

# transcript\_ISH1\_session3\_30112022

00:00

Very good afternoon, everybody, it's now quarter to two.

00:05

I hope you've well refreshed after lunch.

00:09

And it was long enough for all you.

00:14

Before we

00:16

just a reminder that live people with the live stream will hopefully have refreshed their browsers accordingly.

00:26

Before we just come on to the next part of the agenda, in respect of scheme, six, this is. And particularly the

00:34

the route options of not going north of the existing route. Mr. Humphrey, we'll just go through some lunchtime action points.

00:46

Yes, thank you, Miss Allen, the applicant was going to come back about the fine grained assessment environment, assessment of environmental effects on the sales.

00:56

Yes, that's something we can provide. Okay. Well, having when I asked for it, we weren't we hadn't talked about noise at that point. But I think that might be given that's an environmental effect on the sills, if that could be added that would be helpful. Yeah. So we'll take a note of that. Thank you.

01:16

Think that's the only point I had. So Hunter, Mrs. Milligan.

01:23

Thank you. Yes.

01:27

Manuela two other points that perhaps it may be helpful to deal with now. Or we can deal with them at the end, which

01:34

that's fine. You can deal with them now. wasn't clear whether we actually discussed other than that point, I asked whether it would come back after lunch. But yes, yeah. So so the two other points I can deal with. You asked for comparison data for the latest traffic model, to be able to compare the baseline to the to the Blue Route. And that's something we can also provide.

01:57

And the third point was

01:59

the compulsory purchase position in respective lambrick. And that's something we'll provide no written response, when when in the written response to this hearing will provide a merited for that third one will provide on what about the other two?

02:14

So the comparison data for the latest traffic model,

02:20

we can provide that by deadline one.

02:23

And the more granular assessment setting, at this moment, we still need to consider with our experts about the scope of doing that. It's difficult for us to commit to a deadline right now.

02:36

It's something that we need to develop and consider.

02:39

Okay, but you could put your you could tell us when that's going to be in your written submissions following this hearing. Yes. So we can within our written response, we can provide a better indication as to when we'd be able to provide that granular assessment that we can provide. Yeah, we obviously wouldn't want it so late in the exam, it didn't make much difference. We'd want it as early as possible. Understood. So we'll take that away. Thank you. With that, aha, madam.

03:09

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. So

03:12

really, what we're wanting the applicant to do is to perhaps walk us through any reasons or considerations.

03:22

And this is really an addition to, I guess the physical encroachment into the AONB boundary.

03:29

As to why the alternative route north of the A 66 and enter the land owned by Ministry of Defence was discounted, please?

03:40

Yes, madam.

03:44

I think

03:45

it's probably most helpful if we start with with setting out the overarching policy position, which drives these decisions. And I think what we'll ask for is on the screen as we're discussing the policies will have been brought up on the screen. In terms of references for you, Mister where

04:04

we explained within the documents,

04:08

our approach to alternatives here. The first one is the case for the project.

04:13

Its app 008,

04:18

paragraphs 6.5 point 666 point 5.191.

04:32

And then the general response

04:37

to the policies 15132155, which we're about to discuss in more detail sets out and up to four to the legislation and policy compliance statement.

04:50

That's page 178 of that.

04:54

So to take us through that.

04:57

Mr. Smith will now take us through that

05:00

And then we'll be able to provide any additional detail after we've heard from him

05:11

just explained,

05:14

the we have set out in

05:17

some detail within the case of the project, our assessment of our promoted route

05:27

in relation to the various policy tests,

05:30

murder 5151 to 155.

05:38

And in some detail,

05:41

as you'll see that there's there's an assessment, for example, in relation to 151. against each of the elements is you have a criteria of those policies, which includes and evaluation assessment against alternatives. And in this case, to comply with the Exceptional Circumstances Test

06:07

and public interest. We have assessed

06:11

promoted route against an alternative outside of VA, Wendy, for those two sections

06:19

of central and eastern links within the scheme, way to scheme.

06:30

The principal

06:32

conclusions, I mean, I won't go into the detail and I don't want to sort of sort of repeat what's in that document. But if I can just take you through the principal conclusion.

06:45

Firstly, in relation to policy on five one, in terms of why we have concluded that there are exceptional circumstances in the public interest for what are very limited incursions within the AONB.

07:04

The first principle reason as they oppose incursions are very limited.

07:10

They're in a part of the EO N D, which is not fully representative of the special qualities of the EO N D.

07:19

The experience of EO and the these locations

07:25

you is we've concluded significantly affected by the presence of traffic because it follows the current Road in Ireland, the infrastructure associated with the

07:39

the highway, signage etc who've been va 66 Route Corridor it follows the existing corridor.

07:48

Withdrawal so from the landscape assessment

07:52

within Chapter 10 of the environmental statement, which found that

07:58

the proposed sections within the AONB would not affect the special qualities of AONB would not change was special qualities. And we go through each of those special qualities in turn, and conclude that it wouldn't affect those qualities of end.

08:19

There's potential for

08:22

conservation, conservation and enhancement of a landscape

08:27

through adherence to design principles, which are set out in our different design principles document and through

08:37

ensuring that we address all the requirements and commitments set out in the environmental management plan.

08:46

We have concluded there'd be no impact on the primary purpose of the end. We're conserving and enhancing the landscape as set out in the crow act 2000. And importantly, in terms of need,

09:00

early for project, you know, the scheme which is a

09:04

component of the project

09:08

leads to the overall economic objectives, local, regional and national level and the benefits particularly in terms of levelling up and the significant contribution to the northern powerhouse growth agenda.

09:25

We also consulted

09:31

at and engaged with

09:35

the local communities and other stakeholders

09:40

not just on the

09:43

our preferred route or promoted route within the OMB but also the alternatives. Outside the OMB. There was significant support.

09:56

There was some really some some policies who objected that

10:00

But

10:03

what is important is that statutory, the key statutory bodies,

10:10

Natural England and also the AONB partnership.

10:16

We're in support of the bow promoters proposed route, and did raise concerns and issues with an alternative.

10:27

That was further to the north and within the

10:32

end.

10:36

So they were the principal conclusions

10:40

on our assessment, as I say, is set out in further detail

10:44

in the case of a project.

10:48

Okay, thank you. Perhaps,

10:51

perhaps I wasn't clear, but

10:54

I think what I'm asking you is, are there any other reasons in addition to the physical encroachment, why that northern route wasn't pursued further

11:11

in the principal

11:15

me

11:19

I think at this point, it may

11:22

be a little bit about the MO D. Sorry, I think yes. Without being pointed.

11:34

I think Miss Miss course, I think you want to take that first about the reasons we did the MO D reasons. And

11:44

we can follow up with that.

11:48

So Monica, Kosar Griffiths, I work for national highways, I'm the lead for designing DCO.

11:55

Yes, the the other reason why we were not progressing with a route to the north of the 66 is because it's land for the Minister of Defence. And we had a number of discussions with the EO who represents the Minister of Defence, and our understanding is that land to the north of the 66 is operational and required for training purposes. For mo D. We are aware we, we can't compulsory acquire land from MLD. And therefore a engagement with the yo hub, taking quite a significant consideration in our selection of route.

