

SizewellC_ISH2_Session4_07072021_TEXT

00:07

Welcome back. This is the resumption of ISO h two on traffic and transport. Before I start, can I just check the case t in a live stream and the recording of both started? Yes, they both started. Thank you. Right to resume with people with a Hands up. I notice Mr. Bedford is gone now. We'll start with Mr. Wilson.

00:36

Thank you, Mr. Humphries, Chris Watson on behalf of together against sides, we'll see, just wanted to make a quick point for anyone from Mr. Wright road statement on behalf of the applicant in terms of his justification for the adverse impacts for using the B 1122. In the early years, in terms of the urgent need for the project, as we'll see project, in fact, got government policy actually hasn't been set yet in terms of achieving net zero. And he specifically referred to phase modelling and basically that modelling also showed that we could achieve net zero without any new nuclear beyond Hinkley Point C. So we're basically using renewables plus CCS. And we all know renewables can be built far quicker and cheaper than nuclear. It's just that's my point. Thank you.

01:30

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Mr. Galloway, you please.

01:37

Good afternoon, Ian Galloway, into private individual from Cal Sal Khan Colton. First of all, thank you very much for allowing me to speak. And secondly, to thank Paul, Paul calling Mr. Collins, for covering much of the ground that I had intended to do.

01:53

So Mr. Galloway could adjust. Your camera doesn't seem to be on I can hear you. But I can't see you at all.

01:59

Let me just see. It's been playing up there with me.

02:03

There. That's it. That's it. Fine. Thank you.

02:05

Thank you. Yes, thank you to Mr. Collins for covering much of the ground that I was going to cover. However, I do have a few small observations that I'd like to make. First of all, I'd particularly like to make an observation from Mrs. Williamson, where she identified that actually sighs well see now is being developed and planned away from a waterfall model of project management, and more towards

an agile methodology. Specifically, I presumed from what she said, because a waterfall methodology would not allow them to meet the due date, or the date they have in mind for it to become operational in 2035. I have made comments in a written representation to some of the potential dangers of moving away from waterfall and moving into an agile methodology. But I'd like the examining authority, just to be aware that there are inherent dangers in moving away that away from that method. The second one was an acceptance that the SLR is to act as a whole road, something the applicant has previously and stridently denied, saying it was a legacy asset for all of the communities in suffer. And it then comes on to one of the questions about why and why that's important. Well, it's important because we've heard that 70,000 vehicle movements are being avoided by using it as a whole road to move film material to their main site. So it's my contention, given those circumstances, that actually, the SLR is not only developed for a long term benefit for the community in some way by considerable number of people, but also has fulfilled as Paul intimated, not only a resource for film material, but also at the same time, a whole road to enable a great deal of vehicle movements on the highway to be avoided. And that's really my comments can be found in my previous written representations.

04:16

Thank you, Mr. Galloway, before I get response from the applicant, and before I move on to Mr. Bedford, Mr. Collins, do you want to add something else at this point?

04:29

Yes, it was actually a point on from Mr. Ball, Mr. balls, discussion of W. And the fact that he said the W would actually come down after passing over the rail line would decide to come to a roundabout on the B, B 11. And let me let me just get my numbers right here. The B 1121. Which is ridiculous. When you consider the B 1121 joins the a 12, just south of where any link ro w would join, there would be no point in doing that. And as they have to actually elevate and cross the valley just below that, it would seem ridiculous to come all the way down there and then go up again, across embankments or whatever to climb again, across the Fronius Valley and up onto what is basically flat land all the way to the to the site. There was also a suggestion in one of their documents, and I can't remember which one but I'll try and find it, that there would have to also put a flyover across the, the the the branch line that goes to lace them. Well, when you consider the number of trains that will be going up and down the branch line even when it's been resurfaced, etc, etc, and reject to actually take all of these. I'm sure they can manage to manage those movements so that it could just be done through a level crossing. So those those are the main points I had. Thank you.

06:01

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Collins. Before I move on to Mr. Bedford, could I hear from Mr. Flanagan, whether he wants to respond on any of those three submissions?

06:11

Yes, I'm just going to if I may ask Mr. Bull to respond on the call road point raised by Mr. Galloway just now. Thank you, Mr. Ball. Hello, again, Richard Boyle on behalf the applicant. The proposal is for a permanent road,

06:39

not to haul road. The the application is for the road stay as a legacy and support the ship the development Go ahead, the three operating nuclear units that will be sized to deal with outages that would be staggered where possible, but could well be concurrent in the situation of an unplanned outage. In terms of legacy, there's a big discussion to be had about what the B 1122 could become once the traffic is predominantly removed from it. And we've started to have some useful discussions with the local authorities about repurposing that road to support cycle and more cycling friendly infrastructure and particularly linking into the quiet lanes initiative that the intersect with the BLM 22 and to ensure that they can be joined up as practically as possible. And we feel there's a huge legacy benefit there Lincoln into tourism and creating some cycling routes. Circular routes. And the other thing, just to add very quickly on that is you'll be aware of the proposals that we have. Providing off road cycling from the southern extent of the construction site to the northern extent. So there's safe passage for cyclists to link into that infrastructure. So in terms of the question on haul road, now the proposal is for a permanent road, and we feel there is a significant legacy to that road, both for utilising it to support the power stations and also to change repurpose the bit of BLM 22. Just to respond very quickly as well to Mr. Collins point regarding the proposed route, WD two people probably recall that originally it was a D one that was further size, but through the consultation process that was taking place in the 1990s it was moved further north to create some distance from the environment around sternfeld. So I think, however you try and place that particular route corridor, there are significant impacts to it. I think that's that's everything from me. Thank

09:03

you. Thank you, Mr. Ball. Mr. Bedford, I've already waiting for quite a while. Could I hear from you now, please?

09:14

Thank you. So microbead for Suffolk County Council. So I think probably just for hopefully very short point because I think much of this ground is covered in what we've already said to you in written form. But firstly, we do somewhat take exception to Mr. Flanagan characterising our position as being one where we're not suggesting that the SLR as proposed in the application is not acceptable in planning terms. I think it's absolutely clear from what we've said, particularly in our written representation, and I'll just give you two references paragraph 2.3634 12 the SLR has proposed we consider lacks justification for permanent retention, which is why we say that it should therefore be removed at the end of the construction period. It necessarily follows from that, that we're not accepting that as proposed, it is acceptable in planning. So that was the first point. Second point, the issue of what happens to it thereafter? Yes, we are obviously recognising what the applicant is proposing, in the sense that we, we recognise the reality that that is the application which is before this examination. And it's in that context that we have obviously, engaged, hopefully sensibly in discussions about what the position would be thereafter. But that's clearly without prejudice to our in principle view that it's not justified on a legacy basis as a permanent feature. So that that is a part of lack context. Secondly, if I can just give you a reference, this is the deadline three representations, red three, dash, eight, four, where we respond to the applicants comments, in relation to your question, a L, one point 30. And we set out there precisely, I think the point you've clearly already absorbed about the traffic case and the implications of the route in the post construction world and also it relative to how it performs it compared to other alternative routes, including obviously, Wu, stroke, the two, then, in terms of the third point, just to make this is

really a question, which we would appreciate, not obviously being answered now. But in the applicants post, hearing submissions, so far as we can tell, the justification, particularly I think, given by Miss Williams, for the SLR, as proposed, on the basis of helping to achieve a cut and fill balance between the associated development side and the main development side, we think that's a new point, which certainly we haven't seen, outlined previously. And if we've missed it, we would certainly be grateful in the post hearing submissions if we can be pointed to where that particular rationale is explained and justified. And then, I think the fourth point, I think it relates probably back to the point I've just already alerted you to so as you know, our position on legacy is rather different to that of the applicant. And indeed, obviously, as you will know, not quite the same as the Suffolk Council on this particular issue. But there we are. So those are the four points I just wanted to bring across.

13:07

Thank you. Mr. Bedford. I think before I go back to applicant Can I hear from Mr. Tate please?

13:15

Thank you, Sir Andrew, TT Suffolk cancel. So, can I just make three points. The first is the council considers that an SLR is needed. Secondly, that it does not consider that on the evidence that the council has seen that there is any preferable alternative to the route that is promoted as part of this decio particularly having regard to landscape and heritage impacts. And thirdly, so far as the longer term is concerned, you'd have seen opposition, which is that we recognise that there are legacy benefits from the road remaining as it is, first that the road would remain as a dedicated HGV route for the three stations taking account also of the additional traffic from the not in frequent outages. Secondly, there is an important potential benefit if it is embodied in this decio of promoting the B one one to two as a pedestrian and cycle friendly route for that part, which is bypass together with other initiatives. And thirdly, the removal at the end of the construction period would result in additional environmental impacts disruption, which we don't think can be properly justified.

14:49

Thank you, Mr. Tate. Good Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to respond to the two counsels at this point?

