

M3 J9 ISH2 2nd AUG_PT2

Created on: 2023-08-02 11:50:19

Project Length: 00:57:12

File Name: M3 J9 ISH2 2nd AUG_PT2

File Length: 00:57:12

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:03 - 00:00:49:12

Okay. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Think we're all back. So I will resume this hearing at 1135 and continue with our discussion about air quality. Um, item two on the air quality agenda is construction phase impacts. Um, so a question to Winchester City Council. In your local impact report, you state that there's a commitment to the Section 61 Control of Pollution Act 1974 and prior consent is welcomed and early dialogue is requested with so that the Council can be satisfied that mitigation during construction delivers and will provide the level of mitigation assumed within Chapter 11.

00:00:49:19 - 00:01:05:00

Um, can I get confirmation if there's any outstanding concerns that you have about that dialogue and that what should be highlighted? Um, if and if this is proceeding as expected. Please.

00:01:08:29 - 00:01:17:09

So, so, so I said, can I just clarify because there's two points we can talk about, which is sort of construction dust mitigation and.

00:01:17:11 - 00:01:20:05

Construction can cover construction dust separately. Okay.

00:01:20:07 - 00:02:01:02

So so on the understand, we're talking about equality in more general terms. Um, we've already raised our concerns about potential adverse effects within the, um, during the construction phase for both resulting from traffic diversions and potentially in the days of Google and similar other things, the voluntary rerouting that people perform due to congestion. And that's of concern during the construction phase. Um, we've noted the applicant's comments, um, on our, our 102 page 72 of the applicant's response to relevant representations.

00:02:01:13 - 00:02:19:00

But we don't feel that satisfactorily answers our concerns. So still no reference to air quality impacts within a detailed diversion assessment methodology methodology. And we'd request that such criteria is listed and considered and reviewed as part of that consideration.

00:02:21:09 - 00:02:32:15

Thank you. And are you expecting that within current discussions or as part of the environmental management plan that will be secured in the DCO?

00:02:34:01 - 00:02:37:12

I would expect that, sir, as part of the current discussions.

00:02:37:27 - 00:02:42:15

Thank you very much. Um, can I ask the applicant to respond on that, please?

00:02:49:28 - 00:02:57:27

Um, for the branch don't have that. I mean, that's something we can carry on we can discuss with Winchester to. Address.

00:02:59:08 - 00:03:06:24

Okay. And you're clear that you understand the concerns that Winchester City Council have on this matter?

00:03:07:12 - 00:03:19:07

I think we're clear is that the basis of their concerns think within the equity chapter. We do look at the potential for air quality impacts during the construction period due to diverted traffic, both

00:03:20:25 - 00:04:01:21

both through the sort of the main construction period when the northbound on slip is closed and the potential for diverted flows then. But we've looked at that and really because that northbound on slip is not heavily trafficked, that kind of redistribution of flows doesn't lead to a risk of air quality impacts. You then have the sort of the closure diversions and closure routes discussion that we've we've touched upon. But again, there's the sort of the overnight closures etcetera, aren't considered likely to lead to air quality impacts because we're looking at sort of the annual air quality conditions and these occasional overnight closures and diversions aren't considered a risk from that that regard.

00:04:01:29 - 00:04:27:27

Okay. I'll just go back to the to the city council. Um, do you recognize that, that that answer in terms of is the methodology that has been you've seen and the assessment you've seen for during construction is acceptable, as you've commented already in the operational phase? Or do you feel that there's an issue with the assessment and the methodology that's been undertaken for construction phase?

00:04:31:18 - 00:05:05:04

We had filters at Winchester City. We do have some concerns in relation to the methodology with the the assumption of or diversions will be followed in the modeling methodology performed, which in reality I think we would all agree it's not the case and particular reference, we'd just like some more work done on that. And in reference to the consideration of the including in a diversion assessment, some reference to air quality which still doesn't exist.

00:05:05:06 - 00:05:35:05

So we'd like that to be more formally acknowledged. The overall methodology, yes, but we do have we have no issue with it in a high level, but we do have issue with that that detail in terms of the way they've assessed the divergence and the impacts and particular reference to a potential daytime diversions and and congestion and acknowledge that will be try to be limited. And the assessment demonstrates nighttime closures.

00:05:35:07 - 00:05:42:24

But I think we need to see more work on the bits where that won't be the case and more discussion and assessment of that, sir.

00:05:43:11 - 00:05:54:03

And um, it has that additional work been requested of the applicant already by yourselves or is, or is that something that you're seeking latterly?

00:05:55:10 - 00:06:04:27

We have. We have raised that, sir. We haven't. We the only response we've had so far, sir, is the response to relevant representations. But we don't feel that answers that question at this stage.

00:06:05:06 - 00:06:06:14

Thank you. Um.

00:06:08:02 - 00:06:17:12

You can ask the applicant if there's any further commentary on on why that's not something you are looking to supply. Please.

00:06:18:09 - 00:06:53:18

Yeah. Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Happy to continue to have the dialogue as part of the statement of Common ground and and flesh it out outside of this process, the hearing. Um, but in terms of the diversionary routes, um, they will, as we explained yesterday, subject to some sort of emergency closures, will be overnight or extended weekend closures, limited number of them during the construction period. The only long term closure is the M3 junction nine on the slip.

00:06:54:03 - 00:07:26:01

Um, and that has been modeled to and the modeling suggests that actually the number of vehicles that we use that won't generate significant impacts on, on the traffic network that would lead to any significant air quality impacts across the network. Um, however, we can work to flesh out that response if it's not currently to the satisfaction of Winchester City Council in terms of diversion routes and the joys of taking people on whichever route that the satnav considers is appropriate.

