

# TEXT\_ISH13\_EA1N&2\_Session3\_12032021

Fri, 3/12 4:06PM • 1:40:44

00:02

Good afternoon. And welcome back to today's issue specific hearings 13 on traffic and transport that used to Anglia, one North and East Anglia to offshore wind farms. Before we resume as item three, can I just check with the case team that you can hear me on that the recordings, live streams and live captions have started.

00:28

Hi, Caroline. Sorry. We've had a bit of a delay on our end. So just give me a minute to catch up over here. can definitely confirm I can see you. I can hear you. Paul, you might just want to switch off your camera for now.

00:42

I did. Thank you very much. And then I can also confirm with the live stream has started now and the internal recordings are on along with the captions. Thank you.

00:53

And just one final note, Caroline. I think that's everyone that's meant to be back from since we broke. Thank you. Yes.

01:04

In that case, I am going to hand back to Mr. Rigby who is leading on agenda item three.

01:12

Thank you very much, Mrs. Jones. We're on to agenda item three, which is local freight strategy, construction and operation. Under this item, we'll get a bit more local than we were previously and hear from the applicants and Suffolk County Council and other interested parties on

01:31

a miles first. Be Friday st see hgvs and old burn loadstone D HGV on the 1094 e ai lm HGV on the Oxford lovers lane routes.

01:51

F is the need for Freida street improvements.

01:56

She is any residual issues on the beach as in 53 crossing a 30 variety but I just want to close that out.

02:04

He has access to the cable route at section three B and it is just to close out on good design mitigation and legacy. Now with everybody's indulgence, I propose to reorder this to hit the what I think might be the big items first. So you might say I'm going to waste it because I'm going to go a first which is miles furred. We've already spoken on that subject anyway, C is the hgvs and old run leisten. He is abnormal indivisible loads on heavy goods Vioxx for them lovers, lane,

02:42

D is heavy goods on the 1894 and will then take the two Friday's street items together as B and F and then continue as normal. So hope that's okay with everybody. I thought it might make it for a little bit better since we put all this together.

03:02

So let's start with a which is miles furred. The need for an extent of works and assessment of impacts post consent. Now, we've already dealt with this in some detail actually.

03:19

But just to reiterate,

03:25

the need for works at MOSFET only arises as a result of abnormal indivisible loads needing to pass over the bridge and would depend on the abnormal indivisible loading question having been assessed, because there may be some Ai L as we talked about earlier, which would be simply Ai L because they are outside the construction and use limits which are carried on hgvs because they might be too big or they might be slightly over 40 tonnes.

03:55

So it depends on the question. I'm moving assessed, and the bridge being assessed is capable of carrying that load without any work being necessary. So just for the applicant to get you on screen, please just to make sure we've got that right. That was where we got to in the previous item.

04:15

So that that is correct. I'm sorry, I was a bit concerned about putting my hand up given the IT issues. Can I just provide a quick clarification on a bridge point from the end of this morning session? Yes, yes do and then when you finished if you could stay on screen it might be helpful to have you on the counter council representative on screen at the same time if we can manage that. So yes, please go ahead. So it's relating to the lifting bridges.

04:49

on the north side of the bank on on the Belvedere

04:54

port the ball of adore Belvedere heavy ball is is definitely on the side.

05:00

Outside I was correct.

05:03

And pero 4.3 of the winds report, app, five to nine provides a level of comfort that they they won't be considered it's a historic issue relating to transport heavy loads to the sort of Norfolk Norwich type, type area.

05:24

Thank you for that. So if we can carry on, if you could stay there, Mr. Ross. And I just carry on for two things I want to start off with firstly saying your response to our second written question two point 18 point 17. b. That's right at the end of the question says actually help you you're in discussions with Suffolk County Council and anticipate updating your statement of common ground with the counsellor deadline aid.

05:54

Bearing in mind that deadline A is the 25th of March, which if we allow for the Easter break is really only just over a week before the statutory end of this examination, these examinations.

06:07

I was wondering if you could give an update on progress, give us a heads up on what we might expect to see in deadline and eight.

06:16

And

06:18

we've,

06:20

we've, we've been in discussions with with Suffolk County Council and had a number of meetings since that that response and circulated a draft statement of common ground for further review. And so I would anticipate that deadline eight is achievable.

06:48

Thanks. Is there anything you'd want to draw out at the moment? Or will we need to wait or deadline out to read all about it as it were?

07:01

We've made very, very good progress and closed out the majority of matters.

07:11

I think the sticking point or areas of not agreement

07:19

we picked up this morning on the

07:24

operational Ai L roots.

07:29

And there's a

07:34

there's not agreement on that matter, in terms of the root.

07:40

And on the need for that matter.

07:45

I suppose the thing we've made big, big progress on is

07:52

Suffolk County Council's concern with the use of the girt

07:57

methodology.

08:00

And

08:04

we found I think the issue was there was concerns that a sort of binary approach of being applied bigger utilising

08:16

blindly using the thresholds.

08:22

And,

08:24

and I can I can understand subjects concern with the guidance if that approach was adopted. There, there is a risk that some some impacts may be missed. That's not the way the applicant has approached it. And Gert is quite clear that

08:46

the thresholds are designed as a framework for a systematic and consistent approach to assessment. But they're intended to complement professional judgement, direct quote, intended to compliment professional judgement, and the experience of a trained assessor.

09:10

So we've covered quite a lot of ground with Suffolk County Council quite during pre out and during the examination process, and

09:21

the discussions have recognised our differences with with the mechanics of the assessment, but we focused on on outcomes.

09:35

And I, we are now in a position I believe, to agree that

09:44

satisfaction with the outcomes of the assessment and

09:50

and therefore,

09:54

no potential significant impacts have been overlooked.

10:00

Thanks very much for that. That's useful. Sorry, apologies to everybody. I should have perhaps reiterated at the beginning that we'll run this item same way as we did item two. So if Mr. Ross is able to stay on screen while we get Suffolk County Council onto the screen when we need them, and we'll hear the interested parties at the end of the item, as we did previously. And now, if I could just invite Mrs. Jones just to come in briefly, please. Thanks, Mr. Levy, it was just to pick up on a point that Mr. Ross made earlier about being concerned about putting his hand up. The reason for the restart over lunch was to try and fix that issue. So hopefully, that's now been resolved. So please do use that function if you if you want to use it. Thanks very much, Mrs. Jones. That's a very helpful hope. I hope we had better luck with the handles this time.

10:54

Right, I think we've covered the next thing I was going to ask because it's really about the impacts in is associated with the use of massive bridge, we've covered the most likely structural intervention, and also how much space you might need, on the basis of it being a relatively limited intervention necessary. So

11:22

if I could briefly go to Suffolk County Council, and to paragraph 2.7 of your submission.

11:32

I'm assuming you intended to refer to our question 2.1 8.17.

11:41

And we thank you that your submission that you are able to confirm that the worst case assessment has been made. Is there anything you wish to add to that? I'm assuming you're referring to the covering of the assessments in the environment statement?

12:07

Yes, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County codes, just be clear that you're referring to our deadline. Six comments. I think

12:17

that's correct. We gave the gave them IV reference earlier. Yeah. Yeah. Yes, that's the one. Yeah. I look, because I think we've we've said slightly commented further on same point deadlines seven.

12:38

Yes, I think that's correct. I just wondered if there's anything further that needed to be added? And if not, we can

12:48

continue?

12:50

Well, I'll come to Miss Mary in a moment to see if there is anything he wants to comment further, specifically about most Woodbridge, but as you remember, at the outset, there is a separate moles for issue.

