



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	M60/M62/M66 Simister Island
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 1
<b>Date:</b>	27 November 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\_M60SIMISTERISLAND\_ISH2\_SESSION1\_26112024

Wed, Nov 27, 2024 6:14PM • 1:30:47

00:04

Good morning. Everyone. Before I begin, can I just confirm that everyone can hear me clearly? And can I also confirm with the case team that live streaming of this event has commenced? Great. Thank you. The time is now 10am and this issue specific hearing in relation to the M 60 M, 60 2m, 66 Thompson Island Interchange project is now open. My name is Sarah Holmes. I'm a plan inspector and a chartered civil engineer. I've been a party by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel examining this application. I'll now ask my colleague to introduce himself.

00:42

Good morning. My name is Andrew Robinson. I am a planning inspector and a chartered home planner, and have also been appointed by the Secretary of State.

00:51

Together, we constitute the examining authority or exa for this application. For those of you in the room, you may have also spoken to or heard from bat COVID, who is the case manager for this project, Mr. Bar COVID is supported today by Melissa Whitlock, our case officer. For those of you who joined virtually, then you will have spoken to the other case officer, Elias pereiras. Together, they are the case team for this project, and if you have any questions or queries, they should be your first point of contact. Their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you've received from us are on the project page at the National Infrastructure website. Before we consider the items on the agenda this morning, we need to deal with a few housekeeping matters, and I will make sure I get through these as quickly as possible. So can everyone attend in please make sure your phone is switched off or turn to silent. There's no fire alarm test planned for today, so if an alarm sounds, it is an emergency and we will need to vacate the building. Emergency exits are located to the side of the room, wherever you can see the green sign above the door and also back through the doors you entered through. The fire assembly point is at the back of the car park, as far away from the building as possible. If anybody needs any assistance, please, can you let the case team know toilet facilities, including disabled facilities, can be found outside this room, across the lobby and back along the corridor towards the main hotel reception area. As far as I'm aware, no requests have been made for any special measures or arrangement to enable participation in this today's hearing, such as needing to take a break for medical reasons or having to leave the event at a certain time. If anyone does need a break or extra support later on, then please do let the case team know. We will take a break every 90 minutes or so for those people watching the live stream. If we do take a break and adjourn the proceedings today, we will have to stop the live stream to give us clear recording files as a result. At the point at which we start the meeting and the live stream, you will need to refresh your browser page. We remind you of this again. Should we

need to adjourn this event is being live streamed and recorded. Our letter on the seventh of August, which we refer to as our rule six. Letter explain that because we retain and publish the digital recordings, they form a public record to which the General Data Protection Regulation GDPR, applies, the planning Inspectorate publishes and retains recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State decision on the development consent order. So if you participate in today's hearing, it's important that you understand you'll be recorded and that you consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to the plan decision to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings, we would ask that you try your best not to make not to add any information to the public record that you would normally wish to keep private and confidential, such as medical details, financial details, or your address. If you do feel the need to refer to something that's private and confidential, could you please discuss this with the case team first to explore whether this could be submitted in writing and redacted. Does anyone have any questions with regard to this matter in the room or online? Okay, does anyone intend to film or record this meeting? Okay, for those of you attending virtually, can I repeat the request that was made in the arrangements conference, that to minimize background noise, you make sure your phone is switched off or turn to silent and that you stay muted with your camera off unless you're speaking. I would also ask that if you wish to speak, you switch your camera on and even use their raised hand function in teams or speak at the appropriate time. Can I also remind people the chat function on teams will not work, so please do not try and use this to ask any questions or post comments. And do we have any members of the press in attendance? Okay, have any any comments or questions regarding the points I just made in the room or online? Okay, thank you.

04:42

Okay. So moving on to the purpose of today's hearing. Today's issue specific hearing is being held at our request because we want to explore and discuss a number of matters. This is to ensure that we have all the information we need to make our report to the Secretary of State today's hearing. And will be a structured discussion based on the public agenda. I'd like to remind everyone that the examination is predominantly a written process. You'll see in the examination timetable that there are opportunities for the XA to ask further written questions, and we can also hold more hearings if they are needed. I'd like to reassure you that while we may not ask a question on the topic, it doesn't necessarily mean that we believe that this matter has been fully addressed. It could be that we'll be examining it at a later date, through either written questions or in a hearing. We're familiar with all the documents that have been submitted, so when you are answering a question, you don't need to repeat at length something that you've already written about if you want to refer to information that you've already submitted. It would help us if you could use the examination library reference for that document. We're expecting that most of today's contributions will be from parties that have already requested to speak. This is a public examination, though, and if there's a point that you want to make, please do raise your hand if you're in the room, or raise your virtual hand and switch on your camera if you are attending virtually, so that we can hear you. I would like to remind everyone that this is not an inquiry, and unless we specifically request it, there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross examination. This means that any questions that you have for other parties need to be asked through the examining authority. This hearing will follow the agenda that was published on the project page of the national infrastructure web page on the 18th of November 2024 a copy of this can be found in the exam library at reference, Ev, 10, 001, and this is being displayed on the screens in the room, and it should also be been

displayed online. Today's agenda is for guidance only, and we may add other issues as we progress. Should this take longer than anticipated? It may be necessary to prioritize matters and submit matters to written questions. Finally, it is important that we get the right answers to the questions that we ask. Please remember that the examination is predominantly a written process. If you cannot answer the questions being asked right now or require some more time, then we'd rather you tell us that you need to respond in writing than giving an incomplete or an incorrect answer. We can then defer the response either to an action point to be submitted at deadline four on the 10th of December, or to later written questions or another hearing. Are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearing? I don't see any hands up in the room or online. So the case team have provided as with a list of those interested in other parties who have expressed a wish to be present and heard today. I'm now going to go around and ask those people present today to introduce themselves. So when I say your name, please introduce yourself, stating your name, your title, whether it's Mr. Mrs. Miss and who it is you represent. For example, Mr. Joe blogs, local resident, if you are attending virtually, please switch on your camera and microphone when introducing yourself. So I will start with the applicant team. Please

08:25

Good morning. I'm Miss Tony Weston, and I'm a solicitor at Gowling Wlg, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Some of the team are here in person today, as you can see, and I'll let them introduce themselves in a moment. There are also some people attending online, so I don't know if you want to do them next or leave them at the end. Perhaps when you you go to the online people,

08:47

you introduce them after you've introduced everyone in the room would probably, probably help. Be easier.

08:54

Yeah. Okay, and so I'll turn to my right now. Firstly,

09:00

Good morning, sir. My name is Mr. Richard earling. Also is solicitor Gowling and legal advisor to the applicant. Shall I suggest we start the end of the row and work back up so we don't miss anymore?

09:14

Thanks, Richard. Yeah. Good morning, madam. My name is Andy Pearce. I'm an engineering manager at Jacobs working on behalf of the applicant.

09:23

Good morning. Phil Emerson, Costa ndco, lead for the applicant.

