

TEXT_ISH5_Session3_01122021

Wed, 12/1 4:27PM • 1:51:16

00:03

Right.

00:06

So welcome back, everybody, the time is now 230. And I'm assuming the session three of the of this issue specific hearing. Can the case team please confirm everyone who wishes to be here has joined back.

00:22

Hi, Matthew, I can confirm that there have been people that have come in during the break some new ones that you've been made aware of the live stream is working. I can see in your. We've also started the recordings now. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

00:38

But so just before we move on a couple of things, is Mr. Danish there?

00:51

No, okay. Pick up a bit. Am I correct in thinking a representative on behalf of Hilton parish council has joined us for item six. If so, perhaps you could briefly introduce yourself.

01:07

Hello, Mr. Scriven In my name is Peter Balicki. I'm chairman of Hilton parish council. Okay, thank you. Well, welcome. Thank you. Okay. I'm aware we have a Mr. Breeze who has also joined

01:23

Yes, sir. Matthew Breeze, minerals and waste planet the temperature can't cancel. Okay, thank you.

01:30

And we have Mr. Rooney, who has joined

01:37

us. Good afternoon, sir. Jon, Rooney for the applicant? I'll be responding to item seven good design. Okay, thank you. And has anyone else joined? I see Mr. Bruce got his hand up

01:56

perhaps or perhaps let others well, I'll just say briefly that I suspect that could help you sir, that I suspect the noise and air quality is probably something like 30 or 35 minutes to deal with. So that will that will buy a bit of time back. As I was gonna mention. Thank you.

02:13

Sorry, Miss Hansen. Yes. Sonia Hansen for Cambridgeshire county council.

02:20

Well, welcome, thank you. And if anybody else is in the room that hasn't introduced themselves and feel free to put your hand up, and I'll come to you

02:33

Okay, so moving on to item six and that is to discuss the outline construction traffic management plan. And so everybody should be aware the applicant submitted a second iteration of the outline construction traffic management plan at deadline for that the reference for that being rep four dash 012 And so the first part of this is looking at the adequacy of that submitted

03:01

I will obviously tend to local highway authorities shortly and other interested parties.

03:06

But I do have one initial question in here and that's with regard to paragraph I think it's one point 1.4 acknowledging that this detail will follow could you advise when this detail will follow and particularly around how you intend to consult with

03:29

with others

03:31

on

03:32

the detail of the construction traffic management plan

03:39

I'm planning works

03:42

perhaps I can ask Mr. See to pick it up for the applicant please sir.

03:54

Sorry, I don't have that that reference to hand

04:01

so this item is the outline construction traffic management plan. I would expect the applicant to have the outline construction traffic management plan open in front of them

04:28

so is there a problem?

04:31

I don't know Mr. See's in a different building perhaps or I can help in the meantime. Yeah. So the the paragraph refers to at this stage the content is preliminary level of the traffic management plan and provision is required at each subsequent stage the schemes development. And so I'm interested to know in regard to the next major revisions will be during the detailed design stage. And there will be consultation with key stakeholders

05:00

But is there is there intended to be any further consultation at this stage before you get into the detailed design around the outline construction traffic management plan, or, for example, that's that say

05:14

how, how relevant landowners might be affected transport operators that kind of thing in shaping the actual detail design and potentially the programme of delivery.

05:25

Scott Lyness for the applicant. So as matters stand requirements 11 provides no part of the development to commence until a traffic management plan for the construction of that part of the authorised development substantially in accordance with the guideline construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant local highway authority. We anticipated that would be the primary mechanism building on whatever outlined, I'd land construction traffic margin plan is as submitted through the examiner through the examination process. Okay. And that I suppose it's is can you just explain why just the local highway authority rather than other stakeholders as well.

06:16

I think primarily because the

06:19

the relevant local highway authority is the is the primary body that's going to

06:26

be interested in how construction traffic margin operates through the through their network.

06:32

Obviously, the relevant local highway authority may have interest particular landowners in mind, but as a as a consultation exercise, it was thought that the relevant local highway authority primary body that

was going to be interested in how the the operations or highway network will be affected by construction traffic. Okay.

06:53

Couldn't sorry, could I say to those students see for the applicant? I think during that process, we would also look to, to

07:03

for comments from sort of the police force and the sort of emergency services in how we develop that that plan. So they would also be involved. So effectively, statute console T's in terms of

07:20

traffic management arranging changes, that kind of thing. Yes. Okay.

07:27

Okay, thank you.

07:30

So at this point, are we should we expect to see a further iteration of this outline construction traffic management plan over the course of the examination, Scotland's the applicants are at this stage further iterations aren't

07:45

envisaged?

07:47

We've already introduced changes through the through the latest draft, we're not anticipating any further at this stage. Okay.

07:59

presuming you take stock of that following responses today and ever written questions, for example,

08:06

Scott Lyness for the applicant, plainly, Sarah, we will obviously need to take into account our thing. That's that sad, but it's not our current intention.

08:15

Okay, thank you.

08:17

So I will turn I'll get to the local highway authorities first, just on this. So just bear in mind, you've obviously seen the agenda already. There are there are some there are various items in here for for discussion later. So if we can focus on maybe on any areas that aren't covered on this agenda item?

08:37

That would be helpful to me. So if I can turn first to Bedford Borough Council, is there anything you wanted to raise with regard to with regard to this?

08:47

Thank you, sir. I, I don't have anything I'd like to raise at the moment, I would just add that Andrew Prigmore, who's our network manager has been called away. So I'm afraid I might not be able to give such a thorough view as he would have done.

09:05

And just to point out that,

09:08

the the outline construction traffic management plan, it

09:12

is talked about in statement of common ground discussions. So I'm a little bit out of sync as to where some things are, that might have been discussed, but haven't made it into this iteration. So I'm not going to raise anything that's not on the agenda. Thank you. Okay, so

09:31

I think the is the next deadline, the next deadline. Deadline six has got opportunity for updated statements of common ground come forward. So

09:42

just bear that in mind of stuff and go in there. Okay. Thank you

09:52

just checking what's going on with the cameras here? It's a bit strange.

09:56

Right? Okay. Cambridgeshire county council can I invite you to

10:00

to comment.

10:04

So good evening, Francis Tyrrell and on behalf of central authorities, I'm

10:08

in relation to your specific question as to whether there are additional points other than those listed items six to f that we wish to raise. I don't think we do. I think your agenda covers all the items and we'll we'll manage to fit what we want to say within those. Okay, thank you and to central Bedfordshire Council.

10:29

Robert, Robert Bruce central Bedfordshire Council. Yeah, we do have a concern over station road. Essentially, it's not a road suited for large construction vehicles as as anticipated.

10:48

Mr. Punter will just give a bit of detail on that but but broadly, there is an alternative that is the a four to eight works a built out that could that could provide the alternative access. And it's no answer to it to say, well, you can make a TR o restricting large construction vehicles, because any TR o that's made would have to have an exclusion construction vehicles because if someone else wants to do construction, along, for example, when an adjoining property station road, they would then be prohibited from doing any construction. So so we couldn't make it to in that manner

11:23

would have to apply to everybody. So just on that old impasse over to Mr. punter, just to give it some further detail on the on the concerns about the size of vehicles and the sections of the road.

11:38

Thanks.

11:42

Thank you. So I wasn't sure where I'm stationed won't be picked up under point B with regard to the D limited.

11:49

I think it could restrict, if we could bring under under point B. Yeah, that would be if we could raise it again, under that point. Yes. Thank you.

12:01

Was there anything particularly from any other interested parties on this specific point? So we're on point A of six?

12:09

So put your hands up?

12:16

I'm seeing anyone. Okay. Sorry, Mr. Bruce.

12:20

Yeah, it's very short point. But the at 603.

12:27

It has a significant collision record and history. And it's used as a diversion route.

12:35

Sign diversion route. So, I mean, that is something we believe, ought to be covered. Appreciate. It can be dealt with in detail later. But But actually, they need to be appointed to requiring the detail.

12:48

That's a simple point on that one. Thanks. Thank you.

12:52

Right, so moving on to point B.

12:57

Just in spirit, point of clarification, for me in relation to interpolation for Kenny confirm those plans shown in Appendix D should be included in Appendix C of the second outline, construction traffic management plan? And will you how to how'd you propose to if that is a error? How do you propose to deal with with that?

13:15

So it looks like the drawings are in the wrong appendix effectively for the construction traffic management route? Well, sorry, the restricted routes.

13:25

And those aren't restricted.

13:30

Scott Lyness for the for the applicant, Mr. See's manage to look at the document answer this question. If not, then it's something we can

13:40

take away and check.

13:42

If there is an error, then that would be that would be rectified, sir. Yes. Because obviously you're referring to that appendix. And if there's nothing in it, yes. That's entirely understood.

13:54

Julian see for the applicant. Yeah, it looks like an error. We'll we'll have to get

13:59

back to you. Now, one presumes things are moving forward with the appointed contractor regarding the likely number of construction vehicles, particularly heavy goods vehicles using certain routes as that sort of information has been previously provided at the request of local highway authorities in specific locations, including transferred

14:19

would it be possible to annotate a version of the construction route restriction plans provided with the anticipated HG the likely anticipated HGV movements, including an idea of timescale for those movements, potential on a phase by phase basis to assist everybody in their understanding of the likely effects of construction

14:39

and thresholds?