00:07:26:28 - 00:07:59:09

That is not that's an endemic problem that every traffic scheme and including, you know, Winchester local closures and things will have. So we can have a discussion about that. But I'm not entirely sure that that's within the bounds of the developer to to fix. We will be monitoring diversion routes that we put in place. Um, drivers and alike tend to stick to them now. Think they've learned the errors of their ways with satnav. Um, but that it is possible during monitoring for additional traffic management measures to be put in place.

00:07:59:11 - 00:08:18:26

But we would be then talking about the realms of forced turns and things which are not, um, not necessarily desirable. Understand from a traffic perspective. But if we take all of that together, um, and probably the statement of common ground might be the better place to investigate that further with, with Winchester.

00:08:20:04 - 00:08:24:08

Thank you very much. Can just confirm that Winchester with the nods that I've seen um.

00:08:24:24 - 00:08:29:20

So verbally footage of Winchester council. Yes, I'm advised that would be acceptable.

00:08:29:26 - 00:08:45:04

Thank you very much. In that case, we look forward to seeing further progress on what is quite an important issue I know for the locals has been already mentioned in the updated statement of common grounds and further information following this. Thank you. Um.

00:08:48:16 - 00:09:20:07

My next question has just been covered in terms of SatNav, so I will not ask that same question again. So will then in terms of non dust air quality during construction, um, I'm comfortable that that discussion will now happen outside. So unless there's any more questions about construction air

quality, I will leave that my vote will come back to the question of dust, as you've already mentioned it.

00:09:20:22 - 00:10:00:04

So in the local impact report, which City Council stated that construction dust impacts will be mitigated through the environmental management plan and this is acknowledged that this is included in the draft echo. However, again, details will not be provided until the second iteration of the Environmental Management Plan, which Winchester City Council feel means that they cannot comment. So can I just ask Winchester City Council if they would highlight the issues that they are still concerned about with dust and whether the first iteration, how the first iteration of the environmental management plan doesn't necessarily cover their concerns.

00:10:03:29 - 00:10:36:14

Go to Winchester City Council. Um, in terms of dust, just importantly, we're talking about in this section what we could colloquially call nuisance dust as the impacts of Pm10 PM 2.5 fractions of dust. I would include in discussions in relation to impact on air quality in terms of what we could quickly call nuisance dust. We are satisfied broadly with the proposal to to cover this in the environment management plan, but as stated at the moment in first iteration, it doesn't provide the sufficient detail.

00:10:36:16 - 00:11:01:17

We acknowledge that there is going to be a second interim iteration at the detailed design stage and we look forward to seeing more detail as to exact mitigation. Can't form a view until that detail is present as to whether such detail is sufficient. But at the moment it's we acknowledge that it would be difficult to provide that until a more detailed design stage is available to inform that.

00:11:02:03 - 00:11:03:04

Thank you very much.

00:11:03:15 - 00:11:31:18

This was can just ask that. Are you content to place reliance upon that or is there any further requirement or, you know, management plan or say, provisions within the first iteration amp that would provide you with more confidence that this sort of detail will be provided and taken forward?

00:11:33:06 - 00:11:44:28

Filter when should cancel and Am am satisfied that it is appropriate to deal with this matter through the environment management plan and acknowledge the lack of detail at this stage is simply because of the stage they're at in developing

00:11:46:28 - 00:12:06:10

the lack of the detailed design. So I don't identify any specific topics that need to be brought to the table above and beyond that in the environment management plan. But I do expect to see more, more information down the line, and I'm happy that that is the appropriate mechanism to deliver that.

00:12:09:26 - 00:12:15:27

Thank you for that confirmation. Um, does this applicant have any comments that they would like to make on that?

00:12:17:08 - 00:12:42:12

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Now think it is just a lack of detail because we don't have the detailed design. We're not anticipating the need for anything non-standard in terms of dust management. So it should just be business as usual and the plan will come forward at the appropriate time. So if it is all properly secured for now in the film, that's good for us.

00:12:43:14 - 00:13:14:07

And we asked a number of questions about this in the first written questions. So there are some answers that you may or may not have seen that we asked specifically about this and how that will be managed going forward. So that might also support your your thoughts and concerns. Thank you very much. Um, so. That concludes the discussion on item six regarding air quality. So I'm going to move on to noise and other health impacts.

00:13:15:14 - 00:13:15:29

Um.

00:13:18:28 - 00:13:53:24

So this is for Ms.. Porter in the South Downs National Park Authority's local impact report. They explain the importance of tranquility, of which noise is a substantial part. Some of this overlaps with the discussions we had in issue specifically hearing one. But can the South Downs National Park Authority detail how noise impacts on the national park in this area and what further considerations could be considered by the applicant? And if the applicant's response to the local impact report covers any of these concerns already?

00:13:56:20 - 00:13:59:23

He said. Kelly Porter from the National Park Authority.

00:14:00:09 - 00:14:34:20

Um, yeah, it's sort of set out in our local impact report and written representation. Think there are a number of steps that we've suggested could help improve the negative impacts on on Tranquility. Um, we, and we do acknowledge that the, the noise from the existing motorway, it has an impact and we, we've never denied that. But obviously this is a road widening scheme taking roads into the east of the of the national park and particularly on the eastern side there.

00:14:34:22 - 00:14:37:08

It does have an impact on, on tranquillity.

