

TEXT_ISH4_Day2_Session3_20012021

Wed, 1/20 6:08PM • 1:30:15

00:05

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. And before we proceed any further, can I just check with the case team, whether they whether you can hear me whether the live streams and recordings have commenced.

00:20

I can confirm that we've started recording it and that the live stream has started.

00:26

Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

00:29

Good afternoon again ladies and gentlemen rent Smith is my name lead member of these panels. And returning from the lunch break, we will shortly move on to agenda item five onshore traffic and transport. However, before we do, just very briefly, the examining authorities have deliberated over lunch in relation to timing and progress, as would be apparent, and we did differ one agenda item from the morning's business agenda item for see in relation to the lighting. Now what we have provisionally determined is the best way forward with that is to seek written submissions on that item by deadline five.

01:16

However, as I've already foreshadowed before the break, and we are also conscious of the fact that there is time reserved for potential additional hearings in March. And one of the things that we will look at reviewing all of the matters that have been addressed in today's agenda in the round is whether or not that item is an item that needs to return for targeted oral submissions in March. And similarly in relation to progress this afternoon. And if we find ourselves needing to deal with matters that are technical and detailed, and also close to the hearts of the communities that they affect, then

02:05

we may then take a view as to whether or not

02:09

for example, item six public rights of way might also equivalently be deferred. However, I'm very, very conscious in saying that there's it is also a matter that people do wish to speak on. And, and so if we take that decision at the time, it will be only because there is no feasible alternative. And also it will be in terms that we do provide replacement hearing time for that item in March. But let's not go there unless we have to let's try and retain a focus on seeing if we can properly and fairly get through the

business of this afternoon on time. And so finally, ladies and gentlemen, I will flag that we may need your indulgence at the end of the afternoon session, we may be heading towards a closure somewhere in the order of 5:35 5:40 5:45pm rather than the originally foreshadowed 5pm that will be in the interests of fairness and making sure that everybody who wishes to contribute can. One final organisational matter that I wish to draw your attention to is that we will have a break this afternoon. And provisionally we'll target that to 15 minutes at approximately 3:40pm. But again, the precise start time may vary by a few minutes, because we will not cut somebody off at the past we will allow ourselves to move to an actual break.

03:37

Now that Ladies and gentlemen, before we move to agenda item five, are there any matters around that management of this afternoon's order of business that are not clear that anybody wishes to seek further guidance on.

03:50

I'm checking the room for hands. I am not seeing any hands, in which case Mr. Rigby it is your item, agenda item five. Thank you very much.

04:02

Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Following on from what Mr. Smith's just said about what we have to do this afternoon.

04:12

At the beginning, I indicated that I would put questions to the applicant first, what I propose to do instead in view of what we need to get through, is say briefly that in relation to item five, it's divided into three areas. There's the regional issues and effects including ports, and abnormal and divisible loads.

04:36

And I've got, I think three or four areas that I want to look at there. Item b has around about 10 or 11.

04:47

topics I want to have a brief look at and the cumulative effects has a few as well. And what I propose to do is to briefly run through

04:57

each group of topics at the beginning of the

05:00

Part of the agenda items which they relate. And then I will ask for submissions from councils and other interested parties and then allow the applicant to make a response to the points that are raised.

05:15

So if that's happy, everyone's happy with that. That's what I'll do, which means that in connection with regional issues, and F and effects, including ports, and abnormal individual loads,

05:31

first off,

05:38

we've got the issue of the methodology of baseline data and predictive traffic movements. But I'm mindful of the fact that the applicant has put in a submission regarding the roundabout, or traffic signals proposed at

06:03

the Freitas street junction. And so I would like to start with that item. Please, if I may, and ask the applicant to make a brief presentation save 1015 minutes, tops on the new proposals for the Friday street junction. And when they've done that,

06:28

we can take submissions from the council's and from other parties. So to the applicant, if you could please, this is an exception to the rule, I guess. But if you could please give us a submission on the new proposals for Friday street which will put in the deadline for Thank you

06:53

con ns on behalf of the applicant. The party speaking on behalf of the applicants in relation to traffic transportation matters, it will be Andrew Ross and Ross is a transport planning director at Royal haskoning and has over 30 years experience in the field. He started off with a lengthy career in in the public sector, acting for county councils and unitary authorities in the realm of local transport plans and also the development of the East of England regional spatial strategy and other related plans is then moved to the consultancy side of the sector, where he has been involved in numerous large scale projects, including Hinkley Point C East Anglia three offshore wind farm, Dogger bank offshore wind farm Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk forests offshore wind farms, Heathrow West and Sirius minerals project. Recently, he has been co opted as chair of a task group toss was set up by the Institute of Environmental Management assessment to update national traffic, environmental impact guidance. And without

08:04

I think I'll just hand over to, to him to give you the full background as to the Friday junction. Thank you.

08:14

Thank you.

08:19

Thank you, Colin, and thank you, sir. Andrew Ross on behalf of the applicant.

08:27

The the applicants have engaged with the council some while on

08:33

the issue of road safety Friday Street and

08:38

the

08:41

the council's reservations about the application mitigation is well documented and captured in the statement of common ground with the applicant

08:55

wrapped rep 1072

08:59

whilst the applicant considers that the originally submitted mitigation for Friday three, which consisted of rumble strips,

09:10

a speed reduction enforced by a speed enforcement camera to from 50 to 40.

09:20

And enhanced sign in was appropriate to mitigate the road safety impacts identified.

09:30

It was recognised that the council still had residual concerns about the project's traffic passing through that junction. The key issue is the right turn into the a 1094 from the a 12 South

09:53

the review of accidents predominantly identified this manoeuvre is the one that was involved with

10:00

If

10:01

in collisions and

10:05

so,

10:06

the applicant undertook a body of work to establish

10:13

what additional measures may be introduced at that junction that could go some way to alleviating the council's concerns. And the, if you like the evil, evil a evolution of additional mitigation is documented in the clarification, though that was submitted at deadline for

10:40

Appendix B of that document sets out the form of junction that is now proposed, ie a traffic signal solution.

10:56

So, there's been a bit of iteration on the traffic signal solution. But ensure the statement of Common Ground Rep. 1072 confirms that the council's agree in principle that traffic signals at the junction would address their concerns

11:17

regarding the project's use during construction,

11:21

and the applicants intend to enter into a section two, seven, a agreement under the highways act

11:29

in order to facilitate the traffic signal works.

11:35

discussions are ongoing with the council regarding the detail of these arrangements and the timing of the works.

11:50

So is that the what you have to say on the subject for the moment? On the subject of Friday? St.

11:58

Thanks, what would it help? If I gave some context? Just

12:04

maybe two or three things, I'd like to just ask and make sure I'm on the right tracks here. Because I'm conscious for other parties that this has only just sort of arrived as it were?

12:15

Would you be monitoring traffic speeds and behaviour before you start the construction installation of these works, and presumably also when they're in use, so that you can demonstrate a reduction in accident rate, collision rate.

