Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Project
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) - Part 2
Date:	16 September 2026

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.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:09:26 - 00:00:20:29
Welcome back, everybody. It's eleven forty, and issue specific hearing six is resumed. So we're on to item three on the agenda, construction HGB flows on key routes.

00:00:23:06 - 00:00:38:01
In opening, could we please look at tables three-three, three-four and three dash five of the applicant's Rep five one zero seven. It would be helpful if we could get table three dash three on the screen. This is in relation to peak and average daily movements.

00:00:51:12 - 00:00:52:16
Great, thank you.

00:00:55:05 - 00:00:58:02
Table three- three

00:01:01:12 - 00:01:19:28
seems to imply there would be less peak daily movements to Limedown D West, which would be past Bradfield Cottages. Can the applicant confirm this is due to a longer construction program for the four hundred kilowatt substation rather than a reduction in HDV numbers on the route?

00:01:20:10 - 00:01:28:28
James Dale for the applicant, yes, that's correct. We've added in a longer programme for the four hundred kilobytes BEST which you'll see spreads that out a bit as well.

00:01:29:00 - 00:01:38:17
Okay thanks. So based upon your revised numbers then, are the total number of HDVs increasing on this part of the route those over originally assessed?

00:01:40:03 - 00:01:47:14
Yes, they will be increasing because obviously it's sorry, for the four hundred kV we've extended it but kept the number of trips the same.

00:01:49:14 - 00:02:00:25
Yes, I appreciate the extension of program. I'm just trying to determine if the HGV numbers on that part of the route increases overall from your original ES assessment.

00:02:01:12 - 00:02:09:13
Well, the overall HGV numbers have increased, yes, the from original ES assessment based on what we've discussed this morning. MS

00:02:10:22 - 00:02:14:00

can we come down on the screen to Table three-four?

00:02:19:04 - 00:02:28:28
MS Thank you. So this is supposed to represent annual average daily traffic HGV movements for each of the sites, or AADT.

00:02:31:29 - 00:02:45:05
I just when I when I saw this table, it just seemed a little unrealistic to me because it spreads the construction HGV trips over the total two year construction period as opposed to just the number of construction days.

00:02:48:01 - 00:02:57:26
So I just wonder if table three dash five isn't a more use isn't more useful at gauging average daily traffic than table three dash four.

00:02:58:25 - 00:03:20:10
James, doubtfully applicant. Table three-four was just to illustrate what average trips look like. Obviously, when you work out the ADTs for the baseline, for example, it is every single day of the year, and so if you're comparing to that baseline, you to have include every single day of the year. So that's why it that's all we were doing now was

00:03:20:12 - 00:04:00:03
just covering. Okay, thank you. That's a helpful clarification for me. For that table and then subsequent table, which is three-five, I want to specifically look at column two, and it says the applicant's assessment, excuse me, AADT. But if I look at table thirteen-twelve in the transport assessment, which is REP six thousand and fifteen, those numbers are different. So the annual average daily traffic numbers recorded for Limedown A would be ten, Limedown B would be eight, Limedown C would be fourteen, Limedown D West would be six, thirty and Limedown D East would be sixteen.

00:04:00:13 - 00:04:06:13
Limedown E would be twelve, respectively. I think the numbers used in that column too are actually the peak numbers,

00:04:08:25 - 00:04:10:25
not the AADT numbers.

00:04:12:25 - 00:04:23:15
So we wouldn't be comparing apples with apples, but the applicant just wants to take a look at that and confirm for me.

00:04:31:05 - 00:04:34:10
James, I'll just dig out relevant the bit. You.

00:04:40:24 - 00:04:47:18
In the ES, the AADT, the peak was used for the AADT in the ES.

00:04:47:23 - 00:04:53:23
It might be helpful then if we bring up that Table thirteen-twelve of the Transport Assessment, REP six-fifteen.

00:05:13:00 - 00:05:34:06
Yeah. So I've got it here in a paper copy, and it says average day HGV movements, ten, eight, fourteen, and, obviously, Limestone D West is spread across different. And then it says peak eight, six, eleven, nine. But if we go to the bottom row, peak HGV movements with a fifty percent uplift, where that's you get your sixteen, twelve, twenty two, and so on. That was in your other table.

00:05:35:22 - 00:05:49:10
So I'm confused. The table we just had on the screen was showing average annual daily movements, and yet you're using the peak day HDV movements as the comparator.

00:05:59:11 - 00:06:38:00
So if I go back to your Rep one hundred five, which is what, again, I've got here in a paper copy, it doesn't say in section three point four that you're comparing peak day movements, you're comparing average day movements. So we should be using the average day movement numbers. And it matters so much if we go down to the next table, three-five on screen, because if we were to put in the figures of ten, eight, fourteen, thirty six, sixteen and twelve in the second column, then we'd have more pluses in the difference column than we would minuses. So

00:06:38:02 - 00:06:38:17
So

00:06:39:23 - 00:06:42:26
unless I'm getting something wrong here.

00:06:43:20 - 00:06:59:18
James, obviously, I know you're correct. So the second line column is average. The first column is peak, which is what we in the ES was the peak, and assume that was the AADT. So the first column is the AADT and the second column is the

00:06:59:22 - 00:07:13:18
Yeah, no, no, I realise that, but that doesn't correlate with table thirteen-twelve where you clearly say your average day movements and your peak day movements. So it's an average or is it a peak in that column too?

00:07:15:28 - 00:07:18:28
Because it says average, not peak.

00:07:19:00 - 00:07:21:00
Yeah, it's average in column two, is what

00:07:21:02 - 00:07:23:00

I'm saying. Right, so the numbers are wrong?

00:07:23:03 - 00:07:32:23
So the first, yeah, because it's not comparing the peak, it's comparing the ADT, which is the peak, against an average number. So sorry for the confusion, but you're correct, yeah.

00:07:32:25 - 00:07:48:13
Yeah, so those tables are not reflecting. Table three-four and three-five will need to be rerun and new assumptions made by the applicant. Action that for deadline Deadline seven. seven.

00:07:54:03 - 00:07:54:20
Okay.

00:07:56:11 - 00:08:04:09
Just before I move on to my next point, is is anybody else confused by what I'm talking about, or am I making sense?

00:08:06:00 - 00:08:08:00
Bruce Bamba, stop lying down.

00:08:09:18 - 00:08:15:15
You are you are making sense. Although when I looked at these tables,

00:08:18:25 - 00:08:31:26
reaction was, well, these don't reflect what we should be looking at. So I haven't really looked at them any further. But I agree that they if they are reworked so they do reflect what we're looking at, then they could be useful.

00:08:32:15 - 00:08:33:09
Thank you.

00:08:36:08 - 00:09:15:10
Okay. So the increase in overall HGV numbers and the adjustment to peak and average daily numbers has the potential to have notable on impacts key sections of the construction route network. And we talked about this very briefly yesterday, or mister Northover did when he was covering impacts to the Cotswold National Landscape. So as listed in the agenda, I'd like applicant and the Stop Line Down to explain their position on the daily generated construction vehicle movements on key sections of the network. The agenda for this hearing noted we'd be reviewing flow diagrams on page one forty three of Stopline Downs Rep four one three two.

00:09:15:12 - 00:09:55:12
But in light of mister Bamba updating his transport figures in AS zero twenty eight, I think it's the flow diagrams in that document we shall be looking at. Just because that would be a slight alteration to what's said in the agenda. And we'll be comparing those with the applicants' Rep five one hundred seven, the ones in appendix B. So just give a summary of what I think are the differences in flow numbers by the parties. Mister Bamba noted the following impacts on several key links. For example,

forty nine percent increase in HGV movements on the road east of Halvington, but a hundred and twenty five percent increase through Bradfield Cottages.

00:09:56:08 - 00:10:28:05
The applicant's flow diagram states a forty percent and one hundred and thirteen percent increase on these links respectively, so a lower increase. For Acton, Tervill and Burton, stop line down considers there would be one hundred and thirty two percent increase in HD move HDV movements on this part of the route. The applicant's diagram suggest one hundred and five percent increase. For Burton to Gristleton, stop line down consider a hundred and seventy eight percent increase in HGB movements. The applicant suggests a one hundred and forty one percent increase.

00:10:30:20 - 00:10:51:23
And then then along the southern part of the Foss Way, stop line down, considers there will be a three fifty one percent increase in HGB movements, but the applicant's diagram shows a two sixty five percent increase. And I think I've reflected what's in those flow diagrams, but I can be corrected if I'm wrong. So I'd like to understand from the applicant and stop down,

00:10:53:20 - 00:11:12:09
irrespective of the conversation we've just had about HGV numbers, but based upon your submissions in Rep five one hundred seven of the applicants AS028 of Mr. Bamba for stoplighting down if those flow numbers remain as presented, or if there's anything happened in the intervening period between those submissions and today that I need to be aware of?

00:11:14:11 - 00:11:15:01
James,

00:11:16:14 - 00:11:20:25
Daryl from the applicants. No, there's been no changes to our numbers.

00:11:22:01 - 00:11:23:12
Mr Bamba?

00:11:23:19 - 00:11:27:21
Mr Bamba, stop line down. No, I agree that they are still the current numbers.

00:11:27:23 - 00:11:45:02
Okay, great. Coming on to the next point then, and I think I know the answer because I think it's in all the documentation, but let's air it. What would be the implications of those flow numbers on those routes? Mister Bamba, I'm going to come to you first, please.

00:11:45:09 - 00:12:12:09
Thank you. Bruce Bamba, stop line down. Okay, so let's start at the western side. So we're looking at the B4039 through Acton, Tervill and Burton, which is the part of the route that goes through the national landscape. We've got increases in HGVs, daily increases, of over one hundred percent on both sections of the road there.

00:12:12:11 - 00:12:17:05
Could we zoom in on that? Oh, perfect. Thank you. Applicants' team are on it.

00:12:18:18 - 00:12:24:03
I think that's the wrong one. That's the applicant's one.

00:12:24:05 - 00:12:27:19
Yeah. Need to come into AS twenty eight,

00:12:30:11 - 00:12:32:03
and it would be the last page.

00:12:40:08 - 00:12:41:19
Yep. That's it. Yeah.

00:12:45:24 - 00:13:10:09
So the these are numbers particularly important in relation to the national landscape. There was a discussion yesterday about tranquility and some discussion about the significance of these in relation to the tranquility of the national landscape. I have identified sensitivities in both Acton, Tervill and Burton.

