

TRANSCRIPT_BLACKCAT_ISH2_SESSION2 _23092021

00:05

So the time is now 1145, and I'm resuming session two of the of this issue specific hearing. Can the case team please confirm everyone who wishes to be here is joined back. Mr. Governor, I can confirm that everyone that's meant to be has popped back into the lobby or backing. Okay, so moving on to item on item five now. So this is highway layouts and structures. This this session site. The second session focuses on the approach of the applicants proposed departures from design standards, particularly locations on or close to elements of the proposed development, intended to form part of the local highway network in future. And so I think it would be helpful to discuss a and b at the same time. There are Are there any key points on at this point, I will invite the Cambridgeshire local Highway Authority to turn the camera on. And also the applicant?

01:13

Some time, okay.

01:16

So it'd be helpful to discuss items A and B together. I'm presuming that's okay with review. Are there any key points of the submission? rep one dash 048. Section four that Cambridge that the Cambridge authorities and particularly the local Highway Authority, wishes to amplify and bearing in mind just bearing in mind that we have read in full your submission previously.

01:46

Sir Francis Terrell, on behalf of Cambridge House Counsel. efficiency, I don't think so it's all set out in Section four of the written representation, particularly 4.6 and 4.7. And in particular relation to the various functions which would come on to later four point 11 and four point 12 as well set out the the main concerns about side standards in those junctions.

02:10

Okay, thank you. And it's just this kind of at the high level, the applicant has opportunity to respond obviously at deadline three on this, on what has been presented in written submissions so far. But it would be beneficial for us to understand your current position and wherever any changes are proposed to your approach to departures for standards. Across the schemes, I suppose as a whole before we move on to specifics.

02:39

I consider Scotland if the applicant allows Mr. Doherty to give the high level response please.

02:45

When Mr. Scriven Ted Daugherty for representing the applicant, I think the key issue that I'm aware of is in terms of departures and standard that we're proposing is in connection with the cross section width of side roads, in particular, local side roads. Our view of current position and editor it is unchanged is that we've developed the design in accordance with tender in accordance with the requirements of the design manual for voted bridges. And that include for local votes and that's because there is no specific standard for local web design. However, we are proposing that departures from standard are sought in respect of the carriageway cross section the pave width. We basically based on the advice and recommendation from our safety audit team, we are proposing to maintain the existing cross section with local side roads or a minimum width of six metres where the existing carriageway width is below that. And the primary purpose for doing that is that, in our view, localise maintaining or providing a dmrh compliance 7.3 metre wide carriageway over the length of the proposed side road diversions and I'd like to just clarify here with respect to Cambridge account Council. The key roads that I've issue are the btn 46 and the Patan mode, side roads and the total and mode side road diversions. We we fundamentally have issue with increasing the cross section width to dmrh standard principally on the grounds of introducing unnecessary safety risks and in particular increased speeds on on those sections of road and also The temptation for drivers to overtake on those improved sections of road which can lead to problems when you transition back to the the existing side roads. In terms of the second point that you make about transitions, principally the our proposals, we are not looking for departures from standard in respect of the transition back to the existing carriageway, because we would adopt the requirements of dmrh. In terms of those those transitions and the rate at which and how they transition back into it. The the principal issue that we have is over the proposed cost section with and the safety issues that would arise. I just like to add this approach that we're proposing is not untypical, the numerous examples and impact the existing a four to one to the west of backup that the adapt principle has been adopted for the local side roads. And I do think this is relevant as well, Cambridge County Council have indicated that as they are adopting authority, they are insistent that their requirement stands. But this This approach has been dictated in principle by the other local authorities affected by the by the scheme, namely central Bedfordshire Council and bethabara. Council, in that we maintain the existing cross section width to be to, to mitigate the the specific issues of that I've mentioned.

06:53

Thank you. So, I'm going to ask Cambridgeshire County Council to respond just to respond on that.

07:04

So thank you. Can I ask David Mitchell to give preliminary views on those points?

07:10

Thank you very much, David Mitchell county county council. And I think the first issue is the standards that are accepted in other local Highway Authority areas, it's very much for those and for them to decide that we are looking at what we're recovering from cabarrus County Council's viewpoint, clearly as Highway Authority for local roads, in terms of the issue that's been played out in terms of road safety. We believe that, in effect, the the issue actually I think in more detail is that there'll be sort of considerable changes in terms of the width of the highway, and that could cause issues. And and our and our view is, well, if we have a 7.3 metre wide compliant dmrh design, that then we use the normal

tapers within dmr. That takes it down to our existing highway widths. The key issue here is that we're creating a new a four to eight your courage by and of course, with dmr, the linkages from that highway to the local highway network, we believe should be compliant to dmr. Without any without any part departures from standard. Why? Because there are no real reasons why they can't be built like that. And then there are a number of issues in terms of operational safety and maintenance, that not designing them to the dmr will create for Cambria county council. And if I may, sir, I'd like to just illustrate a couple of those points. So on a six metre wide carriageway that's being proposed by the applicants team, where we have two hgvs passing each other, they're actually pretty close together in that situation. Furthermore, the wheel tracks are going to be running very close to the edge of the carriageway. In some cases, the edge of the carriageway won't have any hard strip or as proposed at the moment by the applicant. And therefore we're having loading right at the edge where we don't have any hardening, no curb restraint. Secondly, our drainage assets that are going to be at the edge, whether is a curb, for example, it's going to take extra loading more than they should be taking and more than they were designed to take, I would get the design right for the road. So it's the operational safety reasons. And the other issue is, this is an improvement scheme. And we appreciate that we aren't we're not looking for betterment along the length of our network. But what we are looking at is that the new roads that have been constructed are designed to the correct standard and we believe that is dmr. For the for those reasons. So the the safety issues that have been highlighted in terms of well, we don't I mean, I think it actually says in the design guidance, so it design design standards drafted by the applicants team. We don't want drivers to feel safe. Well that that seems a bit strange. We would prefer drivers to transition from or to the new a four to eight your carriageway in a sensible fashion. Most drivers know when they come up for new road, they expect that the standards will will start changing at some point, but they expect them to be managed through the dmr process, which is what, which is what does normally happen. And as a final point, if you flick it on its head and say well, so so what we're really saying here is you should be having a six metre wide carriageway and not a compliant carriageway in the sense of dmr. And that means the dmr is unsafe. Well, that doesn't seem to be particularly correct, does it?

10:34

Okay, I'm gonna just ask before I go to the applicant, given what's been said, Can I just get confirmation from Central Bedford shear and Bedford Borough Council that they are content with what has been proposed? I know that it's so far there appears to be silence on it, but are you content with what has been proposed? central Bedfordshire first.

11:00

Thanks so Jethro puncher from Central Bedfordshire Council. I by my understanding is that we are content with what's being proposed other than the specific wares on either we're going to come on to with regard to non traditional non motorised provision.

11:18

Thank you, and counsel,

11:21

Andrew brigman Bedford Borough Council, yes, we are continuing with the current arrangement.

11:27

Thank you. So, would you like to respond to the points raised by Cambridgeshire County Council,

11:36

Scotland, and just last Mr. Doherty to respond please.

