

TRANSCRIPT_ISH1_M5JUNCTION10_SESSIO N2_05062024

Wed, Jun 05, 2024 2:06PM • 1:14:47

00:06

Okay, it's now 1137 And hopefully, with time to resume this issue specific hearing we back online. Thank you. Okay, then if I can come back to the applicant and invite you to respond with regard to the openness question with regard to Greenbelt. Thank you,

00:30

sir Natalie, Mr. Cartwright, who's the environment lead for the project.

00:36

Hello, thank you. So Colin Cartwright for the applicant. So with regards to the assessment and consideration of open this, this is taken through from the LVA chapter, app 068, and the effects on landscape character. So the effects of the scheme on the landscape character have been assessed against the stated characteristics of the landscape areas at a local level, namely the landscape character area, it s the six B, and that includes the whole of the scheme and also the more local JCS landscape character areas. So the characteristics of area SD six B, are presented with a chapter and they describe an open landscape with for example, intermittent small ridges, Hilux and undulations. an undulating landform that encloses views in some areas, whilst in other areas there are distant views beyond the veil landscape towards the Coxwell. But Cotswold of Scotland woodland being limited to a few small copses within the area, and the M five motorway forming a spine through the area, often screened by Jason embankments that also filtered views towards the motorway from that surrounding landscape. So that's the basis of the landscape against which the scheme has been assessed. And then the landscape design for the scheme has then sought to fit in with that landscape character. It's sought to replace the woodland and scrub along the end five and around the new junction to try and re terrain to reinstate that screening effect and integrate the new development back into the landscape. And then a similar approach along the a 4019 and the link road with the aim to embed the infrastructure works back into the landscape. For example, along the length roads we have within the landscape design hedgerows and then supplementary blocks of woodland and individual trees with the aim of of reflecting that local character of the area. So then assessing that landscape design against those landscape character areas. The assessment is that the typical characteristics of that landscape character area SV six B are assessed as being retained and potentially enhanced, with the M five becoming more embedded in the landscape through the additional planting through hedgerows being in field and new habitats created and it's expected there will be a negligible beneficial effects on the landscape character of that area SD six be in the long term, the LVA chapter considers that the scheme would sit comfortably within the landscape and potentially provide an enhancement of the environment and a sense of place. With regards to the effect of the scheme on Greenbelt, there is specific consideration made with the effects of the link road on the Greenbelt with the link road being the new

infrastructure for the scheme that is wholly within Greenbelt whilst the junction and the A 4019 parts of those are within the Greenbelt. The works on those areas are changed to existing infrastructure, whereas the link road is wholly new infrastructure. So, with regard to greenbelt and openness on the link road, the LVA chapter concludes that whilst the link road will be a new feature in the landscape, it is not anticipated that it was significantly reduced the feeling of openness in this area. The proposed planting along the length road would help embed the road whilst also allowing filtered views through and across The Link wrote. So as an overall conclusion with regard to openness, the LV AIA assessment has assessed the scheme against the open landscape character of the area in which it is situated and concluded an overall beneficial effect on landscape character and therefore no impact on openness.

05:34

To come to the council's then having heard the applicants, presentation on that, are there any points you would wish to respond to? Or again, are you going to reserve your position for the local impact report?

05:50

John Webster for the joint councils. We have nothing further to what Mr. Cartwright has said. However, we do have a prepared answer, sir on openness. We can read that out for you, if you wish, or we can submit it in writing,

06:04

though I'd appreciate to hear it today. Thank you,

06:08

that's fine. Okay. So the prepared answer, sir, we understand that question is in two parts whether there are particular cases in the Greenbelt where the effects and openness would be particularly pronounced first part, second part conversely, where there are locations where the effects on openness would be avoided, or at the lower end of the harm scale. Respect to the first part, there is none where it's particularly pronounced. The only area where some minor reduction openness is possible would be the West shonen link road that connects Tewksbury roads or Gloucester road, the proposed road must cross the river Scheldt as fire a bridge, the road will be on abandonment to rise up to the level of the bridge abutment in this section. In doing so, a visual barrier will be created, dividing open field areas on either side. However, the effects and openness in this area of Greenbelt are only likely to be reduced when in close proximity to the race section of road and will affect users of the two public rights of way that run parallel to the river child. From further afield views of the raised road should blend into the layers of field boundary vegetation, and it should still be possible to view hills and countryside and the distance this will be the same as the views currently had. So this should not reduce the sense of openness to the greater extent of the Greenbelt area. Second question, the proposed widening of the Tewksbury road on the approach then five junction is unlikely to have an impact on the openness of the greenbelt and would be in keeping with the current situation. The race junction at the end five would also generally be in keeping with the current situation beings is already a rage junction. This area currently forms a visual barrier between the open Greenbelt land either side of the Amphi proposed junction although larger than currently is unlikely to have detrimental effects beyond the current

situation, particularly once proposed planting establishes therefore, it does not reduce openness in this area. Further. It is considered that this part of the Greenbelt is already heavily impacted by the existing motorway junction approach roads dwellings and associated built development, which in turn impact openness at present elements of which are proposed to be replaced or demolished. Notwithstanding the impacts mentioned, it is considered that the benefits of the scheme would clearly and demonstrably outweigh the harms and the areas not subject to any other landscape constraints, the consideration of landscaping and mitigation would serve to reduce the overall impacts of the development. And, as you said, we will be providing this note in the LIRR. Thank you, thank you.

