

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH3_Session2_08072021

Thu, 7/8 2:16PM • 1:37:24

00:03

Hello, and welcome back to this issue specific hearing number three on traffic and transport. Before I start, could I just check with a case team that the live stream and the recording of both started? Yes, both have started. Thank you. Right. Moving on to the agenda. I want to talk about first, the transport review group. I know we've had some discussion about this this morning, but I have a few questions. And then I would like to hear from interested parties at that point. The first question I have is about the membership. It says specifically, there are voting members. And it says, as I read it are three applicants, appointees and three external appointees. First question I have who's Chair of this group, and who has a casting vote.

01:03

So he's not going to call the applicant, the Suffolk County Council is to be the chair of the TRG reference for that, if that's required is in sheduled 16 of the deed of obligation paragraph 3.2. As there is today, no casting procedure is intended deliberately intended to be balanced in a collaborative one. If there is not agreement that can't be resolved by discussion, then there's a escalation process to the delivery steering group, should that be required.

01:35

Thank you. Well, that leads me nicely on to my next question about the delivery steering group, because as I read the deed of obligation, page 95, I can find no reference in paragraph 3.5, sheduled 17 dispute resolution forms part of their remit. Could you explain that to me?

02:00

So, yes, so, the provision regarding the delivery steering group is found in shedule, 16, paragraph 3.2, point two subparagraph II, where, which provides that in the event of a failure to reach reach a majority decision. Any member can refer the matter to the delivery group within 10 days that is intended to be to that matter to be decided, therefore, by the delivery steering group thereafter, there is of course, they say, of course, there is the dispute resolution mechanisms within the deed itself. Which kind of reference for you, sir.

02:56

Sorry, I just format records. It's it's clause eight of the deed. So there is that further tier of dispute resolution. So it's certainly intended, we can look at the drafting, if that's required, but it's certainly intended that every steering group data, that that second stage of resolution?

03:16

Well, I mean, I think the drafting does need some attention, because as I as the way I read it, is if I was in the delivery steering group, I wouldn't know that dispute resolution was my my role or remit.

03:27

So yes, I'm grateful to Philip has just pointed out to me that there is in fact, I think, express provision already, hopefully, that deals with it. So the reference is on the bottom of page 95. Going over to the top of page 96. So we're in sheduled, 17. Here. It's paragraph 3.5. The delivery steering group shall, and then 3.5. Point three at the top of page 96 is provide assistance, guidance, advice on the actions that should be taken, either with unions workers to resolve any matters referred to it by the group. So read, for included.

04:05

Yeah, but assistance, guidance and advice isn't dispute resolution is it?

04:10

Then no said that those are the final bits, the one I rely on, and to resolve any matters referred to it. So it's that dispute resolution?

04:17

Right. Okay. Thank you for that. I mean, the other point that I wanted to raise on this particular issue is the responsiveness of the TRG. I know we've had an earlier discussion about this, but it does. In the first three months, as I understand of construction, it meets every month thereafter, every three months. And I understand the point that it can meet it can decide to meet sooner. But presumably, it would have to meet in order to decide that we did or not. Because Because I mean, I take Mr. Collins point on this that, you know, in the early years, the problems might be significant, almost on a daily basis. But needs some action or some intervention that is done through a system that seems to me every quarter,

05:10

you said that the provision is you say, is that you say set out in the ccmp, that prior to commencement, we'll meet every month for the first three months of construction phase and every three months thereafter, during the construction phase, unless the TRG decides to meet a different frequency. And the second reference is the one you had from Miss Marlin earlier, whereby things can be expedited and sent to the TRG. And indeed, an obligation to do so on the part of the applicant reference there is 8.2 point three, that size will sico obliged to monitor DMS on a daily basis, dealing with your protect potentially daily points against the requirements of the cgmp and the TRG will be notified of any breaches as in when they occur. And the rationale continues 8.2 point three, by undertaking this monitoring on a daily basis SNC CO, consider that any issues will be identified at an early stage and dealt with promptly. So setting the intention is to be responsive. And if within the within the gift of the TRG. If it does need to meet more frequently, or if measures need to be put in place for urgent referrals or whatever to be made, then that's within just within the remit of the TRG

06:29

perhaps of commitments could be I understand that as a process. But perhaps those commitments could be expressed in a way that the TRG, you know, the reference through to the TRG can can be

more responsive, then you're going to decide well, so you're going to monitor every day, and when necessary, escalate it to the TRG. Because it does sound like that could be three months later. You know, it's a question of potentially drafting differently, but I think it would help if people could understand that could clearly see how it would react quickly to issues. So yes, we that certainly wouldn't be capable of. Thank you for that. I mean, that, for me was things other than what we've already talked about on the transport review group. I see. I will I see to some IPS of hands up. Potentially. I'd like to just go through a bit more on a construction traffic management plan. Or wait, wait, no, actually. And then take a while actually on the transport review group. I'd like to hear from the Suffolk County Council. Is Suffolk County Council on the police before we move on. So could I hear from Suffolk County Council please?

07:50

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So in relation to the governance of the TRG. Obviously, we do welcome the recognition as Mr. Flanagan has indicated that it should be chaired by the county council. However, the absence of a ready means for resolving disagreements between an evenly constituted number of bodies does create we think a governance problem. We're not saying that it's incapable of resolution and opposite. What Mr. Flanagan has described is somewhat laborious way we think of disputes being resolved. We think that for both reasons of effectiveness, and for reasons of timeliness, giving a body a casting vote is a sensible way forward. We have suggested that the county council, as the local Highway Authority most likely to be affected by the work of the TRG is best placed. It certainly should not be the applicant or the applicants, as it were representatives who have the casting vote. Obviously, highways England has an important role and an important interest, but we tend to suspect that the daily workings of the TRG are more likely to be of concern to Isa Council and to the Highway Authority of the local Highway Authority than highways England. So I suspect unless Mr. Cooper tells us something different, he would not be gunning to have a casting vote. And we think, therefore, that the sensible and practical way forward is for the county council of the casting vote, which we think would greatly ease these issues, and particularly then the calling of meetings and acting more promptly and so on and so forth.

09:44

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Could I potentially then hear from East Suffolk council next?

09:50

Thank you, sir. Andrew at Suffolk cancel. So we concur with what Mr. Bedford has just said. In addition, I know Mr. Flanagan Then took you to shedule 17, paragraph 3.5 point three. But that doesn't provide a clear resolution mechanism because the governing words are, as I think you indicated, provide assistance, guidance and advice. So that that we don't think is satisfactory as currently drafted.

10:24

Yes, thank you, Mr. Tate. Could I hear now from highways England? Please? Hello, Eric Cooper from Hobbes, England.

10:36

I just want to concur with Mr. Bedford's position there about the chair of the group. The impact of size we'll see is larger. It'd be more on the local road network rather than Sue's road network. However, we do work closely together. And I'm sure that there won't be any issue with them being chair rather than anything else.

11:00

Thank you very much, Mr. Cooper. I note that the police would like to speak on this issue too. Could I hear from them now, please.

11:11

Thank you. So morning, good afternoon parties. And so our concerns in relation to the TRG also some kind of touch on the abnormal, indivisible load. So the issues are without trying to force upon someone indivisible twice. So if I can just briefly touch on AI ELLs because they help set the scene. So we know that the construction management plan will include a matrix relating to the AIA ELLs which are required to be escorted by the Constabulary, that will be an agreed matrix and the final version of CT and cable will be appended to the date of obligation. Variations therefore, to the construction and management plan which fall within the remit of the TRG can have a very significant impact for the Constabulary. The construction management plan at paragraph 2.3. point one says that all key transport stakeholders will be on the TRG and therefore the Constabulary flee Constabulary assumes it is an oversight not to have been invited. And I would like to invite detective Chief Superintendent cutlet to talk about the need for the conservative Constabulary to be on the TRG and how changes to the AI matrix and the cgmp GMP could impact the place.