11:41

Mr. Scriven, Ted Daugherty representing the applicant, I just wanted to clarify and reinforce his point that the the the roads that this is affecting is tozan mode and the B 1046. Road Patan road. These roads are very much war roads, they are war in character, their current design, the bears no resemblance to dmr standards. I just want to then add as well that dmr is a design standard for principally for high speed principal roads, and that could carry significant volumes of traffic. Again, these warble roads are of a different nature, different character. With regard to the point that Mr. Mitchell made over the issue with the proposed proposed 7.3 metre carriageway, it is actually the wider width is the issue. And that improved carriageway design leads hazard and has been proven, and there is evidence to show that where this is being adopted on rural roads, it results in increased speed of vehicles along those roads. And in enticement to overtake, I just was also I'm gonna raise a 14 here that there are at least two examples that I'm aware of where the state of the road safety audit identified issues which are very similar to the ones that we are trying to mitigate in respect of overtaking and the speed at which vehicles approach the transition back to the original cross section. I think you know, that that identified the need for retrospective action, as a consequence of the the proposed carriageway width that was constructed. Now, I'm not saying that dmr is is unsafe, it's just that it's you need to use appropriate standards, but the type of road and managing speeds on local roads is really quite important and is a fundamental factor of maintaining safety. I think just on the final point, I just like to raise in terms of maintenance and the maintenance of the road. The proposal that we're putting forward, we do not see that it would fundamentally change or impact on the maintenance regime that the the the local authority operate at the moment in terms of CDM. You know, CDM would dictate how you maintain that road. And I think we had a good example on the asi that you know, if and when maintenance is is undertaken, but the road mod probably more than likely be closed and the diversion implemented to ensure the safety of the workers. During those those those operations, similarly, I think there may be some operations that are able to be undertaken. But again, by adopting this similar character of road to that they've been know those, the management, the speed that that would achieve would be have a positive impact. I just also want to clarify that in respect of dmr, the designs for the side road diversions that we are proposing they comply with both horizontal, vertical and visibility requirements dictated by dmr, which in our view, are fundamental requirements for achieving and maintaining a safe design.

15:53

Okay, thank you. So I'm interested in particularly in Cambridge Chevron's in terms of the the point of root continuity in road safety and to have a route that is changing in width. And for no apparent reason is that not at the start not creating a safety issue for for the travelling public. Moving to spaces to the to existing, existing horizontal and the width, changing it suddenly to something much, much bigger. And given it a kind of a different a different look and feel, I suppose in terms of the road safety element to it,

and then returning to what was the what was what, what else is elsewhere on the on the highway network is, is this reasonable to expect this kind of treatment in these kind of locations that we're talking about?

16:53

are responsible for chemistry, categorise the type of material? I think I think the the fundamental issue is that the existing network is taking hgvs. They're travelling at 60 miles an hour. And I think what we're saying yes, yes, we understand this is a new linkage that you are constructing here. So it should be designed to the correct standard and the correct standard er view, it's the dmr, I appreciate that the width of carriageway is going to be slightly wider in the new length, I understand that. But the taper requirements within the dmr will bring it back smoothly to the to the size of the network that exists, where it connects. I think the issue here is around correct provision. And in terms of India, in the future, if we have to upgrade other parts of the accounting network, we have got graded, we're not looking at that at this moment. This is about just safe and sensible decision making in terms of connecting what is going to be a new dual carriageway to our network in the safest way possible. And I hear the points that are being made. But I think the the the response in in in regards to an example would be things like the loading of the wheel tracking right at the edge of a tight carriageway with actually V's causes significant damage that can cause pooling of of groundwater, which can freeze which then leads to other accidents. So I think in a sense, the extra width is saving us from some accidents that perhaps and it's a case of what which type of accident you want to achieve it. We don't really want any obviously wants try and minimise those, but I think it's a trade off.

18:24

Okay, I think it would be helpful if we talk through a couple of the examples. And we'll go from there that suits all so if we can move to item C so of this of this part. So that's looking at the bottom roadway alignment first. We've seen the concerns raised by Cambridge is joining joining in the joint representation in Section 4.1 1.1. And that's a wrap one dash 04. Right. Was there anything that you wanted to amplify on that? That hasn't been raised already effectively?

19:06

David Mitchell cabarrus County Council I believe we've set out opposition sir already.

19:10

Okay. And anything from the applicant in terms of response that hasn't been raised already?

19:17

I'll check with Scotland for the outcome will check with Mr. Door. Do you think the main points have been mentioned already but I'll just check the zoning board out.

19:25

Ted Daugherty of representing the applicant, I don't think there is anything else that I want to add.

19:30

Okay. Now, black cat will be discussed tomorrow. So we're not going to not proposing to go into that here today and chosen a road. And so to Cambridgeshire County Council, your concerns referred to in Section 4.12 of Rep. 1048. Did you wish to amplify this matter any further?

19:53

David Mitchell Campbell County Council I believe we've set it out already. So thank you. Okay.

19:58

I did the applicant wish to respond,

20:01

Scotland, the applicant? I'm assuming that we have already given our response on this matter unless Mr. Doherty says otherwise.

20:10

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant? No, I don't have anything else to add.

20:14

Okay, thank you. I'd like to move to the cat's intubate services access arrangements. I'd like to I think if we could hear first from let's go to if we could go to Abby developments First of all, please. Yes. With regard to the the designs that are probably the arrangements that I'll be for us at this point in time is in whether or not there's anything you wish to add to your written submission?

20:49

Yes, thank you Sandy brand from Abby developments Cambridgeshire limited. So we obviously operate off sorry, own The, the McDonald's, Costa Coffee and subway site, etc. I think our representations are sell clearly and there is also representations from ADL on behalf of McDonald's who provide further information in that regard. So I think I can leave it there for now but be interested in further the response really. Okay.

21:17

And was there anything? Thank you? Was there anything that came to your county councillors Highway Authority wanted to raise on this particular matter at this point in time?

21:28

David Mitchell, character county council, I'm not aware of anything that we wanted to raise on this particular point. So thank you.

21:34

So can I ask the applicant to respond particularly to the points that have been raised by Abby developments, please?

21:43

Scott line after the applicant last Mr. Doherty, again to respond, please.

21:49

It's Ted Daugherty representing the applicant. In respect to the concerns that were raised, it primarily was around the by turn goes down on my turn into the services, I can confirm that that facility will be maintained effectively, as it currently is, that doesn't have any impact on the on the carriageway construction design. It will just be just purely a road marking exercise, it will be maintained, as is the other point about the island. Within the ghost Island, I think I'm going to defer that to detailed design. I don't see it as a fundamental concern. I think the the arrangement of the crossings there, I know that Cambridge Cannes Council have made a comment about the cycle weigh in along that section and whether we should stay on the side? I don't again, I don't envisage and see any fundamental concerns or issues, I think that can be an appropriate arrangement can be maintained there. As if we need a more formal response. I'll take that outside of this, this hearing.

23:05

Okay. And so there was this there was I think there was signing was included in the response as well, it's generally that's for detailed design as what autofire we've been told signage is largely a detailed design item rather than something that will be coming before us.

