

# SizewellC\_ISH2\_Session3\_07072021\_TEXT

00:07

Good afternoon, and welcome back to the this issue specific, specific hearing number two on traffic and transport before I start, can I just have a case team? They can both hear and see me, please? Yes, I can hear and see. Thank you and could also chat, the live stream has started and a recording and started. Yes, both have started. Thank you.

00:33

So

00:36

moving on now to I wonder whether I could inquire

00:41

what time you expect to finish this afternoon.

00:46

And, sorry,

00:48

Sally Smith, sorry.

00:51

In that context, would you expect to do the freight management facility this afternoon?

00:56

I do expect to do the freight management has led this afternoon, Mr. Smith, but I can't at this stage say but I mean, I wouldn't like to be going longer than six o'clock. Well, unfortunately, I have to leave at 330

01:10

with engagement as a pension fund trustee. Okay. Thank you for that.

01:15

Okay.

01:17

Given that

01:19

we could do I don't have much in way of questioning on the freight management facility. And given your you need to be somewhere else, we could potentially move that forward and do that now.

01:37

That's all right to the applicant.

01:41

Sir, it is. Yes. Thank you. The only point I raised I think we promised to come back on hearing halls estates. couple of questions regarding we can do that. Briefly. Indeed, just just Mr. Smith, if you bear with me a few minutes and put your hand down, turn the camera off. We will come to you.

01:58

Mr. Flanagan. Thank you. So two questions, I think from Mr. streeton, before the lunch break about the Oxford roundabout and the roundabout on the be 1122. And Mr. If I can hand over to Mr. Richard ball, who's going to deal with him so far as he can at this stage. And that was Mr. Richard ball.

02:26

Good afternoon, Richard ball on behalf the applicant. The question regarding the Oxford roundabout and the design. The roundabouts been designed to do and be standards to capability to deal with the necessary vehicle flows through that roundabout junction.

02:43

It's also under undertaken road safety audits and is capable of managing the I would also say that it's

02:52

it's part of an ongoing process for technical approval that we're discussing with Suffolk County county highways who have raised no issue with the size of that roundabout. So really my answer on the Oxford roundabout is that it's designed to meet the requirements of the road and the traffic flows that go through it. The secondary question about why is the middle two more link roundabout?

03:19

Smaller?

03:22

We would like to report back at

03:25

the next deadline if that's okay. Just to confirm that position. Haven't had those discussions with Suffolk highways in lieu of the process? It's ongoing, if that's acceptable.

03:37

Deadline five would Yeah.

03:42

Could I see to having him hold the state of the hand up? Could I have your only comment?

03:51

Yes, I do. I'm grateful for the indication in relation to the latter. In relation to the form just to be absolutely clear. The question wasn't does around about the proposed work? It was why doesn't around about that TPA has proposed which is smaller and will have a more limited ecological effect not work because they have done the flows they have done a sweat path they say it works and so what we want to understand is why the smaller one which I prepared provided the reference for earlier not work it's a different question from the one that was answered

04:26

Okay, I understand that perhaps if the applicant can't answer that now they could also respond on that point deadline five but I'll hear from Mr. phonic and again.

04:45

Yes, we can and I will try will sweep up more technical response, which will hopefully

04:53

satisfy you Hall at deadline five along with the middle some more rounded out point.

04:58

Thank you, Miss Flanagan.

05:00

With that, then we'll move on to discussion about the freight management facility. I have a couple of questions and I think we'll hear from Mr. Smith.

05:13

My questions a number of IPS have expressed a concern that a freight management facility is wrongly located, in particular the effect of possible closure of the oil bridge, and any implications for operations stack. Can I hear first the applicant's views on that and potentially, Suffolk highways England in the police after that?

05:34

Thank you, sir. Yes, casting a ballot is going to deal with the freight management facility questions.

05:42

Thank you.

05:53

Jose, is Kirsty McMahon on behalf of the applicant? I'll try and be as succinct as possible, but it's

06:00

really quite detailed answer. So there are primary and secondary functions of the freight management associate, I think it's useful to kind of recap on the in terms of the primary, and the primary functions of them itself provides a physical control to ensure compliance with the cgm and the controls that were within that. So that includes the Pico caps, the hgvs arrival time limits at the main development site, and HTV routes.

06:28

It provides an operational control of the arrival profile for ATVs at the main development site and at the Plaza. So that's more of an operational aspect for the applicant rather than a control on the highway per se. It also provides kind of other kind of functions and day to day in terms of induction of drivers and compliance checks to ensure the delivery is in accordance with the DMS and provide welfare facilities for drivers in order to reduce impact on existing lorry parks and lay bys on the HTV routes. So that's the kind of day to day function of what it is intended to do. And that would be obviously supplemented by the and supported by the delivery management system.

07:13

The secondary function is to,

07:18

to hold hgvs back where there'd be an incident on the highway. And obviously, we recognise that one of the incidents or type of incidents that has been reported by

07:30

stakeholders is the potential for the Orwell bridge to close that's not the only incident that could happen. And that's one of them. So looking at the site selection, and there are considerations that we need to take into account. So it needs to intercept hgvs before it gets to the point of the network, which we're seeking to

07:57

be able to control and find the demand management measure in terms of the peak hour caps. And so the the critical part of the network that the the peak hour caps is there to control is the the a 12 corridor that we've assessed between the Seven Hills junction and the a 1152. So we need to intercept those hgvs. Before it gets to that point, in order to fight that additional level of management of those caps. It needs to be of a distance from the main site that allows that certainty of arrival at the Plaza from an operational perspective, because if it's 5060 miles away, we lose the ability or the applicant lose the ability in order to provide that control mechanism and of the arrival profile at the Plaza of hgvs. So it needs to be far enough away in order to make the peak caps effective. But it needs to be near enough in order to make the the kind of control the effective to have an effective control of hgvs at the Plaza. We also in terms of the site considerations need to look at the origin of the hgvs and their most direct route sustaining the park and rides. The purpose of them is to intercept and intercept those hgvs they are on a direct route to the site. And so the level of diversion of that route would be both a concern potentially to the highways authorities because it would add

09:26

kind of more mileage on the on the on the size of a link. So on the strategic road network, but also it would make things

09:37

add to the complexity of the delivery of the projects and tend to have that certainty of, of the hgvs arriving at site.

09:44

So that those are the kind of three kind of sites selection criteria for the primary function. And then obviously, it's the effectiveness of that from a secondary perspective, the effectiveness of the facility in order to hold hgvs and minimise

10:00

The effect of the size of hgvs in the event of a closure. So if we look at so I think that the main point is about whether it should be located to the east or the west of the Orwell bridge. So there were a number of sites during the,

10:17

during the alternative site selection, and considered there were four considered on the east side of all wallbridge and two on the west side that were put forward by the council's when it sprouted at junction 54 of the a 14 and one at stone market. So if you look at if you look at those two sides to the, to the west of the or well bred and go back to the selection criteria, so they do intercept the AC V's prior to the the Seven Hills junction and the in the a 12 corridor. And so they would be potentially effective in terms of the sprouting and stay market sites as an example, potentially effective at controlling the ability to all those peak hour caps, but they are some distance still from that from that section of the a 12. And therefore, the further away you get the from that section that you're seeking to control the the less effective that becomes because you've got that separation between the two things.

11:25

The distance from the Main sights the disparity and sight this put forward and the and the Stowmarket sight of 35 to 45 miles away foot from the site so that the certainty from an operational perspective of getting the hgvs and releasing them and the the connection between the plaza and the and the delivery team at the flowers and the delivery team and the freight management ability suddenly becomes quite disconnected because this 50 miles between them. And lots can happen in that time. So you losing that certainty of that delivery of hgvs. The third aspect in terms of day to day function is the is to reduce the diversion of HIV. So we provide information in terms of where the Hc viziers is the origin of HTV. And we've we've assessed that so if you can think about the strategic road network and where they might be coming from, it could be coming from the a 14 the a 12 it could be coming from Felixstowe. And so from any of those directions if it was if a freight management services provided in Stowmarket sprouted area, then it would only the a 14 hgvs would be passed by trip and all of the other so any any hgvs coming from the far south come from London direction coming from which port any of those they would have to divert through the cop dock interchange, which again is a key consideration of highways England, they would have to divert from the cop dock interchange and go away from the site and divert

away from their trip in order to be picked up at Stowmarket or junction 54 to then be processed and then come back along the back along the a 14 and then progress to site.

