

TEXT_ISH5_Session5_01122021

Wed, 12/1 6:13PM • 14:59

00:09

Okay, welcome back, everybody. The time now is over 553 Apologies for that two minute delay and I'm resuming the issues specific hearing five after you gentlemen have that final session can cased in please confirm everyone who wishes to be here has joined back. Yeah, I can confirm everyone's join back on the live stream has resumed Thank you. Thank you. So there are no procedural decisions emerging from today's hearing. I will now hand over to Mr. Parkin, and maybe Ms Sahai to take us through the actions. These actions will be published on the project webpage of the planning Inspectorate website as soon as possible and no later than Monday next week. Just to know that we will be uploading the recordings of this week's hearings as they come through rather than waiting until the end of the week to publish all at once. Hopefully this will assist you in your as so you can start on completing some of the actions if the recordings are necessary for that. So over to Mr. Parkin?

01:13

Thank you ,Mr Scriven. Yes, this is just the action points which I intend to just run through now. So the first one was from this morning and it's consideration of why Boston Jupiter junction and discussions and an update notes on that from the applicants and Cambridge county council and Bedford Borough Council. This is by deadlines seven second action was to look at the modelling at the M 11 Junction 13 The alters the junction and flow checks on the pots and road and Tozan drug against the applicant and Cambridgeshire county council. And again this was also for deadlines. Second, third action was to look at the flows that Biggleswade north, which would be provided to Cambridge, central Bedfordshire Council by the applicant. This time by deadlines six, I think this was fourth action, the positions from the parties on whether the network management duty be considered at the wider local highway network level, or the more granular detail of individual junctions and the relevant policy justification for that for those for whichever option is chosen. And again, that was open to the applicant and to the local highway authorities for deadlines 6/5 action, more detailed information on the monitor and manage process, generally, and specifically in relation to in relation to the proposed development, including roles and responsibilities, funding for any necessary mitigation, how it would be secured, and the policy justification for respective positions. And again, this is an action for the applicants and the local highway authorities. Six section ongoing but by deadlines six, we could have an update on the discussions regarding toseland Road, pot and road and the be 1046 including the date for submission within the examination period. And a comparison with the Cambridge county council requirements. Side by side drawings were talked about at the time. That was an action for the applicant to provide. But again, my deadlines six and seven faction the protective provisions from the East West Railway Company and the justification for them. The applicants response including any counter proposal and justification. As I've said the action for ew AR and for the applicant by deadline six. The eighth action, just a written summary of the oral statement by cam cycle that was mentioned at the time again, this would be for deadlines six. Number nine is signposting where in the application the various signalised crossings are located. If not included, this would not be if these were not included, would this not be a change to the

scheme. And we're examining like some justification for this. Again, that's to the applicants for deadline 6/10 Action Item six B dependencies error that was discussed and agreed just in just a matter to be resolved by the applicant by deadlines six action 11 are recent examples of how construction heavy goods vehicle movements have been included or estimated in other linear roads incentive incentive schemes. Action for the applicants by deadline six. Action 12 of Cambridge County Council's confirm the status and details of proposal to restrict HGV traffic through Hill To the applicants consider the issue of HTV traffic travelling through Hilton and any appropriate actions in response as part of the proposed developments. So these actions here for Cambridge county council on the applicants, both deadlines six. If you look back at Item six D on the agenda, clarification justification of the monitoring of construction impacts, to be incorporated into the monitor and manage notes, but clearly distinct from from that aspect of it. For the details regarding the contractual monitoring associated with this, and the baseline for the monitoring assessments, this is an action for the applicant, again, by deadlines six, action 14 potential implications of LTN 120 for the design principles and specific structures of post development, and also the submission of LTN 122. The examination library as we at the moment, as far as we can tell, it's only in there via a hyperlink. So just be helpful if we could have that submitted, I put this down as an action for come cycle. But if the applicant is able to provide the LTM 120 documents, again, that would be much appreciated. That's against the deadline six,

06:16

action 15 What changes would be needed to particular parts of the design principles so as to affect the design of specific structures of the proposed developments. And this is action for Cambridge county council based on the discussions we had and it's a discussion is a an action for deadline six. And effectively what we're after is a marked up track change copy of where you feel that changes may be necessary an explanation for those changes. Action 16 is comparison information with other insert linear road schemes such as for the a 14 which was which was mentioned in terms of consultation at detailed design stage. That's an action for the applicants for deadline six. And then, action action 17 is a joint position statement from Central Bedfordshire Council and the Applicant on the discussions regarding noise mitigation measures, which also highlights any areas of this are agreed or not agreed. And again, if we could have that by deadline six from both parties. And finally, following a further further meeting that was discussed between central Bedfordshire Council and the applicants to discuss the potential air quality mitigation measures, note summarising the findings from that meeting. Again napkin SimCity BC. And again, that's the deadline six. So that's a quick drop through the action notes for today. Does anybody have any any comments or concerns that they've not been accurately captured or things that should have been captured? Haven't been?