00:13:12:02 - 00:13:41:15
In terms of Acton Tervill, the B4039 goes through the center of the village. There was a primary school in the village. If you've crossed the road between one half of the village and the other, at that point, you you will have experienced the difficulty in actually seeing to the north as you're crossing the road if you're going east to west. So it's not the easiest road to cross as it stands. There's no crossing facilities on the road in that location.

00:13:41:25 - 00:13:46:11
Is that is that the Tormaton Road? Is is that where you mean?

00:13:46:23 - 00:13:47:08
There's a

00:13:47:10 - 00:13:48:26
pub on the corner of bottom hand.

00:13:48:28 - 00:13:50:11
Yep. That's it. Yes. Yeah. Yes.

00:13:52:28 - 00:14:25:04
So increases in traffic flows and HGPs at that location will have some impact on in terms of severance and potentially also highway safety. In Burton, the road gets quite narrow. There are sections where the pedestrians need to walk, within the carriageway either end of the village because there's no footways. There are dwellings that, open straight onto the back of footways as well. The road again separates north from south.

00:14:25:06 - 00:14:39:14
There's destinations on the northern side of the road. So increases in traffic there and increases in HGB flows will affect people adversely. I

00:14:41:12 - 00:14:46:08
think that's all I need to say about that section increases of the construction route.

00:14:47:05 - 00:14:51:14
In terms of the impacts that you've just stated,

00:14:52:29 - 00:14:57:26
if we think of it from an EIA perspective, where would how would you?

00:14:58:20 - 00:15:15:08
In terms of those impacts, I would in terms of impact on those communities, I would probably agree with the applicant that there's medium sensitivity in those settlements. And we have

00:15:17:03 - 00:15:19:27
a high level of increase in HGVs.

00:15:21:22 - 00:15:37:07
So I believe the two combined would give a medium to major impact in ES terms, adverse, which would

00:15:39:21 - 00:15:43:19
I think you've used moderate to major, haven't you? Applicant?

00:15:43:21 - 00:15:47:24
I think moderate to major would would be the terminology. Yes.

00:15:49:28 - 00:16:05:23
Which does suggest that mitigation would be appropriate in those locations. That's in terms of those settlements. Obviously, in terms of tranquility national in landscape, that is a separate issue. Yeah.

00:16:07:23 - 00:16:20:09
Oh, that level of impact would occur for according to time scale of development development for two months of the construction period. If we strip out

00:16:22:12 - 00:16:58:18
either areas A and B and just look at C and the other way around, just look at C and strip out A and B. That's the opposite of what I just said. We still find that the impact is over one hundred percent in both cases. So we're looking at although the impact for the majority of the construction period is less than we are looking at there, for the whole, almost all of the construction period, the impact is still, that moderate to major adverse.

00:17:01:10 - 00:17:01:25
Okay.

00:17:13:12 - 00:17:45:19
I would also, I suppose, add to that point. The applicant has argued that in certain cases, the level construction of traffic should be understood in terms of low background flows on the B4040 and the four thousand thirty nine. The argument has also been put forward by the applicant that those roads carry significant numbers of HCVs already. In a sense, you can't have your cake and eat it.

00:17:47:28 - 00:17:50:08
The level of HCV increase

00:17:52:11 - 00:18:03:10
is significant in these areas, even compared with not high flows, but levels of flows that are not low, if I can put it that way.

00:18:09:02 - 00:18:12:01
Okay. Thank you. Do you want to come on to the section that

00:18:12:08 - 00:18:47:05
Yeah. So moving then on onto Alterton Road and the Foss Way. The impact there is very high, three fifty one percent, essentially because we have got lower background flows. There are twenty one HDVs a day on this section, which again is not very low. I would call it low, but not very low. So I think we have to be careful not to dismiss the number that this percentage percentage as irrelevant.

00:18:50:06 - 00:19:25:27
As we will come on to when we look at the actual number of HGVs and the frequency at which they are likely to meet on this section of road, it not is they're not rare occurrences. There will be meetings happening quite a lot of the time. In terms of the sensitivity, now we're on the part of the network where we have high levels of cyclists, which are picked up in the NMU surveys on both Alston Road and the Fosse Way. Do have equestrians were observed on the Alston Road.

00:19:25:29 - 00:19:39:00
And we know from submissions made by others that both Fosse Way and Alston Road are used by equestrians, and concerns have been raised by those people separately.

00:19:46:20 - 00:20:26:22
Just thinking what what's appropriate to say at this moment, because I know we're going to move on to other aspects of this. Do you want me to I I suppose that, again, we have this situation where we have two months where A, B and C are being constructed together, and then we have the whole period where either A and B or C are being constructed. So again, we have a two year period at which the level of impact is substantial, but not as high as that two month period that is reflected in the percentage as you see it there.

00:20:30:18 - 00:20:33:21

Then, if we move up to the road to Sherston

00:20:33:23 - 00:20:43:08
before you go on to that. In terms the of EIA assessment, do you regard this then as a major adverse impact?

00:20:43:10 - 00:20:49:15
Yes, I certainly would. I would consider this a highly sensitive link,

00:20:51:11 - 00:21:03:11
both because it is constrained in terms of width, but also because of the numbers of cyclists in particular who are present during the construction hours.

00:21:11:11 - 00:21:11:26
Thank

00:21:11:28 - 00:21:20:01
you. So moving up to the road to Sherston, showing fifty their nine percent increase.

00:21:21:17 - 00:21:25:09
This is a less sensitive link.

00:21:27:26 - 00:21:49:28
The width is in places less than five point five meters, but the number of HGVs and the duration is less. So although there will be times when HGVs are going to meet on sections where they probably are going to be forced to, mount the verge.

00:21:52:10 - 00:21:58:22
I have less concern here in EIA terms than I do on the Fosse Way and Alston Road.

00:22:15:08 - 00:22:18:09
Let me just expand on that.

00:22:21:11 - 00:22:37:19
It would be wrong for me to suggest that it is the impact is as great there as it is on the Fosse Way and Alton Road. There is still an impact. It is sensitive because we have the start is there. We have the equestrians,

00:22:39:19 - 00:22:46:15
and cyclists do use this link. So I believe there still is an adverse here in impact EIA terms,

00:22:48:20 - 00:22:55:14
less severe than on the Phosway. And So would you say moderate? Moderate. Yes. I would I would agree with that. Okay.

00:23:04:20 - 00:23:09:02
So moving across to the junction seventeen coming up from there.

00:23:12:06 - 00:23:36:13
So we have the section of the four a two nine, which is a good standard of of road. I have no concerns there. Then when we come off well, staying on the a four two nine, again, I have no concerns to the point at which the access is proposed either to part of area d or to e. If we turn towards Halvington,

00:23:38:29 - 00:23:42:16
there we have an impact of forty nine percent.

00:23:44:07 - 00:24:09:03
I do have concerns because of the narrowness of the carriageway as we get past the roundabout and head towards the turning for the village. It is a constrained piece of carriageway. You'll have seen it. There are steep embankments, no verges. You can see lots of evidence of vehicle wheels

00:24:10:26 - 00:24:19:15
cutting into to the verge and embankment either side. There's sections where there's very limited forward visibility as well.

00:24:21:00 - 00:24:23:08
Then we come to

00:24:25:01 - 00:24:34:04
Bradfield cottages, which I would as we go past the turning to the street, then we get on a on

00:24:36:06 - 00:24:58:08
sensitive part of the network, where we have narrow carriageway. We have a very sharp bend to the north of the street junction, which we'll come onto. And then we have an area where there are pedestrians, there are cyclists,

00:24:59:23 - 00:25:05:14
and there are limited opportunities for HGVs to pass each other and cars.

00:25:07:19 - 00:25:12:06
I consider this to be an area of major impact.

00:25:16:08 - 00:25:22:21
And I am very concerned that the applicant is proposing no physical measures to

00:25:24:16 - 00:25:31:13
mitigate the impact on vulnerable highway users and also to facilitate the passing of large vehicles

00:25:33:22 - 00:25:45:22
safely and avoid issues with vehicles having to stop suddenly, to reverse in places, to pull up onto

00:25:48:11 - 00:25:53:00
verges, or where available, pulling into side roads, or

00:25:54:16 - 00:26:07:28
in some sections towards the Flying Monk, there are short sections of footway. I've seen vehicles pulling up onto the footway there, to provide sufficient space for vehicles to pass coming in the other direction.

00:26:10:24 - 00:26:18:04
Is it We are going to come on, obviously to looking at the highway mitigation under another section

00:26:19:17 - 00:26:47:16
later on. Yeah, I think so this is again, this is think an area of major adverse impact. And it's clear from the updates in the work that the applicant has submitted that the duration of impact here is expected to be for the whole of the essentially the whole of the construction period. And although

00:26:49:02 - 00:26:55:13
they're on on the of the base applicant's figures, the daily number of HGBs goes down slightly,

00:26:56:28 - 00:27:18:02
that is, in my opinion, more than offset by the increase in duration going from in terms of the large substation going from six months to two years. So we have a long period of impact on a highly sensitive part of the network there.

00:27:19:12 - 00:27:20:16
Thank you.

00:27:27:05 - 00:27:35:08
Is there anything further that you just wanted to raise in terms of the flows before I ask Welsher Council for any additional comments?

00:27:35:15 - 00:27:36:14
No.

00:27:38:04 - 00:27:41:22
I think that encapsulates those figures

00:27:41:24 - 00:27:43:05
pretty well. Wonderful. Thanks.

00:27:43:22 - 00:28:11:13
Dan, because I've to stop lying down. Thank you, mister Bamberg. Just the other thing to flag as well, madam. Obviously, you asked for that to be addressed in EIA terms. Mister Bamberg, in his original rep written representation appendix, also addressed it in terms of the severe residual effect test under

the EIA under the EN as well, which we say currently at least, but you can't be satisfied, is met either. So obviously, that was in EIA terms, but you also have VAT test as well, which we say has failed.

00:28:11:23 - 00:28:20:15
Great. Thank you. Miss Shalaby, does Wilshire Council have any points to make? And we're not looking at mitigation measures at this point. We're just looking at the flows.

00:28:23:06 - 00:28:55:21
David, Wilshire Council. First of all, then, obviously I agree with most of the things that Mr Bound has said about impact though from our position obviously it's the very narrow road and passage which we will come on to which is a concern. I think the only comments I've got to say diagrams is obviously there's two sets of diagrams and in terms of looking at flows and obviously peak uplift flows which these share we can't really have any until the overall HTV numbers are agreed it's

00:28:57:11 - 00:29:35:24
I'll say it's pointless producing diagrams which show link flows but obviously if next week the figures change it's all the percentage is all in the up air again. So I appreciate we're close to that overall table is agreed, and all those matters are agreed, things we've already discussed. I I must admit I didn't spend lot of time a looking at link flows, only obviously noting the fact that the combined link flow, you know, the combined flow on Fosse Way and Alton Row is very high

00:29:37:15 - 00:29:47:05
when you look at it in terms of hourly frequency and obviously the same with the Bredfield Cottages routes which you know we've spent some time out there last week so.