12:27

Thank you. Thank you. So two points. Firstly, when it comes to managing the impacts on on the county's roads, the day to day, delivery of of responses very often falls to the Constabulary in terms of dealing with broken down vehicles, obstructions to the highway offences, accidents. So the decision making or the group that's looking at making decisions about the impact of the of the plan, for me, would really benefit, I think, from the Constabulary's attendance on it, both in terms of the expertise that we bring to the group, but also, you know, from a senior stakeholder in, in Road Traffic Management, to not be part of that group yet have to deal with the implications of the decisions made on that group. I think it's wrong. And I think we need to be part of that decision making and be capable of having an influence science. We touched upon AI ELLs, so we spoke yesterday know the length of an escort avails and the mechanisms. But there are some implications for the Constabulary in terms of ensuring that there is a resource available to do that. It's not a resource we can turn on. You will appreciate I'm sure about this field nature of a motorcyclist or a traffic officer escorting loads. So not only they need to be an officer at probation, so two to three years because of new entry standards into Constabulary, but then specialists car motorcycle escorting courses. So there was all the training that needs to be put in place before we can put someone into an AI Lt. So changes the matrices that will then impact on the numbers of officers we're looking at. The more we're involved in the decision making around the change in the matrices and the impact of it, the greater the benefit to us.

14:38

And so if I could just make a couple of additional supporting points I'm very conscious of not wanting to labour the point. But we are concerned that the applicant has 50% of the Voting Rights whether it's two representatives and that the transport coordinator appointed by them. decisions will be made by the majority and voting rights are important. Because not only can the TRG vote on matters brought to it by size policy, for example, changes to to AI on matrices. But sidewalk seek endeavour effectively block any requirements, the TRG would otherwise like to impose. We have the stakeholders on the TRG Mr. Flanagan is actually good right that the deed of obligation says that sides will see must implement the will of the TRG. But our point here is making the TRG express a desire is in the first place is quite another thing. And we also note on on the matter in court that if sizewell c fails to attend meetings with the TRG, it has no ability to require anything of the applicant. And and if I may just make two further short points that Mr. Cutler says the changes to the Ai L matrix has a very significant resource implication for the Constabulary. So we propose that the deed of obligation should really be restricting the applicant from making any changes proposing any changes to the Ai L matrix without first having agreed appropriate resource appropriate mitigation IE resource to the Constabulary. And then to head off the point, we don't think it's appropriate that Constabulary simply invited on an ad hoc basis to advise the TRG. Detective Chief Superintendent Carter's made clear in his evidence that police and frontline, therefore proactive involvement is a benefit. And then just finally, briefly, before we touch on the ctap, were slightly curious as to why those protections and the mitigation wouldn't apply. During preparatory phase we note the TRG and the ctmp are not required till commencement, we observed that there are a number of construction traffic issues that will likely arise during the prep for parents works, period, and we think there needs to be mitigation.

16:57

Thank you very much for that. Mr. Flanagan. You've heard, I think, from Mr. Bedford, and just now the Constabulary about their views. Could you perhaps respond on both of those?

17:14

We will say I'm going to hand over to Mr. Rhodes is going to respond first, and then I'm going to sweep up any matters if that's acceptable. So Mr.

17:30

So John Rhodes on behalf of the applicant just wanted to say that we are listening very carefully, obviously, and want to pick up the concerns that are being expressed, but also in regular dialogue with the parties who are expressing these views to you. We have very close working arrangement with the police. Mr. Rose can say I can't see you at the moment. My camera says, And so maybe in the short term, I can't okay. apologise. So we say we're distinct very carefully to what's being said and working very closely with these parties. So the question is the control of the TRG. And from our perspective, it's always been sensible to imagine the TRG being a balance between ourselves and the highway authorities. That's not to say that we're looking for any kind of deadlock. we're imagining this as a very collaborative experience. And that is our experience. So two of the things that we've picked up so far from the discussion for working is, are the controls sufficient to comfort to the highway authorities that Mr. Bedford's looking for should be in the detail that we're committing ourselves to? And we will ask ourselves, again, following this discussion, whether there's more we can do to provide confidence in those commitments. So we've also undertaken to you just to look at the response of this of any dispute

resolutions and nothing is stalemated here. And we're very keen to do that as well. And we're gonna it's not our experience that the regime Inc is in any way handicapped or stalemated, but we will definitely look at responsiveness of that, but important to recognise the powers that are given to the TRG deliberately within the deed of obligation, which are powers essentially to require us to spend any amount of money or take any action to remedy or stay within the limits to which we commit are those limits which are enforceable. And so we say we can't, if you like write a blank check in relation to those there needs to be a process for discussing what is the relevant thing to do the reasonable, sensible thing to do within those limits. So we will certainly reflect after this hearing and respond after deadline five to see whether we can provide any greater comfort but My sense of the moment is the comfort needs to be around clarity of the controls that we're committing to responsiveness of any dispute resolution. And certainly fully engagement with the police as we are at the moment. And you'll know in relation to the regime that we've set out, the police will be members of the community safety Working Group transport coordinator will attend the community safety working group, we would all be aware of the concerns of the police. We are separately as you work, as you know, agreeing a protocol with the police to fund the additional police resources, we imagine a very close working relationship with the police, there's no way in which they're going to be marginalised in this process are very important to the delivery of the project. We know that and we're grateful for that. And if the police wished, and if the TRG was functional, the police could attend the meetings at the TRG. But there's a difference between attendance and voting rights. And the moment we think of voting rights with ourselves and with the highway authorities in that very deliberate balance.

21:07

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. I just have one point. I'll hear from Mr. Flanagan. No, no, maybe made a point.

21:18

speech. So just wait to the speaker has been turned off. Thank you, sir. Yes. Sorry, sir. Just make sure that feedbacks. Okay, thank you. Yes, sir. Just two short points, in light of what Mr. Rhodes said, to give you some references, as well, Mr. Bedford, for instance, said I think he's referring to county council as a higher authority, but said that they were, quote, most likely to be affected by the TRG. And the decisions are often Mr. Rose, I think, has explained why in terms of bodies that that is, that's not correct, because in terms of outcomes of the TRG, the references in Section 16, most clearly 3.8 point one SNC. co shall implement any proposed mitigation. So assets lco are directly and significantly affected by the TRG. It's not right to say that it's just the county Councillor impacted by the outcomes of the TRG. And obviously, significant sums of money are implicated in those actions from the TRG. That's the first point. And the second point is that, in this context, asking whether it's reasonable to to give Suffolk County Council a casting vote, and therefore be able to impose their will and including impose their will as to what sums of money are expended by the applicant, it's relevant to look at the tests back in the NPS. 4.1 point eight, if you've looked at it already requires any obligations to be reasonable. And the final words of that paragraph are reasonable in all other respects, and we say it can't be reasonable to give such a significant power, particularly over expenditure of funds to Suffolk County Council and SLC k be unable to do anything about that. So that's what I have to say on that point. The only other point is Mr. Tate, point on the drafting of paragraph 3.5, point three of schedule 17. So what sat down and said was a point you made as well, we'll take that away and see if that needs to be.

