



Hearing Transcript

Project:	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) – Session 3
Date:	13 August 2024

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

M5J10_ISH3_SESSION3_13082024

00:05

Thank you very much.

00:07

Okay, so I'll turn that to national highways, see how we're getting on with availability of people. Thank you.

00:13

Thank you, sir. Sophie Stewart, for national highways. I'm hoping, very shortly, in a matter of moments, Andrew Stoneman, Director strategic transport modeling from WSP, will be joining us online. Excellent.

00:32

Are you, Mr. Are you available? Mr. Soman,

00:41

sorry, I think he was just waiting for the link to be sent from your program officer. Well,

00:50

just to wait a moment, and then hopefully he'll be with us, and then we can go back to some of the transport issues that we were discussing this Morning. I I

01:21

think whilst we're waiting, I think there's a couple of individual access points that we wanted to discuss with parties, so it may be worth getting on with those whilst we're waiting for his connection. So I'll pass over to Mr. Regan to lead on those.

01:38

Thank you, Mr. Mondale. Ultimately, we'll circle back around to the first agenda item on the traffic and transport. Well, if we can move on to the third point now please, which is basically or seeking clarity with respect to some of the individual site access provisions offered by the scheme. And firstly, with respect to Mr. Hadley and his representations to the to the ex. A, could I first ask the applicant to provide a summary with respect to the appropriateness of the access into Mr. Hadley's land, as per his represent representations? Please.

02:21

Thank you, sir. And I came to ask Mr. Craig Jones, who's at the end of the row, who's the highways DESIGN LEAD, the applicant? Plot

02:29

16, nine. A for the avoidance. Thank you. Yeah. Craig Jones,

02:33

for the applicant, the applicant proposes the replacement field access onto the b4, 634, to replace the existing access, but not withstand. Withstand in this the applicant is aware that there appears to be another well used access to the field from Hayden lane, which will be unaffected by the scheme. The b4, 634, is being widened in the location of the proposed access. It will be 10.1 meters wide compared to the existing road, which is 6.1 meters wide. This is therefore an improvement over the current situation. Additionally, a bellmouth axis with radii of six meters and an access track of 3.6 meters wide would be provided, along with a gate set back 15.8 meters from the carriageway. This would allow suitably sized vehicles to pull in and stop off the road when when turning in and out to the site, compared to the existing situation, where the gate is set back approximately two meters from the carriageway, with no space for vehicles to stop off the road. The signalized junction should create gaps in traffic flow that would aid agricultural vehicles when turning in and out of the site. Furthermore, there's a proposed reduction in speed limit from 50 miles per hour to 40 miles per hour along this section of the b4, 634, the

04:03

Yeah, thank you. That's helpful. We're going to be having a separate discussion about dmr departures from standard later on, but just at this stage, can you confirm if there are any departures from standard with respect to Mr. Hadley's access which we should be aware of Thank you.

04:22

There aren't any direct departures for the access itself, but there's, there are departures nearby, on on visibility, along the along the b4, 634,

04:38

understood. Thank you. Mr. Hadley, I'd like to invite you to respond to anything that you've just heard.

04:45

Thank you, sir. Neil Hadley, I'm aware of what the agricultural access, how that can be designed. I'm talking about the fact that. My land is included within the strategic allocation, and to my mind, it shouldn't have been shouldn't be excluded, the access shouldn't be excluded by the traffic lights system that's proposed. As we all know that it's very difficult to turn right in and out have good egress and access into sites when there are signal junctions just a matter of meters away, and the applicant has failed to certainly discuss with me central lane provision and or a roundabout or an elongated roundabout. So bear in mind what's just been said. I'm disadvantaged that we're not going to have good access and egress within my site.

06:08

Thank you, Mr. Hadley, so your concerns don't relate to the agricultural access provision that the scheme offers. It relates to the access into development associated with some future planning application on your land?

06:28

Yes, that's correct.

06:30

Could I ask the applicant to provide a response in with respect to their consideration of a future access into a future development being provided by this scheme. Please. Thank you. Mr. Pierce,

06:46

I think thanks. Tim Pierce, the applicant, I think the applicant has been quite clear in its responses to date to examination, that it has taken quite a clear stance on the provision of of accesses into sites that are allocated and sites that are not. In the case of Mr. Hadley's land, there is the provision of the main access into the whole allocation for a seven which is part of the scheme, but in terms of the subdivision of that plot and any perceived access into a future development site on Mr. Hadley had his land in isolation, then we don't feel the justification is there to provide an access in policy grounds or in terms of planning status.

07:35

Thank you for that. Mr. Hadley is a response that you'd like to make to what we've heard. Thank you. Yes. Neil Hadley,

07:45

I'm sure the applicant would agree that my site is within the red lined allocated site boundary, unless really I ought to be entitled to an access should I require one? And the proposed singling will actually be a detriment to an access Had there been a round about proposed, whether it be completely round or elongated, that would have helped me to gain access onto the old Gloucester road. But to say that my site, I think the words chosen where it's not an allocated site, is absolutely ridiculous, so we can all see it's allocated, and I've had discussions with the applicant from day one about this, and They've chosen to just ignore my point of view. I

09:06

could I invite the joint councils to offer anything they wish to against what we've just heard?

09:16

So the Joint Council night, joint councils, the joint councils don't have any comment.

09:21

Thank you. Is there anybody else in the room who wishes to comment on anything that we've just heard? Nope,

09:36

but I don't give the applicant a chance again, just to come back to Mr. Hadley on anything additional they wish to mention Thank you.

09:46

No, sir, I don't think we it would assist for us to come back. We hope we've made our position clear.

09:54

Thank you. I'd now like to move on to. Lawrence persimmon, now if I may, and specifically, I think it would be helpful if I could ask for an explanation with regards to future access into the safeguarded land, and any concerns about ransom which have been mooted in some of the representations. Thank you. Applause,

10:25

it says the submissions that we make can fall into two categories. One is looking at the land absent the safeguarded land issues so simply the fact that there will be the removal of an existing access into land that is used for agricultural purposes, and that the alternative access that's proposed purely for the agricultural purposes is not safe and suitable. And then the other part of the submissions is in the context that we say that the the safeguarded land there, the ABS the removal of the access that currently would go into the safeguarded land has a few consequences. One, it creates a ransom situation, which currently doesn't exist the two and not wishing to trespass on the funding discussions, but we say that there is a reliance on the safeguarded land coming forward in so far as the Funding for the scheme relies on funding from the safeguarded land, and yet the removal of any access to the safeguarded land prevents the delivery of that land coming forward. Perhaps if I prefer to my colleague, look at the first point, which is forgetting all issues about safeguarded land and ransoms just purely the removal of that access and the alternative means why that's deficient.