14:42

Scott Lyness for the last semester Mr See to comment on whether that's feasible.

14:50

Julian's See on behalf of the applicant.

14:54

I don't think we were not able to provide that level of detail

15:00

At this stage in the,

15:03

in the in the scheme,

15:06

we

15:09

that the key principle of the development of the logistics and supply routes for this scheme is to, is to put in a

15:18

logistics route along the length of the offline section of the of the new of the new scheme. But there's a number of constraints to establishing that route. There's the various archaeological sites there utilities, water courses, and we also need to build the junctions that Cambridge Road nervously to better link up those, those sick those sort of elements of the logistics route.

15:45

And, but so, but once we have that route, we then be able to supply the site predominantly straight off the strategic road network. But we don't have the, the level of detail in the, of the, of the design and the and the construction programme at this stage, including sort of where our,

16:12

where we'll be getting deliveries from who our suppliers will be, and all that sort of detail information to be able to provide that, that what you're what you're asking for, in terms of, you know, sort of those details of, of HGV movements on particular particular routes, we, we we have looked at

16:33

the station road temps foot element, because it's very specific in terms of what we're going to supply, you know, the works that will be supplied down that route. And also because it's for for a limited period, because it's just for the gas main diversion and the and start on the staff of the abutment works on the East Coast mainline bridge. So we could

16:54

we could make some assessment on that. But then we don't have any information on on particularly looking for the I'm not looking for exact numbers, I'm looking for thresholds to be able to take a considered view as to what the likely effects or what if even if the worst case what the likely effects of the construction traffic on those, particularly those routes that are

17:19

going to are going to be actively

17:22

promoted to,

17:24

to your drivers to use. And at this point in time, we as an examining authority are struggling with that. And so

17:34

I just like to know what what you can do to help us on this and an indication of the timescales, we might be able to receive something or if that isn't going to be possible,

17:45

then what can we do?

17:51

Scott Lyness to the applicant, just ask Mr. See after if there is any further work that he envisages, could be done first of all,

18:01

Julian Seesay on behalf of the applicant, I just don't think we can be that we can be that

18:06

can be that sort of sure of what those what those traffic what those HGV numbers will be along those routes, we were generally using the strategic

18:19

road network as the as the as the supply route. And, and back to those plant that plant materials can come in could come in from any, as I said, any direction. So sort of trying to

18:32

put put a fingers on on the number of HTV of number of construction HGVs that will use those routes is just it's just a level of detail that we don't have at this at this stage. We have looked at other DCS. And just to see if that sort of information has been provided on other DCS. And we don't we haven't we don't find that that that information is is there.

19:02

I did look at the the M 42 DCO, which is one that we've been involved in, they actually didn't even get to the stage of producing an outline traffic management plan. So I think we we have got more detail here then then maybe has been provided on some schemes previously.

19:18

And so you're saying you're you're going to be working that detail up in future Who is that likely to be during the course of the examination or is it going to follow? No, it would be it would follow because it will be once we've got a detailed design and we've got a detailed construction construction programme which we just we're not at that stage yet of having a detailed construction programme has to be able to see how the works in particular areas will be phased and how they will be supplied.

19:48

Hi, thank you. I'm going to invite the any of the local highway authorities to comment on on this now. So

19:57

the Bedford Borough Council wish to come in on this

20:05

Thank you, sir. No, we will

20:10

add it into our

20:13

response by deadlines six. Thank you. Okay, thank you, Cambridgeshire county council turn to you.

20:22

So thank you faster on behalf of the criminal authorities.

20:27

It does strike the amateur authorities that more information can be provided nice TG HTV. Traffic. Partly because obviously,

20:35

we're aware that in the environmental statement, assumptions will have had to have been made about construction, traffic in particular HGVs. So there must have been something that underlies those assumptions in relation to amounts of traffic, even if they're only assumptions. So with word of surprise, nothing tool can be provided. Other than that, otherwise, we

21:02

have no particular points to make when I think that position will be similar to applications as well, in terms of those always some underlying assumptions about HDB traffic numbers, and also ratings. I know, for example, here, we have, obviously, an indication of REITs are likely to be affected by traffic noise,

21:21

which was an appendix to the environmental statement. So presumably, and that's app 144. So there must have been some underlying information for that.

21:32

Thank you.

21:35

I'm going to before I go on to central Bedfordshire, I'd invite the applicant to respond on that because it seems a very valid point.

21:45

And Scott Lyness the applicant allows Mr. See to respond to one point that occurred to me immediately as that was for some parts of the assessment there may have been certain assumptions made about total traffic being along particular routes. For example, for the purposes of noise, we can come back to this later.

22:06

Part of the difficulty may be and actually understanding how many vehicles are attributable to the scheme within that.

22:14

It may be you can't draw a parallel between understanding the HTTP traffic constructed in pursuance of the construction of the scheme.

22:29

Mr. Lyness is frozen with Mr. See like to come in?

22:34

Yet? Mr. Julian See on behalf of the applicant.

22:39

Mr. Lyness is sort of description of of how that was carried out is is correct. You know, and it's disaggregation of, of the construction traffic, we know some some total volumes of construction traffic that were that were put together for, for that for the

23:03

for the traffic modelling and

23:05

and then

23:07

the various noise

23:12

noise modelling that was that was carried out.

23:17

But it's not there's no detail to that.

23:23

Okay. I hope that Mr.

23:27

Mr. Lyness can rejoin us. Okay, yeah. I'm going to go and turn to central Bedfordshire council.

23:40

So I'll ask Mr. Punter to respond on that one. To the extent he's got any comments. Thanks.

23:48

Thank you. So just a bunch of central practice. You can also

23:53

as, as I'm sure you're aware from the previous submissions that central Bedfordshire made, a specific concern has been raised with regard to the use of stationary template.

24:06

And without revisiting previous ground too much is because there are three elements along that route, which made it challenging in terms of larger vehicles and construction traffic, the residential properties to the western end with relatively narrow carriageway, single width Lane carriageway to the east end and a heavily used level crossing at the far eastern end of the roads with census data from Network Rail, suggesting a heavier use of their crossing by pedestrians and vehicles.

24:35

And so we have a number of concerns with regard to the suitability of that group for those exact reasons.

24:41

I'm aware from the information provided by the applicant that they foresee in the longer term that they can access the workspace extension of the haul roads from the east and side understanding is it's a matter of programme rather than necessity to use station road

24:57

and upon which would appreciate further conflict.

25:00

From Applicant saying

25:03

thank you.

25:06

Mr. See, would you like to respond on that?

25:12

Yes, Julian See on behalf of the applicant.

25:16

Yes, we have been in discussions with central VShare about about this route, I think the thing is that we that we is very limited on on what we want to use this route for. And it is for the for this cake and gas main diversion, which is

25:37

and the bridge of button works, which which are critical to the, to the overall programme for the scheme.

25:45

That there would be it would be limited, but at the moment, we haven't got any detail from from Caden gas as to

25:54

when they would be would be available, or when when they can complete that diversion works. And they're, they're still going through or they're still they're still need to complete a design.

26:08

And then they would be able to programme the the duration for that works. In terms of the use of station road for for HGVs. And again, I suppose that we've gone over a bit of previous information is that, that we have used that route successfully for the archaeological works that have been undertaken recently.

And, and but we'll talk about it before. Yeah, but I think the other thing is that in discussion with with with, with Bev Chu they they did they did suggest that we we should maybe look into whether we could provide some sort of passing Bay

26:48

arrangement that would make

26:51

that using that route more acceptable. And we will we will look at look at whether we can provide that within the highway boundary

27:02

to make that that route more usable. And I think the other thing is that they seemed that there was there was some concern about sort of using the route for

27:13

oversized vehicles at any time and how appropriate it was for that. And again, for their archaeological works, we did bring in some we had to bring in accommodation in terms of cabins and so on which are which are generally oversized, and we timed those to be outside of the periods when so there were after people have gone gone to work during the during the day and that worked successfully and we'd look to manage that whole

27:43

that whole situation through tem suffered sensitively during during the work so that we we could use that route, but we wouldn't cause

27:55

major disruption. Okay. Okay. So just on those matters, if that is being if that's being proposed or discussed if that's if that's a mitigation measure. So mitigation, if that's a measure to that's being considered or is likely to be taken forward, obviously, that would need to be secured in some shape or form.

28:16

as well. I see, Mr. Bruce, you've got your hand up.

28:22

Yeah, just point out so that.

28:25

And they say limited work. Yes, they're limited to two things. But the works are substantial. So they're not actually a limited amount of works. The other thing is, I just wonder whether Mr. Punter can come in and confirm

28:39

the level of tree HDB traffic estimated along this road? Because Because I understand it substantially different archaeological works is what we're talking about. It's not it's not comparable. So I think when it said it's successfully done via ecological works, one one needs to bear that in mind. And there is the alternative of routing through the eight four to eight as the works are done.

