

TEXT_ISH13_EA1N&2_Session1_12032021

Fri, 3/12 1:12PM • 1:31:55

00:01

Good morning, and welcome everybody to today's issue specific hearings 13 on traffic and transport for East Anglia, one North and East Anglia to offshore wind bands. Before we introduce ourselves, can I just check with the case team that you can hear me and that the recordings, live streams and live captions have started?

00:22

Morning, Caroline, I can see and you the internal recordings have started. And I've just noticed that live streams have gone up, and the captions are working fine.

00:32

Thank you, Emery.

00:34

My name is Caroline Jones. And I'm a member of a panel which is the examining authority for the examination of the East Anglia, one North offshore wind farm application and a member of another panel, which is the examining authority for the examination of the East Anglia to offshore wind farm application. I'm just going to ask my fellow colleagues to introduce themselves. We're starting with Mr. Smith, please.

00:58

Thank you very much, Mr. Jones. My name is Ron Smith, and I'm a lead man. I'm the lead member of the two panels. And I will be participating in most of this hearing, but I will not be leading the questioning. So I'm going to hand over now to Mr. Rigby who will be leading most of the questioning for the remainder of this hearing.

01:24

Mr. Buckley, you're on mute.

01:30

Thanks, Mrs. Joseph hasn't done before first time for everything. Good morning, everyone. My name is Guy Rigby. I'm panel member and I be leading the questioning for most of the items today.

01:42

Morning everybody.

01:43

JOHN Hockley, a panel member are mainly be observing and taking notes today but may ask questions if they arise.

01:50

Thank you, everyone. Those of you who have been involved with or watched any of our previous hearings will note that the full panel isn't here today. This is to allow them to prepare for hearings taking place next week. Can I also introduce our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with on these exams working with us on these examinations, some of whom you will have spoken to already. Emery Williams is the case manager leading the planning inspector case team and you will have met him in the arrangements conference this morning. Emery is accompanied today by Caroline Hopewell and Kj Johansson. These are the 13 issues specific hearings in these examinations, the main focus will be on hearing issues related to traffic and transport, noting that noise was a subject of yesterday's hearings and air quality as a human health issue was heard on Tuesday. I'm now just going to deal with a few preliminary matters. Firstly, a reminder that as with all hearings in these examinations, we are being live streamed and recorded both to enable people to follow the proceedings today and to allow people to watch or listen to the proceedings later. Secondly, to all interested parties not participating, you are very welcome to watch online or listen to the recording and to send in your comments as post hearing submissions at the next deadline, which is deadline eight, Thursday the 25th of March. Thirdly, just to note that we will not be sharing documents on screen. And we ask all of you participating today to Please follow along on your own device. The documents we will be referring to are listed on each application agenda under the relevant agenda item for you to consult yourself as we go along. I'm now going to give you the library references and these are the same in both examination libraries. The reference already given under item one for items two, three and four. pd 030 is for the examining authority second written questions. The Library Reference for the applicants responses to our second written questions is rep 6065. The Library Reference for comments of Suffolk County Council as local highways authority is rep 6092. For item three parts C and D we may refer to the applicant's revised outline access management plan, rep six zero 12 and updated swept path analysis rep 6066 a datum four we will be referring to the sizeable projects cumulative impact assessment node traffic and transport submitted by the applicants a deadline six, which is rep 6043. If anyone does refer to any of the documents, if you could please give the library references at the start of your submissions that will enable everyone to look them up and to follow. Next to breaks, we plan to have a short break at around 1130 and then a lunch break at approximately one o'clock, followed by an afternoon break if necessary. And finally, there are quite a few parts to each of the core agenda items two to four. So to ensure that we are able to complete this common agenda satisfactory, we would be grateful if you could be concise when making your submissions today. In that respect, I'm going to remind everybody that we have cast the net of invitations reasonably widely for this hearing on the basis that a number of interested parties have raised traffic and transport planes So far, however, like the previous hearings this week, this hearing is an issue specific hearing that is primarily to ensure that the technical positions of the applicants and the county Council's experts, as the Highway Authority are fully understood. Whilst we will seek comments on their positions, we would ask that those are confined to the technical points at issue. There's no need to repeat any points that have already been made. And I'm going to ask the participants to introduce themselves. If organisations attending today have a number of representatives, could I ask that you nominate a lead representative to introduce your team on behalf of your organisation? Because I know that for a number of the organization's here today, we do have

several different individuals that we may wish to contribute during the course of proceedings. It would also be helpful if you could let us know at which point in the agenda you anticipate participating. Could I check the name of the main speaker that we have representing the applicants today please?

05:59

Good morning, Madam colonists. partnern chefchaouen, appearing on behalf of the applicants. I'm instructed by Fiona coil divisional solicitor at SPR. In terms of others speakers who may be speaking today. The primary speaker on behalf of the applicants will be Andrew Ross. He's a transport planning Technical Director for alpha screening with over 30 years experience in highway engineering. He has an extensive prior career in the public sector, before joining raha scaling in 2008. He has a particular expertise in dealing with the transportation issues associated with major infrastructure projects and has been involved in Hinkley c East Anglia three Dogger bank offshore wind farm Norfolk Vanguard, Norfolk Borealis ether West and Sirius minerals project, given his extensive project experience. He's also recently been co opted to chair the task group set up by EMA to update national traffic environmental impact guidance. The second speaker on behalf of the applicant will be Brian McGregor, who's the onshore consents manager freestyling. The attorneys time we have one north as a regular time to hear I don't say anything further about Mr. McManus. Thank you.

07:16

Thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. Okay, can I turn to Suffolk County Council, please?

07:26

Morning, Mr. Jones. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed on behalf of Suffolk County Council. And today primarily you'll be hearing from Mr. Steve Mary, the transport policy and development manager who you've obviously heard from before, and he may be assisted by Mr. Joseph off as h Mu GH who is a senior transport planner. And I may contribute on part. We do have two preliminary matters we'd like to clarify about the scope of some of the agenda items and obviously deal with those inappropriate time.

08:03

No, not finished introductions. Mr. Bedford. Can we turn to East Suffolk County? Please?

08:15

Good morning, Madam

08:15

Namie. Good Isa Council. I'm the senior energy projects officer and will be primarily obviously deferring to the county council as the local authority on all technical matters in this regard so I'll probably in the background and raise my hand should I just wish the same thing.

08:35

Thank you.

08:36

Thank you for letting me know was called next to Old Town Council please.

08:50

Good morning, madam. Ladies and gentlemen. Hello, Marion fellows representing over town council. Thank you.

08:59

Thank you.

09:03

And next to malford parish council please

09:10

Good morning Madam I'm Richard Cooper representing moulds fluid parish Council and I may want to speak on the agenda item two D three, a four a and 4g. Thank you.