13:07

By contrast, the Seven Hills junction which ever wherever the the origin of those hgvs are, all of us would route via seven hills. And so the level of diversion away from their natural and most direct site at route to site is limited. And so therefore it provides kind of a better system in terms of the intersection of those trips. So really intended the final comparison of the the kind of site selection in terms of the the secondary function of

13:43

whether it's holding hgvs in the event of an incident.

13:47

All of the all of the Seven Hills effective works is more effective at doing the primary functions compared to the the examples on the west on a day to day so it ticks all the boxes in terms of those primary functions. So therefore the only function that those Western sites perform better than the site that's been preferred, is on in the event that there is a closure of the Orwell bridge, that the the freight management facility that the hgvs wouldn't be held at the freight management facility as they're approaching site. In terms of the Seven Hills preferred

14:31

freight management site,

14:34

if there's a if there's an incident and kind of anywhere else on the net range and kind of to the north on the a 12 it would be effective at holding those so what we're what we're engaging with in terms of with highways England is a they've provided further mitigation recently and improvement schemes if you're well bridge which potentially housings in could talk about in terms of reducing the risk of the overall bridge closure.

15:00

Through speed management measures, and they've been implemented and I think successful. So the risk of the closure has been reduced by highways England. And what we're working with them at the moment through the development of the traffic incident management plan is to agree the extent of the GPS system whereby hgvs would be monitored not just between the freight management facility and the site itself, but also on their approach to the freight management facility. So that we're there to be an incident, there can be that communication there that could be that understanding, and, and, and kind of ability to be able to manage those hgvs. And then to also identify holding points on the strategic road network, which we could direct them to, in the event of an incident. And the other aspect that we've also got available, there's the delivery management system, whereby if it was a severe incident, and it was going the overbridge was closed for a long time, we have the ability to to reschedule and hgvs that are not already on the network through the delivery management system. So probably that's quite a long answer to the question, but I realised that this has kind of come up a few times, and hopefully that that

answers some of those questions. Yes, thank you. The one thing probably missing from now is the implications for operations stack.

16:28

So, I think you recognise that the toughness of management is an ongoing process. I think Suffolk councils have said that one aspect that we could include within the as a comment in the traffic incident management plan in the Tim, would be that where operations start to be needed that potentially the freight the hgvs for size, well, would route direct to site as opposed to routing via the fate maps facility in order to reduce the impact on Felixstowe road and seven hills. The other aspects of thinking also to say on operation stack is that I've understanding and speaking to the authorities, and the place is this is that the primary persons that was the port of Felixstowe, and where there was high winds and the and the port needed to be closed that they could stack hgvs and the the port of Felixstowe have improved their delivery management system as well since operation stack has been implemented and therefore it's used far less frequently than it was previously. And so that's that's our understanding. Okay, thank you for that potentially now, could you hear the abuse of highways England please?

17:44

Chris is going up lifts highways England.

17:48

I'd like to begin

17:51

making a few comments about oh well bridge in and the improvements we have carried out

17:58

had an issue with high winds, we couldn't we couldn't have vehicles negotiate the bridge, under under conditions of high winds. Recently, we have we have delivered a scheme implementing variable speed limits that allows vehicles to go over the bridge under high winds, this does affect a reduction in the closers. However, it does not eliminate the risk of of your bridge closures. And we also have

18:31

closers as a result of of other incidents,

18:37

road traffic accidents

18:39

and reactive

18:41

maintenance. So, we have to accept that all bridge does does close occasionally.

18:50

Regarding the freight management facility,

18:55

it can it can work under a regime of appropriate controls. Again, there are there are risks in how is England perspective. However, we are we are engaging with with the applicant

19:11

in order to create those those appropriate controls and reduce reduce those risks.

19:20

Once that's example of of risks is

19:23

the possibility of ATVs

19:27

parking temporarily at lay bys having arrived earlier than their allocated time slot. But again, this is this is an issue that we could discuss tomorrow under the appropriate agenda item of controls. Thank you for that.

19:46

Good I know you're from Suffolk County Council please.

19:57

Sorry, sir. Hi Mike. Machine

20:00

Didn't seem to like accessing it Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. So only briefly on this.

20:07

We've set out obviously the local impact report paragraph 1600 11 112 13. Some concerns and to be fair, Mullen has, as it were highlighted that there are some competing considerations that you need to take into account. And there's an evaluation of, as it were, where the balance of advantage lies. We know what said and since we also recognise that we are where we are, but we are conscious that obviously, having a facility to the west sorry, to the east of the Orwell bridge, necessarily means then that if the or well bridge is not available, to fulfil, then the function of allowing traffic from the west to get to the freight management facility, then during those times while it might not directly impact on the strategic road network, the consequence for HTV traffic which is size, well bound is to as it were discord from the strategic road network where it should be a norm to the less suitable roads in and around Ipswich in order to get to size one. And that's really our concern, which is why we were obviously keen to see and ensure that options to the west were fully inadequately explored. I say you've seen what we said you've heard the balance of arguments, I don't think we can really add much to that. Thank you for that. Mr. Bedford, through the police want to add anything at this point?



21:40

So unfortunately, Detective Chief Superintendent colours had to

21:45

head away for an operational matter. But I don't think we had a specific point to make on this, although we were going to be discussing the incident management plan tomorrow. And I think we would perhaps, if you would be happy for us to

22:01

park this forum, one of Mr. bedfords transport funds until then. Yes, no problem. Thank you for lying.

22:10

At this point, I think I'd like to hear from Mr. Smith, who

22:17

I think

22:19

a part it correct me if I'm wrong. Mr. Smith, part of what you suggested is from Felixstowe tank cancer was an alternative access arrangement

22:28

that potentially reduce the impact on a 14 and a 12. sec. Correct? Yes, and in particular, on the A, on my mind, stop 1156 the road into x which,

22:41

first of all in just in passing, because I support the comments a few moments ago about operation stack. That used to be a massive problem locally, but he is almost evaporated due to the success of the port's freight management facility, which controls traffic in just the same way as being discussed. And Council has no view very overtly no view on the location at such that sort of either wider issues or the local parishes.

23:09

But we are concerned about the proposed routing to the site.

23:15

In that one way of analysing I looked and we have submitted maps at the Seven Hills roundabout, and identified points in on that roundabout where the traffic to or from the FM f may interact with local traffic. And, you know, we suggest that there were five on the current plan

23:38

at the two other various slip roads and so on

23:42

an alternative road straight not to come off at seven hills straight down to the trim the roundabout and back would add perhaps three or four miles in total for the trip, but it would remove at least two of those five traffic conflicts. The Seven Hills roundabout is a problem at the moment likes to be a bigger problem in the future. And the size of our traffic, although not a huge percentage will clearly make

24:09

an issue on that. But

24:11

then even more

24:13

specific point is the exit from Felixstowe road onto the a level six if I've got that number, right, the the road into Ipswich

24:26

the remnant of the Felixstowe road and that round and that junction were designed as obviously as a byproduct of the build of the a 14 3040 years ago with an intent to have and to control the traffic such that there's a very light traffic, which there is currently there's a very odd, intentionally single track, very unpleasant to use access to the north of trimly but below to the south to the east.

24:54

So that road has a very light traffic, but the exit onto the

25:00

element 56. What we call the crematorium junction is not clever. And in particular, it's not clever if you're turning right. And if that were a succession of hgvs, turning right, I think everybody locally has pointed out that would be an issue. The alternative route would avoid that and we will strongly commend it to yourselves.