13:02

Not related the AI ELLs in relation to the pedestrian community mitigation. And I don't know whether you wanted to have any comment on that at all, or if you've got enough information. Now. Thank you for reminding me. It might be useful given as it came in at deadline seven. If you could give a very brief update as to what that constitutes. We'll invite the council to respond. Thank you.

13:37

I saw is that that question is directed to me. And so yes, if that if that's if that's your area of expertise, and if not, to whoever would work like to represent the Africans on that on that update. So the the most but

13:57

scheme is footway mitigation, in the event that there's

14:04

cumulative impact with sizewell C.

14:10

And again, this is this is tied in with our review of environmental outcomes.

14:19

And this was a route that was identified in the

14:26

the cumulative impact note submitted deadline

14:32

six, rep 6043.

14:38

I'm bringing in previous rep 209. The road was identified as having potential significant amenity impacts in a cumulative scenario.

14:54

As a result of our discussions with Suffolk County Council folks focusing on outcomes

15:02

The applicants are proposing

15:05

mitigation in the form of wind improvements as a proportionate response to the cumulative impact, and these are, these are the details in the the outline for an outline has given them in the outline, construction traffic management plan Rep. 609.

15:28

I think we

15:31

were pretty much agreed on the principles and the concept of this mitigation. But there's some finer detail. And I say fine. Now, obviously, we're still at concept stage. But there's a bit of detail to to agree with Suffolk County Council and we're hoping to to wrap that up

15:58

next week.

16:00

Thanks very much for that. So if you could just stay on cameras for us, that would be helpful. And if I could call on Mr. Murray, I suppose from the county council, you could come back on camera.

16:15

And

16:19

yes, good afternoon, sir. Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council.

16:23

I'll reply, firstly to the issue about the MOSFET footway, and also, while we're doing that touch on the the ies

16:33

assessment of impact impacts.

16:36

Mr. Ross is right. We have had a long ongoing discussion, I think we made it clear throughout all our representations and our local impact report about our concerns about

16:46

the the binary impact as it is so well put by Mr. Ross of the good process. And I would say the the applicant has worked with us and we have tried to actually focus on the impacts. And I think well not think I know we've we've got as far as we're concerned to the final stage where we have agreed the impacts and mitigation, notwithstanding that we still have reservations about the methodology. But I think it's important to actually get to the end point rather than worry about that. In terms of miles Feds. Yes, there's some footway works proposed. There's two sections one to the northeast, which is a little Glen amant. And one further to the south, which West, which is closer to wicker market, the furthest one, so the northeast part were brought in agreement with it, it is a it helps pedestrians cross the road, alleviate the anxiety, which was the main impact we're looking to have resolved. The issue of the South is just a bit of a thought process we're going through is the applicants proposed footpath on the south side. And we're just assessing that to see if that is the best solution to the impact. By nature, we've got to

18:01

if it's on the north side of the a 12, it forms a link without crossing the a 12 between the main residence of malford and wicker market, whereas it's on if it's on the south side, it does actually tie in a set of cottages and some houses which form part of miles. So we're just going through a thought process with that. So we're hoping to resolve that deadline eight. So that's where we are. And also just note that the applicant also offered some footway, improvements at Oxford to also alleviate some impacts there that we considered.

18:32

necessary. That's all I've got to say on impacts and malford. I don't know if you want an update from our perspective, in terms of where we are in terms of negotiation, I'm willing to offer that if you wish, only to say at this point on this subject. What would be useful would be if you have an agreed position at deadline eight on these things are not only other matters you're discussing.



18:58

Obviously this is the statement of common ground, but some

19:04

agreed position would help us a great deal as we get towards the end of the examination.

19:10

What else were you proposing to say? We did did it refer to miles for door to other other aspects?

19:16

Not specifically to miles but it was more just an update of where we think we are in terms of negotiations. Perhaps we could leave that to the end of the item would that be all right? If you just remind me and come in and then we'll we'll know what we've not covered as it were?

19:31

Very much if you'd like to stay on screen that would be quite handy to have you both there if that's possible.

19:37

Right so I think that's the applicants have anything else they want to say under item three, a Mr. Bedford, I see you have a hand.

19:50

Thank you, Sir Michael Medford Suffolk County Council.

19:57

I can't hear you sir.

20:01

Sorry, Michael Bedford Council, I apologise. I thought I clicked the mute mute. And obviously it failed to see did it happen to me earlier? It's easily done. Yes, please. Sorry. So two brief points one, the referencing deadlines seven submission to Molson bridge, where we provided just a little bit more detail about what the concern was, in terms of how it should be dealt with is at paragraph 2.28. So that was just a cross reference here. And then the second point, which is I think, a matter that we can explore further in discussion with, and particularly in relation to the footway mitigation works, should they proceed, as being discussed is a sequencing issue, in that at the moment, the way that they are, as it were tied in or proposed to be tied in to the decio is that they would come in as part of the relevant construction traffic management plan, which would be submitted for approval under requirement 28. And obviously, the timing of the relevant

21:15

construction traffic management plan would be referable to the timing of the main project works to which that construction, traffic management plan related, which is all sensible and understandable. But the the point that I think we would want to ensure is

21:36

addressed in formulating that is that the actual mitigation works, which would entail in order to carry out footway improvements. Some works in the carriageway, whether it's closing off parts of the carriageway, whatever, we would effectively want those works to be completed before that route was then available for the construction traffic and operational traffic itself. So in other words, if you if you left, as it were, the putting forward of these works to shortly before the applicant was expecting to have the construction traffic management plan approved, there might then not be sufficient time to enable the works to be completed for the footway mitigation works before then that becomes needed to be available for actual construction traffic. So it's really just a sequencing point, we don't think it's not capable of being resolved. But we just wanted to flag that up. And it might need some fine tuning of the wording of the outline, construction management plan just to recognise that there is that kind of as it were sequencing of timescales. So that's a sense of fine tuning point. But since it relates to malls, for instance, I say we want to end up with the mitigation in place before it's actually needed. We just thought we ought to raise that. Yes, thanks very much. That's very useful. So you're saying that we'll go into a revision of the ctmp, we would, we would suggest that's a sensible way of dealing with it. Obviously, it's for the applicants to work out how they want to take that point on board, but without a useful way of dealing with it. Thanks. So that would help narrow the issues there that reviews or so perhaps that's something that can go into whatever, Suffolk County Council and the applicants will put in a deadline age as an agreed position. And what would also be helpful is if you can say what's agreed and also what's not agreed. So it's almost like a statement along common ground if you like, if there's anything that's outstanding, that will be very useful as well. Thank you very much indeed.

23:44

Right, I think that's all I need to ask on. isin three, eight, so

23:53

let's whiz along twice and three, see.

23:57

Sorry, just apologies. Did the applicant want to come back on anything that Mr. Bedford just said?

24:05

We unmute I think sir.

24:10

First time today

24:12

hopefully last

24:15

just just to say we know the the comment the D seven comments on on timing of the mitigation works and we'll take them away and respond accordingly and work with Suffolk County Council.

24:35

Thanks very much indeed. Appreciate it. So in the strange Rigby alphabet we have that doesn't quite go ABC will go out an obscene now and we're talking about heavy goods vehicles in older and leisten. Now we've covered

24:58

abnormal indivisible loads through

25:00

And above. So I just wanted to confirm with the applicants before it be helpful here for interested parties, just to clarify the access routes that are going to be used by construction traffic, including HGTV, but obviously not Ai L because we've talked about them, they've got their own particular routes.