12:41

Thank you. That doesn't answer my question. Thank you.

12:45

Any questions in the panel?

12:49

Yes, can I move to the floor that any interested parties present wish? Dr. Martin first.

12:57

Okay, I'll just reiterate some of the arguments for the northern route. And just to repeat that I've been part of the walker Musgrave campaign group and also the Community Liaison Group. So a lot of these good ideas actually came from them parish councils. And we're very strongly supported by local people.

13:19

And if no one wants to sign the petition for the northern route still available, but these reasons are on it. So road which went north of the current a 66 from walk up to Bruff would avoid the building of even more new roads for access and more local pollution. So it would actually prevent all these complicated roads that are having to be a being designed because of the road gate the dual carriageway going south. It would also avoid more local pollution, air and noise. It could be a tourist attraction, and it would take up very little of the entirety of the North Pennine a bit AONB, which is actually very clear from our petition images. Avoid the long term disruption to traffic due to building a new road or on an existing one forward the very real risk of flooding in an area which has suffered severe flooding

14:13



and avoided disruption to farmers residents and the Gypsy community. I mentioned before this has been strongly supported by our by the local MP Neil Hudson, who asked a question in parliament on October 2020 1pm cues about whether there will be consultation between Defra the Department of Transport and the Ministry of Defence and he was assured by Boris Johnson that there would be just a few, a few brief points if I may. So this northern route was never offered to local people in the language area. The only time it's been offered is to very selected parts of near wall cup and that was only from January February this year.

15:00

In December 2020, a survey was conducted by Mark Walker per Musgrave parish councils, and 94% of their responses were in favour of the northern route. So that pressure has constantly been pushed on national highways who've resisted it. The other points about the AONB is, as many people have argued, it's not really very beautiful. It's army land that's been used for firing for decades. It's been hidden from the road by conifers, so you can't even see it from your car. And until very recently, was completely closed to the public.

15:38

So sorry, just so we were what I'm very interested by the fact we were consistently told at consultations that we could then Roque rude, sorry, the road could not go north because it was on an AONB, and it was mid land. But now this has actually been happening at Walkup. And he's justified in the documents 6.5 In the case with support that you've heard reference to,

16:05

there's been no, I would like to know, there's never been any, as far as I know, survey of the northern route in terms of costs, you know, the argument of parish councils, and the campaign is that this would actually be cheaper than the road going south. And just to draw everyone's attention to the very great cost of the Appleby brass section, which together with temple salby and Appleby section, comprise 50% of the cost of the entire Aid section route of the 1.6 Billions. So it'd be worth looking at cost for that. And thank you, I think that's all I've got to say, except there are no speed cameras along that route, just on the safety issue. And I think that this is a matter of urgency. And just in case people didn't know they introduced speed cameras on the A nine in Scotland, on routes, which was supposed to be very dangerous, and that actually, leaves created the problem. So sorry if that's a little bit off the AOA off the northern route, but I think safety is a concern for all of us. Thank you so much for your attention, and I know that Mark blacker jawed has a statement as well.

17:16

Thank you, Dr. Martin, before we move to virtual attendees.

17:22

Ms. Taylor Kenyon, do you have something you wish to say? Yes.

17:32

I was really very interested in the first speakers presentation, because I thought what he gave us a really good reason rationale for why the bits of the ACC six weeks, the new ACC seats, which go into

the AONB should go into the AONB. And I note that in the documentation, they do give a really strong case for that incursion. But my question is, which I think is the same question is being asked by the panel is why was that consideration not extended to that middle section of what has been called the central part of the Blue Route? And it appears to me that that question is doesn't appear to have been answered satisfactorily in the documentation that we've got. But you know, so there's an excellent case for why the incursion takes place. But I don't see an equally good case for why it should not take place. In the in the in that section, that middle section. And the other thing I just wanted to say was, was the MO D Land, I mean, it's just worth checking where the boundaries are because of

18:44

I think I'm right in saying that on the maps, the MO D Land does not extend all the way along this section that we're discussing at the moment.

18:57

Thank you.

18:59

Very brief point. So it's actually in your own in the pins documentation, the minutes in Section 51/17 of March this year, that people think that the initial AONB line was completely arbitrary. It was simply placed along the road because there was a road there. And so it's not actually it's never been justified as being particularly beautiful. It's simply a matter of convenience. And I think that's a really important argument for having the road, you know, at some point north of the line north of the road.

19:35

Thank you.

19:38

The gentleman at the back. Can you just state your name and who you represent. Thank you. Hello, my name is Billy Welsh, and I'm Roma gypsy. I'm speaking on behalf of the Gypsy and traveller community. And I know tomorrow's going to be my I'll get my opportunity to speak tomorrow. But the ladies talking about there and what they're talking about the road gone gone through Mr. de la and the actual route. What they're proposing is

20:00

I'm still going through Mr. de la and the actual traditional laws fair, gypsy OSFI is a more dealer. And so it doesn't matter if it's north or south, it's still going through mo de la and so that that does just not want to make that point.

20:15

Thank you, Mr. Walsh. Before I move to virtual attendees, does the applicant wish to comment on any of what they've heard so far?

20:34

I think just to provide some some references.

20:39

In terms of our response to this,

20:42

to this issue of

20:47

the restrictions posed by this being both AONB and mo de land, you can find that in the route Development Report.

20:55

At number two, for seven

20:58

paragraphs five, point 6.74 to five, point 6.75.

21:09

And then we also go down to paragraph five, point 6.79, which makes a reference to that an NPS

21:17

paragraph 5.5 course,

21:20

that's a requirement in national policy that we need to seriously considering the impact on military assets. Now, that's a restriction posed there by that policy, in terms of the discussion around

21:36

the approach to alternatives and the extent of the incursion,

21:41

our response, we've already given the references and

21:44

to our exceptional circumstances case, but the option that we chose is the one that minimise those incursions.

21:52

And then the final point we'd like to address is,

21:59

again, in respect of Mo, de land.

22:02

And that one, I think, can take.

22:07

Thank you. Yeah, just to confirm that, as it's just been explained, the options do include incursions onto MLD land. But the option we've got, in terms of the the central section of the scheme we're talking about is the impact that that has been discussed with Dr. Yeoh will is supported

22:29

from the aisle. So we are in agreement on that impact, as I said, is minimising the impact as much as possible.

22:40

Thank you. Any further questions from the panel?

22:45

Can I suggest that we start with

22:49

Mr. Keith Lee, please from walkup parish council, virtually.

22:56

Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

22:59

Yes. If you could speak a little bit louder, that would be helpful.

23:03

Thank you. Thank you for letting me take part in your hearing.

23:08

I don't want to speak for too long. But I think it's worth

23:13

telling you for your understanding is that

23:17

the parish council of walk up and Musgrave, we conducted a survey of local people, local residents where we showed them the original national highways route option.