23:23

If I can come back on that Kate Daugherty representing the applicant. In our engagement with Abby holdings, we have confirmed that signing to the services will be provided on the new road and new route, it will be in accordance with trunk road standards. It doesn't it would not be sort of a motorway designs handled with banner sec signs, it would be trunk road siding, and there would be services directing to the services. But the actual specific detail will be covered at detailed design.

23:59

Okay, thank you for that. Mr. brand. Did that cover the points that you've raised? Yes, thank you, sir.

24:06

It did. I'd be grateful to see the plan for the right turn facility, do point in time locking, perhaps take that offline. And just to confirm as well that we have Smith, indicative signage detailing and awaiting response from a camera. Thanks, but we're happy with the position on that. So appreciate the response. Thank you.

24:27

Thank you. So without wishing to open a can of worms on modelling, has that right turn movement into into the services would that have been accounted for in the modelling that's been undertaken of Caxton chyba? Does it affect anything? I suppose it was always your intention to maintain that right. Right turn.

24:50

Come up and Miss Scott. Ted Daugherty representing the applicant. Yes, it was always our intention that by term facility would be maintained.

24:59

Right. Okay, thank you. Okay, so I would propose now we'll move on to item six, which is the effects on non motorised users. I am mindful of time, when it might mean that we take a later lunch. But I intend to keep that the the duration of lunch as as we've, as we've already proposed. Okay. So numerous submissions have been received regarding the effect of the proposal on non motorised users, including walkers, cyclists and horse riders. I refer to this grouping as nm use, I think, in this item. And it's also I think, important to to reflect on one of the objectives of the scheme being to make makes reference to improving routes and connections for cyclists, walkers and horse riders. So can I ask, I'm going to go to each of the local authorities, local highway authorities in turn, if any of the local planning of a local planning authorities wish to raise anything that I'll invite that via the hand raised function, but looking at question six a and it's the approach adopted by the applicant regarding the provision for nm use in relation to accordance with the proposed development accordance with the npps, paragraphs 5.2 5.215 and 5.216. If I invite I'll go from go from the west first. So if I could like Bedford Borough Council, first of all, are there any specific concerns with regard the high level approach adopted by the applicant regarding the provision for nm use?

26:57

We have no concerns.

27:00

Central Bedfordshire council

27:05

just for content from Central Bedfordshire Council, we've raised note specific kinds with a high level of their specific concerns.

27:15

And Cambridge county council.

27:20

So fans turn on behalf of the counsellors. I think in terms of high level I can probably speak but Camilla wrote is also here speak on behalf of the council's I confess, I think we are once again playing bad cop on this issue to the position of councils, there's insufficient support for an amuse them currently. And that the composition does not build upon a lot of opportunities that it could do to deliver a legacy which I think is also an objective of the scheme. So that's the overview. I can invite candidates to address issues. She's on mute.

28:07

Okay, I think I think someone might have put you on mute. That's unfortunate, since let's try and get you back. In the case to

28:14

perhaps Miss Rhodes microphone back on.

28:22

myspace does have a lot to say about this issue. The sponsor

28:30

should be working now with roads, you should just be able to turn your microphone on.

28:36

Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Francis. Yes. And you're right. Um, Cambridgeshire has a lot of concern around the fact that there has not been sufficient attention given to addressing all the enemy opportunities that they are, we've been very consistent in providing detailed recommendations, what we feel they should be and the policy framework around that which goes right from DFT and npps. level down to our reichswehr Improvement Plan, which of course, is a statutory document, which makes specific reference to the a 40 rate itself being over time back in 2006. It was already envisaged that at some point it would be upgraded. And there'd be an opportunity to redress box of the issues around severance and connectivity issues. And one of the points particularly within the rector improvement plan is a recognition that the bribery network is fragmented, and that the questions are very vulnerable users on the road and so although we do welcome obviously the improvements that have been put forward, they it appears to us that the national highways are only really doing the basic amount that is required of them on the previous scheme itself where the new road intersects with existing rights of way. And there's very little additional improvement benefit from the scheme to the to the immediately impacted network has been, for example, upgrades from footpaths, bridleways, but also in additional connections that could be made, and between breaks away, but also on road at junctions, where it'd be very easy to make footways all inclusive and amuse, for example. And we've learned an awful lot from the a 14 scheme, which, of course, is still being delivered, but is a much larger scheme. And we've had very constructive approach with national highways on that. And that approach was taken there. So we were really struggling to understand why the approach isn't being taken same approach isn't being taken on the the the scheme, the a four to eight scheme.

31:11

I suppose. There's a question there for me, particularly around the question provision. With regard is there is there an evidence need for for that improvement? And I understand it, there's those matters that are raised in the rights of way plans, is there evidence behind it to to support the need for for those improvements?

31:33

So I think this is your question, to have the suppressed effects of suppressed demand, is it or

31:39

it could be yes. I mean, you know, if Is this the case? Is there evidence of it? Or is it effectively, you know, suppress them suppress demand? And how someone can take that into account? And we can hear from the applicant on that later?

31:53

Okay, yeah. So from the cast counsellors point of view, we haven't gone around looking for evidence from counting up numbers of stable years and things like that, but we are we work closely with the local

user groups, British or society, regional representative, and they're very, very active. And whilst we don't know, specific issues ourselves in this area, we know from working for around Cambridge, you know, 14, that that is, it's more of a case of providing, you don't know, because there's so many severance issues around here, you don't know what people would use if they could. And, therefore, it's one a matter of providing for that latent demand in generality and to doing what we should be doing to provide an encourage physical, mental well being providing for that activity, active travel routes going forward. So sorry, that's a fairly general answer to your question. But yeah, we don't have specific evidence ourselves. I think the some of the user groups probably put evidence in themselves, that we didn't know if they'd be attending this hearing to get that specific evidence.

33:12

From a franchisor on behalf of council. The local impact report also identifies section 6.6 the particular circumstances for non motorised uses presently. And later on, I see we set out in that document, that's rep 148. The missed opportunities if you'd like which obviously also identifies that I think it's true to say that we haven't disaggregated equestrian from other non motorised users and as they've been treated collectively, because I think that the as the local impact report describes the existing concerns and the lack of opportunity applies to all non motorised uses, not just specifically to any particular class. So I think in relation to that, we haven't said disaggregated, for our question uses.

34:04

The applicant wish to respond on this before we move on to some specifics.

