

# TEXT\_ISH13\_EA1N&2\_Session4\_12032021

Fri, 3/12 5:50PM • 1:35:44

00:01

Good afternoon, everybody.

00:01

And welcome back to today's issue specific hearing 13 on traffic and transport, what he's doing one North and East Anglia to offshore wind farms. Before we resume at the end section of item free, can I just check with a case team that you can hear me and see me and then the recordings and live streams and live captions have started, please.

00:22

Hi, Jonathan.

00:23

I can confirm that the live streaming has started. I can see and you and the recordings and captions are working. Excellent.

00:31

Thank you very much, Emery. Okay, in that case, I'll now hand back to Mr. Rigby.

00:36

Thank you very much indeed. Mr. Hockley. And just to continue with the hearing of interested parties in respect of agenda item three. Next along is Mr. beech from slate, parish Council, please.

00:53

Thank you, Chair. Could I make a suggestion? Please tell me know if it's not going to work about some? I think, Mr. Trap john trap, you produce the report. The date was a detail look at the traffic on the 1894. He's going to ask to speak it was a report commissioned by says I don't want to repeat anything he's going to say unnecessarily. So it might help. Quite a few of us if he was allowed to speak prior to me. If not on, then I'm happy to

01:26

go ahead and say Who are you referring to please, sir. Mr. Trapp,

01:31

john

01:32

trap, who I think was here as an expert for says, No, we, on behalf of Fiona Gilmore.

01:41

I don't think we have in here this afternoon, but Fiona Gilmore is here. So perhaps we could invite her before you in that case was bgsu. slept

01:52

on Trump

01:54

available? Thank you. Excellent.

01:56

Right, when in that case, I'll be calling you when we get to seize. Thank you very much. I wasn't aware. Thank you very much, indeed. Thank you, Mr. beech. In which case, if I can move on to Mr. Collins first for February and eastbridge. parish council?

02:13

Sorry, Chair. I sorry. I would like to speak on my own behalf as well. I simply don't want to repeat some of the things that Mr. Trapp, I think he's likely to say based on his report. Okay. Just Just to be clear, you're here on behalf of snake parish council? Yes, I am. I am here

02:33

to hear you. For snake parish council after we've heard from CS. That's what you're saying? Isn't it? So you don't repeat anything?

02:42

Yes, it is. Do that.

02:44

Thank you very much. Thanks very much, Mr. beech. That's much appreciated. And in which case, if you can switch a camera off now and wait till we've heard from CS, and if I could invite Paul Collins from some sort of eastbridge, parish Council, please.

03:01

Yes, certainly, thank you very much for this opportunity to take the two things. It's Paul Collins from saboten police bridge parish Council. One thing that occurred to me during the discussion about the junction between the a 1096 and the A, and the, or the btn 96. And the a 1094. was what was the effect of all of those traffic, that traffic turning right off the a 1094 into the V 1121. Now, you might, if you've already discussed this at a previous meeting, that I wasn't there, then that that's, that's fine. But it does seem to me that that junction, which is after a blind Hill, coming across, when you're coming east from the Friday street junction, could be quite an impactful change, because very little travelling traffic now actually turns right at that junction. So I'd be interested in any comments on that.

04:00

Thank you very much. Yes, we have covered that in so far as its proposed to route, abnormal, divisible, indivisible loads that way. But there would obviously be a police escort and various other things happening. We've been solid evidence that it's not for hgvs. They're going down the 810 69 off the a 1094. But thank you very much indeed for making that point. And the applicant may well pick that up at the end when we give them the right of reply. Is there anything else you wanted to say to us,

04:36

I didn't know whether it was to be in this part or the next because it wasn't.

04:43

The next part is relating to cumulative impacts with other projects in so far, let me know about other projects.

04:49

And this was really about mitigation is planned for saboten in crossings and we are very concerned at the moment that actually one of the crops Things that is proposed between IV cottages and Manor Manor cottage is actually very, very close to a blind bend the GRP?

05:08

No way up. Yes, that's right. Yes,

05:11

at the junction of pretty road, and there was a discussion about how to deal with that. But the the general feeling is for three cottages. That is it a very in a very, very difficult place. Whereas the cumulative impact of all of those vehicles that will come, which is why I wasn't sure, when I talked about this, it would be much better if the if this crossing or a temporary crossing was placed further within the village. For the majority of the residents, it doesn't really make sense to put a load curb in a place which is going to encourage people to cross it what is a very difficult place to see what traffic is coming. And for the traffic that's coming from the North will not be able to see people waiting or crossing the road.