25:23

aside, as it has been mentioned, that didn't happen last time. I understand it may happen in future. But we will just strongly commend the advantages of a significant reduction in complex on the very congested seven hills, the removal of a very awkward and potentially dangerous function at the crematorium. For the price of an extra I think it's only like three miles in Bern and one mile outbound in the total diversion of HTV traffic from the direct route site. Well,

25:58

thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Could I hear the view and applicant whether they can respond to that now or would rely to respond to it later in writing?

26:11

So we can respond now. So I'm going to ask Mr. Mullen to respond to that issue and perhaps might be convenient to respond to Mr. bedfords points.

26:28

person at moment on behalf of the applicant says a few points just want to cover so just one in terms of the clarification in terms of highways England point so one concern that they raised was about parking on lay bys test the SRN assume that this was meant in terms of kind of the day to day function. And as I set out earlier, one of the

26:52

management rockler second, Mr. Smith, could you turn your camera, microphone off, please my bag?

27:01

Carry on.

27:03

My team is still struggling.

27:07

So

27:09

what's going to serve just last week, so yeah, so in terms of the day to day, one of the day to day functions of the fleet management city is to reduce the impact on lay bys on existing no parks on the road. It provides the welfare facilities it provides stocking facility for those drivers. And therefore, the the concern potential concern by highways England in terms of where ATVs would park and would that cause an impact on the SRN? I think that is the mitigate the freight manager facility provides that mitigation and drivers would be would be told to use the facilities, they're going on to Suffolk County Council, and the risk of ATVs are diverting through Ipswich. So as I set out previously, we're proposing that the GPS system looks at

27:58

tracks hgvs on their route to the freight management facility. So they on the on their approach on the strategic road network, we have HTV routes in place, and within the ctmp that they would be tracked, those activities will be tracked. And and they would be the discussions that we're having with highways England would be there to agree holding locations on their rate until further notice. And so therefore, we're not visiting any there to be any of the controls in place to avoid diversion of of HTV size hgvs through Ipswich. And finally intensive Mr. Smith's point and the access arrangement for the site. So as I said out previously, we've we've we've was very detailed microsimulation model of the eight off corridor, which includes seven hills. And that looks at

28:57

the effects both in the kind of early years and the peak construction of size world traffic not just hgvs but all traffic routing through seven hills junction that's been analysed in detail by highest highways England as part of the ongoing engagement and if you refer to the initial statement of common ground between highways England and the applicant, highways England have accepted the traffic modelling of the of

the Seven Hills junction and that they're not seeking highway improvement to the Seven Hills junction subject to agreeing to approve the management plan effectively. And so all of the kind of our ongoing engagement with highways England is to address the residual comments that they have on on the management plans. And so we were confident that the the modelling shows that there was an impact on seven hills and it doesn't need further kind of highway measures that that that the movements can

30:00

be managed and controlled and that

30:03

we wouldn't need to see kind of alternative access arrangements.

30:08

I understand that. But I think Mr. Smith point was the would this alternative, if you like, produce a lesser impact on Seven Hills? Have you looked at that specifically? Or if you haven't, could you give it some consideration and respond on that point? We can take that away? We one thing that we did consider and was were there to be hgvs coming from Felixstowe, could they come off a 14 early and travel along Felixstowe row, which was one of our earliest suggestions and to the highway authorities. And on balance, I think we're where we've got to, at the moment have to let suffered come in on this. And how is England

30:50

that unbalanced, we failed that. So east, so for westbound traffic on the a 14 for them to actually exit on Seven Hills rather than early would be safer. So there has been part of that consideration being made. And I think we just need to take that away and discuss that in further detail with the authorities and come back to you. Thank you.

31:19

So Monica, did you want to say something? Nice. I just add to that, and we will take it away, as mine says, I think part of the context I think that's worth considering. Keeping in mind is the policy framework that in PSTN one 4.4. Point three is the reference that tells us that alternatives, not amongst the main considerations studied by the applicants should only be considered to the extent examining authority thinks that they are both important and relevant to his decision. And secondly, that alternative proposals, which are in CO aid can be excluded on the grounds that they're not important and relevant to the examining authorities decision. So in terms of alternatives, as I say, we give consideration to what's been asked, but I think that consideration alternatives must always be considered against.

32:09

I think I fully understand that point, Mr. Flanagan, but if you could provide a response on it, I think it'd be very helpful.

32:15

I noticed Mr. Scott, you have your hand up? This is something you want to add here.

32:25

Yes, thank you.

32:28

preparatory comment, can I just say, I spent last night at a parish meeting, discussing what is popularly called rat running in a small village, just off the a 12 spine. So I've got, you know, in a sense of representative interest.

32:43

God is speaking of personal capacity at the moment. I've also had some experience of of traffic management.

32:51

You know, before I retired, all the issues that arise from traffic management rather than being technically qualified in the matter. So I got some some questions. Really, it is a second preparatory thing, I think, still be nice to know about the weather, there are standing instructions conditions, if you like about returning

33:13

routes, as opposed to accessing routes, I think. I think that remains important.

33:19

I wanted to note in passing that there may be capacity questions about the Orwell bridge, as well as closures were wind. It's a long running saga, and

33:31

a supervision investigation of that will find that it's very, very near its natural design capacity. I think that's on the Wikipedia site. There's nothing mysterious about that. So I thought you might want to, you know, ask about that. And I'm also very confused about what the difference is between the GPS

33:53

proposal and ordinary Sat Nav, because all drivers who've got ordinary Sat Nav now. So the question comes about

34:04

the GPS system is going to do I understand all about diversions and so on and so forth. But there are there are questions that arise from that. Particularly, I think about from seven hills up to the turn off point whether it's the the woman to to or or the link road. The classic problem is about punching and convoying

34:27

on roads and and not

34:29

not to not do laying where there are no break points. My understanding is the

34:36

12 was a trunk road.

34:38

It was decommissioned back to Southern county council, I think only about 1015 years ago. And there are little bits as one hopes, you know, of dual carriageway, but there's a shortage of Levi's. I've tried to count them the lay bys and not very long.

34:59

So

35:00

You just had a question arises not only about bunching but about the actual lumpy traffic flows, the congestion flows on it. And also about the actual shift working system.

35:14

Sorry, finished construction site, double day working system, which might overflow with over time. So it seems to be that there is, you know, quite a practical question about how the traffic flows could be managed, if they can be managed, actually on the road on that crucial bit.

35:34

Mr. Scott, could I say is it so far, I think you've talked about traffic capacity and traffic controls, and your well bridge accept as a traffic capacity issue. These are parts of discussions at another time, this is specifically about the freight management facility, rather than the controls, which we'll talk about tomorrow. So is there a point specifically to the freight management facility? Well, then then my question about the freight management facility would be like, I think they've been proper terms. I mean, is it going to be a condition that lorries go to it, or that only some lorries go to it? And if only some lorries have to go to it that can be managed on the road? Then there is a question which affects our villages. And I've talked to people in codman, for example, where there is one way lorry routing is already in existence, Max SDA, 14, who are actually worried that there is not a designated route as such, and that is the concerns. So the role of the freight management

36:39

facility seems to be very, very unclear. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Does the applicant want to make a response to that? I mean, I think.

36:57

So, what I'm going to suggest is that Miss Montego quite a full answer on the principle and the rationale for the freight management facility. So I'm not going to suggest that you go do that, again, unless you wanted to the dividend delivery management system, I think, and the other matters fall under controls. The one issue I think that you identified, which might might want to come back on is the capacity of the Orwell bridge, and whether that's a constraint. So I wonder if perhaps he

37:24

can I ask Miss Mullen to if she can reply on that.

37:30

Yes, just on that issue, Mr. Flanagan, because she did give a fairly full reply on the need for the freight management facility previously. Yes.