07:58

Scott Lyness applicant? Nothing from the applicants point of view, sir.

08:02

Thank you, Mr. Lyness, Mr Bruce?

08:06

Yes, I think national highways we're going to come back on the on the on the relevance of the Vissim. Well, the the implications of the Vissim model all traffic along the a one for air quality on the Carter street properties. So if we could have that would be useful. Thank you.

08:26

So I don't don't recall up was that was that was discussed. We agreed that there was going to be this further meeting to discuss those measures, and that we were going to get something from that. I didn't realise there was anything that had been agreed. Yeah,

08:38

we Yes, Mr. Parkin, it was going to be clarification from the applicant, as I understood it in terms of which which model had had been used in the in the process. And

08:51

that's what got Scott Lyness for the advocate. To be clear, we're happy to provide that as a separate piece of information rather than one which summarises discussions that take place on mitigation measures where we understand why the action point was mentioned the way it was. But on reflection, we've seen a reason why we can't confirm why Saturn was was used. Versus versus vessel was probably appropriate, as done as a separate action point we can do a lot of writing

09:22

Thank you Mr Lyness is specialist Mr Bruce?

09:29

Sorry, I thought the specific point was that. And obviously national highways will check that the Vissim model chose higher traffic levels along this part of the eight one. And I've said that's the more accurate model. So if that's a more accurate model, what would the impact on the air quality be in that area?

09:51

level? I think one needs to be careful in how models are described to us in particular context. I think the Action Point is probably best dressed in a broad sense, which is justification for the model employed in the air quality assessment now we can explain what was done and why. I think some carriers required and how one described what model is used for what purpose, and we can address that in the end as part of this action point.

10:22

The way I've captured it, Mr Lyness and Mr. Bruce is. So the action is the model used for the modelling of the air quality assessments and the justification for this, the use of this model. So that's, that's actually the applicant for deadline six. Is that Is that so okay with Vr Lyness

10:44

At Scott Lyness fabricant? We're content without sir. Yes, thank you.

10:48

Mr Bruce? Sorry, you're unmuted moment. Mr. Bruce.

10:56

Sorry. Sorry. Thanks. Well, the examining authority have heard our point we'll, we'll make it enlightened. Thanks.

11:03

Thank you, Mr. Bruce. See Mr. Tyrrell has his hand raised

11:12

So thank you just wanted to raise the point about the a four to eight, an emu provision. There's quite some discussion earlier and I wasn't quite sure whether or not I didn't didn't hear it in the actions this whether or not you wanted either us or the applicant to talk about the feasibility of that and the value of doing it.

11:38

So so you're offering to provide a feasibility work for for an amuse along with the old a existing a four to eight.

11:48

I think, during the discussion, I think that was what you had asked us to do. The cost and deliverability. I think it's a useful thing to have. I think the discussion was whether or not we should do it first, whether the applicant should do it first, given the resources they have in terms of understanding their their plans and the layouts, then there was deviation. But the question is, do you still need that piece of work done by somebody rather? And if so, who would you rather it be done by? Mr. Scriven?

12:17

So really interested in the I think it's the scale of the task that would that would be necessary to get to that point of having a better understanding. I don't see that being able to do a feasibility report be possible between now and deadline six, for example. Unless you think otherwise. Let's

12:41

see if we may possibly consider that further. And we will consider what we can put in in terms of explicitly what we're asking for and how feasible we think that would be within the existing footprint to the limits. And I think obviously, we can reiterate the policy underlying the long standing history of this being a design scheme, if that would be useful as well.

13:05

Okay. Thank you. Yeah. And to include an indication of the level of land take if it would be required.

13:14

Yes, of course, I think what we propose is within the limits of capital about that

13:20

last album, and we'd be particularly interested in seeing that justification. Sara, thank you.

13:27

Sorry, Mr Tyrrell did you say that there'll be a deadline six submission.

13:32

So on the understanding that as we've discussed, it would, it's not a full feasibility piece because I don't think there'd be enough time to do hope I did like six. We could come up with a letter document by deadline six, yes. Okay, yeah.

13:45

No, that'd be useful. Thank you. Thank you for Does anyone else have any any comments on the actions that we've, we've discussed today? No cuts anyone? sounds excellent. Thank you. Okay, now, back to Mr. Scriven can deal with closing closing statements.

14:14

Thank you Mr. Parkin. So I will now proceed to close this hearing. Thank you for participating today. I appreciate it has been. I don't think marathon is the right word. But we've done we've done well to get through all this. All this today. And I appreciate your patience in get helping us get here. For those of you attending issues Pacific hearing six tomorrow, we look forward to seeing you. Are there any questions before I close the issue specific hearing today? If there are please raise your hand on Microsoft Teams? Nope. Excellent. Thank you. So the time is now seven minutes past six and I'll close this issue specific hearing and have a good evening. Thank you.