



Hearing Transcript

Project:	M5 Junction 10 Improvements Scheme
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) - Session 1
Date:	15 October 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.

TRANSCRIPT_M5JUNCTION10_ISH4_SESSION1_15102024

Wed, Oct 16, 2024 1:45PM • 1:38:08

00:04

Good morning, everyone. It's 10 o'clock and it's now time for me to open this hearing and start with some welcome and introductions. So this is an issue specific hearing being held in connection with an application made by Gloucestershire County Council for an order for development consent for the m5 junction 10 improvement project. Development proposed is the construction of an all movement junction at m5 junction 10, a new West Cheltenham link road east of junction 10, from the A, 4019, to the b4, 634, and widening of the a 4019 to the east of junction 10, including a bus lane on the A 4019 eastbound carriageway from the west chant and fire station to the Gallagher junction. So before I go any further, can I just confirm case team, that teams is working? Yes, thank you, and that I can be heard and seen clearly, both in the room and virtually.

01:08

Yeah, okay,

01:11

right, thank you. And can I just check with the AV team the live streams commenced? Thank you very much. So for those people watching the live stream, just let me explain. If the proceedings are adjourned, we will have to stop the live stream in order to get a clear recording file. When the meeting is resumed, you'll need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. We'll remind you of that again, should we need to adjourn now, just let my introduce myself. My name is Edwin maund. I'm a chartered town planner and planning inspector. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as the lead member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. I now turn my colleague to introduce himself.

02:03

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Luke Regan. I'm a chartered transport planner and a planning inspector, and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of examining inspectors to examine this application. I'll now hand back to Mr. Mound, thanks.

02:18

Thank you. We're assisted at this hearing by our case team today, case manager Spencer barryman, who's in person at the back of the room and was supported online by Caroline Allen, remotely, if you have any questions or queries about the examination or the technology we're using, they should be your first point of contact, and their details can be found at the top of any letter you've received from us, or on the project page of the national infrastructure website. So before I go into the main part of

hearing, I just asked Mr. Regan to highlight a few housekeeping matters and background matters for today,

02:58

as explained in the examining authorities rule six letter at Annex E the issue specifics, hearings will be both live streamed and recorded. The recordings will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes to assist viewers and listeners, anybody speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings are retained and published, they form a public record that can contain public information to which the General Data Protection Regulation applies. The rule six letter includes a link to the planning inspectorates privacy notice, which provides further information on this topic if there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential, it should be in a written form which can be redacted before being published. Please. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off. If attending remotely, I will repeat the request made in the arrangements conference, that in order to minimize background noise, please ensure that your microphone or telephone is muted and that you stay muted unless you are speaking. In order to avoid fatigue, it is our intention to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minutes intervals over the day, and a longer break over the lunchtime period. We're obviously in a new venue today. So just in terms of some other housekeeping matters, there's no fire alarm tests due today. So if one does go off at any point, I'd please ask you to exit via the doors to the rear and then out via reception. In terms of where the most proximate toilets are. Again, they are out of the back of the room and on the right hand side towards reception. I will now hand back to Mr. Mond.

04:51

Okay. I'll just now go to parties listed on the agenda to introduce themselves. So I'll start with the applicant. Thank you. Applause.

05:03

Good morning, Sir Andrew Tate Casey for the applicant. To my left, Douglas Haycock of Burgess salmon. To my right, Steve catesmark, the transport planning lead. To his right, James catamova, land assembly lead, and at the end of the row is Mr. Tim Pearce, who is the planning lead, but there will be others coming forward who will introduce at the appropriate time. Thank you.

05:35

I believe we have the Environment Agency online, if you can introduce yourselves now, please

05:42

Good morning, sir. It's nori Norges from the Environment Agency.

05:45

Good morning, sirs. It's malashi mavga from the Environment Agency.

05:53

And there's a few online who'll introduce themselves.

06:01

I come to you, Mr. Folds, are you if we come to you first, good morning. John folds from the Environment Agency dealing with flood risk issues. I'm sorry I didn't quite catch that. The microphone was very quiet. I wonder if you could just reintroduce sorry,

06:14

beg the pardon. John folds from Environment Agency dealing with flood risk issues.

06:20

Thank you. And then is it Richard bransma,

06:24

yes, good morning, sir. Richard bransma from the Environment Agency, technical specialist, groundwater and contaminated

06:32

lens. Thank you very much. And then now come to national highways, if you can introduce yourselves, please,

06:39

Good morning, sir. Sophie Stewart from DLA Piper, on behalf of national highways. To my left. Rebecca Marshall, Senior Project Manager, and to her left project manager, Terry that's t e r i Preston, thank you. We also have online. Heather Clark from WSP, in case any traffic issues come up this morning, I'll let Heather introduce herself.

07:06

Hi. My name's Heather Clark. I work for WSP, and we're I'm here in capacity as a traffic modeler on behalf of national highways. Thank you.

07:22

I come to the joint councils, please,

07:26

sir Catherine Knight dwf, we're here representing Gloucestershire County Council and its role as local highways authority, Cheltenham Borough Council and chukesbu borough Council's local planning authority, together known as the joint councils. To my right is Andy Padden from actus reus dealing with transport issues. To my left is Nick Bryant, Assistant Director of Planning at Tewkesbury Council, Tracy birkenshaw, Director of communities and economic development. And then James Jackson, actus reus transport, and BIM watts, Team Manager strategic planning at Gloucestershire County Council. Thank you,

08:11

law homes, please.

08:13

Good morning. Tony Weston from Gowling Wlg, on behalf of law homes and bessman Holmes and to my left is Joe wallage from PGA associates. Thank you.

08:26

I think if I can just ask Mr. Badam to introduce himself, he's the only other individual who's named the Time Aware of can you just wait for a microphone, Mr. Badam, and then we'll all be able to hear you do

08:42

Good morning, Sir Peter padham, and I'm a resident of arcington. Thank you.

08:52

So can I just clarify, Mr. Bowen, you're speaking on your own behalf, rather than the parish council. Today, it will be

08:57

on my own behalf. Yes, today. Thank you.

09:07

I believe we have an interested party online. So Mr. Hadley, are you able to introduce yourself this morning? Yes, good

09:16

morning, sir. I'm here. You

09:24

okay. Thank you, Mr. Hadley,

09:32

now if there are any other people in attendance today who I've not yet come to, I won't ask you to introduce yourselves now, but the first time you're invited to speak, if you can, please introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organization or people that you represent. Thank you. So I just turn to Mr. Regan just to go through the purpose and conduct of the issue specific hearing today. You.

