

TEXT_ISH5_Session1_01122021

Wed, 12/1 12:05PM • 1:42:50

00:01

Good morning and welcome everybody. It is now 1001. And I'm open in the fifth issues specific hearing for the application made by national highways for the a four to eight blackcat Captain ship road improvement scheme. We will introduce ourselves fully in just a few minutes. But before we do that, please bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters. Can I just check with a case team that you can hear me okay. Mr Williams?

00:29

Good morning, Matthew. I can confirm that I can hear and see you and the live streams have also started.

00:36

Okay. Thank you. And are there any requests for reasonable adjustments or arrangements to enable participation today for anybody

00:43

and not adjustments? They were just one interested party, King governor that wouldn't be able to join but and Kennedy will be taken over any any matters that they wish to raise. Okay,

00:57

thank you. All right.

01:00

Okay, so on to introductions. My name is Matthew Scriven. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State for the department for levelling up Housing and Communities as a panel net panel member of the examining authority to carry out an examination of the referred to application. Today I'll be leading on much of the agenda. I will now hand over to other members of the external authority to introduce themselves to start with Mr. Hi, please.

01:27

Good morning. My name is Menaka Sahai, and I'm appointed by the Secretary of State as a lead member of this examining authority. I have queries relating to items seven and eight.

01:39

Good morning, I'm Andrew Parkin, also appointed by as a member of this examining authority. Today I'll be recording action points and asking for any record asking any relevant questions in response to points made throughout the hearing. Thank you. And so I think you've already met Mr. Williams, our

case manager and we've also got case officers today covering for you, Mr. Mawdsley and Mr. Saffer. I want to acknowledge and welcome those who are watching on the live stream today. So welcome to you. And finally, welcome to the attendees in the virtual room. Please Would you introduce yourselves when I call your name or the name of your organisation if you could turn your camera and microphone on state your name, your organisation and also your role within the organisation please 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 for parties viewing the recording at a later date. So can I start with introductions please from the applicants team.

02:45

Good morning, sir. My name is Scott Lyness, Queen's counsel instructed by one bond Dickinson for the applicant. As with previous hearings, I'd ask the members of the team who are due to speak today to introduce themselves one by one and I'll go through the list as follows. First, can I ask Andrew Cuthbert to introduce himself please and he will give his position and his area of responsibility.

03:13

Good morning, I'm Andrew Cuthbert. I'm an associate director at AECOM. A comment returned to support national highways and my area of responsibility is local junction capacity modelling.

03:28

Good morning.

03:29

Thank you and Mr. Cuthbert will speak to agenda item three. Next please. Samya Ghosh.

03:38

Hi, good morning, everybody. My name is Samya Ghosh and I am a regional director in a comb and I on behalf of National hybrids, we'll be covering the local network junction modelling and those aspects of the discussions. Two item three again the agenda. Thank you.

04:04

Thank you Next please to Ted Doherty. Good morning,

04:09

Ted Doherty representing the applicant work on behalf of AECOM on covering highways design methods.

04:19

Mr. Doherty will be dealing with agenda items for five minutes today. Next, please Anne-Marie Rogers.

04:28

Good morning. I'm Anne-Marie Rogers, Senior Project Manager for national highways. I'll be speaking on agenda items three, five and six think.

04:39

Yes, thank you. Next please, Julian See.

04:47

Good morning. I'm Julian See. I'm an engineering manager for Skanska, and I'm appearing on behalf of the applicant today.

04:56

Mr. See will be speaking on agenda items six and eight. Next please. Jamie Gleave. Good morning, everybody. I'm Jamie Gleave

05:07

I'm Associate EIA director in a calm representing the applicant. I'll be assisting with any environmental matters relating to Agenda Item eight.

05:19

Thank you. Next please. We're due to have John Rooney. I'm not sure if he's managed to join the call yet, but I don't think he's on the list of participants. But Mr. Reddy will be dealing with Agenda Item seven on design. Next, Next please. Christos Christou

05:38

Hi, good morning yet My name is Christos Christou on the Skanska technical leads and on behalf the applicant and I'll be looking at Agenda Items four and seven.

05:49

Okay, thank you. Next please. Pamela Lowery.

05:54

Good morning. My name is Pamela Lowery. I'm a principal noise consultant with a calm and I will be talking on behalf of the applicant today and items eight and nine and the noise issues covered under notes.

06:10

Thank you very much. Elisha Coutts codes. Finally please.

06:16

Good morning. I'm Elisha Coutts I'm an associate director at AECOM and I'm speaking on matters related to air quality. Thank you very much, sir.

06:26

Thank you. Could I invite representatives from Central Bedfordshire council to introduce themselves if we've got them on the line?

06:38

Good morning, sir. I'm Robert Bruce. I'm a solicitor at Friess and with me is Olga and I'm getting to introduce themselves Jethro Punter and he will mainly be assisting me today.

06:57

Good morning. I'm Jethro Punter from Central Bedfordshire Council, the Highway Development management team leader and we'll be speaking on matters regards to highways and transportation

07:10

and and so we've also got Andrew Cundy you know, he may speak some on occasions but but generally a be myself and Mr. Punter, but I'll let him introduce himself.

07:23

I'm Andy Cundy physical pen offsets introductory Council pretty much.

07:30

Just to say I can still see a few people who asked just if you've done your introductions, you're you're okay to turn your camera off. That's it. And moving on. We have representatives from Cambridgeshire county council, Huntingdon, shear District Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council, I believe.

07:58

So good morning. Thank you. Francis Tyrrell, her partner Pinsent Masons on behalf of the three chemical authorities. With me today, I have allowed them to introduce themselves in order of the agenda, but firstly, as David Allatt will be general lead on matters for the authorities.

08:16

And then David Allatt, assistant director transport strategy and network management, Cambridge county council.

08:21

Good morning.

08:23

Next on Item three, we have Lou Mason-Walsh

08:28

Good morning. I'm Lou Mason-Walsh. I'm the transport modelling manager for Cambria county council.

08:35

On Item four, we have John Border. Good morning. My name is John Border, chartered civil engineering consultant employed by Cambridge county council on highway design matters. Agenda item four. On item five we have Camilla Rhodes.

08:58

Good morning. Yes. I'm Camilla Rhodes, my I'm the asset information manager at Cambridgeshire county council and I'm speaking on matters of your enemies.

09:11

On item six, we have Sonia Hansen. Please We don't have Sony with us at the moment. On item seven, we have Emma Lilley and Bana Elzein. Good morning. I'm Emma Lily. I'm the landscape Officer at huntingdonshire District District Council.

09:38

Hi, good morning. I'm Bana Elzein and I'm a principal landscape officer with South cams. Thank you.

09:45

On Item eight we have Matthew Breeze.

09:49

Good morning Matthew Breeze minerals and lease planner for Cambridgeshire county council.

09:56

On Item nine we have Aaron Morley Every morning from huntingdonshire District Council for mental health dealing with noise. And also, as always, we have the three sort of planning leads from the authorities Gareth Blackett, Chenge Taruvinga and Claire Burton, introduce introduce themselves, although I don't think they'll be speaking today unless you have specific queries that they could deal with. Good morning sir Gareth Blackett. consents team leader Cambridgeshire county council. On

10:31

Good morning Sir Claire Burton, huntingdonshire District Council Project Lead Thank you

10:41

Chenge is with us but okay. Anyway, we, we have a lot as well. So that concludes all the witnesses on behalf of the authorities. Thank you.

10:53

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Tyrrell. And moving on to Bedford Borough Council, please.

11:01

Good morning, sir. One of them's Alister Wren and principal planner at Bedford borough and project lead on this. The team I have with me today and Melanie MacLeod is hopefully they're

11:14

Yes. Good morning, everyone. Melanie MacLeod, transport policy manager Bedford Borough Council. Morning. Andrew Prigmore. Good morning, sir.

11:25

My name's Andrew Prigmore. I'm the manager for traffic operations at Bethabara. Council

11:29

and Bryn Hudson

11:34

Good morning sir. My name is Bryn Hudson and I'm an impromptu health officer of Edinburgh Council, and I'll be responding to any questions regarding noise.

11:41

That's our team. Thank you.