08:45

When we've done a site visits that was two areas which were conscious of, particularly, obviously the raised element going over the river child and how that would be perceived from the public rights away but also with the bridge lane. But also when you're travelling towards the old Gloucester road, and the junction that is proposed, the land rises near that point. And so I'm just interested to know what parties think about those particular areas and whether there is increased effects as a consequence of existing typography, but also the design of the scheme as currently drafted. So if I can ask the applicant first please.

09:48

Call me Cartwright for the applicant. I'm expecting will pick that up in more detail in response to follow but to add into that the current landscape area has an undulating The land form. Anyway, it's not a flat landscape across the whole of the scheme area. And we have the existing hedgerows and entries and rise and fall of the landscape as we go across plus the existing M five embankments.

10:23

I understand that. But in terms of assessing openness, and the effect the M five currently has, you're not just taking views looking towards the M five, you're in considering the openness between the five and Cheltenham is looking in each direction. So the consequential effects of having a new raised road if you're looking towards children, presumably is quite different. And that's why I'm pushing you for a greater understanding of the pot possible effects on openness by the introduction of the road. And equally when you look at the proposed junction with the Gloucester old road. I think I'm right in saying that the land is rising towards the farm, which I'm pologize the name of it's escaping me just at the moment. But as the new link road comes in the land is rising at that point. And potentially a new engineering structure of the new road with a quite large junction arrangement, surely has, at that point quite a material effect on the openness of that part of the Greenbelt, doesn't it?

11:37

So Colin Cartwright for the applicant will come back to you specifically on those two items.

11:48

Okay, thank you. In light of what I said, I wonder whether the council would wish to say anything further or, or not?

11:57

Nothing. I'm John Webster, Joint Council is nothing first, but we respond in writing I think. I think it's received.

12:03

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. And then Mr. Pierce, sorry, sir.

12:11

Tim Pierce, African, just in terms of the action point. Could it just be clear as to the specific elements you would wish us wish for us to come back on in terms of whether it's geographical location or specifics?

12:25

I think, really, what I'm asking you to reflect on wet is whether your assessment of openness properly considers the overall impact on the Greenbelt? Because my appreciation of the Greenbelt at the moment, if you, you're not just looking towards the end five, you're obviously depending on which direction you're going the way you're looking, you will see different things from different places in different directions. And so I think that openness as a concept isn't just looking from Cheltenham out towards the end five, but it's much broader than that. And I think, in my mind, it seems that there are potentially two areas where the effect is perhaps greater. And that is where you're elevating the road to go over the river. And then secondly, where the topography would result in what I think is going to be quite a large road junction on rising land, which is currently field dropping away from the current old Gloucester road. And so if you're looking from there, currently, you've got hedgerows and so on on the road boundary, they will go. And you will then have a view down through the road at the new infrastructure, which my initial perception is could have quite a degree of an effect on openness, which doesn't appear to have been recorded. So I'm testing that assessment that you made, and whether it's gone far enough, or it's as robust as it needs to be.

14:14

Thank you, sir. Appreciate it.

14:18

Thank you. So I'll just open that point to the room to see whether anyone else has any points that they would wish to raise on that particular topic. Now, okay, no, that's fine. Thank you.

14:34

Mr. Morgan, if I could just record two additional action points I don't think I've shared with with the room. I'm now up to 10 and I hope everybody else's. So we have nine which is Lauren persimmon to provide a note with respect to Greenbelt policy position in writing that line one and the one that we've just been discussing, please the note from the applicant on the proposals and its effect on the openness of the Greenbelt, including its overall impact, again, identified for deadline one. Thank you.

15:12

Thank you. So then go on to, I think it's Roman, six, if I've got my numerals the right way around national policy statement for national networks at paragraph 5171, which was referred to earlier this

morning, whether there are any additional policy elements which the examination authority should take into consideration, and and what I'm trying to understand really here is the the strength of the link back to local policy, and whether there is a clear position there, which you can rely upon in supporting your case for the infrastructure within the Greenbelt. So, hopefully, that's clear in where I'm coming from in trying to consider

16:05

Thanks, Tim Pierce, the applicant risk of repeating have kind of alluded to earlier today. The basis of the scheme is is the is the joint core strategy. The JCS, which identifies me from the applicants position identifies the need for the M five all movements function, as well as the policy sa one in the links to the other policy documents which speak to the link road specifically. The site allocation at a seven is obviously defined by the JCS and is geographically fixed. And on that basis, the options open to the scheme to connect the the the site allocation with the strategic road network are, are limited. And obviously from our options appraisal, we have seen that we went through varying different route proposals before settling on the scheme before you. And we believe that the current scheme location in terms of the junction, the A 4019 improvements and the link road, are the are the only options available to us that the others were some of the other options were significantly more impactful upon the Greenbelt itself.

17:42

But we'll come back to that point later with when we're looking at alternatives, because you'll have noted, I think that one of the issues that we're concerned about is whether the green belt as a issue in itself influenced the decision in assessing alternatives. But that's later in the agenda. But thank you.

