



Hearing Transcript

Project:	M60/M62/M66 Simister Island
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Session 3
Date:	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_SESSION3_26112024

Wed, Nov 27, 2024 6:14PM • 1:36:14

00:05

Hey, good afternoon. I would just like to say that I'll start again. Can I just check the live stream has commenced?

00:18

Great. Thank you. And can everyone hear me clearly? Great. Okay, so going to move on to item six on the agenda, traffic, transport and access. I'd like to start by asking the applicant just to spend a few minutes to set the scene with respect to the traffic modeling and the works proposed at the semester Island and the surrounding roads.

00:41

Yep, so good afternoon. David Prater, for the applicant, yeah. So our transport assessment document sets out the process that we followed to undertake the traffic modeling for the scheme, but I'll briefly summarize some of the key points of that process for the benefit of today. So we've we followed department for transports, transport analysis guidance tag in the in the process that we've applied to Undertaker traffic modeling. So the first, first step of that process is to develop a baseline model to reflect observed traffic conditions based on survey data of traffic counts and journey times and people's movement patterns through the network. Now that baseline model had two key components to it, there's the traffic assignment model, which is based in Saturn software, which is an industry standard piece of software that we use to undertake traffic modeling. The second component is what's called a variable demand model, which is based, again in industry standard software, this time it's called diadem. So the first part of that modeling system, the traffic assignment model covers the road network across the whole of the Greater Manchester area in detail, and that bit of the model determines the route that the vehicles take to travel through the road network, and therefore the travel times and delays and flows on each bit of the network, the second part, the variable demand model, seeks to predict and quantify changes in travel demand in response to changing travel times and costs from from the baseline, and that bit of the model picks up four key responses to changing traffic conditions. So firstly, it accounts for people changing where they travel to. So trip distribution, it accounts for when in the day they travel. So if the peak periods get more congested, some people might choose to travel off peak or in the middle of the day. Instead, the variable demand model also accounts for people choosing to travel more or less often depending on traffic conditions. And then finally, it accounts for people choosing different modes to travel by. So the choice between public transport and driving, for example, is picked up within that component to the model. So these, these two bits of the model, they iterate back and forth. They pass information back and forth between between the two components, so demand and travel costs. So we developed this baseline situation, and then we, we then seek to

forecast future scenarios from that baseline, and as alluded to this morning, as part of that forecasting, we take account of local developments that are considered more likely to come to come along, as well as picking up traffic growth forecasts released by the Department for Transport so their National trip end model, and also National Road Traffic projections. We develop forecast scenarios for a world where the scheme hasn't been built and for a world where the scheme has been built, so with and without the M 60 junction 18 scheme in the model. And then the difference between those two scenarios, allows us to measure the impact of the scheme. So the modeling system picks up a number of responses to the scheme. So it will pick up how journey times are forecast to change due to the additional capacity, but it also accounts for how drivers respond to the additional capacity. So whether that's people taking different routes through the network because of the the extra capacity provided by the scheme, or whether that's people changing their travel demand behavior in any one of those four responses I outlined earlier in response to the scheme. So. So in a nutshell, that's the traffic modeling process. But happy to answer any further questions.

05:10

No, thank you for that. I understand the junctions currently stated as they're having a capacity of 90,000 vehicles. What is the junction capacity going to be with the proposed scheme

05:23

depends a bit how, how you measure junction capacity. So in terms of putting an actual number on it, I think I'd want to take that away, rather than kind of quoting numbers off the cuff that may be misinterpreted.

05:42

I Okay, we've put that in as an action point. Then it's just because the junction mistake is currently it has a capacity of 90,000 we just want to comparison number. Just want to move on to induced traffic. A number of representations raised a concern about the traffic model, and in particular, the proposed scheme would attract more traffic to use the M 60. The concerns relating to traffic being induced by the scheme weren't specifically responded to by the applicant. I do note the case for the scheme so A, P, P, 146, paragraphs, four point 5.4 4.5 point 13 and four point 6.8 do mention there will be some traffic induced or attracted to the area by the scheme. But doesn't supply any more detail you just give us, gives an idea of how much traffic you think would be induced by the scheme. What part of the network would this traffic affect? So would it be all on strategic road network, or is it going to affect the local road network? And how's this additional traffic being incorporated into the

06:42

modeling? I Okay, so yeah. David Pater, for the applicant again, yeah. So depends a bit how we're defining induced traffic in this context. So as I was outlining before, the traffic modeling accounts for different responses to the scheme. So there are the modeling is the modeling forecast that people will reroute off the local road network and use the strategic road network instead due to the capacity enhancement and the improvements in the journey time. So in one sense, that's induced traffic in the very local area of the scheme itself. But that's that traffic has transferred from from other roads. For example, the a 56 The second aspect of induced traffic are those travel demand responses that the four that I outlined earlier, and again, the modeling has accounted for that, and the traffic numbers that

are presented in the transport assessment show the combined impact of that rerouted traffic plus the travel demand responses together,

07:48

I think, in the purse submission, if you could just supply that detail, because I'm conscious that people did raise it in relevant reps, and there wasn't that sort of detail in the response, and there are no More concerns about that. That would be really helpful. I just have another question in in layman's terms, what effects will there be on the adjacent junction system as well interchange, if this improvement went ahead? So what people are concerned about is, obviously, you know, junction 18 gets improved. Traffic moves through there quicker and hits junction 17. And what? What's going to be the effect in those locations, particularly at peak times?

08:26

Yep. So the the traffic modeling work considered a wide area that the model covers Greater Manchester, and so looks at junctions upstream and downstream of junction 18, the the transport assessment has a plot showing the changes in traffic flow on different bits of the network. So junction 17 in the westbound direction, it's noted in there that there would be an increase in in traffic throughput a peak time at that location. So I guess every, every scheme you put in has has an upstream and downstream effect to a greater or lesser degree. And the traffic modeling and the benefits, consider the overall, sorry, the overall, overall impact across the whole network, not just junction 18 itself.

09:25

So this is slightly verging into the need for the scheme again. But Can you detail how this induced traffic's been considered in the benefit cost calculations? Because obviously you're improving one area might be putting more traffic into into another. How does that all add up?

09:41

Yeah. So the benefit calculations considers the overall origin to destination of people's journey through the network. It doesn't just consider the journey, time savings experience on the specific links that comprise the scheme. It looks at where people have traveled from and traveled to, and looks at their end. When journey times. So if there's an improvement on one bit of their journey but a worsening on another bit of their journey, then it will consider both of those things together in the benefit calculation.

10:11

That's really helpful. Thank you. And you're posting the submission, if you could just include that, that detail again, explain that. I think that would be really helpful to the people who've raised these concerns. Yeah, yes in the XQ one question, TTA, 1.1 we asked the council if they were satisfied with the transport modeling, and in particular, did they have any concerns that the proposed scheme is predicted to cause an increase of traffic on the local load Road, local road network, referring to a P, P 149, paragraphs, 4.2 point 10 to 4.2 point 16. The Council responded, saying they were satisfied and referred to the forecast traffic increase on the A, 56 the council's response didn't specifically reference the forecast traffic increase to the A, 576, which is covered in paragraph 4.2, point 11 of app 149, can the council confirm if they have any concerns about the predicted traffic increase on this road, and just

comment generally with their content, with the modeling completed by the applicant, including what they've Just heard in respect to induced traffic?