00:14:38:00 - 00:14:56:05

And um, just for my benefit, I mean, is there a kind of a definition of tranquillity? Because it's obviously not, you know, it's kind of, um, specific for a national park in terms of, in terms of that, that terminology would be helpful, I think, for all of us. If you could just expand on tranquillity. Yes.

00:14:56:07 - 00:15:31:06

Yes, you're right. It is quite unique to national parks. And it isn't just about noise. It's it's about that sense of feeling when you are in, if can put it bluntly, in an open countryside. And it isn't. It's it's more than just the noise you hear. It's the feelings you get. So I'm afraid it's not very not very tangible. And I do know everyone really struggles with this, um, but that's why we've put forward other sort of wider landscaping mitigation measures that can help address the issue of tranquillity.

00:15:31:27 - 00:15:44:12

And are you are you comfortable at the moment with how that's progressing in terms of your discussions with the applicant and and discussing how that can be mitigated in terms of noise and tranquillity?

00:15:45:00 - 00:16:03:27

Yes. In the assumption that we will see something happen at deadline five and some more information, obviously, I think the point that probably we're not going to reach agreement on is, um, the low noise surfacing of the roads. But think that's another agenda item is.

00:16:03:29 - 00:16:17:17

Another positive agenda item. Um, and just ask the applicant how they are approaching tranquillity and noise in particularly in the national park um, area please.

00:16:19:22 - 00:16:20:18

Paul Taylor speaking on.

00:16:20:20 - 00:16:21:20

Behalf of the applicant.

00:16:22:17 - 00:16:43:24

We assess public rights of way within our noise study area during opening year in the future year of the scheme and as a result of that, we're calculating the increase to be less than one decibel along public rights of way. So in terms of the noise impacts on tranquillity, they're not considered to be significant.

00:16:47:01 - 00:16:48:15

Thank you very much.

00:16:52:11 - 00:16:57:13

You've just referenced low noise surfacing which.

00:16:59:13 - 00:17:52:26

Appears to be the the main or sole mitigation measure for noise in the documentation. Um. The applicant also says there may be some areas of carriageway which currently have noise surfacing already. Um, just to explore further because I don't think I could understand the, the extent of the existing noise surfacing, low noise surfacing. Can the applicant explain where that existing low noise surfacing is, how old it is, and if the proposed surfacing is in any way an improvement on the existing low noise surfacing? What I'm trying to understand is, is what the improvement over the due minimum scenario is in relation to the kind of relativity of the the improvement of new low noise surfacing when some exists at the moment.

00:17:54:21 - 00:18:29:21

Let Katherine. Katherine Tracy, the applicant. Um. It's. It's somewhere I can't immediately direct you to where it is in the in the document. And we're all sitting here struggling to to recall it in terms of exactly where it is currently on the network. Um, but in terms of the assessments, it has been assumed that it is over the network so that we haven't assumed that we're assessing a non low noise, um, surface and then applying that low noise in the as part of the scheme.

00:18:29:23 - 00:19:00:25

So we're assuming that it's actually on the network as a, um, as a baseline. So for the purposes of the assessment, it, it shouldn't make any, any difference as to whether it's there or not. Um, and we will be replacing any, any surface that needs to be replaced as part of the scheme will be replaced with low noise surfacing. So we should be at worst maintaining the status quo, um, or making it better. But we can find that exactly where it is and where it's not.

00:19:00:27 - 00:19:03:07

We just have to go back through our records.

00:19:03:27 - 00:19:09:16

I'll come back to that in a second, but I'll just ask, um, Councillor Porter if she's got any further comment she'd like to make.

00:19:09:18 - 00:19:40:05

This understanding is that at the time it was placed in a section between Junction nine and the first and the service is just north there, but it was on the inner lane, only on the slow lane only. So browse through you would this no noise be on all lanes or just on the slow lane and also would it extend onto the a34 because the DEFRA sound map included some challenging sites on the A34 Kingswear which have never really been addressed.

00:19:40:07 - 00:19:43:15

And so it would be interesting to know if this extends up to that as well.

00:19:43:25 - 00:20:15:02

Thank you, Councillor Porter. And you've helped me with my follow up question as well. Um, so yeah, I think, think some more information about foot would be really helpful about where it is at the moment, but also because I know that surfacing technology improves quite quickly as well as legislation that we've talked about earlier. So it would be really good to understand where that surfacing is at the moment. I think it's so that we can understand where the you know, what the level of magnitude of improvement could be rather than just we will we will be seeing low noise surfacing.

00:20:15:04 - 00:20:46:02

And so think a plan of the existing and some information about the differences in perceived or noise level reduction that we could see from the actual, um surfacing that is likely to be used. Think I'm also um think it has also been covered but think the two further questions from me about the low noise surfacing. One two. Um. Which will come to Hampshire County Council, but unfortunately, there's no one here in terms of.

00:20:47:01 - 00:21:19:29

So I'll have to ask it to the applicant. Um, there are non trunk roads within the application boundary. Is it assumed that local highway network within the application boundary will also be part of the low noise resurfacing? Because at the moment, as far as I know, you're going to give me some more granular detail, but at the moment it seems as if all the new carriageway will be low noise servicing and that therefore includes Hampshire County Council maintained roads.

00:21:20:01 - 00:21:22:03

Is that's what you're expecting?

00:21:23:03 - 00:21:36:29

Catherine Tracy For the applicant, it is indeed. And any new surface laid as part of this scheme will be low, low noise road surfacing, irrespective of whether it's on local authority network or National Highways Network.

00:21:37:01 - 00:21:38:06

That's really helpful. And.

00:21:40:25 - 00:21:51:00

Are those discussions about future maintenance liability of that with Hampshire County Council, including their ability to maintain low noise servicing?