14:57

Yes, sir. If I may, firstly to Mr. Mr. Bedford. So I think it's important to properly understand suffix position and how certainly we understand it. We have not understood Suffolk County Council to be inviting the examining authority to recommend refusal or the second state to recommend with development consent for the scheme as presented, so that Suffolk are not saying that the application should be refused, because regardless of their concerns about whether the SLR should be retained after the period or not. So, they are not saying that. And that leads us then into policy, which I've already referred to without giving you the reference. But I will give you the references, it's 4.4, point three of the NPS, which tells us that, given the level at a level and urgency of need for new energy infrastructure, the examining authority should subject to any relevant legal requirements, for instance, under the habitats directive, which indicate otherwise be guided by the following principles when deciding what weight should be given two alternatives. And one of those the second of those is that the examining authority should be guided in considering alternative proposals by whether there is a realistic prospect of the alternative delivering the same infrastructure capacity, including energy security and climate

change benefits in the same timescale as the proposed development. So so the policy position is that because of the urgency for this development, great care needs to be taken with positions such as Suffolk County Council are taking it seems to us saying well look at the alternatives or what about does it nearly really need to be there beyond the end of the construction period. The wait to be given two alternatives is guided by that urgency, which underlies the application which is at the heart of national policy. So that's what I say in response to Mr. Bedford, the position of the county in respective Mr. Tate's position. I'm grateful for those comments. So we know that I know the alignment, such as there is between the applicant and his Suffolk as to the legacy benefits you have them for Mr. Teachers then and in the written representations. The way it's posed, which we think is fair and quite right, is that the combination of retaining the SLR plus downgrading downgrading the B 1122. would be hugely significant in terms of legacy benefits, and we certainly subscribe to that.

17:39

Thank you very much, Mr. Flanagan. Could I hear from Josie bassinet? No, please?

17:46

Yes, thank you. This is Josie bassinet. I'm speaking on behalf of Walberswick parish Council. I can be brief, Mr. Collins actually covered many of the points. So I won't repeat those. I would just like to add that some of the applicants statements that we have heard before the break about the early years lack of mitigation and about proper considerations of the alternatives actually isn't very correct in my view. I don't know if he sub the council or Suffolk County have said this to EDF. But every single local council local parish Council, who has participated in the consultation and in our written representations, has stress mitigation must be in place before the start, and that there are viable alternatives to consider. The local parishes have all said exactly as you have Mr. Humphrey, that a proper development requires that mitigation be in place prior to the start of the project. If it isn't in place, then it can't be called mitigation. And there is also no way to ensure that any of the work will ever be done. The fact is, is that EDF has never replied or address this when it's been raised by the local councils. Finally, since it was just mentioned by Mr. Ball and by Mr. Flanagan, I would just like to say that the B 1122 is heavily used by cycles now. I use it all the time. So I'm not sure what the legacy will be. That's been suggested here today. Thank you.

19:12

Thank you Miss bassinet. I think Mr. Galloway is something additional that you wanted to add. Yes, just one

19:21

very quick point. And thank you for indulging me. I just have to rebut Mr. balls, insinuation. I was doing anything other than quoting back Mrs. Williams and use the phrase haul road, not once, but twice within her representation.

19:39

Mr. Galloway. Mr. Collins again, is there something additional you want to add?

19:45

Yes, just a couple of comments on things that have been said since I last spoke. First of all, is Mr. Bowles use refer reference to the suffering to the SLR as being within green space. Well, I'm sorry, but any other pretty much any other of the alternatives that were considered within green specs as far as this is concerned, that's what we mainly have around here. It's open fields and whatever else we have. So it you know, it's, it's not a special area. And in fact, once they've finished with it, it will be a green space full of holes and embankments. The second thing that was just raised was about heritage impacts. And I'd like to abandon that too, because actually, the number of heritage impacts and listed buildings on the on the SLR route Archons considerable more than in fact than you'll find on the web, or D to rent. The last thing is timescales of development. For the D two w versus the SLR, I'm not going to be dissimilar. So let's stop kidding, everybody that the SLR is some sort of fast route to Nirvana.

20:57

Thank you, Mr. Collins, just before we get the heritage issues will be taken up in another hearing, it's not the transport hearings issue to go through all the heritage. The other thing is that it was raised, so just bring it out. Absolutely. The other thing is that I'm always bound to give the applicant the last say, so if you have any further comments about what he might say this time, could you perhaps add it to your written written submissions? I'll do that. Thank you. Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to respond to any of those? No, sorry. If I said no, I've got nothing further to add. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, well, that concludes what I wanted to say about sizewell link road in this section. We've dealt with the freight management facility. In terms of the to village bypass, I have a lot less intensive questioning on that. And our questioning is basically around the whether or not the routing a number of IPS have raised the issue or whether or not the routing of the proposed to village bypass will prejudice and eventual for village bypass routing. I'd like to hear the applicant's views and the council's use. on that issue. Please vote first with the applicant.

22:24

Yes, thank you, sir. Mr. Rhodes is going to cover that so I can pass over to Mr. Rhodes, please. tissue.

22:40

So John Rhodes for the applicants, I hope that the information we've provided so far to the examination is helpful on this. We did answer a question that deadline to that was question a one point 16. And in responding to that question, we provided some figures, which are available in rep to 101. And we hope to position is relatively straightforward. And it's it's this, which is the routes that we have adopted for the two vintage bypass is consistent so far as it goes with the route that had appeared to be the preferred route for the for village bypass. So insofar as any hindrance or assistance to the long term objective, then we think that providing the two village bypass would be an assistance. But what the figures show that we provided with our response was that it would be relatively easy to provide a sperm from the two village bypass that we propose that would then become a four village bypass if indeed, that was a long term objective and something that was proposed by another party. I think everybody recognises it wouldn't be proportionate or sensible for it to be proposed as part of this application. But we also provided figures from the previous studies that have been undertaken, which demonstrated that the consensus appeared to be from previous studies that perhaps a four village bypass wasn't the most sustainable approach. And if they were in the future to be bypasses of the other two villages that are global and miles fed, then the better option may be and it's not for us to say with a better option may be

individual bypasses, for those two villages, rather than the four village bypass and what the figures show is they would be some distance from our two village bypass and so not physically prejudiced by that.

24:41

Thank you. Could I maybe hear from Suffolk County Council on this point?

24:52

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council in our written representation paragraph two point to four, we'd set out the overall position. what we've said is the two village bypass will, in effect, preclude the building of the Segway for village bypass proposals on the desired alignment as set out in the Segway business case, and that perhaps needs a little bit unpacking. You've been provided helpfully by the applicant.

25:28

Sorry, Mr. Bedford. Mr. Rhodes, could you turn your microphone and camera off, please?

25:38

Mr. Rosati trying to it doesn't seem to be succeeding in the moment. Well carry on Mr. Bedford. Yeah, noise is going away. So so I just given you a reference to paragraph 2.24 of our written representation. I was then going to take you to appendix five, see in the applicants, deadline three material, which is the to village bypass summary paper, because in that, that quotes from the Department of Transport reasoning for not funding the Segway proposal in 2019, and sets out at 2.2 point three nine of the document, how that had been evaluated by the department at that stage. And so if you and your colleagues will absolutely understand with any piece of highways infrastructure, there is not only the question of the scheme itself in terms of appropriate alignments, there's also the evaluation of the scheme and whether it will be funded. And essentially, our position is that whilst we would accept that it would be physically possible to achieve a four village bypass following the delivery of a to village from bypass, the cost of the scheme is still likely to require central government funding. The current methodology for assessing schemes, as you know, so relies on benefits measured against accrued journey time savings, and the majority of the delay for which the benefits can be accrued in making a scheme good value for money would be associated with the eastern section of such a route. That is the part which would be bypassed by the to village bypass. So what that indicates to us, it's certainly that at this stage that the business case for a Western section in isolation, would be more challenging to secure central funding for that, obviously, we can't say enough to turn one because we don't hold the purse strings. That's a matter clearly for government. But secondly, because obviously, it would depend on the evaluation at the time. But what we do say is that clearly, given the history of the four village bypass thus far, and the rejection of the Segway proposals, we do see a practical concern that the two village bypass will make it more challenging to deliver a four village bypass, even if a physical route can be as it were depicted on a plan on the on the ground, and therefore the issue is one of making that challenge more difficult. That's I think, opposition.

28:14

Yes, thank you. That's very helpful. Do E's suffer Council have a view on this particular matter? Nothing in addition to that, which Mr. Bedford has set out, Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Tate. Now I see. Mr. Scott, you want to make a comment?

28:36

Thank you. I'm in the context of the design of the two village bypass, can I ask about the latest set of changes proposed to it? Which I have in front of me? And I know tickler.