11:22

And appears Riley Smith for the Council, as I understand it. I mean, the council is overall satisfied in terms of that particular road. I think it's correct that we don't specifically reference it in terms of I think our preference would be just to respond in writing on that, if we may, in relation to that particular road, and to confirm we have heard what has been said, We previously were satisfied. We will confirm in writing, also that we continue to be satisfied, given what we've heard. But just, I'd rather, in relation to that particular road, just ensure we can go back and provide a response in writing, yes.

11:55

Okay, thank you for deadline for please. Thanks. Does anyone else have anything that like to add before we move on to the next agenda item, which is about safety? Okay, so I'd just like to start with the applicant to spend in a few minutes to explain the accidents and casualty impact data that you give in Section six of the transport assessment. I

12:25

So David Pater for the applicant. So I suppose similar to the similar to previous question, perhaps be helpful to set out very briefly, the process we go through to analyze and to develop the forecast accident impact. So again, this is outlined in the transport assessment. But just to summarize the key points of that, we've used parliament for transports standard approach, which uses some software called cobalt, and that software considers the accident rate and the flow of traffic on links across an assessment area. So the area that we've undertaken this assessment on includes both strategic roads and local roads where the scheme is shown to have a significant impact on on the traffic flows. Things also important to define a couple of things here. So there's accident rate, is a concept that we talk about in the transport assessment, and that's a measure of the number of accidents, or the number of casualties per billion vehicle kilometers. That's the standard unit used. So that measures the likelihood of an individual driver being involved in an accident as they pass through the the road network. And then there's the the second element is the the absolute number of accidents and casualties, which is very much a function of the traffic flow on the road, rather than the inherent safety or otherwise of a of a specific link. So for example, maybe to help highlight the difference between these things, we could have a very dangerous road with a very low flow of traffic on it, which would have a high accident rate, but it would have a very low number of absolute accidents because there's not many people using it, and vice versa. So you can have roads that carry very high volumes of traffic, that are much safer than other roads, which would have a lower accident rate, but a comparably high number of absolute accidents. I hope that's clear. So the transport assessment talks about both of these concepts. It talks about the accident rate in the in the scheme area, and it also talks about the absolute numbers of accidents and the absolute numbers of casualties. And so, as noted in the TA, the scheme is forecast to reduce that accident rate within the assessment area, meaning that this. Is making it safer for the individual driver that passes through the scheme that the individual driver is less likely to experience an accident than the situation without the scheme in place. Schemes also forecast to reduce the absolute number of accidents in the assessment area. I don't have the table reference, I'm afraid for that one, but it's, it's in the it's it's in the it's in the section of the of the TA, I think there's some specific effects it's

worth highlighting as part of this. So junction 18 itself, the free flow loop that the scheme is, is introducing for that anti clockwise 60 movement removes traffic from the junction. So it removes traffic from the roundabout, and therefore removes the number of conflicts that are occurring between vehicles, and therefore reduces the accident rate at junction 18. The scheme is also, as previously mentioned, forecast to result in a transfer of traffic from local roads onto strategic roads. And so roads where the accident rate might not change due to the scheme experience flow changes due to the scheme. And so, for example, local roads that experience a reduction in traffic flows will experience a corresponding reduction in accidents and vice versa, on strategic road network links. And I suppose the case in point of that is junction 17, which was mentioned in the in the gender item here. So whilst we're not changing the layout of junction 17 in terms of the offline, off SRM components of that junction, the scheme is forecast to attract more traffic to that particular location so the accident rate doesn't change, but in our forecasts, the absolute number of accidents will increase slightly in line with the increase in traffic volumes.

16:57

Thank you. Yeah, that was one of my questions, because I know in the response to relevant vet 46 You did say that we you'd reduce collisions at junction 18, but conversely, it would increase collisions at junction 17. So it is because of just the induced traffic and the extra vehicles that will be in that area.

17:15

Yes, that's right. Okay.

17:19

So just just looking at the northern route, northern loop, I assume, due to the geometry of the road, there will be a speed restriction for drivers using the northern loop.

17:34

And the first one. Hi there, Andy Pierce, for the applicant, in essence, no Not, not formally, in terms of the regulation in terms of a change in speed limit. The speed limit will be as per national speed limit, because it is a motorway to motorway link, so the speed limit will still be 70 mile an hour, but we will be advising a 40 mile an hour limit on it. But essentially, it's almost self policing to some degree, given you've obviously got relatively tight geometry. It's not, you know, overly tight. It's not a compact grade loop. The radius is 150, meters. Is quite, you know, it's within tolerance for the for the link we provide, providing, so accompany that with the provision of Chevron signs and warning signs. And obviously, people will feel the need to decelerate anyway, purely because of the geometry involved. So there won't actually be a formal speed reduced speed limit on it, like, say, it will be self blazing to some degree.

18:32

So you don't need anything in the DCO to cover sort of any speed reduction, because you're not enforcing a speed video, correct?

18:49

Is there any examples of strategic road networks where you do actually have an imposed speed limits changing between motorway junctions? And if you do, is there a particular threshold that it has to meet for that to be imposed,

19:04

not motorway to motorway. You do get it at compact grade junctions where you're moving from, say, the strategic road network to local road network, where you've got really tight geometry and obviously preparing motorists for that change in speed limit once they meet the local road. But where we're moving from interchange from motorway to motorway. It is convention. It is quite a conventional approach to provide advisory warning signs for your speed limit, rather than actually regulating the speed limit down to a to a reduced speed. Okay.

19:36

Thank you. Just looking at the novel loop again. Do you think there could be any potential driver confusion for those wanting to travel from the end 60 eastbound to the M 60 southbound, being that to do this, they have to pull off left to go right. Just wondering whether stage one road safety audit picked up any issues. In this respect,

19:57

I might switch to my colleague online. Jamie Castle, if he's available, please.

20:05

Yeah, good afternoon, everybody. Jamie castle for the applicant. So in terms of that, we've done quite a lot of work looking at the that issue. It's something we are aware of and have addressed. So we're looking at maximizing the signage that's provided, and that's including signs over the traffic lanes to give clear and direct guidance to motorists which lane they need to be into to complete the the turn of that junction. It's not a completely unique in situation. There are a number of junctions around the network where, in effect, you have to be in the left hand lane to turn right. So we're looking to address that through through the signage and clear information to motorists. One of the things we have picked up as well in terms of rotating for that is when it comes to actually opening up the scheme, looking to work with the satellite navigation companies to make sure that the scheme is in its layout is is provided to motorists through the satellite, satellite navigation systems as well.

21:10

That's that's useful to know. So from what I understand, if drivers did make a mistake and headed to us around about they won't actually be able to access the roundabout at the M 60, and I understand I just wonder whether emergency services would be able to actually access the roundabout. And have you spoken to the emergency services?