34:09

Scott learners for the applicant, sir Thank you, Mr. Doherty to add any more detailed what I'm about to summarise as far as high level positions concerned, sir, we note the question mentions paragraph 5.20 of the nppf. we've assumed that was 5.205. which refers to using reasonable endeavours to address and existing severance issues that act as a barrier. And when one reads five to one, five and five to one, six, they refer to mitigation measures being proportionate, unreasonable, and where development would worsen accessibility. Such impacts are mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We recognise that there's an expectation that impacts on accessibility for nmu should be mitigated. So in that context, one notes that The policy references to reasonable endeavours proportionate and reasonable so and must strike a balance here. This isn't about identifying every single possible missed opportunity providing for its there has to be a degree of proportionality to this. Now, as far as the approach has been taken by the applicant is concerned, you'll have seen in part two of the transport assessment, document reference up to four to the process has been followed, involved the WC eh, our process and assessment report, subject of consultation, followed by another report in 2020, July 2020, that identified opportunities for new and improved facilities within the scheme and that was fed through into the proposals. And ultimately, the approach has been first of all to address several issues directly caused by the construction of the new dual carriageway onto provide safe nmu routes through major junctions on road realignments, particularly where there's an existing nmu provision. So where a footpath or bridle were separate and a suitable link via an underpass or bridge is provided. under law location, the provision made by the scheme we say ensures the impacts created by the scheme are fully mitigated. But beyond that, secondly, we also provide opportunities to access wider networks. For example, rights away to be created along the eastern side of the yield kill carriageway near winteringham. Well I

Walker's to connect with wider footpaths. And thirdly, we've also sought to address pre existing severance issues where it would be proportionate and appropriate to do so. And without going through those sarode directly to the answer to written question, one point 11 point 6.1, which appears in rap one dash zero to two, where we set out where we sought to take appropriate opportunities to address pre existing issues. So we say overall, that the provision made by the scheme improves on the current provision and the errors we've identified and it goes beyond the minimum that would be required to simply mitigate. For instance, the provision of wider roads to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists and the overall net gain and public rights of way provision will be just a touch over four kilometres of the overall gain and nmu provision adjacent to new or realigned roads will be 2.33 kilometres overall, there is a benefit. We note from the county council Stephens today, I think they accept that there would be some benefit the areas that are in dispute as they think we should be doing more. But as we've said, given the way the policy is drafted, we think we have been proportionate and reasonable in the approach we've taken. That's a high level approach. Certainly if Mr. dority has anything to add to that

38:05

TED talk at representing the applicant, I think at this stage, that's I don't have anything to add. If we go into any specifics of the provision, then I'll maybe contribute then.

38:20

So just if I may just want to turn on behalf of the Council. I think it's also probably useful to note in terms of what the county Council's thinking on this issue, there's sort of three classes of things. One is the missed opportunity on a more generalised basis. And I accept what Mr. Dinah says there about the obligations in the national networks MPs. I think there's a question of who has to discharge the burden of proof as to whether or not reasonable measures have been taken in accordance with that. But just to assure the examining authority, the county isn't asking for, it's not a shopping list of flights of fancy what is asked for some things it's asked for actually, very much within the realms of what's currently being constructed, but things are not ever sufficient with or where footways are proposed. Actually, they shouldn't much better be for a wider class of nmu. So in terms of reasonableness, I think the county would suggest that what is asking are reasonable measures to improve Israelites in line with paragraph 205 of the national networks MPs

39:30

so the we've we've heard about the increased the increased length in public rights away and other sort of race is is four four kilometres and 2.33 kilometres, I suppose reasonably proportionate in your view

39:53

Francisco The problem is First here is that starting from a very low baseline. And this whole corridor from Sydney, it's to Caxton and Camborne, and onwards to Cambridge is a very, very well well known well documented area of need to improve transport corridor. And not only for obviously, vehicles, but for for sustainable travel routes as well. So we talked about cycling as well as questions and and pedestrians, of course. So there's a there's a lot in our representations about that. I know. So it's over well, to say yes, there's Balkan almost is more. But overall, when you talk when you're starting with very low base level, a lot of the roots go across the the corridor, the new corridor being created. And that what we what we need is more going east west in that corridor, which is the dominant line that of for

commuters and and that's such like, but we do also need those links to be made with into the wider network so that people can use them not only for commuting, but for leisure leisure purposes and health and well being which we know is so important and was well evidenced how that's working for around a 14 hour of work that's been done. They're heavily used already before they even property opened.

41:36

Okay. Just to address your point in relation to proportionality, obviously, proportionality is it's a relative test, isn't it? In terms of the scale of the works, the main works being proposed is it proportionate to that. So obviously, if it was a very small scheme we had in mind, four kilometres of footpath provision may not be proportionate. But this is a significant scheme. And it isn't the four kilometres, the other sort of extensions of the footpath and the upgrades to the footpath and other rights of way, are long the line of Route predominantly for this scheme. So we're not talking about something that's going off into the countryside, and while a distance away, so those aspects are all relevant to this test of proportionality.

42:20

Thank you. Did they actually wish to expand on any of that? Or should we move on to specific locations?

42:29

Scotland has for the applicant knows we're quite happy to leave it. There you have the figure out you have the figures in front of you we say that applying the policy tests, we are making improvement which are proportionate, we don't understand the county council to be disputing the fact that we are providing overall benefits here, and that's a good starting point for the judgement we say. Thank you.

42:53

Thank you. So turning to the six B. So this is to look at some of the specific locations within the proposed development. And if you could start with the LTS Li Caxton gibbet junction link First of all, can I just before we go to the county council, I just checked with the applicant wherever you are proposing to make any or hadn't have already made potentially any changes to the designs that we have seen as part of the submission for submissions to date.

43:34

Scotland if the applicant can ask Mr. Doherty to confirm the position please.

43:39

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant, I can confirm at the moment we have not proposed any changes to the no new provision through this section. However, I will just take a step back on that there was a comment made regarding an additional provision link of a cycleway link on the northern roundabout at the Altis, Lee junction. And that is something that we will be providing a response to deadline three in the positive

44:16

in the positive, right, right. Right. Okay, so can I just I just like to hear a little bit more from him. I'm just I'm sorry. Mr. Mr. Doherty. Is there is there a change coming? And does this relate to signal any signalised crossing provision?

44:35

Though it's Ted Daugherty representing the applicant. No, it does not relate to signalised crossings.

44:42

But we can expect to change.

44:44

I think it's a if I can clarify our position on that that's more related to cacs and GB junction. We have already provided responses to this sub for the consultation and also In response to the deadline one, the intention is that control crossings will be provided at Caxton gap junction on the slip road crossings. That will be the east. eastbound on slip okex and jjobit and the eastbound the westbound off slipper case in Juba. And also there'll be a proposal that they're proposing that a signalised crossing would also be provided on the northern arm of the 1198. Just also confirmed that with regard to the Cambridge road junction, similar approach that detailed design signalised crossings would be incorporated into the design of the similarly the eastbound on slip and the westbound offset. I just want to clarify that we don't see that as a matter that would impact on the application at this stage. It's just the clarification and it will be dealt with a detailed design. Okay,

46:05

I think we need to digest that as someone in authority as well. Um, if we've got any queries on that, we'll come back I think. Okay, so if we can talk. Thank you. If we could talk about the, obviously this link between autism link and catch udgivet. I think it's missing link of 600 metres or thereabouts. Why is this so critical to the local Highway Authority?

46:32

Ask Miss Rose to deal with that question.

46:35

Well, the issue is that it just sort of stops. And we there's no reason why we can see that it shouldn't be continued to be provided to provide that safe offered access for an amuse. We've seen something about the applicants not wanting to make improvements to the old a 48, speedy trumped because they see it as being outside of the scope of the scheme. But from our point of view, anything that's within the red line boundary ought to be viewed as being within scope, and clearly related to relevant policies that require improvements for an amuse. And it's just illogical, really, that the gap is there.

47:23

Does does the proposals preclude you as a high welfare at doing that at some point in future?