05:58

Yes, yes. Thank you for that. So yeah, we've we've been visited. So what you're really saying is it's further south up the hill towards the pub?

06:06

That's correct. There, there is some proposed changes to the corner on church lane. Yeah, it would make sense if it went just a bit further to the south of that. And even with some sort of control crossing, so that people would stop. And when traffic gets really bad, as was evidenced during the size will be build, getting out onto that road from places like church lane is extremely difficult. And hence the comment that you could put a hatching crossing in there, just for the period at which always assuming sizable sea is built on the before the link road is actually completed if that were allowed.

06:47

Yes, yes. Thank you for that. And you're quite right, because it applied as I read it, it would apply in any case, but it would be applied with more weight in the cumulative situation. But that's right. I mean, the problem even with just one of the applications.

07:02

Yeah. And it is it is true. We do monitor the speed through seven. And in general, as people come into the villages, it's greater than 40 miles an hour. And it's 40% of the traffic that does that. So yeah, the time they get there, they may be going slightly slower. Yeah. But when we've looked at average speeds, leaving the village as well, which we did for a couple of months, they're still going at 36 miles on our average. And that's 36% peculiarly of the vehicles that are doing it. So there is an issue of speeding through the village. And just after a blind bend, that's not a particularly good place to be.

07:40

Thank you very much, Mr. Collins. Thank you. So next I have Mr. Bongo is the wrath from the old British society, please.

07:59

Good afternoon, Mr. Rigby. Can you hear me? Okay? Yes, I

08:03

can hear you fine so

08:05

much. I'd like to start by thanking scottishpower renewables for replying to the email. We sent them about HDV movements, and which we attached to our last piece of written representation. We were very having some difficulty in understanding the numbers of HTV vehicles and their placing, but that email has helped to clarify it considerably. We do know however, have a few more questions. Firstly, we now understand that the plan for five plus five HGV movements at the oberer roundabout is a firm intention. And that is not nothing to do with the abnormal, indivisible loads, but only to do with normal HGV movements on which might be articulated. But we don't know for how long that provision would apply. Because we understand it's for the construction works at thorpeness itself, which is presumably fairly early on in the project. And we would like to know from the applicants how long the traffic of the oberer roundabout is likely to be continuing

09:26

the

09:28

in connection with the Ober roundabout, council fellows has mentioned, the pedestrian crossing and the parked cars. And it's fair to say passing traffic, even just cars outside the co op supermarket before you get to the roundabout on the 1094 causes problems sometimes people feel they need to wait. And so often there are delays in there, just with cars. So with hgvs that will be much more serious. reverting to the discussion earlier about the 1094 junction with the the 1069. I'm not at all convinced that this will be okay, with 135% increase in HGV traffic. It's an awkward turn as it's been recognised. And certainly, it

sounds as though it could be improved to some extent, with some environmental works. But it's in a dark place after a slope in both directions, and the bend. And I've seen near misses there. And I am surprised that there are fewer reports of accidents than I would have expected. I think it is a tricky place. And I think more than doubling the amount of HGV traffic there is a highly dangerous thing to imagine, unless more mitigation is undertaken. And probably it's very limited the least. Why we recognise that Suffolk County Council don't want to rule out the use of the B1094 for HGV traffic and push it all up to the Oxford and then back down towards Laced and because that would add to the problems in that area and number of inhabited communities. But we do think there would be big delays, with HGVs trying to pass each other in the narrow parts of that road after Friday Street, around Snake Watering and towards Snape. And this happens already from time to time when agricultural traffic in particular is on the road. And we could anticipate that becoming much worse with an increase in HGV traffic. And we also agree with Marianne Fellows that the cars have workers on the side and smaller than traffic will be a significant increase to overall traffic. And this would be a significant extra burden of traffic unregulated, which could cause considerable extra extra problems for the local community. As we've said in our written submissions, we don't think this is a suitable project for approval in any case, but we're trying to be helpful in the observations we're making in this technical session. And I hope that these points will be given consideration. Thank you.

12:43

Thank you very much indeed. Thanks very much. If you Oh, you have to hand down. Thanks very much. So next is Mr. Cooper, I believe for mass for parish Council. Thank you, sir.