09:27

Thank you, Mr. Cooper. And I do believe that you're also here representing yourself as well as the council.

09:35

I think my views will be similar to those of the council so we can probably just take them as council views.

09:41

No problem. Thank you. Thank you. Okay am tending next to Snape parish Council, please.

09:53

Good morning. Tim beach chair of Snape parish Council. At some point if I can chair I'd like to reflect my own qualification to speak in terms of transport and traffic matters. Just having heard the applicants reflect some of that. But the items I wanted to speak on were three, primarily around transport. And probably number four on the cumulative impact

10:20

is to reach would you would you like to see a list of qualifications now as the applicant has done?

10:25

But okay, I'm not sure it's entirely relevant, but I've been asked to reflect them. I was a police officer for 30 years in Suffolk as a constable and to up to Chief superintendents. In that period I've policed including traffic matters across the county. Since I've retired, I am a police volunteer, and contributes something called Community speedwatch. Do that currently, which is what he says on the tin, where we volunteer to monitor traffic speeds and report them. And I do that specifically on the a 1094. And the B 1069. With a group of other volunteers. So in terms of I think the title is expert by experience, but

there's no formal qualifications, but I do understand the road traffic infrastructure and have done for 4045 years. Thank you.

11:23

Thank you very much, Mr. beech. If I could have the representative for the Burton and East parish at least bridge parish council please.

11:36

Yeah, Hello, madam It's Paul Collins from seminary nice bridge parish Council. I want to speak on some design of the mitigation of legacy within saboten in particular. And my knowledge of of the of the traffic in this area comes through the fact that I actually run the speed indicator device and know that traffic volumes throughout there and the speeds that they appear through the village Thank you.

12:08

Thank you very much. And turning to Stacy's, please.

12:16

Good morning, madam. My name is Michael Marnie. I'm representing Stacy's today, together with Bill Horford. We will be speaking on different items within agenda item three. And also on agenda item four.

12:33

Thank you very much. Mr. Mani. Could I have the main four C's please?

12:44

Good morning, everyone. My name is Fiona Gilmore, representing sofic energy action solution CS. And we have one technical speaker today, Councillor john truck 14 a lecturer in applied mathematics at the Open University and we would like to talk on three in particular B, D and I and item four on cumulative impact. Thank you.

13:15

Thank you very much Miss Gilmore. And to save our standings please. Yes, good

13:25

morning, Paul Chandler sizable gap resident and also representing save our soundings I finally managed to reread my my system so I was able to join you today. I really wanted to join you yesterday but couldn't couldn't make it but at least I'm here today. I'd like to speak on items three e four A and A but may wish to comment on other items as they rise. As I'm now using my camera my phone rather than a webcam. I don't appear to have a hand so if I do the comment, I will just turn on my camera if that's acceptable

14:05

to absolutely no problem. Mr. Chan does do that. Thank you. Okay, and finally to be over society, please. Good morning, madam.

14:26

Good morning.

14:27

I'm Paul bunker's to Ross, Secretary of the obrah Society. I'm here with Katherine Mackey, my Chairman, but she is called away for work at the moment. We are mainly here to listen to the presentations by the applicant and the council's but we may wish to ask questions on some items in agenda items three and four. Thank you.

14:49

No problem if you just raise your hand if you do have any questions to let us to let us know.

14:55

Thank you very much.

14:56

Thank you. A general reminder for all our speakers today each time you speak, could you please just say your name until you represent and this will help anyone watching the hearing to follow proceedings. That is the introductions are now complete. I will return to Mr. Bedford, who sent you had a couple of preliminary matters he would like to raise.

15:26

Thank you, Mr. Jones, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Yes, it's just questions of clarification on the scope of how you wish to hear from as on two matters in relation to the agenda items. The first one relates to malls food. And if you see the agenda item two D, when it's dealing with the regional freight strategy, and abnormal indivisible load and HDV is has as item D, the need for additional works at malford. And then item three, the local freight strategy and looking at both construction and operation and Item a, in relation to moles, furred need for an extent of works. And obviously, as you will appreciate, at malford. In terms of the the latest information from the applicant, there are two discrete issues. One is the moles footbridge over the a 12. And the question of strengthening works in order for it to accommodate AI ELLs in in particular or other heavy loads. So that's one issue and one set of works proposed. And the second is the more recent works of pedestrian immunity mitigation at malls offered by barefoot footwear improvement works and similar. What we weren't quite clear about from just the way that it's worded in the agenda is whether under both of those items that refer to malls food, you would expect to hear from us on both of those works, or whether you would expect to hear let's say in relation to the bridge works under item two D and in relation to the pedestrian immunity works under item three, a. I say it's just a question of clarification so that we can obviously make sure that we answer you and help you appropriately. So that's the first point I

17:35

think my colleague, Mr. Rigby is going to reply to you on that.

17:41

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. That's very useful. The attention was frightened to to be very broad brush overall in terms of need. And in item three to get down to the details, if that will assist you was basically an item which establishes why there is a need to do work at miles road. And then item three gets into more detail about what would be needed and why and how it might be done and or more of a detail. If that recessed.

18:10

Yeah, that's helpful. Obviously, Mr. Merry can hear that. And obviously, you can reflect on that in the comments he wants to make. Thank you. Thank you, both Mr. Rigby and Mrs. Jones for that, then the second point relates to item three, H. And simply the reference to access is to cable route, section three B. And we are just wanting clarification, that is the section of cable run. Effectively, it's between the B 1122. And slow lane, south of fishes. Lane, which would then appear to be accesses six and seven are the subject of that rather than access number three, which coincidentally there is an access number three, but that's obviously not in that location. So just clarification as to which accesses you were particularly wanting to explore in relation to that item.

19:16

Second, Thank you, Mrs. Jones. Yes, that item is really relating to the choices that still have to be made. Access number two is that the stand and we understand that that's in relation to the use of the 100 River and access to them and nine is on snake road, which is to land to the Western 100 River. The issue I think for the applicants is access from the BLM 22 in order to a section of the cable route, which is relatively short section runs each side of the BLM 22 between the 100 River and I think some parts of the west of the BLM 42

20:03

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rieger. That that is helping and again, Mr. Mary's heard that and can obviously reflect that in the comments that he made. Thank you. Thank you for that those were our procedural queries.

20:14

Thank you very much. Mr. Bedford. I can also see that Mr. Cooper had his hand raised.

20:21

Yes. Just a very brief point of clarification. When Mr. Bedford made his remarks, he referred to the Bridgette miles for being over the age of 12. It is of course over the river or, or not crossing the a 12. Thank you.

20:42

Yes, I apologise. That was that was me being too too succinct and getting it wrong. Thank

20:48

you for clarifying that. Mr. Cooper, can I just ask you to lower your hand please?