10:07

This is provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties, and in particular, the differences between them, to be explored further by the examining authority. The purpose of an ish is set out at section 91 of the Planning Act 2008 it is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations, to enable adequate examination of the issue, or to ensure that an interested party has a fair chance to put to their case, as indicated in the agenda, questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by the other panel member. It is not for the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, sorry, it is for the

examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations. Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct of hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible, whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence, we have identified the matters to be considered at this is and those on which we require further information. These are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing. Participants should note that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate by deadline six please, which is Wednesday, the 30th of October. I hope you've had the chance to read the detailed agenda for this hearing. During the hearing today, we have questions for the applicant and the other invited parties. I'm aware that there are a number of interested parties who may wish to speak on some of the agenda items. Once we have finished our direct questioning on an agenda item, we will ask if interested parties would like to make any submission relating to that agenda item before moving on to the next agenda item, I would remind you that an issue specific hearing and subs and submissions made orally should relate only to the agenda items we will be discussing. I want to reassure you all that previous submissions have been read and noted. I understand that they may be issues not on the agenda that parties may wish to raise, but submissions on those matters should be made in writing at deadline six, please, which, as I've said, is Wednesday, the 30th of October. 2024 thank you in advance for complying with this approach to aid with those taking part today. The following documents are likely to be referred to as necessary. Rep, 5038, which is a principal areas of disagreement, summary statement with national highways, relevant. Rep 026, which is again relating to national highways. Position. Rep 3037, which is the national highways statement of common ground as 078, which is the applicant's traffic modeling sensitivity tests. Rep 5030, which is the applicant's active travel provision within the scheme plans ASO eight, oh, which is the applicant's assessment of slip road closures. App 036, which is the applicant's funding statement. Rep 402042 which is applicant's funding technical note. Rep 5031 which is a letter of in principle support. And finally, the draft DCO, which the current version is, wrap rep 5003, please note that any page numbering references we make in this hearing relate to the electronic versions of the documents and not paper versions. I'll now hand back to Mr. Mond. Thank you.

14:22

Thank you. So if we go on then to the main body of the agenda, and it's item two a you'll be aware that we've obviously accepted a change request, which was subject to publicity and consultation, and in doing so, we need to effectively make sure that all parties affected have the opportunity to either request or attend a compulsory acquisition hearing or an open floor hearing, to make sure everyone. As their opportunity to present their case as they see fit. So at the moment, as far as I'm aware, we don't have very much in the way of response to that consultation or publicity, but it's still, nevertheless something we are obliged to do. So I just wanted to seek views from those present as to whether they would be comfortable with us holding those hearings virtually, so as opposed to actually coming and holding them in person and having access via teams and so on. So I'll go to Bloor and persimmon in the first instance, just because you're not one of the main parties, just to see whether you're comfortable with that or not.

15:53

Attorney Western for blow and persimmon. Yes, we have no objections to that. Okay,

15:57

I'll just look around there. And does anyone have any concerns about that as an as a possibility? Should that be seen as a most prudent way forward? Can I just check then from anyone who's online today, whether anyone there has any concerns about potentially us undertaking hearings purely on teams in November.

16:29

Okay, that's

16:32

fairly positive, I think, as far as one can tell, okay, so my follow up question really is, in the event that someone comes forward later that has concerns about it, is it something that the applicant could assist in facilitating someone who's local in using a council room, for example, to access the online system.

17:06

I can read, as you can see, nods, nods at the back. So in principle, yes, sir,

17:12

thank you. Okay, well, we'll assume it's going to be virtual for the time being, then, unless we hear something to the contrary. And then we'll, we'll need, we'll need to make a fairly quick decision, because we're going to have to issue a letter next week confirming the details of the timing and the location of those hearings. But appreciate the positive response by it by a nil response. Thank you. Okay, so that moves me. Then on to sort of item 2b which is linked to where we're going next. Really, I think hopefully everyone will be aware that there is not only the change request that we've had accepted, but the intention to submit a further change request. And I just wanted to make sure that we had a timetable that was going to work prior to the end of the examination when we did our acceptance letter of the first change request, we included within that a notional examination timetable. So again, I would just want to seek views from those present to see whether there are any concerns or anything about that timetable. So I again, not seeing any hands up in that respect, Mr. Tate, or anything you wish to,

18:54

there's only that sorry, Andrew Tate, for the applicant in the change Application Summary Report, which I appreciate isn't yet on the website. There is table 5.2 which is in the document page 65 and 77 appreciate that's not the electronic page, but I hope it's close. Table five two has an indicative program, which I think largely reflects the program that you had indicated. It's slightly tweaked, but it's intended to enable a the relevant consultation to continue the time the new timetable to be set for examining the proposed change, notification, consultation, statement, any written questions. And A is H or off, if, if required. And so that's set out in Table five, two, but I understand it's very similar to what you had already indicated. It is obviously that,

20:01

I think, must be linked to the second change request, which hasn't yet been made public. So would you mind just going through the main dates on that so that everybody can be familiar, because neither of us will be aware of the slight tweaks that have occurred in the meantime, and obviously we'll need to agree it potentially, in any event, yes, sir.

20:22

So as you indicated this, this proposed change to has been foreshadowed. It was foreshadowed in the in as 61 the letter of the 12th of August 2024 when at that stage, it was intended that change one and two would be combined, and then that was notified that that would be split in as 62 and non statutory. Targeted non statutory consultation has already taken place in response to the advice that you gave in PD 11 on the 21st of August, and the request is for seven changes of a relatively minor Nature, not altering the substance of the scheme. And they're all within the order limits. They're considered to be non material. They don't change the environmental impacts or engage the CA regulations. And coming back to your question, there is considered to be sufficient time left in examination for the proposed changes to be examined. So in terms of the Indicative timetable submission of change application to you, which was undertaken on the on Friday, the 11th of October last last week, it's then suggested there's a decision on acceptance of the change request, change application to within a fortnight by the 25th of October. And assuming that is accepted, then the deadline for relevant representations, which is the closing date for the consultation that's already underway, would be the 27th of October. 2024 then that fits in with the applicant's certification of compliance with the CA regulations for change application one by the 28th of October, then by the 30th the examining authority could set the timetable for examining the proposed changes one and two. Notification on that day of whether a is H or a CH, in the case of proposed change one or open floor hearings taking place on that day, the 30th of October, the consultation statement would be then be issued to the to you on the fifth of November, any written questions from You by the 11th of November, with a deadline for written representations and also responses to written questions by the 19th then, if required, hearings on the 20th of November, virtual or otherwise. And is a response to written representations and comments on the response to written questions by deadline 10, which is the second of December, and a deadline for post hearing submissions also at deadline 10. So that is the suggested indicative program. Contained in the change Application Summary Report, which I appreciate, is not yet

24:12

publicly available. No, that's fine.

24:22

When we started out at the preliminary meeting, one of the things that you raised was the opportunity to have a staggered series of events at the end of the examination, which we did our best to accommodate. It would appear from that draft that that's no longer your main concern, or because it unless there's something missing, everybody's submitting their final submissions on the second of December. Is that right? Do.