23:30

And compare that with a more northerly route, as you've just been discussing.

23:35

And the outcome of that was that 300 or more returns came in and 94% of local people preferred a more northerly route.

23:46

Now, subsequent to that, in consultation, and to be fair to national highways, there have been some more northerly improvements, but we're talking about a few yards here and there.

24:01

And I'd strongly agree with the point being made that in the original consultation, northern options were rejected, because there was never ever going to be a possibility of being crouching onto the mid land or the AONB land,

24:19

which turned out to be not the case. So I am saying on behalf of the parish council of walkup in particular, is that we we appreciate that some of the design has moved further north

24:36

and the Incursions are relatively limited.

24:40

But I believe that there's still

24:43

the opportunity for further incursions into the AONB that doesn't interrupt the work as the mid and that doesn't

24:55

spoil the landscape because kind of London the edge of the mid

25:00

area is not the best land. And there's nowhere near as beautiful as land to the south of the current, a 66. And I was very encouraged to hear that discussion about the language junction. And I support wholeheartedly any proposal to improve that monstrosity of a junction, which in my opinion, is unnecessary. And that might mean a further slight northern incursion. So, I just like to lend my support to those who are in the room and those others who've made written representations that are not a more northerly route would be well supported by local people. And if you can't go as far north as we would have originally wanted, then we hope that national highways can still look at further improvements further north.

25:55

Thank you, Mr. Keatley.

25:58

Mr. blacker Ord.

26:13

Are you on mute? Mr. blacker owed?

26:22

Mr. blacker old, I think your microphone is on mute. Now, can you hear me now? I can. Yes. Sorry.

26:32

I very much. Well, I should explain that I represent myself as a resident of walk up and informally reflect the views of the many residents who oppose the present proposed route. I'm entirely at one with Dr. Martin and

26:52

David quickly. So I'd be able to be I think quite short. There's one matter that I'm slightly confused about and I'm sure the fault is mine.

27:19

Mr Blackett

27:21

can't pause.

27:26

Gonna microphone off and start again, because we got some of the conversation. And then we've got quite terrible reverb. So

27:35

is it any better now? That's better? Yes. I'm so sorry. I've been? I've moved too far from my microphone. Okay, Could you perhaps you could just I think you press if you just start again, with your what you were saying, Please, I'm so sorry. You're quite right to stop me.

27:54

I represent myself as a resident of walk up and informally reflect the views for many residents who oppose the present proposed route in favour of a northern one.

28:09

And those one, because I wholly agree with what you've just heard from Dr. Martin and David piccoli, the parish. Chairman, I can be quite short, but I need help on one as it worked technical point, when I applied following the part six letter

28:35

to to speak to you today, I saw that I should put in a summary of no more than 1500 words as I understood it, and that document duly came in, and you, you would have seen it, and you will have read it. But it was very much a summary. And I had put in a longer statement of objections in February

of this year, with expanding on the point and with some maps and photographs to exemplify the point. Now, I can't that was acknowledged by the applicant, but I can't find it anywhere. And I wonder if anybody could help me as to whether or not it has been included in your papers.

29:37

If it was a submission in February, it wouldn't have necessarily be in front of this examination. I'm looking towards the applicant for them to perhaps assist here. The only two submissions we have from you is from your relevant representation in August, which is

29:56

reference our 115 and the one you

30:00

I spoke about a few moments ago,

30:04

which is referenced PDL? Oh four two in the examination library. So if neither of those submissions of yours contain the information you're referring to, then you may have to put it in at deadline one of our about timetable if you want us to see it. Yes. Well, that would it obviously my fault that I should have gathered that in, but I, it is right, that I can still supply that to you, is it? Absolutely. And you shouldn't take too much of the blame. Because the relevant representation stages is a summary, if you like, of the concerns that you have, and the written representations is the chance for you to go into more detail as to the concerns you have. So absolutely, yes, I would encourage you at the deadline one, to put more substantive comments in. That's, that's extremely helpful. And what I would, I'd like to do, I will put it the document that I put in in February, because I want to make clear constantly, that the applicant has always known opposition, in no way we springing any surprise on him.

31:20

And so I'll arrange for that, and I shall be even shorter. Now if I may, summarising any other points which haven't been covered.

31:32

If I met

31:36

the

31:39

we are up shirt, you we and the examiners are concerned with a piece of ancient landscape of great beauty on the edge to put it neutrally have an official area of outstanding natural beauty.

32:01

The existing road runs to the north of four little villages, each of which has its own lane running up to the road.

32:15

To the north of the road, as you know, is the army train, run random

32:22

acres.

32:24

So

32:26

demands that a new road would run on the army side where there is no residential development, and no lanes to be cut off, rather than on the south side, which is near the villages and involves coping with the four separate lanes with junctions and so forth. And that is the burden of our complaint.

32:53

To that point, the present applicant have always raised one point only, and that is to say you can't go on the A O N v. And there was one point in one of our many meetings with the then engineer who I don't think is with them today and Fred, I forgotten who it was I said to him, do you agree that the only reason why you're not going north is because of the AONB and he said yes, because the reason that I briefly now touch on it is obviously sensible to go south is go north rather than South safe for this point which we must take seriously about the boundary of the AONB.

33:44

We say about the Airbnb Of course, there is a presumption against building any road on an AONB but where you are going to build a road along the extreme edge of the AONB and incurring a little, little now under the latest scheme, actually to go a little way into the O and B, it is pedantry to say, oh, we can't build the new road in the AONB.

34:21

The there are just a reminder of the I think there are really seven reasons why the

34:31

northern route sorry, why the southern route is bad. I put it that way.

34:38

The first point, you will remember I am by way of fitting being a local local historian. And going right to the other end of the new row that we've from where we're continuing up near.

34:57

Up Now the cafe, cafe 66 is

35:00

Get caught



35:02

up there.

35:05

Why?

35:08

I raised this point constantly. There are still some Bronze Age Barrows.

35:19

And to really start at the beginning of the story, when the Romans arrived, literally and literally built their Roman road on literally where the present road is, they found up there a complete stone circle, nearly Neolithic and four, bronze burial, Bronze Age, burial, ma and being Robert

35:48

Wellman. Mr. Blackett ord if I could just stop you there. Sorry. Sorry. I'm

35:55

good. Could you possibly if there is this something that you've already raised in writing? Yes, I have. Okay. Could I ask you to limit your points to additional points, please? That's fair.

36:10

And the

36:15

the other I was going to complain about the Bronze Age under the beret being destroyed by this plan.

36:23

The next point that I would say is that you've known the

36:30

the Gypsy have a rough Hill Fair, fair ground,

36:35

which is

36:37

you've heard about the proposal is to reduce that to immeasurably smaller than the traditional area used by the gipsies.

36:51

It prepared the president Faisal takes away our cricket pitch, which is the only level place in the parish. But all of these could be remedied by simply putting the row 100 yards further north.

37:07

The next point is the ugliness of the structures which are proposed, because it's intended well, all along, we've looked at the language,

37:22

the language of proposal, it's a great mess, and to put that sort of mess on the very edge of an AONB.