11:43

Excellent. Thank you. Could I invite representatives from the East West rail company to introduce themselves

11:48

please? Good morning, sir. My name is Howard Bassford. I'm a solicitor and partner at the law firm, DLA Piper, UK LLP. And I represent east west Railway Company. I'm supported by my colleague, Mr. Henry Jeffries, and also in attendance is Mr. Robert Milner. Should I need to introduce either of them? I shall do so at the time. Thank you.

12:16

Okay, thank you. Have we got representatives from come cycle? Hello,

12:28

my name is Matthew Danish. I'm a trustee of Camp cycle which is a volunteer led organisation works for more a better and safer cycling for all ages and abilities.

12:40

Thank you. Do we have representation from the National Farmers Union here today?

12:58

Take that as a no at this stage. Okay. And moving on to the British Horse Society. AUDIENCE Yes, I'm Mark Weston director of access of British Horse Society. Also on the core Ann Kennedy and Linda Warth. Right. Okay, thank you. Have we got two representatives? So I'm just checking them. So representatives from the Western and Roxanne bridleways group, have we got representation there as well?

13:32

That was Kim Governor, the lady who, unfortunately, has not been able to join the meeting this morning. She hopes to join but it depends how the timing goes whether she can join in time. If she doesn't, then I will represent her. So I do want to come around.

13:47

Sorry, I gotta get her. Am I talking? I can hear.

13:51

If I put my camera on, can you see me now? Yeah. And Kennedy, I'm, I'm a volunteer with the British Royal Society. Kim Governor was representing the Wroxton and why Boston Brewers Association. But she can't attend to this morning. So I have her notes on what she wanted to say. And if she isn't able to join us, I can speak her words for you.

14:16

That's fine. Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. I am aware we will we may well be joined by Hilton parish council later on today. I don't think they're in the call at this point in time. And so finally, is there anyone else who I have missed? If you could put your hand up? Good.

14:38

Nope. All good. Thank you. So moving on to the procedure for running the virtual issue specific hearing today. I have four points to make here. Firstly, a few words to acknowledge the virtual event that we are we are holding. We the examiner for our CIO and attending this meeting from the planning Inspectorate office. We understand and you might well be attending from your homes, offices and so on. Should there be any technical failures, please try to join back using the same link you've been provided with from our and technology has generally been corrupted so far or better yet, I did lose you for a while yesterday. However, that did at least for a lunch break. In case of a complete technology fail, there is a date reserved for hearings on Tuesday, the seventh of December, in the examination timetable. In all likelihood, things will go smoothly. And we will not use the reserve date and the notification of the cancellation and will be via a banner update on the project webpage on the national infrastructure website. Unlike in a physical event, during today's virtual meeting, you will only be able to see the heads and shoulders of the external authority members. We may also be looking down taking notes or viewing from a separate screen. Typically, to avoid visual and noise distractions. Only the panel member leading on a particular agenda item will turn the camera on. I want to show everyone that you have our full attention at all times. We ask that you please keep your cameras and microphones off until you're invited at specific agenda items. We will also pause at various points and give an opportunity to ask questions or make comments as we are moving through. Please do not use the chat function as no one is going to be monitoring the chat. So virtual events can be tiring and so we will ensure that each session of the meeting is limited to approximately 90 minutes. Noting that you may have been in the arrangements conference for some time already. That means that we will take a 15 minute break at approximately 11am. We will resume again for session two at 1115 and go on until 12:45pm. Approximately session three will commence at 130. Again, there will be a 15 minute break around three o'clock and session for commencing at 315 and go on until required up to a maximum of 415. These times are indicative we may have to take slightly earlier or later breaks depending on progress with the agenda. If you decide to leave the meeting during the breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. If you're watching the live stream, then please refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session. So secondly, on General Data Protection Regulation GDPR and live streaming. I'd like to make you aware this event is being both live streamed and recorded. The digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a public record that contain your personal information to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The planning

Inspectorate practices to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order. Consequently, if you participate in today's as to specific hearing, it's important you understand that you will be recorded and that you are there for consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. It's very unlikely the examiner 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's necessary for you to refer to sensitive person information, we would encourage you to speak to the case team in the first instance, you would then explore a view where the information can be provided in a written format, which might be redacted before being published. Does anyone have any questions on this matter? If you do, could you please use the raised hand function? No, nope. Okay. So the third point is the third point is about the substantive matter of today's issue specific hearing itself, which is highways matters. And agenda for this hearing was published on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure project webpage on Monday the 22nd of November. The main purpose of the issue specific hearing is to clarify and get views on Highway matters relating to Operation traffic effects on the local highway network. Proposed highways layouts and junction arrangements provision for non motorised uses the proposed outline construction traffic management plan, good design, construction methods and effects, air quality and Sandy and noise. To be clear, it was not intended to discuss all matters relating to highways here today, but rather focus on the items in the agenda were considered necessary so matters may be pursued through further rounds of written questions or at future hearings.

19:35

We expect the representations at the hearing to provide further detail or clarification following the submissions received to date. We don't need you to repeat previously submitted material this is particularly pertinent for those items that we have discussed previously. We have read that material and have had and have further specific questions or clarifications today. Please focus on answering the questions being asked if you don't I may ask you to do so. or in to do so, or we will move on is the full an ambitious agenda, Mrs Sahai and I will keep under review our progress and we may request certain aspects be held over and addressed as part of your response to the next round of written questions to be issued on the 22nd of December 4 and final point regarding post here and action notes should they arise during this hearing. The assumption is that post here and actions will be expected at the next deadline in this case deadline six which the 14th of December as detailed in Annex A of the rule eight letter however, acknowledging any resource and constraints at your end and I'm aware we had around 20 actions yesterday. If you feel meeting that deadline will be difficult for you please do raise that at the hearing itself so we can if possible accommodate that and the deadlines set out in the post here and action list. If there are any questions, can you please raise your hand on fat? No. Okay. So let us now turn to Item three, perhaps the applicant and representatives from local highway authorities could join me for the seitan.

21:25

Just apologies for me if anyone's picking up a very strange mosquito like noise there's a noise in the background of the office here. Hopefully it's not interrupting anything. So yep. onto item three further discussion period. Now that's all good. Okay, thank you. Favourites previous discussions, the examining authority welcomes provision of the additional junction model sensitivity testing undertaken by the applicant as submitted deadline five. And it is helpful that this was provided in advance of this

hearing for all to digest. We have a slight rejig if the running order for this item in that the extent of modelling undertaken will now follow findings and I will offer local higher authorities opportunity to raise matters regarding points 123 as we go through each hope that's clear for all so if we can turn to methodology first of all, although appearance broadly follow the option to methodology proposed by Cambridgeshire county council. I believe that was in rep three dash 43 As we have had, as we have not had opportunity to discuss the methodology at a hearing. Notwithstanding I appreciate there is some concern on a number of locations included. I would just like to clarify whether the relevant highway authorities are broadly satisfied with the methodology that has been followed. So if I could go to Bedfordshire or a council first please. So Mrs. MacLeod

22:51

Morning. So Bedford Borough Council didn't actually raise this issue. It was I think it was central and Cambridge. Cambridge accounts council. So I feel that I'm just observing this I have I have read the report, but I'm not. I don't feel that I can comment as we didn't particularly raise it as an issue.

23:14

So that but at this stage has no concern to the methodology that has been followed. No. I will not turn to Cambridgeshire county council, same question.

23:29

So thank you. I'll ask Mr. Allatt, or is Lou Mason-Walsh to explain? I think we're reasonably content with a methodology.

23:39

Look, sorry? Yes. Yes, sir. Lou Mason-Walsh, Cambria county council, we've reviewed the methodology used in calculating the revised flows and we are reasonably content that it provides a basis for forecasting.

23:55

Okay, thank you. Central Bedfordshire council.

24:02

So I think we're generally happy with the the methodology. It's what you do with the outcome of the of the results that we want to discuss. Yeah. Thank you.

24:12

Okay, thank you. So we will go straight to I can't imagine there'd be anything that the applicant would want to raise on that. But is there anything Mr. Lyness

24:24

Scott Lyness for the applicant? No, in the light of those responses or think need to add anything, sir. Thank you.

24:30

Thank you. So if we could just move on to the findings then. So I'm not I wasn't proposing to go into the findings of the date and the detail of every in each location that has been modelled here. However, from the additional sensitivity modelling undertaken, it does appear the picture can change somewhat from the previous from that previously modelled in some cases worsening in terms of either average speeds on a particular link or showing a junction to be overcapacity in future. Is that previously modelled? Is this typical of such an approach? And also why and that's to the applicant first of all.