00:21:51:25 - 00:21:57:10

That is indeed one of the points of discussion between the applicant and Hampshire County Council.

00:21:57:12 - 00:22:27:26

I'd welcome that being quite specific in this statement of Common Ground because I think it's similar to the point about maintenance of new biodiversity and vegetation. If, if, if for some reason resurfacing gets changed to surface dressing in the future, I think the the impact of the mitigation will be disappeared through through general maintenance. And a similar commitment about the the trunk road network will be in. Thank you, Mr.

00:22:27:28 - 00:22:28:13

Gillam.

00:22:29:28 - 00:23:01:15

Thank you. Chris Gillam, Winchester Friends of the Earth. Low, Low impact. Low. Low. Noise Surfacing. Smooth surfacing actually has a consequence for particulate emissions. Mean it's I believe that the smoother the surface, the higher the proportion of PM 2.5 in the mix. Um, so there is a cause. I'm not suggesting for one moment that you don't you don't reduce the noise of pavement mean there are other ways of reducing noise by reducing speed, for example.

00:23:01:17 - 00:23:15:25

But I believe there is a consequence for the PM 2.5 modeling if they ever do it. Um, as a result of the surface used, I don't know if they've, if they've used the expected surface within their modeling.

00:23:18:15 - 00:23:21:28

If the applicant could respond on that. Thank you.

00:23:23:17 - 00:23:37:18

Philip Branch on behalf of the applicant. I'm not aware of any. Data that would support that surface obviously will have an effect on 2.5, but nothing specifically linked to low noise surfaces. But in PM 2.5 emissions.

00:23:38:06 - 00:24:02:21

I think it's it's something I'd welcome just in the clarification of low noise surfacing just to pick up that that point I think it'd be quite beneficial just to close that question out. Thank you Mr. Gillam. Um. Can I just ask Winchester City Council if they got any other in light of the fact that Hampshire County Council on here as well where they've got any other comments on those noise surfacing or. I saw a lot of nodding. So I'm hoping that there was a lot of agreement there.

00:24:03:13 - 00:24:19:11

For Winchester City Council. So I think you've summarized exactly the further information that we would like to see. And so like what you said, my guess is our position and welcome that further clarification as you've identified.

00:24:19:15 - 00:24:51:21

Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Um, so just move on to the next point, which is about overall operational phase mitigation and monitoring, Um, again in Hampshire County Council's absence. And so I'd have to ask this question to the applicant in their local impact report. They, they stated that they encourage the applicant to mitigate operational noise of the completed scheme as far as possible. However, as we've already discussed, the applicant has stated that no essential mitigation is required.

00:24:52:02 - 00:25:08:06

Um. Could you, if you have had any discussion with Hampshire County Council about their concern or their comments about mitigating operational noise as far as possible, whether that has materialized into anything specific?

00:25:17:27 - 00:25:21:24

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Currently, that's not gone any further.

00:25:22:10 - 00:26:03:14

Okay. Thank you very much. Think I'll I will probably follow up with the questions of Hampshire County Council because it was it was specifically in their local impact report and there was no specific reference in your response to the local impact report about that. But it also didn't give any particular details or concerns that they had. So I will follow that that up. Um, but will also ask Winchester City Council the same question about about mitigation for noise in the in the operational phase which you haven't raised, but just to confirm that you've had no particular questions or issues about about operational phase mitigation.

00:26:05:12 - 00:26:07:18

I thought you wanted to cancel. That's correct, sir.

00:26:07:20 - 00:26:10:00

Thank you very much. Councillor Porter.

00:26:11:22 - 00:26:41:29

Account supporter, speaking as a county councillor here, that Mr. Ackerman spoke in detail yesterday about the impact of overnight closures and frequently the overnight closures on the current motorway junction mean that traffic goes through the centre of Winchester. It chooses to, it chooses to take those routes and as a result we've had some long lengths of time where whereby the residents are disturbed for many nights.

00:26:42:13 - 00:27:16:01

And in our conversations with us, informal, informal conversations with the teams from national highways and we've looked at diversions with Mr. King and a presentation, we all ask that those number of nights should be limited so that their residents are not having to endure broken nights for many nights in a row. But they should be limited because the new junction is actually going to be less trafficked. It should happen less often, but it would be good for that to be included in your questioning.

00:27:16:03 - 00:27:16:18

Thank you.

00:27:16:20 - 00:27:30:09

Thank you. So can I just confirm, are you are you specifically talking about. The diversions during the construction of this project or any diversion that happens on the motorway during operational.

00:27:30:11 - 00:27:59:11

So that's been happening operationally. So the number of nights was rising and the heavy traffic on the roundabout. The current roundabout means that the lines wear out frequently. There's flooding on the a33 going into up to the junction and a number of other issues relating to the A34. So at any time when the motorway roundabout is closed overnight, which is relatively frequently, then traffic goes another in another direction.

00:27:59:13 - 00:28:26:08

Thank you. So have a question for the applicant. Has any assessment been made of the reduction or the change in future maintenance liability on the motorway because of the improvements at Junction nine? Has that been looked at at all, Whether there is as as Councillor Porter suggested, the likelihood of less maintenance required because of the junction nine or not?

00:28:28:04 - 00:28:33:18

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. I don't know the answer to that. I would have to take that away and ask.

00:28:34:21 - 00:28:36:11

Thank you very much. If you could do that.