37:33

It's quite wrong.

37:39

The we've already mentioned already, that the actually the landscape to the south is much,

37:48

much better landscape than actually in the army land I do. The Army landed I'm afraid what land is usually like when it's been used as an army training The training area is scruffy in the extreme

38:04

is perhaps

38:05

most important. The last point I'll make

38:09

is about the flooding.

38:13

The

38:15

all these new roads are going to have a lot of water runoff.

38:20

Unfortunately, all this the whole length of the new proposed Road, what drains into backs, which ultimately go through the middle of walk up village itself. And they already flood fairly frequently. And they simply cannot stand having this new round runoff added added to them. Now I asked specifically at the last meeting of nearly a year ago. With the applicants I said, well give us your figures, you say it doesn't matter. You say that the won't be flooding because you've done some calculations and asked for this if figures and they said oh well they'll you'll see them when the application goes ahead. And maybe the they that there have been put in some I haven't been able to find them. But I do ask you the examiners to scrutinise with great care,

39:18

the matter of flooding for good. I believe that, particularly with increased heavy showers from global warming, we simply can't afford to have that sort of added water through Walkup. Whereas you put the road further south, you can run a drain for all that water over to the west and put it into the river Eden without going through Walker.

39:45

I think that's enough for me to summarise.

39:49

Thank you, Mr. Black at odd. You'll also be reassured that a number of your points are due to be discussed tomorrow at the issue specific hearing to

40:00

Thank you.

40:05

Before I ask you to respond to that any further points?

40:10

No.

40:14

Madam, I think you've heard our case on the policy tests will be required to me on how we applied those policy tests. The fact that the land being discussed here is both AONB land and mot land and the additional requirements that posed and in a way we've discussed and the documents and of course, in respect of flooding, you will have seen the ies and chapter 14 That deals of roads drainage and water treatment. I don't propose to repeat any of the points that you've already heard. So unless we can be of any further assistance on specific points here, I think we just leave that there.

40:48

Thank you, Mr. Sommer, Kula.

40:51

No further questions.

40:55

In that case, I think

40:57

we're confident to move on to agenda item 2.3.

41:03

Thank you, agenda item 2.3. Then that is scheme. Oh, 405 Temple Sowerby to Appleby looking at the agenda item, the first part of that as the applicant to briefly set out its route option selection process for

scheme. Oh, 405. Having regard in particular to a paragraph of the Yes. And in terms of proximity to residential properties, just in terms of that paragraph, I just like to add on to that, that was referenced yesterday to the purple route.

41:32

And it's, I would like to look at its relationship with the orange routes around Kirby Thor.

41:40

Because the purple route is referred to in app 46 CHAPTER THREE assessment of alternatives. But we don't actually seem to have a diagram of that. And it's just referred to as an online solution. So the presumption on our side is that that goes into the two orange routes that then became one orange route. And we just like an explanation of that on the way through them. So Mr. semer cooler if you could take that explanation, please.

42:10

Yes, so

42:13

I think what we propose to do is first set out the route selection process,

42:18

then set out the reasons for the route choice that could be thorough and then finally end with dealing with the specific points you've just raised in respect of the yes statements. Before we set out in the general route selection process here.

42:33

The over references we'll note

42:37

are up to four for the project event Overview Report, section 5.4.

42:44

AP 247,

42:47

the redevelopment report section 5.5.

42:50

And document just referred to an AP 046.

42:55

The environmental statement,

42:58

assessment alternatives, paragraphs five paragraphs one point 5.21 to one,

43:05  
point 5.34.

43:09  
Starting with that first point about setting out that the general approach or selection process, Mr. crux is going to take that

43:20  
Thank you. My name is Kevin crooks. I'm incorporated civil engineer and I lead the drainage and highway design for the temple salvagedata Appleby section.

43:35  
Mr. Cozzi? Yes, please just pick up a little bit please. Thank you. Yes, of course.

43:41  
So in terms of the route selection, we followed the national highways, Project Control Framework and design stages. So there were several stages that took place to determine this this route.

43:55  
Started obviously, it's design stage one.

44:00  
Where there was about tent there were 10 options, six of them was cut before four of them was further crack and four section and they were split into two parts that really stayed.

44:18  
These were assessed against the project objectives,

44:23  
including economic transport community and environmental impacts and their values. Objectives can be found in the technical appraisal report table 1.1, which is apt 245 and also in Section 7.3 7.1, and 14 of the same report. And also appendix F.

44:49  
Of that same report, which explains those, those options.

44:55  
Four of the q4 options and two of the Kraken four options were discount

45:00  
altered at that stage reasons been longer journey times increase local severance and never negative impacts on the sheduled ancient monument.

45:13

And these are the options. I'm sorry, at stage two, the shortlist options were presented to the public consultation in the summer of 2019, where option E, option F for Kopy thought and option G and option hedge for cracking flop. And these are the options that are referenced in the s, paragraph 1.4 point 11 of Chapter Three that you've referred to Mr. clicks on that I wanted to actually get to what are called the Blue routes, the red routes, the black route and the orange routes, which is the particular section of the yes, that also mentions the purple route. And he also wants to do this quite briefly, because obviously, we've got all the documents in front of me, and I'm wanting to actually get to the important points of interest. So I wonder if you could actually sort of jump a bit quicker to those coloured routes that I've just mentioned. Effectively table 1.7

46:07

Just after paragraph one 527 of the chapter three of the Yes, which is apt 46.

46:17

Okay.

46:24

So the options listed in the last chapter of option E is the northern route around top of Curb ethos, so that equates to the current blue is not quite the same, but it's similar. And then option F is a southern route. And again, it's similar to the orange alignment. We've presented for cracking thought both blue and orange, roughly follow option hate in the the last chapter.

46:54

The purple alignment just to bring that one in. It came in in a much later stage, when we revisited some of the options that we were done at the stage one and two.

47:05

That is shown in the root development report. in appendix B two,

47:14

would you say b two or E to B two, two. Thank you.

47:19

There's a selection of all the coloured lines. And it does have the purple option

47:27

in there. Now the difference between Purple and orange

47:32

was that the purple alignment utilise a section of the existing carriage were passing through Kirby Thor. So what we did was we use the the existing carriageway to provide

47:48

one direction of travel and then we

47:52

added another specially split carriageway as we pass through, it could be called an online duelling, which is what's been what it's been called in the table that I referred to. Okay, thank you.

48:05

So yes, that was just for a short section. So outside of the village and proximately speaking outside of the existing 40 mile an hour speed limit area, either side of that we got your carriageway again, and it was just reduced in into the split carriageway through the village.

48:24

And then reference then to the proximity to residential properties really, in terms of the red and the blue routes to the northeast, okay, so the reason that those routes were close to the northern side of the village is because of the abandoned mine working so there's long rake mine workings.

48:46

They are

48:50

quite close to the village, we've tried to thread the alignment in between the village without and the mind without actually going over the mind workings. So in that respect to you talking of mine workings that are basically between the proposed alignment now and the British gypsum plant. Yes. Thank you

49:10

do have some more in reference to the technical trail report, if that would help.