25:21

Now, I don't think there's been any changes, revision three, deadlines, six of the outline access management plan. So basically, to summarise as we understand it, so the landfall and the cable route section, two verse sizewell gap, so you're not going through less than, or alternatively via the a 1094 and b 1122. through old bra.

25:49

To the substation side, you'll be going via the B 1069, from the south of the 1894.

25:57

And you'll then go across Grove road, so you won't be going by Freston or Grove road. But we know construction traffic along the B 30. And 53 towards thought mess. Hopefully, I've got that correct. Could you just advise me if we have that correct? Yes, please. Sorry, did not quite catch the reference to the B 1069. sale. That's the sounds. That's the route to the substation site. I understand we understand.

26:31

Know, the route to the substation site is the B 1121. Heading.

26:38

North north northwest, but that's not that's a new for the abnormal loads, isn't it? I thought the heavy goods vehicles would be going a different way. Sorry, I beg your pardon? The B southwoods. Along the B 1069. Right. is correct. So there's a self v 1069, which itself for the a, a 1094. I just wanted to make it crystal clear. We're not utilising that route. That's fine. So the main point I wanted to make because we wanted to include lased. And in in this just to close it out, is that you're not proposing to send heavy goods vehicles through leisten. Is that correct? Yes, that's absolutely correct. And we've clarified

27:26

the latest outline construction traffic management plan at D six to state that we're not routing non special order abnormal loads through there either.

27:40

Thank you very much. So

27:44

the applicants by way of another clarification,

27:49

we know from paragraph 21 revision three of the outline access management plan, that there are three options currently being considered to access the part of cable routes, Section three, which is known as section three B, which is on each side of the B 1122. Solving. It was covered briefly yesterday, in terms of noise effects, and construction noise and highway noise.

28:17

These options are listed in the outline access management plan, as firstly access along the hall road from access to which is a sizable gap. Secondly, access along the hall road from access 910 69 snake road.

28:37

And thirdly, access directly from the B 1122.

28:43

And I Mr. McGregor said yesterday, I think that

28:50

one, number two was favoured certainly over number three, but I'm assuming that you would actually need both the first option from access to and the second option from access nine because you want to be able to get to either side of the 100 River without actually crossing it. So is that correct?

29:18

I'm sorry, I thought was on mute.

29:21

No, that's that's not correct. Because a crossover would be proposed.

29:30

Lincoln access six and access five.

29:36

Right. So that means that you take access from access nine, you've come off the highway network access nine. And then you've crossover five and six and work your ways towards Is that right? That's correct. That's what they're missing access. Nine is in the West, the Lexus, Sue's in the east, but you the rivers in the middle. So you you've rather than having three options, you've actually got to you've actually

30:00

Got to use one on two.

30:04

Which sort of begs the question of why you need number three,

30:09

it does seem to be quite a long way around to be going down the 894 to old Bruh, turning left at the awkward round about an old bra, and then go all the way back up the 1122. To old

30:25

rack and we've we've been on the routes.

30:30

And it's about eight kilometres to do that. Whereas it's about three kilometres, I think if you go via access nine, correct me if I'm wrong and more or less some wrong.

30:43

It also means you don't go through the populated western part of obrah.

30:50

And the various other issues you might have to deal with on the B 1122. So I just wanted to keep pushing and see if you come to some further decision on that. And that you might prefer to just use accesses to a nine, I take your point, thank you for that access is five and six.

31:12

So access is five and six would then be converted to a crossing,

31:18

perhaps might be is that something we are considering?

31:22

a primer ground for the applicants, you're you're absolutely correct in terms of our preference or preference to access the area to the west of the river, and to the woodlands and life of Francis then would be fire access nine, we still need the the option of travelling across travelling up to access five and six and taken off the main road, there may be some party workers, for instance, that we need to undertake in that area before to Hollywood is available from access nine such as some vegetation clearing software in the correct season. Outside the breeding bird season, for instance, it may be advantageous to to remove vegetation at that time, rather than wait for the Hollywood, which then may require vegetation removal during an upgrade emergencies. So there may be there may be occasions where we do need to use the road but the predominance would be fire access name. Right? Yes, I understand. That's very helpful, because that would limit that would tend to limit the number of trips you need to make down the 1122. And also this perhaps the size of vehicle that you need, because it's apparent to us from our inspections that that road is quite a difficult one to be able to make any

32:40

large access, shall we say from that road could be quite problematic. So thank you for that. That's a that's a very useful update.

32:50

Does the county council want to say anything? on where we are so far on that subject? Please?

32:58

Steve Mary, first Africans council yes to two very brief points. Firstly, we'd welcome any reduction of traffic up the 1122 from Olbrich, as he does avoid the roundabout there.

33:09

The question would be whether or not that could be described in the access management plan. So perhaps

33:19

that that access would only be used until such time as the whole road is in place, that would be asking a suggestion. The other one is just an operational issue is because of the sweat pass, we've we've recommended that if access five and six is used, that temporary traffic signals are going to be necessary because of the sweat paths. And my understanding is that that's acceptable to the applicant, but I'll let them say whether or not it is there were the two brief points I was gonna make. Thank you very much. It's very, that's very helpful, because the next thing I was going to look at was the sweat pass as obrah.

33:56

And obviously, if there's a method that can be used by signals can be put in place temporarily when it's known that movements are going to be made, that I think that would be a great assistance. If you'd like to stay on camera, Mr. Mary, if that's okay with you, that would be very helpful for us. Thank you.

34:15

So coming to old bra to the applicant, we thank you for your responses to our questions to 1811 and 218 12. Regarding the murder was at the roundabout, we note your submissions of revised swept path drawing showing parking restrictions and zigzag markings associated with zebra crossing. And the analysis is, as you say, based on no drivers parking illegally. So the first question I had was how many heavy goods vehicles would currently make the manoeuvre and I think we may be getting to answer there are very few because the figure I got was 10 a day but I'm hoping that's going to be reduced somewhat. And also

34:58

do they need to be heavy good

35:00

Vehicles Oh, they all could they be smaller vehicles which would still be used for the activities you suggest might be needed in advance of the whole road being open.

35:10

So that's perhaps the first thing to ask the applicant, please.

35:18

Maybe if I could deal with the first question. June 1, we're about the the actual HTV demand there. Again, this term Rochdale envelope worst case 1010 HGV movements,

35:38

that

35:41

would only be five movements that impact this this pinch point, because the concerns are related to turn in northwards of the B 1122. Not not such an issue for return. I think there might be issues both ways but there's a difference and the the issue turning northwards with the very sharp bend is perhaps is something that I i was i was more concerned outside and so was the worst case five Mr. Gross's outline the kind of activities which in indicate that very few of those movements will be larger vehicles. It's particularly it's the articulated vehicles that require

36:32

pilot vehicle

36:34

assistance.

36:37

And they would be they would be a very low percentage in terms of Could they be smaller vehicles?

36:47

There is provision in the

36:54

think it's a in the

36:59

environmental statement all clarify the reference

37:04

shortly. But

37:08

mitigation strategy requires that all HGV is travelling via the old Colbert oberer round about travel first to a construction consolidations site to see if loads can be broken down and placed on smaller smaller vehicles. Yes, that was trying to push it out. Yes.

37:31

Where they can't then if they are the large articulated type, they would be escorted by a pilot pilot vehicle.