23:31

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. I hear from Mr. Bedford again, on this point, please.

23:39

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I'm troubled because I find that some of the things that Mr. Rhodes is suggesting to you are difficult to reconcile with the version of the documents that I'm working to which I understand the the, the relevant documents. And in terms of the question of what the TRG could empower the applicant to spend money on as Mr. Flanagan has directed your attention to 3.8 point two, it's to the proposed mitigation. But the proposed mitigation is then defined in sheduled 16. To mean the measures proposed to mitigate the impact of contingent effects warn or contingent effects to and then those themselves when you go to the clauses which define those funds, make it clear at 3.6 point two and 3.7 point two, that the total payments payable by ses ekco to address contingents affects one shall not exceed the contingent effects one fund and ditto for the continued effects to fund. So in other words, there are ceilings in the way that the funds are to be set up and the TRG can't require Spend expenditure beyond the limits of the identified funds. So that partly goes to the correctness of the way I think it was being put to you by Mr. Rhodes about non limited liability, but then also goes to Mr. Flanagan's point about the reasonableness of the county council being able to as it were put in positions on to the applicant, any such implicant in positions would be limited by the scale of the funds. In terms of what is currently proposed. We have raised separate issues about that. But I think it's quite important that obviously the discussion that takes place in the examination relate to the documents as they actually are, unless we're going to be told that a different version of the document is going to be put forward.

25:44

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Mr. Flanagan. Yes, thank you, sir. Mr. Rhodes is going to pick that up. Okay, Mr. Rose.

26:01

Thank you, John Rhodes, fully African. And there may be a misunderstanding here for which we apologise, we need to make it clearer. The contingent funds expressed in shedule 16 out to do with monitoring which identifies unexpected impacts, not anticipated or mitigated in the decio. that's separate from the obligation to ensure that we stay within the limits, and the mo chair targets. So the experienced inkling for instance, and we can make this clearer if it's not clear in the documents for the experience at Hinkley through the operation of the TRG action is agreed all the time for the way in which things should be managed in order to ensure that we meet the obligations of the of the DCI and the cost of those actions falls entirely on the applicant. It doesn't it's not drawn from a limited fund. It's it's an unlimited commitment to meet the obligations to which we commit ourselves. There is any separately a contingent fund. If as a result of for any other reason, there are impacts that go beyond those that we've mitigated within the DCF. And that's why we be concerned about the exercise of the TRG powers being at the discretion of one party. It needs to be a collaborative exercise as to how best to manage the project in order to ensure it meets its obligations.

27:23

Thank you. Mr. Flanagan. Can I speak? Mr. Flanagan, please. David, the issue I have here is you're creating a group with voting rights, of which there are six people. That seems to me as people have speculated that you could end up with three three all the time having created I mean, it's, in my experience, unusual to have a group with voting rights were the reason no casting vote and the recourse go to the delivery Steering Group, which is we've discussed, I think there are issues about whether or not that's their remit. But either way, the responsiveness of the TRG or not, then depends if there is a disagreement. And the reason the casting vote, on risk, referring it to another group, who presumably aren't as responsive as the TRG. And all of this takes time instead of deciding something there. And then, I mean, I've heard what Mr. Rhodes has said. And I've heard what the police says, which is fairly reasonable, that being part of the the group, the TRG, I think, potentially this needs more thought about actually what your concerns are, and how it will actually work in practice. So you don't need to go through an unwieldy dispute mechanism, because you haven't, at the very start in the TRG. done what most people consider normal in voting rights groups, and given a casting vote. If you follow the I just don't think it's potentially very clear at the moment how this would work effectively and quickly to resolve issues.

29:21

Zell on the responsiveness points, that is certainly something we can look at. And we will look at and we take on board what you're saying, as to as to your confidence that this cannon will work. I think the evidence that that you've heard about that it hasn't does work at Hinkley Point has to be given Wait, this is the same sorts of projects, recent evidence of a similar structure working well and and not not leading to the deadlock and the issues that have been suggested. So we say that when what's involved is one party essentially being forcing another to expend significant sums of money and do significant Things have stopped the project because the mitigation isn't there, it would be proper to have some kind of dispute resolution mechanism. That's that's not unexpected. And that's reasonable reason it complies particularly with the policy tests is to sort of the reasonableness test. And what South Korea's asking for is essentially, a V table, the ability to require a blank check, which, which is not reasonable. And so while we take on board what you say about responsiveness, and we'll take that away, we say that the structure that been put forward both is you've got precedent for it, you've got evidence that it works. And what's been suggested to the contrary, is unreasonable. And there's no evidence that is needed. So that's why we also will obviously take that away and try and refine it. So as far as we can.

30:48

Well, the other thing I'd like you to take away is what Mr. Rhodes said about the contingent funds, I have to admit, I'm a bit confused now about how they, you know, what they're fought, how they will be used, and how. So it would be helpful to understand what control the TRG had over the project's funds in that sense. So I think that needs to be clearer.

31:11

So on the contingent funds, I think Mr. Reva suggested that he does require reference to the deed itself for this, they are carefully set out to refer to specific impacts, and then they are specific funds to be used for those for those impacts for those links and junctions. So we feel that the drafting there has clearly identified what therefore, if it needs to be better explained as to how that works, then we will, will provide that.

31:41

So as Mr. Bradford correct, then that that the TRG only have control over what are capped funds.

31:50

Know that that's not right, because there is the control over those cap funds. But there's also the broader requirement, the ability for the TRG to make recommendations. And you see that within paragraph 3.4. It's of the day this is to consider monitoring reports received from assets lco and any mitigation measures proposed and make decisions in accordance with paragraph 3.3, which is those recommendations. So they have that broader power, which is considerable power over what's to be done. And if something's not working, for instance, then they have a power of to review the ctmp or the construction worker travel plan, and make a record and change it. That is a significant power, and that that's their power. And that's why we it's it seems to us that there needs to be balance in the governance in the exercise of power.

32:42

Yeah, I mean, all I would say is having heard both sides just now is I think you're both coming from the same place about, you know, wanting to exercise the degree of sensible control of all over the groups. But it seems to me that this, this point of detail could be discussed a bit further to find a mutually acceptable sort of wording in for the remainder of the TRG. Perhaps, as well as clarifying that, they'd be a bit more dialogue with Suffolk. On that point,

33:15

you hear what you're saying, Take this away. And I'm just that understood.

33:21

Thank you. And I noticed there are some IPS who want to make a comment, Mr. Scott,

33:34

thank you can I wear my parish council had I referred to recent parish meeting and we have a standing item on Siddons savvy ID, which I don't know a lot about, but, you know, speed control and monitoring and our village. And I think it raises the question, which isn't part of the institutional governance issue, which I've been following with respect, which is, does this body have any accessibility, you know, for affected communities, and with complaints, which would obviously to be taken, you know, taken seriously, would need some sort of monitoring system. Now, having followed the narrative, the only monitoring system seems to be do seems to be caps on hgvs, which attract, but there is all the other traffic. And there is an issue that we've raised, certainly all my deliveries have raised in the relevant rep, about the traffic multiplier, which is nothing to do with direct suppliers to the site, you know, the generation of consumption and so on, which is a very important part of the socio economic agenda. So the question really, really sort of, aside from the internal matters. Does this role have a group for the affected public and communities?

34:55

Right, okay. Mr. Scott, in terms of the the monitoring of other traffic, I think that's a thing we discussed quite a bit earlier on, but I'll put that point to them after I've heard. Mr. cusec, please.