13:01

I mean, the first thing that I would say in terms of traffic coming through MOSFET is that we need a four village bypass. But that's something we can come on to do. In the next session. Yeah. I am grateful to the applicant for coming forward with what they're proposing for Malzberg, which is two sections of footpath. But just picking up a comment that Mr. Murray may add, the southern, one of the two bits of footpath that they're proposing is on the southern side of the A12. On the on the farm cafe. So I mean, ideally, we'd like footpath on both sides of the A12. But if we have a choice, I think it would be better to be located on the north side, because then it gives an easier route into Wicker Market from the main part of the village. I mean, it's not ideal. Whichever way you do it, I think it would provide a more continuous route to Wicker Market if it was on the north side. Yeah. So we'd like both but if only one then on the north side.

14:27

Okay.

14:29

And I would endorse Mr. Bedford's view the work must take place before the construction. Traffic starts to flow. This is a section of road where there is already considerable fear and intimidation. And we've got a number of older people who cross the A12 and when I see them doing it, I have to tell you that my heart is in my mouth. So we desperately need some work done. And particularly in terms of crossing, but we'll come to that when we get to cumulative impact.

15:11

Thank you very much. Yes,

15:13

you are, of

15:13

course to put it in contracts. You're the one might say the first unimproved section of the a 12 after the dual carriageway section.

15:22

You're absolutely correct. I wish more people would recognise it.

15:26

No, we've we've, we've we've done inspections of all the highways around here. So that does become apparent. Thank you very much, Mr. Cooper, if you want to point out and next we have did the mister money from cc's please.

15:51

Thank you, Mr. Ruby. Could I just ask that I'm Bill Horford of safeties goes first, he wants to discuss access 3d.

15:59

Yep, certainly. That's absolutely fine. I use you're both on my radar. I wasn't sure who to call first. That's absolutely fine. Thank you. If you want to just put your hand down for the moment, because I've got you on my list. And Mr. Hofer, please.

16:14

Good afternoon, sir. Yes, as Mr. Mani said, I'd like to refer to section three big I'm afraid, I suppose. But you have heard quite a lot about earlier on. But before I do that, I'd like to pick up on something that I heard Mr. Ross say, and this is not a criticism of Mr. Ross by any means at all. But it's quite important. Early on, when he mentioned, baseline data that had been captured along the old boroughs to be 1122, between older and I think it was up to the parrot. At older him. I actually looked into this very much earlier on in the whole process. scottishpower actually considering putting many more vehicles down the road than the the 10 referring to here. So as a non specialist, not a subject matter expert at all. But I did. I did have some questions about the baseline data. And I think this is quite quite, quite important. I have to mention technical things. You're all familiar obviously with a GTS existing annual average daily traffic flows.

17:35

So anyway, said you continue.

17:37

Thank you. The ATC data published in the early environmental impact report was actually misleading, at least the general public on some of the quiet rural roads along which Scottish parents set in terms to direct its HTV construction traffic. Vehicles gross weights in excess of seven and a half tonnes are actually actually at present the rarity. Now the ATC reports include Department for Transport a class five type two or four vehicles has a heavy traffic that's accepted was when I looked at this a couple of years ago, I suppose it was accepted then the classified counts are notoriously inaccurate. Most vehicles counted in class five are actually small transit type delivery vans and lorries under seven half tonnes gross weight. Now in contrast, HTV traffic associated with a major construction like this, I would expect would comprise typically class 735 tonne flat dead four axle flatbed lorries carrying aggregates, etc, etc. Now, the forecast increased in the forced increases in HCV volumes as a result was highly misleading. And I am referring to the B 1122. Old for to be b 1353. Section. Now it was 10.5 that scottishpower counted 139 ATVs, of which 100 were counted as Type R to clarify, in the main these would have comprised local delivery vans, not he bases, the general public understands the term. So they counted in fact, only 39 vehicles in class classes six two alone, of which 23 were buses. And I mentioned this because I noticed your surprise when Mr. Ross mentioned the baseline figure of 100. But having said that, I I'm happy to move on because I do really want to speak about the junction

19:43

pts if you can guess briefers, you can keep it because it's 20 past four but yes, please do. Thank you.

19:48

Well, you know, it's been a long day but I've been wanting to speak about this whole day. And

19:54

please, when you do speak, please don't repeat things that other people have said on to concur with them because I heard it

20:02

right. Thank you.