37:45

So that goes some way to explaining my next question, which is what happens in terms of the safety of other road users on on such an occasion

37:55

because the safety and the inconvenience I'm trying to sort of say

38:01

in terms of safety, that's

38:05

that's the rationale for a pilot pilot vehicle. In essence, our sweat path analysis was showing that

38:15

the articulated vehicle would place one wheel over the centerline swinging out to get get through there in into over the centerline in the hatched area. And there is of course,

38:34

existing use and background hgvs that currently

38:39

do that and no restrictions at all. The pilot vehicle is the safety assurance if you like and the stock works to ensure that know that when the HTV undertakes that manoeuvre will not come into conflict with oncoming traffic. Thanks for that I was going to come to that. So there are actual heavy goods vehicles making this manoeuvre at the moment. Have you observed any of these I have to say on our inspections, we've not actually seen any

39:17

baseline traffic information will will have picked up

39:24

hdb's on that link.

39:28

Which is



39:36

obviously if vehicles are making this manoeuvre, then that will give us a useful indication of the likely problems.

39:49

So

39:53

background traffic flows for 2023 this is

40:00

Table A 26.3. Sorry, I don't have the the item number

40:08

to hand.

40:10

Background hgvs on that link turn are

40:16

recorded as 147.

40:20

with soy and 147. In what time period?

40:26

That's a daily average. Right. Right. And that's interesting.

40:33

Because it just looking at the the sweat path analysis, I'm just getting up on my screen here.

40:42

You've put on the in yellow, the current parking restrictions. I was wondering, within what hours those restrictions actually operate, leaving aside people who might park on them anyway.

40:58

What kind of restriction there is there on parking?

41:04

I think they're and Mr. Mario, or correct me if I'm wrong, but they're double yellow lines

41:13

are by definition,

41:16

not time bound for safety reasons to protect the junction. And if they're with LI, I wondered if there were any, if you could

41:27

enlighten us as to whether there are any loading restrictions as well as parking restrictions there.

41:33

I don't believe there are loading restrictions. There's no sign of any Blitz on the on the curb. Right. So just thinking from borrowed inspections of this junction, given the houses adjacent to the junction, how realistic is it to assume that

41:56

people don't park there? And I was wondering, given that you've said that these TVs do make this manoeuvre, what problems there are associated with those manoeuvres?

42:12

I don't think it's safe to assume that that

42:18

the motorist won't sorry, double negative won't park there. And it will need

42:30

a strategy to

42:33

inform them that they may be movements. It's a bit little bit like the discussion we had about AI ELLs earlier. It's a kind of softly softly approach, I would anticipate

42:48

giving people prior notification that they shouldn't be parking. And if necessary, it can be reinforced by dropping cones down with notices on indicate and when the movements are likely to happen.

43:11

I was just wondering on that when the scope to actually bunch the movements so that if you've got activities prior to the whole road being available, and you need to do a particular activity, outputs

43:25

RVM whether you could actually say right, okay, for X number of hours, we're going to need to run 10 vehicles through Bang, bang, bang, and then that's it for a while. Yes, that would that would seem a sensible approach, given the low demand as a save five vehicle five movements maximum making that manoeuvre of which,

43:52

you know, there's not going to be many that are articulate. No, that's, that's fine. Just as an aside, I looked at the the the upper diagram of the of the diagrams. And it did appear to me that the left turning vehicle would be in conflict with anything that was parked immediately north of the yellow line. So if your cells on the council are suggesting some form of traffic signal arrangement, then that sounds to me as if that's something that would be worth pursuing on both safety and convenience grounds really, so that people are aware of what's going on. And we don't get a situation where a truck gets halfway around the band and can't go backwards and somebody comes the other way, maybe another truck, and they can't go backwards either. So if you are looking at that kind of mitigation measure, then please give us an update at the next deadline of your agreed position on that that would be very helpful.

44:59

Yes, we can

45:00

Don't want to wait, sir. Thank you because that's something that does concern us. It's not again, it's not maybe not that frequent and event, but it might be frequent enough to be inconvenience and possibly unsafe in some circumstances. Mr. Married, do you want to add anything to what's been said?

45:21

plays game? Yeah. So just to confirm there are double yellow lines there. I'm not aware of any loading or no non unloading restrictions there.

45:32

I would say that nine years ago, I used to look after these areas and maintenance engineer. I wasn't aware of any particular parking problems there. But I would point out that was 10 years ago, and it predates building of the supermarket around the corner. And just in clarify, clarify the comments are made and made about traffic signals was specifically for access three and four, four for the sweat path there where there is considerable length of of the road as vehicles come out. They are overlapping the opposite carriageway

46:03

with Yes.

46:05

And with regard to this, I can cooperate Mr. Ross's numbers he says 147 vehicles a day, that does include the development traffic, so it's slightly less in terms of background. I can't recall seeing the classification table but that's

46:22

presumably includes everything about three and a half tonnes. I'm afraid I haven't got any information about articulated lorries. Right. So I think I miss may have misunderstood that because you're referring to is it sizable gap? No, I'm referring to the temporary access of

46:39

of overrode to be 1122. So I guess Sorry, sorry to interject, Steve.

46:46

Mr. Mary, I think you meant access five and C,

46:50

three and four. Okay, five and six. But it's definitely the ones of the 1122.

46:56

That's where the, the most conflict in sweat pads are because of the narrowness of the road. So that's where I was referring to traffic signals. Yes. Yes. I also just thought that I would just also point out that there was a suggestion very early on in development, this project of actually changing the curb line to make some more space. And I would say that, from our perspective, we didn't consider that a suitable idea, mostly because the amount of disruption it would have caused and the and because it narrows the footpath, and we're more concerned about the deschenes. We're talking about the roundabout here. Sorry, Victoria. Sorry about that. So there was a suggestion to change the curb line to make a bit more space. But like I said, the amount of disruption just again, a couple of 100 millimetres for the number of vehicles just seem to be disproportionate disruption and risk to the pedestrians.

47:50

I think that's really the main comments arise my own Yes, it's around about input four way lights on if you need to, I the the idea of using a convoy vehicle and potentially using Stop, stop or stop go boards have discussed that with their network assurance team. And they don't have any objections to that being used. So that could be an alternative measure. And they'd have been approved to get line of sight for stop go board so they could see each other around the corner as it were.

48:18

They can do although where they are working blind, they would I'd expect, and this is just from my experience, I'd expect them to use radios. Yeah. Yeah, fine. Thanks very much. That's very helpful. Anything else the applicant would like to say? Just the idea of having

48:36

temporary signals for safety that the over roundabout if that were necessary.

48:45

In in principle, I don't think there's a problem with that. But I don't think the overriding safety need would necessitate such a intervention because signals induce delay,

49:03

particularly temporary ones.

49:06

And it feels like we've got a low tech safe

49:12

solution to this.

49:15

Just just on a very minor point of clarification, the 147 figure own guide is his background hgvs you would have to add further 10 movements onto that to reflect

49:31

all HGTV movements.

49:35

That was very much right. So I think we're at the end of last year with pre see for the moment. And so if we continue with my newfangled alphabet, we'll go through to item three, where we're looking at Oxford and lovers lane.

49:58

think we've already discussed

50:01

Whichever way the veils come, they can't come down the 1894. So they have to go down the 812 and the B 1122. And then through lace to them along the 1069. But HGV access to land for under sections One, two of the cable routes will be down lovers lane. So we'll be avoiding lace. And I think that's correct, isn't it? I think we've just to confirm what we said earlier.

50:31

If I could just correct the applicant? That's correct. Yes. Thank you very much.

50:38

So, in our question 218 14.

50:46

Part A, we asked about given the operational conditions on the 1894, particularly in the summer months and in the interests of a simpler strategy.