21:02

Thank you. Before we run back to Mr. Rigby to conduct the main business of these hearings. Does anyone else have any questions of a preliminary nature about today? In that case, I'm going to hand back to Mr. Rigby

21:24

and I got put on mute all by myself again. So I hope everyone can hear me okay. I've unmuted myself. Thank you very much, Mrs. Jones. Good morning, everyone. My name is Guy Rigby. And I'll be leading agenda items two, three and four today, which is sort of the meat of the agenda really. These hearings on the traffic and transport aspects of these projects are being held as part of an examination of an application by East Anglia one North limited for an order granting development consent for the construction and operation of East Anglia, one North offshore wind farm, and also as part of the examination of an application by East Anglia to limited for an order granting development consent for the construction and operation of East Anglia to offshore wind farm. Both these projects are nationally significant infrastructure projects under sections 1415 of the Planning Act 2008. And age consists of an offshore array of wind turbine generators and associated infrastructure, subsea offshore cabling to landfall near Thorpeness. Underground onshore cabling to a substation at Friston and then connection to the National Grid by means of a new grid connection substation, which is also at Frustum. So the way I propose to conduct proceedings is I will hear first from the applicants in response to questions that I have. And I will then hear from Suffolk County Council as high res authority and then from interested parties in the order on the agenda. And this agenda is common to both projects. And if necessary, I will go around and allow the applicants a brief reply to close out the item. So now on to agenda item two, which is rail, freight, regional freight strategy, or regional freight strategy for abnormal indivisible loads and heavy goods vehicles. Under this item, we'll hear from the applicants and Suffolk County Council on choice of ports, choice of mode, which is road rail, short sea and beach loving facility, item C, which is the resulting consequential aisle routes and movements, including through less than item D the need for additional works at miles furred. But as I said earlier in generic terms, just establishing that there is a need and why that need is there. And then the consequential effects in terms of good planning and integration and good design if you like. And I propose to hear from other parties at the end of the item, bearing in mind that this is essentially a technically specialist item, where the examining authorities need to briefly button out certain outstanding issues. Item three is a more local consideration of issues where we will seek the views of interested parties other than the local Highway Authority. We'll be referring to our secondary questions which is Mrs. Jones as mentioned earlier is reference PD oh three Oh, the applicants responses to our second written questions. The comments of Suffolk County councillors local highways authority. And for item three parts C and D will be referring as I think you've already been advised to the updated swept path analysis, as well as item four to the size of our projects cumulus Impact Assessment note, which came in at deadlines six. And again, a plea if anyone does intend to refer to any other documents. Please give the library references a heads up as soon as you can so that people can have a look for it and follow. So vital to a this is the chapter of port. Firstly to the applicants, we note that the outline access management plan has been updated at deadlines six rep 6012 to include consideration of the base sport to be used. So firstly, if you could explain what you meant by port construction and quotation traffic, I wasn't sure if that was a misprint or what? And also you refer to the offshore development area. But is it intended the port construction traffic management and travel plan will also apply to onshore activities? In other words with stuff going through the ports both ways, if you could respond to those preliminary questions, please to the applicant.

25:58

Good morning, sir. And under Ross on behalf of the applicant. I'll pick up the quotation quote first, that's clearly a typo. And I'll clarify in a moment what that actually is. With regard to the outline, Port construction traffic management plan that's designed to deal with a range of offshore activities. So based on feedback from East Anglia warm, the offshore port activities are likely to include delivery of turbine components, assembly of towers, that's fine.

26:54

That's all understood it was just a case of whether it would apply to onshore activities as well as offshore. That was what I was wanting to bottom out.

27:03

It would start in

27:05

your making about the offshore stuff.

27:08

It would imply a lot the last point I was gonna say was crew, crew transfer transfer vessel. So it would it would relate to the traffic demand, onshore traffic demand that is generated by those activities.

27:27

Thank you. I was just wondering whether there was any way that you might be importing through the ports for onshore activities, and whether that would also be included.

27:40

So in terms of importing through the ports, the the assessment contained in in chapter 26, which is AP oh seven six that assigned HGV vehicles outside of the study area, on the a 12. both North and South 100% of hg V's work were assigned south towards Felixstowe and Ipswich and 100% of hgvs were assigned north towards a lot of stuff and Great Yarmouth.

28:33

Yeah, that's, that's fine. I was just wondering whether it works for goods coming from Felixstowe and Lowestoft as well as to because you mentioned going to the port

28:44

Yes, origin destination. The the base assumption was that because of the volume of bulk material, it is likely to have a port origin. There are local suppliers. But the feeling is that they won't be able to meet all the demand. And local suppliers will have permitted development rights to generate HGV movements. If you if you think of a for instance, a gravel pit, they have permitted rights up to a certain amount of HCV movements a day. So those those trips are effectively already on the network is saying the worst case that all the traffic would be generated at the port areas. Then those flows were assigned to the highway network and as I say, to give absolute flexibility we assigned 100% to the north and

100% to the south. Therefore, yeah. That created the If you Rochdale envelope if you like in creative the assessment envelope in which the contractor could could choose the supply chain so, yeah, yeah no

30:17

yeah I understand that that's right. next storm in your response to our examination question 218 seven on the subject. We note your useful explanation of the government's water preferred policy for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads, which is operated by highways England on behalf of the Department for Transport and how it applies to these applications. So as the shortest feasible Highway Route must be used, and as low status to closest port capable of handling and IRL. Our understanding is your left, therefore promoting Lowestoft as your preferred route with Felixstowe assessed as a contingency. And as you said, just in case you've put 100% of the movements on to both those origins and destinations, is that correct?

31:23

That is correct. But the 100% refers to HGTV. Yeah, movements. The movement of special order AI ELLs will be absolutely if it lowers staff is available at the time of order. It will be used. Yeah, it's quite quite simple as if it's not the next nearest is Felixstowe. And therefore, that is it serves as a contingency route. Yes,

31:59

yes, it under the the application procedure, presumably, you'll have to use Lowestoft if it is available. And you will then make a case of it isn't to use the next nearest port for your fuel movements.

32:13

Absolutely correct. There is a further application process that needs to be submitted to highways England to gain permission for, for the movement of special order AI ELLs, something like a minimum 10 weeks notice to allow them to consult with regional authorities, police, etc. And the Highway Authority. But as we pointed out, the leading time is a minimum of 12 months for the transformers.

32:47

So the critical thing won't be actually the Transformers themselves, won't it?

32:52

Yeah. And it provides ample ample window to plan, plan these movements and ensure that all stakeholders are up our arc content before before it's undertaken.

33:06

And based I'm just thinking based on your experience on other projects. What's your feeling at the moment is how likely it is that those stuff will be available? Are you able to give us any more of a heads up on that at the moment?