25:11

Thank you, sir last Mr. Cuthbert to explain the sort of the overall position as far as the results are concerned please.

25:22

Thank you. So, in terms of the overall results, there are two two groups really blackcat Cambridge Road and Caxton gible, which are the principal scheme junctions, and the sensitivity tests there confirms that the new junctions remain within capacity. The there is there are some specific locations where there is slightly more a slightly larger extent to have reduced speed areas on the approaches to those junctions. But we're content and I believe that the local highway authorities who contend that those junctions remain within capacity and this confirms that appropriate level of provision has been made there in respect of the wide Boston Barford road and Biggleswade junctions, the reason for the increased queuing and this is not an increase due to the scheme. But an increase overall, is because we have having gone back to an alternative source of traffic count data based on observations carried out in 2016 2017 and 2019. What we've ended up with is more traffic overall in the model. And that reflects the difference between the strategic model and the local observations. So what's happening here is that there's more there's more traffic, there's more traffic in the in the do minimum, as in without the scheme, and that there's no surprise then that that leads to junctions that are operating closer to their closer to or at capacity and generating longer queues. What I would add is that four with a why Boston and Barford road junctions, the revised assessment confirms that the scheme is beneficial. And there are we do have to acknowledge that there are one or two answers those junctions where there are some slight increases in queue length between the future do minimum and future years scheme. And there is an action that we've taken away from a meeting with the local highway authority that happened a couple of days ago. And Biggleswade in our view, it confirms the fact that the scheme is expected to have a marginal impact on a junction that would by 2040 be already operating at beyond its design capacity. But if you can see impact there, and that's that's our take on what the what the findings are.

28:23

Okay, so just on that any just reminder. I think we've mentioned it before, anything that you're referring to that's outside of the examination isn't before us. So it right if you want that to be considered we'll need that to be submitted.

28:39

Okay, so any further work that we do

28:47

Sorry, Mr. Cuthbert, you're breaking up there so anyone else in the applicant want to

28:53

Scott Lyness for the applicant? Can you hear me clearly? Sir? Yes. Yeah. You know, I'm not sure why the receptions pair of Mr. Cuthbert was he settling two yards away but I understand that he was saying that there are elements of further work being discussed with the dated otherwise

29:21

Okay, now looks like we're losing Mr. Lyness as well. Okay. I've

29:29

some of it by deadlines six and certainly by deadlines seven. If you can hear that. Yeah.

29:35

Yep. Thank you. Okay, so broadly, though, are the, you know, the changing picture is that to be expected of sensitivity modelling such as this that's been undertaken in in any instance. So, yes, yeah.

29:59

Yes, it is. Okay, thank

30:02

you. Just for clarification, does any of the additional modelling work that has been undertaken lead the applicants to consider that any further design revisions necessary at this stage?

30:19

No know that there are no design revisions to the scheme proposed at this current stage and none of the sensitivity test undertaken. Testing undertaken leads the applicant to conclude that design should be introduced you would be required. Okay.

30:42

Okay. Thank you. I'm going to bring in now the local highway authorities. So ask Should we go to Cambridgeshire county council first, please.

30:52

Set of on stone on behalf of the council authorities. I'll ask I'll just pass it directly to Lou Mason-Walsh to deal with these issues. Okay.

31:03

So really, just to invite comments on on what we've heard, as well. So

31:09

we sorry, Lou Mason-Walsh, Cambria County Council. We largely agree with the inputs, as agreed, and we agree that the results now look more reasonable. There are specific junctions where we have issues with the interpretation of those results.

31:31

Okay, do you want to briefly go over that?

31:34

Why Boston junctions the key one, because we're still concerned at the worsening of operation of the Northern arm of Great North Road. And the applicant is still saying that the scheme has a significant impact at this junction. I'd argue that the impact at this junction is minimal. Because whilst the operation of the Great North Road southern arm so the link from the a one on to the a four to eight sees a significant betterment in performance. The other arm three of the other arms remain roughly the same in both terms of RFC Q and delay and great North Road northern arm sees a worsening in queue and delay as a result of the scheme. And therefore, we feel that there is a need to investigate that junction further to see if the reallocation of road space or other such minor changes could make an improvement to the operation of the Great North Road northern arm because it implies the performance of the Great North Road southern arm which sees the largest change would appear to now have significant over provision of

32:50

road space. Okay, that's and we we touched on that previously, didn't we? That the last

32:58

guess it's always it's always been a position that the scheme does not have a significant benefit at this junction because the junction is overcapacity in the 2040 do minimum and remains overcapacity in the 2040 Do something Okay, okay

33:18

so I'm just on this on it and it's this particularly around exit blocking for side roads as well on the on the North Road

33:27

we're not 100% sure why the northern arm is as bad as it is other than it's a very narrow road it was busy in the pre pandemic am and pm peaks and the scheme is not alleviating that problem and more traffic is looking to use that arm to now access the the trunk a four to eight or the a one southbound. Okay.

33:56

applicant could attend to you to respond on is this is this something that two organisations will be going away to have another look at or or what's the what's proposed way forward.

34:09

Scotland for the applicant understand Mr. Ghosh has something to add on this issue asked him to turn his camera on please

34:19

Samya Ghosh from the applicant. Yeah, I just want to break this answer into two parts. The first part is why we are saying that it is actually significant benefit the scheme is bringing on because we have produced the outputs model outputs in our sensitivity test note that on the Great North road south we are reducing in the PMP the RFC from 1.13 2.94 and which would mean the queue on that approach arm would reduce from 73 vehicles to 11 vehicles with is a significant improvement. As far as we think, in the other part about great North Road north, we still consider the impact of a scheme is absolutely marginal. Because here, the RFC of the ejection goes up from point nine, nine to 1.01. In the PMP. And the Q's, they go up from 14 vehicles to 53 vehicles. So ask him is just adding five more vehicles to do that approach. And that being a local network, it is already responsibility of CCC to maintain and manage that. And we don't think by adding five more vehicles to that queue. We own the obligation to do further modelling or thinking about more management of that road. That's our position

35:56

just Scott Lyness the applicant to answer the the panel's question, as far as further discussions with the councillor concerned, because that's something that's going to be taking place. Mr. Ghosh,

36:12

yes, we have had some conversation on this already. And on wiveton There is a specific request from can be shared that if we want to look at the junction, in terms of relocation of the lanes to the different directions of traffic, and that is one thing we have to discuss with our engineering team and go back to national highways to seek their approval, and then come back to CCC which we intend to do before D six and clarify our position. We didn't have time before this hearing to do that.

36:49

That's and that's, that's okay. I understand in terms of the tight timeframes that we've we've been working to Cambridgeshire county councillors that seem a sensible way forward at this stage for you. Yes, sir. Yep. Okay. Thank you. And turning to central Bedfordshire council. So any comments you wanted to raise on the on the particular on the findings? And the comments you've heard today from the applicant?

37:23

Yes, sir. Thanks. I think reference was made to the Biggleswade North junction. As I understand it, that model, the modelling is not the model that's used not been validated. As I think I think it was actually effectively understated that say there was over capacity in 2040, because it actually is way over capacity. I think you're talking about significant problems here, for example, 600 vehicles on a one South approach to the junction in 2014. So we're not talking about small amount. That and the basic position is any worsening, if you have a significant and quite serious impact. Any worsening or the position, justifies mitigation, because they're making the situation worse than what it is for us. I don't think you really get into well, it's a small, it's worse. So that's our basic proposition. On that one.

38:30

There so what's your view in terms of without the scheme? Would that not be a worse situation? In future years as well?

38:41

It would be overcapacity, but they're making the situation worse by producing the scheme. So therefore, that justifies the litigation. If you have a position where there's a small one pact, but you're starting from an acceptable position, what are liberal view if you start off with a very serious impact under the existing or, you know, the no intervention, those scheme world? Then any worsening justifies mitigation. The there are the junctions on the the A one and so on that concern of concern, I won't go through those. That's the principal sort of issue. I think one also must bear in mind that whilst whilst they're saying well, it's only a little bit worse, that that could also be in part due to modelling rerouting traffic away from the junction to do to do to decrease the delay or issues there. So that is spreading problems around in other words, there is there is a further issue which which comes up here which is relevant, and that for example, take the sandy situation. There's a large disparity between the vis vis and Model R outputs in the set of model outputs. So if one was to accept the, the set and model outputs as being more representative of the impact, you're looking at a significant increase in throw in flow through the sandy Township. Now you're aware, of course, that's in the air quality management areas. So you've got air quality problems as well.