51:00

Had you considered sending all your hgvs down the a 12 value Oxford rather than using the 1894 through Snape and bringing forward in conjunction with sizewell See, construction of the new access route salary, Oxford? Now, counsellor fellows mentioned earlier that the new access route salary Oxford?

51:22

I think if I've got it right, the suggestion was that it may never happen.

51:28

Your response doesn't mention the new access route south of Oxford. So perhaps that's why you've not mentioned it.

51:36

And consequently, if there were no access route there, then that would mean all the HGV traffic were going through Oxford and Saboten and would reduce additional traffic through Oxford and Farrington

51:50

that wouldn't be consistent with avoiding lace than not is all in coalfire. Green is are you aware of any of what the position is with this, this new access road? south of Oxford is very update you can give us the Africans face.

52:11

I'm not aware of

52:15

any, any updates. Clearly it says scheme being promoted by Sizewell C.

52:25

stating the obvious our assessment has to consider the worst case scenario. And we were very careful with the assessment not to be reliant on Sizewell C mitigation, unless it was in a cumulative scenario and it could categorically be accepted that

52:48

the measures would be would be programmed.

52:53

I suppose the other comment I would make and just taking us back to the

52:58

this morning.

53:00

Da 1094 is a zone lorry distributor route. And due to the sort of embedded measures we've already unsay undertaken

53:17

in terms of carefully positioning access, and, and

53:21

and the whole road, also listening to people's concerns around oberer. At preliminary environmental information stage

53:33

where the application forecasts a five 5% increase in total traffic on the on the 1890 form.

53:46

That sort of level of demand is indiscernible from

53:52

in terms of total traffic in terms of daily daily traffic fluctuations.

54:00

Thanks, I was just sort of wanted to push down probe that a little bit because of the the conflict between possibly between tourism and construction. But then, of course, we've heard earlier that the tourism

54:15

topic is really relevant all around, which means that it's not capable of easy resolution.

54:24

You mentioned that the 1894 is a distributor zone distributor road for ATVs.

54:33

But nevertheless, it's quite a narrow and fast road.

54:38

I was wondering if the county council had any reservations about its use continued use or whether they had any comments to make about its status.

55:00

The mute button

55:03

so with regards to the the issue between routing traffic via the v 1122 b 1069, or alternatively via the a 1094.

55:14

If traffic's routed around the northern route Yes, accepted the avoid the the day holiday traffic that goes to and from and tourist traffic goes to and from oberer and snipe, it would have to stay longer on the ATL. So conversely, it also impact on the tourist traffic going to, for example, Southwold in other parts of Suffolk, the two main concerns we would have is that it's a much longer route. So did a quick calculation of the distances and to go north bound from the a 12 1094 Junction round to the B 1069. Access is an extra 13 kilometres. And then so not a show, too.

56:00

So the a 12 bit I'm 22. So for northbound traffic, it's it's five kilometres if you route it all round via the 1894.

56:11

So there are increases in distance. The main issue, though, is that we discussed some of the issues through licence. So we've got a level crossing, we've got the narrow pinch point under the footbridge and also Hastings road. But it does go through large communities on it does go through the southwestern part, and Eyston goes through all of nada shortcode for airfare green, it also goes through Britain and Middleton war and it also goes through Oxford. So on balance, if it were looking at the community's effects, it is less desirable to appreciate that the 1894 isn't the most brilliant of roads, that I would say it's got a 40 mile an hour speed limit from and I'm sure there's gonna be some comments later on about how well so abided by, there is a posted speed limit from a 12 as far as snipe it through the snake crossroads, then it's D restricted and fast or

57:07

slow. So do appreciate that. But the D restricted pi is mostly about half and half split between where they turn off the beat and 69 I do appreciate there are narrow, but it's particularly it's Nate waters watering.

57:22

Yeah. Thanks for that. That's helpful, of course that the math would be different if the age 12 was what I might call a decent road north of wicker market. But it does sort of conk out a bit there, doesn't it so it's I can't comment. No of course not. It's not well, it's no longer trunk road are on the way back when there was a plan to actually take it all the way to Lowestoft. But yes, that's the thing, isn't it? It's like the squashy balloon. If we try and do something somewhere, it's gonna pop out somewhere else, isn't it? So No, thanks. That's very helpful indeed.

57:56

And applicants on this item, is there anything else you'd like to say before we move on?

58:06

I think

58:10

tu tu,

58:12

tu tu tu things to say my colleague might want to come in on the first point but

58:18

with assessed worst case, we're not precluding utilising a better route, if it is constructed, and in place in time

58:34

for the project's construction phase.

58:39



And

58:43

the second point escapes me at the moment, but I'm sure it'll come up a bit later.

58:52

Thanks for that. Right. Okay, so we're now going backwards in my alphabet. To

59:01

write some

59:04

three date. Yeah, I think we've probably covered quite a bit of that already, because that was a end.

59:14

94 it's really more focused on the 1094 where it's at the junction with the B 1069, which is that 1121 1069 there's two junctions in close proximity to each other, with a band in between.

59:32

So looking at the sweat path drawings, again, we note applicant your submission of revised sweat path drawings, and these show the hatching in the centre of the B 1069. at the junction with the eight and 94 and the both the right so manoeuvres out of the B 1069 are they're there. They're just about there they just squeak in on the extreme of the centre hatching.

59:57

I suppose again, it's a case of asking

1:00:00

How many heavy goods vehicles currently make that manoeuvre? And what happens in terms of the safety of other road users because it's fairly fast road and there's a couple of bends there,

1:00:15

then what increase in this number would result from your traffic in the worst case?

1:00:27

So

1:00:29

blink

1:00:31

nine,

1:00:33

which be 1016. Nine

1:00:38

to the

1:00:41

south of North Shore, Gulf culvert green

1:00:46

this way snake road West snake road comes out onto the the tense the I 1094. So on that link,

1:00:56

there are currently

1:00:59

based on 2023 projections 196 background, HGTV movements on rats on a daily basis is Yeah, yeah. And

1:01:14

the projects

1:01:18

together concurrently would generate 265

1:01:25

HTP movements. So that means you be got this got my math right. You've been slightly more than doubling the what's happening now in a moment. Yes.

1:01:38

So in view of that,

1:01:45

you're saying you don't need a pilot vehicle because though is within the within the limits.

1:01:54

And that no measures to safeguard other road users are proposed as there are no existing road safety issues, which will be exacerbated. I was just wondering in view of visibility issues from the a 1069 to the 1094. And also the likely speed of traffic emerging is the right turnout, I'm thinking about mostly

1:02:16

whether that's a realistic assumption on what the other risks are to other road users, given that you're increasing the numbers of vehicles by over 100%.

1:02:30

Well, our assessment of collisions at that junction

1:02:37

uncovered that there was

1:02:39

very little

1:02:42

recent recent history of collisions. There's been a, I would say, a positive trend downwards. There's been almost

1:02:52

a step change there in collisions, which indicates to me, maybe there's been some intervention, but Mr. Murray will be able to inform us if that's the case, or not, there's certainly slow markings on the carriageway and advanced

1:03:09

directional signs

1:03:14

we've had

1:03:18

there's there's only been one recorded collision since 2013.

1:03:27

On that junction, so there's nothing there that warrants concern or for intervention. Granted,

1:03:36

the junction wouldn't if it was being constructed. Greenfield wouldn't meet modern standards. But it's it's

1:03:47

it's, it's it's performing

1:03:52

very well. If you compare it with other other junctions of its type in a rural area.

1:04:00

Thanks for that. Mr. Mary, do you have any comments to make on this subject?