09:30

Good morning. I'm Joel Rankin, the environment lead for the applicant.

09:36

Good morning. Panel members, I'm Martin White, a chartered town planner at Jacobs for the applicant.

09:44

And good morning. Mr. David Prater, Senior Associate Director of transport planning from Jacobs on behalf of the applicant.

09:56

And is there anyone online from the applicant that just like to introduce. Use themselves.

10:09

Hi,

10:10

I'm Hazel peace.

10:11

I'm Dr Hazel

10:12

peace, and I'm the air quality lead for the applicant.

10:17

Good morning. I'm Mr. James castle. I'm the operational safety lead for the applicant, good morning. I'm Jennifer Wade. I'm

10:28

the population and human health assessment lead for the applicant, good

10:37

morning, everyone. My name is Sam Pollard.

10:39

I'm the climate lead for the applicant.

10:48

Okay? Is that everyone online that's introduced themselves from the applicants team? Okay? Thank you very much. I'll now turn to very Metropolitan Borough Council.

10:56

Good morning, sir. Good morning, madam. My name is piers Riley Smith. I'm a barrister instructed on behalf of the council and taking a slightly different approach to the applicant, I'm going to read out a list of names of everyone who I think will be potentially having some input today. I'll just ask them to, as it were, way more or indicate to you. So first of all, we will have, or we have Rebecca Jones, who's the Environmental Protection Officer at the council will be addressing air quality. We have Chris Hoth,

who's the unit manager of the Environment Team. We have Sally Shaw, who's an Environmental Protection Officer. We have Jamie Rossi Stevenson, who's the climate action officer, we have Rob Hall, who's the unit manager of the commercial team for noise. We have Melanie Walsh, who's the unit manager for the neighborhood team for noise. We have Fran Smith, who's the Strategic Planning and Infrastructure officer. We have Dean Clapworthy sitting to my left. Who's the development manager. We have John O'Connor, who's from the highway authority. And we have David Dutton from the Greater Manchester ecological unit sitting at the back there. And Madam also. We have one officer online, I believe that should be Mark Kilby, who's the conservation officer on heritage. And perhaps, if

12:24

Mark is there and can I see her hand is raised, I hope I've not missed out anyone. I think that should be a fun thank you.

12:33

Okay. Thank you very much for that. I'll now move on to the affected and interested persons. Next on my list is Marge Poner, from Chair of friends of Carrington Moss. Are you online?

12:49

Hi, yes, I am. I'm chair of friends of Carrington Moss, Vice Chair of save Greater Manchester's Greenbelt, and I'm also vice chair of the National Organization, the community planning Alliance. Thank you.

13:04

Thank you. You have David Lacey from transport for Greater Manchester, okay, who's in, who's is in the room. And we have representatives from the Hillary family as well.

13:21

Morning, sir, madam. Chris Stroud of moral developments, I'm a chartered surveyor, chartered builder, representing the Hillary family. Mr. By the way, you

13:43

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hilary, I think that's everybody in the room. Is there anyone online who hasn't introduced themselves yet? I don't see any hands, so I think that's everybody that's been covered. So I will now pass it over to Miss Holmes, who will lead on agenda. Item number two,

14:08

thank you. So we're starting with item two, which is the need for the scheme. And we'll start with 2.1 about the case for the scheme. So a number of representations raise the concern that the benefit to cost ratio for the scheme or the BCR was low. In response these concerns in REC, 1020, the applicant stated that the quantified BCR, the scheme of 1.17 was considered low but positive value for money. The applicant went on to state that, in accordance with government guidance, the determination of a scheme's value for money should extend beyond its BCR. Value and other benefits, such as promoting economic growth, are not captured and militarized within the BCR. Can the applicant just spend a few

minutes give us some more detail about the statement, particularly covering the other benefits it considers the scheme would provide you.

15:01

Uh. Tony Westone for the applicant, um, I'll introduce Um, Mr. Martin white, who's going to deal with this particular

15:09

point. Thanks, madam. My name is Martin white, representing the applicant. I am the main author of the case for the scheme, along with my transport colleague, who is represented today by Mr. Preter. If I could just first briefly summarize the requirements for the scheme. These are set out in Figure 4.2, the case of the scheme app 146, which shows in the peak period over six and a half vehicles per hour travel through various links in the network at junction 18, drivers are required to pass through around about multiple sets of traffic signals in order to travel clockwise around the M 60. As far as we're aware. This makes the M 61 of the only motorways in the UK where traveling, where, where drivers traveling along it are impeded in this way, and thus this results in delays and queues at the roundabout, which many people will be familiar with during the peak period. Speeds can be low as 20 mile an hour, as shown on figures 4.3 and figure point 4.4 of the case for the scheme, which is app 146 as also set out in paragraph 4.52 of the case for the scheme, traffic flows at peak periods are forecast to increase by as much as 1000 vehicles per hour, by 2029 even if the applicant takes no action to improve the junction. Without the improvements, the junction is at capacity at peak times, and any additional development traffic will make this situation worse. I would just set out paragraph 2.13, of the 2015 National Planning statement for national networks, which states that a well functioning strategic road network is critical in enabling safe and reliable journeys and the movement of goods in support of national and regional requirements. So now just turning to try and summarize the benefits of the scheme, which I'll do as briefly as I can, the creation of additional capacity and creating free flow links, which will increase traffic speeds for users of the scheme network, even taking into account forecast increases in traffic, in traffic, journey time, reliability and journey speeds increase with the scheme in place. Other indirect benefits include that our traffic model suggests that the improvements provide sufficient capacity to accommodate additional traffic in the scheme, area associated with places for everyone, I would point specifically to policy JP, strat six, at paragraph 4.450, of places for everyone, which sets out that the most significant proposed economic intervention in the northern areas is focused along the M 60 and M 62 corridors from junction 18 of the M 60 to junction 21 of the M 62 This covers the local authority areas of bury Rochdale and Oldham and incorporates the atom Valley Mayor Rural Development Zone. I would also say that paragraph 10.51 of places for everyone, states that planned improvements at sinister Island are vital in ensuring that the SRN in Greater Manchester operates in an effective and efficient manager manner and best contributes to sustainable economic growth. I've also noted that figure point 4.6, of places for everyone includes an annotation which shows the junction 18 improvements as part of the overall strategy for this area. In summary, the applicant considers that the scheme is required as a long term solution for the congestion and delays currently experienced at sinister Island interchange, as well as for supporting the economic development aspirations of Greater Manchester. Without the scheme in place, these benefits will not be realized.

19:35

Thank you. If in your pressing submission, if you could include, particularly the bit about the benefits that aren't included part of the BCR that would be that would be really helpful. So you talked a bit about the economic base benefits in terms of its support in the places for everyone. Are there any other policies that would be supported by this scheme? Any other economic benefits not related. To places for everyone.

20:09

Madam, I believe that the main benefits would be to support the general traveling direction for places for everyone. But I would like to come back separately on that point.