49:17

Thank you.

49:28

If that's something that's taking some time to actually locate if that could be provided in the in the oral summary that's being given that's being supplied after the hearing the reference to the technical appraisal report. Yes, we'll add that it's just the reference that that we actually need obviously, yes, thank you. Okay.

49:50

Mr. Crocs having identified those those points that we wanted to deal with, and having had you go through the relevance of the purple route to the orange route and describe

50:00

I've the the buildup if you like to the other routes, is there anything else you wish to say in terms of the route? optioning? Process?

50:08

No, not for me. Right. Okay. Thank you.

50:14

Mr. Semicolon. Was there anything else that you wish to add in terms of the first part of this agenda item in terms of briefly setting out the route option selection process? So no, that's where we want to make his point. Thank you. Can I just turn then to Historic England? In terms of the

50:33

the reference in the agenda item to paragraph one? 411 of Chapter Three of the Yes.

50:43

Could that actually be put on the screen for me, please?

50:47

It's actually one that featured in the agenda of this particular

50:53

item. That's paragraph one. 411 of Chapter Three of the ES

51:01

46 I don't actually have that in front of me. sighs I'm just asking for it to be put on the sweater rack, they'll see it from here is another question. Right, right. Can I ask them? Would it be possible? If you can't see it on the screen above my head? Would it be possible for the counsellors just to make a space on that side? And then fall and you'll be able to see it? That's right. So

51:26

is your question in relation to the impact on the shedule? Monument? Yes, yes, it was mentioned as Mr. crocks actually went through there. I was wondering if there was anything that Historic England would like to say, in addition to what was briefly mentioned, in terms of the auctioneering process? Well, we gave advice with regard to the impacts on the shedule monuments at Kirkby Thor, obviously, we have the Roman fort, and the civilian settlement that lie within the village on the outskirts of the village on the western side. And if the option were to go through more or less keep online, there would be a far greater impact into the sheduled monuments, then we would be prepared to support right, thank you for thank you for clarifying that. And what I'm doing at the moment, I'm actually looking at a paper copy that actually shows all the route options that have been talked about. And I can clearly see what you're talking about, in terms of the if you'd like what we called Online improvements, previously, the orange route and what was a purple route in the area directly to the west of Kirby's door? Right. Was there anything else that you wish to say on that point?

52:36

No, I don't believe so. Thank you very much. Right. So what we've done so far has dealt with the applicants extra explanation. I've had a response to that particular point from Historic England. I'd like



to turn now to I know had some somebody else registered to with an interest to speak on this item. And that's Ms. Emma Nicholson, we obviously spoke yesterday. And so I'm basically aware of the area that you're talking about. And some of the points that you raised yesterday, is there anything that you would wish to add to those or speak to this particular agenda item?

53:13

Um, if we're dealing with route selection, and and the process that underwent, yes,

53:19

there is I've submitted documents, which I think you have, I've got the relevant reps. And I think you've got PDL things as well. But to summarise Firstly, because this was covered in in degree of detail in the first scheme today, what consideration was given to the due north in the de minimis?

53:43

It appears that in the first round of consultation before the preferred route was selected in in May 2020. We've just heard it confirmed. That's my understanding. There was no

53:58

upgrade consideration.

54:02

Considered at all, it perhaps came about as a result of

54:07

pressure

54:09

to say that that had to be considered.

54:13

But the extent of consideration, I would say was very, very limited. I don't know if the panel has access to the SIFT workshop meeting

54:25

in which it appears various routes were first.

54:30

First came to be it was a Microsoft Teams meeting in which these routes were quickly assembled, quickly discarded.

54:42

Could I just hold you there on that particular point? I just like to follow the follow that through is does that basically relate to the purple route that you were talking about yesterday? Yes, that is the first time I can ever see it as being mentioned. And within the same meeting. It was like I then have that

55:00

Upon rooting the table that I refer to in the Yes, and it's called an online duelling, in that in that table, you were suggesting that it was a do nothing option or at the very low in in? Well, I did if I could just finish and you suggested yesterday that it was possibly a single carriageway option. But that is how it was described to us when we

55:20

proceeded, that it was discounted, because it would have to be 40 miles an hour. And so on that basis, I had assumed that it was a single carriageway. It was not proceeded because it conflicted with the scheme principles to deal. That's what we were told.

55:43

And then quickly discarded. Right. Okay, if I could just hold you there for a moment. Mr. Semicolon? Is that something that could be responded to in the written response to this in the in a post hearing, notably, like in terms of a deadline, one submission as to what was actually happening at that particular time? Or is there a reference that you can give me now that might take me to that particular point?

56:16

We don't have the reference right now. So we'll have to deal with that in our note. Thank you very much.

56:26

Right, so Miss Nicholson, I can actually you've you've just heard me how I will deal with that particular point. Would you like now to move on to your next point, we'll just quickly stain with the

56:40

de minimis or the online. Other reasons given in addition to its conflicts with the scheme principle of Julene

56:50

has been safety. Crash map data suggests there is

56:57

no difference and a 66 in terms of accident rates on the dual the existing dual sections, and the single carriageway.

57:09

It was with this in mind that I tried to engage national highways with friends of the Lake District who I was aware had been trying to consult with them on this very point.

57:21

You heard from Dr. Wilshaw yesterday about her efforts to engage with them. I can add to that in case there's any

57:31

suggestion that that was accidental. In my meetings, I provided them with her telephone number email, asked whether they would be prepared for her to attend a meeting. Afterwards, I arrange for meetings with industry consultant, Cambria county council with Dr. Wilshaw

57:50

I was invited to come along all of this to consider some of the options around doing less. And I would say it was purposefully avoided.

58:01

Another suggestion of the day to jail is for each the prevalence of HGV

58:08

traffic on the road.

58:10

But of course, HGVs don't need to travel at 70 miles per hour or

58:18

so taking all of that into account in the acknowledgement that perhaps that would have been disruptive, least disruptive for the people of the village, it appears to have been discounted because the online version is its ability to build visibility off it that is difficult, and it is longer and for that reason was disconnected immediately. And it is another example of how

58:45

the village population

58:48

carried less significance than

58:52

the difficulty in the challenges of building off roads. So if I if I was to ask you your personal preference in terms of the options, the the only one really that you've described to me or the one that you've described to me most fully is the purple option and the single carriageway 40 mile an hour version of that purple option that you've been talking about.

59:16

If you were to ask me my preference, yes, my preference is in the midst of a climate emergency you do what you can to improve the safety and there has been things that could have been done to very quickly improved the safety off this section at any point

59:38

and that is easily achieved. So that is my first preference.

59:45

Other than that, clearly, I have

59:49

very significant interests because we farm on the root or the northern region we are going to be cutting too

59:57

and it is it is more than just

1:00:00

some personal is environmental impact of the northern route which is acknowledged

1:00:09

you are the northern route creates a dead zone between the existing a 66 on the new proposed route

1:00:23

that is, had been intended to be River Restoration Project, which No, I will not go ahead.