20:03

You see, yes,

20:05

I do understand. Now. I would like to express appreciation for Mr. McGregor's his clarifications for 10 HCBS per day. This is just for preparatory work, which I presume is the same thing as pre construction book. He mentioned traffic signals accesses five and six. But what isn't clear to me is whether the mostly code articulated swept pass design that's actually mentioned in our CMP, the latest ANP. River three, whether that is still going to take place or not. Now, if, if you heard him say, No, that is not going to be necessary, because there are going to be traffic lights I don't need to go on. But I'm assuming that it is still going to be there. And my points about that is it's quite a grand design. It's mentioned in our EP six zero 11. And it illustrates haul roads eight metres wide on both sides of the road, plus a very wide sweat path both sides of the road north and south, presumably for visibility to the lorries purposes. I mapped this out on Cisco is to scale drawing. And it takes quite a wide area of land out now as you're

familiar with the area obviously, we're talking about woodland both sides of the road. Yeah. I think this WebPart analysis takes by my calculation, another 120 square metres of additional woodland out, and that's open above and I won't go through the numbers, but I've gotten very large amounts of woodland to be taken out for other purposes such as the watercourse cable crossing. So similar calculations applied to the west side of the road. Now my question for the applicant is, is this new access geometry as defined in the design drawings, and given Mr. Gross's comments yesterday, and recent commitments to minimise tree loss on the land between the road and river? Which quite possibly is protected with woodland habitat? Isn't that natural England? sensibility? Is that geometry still necessary? Because if, in my mind, if you if you've got traffic lights, why do you want Why do you need such a wide swept? path? Okay, just go on. A lot of times the cases I'll leave I'll

22:53

just say just to say that I'll leave the applicant to respond to that. Yes, please continue.

22:57

Thank you. That's going too fast. But I'm conscious of what you said about targets. Yes. Now regarding the same, the same plan, the same sort of length of road which is not 93 metres, as you know, referring to the applicants response to be at q1. I have to say you remember this several older residents expressed concern at the early openflow hearings. The old railroad could be blocked for some indeterminate length of time during construction, the cable corridors that would cut off the south part of old noon from the main village and from Leysin and xa. yourselves ask the applicants in your E x q1, about the possibility of a trenchless crossing of the V 1122. The response from the applicant was actually a commitment to say that the applicants design basis for the crossing of roads is to use traffic signal control to reduce traffic down to one lane, allowing works to be undertaken the closed lane. Once completed, open and closed lanes will be reversed allowing works to be undertaken on the newly closed lane. This process we followed on the five public roads the onshore cable route crosses the evidence therefore do not consider that trenchless techniques are necessary to cross these roads. The applicants also committed to maintain pedestrian access along the road pavement. But one thing that's puzzling me sir is that the latest draft decio states in federal cetto five sts to be temporary stopped up to 93 metres like the P 1122. Auto road is to be stopped up that is the fall with the order limits at old Peru. I have just two questions for the applicant. Firstly, how is the absence deadline one commitment not close the road during construction going to be secured in in the development consent order. And secondly, what is the purpose and attempt Probably stopping up of the old railroad. What is the likely temporary duration? So that that's my, my questions. I hope that's clear. My questions are freebie. Thank you. Just one further question on good design mitigation and legacy. I'm hoping actually in, in talking about legacy that there isn't any possibility of one of the legacies being the whole roads remaining at the end of the construction. And that is a question because I haven't seen anywhere documented that that is the case that the whole roads will be removed. So I'd like I'd like to be clear on that. Thank you, sir.

25:40

Thank you very much indeed. Mr. Holford. Thank you. So while we're still with Stacy's on the double hander, we have Mr. Maroni, if you wish to add anything to Stacy's, please. Yes. Yes. Thank you.

25:52

Thank you, sir. I just wanted to talk about Friday Street and the data that's been used to inform the analysis there. And I've been looking back, I look back at the environmental statement, and it will appear that there are two sources of data one is a manually This is some Sorry, I haven't got the rep number. But it's paragraph 56. On page 19, of chapter 26, traffic and transport.