12:09

Joe Wooldridge for law homes and prism homes. So at presenters, there are three accesses into the land north of troops be road, one of those fields accesses into this is the GCC lands, and one of those is into land under the control of blah homes. The proposed scheme combines those accesses into a single entrance from Shrewsbury Road, from the northern arm of the new signal control junction. That access road continues north for short distance, and then it splits into access tracks leading east and west, and then the Eastern access track, then splits into two again.

13:04

Can I just pause? Would it be helpful? Are you able to display, I think it's sheet 12 of general arrangement drawings, probably as good as any, and that shows everybody what's being described. I think that would Be helpful. I

15:35

Yeah, that's That's great. Yes. Thank you very much. So you can see there's a short section of two lane carriageway from the new signal junction, and then the access road splits into two directions. Now we questions from the applicants how the suitability of that access has been tested, and we were provided with a vehicle tracking drawing that showed a vehicle movement for a tractor and a hay wagon with it with a length of 19 meters and a width of 2.5 meters. And we were told that that information had been used by the applicant to judge that the design was suitable for continued farm operations. However, having discussed this with the landowners representatives, we don't consider that this meets their requirements for a number of reasons. The first reason is that farm machinery is wider than the design

vehicle that was used as an example, a combine half stir is four meters width, whereas the vehicle that's been tested is only two and a half meters within other farm machinery is also three to four meters wide at peak times, the combined access track will be frequently used. You consider that at present there are a number of individual accesses, but when you combine those together, each each landowner may have four to five tractor rigs towing each towing machinery in order to ensure a constant takeoff of of crops on the land at peak harvest periods. As a consequence of that inevitable inevitably, at certain times, there'll be conflicts between oncoming vehicles in this area. And as an example, two vehicles, each tow machinery that's three to four meters wide would not be able to pass within the area that's shown, and as a result, there'll be conflicts in this area, both within the access track and also at the new junction. And we consider this may represent a safety risk. It is the landowners view that access into its lands should be provided via a north, south road, directly from the junction, as opposed to the current arrangement, which provides a very, very narrow access track to two separate ownerships, which results in this conflict. This is a genuinely held view from an agricultural perspective, although we appreciate that the existing access gates are very simple, each landowner is able to access his land independently, whereas opposed schemes and the narrow track will result in safety and operational issues. This has, this has been sort of detailed to the applicant on the second of August.

18:52

So just for clarification, then, where the two gates, one's heading north, one's heading east, they're going into different ownership parcels.

19:00

That's correct.

19:01

Okay, thank you.

19:06

Thank you for that. Could I ask the applicant to come in at this point please and just respond to what we've just heard about, the agricultural access provision into those lots of different ownership please. Craig Jones,

19:19

for the applicant, the existing accesses serve in the safeguarded land a direct field accesses off the a 4019, the main access to field number gr, 21, 6008, is located opposite worthy bridge Lane junction identified as J on streets right away and access plan. Access plans, regulation, five, 2k, sheet 12 at this location, the A, 4019, currently has two eastbound lanes and one westbound lane. These are separated by a non standard right turn in lane with limited storage. Length for turning vehicles over five years of collision data for the period one first of January, 2016 to the 31st, of December, 2020 it shows that there were two serious and two slight collisions recorded at or near this location. Vehicles turning into or out of this access have potential conflict points with two eastbound lanes, including merging traffic from the m5 southbound and one westbound lane of the a 409, as well as right turning traffic into and out of worthy bridge lane, which is in very close proximity. The second field access onto the a 4019, is

located just to the west of the existing lay by as identified on L of streets, rights of way and access plans, regulation, five, 2k, sheet 12.

20:55

Sorry to interrupt. Have you got this plan available so that we can actually see what you're describing, because it'll be much easier for us to understand the relationship if we've got it visually.

21:09

Yeah, I'll have to ask if it can be brought up on the screen now,

21:22

again, just for clarification, the conflicts that you're describing is that the conflicts on the current road alignment or or the proposed road

21:29

correct the current existing layout. I

21:43

just whilst that's being found. Do you know the dimensions of the current accesses into the fields and whether what you're providing is better in terms of overall size, width relative to what's currently available? Do

22:04

get the SEC,

22:15

Mr. Mole,

22:17

James mo for the applicant, the existing gateway accessing west of the GCC owned land is 3.8 meters in width, so less than the the four is

22:36

that the first one that was being described by Your colleague is the plan available? Just To confirm, I

23:30

so where the cursor currently is on the plan now showing on the screen is the location of the access that's currently in place At 3.8 meters in width.

23:40

So that's that's within the box, which, I think is, yeah, the box, which is got the arrow 12, three, pointing down towards the center of it, correct? Yes, okay. But is it the case that that 3.8 meter access currently, effectively gets the land plot directly out onto the wide main road. Correct? Yes. So, so the introduction of the of the almost cul de sac arrangement with the terms involved may arguably make it more difficult

for certain vehicles to maneuver into and out of the sites, and it would be the case going through a 3.8 meter access directly onto a widened carriageway.

24:33

Does. It does introduce more turns than than the current direct access. However, it does offer the advantage of joining the A, 4019, at the signalized junction. So the current the current access, is a direct access, and vehicles are having to cross two lanes of westbound, Eastbound traffic sit into a into a substandard right turn lane. Eight and then gain access to the westbound, the westbound lane of the a 4019,

25:07

understood. Thank you. But generally speaking, would I be right in assuming that a longer agricultural and lot longer and wider a larger agricultural vehicle would find it easier maneuvering via a gate onto an existing, widened highway, rather than via a a route which involves more turns. Is that a fair comment,

25:32

from a maneuvering point of view, correct, but from a from a road safety point of view and delays in actually gaps, gap seeking within, within a busy a 4019, with busy traffic. I'm not sure how, how easy that would be to do.

25:51

So it would appear that it's it may be beneficial for the operation of the adopted highway, but presumably what you're saying is you accept that the level of access that the agricultural land gets at the moment may not be quite as convenient and appropriate in the future for larger vehicles, given the given the turns and the arrangement of the side road stub that's proposed. Is that what you're saying?

26:24

Yeah, I suppose it's it. It's there are, there are more turns, as I said, but it's going to get a simpler, a simpler kind of means of access that that arm of the signalized arm of the junction has a has a timings of about 90 seconds to two minutes, I believe. So there's a, there's a frequent call on, on the green phase of that of that signals

26:54

understood with regards to the traffic signals. But presumably there is a case here whereby larger vehicles, which are currently able to maneuver into and out of the existing gate next to 12 three, won't be afforded the same ability to maneuver via the the kind of side road provisions offered by this scheme

27:19

we we have done, done sweat path analysis. And since receiving the the information about about combine harvesters and trailers, we've we've also run, run sweat paths with with a three and a half meter wide combine harvester, which is as a total length of about 18 meters and and that was showing, showing to work reasonably there. The actual probably looking at, looking at on a plan, doesn't, doesn't, perhaps, do the width justice that the northern, the northern spur from the junction is a minimum width

of 8.3 meters, which is wider than the average, nearly typical, standard single carriageway road. So that's the, that's the the bit section of road, kind of immediately north of of the junction.