12:33

So

12:35

accidents

12:37

on the on the highway network are are monitored by the local Highway Authority.

12:49

We have information that's shared with the police that so

12:54

I'm just asking, because in the original mitigation proposals, you mentioned that you would be monitoring behaviour of traffic before and after the introduction of the new speed limits in order to ensure compliance.

13:09

Will it be a 40 mile an hour speed limit with the traffic signals as well?

13:16

Yes, it will be

13:18

14 mile an hour speed limit with the traffic signals. And the

13:26

is intended that the speed enforcement camera remains and there's a wealth of data that can be extrapolated.

13:36

From that which is collected by the police, which can be accessed to to show compliance. Thanks very much. It's just that you mentioned it as part of the mitigation that it will reduce collision rates. So I'm assuming that that will be something you would be undertaking to demonstrate that that's that's fine. Thank you.

13:56

Just a thought, because there's quite a bit of

14:01

float maybe I don't know, there's lots of total certainty in the exact timing of all the projects that are being undertaken here.

14:09

Would you be considering leaving signals in place you mentioned that temporary? Would you be considering bearing in mind that if you do do some monitoring work, that you might leave them in place after

14:22

they were needed for consider the construction phase may be leaving them until the sizewell c project comes in, takes it all out and puts a big round about him. So many considered

14:34

one of the key basis of design for the junction was to design an arrangement that could be easily removed.

14:49

If deemed necessary, and quickly return the junction back to its original priority junction state.

14:59

The

15:00

The junction is not required for the project's operational traffic, the ultimate decision as to whether to reinstate, or remove the treatment. Oil will sit with Suffolk County Council is the Highway Authority.

15:22

Thank you very much. So now perhaps if I could turn to Suffolk County Council, please and ask for submissions on these proposals. Thank you.

15:35

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council.

15:39

So I think, on this particular point, I can take the position briefly. Obviously, the deadline for submission contains a substantial amount of detailed information. We clearly welcome the provision of a proposal to provide better mitigation than was previously being proposed, which obviously, we had raised issues about in our earlier representations. So in principle, this is a move in the right direction. But clearly, we need time to study in detail what's been submitted at deadline for before we're able to confirm whether this particular scheme and the way that it has been presented does meet our concerns that I say in principle, we welcome the move in our direction. Thank you very much. So if I could move on to planning authority you suffer council? Do you have any comments you wish to make at this stage?

16:39

No, thank you, sir. Andrew Tate, we ally ourselves with Suffolk County Council who are taking the lead. For us we have common issues. And so I would echo what Mr. Bedford has said. Thank you very much. Indeed, it's very helpful. If I could now move on to town and parish councils.

17:00

And if there's anybody wishing to make any comment about

17:07

these proposals,

17:12

I see. can see Marian fellows you have your hand raised? If you'd like to speak briefly. Thank you. Yes. Thank you. Mario follows over town council. I just like to offer a clarification really for yourself, sir. And your colleagues. When the applicants said they had consulted with councils, it is not with local town and parish councils. At no stage has the applicant consulted with over town council or with ordering and thorpiness

17:48

who are not represented today.

17:51

or stone field. And the the idea of traffic lights that Friday street junction has never been discussed with partial town council obrah. And I just want you to be aware of that. Know that has Suffolk County Council or South East Suffolk District Council spoken to the local town council residents businesses affected by that. So I just wanted to confirm that to you. Thank you. Thanks. I understand that of course these these proposals would only just have been tabled. And it will be useful to hear your views that deadline five in writing that were very, very helpful. Thank you.

18:34

Miss Turney.

18:38

Oh, sorry. I do apologise. Mr. Beach, Mr. Beach from snake parish Council. I see your hand up.

18:51

Thank you, sir. Um, can you hear me? Yes, I can hear you. I can see you as well. Thank you. I think it's a similar point to the point made by Marian fellows that we have as a parish Council in the past raised issues about that junction, for obvious reasons, because it links right on to the 1094. We hadn't been consulted about it. And we would ask if there is to be further consideration, that we're part of that. And one of the considerations that we have as a parish is the potential for those traffic lights to block the road heading north

19:31

and create a tailback right round

19:36

into some of the villages. Again, it goes back to the point that I made earlier and I'll return to the level of traffic on that road is such that when it is peak flow, it will cause some really significant tailbacks and that in itself will then divert traffic off onto the beach and 69 and feed back into the issue.

20:00

You are referred to earlier. So again, it's part of that really complex ecosystem of the roads. And I know, we really, we really feel we should be involved in the discussion about how those traffic lights are going to work. And to the point you made, sir, about assessing the accident rates at that junction, and the traffic flow as well. Thank you. Of course you are. As with counsellor fellows, you're limited to submitted deadline five, and we would like to hear from you if you have points you wish to make, particularly the ones you've just made now. Thank you. Very. Okay. Thank you very much. And Miss turning axe.

20:42

So Richard, Tony, on behalf of says is it said it's a similar point, actually, to the one that Mr. beech has just made, namely, that it doesn't appear to us and it may be it's somewhere in the assessment that's been provided only a few days ago on this issue, but it doesn't appear to us that proper consideration has been given to the displacement of other traffic caused by the introduction of a new signalised Junction at Friday Street. The other issue, and of course, that has impacts beyond the locations that Mr. Beach is speaking to, but but we agree with what he says about the impact on the road as it goes through Snape.

21:18

The other issue, of course, is this is a measure, which is proposed alongside emerging proposals for size well, and ratio of around about that location. Of course, if the two proposals overlap in timing, which is a possibility, given the long lead time for these projects, then there's going to be an issue about how that's managed. So whilst obviously the county council has reached a position where they are comfortable on the question of junction safety, the question of delay on the a 12 subsequent displacement of traffic onto the local road network means at large as far as we're concerned, and when we'd like, at the very least, for the applicant to explain where that's addressed, and if not, when it will be addressed.

22:04

Thank you very much. And as with the other speakers, do, please put that in writing to us at deadline five, that would be very helpful, because I'm mindful is quite a lot of stuff to be gone through there. Thank you very much. Right. I think, in that case, I don't see any more hands raised. So

22:28

what I'd like to know now find out from parties present, particularly the East Suffolk Council and

22:39

Suffolk County Council,

22:43

whether there are other outstanding issues in the regional context, because I'm thinking of the responses to our earlier written question relating to planning obligations, planning obligations, and to the scoping out of operations, maintenance and decommissioning activities.

23:05

I think the protective provisions issue I think we could probably can would be better placed in the development consent order hearing. So if I could go back to the county council and ask if there are any other general issues

23:22

relating to those items that they wish to raise at this point.