25:15

The fourth of fourth

25:17

of December. So there is scope for that, and it it to a degree the the timings can be brought forward depending on, as it were, step two, which is the 14 days for the for you to make your decision on the acceptance of the change request. But so there is some scope, but clearly that's entirely in your hands and not for me to so

25:47

I think even if we were able to accept it this week, you know, once the hearings are through, the key dates are going to be the date period between the the certification and giving people appropriate notice for the possibility of CA and open floor hearings, isn't it? Yes? So that will be critical Wednesday, 30th of October. We can't miss. And obviously the certification is that still the fifth of November, or is that earlier now, 28th of October? Yeah, yeah. And is the consultation report that would be the fifth of November? Yes, sir, yeah. Okay, okay, that's helpful. Again. I'll just check to see if anyone in the room or virtually has any concerns or issues about any of those slight adjustment dates. I

27:11

Sir, sorry. Sophie Stewart for national highways, it's possibly something we need to have some more thought and perhaps come back to you later today after a discussion with the applicant, but just around with the applicant, potentially submitting final submissions on the last day of the examination, if there are submissions in there that in particular, make amendments to any provisions of the draft. DCO itself, in particular, there's a slight concern that then there's no opportunity to to come back on those amendments. No.

27:49

But I mean, obviously the applicant will always have the final right of reply, won't they, so I think that's, I understand your position, but clearly the applicant will always have that, that that opportunity. Clearly, if there is a change that's material, we'll have to think about how we address that and advise the Secretary of State accordingly. But yeah,

28:15

thank you. Thanks.

28:23

Are you wishing to

28:25

no so we weren't. We're going to take it away and have a chat. We're just noting the time frames are very tight,

28:31

but thank you. Well, if people want to have a think about it and reflect on it, we can perhaps revisit after lunch, perhaps when people have had an opportunity to just think through and perhaps have a conversation with the applicant behind the scenes, if, if need be so that we can we just revisit that after lunch, if that would be helpful for everybody.

28:59

So that will be joint councils, that will be particularly helpful, because then I can actually have a chat to the team. Thank you.

29:06

Okay, so we'll, we'll do that. Then when we after lunch, we'll just revisit to see what people's thoughts are. Thank you. Applause.

29:34

So we'll move now on to Item three, then, which is traffic and transport. And again, I'll pass over to Mr. Regan to lead on these.

29:50

Thank you, Mr. Wand. I think the first thing I'd like to say is, since we've had sight of the traffic modeling sensitivity tests. Which came in last week ASO 78 I think we'd actually like to flip items one and two round. I think it might be more logical if Firstly, we could deal with the second item under traffic and transport, which is exploring with the applicant, initially the effects of the sensitivity testing and what that actually shows, please, and then hopefully we can circle back around and cover one by default within that discussion. If that's okay, I think it might be helpful as well, if we could, if we could ping up Aso, seven, eight onto the screen, because there are some quite helpful diagrams and visual aids in that which, which may benefit everybody. If they are shown please.

30:49

Thank you very much, and yes. So firstly, if I could just invite the applicant please, just to explain what that body of work is and what we should be taking from it, please. Thank you.

31:00

Steve Case, mark for the applicant, yes, the sensitivity report was carried out at the request of the the exact, basically, what's been happened is that we've undertaken sensitivity tests on the base year model and then on the future year models, where we have adjusted the journey times on the west, westbound links on the A, 4019, such that they meet the tag validation criteria for those specific links. What that modeling has shown and is presented in the sensitivity test note is that the changes make no material do not materially alter the traffic flows across the road network, particularly at a wider level, any changes are very local, and therefore the traffic modeling that supports TCO is fit for purpose, and the assessment of the scheme, which is based on the traffic modeling, is therefore robust, so that's the position we take.

32:14

Thank you. That was helpful. Obviously, we're going to be inviting other people's views on this in due course, but if I could just please explore a couple of specific items within that please. I think that if I could ask just to help my understanding and to help everyone else visualize what we're talking about, could I ask that we show figure 2.2 on the public review screen, which is page seven of 18 in that note,

32:47

thank you. So I think that that is showing us, for the ANP hour, the difference between the DCO modeled traffic flows in the base year and those arising from the sensitivity test is that is that the case, Steve,

33:04

case, wealth for the applicant? Yes, that's correct. Okay,

33:06

so what? What messages would you wish that we take from that particular figure?

33:12

Well, I think that that demonstrates that the flow changes across the network as a result, or are negligible, except perhaps on a very short section of the a 4019, in the area highlighted in the in the box in the top left hand corner. Otherwise, the the changes, particularly if you relate those numbers back to background flows which aren't presented there. They're very small changes.

33:42

Thanks Thank you. So effectively, having regard to the key there in the bottom right hand side, that's telling me that the blue links there are experiencing hourly changes of less than 50 vehicles between the DCO model scenario and the sensitivity test. That's correct. Yeah, okay. And there's the area that you identified there, which is just on the A 4019, in the vicinity of the king's ditch, round about and the shopping center traffic signals that has significantly greater differences, which are shown in red there,

34:21

but they are greater. But again, you have to take that in in the context of the flows on those roads and and yes, the numbers are larger, but they're still not very large numbers. I mean, it's quite common in strategic modeling to take changes of flow of less than 100 vehicles an hour as as not being significant due to the very the inherent variabilities within modeling

34:45

Understood. Thank you.

34:50

I think the amended version of this note which came to us last week had an extra appendix attached to it, didn't it, which went beyond the test. Which look at comparing base year models, and it also looks forward, really crystal ball gazes to 2042 and that provides a comparison of of conditions in the 2042 modeling. Could you just explain to us, please the purpose and findings associated with that technical note, please.

35:21

Well, the purpose of that was to see whether the changes in these during time in the base model, if they were translated into the future year model, what impact that would have on the forecast distribution of traffic in the forecast models as well. And that was the purpose of that. We need to bear in mind here

that the future year model is based on, you know, a slightly different situation, because you optimize the junctions for signal timings, the speeds you assume for the links are based on, you know, that future Year situation. So there is no guarantee that the assumption that is in the base year about the that we've made the adjustment to meet the tag criteria would necessarily be applicable to the future year model. Nonetheless, we've done it as a sensitivity test. We still stand by our future year model as being the correct and most appropriate assessment of the impact of the scheme, rather than the sensitivity test, but we've done it in light of the request for the information from the XA, and again, that does show pretty much the same conclusions As for the base year, that the flows overall across the network are very minimal change, again, except perhaps locally. But I think the important thing to note about those local changes in traffic flow is that they are very sensitive to the signal timing settings at those junctions. Now, obviously, when we're doing a model, we're forecasting. We optimize that based on those force card forecast signal settings, the forecast demand, and that determines the best signal settings. In practice, those signal settings will be set at some future point, and therefore, you know, they will be set to optimize the operation, and that may not directly reflect the settings here. So what this shows is that the signal settings are probably the determining factor here about which route in that local area the traffic take, which is obviously something that can be adjusted in the future. It's not inherent to the scheme itself.