29:00

Mr. Punter, can you help on that? Please?

29:04

Thanks, gesture upon to central Bedfordshire Council

29:08

are given to him stand for the information that's been suited submitted by the applicant to date that the number of AGP movements across an average week might be in the order of 30. But on a peak day, it could be up to 50 HDV movements in a single day, which is significantly greater than I think it would have been a handful of movements related to the archaeological works. Certainly at the time of the application, the archaeological works the important the time suggested that in nothing more substantial than light fans or by falls outside of the initial delivery of the cabins. So I just come in there and just ask the applicant for clarification then here. So when in that figure that was put forward

29:51

of the 30 figure. Was that per day or over the course of a week.

29:58

Now the 30 Sorry, Judy.

30:00

See if the applicant the 30 years is the average figure over the course of a week,

30:06

per day, no average average average number of vehicles of HGVs in a week.

30:13

But But what what we said was that for very specific activities, there, there may be peak days where we have to bring in

30:24

a greater a greater number of vehicles to do for a specific activity. But over the course of the full period of the works, that would be 30 per week.

30:36

Okay, over the full period of the works for what?

30:41

What is required of that

30:43

route? Or third, what's required of that know for what's required to use in the use of that route. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. So, I've got to ask the question at the local highway authority is, does that change your position because the way you described it was

31:00

30 per day up to 60 per day?

31:05

Thanks. So I just went to Central Bedfordshire Council. Apologies my, my intention previously was to say that we've been advised of an average of 30 vehicles week, but a peak demand up to 50 movements per day, during the peak periods of construction that Mr. See's refer to. So for example, during earthworks or concrete pours, or other larger elements of work.

31:31

At this point in time, we've had no confirmation of the duration of works, I presume that the applicant may have that information in order to be able to determine what the average he movements across the construction period may be. So at the moment, we have quite a broad range of potential impacts we've been presented with but no way of estimating, you know, how frequently for example, those 50 hcvp pigments may take less. Thank you.

32:00

So

32:02

is this something that a person wants to respond on now or they want to take away and and come back to us on?

32:09

Julian See on behalf of the applicant, the the anticipate, again, we that we we until we have the full detail from cadent gas on how long the diversion period will work for their diversion works will take, it's quite difficult to be specific on on the period of time that we would need to use that route in in a response

32:32

to,

32:34

to one of the questions

32:37

we have

32:39

confirmed they will be between eight and 12 months, but it was dependent on the cadent gas diversion works. And once we had more detail on that we would

32:50

we would discuss the whole we would come forward with that information to the applicant to the to the local authority could get that no doubt you are anyway but can you look to chase that? We are we eyes? You know, we are but I don't it Caden a very much

33:12

a law unto themselves. I think it's very difficult for us to get commitments out of them at this stage.

33:21

Okay, Mr. Bruce your hands up. Yeah, I think just the final point, Sarah's if you do get a chance to visit that part of the site again. I mean, if you just have a look down that road, I think it'd be perfectly clear to if you said there's 50 vehicles moving down that road, not every week, on occasions. I think you'll reach your own conclusion as to the city down that road. We've been down that road. Okay. Okay. Well, we'll let you reach your own conclusion on the suitability.

33:50

Okay, we've touched on see already presumed the applicant doesn't want to

33:57

does the applicant wish to add anything to that?

34:00

Scott Lyness applicant apologies. So you may see me with an end Victoria red than on your screen and public change computer companies you?

34:14

I don't think we I don't think we need to add anything

34:19

more beyond saying that. Historically, it's not typical of a of a national highway scheme to have the main contractor active in the project at this stage. So we think we have actually provided more information in the world being provided in other cases. But if you'd like any more information on comparison to in this scheme, and others, we're of course, be content to provide this as requested of us.

34:44

Thank you, I think that can that can follow. Yeah. It would be helpful.

34:50

At some recent recent examples, particularly of linear schemes, it would be helpful for very well thank you, sir. Okay, I see I have a hand up

35:01

going on.

35:04

This is from Mr. Balicki. Yes. And it was just, it was actually a, Part B, it was about the construction traffic and routes and the

35:16

question of construction traffic management plans. Now, when the A 14 Seven bypass was built, a construction traffic management plan was produced. And it's a linear programme, with promises that most of the construction traffic would go along the Off Road site. And highways, as it was coming up and saying, Good news, we will stop our traffic coming through your village, which, as chairman of the parish council at that time, and now I can assure you was the biggest source of complaint within the village that construction traffic continued to go through the village with little or no action being taken by highway. So our question or ask point that we want to make from Hilton is that when drawing up the room, but highways insist that construction traffic go along the a road rather than the B road. So it goes, they take us because we believe that stuff will come out of St Ives from the gravel pits to be used in this construction. And so it will need to go south. So to use the existing the old a 14, which is the a 1307 and then go down the 1198 to the construction site and avoid the villages. And we would welcome that being written into the DCO from the outset so that there's no confusion about the fact that construction traffic shouldn't be going along the roads.

36:42

And that was that was incorporated in the I'm sure it's incorporated in the DCO for the A 14 Okay, and by when you're saying highways, you mean national highways? Yes. Yeah. It was highly supposed to the local highway. Yeah. Yeah. Thank you.

36:57

Would the applicant like to respond on that as to and that's so that's particularly looking at that restriction up to a restricted route up to Hilton. And as to whether or not that should be extended in any way. And I'd also invite the local highway authority to comment on that.

37:12

And perhaps Scott Lyness fabric and perhaps, Mr. See to comment on on that suggestion.

37:22

Sorry, Julian See on behalf of the applicant, we have produced the plan showing the restricted routes, we haven't

37:32

extending it that far out would be quite a long way from the scheme. And I don't think we could do it. It would seem strange to just do it in one location.

37:47

I don't know. I think we've sort of covered the we've we've channelled the, the logistics routes down the the main strategic roads and and the A roads.

38:01

So I'm not sure whether that's really necessary. Okay, so would you envisage there being a demand to use the route that stability is talking about by HGVs?

38:13

No, I don't think so.

38:16

Okay, Mr. Balicki, I mean, I think I can see on the A 14

38:21

Hilton was was relative was relatively very close to the to the route but but Hilton's not close to this route. Okay? Peter Balicki Hilton Paris Council, our argument is that gravel pits in St. Ives would be likely to be a source of material. The direct route for some Ives is through Hylton down the B 1040. Down to

38:46

text and jib it. So we are asking that traffic, this route is extended beyond Hilton up to galley Hill, which is the junction with the A 31307. The old a 14 and traffic is taken down the 1307 to the 1198 Godmanchester and uses the a road rather than the direct route, which is through Hilton.

39:11

Okay, and

39:13

the comment might was made earlier, they don't people don't know where construction material is going to be coming from. We would suggest that construction material may well be coming from the gravel pits at St. Ives and beyond and the north south route is through Hilton, we're asking that this is not directed through Hylton because it's a B road and we are in course of getting going through with Cambridgeshire county council getting

39:38

a ban on HGVs. Anyway, but that's not been approved yet. I think. And so

39:45

that might come with this might be a waste of time, we might be successful and getting up 24 hour ban on HGVs. But if we're not, we would like this to be written into the TCO please. Thank you. I'm going to invite the highway authority to come

40:00

Comment on this and also the status of this potential HDV ban as well.

40:08

Yes, sir, if I may come in. I would agree with Mr. Balicki. On that point about the possibility of gravel coming down through Hilton certainly was an issue

40:23

during a 14 construction works, and I think that it would be helpful if the applicant could consider the proposal

40:35

to put no construction traffic through Hilton. Okay. And just tenants that have proposed HTV ban, what state what stages that is it has been advertised? So is this something that the local highway authority are promoting and it's been advertised, and they're supporting us with?

40:52

It's a local high base initiative. And then the moment it says it's out for public comment to the 17th of December? Sorry, is that the TR O has been advertised? Same goes with it, or?

41:04

I'm sorry, I don't know, off the top of my head as a local highway authority could could just clarify on that, because as you say, we It might well be dealt with through that process. I would have to come back on that point. I can't I can't tell you the stage. If you if we could make that an action just to come back on four deadlines. Six, please. And also, for the applicant to consider what has been been put forward here.

41:32

Skyliners for the applicant

41:35

will take that as an action point, sir. Yes. Key.

41:39

Okay, thank you. Thank you.

41:46

Okay.

41:49

This person to be admitted.

41:54

So I'd like to move on to

41:57

proposed monitoring during traffic rerouting of traffic during construction, and any subsequent interventions on the local highway network. Can the applicant confirm how monitoring of traffic rerouting will be undertaken during construction, just a better understanding of how this monitoring will occur? And where it would occur? Is that to be on? Because been? It's come forward? As simple as a commitment to do. But

42:26

what's that going to look like? Scot Lyness Falcon, Alaska, Anne-Marie Rogers to respond to this question, please.

42:36

Thank you Anne-Marie Rogers on behalf of the Applicant, we don't intend to monitor traffic volumes on the local road network during the construction period. It's our intention to keep the traffic on the strategic road network, which will be fully monitored, have you is that by keeping the strategic road network

42:57

flowing, there's no incentive to move on to longer, less suitable routes, we will ensure that the communications levels are high with the drivers. And as we previously consented schemes, we find that compliance is higher when those communication levels are high, to show that the delays on the strategic road network are quite low.