20:20

Okay, thank you. I'll put that as an action point. Thank

20:49

so can I turn to the council now and ask them if they'd like to add anything in relation to the benefits they consider the scheme would be delivering

20:59

piers one Smith for the council no except for to endorse what you've already heard from the applicant and that we agree with the benefits that they set up.

21:08

Okay, thank you. Yesterday, in the compulsory acquisition hearing, we asked questions about alternatives that were being considered for this scheme, and a question that we had about the two options COVID in chapter three of the scheme, the northern loop and the inner links were rolled over to today. Chapter three states that both these options meet the scheme objectives, but it's clear that the inner links would require considerably less land take, including land that is within the Green Belt. I understand from Chapter Three that the northern loop will provide greater capacity improvements and journey time savings for the road users when compared to the inner links. But I'd like the applicant just to give some more detail in relation to this, including explaining the difference between how long these capacity improvements would be felt for each of the two options, and if the northern loop is considered better value for money, with a benefit to cost ratio of 1.17 what was the BCR for the inner links option?

22:08

David page for the applicant? So at the national highways options selection stage of the project, as you set out, there were two options that were considered, consulted on at that point in the process, so the northern loop and the links within the consultation report Annex B, which is document 5.2 in the library the preferred route announcement document sets out the reason behind the selection of the Northern loop option. To summarize the key reasons for the preference of that option over the over the inner links, the members of the members of the public had that as their preferred option. And many of the key stakeholders as well noted that that was their preferred option of the two that were being considered, as has already been noted, the northern loop option provided greater capacity and a greater journey time improvement for a longer duration. It was considered to be the safer of the two layouts. It was considered to be less complex to construct with less intrusive roadworks. Drivers feedback that they felt



that the northern loop option would be less confusing to navigate, and therefore it was considered overall that the northern loop option represented the better value for money.

23:38

So you talk about the capacity improvements. So if you give me some figures, what, how would you compare the northern loop scheme to the inner links in terms of what capacity and how long the improvements would be felt for?

23:57

Yeah, I think that. I think that would be something we'd have to take away and look at the numbers in the background.

24:11

Tony Weston for the applicant, I think that information obviously does exist. It's just we don't have the information to hand at the moment, so it might be something to ensure that we get the right numbers and it's accurate that we just come back in writing on that particular point.

24:24

Yes, it'd be really helpful for me to just understand. So give me a bit of evidence to the statement, where it says the capacity improvements were better for one rather than the other. And also, if you want to take away if you had the benefit cost ratio to compare for both schemes, because I understand one would probably be a lot cheaper to construct as well, unless, unless land I just want to see, just want to see the benefits to compare the two. And we'll put that down as an action point. Can you do that for deadline for

24:59

yes, that should be. Fine,

25:00

okay, thank you.

25:13

So, Would anyone else like to make a comment in relation to the need for the scheme? Nope, not in the room or nothing online. Okay, so I'll now pass over to Mr. Robinson to deal with item three.

25:30

Thank you. Concerns were raised in some relevant representations that an assessment of community of impacts with the Northern Gateway allocations in the places for everyone. Joint development plan hadn't been undertaken, and in our first written questions, we sought further clarification on this under question, C, I, C, E, dot 1.4, and we know that the applicant's response to this in their deadline three submission, which was rep 3023, which sets out your reasons as to why you do not consider that you need to undertake a cumulative effects assessment, which in essence, is due to the absence of detail on this stage that's likely to come forward. Could you just explain further why you're unable to

undertake the assessment and set out little bit more what level of detail you would require to undertake such an assessment, particularly in terms of traffic modeling.

26:37

Jill Rankin, for the applicant, yes, as you stated, we we did undertake a cumulative effects assessment, which is reported in chapter 15 of the environmental statement, which is app 054, and it's supporting annex appendix 5.1 into project cumulative effects, which is at 125, the inclusion of developments for within a cumulative assessment is based on the certainty of information that you have available at that time, that is. And we followed planning Inspectorate advice note 17 on cumulative effects assessment essentially three tiers of information, the tier one being most certain information, tier three would be less certain information, and hence more uncertainty on any potential impact the allocations for places for everyone at that stage, tier three developments, and because of the sort of uncertainty of the information and the lack of information at that Time, those developments were not carried through to stage two, to the shortlisting for the assessment, the sort of information which is required in order to undertake a meaningful cumulative assessment would include information on proposed design and location, the construction operation, decommissioning, information, timetabling and the baseline data and effects from those developments which would normally be anticipated To be available through environmental assessments undertaken to take that though those developments forward as planning applications came through associated with those allocations. At that time, there were for the area, the allocations within the bury council area, there were no planning applications that had been submitted at that time, and so there was no information available upon which to base the cumulative impact assessment. The applicant is currently undertaking review of the relevant planning, planning authorities online portals to identify any new planning submissions that would be potentially relevant to the cumulative effects assessment. And to date, the applicant has is now aware that there is a scoping opinion request has been made regarding the places for everyone. JPA, 1.1 development land application that's under Application reference 71, 262, for bury Council, the applicant is currently reviewing the information contained within that scoping report to determine the the level. Level, and the certainty of that information for inclusion within cumulative impacts assessment, or whether it is suitable and gives us sufficient certainty. And as I say, we are currently reviewing that information, and we'll be able to provide an update regarding the cumulative assessment at deadline five.

30:28

Okay, thank you for that. That's that's actually really useful clarification. So we'll add that for an action point to Deadline five. And the reason, sort of a little bit more interested is we're hearing a lot of the links between what the proposed development is aiming to do in sort of, sort of this relationship with places for everyone. And I can understand why you might not be able to do a detailed quantitative assessment, but given the proximity and the size of the site, location and the likely interaction with the development, is there any way you could do some sort of high quality, sorry, high level, qualitative assessment of the likely what we're trying to really ascertain is, is the proposed development actually going to be able to accommodate this proposed development? If you're saying, on the one hand, that the part of the benefits are for the scheme is to support the site allocation, have you actually done any traffic modeling, or likely traffic modeling to see whether that's actually the case?

31:38

I'll pick that one up. That's right. So David major for the applicant. So our traffic modeling, our traffic forecasting, work that we've undertaken to date follows a similar process to that described by Jill in terms of the development sites that we specifically account for in our forecasting. The Department of Transport's tag guidance, transport appraisal guidance sets out very clearly the type of sites that you can include in your forecasts and those that you can't, depending on how likely those sites are to come along and receive planning permission. So the guidance sets out that only sites that have a planning application actively in process or imminently about to be submitted, can be included in the core traffic forecasts, and that's the guidance that we followed here. And as Gilles noted, many of the parts of the places for everyone weren't at that status when the traffic forecasting work was undertaken. However, we were aware of the link between places for everyone and the scheme and Northern Gateway and so on. And so what we did was to look at the residual capacity that the junction offered. And as we noted in our in the transport assessment and other places, the case for the scheme, the scheme does provide some residual capacity for additional development traffic that would be generated by those sites, even though we didn't have concrete information on specifically the numbers of vehicles that would be generated by each of those sites as part of Northern Gateway.