28:19

So that's, that's basically, if I was to continue through the cycle way and the foot way, it's, it's in that vicinity that you're stipulating the width, is it?

28:27

Yeah, it's

28:28

12 point 12.7 where, the where the leader points to 12.7 going, going northwards. So the, the bluish, kind of Honeycomb Hatcher,

28:38

yes, thank you.

28:40

So, so that's a minimum of 8.3 meters up until the give way line with where the radius are. Then, then that changes into five meters access track with one meter wide hardened verge. So it gives, it gives a sort a total run in width of seven meters.

29:07

Just to come back to the point there regarding convenience. James casmo, for the applicant, I don't think it's fair to say it's any less convenient. I think, you know, yes, there is more turns involved, but it's, you know, a road safety issue vehicles pulling out. It's an operator safety issue in the vehicle pulling out as well, and it is a far more regular ability to get in and out of what can be a very busy road on the A 4019, at times,

29:33

understood, yeah. I mean, I suppose where I was going with the question was, do those turns in that new provision actually restrict operations and vehicles which can access the fields today, doing so in the future as a result of the scheme that's fundamentally where I was coming from with

29:49

understood, and I think it's it's not going to restrict vehicles accessing that currently can. I think the question that's been asked thus far more relates to whether the vehicles can pass one another on that. Track. At the moment, it's an individual access track for each landowner. It's now a shared access track, which is maybe the key point of difference, rather than a convenience or or usability. Just another question. Nom, you're saying that the Combine houses are four meters wide.

30:24

That's the information I'll be provided with

30:26

the essay. So what access points are they using now?

30:30

They use the existing field debts. Well, one

30:33

of them was described as 3.8 meters wide, so it won't fit through that one. So which one is it coming through?

30:43

The information I've been provided with is that all farm machinery uses those existing gates. Unfortunately, I can't provide you with further details about how the farm operates.

30:57

I think it might be helpful if, as part of your responses today, we have clarity on, is it three access points, or however many access points there are to the fields, their current widths, and then clarification of where your clients or Your the current landowners, how they're farming those because unless things change, we need to understand the discrepancies and the challenges that the current farming operations are going to face relative to what's being proposed and ultimately, whether It's better or worse. I suppose,

31:41

of course, yes. James

31:42

Caswell, for the applicant, I guess the only additional point I would ask is frequency of use as well. You know, it's one access and one exit per annum for a combine harvester, for instance, they would normally be escorted due to the sort of size of the vehicle coming down a public highway. So that the frequency would be helpful to understand as well.

32:02

Thank you. Can I just go back to the point you were making with regards to accidents on the A 4019, I think that you you mentioned that there were three or four which were proximate to the existing field access. I think it'd be helpful to understand, did it? Did any of those directly involve agricultural vehicles or maneuvers turning into or out of the that existing field? Access? Please.

32:32

Okay, I can, I can look into that. Provide details.

32:36

Thank you. Applause.

32:44

Is there anything that Lauren soon wished to raise in response to what you just heard before we move on to the safeguarded land point,

32:51

thank you. Says there was a reference there to a further swept path analysis that the applicant says they've done in response to our submissions, unless we've missed it. We haven't seen or heard about that until today, so there is going to be Reliance placed on that. It's any way that we're afforded the opportunity to see that and comments upon it.

33:14

So if I can come back on that Tim Pierce for the applicant, I think it's obvious from discussions today that there is maybe difference of opinion about the type size of vehicles that can access currently and are needed through access in the future. So I think once that information is confirmed, then we can obviously, if we need to update this web path analysis to reflect that, and then we will share that information. I

33:42

Duncan, thank you. If we could then just turn to the second matter that Laura and persimmon raised, which was with respect to the future access provision into the safeguarded land, and whether there was any any conflicts with the scheme, the DCO scheme, and the ability for that access to be provided. Could I have a response from the applicant on that please?

34:13

Sorry, so class you to ask that again, please.

34:15

Yeah, Simon raised two issues, really. One was the the appropriateness of the access into the existing land use, which is the agricultural land. The second point, if I'm not mistaken, was with respect to the ability to access future developments on the safeguarded land, and the appropriateness of this scheme to either either facilitate that or perhaps not, not, not conflict with that happening. Could I have a opinion from the applicant with regards to how the scheme does or doesn't deal with future access into the safe safeguarded land? Thank you. Yeah. So

34:55

of course, I think we addressed this in the previous set of hearings as well, but I don't mind. Summarizing MPs for the applicant. The start, as I alluded to earlier, this stance of the of the applicant is that the provision of a direct access, other than replacement for those being lost into future development sites, is is being provided on sites that are definitively allocated. The scheme acknowledges the safeguarded land in terms of its say, looking to safeguard from the local road network perspective, the ability for any forthcoming development on the safe guarded land to enter on to the local road network by the capacity can be achieved within the local road network, and that the local road network would not be need to be redeveloped, or our scheme would need to be dug up and and re redevelop to to achieve the access that's required. But it stopped short of providing an access into the site itself, because we feel that would be pre determining the planning state, the future planning

status of that site. But it's cog the scheme is cognizant of the fact that its design year goes 11 years past. The JCS plan term, and in terms of the JCS itself, the safeguarded land is reasonably the most likely site outside of the allocations to come forward post plan term, and we're moving towards our design year. So that's that's why it's considered within the realms of the scheme itself, but we stopped short of providing a direct access.

36:52

I fully understand the reasoning and the arguments why you've not designed access, per se, to facilitate the Department of safeguarded land. But I think the point that we're trying to clarify is slightly different to that, in that the concerns expressed by the current landowner and blow homes is that your scheme would result in a ransom arrangement. So you telling us that that is not the case, because we did ask a written question on this, and when I reread the answer, it didn't give us a nice, clear yes or no, and so so a so

37:43

I think the position is that access into the scheme doesn't prejudice access ultimately being provided into that site. And it happens to go through a part of GCC as landowners land that's part of the overall area for development of the safeguarded land, if it is released. And so in that context, the land ownership interest of GCC is no different to any other landowner interest. If it was going through, if it had wasn't GCC, it was someone else, there would be arrangements as between the landowners in the usual way for equalization. That's rather, that's, doesn't that's not same as a ransom. It is

38:46

as if for well, scrolling back the fact that GCC, as landowner, happens to have an interest in part of the site shouldn't alter the overall position as to relationships between landowners who may not be the local authority as landowner. That's the short point.