43:23

Okay.

43:25

We have how I've committed within the ICT MP that if the local

43:30

highways report anything, we will review it together in the forum that we clearly have been established in the ICT MP. Okay. Right. Understand.

43:44

So if interventions are considered necessary as a result of that, effectively

43:50

monitoring by the local highway authority but jointly discussed review,

43:55

how would that be how would that be funded? And so we're talking about this June construction phase and and taken forward with that with the local highway authority taking it forward with the financial support of the applicant or

44:09

or for the local highway authorities to pick up or what's what's the intention at this point, or is that to follow?

44:16

I think that would depend largely on on what was agreed, but I could ask my colleague to see to support that.

44:29

Mr. See, Julian, See on on behalf of the applicant.

44:34

Yes, I think it would, it would depend on how

44:38

how far away from the scheme that that oh, you know, which which routes required monitoring and so on. I think that would be

44:47

be what would need to be agreed.

44:51

Okay, I'm just

44:53

so mind I'm not in eye contact. I am just having a look at the

44:58

eye construction traffic management.

45:00

On the tract version of this

45:03

second I'm bringing

45:08

on we'll start with Bedford Borough Council.

45:15

Thank you, sir. Yes, we've we, it's our view that some of these things are still under discussion, when we're not entirely convinced by some of the statements in the outline traffic management plan or just in principle agreement with, you know, not in principle agreement with them.

45:35

But we have set these out in the statement of common ground and we'll continue to keep them into discussion. Okay. Cambridgeshire County Council. Thank you, Miss MacLeod

45:48

So thank you for answering on behalf chemical authorities. I think this is precisely the point we've raised

45:55

disfiguring to our concerns in relation to the notion of monitoring on the local road network. I think we've heard that

46:03

nationally, the applicant doesn't intend to do it themselves. And we're not quite sure who would be funding it.

46:09

It's therefore being very much left. I mean, it's similar to the monitor and manage discussion we had this morning, to be honest, it is left therefore to local authorities to do in terms of the monitoring, and to report just sort of a laissez faire approach, I suppose. But

46:24

we know that there will be some impacts on on the local road network away from the direct scheme, I refer to before but I mean, it's just because illustration, the plan, app 144 has some roads that are gonna be affected by construction traffic in relation to noise. And we can see where they are. And obviously they are routes beyond those specified in Appendix C, which I think should be Appendix D, sorry, Appendix D, which I think should be Appendix C to the the current version of the T vo C.

47:01

So sorry, I'm saying so the routes shown on App 144, do extend further away. So I think we do know that there will be impacts on the local road network further away from the scheme. And the monitoring for that is totally large, really, in terms of how it would be done and how we fund it.

47:18

Mr. Bruce?

47:20

Yeah, thank you, sir.

47:23

Well, the principles set up by national highways is not accepted. It's not accepted that one can ring fence their scheme and say, well, it's just whatever's in the red line.

47:35

You know, it's in the NPPs. About, you know, reasonable proportionate mitigation. This is reasonable, important portion mitigation, flipping the other way, it's actually unreasonable and disproportionate not to mitigate, I suppose in a way this is about who pays This is that's what it's about. And they're basically saying they're not going to pay, even though they're causing the impacts. So that principle is not agreed, and mitigation measures in the RIP, so I won't repeat them. But as a broad principle, that's not accepted. And it's not accepted that it's in line with the NPS.

48:07

So it would be obviously the applicant is going to be coming back on the monitor manager approach. In terms of operational side of things, it would be helpful for some more detail around what would be expected in terms of

48:22

monitoring of the construction phase in terms of traffic impacts, and just clearly defining who the likely roles and responsibilities.

48:36

Scott Lyness is for the applicant. Sir, I think we're happy to build that into the notice already being prepared. I don't propose to go back over the issues of principle that Mr. Mr. Bruce's raised beyond indicating that sorry, were concerned any significant environmental impacts are proposed to be met, or proposed to be mitigated as we've identified through the application, and we don't accept the sort of characterization that's been put any mitigation has to be reasonable and proportionate. We don't think it's necessarily going further than we've indicated. But we can explain that further in the notes has been identified. Yeah, I'd very much I do very much want that to be, you know, clearly framed separately from monitoring management as of Operation monitor construction in terms of construction, please Scott Lyness ourselves conduct that's noted, sir, we'll make sure it's treated separately in the note. Thank you.

49:34

Okay. Moving I think we'll move on to this. Mr. Tyrrell your hands up.

49:42

Sorry, sir. Francis Tyrrell on behalf of the authorities just

49:46

perhaps I think the authorities will be interested to also know and looking at this a different point of view. The outline traffic, construction traffic management plan or seat stresses, how the routes in Appendix C would be

50:00

forced, everyone would be told not to use them there would be training, etc. For the contractors once they started

50:07

it. I think the authorities are interested to also to understand how is that monitored? How do they know that that initial training has been effective and that there's construction? Contractors are doing what they're initially told to do from the outset? I presume something is envisaged. But we haven't seen or heard anything about that.

50:24

Okay, thank you. Could that be incorporated into the note?

50:30

Scott Lyness for the applicant? So you'd find that helpful? I think we could do that. Okay. At least consider whether doing further weakened out. Thank you. Yes.

50:44

Right. So

50:46

so I can only see that there's a hand up not who's got that hand up. So just bear with me a moment. Is it Mr. Tyrrell with a legacy hand? Or have we got a

50:55

Mr. Punter

50:59

Thank you. So so it was just one additional query, if I could with regard to the vote that stablishment is intending to prepare with regard to construction phase monitoring, I think from

51:10

local authority perspective will also be keen to understand how the baseline for that monitoring would be identified and set against which the impacts on local roads would be measured.

51:20

So obviously, we need to have a realistic baseline in which to determine the impacts of the scheme. And so we certainly appreciate if the note could also give thought to how that baseline will be identified. Thank you. Thank you.

51:33

Mr. Just, what's going on here? Mr. Lyness? Sorry, it's because I'm seeing Victoria Redman in

51:43

Oh, sorry. It's confusing me as well.

51:46

Yes,

51:48

it is it can you add to that? Unless Mr. See has anything at all? I think all I can say is we'll take that on board. We're already preparing the nodes. And if we can address that in the note, we'll do that. Okay. All

52:06

right, move on to the next item on this one. And this is quite specific to Cambridgeshire county council, in terms of requested approach to funding any necessary repairs to the local highway network as a result of construction of the proposed developments.

52:22

Can can come as your county council just explain

52:27

the interpretation of the Seminole authority is that you're looking for some form of upfront payment for the cost of likely repairs or some Was it some form of bond.

52:36

And just a brief understanding as to as to why.

52:45

So Francis Tyrell on behalf of the Cambridge authorities.

52:50

At the moment, we are still in discussions in relation to an agreement with the applicant. And we obviously open as part of that to different methodologies. for dealing with this point, what we're seeking to replicate is effectively the ability of law, the authority to

53:07

get payment from a developer if damage is incurred to the local highway network as a result of the work that they're carrying out.

53:14

So we are simply trying to replicate that position, the methodology for that we are open to discuss the applicant, I'm not sure yet we've actually put through before to the applicant specific details of how that might function. But it's probably best that we continue that in those negotiations. And as the the panel will specifically tell now, in which case, we could probably update in writing in due course, if those discussions to carry on, I think it might be premature about what our view was because then it was

good. Yeah, it was going to lead on some other questions, but let's let's go with that. That's fine. Thank you.

53:52

Okay, so just moving on to the next item, which is the submitted outline travel plan.

54:00

The applicant has provided an outline travel plan for works associated with the construction of the proposed development, the provision of such a document appears to be broadly well supported in the representations was received. Can I check first of all how this is intended to be secured?

54:19

Mr. Scott Lyness for the applicant.

54:24

Mr. See, university sounds like question please.

54:30

Yeah, Julian See on behalf of the applicant.

54:33

I believe that the outline travel travel plan will be included in

54:40

the revised first iteration Environmental Management Plan which will be submitted at deadlines six

54:48

Okay.

54:54

Thank you.

54:56

Okay. So what just out of interest why the need to do that rather than as a separate Standard?

55:00

loan document

55:03

Scotland has for the for the applicant? I think it was, potentially, sir, I'd have a desire to keep the number of documents that are going to be included into DCO to a minimum given there's already provision being made for the first iteration the MP within the DCO itself. So it's really a question of, of neatness and bearing in mind that on that one could duplicate documents unnecessarily. But I don't

think there's any disputed that needs to be secured in, in some way. That was the that was the initial thoughts that we had and how to do that. Right. Thank you.

55:42

The so just in terms of in terms of what has what has been submitted, are there any comments from any of the local highway authorities at this stage? That there will be further written question around this, but I appreciate this has recently come in,

55:58

in terms of just thinking in terms of what you typically expect to see in a, in a travel plan?

56:13

Thank you, sir. I think it's, it's an it's what I'd expect to see in an outline travel plan.

