

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH3_Session4_08072021

00:02

Hello and welcome back to this resumed issues specific hearing three on traffic and transport just before I start, could I checked with a case Dino live recording and started

00:14

and the live stream started?

00:17

Yes, it has. Thank you.

00:20

Okay, so we're now going to move on to agenda item four. And the first bullet point or not, I hope can be a fairly brief discussion. What I'm seeking here is an update. I'm aware that

00:34

following the transport assessment and mitigation side identified in the transport assessment,

00:41

there is a there are outstanding differences in some areas between the council and the applicant. Perhaps I could hear from Suffolk County Council, whether there's any specific areas I want to highlight to me on this issue, please.

01:04

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. For some reason, I think they're having the same it problem for the people that my camera doesn't like to switch on.

01:15

So, you will be aware that there are some details where we are apart obviously, the big one is in relation to the a 12

01:26

corridor and the question of

01:29

mitigation arrangements for the overall impacts of the project on. So you will have seen that we have submitted as an adjunct, also an appendix I should say strictly to our responses to the first written questions, the economic assessment report from a calm, which is therefore it's appended to Rep. 2192.

02:01

And we have also provided you with our

02:06

assessment of what the applicant's traffic figures show in terms of the effects on the a 12 corridor. And you will have obviously identified that unfortunately, when we answered your question tt 1.82, there was an error or glitch in the figures, which led to us needing to issue a correction, which I think is wrapped to 517. It's then I think in terms of update, it's fair to say that the applicant has commented in their three submissions, rep three Oh 46, both on that economic assessment report indicated they don't share our views or conclusions. And they've also issued their response to our

02:57

representations on Rep.

03:00

Tt 182. And again, it's clear there are differences between us. Some of the differences relate to just precise figures, but it's probably the biggest differences, the interpretation of the results, and the significance of

03:17

cues, both in terms of delay, and in terms of queue lengths, and then cumulatively looked at over the network and taking the corridor or, and taking the economic significance of that corridor or, and we're not in a position where I think we are all on the same page, we are very concerned to ensure that the impacts which clearly can be identified, and whilst we might disagree about the precise detail of what the figures are showing, I think everybody can see that the figures are showing that there are negative outcomes during the construction period, on journey times on the a 12 corridor, we can clearly see that those negative impacts do have an economic dis benefit. And we consider there is a need for that to be addressed. We acknowledge that some of the problems on that corridor are the pre existing problems, and we have our own initiative to bring forward a major road network scheme to address some of those problems. What we're looking for clearly through dialogue with the applicant is for them to help contribute to mitigating those effects. We're not asking them to mitigate more than their own effects. But we are asking them to recognise that they will have impacts and that they ought to be addressed so that the where the wider economy have suffered doesn't suffer as a consequence of the construction of this national piece of infrastructure. So that's the main issue. There are

05:00

Also some lesser issues where we're not entirely

05:06

in agreement. There's the issue of the you've already, we've rehearsed significantly the B 1122. Early Years mitigation, how that is dealt with. One could say that as an aspect of disagreement about mitigation, the future treatment of the SLR is permanent or temporary, is a disagreement about mitigation. There are other issues about the B 1125. corridor wesselton doxford nm us, but those are detailed matters, which I think we can probably pick up in written comments. So So I think those are the

the headline points, and that's probably all we would need save state Okay. Certainly the later ones. I suspect we may talk a little bit about and a bit later in this agenda item.

05:52

And thank you for that. Can I hear from the applicant?

05:59

Sir, thank you. It's right, that the A12 issue is the main one between us and we have to miss Mullen to speak about that. And the short point, I think is that the negative outcomes on journey times that Mr. Bedrick refers to things that you don't think they're of the magnitude that justify what's being asked for. So then there's also the B1122, road as mitigation, that is moving forward. And progress is certainly happening there. The other matters, I think it's right are more detailed. So with that overview, perhaps I can hand over to miss Martin to address that those two issues in turn. Thank you.

06:44

So in case not well, on behalf of the applicant, and I said we have been having helpful discussions with Suffolk County Council. And I think we are making good progress on a lot of the information that's in there was covered in the appendix and of the local impact report those three tables and we can come on to that in terms of local impact shortly, those tables One, two and three. And you'll see that in the deed of obligation, the current deed of obligation those further commitments, provide mitigation upfront in little clemency, and miles furred. And we're already starting to have we've just started an initial conversation on the BLF and 25. corridor in terms of Western term, but we need to engage with the parish Council on that. So there's, there's lots of alignment. And I would agree that the the area where we don't agree, is on the A12 corridor. And there's two aspects of that. So obviously, from a highway capacity perspective, but also an economic the set the economic assessment that has been undertaken, and we've received the economic assessment, and we can sit and we're reviewing that. And I think it's easier for us to put that in writing. And that's kind of new evidence that was submitted. And we will do that, by the by deadline. sighs provide a technical note all of that. But there are some

08:13

factors based within the assessment that we think that it's not modelling and if what, what our preferred strategy is, it's overly robust in the assumptions, but also the use of that tool for what for seeking of contribution for an economic impact. So we can set that out in writing, but just in terms of the effects in Germany time on that corridor, we have written about this, it's covered in detail in Tei. In chapter nine of the consolidated TA and in appendix nine C, provides lots of tables. But effectively, what we're saying is that we've modelled those two snapshots in time, the early years and the peak construction and beat need in the in the early years, in sharing that along the the 14 kilometre corridor,

09:04

there would be an increase of between one and 20. So I'd say around 23 seconds along that corridor per vehicle, and it's important to do this in perfect or you're seeing the response to it 1.82, that there's some kind of potentially alarming figures and provided by Suffolk Council, and that it's 24 to 43 hours of delay as a result of Sizewell C traffic. Now, what that relates to is my small numbers of seconds that lots of vehicles over the course of a day, and you cumulatively add it up, but it the the number of hours

needs to relate to something so it's what is the total number of hours and increase over the total number of hours and travelled on that network and actually it relates to one to 2%. So that, that the rather alarming 24 to 42