40:22

Yeah. We've got that we're covering that later on in the agenda in terms of, but

40:28

on dealing with the traffic aspect, because you're sending significant traffic flows through the town. So it seems that national highways are taking the favourable almost hope for the best view by saying, well, we will rely on the visit model. We don't accept that we say that the appropriate approach in that situation is actually you take the model that showing the worst impact, because Because what you don't want us to assume the best and it turns out the worse that that is relevant to the other issues, because if you've got disparity between the models, then one has to take that into account in looking at what was the impacts more or not. So that that's a further point that we rely on. We'll come on to what you do about that in the monitor and manage part of the session.

41:16

So I see Mr. Tyrrells got his hand up. Is there. Was there a comment to come back on what Mr. Bruce has been referring to Mr. Tyrrell Was it a separate matter?

41:27

Sir, no, sorry. It was just in relation to the other junction that was mentioned. Barford road. I just didn't want that to fall off the agenda item but we can do with that. What's missing? What's the applicants responded to Mr. Bruce

41:37

over to Mr. Lyness

41:40

Scott Lyness for the applicant? Thank you, sir. If we take bagels weird junction first and then Sandy, afterwards, can I ask Mr. Cuthbert to deal with Biggles word first, please.

41:56

Yes, in terms of Biggleswade, one has to acknowledge that when junctions become overcapacity, Arkady, as a modelling methodology does struggle to accurately predict queues and delays. What our results show is that there at Biggleswade that there is a slight worsening, sorry that there is a substantial over capacity by 2040. In any case, that that can't be that can't be argued with that the impact of the scheme is a relatively small worsening on the A one arms of the junction coupled with a relatively small benefit to the side road arms of the junction. And I think this is just a part of the way that Arkady responds to junctions that are over capacity where drivers are. It's very much, it's very much a question of the behaviour of individual drivers, and how they perceive the gaps in the traffic flow on the roundabout that they can emerge into. But the the overall the overall response from the applicants on Biggleswade north is that yes, there's a problem there, this scheme is not making it substantially worse. And therefore, you know, that there, there is a case for monitoring. There may be a case at some point in the future for the applicant to bring forward a study of the a one in central Bedfordshire. But it doesn't that the applicants position is that it doesn't require mitigation as part of this scheme. And I think Mr. Ghosh will talk about Sandy

43:53

Yeah, if I can address that response on the sandy and alternate modelling output. So, first thing is I just want to reassure the panel that it is not that we are trying to portray the best possible picture we are trying to portray the most robust picture of the impact. And as it has been discussed various times during this examination, that using strategic model for junction assessment is not the right approach. Because just strategic model doesn't go into that level of details in terms of forecasting the queues and delays that a junction model would do. And micro simulation models wisdom is the best to do it. It is even more sophisticated than junction models like Arkady Piketty, and we have used with them to model Sandy for that particular reason, because it's quite a sensitive network with already quite high amount of views and delays. So we believe that the output from reason is the right output. And that shows the impact on the local network. You really minimal and marginal. And it is the main SRL, which is getting impacted due to the scheme. But that's not significant impact because it's already already a quite congested junction and what it is doing is marginally and that on the SRM. It is marginally adding the delays. And that would be included under the monitor and manage of our our data, the monitor of managed, managed study, both implementation of the scheme. So that's what I wanted to say.

45:34

Thank you could I see Mr Punter's hand is that.

45:39

Thank you. Thank you, sir. There were two additional comments or want to try to see if I could place with regard to the Masters just discussed. I think one of the things that that comes out from the sensitivity modelling technical note very clearly, is that looking at a different approach to modelling, even a slight one can result in quite different results being demonstrated, for example, the pm do something results for people's like North are quite fundamentally different when looking at the two different modelling approaches, one of which shows considerably more cueing on both day one, and also back through the central Biggleswade itself. For reference, that's figure four on five of the

sensitivity test mode, which which shows quite clearly that level of difference. I think for see from a central Bedfordshire Council perspective, that really highlights the importance. And I appreciate as Matt will discuss further, later in the session in regards to monitor manage, that the importance of the relationship between the road network and adjacent local riding road network is given full consideration. I think the sensitivity testing really demonstrates the relationship between the two very clearly. The other aspects are comments upon us with regard to the increases on the street, the road network in delay, and the marginal decreases on the side roads, as referenced, I believe is in part due to the fact that the flows on the side roads predicted to decrease as well as the level of congestion which may well be due to difficulty accessing the junction, because you have a higher flow on the main road on the Hill, North and South. So it's just those two additional points that I wanted to raise. Thanks.

47:32

Thank you. I will turn back to Mr. Tyrrell now.

47:38

So thank you, Francis Tyrrell behalf came to authorities, I just want to simply flag that in the discussion earlier, we were focusing on why Boston junction and Cambridge, I think the points made apply almost identically to the Barford road situation in terms of there was a difference in interpretation as to the degree of increase in performance. Councils considered them to be minimal. Whereas the thing the applicant would suggest the increase in performance is significant. But again, also, more importantly, the authorities are looking for discussions with the applicant, which I think are going to happen anyway on that junction, as with low Boston, in terms of reallocation of road space, as well as as we discussed previously.

48:23

Okay, Mr. Lyness, you want to respond on that.

48:27

Scott Lyness for applicant allows Mr. Cuthbert to deal with Barford, Ruda for me.

48:33

Yes. The the applicants position is that the results of the sensitivity test confirm that there is a substantial benefits of the buffered road junction as a result of the scheme. And, and yes, I would confirm that. At the meeting held two days ago, it was agreed that we would engage in discussions with the local highway authority about whether there's any potential for the reallocation of road space within the buffered road junction to transfer some of the benefit to the buffered road north on which is the one that isn't benefiting quite as much. So that that's certainly something that we have agreed to look at.

49:22

Okay, thank you. Mrs MacLeod. So you've got your hand up as well.

49:28

Thank you. So yeah, so I just wondered if because Barford road and why Boston junction for partly in Bedford borough if we could, if Bedford borough could be involved in those discussions as well please.

49:45

That would seem logical. Mr. Lyness

49:52

Scott Lyness, for the applicant. There are nods in the room next to me. So in principle, I don't think that's going to be an issue. Sir, thank you, thank you

50:06

okay, so we will move on to onto a bit more, a bit more on the extent of the modelling that's been undertaken. At the end of rep three dash 43. The applicant is of the view that having undertaken the additional modern no firm further modelling is required as provided generally provides similar trends to the original development consent order. And I assume aware there's going to be some further discussions between the applicant and Cambridgeshire county council and also bringing in Bedford Borough Council now on that as well. But a local highway authorities broadly content with that view that we will start with if we could start with Cambridgeshire county council.

50:52

Several district on behalf of the capital authorities, apologists turned directly to Mrs Mason-Walsh to deal with that point.

51:00

Good morning, Lou Mason-Walsh County Council. At the meeting we had on Monday, we laid out the reasons why we felt there were more junctions that needed to be included and highways England sorry national highways the applicant confirmed yesterday that they will be submitting at deadline six additional modelling on modelling the mulch and M 11 Junction 13 And the elders link junction. In addition, they will be looking at the Camborne junction, which is one that they've previously studied, and we've questioned the flows. They've committed to, to submit that by deadlines seven, and they've committed to looking at the flows at Patan road and the a four to eight toseland Road. And I'm not sure they've committed to remodelling those but they've committed to doing a flow check. And again, that's to be submitted by deadline seven according to the information we were supplied. Yesterday evening. Okay,

52:14

thank you that.

52:16

So at the moment, I can't say we're happy but they are the remaining junctions that we have queries on and issues with.

52:28

Okay, thank you. Can I just confirm with the applicant that is that's the intention, particularly in terms of submissions and the extent of that fact work.

52:38

Scott Lyness as for the applicant, I understand that that summary that's been given is accurate. So that work summarised is being undertaken under the timescales that have been mentioned.

52:52

Okay, thank you. That's, that's encouraging. Thank you. So, central Bedfordshire Council, did you wish to raise any comments on this?