35:08

Thank you during that Middleton concordantly parish Council, I'd like to address the governance of the TRG. Having heard the debate that's just transpired. I am concerned that as currently constituted, it would seem the applicant would have potentially the upper hand. And one protection which could be made an offer, perhaps, to ensure that that position is not abused will be transparency in the way that it's normally done in local democracy, which is allowing the meetings to be open to the public, and potentially to be addressed by representatives of parish councils up and down the 812. From Walberswick to Melton. Should they have particular concerns to make sure that gene processes seem to be done? Many, many local authority meetings including personal meetings that are held open to the public, and it's a real discipline to make sure that cosy closed door deals aren't done. So my question is, perhaps, if the inquiry address the applicant, will they undertake to hold these meetings in public? Thank you. Thank you, Mr. qussuk. Mr. Southern.

36:26

Thank you, Mister. Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Before we get to my point, I just like to thoroughly endorse what Mr. kousaka has just said. I speaking for Yorkshire parish Council, and Paul Ashton. Councillor. I'm also the police liaison officer for the council. And I, in that context, having done quite a lot with the local police and Constabulary, I would totally endorse the comments made by the police earlier on and in terms of the importance of their involvement in this group. And all the points they made. I would endorse that as a as a parish Councillor and the fact that the arrangements being discussed work well at Hinkley. I think we need to question because the UN in particular when it comes down to this business about dealing with issues and policing, the physical infrastructure and social geography of this area is fundamentally different from that surrounding surrounding Hinkley. The applicant constantly emphasises the complexity of their project as well as the urgency and rest of it. And part of the additional complexity of this project here is the physical and social infrastructure in which it's being built. And the police the challenge of policing for this is going to be very considerable. So all I would say is as a member of the community as well as my police liaison role, I would very much support what the police have said. Thank you very much.

38:12

Thank you, Mr. Sorrell. Mr. Brown, please.

38:17

Thank you, on behalf of Melton parish Council, the main railway along which much nighttime freight is intended to be driven, runs through Woodbridge and Melton. And I wondered in the context of this TRG, does this body have any responsibility for monitoring any problems on that side?

38:41

Thank you, Mr. Brown. I'll put that to the applicant. In a moment. Mr. Collins.

38:49

Yes, thank you, Mr. Humphrey. For colleagues this week, parish council stops, I will say and BLM 22. Yeah, I endorse everything that everybody has just said. And the question about public meetings for the TRG group. But the other question is, How easy is it for the local people to actually submit issues on an urgent basis into this group and get them examine because, you know, despite anything else, whilst I understand hgvs, and what it's all about on a daily basis, and they are going to have very good statistics and a knowledge of any breaches of that, that's not going to be the case for all the other issues, they're much more soft and difficult to actually understand. So if we have an issue of lots of traffic, particularly back in these early years when the B 1122, is so badly affected, how on earth are we going to actually make our voices heard in those in those cases? And yes, I would also support the idea that the police have a role to play in the TRG I think that is something which is missing. Thank you.

39:58

Thank you, Mr. Collins. Mr. Flynn. Would you like to have someone respond on those points?

40:05

Yes, thank you. So can I pick up a couple then hand over to one of the house on the Mr. cusecs points of concern that the applicant would have seen described at the other hand, I think I think that we can provide comfort there and said, For reference for you, and Mr. cusec, for instance, is in 9.4, point six of the cgmp, which provides that if the TRG considers it reasonably necessary, the third the corrective actions are required to address the breach. And there's not been proposed by assets lco the TRG will require assets lco to submit proposals for corrective action. And if assets lco failed to propose the requested proposal, then the TRG will invite highways England or SCC to submit as a proposal. So there is that power to ensure that corrective proposals come forward. And then there's the obligations in the chapter 16 to implement them. So we refer to in 3.3, and 3.5. So there is it's a, it's a body, which has teeth. And so we're, we're content with that, and we say when it comes to the other hand, on the transparency and meetings point, looking at schedule 16. I don't think there's expressed provision for that at the moment. I'm going to turn to miss Mullen and then amendment on that. There's also the point on Melton and freight through there, so might I tend to miss model on those, those two points, please.

41:49

Okay, um, so commitment on behalf of the applicant. I'm just covering off to communication point. And this is already set out within the management plans. But I was just going to talk you through how we're for the envisaging that kind of liaison with the local community and taking on board comments and recognising that they're on the ground experiencing this and we need to be hearing from them. So if you look at figure 2.1, in the in the travel plan, some of this is replicated in the ctmp. But it shows the relationship pose relationship between the TRG and other groups, some of those groups have already set up a meeting and the TRG was set kind of aside the community safety Working Group. then below that you've got the public rights of a working group, local transport and traffic routes and parish councils. And so, the local traffic and traffic transport and traffic groups are already established in places and meeting in order to agree schemes for places like with a market and grammar miles furred, at least and so the that liaison will come continue in order to develop those those schemes, but going to the public and the ability. So the transparency of the TRG is set out in the monitoring ports is similar to Hinkley in that. And in Section 5.2 states, the transport monitoring ports as well as the TRG. Meeting

Minutes will be made publicly available on the east Suffolk Council website. So that's not something that would be on the applicants website and saying this happens at Hinkley. It gets put on the district councils website, just as the case of kind of local meetings, agenda PACs, information monitoring reports that go in. And as part of those monitoring reports, and they need to set out any concerns that have been raised by the local authority, so both by the local communities, and it needs to set out monitoring of things like fly parking, and how that's been dealt with what actions been taken and what instances they've been. So there's lots of kind of softer measures rather than just the data in order to take on board feedback, then going to the contingency fund and realising we probably need to kind of explain this, this better the purpose of the contingency fund was that we've done the assessment and the assessment and the monitoring may show that actually we meet our targets and and and therefore it may stop there. And I think there was a concern. And we understand that concern, which is why we develop that that fund is that an assessment can go so far. But then there's a there's there may be unassessed effects that might happen. And there may be unmitigated effects within the decio. And so the contingency fund effectively acts as the ability for The TRG to be reacted to those community concerns. And those real life issues is this feeding on rows. And it's very difficult for us to preempt things like that we've got driver walls in places, we've got code of construction practices, we've got dedicated funds for traffic policing for ALS courts, and when they're not doing the ALS courts, then they'll be doing traffic policing, all of those act to reduce this very safety impacts. But there may be instances where we haven't gone far enough, and there are unmitigated impacts. And, and that is the purpose of the contingency fund, to then say, actually, that we're getting feedback from the community. It may be to do with size, well, it may not be but there's a there's a perception that there's a an increase in a particular issue, and the safety concerns at certain places. And so it doesn't just relate to safety, it's also relates to capacity. So we've obviously done capacity assessments of junctions, and we consider that we've mitigated those. And but there are certain junctions, and that a model might show that there would be a potential impact on some hours in some scenarios, and therefore it allows us to kind of have a watching brief of those particular isolated junctions. So we don't think we need to do anything about it now, but we need to monitor and manage certain situations to see whether that impact might arise. So it allows us to,

46:38

to, I suppose, mop up those potential impacts, just going back to kind of feedback of the community, there is a community helpline that set out within the management plans. But also, if you look at paragraph 6.5, point nine, so decisions drawing down on the on the contingency fund is based on and these are a number of things, or feedback from parish councils and the community helpline feedback from the community safety Working Group feedback from TRG members on site observations, observations and meetings with stakeholders, it looks at the data that we're collecting kind of GPS data, the traffic monitoring data, and that would be set out as kind of the hard data that we're setting out looking at, is there a rise in, in personal injuries, I know that the most services will be here tomorrow to talk about the potential effect of the project on on on accidents and how that gets considered and reviewed. And then also looking at kind of traffic flows as well. So there's lots of things that are taken into account. So I hate that for policies for for the long answer. But I hope that gives some comfort to the people on on the hearing that their views are very much and will be heard and will be considered by the TRG. Thank you very much for that. And just with regard to Melton I think that was with regard to hate, so apologies hgvs freight trains, so we trains and whether it's so in terms of the TRG obviously,

this Network Rail will be managing the kind of the rail network that we are aware in terms of the Highway Authority and concerns about level crossings. So there is an interaction between the highway authorities and Network Rail. So we'll take that away as a consideration whether that needs to be strengthened within the remit of or set out further in the in the management plans.