21:31

Yes, so correct in terms of the general public, they won't be able to access the roundabout. But what we are doing as part of the design is maintaining the existing link from junction 18 onto the circulatory carriageway for the M 62 sorry, for the for the M 60 and that will be for use for the police and for the traffic officer services. We we've had discussions with them about that, and the arrangement is being

designed so that it doesn't look as if it's a through route. We're going to use the alignment of the safety barriers to to make it look as if it is closed off. And there will also be a gate on that link as well to deter motors from doing that.

22:14

Thank you. And will that also occur at I think it's the get this right from the roundabout onto the M 60 southbound. I think that access is also going to be restricted. That

22:27

that's correct as well. There won't be in that particular location. There won't be a gate provided because of the particular layout. But in that particular case, it would only be people who have got onto the roundabout by mistake that would look to use that location. Sorry, look to use that cut through, and we think from the way the design is going to be that that won't actually happen.

22:49

Okay, thank you. Thank you for that clarification. Does anybody else have any questions or issues in respect to safety before we leave this agenda item and move on to noise and vibration?

23:01

No, okay.

23:05

So item seven is noise and vibration. I just want to start with looking at the 75% activity time value, EXQ, one question, MV, 1.3 queried the activity time used in the calculation of noise from construction works. And in response to the question, the applicant confirmed that they considered the figure 75% for activity was a reasonable assumption, as it was never the case that all items of plants are continuously on operation for the entirety of a working shift. Just want to spoil us a bit further, I understand from your response that a figure of 75% assumed that plant and equipment will be in operation for typically nine of the 12 hour day or night shift, and this allows for breaks in the working shift, as well as downtime periods, for example, when plant has been moved into position. In paragraph 11, point 8.7, of chapter 11, it states that in addition to the 12 hour shift, there might also be an hour before or after for site setup and to close down. And these activities would include deliveries, movement to place of work, and general preparation of works. It appears that there's that would include moving and planning to position, and it sounds like this activity has effectively been double counted. So

24:24

hi, Maji sto noise and vibration lead for the applicant. Yes, that does sound. I can see how you've read it that way, but we still feel that on balance, an activity time 70% 75% across a typical shift, is probably a reasonable representation of how the construction sites work.

24:51

Okay, in response to our question, MV 1.3 it was confirmed that in the 75% figure, that was. Not including generators which will be operational 100% of the time. Can you just give me some detail how

noisy the generators and why is it appropriate to include them in the 75% figure when they're operational for 100%

25:11

of the time, just to confirm that 100% was used for generators in the calculations. So perhaps that wasn't made clear.

25:22

So typically, so they're not included as part of the 75% that's right. That's great. Thank you. I understand 83% was used on the a 12 chance for two, a 120 widening screen scheme. Why is it appropriate that this scheme is considered to use 75% and why is this lower for this scheme?

25:45

It's just been our judgment on this scheme that that's an appropriate figure. It's a question of professional judgment,

25:54

really, can you? Can you give me a bit more in terms of the differences between this scheme and and so the eight a 12 scheme, why? Why is one? Because it's quite that's quite a bit of a difference between 83 and

26:10

75 the some, some of the working areas on this scheme are more constrained, so there's more time to move around. Needed to move things around. As I understand it, I think the day 12, it's got wider working areas.

26:27

Do you think you'd be able to maybe come up as an action point? Just, just giving me a bit more detail to justify why it's 75% on this scheme and not a higher figure,

26:36

we can take that away and look at it certainly and

26:40

with that, I just wanted, do you have any actual activity data from construction sites so you could back check to see if 75% is reasonable? We

26:48

don't have that kind of data. No.

26:55

Does anyone have anything that's like to raise on this before we move to nice, important areas? I

27:06

So A, P, P, 050, table, 11.34, details predictive noise, level changes in noise, important areas. Could we share that table On the screen please? I

28:00

I apologize. Paragraph 11 point 10, point 29. States, there were predictive reductions of up to 5.1 vessels in road traffic, noise levels for some receptors within the noise, important area, 1671 that in the short term would be noticeable and considered to be a likely significant beneficial effect. Can the applicant just explain what will be the effect on the noise? Important areas, all of them in the long term for this scheme,

28:42

my G stay for the applicant. Over the long term, we've concluded that the changes are not not significant.

28:52

So just paragraph 5.2 100 of the national networks National Policy Statement states that applicants should consider opportunities to address noise issues associated with important areas identified through the noise Action Plan process. What opportunities for this scheme Have you considered to address the noise issues in the nice, important areas

29:14

I do stay for the applicant, we've provided the better performing low noise surface, which does provide beneficial impacts in the short term, it's just over the long term period those those impacts reduce,

29:33

yes, so considering that, obviously you want to treat the noise at SARS by doing the Low Noise surfing. But have you considered adding more noise barriers to the scheme, which would maybe address the noise issues over a longer period?

29:50

Mind you stay for the applicant, well, we look at the way we look at noise mitigation is in a hierarchy, in a hierarchy where we started source. And so what we've done here. So we've looked at applying mitigation to the source, which is the low noise servicing, and because that has provided benefits within not looked at providing additional barriers. However, there are already existing noise barriers alongside the scheme, so by making these a little bit total, the other potential benefits from that are much less than if you were putting a new barrier in where there isn't one already.

30:26

So it might be helpful if we could just show the noise barriers. That's figure 11.1, A, A, P, P, 071, so I understand that there's no new additional noise barriers being proposed to the scheme. It's just replacing the existing ones where you need to,

30:47

mighty Stephanie applicant, yes, that's correct. Yeah. I think there's one that needs to be moved. Yeah,

30:52

and that's just because of the widening of the scheme. It's not, it's not moved in sort of position in relative to the road.

30:59

Yes, that's right, to make space for the carriageway realignment.

31:05

So maybe you should just zoom into the M 60 section. Thanks. So the blue, the noise barriers, the yellow areas are the nice, important areas. There's, you can see from the image, there's a few areas where you're in the nice, important area and there is no noise barrier. Have you considered putting noise barriers in those locations, and would that improve the noise impact on the road in those locations?

31:37

Might you stay for the applicant we haven't considered in detail, no, because the provision of the better forming low noise surface does provide us with noise reductions in the short term and then a neutral effect over the long term.

31:55

But if the national policy statement says that you should be looking for improvements, should you also be considering the noise barriers so that in the long term, you have improvements to the noise levels in those in those areas, but just, I'm just saying, because there's gaps at the moment where there's no barriers, I think we'd

32:14

have to look in more detail at what space is available there and whether noise barriers are feasible.

32:19

Can I leave that as an action point for you just to just to consider noise barriers and give me some just a little bit more detail on what's happening to the existing barriers. Yesterday, in the compulsory acquisition hearing, we did talk about a fence that was being discussed adjacent to the M 60 at the end of Warwick Avenue. I appreciate you weren't in the hearing yesterday. I just wanted to check whether this fence was well, the was one of the noise barriers that we can see on here. Now,

32:47

do we sorry? Mind you? Stephanie, is there this fence? Has anyone got a location of that?