37:50

Cast my mind on behalf of the applicant,

37:53

the capacity or wealth, which hasn't been raised as a concern by highways England during our discussions with them. And as far as we're aware, we've modelled the capacity of links and junctions as part of the strategic model. And that includes or well bridge and includes the junctions, either side of that. We've also done detailed modelling that sits below that strategic model to look at things in more detail. So it's not something that we've had raised to us, and that we recognise as an issue. The issue that we've kind of discussed with authorities is the is the risk of closure and the management of that as opposed to the capacity of it. Thank you.

38:41

Okay, well, that I think is everything on the freight management facility for now.

38:47

As we've already changed the agenda and 10 changing the agenda again and dealing with OSI as well link road next.

38:55

To support before I asked the applicant some questions on this just for the sake of IPS, I intend asking the applicant a number of questions and hear their responses

39:07

to get through those questions before I hear comments and other questions and submissions from IPS on the side as well link road.

39:18

So that being said, Could I start firstly with the applicant.

39:27

I look at the case you make for the need for the size welding code and your deadline to submission principle and route selection paper appendix five D rep 2108 paragraph 2112217. You set out existing character of the B 1122. You go on after that section to acknowledge the need for an alternative road to the b1 one to two. In those first few paragraphs he said out the road is not wide enough in places to accommodate vehicles widen three metres from opposite

40:00

directions. embankments in places exacerbate that problem. The speed limit varies from 30 miles an hour to 60 miles an hour, poor forward visibility for a road with a national speed limit. And some junctions have poor visibility. Is that a fair summary of the existing character of the road?

40:25

Mr. Flanagan, you're on mute.

40:27

Apologies. Mr. Bowden missed that question. Thank you.

40:43

Good afternoon, which people on behalf of the applicant term?

40:47

I think we've heard from the conversations this morning, we've got into some detail on the BLM 22 and the challenges that are faced along that road. And I can speak from personal experience of hearing through the stages, consultation, consultation, events, concerns of local residents, from the community as long as the 1122 about the condition state of that road and suitability for large vehicles. I think broadly, what we've said in that appendix is true. It sounds like the the width of the

41:18

courage way is broadly correct, I think. But I'm conscious of the more detailed discussions that we've we've had this morning with regards to AI ELLs and capabilities of moving those along the B 1122. In the early years under under police guidance, but I think we certainly recognise the limitations of the road.

41:43

in its current form, if that answers your questions. Yes, yes, it does to an extent, although I'm not quite sure it's just a matter of veils, because I think I'm correct in saying the police express concerns a road is unsuitable in some sections for two hgv's to pass each other.

42:03

Now, perhaps the police could confirm that for me, or?

42:08

Well, I can't I mean, it is it is a designated heavy goods vehicle route to the leiston and sizewell sites currently. So hgv's do use that road. And my understanding is that that's that's accepted by the highways department. So I'm not. I wouldn't concur that it's unsuitable for ATVs. But the route itself does have have challenges. I think it's unsuitable in some sections to to pass each other. That's either a statement of truth or

42:39



is that correct? I'm just trying to establish a character of the road as we move forward.

42:46

I'm not aware of that being correct.

42:49

Okay, maybe I could, at this point, then maybe ask the police if they recognise that comment.

42:59

So you can see. So I'm told by colleagues in the room that

43:04

I think the increased estimators will be a problem. It is used by hgvs currently, but passing is getting pretty, it's pretty, pretty difficult and

43:16

far from ideal. Thank you. I could probably hear the view of Suffolk County on that one as well, please.

43:28

Thank you. So Michael Becker traffic advocates I bring in Mr. Mary to give you the highway authorities view on this character that we thank you.

43:39

Hello, good afternoon, sir. Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council. Yeah, I was just going to confirm that the the BLM 22 is on a sort of Laurie route network. Just bear with me on just getting up the screen. I'll supply a copy of this. But the lorry road network isn't it's not carte blanche to use it for ATVs. It's a garbage about which roads on the network are suitable. So there are some pinch points. I've had discussions in the past with the police and other locals. There's pinch point in Middleton and it's double bends is the one that comes to mind. There's also as you go pass Mill Road I think it is on the outskirts of Middleton. So while is the lorry route, as you are correct in thinking there are some pinch points that make it difficult for two ATVs to pass. And that is not unusual on some of the routes we have marked on our lorry route network. I'd refer to cardinham as being one which unfortunately is still on every route.

44:38

Thank you, Mr. Murray. If I can go back to the applicant and just clarify a few things about the early years use of the b1 one to

44:50

now as I understand it,

44:54

there will be 300 the cap level of 300 hcvs per day associated with the main development side

45:00

Although following the conversation this morning,

45:02

I think it may be that what you're suggesting is that a cap level, including any associated development sites, but my previous understanding was 300 ATVs, a day associated with the main development site,

45:16

the HTV traffic associated with the construction of the additional associated development sites HTV traffic potentially associated with possible construction of scottishpower applications. In addition, following your response to tt 129, this is on page 100 of 183 of the traffic section a rep to 100.

45:39

He suggested a sudden parking ride, maybe operational and mid year two, which is before the SLR would be complete. This would mean bosses would be using a b 1122. In addition, in addition, de stevies.

45:54

This isn't considered in your early years assessments could add another 150. To Bush, HD, HDTV journeys along to be one to two. Is that the correct summary?

46:07

sound good, awesome. It's been wanting to deal with that passes.

46:30

Question was with regard to So first of all, I can confirm that anything that's going down the 1122 be it for improvement to lovers lane. for building, the main development site building size, my link road were a conscious of the impact on the theatre and 22. And therefore the profile that's being provided, based on that 600 vehicles includes of anything that's routing along along along the bn, b 1122. So it we probably need to make that clearer within the ccmp. And the modelling is it has been based on the traffic modelling has been based around that as well. So in terms of I think what your question was, was about the early years for the workforce, and the Workforce Strategy, and that there are

47:26

effectively

47:29

the use of the the land east of eastland as a park and ride facility until such time that the northern or southern park and ride is operational, and therefore, at that point, they would then start to be used. I think what the question is at that point, what would happen if the those buses are then on the network, that the size one link road was not operational? And those buses would be routed along the b 1120? t? And does that form part of our assessment? that correct?

48:03

Question in

48:05

the first, the first part of this the 300 vehicles a day, are you definitely saying to me now

48:11

that that in the early years? Is all of the traffic that may be associated with any of the work for the project, including the associated development sites? All the A b 1122? Yes, so just clear at all. I don't think in any of the documentation. Okay. Apologies. And, yes, the profile that sought to do, and you're correct is that in order to protect the BLF, 20 t to stay within that, that 600. And therefore, this the design of the size worldlink grows, Mr. Oliver said earlier has been designed so that that HTV, those HCBS can be taken off the B 1122. And when they are on the B 1122. They're included within that daily limit. Same goes for improvements lovers lane, so we can take that away as an action to make that far clearer. And I think so I think, you know, effectively, what may happen is that, that there may be a short amount of time whereby there could be some Park and Ride buses and routing along the B 1122. priority. I think it's based on the implementation plan a few months prior to the size of our link road being operational.

49:27

Yeah, some if I make it 152

49:31

against your 300 cap, so it's like 50% increase 152 in terms of buses. Yeah. What you need to think about in terms of the buses, it's is that it's based on the workforce profile. So we've we've assessed points in time. And we've explained this is a chapter 15 of the local impact report, the letter thorough inspection report, so I don't want to kind of go into it in too much detail, but it's probably worth reading the

50:00

The rationale behind those points in time for the Workforce Strategy, there is a, it peaks and in terms of the workforce profile, and what we've sought to do is assess a peak at peak construction of of the hgvs, coinciding. So effectively a worst day of the peak construction period where, where you've got the peak of the workforce, coinciding with a busiest day of hgvs. And all of that happening on the network at the same time, in reality, is a 12 year construction project. And it's be having assessed every single snapshot in time, but at the snapshot in time that you're thinking about the workforce is a lot lower than that peak construction. And so the bottom a is not a you know, obviously, nobody wants to run empty buses. So they the the the level of buses that has been assessed to cater for the 7900 workforce would not be the same level of buses that would be needed to cater for the 1500 workforce. But

51:09

I mean, I wanted to talk about assessment of impact in chapter 10 of the year tomorrow, but it's fair to say that assessment doesn't include any buses, does it?