28:50

Can I just say, Mr. Scott in, in what respect in about trust, layout or

28:56

respect to? Well, its design, I mean, there is a change to the length of a culvert to advantage otters. And what what I do ask about that, because there are many culverts there, and there's a River Bridge, and I and I, I just wanted to ask if there is going to be at some point documentary support for an HRA process on that,

29:23

that the HRA, and ecology and diversity, biodiversity hearings are the end of next week. So that might be the right time to raise that rather than in the transport hearing. Well, thank you. The design. Yeah, no, I understand. But we're not talking about necessarily the design of the to village bypass here, more the root of it and its transport implications. Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Scott. So with that, Mr. beech, please.

30:03

Thank you, sir. Snow. I'm speaking on behalf of snow parish Council in support. And I have been asked by Richard Cooper for milesplit to make some comments in terms of the for them to village bypass, as well, you'll have read they've done a detailed return. But they do see miles we do that for village bypass is fundamental and if there's a logic to to village bypass, then it must extend to four village bypass all the way through. And I just wanted to make the wider point on behalf of a number of parishes across a much wider area. And I've tried to make a point before that for village bypass would have a really significant impact across a much wider area in terms of the distribution of vehicles. If there's holdups accidents, and I know this probably comes to some of the modelling that we can talk about later. But I just want to emphasise is a much wider area that would benefit from that vote for village bikers. And that would be missed if there's only two village drivers. Thank you, Mr. beech.

31:13

Mr. Flanagan, do you want to make any responses at this point? Sorry, just before you do I noticed close Fortman has his hand up now. Could I hear from him before I hear from the applicant?

31:27

Yes, thank you. Yes, I would like to reinforce Mr. Beach's comments or a passport man comes down to parish council who has worked very closely with smartswitch etc. And Tim and I spoke earlier for Tim to racists a bit more. But I would like to reinforces and especially you know the potential impact Miss for

the four village bypass in terms of all the two village bypass so missing out martyrdom clemen the dangerous situations arising on the a toll for that compact to traffic volume going through there, especially in terms of accessing to and from the minor roads leading on to the A 12 is a huge issue of concern from all the neighbouring parishes here. Plus and I agree with Tim that's probably a modelling issue again, that subsequently because we are creating a bottleneck again, at around Glennon and milesplit. We are going to see more pressures on the neighbouring roads such as Eb 1069 and a B 108. And the a 11. Five, two, which will, you know, create further probably increased dangerous situations of the world around you. Thank you.

32:58

Thank you. Okay, can I hear now then from Mr. Flanagan, whether you want to make any response to those?

33:07

Yes. Can I just respond briefly, I think to Mr. Mr. Bedford on behalf of the County Council, who who as I understand it suggests that the proposals while again I think not not saying development, consent should be refused, but, but making a point nonetheless, that a T village bypass might prejudice or forbid provide pass because of a viability case falling away for the for village bypass. Well, so the position is that for village village bypass was a case for it was put forward to the DFT and rejected. And you have that in the for instance, the two village bypass summary paper that Mr. Bedford referred to the references para 2.2 point 39. Within rep 2108 and the DFT. This was the Segway scheme in 2019. concern that the proposal the four digit bypass did not provide value for money. ot also talks about adverse impact on local landscape and concluded by raising their prospect of a smaller to village bypass instead. So I think it's it's a case that the suggestion that the some prejudice to the four village bypass because their viability issue should be taken into account or given Wait, really can't hold water given the evidence you've got of what happened when a former this bypass was put forward say recently.

34:35

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to make any response to the following two submissions? Nope. So I'm happy to leave them there. Thank you very much. Thank you. Okay, well, that probably concludes my questioning on the to village bypass. I think the remaining part of this agenda was about a North and South Park and Ride sites about the size and the modelling coverage. was mainly a very technical questions from me about modelling. And I think given the time where and the need to move on the agenda, I might put that in writing, which would probably save a bit of discussion because it could be dealt with in writing, if that's acceptable to you, Mr. Flanagan. Okay, well, we'll move on to agenda item four, which is transport assessments and approach. And we'll start with the early years traffic modelling. In your response to TT one to nine, and this is on page 100, of 183, of traffic section of rep to 100. It suggests there'll be a total of 2230 workers which according to the modelling input for early years. This is reference to information about workforce profile in APA 196. However, I need some clarification and interpreting our latest implementation plan Rep. 2044, which is changed from the original implementation plan, as now shows additional work commencing in Year Zero and not at the start of year one, as indicated previously. The obvious effect of this is the bring forward to completion of the ad sites from well into year three into the end of year two. I assume the original implementation plan

that shows the ad sites will be under construction until approaching the end of year three was consistent with a workforce predictions in half 196. And as shown in figure 2.1 of the accommodation strategy, app six one for both of these will indicate workforce numbers will be an excessive 3000 approaching the end of what was year three, please no year two. It does indicate to me that the transport modelling assumption of 2230 workers for the early years could lead to an underestimation of traffic levels in the early years ahead of the completion of the ad sites. Can I have your view on that? I realise that's quite a long and involved question.

37:09

Yes, I'm gonna ask Miss Marlin to to see to answer it so far. She can, sir, as you said, it is obviously a fairly detailed question. And I do wonder whether it may be something we have to take away to some extent it by hand over to miss Marlin to address the the two to 30 question of whether that underestimates the numbers

37:44

ologies, we're doing so well. Currently, on behalf of the applicant, I think I probably will have to take this away in detail, but I'll try and answer it kind of at a high level. So in terms of the modelling, and what we've sought to do is looking at the the the number of workers that we forecast to be travelling to the main development site prior to either to the northern or southern part COMMBUYS being available. But in terms of the associated development site workers and the workforce profile, actually, kind of kind of has a has a different profile, and kind of that's based on a realistic profile. But what we've done is in terms of robustness, we've added together all of the ad construction workers and and assumed that all of them, and that the peak of all of them would all coincide. And if you add them all together, it gets to 730. Actually, the the workforce profile shows it's far less than that at that point. And so that's where you get to the 2230. But it's it's only, you know, effectively based based on the workforce profile in terms of the the work workforce that is travelling to site to site, it's 14 110. In the profile, we've modelled 1500 plus the 730. Now, the 730 would be travelling to different associated developments around around the network the size of a link code or to verge bypass, and they've been assigned to each one of those associated development sites is only the 1500 and which have been assigned to the to the main development site whatsoever that fully partly answers your

39:41

question or not. Really My concern is when you look at what's in the original submission documents, not the implementation plan now is that Mr. maund

39:57

now you finish your point, Mr. Reasonable Just because it has knock on effects elsewhere, which I'll come to.

40:05

Okay. Well, the when you look at original application documents that was based on the original implementation plan that had a start in year one, what seems to have happened and I notice is a very simplistic view is start seems to being brought earlier. But see, which brings the end of some things sooner, which is that when you look at the charts, for the workforce numbers, it's incredibly sensitive,

because there are very steep upward number, the increase in workforce, and the end dates of these early years treated development sites. If they move slightly, their workforce numbers vastly exceed what you've modelled in the early years. That's that sensitivity or on dipping down and in tomorrow's discussion, want to talk about how early years, because I heard Mr. Rhodes say yesterday, that numbers of workers isn't an effective way of controlling it. But that must be an effective way of controlling the early years and traffic numbers that it doesn't overrun your assessments. And so

41:14

the assessment is the assessment in terms of what we will be able to come on to this tomorrow, and the controls and the governance around that need to ensure that there's not unacceptable harm, effectively. And that would be the purpose of those controls. And so, obviously, we can kind of come on to that in more detail tomorrow. But in terms of I suppose, the I appreciate what you're saying in terms of Could it be it's a fine, it would appear to be a fine tipping balance, and is the is the assessment robust enough, and in terms of the number of workers prior to the delivery of that infrastructure? And is there a potential that we're that to be delayed, that it would could result in unacceptable impacts. And so to then kind of take that that through in terms of what's in place at the moment, to follow the argument three would be there, if the if the park and rides were to be delayed, what measures and controls have we got in place at the moment currently, and the workforce of being managed by the workforce travel plans, that's rep 2055. And they will be governed by a transport review group. And they meet quarterly, and they will be reviewing all of the monitoring data that is in place, they will all say I'm sure be very aware of the delivery of that infrastructure and of the implementation plan and how that aligns with the implementation of the workforce travel plan. So the the commitments that we've got within the workforce travel plan are a commitment to Moshe targets. And they would be monitored and reviewed by the by the CLG, a commitment to fund three buses, a commitment to fund or consiting infrastructure, and to limit parking spaces at both the land use of eastland Industrial state and the main site as well as implement parking permits. So there are carrots and sticks here and ability for us to manage any delay where that to happen in order to ensure that the impact wasn't unacceptable. But that is effectively the purpose of the TRG. And the other thing, just finally, that the TRG has the ability to draw down from the transport contingency fund. So on a quarterly basis, the TRG has to say, and this is set out in Section 5.3 of the travel plan, it has to do three things on the travel plan, first of all, it has to say is the is the applicant on track to meet the most shared targets, and no amendments required to the action plan. So an action plan is a rolling call just the same as happened to include. So it's a rolling quarterly action plan. And there is a commitment to for for the applicant to fund remedial measures. And so that action plan would be funded by them in order to ensure that those motion targets are met. Are they not on track to meet it? And if so, Are there additional actions needed? Or are they not on track to me need it but no further actions needed? because that wouldn't cause any any effect. So there is that governance in place in order to ensure that we're there to be delayed within the infrastructure and the workforce to be slightly higher, that it wouldn't result in an acceptable? Well,

44:36

I think, you know, tomorrow's discussion will be about a controls and monitoring. But put simply in this case. If there's more than 2230 workers in the early years, the modelling underestimates the traffic impact and thus your environmental impact, does it not? Correct, right. That's more or less what I wanted to get to know. Mr. Moreland, obviously if, as a follow on question this point, so I'll

45:09

Yes, thank you, Mr. Humphrey. It was just bearing in mind the reference you'd made to the implementation plan. And that moving the date forward for some of the associate developments. What I couldn't understand was the consequential effects of staffing and the provision of accommodation. So I don't necessarily need an answer now. But it's clearly something that I had in mind for Friday for the community impacts. And so if someone can be thinking about that, in readiness for Friday, so we can get a detailed answer, it will be helpful. Thank you. Okay. We'll take that away. And as to thank you. Thank you.