32:58

So is it the end of Warwick Avenue? It was a resident was was asking about the fence and wanting to confirm whether that was a noise barrier and what was going to happen. Happened to it?

33:19

Might you stay for the applicant? And from, from the description, it seems like that's part of EBO four, which is in in the noise modeling, yes,

33:26

yeah, there was some discussion about maybe vegetation on that noise barrier, and something was going to be done to tidy up, to improve, improve the noise but I just want confirmation of what We know about that noise barrier in that location. I

33:45

uh Tony West. And for the applicant, as I understand it, the works proposed there are clearance works and to tidy up some of the vegetation, I don't believe there's any proposed works to the actual structure of the fence there.

33:56

Thank you for that.

34:02

Um, would the council like to make any comment in relation to the noise important areas and the the noise barriers proposed for the scheme?

34:17

Piers, Ronnie Smith for the council, no matter. Okay.

34:21

Does anyone else have anything they'd like to raise on noise before we move on? Okay, I'll now hand over to Mr. Robinson for the next few items on the agenda.

34:34

Thank you. So moving on to air quality. Just want to discuss and establish the current situation with regard to air quality, given that a number of representations we've received have raised concerns with what they consider to be poor existing levels of air quality in the locality, I'll start with looking at the baseline data that the applicant has presented in their environmental statement and. Then we'll turn to the recent results submitted by the council in its response to our first written questions. So I think just to start the discussion on this item, it would be useful if the applicant could just briefly outline its approach to the air quality assessment and particularly how you've established the baseline conditions.

35:22

Thank you, sir. Richard thurling, on behalf of the applicant, we're joined by Dr Hazel peace online, so if I can introduce her, and she'll be able to provide you with that clarification. Dr peace,

35:37

I'm Dr Hazel peace, I'm the air quality lead for the applicants. And so in general, for the assessment, what we do, similar to the sort of like the road traffic modeling, is we do a baseline where we sort of where we already have pre existing and it's the same base year as the road traffic modeling. So we

take the road traffic model data for their same base year. We run it as for our base year as well. We take account of the sort of like the road traffic, so the number of vehicles on the road, the speed traveling on all of the roads within the area that we're studying, and then for that base, and we predict results at any monitoring sites that are on in the that are in the vicinity. And then what we do is we compare for the baseline. In this case, it's 2018 the monitored, and the model results to see if that methodology gives a reasonable prediction, and then assuming that it does give a reasonable prediction, or we look for sort of like issues with it and adjust model and so on. But we then use that same methodology, knowing that it's given reasonable predictions to then predict the model concentrations in the future. So we've done two different years which are sort of like the worst case construction year, and also the open year, which is also the worst case from an air quality perspective. And we run those with and without the scheme, so that we can see what the difference in the impact is. And I suppose, in a nutshell is how we do our assessments, and it's based on the dmr, la 105 standard, and then within once we've got all our results, we look at them and assess them again against the criteria within la 105 standard, to see what is classed as significant, What isn't significant, and come to our conclusion. So that's that's, broadly speaking, how we do our assessments.

37:46

Okay, thank you. So the monitoring stations that you've referred to, that you've used, are they, yes, monitoring stations that have been installed by the local authority and transport for Greater Manchester for their monitoring purposes? Or does it also include national highways monitoring stations as well? Within the strategic road network,

38:07

it includes both all of them. Basically everything we can find. There is a summary table, which is table 1.5 in appendix, 5.1 which is app, dash, 079, which shows all the monitoring data that we've used.

38:28

Somebody could just display that, I think that would be quite useful. And then you could just help talk us through that table, and we'll just get that displayed. I

39:09

Yeah, this is table 1.5 the correct one. So you can see we list in the second column the source of the table. So if we just so this, the initial ones are sort of like, well, that their buries, bu standing for bury, and that those are the sites that are within a reasonable distance of the what we call the affected road network, which is where what we base our modeling study area on. And then there's a few more sites going down. If you could please scroll down and then these are some of the Rochdale sites, Salford sites. The ones starting with DT are scheme specific monitoring that we put in place to try and sort of fill any gaps that we felt might need to be filled as much as possible. Um. And similarly, the ones starting with J scheme specific. And then there's some highways England, or national highways. There were, I think, called highways England, when maybe the monitoring was undertaken, that have been on, that have been sourced as well there. But unfortunately, they're only available for some 2015 and 2016 those locations not available later on. If you kept me on scrolling down, I think that might be maybe, I think the rest of them. Oh, some TfGM. So these are some of the TfGM sites that are used in the cap modeling that they do and the assessment of limit value compliance. So we use some of their sites as

well. So yeah, that's the summary of all the sites. There's quite a lot. And you can see as the scroll through, the ones in bold are the ones that are currently exit. Well, I say currently. These are, this is past monitoring that are in exceedance up to 2021 because at the time when we wrote it, that was the latest year that we had available. So you can see there, there's some TfGM sites that are exceeding something so like the very being, one site is exceeding up until 2021 but say, like very dash b3 is not exceeding at all in any of those years. So it air pollution varies quite a lot spatially. Do you want to scroll up again? We do have modeled base year results as well, which we could show. So the thing I suppose, about this is there are some locations that are exceeding and some that aren't. The ones that tend to be exceeding in our in our base line analysis of monitoring data tend to be related to major road network and also the motorway network, and that, that's what you would expect to happen in sort of like the recent past.

42:11

Okay, thank you for that. Dr, peace, that's that's really useful. Just saying where you're the scheme specific monitoring stations is that monitoring stations that you've installed just to get further readings for this specific scheme. So they're additional to the to the existing ones. Okay, that's really useful. And the locations of all of these monitoring positions are there, illustrated on es figure 5.3

42:38

Yes, correct,

42:39

yes. And they've got the labels on as well, I think, as well. If you go into the zoomed in version of 5.3x in different sheets,

42:49

okay, that's, that's fine. If you scroll down to table 1.6

43:01

so there's that. So you've got this different zones one, two and three. And this is just a clarification question. Are those the zones that are identified on figure 5.3 because I think I just they refer to zones on that figure. And I was trying to work out whether it was this table was the cross yes, we're

43:20

trying to identify different types of locations so that we could group them into zones. And this is part, this is part of our verification, where we compare the monitor to model data and how well the model is performing in different zones. So that was sort of, we had a, sort of like we had a an area where the between junction 1718 with a lot of noise barriers. And that was one zone we had an air that was, I think I would have to check on the figure to check which zone it was, but you should be able to see on the figure. And then there's another zone, which is other locations that are close to the motorway network, and then there's non motorway network zone as well. So those are the three zones.

44:08

Thank you for that. Just in very simple terms, you have to make adjustment to the figures to in order to so you've got your 2018, baseline figures, and then you had some readings from, I think, 2021 and then you had to do some adjustments so that they correlated with the baseline figure. Could you just explain in simple terms why you have to make those adjustments

44:39

so the scheme specific monitoring we had to do in a year where we could go out and do the monitoring, and that was in 2021 but the actual base year for the traffic model is 2018 so we had to back project those. And monitor concentrations to another year is explained in this appendix in detail, and what we do when we do that, we take account of the changes in vehicle emissions over time as well, so we up uplift those concentrations in line with what would you, you would expect for that particular year? And then what we also did is we compared the adjusted the ones that were taken from 2021 the scheme specific to 2018 on a site by site basis. There were some that were sort of that were co located with pre existing local authority or TfGM monitoring. And so what we did is we compared what our adjusted value was for 2018 with the actual value for 2018 and they compare, compared very well. So it showed that the adjustment was working.