10:00

Three hours of

10:02

overall increase in journey time for all of the vehicles travelling on that entire network over the holiday actually boils down to one to 2% increase. And that's of the peak of the peak of what we're assessing. So it's we, we feel that it's better to look at individual vehicles and indeed, in the MRN consultation, on the suffix website, they also consider to look at vehicles per second and say that naturally there will be and so I'm quoting suffered naturally, there will be variations in the delay experience by individual drivers on different approaches, and this is approached on the a 12 corridor, so that the am and pm average delay per vehicle gives a good indication of whether the scheme and the scheme is the MRN scheme, the major road network scheme is likely to reduce congestion. So So Suffolk themselves considered that a good indicator for whether something scheme is having a benefit, or indeed, whether there's an impact is the number of vehicles. So in seconds per vehicle, and this delays, we set that out in a TA that in the early years, it's nought to 23 seconds, depending on which hour of the of those peak periods we consider, and, and then in terms of the peak period, and that it's on the preferred strategy on a typical day, it's nought to 32 seconds, so half a minute, and over the corridor in the busiest day, up to 37 seconds. And I just would like to refer you also to our response to chapter 15, of the local impact report that looks at those snapshots in time, and tries to kind of quantify that in terms of those vehicles, that the seconds that I've just set out, are for the peak construction workforce. Actually, when you look at the overall peak construction workforce, which is, from years three, through to the end of the construction, that workforce ranges between 1280 and 7007 1900. So there's a huge kind of profile and bell curve of that workforce profile. And so the effect, you cannot say that it's a, you know that the effects that I've just quoted in terms of the journey times and the increase in seconds would be a flat profile. And over time, there would be fluctuations, because the workforce profile is boarding over time. So it's we don't consider that there's a need for highway mitigation for those effects a because they're not unacceptable, but also that we've set out a kind of package of demand management measures that is in line with the N one that seeks to control and manage the our traffic along that college or effectively, and therefore there's no residual and unacceptable impact that would require highway highway improvements. So that's a summary of our position that we realise differs to Suffolk.

13:17

But I mean, I think what you just said about the profiling of that you've modelled scenarios based on points in time. And their responses based on those scenario points in time. You've modelled the peak construction, the model in early years. And I don't want to rehearse again, all the discussion we had earlier on and yesterday about what early years means.

13:40

What you're saying I think that Suffolk have provided a calm report in response, and you're gonna provide a response to that. I mean, I think just looking at this, from the XX perspective, there is a highway impact that you have identified. And yes, you can discuss

14:03

whether or not the merits contribution or not. And what we're really hoping is between you and Suffolk, you can find a ground where you may not agree on the absolute level of mitigation that might be required. But I can understand both sides in this in this discussion, but I think I'd like to see the written response you have about what a comment provided.

14:28

And I think I would give Suffolk a chance to respond to your response. So the dialogue going rather than stop it up.

14:36

That's fine, what we'll provide a response and then we'll go from there. We are having very regular discussions with the authorities we meet very regularly. So that dialogue and let me show you will continue. Thank you.

14:53

Okay, that

14:56

I think covers that point for me now in less

15:00

There is a candidate that counsel wants to respond in any way.

15:06

Now, that was about that. Sorry, sorry. Yep. So probably just because Marlin went into perhaps some of the chapter and verse a little bit more than I was rehearsing maybe just helped, we'll just have Mr. Mary's as the effect of the Network Manager of that corridor, just so you actually have something directly from him rather than just hearing from somebody like me.

15:29

Mr. Bedford.

15:34

Hello, good afternoon, Steve Mary. So if we can cancel, rather than to go into details of numbers or otherwise may be just worth pointing out a couple of points is that this does seem to be genuinely

15:46

a difference of professional judgement on the impacts. And just as a bit of background to say that there's been quite a lot of modelling done on this corridor, starting with the vism model, the strategic

model, which was in the original draft transport assessments, we have worked well with the applicant, they have been responsive, we've come to a common ground on a lot of modelling and

16:08

an early stage, we did identify differences between the vism, the strategic modelling and individual junction modelling, and the applicant has undertaken a vizeum model. And just to say that, we have both or both parties have agreed to concentrate on the results from the vizeum model, which we think is more accurate, rather than the more pessimistic junction nines modelling for the individual junctions, or the CTC modelling. So I was just putting that into context.

16:34

I'm happy to bring in other experts to help with actual numbers, but I'm not sure if that's something you want to discuss in detail now. Not given that the applicants said they will respond in writing to your last submission, written submissions. I don't think getting into the debate about numbers now would be helpful.

16:55

Thank you. Thank you.

17:01

Mr. Flanagan.

17:05

Do you want to make any response or now with what was the morning says thank you.

17:11

Thank you. Right. Okay. Well, that covers the point for me. The next is about the approach to assessment of impacts in chapter 10 of the Yes.

17:24

I'd like to start with the applicant.

17:27

And in discussing this, obviously, I'll be referring to chapter 10 of the environmental statement and the guidance contained in the Institute of Environmental Management assessment guidelines for the environmental assessment of road traffic, which I'll refer to simply as the guidelines.

17:44

Firstly, I'd like to ask you about the assessment of magnitude of impact for transport set out and table 10.2

17:54

of chapter 10, which is app 198. The terms use for magnitude of impact in the case of impact on fear and intimidation nerve HGV traffic seemed to differ from that used in the guidelines.

18:08

The guidelines use extreme great moderate, where there seems to have been replaced with high, medium and low. Which on the face of it downgrade the impact when compared to the guidelines. Could you explain to me why that's the case?

18:31

Yeah, so we will respond. It'll be Malala Passover.

18:36

So it would just assist

18:39

us in fact, if you could, the table 10.2 at 198, the fear and in page 10, eight and difference from the guidelines in respect to what factors if you look at across the top of the table, you have guys you have high, medium and low.

18:58

Any impact in fear and intimidation in the guidelines, those same factors, those same criteria are extreme, great, moderate.

19:10

Extreme sounds worse, no more than high and great. More than medium and moderate more than low. To me. That's basically the issue.

19:21

The calibration of those.

19:40

And so wasn't think kind of it's potentially you're kind of trying to kind of standardise and kind of

19:50

impacts the costs. So settlement does I think refer to kind of high, medium and low so it was just a ball centre, trying to mislead impacts and it was just to kind of stay

20:00

To dice that table, so we can take that away to see whether that makes any difference in in terms of things. But effectively, there's the numbers that are there in terms of the SU, saying the IMA guidance is extreme, great, moderate, and those numbers have been being used. So I would like to add, though, that we have been working very closely with the Suffolk County Council in kind of recent weeks, in order to address further comments that have been received by Suffolk. So I think you'll see that what we're aiming to do is to provide you with a technical note that sets out that now, I don't want to put words in Mr. Murray's mouth, or to believe to be a largely agreed approach to the ies assessment and picks up all of the comments that they've raised. But we'll take this away as something to discuss with

the Suffolk as well as Okay, well, in follow up following on from that. Secondly, in response to your question, our question tt 1.117, which is on page 163, of your responses rep to 100.