46:11

Right, that was all I wanted to say on that particular issue. The next one was about seasonal differences. And it may be you are the person who will answer this one this month. I'm a little unclear in your response. T T. 141. is on page 107 of 183 of the traffic section of rep to 100. About the seasonal and outage effects on traffic levels. Put simply, are you saying that the outages have been included in a reference case base level of existing traffic, more than offset any holiday season peaks, such as may happen in August?

46:51

That's that's not what we're saying. And what we're saying try and be as brief as I can. The requirement by n one is to prepare a transport assessment in accordance with web tag guidance, and another relevant guidance. So if you look at paragraph 15 of the Department of Transport planning practice guidance in relation to the scope of transport assessments, it says that in general assessment should be based on normal traffic flow and uses conditions IE non school holidays periods, typical weather conditions, may be necessary to consider the implications for regular users or regular peak traffic and usage periods such as rush hours. So what we've sought to do is the the the fees and the strategic model is based on traffic data collected in May and May in a modelling perspective, we have neutral months are not neutral months, May is a neutral month, non neutral months are some of the winter months where traffic conditions are considered to be potentially slightly lower. And, and then other non neutral months. And there may be traffic conditions with that might be slightly higher, such as in this instance in in August, and given the the seasonality. So that's the May. And this is borne out by kind of traffic count data and collected so soft cap permanent traffic count data. And we can provide further information if you consider it to be helpful. So they've they have permit traffic counts on the a 12. That show that may is kind of his average, and there are higher months, there are lower months, but it provides that kind of average average typical month, which is what we've based assessment on calls with the guidance. So the in terms of seasonality. We are aware the seasonality and we looked at an investigate that set out and summarises section 2.3 of the consolidated ta which is web 2045. And we looked at it a number of points within the on the eight corridor and concluded that we didn't felt there was kind of levels of seasonality around Ipswich and Woodbridge on the a 12 corridor. But then looking at areas further north and at Farnham and Langford. It came we came to the conclusions that in August there's around 10% higher on the in terms of weekday traffic flows north of Woodbridge, typically In an August rather than in May, and then also the in place 2.1 and 2.2 of the TA it looked at a MMP MP periods. And it showed that in a Monday to Thursday is 10% higher in may actually the May was higher than the August in the morning and on a Friday afternoon and varied between 13 and 30% or 30%

being in Phantom. Actually since the TA we've looked further at the analysis that data and the Friday as you can appreciate Friday afternoon, you may experience And it's kind of higher levels of traffic on in the road network. And when we've looked at the Monday to Thursday, the equivalent of that famum is actually reduced from 32 to 12%. So for most of the week, there's not as pronounced difference, as we've actually set out in the TA. But based on experience at Hinkley, the the the Monday to so that the the Friday has less workers travelling than the busiest days are kind of in the middle of the week from Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and either side of the week, there's less workers. So kind of countering the the that Friday peak, potentially in an office being busier, relatively speaking in terms of Hinkley or the the experience of Hinkley is that there's less work or traffic and actually the busier busier days on the site, are in the middle of the week. So the what we what we've sought to do is provide an element of robustness within within the assessment by including that outage traffic, it's not to say that the outage traffic is equivalent to seasonality is to say that the guidance sets out that we should be assessing normal, it's the same with the supermarket, you don't build a supermarket for Christmas, but you experience that it might be busier at certain times a day. And a transport assessment shouldn't be seeking to build mitigation and infrastructure for those peak times for that for those abnormal peaks, it should be looking to create infrastructure for the athlete that the majority of the time, not the abnormal peaks. And so that the adding the

51:39

the the size, well, at the outage traffic, which occurs infrequently to that reference case, was was an extra layer of robustness, as well as other layers of robustness that we've added in to the assessment to suppose provide an additional layer of kind of robustness to the to the impact potential impacts, but not go all the way to the to the extreme of you know, the highs and lows, and some months they will be a lot less than someone's maybe slightly higher. But

52:17

I mean, I do understand how you do a transport assessment, and I assume that was scoped with the Highway Authority. About my very simple question was, does the addition of the outage traffic? If, if you like, exceed any difference that would be without the outage traffic but the peak traffic?

52:39

And I think we'd have to look at it from a Monday to Thursday, from the points I've just set out in terms of the debts based on the further analysis. It's around kind of 12%, not 35%? I think what we set out in the in the answer was based on a comparison with the kind of the Friday peak, I think it'd be helpful maybe for us to set out that comparison, based on a Monday to Thursday on the network, which is far less pronounced. And potentially it does have a similar and it manages to assess a similar level of traffic.

53:12

So I mean, it would be useful to understand that in a very simplistic terms about if there's an outage. And it's not in peak season. Do the traffic levels, actually in your reference base case? Are they more generally than the traffic levels in the peak season with no outage? Okay, well, we'll try to understand and following on from that, okay, comes to be how you manage outages an explanation of how,

because that that in my mind works as a as a sort of like mitigating factor in your assessment, but not if the outage occurs in holiday pick, I

53:55

think I think we've already covered this in the question that you've quoted in that there planned and unplanned outages outside of those outside that states in the spring water.

54:08

So maybe an additional understand how that would be controlled. How that can be controlled.

54:17

Okay, well, we'll say that when they're planned out just kind of schedule definitely of the 18 months around that to avoid the pink period so that that's happened that happens now in terms of size well be that's that that's their general outages that have already planned. I'm not sure that the studies we control that just happens now, but we can take that away.

54:37

Okay, I noticed a few hands up so maybe you want to be around while I listen to these comments. Mr. Fortman, please.

54:48

Yes, sir. Thank you and sorry, Miss my comb. You must get very tired today. I we have an issue with the EDF traffic dictator, I'm assuming a May as being a neutral position. And that comes out of an experience locally here where we're situated very close to one of the largest agricultural distribution depots in the UK and the bentwaters. In Rendlesham, which uses the be 1078. And the a 11. Five two has access to the a 12. And we looked closer at HGV data and the seasonal traffic. And basically the main agricultural season in this area, which is basically software Farnham, I'm talking about is from June to October, peaking in August and September. And to give you an idea of the numbers, we're talking of HTV traffic emanating from bentwaters, feeding into the local roads in May in 2019, which was the last full count and there has been a rising perspective over the last four years since three years since monitoring began on that base started about 2000. And for August, it goes up to 4600 HGV movements a day and in September to 5400. Now if you combine that then pack that two ish, you know, two data from holiday, and potential music, festivals, etc. and Snape, it is actually quite an extraordinary number for what we all know is very much a traffic funnel in the Woodbridge area on da 12. So I just want to point out our problem of average measure because we very painful field that those measures have been applied to us in the past. And it creates really horrific situations at times, because it's averaged out over the year and it doesn't doesn't seem to be heavy. But once you're in those months, it becomes quite unbearable. Thank you.

57:12

Thank you. Paul Ashton, please.

57:22

Sorry, thank Thank you, sir. couple of points. One specific to the Oxford in the a 1120. And the the a 1120 is advertised and promoted and signed as a tourist route. So it's it's use, in terms of the increase in use in the summer period is from observation by locals, significantly higher than significantly higher than, excuse me, which is

58:00

significantly higher than the a 12. And I'm concerned that the approach that's been adopted for the a 12 of measuring in May, and then using constant measuring to see what the uplift is at the peak period. And then extrapolating from that doesn't necessarily apply to the a 1120. And it also suffers from Boyden, there's just been made as a being used quite significantly during the harvest season in August and September, which coincides, I think I would appreciate if the modelling of the 811 20 was a bit more robust around that period, particularly because it's not, whilst it is an exceptional period. It's also crucial to tourism. And this area is has tourism is quite significant for this area. So I think the the understanding of the potential traffic impacts should be better understood in that specific instance.