46:03

Thank you for that expression that's helpful. Your modeling predicts that air pollution from the 28th baseline to the year 2028 and a due minimum scenario would naturally decrease. Could you just set out your reasons for this, and the evidence that exists that this is the case?

46:26

Well, it is generally accepted within sort of Defra, and you know, generally speak and Europe, across the world, that vehicles are getting cleaner the so Defra provide emission factors for different years, and it's based on a rollover model of, sort of like the vehicle data, so how old vehicles are, and then, sort of like they look at, I mean, I'm paraphrasing for what defa do, as opposed to what we do, but they look at, sort of the the vehicle age profile within a given year or over a number of years, and then they say, okay, so it the rate that sort of people are buying new cars or lgvs, and so it's changing by this amount. So therefore, we'll assume that going forward and as new vehicles are bought, we know that new newer vehicles, they are less polluting because of different, sort of like emission standards on them, so that the the emissions over time are coming down. So that's taken into account in the modeling as we go forward and and we we sort of like use the Defra approach to sort of like model our emissions, or the Defra emission factors. However, given past uncertainty over the emissions in the future, we also provide, uh, include an uplift factor as a sort of worst case, just to make sure that we're not under predicting. And it's referred to as long term trends, which is also in this, that same appendix, it's discussed there.

48:20

That's fine, but it's also useful for you to set that all and explain that for us as well. So that's that's been really helpful. Thank you for that. So I'm going to turn to the to the council now, because I'm going to ask about your monitoring, latest monitoring figures. So you submitted, you submitted the Greater Manchester Combined Authority 2023, air quality annual status report as part of your response to our questions. And we've put that as examination Library Reference, rep, 3034, and you provided a

summary of those latest findings in your response to a Q dot 1.2 so just to set the scene for the discussion, could you provide a brief background of the current situation with regard to air quality in well more within your local area, rather than the whole of Greater Manchester, and particularly The areas that are exceeding limit values and also the relationship of these to the strategic road network.

49:32

Awesome. Yeah,

49:33

hello. Rebecca Jones from Derry Council, so yeah, the in Greater Manchester, we look at air quality in a GM across GM as a total so we we submit one annual status report. So we've got two sets of monitoring network. So one is the local air quality management monitoring, and that's specific. That has to the locations. Have to meet specific criteria. So they can't be they have to be so near, near a road, or so far away. There's, there's different urban and rural networks. So So for 2023 none of our diffusion tubes or automatic monitoring stations, which we have four of, exceeded the air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide. So in addition, transport for Greater Manchester also have a network of diffusion tubes that monitor for nitrogen dioxide. And these ones were they're placed to monitor the impact of the Greater Manchester clean air plan, which was to include a clean air zone, which hasn't been put into place yet. So they they the locations of those tubes don't necessarily meet the requirements for just the local air quality management scheme. So out of those, there are there actually four diffusion tubes. I've realized that one of them, although it's got a bury reference, is actually just into Manchester City Council's area, but it's that's the one that's off junction 19. Just

51:40

to assist with your clear note on that the the Miss, as it were, titled berry tubes, is actually in Manchester, is in AQ, 1.2 there's a list in the fourth paragraph down of the tubes. It's cat berry 006 is actually the one that sits within Manchester. Just give you

52:09

a clue. Yeah. So of these ones, the maximum concentration, so these are annual concentrations for nitrogen dioxide, was 44.3 so that was off. Sorry, that's the one that's in Manchester. Sorry, so yeah, the nearest ones to this scheme is cap berry 004, and that was monitoring 42.8 micrograms per meter squared, in cube, sorry, in 2023 and this one is located on very new road, and it's approximately 125 meters north of the roundabout of junction 17. So that's on the a 56 so generally, overall, the air quality in Bury is improving year on year.

53:20

Nothing more to add.

53:22

Okay, thank you so, yeah, when I when I read the document, my understanding is the monitoring stations for the Clean Air plan for monitoring roadside locations, whereas the local air quality monitoring locations are to monitor exposure locations of relevant public exposures, such as residential properties. Is that correct?

53:48

Yes, that's correct.

53:51

Okay, thank you. In terms of the Clean Air plan on page X VI of the local air quality monitoring status report stage government gave Greater Manchester until July 2022, to present a revised plan to achieve compliance levels with of nitrogen dioxide on the local road network in the shortest time possible, And by no later than 2026 so and then also your response to question. AQ, 1.1 states the Clean Air plan will address exceedances for nitrogen dioxide on Greater Manchester roads, with the exception of the strategic road network. Can you just explain to me where the division is between what the council monitors and what national highway monitors as part of its strategic road network.

54:51

So Rebecca Jones for bury Council, sorry, can you just

54:58

Yeah, essentially what I'm trying. To intercept because bring national highways in a minute, because it's the Clean Air plan, saying that the responsibility for measuring the strategic node network is with national highways. But a lot of the monitoring stations are actually on the other side of the motorway. But they could potentially be the figures could be that all the monitoring results that can could be from air quality, from the strategic road network. So what's the relationship between the two different monitoring regimes, and what they're, what they're the results that they're monitoring, and then obviously, the measures that need to be taken to reduce any exceedances.

55:37

So the the local air quality management network. That's about monitoring what we would call relevant exposure. So it's about where people would ex. You would expect a person to spend more than an hour. So, so we only monitor on those, those areas. We've also, we've got four monitoring automatic monitoring stations. So these are more accurate than the diffusion tubes, and give monthly and real time data, whereas diffusion tubes just give an annual figure. So the the idea of those is to monitor our compliance with the air quality objectives, and that is a 40 micrograms per meter cubed. So that is also the same as the limit value which, which we need to meet everywhere, as opposed to just in the relevant exposure places. So that's what the Clean Air plan is going is is designed to do.

56:53

Okay, so in So in particular, the monitoring in locations that's either side of the motorway, places like Kensington street or Warwick Avenue which back onto the motorway. Any exceedances within those areas. That's not within the strategic road network, but would be within the council's area. Does that fall on the council's responsibility to try and reduce exceedances, or does it fall on national highways?

57:20

I think that would come on, sorry. Rebecca Jones, Borough Council, I think that would come under the local authority, because there would be relevant exposure there.

57:38

Thank you for that. That's set the scene a little bit for the discussion that we'll have in Agenda Item 8.4 so that's that's useful. Thank you. Just to clarify, are there any areas that's currently exceeding particular matter 10 to pm, 10 limits within the council's area,

57:58

there are no areas. Rebecca Jones, there are no areas within bury that exceed for the current pm 10,

58:05

okay, and the same for pm 2.5

58:10

there are no legal limits for pm 2.5 at the moment. Okay, yeah,

58:15

I've seen the responses to questions on that, so I don't have any further questions on that at the moment, some of the written representations that received from interested parties raised concerns with illegal levels of pollution within sinister. Can you confirm whether sinister is currently exceeding exceedances and limit values?