21:10

Asking about why the average speed of traffic was not considered in assessing impact, your responses are only a change in speed of 20 miles an hour over would be considered a high magnitude of impact, I can find nothing in your methodology or the guideline that suggests this and approach. In the same way average traffic levels are considered. In a methodology, my interpretation is a plus 20 miles an hour refers to the average speed of traffic being greater. Therefore, speeds of 30 miles an hour greater should be considered as high magnitude. In my mind, that hasn't been assessed correctly, because speed of traffic does not form part of your assessment. It's so I recognise the point. So

21:55

the purpose of this is that it's about the change. So it's about the effect that the development will have on either hgv's on average traffic on average speeds. And so it's not about the speeds that the vehicles are travelling at. So obviously, so if you look at the guidance, it's got extreme is plus 20 miles an hour, great 15 to 20 miles an hour and moderate is 10 to 15 miles an hour. Now, that's not to say that if you have a road that is above 20 miles an hour, and it's a speed limit, that that is then a, an extreme fear intimidation, or that if you have it at 15 to 20 miles an hour, it's a great or moderate attend to 15. Well, that looks that is the the change in speed of the vehicles as a result of the size while traffic so that there isn't considered to be as a result of the size of our traffic and the mitigation that's been put in place such as the two bays bypass and inside something great that there would be such variation, such change in speed and kind of overall overall vehicle speed, and therefore it hasn't been included in sale intimidation. True to be to be frank, I don't agree with that assessment. I think what that what the way you've assessed average traffic is you've added in your traffic and taken the average traffic level to be the total traffic level. So in my mind, the same thing applies, it means if the average traffic level is in that speed category, then that should be a high category of fear and intimidation. I mean, most of us will have walked along a road,

23:41

a 30 mile an hour road, and ATVs gone by on a fairly wide footpath and is a fair degree yet you can experience fear and intimidation yourself to suggest that your traffic would have to be going plus 20 miles an hour over all the other traffic for that to be a case I can't agree with no not that it has to go above that. Sorry that the effect of the of the sizable traffic would result in a change of speed. And of all traffic

24:15

is our interpretation. But you're what you've set out in Table of assessment, is the average traffic level including your traffic,

24:25

then, is it not? You've gone based, you know you've added to traffic,

24:31

traffic levels on the road, and then you've classified them against those criteria for getting the speed for a moment. But including a sizable traffic but then you've just conveniently not taken account of the speed of traffic. I think we can probably clarify to say that this is an area where we consider that so we have sought additional advice on this. And that the the assessment set out in the as we consider to be the metadata

25:00

We've used is incorrect, what it and so therefore the technical note that we're providing on this in terms of the vehicles and the hgvs. And we'll we'll put this in the updated assessment. This is something we've been discussing this with Suffolk. So it's about the magnitude. So the methodology within the assessment has effectively assessed this before you, sir, is that we've looked at what is the traffic with at the moment? And what is the Fed, which threshold assume intimidation, would that result in currently, so how do people feel at the moment, then then we added in, did the same assessment, again, with our traffic on top to see where in the threshold it would be in terms of intimidation, whether that would change the intimidation. And actually, when we've kind of discussed this internally and with Suffolk County Council, nice effect, that the it's the methodology is actually should be about the change in traffic, the change in hgvs, and that the thresholds are there to look at that that magnitude of change.

26:12

I'm still not convinced, but potentially wait to see what this testing mode says. Because I mean, as an e x a, we did a unaccompanied site inspection walkthrough Stratford and Andrew and farnum, at six o'clock one evening, and

26:28

the existing traffic levels give me a degree of fear and intimidation. If you add yet more hgvs, I can't see that that's not a greater amount of fear and intimidation than there is in the existing.

26:41

And that's what the assessment seeks to do. So it's saying if in, for example, there are so hgvs, and if there is a if we are adding, and the and we've got the thresholds there, the 1000 to 2000 to 2000, to 3000, those are the kind of thresholds for the extreme greater moderate, and fan intimidation of additional hgvs. On top of what you already have. And this The same goes with the with the 18, our daily vehicles. So it's probably easier maybe if we take this away, we are preparing a technical note on this. We have had discussions on it. And I think if we if we present the the approach, and within that, then we'll take questions. And obviously, I'm following your review is that if that's okay, it's probably easier. Right? And yeah, that might be it might help me understand it.

27:36

I understand what you're what you're saying. Sir. Could I go on to another response to a question which is tt 1.1 22, which is on page 195. of wrapped to 100 your responses to our questions. Concerning the impact on a, b, 1125 and busselton, you suggest the 61% traffic increase would be considered a low magnitude of impact based on dmrbl 112.

28:05

This document suggests that would be there as it would be less than 4000 vehicles a day changing traffic magnitude would be low. However, as I read dm, rb la 112. It says document provides a framework for assessing mitigating or reporting the effects of motorway and all purpose trunk road projects on a population health. I don't see the B one b 1125 as a motorway or purpose trunk roads. So I'm not sure how applicable but references.

28:38

So no, I take that point. And it was to look at the absolute levels of traffic so that that you could have one

28:49

you'd have one vehicle potentially, and that then we add another vehicle and that could be 100% increase in change. Find contextually, contextualise update by I understand the point. I think we've also kind of moved on since then, in terms of the B 1125. And, and providing mitigation along that corridor. So I think in terms of the the deed of obligation, the next version of it, you'll see kind of commitments to improvements there. Well, it just, that's good, because it remains my opinion, this assessment and chapter 10. There are areas where I'm not convinced it actually represents what the true impact on the character of the roads would be.

29:37

And I think in tech, just to, just to kind of also say, effectively, you know, the process we've been going through with Suffolk County Council is to address their comments, but also pick up comments that you're making at the same time. And to provide a technical note that does that. And that then provides the assessment, but it's then the interpretation of those results and that professional judgement that will then need to come

30:00

Consider, and that is where table

30:05

three comes in of appendix M to the local impact report whereby Suffolk County Council consider that there may be some text to table two and three, there may be some

30:18

impacts on local communities that either need to be

30:24

kind of mitigated upfront, or that they may arise. And we need to kind of monitor those and therefore things like speeding, for example, which is an environmental effect that that's

30:37

being consulted on tentative wesselton. And the deal and 25 that were that survived that that's the purpose of the contingency fund. So it's, it's agreeing those annexes, and we're having discussions with Suffolk on that based on the updated assessment, in order to say, this is where we need to provide that

mitigation. And this is where we may need to find mitigation and it's subject to contingency funding monitoring.

31:02

Thank you for that. Just to finish on this before I take some points from IPS.

31:09

It's about the Scottish comparison of effects with a Scottish power application.

31:14

Your response to tt 1132, which is on page 170, a rep two 100

31:21

scottishpower application have three locations where they've identified that they would be doing mitigation. The first is a b 1122 at saboten. But footway improvements. Second is the Oxford va 12 and a third Mulford now I understand part of the ongoing discussion you're having with Suffolk

31:43

considers mitigation and little lemon malford. In the deed of obligation.

31:49

You Oxford your explanation was that the junction improvement was somehow linked to the footway improvements here that is

32:00

scottishpower proposing but I still can't see any, anything on a b 1122. In Tibetan. I suppose my question is, does your discussion with Suffolk now embrace these

32:14

cumulative impact points?

32:17

reflect Scottish powers assessment? Very much. So. So yeah, so that does what so it's, it's recognising that the proposal says scottishpower doing and tying in our mitigation with that as well. So those deform parts of our discussions with them.