48:43

Thank you for that. I've just got two points. Really. I mean, the first one is will the transport review group be a public meeting? Is it Where will the members of the public have access to that?

49:02

We're not noticing that we haven't proposed that at the moment. At the moment, we've again followed the Hinkley approach whereby all of the information in the meeting minutes agendas, and their kind of monitoring pack is all made publicly available.

49:21

And the other the other point is, you know, if you're a member of the public and you think well, right outside my house, this incident is occurring, what you know how, what's the quickest way to get a response or it's I think, where Mr. Collins coming from escalating through a number of groups

49:40

in the community helpline is the is the quickest point in order to register an issue. What would happen once that there's also a series of forums and in terms of the transport forums, it's a parent Council. So again, I would refer to figure two point one in terms of the kind of the hierarchy of groups that are proposed, and, and how that feeds in.

50:07

Now, I understand that you talked us through the groups and you know, they will all have meeting dates. And by the time one issue gets away all through the group that could be several months later. It's just that right now, there's a problem outside my house. How is that going to be dealt with that? But that that's the helpline, is it?

50:27

effectively, it's the helpline and the community groups, but then also those, those get lodged and recorded as part of the TRG notes, so any kind of feedback that's been received from the community, then gets reviewed by the TRG. On that policy basis.

50:46

Okay. Thank you, just on the point of rail, I think is a very valid point. Actually, if there are issues on the rail on the railway, with a movement of trains, there should be a way that feeds into the TRG, because it is a mode of transport.

51:01

We can I will take that back and address that within the next version of the management

51:07

plans. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

51:15

Mr. Coleman? Yes, sorry. I'm just having trouble with my mouse clicking too many times. Yeah, just a simple question. Really, I suppose. I heard the applicant say that some of these groups are already set up and running. I'm not aware of any of these groups having actually existed at all, or they're being informed in the local authorities or the parish councils. Thank you. I will ask them that. Mr. Brown, please.

51:44

Yes, sir. First of all, thank you for the commandment that they would look at the rail issue. But I think it I just want to emphasise how important it is because we're talking about freight trains running through our village every 45 minutes during the night during the peak construction period. If people find that there is disturbance, potential damage to their property, etc, etc. I wouldn't like to think that there was no way of it being discussed other than by a helpline. And we'd like to think that there was a body monitoring those effects just as much as people would be monitoring the effects on the roads. And and I think it is an oversight, that that's not been considered before. I'm glad that they're going to do something about it. Thank Thank you.

52:32

Thank you, Mr. Brown. Mr. Flanagan, could potentially you respond on on this later, Mr. Paul will respond with first of all. productive Mr. Ball. Hello, good

52:53

afternoon, Mr. Humphrey. Yeah, just in response to the discussion about how these issues are addressed with a project. The first thing I would say is we've got a very active Communications Office within within less than an A team there that are very receptive to issues currently with regard to the planning process. And you know, that interaction will continue. And, you know, it's a very important day to day commitment that we that we have and need to need to maintain. Mr. Collins, referred to the engagement currently being undertaken. And one of the roles that I have had over the last year or two is to liaise with representation from leisten Town Council, also the representation from wicker market, parish Council and surrounding parishes, and more recently with miles furred and Lyford lemon, really to discuss the development of the mitigation within those areas that will be included within the section 106 or deed obligation. So, that's something that we would like to continue, but obviously would evolve and would include wider areas. You know, so the latest and the latest in group would include representation for Surbiton, an East bridge, and so on. So, you know, we want to make sure that the groups are relevant to the to the areas they cover, and they would meet at a frequency that would allow a good debate and an exchange of views and issues and to ensure that we keep on top of things. So hopefully, that's a useful update.

54:45

So, I mean, think in terms of what Miss McMillan said, that is, the community groups are starting up. I think Mr. Collins probably got the impression that they had started, and they were all started but what I think you're saying is You're in the process of developing them now, is that correct?

55:03

I think we are actively engaging within the community. You know, we have regular meetings with the parish councils with our colleagues in Leysin and those groups that I mentioned earlier are set up, what we need to do is just make sure they evolve in appropriate way to deal with the construction phase of the project will be a natural evolution.

55:21

Thank you, Mr. Ball. Mr. Mr. Galloway said just before you just before you go on, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Flanagan, just be able to add a few words on that. Please. Yes, Mr. Flanagan,

55:42

search on roads for the applicant. Just to explain one other point in relation to this is you may have noticed in sheduled, 17, of the draft deed of obligation of blank space in relation to community groups. And that's not because it's unimportant, it's because it's particularly important. And through discussion with a sovereign Council and the county council. It was agreed that we need to work together more closely to establish what the best forum for community groups is going forward. In addition to the direct engagement that Mr. ball has just described, the intention is to set up for instance, and I don't want to prejudge what it would be, but our main site, community group or transport community group, at which size will see regularly turn up and listen to an answer to the community. So it's very much part of our thinking. It's not yet developed within the drafting, but that's because there are an active discussion with the council's as to the best way of structuring that group. But I agree with you, in addition to the working groups, which are already established on specific issues that Mr. Bill was described.

56:48

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. Mr. Galloway.

56:54

Thank you very much, Mr. Humphrey. Just a quick one. I'm Aiden Galloway co southcombe. Colton. As far as I'm aware, the East Coast the suffered court light side as well. Community Forum was last held in 2019. And after requests from parish councils for it to be reinstated, as I understand it, EDF said, well, we'll deal with councils on an ad hoc basis. I just give you an update on what's actually happening on the ground rather than a parallel universe that seems to appear somewhere else.

57:28

Thank you, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Fortman?

57:38

Yes, thank you. I would just like to comment on Mr. Rhodes. And the comments about the community groups. Yes, we are engaging, we are part of the wicker market and surrounding parishes group. But it's not enshrined. It is going to continue. And I would urge pins to really ensure that that will happen. It

has been a good engagement or good group. Or regardless, you know, what the solution mitigation solutions might be, but it's necessary for that, definitely to be enshrined somehow that that will continue. Thank you.

58:17

Thank you. Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to respond on those two points?

58:25

Thank you. So yes, Mr. Events is going to respond you haven't had

58:32

before she could I just take Mr. Collins. You can deal with that to Mr. Collins again, please.

58:42

Yes, thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Yes, we are talking as seven Denise bridge parish council now wrong. The other two groups, we are actually talking to EDF about mitigations and various aspects of the project. Understanding that that was part of the development of the project cycle and where we are right now. Not that this was going to be some evolve or what's not been explained that this is going to evolve into something which is quite different. And I noticed the discussions about community groups. There are other community groups that have different types of concerns about the development of this project, which might require some thought as well. I mean, I know they are going to look at things with the RSPB. Suffolk Wildlife Trust in some of those areas. But there are other groups which are not in those sorts of areas, dealing with coastal effects likes southern coast action on resilience as MLS, G and others. So I'm still slightly puzzled by the fact that some of these working groups are already up and running without any knowledge or any invisibility whatsoever. So it's a bit of a mixed bag and what Mr. Galloway said I think it was about the community working group that hasn't met since 2019. Despite the fact that it's supposed to be meeting throughout the development process, and throughout the planning process has been denied. So not exactly a good scorecard as far as we're concerned.