56:22

Okay. Okay, thank you.

56:26

At this point in time, it's quite, it does appear quite high it is high level and what we may do what, what we might do.

56:33

So in terms of further iterations of this and become a bit more specific, at what stage do you think that's likely to to come in to the examination or not? Now, that's the applicant, Scott Lyness, for the applicant.

56:49

Also, until we receive any detailed comments suggesting any further measures that might be included. I think we don't intend to add any further detail at this stage. But obviously, as I said in previous responses, we'll keep an open mind and response anything that says beyond that, we'll have to bear in mind it is always only ever intended to be an outline plan. If it is included in the first iteration EMP it will be developed into a more detailed plan. At the second iteration EMP and as travel plans go that there's not an unusual approach to take. So that's how we see this and developing the future.

57:28

There are some I've got some questions on it, but I will put them in written questions. I think this stage Thank you, sir.

57:37

So unless there any other comments on this agenda item, so hands up, please.

57:47

No, okay. Thank you. So we will now move. Oh, just Mr. Tyrrell

57:54

Sorry, sir. Authorities as in wanting to get away with

57:58

moving on.

58:00

Just a very minor point, the travel plan, the airline travel plan, I think obviously, cruiser raised earlier in terms of how that would be secured, and how that ties in. I think the authorities will also be interested as to when it is of effect. I'm thinking here in particular, if any,

58:18

I think we call them pre construction pre commencement works rather and to what extent the travel plan would bite on staff engaged on these activities okay.

58:30

This is a point that applies more broadly to the the outline construction traffic management plan as well.

58:36

Thank you

58:39

applicant there's anything you want to respond on that.

58:43

Scott Lyness don't stop could not at this stage. Sir will help well take that away and and consider it's partly due to the drafting of the DCEU really, and perhaps we could pick it up then but I don't think we need to say anymore the stage. Thank you. Right I will now bring a

59:03

for Item seven and eight which is good design then moving on and I will also stay on the screen as well.

59:17

Thank you, Mr. Scriven.

59:20

So moving on to item seven A.

59:28

630 We'd like to explore three further areas.

59:34

In addition to in relation to the scheme design approach and design principles document that has been submitted by the applicant at deadline three, and the responses that we've received to it

59:47

to three areas that we generally would like to cover today are around design principles itself.

59:56

The embeddedness of the design principles in the surrounding area.

1:00:00

area, which has been an area of concern raised by some of the IPs.

1:00:05

And, of course,

1:00:07

securing this document. So what's currently been proposed? And indeed, whether that's adequate. So I'll start with the design principles. Cambridge accounts Council, the the joint Cambridge, Cambridge, your councils raised concerns about design principles at issue specific hearing for

1:00:28

and just looking back at their response to written questions. I think some of the points that they raised that issue specific hearing for yesterday, we're in addition to those points. So I just want to first invite them to make those points if they were in addition to some of the responses that they gave in response to written questions.

1:00:49

Bedford Borough Council have also asked for more engagement and design principles generally. So I'd like to give them an opportunity to just highlight

1:01:00

what specifically they want to see change in the design principle, what kind of input they're looking for, and so on. I will come to IE, East West rails comments on this a little bit later. And I think that can be just covered off with an action point, because we did touch on it at a previous agenda item. So let's start with the capture Council's and the concerns that they've raised about design principles, in particular, the points that they might have raised or that they touched upon at issue specific hearing for

1:01:33

man, thank you, Francis Tyrrell and on behalf came to authorities, the obviously we've raised points previously in response to your questions on design as a general concept, and I think that's what we'll touch on. Yesterday, we were talking predominantly relation to,

1:01:48

to batten back mitigation and the interaction of that with multipurpose crossing points essentially, within us and the contents of that, I think, perhaps we hadn't previously conceived that as a design aspect, but I think it probably is, and I think you're right to see it. And there's rights, which perhaps there might be

why we hadn't raised under design, specifically privacy, but we're talking to it in relation to the patent aspects in particular,

1:02:13

as to what those points were.

1:02:18

The

1:02:20

The key point is just relation to how we ensure that this multi use or some of these crossing points, is reflected in the way that they are designed. And also to ensure that as we think about the use for one purpose, say, for example, that mitigation

1:02:37

assumptions

1:02:39

that are needed for that are not subsequently undermined by the use for another purpose, for example, to provide an attractive and a new facility.

1:02:47

And in that regard, obviously, we note in the applicants documents, which they've now provided as to the design principles,

1:02:59

which is very useful to see that we have some overarching principles, two to six connecting people connecting places, connecting processes, connecting people make road safe and useful, inclusive, make roads understandable to local authorities from transport point of view, it also very much encouraged us and support those design principles that will take you in a certain direction when it comes to an immune or at least we would say so in terms of making attractive,

1:03:24

attractive crossing points.

1:03:26

So the question is really how in design to either square the circle in terms of making it also work as about mitigation prospects. And I think the key thing, that it's how the right principles, and also how the local authority involved, because they do bring us any more holistic approach to these these concepts than just

1:03:45

people that whose remit understandably, is just specifically for bats in this context, for example. So that's in a nutshell, is it we can provide more detail that be useful?

1:03:56

No, that's helpful, Mr. Tyrrell. And I think there's two or three things that you said yesterday, and you've repeated today, which is to take a holistic approach multi-use. And while you've said that with respect about mitigation, but you've also raised, how enemies might use

1:04:12

some of these structures and and how that can more integrated approach can be taken to that. And I think those are valid points. And I wondered if, particularly with respect to maybe Appendix C, and some of the design principles listed against some of the structures and Appendix C whether the applicant would like to respond to that.

1:04:35

I will come back to a question too, and I'm just kind of giving a bit of heads up to the Cambridge UK councils, if they can also highlight if there are specific structures listed in Appendix C where they feel that this kind of an integrated multi use design principles,

1:04:53

you know, is currently missing and would be helpful. So applicant first

1:04:59

helps

1:05:00

Scott Lyness for the applicant? Mouth the way this issue has been raised started really with with bat mitigation, the relationship with Nm U provision. I think that raises one set of issues. Another set of issues is insofar as one was going to deal with that, how do you do it? Is it through the design principles document, or given this started with bad mitigation, whether it's appropriate to deal with it in some other way?

1:05:26

And if we can take those issues and turn understand Mr. Wade should be on the call Max Wade, who you heard from yesterday. And I'd like him if possible to give his broad position on this. This issue of the relationship between the bat mitigation and nmu provision before moving on to the second issue for me

1:05:50

Okay, Mr. Wade should be on the call.

1:06:02

He on the call,

1:06:05

he doesn't appear to be

1:06:10

may have had issues joining the joining the call in that context, until Mr. Wade can can join perhaps I can try and summarise the position as I understand it. After speaking with him,

1:06:22

underpasses which have multiple uses are, as I understand it compatible with the use the species of bats flying within, or near vegetation or services, for travelling through them. That's based on evidence from studies and monitoring of underpasses. So there is a separation of use temporarily as bats use underpasses at night, after dusk and prior to Dong at times when there isn't any or very little passage by agricultural vehicles, walkers and on horse riders. So on that basis, if we're decided to light underpasses during the day, this wouldn't have any relevance to to bats. Lighting on their passes at night is undesirable. But if we're deemed essential measures could be taken to significantly reduce any perceived issues, including the nature and direction of lighting mechanisms to ensure the ladings switched on only when required, the use of specific types of lighting and so on. And those measures combined with any infrequency of use by people would minimise any impact. So I think our starting point is we're not convinced that we see the the need for it given the likely relationship or lack of it, particularly

1:07:43

at particularly out at night. But if it were thought absolutely necessary, measures could be added, which would minimise any impact so that the use of underpasses by bats and nm use was was compatible.

1:08:01

That's the sort of first issue in broad terms. The second issue, as far as if it were, if it were considered that any further steps needed to be taken.

1:08:14

Then, given that this issue

1:08:17

began with

1:08:20

bat mitigation, we were just querying whether it would need to be in the Design Principles Document, because we, if we look back to where this started, man's Design Principles Document was largely about visual appearances of structures. And one thing we're quite keen to do is to make sure that there's a discipline and a control over the scope of that document, rather than necessarily bringing in wider design

1:08:45

related but broader issues that might be capable of being addressed and other plans already in existence as part of the DCU obligation. So if this were

1:08:56

a feature that was related in parts about mitigation, we could see that being addressed through part of the first iteration environmental management plan, potentially, rather than necessarily than the Design Principles Document. There's also the separate pointers to efforts if it's a merger between bath and nmu, and you weren't convinced about dealing with this, in terms of the first iteration, the MP, and you thought this was more related to what we did about nmu provision generally within the design principles document. And that's something we could consider, but in the context where it was important to have some control over the scope of the document to make sure that wasn't going well beyond what the original purpose of the document was supposed to be. But we're content to

1:09:50

indicate that as far as nmu provision is concerned, there would potentially be scope to deal with that in

1:10:00

In certain terms in the design principles document provided there's some control over the scope is up. Okay. Okay, that's helpful. And I wonder if this would be a good time to perhaps bring in some other interested parties if they wish to say something. And I'm thinking about cam cycle here.