39:20

Thank you. Just out my understanding of the point. Is it that the Bloor persimmon land would basically have a lesser frontage onto the adopted highway post DCO scheme than they enjoy today? Or is your Is it your submissions that it is effectively going to be the same and still traversing through Council land. So.

40:00

James Cass for the applicant, I think the question would need to be answered to sort of help provide a response. Phil is understanding where the access would be in a no scheme world, the land holding, which currently fronts onto the a 4019 to the west of the GCC ownership, is relatively narrow. It's also very close in proximity to the existing exit slip road, the northbound exit slip road, was that the original location that was being proposed for access into the site is the sort of key question, or would it always have been through the GCC land?

40:34

So what you're saying is that the scheme will actually reduce the touch point between the blower Simon land and the adopted highway, I get what you're saying about the suitability of that particular location to

provide a suitable access, but is it that what you're telling us is that this the DCO scheme, effectively designs out that touch point with the existing adopted highway, and leaves us in a position where the only kind of route to the adopted highway is via the via the council land, is that what we're

41:09

James casmo for the applicant, it would remove that touch point, or at least separate it further from the carriage way, by means of the cycle way, foot bath, etc, whether it changes the position, I guess, is the point. As you say, would that have been a viable access location in an O skin world?

41:33

I'm correct in understanding that the blob parcel currently has quite a long frontage immediately abutting the current a 4019, and so there is a range of options currently available that could facilitate access with no ransom taking place. And if your scheme comes forward as currently designed, and they're reliant on this access point going to the current junction, albeit they'll be redesigned to accommodate future traffic. That puts the blow persimmon position clear to it would appear to me that they're going to be reliant on third party land which is not adopted highway. Is that correct? James casimo, for the applicant, know, in so much as blow will still have that significant stretch of road frontage the east of the the access point shown on screen at the moment, I think there's a difference there between blows Pinterest and the two independent or three independent landowners who make up the safeguarded land. So the you know, the division between those two key landowners in terms of Brewton Council and Carter's, is a different point to the blows. Blows one, they have control of a significant frontage still in the scheme world post construction, I

43:15

wonder if it's going to be easy to show us the land plans, just to possibly try and understand better What you're telling us You

44:42

I sorry. I don't think the I don't I don't think the stream is picking up your voice for you speak closer into the microphone. Thank you.

44:51

Thank you. James catoff, the applicant with the land plans now showing lots. 12 over 7e will still be in the control or under the agreement that laws currently have in a post scheme world, along with the plot. Immediately to the east, I'm afraid, I can't quite see the plot number, sorry, 12, 7e Roman one, yeah, thank you. That frontage will remain, and that's for balls to benefit from in terms of access in the future, there is a separate consideration between the two landowners which make up this area within the safeguarded land site. If we zoom to the west and north slightly, please, Doug,

45:47

so plot 12 over one a I believe it is north of the blue colored land which is subject to permanent rights, is in the control of A different landowner to the previous plots referenced, and they currently have access immediately to the west of the GCC land. So which is the GCC land on here, broadly outlined by the permanent rights linear feature running along the hedgerows. So the blue colored land plot number 12

over 1b would be part of it. We can provide a deal more detailed plan showing the difference in ownership to help with this point of deadline for certainly, the thing that would be helpful but it's it's not only the current land ownership and the current options, but it's reflecting where the highway boundaries ultimately going to be relative to those options, and whether the concerns that blow and persimmon have identified pan out as they currently are concerned about or not. And that's the bit I'm not 100% clear on at the moment. So it's about almost overlaying your scheme onto the land parcels, so that everyone can fully understand the interrelationships. And then that might give the reassurance or not that the issue does exist or not, so that perhaps would be helpful, we'll prepare those not a problem. Thank you.

47:35

Does that help?

47:37

It does greatly. Says Our understanding is that at the moment, we do have access to the highway, and that the consequence of the scheme is we will lose that, and the only mechanism by which we could gain access to the land interests that my clients have is to go through the applicant control. So therefore our understanding is that the scheme does manifest a ransom where one currently doesn't exist, but I think that plan will resolve that Question. Thank you.

48:20

I think that we've covered access as much as we want to against this agenda item, but before we move back up the agenda and national highways, could I just make sure that there's no one, either in the room or online that wish to provide any comments or inputs with respect to the agenda item on access. Please not seeing any hands. So if we can move back up the agenda, please to revisit some of the national highways points with regards to modeling, etc. I believe is it Mr. Stoneman who's going to be responding?

48:55

Thank you. So yeah. Sophie Stewart for national highways, I have online. Andrew Stoneman, Director transport modeling with WSP, who should be able to address your questions. Thank you.

49:13

Good afternoon. Mr. Stoneman, good afternoon. You can hear, which is a great start. I think that where we got to before lunch is we were keen to explore, really, the differing opinions between the applicant and national highways with respect to the adequacy of the Saturn modeling, and in particular the tag compliance of that. And if you could just please, for the benefit of everybody in attendance. Just just provide some clarity with respect to the national highways position in that respect, it will be helpful. Thank you. Thank you. The position about side compliance is that whilst the model as a whole is compliant, there are. Key areas that are very close to the to the scheme and the scheme proposed which are failing to reach the tag thresholds, specifically around journey times. And it's the issue that we have there is the model is overestimating delays, and those delays are important for traffic to route through and route through the model, but also building the value from, any case, for a scheme.

50:35

Thank you. So just to confirm what I think you're telling, me that there are some areas of the Saturn modeling suite that don't necessarily hit the specific targets and requirements for tag compliance on an individual basis. But overall, is it that your position, that the model of the applicant has, has has put to the DCO application does actually meet The overall tag compliance thresholds? Yes, yeah, thank you. Applause.

51:24

So given that the model is compliant overall, how would you consider that we, the XA and the Secretary of State should be concluding that it is an acceptable modeling tool to assess the impacts of the scheme. My main concern is that the failures are in a location which is very sensitive to the scheme, and that if we're not representing the key corridor correctly, any evidence that relies on that part of the model

52:05

can be brought into question.

52:09

The model as a whole relies on quite a large area of the county. So whilst it is acceptable across the county, we're relying on places in Gloucester and Cirencester and other locations remote from the scheme to basically on average, give us a good enough model.