33:19

Okay, so the moment you haven't got any evidence that the actual traffic model. There's no traffic modeling or evidence to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would be sufficient to accommodate all of these site allocations. It's just an estimate at the moment

33:38

that's great, until we have more firm information on the traffic generation from the sites and and how vehicles will access, the strategic road network, complementary infrastructure, all those sorts of things that go alongside the developments. We don't have detailed traffic modeling that reflects that. There's no data yet in order to support that level of

34:09

analysis. Based on that, just want to test in your response to deadline, one submission to have raised issues on this point you've stated the implementation of the scheme will provide sufficient additional strategic road network capacity to accommodate this, should planning permission be granted in the future, how certain can you be that that's the case if you haven't actually got any sort of concrete evidence to demonstrate that that's the case?

34:42

David for the applicant, I suppose ultimately it will depend on the nature of those sites that come through at a previous stage of the process. We did some sensitivity testing that looked at an early idea of what Northern Gateway might look like, and what the traffic levels might be associated with that site. But as I said, until we've got more detailed information on the site specifics and all the other things I just talked about a few moments ago, it's hard to say with any high degree of certainty exactly whether the scheme or what the, what the traffic generation of those sites would be in the impact that they would have on on the scheme area,

35:30

the sensitivity testing that you've done is that included in the application documents,

35:36

no, that was undertaken at previous stage of the of the scheme development.

35:42

So for that, did you basically take the worst case of how much additional traffic could be hit in the junction and basically check whether it would work?

35:53

We took some forecasts have been undertaken at the time by I think it was part of transport for Greater Manchester's work looking at the cumulative impact of Northern Gateway at the time, but it was a previous iteration of the of the development plans. Things have changed since then.

36:12

So how confident are you that the sensitivity testing that you did is still applicable now? Is it something that needs to be revisited for the scheme. Now that we know more about the places for everyone,

36:22

I think there might be value in looking at what the likely traffic generation of the the emerging plans are now.

36:34

I think so. Just going back to the benefits of the scheme, I am slightly concerned that on one hand, you taking the benefits of that the scheme is going to be able to cope with the capacity for places for everyone. But the other hand, I'm not sure we've got the confidence that we've done enough you've done enough modeling to be able to claim those benefits. Yeah.

36:53

So I suppose to be clear that the BCR, as it stands, doesn't include any benefit from places for everyone. Sites, as I said, they're not firm enough in certainty terms to include in our traffic forecasting. So any benefit from those is over and above the BCR benefits and and so, as Martin said out before, that's an additional benefit for this.

37:16

Okay, thank you. Okay,

37:21

thank you. That was all the questions. I had on this particular Is there anybody who was I see there's a hand up online from friends of Carrington moss.

37:33

Sorry, I'll turn my camera on. Hi there. Yes. I just wanted to mention a couple of things, places where everyone was approved in March of this year. So there's been time to look at the traffic implications of

that. And I just remind everybody that this is a strategic road network, so all the allocations in places for everyone are likely to impact it, and unless we have a greater emphasis on sustainable passenger and freight transport in the region, it is likely that there will be a significant amount of traffic. And I don't have confidence that the plan has taken this into consideration. I understand that at bury there are two supplementary or there is a supplementary planning document that is out for consultation for in relation to two other large allocations which should be available to the team to look in more detail about plans, and there will be information in the other districts as well about the master plans that are being developed. So I don't think there's, there's justification to not take this into consideration. Thank you.

39:06

Would you like to did the applicant like to respond to any points? It's raised. It's been raised now.

39:18

Attorney Weston, for the applicant, I think we will come back to you on writing in respect of that particular point. I think I was

39:29

just wondering, is it worth revisiting the sensitivity tests as a first step, just to see, to give us some confidence in terms of the traffic modeling?

39:38

Tony Weston for the applicant? I'll let Mr. Pro to speak in a moment. I'm not sure that we've got the sufficient information in order to do that, but it's certainly something that we could take away and consider and then come back to you on

39:59

HEY. And has the council got anything you wanted to add? Because reference was obviously made to the site allocations, and you made reference that yesterday. Liquid policy acquisition. Is there anything further you want to add on what you've just heard?

40:10

Beers. Riley Smith for the council, no, sir, but thank you for noting the supplementary planning document that was referenced there was discussed yesterday. It is in a consultation stage. At this point in time, I think, in fairness, the applicant is right to observe that the details within that, I'm not sure, would provide particular sort of further detail that they could then take away to their screening, but it's something that they can consider. But no so we've got nothing further to add.

40:39

Okay, thank you. Does anyone else wish to comment on this agenda item before we move on? Yes, the Hillary family. Restraint

40:47

for the Hillary family, we are being asked to enter into negotiations in lieu of a CPO for the sale of 27 acres of our land, which we will prefer not to have been included within the sinister Island upgrade

design in the first place. And I find it quite astonishing that we should be in a position where we can't even justify the traffic numbers and traffic volumes for any upgrade at sinister Island. Yet we've selected the northern loop as a solution, and we are having to deal with the impacts as two places for everyone. It's been in pretty much its same form now in relation to JPA, 1.1 for four to five years, I would guess. And again, it's astonishing that the whole design for the sinister Island upgrade has not included any form of modeling to accommodate the the impact of the of JPA, 1.1 Thank you. Thank you. I

42:20

just ask you I'll just ask you this. I'll give you the applicant, the opportunity if you want to make any response to that.

42:28

Tony Western for the applicant, I think the only thing I would note is, of course, in order to carry out traffic modeling, you need a high level of detail. It's not possible to guess what the traffic impacts might be from a policy which a very which sets out a very high level, what kind of quantum and types of development could come forward over quite a long period, generally speaking. So. So I think you know, our comments have to be taken into account in that regard, but we will come back in writing on the points that have been raised.

43:02

Okay, thank you for that. Okay, we'll move on to Item four now, which is to discuss the design approach to the proposal. So, yes, the first item is to ask the applicant to briefly outline the approach. So could you spend no more than around about five minutes just giving a brief overview of the overall approach to the project design, what the design visions and aspirations for the design were, how it has evolved, and ultimately, how you have arrived at the preliminary scheme design as submitted.