37:45

Thank you. That's that's helpful.

37:48

Could I please ask again, just to help visualize the point we look at figure 2.1, in the recently appended technical note please, which is page five of 25 of that particular appendix. I can't actually see what number it is in the whole full document.

38:15

No, it's not that one. It's it's further down in the document. There's an appendix attached to that report, yeah, after the summary and conclusions, please, yeah, there's figure 2.1, which is page five of 25 I think that's the one. Thank you again. Just to help everybody understand what you've done here, this seems to introduce a new statistic and a new comparative assessment here in terms of a geh statistic. Firstly, could I just ask you to explain what a geh statistic is and what this is actually demonstrating to us? Thank you.

38:59

Yes. Steve casework, the applicant, I can't give you the specific description of GH statistics, not my specific area of knowledge, but I know it is a equivalent for statistical measure of of how accurate something is in how much it varies from from the baseline. It's not a true statistical measure, but it's a recognized measure that is used as part of the validation process for modeling, traffic modeling, and recognized as a validation technique within the tag guidance. So it is, it is, you know, a measure basically, of how accurate your model is performing in relation to the the the baseline information. So it gives you that output basically in a measurable form.

39:59

Thank. You so looking at figure 2.1 then it's got lots of blue lines and zeros all over it, whereby the GH statistic is a zero. So to all intents and purposes, that presumably is telling us that there is no material difference between either the 2042 DCO model flow and the sensitivity flow is that a fair comment that's

40:23

correct. Yes, thank you.

40:27

Your report tells us that a threshold of a GH statistic of less than five actually shows that something isn't statistically different. Two numbers or two traffic flows are not statistically different. So Correct again, looking at that figure, there anything which is blue or amber, looking at the key in the bottom right hand corner suggests that aligns with the GH test of two traffic flows not being statistically different. Yes, correct. Thank you. So there's, there's one location there. And again, it's, it's, it's, again, no surprises. It's in the vicinity of the of the traffic lights that were subject to the changes to the changes to the traffic light timings there. There are some, some numbers there which are quite substantially greater than five, which your report tells us is a an appropriate threshold to determine whether two numbers are statistically different or not. So, looking at figure 2.1 there are some flow increases, some GH statistic values which are three times that level. There are 15 on on Hayden lane. What is it that we should be taking, if anything, from the anomalies in the GEC, geh statistics in localized areas such as that please?

41:57

Steve Case, mark the applicant, it is what I said before about clearly altering the journey times on those two sections of the A, 4019, obviously influences very, very locally the route traffic chooses to take, and they're Switching, particularly on there you can see the left turn at the Gallagher junction. They switch to Hayden lane. So they're turning left off the a 4019, at the earlier junction, and going down Hayden lane to reach their destination, rather than turning left at the later junction. And that's obviously very sensitive, as I said earlier, to the signal timings and the delay at the junctions and the assumptions you make about what is a realistic link speed along. Those, those, those, those links, as as I said earlier, we believe the modeling we presented in the DSO for the DCO, rather than the sensitivity says, represents a more realistic assumption over the link speeds and the likely signal settings at those junctions in the future assessment. So, yes, this shows that if we were wrong on that and that there, you know, we are a bit out then. Then in this area, there is the possibility that some traffic will choose to take alternative routes very locally to avoid additional delay at one or other of the junctions, so that there is some switching. And as I said, that the signal settings within that we've assumed for the modeling aren't the ones that will necessarily be introduced in the future. They will be optimized at the time and reviewed on a regular basis to achieve the best outcome, the most desirable outcome. So yes, this indicates it's sensitive to that, and really it just emphasizes the need that when the scheme comes forward, that those signal settings are set at an appropriate level and are reviewed and optimized appropriately

44:09

Understood. Thank you, and I think that would appreciate just some help in writing on that. Just just just if you could please focus in on that, on that discrepancy with the with the greater geh statistic

44:23

differences,

44:26

differences in the vicinity of the retail park. It would just be helpful to have that in writing, really, just to understand if we should be making anything of the the 15 value, which is obviously significantly higher than the five threshold, which shows a close conformance. Really, I think it would be helpful if we can just see that to Bonda, please, thank you.

44:48

Okay,

44:55

I'm going to circle back round to Item one on the agenda soon, but before. Do it. Could I just invite national highways first? Is there anything that you wish to say about what you've heard? I mean, we've seen your submission, that d5 but is there any comment or anything you wish to share was about what you've just heard? Please. Thank you. Thank

45:14

you, sir. Sophie Stewart, for national highways, no, I don't think so. As you say, you've seen our submission, and now, in respect of modeling, national highways are happy.

45:25

Thank you joint councils.

45:29

Again. A lot of the modeling we've talked about focuses on the local roads too. Could I invite any comments that you'd wish to make on what you've just heard? Please? Thank you,

45:39

James Jackson, for the joint councils, just to say we acknowledge the modeling that's been provided and continue to review some of that detail at this time. Okay, no further comment. Thank you.

45:58

So we've talked about some quite specific elements within the modeling there. I think if we could perhaps just take a higher view and just confirm where we think this puts us all with regards to the modeling, please. So is there now and again, I'll go to the Joint Council national highways and the applicant, is there agreement between all of the parties that the DCO modeling is fit for purpose and appropriate for decision making? And I'll go to national highways first, please.

46:36

Thank you, sir. Sophie Stuart, for national highways, yes. Certainly, as far as national highways are concerned, there are no outstanding issues with the modeling.

46:44

Thank you. Same question for joint councils, please, sir.

46:51

Case from night joint councilmember hand over to Mr. Jackson,

46:57

James Jackson for the joint councils, just say we're continuing to review that modeling and have no further comment at this moment. Thank you. So that's

47:05

continuing to review, but you are basically saying that you are happy with what you have seen. It's not that something that you You've not looked at yet, and there may be some some issue. We

47:17

haven't identified any wish at the moment. We've identified the changes that have been provided at the state, and we're looking at that in light of the ongoing additional information that's coming through.

47:28

Okay, thank you.

47:33

An extra question for the applicant, if I may. Obviously, the work that you've undertaken shows that there is quite a lot of alignment with regards to the the assigned traffic flows using either the DCO model or the sensitivity test, which almost sits in a silo, doesn't it? Because those flows haven't been used, the sensitivity tests have no other purpose other than reassuring everybody that the DCO model assigned flows and dcl modeling is fit for purpose.

48:04

Yes, sir, correct. Okay.