1:10:17

And

1:10:20

anyone else who may wish to make a comment if you could raise your hand, Mr. Danish?

1:10:28

Yes, thank you. Can you hear me? Yes, we can. Thank you.

1:10:33

For that, yes, this design document. Design Principles Document is missing in Section 3.2. And paragraph three to two in particular, is missing references to local transport net one slash 20, which is the government design manual for cycling infrastructure. Ever since the gear change policy has been published in 20. It does reference a CD 143 which is the design manual for roads and bridges section on designing for walking, cycling and horse riding. But this raises a big problem with we've had with national highways and formerly known as highways England. And their approach to these matters in the past, which is that they have also omitted their own design manual, which is CD 195 designing recycling infrastructure, which was published originally in 2016, as interim advice note 195 and is now encoded as CD 195. But they have consistently refused to ever use that guidance. And we do not want to see that same approach applied with local transport net one slash 20. In the past, what we've seen is the highways England at the time, and I had this conversation with the CEO Jim O'Sullivan, at the time with the help of Daniel's HDMI and P. A, is that they did not see any they they felt they did not need to apply CD 195 Because it was only for cycling infrastructure, and they were building MMU. Well, I think any reasonable person would conclude that if you're building a facility that's being used by multiple modes, then you should apply all of the relevant design guidance and not just none of it. And certainly we would not expect highways England to fail to follow highways design guidance, just because roads

are normally used by all kinds of highway users. So And the same would apply to non motorised user paths, which are effectively roads that just don't have motor traffic on them.

1:12:31

The what I would like to see here is that LPN 120, is looking forward and looking towards the future LPN 120, should be the document that is applied to all of the designs. And I think that will actually resolve a lot of the problems that we're having with the national highways. And the proposed scheme here is if they actually took that seriously and applied those design design guidelines, we would have a much better result overall, we would have a much safer, more inclusive, accessible, connected coherent network for yes, the design guidance is for cycling, but it will help a lot with other forms of active travel. And of course, we would expect the equivalent design guidance to be used for those modes as well. And finally, I must say that the cost of this is not excessive at all, in fact, in many cases will probably save money. It's really just about making design choices carefully and with consideration for all road users, rather than just ignoring them, which is unfortunately, what has been approached in the past. So very much we'd like to see LTI 120 become part of the formal specification of this project. Thank you very much, Mr. Danish, that's really helpful. And what you've done here is given us the justification for the changes that you want. And you've also given us what you think would be the outcomes if we if those principles were integrated, but what you haven't told us is what implication that would have on the principles itself in the document. So where would you what would you expect to see changed?

1:14:05

Either in the design principles or the vision that has been provided or indeed, in the more structure specific design principles set out in Appendix C? And I don't want to put you on the spot here. If you can answer it, that's great. But if you can't, then what would be helpful is if you can tell us what that is in the form of commentary equally.

1:14:29

And perhaps Mr. Scriven might help me here. Do we have LTN 120 in the examination

1:14:41

we have had it referred to extensively but I don't believe the document itself is in the in the app for the examination. What is it Mr. Danish?

1:14:54

Sorry, I'm sorry, what is it you refer to a document called LTN one local transport network.

1:15:00

One slash 20 is government's cycling design manual. It's part it's referred to it was introduced along with the gear change policy in July 2020.

1:15:12

Okay,

1:15:13

so if you think that this should be included here, then perhaps it would be helpful for us to see it and be particularly to understand how this would actually affect the design principles that the applicant has set out.

1:15:30

Just to stress, we, as an examine authority are aware of local transport 120, and what is contained within it, but it isn't in as far as I'm aware, it's not in front of us in this examination at this point in time. Okay, I apologise I would have uploaded it if that was necessary as a submission. I thought everything in terms every policy that's published by the government should be available. And.

1:16:02

Okay, I'm gonna I'm going to move on to Mr. Tyrrell. We did

1:16:07

ask you is that if, you know, particularly with respect about mitigation we have you heard

1:16:14

Mr. Lyoness his response to that. But with respect about mitigation, which structures particularly do you think are currently lacking principles, which should be more integrated, holistic and multi use,

1:16:31

such as also aerations. The previous point, I know that we referred to LTM 120, in the chemical authorities written representation, so I think it may have been provided, but I haven't had time to check as part of the appendices to that document. But so maybe there will be before the examination in that guys. But we can check that point.

1:16:49

I should just add, we've also got available.

1:16:52

And I think we will turn to them shortly, but some witnesses that can speak about good design in a more general sense, but taking your points just in relation to particular structures. And I think if we perhaps take a look at Pennbrook struck just as an example. So if we look at page 57 of the applicants, document schema design approach and design principles

1:17:19

and patriarchy seven in the appendix C we have a new Henrik COVID an underpass.

1:17:26

We see there as a precast segmental concrete box culvert. And we've got a little drawing which shows you literally a box.

1:17:33

We have as the key constraints on the structures and designs that it is combining a watercourse, culvert and nmu underpass into one structure, alignment and flood level of Hamburg buildability the structure within the existing water course. So those are the constraints, the design principles related to alignment and positioning, which predominates relating to Henrik and cooperating the PRI, W.

1:17:58

Scale, height and massing is essentially

1:18:02

dealing with visual aspects, materials and finishes, and then we have landscaping around it. So in relation to that, we have a number of points really good design. Firstly, and this isn't about my bat mitigation point. But this is just thinking about good design for nmu uses. It is known and obviously I think we have made submissions on this previously, but can make more it'd be useful that a square box such as proposed is not the most attractive structure to encourage nmu use, other things can be designed. The design principles in relation to this don't seem to clewd anything about encouraging and I'm you user. And accordingly, we don't see as authorities how we bring forward that specific structure, some of the overarching stuff that we have seen earlier in that document at 322, which would relate to cycling and horse riding etc. But also, and we will also I think echo Mr. Dangerous comments about the importance of LTM 120 in that regard as well.

1:19:03

So we didn't see how good design for an amuse is carried forward into that specific structure under this document. But then turning specifically in relation to that mitigation.

1:19:15

Now,

1:19:16

sorry, birthing a second, I've just lost a note. So I appreciate it. I'm sorry, not the Prime Minister, forgive me.

1:19:26

The,

1:19:28

again, going back through this design principles or key constraints, we also know that handbook is proposed as one of the key

1:19:37

future proofing underpasses for the bats as well, because it's raised yesterday.

1:19:43

There is no mention of biodiversity mitigation or indeed bats anywhere in relation to s 19 In this appendix here in terms of handbook. So we don't know if we're applying this as our design principles, but that is also a purpose for that. Obviously we know it more widely

1:20:01

That incidentally flows for a number of structures identified in EP 3.1, which is apt 91 as mammal crossings, we don't see those structures

1:20:12

in terms of this document in terms of the key constraints as having reference to the purposes, biodiversity mitigation, but I bring, we're focusing on Hamburg just as an example in this regard.

1:20:25

So

1:20:26

we don't have either as constraint or as a design principle for this particular structure is needs to function

1:20:33

well as an MMU, or in particular, as a as a backcrossing. And now I'm just thinking also, we've seen alignment and positioning. And rightly, it's important that it fits in landscape, and rightly, it's important that it

1:20:46

meets the handbook. And obviously

1:20:53

those those things are correct. However, also, it needs to be at the right height and alignment to be on the bat mitigation, the back of migratory routes that they have. So it again, needs to be the right height and location for that as well. And we appreciate this is a difficult thing for the applicant, but all these things need to be balanced, if these crossings are to be successful. So the design, just a box, as is proposed may not be the right design for that. We could, I won't bore you, but we could run through seven of the in relation to plantation pillar plantation crossing point as well. I think the very similar points apply to that. And that's page 61. Yeah, um, well, I, I think that is actually very helpful. It just gives us an idea of what you mean, when you say things like integrated design approach to some of these structures. And I think in just in terms of the point about scope that you raised, Mr. Lyness is

1:21:44

it seems to be within scope, it's not going way beyond it in terms of taking an integrated approach to some of these structures. So is this something that we can perhaps deal with?

1:21:56

Following this hearing? I'm very aware that there are a few hands up and I'm going to invite that comment from Mr. Wren in a minute. But

1:22:04

is that something that we could take into consideration perhaps, you know, to consider some of these more specific, it kind of relates to the next point that I'm going to make, which is about the embeddedness of, you know,

1:22:17

how this document addresses that the local, you know, the surrounding area.

1:22:24

But do you have a comment on that, Scott Lyness, for the applicant?

1:22:30

Obviously, it's in the nature of this document that its purpose is to take on board comments as part of the examination process. So we will, we will do that. But I think I just want to register the abroad concern that

1:22:45

this document is not about bad mitigation.