1:04:09

Very briefly, I think we're in the same position is that your heart tell you to worry about the junction, but when we actually looked at the data is showing that there is not a significant number of injury related

collisions. So it was a little bit reluctantly hard to justify anything mitigation there. from memory that there have been some safety improvements there. But they from memory, they don't rely on my memory, but I think it was for people going straight on those track opposite. And the signs were changed. So this is a T junction rather than across roads. That's the only reason I can remember from memory. Oh, so you mean that people are going down the big 10 sticks of art and just they just kept going because they thought they thought they could go straight across onto the track. That's that's my recollection, but it was a long time ago.

1:05:00

So really providing I know is difficult with budgets providing you can keep what you've got in terms of markings up to scratch and visible and and

1:05:11

noticeable, then. Yeah, the key is, as I understand the applicant is offered is to to make sure the visibility is kept clear. So the visibility as as good as it can be. Yes. Was there any consideration given to the speed limits of any kind?

1:05:29

Not as part of this application, but regulation, and I will check it is that size or maybe proposing a speed limit across their for their accumulate their impact? Right. So something might come cumulus will on the right under the next item, perhaps, possibly, as I would point out that, besides we're not putting any hgvs through here, but it's enough to cater for the workers traffic going up through licence to the main site compound? Yes, yes. Because you'll get an increase in in normal traffic. Yeah. Right. Anything else the applicant wants to say on that subject. Before we close out 3d,

1:06:09

though,

1:06:10

thanks very much. So let's scroll back on my strange alphabet, two, three, B, and three, B and three f are both about Friday St. So first off on three B. That's the applicants for their use of responses to our second our written questions, questions one to four.

1:06:31

They will have to say they will bang on the button. You'll note the contents of the revised clarification note. We note the update on the section 278 agreement, concept design in the updated outline construction traffic management plan. And that in respect of benefits the before situation, you've done something already, which I wasn't sure you've done yet. Obviously, as part of the model calibration exercise, you've already got the before situation in terms of background traffic. So to the applicants, presumably this information will be retained and supplied to the county council to enable the evaluation of benefits both during the construction phase and subsequently. And particularly should the proposed signal arrangement be retained that will be useful for the council

1:07:24

is to the applicants. Am I correct in making that assumption?

1:07:29

Yes, there are two two mechanisms whereby the performance of the junction will be kept under review from the applicants perspective.

1:07:44

One will be we've agreed with Suffolk County Council that quarterly monitoring reports on on the the overall construction traffic management plan will

1:07:58

contain an overview of of accidents including cluding, near misses.

1:08:07

And

1:08:09

the junction itself will be subject to the formal safety audit this so prior to

1:08:22

I'm sorry, one back during

1:08:27

outline, concept design, it's already been subject to a stage one road safety audit. As we progressed to a more detailed design, it will be subject to a stage two safety audit

1:08:44

just prior to opening stage three and then a year after commissioning, the stage for

1:08:55

these will be undertaken by qualified road safety professionals independent to the project. And as part of their brief, they will examine all the latest information on junction performance before setting out

1:09:14

the their audit and any any recommendations they may have at the time.

1:09:21

Thanks very much. That's that's very useful.

1:09:25

So that the stage for audit, which obviously is 12 months after it's opened to make sure it does what it says on the tin, I suppose that will still be within your construction traffic timeframe. So you'll still be using the signal control whatever is decided subsequently.

1:09:46

That's correct. Thank you, Mr. Mary. Do you wish to comment on that update?

1:09:56

I know you've commented on paragraphs 2.1 on

1:10:00

2.2 of your submission in respect to the section 278 agreement, but I wondered if you wanted to add anything else. Only if it's reassures people that the design and implementation will be treated as if it were a permanent installation, not just a temporary one. So it will go through all the necessary checks and balances that we would do for permanent one.

1:10:23

And that'll leave you in the position where if it turns out it really is quite a good idea, then you can actually leave it there. That is intentional, though we'd obviously have to undertake a degree of consultation before we did that. And it is of course all subjects to what happens with ADF and sighs well, whether that comes forward and makes this

1:10:42

not necessary is a boss because it could be replaced by the great big roundabout. Yeah. Thanks very much applicant anything else you want to add on item three be?

1:10:54

Thanks. If we now scroll forward in my strange alphabet, I think we're getting back to normal now because we'll go to item three f.

1:11:01

and really just a bit of a devil's advocate question to be honest.

1:11:09

If the was the bypass of saboteur neox firms, and it was decided to use the eight rail routes from the north for all the hgvs as well as just the Ai L coming from Lowestoft

1:11:26

would the signal scheme of Friday's to require that was the question were asked. And to the applicants, you state that Freitas street signal scheme has been designed to improve baseline road safety conditions. And that it can be reasoned that scheme will be beneficial, regardless of the HGV assignments.

1:11:48

Just to clarify, I thought that originally, the scheme was proposed to improve road safety associated with the forecast. Right turning construction traffic there, rather than just the pure baseline, but perhaps you could correct me on that or at least clarify, please,

1:12:11

for dealing with the last point, first,

1:12:15

the the scheme, as it now stands with the traffic signal intervention is designed to improve the baseline

1:12:27

road safety situation. And by doing that, it it can accommodate

1:12:36

the right turn in

1:12:39

construction traffic demand from from both both both the projects.

1:12:46

I think the comment around

1:12:51

was wasn't it just to mitigate construction traffic? That is probably true. The mitigation that was proposed in the original Applegate cane application.

1:13:06

We see this as a scheme that goes much, much further and does

1:13:13

improve the baseline situation. And should it be determined by Suffolk County Council that is valid to leave it in could be

1:13:25

could have a legacy benefit. I guess that's what we're trying to either in terms of the two village bypass.

1:13:38

sighs well see our record proposing to put in our forearm slightly offline. round about the same location. Yeah.

1:13:49

So the

1:13:52

section 278 agreement that we are

1:13:59

in consultation with with Suffolk on well, quite contained triggers whereby we'll ensure that there isn't a conflict whereby as a traffic signal solution goes in and then around about comes comes along with

1:14:17

a short period. Yeah. So I think to answer your question, if

1:14:24

nearer the time it's identified that around about solution is going to be implemented and is going to go there and then the traffic signal solution is not not required. Yes, quite so. And that'll obviously be somebody that sort of comes out in the wash as it were later on. Yeah, thank you very much for that.

1:14:45

Mr. Mary,

1:14:48

anything you wish to add?

1:14:57

Yep, sorry. It takes a while today.

1:15:00

Only that, from a view whether the traffic comes from the North 100%, or from the South 100%, they still need. The greatest risk, in our view is the traffic turning right going northbound into 1094. But that doesn't mean there's not still risks if it's turning left coming south, because bear in mind that when it's exiting there, it will still be turning right onto the northbound a 12. And also, it's important to realise that there's also the workers traffic that is,

1:15:27

is likely to come mostly from the south, but honestly, all of it.

1:15:31

There was one quick thing I was just gonna mention about triggers on it is something we have responded to is that with all of the mitigation, there have been some proposed triggers. And we've responded in deadline seven in that we think that it needs to cover all of the cabling works. But that's on record now. Yes. In terms of the the two videos bypass Aaron standing from discussions with ADF are that they have actually split out the roundabout for the Northern partner to finish bypass as a separate project, per se. And that's really delivery, and we are pushing them and others to make sure that any online work is delivered as soon as possible to avoid impacting on the whole road.

1:16:18

There will be and I think we will get there onto this end, a question for about the interaction of projects and individual works. But it is very critical that these works are delivered to a robust programme, so they don't affect the impact on the whole road. And that's because as I say, we'll discuss that in 40. I think it is.