1:00:31

So, this is the restoration project that you're talking about in your written representations. I think I've seen reference to that right. Okay. So, for that, and also my belief that the village was not given the proper information at the point, the various routes became available, very short timescale. When you say your your village, I understand you did say yesterday that you're a resident of Kobe. So yes, that's that's what you're talking about. Yes. I just need to keep clear. And we need to get clear in our minds the differences between the things that have been said about Kobe Thor, and the things that have been said about sleeps and how far Yes,

1:01:13

from the purposes of Kirby, Thor and the residents of Kirby Thor, and myself as a resident of Kirby Thor.

1:01:22

The existence of other rates

1:01:26

discounted in a sifting meeting weren't known. We were then in a position where within a very short period, we had our first public meeting, where we have visual representations of routes, where mapping did not show that the northern route could have the advantage also advantage of moving

1:01:50

HGV traffic from the village. We didn't have information about the noise distribution, which appears to have been available and the other sections, we didn't have information about costs, despite pursuing that

1:02:06

the length cost, the carbon, the air pollution, all of these things were missing.

1:02:15

At the point, that these options were explained and quickly removed and went to such reconstituted. I just come back on the point that come just just ask for clarification on the point that you made about HGVs through the village, presumably the, for instance, the British gypsum plant HGVs currently have to pass through the village. And indeed We did part of that route on one of our accompanied site inspections.

1:02:39

The proposed junction then to the north east of Kirby, Thor would presumably take those vehicles straight onto a jewelled a 66, they wouldn't then have to travel through the village.

1:02:53

That was

1:02:55

so the northern route. Yes, it's one of the Northern routes.

1:03:00

Yes, and that is the advantage. And the reason why there is a percentage of the village who prefer the northern route, it would take traffic out of the village.

1:03:13

There is a percentage of the village you say that would prefer? Absolutely, absolutely. But the way in which the southern route was presented, that it didn't show a designated junction and designated side route to the village, then the people for whom that was an issue, never came to understand that point.

1:03:37

And automatically discounted the southern route, despite the advantages that it has, because it was so poorly explained, and so rushed. Okay. Thank you for that. Is there anything else you would wish to say on this particular agenda item?

1:03:54

Just in terms of the selection process, as much as like I heard this morning.

1:04:02

various reasons were given along the way about why

1:04:09

the northern group was chosen. Firstly, we were told it was HGV traffic. But when solutions were suggested,

1:04:22

it became the disappointment to people who already understood because it preferred which was announced that they wouldn't be impacted. When the logic of that was questioned. It became the historic the sheduled monument.

1:04:41

On that basis, it has to be questioned why then if he was understood, that would be a block. They then when they presented new routes in may actually chose an option

1:04:57

in southern end that move just

1:05:00

In closer to the sheduled monument,

1:05:04

I can't remember what the previous southern option was described as whether there was E or F. But that was further away. There was another alternative called the light orange option. Yes, I've seen reference to the two orange options. So basically in that, then I'm seeing reference now to the matters that you're talking about.

1:05:23

I've heard representations from Historic England on the shedule management treasure monument to the north, west, or to the west, really, of Kirby Thor. And obviously, we've talked about HGV movements, is there anything else that you would wish to add to that, obviously, I've got your your relevant representations in front of me, I've got your BDL reference submission. And you also have the opportunity, obviously, to submit written representations in mid December,

1:05:52

in terms of Historic England, having been told

1:05:58

that that was the absolute block,

1:06:02

we corresponded with Historic England on this issue, and they have responded,

1:06:11

it was concerning that they perhaps did not fully understand some parts some aspects of the northern route. But once they did say that their preference was for the

1:06:29

the northern reach, and they had concerns about the southern orange route. They said, It is, of course for others to where to weigh that harm against impacts on other interests and the public benefits of this scheme, right, in order that we can follow that through, then I can see reference to that in your relevant representation. And I've seen it in others, I believe, as well. If you wish to expand on that it will be more understandable for us if it actually comes in as a written representation that can be then incorporated in the examination, and we can take it into account and it can be responded on. If you were to expand on that in your written representation for us. I think that would be a more understandable way of dealing with it. I'm happy for you to continue, but just to flag that that opportunity exists.

1:07:14

Yes. And I have in response to saturate consultation.

1:07:21

Could I just say on on consultation, your consultations have come to us in the consultation documents, that is quite a larger document. It will be useful during the examination, as you've actually appeared before us to have that in writing from you, it can simply be a cut and paste out of something that you might previously have. But if it can actually be brought to us as a deadline one submission representation A written representation that would be useful. I understood that you did have it. We have got it. We have got it in if it was a consultation response. We do we do have it. I can we can go back looking for that, obviously, but you have the opportunity to report it in as a written representation. Okay. Just a few more points. Okay, in respect of of Jetson and the importance that has been attached to that. Jepsen is a mind that is already reliant on imports. It is is this then the fact that you question the remaining life of the plant itself? Yes, yes. So obviously, I've seen that in your relevant representations. Yes.

1:08:30

It is also saying that it's in its own Social Charter, it will be moving to real and that is likely to reduce the impact on the village. And if the planning conditions that apply to gypsum were actually enforced properly. The movement of traffic in the village would be less.

1:08:51

Just one more point about how information is presented.

1:08:57

The landscape issue

1:09:00

appears to have come very late. It's flagged up I think, in natural England's statutory

1:09:08

response to such free consultation, that there isn't a landscape assessment and that perhaps, whilst this section of the route is in the setting for the Lake District and Yorkshire National Park and the AONB, the EO and V should do a response on that. It is

1:09:29

I would say notable to highlight our it is

1:09:34

this is consistent with high highways operate their response. The AONB say in their ethics their statement of common grind, as there is no southern route available, due to the constraints have an environmental impact on the river Eden, the only alternative was the northern route. That is not correct and

1:10:00

and find Natural England, Eden rivers trust, their preference was the orange route to keep it out of the trackback. SAIC.

1:10:13

At the point that we went to statutory consultation, flooding information wasn't available on the bridge span wasn't confirmed. So their ability to comment on the routes was incomplete

1:10:28

as it was for a number of different issues, because the way in which this scheme has developed is that the route was chosen first. And a lot of the schemes followed. A lot of the surveys followed. So it's it's some

1:10:41

decision built on

1:10:44

shifting sands, really, because they didn't have full information. Right. Okay. Did you Did I hear you say that that was your final point? Yes. Okay. Thank you very much. There's a number of things there that we obviously we obviously take note of. And you do have the opportunity there to, of course, attend the hearings later this week, but also to put a representation in at deadline one, which can be a summary of what you said today, or there's also the opportunity for written representations additional represent making representations at that stage. Okay, thank you.

1:11:17

Mr. Sammon Kula, is there anything that you wish to respond to that at the present time, or I did ask for a post hearing note, to cover the initial things in terms of the orange route and the purple route? I'm happy to, for you to respond to that in terms of post hearing notes, if you wish, it's up to you.