23:29

Thank you, sir. So I did actually have my hand Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, I did actually have my hand raised at the conclusion of the previous discussion about Friday Street, simply because as I couldn't see your hand on my screen, watches. Yeah, don't worry. The thing is, please speak to the previous item. All I was going to say was that given the concerns and comments that were raised by the parish councils and by Stacy's in terms of that proposal, I thought it probably would be helpful for you to hear directly from the county council officers concerned as to why they have reached as it were the position of welcoming in principle, the proposal for traffic signals

24:19

at this particular junction, because that may provide you and indeed the interested parties with some reassurance as to what the county council has considered, and what it would expect it will need to further consider before it's able to confirm its position. So, so could I bring in Mr. Mary, this is Mr. Mehra, who you heard from this morning. From the county council just on this position in relation to the Friday street junction, particularly in the light of the remarks that have been raised by the the county Council's sorry, by the parish councils and faces, if yes, if you would, and if you would, then perhaps move straight on to

25:00

The other two outstanding issues I mentioned. And then when I've heard from other parties, I can bring the applicant in on all that kind of stuff. Because originally the Friday st junction was just one of the list of issues. Yeah.

25:14

Yeah, absolutely. So so will Mr. Mary, Mary, you've heard that. So could you please deal with first of all Friday Street and then the Mr. Rigby to other additional issues as part of this regional topic, please? Thank you Is that Mr. merrit, that was planning obligations and scoping out issues. Thank you. Thank you very much.

25:37

Thank you, Mr. Buffett. And good afternoon, sir. In terms of Friday street junction, it has over the years course camp counsellors quite a lot of concerns. With this came with schemes come forward, our primary concern here has always been the safety, it's got a relatively poor road safety history. And the main issue we had was the right hand turning hgvs in and out of that junction. So. So as part of that, as you saw in our local impact report and our written representations, it was a major issue for us. So we have been engaging with the applicant, and thank you to the applicant for actually listening to us. And apologies to the parish councils. Unfortunately, these things that I do tend to be confidential. And until

this point, we haven't had certainty that this was going to move forward. So that is one of the reasons we haven't been in touch with anybody. In terms of proposals, the two options we were looking at was a roundabout or traffic signals junctions. ish. We have gone through this and a lot of depth internally, based on the evidence provided to us during the discussions, we do need to check what's been submitted just to see there are no changes

26:46

the roundabout in terms of the proportional impact of this scheme, and the costs and deception around about it was a difficult decision. But we did look at it and come to the conclusion that around about in terms of the amount of time it would take to deliver the disruption potentially to size well, but also the disruption to the local traffic during construction, because it would have had to be built online, ie within the highway boundaries, that causes some concern. And hopefully, for reassurance as part of the 278 process, we do go through a formal road safety audit process. And that doesn't just stop at completion, that will include a stage three on completion and are staged for road safety audit. Following that 12 months afterwards. The decision about whether to keep it permanent will very much depend on what happens with sizewell, but it's something we would review. And as part of that review, I'd be happy to commit that we do speak to the local parish councils at that point. And I would also final point on that is in terms of the 40 mile an hour speed limit? Yes, we understand it's part of it, and we would welcome that, at least as a temporary measure.

27:56

So thank you for that. Thank you very much. That's very useful.

28:00

So in terms of planning obligations, this is very much a case of within is that there are quite a lot of complicated issues here. We have raised them in our local impact report and written representations and in deadline responses, what we are looking for is through the decio and the required requirements, and if necessary obligations to have certainty on a number of things. Probably the most pressing on I could go into lots of detail, but I'll probably focus on the main one. The main one is the controls. And we're looking to see how that can be delivered through the outline construction management travel transport plan, and whether there are some obligations that need are needed to support that. We would hope that it can all be included in that management plan and the other management plan such as the

28:51

the travel plan and the access management plan. But we are conscious that there may be some loose ends that needs to be tied up in terms of obligations.

29:05

Thank you. Is the do the proposals at Friday street? Do they alter that in any way? Or is that still an issue?

29:12

The there is still the issue of how this work is secured in terms of delivery, it's fairly straightforward, we would accept a 278 agreement which for those who are not party to this is a whole is an agreement

between the developer and the high risk authority to deliver the scheme. The question is how that that is secured through the DCR process that there is a requirement or as something within the construction management construction transport management plan.

29:43

Thank you. So the last item I think is on the hit list was the scoping out of operations maintenance and decommissioning activities.

29:53

Okay, in terms of the operation and maintenance, we do recognise that once the substitute on it

30:00

This refers particularly to the the, the substation, but there is one minor point I would make, like at this point as well is there's a little within the DCA submission and supporting documents. There are, on occasion, some uncertainties and one of them is the applicant is committed to putting the ducting in for the second of the phases, secondary schemes, but he's unclear about whether that includes the charging components. That's fine. That's that wasn't really related to this.

30:31

I'm happy to to put on five. Okay, so in terms of operational maintenance, obviously, the the cable routes will need very minimal work on them is particularly the substation. And we recognise that actually, in terms of the day to day maintenance is only going to generate a small number of pre light vehicles. The concern we have is firstly, the resilience is that unless there is a suitable route for heavy goods, vehicles and AI ELLs to the site to the substation site, we think there's a risk that we will end up going through this iteration if every time an abnormal load or a large load needs to get to site we have to basically revisit that situation. And as was mentioned in the past hearings, there is this concern about the the bolting on additional substations to the site and how this is resilient. It is we are when we were going to get on to the local impacts, I was going to raise some of the local impacts on the extension of the abnormal roof south of Boston. Yeah. Thanks very much. That's very helpful. Right.

31:40

East Suffolk Council, anything else you want to say on those other extending items before I go to?

31:46

No, thank you. So we have nothing to add is the county leading for us on this topic. Thank you very much indeed. Thank you. So if I could go to the applicant, please to respond to what we've heard so far, on Friday Street and the other two items.

32:08

Some of the applicants, I'm just going to hand over to Mr. McManus in the first instance, who's got a couple of points and then he will hand over to Andrew Ross to really deal with the substance of the response. Okay.

32:20

Brian Morales for napkins just on one of the data points on the during the operational phase and abnormal indivisible loads that are required for for the site. The only al is required during construction is for the Transformers within neons for substations in in the event that during Operation those need to be replaced, they are not short lead items, it takes an excess of 12 months for those items to be manufactured and delivered to site potentially even longer. So, in terms of any pre planning to accommodate the transfer of those Transformers to the site, we will have ample time to liaise with local authorities and establish the most appropriate means of accessing the site. On any very rare occasion to meet we may require these Transformers to be replaced. And just following on from not in terms of the design integrity of the Transformers within the onshore substations the diligence that was undertaken during the the manufacturing during the delivery during the installation during the commissioning of these transformers, they are critical to the operation of the project. We take the utmost care our contractors and suppliers will take the utmost care through a series of factory tasks of delivery tasks of commissioning tests to ensure that the transformers are correctly constructed and reliable for the life of the project. So it's an exceptionally unusual occurrence for a transformer to require replacement during the operational phase of a project. I can hand over to Andy Ross to causing some Delta points.