58:39

Rebecca Jones, my understanding is that none of our diffusion tubes located in semester exceed the air quality objective for nitrogen dioxide or for pm two point pm 10.

58:59

Okay. Thank you.

59:09

So based on the discussion that we just had there, comparing the findings in Table five point 15 of ES chapter 15, which shows the locations where concentrations of nitrogen dioxide have been exceeded, and with the local air quality monitoring results, is it the case that the current situation with regard to air quality is is better than what's presented in in the environmental statement? And that's an open question, and I'll turn to the well alternative though, because I'll turn to the council first for you, for you to respond, is that, is that the case?

59:48

Um? Rebecca Jonesboro, Council, we can only know what the measurements are within where we have monitoring, where we have diffusion tubes. So. So the current modeling for the Clean Air plan only shows, I think, potential areas, the only areas in bury that will be expected to currently exceed the air quality objective is more near the center of bury, an area we would call bury bridge. I also believe there was some an area on the a 56 north of junction 17 that was highlighted by Defra as an area that might exceed the limit value.

1:00:42

Thank you. I'll turn to the applicant if you want to make any comments on on what you've just heard.

1:00:49

Thank you so much. Turning on behalf of the applicant. I can see actually. Dr, peace is coming online as I speak, so yes, invert to Dr peace

1:01:00

i Dr peace with the applicant, please. Could you confirm which table you said in the chapter? I said

1:01:09

table 5.15 of the ES chapter, and we will be, I would imagine it's air quality.

1:01:18

It will be, yeah, I'm just, I know.

1:01:23

I mean, whether it's the appendix or whether it's the actual chapter itself, I think

1:01:28

it's the actual chapter. Yeah, so I found it now, yeah. So that shows locations where it's exceeding in 2018 I suppose it's worth pointing out that this is 2018 so we were modeling the past year, for which had to correspond, really, with the traffic model base year as well. And 2018 is quite a long time ago now, whereas what bury NBC have been talking about is more recent monitoring data, which is not showing in a lot of those locations, apart from north of on north of junction 17, on the a 56 there isn't really now any exceedance. But in 2018 there was

1:02:17

okay. Thank you for that. I is that brings an end to my questions on this agenda, and so I now open this up unless ms Holmes has got a question. So is there anybody on online? I know we've got friends of Carrington moss that is here today, and actually you've got your hand up, I wonder whether you want to make any comments on what you've just heard.

1:02:47

Yeah, I'm astounded. I think it's amazing that there's been such a massive improvement in air quality Since 2018 without needing to go to the expense of implementing a clean air zone. I think there needs to be a lot more consideration of this issue. Are we going to come on to talk about pm, 2.5 and the new targets that are coming into play? Because I do think there are issues. Greater Manchester, as part of places for everyone, has put in place a number of allocations that will have large warehousing developments, and they are going to put 1000s of HGVs on the road. And however much vehicles are improving their ability to support cleaner air. The HGVs are moving a lot slower than anybody else or any other type of vehicles, and those vehicles will all use the SRN and will all be diverted during the construction phase onto local roads. And many local authorities, and I assume the local authorities involved in in this scheme are doing what they can to encourage people to use active travel as a means

of getting around, and this is going to increase their exposure to all types of pollution, but particularly pm 2.5 so I think there needs to be a lot more consideration of the of the air quality issue. I don't know whether you're planning to come on to talk about the targets that are being introduced with the environment act at all. Okay?

1:05:00

Yeah, it wasn't due to be part of the discussion today, but I'm on the agenda. But whilst you, whilst you've raised it, what I will do is let the applicant respond to the comments that you said, that you've made. On onto PM, 2.5 if the applicant would like to respond to the comments made, please. Thank you.

1:05:26

Alright? So I was just pausing originally, on behalf of the I can see dr pieces just, just coming off, on onto screen, so I'll allow her to come in now.

1:05:36

Um, we, yeah, we have, I think, previously responded to this before, in terms of the legislation and national highways interpretation of the legislation. It's also in the chapter five, the air quality, which is app dash zero, 44 again, there's a summary paragraph five point 3.5 which explains what the interpretation of that is, which is basically that the environmental targets apply at the monitoring locations. That is how it will be assessed whether the UK has met those targets. So it's and I think we've, we've provided more response in let me just see. Or we're in the process of providing it, I think, for the next submission for d4 Sorry, I was just trying to multitask via lots of different documents. Sorry,

1:07:06

Richard Thompson, I think Dr peace is referring to the fact that we, we did, of course, provide a response to it was the AQ, 1.6 in terms of the question there, which touched upon. PM, 2.5 I think the point has been raised by friends of Carrington moss in their deadline. Three, response. And of course, we are preparing a response to that for deadline four, in case that assists in terms of covering matters swiftly today,

1:07:36

thank you for that. I'll bring friends of Carrington moss back in because you will have heard what's been said. Is there anything you want to add to that? Is obviously some some responses from and we asked some questions as well on pm, 2.5 in our first written questions. And it sounds like the applicant going to respond to some comments in deadline, for which obviously, then you'll you're welcome to read and then respond to it the next deadline. And of course, we will. We will take those, all of those comments into account. Is there anything you want to to say at this moment in time?

1:08:12

No, thank you for giving me the opportunity and and yes, I will respond to to their response, if that, if that's necessary, I think the only point I wanted to finally make is that, you know, air pollution is a killer. So if we're going to put if we're going to generate increases in traffic, increases in air pollution and other pollutants, then we should be really serious about monitoring what the impacts of those are. And whilst

the legislation does at the moment require monitoring at the locations where the monitors currently are, it did include the opportunity for new monitors to be put in place, and I'm frankly quite astounded that it isn't being expected, particularly by bury Council, that new monitors are put in place to enable a clear understanding of the impact on the health and well being of local populations as a consequence of this proposed development. So thank you for that.

1:09:37

Okay, thank you for your comments. There is anybody else that wants to raise any comments on on this particular discussion we've just had no okay, that's fine. I will move on to talk about now about the impacts from construction, so questions to the applicant is. Noted that paragraph 5.4, point six of ES chapter five states a construction just assessment has been undertaken in accordance with DMR B, LA, 105 which identifies all sensitive receptors within 50 meters, 5200 meters and 100 meters to 200 meters of all construction activity bounded by the order limits, whilst the XA recognizes that this distance has been driven by dmrB standards. Could you explain further why 200 meters was considered an appropriate distance for this case, with regard to any local circumstances.

1:10:49

Hazel piece for the applicant. That's what the dmrB, la, 105 standard says to assess. It's quite similar also to the the Institute of Air Quality Management dust guidance, which also suggests 250 meters. So it's similar. But the reason behind that is that dust is quite large particles, so it doesn't tend to travel very far. And we've, we've based it on the actual boundary of the activity during construction our assessment.