58:56

Thank you, Mister, thank you. Mr. Mr. Fortman. Could you? Put your hands up down please? Mr. Collins?

59:11

Yes, thank you. It was really about the comparisons that were being used between here and Hinkley Point and the places that they were really doing those modelling comparisons. The road networks here are very, very different. And I wonder as to the validity of thinking about, for instance, the junctions and what is happening going through Bridgewater and coming off the M five versus what happens at Wang furred and I forgot where they said the other point was on the wooden bridge or somewhere on the a 12 they're vastly different. And I'm not sure that those comparisons are really appropriate.

59:54

Thank you Mr. Collins, Mr. Galloway.

1:00:04

Good afternoon, Ian Galloway, resident counsel compelling, very briefly just to draw your attention to a letter from the Department of Transport at appendix eight of my written representation earlier this year, which came as a combination of discussing the tag advice regarding holiday periods. And the discussion basically revolved around the basis of the department's advice, which is long and protracted. But the essence of it was that it was primarily designed for urban areas where of course holiday impacts, mental traffic decreased because he went on holiday and times emptied, etc, etc. And I'd refer you to the letter because basically, after the conversation, the department suggested that they couldn't comment on individual cases, it would be sensible to regard a holiday destination, and the measurement of that traffic in very much a different way from an urban setting. And I just like to draw that to your attention.

1:01:05

Thank you, Mr. Galloway. I'll take Mr. solara, and Sutherland with john Sutherland, please. Thank you very much. Mr. Neal. Have you gotten it? Yeah. Yes, I have. Thank you. Mr. Galloway, could you turn the camera

1:01:27

on? I'm very conscious of how complex this whole project is. I'm also aware, as highlighted by Mr. Flanagan, that is how urgent it's considered by them. A lot of In fact, the vast majority of what has been given us evidence from this community has been about the impact on our community. And the level of destruction and, and the progress of traffic and all the rest of it. What we've been discussing today, question I've got for the applicant is this, particularly bearing in mind that so much of their planning appears to be based on the Hinkley model, which, as Mr. Collins has just pointed out in a very different area with a very different infrastructure, in their planning, have they considered the huge frictional effect of trying to apply their plan on the infrastructure in this area, I can see a situation where they're best laid plans are going to grind to a halt, or at least be very much slowed down by the very issues that we've been discussing today. And I'm just really interested as to whether the plan has even taken this into consideration. I'm a historian and klaus had a phrase for factoring war, which was that was called friction, which was that the best laid plans were encounter all sorts of problems. And I suggest that a lot of the problems that the applicant is going to run into here is the very infrastructure problems we're trying to highlight. And I just wondered whether the applicant is considered this in his planning.

1:03:21

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Fuller. All Mr. Wilson.

1:03:30

Yes, thank you. Yes, Kris Kristofferson from together against sighs to say, just a couple of points relating to the ADF representative, before referring to the traffic flows with the planning of outages. Obviously, there are unplanned outages as well. I mean, currently, we have a sizable B, outage extended probably list in the end of ghost, which obviously will hit the peak traffic flows. So I wonder how much that's been factored in in terms of unplanned outages. And second thing. She referred to comparisons, so more recent studies, in terms of chain. Health traffic flows were different at different times of the year. And I wonder if the more recent ones were carried out during COVID restrictions were, obviously a lot of people weren't travelling anyway. So I'm just wondering when those more recent studies were done, and whether that would have impacted on those. Thank you.

1:04:37

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Mr. Sutherland, could you turn your camera and microphone off, please? I do apologise. I'm so sorry. Right with those Could I hear from the applicant about responding to those points. And in the case of scoping, the transport assessment and how that was done, I'll probably hear from Suffolk County Council after you. Thank you.

1:05:01

Customer on behalf of the applicant and taking them in terms of fortoment with regard to the bentwaters, and the traffic generation around kind of the season. So there is a acceptance that the as with lots of throughout the country, there is variation in traffic throughout it, and there will be variations

to come from different roads and different areas. But what we're trying to do is establish what is the impact of size while traffic. And so it's, it's from a from an environmental perspective, actually, lots of that impact is based around percentage change, and we'll come to that tomorrow. So we're there to be a higher background traffic, then effectively, our impact in terms of the size, an impact would then reduce, and you would see that an environmental assessment, because the the that that is the kind of relative impact of that traffic. So I think we just got to be quite careful in terms of what the effect may be that, again, adding more background traffic onto the network, and then adding sizable traffic on. And we are looking at the impact of that sizable traffic, not the not the operation of the of the road network in its totality. The other thing to point out, so I think that kind of covers a few points, temps of the A, just before you move on just on that

1:06:34

particular point I understand the point about is the background traffic goes up. But the environmental effect might be lessened because your traffic is a lesser percentage. But in terms of junction, highway analysis, your traffic might be the straw that breaks the camel's back,

1:06:53

I realised that I mean, there's lots of things kind of quite a complex topic. In that what we've also done is we've factored up traffic flows. So we've taken account of and the growth in traffic has been agreed with the authorities and set out in the statement of common ground that the traffic gets counted, then it gets gross to based on government forecasts of how how much housing jobs, and also how much use of the car we will be doing in the future. And, and so that then adds further traffic onto the network, and that there needs to be consideration. So in terms of website guidance, there's recent guidance that's been issued around COVID, for example, around the uncertainties of modelling post COVID. And that's not just COVID, it's also setting out that the forecast that we've based our traffic modelling on, and actually the Department for Transport is, is reviewing those forecasts in light of a number of things. They're reviewing it in light of popular population growth not being as they forecast it to be it's quite gloomy, read it personally that they are economic forecasts are not going to be as good in terms of GDP as they forecast it to be. And therefore the rate of traffic and the growth in traffic would be less. However, we forecast our traffic based on forecasts at that time, those forecasts are being updated and reduced by the government at the moment. They're not available yet, but they've made us aware that actually they've over forecast that. So the other aspect to consider is about about COVID and and how that and the effect that that has had. So what we've done is we've modelled, and we've forecast the future, based on history, and in that how people would travel and in the future will be the same as how they were travelling, kind of pre COVID. And that's another thing that the the latest guidance from Webb tag has sought to kind of a say, this is a great opportunity in terms of travel behaviour change. We're all obviously here today, virtually, but not travelling around the network. And that may you know that there may be effects. And I think everybody recognises that there are potential long term effects of COVID in terms of travel behaviour. However, that hasn't been factored into any of our modelling. So we have to be really careful about kind of the the layers of robustness that you add to a model. And if you continue to add layers of robustness, it's then actually are we predicting you're falling into the trap of predicting and providing infrastructure, when actually the approach now for kind of transport planning is vision and validate rather than predict and provide so it's a really careful balance and what we've tried to do Then our assessment is not trying to layer robustness on robustness and worst case and on worst case, but

actually seek to provide a reasonable element of robustness that is reasonable, but not overly robust. And looking at every potential eventuality that might just happen to break a junction. And that's not realistic. It's not what planning policy requires us today.

1:10:28

Okay, what about Mr. Galloway's point about the letter he's submitted from the DFT about seasonality and the use in urban areas?

1:10:39

I will I will need to take a look at that, because I wasn't aware of that. So apologies. I will I will take that away as an action to look at that letter and to respond on that.

1:10:47

Thank you, could it at this point? I realised there's two more hands up but Mr. Bedford for Suffolk County Council, could I perhaps ask you about the scoping of the transport assessment, whether you're content with the you know the seasonality effect being covered properly in the transport assessment? Thank you.

1:11:09

So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, you're absolutely right that there was a scoping exercise for the transport. Assessment. As you would expect, the county council did obviously give consideration to the methodology and the assumptions that the applicant was intending to utilise. We were content with the use of a neutral month in line with webtech guidance relevant at the time. And we have noted that there is an element of robustness in through the inclusion of outages, but we didn't see the modelling assumptions, as long as the cost as as it were any concern. As the Highway Authority for the county. We're obviously familiar with the way that the network works in Suffolk. We're familiar with it to having large areas as a holiday destination. We obviously carry out our own projects infrastructure projects in Suffolk and we use the same conventional methodology and community uses neutral marks for traffic assessment that's been found acceptable both to us and indeed to the Secretary state in approving projects, including I think you've probably heard reference to the lowest off Gullwing bridge scheme recently approved as an inset. So we work contempt, I think is the short answer.

1:12:24

Thank you for that Mr. Bedford. Okay, Mr. Wilson, do you want to say something else? Mr. bolson? Sorry, no, I didn't put my hand down. I'll do that now. Oh, thank you, Mr. Wilson. Okay, counsellor, Robin Sanders.