34:04

Thank you.

34:09

Thank you, Brian. Thank you, sir. Under Ross on behalf of the the applicant. So

34:16

the issue of operational traffic

34:21

are welcome. suffered counter counsel, Mr. Murray's acknowledgement that there'll be very limited operational traffic and Mr. McGraw Ellis set out the likely demand for IRL movements, or the unlikely I should say demand for Ai L movements during during operation. So I don't propose going going over the thought again. With regards to obligations discussions are ongoing

34:58

through the statement, of course

35:00

unground

35:02

process so

35:05

and

35:09

so I don't propose again going into detail, they're

35:15

just picking up on sasses point on

35:19

this too two key issues there, which was

35:24

the displacement of traffic

35:29

the default submission

35:32

for for ID street contains it's weighty and and it's got the modelling outputs in there and these outputs demonstrate that the

35:49

the delays at the junction and the cue lamps are

35:55

or not significant in terms of incapacity terms and there is

36:02

substantial reserve capacity at the signal arrangement and this no doubt will have

36:11

I mean, this did form part of the review of the concept and a number of charter tweaks have been made to the junction

36:23

following feedback from Suffolk County Council is the highway or authority. So, based on those that modelling we do not anticipate

36:36

a transfer of traffic onto other routes, because it would simply be more time consuming than waiting at the junction for a signal cycle.

36:49

interface interfaces with sizewell

36:52

See,

36:54

with regard to their around about construction. And, again, Suffolk County Council been very, very helpful in in coming forward with their comments.

37:08

The the interface and the overlap between these two projects and how it's managed,

37:15

is set out in

37:18

cumulative impact clarification, I

37:22

would choose

37:24

rep 209.

37:28

And it's, it's a management strategy and its continued engagement with sizewell C, to ensure and Suffolk County Council to ensure these works are all coordinated. Thank you.

37:45

Thank you very much. Now, just quickly, before we move on, one of the things I wanted to check about Friday streets was how it would be secured in the DC area, would it be part of

38:00

traffic management plan of some sort? Or are you intending to do it in a separate way altogether?

38:09

That's not fair for you, sir. But for the applicant generally.

38:14

I wonder if I could

38:17

defer to my colleague, Mr. McGraw Ellis on this. Thank you.

38:23

Yeah, I ran across the board outcomes. The measures that we're proposing on Friday Street, are considered to be an additional measures not mitigation for the projects. So therefore, we do not see

requirement for them to be embedded within the face of the dcl. However, we would be willing to include the commitment to deliver the Frederick street solution with a narrowed lane construction traffic management plan. And thereby, it is then because the final construction traffic monitoring plan needs to be in accordance with the outline plan, a dam carries across into the delivery of the project. Thank you. That's very helpful. I see a couple of hands raised. Mr. Beach. This is Gordon Moore.

39:10

Is this something you feel you really need to add at this point to do with what we've just spoken about? And if so, could you please do so Mr.

39:21

beech first piece.

39:24

I can come back to it, Sam. Sir, I hadn't realised I must have left my hand up for us fine. If you've no problem. We're quite used to it. Because there will be opportunity to comment further later on.

39:39

So and Fiona Gilmore, see us?

39:46

A very quick question. Sorry, find me in reference to what has just been said. We have many supporters most concerned about the a 1094 for emergency service.

40:00

offices in particular. But you mentioned it was discussed the transportation of the 254 tonne Transformers on 50 metre long transporters that will require rock road closure to strengthen bridges and roads, rounding of bends to accommodate the length of the convoy, besides the actual transportation at five miles per hour, and becoming becoming to abnormal loads and a little while if that's okay. Okay. May I ask my question then? Yes, by all means, thank you so much, so much. Thank you.

40:38

Right. So if we can move swiftly on, and still on regional issues and effects.

40:49

My headline headings, if you like, there are the subject of the base port, which is still open between two ports, and how that influences the movement of abnormal indivisible loads around the network.

41:08

And the heavy load routes themselves

41:12

and other abnormal indivisible load related issues that are not local. Right. In fact, we raised them here, that's a no import because they're raised. And that's done. So

41:28

if I could ask for submissions on those issues relating to the port's the abnormal indivisible loads, by which I really mean the great big ones that have special vehicles, and

41:46

the heavy load routes. So if I could start with Suffolk County Council, please. And as before, I'll hear the applicants on the issues that are raised. Thank you.

42:00

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, for Suffolk County Council. I'm going to bring in Mr. Mary, to deal with the substantive issues on ports and AI ELLs in a moment, but just just didn't sense to put down a marker. We welcome that, I think in the latest iterations of the

42:25

draft you CEO and the associated construction, management plans and transport plans, there is recognition of building in a role for the county council I Suffolk County Council in relation to being the party that will be involved in discharging various of the requirements, and that is clearly welcomed. But there is a particular issue with the ports. Where there is a

42:56

question. Clearly, if the port concern lies in the county of Suffolk, then the county council will be the Highway Authority not only for the roads leading to the port, but also obviously, for the roads associated with these proposals. If the port in question is not in the county of Suffolk, the relevant Highway Authority for the port will be a different body. And obviously, in particular, I'm thinking of Great Yarmouth and Norfolk County Council as being an obvious example, quite clearly, the traffic from the port, and particularly in that instance of Great Yarmouth reaches the Suffolk highway network within a very short space time. And so this short point, and it's not necessarily to be explored in detail today. But that we think that some further work needs to be given to considering how to engage with Suffolk County councillors Highway Authority in terms of Port traffic, when it gets to the highway network in Suffolk, which I say will be in a fairly short space of leaving, let's say Great Yarmouth. So that's that was that was a general point. And we can pick that up more when we get on to the details of the drafting of the documentation. And then if I can bring in Mr. Mary to deal with the more substantive points on where we stand now, in relation to ports, and concerns about AI, ELLs, and any road improvements that might be needed associated with handling AI ELLs.

44:22

Thank you very much. Very helpful. So Mary, thank you. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Michael. Yes, starting with the the ports issue sorry, Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council. Starting with the port's issue, it's important to realise that there is

44:37

a subtle difference between where the origin for AI ELLs are in terms of port and the port where the air the construction activity is going to be and the port construction plan. Construction traffic management plan does deal with that but not the aim. And it's important to realise that there are two bridges across the river at lower staff, neither of which currently takes

45:00

high end heavy loads. So the special order movement loads and also the forthcoming golden bridge delayed loading third crossing, that is not going to be future proof for the heaviest loads either. So that will form a barrier to AI ELLs coming from from Gary armour. I'll base most of my comments on the winds report which was submitted as appendix 26.3 of the original decio which was I'll give them credit is a very complete report and has some useful information in there. So starting off with the ports, the the applicants proposed two ports, there is the lowest of port which is the South Bank, which does form part of HR 100, which is an approved high, heavy load route from Lowestoft through to to size Well, it has changed over the years, but it's not reflected in the in the the paperwork within the DFT website. The other one is Felixstowe, which isn't on an approved route. Both of these have been used recently, according to the winds report for loads of up to 170 tonnes in the past few years past four years, I see.