26:21

Oh, seven for property? Yes. Yeah, people are following. Yeah,

26:25

yeah. And there appears to be two sources of data. One was a manually classified turning count, which was conducted on a single day back in on the 18th of may 2017, between seven in the morning and 1900 hours. And the confidence expressed to be high, and then appear to be a second source of data, which was manually classified turning and queue length counts, it just refers to do 19 is not clear that was every day in June 19, but only into presumably What are considered to be peak periods, from seven till 10. The morning and from 1600 hours to 1900 hours. So I don't understand why wasn't done for 24 hours. Also, it was done in June, when the really peak months are July and August. Now, given everything that is being based on averages at the question has to be and given all the concerns expressed by the community, how confident can we be the data we're relying upon, is good enough, because if this goes wrong, it will have very serious consequences, which have all been expressed, both in writing and orally. And the other thing I'm concerned about, and obviously, I'm not speaking as a traffic expert. But I understand that in other projects, and we have mentioned wolfer, that a greater range of survey data was carried out. And we've heard a lot during the course examination about what's normal, or what standard. But the question must be, we need to make sure we do what is necessary to make sure we get an accurate picture, what is normal and is standard is a starting point, not a finished point. And that and therefore know that that is there is that concern about averages survey data, and that really needs to be interrogated very thoroughly. In particular, in terms of what's become best practice or better practice on on other infrastructure projects. They've got a few comments on the outline, construction and traffic management plan. The, the data we have is about peak daily HDD numbers. And new groups data is the planet the plan is rep six, and it's numbers nine and 10, depending on spleen, or tract. And the numbers are set up for various links along the road along the roads here. But what is not clear is how long the peak is. I mean, is it for two weeks, three weeks, four weeks? Obviously, you've got the overlap of the projects and everything else. And I think we need to understand given what people are concerned about in terms of tourists periods. So how, how will the peak HTV periods linked to peak tourist periods? And how long will those peaks last fall? Because a lot of what that he The movement is about is soil, alternative aggregate being delivered to the forest and site. Now we're aware that the applicant actually doesn't know what the finish ground level is going to be at the Freston site yet. So it doesn't know if it's going to be removing a lot of material or having to add a lot of material probably the latter given the surface water flood rates, but we don't we simply don't know. So it doesn't seem to be any analysis. And I could say I'm not a traffic expert. So I could be wrong. That doesn't say what the peak the duration of peak peak HDTV movements are. Again, and this is another point related to concerns expressed about the Friday st junction, and the outline construction, the hc TMP, been practising that does talk about managing traffic and demand during major events, which was very pleased to see that. But the problem is that he talks about major events

on the highway, Eg bike races, parades, and also around public holidays. Last has been expressed you There are many major events here, which don't fall into that category. For example, we're on the biggest events is latitude, which is a major Pop Festival, which we all hope will return post COVID. There's your festival. There's your food and drink festival. There's focused, there's us and they carry on. I mean, there's a huge number of events in this part of the world, particularly in the summer. And that part of the plan doesn't seem to address that. Also, the mitigation measures are extremely vague. It simply refers to sign it will ensure that there are limited HGV movements, what does that mean? We need to have much greater specificity. And I and I know it will be said that these things can wait till post consent. But given the importance of making sure that isn't chaos on the roads around here, I don't think that answer is good enough. And the other thing that causes concern in relation to this is that it says that

31:19

the various construction management officers will liaise with local stakeholders to understand when major events may occur, that should have already happened. You know, as well know what the major events are around it, there are a significant number of them. So it's not good enough to wait until after consent to deal to deal with those important matters. And lastly, this does touch on a little bit on the discussion we had yesterday. And it's this issue of deliveries and traffic arriving outside of construction hours. And again, the paragraph 54. It's a new paragraph that's gone in and it it doesn't really close off the risk that we're going to get traffic movements outside of the construction as leaving aside whether it's seven till seven or eight till six. I won't read out the relevant parts, because but you can read it for yourself. Yeah, but it clearly it there's plenty I mean, I'm a lawyer by background, it's probably guess there's plenty of scope in there, too, for deliveries to happen outside of the construction hours. And the thing that really made me concerned it said the delivery instructions will include a device that drivers will not be permitted to wait overnight. Unless at licenced location advice. I mean, that's jolly interesting advice and it will be put under the seat. And the advice is good enough. It's worth it shouldn't happen. These things should be mandatory. And I think I've got one more point to make later on human impact but that black and white. That's the end of what I got to say on that subject. Thank you very much.

32:53

Thanks very much indeed. Mr. Maroni Mr. Hall for the SE C's. Next I've got Fiona Gilmore from CS.

33:02

Hello.

33:04

Thank you very much, sir. Good afternoon, Fiona Gilmore, footsies, Salford kenergy action solutions. I'm just going to be one minute. And then I'm handing over to Councillor trap. Just wanted to say if we just stood back from all of this. I am truly shocked at the conversation today at plants of almost complacency on many people here about well, this is all pretty good, really. And we've got mitigation and it's all gonna be okay. I am deeply concerned that we are missing the point. If we will have having this conversation. Do you think that Cornish would just give in like this and say Padstow does that we can have an infrastructure project destroying our tourism. They have Rick Stein lying on the road, they'd have waste slides waving? Well, we've got our equivalent of Rick Stein, we'll bring them along.