1:22:48

And we need to be careful that in

1:22:52

in trying to deal with what started off as this relationship between bad mitigation nmu provision, that it doesn't broaden into something which

1:23:02

is identified largely as an exercise and bad mitigation. As I've said, we accept that there is an MMU element to this, and I don't think there'd be any objection. And having a cross reference within the documents to the requirement to meet particular dmr standard for nmu. Provision. I don't think we'd go as far as suggested that needed to incorporate Lt. 120, because I think as previous

1:23:37

responses have made clear to the examination, we don't consider that should be applied in this case. But I think we're prepared to accept that, as far as nmu provision is, is concerned, it would be appropriate to incorporate within the design principles document or requirement to meet what we would regard as being specific dmr standards that applied nmu provision, we need to make sure the drafting of that was dealt with correctly, because for example, there may be more specific requirements that relate to bad mitigation, rather mitigation the pier separately, that would need to be taken into account as part of the general application those dmr standards, but we think that might be a one way forward and dealing with high nmu provision has dealt with was it within this design principles document. I know

Mr. Mr. Christou, to Christos Christou, who might be able to comment on a particular standard that we can we consider could be incorporated within the document.

1:24:41

Yeah, I that sorry. Yeah. Christos, Christou, for the applicant is already mentioned previously because we stayed in the CD 143 that we're referring to with regards to how we're designing for sideways, always in question. I think the key point for me, I think we do need to differentiate between

1:24:59

technical

1:25:00

functional or technical design and functionality, and then the aesthetics element of it. And this document from our intent was developed from an aesthetics perspective, from good design, not to look at how we're integrating the design from a functionality basis in whether it's a suitable,

1:25:16

suitable solution.

1:25:19

Mr. Christou, I'll just just interrupt you there that NPS nn actually does not when it comes to good design does not really make a distinction between aesthetics and in fact, asks for

1:25:32

an I will in a second pull that up, that makes a very clear

1:25:37

correlation between functionality and aesthetics as good design pretty much in most policy, government policy documents, so I wouldn't necessarily make that distinction. But I do see Mr. Lyness point that,

1:25:51

that,

1:25:53

that while this document,

1:25:55

you know, many of the design principles should be clickable across the board.

1:26:00

It is not to, for it to proliferate into something that becomes, you know, a second EMP almost, you know, so it is it's absolutely fine to kind of cross reference other things.

1:26:14

Uh, but what I am

1:26:16

reassured by is to say that, of course, the part of you know, you consider

1:26:22

taking on board comments made on this document as part of the process during this examination, and I think that Bedford Borough Council will be pleased to hear that as well. So, so what I will say is that I, I'm going to move on to the next bit, but

1:26:36

that, let's have some of those more specific comments on the document in and as you know, given that the local authorities are the local experts, I would say that those specific comments such as what Mr. Tyrell just outlined for hen Brook is what I think the applicant might find helpful, the examining authority for sure will find helpful. So so so if I can, if I can close this point off, about, you know, what kind of changes we would expect, during the course of this process in this examination,

1:27:09

to basically follow that route.

1:27:13

Now, I, Mr. Danish before I come to you, I'm just going to very quickly double check with Mr. Wren. He did have his hand up and see if there was anything that he liked to say, for to Sonia minor point, when we were discussing the bat issue is raised yesterday. And we have got the Wildlife Trust available to comment specifically on the bridge if needed. But I believe Mr. Lyness has his response as a as a way forward and your suggestion that goes through written raps may be more appropriate now. Okay. Okay. That's good. Mr. Danish.

1:27:51

Thank you. Yes. So just I'm not to extend this further, I just want to say I CD 143 is a very, doesn't have very much in the way of detail is not a design manual that could actually be used to realistically design. For example, cycleways,

1:28:09

whereas LTN, 120, is a myth design manual, and the LTN 120 across all projects, they receive government funding. So unless the applicants are planning to build this without government funding, I don't see how they avoid having to use that and apply that guidance in their project. If you would like me to submit, in written form, further comments on here to sit, for example, to say which portions of the documents need to be updated, he would like to submit a copy of LTN 120. And gear change. Please tell me what, what would be most helpful to you.

1:28:47

So I understand what Mr. Tyrell said is that there is a form in which LT and 120 is before us. So I don't think we need that government guidance in front of to be resubmitted.

1:28:59

But I, I think, the point that I just made, that the submission, your comments on how any guidance or government policy would make

1:29:13

it relevant government guidance or policy should be taken on board with respect to this document would be very, very helpful.

1:29:22

But quite specifically, at what points and in particular, if that can be with reference to particular structures, as outlined in Appendix C would be even would be quite quite quite helpful to the examining authority and indeed, for the applicant to come back on. Okay, so to be clear, you're talking about Appendix C of the scheme design approach and design principles. Yeah, okay. And in general, were anywhere in that document you would like me to be pointed out where it should be inserted the references? Okay, okay. And the next

1:30:00

deadline is the 14th. He said, I think it's deadline six, and case team can help you further with means of submitting that evidence.

1:30:10

Sorry, say that, again, the case team can help you further about the process and mechanism of making submissions. Okay, thank you very much.

1:30:19

Is that everything for you? Mr. Danish, I believe I've been told by my colleagues that I might have missed something that you've said previously. Have I covered everything? I mean, the previously in this particular agenda item? Yeah, I think not effectively, what we want to point out is that the project needs to be following LTN 120 and the gear change policy, and that should be incorporated into this document, and others as well as needed.

1:30:47

Fine. Okay.

1:30:50

I am going to move on unless Mr. Lyness, you had anything particular that you want to say, we're still in that agenda items, I do want to make a swift

1:31:01

cover of a couple of more points, Scott Lyness topic, and nothing more on the points we've just been discussing, mom. Thank you. Okay, thanks. So the next point was just is still on design principles. And I wondered if, Mr. Tyrrell, did you want to say something?

1:31:17

Sorry, I'm very brief, perhaps not very important point. I just,

1:31:22

I've had it clarified.

1:31:24

Written representations did refer to LTM, 120. We didn't provide a hard copy of the document, we sent a link to it, we can correct that egregious error, if that would be useful and provide LTO 120. ourselves, that'd be helpful.

1:31:40

Can I get back to you on that? I will discuss with my colleagues and see if there is a need for that. Okay. Okay.

1:31:48

Secondly, are you planning to still deal with items seven, a return in terms of good design in the general sense, we're moving on? Okay.

1:31:58

So just one point about principles. And I think this slightly touches on the very brief representation from Bedford Borough Council. So if they'd like to come and join us for this discussion, that will be helpful. But basically, you've set out the principles under three broad headings, scheme, engineering, and environment. And what I find is that there appears to be a bit of a mix and principles that have been considered so fine. So it's a mix of principles that you've considered so far in arriving at the design, you know, and what what often ends up schemes would refer to as embedded mitigation measures. And then there are principles that would be considered for the next stage of detailed design, you know, as you're considering detailed design, and I, I just wondered, given that

1:32:47

parties still have concerns about how they can influence detailed design. I wondered if unpacking those two types of principles would help. So there's the design principles that justify the decisions you've made the design decisions you've made in arriving at the proposed development so far, and the design principles that will that will

1:33:11

influence your decisions going forward? And indeed, where there is flexibility, and where potentially, you can invite stakeholders to hold you to account?

1:33:22

And I'm just going to leave that question there. And, you know, especially because, given that this is the opportunity for other parties to actually influence these design principles. Would it help

1:33:34

for them to know what they can influence? Post consent, should consent be granted.

1:33:41

Scott Lyness for the applicant? I'll ask Mr. Rooney, if has anything other than in due course.

1:33:49

mumsy approach taken in the document

1:33:52

is, as you say, identified within earlier sections. The approach has been taken thus far. But as far as we were concerned, Appendix C, in particular, were the design principles, including features for specific structures that we saw fleshing out the second, the second element of what you've mentioned, ma'am.

1:34:16

No,

1:34:17

we don't think that it's necessarily the case, you should somehow bring forward the material that's within Appendix C, into the main body of the document, because I should be clear that that's the approach we're taking. And our approach at this stage is was will always listen to specific points that are raised through the examination process, the other party's we think Appendix C, really, fulfil the second element. So both are covered in a reasonable way within the document.

1:34:50

Yeah, I think I can see I can see some sense in that. I will come back with a follow up question, but

1:34:57

do we have any further questions from other parties here?

1:35:01

Miss MacLeod.

1:35:03

Thank you, ma'am. I think, from memory, our concern on this item was more to do with the engagement. Okay. process. Yeah, the process given the scale of the structures in Bedford borough, and, you know, the the potential visual impact.

1:35:25

And given, you know, the impact on local communities. So really it was on an I'm looking at paragraph five point 1.4 on the engagement. And I think it was that

1:35:43

it isn't clear if the local stakeholders will be included in you know, the processes set out there doesn't necessarily include the stakeholders. So I think it was just clarity on that, that we Okay, I'll come back, I

will come back to that point. So then in that case, you're generally content with the principles as they've been set out in the document that will guide detailed design going forward? Yes, yes. Okay.

1:36:12

Mr. liners, then going back to your point that you've seen that distinction between the main body of the text and Appendix C,

1:36:21

I think that I can see some sense in that, but even within the main body of the text,

1:36:29

there are design principles set out under you know, as you said, under scheme engineering and environment,

1:36:38

which does, which kind of explain your position so far, but there are others which will be considered later on. So for instance, it's there are some principles relating to location and siting. Whereas there are others which are, which relate to material and, and height and scale and so on and so forth. And so you could you could draw a distinction between scale height and materials is something that is going to be considered in detailed design stage, various sighting is something is a design principle that you've already made a certain decision on. And, and so I think that's the distinction that I'm, I'm kind of trying to draw and wondered if it might help local authorities to know that this scale materials and height and those sorts of aspects of design principles, they can still influence a detailed design stage.