47:31

And? Well, it's all subject to funding. And our concern is that this is something that should be done as part of the legacy for the scheme. And the burden shouldn't be put on the local authority to do it, where there's an existing scheme that can deliver it. It's much harder for us to do it after the event as a new piece of work, we've got to find the funding for it. And it doesn't make sense, particularly where there's a route bill being provided half the way along the route, and then just stops. And it's a very important corridor that this there's a lot of latent psycho demand. There's a lot going on with development around Camborne and onwards to Cambridge, and it's vitally needed. Okay.

48:22

Sorry, sorry, if I may just just add fancy chair on behalf of the council's as is also set out in 6.57 of the written representations, which is at 148. The there's potentially also a question of safety about the current situation in terms of you have new revenue link being provided as part of this scheme, which suddenly stops and then requires the users to cross the realigned all day. 48 was no specific version for them. And so part of what we would say is that you're what's been designed is these an unsatisfactory, potentially unsafe position. So it should be completed to prevent that circumstance arising. Obviously, this is not a situation that currently exists, because what's been extended isn't there at the moment, and you just have a gap, which is a creation of a new problem as part of the scheme. So I think that's also relevant to the why it should be done now as opposed to reliance upon the county council to sort it out later.

49:26

In this race,

49:28

we have experienced with a four to eight where a similar kind of works weren't done. And then remedial works essentially sorry, their 14 scheme, remedial works ended up having to be done which was much more costly to do in the scheme, so hasn't been delivered there. Sorry, finished but him. It wasn't additional work that then had to be factored in. It was very complicated and additional, more costly and that needed to have been. That was Histon road junction

49:59

in Cambridge, Thank you. So with the applicant like to respond on on those comments,

50:06

Scotland for the applicant to ask Mr. Doherty to add what I'm about to say if necessary, but as we understand, I will say there aren't any existing nmu facilities. So in providing a new shared on segregated footwear on cycle wares included within the scheme, which we say doors provide a safe route around the new round of bikes and over and over the bridge. Obviously, if if the console were, as you indicated, sir proposing to look at this themselves is something we'd be prepared to work with them on, but it's not something we need to provide for the purposes of this scheme. Underwood, suppositories, he has only gotten up please

50:47

talk to him representing the applicant. Now I don't have anything else to add.

50:56

Turning to footpath 117 and that's a bit silly. And what can you just I see that there's a there's a desire to upgrade that to full bridleway status. And can you just explain the rationale behind that if there's any evidence behind? That's why it's necessary as the local Highway Authority.

51:23

Yes, so so this is she takes I think, isn't it of the Whitestone access plan? So just get up for myself? Yes, so this, this is a footpath diversion as you as you say, but um, what we are trying to plan. We don't have evidence now of demand. But what we're trying to plan for is for future immediate and future demand. Because we have the opportunity now to put the infrastructure in place. And, for example, further down LTS Lee, that is a Broadway and the Broadway underpass has been put in. It's it's much more cost effective to put the infrastructure in that the it's I think, actually, the underpass is wide enough already that there's been proposed to put it in. So it's just a matter of changing the status. And if we did that, then that would create the opportunity for circular routes for people coming out from subnets and back in. And we know from all the research we did for the rights for improvement plan that that is what people want. They want circular routes, there's massive development going on, on the east side of subnets. And so we need to look and provide for that where we can and this is a excellent opportunity to do that at very minimal additional cost.

52:43

To the applicant on that, please ask Mr. Doherty to take us one place

52:48

that Daugherty representing the applicant. I think our position there is that we are not preclude in the future provision of vital weight and in respect to the footbridge crossing on 117 I accept that that would not be possible to upgrade to a bridleway as opposed come and design. The one of the main concerns we have is this this wider area, there are no bridle ways in the area through this section for to connect on to him. You know, there, it's I don't say it's the schemes. It's not possible for the scheme to deliver those, though. Any enhancement, by the ways I'm not aware of of any strategy and respective vital ways in that in that area. There's obviously issues associated with imposing vital ways on third party land. It's just I think, there's so much uncertainty as to what can can be delivered delivered in respective equestrian provision in the wider area that it's not possible for us to make provision as part of our scheme. However, as I said, at Handbook, as you pointed out, I think that's what you were referring to miss Rhodes, that Handbook, you know, we are not precluding that being upgraded or designated as a vital way through then that sometime in the future. I think in terms I just want to clarify into in terms of the the public right away provision that we're making into this section and the circular routes. So I just wanted to make it clear that our strategy in that area has been to rationalise the existing public mine network, public right way network in the area being cognizant of the the proposals that have been implemented as part of the winteringham development. We are also as part of our proposals linking up on the southern side, South East and side of the of our proposed road. All of the public rights of way that run to this area. So pins v there is this. This this kilovolt will be delivered certainly for pedestrians or, you know, footpath users. And I think that that will deliver significant benefit to the area.

55:11

So I think I've just so have I heard then that the the only the only effective change that's required to achieve this for footpath 117 is effectively a status change or is there infrastructure change that's needed as well to deliver this?

55:30

Can I Ted Daugherty representing the applicant? If I can clarify that point? footpath 117. It crosses the footbridge over the main line. That is, the proposed current proposal is that that is a footbridge. It would not be the proposal could not be upgraded to a vital way. What why I'm saying is that hymnbook, which is further to the south, and is the the the underbridge, which includes provides for handbook through through the, under the main scheme plus the public right of way, there would be opportunity, we wouldn't be including that being designated as a Bible.

56:16

Okay. Miss Rhodes on that, please.

56:20

And put Yes, apologies if I caused confusion on that agree with Dr. said about that path, one nine at hen Brook. And so yes, the infrastructure would need to be changed at 117 to three involving for example, parapets, and possibly with that would be a detailed design matter, I imagine. But, yes, so, in terms of providing this interconnectivity is not just a question to talk about it is cyclist as well, and providing for those opportunities for cyclists and the variety for them next to a very large growing urban area. So with regard to upgrade outside of the redline boundary, the ongoing routes that can can be done, that would probably have to be done by the local Highway Authority, but it can be done by creation order. And in fact, we are having to look at that uncouple of the improvements on the a 14 scheme. But it's it's looking ahead to making sure that we're putting that infrastructure provision in place at the time when it's possible, because after the event, it's not impossible to go back and close the road to put in place improved infrastructure. It's very, very difficult.

57:48

Thank you. Anything further from the applicant on on this particular

57:53

location? Scott lyase, for the applicant? No, sir, apart from to say that as far as the question usage is concerned, it's important to kind of accept that there isn't actually any evidence of current demand, which we say, is important. More generally, when it comes to this issue of extra nmu provision, insofar as reference was made to making provision for the future in areas where you have urban areas that are growing. Obviously, when you develop and comes forward, there'll be opportunity to consider with any individual development through one of six obligations, the need to improve existing facilities. And that's another route through which the county council or any local planning authority can supplement provision in the normal way.