32:35

Okay, thank you good at this point. I'll take comments from IPS. Mr. Collins.

32:44

Yes, for a minute. Thank you very much for comments from seventh nice week, parish Council, particularly this time, although everybody else included.

32:55

I'm planning to come back to the the BLM 22. We did, I did try to raise this issue yesterday, but it was clearly not in the right space. But what's in the current deed of obligation is just basically preparing the B 1122 for a lot of traffic.

33:12

And I'm sorry, when you look at the Scottish path to gation, that is proposed inside that button is pretty minimal. And in fact, one of the proposed

33:23

impact or one of the proposed changes was actually in a somewhat dangerous position. Now, I haven't been back to look and see if that has been changed, which I should go and do. But the fact of the matter is, the number the amount of traffic in the early years in particular, that is going to go through that village is going to be quite a significant increase. But most of us, let's be honest, 80% of it is due to the size we'll see operation, it's not due to the Scottish power

33:56

plan at all. So, we would look to see some more mitigation, certainly some sort of crossing temporary or other certainly temporary, if the SLR goes ahead and if it remains as a permanent fixture, but we would not want

34:13

but there is no mitigation. Basically it is completely absent as far as this proposal is concerned. Now I know we are due to have another meeting with EDF about it and I have been told that they want to talk about mitigation in sabut. Nice bridge, but at the moment, as far as the deed of obligation is concerned, it's got nothing in it at all. Thank you, Mr. Collins.

34:39

Mr. cusec.

34:44

Thank you, Julian cusec. Middleton come for the parish Council.

34:50

My residents, our residents had numerous serious concerns about the impact of the SLR on our parish.

35:00

And you can categorise them under the general heading of severance. And there are three major issues. One is the blocking on the current plans or the minor routes minor over it's the south, which are used by residents to access facilities and sex bonds and beyond. The second is the disruption of farming businesses from the loss of land to the road and the blocking of access routes causing increased costs of working. And the third is the intrusion of this law into the and scape and the fiscal divide it will make between Ford, Lee and Middleton, which very much regard themselves as one community at present. Now there are many detailed points which flow from those general headings. And I appreciate that I will be taxing the title of encouraged to go into them all in detail. Could I could I

just help you there, Mr. cusat? This one is about transport. So if we could limit your comments to transport a photo to a landscape point, but landscape will be a separate I sh. Thank you for that guidance and say yes, absolutely. So I'd like to take one particular example of a transport issue others we will put in our written representations. Thank you. This actually concerns rights of way for pedestrians and cyclists. And by way of background, and our parish, in in common with with many other local authorities, has been working on encouraging the use of our minor roads for recreational walking, cycling, horse riding, and generally using the advantages that we've had under the quiet road scheme and other

36:40

other schemes proposed by Suffolk County Council to improve the environment of these roads for particularly for walkers and pedestrians.

36:49

One of these roses from wall road and this is what I'd like to use an example. And the current plans a little more road which goes roughly south from the B one one to two in the direction of Cal sail is proposed to be stopped up, both on the south side and on the north side. And in the latest iteration of the applicants proposals, there is proposed to be a write a new writer create way created, supposedly for pedestrians and cyclists, which will initially take a route to the west crossing the Middleton link road. And then would require the cyclist has already had to wheel their bike across one main road, or the walker to dodge the traffic at six mile powers on one main road. So then cross the SLR itself from north to south before eventually making their way back to the old Livermore road to continue their journey into Cal sail.

37:49

I had a meeting recently with the applicant and I asked them what provision was going to be made for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists? I asked what the be separate crossings could the people open crossings with the foot bridges with the central refuges of any kind provide protection and facilitation for these dangerous crossings? And the answer I got back was none of the above essentially, although they did concede that there might be some steam under which cycling and pedestrian routing would be facilitated in the future. This is totally unacceptable that these roads should be disrupted and requiring pedestrians and cyclists to dodge across traffic moving at 60 miles per hour on the Milton Nick road and the size of that road. And I've used this as an example because I think the same issues apply quite commonly along the route of the SLR and in other parts of the the routes to and from a sizable site. And so I'd like to record in the strongest terms, my parishes objection to the proposals by EDF and our view that it's absolutely impossible to mitigate these to any significant extent. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Pusat. Can I hear from the applicant on those first two points, please?

39:06

Yes, thank you. So Mr. ball's going to address those two points for Mr. Key second. Mr. Collings. We're on the 11th 2010. Yes, thank you, Mr. Ball.

39:19

Good afternoon, which are both for the applicant just if I could perhaps respond to Mr. Collins. Initially.

39:29

as we as we just mentioned, we have had some initial discussions with Mr. Murray's team at Suffolk County Council. And

39:38

we would definitely like to engage at the next meeting with with Mr. Collins and other representatives of the parish council to discuss early years mitigation within saboten. I can assure him that it would be much broader than that, that is proposed within the scottishpower renewables application and without going into too much detail

40:00

We're considering similar items to those discussed with with other parishes such as malls, food and little glenumbra. So,

40:08

you know, an appropriate crossing point.

40:12

entry points to the village and enhanced amenity for pedestrians. So that's something we'd very much like to take forward

40:21

with the parish council

40:24

with with regards to

40:27

the points from Mr. Q sack, we did have a useful meeting miscue sack, actually, last week, and I had the discussion with him on the public rights of way, I just take that point First, the specific

40:42

example discussed

40:46

with regard to a little more road

40:50

about how to trust the middle to more link and then the size will link road rather than just make one crossing.

40:56

That changes as a result of a road safety audit and actually aligns pedestrians to actually cross the road in a much more safe location on a quieter in inverted commas, quieter part of the link road I to the west of the middle to more link. So that was a direct response from road safety audit. And we felt that that was the right change to make.

41:21

He makes a good point with regards to psych 18, we had a very good conversation about the use of little more mood.

41:32

In the future post, the construction sites will link crowd and how that could encourage a cycle route down from Milton more down to

41:43

South road towards towards Saxmundham. And that again feeds into the point I made yesterday about linking into the quiet lanes and potential benefit to develop some cycling routes. That's something we'd very much like to take forward further with the local authorities and discussion with the parishes. The question I was asked in that meeting was is a bridge provided there for pedestrians or cyclists? And I said No, that isn't within our proposals.

42:13

Such an intervention would be based on the amount of foot traffic and so on on a particular route. But that isn't, you know, we're happy to continue those discussions and include that, within the overall discussion on cycling legacy and the potential. The the fund

42:33

mentioned in the meeting was the cycling connectivity Fund, which I mentioned to Mr. Q sack is something that we're keen to ensure that that goes to,

42:44

to the right areas to promote cycling within the region. So I think there's a huge opportunity to develop that. So we'd like to continue those discussions certainly with with the parishes and the county council. So hopefully that covers both of those points. Yeah, I would certainly like to encourage you to continue those discussions. Because clearly there's there's quite a lot of issues that people are raising that need to be addressed or you need to try and address them. So I definitely encourage you to continue that dialogue.

