models that are not necessarily accurately reflected within the strategic model. And so I wouldn't expect a strategic model of the size of this one to accurately reflect individual turning movements because it would just not be possible to validate the model to that to that level of detail. So that's why we've requested the best practice methodology of modifying string tgw model flows based on a validated base model to give us the confidence we require to understand whether the the elements of these junctions that CCC as the local Highway Authority are being asked to adopt are too big, the right size, just so we can have confidence.

1:15:24

There are other interested parties who have raised comments with regard Caxton Juba round about and and acts and the access to services that will be a separate matter later on. And but did any of those interested parties wish to raise any concerns about the modelling? And specifically, if you do if you put your hand up? If not, then I will move on to the applicant. Okay, so with the applicant wish to respond on the katzenjammer issues? It seems like we're dealing with a recurring theme here around confidence, isn't that and so it's the opposite side? Is the applicant set that there will be no additional

monitoring, side modelling underneath undertaken in these locations? Or is that something you want to go away and think about?

1:16:19

Sorry, Scott liners for the applicant? We're happy to take that away to think about it, possibly not so much in terms of actually setting up new business models. But one thing perhaps think about is how we might progress the degree of sensitivity testing. And we're prepared to consider that. Take that away. Without Prejudice, our main position that this isn't necessarily the reasons that we've heard. I can ask Mr. Gove to pick up that particular issue with Caxton gibbet to explain more of the general theme. We understand that the concern expressed by the county councillors at the model assigns new traffic to particular right turn between the a 1198 north in the A for two yet a Coxon. Give it guys, Mr. Goes to deal with that. But to cover the broader point we can we can take this away and reflect on whether there's anything more that we can do to provide more confidence on this.

1:17:21

Okay, thank you. I say so anything, just go back to Cambridge in particular on this one? Is there anything? Is there anything in particular that you would reasonably expect? That hasn't been? You haven't put down in your evidence already?

1:17:38

Sir Francis, from convincing Mason's on behalf of Campbell County Council. One thing I just mentioned terms what Mr. Lyons was just saying, I'm not sure. Sensitivity testing based on the Saturn model will necessarily deal with the issues because I think you're you're still descending down from that high level strategic model and attempting to second guess, some things by running a sensitivity model, you will not highlight the concerns that we've raised in parallel illustration on particular junctions, which come from the observations against the existing baseline data. So I think it's that there may be a slight flaw in that as a concept in terms of it doesn't deliver what the county Council's after, but also what is necessary to fully understand the impact on the junctions. Because, as I understand it, any sensitivity testing will be from flowing from the Saturn model in the first place.

1:18:30

Okay, Mr. Lyons, did you want to respond on that?

1:18:34

I think we just need to take that away, because a lot will depend on Hi, Annie sensitivity testing is actually set up as Mr. Golf to to deal with artists to what work could be could be contemplated?

1:18:48

Well. Yeah. Sorry, is this something that you did, the two of you could could deal with in terms of an agreed methodology as a starting point. and go from there,

1:19:03

Scotland's for the applicant, I'm sure it's something we can reflect on outside the examination hearing today, and see if we can progress with the kinds of appreciate the point has been made by the county

council, but where we don't think it's going to be necessary to prepare an entirely new business models on the grounds that the county council is advanced. We're looking to explore if there's any other way of getting through this issue. And we can see if there's a an acceptable way forward for an agreed procedure.

1:19:35

Several, I think, mostly from the gas Council's point of view, we'll consider that and I'll take instructions, I think, obviously, just attitude and obviously, where we have had the technical note produced looking in particular at this particular aspect of a bottle, we found that there is error. So I think we shouldn't in the application be complacent, particularly on some of its overall approach that because the benefits in a general sense on junctions will be good or strong. We don't need to worry about this modelling point or this baseline point. So I think, and we also heard, I think from Mr. Ghosh that it just isn't generally policy or if I was England to do what we're requesting, I think in order to make progress, we'll have to see an attitude or change on that basis as well. Well,

1:20:15

Scotland's, for the applicant, I can assure the kind of kinds of there was not a complacency on the part of the applicant. Just to put down a market, we do say it's relevant to look at the overall operation of the wider network. We do say that it's relevant to take into account wider benefits over the network. There may be, as Mr. Ghosh has indicated, issues with particular arms and any on any junction, but that's not the appropriate metric for the judgement, as far as this case is concerned. Right.

1:20:50

So just if I may, just one point in that way, Fox journal off the applicant. I mean, I agree with what Mr. Lyons has says but obviously it's a balancing exercises and it's taking the benefit on the one hand compared to the impact on the other and the problem is we do not know what the impact is. Okay.