33:23

Um, it's difficult. Difficult to say I would say there's a pretty good opportunity because it served heavy home movements for for a number of years, I guess where the applicant is taking a cautious approach because commercially, you don't know whether someone might get in there first and take the slot or Yeah. Or it might check in the poll might change, change hands and they might decide they want to do something different with the heavy haul key. But I would say there's a pretty strong possibility that it would be lower stuff.

34:08

Hmm. Thanks for that. Now you've said that, yes, I think I've covered all I need to cover just after the moment. So thank you very much for that. That's very useful clarification. Mr. Ross. And if I could go to Suffolk County Council please. If you have any comments to make, in particular. Do you think that a port construction traffic management plan and or a port travel plan will be required because I notice in the in the in the writing, it's sort of an if if the council would require it sort of thing.

34:55

Sir, Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, I'll bring in Mr. Mary in a moment. Sir, just as a point of detail, I don't think Mr. Ross actually answered, although he tempted us with what the result of the typo was. Yes. Thank

35:10

you for reminding me. Yes. If I could briefly go back to you. Mr. Ross. I'm sorry. I misheard. I understood you were going to come back to that later when you take some advice. He was able to

35:22

sell that now. I am yes, I do apologise. operation. Ah,

35:33

books are Yes. That's, that's Yes. That's an interesting one that Yeah, we've we've had a few typos ourselves. So it's actually quite an interesting one that Yeah, like, yeah, thanks for that. That makes complete sense. Now,

35:42

I shall chastise our quality assurance people. And that's

35:46

why they might be Google trying to tell you how to spell things. I mean, who knows? Thanks for that. That's really useful. So yes, thank you very much, Mr. Ross. And if you could confirm that anyway, when you put your submission in. And thank you very much. Mr. Bedford. Please continue.

36:03

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk. County Council, then on the matters that Mr. Ross raised in relation to how they see the outline port construction traffic management plan. And its scope. Certainly, we see it is that there is a potential for as it were two way traffic movements, from and to the ports to clearly impact on the county Council's highway network. So we would certainly see the port

construction traffic management plan as dealing with and sends traffic in both directions in and out. And therefore potentially applicable to materials coming for the onshore activities as much as materials going to the offshore activities. But on the point that you raised to us about whether such a plan would be needed. Certainly, our view is it is very likely to be something that is needed. And certainly, if the port concerned was a port in Suffolk, which on the basis of what Mr. Ross has been saying, would seem to be more likely than not, then I think we when we were consulted, would expect to require such a plan. There is as you will have seen from the documentation still NSU outstanding, that the applicant hasn't actually committed to a port or indeed to a port in Suffolk. And there is therefore still a little bit of an issue between us as to whether there is secured consultation with the County Council on the need for such a outline port construction traffic management plan. So that's that's the overarching position. But I bring in Mr. Mary, if he's got any specific comments in the light of what he's heard.

38:15

Thank you.

38:22

Hello, Good morning, sir. It's Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council. I was just waiting for my camera to come on. It just has only a few comments to add to what sir Mr. Bed putted on our behalf. One of the things we are conscious of is how a the port, the outline port construction, traffic management and travel plan fits in with permitted development from ports, which is something that would come out in so the round of things. The main concerns we would have is less to do with the construction materials because we're imagining things like the sand and gravel that's needed for most of construction will come from quarries. So that has been covered in appendix 26, which is the environmental statement, which covers the transport. So the main transport issues we're looking at are the sub movements in and out to do with a set of construction of the wind turbines, the offshore side of things. So that'd be the main concern. And also the workers associated that which is within within the title, the issue I just mentioned, it's more to do with the operational side of it. Beltsville yard is the main location where loaded or unloaded in Lowestoft, and it's just as a point of fact is that the two basketball bridges in Lowestoft, neither of them are suitable for large abnormal loads. I can't remember what the exact threshold is, but I'm pretty sure it's 100 tonnes for the mud fidlock bridge which is ours and I don't know for housing was bridge on the a 12 The final point I'd make is that, yeah, we are considering in this examination or you're considering this examination, a one and a two. But there's also the the wider aspect of this of how all of the activities and it's a constant theme we've we've put in our representations about the sort of the global Suffolk energy coast and also the northern energy coast, about how this fits into the wider round of things. And that's within the assessment. So far, they have covered very much the transport to the cable site, the landing site on the coast and the substation. But there's so lack of clarity on some things, this port activity, but also some of the known unknowns, like the master bridge, which we'll come back to later. So that was just a point I wanted to reinforce. So thank you.

40:51

Yeah, thanks for that. Thank you very much, Mr. Merrick. And we'd be able to revisit that under item four, I would think, where we're trying to work out or how all the projects will fit together. So thank you

very much for that. So next, really, our Suffolk County Council and I suffer council consent with the current outline that has been put in in terms of Port construction, traffic management, and port travel.

41:24

Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. So in terms of principles, yes. But as I say, there are still some points of detail. And I said, we've raised this point about reference to a mismatch between what is proposed in the requirements what's proposed in the language of the plan as to liaison with the County Council, if it is a non Suffolk port, which is ultimately utilised. I think that that's appointment I think we've raised on a number of occasions. Yes.

41:52

Yep. Yep. Thanks very much. Yes, we've we understand that? Yes, it's all it's all to do with Suffolk County Council early exercising jurisdiction over Suffolk and not over the wider area. So yes, we have that point. And thank you. Thanks very much. So just to close out item two, a, would the applicants care to respond to anything that they feel they need to respond to at this point, please?

42:24

Thank you, sir. Under Ross, on behalf of the applicant, just a few points, there

42:37

seems to be some confusion about materials that might come via the port to service the onshore construction activities as opposed to traffic demand that's generated by the offshore construction activities. With regards to the latter, it is it is by no means certain that that baseball activity will it will occur within within Suffolk and as it says in all I represent the applicants representations that this is still to be determined. To answer the question, is it required? Well, if you take the port of home poll, for example, where Siemens have invested a lot of money in the offshore wind farm activity, if that was to be the base for offshore construction activities, you wouldn't need a construction port construction traffic management plan, because it would be covered within the permitted development and you would just need to to evidence that in terms of consulting, Suffolk well there is reference to the relevant or authorities which may or may not be Suffolk but we have put an extra note clause if you like in the in the outline for construction traffic management planet power, paragraph eight that specifically notes that Suffolk County Council must be consulted.

44:46

Thank you.

44:49

Okay, anything else the applicant wishes to say?

44:55

Morning, brian ross productions I just clarify the point on the grits. We do anticipate the aggregates for the onshore construction works to be sourced from the from the regional area, as opposed to being imported Fiat fireboats just wanted to bring that up.