43:12

We will do sir. Thank you Mr. Ball. I am mindful of Mrs. Lavender. If you're still here with us.

43:21

You did make a request this morning that you'd like to speak at this this part of the agenda. Thank you.

43:31

And you ever I can hear you but I can't see you miss miss lavender. Well, no.

43:37

worry about that. I

43:40

I tell all the technology all day but if you can hear me and that's okay. I certainly can. Right. Okay, well thank you very much.

43:50

Now, I'm speaking on my own behalf but to say I am in close liaison with multiple parish Council have been very supportive. In this I have had concerns for the last three years in respect of pedestrian safety at the age of 12. I've just to set the context and it

44:11

just from the documentation as submission three deadline response to examination authorities questions and taking point 1.25 examining authority also question of the applicant to explain the mitigation propose to address the concerns of most of them little plan regarding adverse impacts or size of the process. We have taught us today but I will just quote because they were talking about to

44:46

the proposed improvements include new 70 miles per hour speeds who offered an extension 40 miles per hour speed limit traffic, calming measures, measures

45:00

drills, features and wider foot foot ways of crossings. And these the applicant actually considered wood

45:11

measures adequately to mitigate hate against any potential effects.

45:19

Mostly continue to be concerned about safety of pedestrians. And then the second question why I raised this in terms of you answer that

45:33

authority also Suffolk County Council and Suffolk council whether they was satisfied with the protect with the provision for people with protected characteristics who might be disadvantaged by the development, and the current Suffolk County Council's response was that the need for improvement in pedestrian facilities, which may reduce the impact on people protected characteristics, by reducing

46:03

sufferance, improving access and reducing pedestrian

46:10

intimidation. Now I'm speaking as someone who does come within that category, but I just want to talk to display briefly about the issue of

46:21

causing a 12 report, say, I live less than a mile from the proposed signs of open rides between the junction v one SM eight

46:35

E, access on and off the HL from the bell lane junction. And crossing the road can be particularly difficult from say some hopping morning to make day on Mondays afternoon is to deal with the volume of flow of traffic. And we thought you heard about that. And the prop. It is problematic crossing, particularly for north to south, because component has to actually have sight of the cost of the band on the southbound traffic.

47:12

And in order to do that, it's sometimes necessary just to step in, today by

47:19

and the downside here, understandably, I suppose, is southbound traffic, having to undertake traffic, seeking to turn the rights of focus on the rights of the 812. So that's a potentially really dangerous situation.

47:40

It is a matter of time, this is actually taken, it can take up to five minutes or five minutes, sometimes more to cross the 812.

47:56

It's okay for someone who's

47:58

40 as I am, but for people who really

48:02

not able to move fast, it's potentially extremely dangerous. I've taken to wearing high visibility clothing

48:11

at the time of day.

48:14

So I'm thinking that water ever starts how we estimate the volume of traffic. And we have

48:24

disadvantage, however, we actually look at that the increase in volume and flow of traffic how that is measured, and how far that is going to be significant. In terms of its impact.

48:40

We are already in a situation that needs those measures, some of those measures which are described just without in terms of speed limit and the crossing.

48:51

And so the at the end of the day, it is something separate is already there. we're well aware of it. It has increased since I've moved here that has when I moved here, just 30 years ago, that has increased. So the answer would seem to be in all of this would be for village bypass, but it is very good. And I do acknowledge what I've heard this morning about the ongoing dialogue with by the applicant and the consideration of this this mitigation. So thank you. That's really all I have to say. Thank you Miss love and I'll ask the applicant if they want to make a response now. Thank you. Thank you

49:38

Flanagan.

49:44

Mr. Poole.

49:49

The outcome just just a very brief response. And as previously mentioned by Mr. Mullen, we're having good dialogue with both sub county counsel and representation from the parishes of miles for the client.

50:00

them and scheme that we're developing within the to be included within deed obligation does include a number of measures, including a controlled crossing in or formal crossing in mouse furred and default lambs. So that's that's all with the parishes where we've just shared our latest proposals with them and we have another meeting with them arranged to engage with them on that on that basis. Yes, thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Bull.

50:34

Thank you, Mr. Lavender. Thank you.

50:39

Mr. Flanagan. Did you want to say something at that point?

50:44

No, I didn't say sorry. I just lost connection. So have to rejoice.

50:48

Okay, thank you, Mr. Southern.

50:54

Thank you, Mister. Thank you, Mr. Humphrey fellow before it's fine.

51:02

follow on from the previous speaker, because what I want to address is the issue of severance.

51:10

As you appreciate jocks, that actually is split not in a 12. Although the bulk of the villages to the west of the a 12, there is a quite a big, lots of estates. To the other side to the east side to 12.

51:25

I was very grateful to hear the fact you do walk va 12. A little bit further south. And the way you felt about the traffic, because certainly that's the word same way I feel about the traffic when I'm trying to cross the a 12.

51:41

At the Oxford or indeed trying to walk to Darwin station, da 12.

51:49

This is particularly applies to the the early years, which is we think we now realise is going to be a minimum of two maybe more.

51:57

When the it's going to be heavy traffic coming from the cells into the Oxford turning light up in the bL 22 before the roundabout is built. And then there's going to be additional traffic generated by the roundabout itself, and the bypasses and the park, right. So we're going to have heavy traffic on that road. And

52:21

crossing that road already is dangerous. And we really feel that we do need to have a crossing and I'm very interested in what Mr. Ball was saying about control crossings in master.

52:32

We do need a crossing there. Now, we submitted this in feeding this into the income Community Impact Assessment.

52:42

And we were disappointed to see that actually, the impact assessment passed on by the Southern District Council did not reflect this.

52:53

We believe that is perhaps because they didn't appreciate that we were talking about specifically about the early years justification where the traffic is going to be very difficult before the link road is put in. So I was going to ask you if you could

53:11

if we could consider if the applicant would consider providing a crossing as part of their mitigation. And also ask a Southern District Council whether with improved explanation whether they agree the need. Now I listened very carefully to what Mr. Mr. Ball was saying. And he's obviously in consultation with a number of parishes. And I was going to ask if Mr. Ball could come and discuss with the opposite parish Council. We've got a meeting sort of on tap, but it hasn't happened yet to discuss the specific mitigation measures because it would make a huge difference. Thank you. Thank you for the room for the roll. I'll put that to Mr. Ball now.

53:50

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Humphreys. Mr. Ball.

54:00

Hello, Richard, both the applicant. We've been we've been more than happy to sit down with Mr. Sutherland, the parish council to discuss all elements of the project. Obviously we're not in a position to to commit to any litigation at this point, but very happy to sit down in a meeting and discuss his concerns and reflect on that, sir.

54:19

Thank you very much.