51:18

On the day 1122. That's correct. Yeah. Okay.

51:24

Could I maybe at this point, take a view of Suffolk County Council? What I don't want to add anything to this discussion about the levels of hcvp DVDs in the early years.

51:39

So

51:41

Michael Beckwith, suffolk county councils, I think, given the as it were, well, well, we certainly see has changed information about what the assessment intention was in relation to the 300

51:55

ATVs. I think we would welcome seeing the clarification from the applicant as well, that's poor before we actually finally comment on that, obviously, we'll have that opportunity in response to what is submitted deadline five.

52:11

So without saying too much, clearly, it underscores our concerns to ensure that the early years is clearly defined, and that the early year period is deliverable in terms of the mitigation which then offset the impacts of the early years. And then as all I say, at this stage, yes. Thank you for that. Mr. Bedford. Okay, then moving on, from your response to question tt 195 is on page 149, of 193 of the traffic section of rap to 100. You stay the works and the main development site that will be started as soon as practicable following the grant decio in the following the final investment decision in the view of the urgency of the project, the need to meet the policy expectation of deployment by 2035. And the need to bring forward the benefits of the project for the national, regional and local economy as soon as possible. Could you explain where the policy expectation of deployment by 2035 comes from?

53:19

So you haven't heard from me yet today? Mr. JOHN Rhodes is going to deal with this question of timing liberally in terms of policy. Thank you.

53:41

Says I think john Rhodes on behalf of the applicant says I think you know, the policy position set out in the NPS is an expression of urgency for the generation of

53:55

for energy generating projects. And in the document we submitted a deadline to which was the updated planning statement, we sought to bring that up to date by reference to government policy.

54:09

And we identified the policy set out in the energy white paper, which confirms that the needs assessment set out in the NPS remains valid. So the urgency expressed in national policy remains valid.

54:23

And the government has a result set out in the energy white paper a commitment to bring forward one large scale new nuclear project to final investment decision within this parliament. And we know that this is the only large scale new nuclear generation project that could achieve that. And the government at the same time published a press release to explain it was negotiating with EDF regarding the financing arrangements for size We'll see. The the 2035 date is set out in the energy white paper as a benchmark for the trajectory to net zero and public

55:00

With the white paper

55:02

was the base modelling of the trajectory that was necessary to get to carbon zero by 2050. And that included, if you like,

55:13

a trajectory to 2020 2035, which was expressed as being just as important as their Schecter into 2015.

55:23

And the Bayes modelling identified two principal alternative scenarios, both of which require eight gigabytes of new nuclear generation by 2035. One of those is Hinkley Point C, the other one has to be this project. And that modelling is directly consistent with the climate change six climate change committee's six carbon budget, which confirms the same thing, the need for effectively 10 gigabytes of nuclear generation by 2035, in order to meet that trajectory, or 2035, on the way to that zero, or 2050. So that's why, but that's why

56:07

the urgency is expressed in the way that it is in the energy white paper was identified as urgent, as you know, in the NPS, in 2011. But all the work done since then, identifies the requirement for increased electricity generation, and particularly an increase in low carbon energy generation. And the timing we've expressed comes from the modelling that underpins that policy.

56:37

Okay, I follow that, but but in terms of a B, one, one to 10, in terms of the impact on a B, one, one to two, are you saying the impact on a B one, one to two, is a result of this target date, the need to do the project by them? Because the more traditional way of looking at this would be you do the mitigation before the harm? Be one one to two seems to be

57:02

seemingly suffering quite a significant amount of harm in the early years, which is an unknown quantity. Well, I want to talk about what is the definition definition of early years, at a later time in the hearings, but

57:16

is it because this date is what dictates your end.

57:24

So there is a calculation, which

57:27

was Williamson can explain the winds that 2035 would not be met, if we were to provide the size of building road first, that would be a delay, as you can see from the implementation plan of over two years in the commencement of the project, of quite apart from the logistical difficulty of building a DSLR without having the main site available at the same time, which which we can explain. But

57:51

even if it wasn't for the precise date, the policy imperative is clearly an urgency. In fact, it's probably no exaggeration to say there is no planning objective, which is more important than to get to net zero. And if that's expressed in in urgent terms of national policy, clearly that impacts on us the way we think about planning the project. So it's a balance. And it's a judgement that has to be made, whether the whether the short term impact on the vlm 22 is acceptable in the light of the fact that we're dealing with something of extreme importance from a national perspective, and that we're working as quick as we can to deliver the SLR to bring that not only that short term, but long term legacy benefits to the BLM 22. Well, yeah, ultimately, that's a decision, you know, a recommendation that we have to draw a balance on as an examining authority, and about the impact on the B one, one to two. But thank you for that. Mr. Rhodes.

58:52

Is it do Suffolk County or a separate council? Want to have a comment at this stage?

59:04

So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, we know what is said by Mr. Road.

59:15

Call me. I think it might be Mr. Rhodes, actually, Mr. Rogers still got Yeah.

59:23

Sorry, sorry. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. We know what he said by the applicant through Mr. Rhodes on this point. It's fair to say I think that what Mr. Rhodes has suggested to you is factually his interpretation, or in a termination of different elements of government statements. I don't think you can actually say it's government policy in the way that perhaps it was presented. It's it's a tenable view that that's as it were, the direction of travel, but it's then a question of how much weight you have to give on that.

1:00:00

compared to the other considerations, including, as you say, the completely conventional one, that if you identify harm, one would expect that harm to be mitigated

1:00:10

proportionately, which usually means mitigating it before it arises. So that's the kind of the background comment. I mean, clearly there is an issue. In relation to this, we have, to an extent acknowledged that the delivery of the size well, Link road is something which will take some time. And it's therefore critical to ensure that for the period that it is not being provided, there is not only as much mitigation as possible, but there are as much controls as possible. And we've also stressed the point about ensuring that the CyberLink road actually is committed to delivery. And obviously we'll talk about that more tomorrow when we talk about control matters. But I think that's probably it in terms of the overall we would say that it's balanced weight, and perhaps not as black and white as maybe Mr. Rhodes was implying. Thank you, Mr. Bedford. to East Suffolk have any view

1:01:10

before you respond, Mr. Flanagan, could you say if if Suffolk have a view?

1:01:15

Thanks. I hope I'm on screen now. Mr. Tate, I'll see if I can't see myself anyway, that that's not very important. Andrew Tate is Suffolk. So now I think the way Mr. Mr. Bedford put it is an accurate summary of the position of the Suffolk that we have recognised the reality of

1:01:38

that two year gap, but we would want to make sure that if that is the case, that the mitigation is adequate through caps or otherwise suitable caps or otherwise to ensure that those impacts are minimised as far as possible. Thank you, Mr. Tatum.

1:01:56

Mr. Flanagan.

1:01:59

Thank you, sir. Just a couple of points to come back on. And I'm also going to ask Miss Williamson to say a word or two if possible. Firstly, just an observation obviously, that neither Suffolk County Council nor his Suffolk County Council have sought a Grampian style requirement to prevent commencement until the SLR is in place, which, obviously there's been the opportunity for that, and that has not been put forward. And which recognises that the balance must recognise that the balance in their view comes down in favour of allowing construction to commence without an SLR DSLR, then coming on stream online after that. Secondly, in terms of drivers, you've heard from Mr. Rhodes about government policy, Mr. Bedford wanted to re characterise it as a government statement, not government policy. Typically, it is government policy. It isn't the MPs, the word is urgent repairs. And then a 10. word search indicates in the MPs that is the government policy. And as Mr. Rhodes said, You've heard the evidence from him and the significance of that policy. The other driver, which Mr. Rhodes referred to, was the

1:03:10

logistical, operational reasons, which Miss Williamson here can speak to, as to why the V 1122. Or this or the SLR

1:03:22

that what happens to the excavated Phil from that and why that needs to happen at the same time as the project construction commencing. So perhaps on that issue, could I hand over to miss Williamson to say a few words, please?