43:42

Thank you, Sir Richard. Turning on behalf of the applicant, I'm going to introduce Mr. Martin white to he'll talk you through how the scheme design has been arrived at, and he may well be supported by Mr. Pearce in relation to the actual preliminary scheme design. Applause,

44:03

so my name is Martin white. On behalf of the applicant, I authored the scheme design report based on input inputs from colleagues, as noted by Mr. Sterling. I'll try to briefly summarize the approach to design, covering some of the points just mentioned. The first thing to point out is that the applicant has its own internal design guidance, referred to as the road to good design, and it also has a requirement to comply with established technical standards from the design manual for roads and bridges, now referred to as the bmr. In the rest of my statements, the road to good design sets out 10 design principles which we believe align with the criteria for good design, which is outlined in the relevant national policy statement. Duncan, and also the National Infrastructure commissions for design principles, which are climate, people, places and value. We believe that all these principles are embedded into our design I'll refer you to table 4.1, of the scheme design report, which is application reference 1.51 this sets out a detailed assessment of these 10 design principles and how they have

informed the scheme. I'll try to briefly summarize these 10 design principles. First of all, the scheme has been designed for following extensive collaboration consultation and it is inclusive. This has been demonstrated in by our documents, the consultation report and the equalities impact assessment, as mentioned, the design has been developed in line with the dmr, and it's been developed by an integrated team of engineering built environment and environmental specialists, many of which are represented today. The contractor, who is also represented today, is part of our team at an early stage, and this also ensures that the proposed design can be constructed. The traffic model, which Mr. Preet has outlined, is used as the basis to define the design parameters at the outset. The results of this demonstrated that a five Lane main carriage weight is required between junction 17 and junction 18. All of the links are informed by the traffic model to ensure sufficient capacity is provided at the design year, which is 2044, an overarching principle is that the new infrastructure is safe as possible. For example, we have incorporated a hard shoulder, except where land requirements or physical obstacles prevent this. The signage and gantries has also been designed to direct traffic efficiently and safely through the network in line with the MRB. We also consider that the design fits into the local context and incorporate sustainability, as shown on the environmental master plan. We consider that it aligns with the principles which are set out in paragraph 4.248 4.28 of the most recent version of the national policy statement for national networks designated in May 2024 This includes, amongst other things, to avoid or mitigate impacts. For example, The design incorporates biodiversity net gain, which includes woodlands and grassland habitats and tree and shrub species, which will provide similar or improved habitat to the any vegetation that is going to be removed. We've also sought to design the landscaping to take account of the formerly designated special landscape area, although this designation has now been removed since we submitted our documents, for example, we carefully designed groups of trees and shrubs to help integrate the scheme into the surrounding vegetation pattern. The embankment gradients for the northern loop have been reduced to help integrate the road into the local setting. The design is also resilient to climatic variations. For example, the sustainable urban drainage will have a service life of 60 years and has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional runoff associated with potential increases in rainfall intensity of up to 30% the outcome of this design process is a combination of alterations to the existing motorway infrastructure and the introduction of new or improved free flow links at junction 18. This design embeds sustainable and Environmental Design measures as well as ensuring it is resilient, resilient to potential variations in the climate.

49:38

Thank you for that. Mr. White, you mentioned the national highways road to good design, and I've seen that the scheme design report submits that. Would it be possible for that a copy of that document to be submitted to the examination? I know it's publicly available, but if it's got an examination, library reference is always useful that it can be referred to for. As part of the application documents, could that be submitted as part for deadline for submission?

50:07

So Martin white for the applicant? Yes, that's possible. Okay, thank you.

50:18

On the Principles for Good design that's ultimately your principles that could apply to any road project. Did you actually have any design principles set out for what the scheme needs to achieve? So you've got overarching principles for the scheme as a whole, did you actually have any design principles itself drafted for what scheme needs to to achieve at the beginning, and that has followed all the way through your design process. You know how your design has aligned with those principles that were set at the beginning.

51:01

So Mr. Pearce is going to answer this question. Who's our design manager? Yeah,

51:06

thanks, Martin, yeah. Andy Pierce for the applicant. Ultimately, no. Essentially, the basis for the design is initially the design standards, the dmr, as Martin referred to. So no. In terms of those design principles as outlined. It was, it was principally Can, can the scheme satisfied design standards in the first instance, and then we'll see what you know, following engagement with Design Council, where there's value to add through that process, we sought to do that as a sort of secondary backup. Ultimately,

51:37

okay, so there was no initial design narrative No, at the beginning, it was just principles.

51:43

It comply with achieving the scheme objectives as they were outlined in the res. Yeah,

51:47

okay.

51:48

Road investment strategy.

51:50

Has any regard been had to the design principles for national infrastructure, which was published by the National Infrastructure commission in February 2020, in the design, particularly in respect of climate, places, people and value.

52:08

Sir Martin, why for the applicant, I believe that those principles are embedded into the 10 principles of good design which cover those four broad headings.

52:21

Okay, would it be useful if you could put that in a in as an action point, just so to align clearly, just an explanation as to how that's the case. Sir Martin

52:33



white, for the applicant, yes, that's the case. Thank you. I

52:45

Okay, you explained before that it's been an extensive process that you've said you've gone through with the design. So I'm going to turn to the consultation that was undertaken, just to that was undertaken during the pre application stage, just to understand a bit further how the responses that you received on design have been taken into account. So I'm aware that there's detail of this in your consultation report, which is reference a P, P slash 021, and the company appendices, particularly annex Q, which is a P, P, 038, so you undertook a statutory consultation period over six weeks in February and March 2023, I believe. Can you explain further how the consultation has informed the final design you?

53:48

Hi Andy pier, for the applicant. Yeah, I think there is a table within the consultation report which sets out, ultimately, how the applicant has had regard for some of the key issues raised. I can't remember the specific table reference. I think one of my colleagues is going to try and get that for me, but ultimately it schedules some of the key points that were raised by people who responded to the consultation, made representations and where we were, there's opportunity to ultimately change the design in line with some of that feedback we undertook some of those opportunities.

54:25

Yeah, because I did look at those tables, and there was an awful lot of comments in it where you didn't seem to take into account comments that had been made by members of the public or other consultees. And particularly there was the table that had there wasn't very a huge amount. So just useful for you to explain a bit more why some of the comments that you received you didn't take into account. I.

55:04

Yeah. Point notice the applicant, I think, given obviously there's quite a large table with quite a lot of elements in it, if we can respond formally in writing on just to expand on some of the issues that you've raised, that I think that would be beneficial. Thank you.