52:39

Thank you. I'm just trying to understand that if, overall, we are presented with a model that that meets the overarching tag compliance thresholds, is it not that we heard from the applicant before lunch that was explaining that, you know, a model is obviously a complex beast, and if you tweak one particular part of the model or pull a particular lever, then things fundamentally change, and you may get more diversions from from tight thresholds in other areas. So what is it that you think the applicant needs to do in terms of, you know, ticked meeting thresholds to have a model, which I mean, it seems to me that you're almost asking the applicant to go, go beyond, beyond what the tag requirements are, ultimately are. Is that a fair comment? I would like to see whether changing the coding of that corridor does have such a disruptive impact on the model as a whole. It's it seems to be that in the evidence, there's two or three junctions where the model is failing, and I haven't seen anything that really explores and gives me any sensitivity or sense of how, how reliant the model as a whole is on, on those junctions and that corridor failing for the rest of the model to pass. It could be that that corridor has changed, and there is very little disruption elsewhere in the model. I Yeah, thank you. I mean, at this point, could I just go back to the applicant? And I know that we were discussing some of those possible changes this morning. Is there anything that you want to respond to with respect to what we've heard from Mr. Stoneman and indeed, his requests to explore some of those journey time nuances. Thank you.

54:52

Steve Case Mark, for the applicant, firstly, one point of clarity I walked during the lunch break. Clarity that. The statement I made earlier about the journey time validation being consistently against the median, that is correct. The validation presented is in all cases against the median, so it's consistent.

The other point is that we can, we can go away and look and see if we investigate the possibility of doing some sort of sensitivity test to see what that might do. But I, you know, I'd need to discuss that with my modeling team before confirming that is something that we feel is appropriate to do. But we can go away investigate it. And the timing of how quickly we can we can get some results from that? Yeah,

55:43

I think, based upon what we've heard today, I think that I've got the answer, but I'd very much like help from from national highways and the applicant. I mean, it seems to me that national highways written response on the 30th of July is citing issues with Tag compliance, but then what we're hearing verbally today from Mr. Stoneman, it seems to be a slightly different pitch, and I think they'll be incredibly helpful for us as we're sat here today, just to understand if there is any dispute between the parties whatsoever with regards to the overall compliance of the model with with Tag guidance. I get that there is some disagreements with regards to whether certain aspects of that model could be pulled more appropriately into line with regards to journey times, but I think the ultimate question that I want to understand is, is there any dispute between national highways and the applicant with regards to the adequacy of that model and its compliance with tag. So if I could have a response from both of you with respect to that, please, and I think the applicant suggestion there as a follow up point, I think would be quite helpful if there is a way to, firstly understand the adequacy of the model and compliance with tag, but also to, perhaps for you to explore what the implications of of Mr. Stoneman and national highways concerns are with regards to journey times, and if, if there is the ability to address those and and perhaps get a even more robust model than it than it is at the moment, then I think that would put us in a slightly clearer position than We are at the moment.

57:33

Yeah, understood. Thank you. I

57:50

So are you going to let us know by deadline for your whether you're going to be able to undertake your sensitivity testing, and hopefully, in the meantime, have a conversation with national highways about the timing of it, how long that would take, and then how long it would take them for to review any things that are coming out of it in the event that it is being undertaken.

58:19

Yes, correct. We will do that.

58:30

Thank you. I suppose that spins off into areas we've touched upon, such as merging diverge designs and other areas of the scheme. Again, if you could signpost in your response, if the model is found to be an agreed to be tag compliant, if there are any areas of the of the scheme which are affected positively or negatively, you

59:03

I think at that stage, if we can come away from the kind of high level modeling, I just want to focus on a couple of points with respect to what's shown in the Ta please. There are four scenarios which were

referred to within the transport assessment scenario, p, q, r and s. Just to help my understanding of that, could you explain to me what, what the prevailing or the included highway arrangement is within the DCO boundary, four scenarios, p, q, r and s, please.

59:48

Steve Case mark for the applicant, yes. So scenario Q is the future situation with no scheme. And. Up with the dependent development, so no highway scheme and the dependent development. So it includes the full quantum of dependent development, but it excludes the scheme, the actual physical highway scheme scenario. P, let me get this right. P, is these without the scheme and without the dependent development. So that's assuming neither Go ahead. Scenario R is with the dependent development and the scheme, and Scenario s is with the scheme, but without the dependent development.

1:00:50

And the scheme in in the the scenarios I've just described, the scheme in those scenarios is the same, where we've included the highway scheme, it's the same scheme.

1:01:02

So it's either all in or all out, because the DCS scheme Correct. Okay. The reason I posed the question was just looking at some of the volume over capacity plots attached to the transport assessment. So appendix L, for example, and the traffic forecasting report, which, for Scenario Q, suggests it should be have it should be based upon the existing road network. There seems to be some kind of inaccuracies with regards to my interpretation anyway, what it's showing, because it seems like the West Cheltenham link road is featuring in a lot of the different volume over capacity plots. So to sign the post, figure e9, and E 10 on page 153, and 154, of appendix L of the TA. When I looked at that, it seemed to suggest to me that the West Cheltenham link road was In was in place. I

1:02:24

we pull that figure out.

1:02:40

Uh, can I go away and get some confirmation that I'm not sure whether that's been a drafting error in the production of the figures, which is what I suspect has happened here, rather than, you know, I confident with what I just said about what's included in the different scenarios? Yes,

1:03:03

no, I understand. I'm just looking here. Page, page 153, of 161, figure e9, is titled volume over capacity ratio, 2040 2q, am peak. And that, to me, seems like it has the West Cheltenham link road into the east of withybridge. So, yeah, it's just, is it a case that the figures labeled wrong, or is it that it's the wrong Yeah,

1:03:33

yeah, I will, I will get confirmation that I can't give you an answer right now.

1:03:36

Thank you. And also, just a signpost, the transport assessment, Appendix O, and again, it's a strategic road network, volume over capacity plots. Again, those appear on the face of it to have the West Chatham link road and some of the scenario B plots. So if you could please just have a look at what I've said and how they correct me, or update what needs to be updated, just so we can see what the position is. I think that would be helpful. Thank you.

1:04:12

Yes, I'll do that. You.

1:04:45

No just turning to your first written question. Response to 15, 03, whereby we posed a question with respect to the usage of. Unposted construction stage routes and the transport assessment, I believe, tells us that the modeling that you've done of the slip road closure phases, it effectively enables the individual driver to basically choose which route they'd go upon so that effectively they wouldn't necessarily follow the sign posted route they would displace over whichever route they chose to use. Is that a fair summary

1:05:33

stickers won't be applicant yet. The way the traffic routes uses the same parameters within the SAT model as as it does for the operational scenario. So, yes, there's no, no restrictions on that. The traffic is assigned based on the most advantageous route for the user.