1:11:34



So many of those points, as you said, will have been raised in the representations that we've received. I just want to give a reference to Pdl, zero 11, where we've provided a response to a number of the points that Mr. Carson has raised there.

1:11:50

I think there's just one point that that we want a cover

1:11:54

score is going to take that now. Could I just say before you do that, then there's there's still the aspect relating to the purple route and the references to the purple route that you are going to come back to us on Yeah, thank you. Yes, sir.

1:12:13

So this, this was just in respect of the first point made there regarding the do minimum and I think we're going to address that very quickly. Hey, thank you.

1:12:22

Good afternoon.

1:12:24

paccheri representatives applicant. Good afternoon.

1:12:28

Yes, just wants to pick up on

1:12:33

conversation about the minimum or a policy reference de minimis in terms of the way that we've treated that through the development of the project from conception feasibility stage

1:12:46

right it Project Control Framework stage zero, the principles of route selection, looking at feasibility studies, route wide corridor wide regional wide approach includes an appraisal of do minimum throughout that process.

1:13:02

As the project progresses, obviously, that the the the solution in this case a transport solution, we have looked at, praised the minimum solutions throughout at

1:13:12

taking guidance from aspects such as the Green Book in regard to the definition of do minimum, and password I wanted to dwell on most was the the objectives that the project set during stage notes as a consequence of the feasibility study. For reference, those objectives appear in a number of documents, but perhaps are directly towards application 244. In terms of product development, overall review report

section three point 3.13. As I say, they do appear in numerous other documents. And they are consistent

1:13:46

so that those objectives are based around a number of themes, particularly around economic transport, community, and environment. And I don't propose to read them verbatim at all. But all I would say is that in appraising the routes throughout it that each of the project control drove Project Control Framework stages, the premise of aluminium has been constant throughout beta single carriageway solution, be it an offline solution, be it safety improvements, be it perhaps smaller scale improvements, but ultimately, we come back to satisfying the objectives. And in our submissions.

1:14:28

were of the view an internal meeting the objectives that cannot be achieved with a do minimum solution in order that the objectives and the SMART objectives can be achieved to? Perhaps I'll leave it to that in terms of the specimen coolers

1:14:43

that that covers? I was hoping we'd go with that. And so that reference for it, I still don't have it, but I will have it for you in the note it's been taken down at you on that reference. And yeah, yep. Because obviously the purple route and the points that have been raised we as a panel would obviously want to follow through. So we would need the reference to be

1:15:00

be able to follow those through. I'll make sure you get those. Thank you very much.

1:15:06

So the only person that I believe I had registered to speak on this agenda item was Ms. Nicholson. I understood I thought you said earlier in the hearing that there's Felicity Nicholson and wasn't appearing that you are appearing on her behalf effectively in this. Is there anybody else in the room that would wish to speak on this agenda item? Just looking around quickly? I don't see any hands raised? And is there anybody online who would wish to speak against this item? And again, looking at my screen, I don't see any hands raised. So if that's everything on this agenda item, I'll hand back to Mr. Allen. Thank you all. Thank you.

1:15:43

I'm very conscious of the time we're approaching have just gone three o'clock. So we don't have very long in this room left.

1:15:53

We weren't going to have a session on any other scheme. If anyone wants to say anything.

1:15:58

We may have to now defer that to writtens representations instead. But I will just ask, is there anyone who wants to say anything particularly urgent against any other scheme? Today?

1:16:15

Not seeing hands up in the room? I'm not seeing any hands up.

1:16:20

Dr. Wilshaw Yes.

1:16:24

Yeah, this was actually what I was going to be speaking on. Anyway. It's already been, it's kicked off. So a friend of the Lake District, the representative from national highways has actually covered quite a lot of what I wanted to say, which was about the why the do nothing or safety upgrades was not taken forward instead of a dual carriageway. One thing I would say is that if this started being in progress in the res one, so the roads investment strategy, one, things have changed since 2014. Since this was actually taken forward as being an option, we now have a lot more information about what we need to do for zero carbon and for reducing climate change issues. And also, we basically need to consider our road upgrade actually, what is necessary? And could we actually be looking at a situation where we do safety upgrades and junction improvements to actually improve the safety of the road? But do we actually need a road at 70 miles an hour all the way from Scotch corner to the eight dem six. Secondly, the

1:17:33

applicant basically states that one of the justifications for fully dual carriageway is supporting access to key tourist sites, which as I said, yesterday, the Lake District National Park authorities actually disputing they don't want more people coming in cars, we actually need to be looking at a different way of doing things. And I'm not sure that brand new dual carriageway sections is actually something that should be being considered when we are in a climate emergency. And I'll stop there.

1:18:03

Thank you, doctor, we will, we will be covering your first point tomorrow. If you are coming, tomorrow's hearing, we have an agenda item where I think this will be at will be debated. So I hope you can come to that. And anyway, I'll just ask the applicant if they want to come back on anything that Dr. Boucher has just said.

1:18:28

And the potential effects of the project on the climate and in require mitigation is set out in chapter seven of the environmental statement. That's at zero 50.

1:18:40

Of course, as the detailed design process progresses,

1:18:45

opportunities will be sought to limit

1:18:48

emissions resulting from any construction of the project. And then you've also got the environmental management plan so that this is appointments being considered. Mr. Samuel, I think also I've got some thoughts tomorrow about discussion on the carbon management plan and the development of that join the project. So I'd like to bring that in then as well.

1:19:05

Thanks.

1:19:06

And also this issue that Dr. will show us raised yesterday and today about the

1:19:12

tourism benefits, which he disputes and says that the the cause of discouraged from rather than encouraged, which I think is what you cite as a benefit scheme and I'm content to leave that as a written response to that if you prefer.

1:19:31

As part of a post hearing note, I may be able to get your immediate answer if I can. I can do that.

1:19:52

So as Dr. Wilshaw

1:19:55

if there's any clarification that we could get in terms of the policy that she's referring to, so that we

1:20:00

To provide a response to that.

1:20:04

Okay.

1:20:07

Basically the National Park Authority, state that they don't want more people coming to the Lake District in cars, they're trying to discourage cars. It's in the Lake District National Park Management Plan. The Lake District National Park Authority will actually be putting a statement in as a written representation about this. They weren't able to come to these hearings, but I was in contact with them yesterday, they contacted me to ask me to raise this as an issue. So this isn't just coming from me this is actually coming from the statutory body, the Lake District National Park Authority. If they are they proposing to put that in it deadline one, do you know they should be? They did do a relevant representation about it.

1:20:51

I'm just trying to find it. I can't actually remember what number it is.

1:20:58

Sorry. No, it doesn't. I'm sure we can find it. Yeah, essentially, the National Park puts in a relevant representation. It's on the list. And it basically says it reiterates what I've just said. Yeah, thank you.

1:21:11

Thank you. Any final comments on from the outcome? Representation? 055. That's the reference for you.

1:21:18

But I don't think there's anything else we can assist you with on that point today. So okay.