00:29:47:08 - 00:30:16:27
We'll to come hourly frequency shortly. Have some proof on that I wanted to, to to draw out. Mister Bambi, your microphone's still on. I'm not sure that it's intense weekend. I want to come to the applicant then. I don't know. I mean, it might just helpful be to leave this image on the screen, but obviously your numbers are different. So if you wanted to bring up your own flow diagram from Rep five one hundred seven, that would be okay.

00:30:18:02 - 00:30:36:27
For the applicant, the numbers are different because as we explained this morning we've got two different sets of trip generation numbers so that's why they're different. In terms of I think the best thing to do is compare what we're showing now against what is in our ES, we have a obviously updated ES.

00:30:39:07 - 00:30:42:27
We could take it in the order, Bambi, that would be really good.

00:30:42:29 - 00:30:51:23
I'll start from west and go east. Starting at the B4040, B4040, in our ES we were showing a

00:30:53:11 - 00:31:01:08
sixty eight point five percent increase. And in the new flow diagrams

00:31:19:16 - 00:31:21:25
Passes for that unfortunately. So

00:31:23:23 - 00:31:34:16
B4039, we had seventy five point eight percent increase and now it's a one hundred and five percent increase.

00:31:34:18 - 00:31:37:18
Can we zoom in on where you're referring to?

00:31:39:03 - 00:31:40:07
Sorry I'm

00:31:40:09 - 00:31:40:24
going

00:31:40:26 - 00:31:41:23
from West. So

00:31:42:02 - 00:31:46:05
this is the route to limedown A, B and C and this is the CNL route as well.

00:31:46:07 - 00:31:48:26
So you said it was eighty eight percent originally?

00:31:49:20 - 00:31:53:15
B4039 was seventy five point eight percent. And

00:31:58:11 - 00:32:04:21
then so moving on to the next one, so it's road west of Christelton

00:32:06:13 - 00:32:12:15
which is one hundred and two percent and on that diagram you'll see it's one hundred and forty one percent.

00:32:17:11 - 00:32:27:19
Obviously there's quite large jumps in percentages because the base HDB flow is quite low so any slight change is going to jump the percentage up quite significantly.

00:32:30:15 - 00:32:43:06
Then Aldenton Road if we move on to Aldenton Road we had a two fifty percent increase in the ES. Now we're saying two sixty five percent.

00:32:46:17 - 00:32:50:04

Whilst it's not a big increase in HEVs it's a big percentage increase.

00:32:53:06 - 00:33:01:22
So then if we move to Fosway, two thirty eight percentage increase from a baseline of twenty one.

00:33:04:03 - 00:33:07:18
In our assessment we're showing two sixty five percent.

00:33:17:06 - 00:33:39:28
Then between Fosse Way and Sherston we've got thirty eight point one percent and then the new figures are showing forty five percent. So the difference there is, well the base traffic on Fosse Way and Chirsland is forty two and then the proposals increase it by nineteen SGPs.

00:33:41:28 - 00:33:47:04
Then moving to the route to Lime Down D and E,

00:33:49:04 - 00:34:07:07
so the A49 north of Junction seventeen we had fourteen point four percent. Sorry how much? Fourteen point four percent increase on the A49 north of junction seventeen, that's what we had in the ES. And then you can see from that diagram that we've got seventeen percent,

00:34:08:22 - 00:34:14:17
so that's moved up slightly. Road east of Halamington, so that's

00:34:16:17 - 00:34:20:10
previously in the ES we had forty one point five percent

00:34:25:11 - 00:34:28:28
and got now forty percent as you can see from that diagram.

00:34:30:02 - 00:34:38:28
Because the period of time for constructing the substation has been lengthened?

00:34:39:00 - 00:34:39:17
That's right.

00:34:39:19 - 00:34:40:04
Yes.

00:34:41:00 - 00:34:47:26
So lengthening of a construction period reduces the peak.

00:34:50:20 - 00:34:55:04
And then to the Bradfield cottages we were showing one hundred and seventeen

00:34:57:04 - 00:35:02:00
and now we've got one hundred and thirteen for the same reason.

00:35:03:18 - 00:35:19:03
So that's an increase of fifty four HGVs shown on that diagram there compared to an existing flow of forty eight. Something to note on there is a lot of the existing HGVs travel up Bradfield Cottages to where you've got the concrete delivery

00:35:24:19 - 00:35:50:29
element which is just north of that bridge on the right hand side on Bradfield Cottages, and then as you keep moving north along Bradfield Cottages the number of existing HGVs starts to produce significantly. So for a peak, when I looked at these peak hours on an existing flow along there, it's seven HEVs north and about four south I think, which we can confirm. We'll get into that in a minute.

00:35:51:01 - 00:35:52:21
You're not sourcing your concrete from there then?

00:35:53:11 - 00:35:55:14
Well we could do.

00:35:55:16 - 00:35:56:01
Could reduce your

00:35:56:03 - 00:35:57:18
number? Yeah, wouldn't.

00:36:00:03 - 00:36:10:28
Okay, so in essence then, you don't consider that there's any change to the assumptions you've made based upon these numbers?

00:36:11:00 - 00:36:29:01
James Darrell for the help, not given the sort of low existing htv numbers in some locations, also the high percentage increase doesn't necessarily conclude that it's a high number of htvs or it's too high for these routes, so too many vehicles for these routes. It wouldn't change our conclusions, no.

00:36:29:03 - 00:36:59:01
Okay. I keep hearing the and reading there's a low existing baseline, and I know that's been used in other examinations as well where examining and authorities have reported that, yes, it looks like, you know, a hundred percent increase on a route is substantial, but there's only two HGBs use the route. And if you increase that to four, then, you know, I can I can understand? There's a there's a logic in that suggests the percentage numbers don't always really relate to, you know, the small numbers of movements.

00:36:59:03 - 00:37:32:16
But on some of these routes, just as a as a person who lives in in a in a village where any noticeable noticeable increase increase in in HDVs HGVs is noticeable. So although at the moment there might

be low existing flows of HDVs on some of these routes, that's what those communities have got used to, those residents who live and drive on those roads. They've used to low flow. So when you increase, whether it's from two HDVs a day to four, they notice that. And it seems that it's too easy just to make it insignificant.

00:37:32:28 - 00:37:35:29
What would you say to that, Mr. Jarrell?

00:37:36:01 - 00:38:01:20
Yes, James Darrow for the applicant. I agree with you actually, and that's how we've assessed our ES. So we look at the percentage changes and then we take it forward for further assessment, and in that further assessment we look at things like fear and intimidation, which is essentially linked to what you were talking about there, and is that to do with a step change in HGB numbers. And we've looked at that, and it doesn't create a step change in HGB numbers, so even with the new numbers.

00:38:01:22 - 00:38:09:27
All right. That was going to be my question. So even with the new numbers, you've redone that, you don't consider there's a need to revise any of the assessment in the ES?

00:38:10:28 - 00:38:17:25
James Darwin for the applicant. We'll update the ES with the new stuff, but in terms of the conclusions, no, they're

00:38:17:27 - 00:38:32:04
not going And change. Clare Project for the applicant, we what think might be helpful is that if we when we update, the yes. If we show the original numbers and then the new numbers so that you don't have to flick between documents and it's it's quite Yeah.

00:38:32:06 - 00:38:38:12
That would be helpful if it's all encapsulated in one. All in one. That would be your final position. Yes. We will have where we started with.

00:38:38:14 - 00:38:39:27
Where we started. Yeah. Exactly. We think

00:38:39:29 - 00:38:43:20
that might be helpful. Yeah. That would be extremely helpful. Alright.

00:38:45:23 - 00:39:28:05
So we've looked there. They're they're the daily flows, which it says, you know, the peak daily construction movements. Can I just get some clarity on hourly frequency on the links? The construction traffic management plan commits to deliveries obviously being scheduled between nine thirty and four thirty on the weekdays, and I know there are some hours on a Saturday, but let's just focus on the weekdays. If if I took mister Bamba's figures, sixty daily construction HGV movements at Bradfield Cottages, that would have in my view, that would equate to nine HGVs an hour rounded up.

00:39:28:07 - 00:39:53:12
Or if we use the Atkins numbers, that would be eight on that link. And if did I the same assessment on the Foss Way, for example, you know, from Alderton Road, if there were seventy three construction HDV movements, as mister Bamba suggests, then we'd have ten HDVs an hour or eight if we use the applicants. Would that be right in assuming that for hourly flows?

00:39:55:17 - 00:39:59:07
James Stafford applicant, yes, that's correct, it is for a peak day.

00:39:59:14 - 00:40:03:21
Yeah. So what would they be? What would those numbers be if it wasn't a peak day, if it was an average day?

00:40:05:11 - 00:40:07:23
Is that information available?

00:40:08:10 - 00:40:16:03
We have that information. I'm not sure whether it was submitted in our response because we're focusing on peaks, but I can tell you what it is if you'd like.

00:40:16:08 - 00:40:23:14
That's fine. I can have it in writing, but mister Bamba, if you did you have that information in your submission?

00:40:23:18 - 00:40:29:14
Bruce Bamba, stop line down. The peak day is fifty percent higher than the average. So I'm

00:40:29:16 - 00:40:31:14
not a mathematician, mister Bamba. Break this down.

00:40:31:16 - 00:40:50:02
So it will be two thirds. Okay. I think that's right. Two thirds of these numbers. So if you've got ten in an hour on average using the peak, then it would be two thirds that. So six or seven in an hour would be the average.

00:40:52:18 - 00:41:21:19
See, that's really simply explained. Thank you. It's so helpful. You'd be surprised so often I ask my daughter to do a basic percentage calculation. Okay. So these we as as we know, these are based on the peak. So whichever set of numbers the XA chooses to prefer when we come reporting, if we prefer either, would we be correct then in assuming this would be the worst case?

00:41:23:07 - 00:41:25:22
James Dodd for the applicant, yes, the peak is the worst case.

00:41:25:24 - 00:41:28:01
Yeah. All right.

00:41:31:19 - 00:41:34:27
Any other parties want to comment? No?