46:09

It is acknowledged that some of these loads are going to be even bigger, so 282 tonnes has been quoted. So from a county Council's perspective, the concerns we have on the approved route is the condition of the structures. I understand the applicant has been speaking to my structural colleagues regarding that. But the fact they can carry 166 tonnes two or three years ago doesn't mean that Nestle carry those loads now.

46:36

And as a point of interest, also, I did explore the issue of the mass wood bridge with them as well. And the response I got back from structures team is they are a little bit

46:47

confused, and overstatements, but they are a bit bemused by the inclusion of that on the most recent information we have, is it it's an Elvis took the load from Felixstowe, which is I think it's 170 tonnes few years ago and carry out 280 tonnes we estimate but that would have to be confirmed by investigations.

47:08

So

47:09

in summary, they is the structural issues put it on the a 12. In particular, the BLM 22 as far as lovers lane in leisten, is also part of the approved h heavy loads route. So that should be with the providers of the structures and some safety issues to do with straddling the white lines should be suitable because it has been used in the past, there is the question of quantity.

47:33

And I would also take this opportunity to also point out that at the moment, I'm talking about the heaviest loads, so these are the special order movements, but it's also pertinent to realise that abnormal loads or anything over 44 tonnes, they come in a variety of guises be they wide, long or heavy or high. And one of the things that is causing us a little bit of concern is that in the in the submission from the applicant, Appendix 26.3

47:57

they have some evidence there from Network Rail who are stating that there's 100 term limit on the brick arch rail bridge on the a 20 1094 at Friston Alfriston at Farnham

48:10

my understanding is that that is there are there abouts the the weighting of the cable drums on their low loaders. So potentially it could be it's not just the special order movements, which would need to come from the north, down 1122 and then be 1069, but also some of the other ones. And it may be depending on the size of the cranes and I can't say I'm an expert on cranes, but again, they can potentially get to that sort of level. So there's concerns about that. And while I'm on that subject, it's also vary from absolute for local authority, clarity is key in a lot of these things. And within the controls, it clearly states and I know hgvs will come through leisten nor will hgvs used to be 1121 through Friston, but that does appear to exclude abnormal loads of all varieties. So, that is something I think we should be clarified. Then if I may, if I can just get on to the the detail as we go down from laced and that is the bit that really does concern us and that is going off and approved heavy and heavy labour is going on to be rode with limited width. Any loads effectively from the a 12 through to the proposed site will be straddling the white line, they will be moving slowly. The maximum speed I recall is 20 miles an hour.

49:27

As is actually said in the report, one of the concerns are where we've got unsupported edges. Typically our B roads don't don't have curbs, they just end in earth. So there's the weight waiting on that. And a particular concern is actually the centre of leisten. There's a narrow section in Haley's roads, which is I can't remember the exact distance because I haven't actually mentioned mesh mesh the width but on the basis that the the overselling girder supported Transformers they are over five metres wide and the actual carriageway there

50:00

is marginally over five metres. And then we have some narrow footways either side and then houses.

50:08

And also the concern there is underground apparatus there Victorian terraces. And I'm not aware of any major utility works there in the past. So there is a possibility there would be shallow and possibly fragile services under there another thing to be considered.

50:25

There are issues or concerns on the applicant has gone some way to resolve the concerns about abnormal loads turning right out of the B 1069. It is we are aware it's very much a theoretical study. And

it should work work in practice, we do have a slight concern if somebody's over sailing in as part of a parcel of land that is not going to be secure, secured permanently. So every time a very large load goes through that land, we have to be secured for oversight and if necessary,

50:56

chiefly, because you're referring to operations or replacements, rather than construction at that point. Yes, because it will be within the appliques control during construction. Yeah. So yes, you're seeing results.

51:11

So think that's covered most, there are two structures on that part of the route as well as a Bridgette nod issue and the COVID Friston would need to be looked at. And I would just point out is that it is it does strike me on is whether it's relevant or not, I'll leave it to you to make to make your decision. But the access road to the substation is being built to a very good standard, I think from memory is about eight metres wide. So that does contrast somewhat with what we have is our existing road network. Yeah.

51:41

Thank you very much.

51:43

That's very useful.

51:45

Just pass briefly to the Suffolk Council, I realised that you

51:51

may be deferring to Suffolk County Council. But do you have anything you wish to add on those topics? Thank you for asking, sir. But no, we're deferring to Suffolk on this entire topic number five.

52:05

If that proves not, if there's some additional point that I'll put my hand up and signal that I would like to speak and otherwise, we're going to agree with the county on these matters. Thank you very much. Indeed. That's very helpful. So now if I could go to the sound parish councils,

52:28

for if they have anything they wish to say, I can see.

52:38

Mr. Cooper has his hand raised miles for parish Council.

52:47

Thank you, sir. Richard Cooper milesweb parish Council.

52:53

Mr. Murray referred to the bridge in miles food, which is on the 12th. Route up to Kristen.

53:04

Were concerned about it because there is a suggestion but with very, very little detail in the dceo, that bridge strengthening works would be required. And and I can absolutely believe that would be the case, if we're talking about 250 tonne loads.

53:25

And in addition to explaining that they may need to strengthen the bridge, the applicant has put a red line around what they described as a lay down area, which will be used in the event of strengthening works.

53:44

That lay down area is prone to flooding, it's in a flood risk three zone and the Environment Agency have already raised their concerns about its use, particularly in relation to impeding fluvial flow.

54:04

So we've got great concerns about it. And I'm surprised that we get to this stage in the examination without having any firm detail on which port will be used. And we understand that maybe difficulties with the Belvedere yard, and we understand that highways England would prefer not to use the a 14 and a 12 from Felixstowe. So. We're slightly confused as to what the proposal really consists of. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much. And next, I say sure to go more from Cirrus. You have your hand up.

54:53

Yes, thank you. So this was the question that I think is now relevant, given what we just heard.

55:00

From the council, that if you have the 254 tonne Transformers on 50 metre long transporters, and we've just been talking about what what they may have five metres potentially, the Victorian bridge on the A 1094 is not going to be able to cope with this in in any sense whatsoever. Have we got detailed proposals on road closures, strengthening bridges proposals, rounding of bends to accommodate the length of the convoy? Do we have detailed proposals for the whole length of the route? I think this is very critical. And it seems to be a rather late stage in the proceedings. Given that we can assume that four of these at minimum is required six have scaled up from data on black helix site, which is a relevant case study.