45:13

Thanks very much. So if we could just move on to item to be now she's really quite a quick one to be honest. So really, what I'm trying to bottom out here is how and when following the need to comply with the government's water preferred policy, which we refer to you then made choices in respect of the use of road rail and short sea trips, maybe to a beach Landing Facility close to the proposed site. And whether and if so, how these choices have influenced the actual applications themselves. Is that understandable, the applicant please.

46:00

Thank you, sir, under refer on behalf of the applicant.

46:04

Yes, yes, it

46:04

is understood. So, as you quite rightly point out, national policies to see whether materials can be transferred by rail or water before examining road base freight rail was examined, but it was not not considered viable for the project's great demand. This was based on the location of the existing railhead at least and which would, if utilise would serve to induce HTV moving movements on local routes to the west at least, and to access the cable route and potentially could increase HTV vehicle kilometres on on local roads. So, unintended consequences of removing them from regional routes could create an awful lot of demand on local roads. And it was also considered that there was a number of challenges as can be evidenced in size while C's application regarding line upgrades, load in storage, securing train past and potential environmental knock on impacts which widget indicated that it was not a proportional approach for the scale of the projects and material demand. Water similarly, if we're looking at some beach landing or marine offloading, facility mould was equally not considered viable. And again, the issue is that it's unlike sighs well see, when we're not looking at the single origin and destination to unload Volkmar type materials, this is a linear project with a number of access points, which is which is landlocked in places and has other constraints. So, that means that a Morph would only partially serve the onshore cable route protection potentially sections one or two. But similar to rail would induce HDV movements on the local road road network and on some routes could be as much as doubling the HDB demand. And again similar to rail, there is the the truck traffic demand generated by construction constructing the piece of infrastructure. So So in terms of complying with the water based strategy, activities were focused at poor origin and have the appropriate facilities to deal with them with the project's demand. In terms of the road base mode, the applicant has applied a hierarchical strategy examining network performance, and its utilise the Suffolk Laurie road network. And interesting fact is that 90% 96% of peak HGTV demand is online. lorry route networks are only a very small percentage of the of the delivery routes are located on non non designated HGV routes. And this, this aligned to a whole route, which runs the majority length of the cable cable route safe for the land locks. And carefully chosen access points as ensure that there's the embedded mitigation, which has kept HGV movements on local routes to to a minimum and away from sensitive communities and, and again, from another factor in we're actually looking at a 5% increase in total traffic only on the a 1094. Thanks, that's very helpful. Just going back to the

51:04

the see the short see aspects whether you'd consider using short See, in conjunction with the haul roads so that you're thereby getting rid of a lot of the heavy goods traffic on the local network. As you can new you can use the short sea and then use the haul road.

51:31

The issue is the land lock in the hundreds river and other constraints would would would mean that you would have to gain access to the west of of the whole the whole the cable route in some way, which would force that HGV traffic out onto onto local roads. So, did

52:02

some Did you look at some running the whole road across the 100 River at all said you could go the entire length

52:11

and then putting aside environmental constraints the the engineering investment would be quite substantial to do that coupled with a mall it's given that the the traffic demand can be contained on the designated lorry route network that that it was felt that it would be disproportionate to for the to put in major infrastructure that would be significant traffic generator in its own right and have knock on environmental impacts are similar colleague was gross. Nice. Thanks.

53:08

Yeah. I got to add to that please. Thank you.

53:12

Yes bramah grouse productions. The other consideration is of course the SBA itself soundings SBA on behalf effect play a lockout at the soundings SBA, where we do not have a whole route going across the assembly industry today the environmental sensitivity or environmental interests and not area is a sunset very much a balance of proportionality. Given that given the given the lockouts and given the the number of vehicles required to deliver seven materials to the to the facility. The doors locked guards both at the 100 River on the SBA ecologically are running that case to maintain those locks for the purpose of these projects.

53:58

Yes, yes. Thanks for that. That's that's useful clarification. If I could pass to Suffolk County Council, if they have any comments that bottom make on that submission.

54:12

Thank you, sir. Mike Baptist Suffolk County Council I bring in Mr. Mary, we understand clearly the policy position and the policy preference. But we also understand the practicalities that have just been referred to and clearly we wouldn't want to see, as it were. Solutions being promoted which had the indirect effect of increasing HTV traffic on local roads. So I just bring in Mr. Murray in cases, specifically he wants to now comment on in the light of what we've just heard.

54:43

Thank you.

54:44

Good morning, sir. Seabury from Suffolk County Council. Thank you Michael first introduced me just a couple of comments I'm from the County High Risk perspective is yes, we do regret there's not more use of rail and and see but With the location, we can understand that one of the points that we would certainly like to be explored if that is possible is that EDF if they are permitted, or like to have a beach landing facility for their f a site, or C, and certainly for the larger load. So, we'll come on to this in a minute about the 280 to 10 transformers. But if there was any way that the two, three projects could coordinate their activities, so that that could be exploited, that would certainly remove the issue about bringing such a large load down through the a 12 and the B 1122. So that can only be an advantage. And in terms of sort of trying to minimise road transport, also, whether there are any winds, I appreciate this would be mostly suppliers to the project. But again, with size was a lot of work going on to minimise HGV movements. And that will tend to direct supplies hopefully to using more sustainable transport. So rail and see, for example, delivery are some of the aggregates, possibly even rail delivery of concrete powders, but it is a little bit of an unknown. I would also I presume that Mr. Ross was referring to the 90% of SPR movements being on the soft glory routes, which would be welcome. I'd be lovely to be 100%. The other comment is just on a technical basis, I do appreciate having been involved with this in the past is that to bring abnormal loads down haul roads, they really would have to be very well engineered our 292 10 transformer, certainly, I think would struggle on an unbound haul road, which is what I understand the applicants are providing for this project. So they were the comments I was gonna make from a technical background.

56:50

Thank you very much. Mr. Mehra. That's very helpful. Indeed. So I think is do the applicants wish to say anything more on item to be before we move on?

57:05

I brown grounds for applicants. Just to follow up on Mr. Mary's point on collaboration with Sorry,

57:10

my cameras, right. My hand is raised before the applicants finishes, please, sir.

57:16

Yes, we, as I said at the beginning, we'll come to interested parties at the end of item two, if that would be okay. I want to hear all the technical aspects as to how we've got where we got, and then we can open it up at the end of this item. Thank you.

57:32

If I if I could just briefly interject on that point. So there's all interested parties are completely clear. And the way that we're conducting these hearings this week is slightly different in character to previous hearings, where essentially, we are very strongly focused on expert technical review. We're passing through expert technical review, where we're flipping backwards and forwards between the applicants,

relevant technical experts, and in this case, the highways experts from the county council. Once we have drawn all of that material out across the entirety of an agenda item, will then open the floor up for responses from other interested parties before we move on to the time to come in counsellor fellows will be at the end of agenda item two. And similarly then, Mr. Wrigley's intention will be to run agenda item three in the same manner, etc. And this is the way in which I ran yesterday's hearing. And indeed, Mrs. Jones ran the hearing on the day before. Is this the same general approach being taken to all technical hearings? So I just thought it was worth laying down that explanation before we proceed any further. So apologies, Mr. Quigley. I'll pass you back to Mr. McGregor.