54:21

Miss bassinet, please. Thank you, Mr. Ball.

54:27

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Humphries.

54:31

I just wanted to make a couple of points related to the issues actually that that you specifically raised?

54:39

First of all on the modelling of the 812 corridor.

54:45

I just think that no one who lives here or uses the a 12 m would say that EDS figures on the impact or anything really but rhizobial

54:56

It also seems to be that EDF smart

55:00

Link does not take into account what the impacts are in the early years if I understood the applicants statements.

55:09

So I think that that's a critical issue. And finally, I wonder if EDF has done any modelling, when tractors and other farm equipment are actually on the a 12, which is a perfectly common occurrence in this part of the world, and I didn't hear that that was part of their model.

55:33

I would also like to specifically then concentrate on the road network that is north of the B 1122. And I thank you, Mr. Humphrey, for raising the question of the B 1125. Because that's what I would like to concentrate on.

55:49

As I had said earlier, I represent Walberswick, which is one of the communities that's on the BLM 25. The BLM 25 is a direct route parallel to the a 12. We're to the east of it, and it comes from the north directly into the 1122. In fact, before all the Sizewell hearings, I always thought it was one road, I didn't realise it was the split between the B 1125 and the BLM 22.

56:20

It is used today by workers at Sizewell A and B, who use it today to avoid traffic on the a 12 despite it being a cycling route. And despite it being the only car route that the local villages can use. We believe that the B 1125 will be the route of choice of the workers in the early years to get to the Sizewell C site. We also believe it will be the main route run for everyone else who today uses the a 12 who will need to escape from the A1 ELLs and the HTPS from Sizewell into the associated development coming from the north that will clog the a 12.

57:03

Right now the B 1125 can become a dangerous and heavily used road during rush hours during school runs. And particularly in the summer when tourists come to the area.

57:15

This includes through Blackbird past Walberswick, down into Wessington. And as we've all been putting in our written representations, and consultations through 10 years, this is a major concern of ours. It has been ignored by EDF as far as we all know, until today was the first time I heard EDF say that they're thinking about the B 1125. When the B 1125 doesn't run, no children can get to school out of our villages. No one can get to work. No emergency vehicles can reach our communities. There is only one way in and out and it's the B 1125.

57:56

In the summer months, the traffic

57:59

trip doubles and sometimes triples. So we've done traffic counting into Walberswick, that comes off the B 1125 into our B 1387. If you look at this, this is figures in November 2018. So well before we've had these summers of COVID. Tourism, and the numbers can go from four or 501. Way. during November, that number reaches 14 101 way in the summer. And I asked whether EDS modelling has looked at the

difference of the impact of this area of roadways during the tourist season, which now runs from approximately made to October.

58:45

Finally, before I leave this, I would just like to remark I heard it yesterday. And I've heard it again today from the applicant about creating cycling routes around right now we are cycling routes. The B 1125 is the cycle route that is used by anyone who comes from these communities going north to hit these different roadways. Once the size weld is under construction, the B 1125 will no longer be saved for cycles. And none of this is being mitigated. So I'm just wondering, you know why EDF has ignored the B 1125. All this time? Why there's nothing in the deed of obligation as far as I know about mitigating the B 1125. Thank you very, very Thank you. Can I just say before you go that I think the issue with the a 12. I think we just discussed earlier on Suffolk and the applicant dark in discussion now and trying to find a place of agreement on that on that issue. The seasonality issue we did discuss yesterday at some length so don't want to reopen that but I will ask the applicant for any further comments. Have an idea

1:00:00

1125 Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:00:06

So yes, thank you, Mr. Mr. ball will address the 1125. Again. Thank you.

1:00:18

Hello, which both for the applicant, thanks to Miss basnet for that, that verbal submission. We're very aware that there are concerns in western and she's quite right to say that this has been raised through the consultation process. I think the particular concern is the existing speed of traffic through through the village. That's a point that's been consistently made.

1:00:43

Miss Mullen mentioned a little while ago that we're

1:00:48

we're very keen to engage with the parish council about about appropriate measures.

1:00:54

For the BLM 25, similar previous discussions on other roads, we've started to look at that. And certainly, as mentioned previously, things like additional pedestrian enhancement and vintage gates from gateways and ways of trying to control the speed of traffic through through that route, I think is something that we would like to deliver. In terms of cycling on that road, we understand that the, you know, that area around Western, no doubt does attract cyclists and that that's something we very much it's good to hear we would like to make that route corridor safer. And that's something we'd like to look at, certainly the discussions we've had with Suffolk County Council. And the comments they've made has, they've raised concerns about the safety of that road, in particular for for cyclists and Wi Fi to

minsmere. So yeah, in short, we will discuss and move further with this proposal to make sure it's formally included within the deed of obligation. Thank you Miss bassinet. Can I just say that?

1:02:06

I know you've got your hand up, but you can't just turn the camera on. Is there other people have had their hand up for a while, but given it's on the B 1125. And your response that I'm happy if it's very brief, but I don't want this to become a dialogue about your concern about the B one, one to five with Mr. Ball.

1:02:25

No, sorry. I just wanted to raise a clarification Mr. Humphrey. It's in that I represent the Walberswick parish Council, which is another Council and there is also the blind PR Council. So I wanted Mr. bolt to realise that there was more than the wesselton Council. That was my Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. And can I hear from Mr. Galloway now, please?

1:02:51

Good afternoon, Mr. Humphrey. Thank you for

1:02:55

listening to me again. I just wanted to pick up on earlier comments made by Mr. kousaka. At Middleton Comm. forwardly an echo his concerns, as you may be aware, go away. I can't see you again. But I can hear you very well. And happy with that. I'm sorry, the camera theoretically is on Berta

1:03:15

just carry on. You may or may not be aware that Middleton comm forwardly combined with Cal cell comm Colton parish councils, alongside saboten have recently formed a network of green lines that have just been approved by Suffolk County Council. And it's in that respect, and in the connection with Fort Lee road that I want to just carry on from where Mr. cusec left off. That route is now going to be a Greenway. That route severed by the sizewell link road. And with a large apron entry into it becomes a natural shortcut for traffic that is trapped on the SLR due to either an issue on the 12th or indeed an issue on the SLR itself. And our concern, and I speak for myself as a private resident of chaos outcome, Carlton, but I have worked closely with council parish council over the past eight years, poses an existential threat to some residents for the road, but also to residents on North green on in Kelso itself, it poses a threat to regular species, the conservation area, three nature reserves, and all of the heritage assets, basically along the whole route and interpreten. And I just want to raise that issue, because it's one of those things that really cries out for a resolution like is that such as has been achieved at Pookie road, because the open traffic flow off or onto the SLR will actually create a nightmare on what a very steep

1:05:00

saw the lines as I think you observed when you went on your visit, and stopped with the laces.

1:05:07

that extends right away into Cal Cellcom calm, and it really needs urgent addressing and a resolution.