55:59

And then we have to multiply that to take into account potentially Nautilus euro link Ghana per great Gabbard and the two new ones SDC one SDC. Two, that we have potentially over a period of 12 to 15 years of construction, dealing with this Victorian bridge and other such very difficult challenges. reinforcing the feeling that this is such an inappropriate place to be looking at 50 years of mass industrialization. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

56:42

Miss beach. I think your your hand stuck, Mr. Beach, or do you wish to speak Sorry, my apologies. I thank you, sir. I do wish to speak now and my hand isn't isn't stuck. Thank you very much. It so it's Tim beech on behalf of snow parish Council. It's a similar issue to the one that

57:04

Fiona Gilmore raised, but it's the whole stretch of the a 1094. Effectively from Friday Street, all the way to the far end of the village of Snape, that little stretch of road we have repeatedly asked about the width and its ability to take larger lorries and even full size 44 tonne lorries? We have questions. And I haven't seen in anything as yet either in chapter 26, or the clarification node, which makes it clear that that route is wide enough that anybody who lives down there, and this is anecdotal, can tell you that traffic frequently comes to it. HGV traffic frequently comes to a stop on that full section of road particularly around snake watering, and particularly through the village. So again, it's about the analysis and the work that still appears to be outstanding on the 1894 through the village.

58:08

Thank you very much Mr. beech.

58:11

Right, if I could now go to the applicant. And please if you could respond to the points that are being raised in relation to item five a.

58:23

That is ports loads and the Ai L heavy load network. Thank you.

58:32

Clients from half Africa to be Mr. Ross's responding.

58:36

Thank you.

58:39

Thank you calling. Thank you, sir. And

58:43

just to clarify. So presumably the point about the a 1094 will pick up in the agenda item that covers local. Local Yes, but it's

58:54

not will allow me to.

58:57

Yes, thank you, that allows me to focus on the the points that have been made about

59:05

AI ELLs.

59:08

I think it's important just to set out what the the Ai L strategy was just to set a bit of context and

59:18

paragraph 80 of chapter 26 up seven for details a total of two Ai L transform, transformer deliveries per project, a total of four

59:34

transform and deliveries if the projects are constructed simultaneously.

59:41

As quietly rockpoint pointed out earlier, these will be special order vehicles due to this white

59:49

age a maximum design window of 280 tonne loads was was assumed and that's

59:59

that's encompassing

1:00:00

In the winds report that Mr. Murray refer to, which is appendix 26.3. At the end just so just briefly into Jack's, does that figure include the deliveries for the National Grid part of the works or is it just for the East Anglia substations?

1:00:23

There are no Ai L deliveries anticipated for the National Grid works. So it's it is the project's transformer demand. Thank you Please continue.

1:00:40

So, Appendix 23 26.3

1:00:46

contains the IPL strategy and it confirms that there has been substantial consultation with the port's highways England Network Rail, Suffolk County Council structures

1:01:01

to look at a poor origin of either Felixstowe or lower staff, as pointed out last staff is highways England's preferred route, because it is an existing heavy load route.

1:01:17

And it is also

1:01:19

the shortest route to site. However, as also pointed out, there are some

1:01:25

uncertainties around the heavy load dock at lower staff

1:01:31

over the yard and its availability. So Felixstowe was assessed essentially as a contingency should load of stuff not be available.

1:01:45

It's important to understand the mechanism for

1:01:49

moving large loads across the highway network in in in England, and highways England administer all Ai L movements on roads in England on behalf of the government.

1:02:06

Again, in planning, consent, and acknowledging IRL movements, is the first step in the process. There is a subsequent process called

1:02:21

STL in electronic service delivery for abnormal loads, which is administered by highways England, which involves consultation with them affected local highway authorities and the police and to establish

1:02:39

permission to move the loads. So that if you like is the kind of comfort blanket and if there's deterioration in in structures, or if there's a long delay between consent and moving the abnormal life raft quite a bit of this in the examination already. That's That's great. One quick question while you're talking about our style.

1:03:08

We've heard from submissions about the AIA L, which are on standard HDTV trailers, they're just too big or too heavy to be standard construction use. Are they also subject to the Add style regime or not?

1:03:26

It depends, obviously big and heavy.

1:03:31

It depends.

1:03:34

Where it doesn't depend they are subject to an to the STL regime or the notification and consultation regime. And that's very much that's just that's what I needed to know. Yeah.

1:03:49

Sorry, I should just clarify, though, but the whether it's consultation or notification depends entirely on the size of the load. And as you pointed out, some of the loads are only will say on standard hgvs with just a bit of over overhang. Yeah. And

1:04:09

as Mr. Murray pointed out, the final leg of the

1:04:12

journey from the B 1122 to Friston does not have a heavy route designation.

1:04:20

The applicants have discussed the process to extend the grid network with highways England, which dates back a good while now. And highways England are not minded to extend red network.

1:04:36

And it's incumbent on developers to secure access on moving special lights and

1:04:46

the edge there was questions about the structures

1:04:58

the iE 1094 network.

1:05:00

rail

1:05:02

structure Yeah, Network Rail have advised in the strongest terms that that bridge cannot be utilised. And there's little value in carrying out a structural

1:05:19

assessment to prove otherwise.

1:05:22

So,

1:05:24

does that mean that they would not be amenable to any discussions about possible strengthening of the structure

1:05:31

they said that they would

1:05:35

would consider strengthening of the structure.

1:05:41

But this

1:05:43

this is littered with with problems in the is over a live live railway line and, and could take a good while to get approval in principle, but understand if you could include a brief rationale for that in your deadline for submission that would assist us greatly.

1:06:03

Yes, of course, so, thank you very much. And the other structure models for bridge that has been spoken about quite a bit and all structures on the project's Ai L route both lower staff and size well origins have been subject to a risk assessment of their capacity to bear the transformer loads,

1:06:25

this risk assessment considered age inspection data and structural parameters such as span load spread in

1:06:38

in context of the loads that were were proposed. And

1:06:46

the on the basis of this risk assessment the moles footbridge was identified as being at risk of requiring strength in

1:06:58

a more detailed structural assessment would determine the scope of works. This could range from manoeuvring vehicle to the centre to carriageway to structural reinforcement.

1:07:11

Again,

1:07:13

achieving approval in principle for treatment on on on structures is a resource up in and lengthy process and it was considered

1:07:25

given this as a contingency word

1:07:29

it would be better managed for the final cgmp submission to ensure the works are designed and programmed to minimise disruption to the travelling public should they be required.

1:07:44

Finally, non special order abnormal loads, there is a require for a number of smaller abnormal loads and this is set out in the applicants clarification note to the examination that deadline one rep one and for a

1:08:02

it can be observed from there that there are very few

1:08:08

If not, no over 110 tonne, sorry 100 tonne load vehicles, and the majority of these loads will be transferred or transported by standard h hgvs. With overhanging loads, similar to observed on the network for static caravans.

1:08:29

It is a total of three of these movements.

1:08:34

And, sorry, the three deliveries

1:08:39

per day is forecast for two months during peak. For the rest of the time, the average abnormal loads are less than less than one per day is not considered that this quantum of abnormal loads would cause significant delay on the highway network.

1:09:01

Thanks very much. That's very helpful.