00:28:36:24 - 00:28:59:22

If I may think the strength of the conversation. Also wanted to bring out was the fact that we all county counselors at the time and the Mr. Ackerman discussed with Mr. King the principle of never having long lengths of time whereby the residents would be disadvantaged by noise overnight in the operational phase as well as the construction phase.

00:28:59:24 - 00:29:00:18

Thank you very much.

00:29:02:14 - 00:29:28:03

The last thing I just wanted to cover in the mitigation and monitoring is effectively the similar questions we had with air quality for Winchester City Council. Um, there is no proposed monitoring in the operational phase post completion. Um, is this in this? Are you content that the assessment has shown that that is not required or is, or do you have a different view on that? Please?

00:29:33:01 - 00:29:36:03

Good. Excuse me. City Council. Um.

00:29:39:04 - 00:30:11:23

In answering that question, I had to revisit exactly how we got to that position. And it might be worth recapping that, and that will answer hopefully the question of where we are. And I'm satisfied. Um, paragraph 1110 for a Section 6.1 environmental statement is where it makes its iteration. Um, and that makes reference to paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of at 8111 as the assessment methodology is coming to that conclusion.

00:30:12:16 - 00:30:48:17

Um, however, although we take no issue with paragraph 4.2 in terms to in relation to the long term noise monitoring of the operational phase where we have no dispute with the applicant in practicality as to long term noise monitoring, we do take issue with the applicant in line with paragraph 4.1 of 8111, which relates to the acoustic assessment and performance of the proposed mitigation measures, which goes back to the reference of the um, the, the low noise tarmac.

00:30:48:19 - 00:31:10:20

We've made reference to already and I don't think it would be unreasonable in Winchester's view, for for some assessment in relation to, to that particular scheme, in relation to the assessment of the low noise tarmac to ensure it generates the operational acoustic performance that was presumed.

00:31:13:21 - 00:31:20:28

Thank you very much for that summary. Can I ask the applicant to to respond about the absence of the post-construction monitoring, please?

00:31:23:13 - 00:31:48:17

Paul Taylor speaking on behalf of the applicant. Um, think we agree with your comments in terms of long term noise monitoring and the difficulty in which can be faced in doing that. Um, the commitment to monitor, um, the inclusion of the low noise road surfaces mentioned in the film and um, yeah, don't think we've got many more comments on that.

00:31:52:02 - 00:32:01:03

Can you just for completeness, just highlight what that commitment is in the the environmental management plan, please.

00:32:03:28 - 00:32:06:09

Uh. Just give me a minute. Yep. No, thank you. Thank you.

00:32:38:07 - 00:32:56:08

Just while we're waiting and just ask Winchester City Council if they are also content to continue this discussion in with the applicants in line with what we've already discussed in terms of continuing discussions and and trying to get to a resolution.

00:32:57:26 - 00:33:06:24

Winchester City. Yes, sir. This is another one for further discussion in relation to the EMP and we'll revisit that again. And all next questions relating to construction.

00:33:06:26 - 00:33:07:11

Yeah.

00:33:07:13 - 00:33:08:02

Thank you very much.

00:33:10:10 - 00:33:11:00

How are you doing?

00:33:11:16 - 00:33:29:03

Paul Taylor speaking on behalf of the Applicant three In the states that reduce noise impacts associated with the operation of the scheme, low noise road surfaces proposed where new road surfaces are to be laid. The surface shall be specified to achieve road surface influence of -3.5 db.

00:33:29:29 - 00:33:45:29

Okay, so that's. So the statement is just about the noise surfacing rather than the monitoring. Okay. Thank you very much. I'll let you finish the conclusions, but we look forward to seeing some progress in terms of understanding how we can look at the monitoring of that noise afterwards or not. Thank you very much.

00:33:47:18 - 00:33:48:03

Sure.

00:33:50:01 - 00:34:24:18

So moving on to construction phase impacts. Um, so I just wanted to get a general understanding of the assessment of noise generation. And I know that there's probably been some, uh, advanced commentary about this. Can I just ask Winchester City Council in South Bend National Park Authority to highlight any remaining concerns they may have regarding noise generation and impact? And now we are during construction and has the applicant sufficiently detailed how noise generation would be reduced? Um, to your to your understanding, please.

00:34:24:20 - 00:34:26:07

I'll start with Winchester City Council, please.

00:34:28:15 - 00:35:14:23

Noted Winchester City Council. We're satisfied these matters can be covered within the environment management plan, as we've discussed previously. However, the first iteration of the Environmental Management plan, it's not possible to set the general level of such understanding and compliance is acceptable. This is again acknowledged, is a function of where we are at the moment, because currently the the noise and vibration management plan or the MP is not present in the first iteration, so it's very difficult to say have they assessed? The understanding of the noise sources and their control when it references you to an appendix that says two to follow.

00:35:15:03 - 00:35:25:11

So at the moment, I'm sure you'd appreciate until we have seen, as I understand that the second iteration, which includes the noise vibration and management plan, it's very difficult to provide comments, sir.

00:35:26:12 - 00:35:57:03

Thank you. Will go to the applicant on this one because it's something that I wanted to ask as well. In our first examiners questions, we did ask about some of the missing or the the appendices that hadn't been included in the first iteration. And from memory, I think there was a response that you would provide an essay rather than the the the, the, the document. And as far as I can recall, I haven't seen those essays yet.

00:35:57:05 - 00:36:25:20

I think I think it was a fair proposal to do such and think it would help Winchester City Council and and us as well to understand um where the thoughts are heading. We do appreciate that the second iteration is is following on, but think that essay would be very helpful. Is that something that could continue to be looked at and provided at the earliest opportunity? Please?