1:05:57

Understood the response that you've given us to that question, 1503 basically responds to the diversion of construction traffic over the construction period. Now, I think that the XA weren't particularly helpful when we were drafting that question, because we excluded a word from the title of the question, which would have made it quite clear, compared to what it was, but where we were actually going with that question. If we wanted to know what would happen during the construction stage, with regards to the use of the sign posted diversions, the response focuses on effectively construction vehicles and trucks. It doesn't actually give us an answer with respect to what happens when you close a slip road and you've got obviously, a materially larger amount of traffic that's going elsewhere. You've got the 1000 vehicles or so in a in a peak hour going on to alternative routes. So I think it will be helpful for us if you could revisit that question and also look at effectively whether, whether your answer would change, with regards to the appropriateness of allowing basically route choice for all traffic on An existing slip road. The reason I'm posing the question is, if you have got, you know, 3030 HDV construction vehicles in an hour being diverted over different routes, it's clearly a different magnitude and a different proposition to 1000 cars in the peak hour going off a slip road. Because presumably you'll accept that whilst what you've done enabling route choice may actually overestimate increases on roads which are not the signposted route, the flip side of that is that by definition, there is less traffic, less congestion, less environmental effects associated with traffic on the sign posted route. Is that a fair comment?

1:08:06

Yes, I think that is fair. And yes we I mean, the complication here is that the modeling the way it's at multiple it's extremely difficult to force traffic to use a certain route. So, you know, the the way to actually model that is is quite complex, so, but we can look in to see what we can can do to assess what we think the difference might be if traffic followed the sign posted route.

1:08:33

Yeah, I understand that Saturn is, by definition, an assignment model, so it does what it says in the candidate assigns. But, yeah, clearly, if we are closing one or two slip roads, depending on the stage of the construction, you presumably will be able to know what the hour and daily flow is on the slip road, and what, therefore, the magnitude would be if 100% 90% 80% of that traffic did indeed follow the sign post posted route.

1:09:00

Yes, I think it's coming to a conclusion what portion you assign, given that some traffic will, by definition, local traffic will know the shortcuts and won't follow the signposted route because they're regular use of the road network and know all the various shortcuts and will choose their most advantageous route. But also the fact there will be an element, I suspect, of some demand suppression during some of those situations where people will evolve void the whole area avoid traveling during that period because of the disruption that is caused by the construction work. So it's coming to a conclusion, what is an appropriate proportion to assume it follows the signposted route. And you know, understood, we'll have to make some sort of assumption on that.

1:09:43

Yeah, I just think if you can give us something which looks at that total quantum of traffic associated with the slip road closure, not just the construction traffic during those phases, and also make some robust and appropriate assumption. About, about, yeah, the usage of the sign posted route, because, presumably, I'm not taking a massive leap of leap of faith to suggest that routes are signposted, because people do actually value the signpost being there and and do use them to some extent. I think if we, if we could just revisit your response to that, I think it will be, will be helpful. Thank you.

1:10:36

I think that's all I've got with regards to the residual points under the modeling.

1:10:47

Can we please then go to Roman numeral nine, and in particular the safety report submitted at deadline two. I think that identifies 14 dmr departures from standard in the first instance, could I please just invite the applicant just to explain, explain those to us and explain their findings? I don't. I don't mind if you want to group them into common points, or if you want to focus on any in particular, but I think that there's perhaps some follow up questions on some of them I want to pose, and if you could just please give us an update with regards to those departures from standard and the appropriateness of them, please.

1:11:36

So that'll be Craig Jones.

1:11:42

Craig Jones for the applicant, there's four number departures from standard on the on the national highways network. And when we, when we're initially developing the scheme, the first, the first one, one of the early, early processes within that was, was to hold the call with with national highways safety and engineering standards specialists for geometry. So, so we did that on the the eighth of September, 2021 and during that call, we discussed the scope of the proposed departures and to gain an understanding of their likely acceptability. That was, that was a positive, positive call. We were encouraged then to formally submit those, those departures within the national highways gas system. So we, we then, we then prepared those, those submissions, and they were granted provisional agreement on the the 19th of November, 2021 provisional agreement so caught in national highways guidance, it states that this is, this may be given in scheme early in the scheme life cycle by a technical specialist for departure that is critical to scheme success, and in principle, can be approved. A full application is always required before a departure may be incorporated into the works. Which is, which is what, what we intend to do now with the scheme, kind of during, during the detailed design phase of this, of the scheme, they would be resubmitted for for full approval, that that's the, that's the national highways departures from standard. They, to give you a bit of a explanation as to what they are. There's one there's one for each of the four slip roads, and that's to do with substitution of the proposed merge and diverge types. So the design standards, using the forecast traffic flows suggest that the compliant design is a is a lane drop and Lane gain arrangement. So that would be a four lane, four lane, m5 dropping down to a three lane, through through the junction, and then then gaining a lane back to four lanes. The the the m5 in this, in this, in this location, is a three lane, three lane motorway rather than four lane motorway. So beyond the scope of the scheme to kind of increase, increase a lane on the motorway in either direction. So, so we, we discussed that with national highways and our our proposals, with with the with the go for one, one step kind of down in the capacity layout, which is, which is a ghost Island diverge and a parallel merge, then which is. Which is what, what we are proposing. So, so the departures themselves relate, just like I said, specifically to the to the to the merge points and the diverge points, not to the, not to the, you know, the general length of the connector road itself. And they, yeah, and, and, like I said, they currently sat at the provisional agreement stage.

1:15:26

Thank you. That's helpful. I suppose I want to ask you to move on to the to the local road departures in a minute. But perhaps at this stage, can I like national highways to provide an opinion on what you've just heard with respect to the status and the acceptability of those four departures for standard to do with the most in divergence, please.

1:15:47

Thank you, sir. Sophie Stewart, for national highways, I can confirm that that summary is correct. Provisional agreement has been provided to the four diver four departures that have been identified, further information will need to come forward as part of the detailed design process to get full agreement which will happen in due course. The only other point that I would raise at the moment is that some of the dmr standards have been updated since the provisional agreement departures were submitted, and therefore that just needs revisiting again to make sure that standards are met and that

there are no further departures as a result to the update to the design manual for road and bridges, the reference, yeah, and it's in particular CD one to two of the DRM dmrB that's been updated. Thank you.

1:16:58

Thank you. That was helpful. So presumably we can ask the applicant just to go away and check what the requirements of the CD, 122, update are, and let us know if there's anything which needs to change with regards to the content of that safety report.

1:17:15

Okay, yeah.

1:17:21

But then I invite you just to move on to the local roads, really. I know there are, I think, 10 departures from standard identified there, if you could just talk us through briefly what they all are, and if there are any in particular that you think are worth focusing in on, and there may be that I have just a couple of follow up questions at the end. Thank you.