1:03:36

Thank you.

1:03:45

So Williamson for the applicant, I think I will talk in detail about the

1:03:52

the approach for the SLR but I think there are a couple of other points that I think are useful to put into context. So first of all, the overarching programme and how we set off with the with the milestones that Mr. Rhodes referred to in terms of working back from the date at which we'd like to switch on the power station and provide electricity.

1:04:11

I'll touch also on the on, on how we view the early years, as in the period before the sizewell link roads operational. And then when we talking about what that particular element of the programme which is the link road, I just want to try and talk a little bit about how we think about putting the programme together and how effectively if we move one PC as he has multiple knock on effects so that we all have an overall picture of how we've tried to approach this thing and come up with the scheme that you see highlighted in the implementation plan in the various other diagrams.

1:04:49

So if we start with the with the programme, Mr. Rhodes mentioned 2035. And from our perspective, what that means is that we need to get this site in order to be

1:05:00

To be commissioned and producing electricity in a good time before that this, we need to get to the site to a point where we start in the main power plant structures in early 2027, which isn't relative, it's not too long away. So the first thing that we look at when we plan in this thing is okay, When do we want it switched on? And what are the key milestones that we need to achieve before that, then, as we as we plan in as we plan in the works, there are a number of things in our minds. So meeting the objectives was obviously delivering the works safely to the right programme.

1:05:37

And and between all of the really relevant requirements that are put upon us but including our own obligations to deliver best practice for our for our neighbours. And these are this is important, because



this is what we think about the entire time as we are funding the works. So if I, if I rather than just go on to the straight onto the size of our link road,

1:06:01

just just to characterise the early years, if anybody has I don't know what the document references, but if you look at the vehicle profiles, and I know we've committed to clear that up a little bit, the early years is, before we have the sizable link road operational, you see the receipt, there's one year where we were, when we smooth this out, it will be within the within the 300 limit. But the second year, the vehicle numbers is significantly below that. So that's why now, as we plan in this work, we've got that in our mind where we are, where are we against what we see is this limit. We've got some other things in our mind. So we've got our sustainability commitments, you've probably heard about, Oh, thanks, James. It's plate 4.2 of the freight management strategy.

1:06:45

we've committed to reuse materials as far as possible. And we've made great steps forward without with the craigory use on the main development side, we've also been able to apply that same principle to the Associated developments. And what does that mean in terms of the size of the link road and the main development site? Well, for us the first job that says well, Link rotors, he acts as a haul road. So it allows us to for a cotton field balance, it allows us to take material, not just from the SLR footprint, but from the to village pipe bypass sorry, and the Oxford roundabout, we're able to move that material onto the MDS and store it there for later use as Phil. So we see this is part of that of that whole piece. So we need to be working on the MDS at the same time as the ad. The first work that we do isn't what you'd call construction, the first activities are around ecology, archaeology, and they have to use many of the people on the call will understand they have to be done in certain windows. So if we don't do those, when we plan them, we cannot be kind of a significant knock on effective in terms of how it moves the rest of this machine, this link together programme.

1:07:56

So we so for us to get the whole thing to work together, we need to be working on a number of police on a number of work fronts at the same time you equally will be built, we'll be working on the workers accommodation. So the the caravan site. And we also take advantage of getting onto the main development site, obviously to do the preparation for the main works are to create the dry box, but also to get the MDF up and running. That comes online from memory in

1:08:30

q2 in 2025. So if we if we were to if we were to delay the size while link road, there obviously wouldn't be a knock on effect to the overall delivery of the programme. But effectively, it forces us to rejigger our entire delivery machine. So there is a there is a significant impact on this. And, and as I've just said you when we've when we've been developing our thinking around this, we did we have thought very carefully around all of the constraints as we perceive them plus our own professional constraints to be a good neighbour.

1:09:04

So I think I covered all the key points on that.

1:09:12

Oh, sorry. Yes, sorry. Sorry, the will just one more point to make on that is that this, this mass balance this despoil removed to the main development site is the equivalent of 70,000 vehicle movements.

1:09:28

So the fact that we can use that whole road and take advantage of that so easy is actually in our view of life. It is actually beneficial.

1:09:38

Thank you. Thank you.

1:09:41

Maybe I'll

1:09:43

one point, I mean, you mentioned about I think,

1:09:48

I understand the importance of the size, welding corrode and the need for the size welding corrode the wine knocklyon perhaps we'll talk about the definition of early years and the controls

1:10:00

What happens if that's delayed because that will simply increase the impact on the B one one to two, for a longer period, it seems to me.

1:10:11

So, at this point,

1:10:16

I'd like to talk about

1:10:18

the route of the size well link road.

1:10:27

First, I'd like to hear from the app and the applicant, please.

1:10:38

I've looked at the selection of the proposed route, for the size rolling quote, and in particular, the route choice compared with a more southerly route, which for the purposes of discussion on Facebook w that your submission is route w north, which sort of reflects the earlier do D two option.

1:10:58

I know you've submitted a size welding road principle and a route selection paper, which is appendix five D of rep 2108. And I discussed some points that arise from that paper.

1:11:10

Firstly, you made reference in paragraph 3.18. To two a note from the 2014 econ study commissioned by Suffolk County

1:11:20

says a more favoured options are largely bypass options to be one one to two rather than a duty route that is proposed to be located on open Greenfield sites.

1:11:31

Is that? Yeah, I actually I understand the context of that comment, because this study looked at two possible options of individual bypasses of Capitan and Middleton rather than a route as you propose it now, which goes away all the way from the a 12.

1:11:51

So I'm not sure that saying that is a statement is justifiable by what the study looked at. So can I hear your views on that?

1:12:09

Thank you, sir. Yes, we will answer that Mr. Mr. ball is going to address that question questions generally on consideration of alternative routes. So pass over to Mr. Risk of grittier populism. Thank you.

1:12:30

Good afternoon, which you belong to half the applicant? I think

1:12:35

our interpretation of the iKON report was I agree it was focused on the

1:12:42

C, SF feedback coming through. No, it's fine. Okay. So our understanding of the acorn report that yes, that that report did spend some time focusing on the shorter routes, but I think it was in the context of the broader discussion about what mitigation could take place along the route corridors from the a 12 to

1:13:05

two, the lace and size will area. So

1:13:09

you know, we don't think we've Miss misrepresented it. In our

1:13:16

submit Well, well, I think though, it was much shorter and to individual bypasses rather than a much longer SLR that you're proposing. So it didn't consider the impacts of the much longer SLR. So it's not really a direct comparison, which this that comment you've added in there suggests.

1:13:42

That was that was my comment on that. But moving on from that to appendix 10, the technical note and traffic modelling

1:13:50

comparison route W. Firstly, looking at table one.

1:13:55

Could I ask why sizewell hgvs are being routed through the Oxford after construction of Route W. In the earlier years, you are proposing much higher levels of HCV using a b 112. To

1:14:08

the level in this table of HD, the use will be considerably a considerable reduction in the early years level and avoid your concern of impact on the Oxford.

1:14:22

Yeah, I think the point we're trying to make so if a sudden alignment were delivered, if that was indeed practical or possible based on a number of other other reasons, then the BLM the BLM and 22 would remain in place and any hgvs from the north, originating from the north for let's assume that's 15%. So on the busiest day, in a peak period, there will be 105 hgvs, originating from the north plus I think we've assessed up to 229 bus movements from the northern part.