1:21:06

And then that kind of the leads I think quite nicely into the final question on this one, which is see particularly around the network management duty. And I appreciate this has been very Cambridgeshire County Council centric, but I will be inviting comments from the other highway authorities present. And that's to do with the the the network management duty. So notes in the comments made and those received and written submissions connects to the local highway, authorities confirmed on the basis of the traffic modelling information before them, whether the proposed development would affect their ability to fulfil their network management duty as defined in the Traffic Management Act 2004. And for the benefit of people who maybe not might not be so aware of that. And that is to as far as as reasonably practicable ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on the authorities road network, and facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic on road networks for which another authority is the traffic authority. So if I go to Cambridge county council first, please. Is it my question is is this so bad that it's going to affect your ability to discharge your statutory duties?

1:22:16

Yeah. And to echo previous comments, we we don't know because we haven't validated that the models and flows being pumped in? Correct.

1:22:26

Okay.

1:22:27

I think Francis remember off napkin, the position remains, I think I missed out it will agree as set out in 10.03 of the local impact report, which is that we don't pending the modelling and can't really respond properly on that question.

1:22:41

Okay. So, folks tend to Bedford Sheriff County, Bedfordshire council

1:22:50

under approval, so, we do not we do not consider that sorry, we consider that we can the current arrangement will enable us to carry on we don't consider it to be an impact on our network over

1:23:06

thank you to set for bed for cheer Next please.

1:23:13

Thanks, sir Jethro punter from Central Bedfordshire Council. I think position is similar to although perhaps to a lesser extent than that expressed by Cambridgeshire and as much as we have some remaining modelling queries, particularly with the operation of the local road approaches to junctions on the one which we are currently and going further discussions. And I think so your age.

1:23:38

So you're having further discussions with the applicant on outside of this. We,

1:23:44

we've we've been provided with further information by the applicant, which we are currently reviewing and awaiting further information. But until those discussions are concluded, I think that we couldn't comment upon defecting might have upon our ability to discharge our duties. Thanks.

1:24:03

Okay. Thank you. And so if I can invite the applicant back here, I think

1:24:11

Scott last the applicant, sir, as I wonder, sir, as you recognise his relationship, obviously between this question and the previous questions have been put in the in the agenda. We don't accept the position that any of the authorities should be concluding at this stage that they're unable to discharge their duty must bear in mind that the network mileage and duty is in relation to the road network of the authority as a whole. And our position is that one looks at the overall impact of the scheme taking into account benefits which are acknowledged by the authorities across the across the network. any impact on particular arm shouldn't be Traders putting the authorities into situation where the counters north or JD,

the important point is to look at the network as a whole. And we say there is signed evidence to indicate that there's going to be a new conflict with the exercise of that duty. That said, as we've indicated under previous agenda items, we will take the issue of sensitivity testing away and hopefully we can provide more confidence to the local highway authorities in that respect.

1:25:28

Okay, thank you. I think there is an action here, I think so there's obviously there's the sensitivity testing you've referred to, is there scope for the jointly agreed position statements on this from each of the local highway authorities? I'm mindful that we've got. We've had central Bedfordshire saying there's I think additional material being passed to them outside of the examination, chemistry county council are clear in their position in terms of lacking confidence in things at the moment. And we've got Bedfordshire Council, who are our sound sound content with the modelling that has been undertaken. Is that something that the various local highway authorities and the applicant would wish to provide?

1:26:21

Scott liners for the applicant, sir, we'd be content to initiate that process and deal with by way of position statements and obviously that can feed into wider statements of common ground. Yeah. As well, sir.

1:26:33

Okay, thank you. And so can you county council? Is that something you would agree to?

1:26:41

Sir Francis, on behalf of council? Yes, obviously, I think position stems can be useful. I think part of the concern might be the position seems to be, as we've heard today, at the moment, perhaps once we've heard more from the applicant about what they suggest and what the sensitivity tests might entail, and how they'd be derived and we can express a position in relation to that.

1:27:02

Okay, thank you. Central Bedford. Cheers. Does that work for you?

1:27:10

Yes, yes. I just happen to have a central Bedfordshire Council, classic opposition.

1:27:18

But for cheer Council, presumably a simple one for you.

1:27:25

Yes, under approval from Council. Yes. That's that. We can go with that way forward.

1:27:31

Thank you very much. fully appreciate this. This item has has gone on somewhat. I propose now that we take a 15 minute break and we can so it's 1130 now and we can reconvene at 1145 Okay, thank you.

1:27:48
Thanks.