58:49

Once the wintering and park developer strategy already includes new breakaways and cycle tracks, which and this will be a key direct linkage to it. So that's why I say we there's there is evidence kind of from a strategic point point of view, why it's going to be needed if we don't deal with infrastructure now for the this bit of the path to put infrastructure in place, then we missed that opportunity because it really hard to come back to do

59:20

Mr to hold your hands up because as well

59:25

so thank you. I just wanted to make the observation really. So I want to turn them off the counsellors automated observation, we've heard a lot think from Sam Daugherty about various things not being precluded. Now, obviously, much of this is the three aspects isn't there? One is the official designation at the outset of these these various rights of way. Secondly, is the way they are constructed outset and that is the design the detailed design. I mean, would it be we haven't heard anything Yes. And perhaps it might be of comfort to the counsellors to hear something from the applicant as to how the detailed design of these will be progressed to make Sure that subsequent use or upgrades to bridleway is not precluded, and the furthermore that those upgrades can be done in the most sort of efficient and simplest way possible because as Miss Rose has already mentioned, particularly relation to the bridge coming back and doing it later is much more expensive, much more complicated than doing it at the outset. So, I think maybe if the applicant could consider those issues and see what can be done in relation to these particular aspects, haven't seen this footpath in terms of design commitment about making it easily upgradable

1:00:37

I think that's something we can I'd like to go through each of these individually. First of all, we have got the we got the design item later on on the agenda as well. So there's opportunity to talk about what in general terms about the detailed design the level of it at this point in time and what we will get COVID going forward and when I think we can cover some of this then because there'll be recurring issue I think through these and I just like to think we've cut we've kind of mentioned the existing a four to eight and provision a long it and the desire from Cambridgeshire County Council for for that to be increased provision along the existing four to eight. Was there anything to set out from that, Cambridgeshire on what you already provided?

1:01:32

And just to highlight the ltn 120 is very relevant to that strategic desire. And also, I'd like to just point out that that corridor is not very far at all from the a 14 corridor and all the improvements that have been done. There's now a new actually right away, all inclusive nmu running from Cambridge along local access road, and then also coming down Main Street to Wall Street, Caxton gibbet, and there are a good bright there's a good brighter and byway network that goes from just north of Camborne nap well, through up to the same, though co access Robert very bright away. So in terms of, for example, cyclists wanting to go from sunny x or Camborne into Cambridge there, that the provision going north from capstan Juba is already there, pretty much. So, this is the next link. And so, and we do know that people will cycle all the way from Huntington to Cambridge, for example on the guided busway are now

going along this new local access road and a new route they in this area people will cycle along a long way in particular as a matter of for commuting purposes. So, yeah, just wider context

1:03:01

as the applicant intending on any any changes to what has been proposed at this point in time just in this location along the a four to eight that we should be aware of.

1:03:14

Scotland itself can ask Mr. Doherty to cover that again, please.

1:03:17

That Daugherty representing the applicant in respect to the existing APR 208 between St. neots and elders Lee, no, I can confirm we are not proposing any changes. I just wanted to clarify, though, in respect of the our approach with 13 elders leave in Kingston and Camborne that, you know, we being what we are proposing is cognizant of those those opportunities. We tied in with the proposed cycleway provision that is to be provided by Cambridge county council between Papworth and Campbell and down the ministry. I'm not sure on the current status of that. I don't know whether Cambridge you're able to advise on there. But we've been we what our proposals have been developed cognizant of that, and then the continuation into Camborne by Berkeley road. I think the point I would like to make it's this proportionate and reasonable provision that I know a request has been made by Cambridge county council that the cycle will be extended along the old a four to eight and bulky bow to to Camborne. That's basically in our view outside the scope of asking, and it would be for the local authority to deliver such a provision.

1:04:43

Okay, material.

1:04:46

So I think he wants to turn on part of the county council. Just also just wanted to in terms of summary, in relation to this particular point. Explain that thing. There's different footpaths, we've looked at all the different property rights away we've looked at so far. have slightly different characters and classifications and sense of how they're analysed after the first one enters the the county's point would be that the proposition being proposed by the applicant is at least slightly unsafe position. We've talked about avid steam, which is a different position again, along the a 48, there's obviously a road that has to be de trunked, and to be passed into the ownership of Cambridge county council. So again, slightly different situation. And so in this case, in addition to the the policy requirements about making provision for public rights of way users, there's also something to be worn in mind, which is the burden that will be placed upon the county council at once the road is given to it because wanted is in once it is in their hands, obviously, they have particular policies and standards that apply to them, in particular ltn, one slash 20, which relates to prison for cyclists. So if this road is handed to them with an unsatisfactory cycle provision, then there's almost an immediate obligation on the county council effectively to put measures into place to deal with that. So the this has a sort of a burden requirement on it as well as the other parts we've looked at perhaps don't.

1:06:07

So with the applicant might respond on whether there's a need there that's been evidenced tonnes of the a four to eight for this, this, this cycleway provision, particularly

1:06:20

Scott largest applicant to see Mr. Doherty's primed to answer

1:06:26

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant. I think that's quite that there's quite a key point but we have not seen and as part of our assessment, which is the which are that Mr. Line is referred to, you know, did consider this, and that is reported within the which our position on that, but there is not the evidence for justifying the provision, it would be a significant additional piece of infrastructure, it would require, I would suggest that it would require additional land take I would question whether the appropriate in terms of it the level of usage and sort of maintenance liability associated with it. I just feel it's it's it's an I would also add in respect of LTM 120, we have differing views on the applicability of LTM 122 to the scheme. But as it stands, we we don't see the need for providing that such provision. And it's definitely outside in our view outside the scope of our scheme.

1:07:41

I propose we now move to look to item three, I think there's going to be there'll be some further written questions or so likely to come in association with particularly with this one. But we've we can move on to item three, what I'd like to do is go through the various bridges that are intended, and I think we do that from the west move from the west. So the comments have been raised. So if I could ask Bedford Borough Council to join us for comments regarding the Roxon road bridge.

1:08:27

Andrew creekmore bethabara Council. We don't really have any comments, but we are aware that the British Royal Society have raised concerns about the the parapets, the height of the parapets going over this bridge. So we were although we haven't made our own objections on that, or that we would be grateful if the if you can Catholic can consider the views of the British Royal Society in this respect.

1:08:56

Do you share those concerns of the British or society?

1:09:01

When we've looked at it's about the suppressed demand again, and we there aren't that many by the way is north of the iPhoto a. But in our discussions with the British society, they are saying that there is a suppressed demand and horse riders would like to use the road network if not the Broadway network, north of the a 41 going towards by Boston etc. So on that basis, yes, we would support their view that this needs to be looked

1:09:39

at the response on on that.

1:09:44

That's what's regarded to cover that please.

1:09:46

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant. Just to clarify, I think this is a similar situation to the previous discussion on by the way, provision. One, seven In that there are no currently no vital ways in the immediate proximity or approaching the roxton road bridge. Our assessment today has not identified any significant use by horses. I, you know, we obviously we are aware of this point that suppressed demand, but at the moment, we just there is not the justification. I think our position is currently that, again, we would not be precluded in the provision of a vital way at some time in the future. The key area of concern that has been raised is the height of the power pits over the Boston road bridge. I would say our common position there is that again, you know, we are not preclude in the upgrade of those power pits to, by the way, parapets should wider area measures, should that really become a vital way in the future? I don't see that that it wouldn't. It wouldn't require a fundamental, fundamentally impact on the designer or the construction of the bridge.

1:11:06

It's not a significant change for you, not just on that, I suppose. Similar points again, along some of the other bridges, is that a significant change that we required to make in that design to enable this?