58:45

Thank you very much, Mr. Smith for reinforcing my earlier message. That's great. Yes, please carry on. Mr. Magalies. Thank you.

58:53

Thank you our brown grass for the outcomes. In response to Mr. Mary's point on science while C, we would like to point out the statement of common ground was submitted a deadline one with Sizewell C, does identify both parties' intention through continuing to engage directly with each other during the design and construction of projects. So that any interface between the projects can be considered at an early stage recognising that it's in the interest of the applicants and sites will see as well as the wider community that all projects are coordinated as far as reasonably practical. But that's a statement of our intent to work to coordinate and work together where we can but also recognises that there may be other obstacles in place to actually delivering that solution but the the coordination and communication is absolutely agreed.

59:49

Thanks very much indeed. Is there anything further the applicant wishes to say at this point before we move on to item two sea ice? You know, ships. Right, let's move on to item two. See, this brings us to the applications before us and towards the opportunities to mitigate the residual impacts. So first off a few short clarifications, I just wanted to bottom out. We note to the applicants your response to our examination question 218. Five. And in particular, your statement of highways England on behalf of the Department of Transport is concerned with your proposed routing of abnormal indivisible loads. Now, presumably, as the A12 is no longer a trunk road. This is in respect of highways, England's role to administer the high end heavy load route network on behalf of the Department of Transport. So that's it. Is that correct? Could you briefly confirm that for us?

1:00:53

Yes, that, that, that that is correct. And also they in rollers, trunk road administrators for the the A14 should Felixstowe contingency?

1:01:07

Yes, of course that remains. Thank you. If you'd like to remain on screen that might help because it's just a few short, sharp things here. Secondly, only the route you plan to use from low staffed which, as we understand is your preferred route, if possible. As far as level lovers lane is currently designated as hr 100. That's correct, isn't it? I think the other routes you're proposing are not designated.

1:01:32

Yes. Yes, indeed.

1:01:34

Thank you. And also, point three to confirm that highways England on behalf of DFT is not currently considering any requests to extend the routes. Is that correct?

1:01:49

That's correct. Yeah. So or any routes in England?

1:01:53

Yeah. There's a national thing is not just for here. Yes. Thank you. So for instance, for Ai L access from Lowestoft. There's no proposal to extend from lovers lane via at least under 1094 and Friston and for access from Felixstowe, which you would use if you needed to had to, there's no plan to extend up the 812 to Oxford, and then along the same route again.

1:02:22

That that's, that's that's correct. I mean, regardless of highways, England's priorities is unlikely. While the route would not qualify for the frequent use, that was set out by the the, the old circular 6172. The guidance was originally drawn together in response to national thoughts or authority study was really designed for frequent use Ai L routes,

1:03:00

we ask now understanding from submissions that have been made is that these routes are probably only used maybe once a year at the most. Would that be a reasonable assumption?

1:03:11

I can't really comment on on size well, C's sorry, B beg your pardon these demand. But suddenly, for the project, as we we've we've documented it will be

1:03:28

a

1:03:31

simultaneously it will be for for deliveries. Yeah, yeah. Julie, we too for each subsection?

1:03:38

Yes, of course. Yes. I understand that. Yes. I'm just trying to establish some sort of context. My understanding is that, that might that might be an increase in use, but we're not talking about very large numbers. In any event, we're probably talking about maybe one or two deliveries a year at the most. So yes, that's, that's quite helpful. Thank you. Yep, that you've covered that. So let's turn to the past of the proposed route, which runs along the B 1069. From the end of the HR 100. designation, and through least and so if I can keep on asking of the applicants, your report on the abnormal indivisible load

access to the onshore substation, which is in your application at a double p five to nine, I think that's what I would call the winds report indicates that it is physically possible to get an abnormal indivisible load through Leeson and under that footbridge, but it's having a look I just had one two things I wanted to ask you. First off, they've proved it's physically possible, but how would it work in practice? Would any street furniture in least need to be removed or replaced Does the assessment take account of obstructions such as Park vehicles? And what would happen if a low got stuck, for instance? So perhaps if you could offer some clarification on those points, please.

1:05:19

I suppose the first point to make is that, as I stated earlier, the lead in time, a minimum of 10 weeks under the highways England notification period. So, if there was a problem with parked vehicles, you could have plenty of time to issue notification to let people know when the movement will be coming through. The other key point is that these loads are of such a scale that police escort will be man Monday during. So and it's usually when it's entirely up to the forces resource, but usually two vehicles front and front and back. And they have powers to clear them. That said,

1:06:11

I just to interrupt briefly that and that going in such a distance, they can go to the next junction and make sure nothing gets in the way as it were.

1:06:18

Yesterday, effectively Close, close the road for him for a temporal period. That said, winds assessment indicates that there's there's not that there's not a notable street furniture removal required through leisten. Although there are there is on other parts of the route. And I'm sure we'll come on to the PPA agreement and obligations later. But part of those are the funding for the removal of highway streaming furniture and reinstating it. think in terms of least and the key things that came out was obviously as a level crossing. So there's standard Network Rail precautions required there. And yeah, there'll be part of the there'll be a stakeholder or key stakeholder to be kept. bridges on on in terms of high town to strange. And there's a lot of parking on on double yellow lines. So the usual thing with that is just to notify people, the softly softly approach we're coming down hard part on on an enforcement ruling. And the thing about winds, the reason we choose wins, apart from the fact that 150 years experience is there. Although they do have the holes themselves. They're effectively independent. And you will know from the report, they've examined three vehicles in the UK that are capable of trans transporting the 280 tonne load and some of which belong to their competitors. Yeah. They're effectively taking an independent view of the feasibility. I suppose the other points of no is the 290 10 Lowndes again applying Rochdale? Yeah, envelope,

1:08:53

the largest you think you'll you'll need?

1:08:56

That's that's definitely the ceiling for the assessment.

1:09:00

Thanks for that. And yes, if I could just quickly ask also, presumably the emergency services would have been consulted or uncertainty will be later on. And there will be some kind of emergency plan. And in terms of the planning performance agreement, which you're now entering into, he says it includes relocating and removing street furniture, but we've sort of covered that probably isn't going to be necessary and structural surveys to facilitate our movements. But would it also include any gauging or property surveys that might be needed if there were problems with large loads moving close to properties?

1:09:48

So primarily, I suppose, crudely, crudely speaking, wins assessment was feasibility From 333 dimensions, so width height and manoeuvrability of the of the vehicle, so that that first pass will have picked up if there are any issues with adjacent properties or structures that are in danger of a vehicle, a vehicle strike and nothing of nothing was really raised in that regard, notwithstanding there is this safety net or the the the I'll refer to it now from as the STL. system, which is the electronic application to highways England.