1:05:14

Thank you, Mr. Galloway. I'm sure you appreciate it. I won't ask the applicant to respond on the other issues but the traffic at this hearing, but I will ask the applicant to respond on the traffic issue of that.

1:05:28

stubble

1:05:29

or Mr. Foley? It will be Mr. Ball. Thank you.

1:05:39

Yes, Sir Richard Richard ball for the applicant.

1:05:43

We have we've had a number of discussions with for the road over a number of years in terms of what what's the right solution here and we've we've tried to work with all stakeholders land, landowners and the parishes to come up with

1:05:55

the most appropriate solution in the in the circumstances, we feel an outcome like we've proposed in the change request for pretty road isn't deliverable in this solution in this location,

1:06:10

the size of our link road

1:06:14

proposed alignment will be about one and a half metres above the existing level of 40 Road to accommodate

1:06:20

the upgraded coverting. For the for the watercourse to comply with the flood risk assessment, it's not really feasible at all to take the road any lower, which means if you're then planning to

1:06:36

potentially put the link road over for the road, it creates a very large structure in

1:06:46

in in the landscape would increase the height of that road by another five and a half metres and increase the embankment to the west by around about 300 metres before it could tie into the current proposed alignment. So we haven't looked at it in quite some detail, we don't feel that there is a solution that delivers that outcome.

1:07:11

So then we're left with what is the most appropriate outcome. So we're trying to manage issues such as,

1:07:18

as was mentioned severance between Middleton Moore and Cal sales. So we're trying to maintain some connectivity or be it I fully understand that it's not for the road in its entirety, but it would require a diversion onto the link road and back on to the V 1122. And that is not an optimal solution, as reported back by a number of stakeholders, but it is sort of the sort of the best outcome we can achieve. in that location. We do fully support the quiet lanes initiative, and we understand for the road is either has been or will be designated a quiet road. And we have no intention of promoting any of our traffic on that road. And we'll do everything we can through signage to ensure that none of our traffic does go on that road. And we'd like to think as part of the the mitigation for size we'll see and the deed of obligation that we can have a productive on ongoing discussion with the local authorities to make these routes more visibly quiet. So I know that the quiet lane strategy has has signage on it. And it the appearance of it is different to what would be a normal route for traffic. And I think there are ways and means by which you can discourage traffic on these these quieter roads to hopefully try and minimise and avoid as far as possible anybody taking those routes. So we're fully aware of the concerns and the issues and we'll do everything we can to mitigate them as fast as we could take you Mr. Ball just to help the examination and help IPS if you'd like respond in writing to this at a later date. Could he set out the approach is more or less outlined to me in writing about the considerations you had for the road? Can it be done the same way as pretty road? And following along for that the strategy you do have to afford the road

1:09:14

app to do that. Thank you. Mr. Fortman.

1:09:21

Yes, thank you class, Fortman County, parish Council, and other neighbouring councils.

1:09:28

Like Mrs bassinet we find EDS assessment are difficult to marry up with already occurring and worsening experience of our residents here. And with regards, especially with regards to congestion in peak hours in the area, even before sighs we'll see frisky brighter lights etc.

1:09:52

A question arises, for example regarding negative impact on journey times.

1:10:00

are surely impacts increase with

1:10:05

the required or the intended mitigation measures when they're put in place, ie speed limits or miles for it and crossings, etc. So my question is, has that been taken into account when those assessments modelling

1:10:24

plants were made? Thank you. Thank you, Miss.

1:10:29

Potentially, Mr. Flanagan to respond to that, please.

1:10:36

Yes. And last Miss Rollins responded, that's, that's all thank you.

1:10:54

On behalf of the applicant, it's always a fine balance, isn't it in terms of kind of car giant times, but then also balancing that with other users and vulnerable road users. And so in terms of the purpose of the

1:11:10

proposals, that little clemen it's to mitigate the environmental effects for vulnerable road users, and the tariff seeking to use the a 12 and walk along hit and cross it, as we heard earlier, because of the difficulties of crossing it. So it is a balancing act. But we feel that on balance, that the needs of the of those vulnerable users in terms of the impacts, and our mitigation is appropriate, and the change in speed limit. in those areas. We haven't then these are kind of ongoing discussions they haven't fed into our models would say that we haven't got a the vism micro simulation model, there's a quoted kind of detailed analysis of earlier only extends up to the 11, or just beyond the a 11, to a 115 T's and Melton around there. So it's just north of there that the model then stops beyond that we have a strategic model in place where I'm not sure it would pick up such kind of fine differences in terms of moving a speed limit backwards,

1:12:26

or back a few 100 metres in order to kind of pick up the overall kind of anytime it's not that type of model to to pick up such fine nuances of speed limit changes, or kind of variation speed limits. And that's really where the vism mic simulation model is, is very good at doing that. So I think it's a, we haven't modelled it, I think it'd be very difficult to as what to model the effects of that with the, with the tools that we've got available. But the purpose of that is to kind of provide for for the fund for where it is is but there are benefits that along the a 12 corridor for

1:13:06

for traffic such as the tivos bypass so it's there's that balance between providing for the vulnerable wages, but then also providing for for those kinds of uses and convenience of those and effectively the the TVs bypass with 5g anytime benefits rather than having to channel through to find them.

1:13:25

Thank you very much.

1:13:28

Mr. Fortman. I don't want this to become a discussion about what you've just heard.

1:13:34

Is this something additional you want to add?

1:13:38

Now I take your point and thank you. I'll put it in the written

1:13:42

submission. Thank you very much.

1:13:45

Mr. beech, please.

1:13:51

Thank you. So yeah, timber, each person, a parish Council and softball and also making some comments for Mansfield. I just wanted to echo the points made by Josie Batson at

1:14:05

all this week. There everything that applies to the 1125 applies to the bb 1069. We've made those points in written representations. And we have met with

1:14:19

I think, Mr. Ball, and some of the staff that have some of those conversations, but I'd welcome the opportunity to do that again and see at least some of our concerns may be reflected in that deed of obligation as well. They're exactly the same issues and just as a point of interest. Snape and just off the V 1069. We have now got to have the will referred to as green lanes that are actually quiet lanes. We were the pilot for two of those. And again, they're some of the lines that are at our at risk if we don't get mitigation on the V 1069. And his crimes foreman said on the 1078 on all the way down to Mt.

1:15:00

So again, I'll just welcome that further conversation with Mr. Ball and any other staff. I will put that to Mr. Barnes to beach. Thank you very much.

1:15:10

Good to hear from Mr. Ball.

1:15:19

Hello again, Richard, both the applicant you're more than happy to have the ongoing discussion with with Mr. beech. Certainly, I think,

1:15:26

obviously, any mitigation proposed needs to reflect the assessment and the impacts that have been

1:15:37

recognised recognised and

1:15:39

the volume of traffic on the road, but absolutely happy to continue the engagement, Mr. beech, so no problem at all. Thank you very much, Mr. Ball. Mr. Collins.