1:11:21

I think I will have to take that introduction from a client. And I was national highways on that matter. I think I think the point I would add though, here is that the proposed wachsmann low bridge is a significant improvement on the existing structure. The existing structure has very narrow verges as we saw when we are on the ASI. As part of our proposals, we are providing wider verges certainly on the western side, and across the bridge we are providing for a Jeju cycleway pathway with separation over the bridge of the actual width of the on the eastern side of the structure will be five metres. So they are you know that the feel of that structure will be quite different from the the existing structure. I do have another. clarify this point. We are not precluding horses or questions from using the vote. Yeah. But I think the position would be it we shouldn't be encouraging them to use the public right of way or the shared you cycleway footway, simply for the fact it's illegal for them to divide on foot weight and potentially by providing the higher parapet you would be encouraging that use. I know that the questioned bodies are saying that there is a concern over the use of the vocs. And by using the carriageway and the impact of the with the additional heavy goods, vehicle traffic that potentially we'll be using that in the future. Again, I think it's you know, it's proportionate. We're not precluding it, it's the provision of the Bible and the future, but it's it's that level of usage and that we just don't have the evidence for to justify

1:13:29

it. I think I'd like to move on to briefly discuss offered road bridge. So can central Bedfordshire council join us for that one.

1:13:44

Just referenda from Central Bedfordshire Council.

1:13:47

Thank you, and is there are there any points in addition to what's been raised previously with regard to Barford road bridge and on the provision?

1:13:58

The majority of our points for raised in Section seven of the written representations also in the answers to question one point 11 point 6.1, which I had right away team made reference to a desire or joining between ourselves and bed for temporary the right away network in area. The concern being that a lack of non motorised provision across the bridge would be a future for severance, which would be much harder to overcome once you're looking at putting that provision, infrastructure, whereas at the moment up putting alongside an upgrade road, search the future complication and severance that a lack of provision at this point in time or lack of allowance provision would result in

1:14:40

turn to the applicant. Would you like to imagine similar arguments, but would you like to respond on that?

1:14:48

Scotland is the applicant? So I think you're right. I suspect the art is similar to what we've heard already, but we just asked Mr. Doherty to confirm

1:14:56

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant and I We'll defer it to our response that we'll be submitting it deadlines v tilde on this point.

1:15:07

Okay. Thank you. So, just was just one additional point. We have also outlined the level of additional bridge deck which would be looking for to see achieve with with the applicant said there were after the details of the request and we put forward to try and enable our connection.

1:15:31

Thank you. Right, we will move to cotton road and Patan road bridge. And if I can invite the highways. Alrighty. Do we have Cambridgeshire with us anymore?

1:15:57

To say Yes, we do. I think

1:15:59

sorry. It's nearly lunchtime. We will. We will we will break shortly. Okay, I would like to just discuss the Patan road bridge and tozan Road arrangements as well. I'm, I'm happy to do deal with with both collectively if it's distant if similar issues at play again.

1:16:18

So, yes, it is I think, I think Miss Rose is primed to speak on this issue.

1:16:25

Thank you. Yes. So, I'm sorry, this is this is the bottom very brief one. So, we are seeking safe nmu provisions within the verges for the realigned Patan road which should be able to then connect to footpath 11 This is the obviously sheet five of the routes when access plans and as well as to the B road and these roads have a 60 mile an hour speed limit and that the new T junction and the bridge will prevent visibility issues so we were looking for the proposed bridge to include safe enter new segregated provision across the new photo of a four to eight and and then future proof of that site for future potential improvements to the enhancements to the cycle network in that area as well as thinking to the wider rights my network and that would make it compliant then with various ro IP statements of action.

1:17:28

Okay, the applicant might

1:17:30

respond. Please ask Scott last applicant. Sir I suspect the answer on Pelton road bridge is the same as it was for Barford road bridge will just ask Mr. Doherty to confirm

1:17:41

Daugherty representing the applicant. Yes, I confirm. That's correct.

1:17:45

So So when you say you can confirm that you're likely to be providing us with something that deadlines right. That's correct. Okay. Thank you, and quick move to Towson road, please as well.

1:18:03

So is that over to me? Yes. Yeah. Okay.

1:18:07

To the Highway Authority or its view,

1:18:11

Camilla roads came to the county council. So yes, this is sheet 11 at the right speed and access plans for me just kept that up for myself.

1:18:26

So here we are we at the moment on the draft plans this way over a total embrace is shown as being only a foot way. Previously the route was shown as a shared use route and early reiterations of design and appears to have been downgraded. This is a great concerning for us and disappointing. It needs to be an nmu route here an all inclusive one there's there's far as we can understand no reason why it couldn't be again future proofing but it will allow cyclists to continue North with a suitable transition from

off to on road if you do that. And then south of the bridge. We are looking for a crossing facility to be provided to enable safe access to the Abbotsford road on the south side of the current a four to eight.

1:19:24

So can you just explain how things might have changed then the applicant please? What's been previously discussed with Cambridgeshire County Council not with not with us,

1:19:38

Scott Lynas for the applicant, Mr. authority to cover that place.

1:19:42

Ted Daugherty representing the applicant, I just want to clarify our position and title and mode. Firstly, within the consultation, all consultations as opposed to statutory consultation and the supplementary consultation. It was always the case that we were posing A footway, I do believe that potentially that the draft version of the rights away and access plans that were issued to kpg came to Council. This was incorrectly defined on those plans. I also wanted to just point out and that has been corrected. And as is as per the version that is included within the application is the correct version. I just want to clarify also the purpose the primary purpose of this nmu provision, along total and mode. So we are diverting the existing public right away, just bear with me, to these loci located to the east of totalling mode. The demand along that route from our surveys was negligible in terms of usage boasts in this 2016 to 2020 surveys. I believe that Cambridge county council, I'm accepting of the principle of diverting that footway. along to 78, seven, thank you very much. diverting that to you totally mowed over the ocean, no diversion, and then back along, to reconnect on the south side of the new road. But in addition, and as additional mitigation for that diversion. We propose this footway provision along the east side of the tozan vote, running down to the existing a four to eight, tie into the existing footway provision on the existing port food, four to eight. And I think there would be a provision for potentially that would connect into the foot play on abbacy Road. So in that respect, we were never we never proposed into the make it a cycleway foot way or an equestrian route. And I think on that point, again, we would question the demand. To justify that provision. It's where we're not aware of that provision, I would suggest that cyclists would continue to use the carriage route rather than the the nmu route, if it were in similarly the the questions we just don't see the demand for use of that. That route.

1:22:39

Thank you. Is there any comment there? from? From Thank you, county council, we'd like to raise I think Mrs. Mr. High would like to come in and raise the general question as well, shortly. Before we break. Still.

1:22:57

So thank you, Carol, on behalf of the County Council, just again, an observation I think we've heard a lot about existing demand and whether or not we think existing demand justifies provision. I think we in the applicant should be acutely aware that obviously if I think the paragraphs 315 on the national networks national policy statement in relation to the commitments to sustainable transport, and also encouraging modal shift, and I'll set up similarly will align with highways. So national highways own ambitions about becoming net zero over time and putting zero for its road users. And obviously, we

talked about here in some places are footpaths in and around what will remain its network as well as footpaths that will be in and around Cambria county Council's networks, I think it's important not to get too hung up on what the current usage is, if we are to achieve those policy goals of carbon reduction along the road network and modal shift due to that.