1:16:44

Thank you very much. Anything else from the applicant to close off this part of Iseman three.

1:16:52

Thanks very much. So let's move back in normal alphabet mode now. So let's carry on to item three G. Really quite a quick one.

1:16:59

We asked about this in our second written question two, point 18.5. And the applicants say there are no residual concerns to be raised about the B 1530 and 53. Crossing. That's the one down to thought ness.

1:17:14

Sally a straight away from Suffolk County Council. Do they have any residual concerns?

1:17:27

There is one very small residual concern which can be resolved during the design process. It's just the drawings don't show the visibility of crack for construction vehicles approaching either side of the crossing. So provided that that's closed out during the detailed design, it's acceptable. And that's something that you can put in your sort of state your deadline, a joint sort of submission, if you like. Yes. And to be honest, it'd be something I'd expect to be covered in the safety audit and the detailed design anyway, that'd be the backstop to make sure it's picked up there. Yeah, I'm just going to make the main thing is to make sure that you know that you can actually do it satisfactorily. You've already where you know it can be done. Yes, we'll ensure that we'll talk to the applicant to make sure that's in the deadline age response. Thank you very much

1:18:16

to the applicant. Just very briefly, is there anything you want to say

1:18:20

about that?

1:18:25

You've said the Navy's digital concerns I just wanted to offer you know, in my reply, it's all pretty standard. No, no Mr. Murray's comments, and we will work with him to resolve that very minor point. Thank you.

1:18:42

Three h concerns the accesses to cable route, section three B. And I think we've pretty well talked that one through already in the previous item.

1:18:54

But very briefly, is there anything the applicants want to add to anything they said earlier about the three options there.

1:19:03

And Suffolk County Council anything you want to add?

1:19:11

Not that we've already that we haven't already discussed. Thank you very much. So in that case, finally to the last item that mitigation or legacy.

1:19:21

The applicants mentioned the Friday street traffic signal junction just now if it's the case that it stays as a sort of a legacy item if you like.

1:19:35

And we were sort of having a think about it since the end of the last item. So now that we're at a closer look at the local effects and issues expected to arise during construction or operation, and obviously bearing in mind they're a great big uncertainties about all the other projects that are going on that will come on to

1:19:52

I wondered if there was anything else that the applicants wanted to say about their mitigation

1:20:00

of the consequences effects of the project

1:20:07

just as a sort of a catch all if you like.

1:20:12

So the with regards to the footway mitigation work so at

1:20:21

miles furred the Oxford in a cumulative scenario and Everton and snipe

1:20:30

for the for the projects.

1:20:34

They could be considered as a legacy benefit. They're there to assist with pedestrian amenity

1:20:46

their permanent type works. They're form part of the drafts, section 278 where we're currently agreeing with Suffolk County Council. So they could be considered as legacy and with regard to Friday Street,

1:21:07

the signals

1:21:10

of course, they provide legacy

1:21:14

should should Suffolk be minded to to adopt them permanently. But they also

1:21:24

they do not

1:21:27

lead to secondary impacts of traffic diverting, which there's been quite a quite a lot of comment on that the delays

1:21:41

are

1:21:44

so

1:21:45

I think sir has expired express the DSA is expressed concerns with the southbound delay, because clearly we're stopping traffic where the more it was.

1:21:58

Was three free flowing. I believe 26 seconds was quoted as a maximum delay. I think that's Yeah, yes.

1:22:08

physical movement is going on the 812 southwestward was isn't that yes, indeed. And the the right turn is in the order of 14, the right turn into the 1894 is in the order 41 seconds, which is actually a 10 second reduction from the calibrated baseline situation, these delays are not in the order of magnitude that they would cause traffic to reassign, just to give a point of reference, a typical traffic signal cycle can be anything between 120 seconds and 60 seconds. So that level of delay in in in the real world, a motorist is not going to experience a noticeable delay. Yes, thank you for that. I was gonna say that. My experience two minutes is normally the maximum cycle time. Presumably, if you've been capturing information to calibrate your model, you may already have information about how long traffic going west, on the 1094 has to wait with working sofa turn right and make the complete manoeuvre onto the a 12. So that that might inform

1:23:24

how that compares with the 41 seconds you've just quoted,

1:23:28

which presumably is the total delay time from the stop line right around.

1:23:34

So

1:23:36

in the existing situation,

1:23:40

from the 1094 to the a 12. North is a

1:23:48

23

1:23:51

second delay

1:23:54

with the traffic signals

1:23:57

in place. We're looking at

1:24:04

27 second delay,

1:24:10

not a big difference and sly Ingres button, of course, done in a no conflict. The jetsmart that's what I was trying to sort of bottom out, because it's it's obviously a trade off like signal installation is often the art to trade off to the safety in time. So indeed, feeling in the trades off are are relatively small at this junction. It's not. And this is obviously for Mr. meritage comment on but it's not. It's not a huge policy trade off, in my opinion.

1:24:45

Thank you.

1:24:47

Does that conclude what you want to say under this item to the applicants? Does? Yes, thank you, Mr. Mary. anything you'd like to add?

1:24:59

Only to runes.

1:25:00

The primary reason for the traffic signals is road safety. So that's, that's what we think they should be mitigating. And we have accepted that it's the decrease in capacity is acceptable for the benefits in terms of safety.

1:25:16

Thank you very much. Right. That brings us to the end of the specialist techie part of item three. So I'd now invite submissions from other interested parties. And if I could start with the Suffolk Council, please.

1:25:41

Good afternoon, sir Naomi, good Isa Council, and with no further comments to add and support the comments from the county council. And Mr. Murray. Thank you. Thank you very much for school. So next we go to the town and parish councils. If I could start with Oliver town council first.

1:26:10

Good afternoon.

1:26:13

Thank you, Mr. Rigby. Ladies and gentlemen, Moran fellows speaking on behalf of Orah Town Council.

1:26:20

We really do appreciate the opportunity to contribute. I know it's been a long week for you. And another long week next week on and getting towards the end of the process. So thank you for your continued expertise and energy into this examination.

1:26:38

I'm sure my colleagues counsellor Tim Beech for Snape, and over society reps will no doubt add far more detail in terms of Friday streets and numbers of hgv's. You know, we're in speeding and things like that, especially with regard to the golf course crossing pedestrian crossings the to the primary school, and the supermarkets and the roundabout. However, there's a couple of things that I would like to mention in terms of inconvenience and safety.

1:27:09

So firstly, I'd like to mention quite specifically that there's a lot of uncertainty and over following, we believe it's not been confirmed recent approaches by the applicant to properties in the vicinity of the roundabout.

1:27:27

That's all I'm gonna say about that part.

1:27:30

There was mentioned of pilot accompanied vehicles, but I think it was said there's no warning of those. So they could happen at any time. Unlike the AI elsewhere, we will have warning off so we can prepare for those.

1:27:47

They said that vehicles often straddle the white hatch lines.

1:27:53

But there's very little traffic currently that does that on a regular basis, certainly coming down the 1894. Or going on to the BLM 22. At the roundabout.

1:28:05

There are double yellow lines, as has been mentioned by the applicant, but these are actually only very closest to the roundabout. And there is a lot of on street parking both on the 1894 and the BLM 22.