00:41:38:18 - 00:41:57:29
Okay so I want to come back to a really early representation from stop lying down, which was rep one one seven two. That was the original written representation, and it included a table at table five, which was entitled Increases in Daily HGV Movements on Links.

00:42:01:00 - 00:42:04:04
Might be useful if we could have that on screen. That's the one.

00:42:06:21 - 00:42:27:28
So I think it would helpful if this could be reproduced. And I realize the numbers are still moving. There's still discussions happening. But for our very last deadline, if this table could be reproduced by both parties, applicant and stop line down, with their take on this table,

00:42:29:23 - 00:42:49:09
with the final HPV numbers going into the close of the examination, percentages percentages for daily flows on the key links, and an extra column for the annual average daily flows would be helpful. And in fact, if we could go a step further, we could include hourly flows, but the table could become quite big.

00:42:51:09 - 00:42:57:26
James, for that point. Would you want the AADTs as the busiest twelve month bit of the construction period?

00:42:58:05 - 00:42:59:21
No, I'd want it just averaged.

00:43:03:17 - 00:43:07:22
Because if we're looking at the busiest, we'll get we we're working on the peak anyway. So

00:43:09:19 - 00:43:12:06
does anybody have any objection to that being in action?

00:43:14:06 - 00:43:14:21
No.

00:43:19:02 - 00:43:55:28
Now you've said you will be updating the ES, miss Dale, miss Broderick, with, obviously, revised tables in light of the numbers in Rep five one zero seven. Now I'm hoping you're going then to revisit the tables thirteen dash two two dash twenty three dash twenty four dash twenty five and dash forty six, of the ES because they all relate to traffic flows, and they haven't been adjusted either since Rep

five one hundred seven. It's not just a case of looking at thirteen dash twelve or thirteen dash twenty, I think it is in the ES chapter, but also looking the at flow table.

00:43:56:00 - 00:44:18:29
It would need to be a real thorough overhaul of any of the tables where the numbers have shifted. So again, we would take that as an action. Then similarly, tables thirteen sixteen dash dash seventeen dash twenty three and Annex F in the transport assessment will also need revisiting because they also cover peak numbers.

00:44:25:08 - 00:44:53:16
Okay. So I want to come on now to the issue of two HGVs meeting each other on the Fosse Way and Bradfield cottages. Now in Appendix C of Rep one five thirty, stop lying down included two tables which showed peak construction hour traffic on the Fosse Way and Bradfield cottages, the likely speed of traffic and the frequency of HGVs meeting in opposing directions in one hour. Now this information was similarly reproduced by the applicant in its REP 6B-twelve.

00:44:55:16 - 00:45:12:01
Now, both parties have stated that they agree that on the FOSS way, when using the combined peak construction hour of existing and proposed HDB flows that there would be two point three one HGV meeting events in one hour, and for Bradfield Cottages, the number was one point seven one HGV meeting events in an hour.

00:45:13:26 - 00:45:29:20
Can I confirm the source the proposed construction HDV numbers which were used in these tables? As in, were they the original HDV movements or were they the revised ones from Rep five thousand one hundred seven or were they Mr Bamber's revised HDV numbers? I'm not sure what numbers were agreed.

00:45:30:25 - 00:45:48:20
James Darrow for the applicant. So the existing flows in there are obviously the same from the surveys. The proposed HGV flows are what we originally had in as hourly flow. So for example, Fosse Way, we had four northbound, four southbound in an hour.

00:45:48:25 - 00:45:51:26
That's a Now we've revisited those HGV numbers.

00:45:52:11 - 00:45:59:26
We have, yeah. So they might have slightly increased, but that's eight movements on Fosse Way we've assessed, for example.

00:46:00:08 - 00:46:08:25
Does that an hour. Do those tables, which you've both submitted the same of, need to be revisited with new numbers? Mister Bamba?

00:46:09:14 - 00:46:17:05
Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. Yes. They would need to be updated with the latest

00:46:19:26 - 00:46:25:12
so the applicant's latest calculations and our our latest calculations.

00:46:25:20 - 00:46:41:20
I mean, I'm asking because it's it's the statement is is clear on paper. These numbers are agreed, but, actually, the base the base numbers are not agreed. So to the XA, it looked like this was a settled matter, but it clearly isn't settled.

00:46:41:22 - 00:46:59:03
Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. I understand. You're you're quite right. The it took us quite a while to agree the methodology to get it get this right. Yes. These are agreed for the original set of figures, but they do need to be updated with the current figures.

00:46:59:05 - 00:47:05:00
Okay. So again, something to be done for the next deadline for the closing position.

00:47:09:00 - 00:47:20:06
And if you could make it clear, miss Fambert, if you're agreeing that you although you disagree with the applicant's SUV numbers and flows on those routes, but you agree if you use those numbers,

00:47:21:24 - 00:47:26:18
that's what would be the hourly number of HDVs meeting.

00:47:28:09 - 00:47:35:00
So if we just use the numbers in those tables for the moment,

00:47:37:21 - 00:48:09:18
Would the frequency of meeting be low or high? One point seven one on Bradfield Cottages, it might go up. Or two point three one on the Fosse Way, do we consider that sort of low or high chance of HGBs meeting? Or does it depend on where they meet on the route? Because if you meet on a constrained part of the route and you've got a reverse a long way back or you've got the bend at Bradford Cottage, does it I'm trying to understand. The numbers don't seem overly significant, but I don't think the numbers paint the picture of the implications.

00:48:09:20 - 00:48:12:07
Bruce Bamba, stop lying down.

00:48:13:27 - 00:48:46:21
Yes. The what the numbers show is that, first of all, HGVs will meet each other on both those sections of road, and the chances of them meeting are not insignificant. So every hour, we'll have two point three on average, two point three HGVs meeting along that section of the POS Way. There will be times when those HGVs will meet on sections where there is a passing opportunity, because there are some passing opportunities.

00:48:47:01 - 00:49:01:09

But by the same token, there will be times when they meet in places where it's difficult to pass and we'll come on to that those constrained areas. Similarly on Bradfield cottages,

00:49:02:24 - 00:49:26:09
where the constraints are also significant, it's not the case that we are going to have the odd HGV meeting. Every day, we are going to have if it's one seven point one, if we use those figures and we have seven hours of construction, then that's seven that's ten or eleven meetings

00:49:27:27 - 00:49:38:05
over that day. And there is a good chance that a proportion of those will be in locations where passing is impossible.

00:49:40:00 - 00:49:45:04
So my view is that these calculations demonstrate that

00:49:47:21 - 00:49:57:11
the risk of HEVs meeting in locations where they are unable to pass is a significant risk.

00:50:07:27 - 00:50:19:01
To ask the applicant for their opinion, if we just use the original numbers, on whether they agree that these numbers represent a high chance?

00:50:19:27 - 00:50:28:03
James Al for the applicant. Just to set out some background, so we both actually agreed this probability calculation in combination.

00:50:29:26 - 00:51:03:14
The numbers in there, as I say, for the existing flows, that's the peak existing flow, so it's an hour in the day where there's the most existing HDVs and then we've stuck on our construction traffic on that. So it's very much a peak hour in the whole day, so it doesn't replicate what happens every single hour of the delivery window. Two point three one is number of encounters in an hour along the route. So this, for example, Fosse Way actually includes Alderton Road and Fosse Way as well, and it's along that route. And that doesn't exclude areas where you can actually pass.

00:51:04:22 - 00:51:29:12
So you need to take off the route length the areas that you can pass and that lowers the number of encounters to about one point five. So the one point five would into take account passing points. What it doesn't take into account is HOVs waiting in a passing point either. So it assumes these HOVs are moving along. Yeah I broadly agree with obviously we agree with the calculation.

00:51:31:08 - 00:51:47:29
In our submission we also provided a further test looking at what happens when you release vehicles in convoy which is a common occurrence for CTMPs and construction sites and on Fosway that would lower encounters the to less than one hour in a peak hour.

00:51:49:10 - 00:51:54:11

Would that then just require a bit more management on behalf of your traffic management operator?

00:51:54:14 - 00:51:55:03
Yeah.

00:51:59:08 - 00:52:14:12
Mr Bamba, obviously, they they were those extra tables put into the applicant's version of the of of the document. Did you have a position on those? Because the one was the convoy, one was when you took out a section of the rooks as well.

00:52:14:24 - 00:52:18:20
Yes. Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. Yes.

00:52:20:11 - 00:52:28:28
There will be sections, as I said, where HGVs can pass. If we look at sections where they can't pass, then we still have. I think I maintain

00:52:30:13 - 00:52:48:23
the position that it is in fact, it reinforces my position that it demonstrates that if you just look at those sections where they can't pass, then we still have one point five four HDBs meeting on average on Fosse Way and one point one five on Brentfield cottages per hour.

00:52:51:08 - 00:53:09:21
On the point about letting vehicles leave in convoy, it reduces the number of meetings, because obviously we're putting two HCVs together. But at the same time, that raises other concerns about how to pass those two HCVs. So

00:53:11:16 - 00:53:19:01
it's a there's a playoff there. There's there's fewer meetings, but the meetings that do occur are potentially more severe.

00:53:26:14 - 00:53:50:00
Which council Lee: you have any position on this matter? I'll hand over to Mr Lier in a moment, but I understand one of his concerns is that the council hasn't been provided with the assumptions used to reach these probability figures and has been asking for them, that have been agreed between Stop Line Down and the applicant. Mr Leeu?

00:53:52:19 - 00:54:05:10
I asked a question about that. I have David Lear, Wiltshire Council. I have in past a spreadsheet with the methodology since because I'd seen the numbers and I'd not been privy to the original conversations.

00:54:07:15 - 00:54:15:26
Although I've got a reasonable grasp of mathematics, mathematics, I will confess to my colleagues that I didn't quite understand all the assumptions, so it's probably another conversation that needs to

00:54:15:28 - 00:54:17:05
be had. I

00:54:17:07 - 00:54:58:24
mean, I welcome the fact that the it's been done. I think from my point of view, if we take if we take FOSS way as an example, and if we say, well, there's no such thing as zero point three of an HGV. So if we round it up to three, what it says to me is wherever they can meet, there's basically, as a chance every twenty minutes that two HGVs, and keeping it in simple terms, every twenty minutes, every hour two HDVs could meet. They might meet at a passing place, they might not, but it reinforces the view to me that we need to make sure the passing places are suitable and numerous enough to make sure that wherever it occurs, the risk of actually two HEVs meeting and one having to reverse a significant distance is reduced.