18:11

Okay, and I think that takes us then to to Item three, which is the question of, of need. And this is really, again, I think it will extend a bit beyond where we went this morning. And trying to understand the I suppose the extrapolation of the scheme relative to national policy and local policy. And whether we can, whether it's right, to apply the need case that set out in national policy to all three elements of the proposed development. And I heard what Mr. Tate said this morning about how it's all one then CIP and the same tests apply. But I note that within your statement of reasons at paragraph, two point 2.2, which identify the improvements to the MFI of being required, and that's reiterated in paragraph two point 2.4 and 2.2 point 13. But in that assessment of need, that doesn't seem to extend to the other two elements of the proposed development. So seek clarification from you as to whether that's a point we really should be focusing on or whether you have a you know, what the strong what, what your view is on that. And because the planning statement also says and it's reflecting what paragraph 1.1 of the National Policy Statement sets out Where it says, sets up the need for and government policies to deliver the development of N sips on the national road network. So if you can respond to those points please

20:30

said some PSA applicant in simple terms. So you returned to the scheme objectives and the scheme objectives certainly, objectives 123. All focus on the required improvements to the road network in both northwest and west Cheltenham to facilitate the associated allocations. I don't think you can therefore,

separate out the varying scheme elements from each other because they're all interlinked in terms of serving the purpose of meeting those objectives.

21:25

The first two scheme objectives supporting economic growth is first one. Enhancing the transport network in the western northwest of Cheltenham is the third one which relates back to the strategic road network. But what I'm trying to test is whether the national policy need which can equally be applied to the the local road elements of the of your project.

22:06

It may be that we will cover this in our response to the money action points are in terms of the the the MPs, and in particular the the 2024 MPs, and the emphasis that is put on the local road network within that policy document.

22:23

But it'll be important, perhaps more important to address it with regard to the current MPs against which that is the key policy against which we have to examine this case. I don't think anyone's disagreeing with that. Obviously, the 2024 version could well have important and relevant considerations was first to take on board. But the key for us is to understand the current MPs and whether the need argument that that's sets out for the national road network can equally be applied for the local road network or whether well does it or doesn't it

23:16

as a fluid so we will come back to you in writing on those particular points on both NP NP at both MPs documents but I've referred to my earlier point in meeting the scheme objectives it's impossible to separate the elements of the scheme because they they are a combined package needed to deliver them without all three elements you cannot deliver the scheme objectives.

23:43

And that obviously takes us back to the point Mr. Reagan was making earlier about getting that clarity of the scheme objectives and the relationship between them and national policy which we will provide that I want to okay

23:58

can just add in relation to the appreciates important and relevant rather than the determining MPs. But paragraph 342 of the revised MPs acknowledges there are interdependencies between the efficient operation of the SRN and its impact on the local road network and vice versa. And effective operation and optimization of both SRM and Irn are essential to achieve the outcomes of the transport decarbonisation plan there. There's also reference in 331, as to that interdependence about improving overall performance of the wider network of local roads, as well as the SRM. And I think that was the passage that Mr. Pierce had the passages Mr. Pierce had in mind. Thank you

24:57

just see if national highways have any further points with regard to that, or you would refer us back to what you said earlier. Okay. Thank you.

25:13

So, again, I think that we should be repeating myself, but it comes then I think we're in agreement that both the A 4019 improvements and widening and duelling and the link road are associated development. We're agreed on that, aren't we?

25:39

Yes, a where you draw the boundaries and other matter. But yes, in broad terms. That's great. Thank you.

25:52

So, in terms of the guidance, and I think you've, you've gone through this already, it's

26:07

it says in the guidance that is for the applicant to decide what is associated development, but it also says is for the Secretary of State to decide ultimately, what to accept as associated with them. So we almost have this ping pong match. But the Secretary say, I think we'll need to be clear as to which elements of the scheme are associated development, even if they're not separated out within the actual DCO. And as you quite rightly said, the M three junction nine as one example doesn't list associate development as a separate, identifiable category, it they all come under one paragraph, and then the various work numbers follow. But I just think it would be helpful if when you address this in your written submission, there's this clarity on how we would set out to the Secretary State the distinction so that the sector state is clear what their decision is relative to associated development. I hope that makes sense, just

27:15

so that makes sense. It won't be a bright line necessarily. And it also depends on exactly the area that the national highways wish to accept ultimately, as part of the SRN or not. So there'll be that sort of future element, which won't be necessarily determined at this stage. Hence, there are there is grey between the one colour and the other. But but in conceptually, we will be able to answer that better, even if we won't be able to define points a to x and point y to Zed. Are the two distinguishing geographical boundaries.

28:05

We'll come on to that tomorrow. I think when we're discussing the DCO, bearing in mind, some of the comments national highways have said about the DCO. And where the strategic road network, starts, finishes, etc. So yeah, thank you.