We'll make sure you hear them. Because we got our Amex, we've got our sand. We've got our all about we've got our George, we have people crying out for this not to happen to the a 109 for it is going to be the destruction of all bruh as no it and I cannot accept this complacency. So when you listen to cancel a trap, we are the only team that had done the modelling. The devil is in the detail as we've heard many times before. averages are unbelievably dangerous. We need to look at the worst case scenario noon in September. On a busy tourism day. The fact that June the 17th figures were taken early in the morning and late in the afternoon and they didn't look at noon. That is a huge mistake. Anybody who knows anything about tourism knows that a lot of tourists go to all bruh at about noon. So we need to look at the whole day look at the peaks. So I'm going to hand over to counsellor trap, because he would like to contest the data presented by the applicant. Thank you.

35:21

Thank you.

35:25

Hello.

35:26

Hello. Can you hear me?

35:29

Yes, if you could introduce yourself, please.

35:32

I'm john cancer crap. I have been asked about mathematical modelling or ex mathematical. One never dies. And I've been looking at some of the data that has been I've been gone that from various places, including from the beach, of Snape. Um, first of all, I mean, Mrs. Jones referred made some reference references about what the references are, but I was too slow to take them down. So I'm afraid, but there will be in my way.

36:02

To the point she wants to know. Okay,

36:04

fine. Okay. Um, I've read quite a number of things there. And I'm impressed by what's been happening so far. First of all, I'm grateful to Mr. Holford for classifying the vehicle. designation that summer Igbs and summer HCBS. I also would like to confirm Miss Mike Moon is calculation about the failure, it is just about four times what it is maybe slightly under 414. And also, and this is the other thing is, I think he made a very valid point which I was going to make as well about averages, averages are not quite the right thing, because they don't show the real frustration when you have things. And the other one and this is Fiona Gilbert, I should touch upon was the peak hours measurement at the Friday street junction didn't actually include the noon traffic movement, because both the data that I submitted from based on the speed indicator devices at us nape showed that the major traffic was during the of the early late morning, not early morning and late afternoon. And this is actually confirmed I'm trying to be as quickly

as possible. And yes, please. Yeah, thank you much appreciated. And this is actually confirmed by the data that the applicants have produced. When I looked at that, and I actually graphed it and it will be in my report that I grafted, it showed exactly the same thing that the counts may be different. And that may be due to the fact that they took it just after the bank call the half term in May it was the first third of June so it was I think, probably not act typical period. But it showed the same thing. The main volume of traffic along the a 194 was around about noon between 11 and one that the minor minor piece smaller at the extreme at the what we call typical peak hours. And also it showed that the Westwood traffic differs from the east with traffic. The Westwood traffic actually peaked later in the afternoon at about 12 was going tooled, bro was peeking around, but 11 to 12. So that is confirmed by the by actual data that the applicants have taken. So that's good. Now the other thing I wanted to mention is right, so we're not talking. Now the thing about averages, and they've quite good, but they do mask, the fact that peaks occur. Fiona Gilmore said that there are many there's around activity at all the bra. There's festivals, there's all sorts of things happening. But it doesn't mean that this is happening all the time. They happen all the round, but they peak. And it's the peaks which are important, because that is when the biggest frustration and then that accidents will arise. And the tourists are actually volatile. If they've and a lot of the as I've mentioned in my previous report, a lot of the tourists are repeat tourists. But if they say oh gosh now but not going to go to aldborough because actually despite delays on the on the road, they're not coming back again find somewhere else. The other thing is that in the response by the applicant to My paper, one of them's it said something on this lines, the site selection process was based upon the requirements for suitable connection to the electrical grid, not upon the supply chain supporting construction.

40:17

That's been, I can just say interject and say we've that's already been okay. All right, I just want to focus on traffic and transport if I may, so that everybody can have

40:27

the whole point about this is that the, the supply chain is important as and the electrical grid is all over the place, you can connect to it as that has been done at Branford. So that is done. So I think what I'm going to do is stop there, if I may, and give you more detail in the reports I'm going to give you.

40:52

Yes. So I understand that you have of course already submitted information to us anyway, we already have. So anything you've not already submitted. That will be very helpful. Thank you very much indeed.

41:04

And I applaud your stamina and tolerance. Oh, did

41:08

we do

41:09

a very, very big process,

41:11

we do our best we need to hit we need to hear what what folks have to say the difficulty is in repeating things that have been said before. So thank you very much counsellor trap. And Mr. beech, you wanted to come after CS. So I have your next on my list.

41:25

I have. Thank you, Chair.

41:27

Thank you for being helpful on that one. Anything else? Sorry.