48:07

It will be remiss of me not to recognize that the transport modeling clearly has a wider reach than just looking at traffic capacity and design. It also spins off into the air quality assessments and the noise assessments in particular. Is there anything that we should sorry? Is that? Is there any reason we should we should conclude that there are, there is anything in the sensitivity testing that puts doubt on any of the air quality or noise assessments that has been submitted already using the DCI modeling.

48:46

Steve Case, we hope for the applicant. I don't believe so. I think the changes are all well below the thresholds that would trigger any change in air quality or noise assessments.

49:01

Can I just check if, if that view, with regards to the adequacy of the S is shared by the Joint councils and national highways? Please. Sophie

49:08

Stuart, national highways, yes, that view shared by national highways. Thank you.

49:18

Andy Padden for the joint councils, yes, we also agree with the that's No, there's no

49:24

thank you. That's helpful.

49:39

I think I've asked everything I wanted to ask with regards to items one and two on the agenda. But before we move away from those two items, which hopefully we've covered collectively, can I just invite anybody else in the room if they wish to make any particular comment or representations with regards to transport model? Link, now is the time, please,

50:04

not seeing any hands. Thank you. Applause.

50:27

If we can move down the agenda to sub point three, please, which is with respect to the d5 plans submitted by the applicant showing active travel provision with us within the scheme, again, I think it will be incredibly helpful if these Two plans could be flashed up, please. Rep 5030,

51:02

that's great. Thank you. Firstly, if I could invite the applicant to explain what those plans actually show and what the design rationale rationale was taken behind the sustainable connections included on those please.

51:21

This will be Tim Pierce.

51:25

Thank you, sir. Tim Pierce, for the applicant, the rationale for these plans was through discussions with the joint councils and a request to demonstrate the active travel provision within the scheme in the context of the local local plan policies and the, obviously, the links that were being sought through those policies, through GCC as Highway Authority, and the relevant, relevant planning policy. So the first plan, which is the plan above this one simply just shows the outline of the scheme, the three kind of key site development, site allocations and the relevant cycle links within that plan, and then moving to the second, second plan that obviously, then inserts the scheme itself and demonstrates the key active travel links that are provided with it through the scheme and within the scheme, you'll see that through the Well, for those who can see the the annotations along the April one line to the north, basically running alongside site sites A and B on that plan, there's a segregation, segregated off carriageway facility for pedestrians and cyclists. Long A, 419, there is all so that runs for that's kind of the the red

line shown along the 8419, there is also an equivalent line running down the link road going from North East to South West. At the far northwestern end of the April one nine, the segregated facilities are not possible in its location due to limited space within the highway boundary, and that's demonstrated by a purple line. The same is said at the southeastern end of the a 4019 the light blue lines on the southern side of the a 4019 to the eastern extent are new foot ways. And obviously, what? Well, what I will say down at the southern end of the link road, what maybe isn't clear on this plan that is also within the scheme design and within the submitted documentation is a link from the southern end of the link road along the northern part of the the old Gloucester road, down to the house in the Tree Pub, and then allowing A access into the southern end of witherbridge lane as an as a further alternative cycle route back up to the 4019, in that direction.

54:11

Can you Is there a detailed plan showing that connection to the to the pub and also to the other area you've identified, because obviously, as you say, is not something

54:23

they would be within our in our works plans and our GA's, but maybe we could come back and pull that up later in the day for you, so that, I think the the premise of The the active travel provision, obviously, within, within within the scheme, there is the bus priority provision within the bus lane within the scheme, along the a 4019, as well. It was the intent of the scheme, obviously, through its objectives, to unlock the strategic allocations within the joint core strategy and. Uh, on our basis, the intent of the scheme was to provide the relevant links to those sites for them to be able to gain access onto the the major infrastructure, both the road infrastructure and the active travel provision, but then also with a relevant planning policy there to seek for those strategic allocations to make their own provision through their own applications to broaden the active travel provision. So there is what this what this scheme brings forward is the more holistic elements that maybe couldn't be provided on a site by site basis, where there may be other links, missing links closed by the active travel provision provided by both the ELMS Park and the west of Cheltenham developments. I wouldn't want to speak for other developers, but certainly for the publicly accessible information, it certainly would appear that within the North West Cheltenham planning application, there is provision for both bus priority and two way cycle provision running east of our site, extent through King's ditch and towards north west Cheltenham, and For the a seven strategic allocation the Golden Valley SPD certainly demonstrates in its master funding, both bus provision and cycle provision running in a Southwest and north easterly direction From its site access along the old Gloucester Road in

56:45

Thank you.

56:47

Just bring some of my screens. Is better than one second. Please. You

57:20

so says, if it would help potentially get to the applicant. We do have that general arrangement drawing, if you'd like to put that on the screen, just so you can see what I was speaking to.

57:30

Thank you. As

57:38

you can see there, says the link roads coming in from the north to the junction set for the eighth and seven strategic allocated site. And then there is a continuation on the northern side of the old Gloucester road down to the south west to Southwestern extent, which links in then with the southern end of woody bridge lane and allows access there. So thank

58:00

you.

58:18

Thank you for explaining that to us. I'm mindful that the purpose of these plans was responding to an issue that the joint Councils had in their statement of common ground. And if I just find i

58:46

i think it relates principally to Item 1.2 in the in the statement of common ground with the joint councils. And just with respect to that, from my take of what the Joint Council was looking for from from reading that it looks like there was a bit of a dispute about the approach taken with regards to sustainable travel provision within the scheme, and that effectively that they should have been considered their provision should have been considered up front during the design evolution process. Is that a fair comment? We

59:31

also, I'd have to come back to you on that, because in terms of design evolution, that's outside of my knowledge base. I

59:47

Yeah, could I invite the joint Council's review on on the statement of common ground item in that respect? Please? You.

1:00:07

So kes from night joint councils, we're actually just looking for that particular point. Yeah,

1:00:11

I think, if I could help, it's actually what 1.2 is relevant. But I think 4.2 is the one where I'd like to take you to please, which is page 83 of 89

1:00:30

it's under the guise of the the previous request for a transport chapter to be produced within the ES, but but your response to that. So it's impossible

1:00:41

for the applicant to bring it up on the screen, please, thank you,

1:00:46

or to give us the direct number.

1:01:00

So is case from night Joint Council. This is when my my common queries, when something goes on toms, my aging eyesight. Do you think we can make a little bit bigger? Please. Thank you. Do

1:01:24

James Jackson for joint councilors. I think I can't, I can't actually see the detail of that, unfortunately at the moment, but I think what you're referring to is the original comment around providing a separate chapter, and I think a lot of information subsequently be provided by the applicant, which has covered that often a different way, has a slightly different in terms of the detail, if I can without, without seeing all of the detail on it, without being able to read it. But I think, I think that's, yes, absolutely, slightly different in terms of the detail that we're looking at in terms of the cycle connectivity. Thank you.