00:54:58:27 - 00:55:17:12
Yeah. Yeah, I fully acknowledge that. Okay, I don't have any other points to make on this agenda item. I feel like I understand the positions of the parties on the flows and the implications on the routes. And because we are looking next at

00:55:20:07 - 00:55:35:29
highway improvement works and mitigation, I don't want to labor anymore over the flow numbers. So unless any other party has anything to say, just want to crack on with item four. So we're on to construction route highway improvement works.

00:55:37:20 - 00:55:47:25
I wasn't intending to bring up every diagram in annexes I, J and K of the transport assessment and pore over each individual bit of the route,

00:55:50:03 - 00:56:21:10
But I think maybe the parties, certainly the parties that Stopline Down and Wiltshire Council may want certain plans put on the screen to take me through some of their points, but we'll come to that in a moment. But I think really from the outset outset of the examination, it was unclear what highway improvement works would be proposed to deal with pinch points along the route network to enable the two HGVs to pass, or indeed HGVs to pass NMUs. We really did go over this in some detail in ISH3. But

00:56:21:12 - 00:56:55:04
But since then, I am pleased that the applicant has submitted more information on the drawings of the stretches of road between Fosse Way and Sherstone, Alderton Road and Fosse Way and east of Wellington Bradfield Cottages, and those plans being in annexes IJ and K of the transport assessment. But I'm not a transport engineer by any stretch of the means, and I am reliant upon Wiltshire Council, at this point to really guide me on whether the information that's within those,

00:56:57:02 - 00:57:22:28
documents is satisfactory in terms of presentation. There was talk last time about whether they were based on an OS base, whether they'd been surveyed on-site. You know, are we are we satisfied that just the base information is now correct? Because everything obviously hinges on in that terms of how

the applicant designs where they put in litigation or if they can and can't. So Mr Lee, do you have a position, please?

00:57:25:12 - 00:57:59:27
David Lee Wilkes, Council. Yes, we've seen latest the plans and yeah we did have a preferred we did suggest a different way of doing it but obviously the where the applicants marked up five point five and six meter sections was a good way, good starting point. We did have a site visit to myself, mister Bamba, mister Darryl last week when we went out because there was some concern raised that some of the widths, some of the five point five meter sections being stated as five point four foot as such weren't the case.

00:57:59:29 - 00:58:40:02
So we've gone out and done some check measurements on those. I think it's fair to say on a lot of the routes it's actually quite difficult to define where the edge of the carriage actually is because, and we'll come on to that when we talk about improvements. Mean, and I and I cite I'll I'll Bradfield cottages or basically as we go up from the Lavington, the junction Lavington junction around the bend and up to the railway bridge there. I mean, the carriageway bridge the carriageway edge is so damaged on one side by overrun that it's almost impossible to decide where the where the surveyor who did the drop corrupt survey took the edge line to be.

00:58:40:04 - 00:58:40:19
I

00:58:40:21 - 00:58:50:00
mean Is it is it damaged where it's ridden with puddles or is it damaged where literally it's just eroded the verge so it just has made the road look like it's slightly bigger than it actually is if you

00:58:50:05 - 00:59:21:05
In some cases the verge is actually rutted in and been overrun and in some cases it's been stoned in to basically fill in the fill in the damage. In some case, the whole road edge is actually you know, we made the point before is where where there's no restraint on the of the edge carriageway now, k, and you've got heavy vehicles right on that edge, it will, in time, deteriorate. And what we find from that bend almost up to just before the railway bridge is the whole carriageway is almost in piece is is quite heavily heavily damaged.

00:59:22:12 - 00:59:46:13
We also picked up further up beyond the railway bridge areas such as the junction with Brookside, and then there's a and and there's another junction before you get to the Monks Tap where clearly there'd been vehicles trying to get into those junctions and effectively the curbs have been quite heavily damaged. So I think the point I make is that we we did pick up diff I think it's fair to say that,

00:59:47:28 - 01:00:07:29
mister Bamba took fair number measurements and there was a fair bit of discussion some of the measurements didn't quite tie up because obviously it was depending on whether you where you took that edge measurement to be. I mean a good example was on the route from the Fosse Way up to Chirston up past the stables.

01:00:09:05 - 01:00:10:06
Ladywood stud?

01:00:10:08 - 01:00:46:01
Ladywood, yeah. So from the actual Fosse Way junction up to stables themselves I think most of the measurements checked could be because there hadn't been overrun and damaged and therefore most of the measurements there checked out but beyond the stables almost quite a long way up towards Limedown the Prose Limestone entrance. I mean, edge of the character has almost been defined by, like, tractor damage into the verges. So it's in some cases, is five point five, but only if you measure to the edge of the damage.

01:00:46:29 - 01:00:49:16
And I don't I think it was a case that

01:00:51:02 - 01:01:21:29
and mister Daryl will probably correct me if I'm wrong, that I think some sections that maybe weren't shown as five point five were five point five and there was some need to review that but mean most all of the route now is based on topographical survey which is helpful. So we've got no issue with the base but obviously bear in mind that a surveyor going out not faced with a hard line on the edge of the carriageway in some cases it's there or it's there.

01:01:22:01 - 01:01:24:16
Do you think though that

01:01:24:18 - 01:01:42:21
the applicant based upon that and you've all three of you been on-site together and identified some areas are good, some areas are bad, or it's not the numbers are not so are the numbers so wildly out that we can assess the applicant's drawings as being inadequate or are they for the purposes of assessing

01:01:44:07 - 01:01:48:07
where they can put mitigation in and passing places and improve visibility.

01:01:49:25 - 01:01:54:24
I think so. Are drawings that flawed or are they reasonably acceptable?

01:01:54:26 - 01:02:35:10
I think they're reasonably acceptable, but obviously they're because of the difficulties of because of the state of the carriageway in many cases it's and what the surveyors had to try and take a decision on where to measure to. There were some variances, but they they weren't huge, but there were areas, for example, that were marked as five point five, which when you looked at it probably weren't five point five, but then equally there were some areas that could be considered just about acceptable, but obviously were shown as narrow. And I think, but that's because you've got a hard curb edge to measure, it's really, really difficult through there and add the damage in and add the edge damage into that and it becomes more difficult.

01:02:35:12 - 01:02:38:21
I think the point I make is that there's already a lot of damage now

01:02:41:17 - 01:02:53:20
bear in mind that when if and when construction starts, those lorries, when they do overrun, will be effectively already contributing to an offer. Basically, it's not going take long for it to get a lot worse.

01:02:54:26 - 01:03:08:12
But from the applicant's perspective, and at the moment, I think I'm really wanting to focus upon safety and hence the need for mitigation and passing places and so on. But the applicant will have a, you know,

01:03:10:03 - 01:03:50:09
road condition survey undertaken through this process, which will be continued to be monitored. So whilst you would hope that worsening would be rectified, obviously, the the applicant's not here to rectify the current situation because obviously that's Willshire Council's responsibility to maintain its roads. Obviously, if the if from a road condition service, the those areas of the road get worse, then there is a certain likelihood that it can be attributed to the development traffic, given the low baseline in some of these areas of existing HDBs, and then they would be required to rectify Are you are you not confident in that process?

01:03:50:23 - 01:04:09:03
I am. But where the damage is already already quite bad, and we know that it's gonna get worse quickly, it's it's possibly either you could argue, oh, we'll just wait wait for it to get bad. And when the construction project and when the when the traffic's already increased to the levels we say, we'll then go in and basically sort it out then.

01:04:09:05 - 01:04:19:06
So what would be your solution then? Let's assume this project does go ahead. What is the council's solution to already damaged roads?

01:04:20:21 - 01:04:31:26
Well, in certain sections where where it's already already proved that passage is it has best passage has been a problem, and it's already bad, then we would say that mitigation should come first.

01:04:31:28 - 01:04:34:11
Okay. Yeah. Okay.

01:04:38:18 - 01:04:53:21
Which of course, if it comes from the public the council is loathe to spend public money on improving a highway which ultimately will the likelihood of it being redamaged but then the applicant would have to

01:04:55:16 - 01:05:02:21
correct that? Or is it the council's expectation that the applicant will pay for the mitigation upfront?

01:05:03:03 - 01:05:09:18
I think what we would say is, mean, we would argue if the damage is already proving passage is a problem for large vehicles.

01:05:12:00 - 01:05:35:15
I'm looking at, if we take, for example, if we take Fosse Way, we're saying the number of SUVs is going to increase by two hundred-three hundred percent. So it's not going take long for it to get a lot worse. So why would you why would you you'd say, well, actually, this project is going to make damage a lot worse. Therefore, it needs we need to mitigate it up front rather than wait for the problem to happen and sort it out midstream.

01:05:37:01 - 01:05:41:24
Not being unreasonable, but, obviously, we've identified particular areas where there is damage

01:05:44:28 - 01:05:46:23
or potential for damage.

01:05:49:03 - 01:06:15:04
Okay but we can we can conclude putting aside whether we deal with it upfront or we deal with it during or after any more damage. The applicant's plans current from the council's perspective in those annexes I, J and K are now a reasonable assessment of the widths of the roads, notwithstanding the caveats around certain areas are hard to measure.

01:06:15:26 - 01:06:21:10
Yeah. I mean, it's not perfect, but it's it's it gives a reasonable degree of where where those little white sections are.

01:06:21:12 - 01:06:25:08
Yeah. Yeah. Mister Bamba, I'm going to come to you, please.

01:06:25:10 - 01:06:27:10
Bruce Bamba, stop. Line down.

01:06:27:17 - 01:06:30:07
Back to mister Shaleja. So he's just booked up.

01:06:30:11 - 01:07:04:02
Just to clarify my position on this. I think it was clear when we went out on sites, and we did only look at Gladfield Cottages and that section of Sherston Road. We didn't look at the Fosse Way at Alston Road. The topo surveys, I have no problem with those. They have been prepared and presented correctly. What I'm concerned about is that the lines that have been drawn on the interpretation of those topo surveys in some places are not do not reflect what's actually going on.

01:07:04:16 - 01:07:22:25

In some cases, as mister Lear has said, the the width of the carriageway has been, well, in most cases, taken to the most extreme point at which there is evidence that wheels have passed. Right. So when you go out on-site, you will see, for example,

01:07:24:13 - 01:08:08:01
on Bradfield cottages in certain places where there's a steep embankment, you will see where vehicles, large vehicles or smaller vehicles trying to avoid larger vehicles have gone right up into the embankment and the edge of that embankment has been sort of sliced away. There are areas where it's not a steep embankment, but there's a verge. And then you can see there's gravel area, and then there is evidence of tires going into the verge. The road wits have assumed that all of the existing carriageway, including the most extreme point at which there's evidence that wheels have passed, is included in those widths.