55:19

Okay, that's fine. Well, we'll add that as an action point for deadline four. And looking at the questions that you asked in the statute consultation, appears to me that it was questions three and four which appeared to be relevant to design, which are detailed on pages 33 and 34 of annex L, the consultation report, and that's document reference, a P, P, 033, and that asked, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the key features of our latest proposals for this scheme? Can you just explain to me a little bit further the rationale for those questions and why they've only folk, or why they only focused on particular aspects of the scheme. So for example, it asked questions such as, are you happy with the location of pond one? It was just specific aspects that were highlighted. I just want to know why that was the case. I

56:30

a philomeson for the applicant. I think when we're sort of scoping out the consultation exercise, you know, we're looking at what information has previously been out for consultation, how things have evolved, you know. So what are the key points, if you like, for this particular consultation that we need feedback on? There's quite a few different elements come into that. I mean, just looking at that, you know, I've not looked at it for quite a while. I hope we appreciate particularly, you know, we're picking up, so perhaps new features that have been consulted on, elements which we would want to draw people's attention to. I think we also sort of think that, you know, the distributions for these consultation bros are quite wide and broad, and so it gives people the opportunity to just comment on those elements and the proposals that are near to where they are or that particularly concern them. So there's quite a few things that leads to us picking out certain aspects about people's comments on but I think probably it's a combination of things like I say, things that we particularly note are new, if you like that particular round of consultation. Sorry, if you just take a moment. I'm just confirming my colleague.  
I

57:48

yeah, I think it's trying to understand, you know, what people would seek to comment on, so that they're a kind of indicator we provide a little bit of direction, I suppose, in that. But then there's open questions also, to invite people just to respond generally on the proposal. The proposals. I think otherwise. I mean, perhaps we can. I think that's probably all I've got to say at the moment. In terms of how we came up with those specific elements in that section three, you'd reference section four as well. Yeah. So there's a general open question, question before, okay,

58:21

so more of like a sifting exercise of what you consider the sort of main issues are, of what's been raised and you focused on that is that sort of what you're saying

58:32

in so much there that we've raised a number of sort of engineering features, if you like, or feature the scheme. I mean, there are other questions on environmental matters further into that questionnaire.

58:48

Okay, thank you for that. I'll just ask the council now, because I'm aware that your response to question, there's 1.1 in our first written questions on design, in which, in summary, stage you are satisfied with the design, but in general, can you elaborate further on the advice that you provided on the design during the pre application stage?

59:19

Please for the council, I think so if we make we come back in writing on that, just because, in terms of making sure you've got an accurate, and I think comprehensive description of it, and we certainly did, and I know it's some writing the statement of common ground,

59:33

but I think that would be useful, because when I was reading through, I saw your response, and when I read through annex Q, which is a very long document of 800 pages, it's very difficult to sort of sift out

within that where the design comments are, because you take each respondent in turn, and it's not done in a topic order, and the tables that we're referring to before, I think. Is 5.14 in the consultation report, then refers back to that table in terms of for looking for more detail. It's, it's just having something in one place which is really summarizing all of the comments that you got from on the design and how they would take them forward. But in particular, in Annex Q, I didn't, I couldn't find anything where I saw the council's comments on design that was done at pre application stage and what you did with that. And I'd be interested to see what comments were provided by the council, just to get the picture of everything that you've done. So if you can pull that together, that's that would be useful. I on,

1:00:53

yes, and if the outcome would like to respond on that, please,

1:00:56

yeah, I think just a point. I mean, we'll, we'll speak to bury Council. I think the reality has been that, you know, I've been chairing a meeting with bury Council on a monthly basis for a couple of years now, and I think they referenced extensively in this statement of common ground. And so we've generally talked about the matters. And, you know, we gave an update on what we're currently looking at, what we're currently developing. So I suspect if the panel are looking for a response on design. I'm not aware of one that we've had that specifically. So I suggest I appreciate the comments around annex Q as well. So perhaps we'll, we'll talk to the council about that, and we can try and put something together so we understand the question, I think, and where you seeking a bit of clarity? I suppose so. But I don't think this particular document in a kind of written response from Borough Council. It's, it's evolved over time, which I suspect is the correct way to do these things, but we can, perhaps we'll come back to in writing on that, but we'll speak to the council about

1:01:56

it. Okay, thank you. I think that's, that's, that's fine for the time being. Is there anybody who wants to raise any comments on what they've heard? Anyone else in the room? Yes, I'll turn to the Hillary family.

1:02:09

Chris Stroud, for the Hillary family, I was interested to hear Mr. White reaffirm that the whole design was based on the principles of biodiversity net gain. We are all aware, I'm sure, of the impact of bng in terms of land take, the requirement to provide land, to mitigate some of the land taken, and the impacts in the recent responses to our submissions, national highways have confirmed that there is no requirement to meet biodiversity net gain principles, and therefore we are concerned that The land tech that they have required of us is grossly overstated.

1:03:06

Okay, thank you. Miss de Hilary, I think we'll probably come on to the merits a bit more of this later on when we talk about the biodiversity. So I think we'll part that issue for the time being. I think it'd be better to talk about that later on, but yeah, we will talk about that later. Okay, I'll now move on to the role of the design review panel, because I just want to understand a little bit more. It's input into this, and we've noted the case for the scheme, and the scheme design report refers to the use of a design

review panel. Could the applicant explain in further detail the role of its design review panel, its appointment and its the personnel and makeup and how it's appraised the design of the scheme.

1:03:54

Thank you. Sir Richard turn on behalf of the applicant, Mr. Pierce is able to walk you through the role that the design panel has requested.

1:04:05

Thank you. Richard Andy Pierce, for the applicant, so yeah, as set out in scheme design report, which is application document, A, P, P, 151, the applicant considers design reviews as a sort of integral part of the process of delivering the design to in accordance with those 10 design principles as part of the road to good design. So through collaboration, collaboration with the Design Council, the applicant has created that independent, independent design review panel in the form of the Design Council, to basically consult on, obviously, the design as a holistic piece, but also as part of the how it fits in within the built environment. So the design panel itself is impartial and has evaluated the scheme design with the remit to sort of constructively challenge the design approach as a whole. And the panel. Helps deliver schemes which benefit local communities and the environment. They provide scheme specific observations and general recommendations that help national highways as the applicant to put good design at the heart of the network improvement. So in terms of the context of how that came about, to the preliminary design stage, we basically a similar time to the statutory consultation process. So back in March 2023 the applicant reached out to the design councils. Obviously, at that point, the design is a sufficient level of detail, obviously, to inform the consultation itself. So they weren't engaged right at the start of the process. As I said earlier, that was the principal nature of the design is based on function of achieving the design and according to the dmr and skill objectives. But then we seek to sort of engage the Design Council, to sort of add some values to some things we may have missed, ultimately, as a collective design party. So that panel consisted a number of key key attendees covering, obviously, things like structural esthetics, environmental mitigation, walking, cycling highs for horse riding experts as well. And yeah, we ended up having a sort of presentation session with them, site visit, followed by a sort of Q and A session, and that concluded with a with a number of recommendations that the council came back to us on, some of which we were able to sort of implement an action, and some of which we ultimately, as part of the scheme, just weren't tenable. And yet ultimately that's, that's how the process sort of evolved and where we are now.

1:06:43

Okay? So it's done in collaboration with the Design Council, who did they advise the of the makeup in terms of the people that are on it as not national highways, employees. It's just independent. Could it be independent? Independent parties? Yeah, it's independent parties. Yeah. Okay, that's fine. And the table that's in the scheme design report that provides a summary of the design review panel's comments is that all of their comments, because there's a letter that says it's a confidential letter, and are all the comments that summarized in that or is it just a selection?

1:07:28

So Martin white for the applicant, all the comments received in that letter are incorporated into that table.