1:02:05

That's in part where I was going. But, I mean, I'm suffering with eyes as well, but I have the benefit of an extra screen here, so if I can, perhaps just

1:02:11

it's rep for zero, 22 if that helps,

1:02:16

if you then able to get, I suppose where

1:02:19

I suppose where I was going to with my question was just looking at that item in the SOG, 4.2 the joint Council's response to the to that particular items says in the middle of that paragraph, the sustainable modes are considered as part of the design. Once options have been assessed, sustainable modes should be considered upfront in providing a complete network linked to the identified development sites, including to the west of Cheltenham. So it seems to me that, obviously, that these drawings and analysis have come in at deadline five. I suppose what I'm just looking for, really, is, is there any any any issues with regards to the timing that this assessment of sustainable transport links has been provided? Does it give you any and any cause for concern over the sustainable transport provision within the scheme as we sit here today, please?

1:03:20

James Jackson for the joint councils. So in terms of the the additional information that's now been submitted, I can confirm that the elements within the red line we consider to conform to the local plan policy. However, there are, as was discussed, as was presented, still some missing links outside of that red line, which we're continuing to explore with the applicant and understand, to understand how those can be delivered.

1:03:59

So those presumably wouldn't be delivered by this DCO.

1:04:02

I DCO.

1:04:03

Then they're not within the red plan, no, within the red line.

1:04:14

Okay, thank you.

1:04:22

Can I ask a supplementary then, in light of the test in the NPS for national networks, what's your position then, with regard to the sustainable travel element of this scheme?

1:04:42

James, Jackson from the joint councils. So in terms of those, those elements outside the red line, the position is that we're, as I say, have requested additional information to gain surety around the deliverability and funding availability to deliver those. Is to ensure that there is that connectivity to the existing network. So we're continuing to work with the applicant to understand that position.

1:05:11

I understand what you're trying to achieve, but my question is, what's your position with regard to the DCO proposal, relative to the policy tests in the NPS so

1:05:53

So Catherine Knight, joint councils, the position from the Joint Council says is that the connectivity is actually required for the provisions in the DCO to actually be provided in full, and actually meet the policy tests and the local plan, and therefore actually be fully provided. So in respect of the MPPS provisions, the joint Council's position is that is actually not fully met at the moment, and this connectivity is actually quite important, and discussions that are ongoing with the applicant. At the moment, I can bring you back a hopefully discussions are, they are actually ongoing, and I hope we can bring you back something in written submissions, which is positive.

1:06:39

I think, just following on the same point there. And I think there's quite a helpful paragraph within the triple NPS, which is five point 2.11 under the heading of decision, decision making, and that that basically states that the EXA and the Secretary of State should give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks and policies set out in local plans. The reason I'm signposting that particular paragraph, and again, I don't invite the applicant's view on this really, is that obviously, from from the outset of submitting this application in the planning statement, there is an appendix attached to that, which I think is appendix, a one which provides a kind of comparison, sorry, a statement with regards to

alignment of with local policy. But from revisiting that, it seems to me that the kind of purpose of that planning statement appendix seems quite far weak, far reaching and generic. The thing that struck me when I saw these two plans is that they, I think, and certainly based on what the joint councils are saying, as well as I think it would appreciate a specific local policy compliance statement which sits alongside those two plans, please, because those are obviously showing very particular sustainable design features which are obviously high on the agenda of the joint councils. I think we'd appreciate a commentary really, which would enable us to really consider paragraph five, point 2.11, of the triple NPS, and also bring into that a compliance with how all of those specific measures included within the in within the DCO scheme do or do or do not meet The requirements of the local plan, and in doing that, hopefully it will also signpost some of the outstanding issues that you perhaps have as well. So I

1:08:50

guess from that joint councils that would be extremely helpful. Thank you.

1:08:56

So this debate has confirmed the scope of of of that written response, is it relating specifically to the active travel provision policies within the local plan, or is it wider than that?

1:09:10

I think that's right. I think again, having regard to paragraph five, point 2.11, of their triple NPS that requires the XA and the Secretary of State to give due consideration to impacts on local transport networks and policies set out and local plans. So I think what I'd find helpful is a note, really, which pulls together the local transport policy position and signposted signposts, particularly how the for the second plan of of the two is probably the more relevant one to signpost how the the DCO proposals align with those policy requirements, please. And I think it would equally be as helpful to show where there is perhaps some ambiguity with regards to what the scheme can or can't achieve based upon what. Have heard from the joint councils as well?

1:10:01

Please. Yes, certainly that's echoed in local policy as well. So that's fine. Thank you.

1:10:06

We have that information available so we can collate that

1:10:09

thank you very much. Applause.

1:10:23

I don't think there's anything else I want to explore with regards to Agenda Item three and the active travel plans, but I just invite anybody else in the room if they wish to raise anything on this item. Now is the time?

1:10:38

No? Okay? Thank you. Applause.

1:10:47

So moving on to the next item, which is four. And this is again something which we've received and as an additional submission within the last week, and it's the assessment of what may happen to background traffic flows during construction, when the slip road closures are in place again. I think this might be helpful, if this could be bounced up on the screen. My note suggests it's as eight zero, and firstly, if I could invite the applicant please to explain what this is, what you've done, and what we should all take from it. Please. Thank you.

1:11:33

Steve casemal, for the applicant. So what we've done here is we've taken the flows that currently use, the southbound off slip and the northbound on slip at junction 10, m5 in what I say currently in the future, base year model, without the scheme, we've taken those flows, and what we've simply done here is we've manually added that traffic to the proposed signposted diversion routes in full, so 100% of that traffic. Sorry, could I

1:12:12

just ask you to flash up figure 2.1 on on page two there, so that we can all understand what we're talking about. Thank you. Sorry,

1:12:19

yeah. So the blue line there is the proposed diversion route for the northbound slip road closure, the North on slip closure. So traffic for the when the on slip is closed northbound, the traffic will be diverted onto the a 4019, to Coombe Hill, and then up the a 30 up to junction nine for the southbound off slip closure. Traffic is diverted to stay on the m5 to junction 11, and then come back on itself along the a 40 and around the route as indicated there. So what we've done is we've taken the flow that currently uses those that in the base year model that uses the off slips and added it in full to those links, which, in our view, is a totally unrealistic scenario for various reasons. We stand by the modeling that was submitted for the DCO that assumes people follow the most attractive route for them to get to their destination, rather than necessarily following the signposted route. And to emphasize that, for instance, for the the RED route there the diversion, diversion route for the southbound offshore closure traffic that's current, currently leaving the motorway at that junction is on that offslip is clearly heading towards Central Cheltenham. That traffic, its destination is going to be central Cheltenham, or somewhere in that vicinity. So if the traffic is then diverted down to junction 11 and comes back on itself. Clearly, not all that traffic is going to follow that diversion right back to the point of where the the off slip joins the a 4019, it is going to only travel on part of that before diverting off to reach its destination. So it clearly, it's, a very much a theoretical exercise we've done here in response to show, show you know, an absolute worst case scenario, which, in fact, we don't believe is realistic of what might happen. And the reason we've done that is to demonstrate that the the if we add those flows in to the diversion routes, we stay below the thresholds for noise in any noise impacts in terms of triggering any impact, recognizing the fact that we believe it is a, you know, an overly onerous view of what is likely to happen. Very, very much over a solo review. But to demonstrate. Rate, even in that world, we still remain below that threshold and on, just to point out on the air quality point, the dmrp guidance is that air quality assessments isn't taken for undertake for anything that is as a duration of less than two years, and the

duration of the closures, from the first closure of the first slip road to the opening last opening of the slip road is 90 months as currently scheduled, which is below the two years. So there is no need for an air quality assessment. So