41:32

Tim beach chair of Snoke parish Council, I just want to re emphasise some of the points that have many others have made now. But in from a slightly different points of view, the issue about the 1094 the 1894. And particularly with the junction with the btn 69 is one we have raised repeatedly since 2019. And expressed concerns about this use of average traffic movements and the gear data. And it is never adequately been addressed. I do want to just flag off one particular issue about the dangers of that road section, the 1094 between Snape watering up to the village on the way to old bro where you leave the restricted speed area. We the data that Mr. Trap counsel trap referred to information from a said system speed indicator system that we had put in place we as a village paid for because we couldn't use the usual battery operated Cid systems, we had to use rig them up to mains electric we had to pay for that Suffolk County Council decided it was too dangerous for anybody to be walking along that section of the road where those speed indicator devices are. And similarly, the police wouldn't let us do Originally, the community speed watch that I referred to this morning on that to the night, section 1094. All of that was predicated on the basis that it was decisive in the 30 mile an hour limit. An area that was too dangerous to allow people down most of that was based on traffic movements, the number of traffic movements hgvs passing along that road and the speed of those vehicles. The issue. The second point, I wanted to make collisions. I gave you some of my background. And yes, Mr. Mary, or or Mr. Ross can correct me if it's changed. The information about Road Traffic collisions is based entirely on police attendance and police reporting those accidents through to the county council who record all that information. Yeah, most of it is Mr. Mary mentioned, is only when there's an injury. I think collision. Yeah. So many, many, many accidents. And I've seen many more than that of those junctions. But it simply never reported. And even if you do report them to the police, then we won't turn up. And the drop in the collisions may be not unrelated to the fact that over the past 10 years, there's a 30% reduction in the number of police officers. So by definition, yeah, best officers to attend those and there are occasions there cannot I know, attend and they will not be recorded unless they are serious injuries. I've

44:31

got this right, this double issue there. There's one is that it's certainly reported if there's an injury so there could well be a prank without the being an injury or serious injury at least. And the other thing is that there aren't enough officers to take the reports or people just don't report it anyway because there are fewer officers to

44:46

send you you will receive advice. Anybody will receive advice if have you exchanged details. Is anybody injured? If the answer's no, nobody's injured. You've exchanged details. They will tell you you will be told we will not be attending Yeah, no, it will not be recorded

45:02

for. Thank you very much anything else you wanted to add Mr. B,

45:06

just the issue about the B 1069. coming onto the 1094. Again, I just want to emphasise the fact that I've seen nothing that addresses as Yes, the length of the queue, those peak periods, again, right back into the village, simply because traffic cannot get out onto the a 1094 where it can take you up to an hour particularly bank holidays, the points being made lots of times these dependent on what's happening at the Maltings, various events there right through the year, but at frequent.

45:46

So there's a problem you've got already and you're worried is going to get worse,

45:50

it will get worse. It's an existing problem. And we flagged it since 2018. My last point, legacy and mitigation. As Councillor fellows mentioned, I wrote on behalf of seven parishes and towns that includes obrah and loosen and snipe briston, to ask to talk with the Suffolk council about what the mitigation that they've agreed with scottishpower renewables and about their change of position from proposed to neutral but the mitigation in particular, he suffered counsel twice, refused to meet with us, or even discuss it with us or even engage. I think everybody everything else is pretty well covered by other people. Thank you.

46:38

Thank you very much. Mr. beech was very helpful. And last. Mr. Chandler from several some links. If you can take your hand down Mr. beech. That'd be great. Thank you. Thank you.

46:54

Yes, thank you, Mr. Rigby full time to save our soundings as Taylor and Charlie, I will keep this very brief because what I was going to say has already been covered around about 147 HD TVs that have been quoted. The majority of these will be three or seven and a half tonners light haulage vehicles for delivery trucks. No artix no tipper trucks. Or if there are there's probably one or two a year a rarity. So that's that's then I think, what what is needed is the good old Mark 10 eyeball, someone needs to go there and stand and record the traffic that's going through there. And I think there will be quite surprised that there are no Arctic's going through there at all. So that's that's Friday, St. The junction, confirm what Mr. beech has just said, most of those are fender benders, people start to pull out their stops on car behind crashes into the back of them. Broken lights, yeah, extended details on your way. Number of those happens very rarely, very regularly. So I think the the proposals that have been put forward to put traffic lights at this junction, really were just tinkering with the problem. This is the most confusing junction I've ever come across where you're crossing over. What is you know, you've seen how it

works. What we really need is the roundabout, that's what this is the the best solution for that, if we're going to have traffic lights, they need to be very carefully phase so that we don't get traffic that's travelling north on the a 12 wants to turn right on to the 1094, we get a long period of traffic and it backs out into the 12 and actually blocks traffic off that point. So I think that's traffic lights, it needs to be very, very carefully controlled. And that's really all I have to say on that matter. The rest is all been covered by very eloquently by the people before me.