1:00:17

Thank you, Mr. Collins. I mean, I think for the purpose of today's discussion about transport, I'd like to keep it to the transport review group issue we're talking about, but probably, I hope, Miss Vince can explain this to us.

1:00:37

Afternoon, good afternoon. Can you see and hear me? I can see you. You're called John Rhodes on your computer there.

1:00:45

Sorry, can see and hear me now? Yes, sorry. And so as you would expect, throughout a DCA project, the approach to engagement does evolve, we have continued to maintain dialogue with both the communities prior to our application going in, through the community forum. And then as Mr. Collins said, on a more bespoke approach with the parish councils. And once since we've submitted our application, it is our intention to continue those discussions through community groups, Mr. Rhodes

indicated, he mentioned that they are under active discussion with the local authorities, I just really want to reassure the communities that we will put a draft into the date of obligation. And by that by the deadline on the third of September, to enable all parties to consider those make their representations so that we can have regard to those in the final version of the DCI, it's really important that we get the governance not only from the community perspective, but also all of the technical working groups, right. And we will continue to work quickly and hard to set those out. And in terms of whether these groups have started, as my colleague Richard ball mentioned, some of the very technical groups around that traffic and transport with, we can market and laced and have started. And that's really to ensure that their views informed the measures that are being secured in the deed of obligation. That's why we've expedited those discussions. And we haven't formalised yet the working groups around environment, traffic and transport. And that's because we are having active dialogue with particularly Suffolk County Council and other stakeholders, and throughout this phase of the project without obviously formalised in the deed at this stage.

1:02:49

Just one point, Miss Vince, you mentioned that the third of September, there's no way that could be done sooner than a third of September.

1:02:58

If there is a deadline before then, sorry, I don't have the programming seats. We we won't be able to do it by the fifth. We did you can appreciate we need to continue the discussions. Okay, we will do deadlines six, six, which sixth of August.

1:03:17

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Right. Okay, that I think concludes our discussion on that transport review group, I now move on to the construction traffic management plan. Now, I realise hopefully, we have been through a lot of the details about the governance of these already in our discussion. So I can can I start on this one with the applicant to explain to me and I think we've talked about how the levels of hg V's will be monitored and measured out. I also like to know about LG TVs, how they will be monitored and measured. Yes, thank you. So misbalance, we've addressed that LG V question. Thank you.

1:04:20

Miss Kurtzman on behalf of the applicant and monitoring of Itvs just to set some context of Itvs. And if I may, so there's two types of Itvs. So there's the Itvs going through to the site of which we've assessed 200 Itvs per day in the early years assessment and a maximum in terms of Itvs. Once they once the size well then corrode and to bypass for price, sorry, that's HTV. So the maximum we've assessed of Itvs at peak is 520. to five per day of LTV is going through to the site is what's included in assessment. In addition to that, there are some posts or there's Itvs, associated with the postal consolidation facility at Wickham, Park and parking guide. And so the proposal is to have any post consolidated at the southern parking ride. And then there would be two lgv movements in each step. So two lgv trips a day between the southern parking vide and the main development site to take the the any post and courier stuff. So in terms of the we deal with it backwards, the postal consolidation, we've assessed those as new trips on the network, and was actually in fact, this vehicle. And we'll realise you probably

appreciate your and COVID times that we all get deliveries every day, and that there's LG V's going around the network. So they already exist on the network. And the purpose of having them at the having the consolidation Centre at the park and ride facility is that the LG V's on the network at the moment, sorry, the LG fees on the network at the moment. And we do not want them to have to divert from their trip and go along the B 1122. Or go along to site. And in order to deliver that, in fact, we just want them to be intercepted. And so that we can then consolidate that post and take it through to site in order to reduce their impact, they will they are likely to be kind of passing by on the a 12 and other routes on their, on their journey as they're doing. It's not just sighs well posed that they will be delivering, and therefore, and therefore that it successfully intercepts those trips. We haven't assessed like that we've assessed them as all new trips on the network. And but what we're saying is, is that a, we wouldn't have the effect that we've assessed because they're not new chips on that web, but also that we wouldn't be able to successfully manage them because they're not just dedicated to size well. So to track those vehicles is a very difficult thing to do. They're making multiple trips and to multiple places. And so it's very difficult to contractually make them kind of abide by any any rules because then their trips are not just associated with the existing trips and not just associated with sighs well. So we're not proposing management measures for them. But there would be signage strategy directing traffic to use the the same HTV or for lgv to use the LG the HTV boots that we've set out in order to encourage them to do so. In terms of the LG v3 site, we're proposing that they are they are monitored through the D. DMS Booker system. So we would know on a daily basis, how many LG V's would be

1:08:21

routing through to the site and associated with site or C, and that monitoring data is proposed to be provided to the TRG. And what we're seeking to do there is to say that, I think the issue is about whether we track those LG V's. So two things the announced so from a from a monitoring perspective, hate the heck the definition of HTV is three and a half times or more. So any kind of larger and ltv's would actually be required be classified as a HTV. And B requires to use the HTV rates and would be included within the caps. So that's one kind of mitigation measure that we've put forward in terms of ltv's. And the other aspect is that we've we've monitored them what we've we've modelled them these ltv's with route choice. And that's that route choices based on we've assigned them to the traffic model. And based on how LG V's behave at the moment within Suffolk and the distribution of those ltv's within Suffolk. So they're included within the modelling and they're available within their strategic model to make that route choice in order to get to the site. And therefore the junction modelling and all of the other assessment has considered the effect of those ltv's routing through to the site, provided that it's the level that we've assessed stays the same. So what we're saying is, is that we would monitor the number, but that provided that we stay within that number there shouldn't be Any unacceptable or unmitigated effects of those ltv's? Because we've we've effectively included those within the assessment. So it's the control, therefore, we consider is sufficient in terms of what we're proposing

1:10:17

for the control is when they get to the site, that's what your monitor, is that right? Correct. Now, on a previous discussion about hgvs, we're talking about, we're talking about mobile phone apps. If it was a problem, if it did get to be a problem, or an identified problem, is their intervention, you could do

1:10:40

so so again, that is something that the TRG has that has the gift to do. So it's not just about if we, you know, in terms of the funding and the mechanisms in place, that if, if there is a potential unmitigated impact that we then suppose kind of build our way out of trouble is actually goes back to E and one and the hierarchy of what, what, how we've set out the transport strategy in the first place, but how we should consider any remedial action. So the immediate action, and no one would ask us to look at demand management measures prior to any highway improvements. And therefore, you're correct, sir, that one demand management measure that may be required or considered to be required by the TRG. Were this to be considered to be a problem could be to to implement a an app or phone or rollout and that base tracking system for Itvs. What we're saying at the moment is we don't envisage that to be an issue. But that's that is at the gift of the TRG. Should that should that issue arise.

1:11:48

Thank you for that. Mr. McQuillan. My next point is, we talked yesterday, fair bit about whether the HTV caps were correct, you know, at their level they're set. Now, I'm also aware that Suffolk County Council and the highways agency may have views about the caps how they're expressed, could potentially now hear from Suffolk County Council about their views on the cap, not the levels of the caps, but how the caps are expressed.