1:15:57

I was at the moment today, coming off the m5 junction 10, southbound. If I was coming off the southbound slip road, I would then be going along the A 4019 into Cheltenham. In the future, during construction, I'll be going down to junction 11. I'd then be turning left onto the A 4019. I'd be going north on the A 4013 and then I turn right, not left, on the A 4019, so I think correct me, if I'm wrong, what I think I took from this plan really is that even in that 100% everybody using these diverted routes scenario, what you may actually find is that even if people were minded to follow the signs, you would see those significant increases, effectively, on the red line on the A 4019 and the A 4013 not on the red line on the A 4019 because it would actually be people turning right rather than left, and aren't going to go to the closed motorway junctions, I suppose is what I'm saying. So I think that in some ways, I was seeing this as in that worst case scenario of everybody using the signposted routes, you wouldn't be seeing those increases along the sections of road that lead to the slip roads that, to all intents and purposes, wouldn't be there. Is that a fair and fair summation of it?

1:17:15

Just yes, that that's correct. It all depends on the ultimate destination of the diverted traffic, which is, you know, dispersed over. You know, clearly a large portion is central Cheltenham, but they are, there are other destinations that people coming off at that location are heading for. So the amount of traffic on each section of the diversion route will therefore vary depending on the destination. But, you know, we haven't been able to model that. You know, this is a manual exercise. As I said, we can't force the model to direct traffic along a particular route. So, so it did. This is not a modeling exercise. It's a manual addition of the traffic. And obviously, diversion routes are always signposted to the point of the very end, even though no one actually wants to follow it, apart from maybe occasional landowner who might live very close to that, that point where, where the end of the closure the slip road, but, but you signpost them all way back to that part. But obviously people know not to follow the whole diversion route, because it varies on that by the destination.

1:18:28

Thank you. That's helpful. Can I just ask if you can bounce up table 2.1 please? And I'm seeing this as the kind of nuts and bolts and what's under the hood of the car really, based on what you've just told us. But can you just explain to me, working across the top of that table, from left to right, what those I mean? You're grouping four, four columns at a time under main headings. If you could please explain what those main headings over the over the four respective columns are telling us? Please

1:19:09

certainly can. So the first four set of columns there's obviously for the ANP care, the inter peak hour and the PMP car, and then the 24 hour traffic flow. And the first four columns is the traffic flow in the future, base year model, without the road closures. So it's the traffic that is currently using those roads in the future, or forecast to be using those roads in the future, without the scheme, the next grouping of four columns is, if we is those flows with the traffic using the slip roads that are closed, added on to the

relevant diversion route. So it's the. Cumulative flow, and then the next four shows the difference. So that is basically the slip road traffic that we've taken. That's the in the columns there, where it says difference in two way traffic vehicles. That is the the slip road traffic that is is on those sections, and that's why they're consistent numbers because we've applied 100% to every section of the route, and that's why they're the same for each section of the route. Then we have the next set of columns, the columns that were derived by the noise team for the environmental assessment that looked at the the roots and looked at the thresholds that would trigger a significant noise impact. And the assess, the way in which that's done, is set out in the environmental assessment which which says how those thresholds were established, but they're based on the DMR guidance about changes in decibels triggered by certain proportional increases in traffic, which basically gives you the the the maximum flows that that would trigger either a minor or moderate noise impact there and then. So you can compare those with the traffic flows in the second set of four columns there where it's two way traffic flows included in diversion routes. And you can sorry with the difference in two way flow. And you can see that where they that they don't exceed that that change.

1:21:47

Thank you. So just to help my understanding of it then, and apologies if it sounds like I'm saying exactly what you've just told me. But so the first line there, the 738, in the first numerical column that's the existing or the base. So the base construction year AM, peak hour flow on the A, 4019, west of the m5, junction 10 is 738

1:22:14

vehicles.

1:22:18

And the next column then assumes that all of the 354 vehicles in the amp cow are on the existing slip road. Novae onto the a 4019, west of that yes, m5 junction 10 route, which gives us the 1092

1:22:37

correct okay.

1:22:39

And then the two right hand columns on that table seem to me to compare the the increase in traffic, which is the 354 and the third family of flows, with 185 or 738 to reach a view on whether it is a minor noise impact or a moderate noise impact. Correct.

1:23:07

Okay, 185 seems to be

1:23:16

conveniently at 25% of the baseline flow, the baseline hourly flow. So is it that you are saying that a 25% increase in traffic on that road would trigger a minor noise impact?

1:23:31

Unfortunately, I'm not a noise specialist, so I can't confirm that that like you, I suspect that is the case, but I cannot confirm that I would need to revert to a noise specialist, convert, confirm that?

1:23:43

Yeah, I

1:23:44

think that would be helpful. Because, I mean, from looking at, I think bouncing along to the last family of of four columns, if you like, on the right hand side, it has an amp hour threshold of 738 which I'm reading that as a doubling of traffic would give rise to a moderate noise impact? Yes. I

1:24:04

mean, I do know that is the case for a more it is a doubling for one of the thresholds, which clearly does relate to a moderate impact. Yes. So yes, I'm 90% confident that that is a correct interpretation of how the numbers have been derived.

1:24:18

Yeah. So again, I appreciate a written response on this, but just to help my understanding, I'm reading this that you are saying that unless the kind of flows are greater than if the flow increases greater than 25% that, to me, suggests that this table tells me it's a minor noise impact, And a doubling is a moderate noise impact. I think I just have seen the dmrB section that sets out minor, moderate and significant noise decibel variances. And those are very clear in terms of what they say with regards to the the. The kind of increase in decibels, what, what? What's less clear is where I can find comfort with regards to the the doubling of traffic and the and the lesser increase of traffic for the minor and moderate noise impacts. So if you could signpost that to me, I think, I think that would be helpful. Please.

1:25:20

Yes, we can do that.