00:36:26:26 - 00:36:41:18

Catherine Treacy for the applicant. Certainly. Yet plans are being produced for certainly. Remember, there were two specific ones which have already been provided. But think with noise and vibration management. Think that is something we can take.

00:36:41:22 - 00:37:00:18

So I can't recall. I appreciate a couple word. There was a couple of updates, but I think also I think agree with Winchester City Council that there wasn't one for noise and vibration. I think it would be very helpful if there was an essay provided for that in in lieu of the further detail that will come forward.

00:37:01:05 - 00:37:02:20

Yeah, I've had confirmation that that's fine.

00:37:02:22 - 00:37:18:19

Thank you. And that this discussion may help with some of the coming questions that might just be covered in that could ask Miss Porter if the South Downs National Park Authority have any any concerns as well about the construction phase impacts?

00:37:20:07 - 00:37:34:24

Thank you, sir. Porter from the National Park Authority. Um, no, Our concerns are outstanding, but it's all tied up with our concerns about the location of the construction compound and obviously the immediate impacts to the residents of Whitehill Cottage.

00:37:35:11 - 00:37:51:05

And in terms of the construction compound, um, do you feel that you have sufficient information about the potential noise generation and the potential noise mitigation, um, to to have any view on that at the moment?

00:37:51:21 - 00:37:59:15

Uh, yes, we have sufficient information and obviously we agree to disagree on, on whether there's sufficient mitigation.

00:38:00:04 - 00:38:04:03

And I'm sorry to, to question I'm asking specifically about noise rather than.

00:38:04:07 - 00:38:05:23

Yeah, no, that is related to noise.

00:38:05:25 - 00:38:07:09

Thank you very much. Um.

00:38:08:24 - 00:38:27:27

That's really helpful. Thank you for that and look forward to that. And I think that will help. Um. Winchester City Council. And if that if I could ask that for deadline for I know we've, we've talked about deadline for not being that far away. It would then allow Winchester City Council to reply by deadline five. Um, if that's possible, please.

00:38:29:15 - 00:38:34:23

I have asked that question of my team, but I'll let you know. I think that should be possible. Yeah.

00:38:34:26 - 00:38:36:18

Think as we asked, as we were

00:38:38:08 - 00:38:43:22

given that in one of our initial questions that that might be provided, I'm hoping that would be possible now. Thank you.

00:38:43:28 - 00:38:46:00

We'll do what we can to do it for the deadline for.

00:38:46:18 - 00:38:49:00

Thank you very much. Um.

00:38:51:29 - 00:39:24:12

My next question was going to be about the issue about satnav diversions, because I know that there's going to be a lot of overlap between noise and air quality in a couple of the things that have been raised. So I'm not going to revisit that unless there's a particular, um, request to revisit that. But I note the comments that have already been made. And in terms of monitoring, I'm sure that the, the City Council will be doing the noise monitoring alongside the air quality monitoring as required. So I will not pursue that that any further.

00:39:24:22 - 00:39:25:07

Um.

00:39:27:12 - 00:40:12:24

So just looking at mitigation, um, during construction. Um, Winchester City Council in your local impact report. Um, you highlight that chapter 11 concludes that only that only with mitigation or

construction stage impacts acceptable at identified sensitive receptors. And it references that these will be delivered through measures identified in the environmental management plan. Um, I know that we've already talked about the mitigation in the environmental management plan, but this is I just want to search this question in a little bit more detail because you've highlighted that there are specific receptors that you have considered, um, required that mitigation.

00:40:12:26 - 00:40:22:02

Again, are you, are you comfortable that the first iteration provides that mitigation at those particular receptors or not?

00:40:26:04 - 00:40:53:21

Go to city council? No, it's the short answer to that question on the grounds that with the lack of information, again, we've already mentioned the noise vibration management plan. I can't assess whether that mitigation I'm satisfied looking at the receptors and the data the applicant has provided. There's no objection in principle, subject to suitable mitigation. It should be available, but haven't obviously cannot assess that mitigation at this stage, sir.

00:40:55:02 - 00:41:21:29

That's thank you very much. And I think subject to your confirmation of this, if that could be. Part of the essay simply because there is a very specific number of receptors that you have in your environmental statement said can only be mitigated. You actually need mitigation. Think it would help us all to understand what the likely mitigation would be in those those receptor locations?

00:41:23:14 - 00:41:31:17

Katherine Tracy For the applicant, yes, that will be fine. It is just those receptors listed in our ears. There aren't any additional ones.

00:41:32:14 - 00:41:34:00

Just confirm this.

00:41:34:17 - 00:41:39:26

Photo. Winchester City Council. No, only the ones that we've identified that we agree with.

00:41:41:24 - 00:41:42:10

Thank you.

00:41:48:13 - 00:41:49:11

Thank you very much.

00:41:56:24 - 00:41:57:09

And.

00:42:01:05 - 00:42:39:24

My, my last question on this element was, um, was for Hampshire County Council. And but again, I will, I will put it through the applicant if they can help with the with the question in the local impact report, Hampshire County Council, their local environmental health team, they stated, will need to be satisfied that the impacts of the scheme during construction are an acceptable level based on the evidence and modeling. And was going to ask Hampshire County Council if there was further information that they could give specifically about what they their environmental health team, the what they consider the local environmental health team would need to consider.

00:42:40:07 - 00:42:53:07

But in their absence, um, I would just ask the applicant if they have had any, any discussions with Hampshire County Council about noise, vibration and mitigation.

00:42:57:03 - 00:43:04:24

Anthony Tracy, the applicant. We they haven't raised it in discussions that we've been having to date, but we can certainly raise it as you raised it.