1:15:51

Yes, thank you very much, ministers parish Council on the 1122. And stop signs We'll see.

1:15:59

like to go to severance of public rights away and support some of the comments that have actually been made by other participants on other IPS.

1:16:10

It would appear that you know, we have something like 10 different public rights away that is severed by the SLR. Some of the some of those diversions are quite long, some of them up to 270 metres. And they're obviously along the side of this

1:16:29

roadway, which is not going to be very

1:16:32

attractive to the users of that. One of those is a recreational circuit that is

1:16:39

promoting by Suffolk County councillors also local local policy plan sdip 7.1. So these are, you know, important tourist routes, people use them quite a lot. And we do think that what is being proposed in these diversions doesn't really match up to the sort of area that we expect and the severance that's being provided there. On another issue,

1:17:05

we've heard on several occasions, the new size well, Nick road is is actually being produced to dmrB standards.

1:17:14

dmrb standards also require that cycle lanes be provided, or a cycle lane be provided alongside that in cd 195. And also, it's consistent with government guidance. Itn, one stroke 20. So none of that is appearing in this particular

1:17:36

site as well link road proposal. So we also have an issue now with cycle routes along that so they're not really encouraging cycling to work along those routes. Now, it might be that the B 1122 gets eventually downgraded and made into a cycle route, but it's certainly not providing that sort of level of encouragement from the get go. And if you look at what's been happening down, certainly down in Hinkley Point, there have been some fairly extensive cycle routes put in to try and encourage people to

get to the Hinkley Point sites by cycle at quite a quite a distance from the site. So I'd like to hear what the applicant has to say about those. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Collins.

1:18:23

Mr. Flanagan.

1:18:27

Yes, Mr. ball is going to respond to that. Thank you. Thank you.

1:18:35

Hello, wish you both the applicant.

1:18:39

Just with regards to Mr. Collins first point about the diversions we've we've worked very hard with the Suffolk County Council public rights away team and our own designers to come up with the most appropriate safe route. And that has to be the overriding input into the these diversions.

1:19:00

That said, When Mr. Collins talks about a diversion along the road, you know, I would like to think that we could take that into account and into our landscaping strategy and see whether there are opportunities to actually make that more appropriate where where that is possible.

1:19:18

That the second point Mr. Collins, raised I think was Dr. mb dmr. standards and cycle lanes on the link road. I mean, he goes on to make the point about the B 1122. And what that could be post the construction of the link road in terms of repurposing, and I think I didn't make that point yesterday. That's pretty much our view that that would be repurposed to a road with left less traffic on less traffic going through the village much more appropriate for cycling and having signage to link up with the quiet lanes that

1:19:59

go

1:20:00

Each side of the beer 1122 into the wider area. So that's something we very much support. And we'd like to continue the good discussions that we're having on that matter.

1:20:10

The last point was with regards to cycling infrastructure at Hinkley Point, Mr. Collins will be aware. And again, I mentioned this yesterday that we are providing an off road cycle route from sizable gap the size of the construction site, through to across all test farm along

1:20:31

Abbey Road to East Bridge Road to the north construction sites, that safe passage off road

1:20:39

for cyclists in the questions along that corridor, and that has the potential to again feed into a tourism offer.

1:20:50

The site that the local authorities could develop a cycle, the heritage coast type offer without which size we'll see would not

1:20:59

preclude and could actually facilitates we think there's there's a huge benefit here to that. That potential links into the future, the BLM 22.

1:21:10

Again, creating cycling routes to the wider area. So something we very much support as a business and as a legacy of size. We'll see do do Mr. Ball before you go do in cycling along the B 1122 and cycling connections to the BLM 22. Is there somewhere, you'll have to remind me that you set out a cycling plan that includes the BLM 22, or could that be set out so people could understand the cycling provision along that corridor and how it connects? Yeah, it's a work in progress. So at the moment, we had a good, very useful meeting with the local authorities a week and a half ago to start that process going. And we'd very much like to be a part of that ongoing discussion. We have a site and connectivity fund that is part of our deed of obligation. And as I said, it's fundamental, I think to what the B 1122 can become post construction the link road. So yes, I think as that evolves, we'd very much like to get that formalised and set out for you. Thank you very much, Mr. Ball. Mr. Collins, I see I have a hand up again. Now the similar point to Mr. Fortman. I don't want this to become a discussion about cycle routes along the B 1122. But if there's something different, you want to ask

1:22:26

just a minor point that actually I omitted to say. And that was that. It's interesting, they're going to do this, looking about how to put cycle roots in but i'd perhaps remind you that one of the big one of the sides will link roads, goes through the Oxford roundabout and the Oxford roundabout then uses the B 1120. The existing v 1122. To get to the size on the road through the other link road if you like

1:22:54

the current roundabout doesn't really facilitate cycling,

1:23:01

according to the to the instructions. And if you wanted to come from dharshan station, for instance, and cycling as one of your possible routes that really precludes that actually happening. So there are still some issues. I think we accept, I think I accepted some issues. And I think that's part of the reason I asked him what I did just now but I you know, I have to now ask him to respond again on that point. But thank you very much.

1:23:27

Mr. Ball, perhaps you want to finish that point off

1:23:34

as the applicant? Yeah, absolutely. That that is the most challenging areas be 1122 between the link and the roundabout, and that that is something that we need to give considerable thought to. And that's, I think there's a number of solutions that could could be delivered and

1:23:52

you know, something we're discussing with,

1:23:54

with stakeholders, so absolutely take that on board. Thank you very much, Mr. Ball. Right now. I don't see any more hands up. So Mr. Flanagan, is there anything you want to add?

1:24:08

So I'm just checking with my team. No, that's nothing to hide from us. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Flanagan. Before I close the hearing, then let me remind you that any post hearing submissions, including and written summaries of cases you have made orally in the hearing should be submitted deadline five on Friday, the 23rd of July 2021. There are no other matters that anyone wishes to raise. I shall now close the hearing. Thank you all for your attendance and participation at the hearing. Time is now 1709 and hearing is closed. So Mr.

1:24:47

Mr. Bedford

1:24:49

death

1:24:55

so Michael Bedford, Suffolk County, so I don't want to prolong this at all.

1:25:00

I just noticed that you haven't directly referred to what I thought was the last bullet point on the agenda for item four, in relation to integration of cumulative impact between Scottish power. And these proposals. We didn't actually have anything strong that we wanted to say about that at all. And it clearly has been covered in all the written representations. I just didn't want anybody to think while they were waiting for that. And I did. I did actually cover that earlier on in a discussion about the mitigations identified in the scottishpower applications against the mitigations identified with sizewell c applications. In that case, I've got nothing further to say sir, thank you, sir.

1:25:45

Thank you. Okay, the time is now 10 past five and the hearing is now closed. Thank you very much.