28:35

Thank you, Mr. Milan. Just moving on to the second point underneath need. I think that we're kind of clear. Well, hopefully, you're clear where we are with regards to the three different components of the scheme. And we'll obviously await your submissions with regards to how are you seeing that see those

relating to each other and being independent? I don't necessarily think we need to be revisiting that because we've touched upon that numerous times today. If I could just focus on the second part of the of the number two bullet point really. And I'm ready to move on to have a discussion really about the need for vehicular capacity. And what I mean by that is, clearly additional road space and infrastructure to infrastructure schemes provide additional capacity to accommodate vehicular movements. I think that's a unequivocal truth. However, it isn't a binary switch there isn't there isn't a kind of switch which says, do nothing and provide capacity. There's obviously an area of grey, whereby different levels of infrastructure can provide different levels of network performance and obviously that is reflected in transport modelling in the kind of way that professional transport one roles would identify things like journey time comparisons with or without schemes, things like queue lads. Things like volume over capacity. So, with that in mind, I suppose the question that falls out from that, if I may, is what assumptions have that the applicants team made with respect to how much capacity This game needs to provide? And to provide a specific example? What what is deemed to be acceptable in terms of levels of delay in the future? And what is deemed not to be? How was this? What are the specific performance indicators for that highway scheme? And how have they been arrived at please? Thank you.

30:53

That's the Mr. Cates Mark, who is three down? And is the transport planning lead

31:01

SDKs? Well, for the applicant? Well, the obviously the in terms of congestion on road network, there is a certain amount to subjectivity to how people view what's acceptable, what's not unacceptable. But in terms of the scheme itself here, the there were very clear thresholds defined in the traffic forecasting report that was produced for the HIF application that I supported the outline business case for the housing infrastructure funding application, and that set out very specific criteria regarding you know, changes in queue lengths, capacity, demand capacity ratios, etc, which were looked at in the modelling for the scenario where you with the dependent development, but without the scheme, and looked at the impact that had on the road network, and looked at those thresholds, and that effectively will determine the trigger points for for the need for the scheme in terms of the capacity uplift that was required. In terms of designing the scheme. It's an iterative process. Clearly, this is not a highway improvement scheme in the sense of a as a normal scheme, this is a scheme to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the JCS developments, and therefore the target was to achieve more of a Neil detriment situation, the objective here was felt to achieve a nil detriment situation to to that if you just had the the future without those developments, what the operation the road network would be, would be like, and the scheme was designed with that in mind, and nothing the modelling, without going into specifics, again, you can't be you have to be general about the operational of the road network, because it consists of journey times on different routes. And with the scheme, you've got traffic rerouting and other aspects. So in terms of the scheme, it's it's to look at whether the overall, the the with the scheme, the performance of the road network is pretty much the same as it would have been without the development without the JCS developments. So that was that was the starting point. But in terms of the scheme itself, all the junctions and components of the scheme itself, have been designed to work operate within capacity. In other words, within approximately 90% of demand to capacity ratio. In the scenario with, with all the dependent development.

34:07

Just Well, my colleagues making a note, the original document you made reference to which was the produced for the HIF. Is that something that's been submitted to the examination? No, I don't believe so. So perhaps we're going to need that.

34:25

Yeah, I think that's correct. We can submit that.

34:30

And thank you, thank you for your response that was helpful. And there's just a couple of questions that are immediately springing to mind or they would help me really just taking that forward. You've said that your position is that the the scheme seeks to basically achieve a nil detriment scenario, which in my simplistic mind means that queues and journey times will be no different to what is experienced in the in the do minimum scenario. Is that Is that something you're agreeing with?

35:06

Well, on the widespread debt, well, obviously this, this scheme isn't solving all the problems of the wide road network. And we do want to take into account this background growth here. What I'm saying within the scheme itself, no, that's not the case had improved the situation within the scheme itself. In terms of things like the queues on the slip roads for the to the M, five, etc, it improved the situation over the current situation quite significantly. What I'm saying is that you can't make a broader statement is solving all the problems of relieving congestion across the whole of the wider road network.

35:40

Indeed, I suppose the question that follows if the kind of benchmark is broadly achieving nil detriment within the confines of the extents of the scheme? Is there any policy justification, which which sets out that level of performance that you can find tools to please?

36:00

The I think that's not correct, what what I'm saying is for the wider road network is achieving the sort of nil detriment type situation we're looking at the overall the road network, in terms of the scheme itself, within that it is improving the operation of road network within the confines of the scheme itself.

36:20

Yes. And is there a policy, as far as there aren't any material policy which actually sets out a requirement for that improvement to be realised?

36:34

My it's not not policy, but my interpretation is that this scheme is coming forward. The intention is going to be part funded by the developers of the sites within the JCS they would only be prepared to fund a scheme that is accommodating their development and the delivery of those developments. There is no justification for funding above that.

37:05

Yeah, I mean, I suppose where my mind is going is to perhaps one back five or 10 minutes. So obviously, highway schemes aren't binary, provide capacity. And it's a certain finite quantum there is a range of different interventions that can be brought forward, which deliver a range of different highway performance is and all of those have, you know, spin off consequences to things like land take and environmental impacts and all of those things. And I'm just trying to understand that the the heart of the scheme development, whether there was any particular kind of benchmark key performance indicators that were applied in if there was a policy justification, I think, what what you said is helpful, but it seems that it's almost been a thing, just a kind of arbitrary decision within the confines of the scheme to seek to provide a betterment without being gay recognised benchmark. Is that a fair comment?