1:15:00

Ride, they would either have to take the V 1122 to the main site, or indeed, if they were diverted to a southern alignment for route W, they would be going through through Oxford. So that was the point we're trying to make. Right? Okay. Well, the point with that is, in the early years, you're proposing 300, HTV movements and to be one, one to two, this would be 105. Your point about the buses,

1:15:30

the SLI, and SLR and its proposed route, you're routing buses from the south, to the SLR, when there are more direct and quicker routes further south for buses. But your choice here, quite rightly, is to use the SLR to route your buses along. But why would it be different? When if the SLR was further south? Why would you choose to send them on to be one to two and not to further south to the SLR?

1:16:02

If it works for the southern park and ride, it should work for the Northern park and ride?

1:16:07

Well, I think anything anything travelling from the south to the north would be travelling on a 12. And we with the alignment proposed for the size will link word road it those ATVs and buses avoid Oxford, all

I'm saying is that there would be a significant impact through through Oxford through the additional hgvs that do not arise through our proposed alignment, which is specifically designed to mitigate the communities on the B 1122. And indeed, the majority of the Oxford itself. I accept the point on the buses, potentially through Oxford. But the hgvs, as I explained just now is actually would be a lot a reduction on your early years use of the B 1122. And HTV 205 against the 300.

1:16:56

Indeed, but I mean, did the early years impacts on they're not sort of separate, I appreciate that they are important. But they would they wouldn't be there irrespective of which alignment. We we went with Dell with that they are important, but I mean, it's just in terms of what routing you've used for that modelling. But moving on from that notwithstanding those two issues. Can we look at table three? From my rough initial rough calculation seems to me they're likely a Steve HDV killer kilometre year saving is around 1 million vehicle kilometres. Would you agree with that rough approximation?

1:17:33

I'm not, I'm not in a position to disagree with it. That's for sure. So

1:17:38

Okay, then.

1:17:40

It's just, this isn't even the calculation for all traffic is just HDTVs.

1:17:47

And the report doesn't consider anywhere the beneficial traffic effects on communities to the south of the SLR. Should this be a consideration.

1:17:56

I think I'd repeat my point earlier about the consistent feedback from the stages of consultation from the communities along the B 1122. And statutory consultees about mitigating the impacts of the project along with a B 1122. And that was our prime focus. And that that is how we've come up with the route that we have for the sysvol link road. And I would add that we have

1:18:20

looked at the other routes and don't consider any of the alternatives to either mitigate our impacts along the B, B 1122. sufficiently or indeed our deliverable alternatives. So what you're saying is purely the impact on a b 1122 rather than wider communities and a wider network. I think that was our prime focus. Yes. Okay. Well, just just on that you've got a table in the site, which is table 7.1. On page 160, have a site selection report app 591. Its table of environmental comparisons.

1:19:02

I would have thought that the vehicle kilometres per year and the journey time savings would have formed part of that environmental consideration. What in transport terms seems to be how many roads

it crosses and how many public rights away to vehicle mileage and journey time savings not have any environmental consequence. Is that not a consideration in a rich choice?

1:19:27

I think what we did is that we we walked the routes and we undertook an assessment of those routes they weren't it wasn't a full environmental impact assessment of all routes, but we used a planning judgement based on a number of different criteria to come up with our route selection was set within the context of mitigating the impacts of our our development. And the other thing I would mention is that following feedback from console tees, we did ask a con to undertake a peer review of our selection process and left it to them to scope it out and how

1:20:00

Have no

1:20:02

no interaction or impact in the production of that report, and they have come up with the same

1:20:08

answer. That was that was one gentleman, one man who did one site visit, is that correct? And he did a peer review report. But again, it comes back to why his peer review might not said actually, your environmental consideration in sustainability terms should have taken account of vehicle mileage and view journey times, because that I'm sure you accept has a sustainability effect on your route choice. Yes, it's not there in the site. It's not there at all in the site selection report that I can see. There's an environmental consideration. Okay, well, I think we'll take that as an action and see whether or not that that was undertaken to the rigour that you're suggesting the world will report back on that. Thank you. And I think probably Finally, response to question tt 192. This is page 147 108. Three and rep two 100.

1:21:02

It didn't really provide a direct answer to the question using tables 8.5 and 8.9. Both in chapter eight on page 22, and 35 of ta rep 4005.

1:21:15

I roughly calculate the combined flow in a size rolling road and the B 1122. And the operational year 2034 is less than the early years flow on a b 1122.

1:21:29

Whereas accept the need for SLR and peak construction. In traffic terms. This discrepancy could either point to the impact in the early years being too great on a b 1122. Or it challenges the traffic legacy benefit the SLR could have your view on that. Because the early years Put simply is higher than the operational level

1:21:51

on the B one, one to two of the combined SLR and the b1 bond to two.

1:21:58

I think on that point, so I would I would like to just take a look at the information and the data and confer with colleagues and if it's okay with the sound and authority actually provider once.

1:22:12

Okay. Thank you for that Mr. Ball. Now, I will hear from IPS now on the size well, Link road. I know first hand up I can see is Paul Afton.

1:22:24

Thank you, sir. And I do want to go back to the early years and the point you were raising about the B 1122. And just to point out that the impacts you were identifying and the questions you're asking also apply to the a 12 three Oxford, albeit not with such a narrow road, but obviously a more built up area and more particularly community severance, which at the moment has no mitigation whatsoever. And so really, just to point that out the areas being the concern there. Thank you, Mr. Ashton. I think tomorrow we'll probably talk about that very point about the mitigation and a severance on a 12 in the Oxford So okay, here tomorrow, probably raise it again, then. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

1:23:13

Yes, thank you, Paul Collins from stop sighs all C's parish Council on B 1122. I have to say I'm not exactly sure where to start this because

1:23:25

at the very beginning of not the very beginning, in the middle of this, we had a justification based on NPS, one and NPS six, needing this whole project to be there by 2035.

1:23:39

Committee for climate change provided a number of different scenarios as to what could be done to actually meet these targets. And of course, I think the applicant has selected the one which most beneficially

1:23:55

addresses their requirement or their need to build this power station. So I don't think that's necessarily the only view that you could take on that. The second thing is that MPs one and MPs six are now well recognised to be out of date. And they are in the process or will be in the process in the next 12 months of being reviewed. And in fact, NPS 60 is 50% of the way through its review, which is saddled up parked by the government and this needs to be started up again. But enough of that, if we now go back to the size will link grown to be 1122.

1:24:33

On the issue that was raised about the widths of the B 1122. In the early years and passing of hgvs it's quite right there are about three places along there where this is going to be an issue and that is on the double bends near middle to more at the top of Mill Street where there's where there is a very poor visibility point. But also as you come into seven at the pretty road junction where you haven't been

1:25:00

corner, which is always interesting when the aisles come past because getting the rounded corner sometimes proves quite tricky and interesting.

1:25:10

The fact that with the early years, we now find out that actually we have a large number of

1:25:17

articulated heavy vehicles coming in is only going to exacerbate that problem. So that it really is an issue. You know, and I think the police were being fairly easy with their criticism of this, it is an issue, this road is not that wide.

1:25:35

I'm not quite sure why even now, size will be size, we'll see company needs to have its site in place to actually build the size one link road. Most other link round or road building projects don't require such a large facility at the far end of where they're going. So that's a sort of an interesting point of view. I don't really believe that. And I'd like to say, you know, it has taken many consultations before actually, sighs We'll see. And the applicant has actually recognised the need to do something about mitigating the traffic on the BLM 22.

1:26:22

It was interesting in the freight management discussion, just earlier, we heard that one of the things that they wanted to do minimises the travel distances and route diversions for hgvs. Getting to that site. And I think this goes to what you were trying to bring out of the applicant a little bit a moment ago. And the size of a link road is at the northern end of a triangle, where they have to come all the way up the 812, almost to Oxford, before actually going back south and east again, to the site. So the overall journey times and the pollution and everything else. And the sustainability of that particular route has to be seen in the context of the entire length of the journeys that they're proposing.