1:13:01

All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Humphrey, thank you very much for letting me come in on this. You did raise a particular issue there with regard to drugs and capacities, and it's that hard, particularly want to concentrate on and discuss and ask questions of now. In the recent report, our EP four double zero,

1:13:19

they're interrupting one second, Mr. Wilson, could you turn the camera off, please? microphone. All right. Thank you Good could carry on the society sorry about

1:13:33

in the recently published reported deadline for our EP four dash 005, which is the revised fourth revision of the consolidated transport assessment in alterations and Northshore significance to the particular junction that we're interested in, within the Woodbridge area, and it has been acknowledged by the applicant, Suffolk County Council and most interested parties representing the places along a 12 that peak tank capacity issues exist, particularly in the Woodbridge area, and particularly between judges 28 And finally, six and 28. Um, Mr. Mr. Humphrey, I don't seem to be moving. Yeah. All right. You are still there? Yeah, sorry, your room, it's gone. Completely. I'm still here, though. Hear me, I've just wondered marlink. In particularly looking at that report, we've noticed that there is significant alteration to the assessment at junction 26 at ca 12 B 1438. And in that in the early years, there is now an indication of significant delays occurring there in the reference year case, which is for that same date 2023 there's shown a delay Have 30 seconds. However, for the case with the traffic from title A, C and n are presumed possibly the Scottish power Once added into that as well, it now is up to 335 seconds, which is a very substantial significant delay that we are concerned about it because we believe that that will lead to rap. Now, one of the issues that has been stated by the applicant in 8.725 is that they consider the modelling shows that people will queue and will not reroute on alternative routes. But this is given it's not to the specific junction, there's a general statement. And I believe in relation to junction 26 that is not realistic. The observed behaviour that we see at that junction even now when traffic flows occur, or for vehicles to go along the V 143. Hate to miss the problematic traffic tree learn 26 and 27. And also, if they're aware of it to come off at junctions 23 and 24 for use the pre martlesham bypass a one of nine three and former a 12 Pass test goes on Chrome point connecting to the beat 1438, East of junction 26. So we consider that that latest traffic assessment really support for me in saying all along that there are going to be significant issues there. In addition to this, what doesn't seem to have been taken into account is that you discussed earlier in our meetings about the a 12 works with Suffolk County Council was referring to unfortunately, in the consultation that those works are planned to be constructed between winter sorry, autumn 2023 and winter 2025. Now those works are all online improvement works at the junctions but between 26 and 27. It includes online improvement to a single carriageway section. Now as a traffic engineer and myself as the highway engineer, you will recognise that this is an adorably going to lead to major traffic management and to reduce speed limits up through that section over an extended length. And if one takes up into account, and this is an early stage, early years forecasts sort of early stage but early years forecast, then the delays that are already predicted in that revised report are likely to be more even more significantly affected. And we will have further rat running and diversion onto the B 1438. At the current stage, Suffolk County Council and the applicant have made no provision for assessing what can be done to mitigate for the impact of that

1:17:56

which we believe as a kind of as a time capsule will be significant and will severely impact the time over those two years, particularly 2023 to 2025. funding. And obviously with those works occurring, the move of AI ELLs through those traffic works will cause yet further problems. And we're taught earlier on about there being in the order of one a day. Now. One only needs to think of all these things added

together. And we believe that the problems that will exist at junction 26. And all the roads associated around there will be substantial and will become unbearable. So I raised that as question and would ask, What can be done? What has been done to assess this? And what mitigation, if any, has anyone considered at this stage? Because at the moment appears to be none.

1:18:57

Councillor Saunders? Mr. Humphrey is having a bit of an IT issue at the moment. Mr. Collins, do you have anything else to add? I noticed your hand is up.

1:19:11

Yes, just just one question actually. And that's to do with particulate monitoring at the Oxford junction with the B 1122. And the a 12. Where the applicant seems to indicate that particulate levels will fall during the early years and fall further still wants to link size or length road is open. This seems pretty inconceivable considering the increase in traffic that's going to be going through that junction and I think perhaps requires further explanation and expansion by the applicant please.

1:19:47

Thank you very much. If I can turn to the applicant if you do have any response to the last two set of comments that have been made, please

1:20:00

cast him out man on behalf of the applicant I realised that Miss mister sorry.

1:20:08

I can't see you. I don't know whether it's on on mine apologies. Let me try that again. I can I can hear you

1:20:17

end of the day if when you can put in the laptops fatigued. And so it cuts out Milan half the Atkins I apologise. I missed Mr. Sowell's question earlier just in terms of applying the HPC plan to Suffolk area, and how that could possibly work because the networks are different. So I think it's very important to set out that whilst we have looked at Hinkley data from a trip generation point of view, in terms of what could be generated by workers by trade and other important things. And that's been a very useful wealth of data from that perspective. And what we haven't done is then said, well, actually the network and in Hinkley is the same as the networking in Suffolk, we've built and kind of gone through a lot of discussions and audits of models that are built specific to the suffit network. And there's a hierarchical approach of those from the strategic model down to junction models of individual junctions, I wouldn't be able to quote how many junctions but it's definitely over 40 of key junctions around around the network, as well as to microsimulation corridor models, one around the Oxford, one covering the a 12 corridor between the a 12 and the B 1152. So we have collected a lot of traffic data over the years. And we've built a lot of models, we've had a lot of discussions with the highways authorities. And I would point you to the statement of common ground between both the local authority and the local authorities and highways England that technically those models have been agreed as being acceptable for the

purpose of assessing the project. So just to kind of clarify that bit just on the the points that Mr. Saunders race, and one was this particular thing around Woodbridge and around junction

1:22:29

26. So and junction 26. So that because there's lots of junctions that have been assessed, they're all numbered up. So it's not like a motorway, we find that trunks on a map. That's our numbering. So I would point you to table 9.1 to zero unfortunately is 120 tables in chapter nine of a TA for people to wade through. So a really useful summary of chapter nine of the consolidated ta is 9.1 to zero. And that looks at the largest increase in delay per vehicle due to size well flow relative to the reference case. And jason 23 is the junction of the a 12 with a B 1438. Now that that model actually has been model so that jnks has been model three times it's included in the strategic model, it's included in an isolated junction model based on a modelling software called junctions nine. And it's also been included in the vism a 12 micro simulation model of that corridor or so we've got lots of information and assessment of that junction. Now, I'd say that the most detailed and kind of invalid and the most confidence with and I think that the Suffolk County county that will speak on their behalf. And but that we're aligned on this, that the fifth and the eighth orphism model provides us with the ability to make judgments on the effect of sizable traffic on that corridor. Now, the the seconds in delay that were created previously by these scientists were based on a junction model and which are sometimes quite crude in terms of in terms of the delays in seconds. And actually when you look at the table 9.1 to zero, the the seconds in delay are based on the vism micro simulation model which has been accepted as a technical model from which to assess the effects of of size well. And that shows that in 2022 in the early years as the largest increase as a five second delay per vehicle on any arm of that junction moving to 2028 have a 16 second delay and by the operational year of a two second delay, and the star next to the two second is because the visit model doesn't cover the 2013 scenario. So that actually is based on the juncture modelling. So, so to kind of that hopefully gives us some understanding of that than just the final thing just in terms of abnormal load. So I think we've kind of covered this earlier that the abnormal loads and the management of those within the ctmp would mean that they wouldn't be travelling and network peak periods, were not permitted to escort them in the hours of darkness. And the largest ones would be controlled, or would be escorted by the place. And most of those abnormal loads are smaller in size. So they would be avoiding those network periods anyway. Stick just one other things. So it's it's come up a few times it's running, quickly summarise that.

1:25:47

Just very quickly, please Miss McMahon.

1:25:49

Yeah, sorry. So just on that rat running, prefer not to call it back via money and call it route choice. But so everybody obviously has a choice within a network and the strategic highway model. That is the purpose of that it looks at a wide area, and it looks at the only one choice that people might want to make as a result of increase in traffic, there were other choices that people make, and other decisions that they make, they can change mode of transport, they can decide not to travel, they can change the time that they travelled as well. But the only response to congestion that that strategic model is able to make is route choice, it's still a helpful model to use. And that's allowed us to understand what the potential effect might be of the size of our traffic on Route choice and and people choosing different

routes in the network. Now that junction modelling then takes that the results from the strategic model that include that route choice and rerouting of traffic, and it tests in the junction models, it tests the effect of that to see whether it would have a capacity effect on the junction. So all of the junction modelling that you can see takes effect of Route choice, just in terms of the vism micro simulation model. What we've sought to do, there is actually any traffic on the a 12 that wants to travel on the a 12 in the future. And is has been added on to that network. So it doesn't take any consideration of traffic being displaced by sizable traffic because we wanted to see whether there would be a need for an improvement on that corridor. Now, it wouldn't be a valid assessment. If we said if we took the the modelling results from the strategic model that may have some rerouting your traffic away from the a 12. If we took those results, and put them in the micro simulation model, and added the sysvol traffic on to that, then effectively, we haven't we we and then said we didn't need an impact. What we're doing is saying Well, our traffic's replacing other traffic that wants to be on that corridor. And therefore we don't need to provide any mitigation we've actually done is assessed any traffic in the future that wants to be on the a 12 corridor or has been modelled on that corridor as part of the system modelling. And we have added the size of our traffic onto that to determine whether we consider there to be an unacceptable impact or not. Once all of the traffic that wants to be on that network continues to be on that corridor. So that's the different approach to route planning or route choice.