1:07:42

Thank Okay,

1:07:47

and has the design review panel, how the scheme that they considered was the preliminary scheme design? Well, it's the scheme that was in March 2023, how much has that differed from what's before us today.

1:08:09

Andy Pierce, for the applicant, ultimately not, not substantially different, the main, some of the main changes that we made following that process, and was probably like I said, when that occurred in terms of statutory consultation, also occurring at the same time, were principally made as a result of some of the feedback we received at statutory consultation, rather than anything tangible that came out of the the design panel review that said some of the advice received, for example, I think They made a comment on the use of wet woodland planting, which is something that we did end up incorporating into the environmental Master Plan, which is as part of, I think it's application document, which one it is, but it's the ES figures, chapter two that does include wet woodland planting some of the low, lower areas of the scheme. It's app 057,

1:09:15

hey, and because one of the comments they did raise and they strongly encourage the design team to introduce more trees across the scheme. And we heard before from Mr. White, who said that local context, of how that of how the scheme have been taken into account landscape, landscape, surroundings, and you have that response from the design review panel, which you didn't accept and didn't take forward. Is there any particular reason for why that's the case and

1:09:52

appears to be afflict not that I can specifically recall off the top of my head, we'd have to respond and write a review as to review specifically why that? Recommendation wasn't taken forward, I

1:10:02

think it'd be useful because you said the scheme hasn't really changed too much, but there was obviously something in the in the scheme design that was presented that they felt was lacking on a design spectrum, would just be useful to understand a little bit more why that one, particularly when the words are strongly encouraged. So yes, if you could take that away to provide a little bit more information, that would that would be useful.

1:10:30

Yeah, that's fine. Thank you.

1:10:35

And finally, on the Design Review Panel, is there any intention to involve or consult them at the detailed design stage,

1:11:00

and appears To the applicant that is something we are still considering in terms of the value given, obviously, the the how the design is progressing, in terms of the detailed design and the pre construction design, which is now in sort of occurring in parallel with this process, in order to us, enabling us to achieve our sort of start with work state of, sort of Back end of 2025 early 2020 26 the timescales for sort of re engagement with the Design Council as a panel, in terms of the value they could add given the fixity we need within the design now to provide cost certainty and things is something that we will consider, but i We can't guarantee that it would take place.

1:11:41

Okay? Well, we're going to discuss about securing good design coming forward in a bit, so we might come back to that issue, but that's a useful position anyway. Is there anybody in the room? That's all my questions on the role of the design review panel? Is there anybody in the room or online who wants to raise any comments on this? I don't see any hands up. So I'll move on to the next item, which is to discuss pike fold viaduct and pipe fold bridge. So I just want to understand a little bit more the design approach for these structures, because both the case for the scheme that's rep three, slash 018, paragraph, 6.74 and the National Policy Statement, national networks tracker on page 85 state the semester pike Ford viaduct and semester pike for bridge are prominent new structures and have been subject to a design process aimed at providing structures that acknowledge the potential impacts on the wider landscape. Can the applicant explain in more detail the design process that was undertaken for these structures and how this informed the chosen preliminary design presented in sheets 22 and 23 of the engineering section drawings?

1:13:02

Yes. Yeah, yeah, certainly Andy Pierce for the applicant. So as set out in chapter two the scheme with the environmental statement as well as the scheme design report, both the pipe forward viaduct and the pipe forward bridge have been subject to a design process aimed at providing bridge structures that acknowledge the impacts of the scheme and the wider landscape, as you said. Now, the span arrangement of the viaduct has been a key consideration of the design. The structure is symmetrical, in essence, in terms of the span arrangement that it provides in terms of 43 meter span, 56 meter span and 43 meter span, respectively. Ultimately, this aids a more efficient design and also helps facilitate and improve buildability. So that is to say, it sort of contributes to a more efficient fabrication construction and ultimately the erection of the superstructure itself, in terms of the materials that have been chosen. It's a combination of reinforced concrete and weathering steel for the longitudinal beams. This is provided for both the bridge and the viaduct spans with reinforced concrete piers and abutments combined with what we term a mechanically stabilized earth wind wall. So in terms of esthetics over time, as a dark sort of bronze and deep purple coloration forms on the wedding steel. This helps the structures become more recognizable, Gateway features for users of both the M 66 and the northern loop, and the combination of that weathering steel and the landscape planting along with structural embankments, will we think obviously, the way we've assessed it is that it become visually attractive and will help to physically integrate those structures into the landscape, and will provide a sort of strong design statement, the XA will hopefully recognize that a deadline, one the applicant submitted a new examination documents in the form of supplementary photomontages. There's an application

document, PD, one, double, oh, seven. And we think these help illustrate. How these structures would appear to the motorists in the design year in 2024, 2044 Sorry, that was 15 years post. Scheme opening.

1:15:12

Yes, we did see those photo montages, and they were, they were quite, quite helpful. So the design and architect, architectural vision for these structures, was there any design brief that was introduced at the beginning to set, to set this out? Was it just explain that to me?

1:15:34

Ultimately, no, the again, it's the balance of that function in terms of the what does the structure need to do physically to support the actual objectives of the scheme and the highway geometry associated with it? That is to say that obviously, the actual combination of materials chosen ultimately aligns with the way that national highways as an applicant, as a designer of the strategic network as a whole and structures to implement, it's complementary to that as a national approach to their bridge design, and we've essentially followed the same sort of remit, rather than anything specific in terms of a design brief. It's sort of harmonized with national highways approach in general to structural design,

1:16:21

so effectively a standard approach that really could be anywhere ultimately,

1:16:31

terms of the esthetics, was the only comments provided By the design review panel, effectively those relating to pie four bridge. Was there any comments about the viaduct himself, given that that is a much larger structure?

1:16:53

Andy pierce with applicant, I don't recall any,

1:16:59

because I'm trying to understand is, to what extent have you achieved the most esthetically well designed structure that you could it seems like a very standard approach has been taken for this, particularly in your road to good design. You've got some photographs of bridges over motorways that you could argue are quite well designed and esthetically pleasing, and it seems to me that quite a lot has been done in terms of integrating or screening the structure into the landscape, rather than focusing on what its esthetic appearance would be. Is that a fair statement? Just make one or not. I

1:17:50

and appears for the applicant. Essentially, I don't have anything specific to add on that particular point. It's we're essentially delivering a scheme that or delivering structural design that I could say is in harmony with the way national highways approach in terms of the value and economics of structural efficiency, rather than focusing on a new superstructure that forms that gateway. I think that the Design Council made that comment about gateways feature, there's need to be a balance of sort of structural

performance and esthetics. I guess the scheme ultimately is working, also within a constant, unconstrained budget to some degree.

1:18:38

Okay, going back to the consultation that was undertaken was the appearance of these structures actually subject to consultation during the pre application period. So I was looking through the documents and I couldn't see that. All I could see was the layout plan. So was, was that actually subject to any public consultation?