1:10:50

Yes,

1:10:51

yes, emergency, of course, emergency services. And it does set out the whole year, we'll have to set out a communication plan and protocols should the vehicle get into to difficulty on these things.

1:11:12

So what we're really saying is that that's very helpful. Thanks. Because what we're really saying here is that we don't need detailed requirements in the order because you will have to use the STL process anyway to be able to move anything.

1:11:25

Indeed, and the STL process is an application, it's not notification. So there are the it is a safety. Yes. You know, and I suppose the other point to mention is in terms of structures. The winds report has done some preliminary work on structures, but notes that further information needs to be gained as part of the application.

1:11:54

Yes. And we noted that they did have correspondence with Network Rail, and the answer there is a fairly firm know, in respect of the other route that was being considered. So that that's quite helpful as well, really, I suppose.

1:12:07

Yes. And, of course, if lower staff is the preferred route, you wouldn't use that structure anyway. Because? Yeah,

1:12:19

absolutely. I was just thinking in terms of the alternative that you might need to use that was actually quite helpful, even though it was negative it was it was useful to know the position there. So thanks very much for that in terms of the PPA, I suppose Yes, I think that I think that gets us where we want to go. I was just wondering if that if those things were necessary, would they be included in the PPA? Because I noticed it doesn't include them explicitly. Any or any involvement by the council's Isa Council in terms of anything they might have to do as a result of ayar movements?

1:12:58

I thought, I thought that GPA or certainly the preliminary text did did cover expenses relating to structures and

1:13:13

included relocating and removing street furniture and structural surveys to facilitate the movements. But that seemed to me to be a little bit open. And I was wanting just wanted to test whether it was your understanding, it would include the matters we've discussed. He wouldn't search a service wouldn't be just a highway structures, there might be of adjacent properties also.

1:13:36

Yes, anything. Any costs relating to the Ai L movement will be covered by that PPA?

1:13:44

No, that's very helpful. Thanks very much. Indeed. If I could move on back to Suffolk County Council please the Highway Authority if you'd like to make any comments in respect of what we've just heard.

1:14:00

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council I'm going to bring in Mr. Mary, to deal with this issue. Because we certainly seem to be moving into some of the detail of the Ai L operation and I think we do have a number of matters that Mr. Murray will want to bring to your attention.

1:14:17

Thank you very much.

1:14:20

Hi, Steve, Mary Suffolk County Council. Yes, there are some points would like to make I should try and put them in a coherent order. So starting with the HR route, they have preferred heavy load routes just a couple of things to note is the actual in practice route doesn't follow the HR route. The original one published back in the 80s goes down London Road south in low stuff but since then Tom Chris way and the HR have been diverted minor thing but may be of interest. So just to point out as you're aware, there's no equivalent route from Felixstowe. The ends also that route finishes at lovers lane As you're aware of a lot of what I say does refer back to the wins report, which is app five to nine. There's some very useful information in there and would actually commend them with the information that is in there. And it is clear from there there's there have been historical loads moved across the network, generally in the order of about 170 tonnes and I've come both from Felixstowe and Lowestoft to size oh and substation at least and what what has not been moved is anything of the order of the 282 tonnes which

is the the load that winds discussed in the report. And as it made the point is also the a 12 bascule Bridge and like, I think bridges, they are not available for heavy loads. Something also quickly point out as well is you refer to the rail bridge at the 1094. Now, my understanding is from the correspondence that has a weight limit of 100 tonnes, I think it is now that does leave a gap between the special order movements, which are 150 tonnes plus and 100 tonnes. So there would be a presumption that those loads would also come down through the B 1122. And B 1069. As part of the on structures have been a subject of considerable discussion, and what I've done is, and we'll submit this at a deadline seven in response to this this hearing. Meeting. deadline. Yes, sorry. Thank you go so fast. I forget.

1:16:28

The

1:16:30

I've got a good statement from our structural team, which I shall submit at that point. And what they do make it is very clear about the risks involved in this. So while they're correct is there is a long leading time, the approach the Suffolk County Council has is we've we manage our structures on a risk based approach, which is based on a national guidance, the well managed highway infrastructure guidance. And as part of that we do undertake structure reviews. But what it can mean is there is the possibility that infrastructure would fail one of those inspections that there could be a weight limit put on it short notice now, realistically, that's likely on the a 12, but as a potential on some of the smaller stretches, particularly where they're not. they've not been subject to historical, heavy load movements. And the other point, I will also say that, yeah, we do our best to endeavour this, but the concern would be is that there would have to be quite a long lead in time for the structures to be reviewed. And also to point out, it's not just the massive bridge. I think on the two routes combined, there's 54 qualifying structures have been made aware of that wouldn't need some some inspection. So it's effectively made clear to everybody, particularly the applicant about those risks are involved is there could be some significant work required to base both survey and to undertake any work necessary to try to get those work those large moves to be diverted loads to be moved. In the data and something else that wins mentioned, we we've talked a lot about structures and heights in particular, but it's also issue width. There are a couple of points, pinch points through leisten. There's the as you actually go into the footbridge, he does narrow up there and you have got some steep banks and walls on either side. And the one that particularly concerns me is the there's a narrow section on Hayling healings road or Hastings Hastings road in leisten. Where the carriageway I regrettably haven't been out to measure it. But from maps, he appears to be around five and a half metres or less. Yeah, and from recollection, a lot of the the overhang of the load was 5.8. So it would be overhanging the footways and those foot waves are quite narrow with houses next to them. Yeah. So that would be concerned, I would just point out as regards the sort of the likelihood of damage to houses and structures and non highway structures associated with these movements, I would see that very much as something that the District Council would be involved with. So I'd certainly support any involvement in them any planning agreements. And also say that it's the responsibility of the applicant to look at those issues rather than the hiring authority. Besides the work, there's also the the actual structural capacity of the road in terms of its strength. No heavy loads have been moved on some of these roads, particularly to be 1069 to be 1121 and the 10 1094. And as winds do point out, there is that structural crust and the risk of that being damaged. Again, it's something that in our view is manageable, and we would expect any damages to be

repaired. And that is part of this planning agreement. But the concern is that it could cause some considerable damage particularly on the unrestrained parts of the B roads where they're not curved. Most of our roads are traditionally involved. So they've never actually been designed. They're effectively hogging roads that have been surface dress and surface over the years. And one other aspect I did want to bring to your attention is, and again, I think this is a revolt resolvable issue, but it's something to be aware of is the level crossings, we do have two level crossings on this route besides the a 12 dartium. So there's one on the 1122, a Middleton more. But there's also the one at in laced in itself on station road. The a 12 is labelled as either side. So loads can pull in and phone, this signal man and get permission to move. The 1122. Middleton does not nor does station road in licence, the licence one less of an issue because this is better, it's not very much used. Lift is used by size, well, presumably the green railroad to be opened by then. But there is a question of the the actual management of the load and quite how that's integrated with the Network Rail. But I'm presuming that is something managed by sort of a method statement. So the other main was, one final point is in terms of police escort, yes, we'd expect these particular special order movements, they would have to be police escorted, because they will be straddling the double white line systems on a lot of these roads, the 1122 and even the a 12. Also, they would have the power to move cars. But I would also suggest that one of the other reasons to involve he suffered is they actually now the organisation that manages parking, so they manage these of