1:28:32

Thank you Miss McMillan, can I just ask you one thing? As I understand it, there is still a discrepancy between what Suffolk County require in terms of mitigation on some of the junctions on the a 12. And what you are offering, is that correct? And we'll talk about that more tomorrow. I realised that that's correct. Yes. Thank you. Now there's a few people with their hands up. Could I start with Mr. Scott? Yes. Thank you. I

1:29:06

want to make a precise intervention. The proposal which I think you're aware of the smart traffic lights to go on the junctions that are in question has built into it a Suffolk County Council assumption of 1000 extra vehicles. I don't know over what period for, for the for that proposal in the submission to government. There's a government funding for it. And I just wonder whether you would consider how that statistic might fit into the rest of the analysis. That's one point. And the second point I wonder about and this is from local experience, I did submit to that consultation. And the other one is that there is very very considerable concern about the concentration of The disproportionate allocation of new housing to Suffolk in terms of average, you know, an average for national counties. And the, it looks as a pattern of building on the spine road. So for example, in that junction between seven hills and Woodbridge, we've got martlesham. The major GPO is, you know, the major telecoms Research Centre. And the bright well lakes proposal there. I think there's confirmation now of the first 5500 new homes without actually their own round about quantity, a 12. And it's contingent. And it's, that's the first of three phases, I think about 5000 new houses there. The Suffolk police station site is is up for potential housing. So I think the underlying question is, is average statistical modelling relevant when you look at the existing actual structural pattern of challenges on the a 12? Thank you.

1:31:04

Thank you, Mr. Scott. I will ask the applicant to respond in a in a few minutes. But I think they will have taken a character committed development, but I'll get them to respond to that. And John's federal release, is now joining.

1:31:24

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. And, and indeed done. Thank you Miss Mullen on explaining your adaption from your Hankey model. I'm most grateful for that helpful, that is slightly misses the point, what I'm really trying to get at is whether you in your planning, of taking an account of all these traffic issues on your plan and your operation. So we've got all these heavy good vehicles and big loads and all rest of it all the workers going to work and all rest of it, and they're going to encounter a lot of traffic congestion, it's going to slow up your plan. And I'm just wondering the extent to which you've, you've taken that into consideration. it again, to use a parallel, it's a little bit like it's fine. Getting an Armoured Brigade to advance over good roads and all rest of it. But when the roads are full of refugees, it tends to muck the plan up. And I'm just wondering if you've actually taken that into consideration. Thank you very much.

1:32:28

Mr. Sutherland could before you go? Are you asking the applicant, whether their traffic assessment takes account of the fact they will also there will also be works ongoing on the highway network? Or are you saying has their traffic assessment? You know, taking account of all the changes that they are proposing in their in their development?

1:32:52

I see, I think, I think both actually, but more about the impact of what all this potential congestion is there, right? And we're wrong, that won't be a problem, that if we're right, and there is going to be a lot of congestion. I'm just thinking of whether they've calculated the impact on what they are trying to do at size. We'll see with all those heavy goods and all rest of it on their plan. They're stressing the urgency of what they've got to get done. There could be some tremendous delays here. I'm just wondering if they've taken that into consideration. That's Thank you.

1:33:26

Thank you very much. So the NRF, I think is having a state. Can I hear from you, please?

1:33:37

Yes, thank you very much, Charles Street and Council for the halvening Hall estate. I noted that Miss Mullen spoke about the gravity and visit models and absent points on those that I was perhaps going to save for the last item on the agenda. But they might now better be made now. So I'll just deal with the first relates to the gravity model. And it's in particular in relation to what's said in appendix seven at the consolidated transport assessment that document rep 2046. On the PDF, it's page 454, where it's made clear that the workers who live on the main construction site are not taken into account they're not distributed in the gravity model. Now we say that the effect of that is that 35% of the total workforce, which will potentially move tidally, say on a Friday night or a Sunday night, out and in are not in the gravity model. And that doesn't seem to have been taken into account overall in the modelling. So we have a serious concern about the robustness of the modelling. In light of that. The second issue is the vism model, the micro simulation model and we have three points. about that. The first of them relates

to the significant departures between observed levels and the model levels. And give an example of that in document, app 605, figure nine on page 22. What you see. And what the promoter will see is that the model levels at Firstly, are very much above any, or very much below the observed level. So all of the runs of the model are very much below the observed level. And therefore, as you would expect, the model average is very much below the observed level. And so we say that that raises a serious concern about whether the model accurately reflects reality, because neither the runs nor the average come close to reality. The second point on the vision model relates to the approach to validation, and in particular tables 1213 and 14 in that document at 065. Because what's done there is that where a particular leg fails the test, it's regarded as being a pass if the overall average would involve a pass. And so we say various legs on a scored pass, where they scored should have been scored, scored as fails. And that smooths out issues with particular legs, which particularly when viewed in the context of the disparity between the observed and modal levels, undermines confidence in the model. And then thirdly, and these are set out in our written representations that document rep 2278, particularly on page 89, we say there are a series of arithmetic errors in the vism model. And those don't seem to have been adjusted by the promoter, notwithstanding that they're raised in our written representations. So we say that that raises questions about the quality of the modelling because there are those arithmetic errors. That significant thing as a matter for the promoter to address having dealt with them.

1:37:13

Thank you. Can I ask the applicant to respond at this point? To those points made? Mr. Flanagan? Sorry, it's me again, I'm afraid. Can you hear me and see me? Okay, I can hear you. But I can't see you. I've got a blurry picture of Mr. Flanagan. Try again. Did that does that work? No, I haven't got you, but I can hear you. So carry on.

1:38:00

Just had a facelift. Okay, so Mr. Southern, they recognise that the purpose of mitigation and in terms of our plan, and how does that fit together to to kind of deliver that plan with the network and congestion. So that again, nobody is more incentivized than the applicant to ensure that workers get to site and are able to get to site and do the job that they're employed to do, and that the hgvs get to site as well. And there's a package of mitigation that's been put in place. And we want to deliver that quickly. And to provide kind of that certainty of that plan and delivery of it. So I think we are very aware that the package of mitigation is there in order to mitigate the impacts both highway improvements, but also the kind of the controls and the management measures in order to mitigate those transport effects. So we have we are mindful of that and understand that point in terms of the Haven or est points, that they are quite dated, and we may need to take these away in writing I'm afraid. So one one aspect is in terms of the gravity model and what's included and not included. So it's correct that if you live into the purpose of the gravity model, or truncate as quickly as possible, as succinct as possible realising the time, the gravity model is there to forecast the the distribution likely distribution of workers across the network, and they are both home based and non home base or the home based ones being those that live in their permanent residence and travel through to site and they've been assessed in the gravity model of travel time of up to 90 minutes to site, the home base so non home based or those that move to the area and live in accommodation. There's obviously the the gravity model is linked to the accommodation strategy and And what is to be delivered in terms of the accommodation. So it's not for me to say whether the campus is for others, I think it's on Friday in terms of the, the the deliverability.

And the success of the campus team, kind of for those workers to live next to the the main development site. But that what we've assessed is that the the campus, those workers live next to the site, and therefore we don't we know where they are, we know their origin and destination of that trip, we don't need to include them in the gravity model, because they're there their trip to work, and is effectively walking next door to the site, so that they're not included, in terms of the other point about the trips that they may make going home. Now. It's fair to say that not all of them will be UK based, not all of them will live in the in the locality, they will be working on a kind of rolling shift. So it's kind of been visiting kind of a rotation, I think it's here for six week rotation. So they won't be insane happens entirely. They don't go home every weekend. And but there will be trips made outside of the from the campus workers, we recognise that, that but we haven't assessed those in terms of those trips to their to their place of residence. So that isn't included in the in the core assessment. The bits that I will probably have to take away are the observed against modelling and the in the validation points that were detailed now. All I would say is that the model has been all of the models have been audited. And perhaps you want to hear from Suffolk County Council on this. They have been audited. In a lot of detail. There have been a lot of refinements made to those and they've been accepted as an acceptable base from which to to form judgments from. Okay,

1:41:58

thank you. So you'll, you'll respond in writing to having them halls concerns.

1:42:05

And we can do this one point about committed development and yes, confirmed that the committed developments have been agreed with the local authorities to be included within that modelling. So bright well lakes, and for example, I think was mentioned the traffic generated by that and the committed highway improvements, after particular points in time have also been included within the within the modelling.