1:18:58

So as Sandy pierce the applicant, so as part of that consultation exercise, we produced a video scheme visualization video which is available, it was available at the time on the national highways website as part of the consultation exercise, and that did feature, obviously, the two prominent structures as part of that visualization. So it was a, it was a, basically a camera flying over the scheme showing how the scheme will look on the ground from a 3d point of view,

1:19:27

but that was the only sort of images that we were able to provide at that time.

1:19:34

Okay, so it wouldn't have been it would have been the the links that were sent out from members of the public, but then the questions that were asked in the public consultation where you selected particular elements of the scheme, you haven't you didn't ask anybody whether they had any comments on the visual appearance of the structures, given that you've said that they've meant to be visually or will be visually prominent structures, and you didn't have. Have any questions prompting people to make any comments on that? Is there any particular reason why that was the case?

1:20:08

No specific reason. No, that's just the nature of the questions

1:20:19

we asked. So Richard Thompson just being advised by the team that the visualizations, in addition to being available on the website, were also played during the public consultation events.

1:20:40

Okay, staying on this topic. So paragraph 4.35, of the national policy statements here states where a number of different designs were considered applicants should set out the reasons why the favored choice has been selected. We've seen that from high level alternatives, such as between the northern loop or the inner links. But were there any other options for the appearance of the viaduct and bridge that you explored, or was what you've presented in this application essentially the only design that you came across and appears

1:21:16



to the applicant? So ultimately, as part of that design development and sort of the organic way that that develops. Several structural options were considered early on in terms of the different form and function of those, those two bridges, in terms of the potential pier arrangement, the span arrangement, all of that was considered and went through a sort of critical review process, as with us as a design organization, but also our client has got with costing as the contractor to essentially evaluate the best form of structure we should take forward those documents. Obviously, they're internal, and that's that's essentially a sort of internal design process that we undertook, but it hasn't been formally issued as a publicly available document.

1:22:07

Okay, thank you.

1:22:14

So, is there any what? What aspirations have you got for the finished quality of the end product of these? Because they're obviously a preliminary scheme design. Now they need to be designed in detail. What's your aspirations going forward on the viaduct and the bridges to ensure that the design, and particularly the visual appearance of them, minus any landscaping around them to try and screen them? What's your aspirations that they are going to be esthetically pleasing and visually attractive as they can be in your final design, you

1:23:06

so Richard thurling, on behalf of the applicant, I'm mindful that in the scheme design report, it talks about the different types of materials and weathering. But is that something that we can perhaps expand on and come back to you in with a written response?

1:23:20

Absolutely, that's fine. We'll just add that to as an as an action point. I

1:23:43

Okay, that's, that's all the questions I had on the divided and the bridge is, does anybody want to Mr. White, yes,

1:23:51

sir, could

1:23:52

I just clarify you mentioned 4.35 of the National Policy Statement? Can I just clarify it? Because I don't have it right in front of me is that the 2024 version,

1:24:04

it will be the 2015 version that I've referred to, adopted 2015 but initially he's got dated 2014 If you see what I mean,

1:24:20

yeah. Dated December 2014 designated 2015 Yeah, thank you.

1:24:31

Okay, I'll just we'll go through the last item on this agenda before we'll take a break, which is securing good design at the detailed design stage. So as I said before, you've got a preliminary scheme design that's been submitted in this part of application that's going to be designed in detail, which would be secured under requirement three of the draft development consent order. Could you just provide a little bit more further detail of exactly what further design work is needed to get to your detailed design? So.

1:25:12

Yeah, Hi Andy Pierce for the applicant. So every individual infrastructural element, so that's obviously the geometry, things like the fencing design, the drainage design, geotechnical design, etc, all goes through an element of polishing and final specification in order for us to basically, like, say, comply with both the dmr, but also the mch, which is the manual contract documents for highway works and those the mch outlines the sort of specification for for materials and such like that need to be used to build a scheme that level of detail isn't, isn't wholly embedded within the initial preliminary design process that then been used to inform the submitted design for this application. But then the pre construction design that we are like, I say, we are ongoing with that activity now starts to bring that information into into the into the design as a whole, to help inform that final scheme cost ultimately, and polish the details of how we're actually going to construct it In finite detail.

1:26:19

Okay, so heavily influenced by the dmr, by the sound event,

1:26:24

yes, okay,

1:26:26

because you haven't got any, you didn't have any design principles set out and and in schemes that we've seen, we have had sort of high level design principles set out for particular topics, for the final design to achieve. So that could be a design of contain things like design vision, scheme objectives, where is, have you got any sort of document that's going to bring all of these together? Because obviously, at the me, you've got the register of environmental commitment and actions, which has got various different mitigation measures that are proposed for various topics, mainly during the construction stage. Have you got anything that would bring everything together for design in terms of principles going forward, so that your design, detailed design going forward, actually adheres and takes on board everything that's within the application document.

1:27:35

Nothing specifically could that. Sorry Andy, personally applicant, nothing specific of that exact nature, we will wholly rely on a combination of the specifications, the dmr, the principles we've already sort of discussed as part of the road to good design, the requirements of the NPS, and, again, as you allude to there, the commitments in the React. But as things stand, there isn't any one document that helps sort of enshrine all those things together and cover them off as a holistic piece.

1:28:09

Would it be useful for you to produce such a document through the examination that then could be tied to requirement three, so that we can see exactly what the what design principles you're going to take going forward in the final design, which has been done on other national highways schemes.

1:28:31

So Richard thurling, on behalf of the applicant, I think this point we can take away and consider, I'm mindful of the reference to the React, and of course, that instantly makes me think of actually requirement four, which requires you to then produce the environmental management plan and secures all the commitments that are in the React. So if we take that away and give it some thought, and then can come back to in terms of whether those commitments are actually already secured, or how they are, or whether there's something we can include at requirement three, as you talk about in terms of specific to design, which is where I think your point was starting from.

1:29:12

It is because they're obviously two very different things. So that's obviously the React, or register of environmental actions and commitments has its own purpose under requirement four, mainly through the design stage and sort of mitigation going forward on certain issues. But this is very much specific to design. Is what we're doing, which is requirement three. So yes, more than happy for you to take that away and consider that.

1:29:35

Thank you, sir.

1:29:42

Is that okay for deadline far, or do you need longer?

1:29:49

Thank you. I think in terms of considering the point and coming back to you, that'll be fine for deadline, for whether we need to make any adjustments to something like. Third draft eco, we've committed to do that for deadline five. So it might be that cascade.

1:30:05

That's fine. Thank you.

1:30:11

Okay, that's that's all the questions I had on securing good design. Does anybody have any points they wish to make on this in the room? On this agenda. Item? Is anyone online? No, okay, well, the time is half past 11, so I think it is now time. A good time to take a break. So we will take a 15 minute break, and we will reconvene at quarter to 12. So this This hearing is adjourned until quarter to 12 so.