00:43:04:26 - 00:43:41:20

And because it's the responsibility of the City council, I would expect that answer. They did, however, just make a comment in the local impact report and wanted to explore that. So but will ask them a separate question. Thank you very much. Um. That concludes my questioning about noise impacts. Thank you for that and look forward to the essay, which I think will help a great deal. Um, so the last part of the, the noise and other health impacts, um, was related to the wider health impacts which again we've started to explore briefly.

00:43:41:27 - 00:44:14:26

Um, again, I'm hoping that the applicant will help me in this first question. Hampshire County Council, in their local impact report, stated that a full health impact report would be beneficial. Um, the applicant, in their response to the local impact report stated that it's best practice to consolidate all health considerations. Um, could you explain in reality what that means in an answer to the difference between a full health impact report and consolidating all health considerations?

00:44:15:21 - 00:45:09:08

Yeah. Katherine Tracy for the applicant. So impacts on human health across the board have been considered in in chapter 12, which is a population in human health chapter of the environmental statement. And that assessment has been undertaken in accordance with 112. Um, and that sets out the requirements for assessing and reporting the environmental effects on population and human health from construction operation and ongoing maintenance. Um, we followed that guidance and so the topics considered a location and type of community recreational education facilities, severance, green space, um, and whether there's any severance healthcare facilities, transport and connectivity, safety of the existing affected road network, ambient air quality and any air quality management areas.

00:45:09:10 - 00:45:37:08

Noise and noise sensitive receptors, noise management areas. Um, sources of pollution, landscape amenity. So they are all covered already in chapter 12, which is in line with what's required in the environmental assessment. And that essentially discharges that duty to cover those, um, health impact assessment. It is. Exceptionally similar. So it would be a duplication.

00:45:38:20 - 00:45:54:11

So did you understand from Hampshire County Council's point of view what they what they thought of full health impact report would do differently to what has been included in the Is? Did you did you get an understanding of that?

00:45:56:17 - 00:46:09:26

No, because we think it's properly everything that would be covered in a health impact assessment is covered in our Chapter 12 assessment. So we're not sure what they consider is missing from from that.

00:46:10:20 - 00:46:24:27

Thank you. Um, just noticed Winchester City Council. You were talking. I just didn't know whether you might be able to know is whether you were. Might be able to help with that question. I'm not asking you to answer if you don't feel you can, but if you can, that would be helpful.

00:46:27:02 - 00:46:58:11

A filter just went to city council. My understanding as environmental health professional is health impact assessment is a consideration, as it says, of health impact. Um, and can look at the cumulative effects greater than the, the way that health impacts are often considered by compliance with guidance. A guidance B guidance C So think this comes back to the topic of people saying just because something complies with certain guidance doesn't mean it looked holistically.

00:46:58:13 - 00:47:31:01

There isn't an adverse health impact and this is the opportunity for the applicant to give a more overview of those those potential health impacts, which we welcome. And we've already heard about the difference between compliance and health impacts in relation, for example, to air quality. So my understanding is it should be a greater level of data assessment of overall health impacts than possibly comply with guidance, say guidance, be So it would provide the applicant with that assurances to the public of their concerns.

00:47:31:03 - 00:47:31:18

So.

00:47:33:26 - 00:47:57:10

Thank you very much. That's very helpful to have your professional view, even though it wasn't raised by yourself. So thank you for helping us out there. Um, I don't know whether that changes or the applicant wants to come back on anything for that, but I would obviously ask Hampshire County Council a follow up question to, to close that out in their absence. But thank you both for that. Um.

00:48:01:12 - 00:48:37:25

A number of these questions are about the local impact report from Hampshire County Council. So please forgive me again for asking the applicants their understanding of progress in their local impact report. Hampshire County councils state that considerations beyond the red line boundary will also be important for the scheme in relation to public health impacts and outcomes. Could you explain where you where you have undertaken assessment beyond the red line boundary? And I was going to ask Hampshire County Council to explain further what they feel may be missing, but didn't know whether that's something that you could

00:48:39:12 - 00:48:40:20

elaborate on, please.

00:48:42:27 - 00:48:56:17

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. I don't believe we've specifically assessed anything outside of the red line boundary outside of Chapter 12, where we we look at the wider impacts with health and population.

00:48:56:24 - 00:49:31:15

Thank you. Will will follow that up with Hampshire County Council in the same sort of vein to see whether they are now happy or content with your your response from the local impact report. And um. Another question about Hampshire County Council's local impact report. They state that the inclusion of connectivity, active travel routes, public rights of way landscape areas and tree planted are not recognized as key community assets within table 12.8, and that the County Council would consider that these are community assets.

00:49:31:20 - 00:49:47:03

Um, from for my benefit, can you potentially explain why Hampshire County Council would be keen to see them as close as community assets and and if that would or could have an effect on any assessment that has been undertaken in the years, please.

00:49:51:17 - 00:49:55:09

Katherine Tracy for the applicant. Could we have a moment to do some musical chairs?

00:49:56:12 - 00:49:57:07

Please do.

00:50:25:07 - 00:50:29:00

So this is. But Prudence don't know her name.

00:50:31:13 - 00:50:32:04

Who's our?

00:50:34:00 - 00:50:36:11

Public population in human health specialists.

00:50:37:11 - 00:50:38:08

Thank you very much.

00:50:39:01 - 00:50:43:17

Prudence Wales on behalf of the applicant. Um. Time to hold this down. That's fine.

00:50:43:19 - 00:50:44:04

No, you don't.