1:25:31

Thank you. So from reading through this report, it's clear that and what you've said, it's clear that the conclusions relate to noise effects on those on those diverted routes. I've heard what you said about air quality as well, and that's that's noted. But is there any any comment you'd wish to make with regards to what the the kind of real world traffic implications could be with additional traffic on those routes? Again, I'm just thinking about the normal transport environmental issues. Of you know, congestion severance, any particular impact with regards to road safety, if you could please give me your position, really, if there is anything we should be taking about possible impacts on those routes with regards to congestion severance and and and road traffic accidents.

1:26:24

Thank you. Well, this

1:26:25

hasn't been modeled, you know, we haven't tested this so, you know, these flows, we don't know what this means in terms of capacity of those links, because we haven't, haven't modeled it as such, but, but the point is, if you modeled it, what you'd see is, I think what's key to note here, there's two aspects to this. Firstly, as I've said, several aspects to this. Firstly, as I said earlier, we believe this is an unrealistic view of what would happen in terms of the volume of traffic, because not all of the traffic would use all of the all sections of the diversion route. There's also the point that there would undoubtedly some be some suppression of demand during construction of the scheme, with people choosing not to make their journeys or potentially re timing their journeys, and that's not taken account of the next point is that the the traffic when it diverts to the diversion route, traffic using those diversion routes is then displaced, because those people who are using currently using those diversion routes choose to find another route because the additional congestion. So you get the knock on displacement, and that's not accounted for here. So it's very difficult to draw any conclusions to congestion delay from this technical note. And we draw back to the fact that the modeling that was presented for the DCO, we think is the best way to model that, because that models that displacement inherently because the way the reassignment works within the model. So you pick up the displacement, and you pick up the fact that people are choosing the most advantageous route for themselves. And I would also argue, as I've made the point, I think at the last issue specific hearing is that, you know, with the advent of satellite navigation being used by a high portion of drivers now that they're more likely to follow the route that's most advantageous to them, as presented by their SAT navigation, rather than follow some signposted route, than in the past, when perhaps people didn't have Sat Navs and you didn't necessarily have a knowledge of the road network, so you would blindly follow the signposted route, I would argue that that is much less likely now, and therefore the model is better at reflecting behavior in the result of the advent of satellite satellite navigation being used by a high portion drivers.

1:28:56

Thank you. I do take your point entirely about satellite navigation and route choice, but I think it would be remiss of us not to be cognizant of the what if scenario whereby people do actually use The signposted route which you are proposing to promote you.

1:29:33

In the baseline construction year so that, again, I haven't got my calculator to hand. But that, to me, I think would equate to about 15 additional vehicles per minute, using those using those three roads, understood what you said about route choice, and that's entirely noted. But again, I think just to kind of finish on this point, really, if you could. Just perhaps follow up with something in writing, just explaining to us whether we should be harboring any concerns about road safety, pedestrian severance, congestion in the in the event that people drivers are minded to use the signposted construction routes which you are promoting. Thank you.

1:30:21

Yes, we can do

1:30:29

that. Turn to the local highway authority of the joint councils, please, and just invite any, anything you wish to share with regards to what you've just heard or and any, new point with regards to the diverted construction routes and the assessments of those Thank you.

1:30:50

Andy Padden for the joint councils, this report was issued last week, and we've read it that we need to probably do some further work on it, just to understand the points that you're making. We also looking at the diversion route. Agree with your statement about the fact that maybe some of the traffic will not actually go follow the diversion route, and certainly southbound m5 southbound traffic is unlikely to go all the way down to junction 11, and if they're going into the north of Cheltenham, would probably use junction nine as well to divert rather than coming south and then going north. But other than that, we have no further comments to make. Thank you. Thank you,

1:31:38

national highways. Is there anything you'd wish to add to this item.

1:31:42

Thank you. Sophie Stewart, for national highways, and I may very well pass to Rebecca Marshall in a moment. As noted, this report came out last week. I think if there is national highways, are obviously looking at it at the moment, if there is one, one area of concern, it would simply be, as Mr. Katesmark Acknowledged, there's been no modeling on the impact of the the motorway junctions themselves, and it's just ensuring that there's no queuing back onto the main line, which could have a safety impact on the junctions. Thank you.

1:32:21

Thank you. Is

1:32:25

there anybody else in the room who wishes to make any comment on this? Mr. Badam, you

1:32:45

Peter Badham aggington resident, I just wondered if any indication could be given as to how long this proposed diversion might be in place.

1:32:58

Thank you for that. Could I go back to the applicant and please respond to anything you've just heard, including Mr. Badams question? Thank you,

1:33:07

just in case. Well, for the applicant, firstly, just to respond to joint Council's comment, I mean, in Appendix m of the transport assessment, there are some plots at the end there which show the Select link analysis for the slip road. So that shows where the traffic using the cut the slip roads currently that are going to be closed, where that traffic destination is, how it routes across the network in the future, base year model, there's then some plots which show following that, which show how the traffic that

traffic reassigns in the modeling submitted in support of the DCO, and that shows exactly as you you pointed out. It shows traffic coming off at junction nine and heading south, so that you know that reflects the view there. So you know, that demonstrates the modeling that we've undertaken reflects the common sense view of what people will actually do. So that was just just to make that point, second point regarding the duration. The duration, as I think I said earlier, the closures, in total, the two, it's a 90 month period with an overlap where they're both closed to five months. And

1:34:33

can you just confirm broadly when that five month closure of both lip rose would be just to help Mr. Badam,

1:34:45

if you bear with me a minute, I can't recall them. I'll have to look them up.

1:35:04

Right? So the southbound off slip closes in month 11, the

1:35:13

So, month 11 from, if we just happen, and I admit it's an indicative, but again, just up, Mr. Badham, month 11 from when

1:35:29

it

1:35:33

does that broadly, put it in the middle of 2026 based upon

1:35:40

October October 26 Yeah, October 26 Yeah, thank you.

1:35:53

The northbound slip road closes four months later, month 15 so, so that'd be January, wouldn't it? Jen, Jen, 27 the southbound slit road opens in month 20. So that's five months later. That's May, isn't it? May? June, June, 27 and then.

1:36:36

And then, the southbound slit road opens in month 27 i i try and put the dates against those first so the end of 27 Thank you. We can confirm those dates in writing.

1:36:53

That's from app a, PP, 61, table, two, one. I

1:37:07

thank you.

1:37:17

I think I've gone as far as one to with the slip road closures. So if we could move on to Item five on the agenda please, which is really just to explore.

1:37:34

In fact, I

1:37:35

think we've perhaps at a point where we could all do with stretching our legs for 15 minutes or so. So we break now for a whole 18 minutes and reconvene at 1155 please.

1:37:49

Thank you. If anyone's watching the live stream again, just remind you you'll need to restart your browser page on, on resuming. Thank you. So we just adjourned for until five to 12 and.