1:27:10

It's also the case that, whilst the icon report did look at those smaller

1:27:18

bypasses, and the applicant keeps telling us how they want to minimise and mitigate the effects of Middleton, and saboten. In fact, if you look at something like the D two or w north, or some variety there have it completely mitigate well doesn't completely mitigate it. But it takes 85% of the hgvs away, it takes all of the Southern park and ride away. And it would only leave the 15% of HTV is coming from the north, and those coming from the park and ride a dash. And in reality, those numbers aren't that big for that long, that it might not have been acceptable to the local community to have them travel, the be 1122 rather than go through all of this nonsense and actually, to say that they wanted to send everything then down to the route w entry onto the A to Lv is a nonsense, you wouldn't do that for now. I don't think anybody would have expected that. And I, I think that's something that was never really looked at or talk to the communities involved as to whether that would be an acceptable compromise. As it is we end up with the SLR, which now seems to be



1:28:37

Rick required as a whole road, fulfil material that is going down to the main site. And I can only think that the fact that they've chosen a route that requires plenty of cuttings and various other things into the landscape is how they are going to get their film material onto site seems a very poor reason to actually build the SLR where it is. And actually the if you look at the W, which incidentally, I think was actually joined to the a 12 in the most ridiculous place halfway through where I have to say he suffered council want to build a rather large housing development at some point. If they'd moved it further south towards Ben Hall, they only have to cross the valley, that sack south of Saxmundham. And then they come on to flatland, which goes all the way down to route w north and joins the B 1122. Almost in the same position that the SLR currently is proposed to join it, which incidentally in their description in work. Number 12. b

1:29:47

says it has a 3.3 finger round about at the end of it. Well, it doesn't and it never has on any of the maps and plans I've seen so I think that's just an error on their behalf and it should be changed.

1:30:01

What else do we have?

1:30:03

rat runs on, and the whole business about the dog leg. If people find the B 1122, and the sadness of this size will link Road The SLR SLR to be impact in traffic on the a 12, then you will get people wrapped running on the southern parts and coming across through sex mountain. And other areas were down through the old burn Friston area. So I think there are issues not necessarily with really applicants, workers, it will be other people who are doing this. I know and they don't have any control over those. But the effect of what they're doing is going to produce that.

1:30:47

What else do we have? Yes, the 1122 mitigation in the early years. But I don't know whether this is the right place to put it. But in the in the section 106 yesterday, which unfortunately, I wasn't able to stay till the end, there is a whole section about the BLM 22 Highway conditions, survey and contributions. And the only thing that seems to be being done is they're going to resurface it or at least improve it. And in fact, all of the mitigations that we're going to be proposed when the BLM 22 was going to be the main route to site have been removed. So there's no improvements. But at Middleton, there are no improvements in the junction in in the village at saboten. So any, any children who need to cross the road, most of the children in the saboten village are on the west side of the village. And if they want to get to the playground, which is on the east side, just beyond the church hall, does nothing to help them get across that road with this level of traffic running on it. So there's there's a whole issue about what mitigations are being provided on the B 1122. For the early years. It's not good enough. And I think we'll be talking about noise and other things tomorrow on this, if that's quite correct. And controls there. So I would leave it at that for this point.

1:32:11

Mr. Collins, the last point you made there, we'll talk about later in the agenda today or tomorrow, that noise will be a separate thing. What I'm trying to do here is just traffic rather than the consequential effects of the traffic, because it's quite a big topic in its own right. So I'm trying to get through that. And I'm also aware, it's just after quarter to four. So we're due for a break. So what I will do now is ask the applicant where they want to respond to that now and Mr. Wilson, Miss butter bassinet. And Mr. Galloway, could I be bear with me till after the break and alter your comments then

1:32:53

say yes. Can I can I respond just a couple of points from that.

1:32:57

Two points from me. Firstly, regarding alternatives is a slightly different point might point I raised about alternatives earlier. If the SLR is acceptable or judged to be accepted in planning terms, the existence of an alternative is not a reason to reject it, that that is the appropriate approach clearly and correctly. The appropriate approach we case obviously, is that the SLR is acceptable. And I note that neither Suffolk County Council nor East Suffolk council say it is unacceptable.

1:33:30

We also say that it's markedly better than the alternatives which have been discussed that in any event, the existence of those those alternatives is not a reason to reject it if it's found to be acceptable. So that position I think needs to be properly recognised when, when these alternatives are put forward. That's the first point. The second point is a brief one, Mr. Collins

1:33:54

referred to made a suggestion that the NPS was out of date. So you all know, obviously, the questioning of national policy is not for this examination. It's not for this examination to re examine national policy in that way. So those are the two points I wanted to make. I just want to chat with Mr. Ball, whether he wants to come back on any of the the other points is not only so let me just hand over to Mr. Ball briefly, please.

1:34:30

First of all,

1:34:32

good afternoon, Richard ball on behalf of the applicant. Just Just a couple of brief points ready to respond to Mr. Cohen's suggestions. I think there were there was a question whether or not the alignment had been specifically chosen to ensure that there was material to take to the construction site as fail. So

1:34:52

obviously, we have looked at that alignment in terms of delivering the right mitigation and getting the road in

1:35:00

in the right location, and obviously dealt with the typography through through the design process. And the result of that is any cut or fill balance. So that's been an output of the design work rather than an input to confirm that work.

1:35:17

We'd welcome a discussion on the B 1122. Early Years mitigation, when you choose to bring it up. So we've had some recent discussions with Suffolk County Council and we're keen to get progress discussions with subs nice bridge parish Council on potential early years mitigation.

1:35:37

The other point made was with regards to the Suffolk plan, and the proposed housing scheme to the size of Saxmundham. And

1:35:50

when we walked these routes, we took footpath from the BLM and 21 sides, the Saxmundham and you can walk up to the rail line. And if you if you stood on that rail line, as you'd look to the to the west, you between the a 12. And on the rail line, you'd see where the houses are proposed. And then if you look to the east of the rail, and that's that's green space, and

1:36:15

essentially that would be the root of the root W and the root itself would leave the a 12 and it will climb on an embankment for 500 metres to a maximum height of seven and a half metres above the existing rail line at that point.

1:36:33

And the embankment would reduce to some extent as it follows the topography in a dime, and would meet the BLM 22 sorry, the 1121 at ground level, probably with a new roundabout, and then it would head east across the watercourse and then the frameless Valley on quite a significant structure through the landscape and up through the woodland though, when this route was proposed in 1990s. The crossing of the East Suffolk line was essentially a humpback bridge. So it went to, I think, a six metre height over the bridge, but very quickly dropped to a three metre cut, which essentially would have been a humpback bridge so that the

1:37:18

the requirements for designing major road schemes now have moved on since the 1990s. And the requirements the engineering in that first one kilometre of that route, is hugely significant and has a big impact, irrespective of the proposed development, the local plan, but a huge impact on that area size of Saxmundham. So I just wanted to make the zoning authority aware of that point. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Ball. I do intend taking a break at this point. But before I do, can I have a word with Mr. Flanagan?

1:37:59

This, Mr. Flanagan, I heard what you said about the alternatives just before, but I think you'd agree it is entirely proper that we report to the Secretary of State on the full environmental effects of the choice and the potential

1:38:15

additional vehicle mileage and vehicle journey time on the effect of the sustainability of that choice.

1:38:22

Say yes, I don't know from that. And Mr. Boyle, I think said he would

1:38:29

take away your point and if there is an additional further clarification needed, we will make sure we provide. Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. Just to say again to Mr. Wilson. Bazinet, Ian Galloway, Michael Bedford, Paul Collins. I will take your comments after the break and is now 1553. So could we say we will resume at 10 past four please.

1:38:54

Thank you.