1:23:59

Mr. Price, did you have anything further to add?

1:24:03

yet? It's just two points. One, first to point out on the question one, there are so there are two broad ways that you go off north of va 428, just west of here. And if there is a linking all inclusive nmu route long the existing a four to eight to BD Trump, then that creates a circular safe circular provision for them. Whereas currently they come down to four to eight. And although the traffic may be less on the detract road, it will be faster. So that's a worse we're no or no better situation for them. But if there's a safe provision alongside it, then they can get round and create all important circular route and the questions do go 20 miles an hour 10 quite easily. So and then if there is a safe provision, quite frankly, if you're putting in a footway, which is inclusive for cyclists then they question As we know, from what with feedback from cyclists from the questions that we have in British society, they will use that same facility, it doesn't need to be any different for them. So it's just a matter of status change provided that it's, I think, if it's sufficient for cyclists, it's sufficient for questions essentially. And just providing that safe off road route. The officer which wanted to point out and in relation to the footpath diversion, this actually is a is a, an unpleasant diversion, and much longer diversion. for pedestrians. I think we recognise the necessity. But therefore it would be helpful, very helpful to offset that necessity with some benefit for the local users as well as the wider ones. With that, in a new facility, it doesn't seem too much to ask. And further, I would point out in regard to cyclists, that if there is a, an nmu corridor all along the a four to eight, as we said, this, this is a really important travel corridor between subnets and Camborne and onward to Cambridge, then people, it's not only East West, but people want to come down from the villages to link into that corridor. And so we need to think about the connectivity, safe connectivity with the wider communities linking to it.

1:26:30

Thank you, applicant, is there any I suppose there's something there for me in terms of the actual The reason for usage of these of these links? And my understanding would be this was primarily leisure usage in terms of this what you were saying about this? The The, the diversion for this particular is, is that not a leisure usage at the moment?

1:26:50

Probably a third path use would be probably leisure. But you know, it's important because of mental and health and well being at the moment. It's a really unpleasant era, people probably would use it once it's downgrading. But yes, I was thinking about the cyclist is more potentially commuting.

1:27:10

Yes. Okay. Thank you, to the applicant wish to raise any more comments on that.

1:27:17

I'm just got laughed out because last Mr. Darnay respond, but just to deal with the broad point about encouraging modal shift and sustainable transport policy. And obviously, one has to apply that in the widest sense of the scheme overall. And I would refer you back to the comments that were made earlier about the overall nature of the improvements and the benefits that are offered by the scheme. Secondly, when one is looking at more detailed elements of this game, we still say that the album's of only demand is relevant as to whether or not one satisfies the ultimate policy test here, which is whether it's proportionate and reasonable to take any steps within the within the scheme. on circumstances where we don't see much evidence of demand, we says highly, highly relevant. And thirdly, insofar as we're dealing with sustainable transport and modal shift, as Mr. Doherty has said, what's being proposed here needs to be borne it needs to be borne in mind that cyclists may well just use the carriageway in any events. This isn't really a question of Moodle shift, because we're still allowing for cyclic provision to take place. I don't know if Mr. Darley is adding to that.

1:28:28

That doctor representing the applicant, I don't think there's anything else I can add at this stage.

1:28:34

So I was before we, before we close for lunch on when Mr. Hyde wishes to talk as well, on points for this item. I propose we will deal with that. As a written federating question, instead of going through now, Messiah was said, so many wish to raise?

1:28:55

Yeah, just very briefly, I think one of the things, it's been an interesting discussion, and one of the things that I've I've picked up is proportionality, and what's within the scope of this scheme or the proportionality. And I think there's a difference of opinion and what how you assess what is proportionate. And so from, you know, from county Council's point of view, it's roughly to do with the fact that, you know, the baseline at the moment is not necessarily an accurate reflection of what the latent demand is. But equally from the applicant side, it's about defining a scope for, you know, what's considered within the scope of the scheme and what's what's not within the scope of the scheme. But my sense is that there's such fundamental points that that have been raised that and evidence which is relying on the length of increase in terms of public rights of way, is possibly not the most convincing argument at this point. And here, I just want to bring in the PowerPoint there. Two lines that you've just made, which is benefits in public interest, which is something we touched upon yesterday, the compulsory acquisition hearing. And as that is one of, you know, one of the benefits that you've demonstrated for the argument that this scheme has delivered public interest, I think it just makes this point a bit more crucial. So I don't think that there's a hearing action here. But I do think that in the statement of Common Ground expected a deadline for it would be helpful for the examining authority to see where the applicant at and the local authority where there can be a common understanding of how, what is proportionate, and what is within the scope, and what's outside the scope. And indeed, how you measure that proportionality. And just one thing to say is that what, what, what, you know, what one of the terms that was used during this discussion is what's upgradeable? And, indeed, what, potentially, is something that the local authority unit, something it's not, does not preclude preclude the local Highway Authority from doing later on? I think there is merit in that as well. But there's merit in that argument.

But as long as there there's agreement between the local hiring authority and the applicant, on you know, what they consider to be a proportionate improvement, proportionate in terms of the benefit that the scheme delivers. Is that something I can leave for discussion outside the hearing, and for something to be included in the statement of Common Ground

1:31:46

Scotland as for the applicant? Now, of course, if you've requested that, we will consider it. I'm not sure how much progress we'd be able to make in terms of providing a precise definition of what portion ality mean, because obviously, it's a broad judgement that just needs to be reached in the in the broader circumstances of the case. What we could do is on the basis that the County Council have already accepted that there would be an overall sort of benefit and provision as we understand it, we can try and put flesh on those bones to try and set out what the extent the agreed extent of the benefits are. And that can feed into the wider balancing exercise that you've mentioned.

1:32:25

That's fine. I don't think it is a precise agreement. Mr. Lynas, it's more an understanding of where they're where there is agreement on those points. But the other thing also is that the wider the overall benefit, I think has to go should potentially be wider. And I know it is I know it is in the application already. It should be wider than the increase in length, it should cover points that we have talked about, which is such as strategic, you know, where movements were not initially possible previously possible are now possible, you know, where it possibly creates an opportunity for further work to happen from the local Highway Authority, health and well being as Miss Rhodes just recently mentioned. So So I think those overall benefits if you can put flesh on the bones with respect to these wider things, then then I think that will help greatly modal shift, I completely take your point that has to be seen in the widest sense. But I think that this is such a crucial part of the modal shift in the NPS national networks, that I think that that also needs to be included in that argument. While I totally accept that that is a wider scheme wide benefit that has to be taken into account.

1:33:44

Scotland fell because that's understood. What we had done initially and the written questions response was to satellite where we gone beyond pure mitigation from what you're saying. I think we can go back and flesh that out more as part of the wider step into the benefits. I'm sure we can do that. Sorry, mom, you're on mute.

1:34:13

Yes, no, I think that will be helpful. And yes, I think that that's all for me. Mr. Scriven. Mr. Scrubbing your microphones off.

1:34:27

Oh, we're all at it today, aren't we? Right. So I would propose that we break for lunch now. It's 119 and we will return at 2pm. Okay, thank you. I guess