01:08:08:23 - 01:08:39:20
So the implication of that is that the same driver vehicle behavior is assumed to continue once construction would start. And so, the question is whether that is acceptable given frequency at which this is going to be happening. There are certainly places along the route where even now the embankment is being eroded, debris and stones and rocks rocks are being thrown out because that it is being

01:08:42:14 - 01:09:14:27
there's there's just that wear and tear because of the passage of vehicles. That's the general kind of understanding of how things were presented. There's one or two areas where I and I think we agreed on sites where the measurements are just not right. And one of the key areas there that we looked at was that that sharp bend south of the railway, where the width that's identified there would take the vehicle well onto the verge.

01:09:14:29 - 01:09:15:19
So it's would

01:09:15:21 - 01:09:36:18
it be helpful if we put a plan on mister Shalada? I know you're online waiting and I will come back to you but if you could turn your video off for the moment, I won't forget. I just think we're talking about a section of road and I don't know if the applicant's team can bring up relevant plans for rabbit cottages. I'm not sure which of those three appendices it's in.

01:09:38:27 - 01:09:45:19
James Dowling, it should be annex an I. This is the widths for the passing places. It is

01:09:46:08 - 01:09:48:20
It's one of the paper documents I don't have.

01:09:54:06 - 01:09:57:17
There's p l three five zero b? Yeah. That's yeah.

01:09:57:19 - 01:10:04:11

I was wondering whether there's a better one to show. But, yeah, p l five three zero five b. You can zoom in on the bend.

01:10:06:04 - 01:10:08:17
Just just north of the street junction.

01:10:11:18 - 01:10:12:03
Yeah.

01:10:56:06 - 01:10:59:07
Yeah. Do you want to talk us through that, mister Mummer? I think it'll be helpful.

01:10:59:09 - 01:11:25:25
Okay. That's that's helpful. So, we have the bend there and if you've I'm sure you have, been out on-site there. The inside of the bend there is there's a stone wall almost immediately adjacent to the carriageway, and then there's a kind of very sharp piece of embankment at the bottom. So there's a quite a a rigid kind of boundary that can't be crossed unless you wanna lose your wheels.

01:11:27:25 - 01:12:02:17
Now when we measured that on sides, if you see there where it's got a six point two four just on the northern side, If you measure that six point two four from the extreme inside of the bend, that takes you right on to the verge. So that section there that suggests that there is a a widened section. I don't believe is correct. And I think we agreed on-site when we did the measurements and had a look that that is not representative of what the actual situation is in that location.

01:12:03:22 - 01:12:25:20
Also, as you go north from there, north and east, there's a section there that's indicated as over five and a half meters wide. And certainly, again, taking the measurements right to the edge of where wheels have been. That that's not the case. It is less than five point five meters along that section.

01:12:26:05 - 01:12:40:05
So, if the council were in their duty as a highway authority put to some bollards or great big boulders in the ground to mark what would be the carriageway, you're not suggesting that's what the council would be doing. You you would have a your your road would be much narrower.

01:12:41:11 - 01:12:45:07
Yes. If if if it was actually constrained to

01:12:45:19 - 01:12:48:15
The what would have been the original road. What is that?

01:12:48:17 - 01:12:55:15
Yeah. Yeah. Essentially, the functional highway, I suppose, you'd call it, wouldn't you? Yes. It wouldn't be as wide as that.

01:12:55:29 - 01:13:04:14

And the implications would to what extent would they be different if the applicant were to change the numbers on this plan?

01:13:06:11 - 01:13:28:02
I think the the implications at this location location is that because we've got a bend as well. So as large vehicles, particularly, well, any large vehicle has to kind of swing out there. So it's taking up more than it would on a a straight piece of road. because And there's very poor forward visibility around that bend,

01:13:29:27 - 01:14:04:10
the ability to safely accommodate two way HGVs at that location is less than shown there. And even what's shown there may not be wide enough to accommodate two HGVs passing. The way the only way to safely manage that would be to make that essentially at any one time, one way around that bend. So you'd have to put in some kind of signal system. But we're confronted then with a problem of the section of highway to the north being less than five point five meters.

01:14:04:17 - 01:14:18:13
And certainly, that section to south is less than five five and a half meters, almost as far as the street junction. So if you were to put in place Traffic lights. Any traffic light control,

01:14:21:00 - 01:14:27:00
look, on the existing carriageway there, you've got to separate those lights by a long distance.

01:14:27:02 - 01:14:37:20
Yes. Because you'd have a you'd you could have an HGV stopped waiting at a red light to allow the other vehicle to come through, but at which point when they meet Yes. There there's no way to pass.

01:14:37:22 - 01:15:08:06
Yes. So you couldn't put a a light immediately south of that bend because any HGV coming around the bend would be unable to pass the HGV waiting. So you've got to pull that stop line right down to the south. And then my concern would be, if you did put something like that in, you would start getting quite long queues and delays. And once you get that, you get people deciding to use other routes around the network, and you have knock on adverse impacts. So is

01:15:08:08 - 01:15:10:08
the suggestion then that just this part of the

01:15:13:14 - 01:15:16:05
acceptable route to Lime Down Dee.

01:15:16:22 - 01:15:17:16
I I I

01:15:17:23 - 01:15:48:21
I mean, is that that's the inference, isn't it? Yes. If we can't mitigate because you can't put traffic lights here because you you you'd you'd have to have, as you said, sets of traffic lights at some distance

apart to accommodate two large vehicles then having to want to go alongside the waiting vehicle. If you do that, you've got then long waits on network. This is a well used local network for just light vehicles. The inference is this just isn't an appropriate route to get to Limedown D.

01:15:48:23 - 01:16:07:04
Yes. And you've also got to bear in mind that it's not just the heavy vehicles using this, and there's quite a lot of staff using this route as well. So if you have well, you'd also have signals in place presumably for two years. So it's a very long duration of impact as well. So I can't see

01:16:08:24 - 01:16:28:29
and, you know, we had an opportunity on on-site to talk about this and consider what the options were. Mister Dowell suggested traffic management, but when I try and think this through, I'm I'm not coming with up any, obvious solutions about how this could be done without adverse implications that have not been assessed.

01:16:49:09 - 01:17:04:18
Okay. So, I'll come over to mister Daryl then because this is clearly a pinch point, on the network, and we've just discussed possible mitigation, but that leads to other issues.

01:17:06:11 - 01:17:09:22
What's the applicant's approach to this?

01:17:10:16 - 01:17:14:22
So James, now for the applicant. So do you want me to respond to Wilshire's comments as well?

01:17:14:24 - 01:17:16:26
Yeah, do it in the round please.

01:17:16:28 - 01:17:53:16
Okay, so in general I'm agreeing with what David's saying. We are using on our plans an area at the side of the road which has got gravel on So we are using that because that's what's being used at the moment. We've assumed that's usable carriageway. Now there's no no one can say whether that is actually carriageway or it's not. I know Bruce is saying it's not, but I think a lot of locations it actually is carriageway. The reason why say that I is because the verge itself doesn't have curbing along it. And I would say when it's raining and there's runoff and things like that, obviously it's going to mess up the verge edge as well as vehicles driving close to it.

01:17:53:18 - 01:18:26:20
So there's no we can't say for certain whether that's carriageway, but what will happen before the construction starts is there'll be a precondition survey that will look at all of these areas. And as a result of the condition surveys then obviously we have make to any repairs if our vehicles have caused any damage during the construction. Then when we make repairs we won't be returning it to the gravel but returning it to carriageway. So you know it's a point that we're committed to condition surveys.

01:18:26:25 - 01:18:32:18

We are in our set paths using in some areas the graveled area next to the verge.

01:18:34:18 - 01:19:03:14
And then when was talking about the widths there, didn't agree on-site with some of his measurements and the way he was measuring it but our width of five and a half meters again it includes that gravelled area so that's why we've got five and a half meters on our plan and then we've used a sweat path analysis to see what HEVs can pass there. Now that bend is tight and we've shown on our plan that there is no inter visibility for about thirty or forty meters through there.

01:19:05:09 - 01:19:23:23
So I'll look to that in a bit more detail in terms of what are the likely numbers of vehicles using that, and what the encounters are what number of encounters are likely on a peak hour on a peak day. And so in a peak hour, existing flows are seven northbound, HDB flows are seven northbound.

01:19:23:25 - 01:19:28:05
Can you slow those down so I can look at the transcript but I want to look back at my notes?

01:19:28:07 - 01:19:31:06
It's it's yes, okay. It's in our submission as well.

01:19:31:08 - 01:19:35:11
Sorry, just to say it again, you said in the peak hour seven northbound.

01:19:35:13 - 01:19:44:03
In the peak hour the base line traffic in the delivery window it's seven hgvs northbound and four southbound.

01:19:45:00 - 01:19:45:19
Thank you.

01:19:45:21 - 01:20:18:09
So if there was really an issue here you'd think that you'd see something like that in the accident records which we don't see any accidents there at that bend. And then three, this is from the previous numbers, it's three northbound and three southbound hgbs for the construction traffic. And then when we use the probability calculation that we've agreed over that thirty meters the number of counts is at during this peak hour in the delivery window is zero point zero eight.

01:20:18:11 - 01:20:42:16
It's very low numbers, very low probability, but they'll also be driving incredibly slowly around that bend. So when you couple all that together we really think that we need to provide any mitigation there. That's what it all comes down to is whether we need to provide mitigation at this bend because there's lots of public eyewear there and you could widen it.

01:20:49:03 - 01:21:01:27
I will come to the party but Mr Shillada had his hand up. He tried to come in before we've jumped about, to hear some other submissions. So mister Chaleda, I'd want to bring you in, please.

01:21:03:03 - 01:21:37:02
Okay. Thank you. It's Kevin Chaleda, Wiltshire Council. Yeah. I just wanted to make a point after David, mister Lear made his speech about when best to do the maintenance. It's worth bearing in mind, I believe, that if there was any maintenance during the construction period required to the road, it would require a road closure, due to the widths. And therefore, surely, would be better to do any remedial works or, prior to any of the construction starting.

01:21:37:14 - 01:21:38:16
That was really my point.

01:21:40:15 - 01:21:42:18
Thank you, mister Schleider. That's very helpful.

01:21:48:11 - 01:21:55:14
Miss Chaloby, do was it just for me to bring mister Schleider and order to back Mr Lier? Then I'll come to you Mr Bammer.