1:21:33

the parking attendants that can issue tickets and move cars. So that may be of interest. And also not forget, it's also the overhead cables that they would need some some work on. And in our representation, final point is we have mentioned also going back to house, something I did forget to mention. Also prior to opening of the to village bypass, if that is delivered if site or does go ahead. It's also pertinent to note that large loads may need to go through farm and it has been swept up as done that, and there is clearance but only just I think it was 200 mil from memory, which is quite concerning. So I think they were the main points. Yeah, that's what I've got written down. So thank you very much.

1:22:23

That's really helpful. While you're here, just to say thank you for your useful responses that deadline segues to Suffolk County Council. Just I know, it's only a very small thing. But in respect of part A of your response in paragraph 2.3. You say there is a corresponding route from Felixstowe to sighs Well, I presume you mean there's no corresponding route? sighs well,

1:22:58

knows it. Yeah, so there is no preferred route from Felixstowe to si as well. But it has been used in the past.

1:23:08

Yeah, fine. And you did attach a hyperlink. But see, it will be useful if you could attach the PDF because the hyperlink wasn't actually working for us. I think it's really a relation to the heavy, heavy and high load route network, I think you'd be a diagram. And also, in respective of Part B, thank you for your useful reminder, your paragraph 2.4 of your submission, telling us about the loads that have been delivered 166 tonnes and 170. I think, just useful to have some background as to what's actually been

moved. I'm assuming we spoke about it earlier, but I'm assuming that the load that was moved 2018 from Felixstowe did use the route that's been proposed by the applicants in other words, the a 20 Oxford and then down from there, would that be something you'd know about or or or not?

1:24:04

I don't know the exact details, but based on the description, it was moved to the licence substation, I'm presuming that was a licenced substation next near to size. Well, yeah, we followed the a 12 to the Oxford and then hr 102. sighs

1:24:18

Well, yes, of course. Yeah. Thanks very much. That's very helpful. Also, the you're confirming that in paragraph 2.5, your submission that you don't actually have a legal duty to keep the heavily the HR 100 rooms open. It's so I just thought that was important. Just Just to note that so that given the above, are you as the Highway Authority for the roads in question, consent with the approach taken by the applicants in respect of not establishing any new our routes, and are you content with the choice of routes, particularly through less than 10 lines? for up to frister

1:25:04

in reverse order, are we content with the routes, they are the least worst option, they appear to be the only option. We think the the damage in the history of disruption can be managed. But it's not to say there isn't damage and disruption. We have made point point in the past about the fact that in this examination, we are only looking at Scottish power, not a one north and a two. And we have concerns about the legacy and longevity and resilience of this route. If future development is going to come forward in this area. So effectively, the the route will be strengthened and made suitable for the passage of the three AI ELLs for this project. But then the other feature project will have to do the same. And there will be no resilient routes left in the future. So that that is of concern. In terms of the management of the abnormal loads, again, we were we are content, there is a way of doing this. But what we are trying to do is point out there are risks associated with this, particularly with regard to the structures.

1:26:13

Thanks. So that being the case. Are there any further items you'd like to see in the outline, access management plan? And the supporting plans? And are you content to leave the resolution of any associated outstanding matters to consideration post consent?

1:26:37

The first two items, respectfully, I would ask that we could reply today at deadline eight for that. I feel I'd have to reread them to my device. And in are they manageable? I think the answer is on the evidence. Yes, we are contented they are manageable.

1:26:58

Thanks very much. Indeed. That's very helpful. Now I know that Mr. Ross has his hand up. And I was in any event going to come back to the applicants to make any remarks on what we've just heard. And Mr. Ross, with the remarks on where we are up to now be relatively brief, and then I will take a break.

1:27:25

Thank you. I'll try and be brief and not what I take it with picking up miles but bridge after the break. And yes, we are.

1:27:34

I was just thinking I just thought you might want to reply in respect of what you've just heard from Mr. Mary.

1:27:39

Yeah, if I could reply to the generic point on on I LSB. Sir, and under Ross on behalf of the applicant, yet. Mr. Mary's comments on on AOL movement are, are useful and have been throughout throughout this process, the applicant is alive to the risks on on the a 12. With regard to structures, significant preliminary work has been done to identify the risks. And that's really where the multiple bridge issue comes from, in the based on the information supplied by sec structures. And examining the critical elements of the bridge aligned to the constrained access there. It's you can't get underneath that for inspections unless you're the highway or more authority. A precautionary approach was taken to identify that bridges maybe maybe needing mitigation, it's fine by no means certain. tonnage, we've mentioned tonnage quite a lot. But of course, we've AI hours the critical thing is the axle load in, and also how much of the load is applied to the structure. So if you've got a large span bridge, there's a bigger risk, because more of the axle load in a more of that total way will be applied to the bridge deck. So that's a great critical metric. It's less less about the tonnage, although obviously, bigger, bigger the envelope gets, the larger the vehicle.

1:29:49

Yeah, the outcome to that port later, I

1:29:51

think anyway, yeah, thank

1:29:51

you.

1:29:53

The 200 mil for famum Benz. Yes, that is tight. In recognition of that, we undertook a topographical survey there. So the sweat paths are based on topographical data. So we're, we're aware, we're confident that that tolerance, level crossings. I've experienced this yet you have to go through an approval in principle. So I can give Mr. Murray the assurance that there is a process that feeds into the STL process for for level crossings. And there is a long lead in time for Network Rail to turn around and approval approval in principle, it's took from my experience, three months is rapid. As there is approval in principle, two, for structural intervention quite a long lead in time. final point, if I may. So there's a commitment in the outline construction traffic management plan, meeting deadlines six to to comply with that style. So that your your catch all. Yeah, security, if you like.

1:31:22

Yeah, that's noted. Thank you very much. Indeed. Mr. Ross. That's very helpful. I do have some further things to ask you. But I think at this point, it is just one minute later, not quite on the button. But 1131. Could I suggest we come back at 10 minutes 12. And thank you everybody very much for your submissions so far. So we'll return 10 minutes to 12. Thank you very much, everyone.