38:10

Yeah, there's no clear benchmark. I would say that's a fair comment. That is, you know, the starting point is that the, you know, the policy is my colleague, Tim Pierce said the policy here is that the enl movement junction is required at a junction 10 The link road is required part of that scheme, the widening and duelling of the A 4019 is an inherent part of that because of the knock on impacts of those other two elements, in terms of ensuring that you don't get backing up onto the motorway from constraints on the local road network. So, they are all intrinsically linked components. And and therefore, the DCO scheme, we, you know, we took the policy and move that design forward to achieve those policy aims, including those key components that were required. And then there was an iterative post process in terms of the design, which looked at optimising that design to achieve those outcomes. For example, you know, with during the design process, roundabout junctions were looked at as alternative signal control junctions, but in the modelling showed that they didn't operate adequately, they were overcapacity. So, we moved to a signal control junctions. Similarly, the link road one point was a dual carriageway, and it was decided that that was not what necessarily said with reduced down to a single carriageway row. So, the design has been optimised in as an iterative process with regard to the modelling.

39:42

Thank you. I think that it would be helpful if we could see the half documentation that perhaps provides an explanation to some of that. But also if there's there's anything you could kind of give us to explain any, any particular operational thresholds that you applied, which led to the development of this scheme, and I'm kind of just thinking about what the National Policy Statement tells us at section 2.24. And that sets out what the government's policy isn't with respect to traffic growth. And it says it isn't the policy to provide for growth, regardless, individual schemes will be brought forward to tackle specific issues, including those of safety rather than to meet unconstrained traffic growth. And I think it'd be helpful if, as an action point, we could have a response which basically signpost where we need to be looking at their health documentation, and also provides the applicants position with risk with regards to the capacity of the scheme that it provides. And the government's policy not to meet unconstrained traffic growth, I think that would be a helpful signpost for us. Thank you.

41:04

Thanks, Andrew state, so we will deal with that, that may also involve going back to the DS one to seven process, where, obviously in the context of the of the MPs where that process was applied. So we will we will give you a global response.

41:22

Understood. Thank you.

41:23

So I've got that exact point. 11. So hopefully, that's we're keeping tabs.

41:33

I've got it as 12 only because I think the HIF might be 11 on my couch and could easily be wrong.

41:38

No, no, I think he's I've joined the two together. So what I've written down action points have submission document to be provided and signposting document for capacity and NPS policy on not providing unconstrained traffic growth. So I'll happily divided if that's okay.

42:00

And before we move off that point, if I could just turn to national highways please and see if there was any anything you wish to add with respect to the quantum of vehicle the capacity that the scheme provides. And and if you have any specific points you wish to raise with respect to that. Thank you.

42:19

Thank you. So Sophie Stewart for national highways are need to take instructions on the specific point around the clock capacity being provided and will return to you in writing. More generally, you'll know from a relevant representation are 26. That national highways has only recently been provided with the traffic modelling packages and work undertaken for the scheme. And whilst we will come back in detail at deadline one, having undertaken an initial review of the modelling that underpins the scheme, there are still significant concerns that need to be addressed discussions are ongoing with the applicant to try and resolve those issues. But at the moment national highways because of those inconsistencies, and some significant issues particularly around the satin model being based on a 2015 base and requiring a present year validation exercise to also take into account of flows during COVID being required, and also some concerns around the parameters models and the effect on junction 11. If the junction 10 proposals come forward we are unable at the moment to draw any conclusions about the impacts of the scheme on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network that will provide detail and writing.

44:00

Thank you just to help me understand the discussions that are going on between you and the applicant. Is it that you will be in a position to make a comprehensive response to that deadline one or is it going to be some residual modelling issues that are going to drift further into the examination period?

44:31

Thank you, sir. Our concerns have already been shared with the applicant. Our understanding is it's fun now for the applicant to respond to the concerns that have been raised in line with the modelling. We can obviously provide an update as to where we get to with that for deadline one, but I suspect it may fall further into the examination timetable.

44:54

Understood Thank you. I'm gonna come to Blogger and Persona moment just to see if there's anything you wish to raise with regards to the points we've been discussing around appropriate levels of vehicular capacity. But before I do, adjust if I could give the applicant a chance to respond to what you've just heard from national highways and their concerns, is there anything that you wish to say now?

45:22

No, sir. I mean, there is to and fro, and it may be fro at the moment. But it'll be two shortly, but I can't. There is extensive dialogue between the parties. And I don't think I can comment further on that in in any substance.