1:11:36

Okay, so because of that, you're you, you have the opinion that all premises and locations that may be affected by dust emissions within those 200 meters, or even just beyond that would be, would be covered in the assessment. And the reason I'm asking that is because of the particularly given the location of the construction

1:11:56

compound, yeah, well, we've used the boundary, so if someone could bring up, I think is it Just trying to look at which figure it is. I

1:12:24

by figure 5.7 in app zero, 15 nine, you

1:12:49

so this, this shows you can see, you can see that the order limits is the thick red line. So we have based our assessment on that thick red line. So it takes into account what anything that might happen up to the edge of that order limits boundary. So in a sense, it takes go it's a worst case, and then that assessment then highlights the level of mitigation. So it gives it a level of risk for dust and dust effects, and we've assessed it as having a high risk. So even if we assessed further afield, it wouldn't matter, it would still be high. High is the highest you can go in terms of risk for dust. So we've assessed it, and we've assessed it as high risk, and that means that the mitigation we have then puts in the the first

iteration of the environmental management plan, appendix. A had to sort of check the title of this outline, air quality and dust management plan, which is AP dash, 128, the mitigation in that is the worst case mitigation. So we've put in the worst case mitigation, and that's based on best practice. And with that mitigation in place, then in most normal situations, it would mean that the impacts from dust, construction during construction would be insignificant. So

1:14:23

okay, I'll come on in a little bit about the how the mitigation will likely work. But just staying with that plan on the screen actually, and in table, 5.21 as well, which actually, I think, sets out the number of receptors within these areas within the 5200 to then 200 meters. We asked a question on this in our first written questions, and it related to. The content of paragraph, 5.57 of ES chapter five, which basically stated that the limits of deviation could result in minor changes in the number of reported receptors in Table 5.21 which, as I just said, I think, is the numerical figures for what's shown on this plan and figure 5.7 that could be affected by construction activities, although this would not change the conclusions of the dust assessment, which, as you said, it would be high risk. What we asked was you to identify the changes to the reported receptors for dust assessments which could be affected through the limits of deviation. I don't think the response really answered what we were looking for. We were actually looking to see if there was any changes in the limits of deviation. Would the number of receptors that are illustrated on this on this plan, and also those that are within table 5.21, in ES chapter five. What's the likelihood of those changing? Could they increase, or could they decrease?

1:16:13

If that order limits boundary changes. So, if the order limits boundary changed. So the limits of deviation, it depends on whether it's within the order limits boundary or not, and somebody else might be able to better talk about that. But if it increased the number, it wouldn't change that. It was high risk, so it wouldn't change the mitigation. So it's, it's, it's got the maximum mitigation it can have, in essence. So it wouldn't actually make any difference to the conclusion. But in terms of the order limits, I think somebody else was going to come on. So

1:16:59

thank you. Dr fees, sorry. So Richard sailing on behalf the I think it was just I think it was just to clarify as I understood Dr Peace's earlier response. She explained that the assessment had been done to the edge of the red line there, which is the order limits. And your question was relating to limits of deviation, which sort of within the order limits. Is that the order limits wouldn't extend beyond the beyond the red line boundary. So I think when you when we get that point of clarification that so there wouldn't be a change to the receptors we've already assessed, the worst case was because we've gone right to the edge of that red line boundary, rather than the limits of deviation for the road.

1:17:38

That's fine, that that answers the question, but the responses combined definitely answers my question on that. So thank you very much.

1:17:51

And the high risk that has been assessed, has there been like in other chapters of the environmental statement, where there's likely significant effects, has a similar approach been taken in this case, to identify what the significant effects would be prior to mitigation, or is that high risk? The assess effectively the assessment. So it's not saying whether it's a moderate adverse effect, whether it's a major adverse effect. In this case, you've you've just done, whether it's high to low risk, is that the assessment effectively of significant effects prior to doing any mitigation, your mitigation? Yes.

1:18:34

So it's high risk before mitigation. And this, this is basically based on the dmr, la, 105 standard, and this is what it says that you are meant to do. So, as it's a national highways project, we follow the dmr standard, and that all you do is you just define a level of risk based on the number of receptors and sort of professional judgment.

1:19:04

Thank you. And moving now to the proposed mitigation measures that you referred to before, which could you explain a little bit further how the measures that you're proposing to do to manage construction dust risk would successfully mitigate dust, and I'm particularly interested how particularly interested how you would do it from the stockpile areas. So I know yesterday, and I think it was early on today, we had a plan that showed the stockpile areas in the construction compound. Could you just explain a little bit further to me how you would mitigate the dust emissions from the stockpile areas. And could you just advise any of any projects where you've done this in the success or otherwise of of those mitigation measures? And the reason, I say is just because of the very close proximity to residential properties in this particular scheme

1:19:57

for the applicants. Um. I think I'll certainly have to come back to another project. But in terms of So, Appendix A that Dr peace referred to the environment first iteration Environmental Management Plan lists out quite a long list of mitigation measures that cover a number of factors and so there you talked about the stockpile area. So there's just some of those that would apply, I would suggest. So it talks about locating just cause, just causing operations away from residential properties. In terms of that, I suppose we talk about the North West quadrant that we've been talking about that quite a lot. And so those you'll see the stockpiles are over towards the junction, I suppose, rather than closer to properties of Marston, close mode, Hill lane. So that's one of the mitigations outlined. Is to site those materials as far away as reasonably practical. We then talk about covering, seeding, fencing stockpiles. So some stockpiles of materials brought in and are used then pretty quickly. So, you know, there's no opportunities really address them other bonds, such as topsoil, for example. So I talked yesterday about how we would typically strip a site, strip the topsoil, bond it. We tend to do that put it out the way, really, because that's they're not going to be used until the end of the scheme, or when we're landscaping. Those kind of buttons that are going to be there for a while, as one of the mitigations outlined. So the covering seeding to prevent that wind spread, that's one of the specific items mentioned. So that will be relevant. And so longer term storage, that is where that mitigation is relevant, that we can dress and seed in some cases. And we certainly have done that. I'm just trying to see if there's any other of the specific elements that relate to storage and materials. I suppose part of the process of storing materials is the haulage aspect. So we have haul roads. They're marked on the

palms, referred to extensible. Yesterday, I've learned it now at 057, so the haul roads are in there. There's a number of mitigations, again, in appendix A which relate to haul roads. And so that track in, track out, dust suppression on haul roads and such like. Again, that's all part of the package and measures, and those ones will be specifically related to the activity mentioned of Bund. So, yeah, the different materials as well cause different dust issues. So a clean aggregate doesn't has low dust content, if you like. I suppose soils and things like that high dust content. So it's a little bit different depends what we're storing. And so we'll follow that. I suppose there's a bit of a hierarchy there in terms of designing the layout of the site first, and then practical measures that perhaps happen on a daily basis, if you like.

1:22:47

Thank you. Yeah, if you could expand upon that in a post hearing submission, because obviously, we've, we've seen the mitigation measures, it's just ensuring that we can be confident, when reporting to the Secretary of State that those mitigation measures are likely to be, you know, successful. And that's really what we're sort of trying to seek, the clarification on and the confidence on that the measures that you're setting out will be able to work. So if you could, as an action point, include what you've what you've said, and expand upon it, even if it's just some examples of how that's worked in other schemes, particularly if you've got other schemes that have been close to residential areas, such as this, and whether the measures that you've done have actually been successful, I think we would find that quite helpful.