1:12:32

So thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I'm conscious of the time so I'll just be brief, because we've covered a lot of this in our representations to you at deadline free, think the principal issue where there is a significant disagreement is not the only disagreement. But we we do consider that there is a need for quarterly caps, in addition to the daily caps. And we also consider that the hours for the peak control should be beyond the peak hour and should cover the peak periods. So we were happy to continue the dialogue with the applicant. We set out in our representations, the areas but we do have concerns as to the way that the caps are currently articulated.

1:13:18

Thank you. Does the highway agent, highways England want to add anything?

1:13:29

All of Christos Gala. innopolis from highways England, we're in agreement with Suffolk County Council that when you take a look at the timetables and avoid any peak hours, if and when necessary, that will be implemented by by constant engagement and review with both the local authorities and the applicant. Thank you. Thank

1:13:52

you. Thank you very much. Mr. Flanagan, would you like to respond to any of those two points? So yes,

1:14:06

we will respond to Thursday, the two issues raised by Mr. Bedford, the quarterly caps and the extra peak hours of controls and attend to Mr. Rhodes to respond to that.

1:14:24

Thank you, John Rhodes fully applicant, to certainly question quarterly caps. As this came up yesterday, we did have a discussion after the examination to say that we want to take this away and considered law five, whether it's an appropriate and useful thing to do and what implication that might have. Additionally, what are two things to say about that? One is that we set out a profile of HTV movements. I think we will set that out again as clearly as we can with as much information as we can and deadline five itself. The best estimation of what we think the profile will be, also need to be careful about hugging that profile too tightly because things will change. But I guess that's, in a sense, that's the significance of the quarterly cap. So something that we want to consider and what has implication would be. But we're also aware that we just need to be careful in relation to caps and not just for the reason that I've explained, but because HTV or any one mode of transport here. And if a consequence of having to tighter control on hgv's is, for instance, increases the need to have training six days a week, that's something that we all need to consider what's the best balance to strike. So we've tried to arrive at what we think is a balanced strategy, I'm sure through the continuation of the examination or think about the best way of achieving that balance and controlling that. But he kept by themselves, not necessarily the only issue that we need to address. But I principally wanted to say that we will take away that question, and we will respond properly.

1:16:07

Thank you very much. And the next point I wanted to raise was we talked yesterday and a bit today about the the ACV. Cap being expressed, certainly in a b 112. Team, is a total vehicles travelling along which would include the associated development side hgv's. Why, in a wider sense, can't associated development sites be included in a cap or some description?

1:16:42

The sensible thing for me to do is to hand it over to Kirsty we're willing to answer but I would just duplicate it for planning perspective, just expressed the view that I'm not sure it's necessary to cap everything, we're aware of a particular sensitivity on the V 1122. We've assessed all the impacts by beyond the 12, whether it's appropriate to try and have that measure of control, because one of the difficulties of that measure of control, if it's exceeds what's necessary, is the consequences if it needs to change for any reason. It needs to change for any reason, what we don't want to get into position is going to make a DTO formal do change, for instance. So we need to have a process for for discussion and easy resolution. But those sorts of controls, from my perspective should be can should be committed to where they are necessary to protect against an adverse impact, we have measures to protect against adverse impacts. And we're particularly aware of the 1122

1:17:44

Yeah, no, I understand a b 1122. point but the a 12. In the early years, we've fallen and Stratford St. Andrew, that that particular issues there as well. So it's not just the BLM 22. We're interested in it's it's the network in the early years that those caps might be useful. Understood.

1:18:07

Thank you, I just say understood for the moment rather than what our response would be. But understood. Thank you. Thank you. Miss McMillan, do you want to say something?

1:18:23

I was just to add the in terms of the associated sites, and that we are proposing to track the ad. And this obviously will be in the next version of the ctmp. So at the moment, there's less controls around the ad construction vehicles that we would track those ht V's for compliance with the HTV routes, and that we would monitor and provide the monitoring data of the HTV movements via the DMS Booker and to the TRG. So at the moment, we don't consider a cap to be needed on the ad sites on the a 12. But that we can monitor and provide that monitoring data. And we can track compliance with the HTV routes. So that's, that's what we've proposed so far, but they were listening.

1:19:16

Thank you. Okay. This point I see Mr. Stansfield has his hand up.

1:19:28

Thank you, Mr. Humphreys. Coming back to LG V's most logistics companies have sophisticated packages to manage the distribution based on destination. So moving the postal facility to brick and market does not necessarily mean that they're just going to divert off the a 12 because it's convenient because the package the logistics company will happen. a route that will minimise the number of stops etc. Coming back to the postal facility, we can market in the questions to the examiner, question a II one dot 24 which is about the selection of wicker market is the park and ride EDF state that even if the Parker ride was somewhere else, the B 1078 would be still subject to substantial lgv traffic because of the park and ride so because of the postal facility. So I just wanted to make those points. Thank you. Thank you. I'm also speaking on behalf of frickin market parish Council. Thank you, Mr. Collins. Yes, thank

1:20:54

you, Mr. Humphrey. Paul Collins stops as we'll see and B 1122 and 13 issues parish Council. Miss McMillan said that if they needed to implement an LG V app, that which would be at the gift of the TRG, presumably as this was something that wasn't in the decio. This comes out of the contingency fund. And therefore, what happens if the implementation goes beyond whichever of the two contingency funds, it would come out? So that's my only concern.

1:21:31

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Collins. Miss Jenny curtly, please.

1:21:41

Thank you, Mr. Humphries. I'm speaking on behalf of task. I'd like to ask if LG V's and white vans will be using the a 1120 already a designated tourist drew from the west which will cause a lot more traffic. It's very, very busy now. I live along edge and then which will then surely cause congestion through the Oxford queuing back pass the Oxford primary school. We don't hear much about a 1120 but I think it will be impacted. Thank you. Mr. Fortman.

1:22:24

Yes, thank you. Yes, we can see ash parish Council of transport when we are very concerned about LTV with slightly also I say dubious about the modelling but we talked about that yesterday, based on

today's issues. One of the reasons is because lgbs wide ban will most likely be the cause of choice of subcontracting companies which fall basically totally outside any of the caps etc. level set. So, our issues we feel ltv's most certainly would need to be somehow monitored and the technology is there as was discussed at various meetings with CDF within the weaker market and swarming parishes. Group. Thank you. Thank you. Mr. Southern. Thank you, Mr. Humphreys.

1:23:27

JOHN, Southern Yorkshire parish Council, just to support what Jenny Kirkland said. In fact, Yorkshire parish Council have consistently raised concerns first through the submissions, including yourselves earlier on about the traffic increased traffic along year 1120, in particular, LG V's and white vans, but also other hgvs. But she's right that it hasn't come up in this meeting. But I just want to reassure her in a sense that we have registered this from the Oxford parish Council, you're obviously major affected with the planet. Thank you.

1:24:06

Thank you, Mr. roll. Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to respond to those please?

1:24:16

So I just deal with a couple before handing over to Robin. Thank you, Mr. Stansfield. The point about the postal facility we can market I think it's just the madam, you have an explanation from Harris to the purpose of that and the consolidation, which then avoids further, a greater number of lgbs routing to site. So we see that as a positive thing in traffic management terms and immediately terms. The the other point I'll just deal with is Mr. Collins's point about the if, for instance, it was thought that because of an issue in lgv, app to track ltv's was necessary. Mr. Collins said, Well, what if the contingency fund which is a defined pot of money has run out well That that would not prevent the TRG saying that that remedial measure needed to be taken forward. And as I've said, they would have the power to to improve that. And that would have to happen. So that would not be an obstacle. So the other points from is currently, 4 million. Mr. Sato will pass back and just hand over to Mr. Bolen, those. Thank you, and curse have been on par for the applicants.