1:37:31

Ma'am, probably just deal more broadly, Scott liner for the applicant with this question of engagement. I think, as I said, already, the way we see this working is that if there any comments to be made by stakeholders, primarily, the examination process is the opportunity to do it, because what we advise is happening was that

1:37:55

the document itself would be secured at the moment, we're anticipating suggesting an amendment to requirement 12 within the DCO. That would require

1:38:11

any detailed design to relate to this to relate to this document. But we think that the main process of engagement should be through the exam examination process. And then requirement 12 would require the the the applicant to effectively apply the principles in the manner identified and the requirement at that at that stage. So we we feel that it's appropriate that demand engagement from local authorities is in the establishment of these principles at this at this stage, within the requirement for for the applicant to apply these principles as determined through the exam process when it comes to detailed design. That's how we see that's how we see this working. So the principles to be established right now. And then how the principles are applied to individual structures as a matter of a detailed design. And that's where the engagement comes in. But no, we well, the as far as engagement is concerned, we see that

happening at this at this stage, or under requirement 12, we would simply have to make sure the detailed design adhered to the Design Principles Document, but where we were willing to consider any departure from that under the requirement, we'd have to satisfy the Secretary of State following consultation with the relevant local authorities that those changes didn't actually

1:39:48

engage in a materially new or different environmental effects. So we see engagement taking place no, we don't see engagement taking place as part of the details.

1:40:00

design process because the whole idea this document is to allow local authorities contribute to this stage.

1:40:07

Okay, Mr. Lyness? I have quite a few questions on that. But that is underwriting B.

1:40:14

I think let's come back to that. I do think that there's a few other things to

1:40:19

talk about the content itself.

1:40:22

But But let's come back to that.

1:40:26

As far as the other elements of the question are concerned,

1:40:30

we, as I say, we had seen Appendix C, operating as the element of this document would say, Well, what happens next?

1:40:42

The design principles had been grouped together in that context to include alignment, positioning, scale, height, and massing, as well as materials and finishes and, and landscaping.

1:40:58

Were content that that identifies the broad design principles that would be applied going, going forward.

1:41:08

We don't necessarily see any reason to somehow distinguish between these at this at this stage because it offers a list of design principles that are appropriate nor NRV.

1:41:26

But what we've just discussed is for

1:41:31

you, yes. So for the comments to come on that at this point. Okay. That's that's understood.

1:41:37

Mr. Tyrrell, you have a question.

1:41:42

Thank you, Francis, from both camps, authorities, just emotion to query it about the content and not getting misaligned, it's probably more becomes ever more important, but I know, I'd like to just bring in Miss Emma Lilley from the camera authorities, because they just to express the concerns they have, in some respects about the general content of the of the design documents. Okay. Yeah. Thank you.

1:42:10

Good afternoon.

1:42:11

Good afternoon.

1:42:15

So,

1:42:17

we have some concerns with regards to the appearance and in respect of agenda item seven, a,

1:42:26

and compliance with policy, we don't feel that the details outlined in the document

1:42:35

are compliant with

1:42:38

the requirement to to provide beautiful design that is sensitive to place, which are policies that are aligned throughout the NPPF as well as our local plan, policy hdc local plan policy 11 and Cambridge South Cambridgeshire local plan, policy HQ one,

1:42:58

the document, rep three

1:43:02

dash zero 14 states in paragraph 3.3 point 15, that structures have been designed as a family with common design details, materials and structures, this approach has been taken to reinforce sense of place, create a memorable journey and maximise efficiency and build ability. And it's our view that the

proposed materials are particularly you to utilitarian and don't in any way, make the journey along the proposed a four to eight, in any way recognisable or relate to Cambridge.

1:43:40

We had hoped that there might be more ambition

1:43:45

to create landmarks along the journey.

1:43:51

And I'm now concerned that if the principles are to be agreed at this stage, and there's no no more consultation further down the line, that there might not be the opportunity to to bring these details in. Furthermore, going back to the biodiversity concerns

1:44:12

if if again, these principles are agreed at this stage, they must also accommodate the bad paths that have been discussed. So therefore the document does is required to address those issues given that the

1:44:26

environmental Master Plan identifies those structures as multi use manual routes, as well.

1:44:37

That that's really helpful Miss Lilley and and I think it kind of goes back to the point about

1:44:44

potentially telling us as, as the local authority, who knows the area, what makes it particular to that to your area of where what type of design principles might be needed in order to bring that law

1:45:00

embeddedness and sense of place that is required by NPS and policies under good design. So So I think in general, what you've talked about,

1:45:12

you know, as the applicant has set out at the start of the document that is their intention as well, it's the it's more the specifics how you feel where the document might be, not Mike might not be able to deliver on those outcomes, design outcomes, it would be helpful to know that.

1:45:29

Okay.

1:45:30

I'm sorry, could you could you repeat that? Could you reframe the question? I'm not sure I. So we had an action at the when we were speaking earlier, that we would like to hear from local authorities and other parties, more specifically, the type of changes, particularly structure related design principles that

1:45:50

you feel change where you feel changes are needed in order to make it rooted in the in the local environment, in the local area. So in order to achieve everything that you've just set out for us, where do you think those design principles need to change in order for the examining authority to consider and of course, for the applicant to respond to?

1:46:13

What would it be okay to respond in writing to this? No, absolutely. Thank you. That will be in writing. Ma'am. Thank you. Thank you. I think we understand that you would like to see a comprehensive mock up of this document with with with what we would like to see in an ideal world.

1:46:28

Yes, yeah. Essentially. Okay.

1:46:33

I think that broadly covers let me just have a quick look.

1:46:38

So I did have one question, and I know I put this in written questions.

1:46:46

Why does Appendix C not include structures like gantries and signage

1:46:54

given that that is likely to have quite a good particularly because gantries has been included in terms of identifying locations and things? So why does Appendix C not include them?

1:47:04

Scotland? Perhaps I can ask Mr. Rooney if he has anything to add on this.

1:47:11

Good afternoon join me for the applicant.

1:47:15

In terms of signage, I think there are and gantries in fact there is a section in the document, which are seven turn up now, which refers specifically to them.

1:47:25

There are four countries proposed on the scheme, and they all have the same style. So we didn't feel it was necessary to introduce a separate section on those and the signage is for the detailed design.

1:47:41

Yes, but did you not feel that these needed to be included in Appendix C is are you saying that they're not included in Appendix C because they're all identical and so they don't

1:47:54

that's the for the gantries? That's the reason we haven't included that detail. If you feel it would be helpful to add that for completeness we can we can put that in?

1:48:04

i Well, I think it's one of the things that we did set out was.

1:48:10

And we did ask this question in written questions that it's

1:48:15

it's about the design principles and how they apply across the board. And so I by I think it's something that I would ask you to consider and see where you know, what, how you feel

1:48:28

where we can take this.

1:48:31

I'm going to work on Sorry, sorry, mascot blindness for the for the applicant, as Mr. E is indicated. We will do that. And I think it's just worth saying that. Certainly if we rewind and we look to where this process started, I think our understanding had been in the way that the question that we initially put that, as an appendix such as Appendix C was going to be created is going to be in relation to the main structures

1:48:54

on the scheme. That's the way we'd understood this issue to have a reason and questions for yourself, ma'am. But f have after reading as page 11 deals with gantry signage and lighting, you feel that it may be more appropriate to move that type of content into Appendix C for for clarity purposes don't that's something we can look at.

1:49:17

Especially because there are matters in there which will have an effect which will have an impact on

1:49:25

visual appearance and particularly visual impact on landscape. I think there might be there there is benefits in doing that.

1:49:34

But like I said that it is something that I'd like the applicant to consider and think about and perhaps respond to in future iterations but including for IPs to perhaps comment on

1:49:49

applicant? Yes, ma'am. We'll do that. As Mr. Rooney's indicated. I think the point one of the reasons that may have been included in the docket is we'll have to draw a line you know somewhere as to

1:50:00

Where one stops with the setting out what the design principles apply to. And clearly the structures are an obvious starting point want to get down into finer grained detail? The gantry signage and lighting are covered together in that in that section, you have to draw a line somewhere, but we'll consider that. Okay.

1:50:19

I am going to take a short break.

1:50:23

But I

1:50:24

Yes, I think I think all other matters we could potentially cover under process.

1:50:31

Sorry, Mr. Scriven will hand back to you in order to announce the break. But I was just gonna say that matters relating to how this document is secured. And the process of engagement, which is quite a crucial point. You've already made some points about that. Mr. Lyness is we can we can do that after we come back from the break.

1:50:51

Thank you, Mrs Sahai. So the time is now for 21. I would suggest we take a break before we go on to Item eight and then we will run through from there and pick up noise and air quality as well. And if we could be back at 430 Please that would be that'd be useful.

1:51:11

Okay, thank you.