1:28:22

And in fact, tesco's and the co op articulated delivery is prohibited. And this is a planning condition as part of the supermarket being allowed to be built there in the first place. So their deliveries have to be in smaller vehicles. And on the B 1122, the regular bus service to and from obrah. The bus has been stuck several times on the B 1122. Because there are parked vehicles. And it's only just a gentleman's agreement at the moment if you like that households stagger their parking so six or seven of the houses Park this side, and six or seven other houses park the other side, there's actually no double yellow lines on to prevent that parking.

1:29:17

Unlike what what has been said there have been accidents and near misses with fatalities on both the 1894 and the B 1122. And Friday streets. And as a regular user of these roads, I can tell you they're not free from frequent near misses.

1:29:38

I think there's more clarification really needed in terms of the timeliness of the work. Both the construction and the mitigation works on various parts of the projects. Because for example, if work is taking place on one area, there may be traffic that's

1:29:57

diverted to another area.

1:30:00

where there might be work going on, and that would have an impact on it being put into a third area. So how all these pieces of the project go together, I think there's still a lot of work to be done to rationalise all of that and to set some clear parameters as to what will be the plan

1:30:21

for eczema Arbol when is the whole road actually going to be constructed.

1:30:28

Then then coming on to my main

1:30:32

part of of this agenda item really, although this agenda item is entitled local freight, because there is no other place to discuss it. I'd like to mention lgv and work of vehicles. So in terms of impact of inconvenience and safety.

1:30:52

As you know, unlike Branford, which is only four miles from Ipswich, the whole of the surrounding area to the Freston substation site, the cable routes and the land for the whole area. His rule is, we're a long way from the a 12.

1:31:09

Even driving at 30 miles per hour, which is the speed limit around here, an LG V or a worker car would seriously injure a pedestrian or another car user. And I know the applicant has said it will be 1.5 people to up to three people per vehicle. But even at that rate, the worker traffic will be significant.

1:31:32

And we must note as well that we have several pedestrian crossings, and these routes are residential areas, Routes to schools and things like that.

1:31:43

I'm not sure how ltv's work vehicles will work on a day to day basis.

1:31:49

I've tried I've tried to have read through a lot of the documentation by the applicant, and I'm grateful for that. But I can't see specifically how it will work in terms of where workers will park contractors, subcontractors, subcontractors or subcontractors. Where are their compounds going to be where will they store their materials and the tools and understand about large layout areas I'm talking about the sort of lower down the chain, if you like

1:32:21

traffic, more movements and counting of traffic and mitigation shouldn't just be for those one journey from home to work and one journey home from work. I think that's very naive.

1:32:36

For worst case scenario with one team working say, for example, at the softness landfall at the same time is one team working on a bit of the cable route, and one team working at Friston

1:32:48

all those workers arriving into the area, then travelling to where they were

1:32:55

then going to get a sandwich or a newspaper, on their break time and then travelling back to where they're working. And then perhaps going back to the compound to pick something up. And then going back to talk to the foreman about something and then coming back. And then before they going home going somewhere locally for an errand, the actual volume of traffic in the local area. And the potential for harm from fly parking in the local area. While all of that's going on, is really, really huge.

1:33:30

The other point is this this dynamic of relationship, which the applicant has said exists, where sub contract subcontractors can actually choose sometimes to do their own slight model of things, and how things enforced between a contractor and then a subcontractor. And we have seen problems of this, when size will be was being built that it isn't as easy to enforce. Yes, you can say hgvs can't use a certain route. And you can put a little disc on the HTV with a number so a member of the public can quickly write that down. But in most cases to do anything about a contract or a subcontractor, you have to be able to spot their licence number and then report it to a liaison officer. And they might get one warning or it might be three stripes warning and they're out. But there's significant harm and inconvenience and safety risks before you even get to that point.

1:34:30

As mentioned earlier this week, if the maximum working hours are seven in the morning to seven at night, which we can still consider is too long. It's too early and it's too late for that to happen. Then worker cars are going to be arriving into the area before seven in the morning and leaving after seven at night. How's that going to be controlled and and this syndrome of kind of bunching up and waiting at the gate. Nobody wants to be late. They've all got to clock

1:35:00

corn. So how do we manage this some melaye of cars, again in a rural area. So it's engine noise, it's slamming car doors, it's okay. They're not louder radio on the site when they're working. But you can't prevent someone sitting there with their window open, having a cigarette out the window, listening to BBC Radio stuff on the news, the quarter to seven in the morning, right outside a residential home.

1:35:32

And that leads me to say and to remind us all which I'm sure you're aware of sir. This item does relate closely to the interaction with noise issues we discussed earlier in the week. It also links very much to health and well being or to fear, fear of crime, anti social behaviour works in the area of fear of accidents, social accurate economic impact on tourism, with perception of traffic on the roads of accidents on roads, so delays on roads.

1:36:05

And it will impact a very, very wide area Snape overlays and Saxmundham the whole of that area.

1:36:13

Today in talking about traffic and transport issues, we've not mentioned road closures or diversions onto other roads, which may be planned or might be just necessary due to due to unforeseen matters.



1:36:28

And I don't think any reliance can be put on measures proposed by sizer see at this stage. It is we've been told before earlier in the ration that we can't include community.

1:36:45

Sorry, we can't include community of impacts of other projects which are not fully in the public domain, all the details not known sufficiently. So I don't think we can also rely on the positive elements that may come if sighs we'll see put in some infrastructure potentially.

1:37:04

Also, the National Grid substation element remember may bring additional projects Nautilus and urine link within the same number of years. So the impact on traffic of those projects, I think, has to be discussed. And that has not been included as yet. Although we may get onto that, when we talk about community of impact.

1:37:27

With regard to mitigation, and compensation or legacy item ROI

1:37:33

that's been agreed or in statements of common ground, I didn't have to tell the inspectors again, that no discussion has been undertaken by a Suffolk or Suffolk County Council with local parish or town councils or local affected individuals. In fact, the proposal for traffic lights at Friday street, and to detailed section 111 were complete shocks to us. That was first we heard about it is when it was put in in a cabinet paper and then forwarded to the planning spectrum.

1:38:12

Thanks. I'm just as human last, my last last thing waited, I've waited myself several minutes at Friday St. in excess of the times mentioned by the applicant throughout my life. So on the 1894 to a 12 North turning turning and left.

1:38:33

You wait on a daily basis more than 23 seconds now. And the traffic going the other way. The other thing was, I don't know if a traffic I've never experienced a traffic light in this area that goes through a cycle in 27 seconds. So if it's red to start with just maybe just interject that briefly we were referring to the delay you might experience on average. So cycle would be between one and two minutes in total. But if you're coming from the 1094 monitor turn right. What we've been told and evidence today is that the average waiting time will be 27 seconds. Does that clarify that for you? Yeah. I mean, it's it's far more than that now. So I don't see how that could be less with additional traffic on the roads. So, in conclusion, we do disagree with the assessment by the applicant, on all traffic and transport matters, where they've stated in their documentation and verbally, that it's negligible or not significant. We believe it will be Thank you. Thanks very much indeed. Right, just looking at the time is 24. We've got

1:39:46

Tim beach Paul Collins, Paul bonkers Duran, Michael Marni Fiona Gilmore on Paul Sharmila before we finish this item. So what I'm going to propose is that we break

1:40:00

Now until four o'clock, and that's we hear those people after the break. Is that agreeable to my panel colleagues and to other parties?

1:40:13

Yes, that's agreeable to me. Mr. Ridley, thank you very much. In that case, as the French would say it isn't the four o'clock. So if we all come back at four o'clock prompts, we'll finish off hearing

1:40:27

other parties on item three, we'll hear the applicants again, to wrap it up, and then we'll get on with item four. So if everybody comes back at four o'clock, thank you very much.