1:09:08

I got a question. I can't remember what it was now. Now I'm grateful for the clarification about the small Ai L. And that you will give us some arguments against the use of the railway bridge at the a 1094.

1:09:24

I think that concludes everything I want to cover on Friday. So I'd quite like to push on to part B of the item. mindful that we'll already have covered some of these things in the discussion we've had so far, which I think is probably inevitable.

1:09:43

So if we move to

1:09:49

local issues and effects,

1:09:54

obviously if concern is the HGTV strategy, but I think we've dealt with that at a relatively regional

1:10:00

level.

1:10:03

I do, however, have

1:10:05

an item relating to heavy goods vehicles at the a 1094, b 1122. junction, on the edge of algebra, and also at the a 1094 B 1069. junction.

1:10:25

The other item I want to touch on is the B 1353. Crossing

1:10:32

the access to cable routes, section three B in altium

1:10:39

the accesses via b 1069, a 1094 and b 1121 through Friston to the permanent access.

1:10:53

And we've dealt with the a 12 through miles that already

1:11:01

there's the off site highway improvements that semitones Snape

1:11:06

and finally I've got road closures and speed limits. So those are what I'm thinking of as the local issues and effects which are not cumulative, which are relating just to this project. So

1:11:23

I would like to hear submissions from the county council first on those local topics.

1:11:38

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, I'm gonna bring in Mr. Mary to deal with those details. But certainly, it might be helpful. Certainly my note wasn't as clear as that should be. If you could possibly just run through again, your list of particular locations that you specifically wanted to hear about so that Mr. Murray is able to, as it were, make sure that he picks up anything that the county wants to say on those things. Thank you very much.

1:12:07

Certainly, yes.

1:12:10

I'm thinking of what we haven't already spoken about in relation to local issues. So in respect of heavy goods, vehicles by which are now mean standard hgvs.

1:12:23

There's a strategy, which translates into issues about hgvs on rural roads, and then in particular to the junctions in old bruh. And on the a 1094, and the B 1069.

1:12:41

The old junction Wi Fi 810 94 under b 1122.

1:12:49

I then have

1:12:51

an issue about the B 1353. Crossing where the cable route crosses the road.

1:13:01

We then have the access to cable routes, section three B which currently has several options on the table in altium.

1:13:12

There's access to the land for and coming back to Al very briefly, I think we've probably already covered the issues about it going through to the permanent access on Saxmundham road.

1:13:29

We've covered miles for so forget that.

1:13:33

There's the off side highway improvements at saboten and Snape, which had been identified. And finally I've got road closures and speed limits. I'm thinking about road closures principally in the context of trenching across roads on the cable routes and the speed limits which are associated with those closures or Park closures of roads. Does that help you Mr. Mary?

1:14:00

It does if sorry. Apologies sir. Seabury Suffolk County Council Yes, if it's okay, I should try and take it in a sort of a clockwise direction if I may, just for my own peace of mind. So it would suit you but don't don't go back to anything we've spoken about already. Okay, so the B 1353. The road to thought ness the crossing note or go back one the access to the land for our understanding is the access to the landfill comes off the site accesses one and two off site or gap road.

1:14:37

So we're not have the understanding that anything we'll be accessing the land for other than some proprietary work land clearance and archaeology from the B 1353. To thought ness. So that is not an issue that we're aware of the on the subject of psychology

1:15:00

Road, the critical thing there is to keep the road open, it's obviously the access to size or B. And if it's okay by you, I will wrap that up when we talk about road closures and traffic management in general. So the 1353 crossing, priding the junction, the visibility for the crossing, and it's a crossing, not a junction is provided that that would be acceptable to us. Moving to the ordering of access,

1:15:28

we understand from the client, this is going to be only used by very, very limited number of vehicles, and that's to the east and the North access will be taken from scytl gap road crossing the 1353 as far as the river, and it's just a small section between the 1122 holding and so this obrah road back to the 100 River, which will be accessed off there, it does have a knock on impact on the roundabout in over itself, which is difficult to access by hgvs. But in view of the very small numbers, we would accept some degrees of traffic management there to safely get them through there if that were necessary. To be honest, we have looked at there were some original proposals to

1:16:17

change the curbs very slightly to enable traffic to get round. But to be honest, that's going to cause far more disruption than it would do the traffic management for what we understand other limited numbers are going through there. And that brings me on to something I mentioned at the end, which is Ctrl E.

1:16:35

So moving further to the west to the B 1069. And a 1094 Junction. And this is the first and one so as it comes down from nada Sure, we have discussed the issues that I is there.

1:16:51

We we do have some concerns on that junction, we've we've looked at the traffic modelling, we looked at the road safety in in theoretical terms, they do not trigger any form of mitigation. But it is a junction that I know the locals have had concerns about in the past. And it's something we would keep a watching brief on to make sure that nothing arises from

1:17:13

the next junction, the a 1094 Junction to the B 1121. That goes up to Preston and stern field. The issue there is well firstly, according to the submission, there should be no hgvs going up that road, so nothing should be exiting the 1094 to go on to the BLM 21. The concern is if anything does, there's two issues, there's a very sharp oblique junction it's about 135 degree junction doubling back on yourself as you go towards obrah. So the concern is both the traffic team left into it and right into it is it's on a bend, it's in a dip and they would have to swing across the opposite carriageway to access it. So we certainly would not support hv is going through there.

1:18:00

Today briefly, St. Mary, thank you very much. I probably didn't, I should have said, to ask you whether you had concerns about the A1 movements there? I mean, I know we've covered it previously. But in particular, there's the movement through both those junctions? Well, the answer is the answer is yes. In terms of theory, they can get through the A1094 B1069 Junction. And they've got the overselling and they've got the local widening on the side. So theoretically, they can always very conscious, practical experience. Sometimes it means that what looks good in theory can't be done. particularly concerned there's an earth bank on the east side of that junction. So it needs to ensure that there's oversight there as well. And probably vegetation clearance there. The concern is more the B1121 junction with the 1094 is I can't see how those movements are going to be done without some form of traffic management. And there is a point we made in our submissions is that anybody moving vehicles around has to be careful that they they have the correct authority to stop vehicles. It's not something anybody can do.

1:19:07

The applicants may be in discussions with the police to move it I know EDF ARB, I'm not sure about scottishpower So the answer to your question is yes, I would have concerns about abnormal loads moonta is the forward visibility and as local people will surely know Don't remind me is that that section between snabe and the junction there is a very fast bit it's the only straight bit of a 1094 between allbritton a 12. So it is fast

1:19:34

and is continuing. So there were concerns raised about the A1094 B1069 Junction at Snape and and this is the one that's further to the west is as the 10 six nine staggers across the 1094. Again, it's something that's it's something that does concern us but again, going back to the theory to the the information and the numbers we've got in terms of

1:20:00

junction capacity. And please bear in mind that junction junction capacity in traffic modelling is done on averages. It's not done on exceptional days. That is the industry standard. And that is what we have to follow. So we had in this morning, we briefly managed to get time to have a quick look back at some information supplied by EDF and junction modelling. The reason we chose that is it covers both projects. And at that stage in terms of capacity, it's not at capacity, it's under capacity.