1:25:39

So just in terms, I think one of the points about ltv's on the 1120. And how's that being considered, again, just to go back to kind of repeat the point, but the 1120 is not part of the HTTP boot. And the definition of HTV is three and a half times so that hopefully that provides comfort to the communities along the 1120 that any kind of large LTV, wouldn't they wouldn't see that on that code ox isn't from part of the HTV boot. And that the the models that we have undertaken, do includes the elf and 20. And doing the the strategic model includes that whole corridor. The Environmental Assessment chapter includes that corridor, and we've done junction modelling in around you Oxford, and that set out in detail in the TA, consolidated and transport assessment that includes the ltv's assigned with route choice, some of which may choose to get the smaller ones may choose to route on the a 1120. And that's considered an included within the traffic modelling. We do not consider there to be a highway and unacceptable highway impact. We're still liaising. We'll come on to it later in terms of the environmental assessment. We're still liaising with the authorities on that, but we can consider that and further this afternoon. So it wants to answer that environmental effects just now.

1:27:11

Thank you very much. Well, I'm aware that it's approaching half past one and I like to take a lunch soon, but I'll just take Mr. Stansfield, then Mr. Sutherland first, please.

1:27:32

Hello, Arthur Stansfield. I speak to myself but I've been involved with this point. But I've been involved with wicker market in discussions with EDF. I've, I've got experience in vehicle tracking. And I have suggested the use of an app and geo fences to buy to not only LG V's but private vehicles go into the park and ride to ensure they don't travel through wicker market unless necessary. And EDF have not taken that any further. Alternatively, smart cameras with anpr could be used to to monitor whether sides were related traffic goes through certain locations where it shouldn't. As far as the postal facility goes, it might be better that that was cited at the a 12, a 14 junction and consolidated there to avoid the roads as a route for the vehicles. Thank you.

1:28:39

Mr. Stanfield, I just say that your point about the mobile phone to monitor travel to work is one of the issues I was going to cover in the construct travel plan. But I mean equally. I could take a risk. I will take a response from the applicant on that point. After I've heard from Mr. Sutherland. Thank you, Mr. Sorrell? Yep,

1:29:03

thank you, miss. Sankey. So just my point for this makalah. I mean, we understand about the modelling. We've looked at it as far as we can, and we drill down as far as we can. Not easy to do. I have to say we've asked for additional information on it. All I would say is that we're not convinced. That's all that's okay. But I mean, we recognise that the modelling has been done and they've got it. We are concerned that it is not going to cover what's actually going to happen.

1:29:37

Thank you, Mr. Thorough. Mr. Bedford.

1:29:43

Thank you. So just before we say microbead for Suffolk County Council, just before we move off from this topic, I know Mr. Mary did have something he wanted to say about the associated development traffic and the B 1122. So if I just bring him in briefly on that Thank you.

1:30:03

Hello, good afternoon, sir Steve Murray from Suffolk County cancer. We've got some detailed comments on the conversation we've had this morning, we'd like to add, but I just wanted to make a specific point, if I may, builds on the conversation from yesterday about this potential of 7000 tonnes of bulk material being moved from at least the site size or link road to the main site. And it comes back to this this ambiguity, possibly of HTV movements? And it's really a question of where are those bulk fill loads coming from? Are they covered by the main site HTV movements? Are they covered by the ad sites do refer to paragraph 5.3. Point two of the construction management plan, which does say that's

all associated development sites are accessed off the a 12 corridor. And it was just if I, I'm not sure if I'm allowed to, but it's something we were raised with the the applicant bad weather those movements on the 1122 have been adequately assessed, particularly depending on where they go in terms of construction compounds within the size or link road site. That was the main point I wanted to make. So thank you.

1:31:16

Thank you, Mr. Murray. Mr. Flanagan. As is 2.2 points I want to Mr. Murray, obviously, but the first point from Mr. Stansfield was appointed is going to raise it that he had raised in the next item. But given he's raised it now, could I have the applicants view of using a mobile phone app to monitor travels or work and lgv. But we discussed LG TVs but travelled to work?

1:31:48

executive Brigade, Mr. JOHN Davis, you'd have on that subject. So ask him to feel that answer for us.

1:32:04

Hello, john Davis, speaking on behalf of the applicant? Yes, we've looked at the ability to use GPS tracking for the monitoring of worker car movements. But actually, the there are implications from an employment contract perspective, that prevent us from doing that, without without significant implications from an employment contract perspective. So our strategy is to focus on the sign in strategy to ensure workers are using the main routes to avoid travelling through worker market.

1:32:45

Thank you. I mean, is it Are you saying it's not possible for an employment point of view? Or it's not something? It's actually difficult, but it could be looked at if need be?

1:32:58

I think it's both of those things. I think they're from a whether it be a GDPR. Or you actually would be looking to track people's own mobile phones. You know, every every individual will have a different view about their willingness to accept that. So I think both on their employment law expert, but it's difficult in that context, and it would be very difficult to get workers to commit to that. You can't You can't bake it into their employment contracts.

1:33:30

Thank you. Mr. Stansfield. I know you have your hand up. But this isn't something I necessarily want to enter into discussion about in this hearing. If you have a comment to make on what Mr. Davis has said, Can I ask you potentially to put that in writing for the next deadline? And can I hear from the applicant about Mr. Murray's point?

1:34:04

So yes. Mr. Mary's points. What I'm going to offer there is an answer now and take it away more details required. It was quite a detail point, but points understood. And so the answer I gave earlier, I think largely covers it on the basis that the sensitive route is down the B 1122. And by locating the geo fence such includes the sensitive parts of the V 1122. you capture those HD v movements within the cap, and

therefore the A HD move HTV movements associated with the SLR ad site, which have the potential to impact on that sensitive route would be caught the HIV AIDS movements, the other ad sites for the reasons model explained, we don't think need to fall within that cap. So said that's the I'm going to give now and I'm going to say far as any more details required off to take that away and come back in deadline, five of the more detailed answers is no closet.

1:35:09

Yes, please, Mr. Flanagan, because I think, Mr. Mary probably like me, the approach to the B 1122. In terms of the cap, it being in the geo fence and the B 1122. Being a route that is kept with all hgvs associated precise, well, is a new approach from what I understood the application documents said. So it would be helpful to explore, you know, for you to set out exactly the approach. Understood, we'll do that. Thank you very much. Okay, I think that's probably all I wanted to do on the construction traffic management plan. And it is now the next item after lunch. What just gonna like Mrs. Lavender? Did you want to say something? Yes.

1:36:02

I'm sorry. Yes. I've lost a lot of the agenda, because everything popped out now stuffed again. So I apologise for coming late. I'm not sure this was 15. But in terms of mitigation in relation to people is that characterised protected characteristics in dealing with crossing the I 12. I don't know where that would be an appropriate point to or not?

1:36:38

Well, I think probably consideration of local traffic impacts, which is agenda item four, which will be at some point this afternoon after

1:36:46

lunch. That's where I anticipated it would be. So I'd like to speak then. Thank you very much.

1:36:52

Okay, Mr. lavanda. I'll try and remember that you want to speak and I'll request you then. For much indeed. Thank you. Okay, the time is 11 1336. Could I say we will adjourn for lunch till 20 past two. Thank you.