1:42:31

Thank you. Thank you for that. I don't know if Suffolk want to make a comment at this stage or not.

1:42:41

That microbead for Suffolk County cancer, I think what we would prefer to do if this is acceptable to you is we will look specifically at the points that TPA have made on behalf of the people in all of state. If we have anything to say about those, we'll come back to you. And if we're silent, you can take it we were content.

1:43:01

Thank you Mr. Bedford. Okay, at this point, I mean, as I said previously, I've just noticed the agenda has to park and ride modelling sections. And I've already said I would cover the concern I had in written questions later on. So unless there's anything else at this stage, I can draw this hearing to a close. up before I close the hearing, let me remind you that any post hearing submissions, including written summaries of the cases you have made orally at this hearing shall be submitted deadline five, Friday the 23rd of July. Just for a moment, Mr. Lovelock What? Mr. Lavoie, you got your hand up?

1:43:50

And uh, yes, yes, I do. I understand that we are not going to deal with the park and ride sites traffic modelling at all now.

1:43:59

Well, I the question I had on that is I will put in writing it's a very technical question about the way the way it's modelled in their assessment.

1:44:09

Even my concern, my concern is is the response to tt 1102 which is about the northern park and ride at Darshan and the risk of traffic rocking back over the crossing. I do want I mean, I can do it now or we can do you want it in writing? I mean I I have a serious concern about this crossing. And I don't think they've modelled what would happen if traffic is turning right to use the filling station just north of Darshan crossing. I have I have personally believe me. It's an automatic crossing. It has box junction marking on it. It might just as well not be there the box junction marking it is not adhere to Probably a question to network well, do they have any evidence? Or do they? Do they know that I know they have road light cameras, but that's that's red road light cameras, they're they're specifically looking at people getting red road lights. But it's whether they whether people observe the box junction markings, because one day, we're going to have a train in the side of the car.

1:45:25

That that that in itself is a safety issue except not a traffic modelling issue. But Mr. Lovelock, there's just what I intend to do is rather than start the debate again on the park, and Ryan cites the agenda tomorrow allows for this for this to be done tomorrow morning. So if you're available tomorrow morning, we'll do this on the first first part of that meeting. And we'll take your submission then. And that probably applies to you, Mr. Scott, unless you've got something specific procedural about today's meeting.

1:45:59

No, no, yeah, I'd be happy with that. It's it's a problem that can be seen through traffic flow analysis. Thank you. Thank you. I, I'll be here tomorrow morning. Thank you, Miss Hodge.

1:46:14

So if, if it helps, I can quickly answer that in one line, that question if it saves somebody. Whoa.

1:46:22

Well, I mean, certainly in terms of the

1:46:24

just in terms of the modelling, just so just in terms of there's a, there's a visit micro simulation model of the Oxford area, and that includes the dash and level costing the filling station, and the park and ride access, and there was no blocking back, and impact of blocking back across the level of crossing as part of that. So that's another model that's been audited by Suffolk County Council.

1:46:54

Thank you. I did briefly see, I think network rails hand up.

1:47:05

Hi, yes, sir Hodge on behalf of Nova rail. I just thought I should also make a quick statement as around but actually intending to be present at the hearing tomorrow. Okay, that's fine, too. Just to clarify that, yes, we do have some concerns, obviously, about the impact of the additional traffic due to the parking ride on the darshan level crossing that is being addressed with the promoter. And as I mentioned, earlier in the day, we are sort of close to agreeing a contract essentially between the parties that will deal with securing that mitigation. But I would also just like to give Mr. Fisk an opportunity to say something on that again. So to save him coming back tomorrow morning. Thank you.

1:47:58

Yeah, hello, Daniel Fisk, public and passenger health and safety manager for network grow. Yeah, so we just echo what Sarah said. So we have got concerns around the traffic flows over dartium hb it is an existing problem we're trying to manage the park and ride will only make the situation worse. But we are making positive progress with the discussions with with EDF and hopefully to reach an agreement on what would need to be done to Darshan overcrossing to manage the risk.

1:48:27

Thank you. Thank you for that. I still have Mr. Stansfield. Sort of procedure. So I haven't received an invite for tomorrow's meeting. Although

1:48:44

perhaps someone from the case team can take that up with you after the meeting assistance. Thank you. I think we have dealt with Mr. Lovelock's point. Oh, Mr. Scott, rather than restart this agenda item tomorrow. Is there something you wanted to add now?

1:49:05

Whoops. Yes, it's very simple. I did mention it I think in a written submission or a document It's uh, I wanted to draw your attention to the the park and Ryder Wickham market and the five ways roundabout, which is the access to it. And I've noted unless I've missed some, you know, change in the design, that the entrance and the exit two it is on a north facing slip road. And so that traffic for example, returning to wicker market, the buses, and other people would have to come down and go across the bridge and enter. But of course, somebody's getting off the bus and going home. South has got to go north, up into the to lower villages and quite a long way to find some way of turning South again, I think it's the modelling fault, which could be seen, you know, from the point of view of environmental issues, excess mileage, and so on and so forth. But I wonder if you could look closely at that and just seems to be quite a quite an extraordinary thing. I think it's probably derived from the origin of designing for villages bypass, which would of course, have provided around about,

1:50:26

I think, I think there may be a actual simpler answer, Mr. Scott, which I'll ask the applicant now to give a quick response to Yes, Mr. ball is going to address that briefly. The clicker

1:50:51

is thank you but she belongs on behalf of the accident applicant. You're quite right Mr. Humphrey actually did is fairly straightforward. Traffic exiting the park and ride site and wishing to travel sales on the 12th would not have to turn and go down the slip road northbound on the top. So the actual slip road for five ways ways roundabout is two way currently to accommodate farm traffic, travelling back from the fields in the vicinity where the park and ride side is. So there will be a two way flow of traffic on on that slip road, allowing traffic leaving the park and ride site to turn right back to five ways roundabout now that will need to be enhanced with appropriate road sign road signage and road markings to ensure that everybody is fully aware of that, but that that is firmly within our proposals. Thank you.

1:51:48

Thank you. Okay. I have a hand up from Jenny curtly. Can you hear me, I can hear your can't see you at the moment,

1:52:10

I can see myself. Anyway, I just wanted to talk about the northern park and ride. I live in the area. And I'm very concerned that the rat runs that will incur with this park and ride will actually be quite significant. There are several roads that lead up to the northern park and ride or from the a 1120 before you reach what will probably become a very busy junction at Oxford. And these are tiny roads, I did point out in my written representation. And I really think that EDF hadn't really the outcome hasn't really taken into consideration. And they certainly didn't when I spoke to them at one of the consultations that these runs may cause a lot of problems you can get to them from the hills with road hills with Brownfield road. And then as I say, there are at least three opportunities to leave the 1121 or two of these roads actually go round what is happening in Hall estate. So I'm sure they will be interested in this as well. Thank you.

1:53:27

Thank you. Could I ask the applicant for a brief response whether they responded to miss Curry's representation

1:53:47

on behalf of the applicant so the in terms of the there's a number of measures so that the purpose of it being on the age 12 is because that's the kind of key corridor for workers be able to then use the A roads and the main roads to site there would be a signage strategy directing them to that the workers will be will have a code of conduct in terms of their driver behaviour as well. So we feel that that is a is in the right location orders intercept those trips and the workers should be travelling on those kind of key routes.

1:54:26

Thank you Thank you that i think you know can cludes Miss curtly.

1:54:33

I'm sorry, but I didn't think that answered my question. It wasn't about the a 12 it was about the rat runs that are going to happen. And EDF actually themselves pointed out that they could not make the uses

of the park and ride. Make them use the 12. So actually, it's the rat runs we're all worried about we all use them to get to Halesworth and Asleiden will be pretty much shut off. I think it's not a very good answer. Thank you.

1:55:05

Thank you Miss Curtly. Does the applicant want to make any further response? They said we're happy to leave it with a response we've already given. Thank you. Well, with that, I think that concludes the agenda item for. So there is no need to continue it tomorrow morning now. So, before I close the hearing, let me remind you that any post hearing submissions, including a written substance, Mr. Stansfield, can I hear from you, please? Yeah. So that does that conclude your discussion of the parking rides because I've been with the market, representing the parish Council. And we would like to talk about the parking lot in the southern part of the modelling of the organoid.

1:56:04

about the impacts on Wicker Market. I think the impacts in terms of we're going to have a discussion tomorrow about consideration of local traffic impacts. Okay, that might well be you could something you could raise them all, just wanted to make sure that I would get an opportunity. Thank you, indeed. Thank you. So hopefully this time, before I close the hearing, let me remind you that any post hearing submission including written summaries of the cases you have made orally at this hearing should be submitted a deadline five, Friday the 23rd of July 2021. If there are no other matters that anyone wishes to raise, I shall now close the hearing. Thank you. You. Thank you all for your attendance and participation at today's hearing. Time is now 1807 and this hearing is now closed.