53:05

I don't I don't believe so. That Mr. Punter correct me if I'm wrong. Thank you.

53:11

Thank you, sir. Jethro Punter central Bedfordshire Council. The we do have one outstanding query with the applicant, which is with specific regards to the flows input into the Biggleswade North junction, just referring back to my previous comments about a suspicion that there's a reduction in psycho flows. That's been reflected in the modelling we've received so that that's a matter that we have discussed with the applicants and we're awaiting confirmation of those lows.

53:38

Mr. Lyness, you want to respond on that?

53:41

Thank you, sir. Scott liners for the applicant last Mr. Cuthbert to do this please.

53:46

Yes, we have agreed to provide details of the flows at using the sensitivity testing at the biggest way north junction. And I've instructed somebody to produce the spreadsheet that that we use to calculate those flows. And it will tell Mr. Punter Where did we get them from and how did we calculate them?

54:11

Okay, thank you.

54:15

Was there anything from Bedford borough on this?

54:20

Melanie MacLeod Bedford borough? No, thank you. We don't wish to ask her any further detail work.

54:26

Okay. Thank you. So, moving on. Previously came she county council and central Bedfordshire Council believe felt unable to comment as to whether the proposed development would affect their ability to fulfil their network management duty as detailed in the traffic management act 2004. Do you now feel better place to comment on this matter? And that we will go to Cambridgeshire county council first.

54:53

Francis Tyrrell on behalf chemical authorities, I think the position is we wait and see the information that's been promised but I'll ask Australia at home as much as they want to add anything to that.

55:07

No, so that that's the situation we're waiting for the additional information unfortunately, without that, we can't confirm our network management duty.

55:19

Okay, and central Bedfordshire Council.

55:24

Our view is so that it doesn't interfere with the duty it also implicates on national highways duty, because you will notice that duty doesn't just reply to simple Bedfordshire. Yes, so it also is it also says facilitating the expedition expeditions movement of traffic on road networks of other authorities. So it's implicating their duty, we don't think that that can be we want we think there's doubts about finishing

55:56

duty. So I suppose from the examination authorities position, it would be very disappointing if by the end of the examination that any highway authority did not feel able to comment on it slightly ability to deliver against its statutory duty as a result of the proposed development. So at some point in future, we will be looking for definitive views from the on this from from local highway authorities. And I just think there's a there's going to be some there's going to be some some further questions around this in written questions just in terms of interpretations of that duty, and at what level that duty should be interpreted. Whether that's at, say the in the wider highway network, or down to the granular level of individual individual junctions. So I'll just flag that that will be coming in forever written questions. Okay, let's do anything the applicant wants to respond on just briefly on that on that.

56:56

Scott Lyness for the applicant? I don't think so, sir, not at this stage, other than to put the market on that we don't accept that the information is before you indicate that any authority would be in a position where they're unable to fill their network management duty, in anticipation of the written questions, or perhaps not say too much more about how the duty should be interpreted. But the basis that we've been operating on at the moment is that obviously, you need to look at the overall performance of the network and the overall benefits that are offered by the scheme in relation to the network of local highway authorities. And that's going to be an important factor to take into account. Because Mr. Cuthbert, did he has anything more to add at this stage?

57:47

Sorry, I know, I wouldn't wish to add anything to that. I think I think all the concerns that we've heard about today do need to be seen in the context of the significant overall benefit that the scheme brings. And I wouldn't wish to add any more to that.

58:04

So I'm just just be thinking now, written questions comes out just before Christmas responses won't be until middle of January. Can we agree to an action on this here today? In terms of getting to get into the bottom of this this question around around the various local highway authorities interpretation of the network management duty, and also from the position of the applicant on that as well, really, in terms of how that duty should be interpreted at say, the the wider network level and the granular detail of individual junctions and how that should be considered. And also recognising that in that duty there is reference to as far as is reasonably practicable as well.

59:03

Scott Lyness concert, thank you anticipate as a further point that we would address in the written material. But that's a longer statement noted, sir. Thank you.

59:13

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Tyrrell, I see your hands up.

59:18

So just in duration, Francis Tyrrell behalf of the chemical authorities just in relation to timings. I'm conscious, obviously, as we discussed there, and I think the applicant agreed the timetable for delivery of certain information, some of which in terms of modelling was for deadline six. Some of it though, was in terms of looking at Camborne junction and the bottom a four to 8000 Junction was deadline seven. I'm conscious that deadline seven off his 14th of January, so that the federal questions will be published on the 22nd of December and will be responded to Deadline seven. So just in terms of managing expectations, if the local authorities need the information before they can comment on their duty, then obviously they wouldn't be in a position to comment by seven of them. So information I am

59:58

specifically interested in Your various hiring authorities interpretation of the of the duty itself, as opposed to the effect of this proposal on their network. And then so depending on the outcome of what comes back out deadlines, the next deadline, then that could that could lead us down a slightly different route or a response from the applicant in future. Do you understand where I where I'm coming from on this,

1:00:32

Scott Lyness for the applicant, sir, I think we do. But just to reassure the local authorities that insofar as There was reference to information being provided deadlines, seven were anticipated that would go to the examination deadline seven on the normal course of events, that information would hopefully be available to authorities in advance of deadlines seven. So to the extent that the authorities were hoping to take that into account, before giving their views on the interpretation of the duty itself, we would hope that at least some of that information is going to be available before deadline seven in any event.

1:01:11

Thank you. And so I would propose we move on to this the next item, and I am weary of time, but I think let's try and try and deal with this. So we would, we'd like to learn a little bit more detail the term that's been referred to by the applicant, monitor and manage specifically in regards to the operational

effects of the proposed development and what it might look like in reality and how this is secured. If indeed it is. applicant, can you confirm whether any ring fenced effectively pot of money associated with the scheme is to be set aside for the purpose of operational monitoring and managing?

1:01:47

Scott Lyness as per the applicant, Alaska, Anne-Marie Rogers to answer that question she's able to at this stage, sir, thank you.

1:01:59

Good morning. Anne-Marie Rogers on behalf of the applicant note, we don't ring fence that on the scheme itself, monitoring managers taking part of our wider network duty.

1:02:11

Okay, so starting with monitoring the effects of the proposed development, how would this be funded and delivered by the applicant? Or? Or does that require local hiring authorities to do it, we're trying to understand better what is going to happen in reality,

1:02:26

okay, we will monitor the strategic road network. We also monitor key locations for to measure the scheme benefits. But we monitor the whole the whole of the strategic road network and it's continuous, it's not just in relation to the scheme. We understand that by improving the performance of the strategic road network in the area, this will deliver real benefits to local road network. It removes the rat running that takes place company across the local highway to avoid congestion and the local benefits obviously, which results

1:03:01

okay, so in terms of monitoring, is there a standard methodology to be followed for such schemes as this so as to determine success or otherwise?

1:03:10

Yes, we undertake traffic counts, we take observational data from our own officers from schemes and from the local authorities will produce strategies workshops with some local authorities contribute to as to our operational teams.

1:03:26

Okay, so where's this detailed in the application?

1:03:32

believe we have previously commented on it another earlier questions. I couldn't give you the reference off the top of my head, but I would be happy to add that to our in submission.

1:03:40

I'm asking because it seems it seems like quite a high level reference is quite high level referencing to it in the in the application. And I think we could all do with more detail in terms of how we're going to

understand whether if this proposed development happens wherever how it's judged to be a success or not, particularly from the point of view of traffic. So, detail of what sorts of before and after studies would be undertaken, for example,

1:04:08

Scott Lyness for the for the applicant, sir, the transport assessment. Annex is one location where the monitor and manage approaches is summarised. If you're wishing to have more information building upon that is at page 148 and 149, paragraph 3.2 2.5 to seven. If you're wishing to have more explanatory information to build upon that I'm sure that's something that we could provide

1:04:42

for the examining authority that would would certainly be beneficial and also to understand what's what is expected, expected of local highway authorities in this what was their role in this effectively and because they On this day, many instances in the application where there is reference to this scheme, or this particular judge, junction or link will be the subject of monitor and manage. It's how that will then be held that is then secured as well. So if that can be included, that would be helpful. So at this point, can I bring in local highway authorities if they want to raise any questions or comments on this? So if I can start with who start with Bedford Borough Council, please.