00:50:44:17 - 00:50:58:17

So we'll. Public rights of way are covered within the chapter and under walking, cycling and horse riding. They're just not defined. But then guidance as a community asset. So they are covered in our assessment.

00:50:59:24 - 00:51:15:29

Thank you very much. I think the question I had in the absence of Hampshire County Council was what of what effect? Having it labelled as a community asset or not might affect the assessment or from your point of view, does it not?

00:51:16:20 - 00:51:31:08

Um, Prudence Wales are behalf of the applicant. Um, from my perspective it does not. Um, it's still covered under our significance, um, assessment. So it wouldn't change our assessment of those public rights of way.

00:51:31:28 - 00:51:42:10

Thank you very much. In which case will, as I've said with the other comments, will make sure I'll follow that up with Hampshire County Council to make sure that they don't have any further comments about that. Thank you very much.

00:51:44:10 - 00:51:44:25

Um.

00:51:46:13 - 00:51:55:13

Is there any other issues that we haven't covered in other health impacts? No. We've covered a number of things with health impacts throughout the morning. Um.

00:51:57:24 - 00:51:58:17

Councillor Porter.

00:51:59:13 - 00:52:42:19

Thank you. Know that the subject of noise and other health impacts and we're also looking at carbon next week. But one of the conversations that has been ongoing for some time is that the the speed limit that's going to be operating on this section will mean that it's actually going at 70 miles an hour for the whole thing. And I wondered if any conversations have been taking place regarding a lower speed which actually would have a greater effect on low or lower noise, but also a greater effect on the carbon emissions, and wondered if that has actually come up through any of the pieces of work that have been taking place with Hampshire County Council.

00:52:42:21 - 00:52:53:07

I haven't seen it. Certainly we've not raised it specifically at Winchester, but it was raised before Fitzpatrick before and now with a new applicant, it would be interesting to know Thank you.

00:52:53:09 - 00:52:55:21

And which we're.

00:52:55:23 - 00:52:58:18

Intending to, to raise it again as part of the climate.

00:52:59:08 - 00:53:03:29

No, my question was going to be which part of the road network we use specifically referencing.

00:53:04:04 - 00:53:06:27

Specifically this this whole section within the red line.

00:53:06:29 - 00:53:10:22

So the whole of the red line boundary, because obviously there's parts of the red line boundary which aren't 70 miles.

00:53:10:26 - 00:53:27:12

The ones that don't exceed the ones that are currently at 70 ones continue at 70, because currently the the vehicles come off, go to a lower speed, run the round accelerate on. But actually in the new arrangements they will be going at 70 my understanding is up at 70 throughout.

00:53:28:07 - 00:53:38:16

Thank you very much. You're in the operational phase. Yeah. Thank you very much. If it's the applicant had any discussions about lower speed limits.

00:53:40:12 - 00:53:50:26

Katherine Tracy, the applicant now believe will be working at national speed limits throughout being, although I would have to go and double check. That.

00:53:52:22 - 00:53:56:12

Exactly how that will work with the free flows so can come back on that.

00:53:56:14 - 00:54:15:15

But think think a follow up question would be the assumption would be that those speed limits changes or the new speed limits are part of the overall noise assessment that has been undertaken. Therefore, the predicted noise includes those speed limits. I would assume that that would be the case.

00:54:15:29 - 00:54:24:14

It was a conversation that was going on going before. Fitzpatrick But now with a new applicant, it's obviously a starter again, and I'd just like to raise that.

00:54:24:16 - 00:54:25:14

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:28:18 - 00:54:39:08

We're not a new applicant. Is that in relation to the smart motorways discussion with. But I don't think that's bold because what.

00:54:39:16 - 00:54:54:09

If got wrong wrong words, but basically it was discussed because obviously it was part of the way and part of the the whole conversation, but also part of the decision about speed and noise as well as accident rate.

00:54:54:14 - 00:54:55:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:58:00 - 00:55:19:27

So Tracy, for the applicant, we will have assessed in the noise and air quality and all the other assessments, the operational speed limits that will be set out in relation to smart motorway or not. I think that's a discussion for next week possibly, but we have undertaken the assess all of our assessments without smart motorway being in place.

00:55:21:27 - 00:55:34:03

Thank you very much. Um. I just checked with Miss McCoy, and we don't have any other matters that we wish to raise. So unless there are any other matters. Mr. Gag.

00:55:35:28 - 00:55:37:19

Thank you and apologize.

00:55:37:21 - 00:55:38:11

If I've missed the.

00:55:38:13 - 00:55:38:29

Reference.

00:55:39:01 - 00:55:59:12

But relating to Mr. Rogers suggestion that there are combined effects, I would feel pleased if we could add mental health to the list of types of health that should be discussed at this point.

00:56:01:07 - 00:56:08:24

Thank you very much. Can I just ask the applicant if that is included in the assessment?

00:56:19:23 - 00:56:32:27

At Catherine Tracy for the applicant. No, it's not assessed directly and currently it wouldn't be actually possible to assess it that there's you'd need a baseline and and various other.

00:56:34:26 - 00:56:39:15

Metrics to calibrate it all against, and that's not required in current assessments.

00:56:39:22 - 00:56:51:21

Thank you very much. I think, Mr. Gallagher, obviously, as I've said, I've got a follow up question to make to Hampshire County Council about their questions. So I will wait for their response. And thank you for your comments. Um.

00:56:53:16 - 00:57:09:26

So if there are no other matters that anyone wishes to raise, um shall now close issue specific hearing to. Thank you all for your attendance and participation in the hearing. Um, this hearing is now closed. Thank you very much.