45:39

Understood, thank you. If I could invite comments from Lauren Personen, please with regards to the

45:48

the Thank you, Joe Wooldridge from PJ. I was interested to hear that a nil detriment overall approach has been considered to justify the need for the scheme to release the allocations in the JCS because applications for development are assessed against NPPF. Paragraph 115 sets the threshold as being severe rather than mil detriments which would seem to be considerably higher bar. And so it seems that the the need for the scheme is to release development is assessed differently to how applications for development are assessed. The second part, I suppose is that it is stated that the nil detriment is for JCS allocations. But what has been assessed and designed for is a much greater quantity of development that is allocated in the JCS includes the increase from 1100 homes to around two and a half 1000 at west of Cheltenham. And it includes development in the safeguarded lands. And neither of those are allocated for development in any specific policies. But both of those mean that and Neil detriment assessment for much greater amount of development, there's allocated results to the potentially much higher infrastructure need than is actually required for just for what's allocated in policy. The second point I'd like to make, and this is interesting Surtur, he talks about the national policy statement not being needed. This list is not to meet unconstrained traffic growth. The evidence that we put forward as part of our presentations and as part of the planning application for Northwest Cheltenham is that as severe impacts can be avoided to a combination of both highway measured measures and sustainable transport infrastructure to deliver mode shift. And that would be a way of enabling delivery of Northwest Cheltenham without reliance on the junction 10 scheme. So that was a bit of a difference in terms of was what need has been assessed and what we think is necessary in planning terms. Thank you,

48:24

as if the applicant would like to respond to anything he said.

48:27

Yes, so we haven't addressed the point about the safeguarded land yet and its status in the morning, and I appreciate that's coming up as the next question. But that was touched upon briefly. And of course, the scheme is not looking just to the world as it finishes in 2031, which is the end of the JCS period. But beyond that, and has included growth, beyond that whether in the form of work has included growth. Beyond that. I don't know if there's anything Mr. Cates Mark wants to add a severe impact study,

49:06

I just add that in terms of the modelling, we would would suggest that the scenario without any highways improvements, and the with all the dependent development does result in a severe impact on the road network. So there is a need to address that. Thank you.

49:36

Let's move on to the safeguarding land. I think that's a good place to go at this point, and I think I'd like to go to the appendix L in the transport assessment, if I may, which is application document 142. The reason I'd like to take those is I think I've been incredibly helpful if the applicant got Would it make some kind of help understanding table six which is included on page 17 of 161. Because that obviously shows what is identified as HIFF deadweight dwellings have that way employment dependent dwellings and dependent in flip plot employment floor space. If you could just spend some time please explaining to me firstly, what all of those definitions means for the benefit of everyone in the room. And secondly, what assumptions underpin how things have been categorised it within that table?

50:42

Before you Is it possible to just display that table so that everyone in the room can can see it? Thank You

50:56

page 17 up doc 142.

51:16

I'm gonna ask Mr. Cates mark to run through that. But and I think the concept of deadweight may be more clear once the you've had the chance to see at first part of app 11. But you don't you don't have that at present I appreciate so. So

51:40

it gets

51:42

rusty placemark the applicant

51:44

just to clarify sorry, Miss Kate, are you able to see it now Mr. Hadn't by all by all means by all means come forward. Okay, move it

52:01

to the side.

52:06

Is that better? Okay.

52:16

All right stick as well for the applicant, just to be clear the dead weight development is the quantum of development that was considered that could be delivered without triggering the need for the scheme. Okay, so that is that is the quantum development that can be delivered without triggering the need for the scheme. The dependent development is the development that it that can only be delivered can be delivered with the scheme to unlock the road capacity necessary support that development. So is that clear? For everyone? It

52:50

is Thank you. By just working down through that table. I get the distinction between what you've categorised as what can be delivered in the absence of the scheme, which is before us and what what can't but then how have you worked that down across the various Northwest Cheltenham, West Cheltenham allocations and indeed the safeguarded land? How have you? How have you how have you divided up the deadweight dwellings across those different sites? What have you applied in terms of assumptions?

53:24

Well, as you can see that the numbers in in total work were originally consistent with the JCS quantum of development that was refined for down track reflecting updated knowledge and the West Cheltenham SDP document. But if you look that has just resulted in the overall numbers don't change significantly. It's just that the some of the development that was in safeguarded, identified as safeguarded land in for West Cheltenham was not deemed to be deliverable. Because there there is a sewage treatment works in the middle of the site, I understand and it's not believed to be deliverable. But at the same time, it was viewed that on the basis that applications coming forward, etc, that the volume that would be likely on the allocated West chunk site would be increased. So it's just been moved for modelling purposes. We moved into that, that that allocated site, but overall, the numbers stay broadly, broadly the same, but there have been some refinements to the numbers in terms of how they're broken down between dead weight and and dependent that will have been based on the trigger aspects of the analysis that was done for the the HIFF bid in the traffic assessment. I don't have the details to hand of how specifically for each site or each allocated site that was determined, and I'd have to come back to you with further information on that. That will

55:08

be helpful. Thank you. I mean, it spins back to the hips of admission and signposting that to us because it does seem as if there's certainly confusion on my part in terms of, you know, on one hand, we haven't

been signposting any particular thresholds that you've applied with regards to scheme performance. And on the other hand, it seems that there are some triggers and some things that you've applied to get you to this position in this table. Just before I lose my train of thought, the safeguarded land, then it's clearly not allocated, yet. There aren't any firm proposals for the safeguarded land. So what assumptions have been made with regards to what that site ultimately want? Ahmed aid in the absence of an allocation?

56:01

A suitcase full of the African? Yes, you're correct. The safeguarded land for Northwest children has been included in the as dependent development. That was included because the half funding application was based on that development. And so therefore, that development is intrinsically linked with delivery of the scheme. The site because it's the sacred lands been taken out the Greenbelt by the JCS policy, it's therefore more likely to come forward as a development. And the view was that you was the end because of the proximity to the scheme itself. The view was that this was an exception. And it is perfectly reasonable in this case, to assume that even though that's not an directly allocated site, it was reasonable to assume or to take the assumption that should be included as part of the assessment, because the scheme is there to unlock that safeguarded land, as well as develop a future safeguard the future that safeguarded land, so I accept it is an exception, but I think it's a justified exception.