1:05:42

Hi, Melanie MacLeod Bedford Borough Council. We were interested in rep 5018. There was in the summary and conclusions, there was a proposal that post opening I can't remember what the next P stands for. But the pope processes it used to be called could be a way of dealing with this. And that local authorities would be involved in the scoping of that of the Pope. So really, how does that fit with the monitoring managing in app? To four three? That would be my question. Thank you.

1:06:35

Okay. Thank you. And I think we'll go we'll go to Cambridge, your council, cabbage county council next before going to the applicant.

1:06:47

Sir Francis Tyrrell on behalf of authorities. Thank you. As you alluded to, I think the authorities are concerned in terms of the detail of what will be monitored and what mitigation would be required, that has not been supplied was the in app 2043. The and the paragraphs to which Mr. Lyness just referred this out certain junctions. And the detail give given is that which was just briefly summarised by Miss Anne-Marie Rogers in terms of what that would comprise. Separately, then we have details or the reference in the junction model sensitivity test results document to the Pope programme, and that would refer to junctions which are TBC, I think. So we would echo the concerns of Miss McLeod in relation to that. I'll ask Mr Allatt add Miss Mason Walsh, they wish to add to anything?

1:07:51

Not for me. Thanks. So for instance, I think I think we share that concern about the monitoring and the associated mechanism to make sure that any identified local issues from the modelling can be put right. I think you've all commented.

1:08:03

Thank you. Mr. Punter. I see your hands up and I was going to turn to us now. Anyway. So yeah, over to you.

1:08:15

Thank you, Jethro Punter from Central Bedfordshire Council. I think from Central beneficiaries perspective, we are particularly keen to see definition around the monitoring manage process house, it is the sole mechanism that is referred to within the transport assessment acts with regard to the junctions within the central Bedfordshire authority area, several of which has been identified through the sensitive testing and previous discussions are very sensitive and overcapacity junctions already. Certainly feel what has come out the sensitivity testing and the previous discussion reference with regard to Sandy is the interrelationship as well between the local road network adjacent to the strategic road network. And the routes directly impacted. And so what we would be very keen to see and would ask to see is that the monitor monitoring process is not restricted purely to the strategic road network, but it takes into account for potential displacement of traffic onto the adjacent local roads. I think the feeling is that if the monitoring process excluded that, then it could well miss a significant implication of additional traffic induced by this game. Thanks.

1:09:27

Thank you. Mr. Bruce. Your hands up.

1:09:31

Yes, thanks. Just put my hand down before I forget. Yeah, I think the the questions you raised with the applicant were were spot on really so that the only reference we're aware of is the one Mr. Lyness gave, which is totally an inadequate reference. Given this as as we understand it, the principal way of mitigating the impacts of the project further, as you have noted that Bad is in the TA for as I'm aware that's not in the shedule to DCO documents, so it's not secured. And as and national highways just explained, it's actually what they do anyway. So it's not a response to the project, I would agree that it's a mitigation that could be taken into account, because they do is, but isn't this response to the project is not a response to the impacts and specific impacts of the project were needed. So we don't accept that as an adequate mitigation. Further, as I've pointed out, it relates to the street strategic road network, whereas concerns also had with the affected local net road network. And that should be included in the monitoring managed process that therefore necessitates involvement, as you've just pointed out, so it's the same analysis of web reach to mme necessitates involvement of the local highway authorities. Further as that the cost of the project is being generated, that has to be paid for and us in ensuring by national highways. So it's it's not a rowboat robust mechanism at present, it doesn't adequately deal with the impact and it is necessary. There is with I won't go through it, I won't repeat it. There. We were set out what we think is required in terms of central Bedfordshire Council in the measures needed so already set that out, we stand by those and think they are still needed. I would highlight that this has been under discussion ad nauseum at length for a long time. I think later meetings, national highways have indicated they're not proposing to offer anything further to central Bedfordshire council. So we are in a position where we're open to further negotiations. That's all fine, but we've been here before with national highways. I don't say necessarily central Bedfordshire, but I certainly have. So I think we're

now at the end game. We're at the end where there's a little further road left for negotiation, as I understand and so we will be asking the Secretary of State and pose as a requirement, the measures that we have been outlining, and that's either through a DCO requirement, or one of the documents in the schedule to or if necessary. It was recently done on I think the south Humber energy centre DCO, a DCO requirement, which effectively requires the applicant to put in play a development consent obligation if that were needed. So there's plenty of mechanisms to do it. We don't need to get into precisely how one does it but there aren't mechanisms to do it. And we say that's required as necessary mitigation in connection with this project. And we do we do sort of conclude on saying this, this is so important to the mitigation of the impacts. We do think this is it's not a credible mitigation package without what we're suggesting as needed and potentially questionable under the EIA regs. Because mitigation that's needed is not being secured. And the end is inadequate.

1:13:09

Okay, thank you. I'm going to turn this obviously, there's a fair bit there to respond to, to the applicant, but I'd be I'd welcome your comments,

1:13:19

Scott Lyness for the applicant, Alaska, Alaska Anne-Marie to pick up the answer to this, please, Anne-Marie Rogers, but just one introductory comment, sir, the reference and the T and the TA annex isn't the only place in the application documentation whether it has mentioned the the junction bottle sensitivity test results, as I think has been alluded to already included in the conclusions, paragraph 6.16, which also summarises what the thinking of the applicant is, as far as monitoring is concerned. There's reference made there, as has been mentioned already to post opening project evaluation programme.

1:14:01

So this is and this is kind of is my point, there's, there's various references to monitoring and manage. And also, as has been pointed out Pope as well. And I'd really like to see all of this brought together in one place so we can better understand understand things and also what you consider to be necessary for the local highway authorities to pick up as part of this process as well.

1:14:27

Scott Lyness That's understood. Sir, we've noted the action point that's been that's been mentioned, but I'll ask Miss Rogers to pick up further detail at one further point. It would raises other stage obviously, as Miss Rogers has mentioned, the the monitoring is being carried out by national highways is understood to be part of his licence obligations in any event. So at this stage, we're not convinced not suggesting this should be picked up as part of a specific requirement in the DCO I can ask Miss Rogers to, to elaborate on a response. The points have been raised already, please.

1:15:07

Of course, I'm Anne-Marie Rogers on behalf of the applicant, I'd like to refer first of all to Bethabara, at the end the discussion on the data collected within in the pub, which post opening project valuation. And that does feed into the strategies development, which then eventually forms part of the road investment strategy for the next batch. So that data is used, it doesn't just just go into the ether as

such, we haven't fixed the locations for the evaluation within the PERT that does normally happen much later in the process. But we'd be happy to outline that as as, as suggested.

1:15:50

Okay, thank you. So, yeah, there's a, there is an action there. And just to make sure that's been being recorded, and agreed. Mr. Tyrrell.

1:16:04

So thank you just jump off the couch from authorities. I mean, just to echo the the concern, really, and just building on a point, which was mentioned, the, if we haven't monitoring and mitigation of the effects of this scheme, then we cannot simply have monitoring, which is in the form of identifying a problem, which then goes into a wider investment programme, we're going to come I was going to come to that way, just in terms of certainty, because I see whether or not is then taken forward would depend on the funding available under that programme, and also that, that whatever else is in the queue, essentially.

1:16:38

So yeah, I'm this this is particularly around the monitoring, I was going to turn to the fact to be the managing next. That's okay with everybody. Yep. So, if there are unanticipated impacts of the scheme, how readily Could these be realistically addressed by the by the applicants, and I'm thinking in particularly those junctions, where maybe sensitivity modelling has either not been undertaken or shown a worsening picture, for example? And would any subsequent proposed intubate interventions being competition with those associated with other road investment strategy schemes.

1:17:13

Scotland's document allows Miss Rogers to pick it up, please.

1:17:17

Sure. Anne-Marie Rogers on behalf of the applicant, me local interventions are unlikely to be funded through designated funds. Therefore, that wouldn't be in competition with the road investment strategy. Before that, we would work with the local authority to develop those applications.

1:17:35

Okay. And so there is there is we will we will talk about designated funds a bit later on in the agenda. So, I think there's a scope to bring that in. So but I'm still trying to understand so what what certainty is that is there that if the scheme does result in isolated problems on either the local or indeed the strategic road network that management measures can be swiftly enacted?