1:17:52

Yeah, the local road departures from standard focus on a variety of issues from geometry, sort of based, based issues. There's one for a gradient of a cycle track on the western side of the the A, 4019, west of west of the M5 there's a number relating to reduced foot, foot way widths. These principally relate to tie in points. So, so generally speaking, it's not, it's not the main, main scheme proposal, which is, which is deficient in that, in that respect, it's just where we actually tie into side roads and existing provisions.

1:18:46

I think just on that point, I know that you've given us quite a lot of helpful information at table three, dash four within the safety report, but I think what would be incredibly helpful alongside the text in the description is to have a plan which actually identifies where all of these things are, because I can make a good guess, as I'm sure others can, in terms of where these specific points are. But I think it'll be really helpful if it could just link back to one overall plan so we can see specifically where all of these departures are occurring. Yeah.

1:19:20

Okay, that's fine. Yeah, we've got well within, within this submission to GCC, it went to their departures panel, and we put together a departures report so it spells out, you know, or it kind of mirrors much of the requirements of the of the national highways departure form. So so we, we've put all that information into into a report. So So locations are included in there. So so we can, we can provide that information.

1:19:53

Thank you.

1:19:57

I was Yeah, saying that the the. Foot way, foot way, with sort of tying into to existing, existing foot ways are a one, one, there's probably about three or four, which, which relate, relate to that.

1:20:15

There's,

1:20:18

there's visibility on, on, on the b4, 634, from, from Hayden Hill Farm access. That's, that's a farm access which is, which is within the, within the footprint of the scheme. But it's a current departure, which, which we've, we've identified because it's, it's within the footprint of of our scheme, so that that remains largely unchanged. And then there's, there's some as we mentioned, as we mentioned earlier when we discussed Mr. Hadley's access. There's a few departures on the the b4, 634, which are principally around the Hayden Hill junction, and visibility On approach to the to the Hayden Hill junction.

1:21:22

There's departure, departure number 14 in the table as well, is, is a, is a horizontal alignment departure, which is on a on an access road. So it's going to be a sort of a manual for streets design then, rather than a dmr design, and it's, it's for reduced horizontal radius of on, on this, on this, access to to properties. And the final one on the list then is, is the ekington junction at the green, the green layout, and it's, it's for aspects not covered by standards, and that that relates to to two service roads coming into the into the green, which are quite close proximity to to a stop line, proposed stop line for the the northern arm of the proposed signal, signalized junction.

1:22:32

Thank you. That's that's helpful. There's just a couple that I'd like to touch upon, if I could, because I think there's a few that I'm going to mention that I think I'd appreciate some additional submissions on, just with regards to what, what you appear to be saying within the safety report. And the first one then is, is DFS 10, which is the A 4019, Gallagher junction. I And that seems to be suggesting that there is a rate of change of cross section width which is less than half of what it should be. So it should be one one meter in 35 and it's one in 14, correct? Yes, okay, but then just just looking along to the kind of mitigation or justification that you've provided in support of that, it seems to me that all of the justification that you've provided relates to the necessity for third party land. It suggests that just just reading here, it would require additional acquisition of land currently occupied by the Sainsbury's store, and would introduce further costs and likely objections. Correct? Yeah,

1:23:53

yeah. I

1:23:54

think that where my mind's going with it is irrelevant of the of the cost or the land take burden. Are we left with a departure from standard that is fundamentally fit for purpose and safe? Yeah? So irrelevant, of relevant, of what you're suggesting is the land case. I just appreciate some help, really, with regards to why the one in 14 is okay when it should be one and 35 Yeah,

1:24:23

the big, the big sort of mitigation for this, for this diverge, is also the fact that it's, it's traffic. Traffic is moving away from, from the from the diverge. So it's a, it's a widening of the carriageway. CD, 127, cross sections and headroom from the dmrj just gives, just gives a taper of of one in one in 35 but it doesn't, it doesn't this. Distinguish between whether or not you're, if you're, if you're driving towards that, that taper, or going away from it in this, in this instance where, where the road, carriageway is actually widening, so you're gaining again in a lane. So vehicles are not not being tapered, funneled in, they're being funneled out, so as a lane sort of gain scenario. Yeah,

1:25:22

understood, but that isn't what this table tells me. I think considering that we are considering the conformity of the scheme before us, with regards to the National Policy Statement national networks, which has an obvious and right focus on safety, will be helpful if, if this response, you know, consider the departure against those things that you've helpfully articulated, rather than the land issue, I suppose, is my point will

1:25:51

do. Thank you.

1:25:56

And again, this is where I would be very helpful. But just moving down to DFS and Evan the Hayden Hill Farm access, that, to me, suggests that there should be access visibility of 120 meters for a prevailing back design speed of 70 kph, which is achieved to the west, but to the east it's it's only 95 meters, correct. Okay, so the justification provided for that is that the provision the position of the existing access and visibility to the east is not affected by the proposed scheme, and it's an existing departure, and the introduction of the proposed signalized junction and associated signing should assist with speed control at this location. I think that the question that I have following on from that is, is the main road, the b4, 634, not subject to design change in the vicinity of that access, are your proposals not altering the road upon which that Hayden Hill Farm access joins?

1:27:15

Yeah, just, just to just kind of ties in probably 510, meters or so, I think, beyond the access, but the visibility, the larger visibility of 95 meters. You know, could you look in? You're looking at features and an existing road which is, which is then unaffected by our our proposals.

1:27:35

Yeah, I suppose the question I would pose is, if you are changing the main road and the prevailing highway conditions, a stone's throw away from where the access is. How appropriate is it to be relying on the fact that it's an existing departure when that when the fundamental character of the road is altering, and again, it's not anything that we need to necessarily get to the bottom of today? Yeah, I'd certainly appreciate a written response which can give us some more comfort in that respect.

1:28:06

That's fine. Yeah, I don't think we are relying on on it being an existing departure. If we're not, we can provide the information to show that we're comfortable with it, you know, within in the scheme as well.

1:28:18

Yeah, and I think that's where a plan would help. But I think following on from that as well, the table seems to suggest that the proposed signalized junction and associated signing should assist with speed control at this location.

1:28:33

Yeah, there's, there's a proposed speed limit reduction, which that text doesn't, doesn't mention that so the so the sign in referred there is probably largely relating to speed limit site signage as well. Which, which we're proposing to reduce the speed limit through this section from the current 50 mile per hour to 40 mile per hour.

1:28:57

Okay, yeah, so that's reliance on a traffic regulation order. And is that built into the DCO? Correct? Yes. Is it?

1:29:06

It is yeah, whereabouts. It's within the TR o plans and the and the appropriate schedule within the within the DCO, I've got the reference. You're the Yeah, be

1:29:21

helpful. If you can just flag that to us, to me, to where it where it's secured, sure.