57:24

Okay. Obviously, this is something which is gonna very much benefit a written submission, because there's a lot to grapple with here in terms of assumptions which have underpinned the modelling and what you've included, and why it's been subdivided in the way that it has. There are also perhaps discrepancies between what this table is telling us and the cyminum law planning application, which if I could just question that briefly, please, because and this is really a characteristic which I'm going to going to offer a comparison with Lauren persimmon, but it's an explanation really that like for the whole whole table, really, insofar as this table six is telling us that the Northwest Cheltenham allocation is for circa 4000 homes, yet only 973 of those can come forward in the absence of this scheme. That's what this table tells me. Is that a correct assumption?

58:32

STI case for African? Yes, that's correct. Okay.

58:35

And then obviously, there is a local highway authority consultation response for the law for similar application, which, on the face of it accepts a different a lesser level of mitigation for a very similar quantum of homes and development of about 4000 homes. So I'd very much appreciate. I don't think we're going to get to the end of this today in this discussion. But there's obviously some help that we need really just to understand what you've assumed in terms of deadweight development, what you've assumed in terms of dependent development, and also how that factors through not only the existing allocations, but also the safeguarded land, because very simplistically, I mean, this is just a, an example to perhaps aid the discussion. But, you know, to pose a question, why could the the safeguarded houses not be allocated in a different way against against the joint poor strategy and thus,

more of the live allocations can come forward in the absence of this scheme? There's obviously been some assumptions which have underpinned your decision making and how it's been divided in this table. But it'd be incredibly helpful if you could really just share those workings with us so we can understand what you've done and how and the mechanics It's all

1:00:03

stickers. African. Yes, we can, we can look to provide that. Just in terms of the discrepancies in the numbers you alluded to earlier. I mean, these numbers are consistent with what went into the HIF funding bid. And so there needs to be that consistency because the skin needs to be tied to that. If, if, if funding. So there's and it was based, therefore, on the best information available at the time, given, you know, leading times for traffic modelling and preparation for the DCO. There, you know, I'm aware that things have moved on applications have come in subsequently, things have moved on. But clearly, it hasn't been practical for us to or possible for us to take account of that given the timescales.

1:00:52

Can I just think, firstly, I've noticed an action point. And hopefully, my description of capacity assessment per site, including safeguarding land, dead weight development, assumptions made and mechanics supporting the appraisal is a reasonably clear expectation of what we're trying to get to. So that's, I think, action point. 13. But the point you just made about the timing, I think it's going to be helpful to understand that as well, because the blog persimmon application was submitted quite a long time ago. I can't recall exactly the date that the consultation response was submitted to the local authority on that scheme. But that I would be interested to know when that was relative to your HIV bid. And, and, therefore the consequences of understanding better the relationship that was going on at the time and how you've got to where you've got to.

1:02:08

If that's Am I making it clear? Am I just talking Double Dutch?

1:02:15

Yeah, now, that's clear. I mean, obviously, the you need to appreciate that the the lead in time from your pairing your uncertainty log, which under fits your demand forecasting, which then feeds in the traffic modelling, which then has to be processed, analysed. So there is a considerable lead in time to that process. Yeah,

1:02:39

no, I appreciate that. And it may be that you're going to need to prepare sort a table for the different processes that were occurring so that we can understand the dynamics between them. It's really trying to understand how you've, as a county council Highway Authority responded to a planning application saying one thing. And yet it appears on the face of it from that table that Mr. Reagan's been referring to, and your assessment on traffic for this scheme. They don't seem directly compatible. And so we're trying to understand that broader picture in the round.

1:03:25

So undertake for the applicant just to to overlays there as well. There is a recommendation from national highways, which imposes a cap on development for this site, Northwest Cheltenham of 1000 dwellings so that it's 973, in the in the document we've looked at that says 1000. And secondly, the Appendix for to the relevant representations on behalf of blue homes Limited has a response from Gloucestershire county council to in respect to that application of October 22. And on the second page, it's made clear that the response is based on the that on the basis that improvement works are delivered junction 10 on the M five. So it the response in relation to the that overall proposal is qualified by by that moment.

1:04:34

Yeah. Yeah. Obviously, there's

1:04:37

a few spinning plates on this issue. But I suppose, you know, we're not going to get to the bottom of it today. But hopefully you can see where we're going with our with our thoughts on it. Just just to summarise, I think in some ways we just need if I can try and put this into sentences, which is an incredibly difficult thing to do, but it's almost we just need clarity on what your calculations and assumptions have been. With regards to developments coming forward and the amount of traffic they would generate. And secondly, to go back to our discussion perhaps 20 minutes ago, what what are you assuming is acceptable in terms of highway performance and delay? I think if you could encapsulate that kind of overarching thought within your wider submission, that would be massively helpful. Thank

1:05:23

you. Understood.