1:17:59

It depends on the scale of the intervention that's required. To be honest with you, large scale interventions typically come through their own investment strategy, and that those schemes are defined every five years. Our scheme opens for traffic if consented in 2026, and the next road investment period start and the subsequent decade.

1:18:21

So okay, so something so for example, signage, if additional signage is required, does that need to wear with on the local highway network that would need to come from designated funds? Would it

1:18:32

potentially or or operational latencies, may be able to support as defined find that?

1:18:45

Local highway of voters would you do? Do any of you wish to comment on this? Mr. Allatt
Cambridgeshire County, county council,

1:18:56

I think the level of certainty associated with mechanism to put right issues doesn't really doesn't really reflect the I mean, we need to be able to manage as well as monitor. So having the certainty that there is a workable mechanism that will allow for an expedient response to issues identify on the network is absolutely key, I can understand that. designated funds are operational maintenance budget may be a way of doing it, but the more certainty that we could have on that. Because otherwise, it's we find ourselves in a position where there would be a known issue on the network without a solution or a means of getting to that solution.

1:19:38

And so what would that serve? If in your your after certainty what sort of what, what would that look like?

1:19:44

Well, I think I think that's the question but the question that we need to, we need to see but I think if we identify that there is an issue on the network, the scenario that we want to avoid is that we affect you effectively have a hole in the provision with no means of guarantee in the funding to implement the relevant measure whatever that measure would be. So if we sort of caught up in a scenario where we've we are simply stuck on a on a sort of waiting list that's got never got a means of materialising with the funded infrastructure. I think this is a lesson that we've learned historically on in terms of not being able to respond as effectively as we like to to real realised issues associated with nature schemes.

1:20:31

So, Francis Tyrrell from pivotal authorities, if I could just add to what Mr. Harrison said, in terms of your question about certainty, obviously, what we have heard is a bit vague in terms of funds may be available from some sources in some circumstances. And I think obviously, this scheme, this probably picks up on what Mr. Brewster said earlier, as well needs its own monitoring and mitigation plan projects document essentially, which can be secured in a variety of ways as has been alluded to, but it needs to have some certainty. Obviously, we have set out in app 243, a list of SRN junctions, we don't have any certainty on other non SRN junctions. That's the first thing to them to where things should be monitored that needs to be provided for. But secondly, we need some certainty probably more importantly, on the local road network as to how funds would be made available and some guarantee that they would be made available. Obviously, a major intervention on the strategic road network is

highways, national highways, business as it were so more comfortable that their processes would apply to that and should continue to apply to that. But in terms of interventions that may be required on a local road network, currently, there is no, we have no certainty about any funding being available for that, or when it might happen. So I think we do need this monitor and manage which has been relied upon by the applicant across the piece to be backed up by a particular documentation, which gives them

1:21:57

Okay, thank you. I'm going to turn to Mr. Bruce then Mrs MacLeod and then back to the Applicant. Mr. Bruce.

1:22:05

Thank you, sir. I think the simple point which has already been alluded to which I won't repeat is simply this that Mr. Lyness said, Well, you don't need to secure any thinking in related DCO, because we're obliged to do it under you know, other other other requirements, in other words, having a regard to another regime, but the other regime does not extend to the local highway highway network. So it doesn't cover that. And it's not a sufficient answer to your question, I think, what would you do if there's some signage required on the local highway network? We did? Would it be designated funds? And I think the answer was something like, potentially it depends. So really, what's been said to you is that the national highways are really only considered, or their main concern is about the strategic highway network, because if impacts occur on the local highway network, they can pass the liability to local highway authority. So that's not accepted as a sufficient mitigation and the central conclusion of that submit that contention is this that, to the extent that mitigation is not secured you it's almost immaterial, almost not quite. But I'd say that you can only give a very limited weight. So when you're considering the matter, if nothing comes forward, would only be very limited weight, that could be given to it because it is not secured, then it's something that can be taken into account, but only in a very limited manner. That and we extend that point to say, well, it's not whether it's offered, actually, we're asking the Secretary of State to impose it.

1:23:35

Thank you. Thank you, Miss MacLeod.

1:23:40

Thank you, sir. Melanie MacLeod Bedford Borough Council. I just wanted to note for the record that we concur with what's been said, if it's through the planning process, not the DCO process, a developer. We local authorities have the ability to ask developers to set aside funds for mitigations that come up as from monitoring. That doesn't appear to be a mechanism that's open in this pro through this proposed development. So it's just to note that really, thank you.

1:24:17

Thank you. Mr. Tyrrell, would you like to respond on on this?

1:24:26

So do you mean Mr. Lyness

1:24:27

sorry, Mr. Lyness

1:24:31

Scott Lyness liners for the applicant? Sorry, I think many of these questions are probably going to be covered in the in the note that's been discussed already that we'll be submitting for deadline. Six, but I think it's an important principle that as far as the impacts and the local network are concerned, new housing and doesn't accept that, should there be impact on the local network that they have to be cured by where the mitigation that's offered? Part of this scheme. Secondly, it's impossible to set the stage whether as a result of any monitoring what the scope or the extent of any work that might be required is some possible together. So the funding commitment at any particular level for any works may be required anyway. But as I said, no funding would be required to be provided as far as we are concerned in order to make the scheme acceptable, because the overall impact of the scheme, as we've said before, must be judged in its broadest and its broadest sense. There may be some junctions where there are impacts and local network, but must be seen in the context of an overall scheme, which improves we say, the highway network overall. So I think fundamentally, we've got to draw ourselves back to the position where we're saying that any impacts that arise on particular junctions as part of the local network, do not mean need to be mitigated on the grind in order for this scheme to be acceptable. And as far as any wider monitoring is concerned, that will take place as part of the licence arrangements that high network national networks national highway sorry, have to comply with an any event. I don't know if there's Mrs Rogers, on add to that. Sorry,

1:26:23

I'm just struggling a little bit. Are you saying then that said, the proposed development if if the proposed development goes ahead, then highways or national highways rather, and it might have been unfair here, but you effectively can walk away from any of the problems that might be created on the local highway network.

1:26:42

And Scott Lyness for the applicant? Know, the point that's being made, sir, is that the applicant has said its application materials, and it will further identify through the extra notice being provided that there will be a monitor and manage approach that is, that is applied. And that was as far as national highways needs to need to go. Obviously, in any, in any in any scheme. If one is providing a new highway and a strategic road network, there may be impacts which are created off it, but one must judge the overall effect in the scheme in its broadest sense. So the fact that there may be some impacts on the local network, and a specific part of that network does not mean that the scheme as Onyx is acceptable when when George George and his broader sense. Miss Rogers, I don't know if she has anything to add to that summary of our position.

1:27:45

Just if that's if that's okay. And designated funds applications are processed relatively quickly, they don't have they're not in line with the rest periods. In that sense. We typically given an answer to a fully developed application within a month of receipts for just that helps with the timescales. I don't know how relevant you may consider this, but it is worth noting that we don't introduce any new junction

locations as a result of this scheme. So that our opinion, really is that traffic making its way more directly to just treat it road networks where that traffic should be not route running through the villages. Hence the overall benefit, which is something which we are keen to to get across, particularly as that is very well perceived by the public.

1:28:38

Thank you, Mr. Tyrrell. I see your hands up and affiant. Mrs Sahai got a question here as well. So Mr. Tyrrell t, please.

1:28:47

Say thank you, Francis Tyrrell on behalf of the interim authorities. Just on the point Mr. Lyness made, which I think you've picked up on already, but the I think it was stated the applicant has not accepted has to cure impacts on the local road network. And I think Miss Lyness clarified he was talking in terms of whether or not that then that failure to do that made the project as a whole, acceptable or not acceptable. And I think, to be clear, the authorities position is that the impact should be mitigated. That's a different point as to whether or not we're saying the scheme as a whole is unacceptable. Our view would be that the project the impacts can be mitigated. We've discussed obviously ways previously of how that could be done. So there is an answer here, we're not suggesting the scheme would have to fall simply because there may be some impacts on the local road network. We're just suggesting they should be mitigated. So I'm not I'm not sure. The approach that the applicant is putting forward in relation to that. I would assume that the applicant isn't suggesting it doesn't have to mitigate it. It's not I assume the applicant is not suggesting that it's not obliged to mitigate adverse impacts that it has as a result of the scheme. Secondly, as we discussed earlier, in terms of the location of it, And then if there's a concern, well, gosh, we as the applicant don't know where on the local route network or how far removed or how remote these impacts may be, I think, as has been set out in the application and the applicants document really in terms of the junction model sensitivity test, there are particular junctions we are concerned about. So, as I discussed that in putting forward this particular document, which will set out how the monitor and manage approach will work, we can specify the junctions that would be caught. So that would deal with any problem of ever ongoing ever remoter effects on on the local road network.