1:23:32

Yeah, that's totally understood. I perhaps can't promise to go for deadline four. Maybe we'll see what, but it's only about deadline five, if not

1:23:41

before, yeah. I mean, aim for deadline four. But if you need more more time, then okay, we'll, we'll put deadline for slash five and our action points, and we'll see what comes in line four. Okay, I'll just, the only final thing I want to talk about on construction is just the how the construct, construction traffic on air quality has been determined, and particular how you've decided the model routes. It's obviously been there's a link here between what the machine, what the transport modeling has done, and it's taken that. But if we could look at, if we could turn to figure 5.8 and I want to look at sheet three of 28 in particular, I'll get the reference number. It's

1:24:40

so it's a PP, dash, 060, and.

1:25:17

Yeah, that's

1:25:20

okay, what I'm what I'd like a little bit just explanation on is how the modeled routes have been included, because I've read that there's this thresholds of how you've determined these modeled

routes, and am I correct in saying that these are these modeled routes have been included because they're they're of a certain traffic volume that's with within these roads. Is that correct?

1:25:53

Yeah, so, so the Hazel piece for the applicant, so the dmr, la, 105 which is a standard that we follow for national highways. There is a definition early on in the guidance, a screening definition, which basically says if the annual average daily traffic flow changes by more than 1000 on a sort of like a two way link. So that's two way traffic combined, or the speed chain, or the number of heavy vehicles, changes by 200 or if for national highways modeling, if the speed band changes. So that's a sort of like a band of speeds, whether, whether it changes, some say like high speed, low speed, or congested, so uncongested, then you that is how you define the roads are affected. And if you go beyond that area, then it's unlikely that you would have any significant effects. So we defined what the affected road network is, which is the purple lines, that's our affected road network in 2028 for construction. And then the sort of like little dots that you can see, those are the modeled receptors, which are within, sort of like key locations, worst case locations, within 200 meters of the affected road network. And what you can see also are the different colors. I think if we scroll down, you can actually see zoomed in areas, possibly, um, yeah, so it then zooms in the different sheets. Zoom In just to make it clearer, but you can see that a lot of them are yellow, which is an imperceptible change. So that is such a small change in concentration that it's it's classed as imperceptible. It's, in essence, not classed as a change. And then the locations where you've got, you've got also got small decreases, which are the sort of like the light green ones, and then you've got the sort of like the slightly orange ones, which are small increases. And I think if you zoom in, yeah, the around the junction, if you're actually looking at a beneficial impact, because you've got a reduction in air pollution during construction, and that's because a lot of the traffic changes on the sort of like the motorway network around here during the construction, it's either going on other roads, so it's been diluted onto the local road network, which and the but the traffic changes on those roads are not high enough to class be classed as significant. And can I tell you about this? If you wonder why there's a transect. We put one in just to see so this sort of like the north west of the sort of junction 18 that's that's in there to just see what sort of like the impact will be on that parcel of land near to the junction. But you can see, if you can go up to, I think it's sheet one,

1:29:27

please, which is the zoomed out version with all of the receptors in,

1:29:35

okay, that's, yeah. You can see here that the basically green, or which is a small decrease, or they're imperceptible, which is the yellow. So we're not it's actually improving it, because it's diluting the traffic on the, sort of like strategic road network, onto the local road network. But it's, it's, it's a, sort of like a dilution over what. Different local roads rather than one particular road, and that's based on the traffic modeling.

1:30:09

Okay, thanks for that one location that I'd just like to just for clarification on. If you go back to sheet three and we zoom in, you have a number of, yeah, if we zoom into a Derwent Avenue is we have

1:30:30

that's fine. We have a

1:30:33

This illustrates, effectively, the modeling ending halfway down the road and then mode Hill Lane hasn't been included. Is there any particular reason why mode Hill Lane hasn't been included? Given the access to the construction compound

1:30:52

is, well, it's not in the traffic model, as you can see, I think, and it doesn't actually trigger. So you can see that the roads going up to mode Hill are orange, so they're not part of the affected road network, and if mode Hill was triggering, so that the number of vehicles going down it aren't high enough to trigger a significant change in air quality. Basically,

1:31:17

thank you for that. That's all the questions I had on construction. Does anybody want to raise any points? From what they've heard, no, and we have Yes. We've got a light hand upon line from friends of Carrington, moss.

1:31:37

Yeah, sorry to keep on about this, but the traffic changes during construction will obviously reduce traffic on this part of the strategic road network, but if the traffic goes the other way around the M 60, then surely it's going to increase pollution on those parts of the network. And if it goes off the strategic road network onto local roads, and it seems there's an expectation that a lot of local roads will be impacted, not just one, then it's going to increase pollution on those local roads. What mechanism is has been put in place to monitor the levels of pollution that are going to occur as a consequence of this so on those local roads, for example, that the construction traffic is going to be diverted onto. Will the pollution levels be monitored and the on the strategic road network, if the traffic goes the other way around the M 60 to avoid this area? Will the pollution levels be monitored there too. Thank you

1:33:07

for that. The applicant like to respond to that point? Please.

1:33:16

Hi. Dr Hazel peace, air quality for the applicants, we would only monitor if there was a significant effect, and as there are no significant effects, we have no plans to do any monitoring.

1:33:36

Just to expand on that a bit more by significant effects, are you meaning exceeding limit values, just to Yeah,

1:33:42

so exceedances of the air quality objectives or limit values, or, I suppose, substantial increases as well. And we're not, we're not seeing that in what we've looked at. So you can see from that figure that the

Arr, a lot of the the weather, significant traffic changes are happening, that you're either getting a negligible change or imperceptible change, or you're getting a decrease so it's, it's not okay if there's nothing, that's,

1:34:28

yeah, I can see turn back

1:34:32

to friends of Carrington Moss, that's, that's obviously the applicant's

1:34:38

position on that. Yeah, you

1:34:39

want to add on that, yeah, if

1:34:41

you don't mind, just like to mention that we've talked about places for everyone, and its impact today and all the additional traffic that's going to ensue from that. And so we're in a position where we have 90,000 vehicles a day on this part of the MO. Away, and that traffic's going to be diverted onto local roads, or certainly some of it is, and it's not going to cause any increase in air pollution. It just isn't believable. I'm sorry. So I mean, as I said, as I said earlier, I think this needs to have a much more in depth consideration and certainly more monitoring. Thank you. Okay, thanks

1:35:35

for that. We're obviously going to be coming on to the need for any monitoring in item 8.4 so I think we'll park part that issue there, but I've heard the point. So thank you for your contribution. There any other comments on this agenda? Item 8.2 No, okay, that's fine. Well, the time is we've been going an hour and 35 minutes now, so I think we will, we will take a 15 minute break, and we will resume at 10 to four. So we've we'll adjourn this hearing now until 10 to four.

1:36:06

Thank you. Applause.