1:05:26

Steve Case, my African just to make one point on that about clearly there is no recognised metric for assessing the capacity of a network as a whole comprising of junctions and links with different differing levels of reserve capacity, you know, it is a you can look at various different matrix, but there's not one overall defining metric you can quote, to define the operational performance of a road network in the wider sense, just to make that point.

1:06:01

Yeah. So if you could Sassuolo this out in writing, please. And alongside the office, late, signpost, any, any relevant policy and also perhaps any kind of compliance or otherwise, with the with the nrps point about not meeting constraints traffic growth, I think that would enable us to move it, move it forward a bit. Thank you.

1:06:24

But I'd also like to just ask national highways in light of the comment made. Is there an agreed position between national highways and County Council's Highway Authority on the limitation of development that can go ahead in advance of improvements to the junction on on the motorway

1:06:55

safely strapped for national highways? So we're just checking, excuse me. We're just checking with spatial planning colleagues, but I have no reason to contradict what Mr. Tate said in terms of national highways previous response. I assume that the will have been a view taken but as soon as I hear back from spatial planning, I'll confirm that. And if not today, we'll follow it up in writing.

1:07:23

Okay, thank you. And I just, I was just going to come to you next, just to hear your views in light of everything you've heard. Thank you.

1:07:32

Thank you very much. With regards to the strategic highway network, the JCS IDP includes other schemes on this digit road network includes improvements at M five junction 11. And it improves includes improvements at a 40 Elmbridge cord. As included in our representations, we've identified that those schemes would be suitable to mitigate the impacts of the JCS allocations at those junctions. We've been having some discussions about those schemes with the National Highway spatial planning colleagues. The National Highway spatial planning team are do some further investigations around schemes particularly at Elmbridge. Court with regards to making sure that those are deliverable because as I say that IDP does include further improvements. It's also wanted to save you consider the the charts at the end of the transport assessment for the applicants scheme, there's identified that more traffic will be put through some of these SRN junctions, rather than being summoned to solve issues. So I think the key point there is that the DCO scheme doesn't solve issues on either junctions or the SRN. The two things aren't on unrelated spreads. The second point I'd like to make is that this this table refers to what the half funding is intended to release, which is development beyond the JCS. So includes safeguarded land decision making in terms of current applications have to decide it against current planning policies, which is limited to just what's in the JCS. It's not the safeguarded land, and it's not extra development at west of Cheltenham. And so the two decisions have to be made separately. You can't use evidence for the hair funding to say that there's a need for current allocations. There's and that's clear.

1:09:53

There's obviously quite a lot of different dynamics at play here. And clearly, it's not our position to be reexamining the joint core strategy, we've got to try and understand this highway scheme as a DCO. But it's obviously quite a lot of interrelationships to understand the need argument, and how far that need extends relative to the different component parts. And I think you've potentially been left with quite a challenge in promoting a highway scheme that comes to facilitate housing and other development on the back of that. And it seems to me that a lot of the NPS is written about highway schemes being the starting point. And it's almost like you're approaching it from the other end, not saying that's unreasonable or wrong, but I think it gives her a very different dynamic and quite a different challenge in explaining how it meets that policy test. But it's not a question is just the way it appears to me that what we're wrestling with is slightly different from a national highway scheme, for example, because it's seeking to achieve something slightly different.

1:11:22

You're not looking for a response now. But we have got that on our list of matters, including the different articulation in the important and relevant, revised MPs, which is more explicit in that regard.

1:11:36

Thank you. Can I just come to Mr. Matthews just wondered whether, in light of everything you'd heard whether there was anything you wish to add, from your perspective.

1:11:49

Thank you, sir. Now, I've been typing furiously during this part of the discussion, one of the matters, which is obviously of direct relevance to the applications that we've got in at the moment for the West chelton, part of this site that I'm involved in, and I'm sure others will be interested. On the other component parts is the deadweight capacity as shown on table six here. I'm very pleased you asked a question about the safeguarded land, it had confused me somewhat to see a, an allocation of 513 dwellings to an area of land, which isn't allocated for development and only 225 to an area which is allocated in the JCS and which has current planning application sat on it. I just, uh, suppose a brief procedural question was the only thing that I wanted to follow up if that's okay. You've asked for clarification on these matters from the applicant? When what are the sort of timescales for that being provided? Because I want to make sure that when we provide you with our response, we're able to do so in light of the most up to date evidence and in response to the questions that you've asked.

1:13:15

I think our expectation on this, obviously, part of our Action Lists is that we will get responses to these various points a deadline one, which is the 18th of June, I think we would ask anyone who's partaking today, equally to provide summaries of your position at the same time, but then obviously, as we go through the examination, everyone will have the opportunity to see what each other party has said. And hopefully, we will start to narrow the gaps, but we will see see how it goes. At least hopefully have a clearer understanding of the various positions and what hasn't, hasn't been included. Thank you. I'm just wondering whether it's an appropriate time to take a pause it one o'clock. And before I do, can I just check within the room, whether anyone has any other points that they would wish to raise on, on what we've got discussed so far? Okay, well, I think if we adjourn now, and we come back at two o'clock, is that going to give everyone sufficient time? Yep. Okay, so, again, if you're watching on the live stream, you'll need to restart your browser when we return at two o'clock. Thank you.