1:30:38

Thank you, Miss. Mr. Bruce. I see your hands up. And your your mute?

1:30:49

Sorry, just one point. But I think you've got it that I think response to your question about impacts on local highway network, the first point was monitor and manage but monitoring managers we understand it released the strategic node road network through what the national highways are doing under other regimes. So it does exist and the information in the documentation is general and unclear as to the extent to of this process. So we do require, as you have said, a far better defined clarity on what that monitor and manage actually is. And we needed to extend it to the local local highway network. Thank you.

1:31:32

Mrs Sahai So just just on that the the kind of the, the loose, what I'd say is loose wording in the application, my interpretation of that would be that the monitor and manage approach would be on to the local highway network as well. But that's for the applicant to confirm or otherwise in the note that going to be providing Mrs Sahai

1:31:53

I am just unclear about the kind of mitigation that could be required what what is that scope? What are the types of concerns that might arise on the local highway network? And I think Mr. Bruce was speaking earlier. And it just seems to me like some of the concerns that Mr. Bruce seems concerned about that might happen. The impacts on the local highway network might need quicker responses through whatever scheme there is the monitor and manage or whatever scheme they might be. But it would appear from what Mr. Lynas has said that and in fact, from what Mrs Anne-Marie Rogers has said that those impacts in the local highway network that would be covered under a monitor Amanat scheme are, let's say slightly larger impacts that, you know, the bigger the the more larger impacts on the local highway network. So I'm, I'm just slightly unclear about that. What the scope might be of the impacts and the mitigation that is required.

1:33:05

Mrs. Mrs. Rogers, I think you've got your hand up, etc. Respond?

1:33:10

If that's okay, so I didn't mean to give the impression Mrs Sahai that our monitoring managed does apply to local network monitoring manage is in direct relation to the strategic road network.

1:33:30

Right, this is okay, I think we need this. We need this note to clarify this and the roles and responsibilities of the highway authorities. But for my observation, as this this term has been has been used throughout the application, and in relation to matters that may arise on the local highway network.

1:33:55

Sorry, Scott Lyness for the applicant. I think, given the the nature of the debate that occurred this morning, this is something we're gonna have to cover in the, in the note to explain this more in more detail. As has been noted, as an action point already, and I think we need to cover this in the note, there's going to be provided in due course.

1:34:17

But there is a fundamental confusion here about what the scheme applies to. And when will it be relevant, what sort of mitigation it might trigger? Or what sort of impact might trigger a mitigation and how that mitigation would be delivered? So if there is any further clarity you can give us today, it would be helpful because if you what Mrs. Rogers just said is that monitor manage scheme only applies to the strategic road network. Then the question Mr. Tyrrell asked is very valid that are you then saying that the impact on the local network or indeed, our understanding the examining authorities, understanding that the impact on the local network is something that you can effectively not address.

1:35:11

Scott Lyness has for the applicant. My thanks to the broad answer to this subject, as Miss Rogers has to say is that want judging the effect and the need for mitigation, one has to look at this in the broadest in the broadest sense of the scheme, that one can't simply judge this question by reference to specific junctions when the overall effect of the scheme is going to be beneficial, particularly when the scheme itself is going to be taking traffic off the local node network, local road network is not as simple as identifying particular junctions or particular areas of it, where there is an impact and saying that national highway should mitigate for that, we don't accept that the proper approach because it doesn't involve a broader consideration of the wider effects of the wider effects of the scheme. Where there is no significant mitigation required as part of the scheme we have proposed. But we don't accept that it is for national highways to chest on every impact on the wider router network, make provision to mitigate that as part of the scheme that involves only a partial approach to the wider benefits held and prospect by the scheme. So I think our position is that we don't we don't consider the it's the it's the rule of the scheme to chase down every single impact that can be traced throughout the wider router network, make provision to mitigate that. It's not what the it's not what the overall judgement on the scheme should be doing.

1:36:53

I think in principle, let's say that, in principle that that's before us, which is fine. But what does that mean? You're saying that it is about assessing the wider impact of the scheme. And it's not your responsibility to chase down every local impact that might happen? But what would you chase down? What kind of impact would trigger something that you feel required requires mitigation and would go to would be covered under the scheme

1:37:25

of ? Ask Miss Rogers to deal with that, because it probably falls within the wider scope of the monitor and manage position.

1:37:35

I would have to refer to colleagues, but initially, my feelings are certainly issues of safety.

1:37:41

So if there are issues of safety on the local network created as a result of the proposed development being implemented, you would mitigate that through the monitoring managed scheme.

1:37:52

They would certainly take a higher part, we would definitely look at it very closely. I can't go further than that at the moment. But I'd be happy to address that within documentary prepare. Mr. Scriven,

1:38:07

I can't say that my questions have been answered. But that is it for me. I know that there are other hands up. So I'll hand back to you.

1:38:13

Scott Lyness for the for the applicants just to bring this back in terms of policy. So again, we can cover this and the note, but obviously, under the NPS mitigation under 5.215 should be proportionate and reasonable. And mitigation measures need to lead to design layout or operation of the scheme. So again, there's a judgement to be to be made, as I said, it's not for national highways, detecting proportionately to chair Stein impacts in the in the wider local network, particularly when one of the main functions of the scheme is to draw as part of this broader judgement, traffic away from the wider from the wider network.

1:39:01

Okay, I'm mindful of time. I've got hands up for Mr. Tyrrell and Mr. Bruce. So we're going to receive the material from the applicant, the next the next deadline. And I think it's fair to say there's bound to be various written questions that are going to be around this as well as a response to what comes in is, Mr. Bruce, first of all, is there anything you briefly want to raise? I think you can see the position where we are as an examining authority on this. You're on mute.

1:39:38

Sorry, keep turning that off. Just it's just very briefly to say that you can't desegregate the issues here either because it comes back to the network, network to management duty and all of that. That's what that's all I want to say that it does bring in. If the if the monitoring, manage doesn't work or doesn't is not adequate, then it brings it There was open to all the issues. And I think all of this can be solved through this approach.

1:40:06

Thank you, Mr. Tyrrell

1:40:09

So thank you very briefly fonts to over half the games for authorities just wanted to sort of deal with two points, there seems to be a theme that we're looking at the the local road network as a whole. And there may be, as I mentioned before, just generalised impacts all over the place. And we just reiterate, obviously, what we have here is some specific junctions, where we are aware of specific impacts that may materialise on the local road network. And, as we've suggested before, any mitigation measures could be allocated to relates to those particularly, we're not looking for national highways to basically take over responsibility for the local authorities road network, and to mitigate those impacts. And I think, given that second point already, in terms of where we know, there may be specific impacts on where and we intend to monitor. Because we know there may be specific impacts, I think it's a strange position to adopt to say, we will not need to mitigate the impacts at those sites if we found them. Because we look at the scheme as a whole. I mean, by analogy, if we were talking about noise, and we knew that one property was going to be very badly affected by noise, but six properties had a much more improved effect, we wouldn't simply ignore the one property with the negative effects because of the six they're improved. So I think when we're talking about specific impacts or specific locations, I'm not sure Mr. Lyons his point really is valid. Thank you.

1:41:32

Yep. Can i Is there anything you wish to respond to immediately on that prior to us taking a break?

1:41:38

Scott Lyness if the applicant, nothing further to say, Sir, beyond indicating, and again, under the terms of the policy, the MPs policy, the requirement for us is to mitigate all significant impacts, which we say that has been done that was not necessary for us to go further than beyond referring to the monitor and manage approach that will be detailed in the technical note will be submitted to Deadline six.

1:42:06

Okay, so I will I think I'll close this agenda item now. And we will obviously awaits the documentation from yourselves. And so we will take a break now, and the time is 1143. And if we have a short break of we say 10 minutes, or just over 12 minutes, we can rejoin it five five to 12. Please, if you decide to leave the meeting during the breaks, then you can rejoin using the same link provided in your invitation email. If you're watching a live stream then please can you refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session? Thank you very much.