1:21:25

Just quickly on that point, I raised this with high was the Lake District National Park policy and failures consult was in three eyes. They didn't take it forward. The relevant representation from the Lake District National Park also calls because it's a world heritage site for a heritage assessment.

1:21:45

But like many others, they weren't aware that their relevant representation had been responded to on there have been waiting for national highways to contact them, I thought may be an error. But it's a very significant area that at this late stage has not been covered at all.

1:22:05

Thank you, again, that come once a risk. Do you want to comment? What you just heard or?

1:22:16

We are aware of the issue of the Lake District being both the heritage site.

1:22:25

And National Park and that point is one we're aware of? And I don't know for the comments we have on that now. But it is a point that we understand.

1:22:34

Thank you.

1:22:37

Okay, so I'm going to look to draw this hearing to a close. Before I do. Can I just ask the applicant to clarify what they have down as their action points arising out of this hearing.

1:22:54

We'll compare it with ours, hope we're aligned.

1:23:16

So we've got the three points that were we've already discussed that I'm not proposing to bring up again, to discuss at the beginning of the afternoon session, I would like you to place it said.

1:23:44

So the first point was the comparison data for the latest traffic model, which we said we provide by deadline one.

1:23:53

The second point was the more granular assessment as to the impact on the sales, which was to include a noise impact assessment.

1:24:03

Or better yet, rather than using that term and assessment of noise as part of it.

1:24:08

We said we'd provide a response as to what we're going to when we can achieve that within our written response to this hearing.

1:24:18

Then on the question of compulsory purchase that language, we also addressed that in the written response

1:24:26

and describing

1:24:28

Yes, so the second one fine grain assessment. That would be D one to confirm when you're going to be deadline one when you did the written submissions with it.

1:24:41

You want us to confirm it, but we're by deadline one as to when you're going to provide the earliest that's fine. We can do that by deadline once you're done other the other one I've got is actually about reviewing the design around lamb Greg.

1:24:55

I thought we discussed that.

1:24:58

But looking at the options as part of

1:25:00

To change.

1:25:02

Yeah. So that I understand that's going to be part of the changes submission, which we've already confirmed. But we can add that to our action points. I'm coming out a little bit something we're already going to address by the changes submission. Thank you.

1:25:21

And there's this references the orange and purple routes as well, that we've just discussed. Yeah. So apologies, I'm just working my way down to find the ones from this afternoon.

1:25:32

There is that reference to the orange and purple route.

1:25:36

Okay, which we said we provide in our written response.

1:25:54

That's

1:25:56

another reference

1:26:00

as to the discounting of the route, which involved a single carriageway

1:26:08

in response to miss Nicholson's representations, was a request

1:26:14

that you receive as part of response on this by deadline one.

1:26:27

The notes cover the orange and purple rule is one we've already addressed. And

1:26:34

I think that's all we have.

1:26:38

If that's all you have them with, that's all I have is water.

1:26:42

Excellent. Okay. Is there any other matters that start? Yes, Dr. Marcin, sorry. Is it possible to have a microphone? Is it possible to have a date for option? The points three and four, when we're likely to hear about this? I mean, the compulsory purchase is more checking previous records, but reviewing their design at Lang reg.

1:27:09

Is this for deadline one? Or do we just not know yet?

1:27:14

Well, we just said it's been impossible. Yes, it was.

1:27:18

In respect of the deadline, deadline one exists, we just have to make a decision as to which date that is, we have, as you see, we propose the draft date, which was the 14th to December, both the applicant and the council's have asked us to push that date back. We need have to consider that over the next few days. And our firm's timetable will be published next Tuesday, I think.

1:27:46

Okay.

1:27:48

And

1:27:49

in respect to your sorry, your second wishes about the let's see a response. And,

1:27:56

yes. So it was about the design process at langree.

1:28:00

Which, that's all part of the changes design process that we've already discussed. So that was discussed yesterday. And

1:28:08

yes, I mean,

1:28:11

the

1:28:13

short answer is, is the applicant has indicated that they intend to review the design and put a change request in. I think more information will come in on that deadline one, which is what we were talking about yesterday, about a more of an informed letter about telling us what what was going to happen. At this moment, we pretty much have the same information. I don't know, if the applicant has said they're going to do it, they can easily change their mind and decide not to do it, they can easily decide they're going to push it back. And they need further time. So it is in that respect when when we'll see it.

1:28:49

When I think they are I'd like to say that I did try to make myself clear, I'm sure I'm sure the outcome is clear that the that language junction is of interest to the examining authority, especially the effect on on your parents property. And we await to see their changes in the hope that they can take away that there is a potential issue there. So



1:29:16

we will await I think is all we can do but but the indication is I think that you are looking at a design

1:29:25

design change request at around the 24th of January is that correct? Around deadline three

1:29:34

that's what you've that's

1:29:37

all I can say at the moment. Thank you for clarifying. Thank you. Okay, does anybody else wants to say anything councils, nothing from the council's any other party as the outcome wants to make any final words before I close the hearing?

1:29:51

Nothing further from us today. So, okay. I just leads me to thank you all for coming. I think this has been a really you

1:30:00

Still in helpful session, I think I really want to stress that we were fully aware of the depth of feeling around roots options from the relevant representations. That is why we chose to have a hearing about it right from the start, I think we've certainly gained all the information we need in respect to alternative route options. Now.

1:30:25

While we, of course, don't discourage parties who may want to write about it during the examination,

1:30:33

it may be that the examining authority does not need to ask any further questions now, on this matter. If that is the case, either in written form or orally, I do want to stress that that doesn't mean that matters are sorted, they no longer matter. We're not concerned about them anymore. It just means that we have asked the questions that we've needed to ask. And today has certainly very much helped with that and got the answers that we need. So as I said, if you if you through the rest of the examination, do not see any further written responses or questions from us on this or any are not discussed any further hearings. Please don't take it that it's it's a done deal from our point of view is just that we may have got the information we now need to take forward to our recommendation. So I just wanted to make that point clear. And I think today, as I say, has been extremely helpful in gaining the questions that we need.

1:31:30

Thank you.

1:31:32

So if there are no other relevant businesses, I remind you that the deadline one car as it currently is in the draft timetable is the 14th of December 2022. That date may well stay, as I say the EXA is to take a view as to whether that date should change or not.

1:31:49

May I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectors website as soon as practicable after the meeting. Once again, I thank you for attending today both in person and online. We should consider all of your responses carefully. As we go forward, as I said with this examination. So the next event is tomorrow, the second issue specific hearing, which will be discussing the environmental management plan, other environmental matters, the elements of the draft tournament consent order, and Bruff Hill Fair, which we want to have a session on that. And hopefully we can again have another good day of getting information from you and discussing matters. So that will begin at 10 o'clock and to say the rules successor and our supplementary agenda set out what's happening tomorrow. So I think we've timed that pretty well. 18 minutes past three within our 330 deadline. So those who are coming tomorrow, we'll see you tomorrow. Other than that, this hearing is closed. Thank you