1:29:38

Yeah, I suppose if, in responding to that departure for standard, just the nuances of the proposed signalized junction last to get that that may be congested and busy for two or three hours of the day around peak periods, and the traffic may be held at red lights and slower moving, there is obviously going to be time. When the red light isn't effective in slowing people down and they're going to be in free flow conditions and, yeah, and shooting through a green light. So again, if you could just respond with respect to how that proposed signalized junction does or does not mitigate the departure from standard. I think that, again, would help us in considering the scheme against the safety requirements of the national policy.

1:30:38

And I think the others, there's one more that I think I could do with some help with as well, please, which is the Hayden Lane junction, which is departure for standard 13. Now that tells us that visibility associated with a 70 kph design speed should be 120 meters along the main road. And what we're actually achieving, what the scheme achieves to the east, is visibility of only half of that, which seems to me to be quite a substantial departure.

1:31:20

Yeah, again, again. That's based on a on an existing, existing situation. Our our scheme ties in before, before the Hayden lane. So we're not doing any any physical works or realignment at the Hayden Lane junction. Those visibility, visibility to these then, is limited by by an existing boundary, boundary fence, which is, which is the current situation. So we're, we are looking and assessing that on the basis that it's a current, current layout, which we, which we deem to be improving on the basis that we're reducing the speed limit from 50 mile per hour to 40 mile per hour, and introducing, introducing a signalized junction there, which, which, which would, kind of, in the majority of cases, slow vehicles down, as opposed to the to the permanent free flow arrangement, which is there at the moment.

1:32:28

Thank you. But would you accept that if the DCO scheme before us increases traffic volumes across the local roads, that it is an effect intensifying traffic flows in locations such as this, which could then point to a different outcome in terms of road safety.

1:32:53

It's a factor to be considered Yeah. It should be should be considered

1:32:58

Yeah, if you could perhaps just provide a response which perhaps gives us some confidence with regards to the these departures, with regards to any changes of traffic associated with with, with the change prevailing road conditions, I think would be incredibly useful for us. Well, thank you. Applause.

1:33:30

Can I just revisit something with national highways, please? And it's just something which is in the statement of common ground, and it's, indeed in the pads as well. And it's, it's the position with respect to national highways and the applicant with regards to the road, road safety audit and its compliance with GG 119, I think that there appears to be some discussion or dispute between the parties at the moment with respect to the date of the Road Safety Audit, and indeed, whether it was in accordance with the stage three preliminary design submission, or if it was actually at a time which didn't fit within within that time frame, it's, it's, it's item 5.46 within the statement of common ground, it's on page 67, of 78, I

1:34:42

I think fundamentally, national highways appear to be seeking clarity from the applicant with respect to the the issue date of that and the subsequent ability of it to meet the requirements, the requirements of GE, 119, I don't know if there's anything here. I mean, it was. It's identified as a as a high point of concern. So as we're all here in the room, if there's any any update that either the applicant on national highways wish to air, that was

1:35:18

my sir. Thank you. Sophie Stewart, for national highways, my understanding is that we're still waiting for some further information from the applicant. Thank you.

1:35:30

Is there anything at this stage which the applicant can add, and if not, then by all means, we can defer to written submissions.

1:35:43

Sorry, so can you give the paragraph and page number again? For me,

1:35:46

I'm looking at the national highways statement of common ground, deadline three submission, and I'm on page and this is where it might get a bit confusing, because I've unhelpfully printed out the Track Changes version. So the page numbers could be wrong, but it's item 5.46 in the in the areas not agreed, 5.46 and it's basically whether the the Road Safety Audit is capable of meeting the requirements of GG, 119, so I

1:36:23

think

1:36:24

in the interest of time, so I think we'll come back To you writing on that one understood.

1:36:28

Thank you. You

1:36:43

I think, just to open up to the to the room and people online, if there's anything and anyone else wants to raise under the agenda items mentioned, then by all means, do Yes. Joint Council, the Joint Council. I've

1:36:57

got a question I'm going to hand over to Andrew Padden

1:37:02

Andy, Padden from the joint councils just a question for the applicant. Craig mentioned that a report and a plan have been submitted to GCC, departures for standard panel. What was the outcome of that have? Have they been considered? And are those departures from standard approved

1:37:30

your applicant? Yes, they were. They were considered and signed off by by GCC.

1:37:41

Thank you. Do you know the date?

1:37:44

I don't. I'm afraid.

1:37:49

Is there a particular concern that you have into or is it just something that you were unaware of?

1:37:56

It was something I was unaware of, not having had conversation with GCC or anybody from that panel, and it was something that I was going to when I saw the safety report submitted at deadline three. It was one of my actions to review it. But obviously one of the things was to go through this departure system standard, I will have a conversation with somebody from that panel about whether there was any concerns raised, but if it sounds like there isn't, so just a just a question, really, whether that it had been signed off.

1:38:33

Okay? Well, I think it would be helpful if you have that conversation and then you can confirm to us that you're content at deadline for assuming that is the case, and obviously, if there is an outstanding concern again, let us know that at deadline four.

1:38:53

Yeah, we'll do so. Thank

1:39:01

you. So before we just move off the traffic and transport points on the agenda, is there anything else anybody in the room or online wishes to raise? Thank

1:39:10

you, sir. Andrew Tate, for the applicant, just a point of information. We're going to come back to you anyway. But in relation to the prescriptions to speed limits, that's article 14, five and schedule three, part four, which makes an offense so in relation to driving above that speed limit. So, but we're going to expand upon that in in due course.

1:39:37

Thank you. That's helpful. Thank

1:39:53

sorry, national highways,

1:39:54

thank you, sir. And going back to what Mr. Stoneman said before, if. Assists when he made the point about the model as a whole being tag compliant, but key corridors not meeting the necessary compliance levels. The reference to that in tag is tag unit M, 3.1 highway assignment modeling, paragraph 4.3 point two.

1:40:23

Thanks. Could you repeat that reference?

1:40:25

Sorry, yeah, tag unit M 3.1 and it's called highway assignment modeling, and specifically at paragraph 4.3 point two, it talks about the general purpose model where a range of journey times, routes passing the threshold is acceptable, but those used for specific interventions need to include the most affected routes.

1:40:55

Thank you for that, and presumably both national highways and the applicant can look at that and weave that into their responses with regards to tech compliance that we've already identified. Thank you. Applause.

1:41:25

I think again, it's probably a suitable time now that we're the end of the traffic and transport section to just have another break before we move on to funding. It's 20 to four. So if we can come back at five to four and again, I'll just remind those on the live stream to restart your browser page when you return. So if we could come back at five to four, thank you. Applause.