01:21:55:16 - 01:22:48:06
I just wanted to go back to the comments about Obsticharri Mau. I don't think we would ever advocate shuttle signals over the distance, advocated. So I've been out on the same I mean, it's the case. It's a Ben there now. It's used by heavy vehicles. The point I did make is when you if look at the diagram on the plan, if you've got a vehicle traveling towards the Ben from the we'll call it the northeast because where that's the plan's orientated but when that vehicle comes into the corner the road down to the crossroads at the street junction is too narrow so that vehicle, that driver has to get to a position, a waiting position, about three quarters of the way around that bend before we can actually see whether it's actually safe to proceed because obviously he's got to get around the corner and say actually.

01:22:48:08 - 01:22:53:15
So where pretty that blue line the bottom of the blue line on that Yeah. You just have to get to that point to

01:22:53:18 - 01:23:24:10
That's right. The sweat path at the moment shows the sweat path that and I I I basically had discussed this with mister Daryl anyway. The sweat path at the moment shows the HTV waiting on, like, the quarter position. Well, at that point, they can't see a thing. Yeah. So the driver has to get almost around the corner before he can see another HTC. There's another HTV coming, then he, obviously, has to wait to that position. So the sweat path then that you would get with that would probably take it well into the verge which is already as we've already discussed already overrun.

01:23:24:12 - 01:23:24:27
The

01:23:26:08 - 01:24:00:17

increased frequency in hgvs, I mean we're talking a lot of hgvs every for day two years is going to cause that to deteriorate. When you get around the corner, when the HGV gets around and straightens up to go down towards the railway bridge that's already damaged. As we always say it could to do be with obviously got the concrete work stand but the point is already in a bad state and the verge is already being effectively used as as a pseudo carried away and our concern is it will deteriorate quite quickly, I think.

01:24:02:27 - 01:24:21:09
Based on what my colleague, mister Cheleda, said, I'm sure that the last thing Limedown would want is to basically get two months into two months into their operation, and we say, this road's now got so bad. Basically, we need to close it and do this. Then what do Lime Down do to get to d?

01:24:23:02 - 01:24:26:03
Point is, you know, stitching time saves nine, potentially.

01:24:26:05 - 01:24:51:20
Okay. Coming back to your sweat paths point, obviously, you're looking at the sweat paths coming from north down to south. And we were in terms of where an HGV driver would have to be coming off that bend to see anything approaching from the south. What would coming the other way because your driver's on the other coming in the opposite direction. What's what's the level of visibility coming? I mean, you see they can't see rounds up behind the bend.

01:24:51:22 - 01:24:53:13
You'd have be on the crown of the bend.

01:24:53:15 - 01:24:56:03
Have to be on the crown as well. Okay.

01:24:57:21 - 01:25:31:26
Yeah. I mean, it's quite I the winter visibility across that corner is I mean, obviously, it's a sharp bend. It's a stone wall on the inside with a high hedge. You've only got limited visibility. So the drivers would be proceeding slowly, you would hope, well, the curvature would dictate that. But if, you know, if Laurie came up there and it was obviously coming the other way and there was nothing, I mean, we found when we were there, vehicles tend to take it wide anyway because you can't see. You think you know if you drive towards that bend even there's a light vehicle you think I don't know what's coming round so I'll tend to hang towards the outside edge of the corner.

01:25:32:01 - 01:25:42:22
And I think what you see at the moment on the edge that bend there's a large area of gouge damage on the outside it's not it's not cut in, but it's it's obviously been it's been overrun.

01:25:42:27 - 01:25:53:02
I mean, we have driven this as an ex a countless times, not nearly as many as local people. But I can't for the life of me visualize the embankment on the inside of that bed.

01:25:53:04 - 01:25:56:14

It's just an area of overrun verge. It's not embankment on the edge.

01:25:56:16 - 01:26:13:21
No, it's just a verge. So if that is the case, did the applicant not contemplate including that land in CA to make improvement an on that bend knowing it's such a difficult bend to deal with. And it's not a question for Mr. Darryl. It's more one for Ms. Roderick and Mr. Thrankel.

01:26:14:10 - 01:26:50:02
Clairvodrick, obviously, so Mr. Darryl's position is that our position was that there wasn't necessarily a need. There was sufficient space here. But I think what we're hearing from the discussions today is that, as I understand it, the Wiltshire Council's preference would be for the road to be more formally widened in this location, and would that seemingly address some of the concerns that have been raised today and that that for that work to be done in in advance of construct in part of construction before vehicles start using this rather than as a remedial action.

01:26:50:04 - 01:27:16:03
That's and that's it. What I'm hearing is that if the if the road was widened in on the bend, then that would address the concerns that are being raised here. Our understanding is that the verge is part of the public highway here, and so those works could be facilitated. But it's something we can take away and just double check that there wouldn't be any impediment to the delivery of those road widening works. Yeah. Think it would just be helpful. Obviously, as

01:27:16:05 - 01:27:39:23
an ex say, we may, when we come to consider your position is reasonable. However, we may not and we still have to make a recommendation. It would be helpful to understand what implications there would be from a land ownership, whether, you know, it is feasible to widen the carriageway at the council's request. Does it, you know, does it trigger anything from a CAA perspective? That's what we

01:27:39:25 - 01:28:12:01
would find helpful. That's fine. We will take as an action to confirm that the verge is part public of highway, which is what we understand to be the cons the scenario, which would allow us under the powers and the DCO and the the approval mechanisms that are contained in the protected provisions to do the work subject to, obviously, them being approved by Wiltshire Council. So if we will take that as an action to just confirm that there isn't a land reason that those works can be delivered should the recommendation be that those are required to mitigate impacts in this.

01:28:12:03 - 01:28:15:27
Yeah, that would be very helpful. Mister Lear, go ahead.

01:28:16:12 - 01:28:26:14
Just a quick point. Just to clarify, I'm fairly sure and I think mister Jay mister Dyer will clarify all all the all the all the land around there is be within the public highway. So we're not looking at private

01:28:29:12 - 01:28:31:07
You said you we are looking at private land?

01:28:31:09 - 01:28:34:23
No. No. There's no there's no third party land. It's it's all public highway.

01:28:34:25 - 01:28:37:19
Okay. Thank you. Mister Bamba, please.

01:28:37:29 - 01:28:41:03
Mister Bamba, stop lying down. Did

01:28:43:08 - 01:28:52:26
you I may have misheard, ma'am, but did you, say you couldn't envisage what was, the embankment on the inside of the, Yeah.

01:28:52:28 - 01:29:03:05
Because we were talking of sweat and it was yeah. I have to come, as mister Lee has suggested, pretty much to the bottom of that blue line. I I just in my mind, I can't imagine when I'm driving that section of the road.

01:29:03:24 - 01:29:08:25
Yeah. The the inside is is a solid brick and wall.

01:29:08:27 - 01:29:10:29
It's a wall. That's what you said. Yeah.

01:29:11:01 - 01:29:28:02
Yeah. And it's it's very steep, and I suspect that the extent of highway on the inside is negligible. I imagine that private land starts almost if not, you know, it is the wall. So I don't believe there's going to be any scope to do anything on the inside.

01:29:28:04 - 01:29:29:24
But it's on the other side.

01:29:29:26 - 01:30:00:16
On the other side, there is scope. But because you have the constraints on the inside, the bend and the visibility that is constrained, if you're driving south there, you've got to get to a point where you can see down to the street. If another HTV is on that stretch, by the time you've seen them and stopped, it's going to be very difficult for an HTV coming the other way to use any widening on the outside of the bend in order to pass.

01:30:00:18 - 01:30:01:03
So

01:30:01:14 - 01:30:19:17
we come down? Is does that plan come down a little bit? It just so we can see a bit further south. Yeah. So it may be that it's not the bend that needs the widening. And and I realized you've almost has to almost come much further out.

01:30:19:19 - 01:30:34:01
Yeah. The that section of dreadful cottages is highly constrained. It's are balls, hedges, to base deep embankments. It's gonna be difficult very to widen along that section.

01:30:34:03 - 01:30:38:10
Sufficiently to make it if you were coming south to even have any reasonable visibility.

01:30:38:12 - 01:31:01:08
And there's also an issue that if if you at the top of the plan there on the left, that is the public right of way that goes into Halvington, which is closed at the moment because of the housing development that's going ahead. But we have a if you like, the worst possible combination of HGB's sort of swerving

01:31:02:26 - 01:31:24:27
to get around that verge with people emerging from the public right of way, and also those people who will be coming out who want to then walk beyond that along Bradfield Cottages, an area where we have pedestrians emerging the same at point at which we have quite severe vehicle conflicts going on.

01:31:24:29 - 01:31:45:00
I don't like to suggest, and we're very late into the examination and possibly should have asked this question a lot sooner, I don't like to suggest divergence of public right of way, but was that considered here to to to move the in and out of that public right of way off that bend just to address this

01:31:46:26 - 01:31:49:18
conflict point for pedestrians?

01:31:53:18 - 01:32:02:09
I don't think it was. That's an yeah. That is an existing conflict point. Not sure it was, but let me just check that quickly.

01:32:02:11 - 01:32:12:11
Okay. All right. So is there anything else anybody wants to tell the XA about this section of Radfield Cottages?

01:32:14:09 - 01:32:16:26
And if not- oh, Mr Darrell?

01:32:16:28 - 01:32:27:26
Sorry, yes, it's Darryl for the applicant. I just wanted to say that we can provide an indicative plan showing the widening on the outside of the bend. It needs to be wide enough for two SUVs to obviously pass each other.

01:32:27:28 - 01:32:40:24
Yeah, obviously we possibly don't overcome this issue of visibility around a bend with a solid wall, but it might be helpful I think it would be helpful in fact just for us to appreciate what

01:32:42:14 - 01:32:45:03
level of mitigation could be undertaken there.

01:32:46:21 - 01:32:47:20
Mr Lee?

01:32:49:06 - 01:32:54:04
This is a closed conversation, are we talking about the whole of the section up to Bradford Constitution?

01:32:54:06 - 01:33:15:04
No, I'm particularly talking about this bend, That's But, obviously, I just want to come off this particular part of the the the route, and then ask if there are other parts of east of Alabington to Bradford Cottagees, we really need to air now with the plans where there are issues.

01:33:17:28 - 01:33:30:07
There was one when we were on-site, there was one other area we identified between the Monks Tap and the Line Down D entrance where there is no visibility between amongst tap where there is width?