1:20:30

But this is theoretical capacity, I hasten to add. So it's in terms of the theory functions, there have been five crashes there. And again, that would be very much a watching brief to make sure that the additional traffic doesn't make that worse,

1:20:46

worth pointing out to all of the HGTV should not there should be no HTML turning in and out of there to do with this project. So that that is one thing that

1:20:55

the, that's the junctions with the exception of coming back to the main site entrance. And that were the three junctions as the exit of the B 1069, South and oddish. Or the only issue there is, firstly, the small area of land isn't within either the visible display of the red line, which could cause problems of visibility. Other than that look to the access plans and they're fine.

1:21:21

There has been a little bit a little bit of lack of clarity about whether some of the smaller abnormal loads will be entering in there at the moment memory, it's only been checked for swept pass for an articulated lorry. So 44 to an articulated lorry. So if they if there are wide loads coming in through there, that would be something to be considered.

1:21:42

Grove road wasn't on your list, but very quick mentioned about Grove road is that's a very narrow road, single track. So there where the crossing point is there, we do appreciate they've not got any turning movements there. And we agree with that, where the crossing point is there, there needs to be adequate space for two vehicles to stop and pass obviously.

1:22:07

Then the main site entrance, as I mentioned before, it's a wide junction it's built for a house. it the only comment I would make that it does I put the permanent

1:22:20

junction is pretty much the same as the temporary junction. The concern we had there was the speed limit is

1:22:28

we would usually require

1:22:32

speed, I think there's a D restricted, so that would be usually 210 metres visibility, the applicants put forward some speed data, which suggests the traffic is only doing 40 miles an hour. So that would could allow us to have a departure down to about 160 metres that that design would be acceptable. Although I do question why a 40 mile an hour speed limit is required for temporary access there and not for a permanent one. I understand part of the applicants argument that they've put to us in the past is that we very few vehicles going in and out of the access. But the counter argument was in that case, people are less expecting to see somebody pull out of there. And the concern is actually the people on the main line.

1:23:16

So that is hopefully going through most of the minor junctions. And just the opposite side highway works. In principle, they are acceptable for mitigation. And I'll make this clear for mitigation for these projects. So a one north and a two in isolation. And that's maybe something will come on into the cumulative impacts

1:23:39

in terms of road closures and speed limits also widen listening to traffic management is

1:23:47

I had a look through the post traffic I have some concerns mostly based on again on a practical looking at it. Certainly working with contractors I've worked for the sort of roads we're looking at the the ones I work with are very loath to work there without road closure particularly for doing anything in the centre of the road. So whereas it may be practical to build accesses with to waste traffic lights stop go or something similar, then that is possible but certainly when it comes to the trenching and there are two specific issues here with the trenching is that the idea of slowing the road to get the safety zones firstly it doesn't work at six metres because if you need a three metre road you need a half metre safety zone. So you've only got two and a half metres roading work on you reverse it and you still end up with that metre gap in the middle. But most most importantly is that several of the roads so sizable gap in particular and also the B 1120. old old road both have footpaths next to them. The one on size gap is a shared cycle footpath so I would be interested to know how the road is going to be slid one metre either way with those footpath there. And that is something that we'd be very is very important to assess the safety of production

1:25:00

Where those production facilities exist. So what from a hiring authority perspective, what we're looking for is clarity. We would rather know the bad news now if road closers are necessary for this work rather than trying to avoid that judgement there. And if I may also just quickly mention HDD and trenchless construction and open cut construction of the public high over the public highway. Our preferred preference is to have non disruptive activities of no excavation. Whenever an excavation is reinstated, it's never as good as the road was in first place. So we would prefer to trenchless or HDD, I have taken on board the comments from my colleagues in Suffolk about the dust and vibration, or they would also point out that they saw cutting and excavation of roads is also dust and noisy. So from our perspective, we would look for the least worst so we look for the most acceptable method of doing it. So our preference is not to dig through the road. But if that is the most acceptable method, in terms of environmental impacts, it's something we would have to consider. And finally, if I may come on to probably the most important matter I'd like to discuss on this subject is the controls.

1:26:18

Within the construct of the outline construction traffic management plan, the applicant has put forward some controls and these across a very various number of things. The wireless free most important to us is HDTV movements.

1:26:34

The proposal is to well, originally there was a table included, which did set out the movements into the individual accesses and a global figure for the network. That is since disappeared from our from a local hope perspective, we would

1:26:53

insist maybe it's hardware, but we really need some tight controls just so that we can demonstrate what is included in the environmental statement and the assessments is what is actually being delivered, that does also lead on to how that is going to be monitored and controlled.

1:27:08

In terms of monitoring, the applicant has suggested something that they did use on a one, which is to have livery vehicles with a sign in the windscreen and a phone number at the site entrance.

1:27:21

We think that is firstly, it's not up with modern technology and modern technology, we've got GPS satnavs, all of these things are much better ways to do it. And we can perceive a weakness in that is from

1:27:35

it is a lot to expect people to actually go to the site to actually find that phone number on Yes, it might be on the website. But it is.

1:27:44

And also if there is an issue, it's very hard to track back and actually prove it. And I would add that we got fleet of critters, they've had GPS since at least 10 years ago. And we do use them to to track and monitor those.

1:27:59

Right where we are with controls.

1:28:03

Yeah, and also in terms of travel plan, again, it is to make sure that where where the applicant is relying on assumptions for the modelling and for assessing impacts that they are clearly stated. And they carry forward into a mechanism for controls. And as part of those controls, it's also how they are delivered. And they're in full size while they're developing a transport review group. And we would like EDF scottishpower as input into something similar. So the if sizewell and a woman come forward, they are coordinated. So that's yet to to reassure local road users and local residents, that we have a method of addressing their concerns during construction. So apologies for went too long a bit, but I'm Welcome to take any questions if you have any. No, that's absolutely fine. Mr. Mehra, that's very helpful, because we've tried to condense quite a lot into quite a short

1:29:06

space of time there. Now that's very helpful. I have no questions at this stage at all. Thank you. Could I briefly ask you Suffolk council if they have anything to add or whether they wish to defer to the county council on these aspects?

1:29:26

Yes, we're happy to defer on this to the county council. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much. Indeed, sir. In which case, I think we should take a break shortly. And I will hand over to Mr. Smith, who will tell us all about that. Thank you. Thank you, everybody, for your contributions so far.

1:29:44

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. Now, this will be very brief. And we will break ladies and gentlemen in about 10 seconds time at 340. Can we resume please at 3:55pm

1:30:00

Ladies and gentlemen, that is 3:55pm where we will continue with Mr. Rick, this item. Thank you very much