01:33:30:09 - 01:33:30:26
Could we

01:33:32:16 - 01:33:34:04
orientate the plan?

01:33:34:06 - 01:33:36:14
Might need a small area of treatment.

01:33:42:03 - 01:33:54:15
Conscious that we're getting to the hungry stage and we will need to, but we may have to cut off halfway through this item and come back to this item after lunch. But let's deal with this bit of the root network now.

01:33:54:23 - 01:33:59:22
Okay well actually James could you just shift it back up down a little bit because we may as well talk about those other

01:33:59:24 - 01:34:02:23
two. So Brookside there.

01:34:02:25 - 01:34:11:17
So yes so what I want to say so one thing I've mentioned earlier is when we were we looked at Brookside and we also looked at the

01:34:13:05 - 01:34:44:13
access to the north which has the large concrete apron it's an access that goes into the back of the Monks tap. So both those locations at the moment, the junctions are fine, but but the curbs either side and the verges are damaged. So I think what we concluded, well, if you look at the lengths which are passable there, if you had a an articulated vehicle going north and another one coming south or even any other any other large vehicle going south, an articulated lorry would not be able to get into either of those locations.

01:34:44:15 - 01:35:24:14
So there is no there is no passage from the railway bridge up to the Monks Tap, which could be used by effectively, if there was a if there was sixteen point five meter articulated vehicle nothing could pass it. It couldn't pull into other locations but I think what we I concluded in my notes there it was an area to monitor to see what because you could get tipper a small like a ten meter tipper would be able to squeeze into those locations but even then we may see some damage. So the damage is already there but I think we agreed it was something we wouldn't necessarily seek mitigation now but it might be something we might need to monitor.

01:35:24:23 - 01:35:36:09
So if you can push the plan up just push plan to the north a bit. So when you get to the Monks tap, go to the Monks tap, it's not there is it?

01:35:38:11 - 01:35:46:11
Just go. So you've got passage there but the point I'll make there is that the road then narrows and eventually

01:35:46:18 - 01:35:48:28
Are moving north? We're moving north,

01:35:49:00 - 01:36:24:13
yeah the road might want to bring the scale bring the scale to yeah. So when you move north amongst TAP, the location there's a tree there. Keep going north. There's a long section there which is nothing so you can see where the road curves it's got a hedge one side where there are two trees so there's no sight line between as you lead amongst tap to where the road narrows and then eventually there's a white line in the middle that comes up to where you can pass.

01:36:24:29 - 01:36:41:07
So we did look at whether it be possible to do something there to in basically see if you get an HGV lead amongst tap, once coming the other way, you'd have there's a there's a section there. It's maybe a hundred and hundred and sixty, hundred and seventy meters long. There's no there's no intervisibility between that point where there's a

01:36:41:09 - 01:36:44:22
That's quite a length. Sorry? That's a length.

01:36:44:24 - 01:36:47:16
That's quite a length. It may need

01:36:47:18 - 01:36:53:26
some You would definitely either be overrunning the verge and into action or you'd be reversing a very long way.

01:36:54:25 - 01:37:00:01
Yeah. But the point is if Laurie makes them come to me, they won't know till they see

01:37:00:03 - 01:37:01:09
each They're

01:37:01:14 - 01:37:16:28
shielded on the inside by the hedge. So you also miss where those two trees are on the offside of that bend, need some. We did look at when that we were on-site, and there was possibly the opportunity to just widen the carriageway very slightly there to try and get two vehicles past. But, again, it needs looking at.

01:37:17:00 - 01:37:18:28
And you'd but you'd lose the trees there?

01:37:19:00 - 01:37:25:21
You wouldn't lose the tree. You'd have to do it on the other side of the road. Right. See, outside. You wouldn't be able touch that side because of the trees.

01:37:25:25 - 01:37:29:16
And mister Daryl, what was your feeling about that on-site?

01:37:29:28 - 01:37:30:13
Don't know.

01:37:30:15 - 01:37:41:21
One hundred and seventy meters for two HDBs to all of a sudden I mean, I'm sure well, hope let's it wouldn't happen, but that's a long way for an HGV to have to reverse or try to take out a hedge.

01:37:42:13 - 01:38:17:17
James Dowell from the applicant. Yeah, so as I said, the existing HGVs drop from that point forward. But if you look at SP51A, which is in Annex K, it shows a sweat path analysis of HGVs and it shows a sort of shorter intervisibility there but the inter visibility line does go very close to that tree so you'd have to trim back the hedge quite a lot so I think David's point is actually that tree when you're on the ground and you're looking down there it does actually block that into visibility.

01:38:18:09 - 01:38:30:24
But from our plans and from our top post survey and site visits that visibility line looks like it can be made but I think you need chop to back the hedge quite a fair bit, not remove the hedge but trim it back.

01:38:31:13 - 01:38:34:21
And so has the applicant put that forward as mitigation?

01:38:34:29 - 01:38:37:25
That's not as mitigation no, we haven't put that in there.

01:38:37:27 - 01:38:43:28
So I suppose question my is, should it be mitigation that should be factored into the plans?

01:38:44:29 - 01:38:48:03
It should be, but I think what David wants is some widening there.

01:38:57:27 - 01:39:03:25
Mr Bamba, do you have a view on that on that section? Whether it should be widened or it should just be hedge trimming?

01:39:04:14 - 01:39:06:04
Bruce Bamba, stop lying down.

01:39:07:25 - 01:39:17:13
As Mr. Lear said, on-site it was clear that there isn't existing intervisibility along that section,

01:39:19:06 - 01:39:53:12
and there could be potential to do some widening in the area opposite those trees. But you will see if you go past that point, there's not a lot of space or opportunities to do that before you get to quite a high, well established hedgerow. I think there could be a ditch there as well. So it's one of these areas where you could potentially do it, but I think it needs to be thought about carefully.

01:39:54:08 - 01:40:21:19
You wouldn't need to widen it too much, perhaps a meter. But whether that takes it into the area where we start to get quite significant impacts on existing hedgerow and things, I don't know. But we did discuss that on-site and thought that certainly, Mr. Lear felt that there was an opportunity there to put something in to prove that section.

01:40:23:22 - 01:40:55:18
Just to go down back that section, I would reinforce what Mr. Lear said about there being very limited opportunities for the largest vehicles to pass each other south of the flying monk. There was evidence next to that concrete slab of vehicles going over the existing curb to get onto the slab, presumably to let people come by the other way, and also damage to the small embankment on the other side as they sort of rejoin the carriageway.

01:40:56:21 - 01:41:16:24
So certainly, there's the existing situation is tight for the types of vehicles that are going along there. And I think given that this is going to be the route for a lot of the heavy construction vehicles. I am concerned about this route. And

01:41:18:24 - 01:41:38:01
I do appreciate that Mr. Lear is taking a very practical pragmatic view to some of these areas. But if we were designing an access route from scratch, we wouldn't be designing anything that had the potential level of conflict that we're looking at here. So

01:41:39:29 - 01:42:10:27
I don't think to there's be a way to avoid all conflict. And it's a question of balancing up, well, is this an acceptable level of impact and conflict in this kind of area, given I mean, we'll come on to this, but the sensitivity sensitivity in terms of the number of vulnerable highway users, the people living next to the road there, the presence of the flying monk, and the fact that it attracts people walking to and from that location as well.

01:42:11:09 - 01:42:14:08
So again, is another highly sensitive part of the network.

01:42:14:10 - 01:42:26:26
Yeah, sure. I'll just come back to something Mr. Daryl mentioned though, when we were talking, when we were quite detailed on that one bend where the public right of way was coming in.

01:42:28:12 - 01:43:04:29
Mean, mister Darrell's point was, you know, there are a lot of HGB movements going to and from the concrete batching place already, and there's the accident records don't which the council keeps don't show any accidents. Well, I don't know if said any accidents or just insignificant number of accidents, but, I mean, the evidence isn't there to show that I mean, clearly, it's a tight bend, and I'm not trying to to diminish the concerns, but the existing accident records don't show this, you know, two HTVs have to pass on that bend because of the the concrete battery, and we know the baseline numbers.

01:43:05:01 - 01:43:08:17
I mean, I summarizing what you said correctly, Mr Darrell?

01:43:08:19 - 01:43:22:17
James Darrell, yes. So there's existing numbers on there. As I said, seven north, four south HEBs, and there's no accidents reported at that bend. And it might be because it is tight that people drive a bit more carefully around there when they're in an HGB.

01:43:22:27 - 01:43:53:25
And then yeah, there could be the fact that the concrete matching, use the road every day so they're very much aware that they will have to stop cautiously come around that bend. They're aware of people on the public right of way, whereas we've got a whole new set of construction drivers who won't know that, and it will only take one to hit a pedestrian or hit another HDB or cause a severe accident. And everything that I we've said here today, you know, will be the worst worst possible scenario. So I'm not taking this very lightly. I just also trying to factor in the existing, situation.

01:43:53:27 - 01:43:55:01
Mister Bamba, please.

01:43:55:20 - 01:44:27:02
Bruce Bamba, stop. I'm down. I think there's also a point to be made about that. I think you're right to sort of think about that particular issue. Obviously, an absence of personal injury accidents doesn't mean that there's an absence of risk. But I think the type of vehicle that's going to be using this, particularly accessing the Bess and the large substation and a lot of the containers for the solar panels, it's going be much larger than a concrete mixer. Point well made. There will be a difference in type.

01:44:27:04 - 01:44:36:13
Yeah. No, certainly didn't mean to diminish the risk, but obviously I'm just trying to weigh all the evidence in the balance. Mr. Darrell, you didn't have anything else to add? Oh, you

01:44:36:15 - 01:44:37:00
did.

01:44:37:02 - 01:44:45:20
Yes, please. Yeah. James, I've taken. I just wanted to just make sure everyone's aware that for these trips eighty percent of them will be nine point eight metre long tippers.

01:44:46:04 - 01:44:46:26
How many?

01:44:46:28 - 01:45:00:22
Percent is what we calculated from the numbers. And then for the PCS units and BESS units they're AIL vehicles because of the weight not necessarily the length because of the weight and they'll be escorted along the whole route.

01:45:08:14 - 01:45:22:01
Okay. Thank you. We're certainly not done with this item, but I think it's a think we need to stop and grab some lunch. It's twenty five past one. I think, we will return and then look at other aspects of of the network.

01:45:23:19 - 01:45:34:13
Fosse Way, Elderton Road, so on, and go through a similar exercise this afternoon. So if we can break now, let's take an hour, twenty five past two, we'll adjourn. Thank you.