49:00

Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I thank you. Before I go on to the applicant to reply to what's been said, I just flagged that is coming up to 10 to five, and we may need to carry on beyond five o'clock to half past five. And if we were to do that, does anybody have any concerns or problems with that?

49:32

Not seeing Mr. Collins, you have your hand up? Is that a problem? Is that because you have a problem? I'll quit because your hand is stuck.

49:40

Sorry, admitted to take it down again.

49:43

That's fine. It's okay. Not a problem. Thank you very much, right. In that case, we'll push on. And if I could go to the applicant, please on what we've heard, and to ask if there's anything you want to respond to right now or whether you want to reserve Have to deadline a bearing in mind how close we are to the end of examination. And the time it is on a Friday afternoon. Thank you.

50:10

comments from half the applicant, I'm going to be very brief. I'm just going to respond to matters. The first relates to counsellor fellows and SPR making contact with people around the roundabout. I've taken instruction the matter, and we can find no record of having any engagement around the roundabout, nor on the basis of what we understand. Is there any reason why we should do so? Anyway, so that's currently unexplicable. And certainly, we have no record. The second point I was going to respond to was Mr. hallford, about shedule. Five, to the decio, where he raises the issue about the otter Baroud. shedule, five stopping up in terms of the way that sheduled is written, it's if there's stopping up over half, we would need the power to stop up. So and because it's of either side of the road, we need the power to stop up that part of the road. So that's why it's drafted in that way. And points over the full 93 metres is depending on how we stopped up the half, we would have to where it was, it would be within that limit. And that's the way the decio is drafted. It's around the full limit of it, not what's actually required. So it's where it could occur within the order limits. So that hopefully gives an explanation of of how that drafting is there. And why it represents the maximum distance of the order limit. And I'll now hand over to Mr. Ross, if you've got anything he particularly wants to raise in relation to matters. But I'd asked him to be relatively brief if it could be. Thank you.

51:48

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Ross. If there's if the things that you've already said, then you may brief clarification, maybe all that's required. Thank you very much.

52:01

I think, given time constraints that I can deal with general matters, matters of detail, as you quite rightly point out so we can we can do in deal within the deadline I read. And I think it would help interested parties just for me to just give a quick overview of the building blocks, if you like of the the assessment and how we came to the Rochdale envelope, if you like worst case scenario in terms of traffic demand. So there was mention of concerns with like commercial vehicles. So to put the assessment together, we made the base assumption that all sections of the cut cable route would be operating at maximum intensity at the same time, and therefore, the associated HGV and traffic demand would be assigned to the highway network at the same time. So that's very much worst case scenario.

53:16

So sort of double counting in a sense, because you don't know exactly what combination you have.

53:21

Yes, the reason we did that is we wanted to make sure that the impacts were covered were assessed on all the local routes. The alternative and poor practice which I have seen is people just pick up peak a peak month of demand and of course a peak month for demand for the whole project might not be might leave out a little section where there isn't a demands. So effectively the total traffic demand you see that is very much a lot Rochdale envelope once it gets onto the collector road ie the a 12 we then cap it at what we know will be the maximum HDV personnel demand associated with the onshore infrastructure includes construction consolidation sites. These are located in such a way that they serve each section. This will be the origin for sorry the destination for light vehicle movements. Within the traffic traffic management plan we've got various controls commitment to limit in parking, welfare facilities and of course they provide linkage to the whole road zone. Extreme journeys back out onto the network will be very few and far between. and the odd ad hoc movement is more than covered in the, in the robustness of assuming that level of intensity for all all the sections. I think the question was asked about how long will the peak be? Yeah, well, we've extrapolated some information from appendix 26.13. Up 539. And what that's showing, and this is an important point that the maximum HGTV demand is 270. But this only occurs for one month during month 34, which is towards the back end. And that's associated with rent reinstatement, which kind of touches on the question about when the whole road? Is that the

56:11

is that a figure for the entire project? Not on one particular highway?

56:15

The entire project shares? Yeah. So the consolidated HDV movements on the collector road? Yeah, will be 270. But it's signed on to the local network. So there, it relates to that. In terms of average, the average HTV movements for the duration of the construction phase are 153 to two movements.

56:47

Is that per day on the whole network?

56:50

Yes,

56:51

yeah, thank you.

56:53

So there is a marked reduction, and for some months, it drops down to less less than less than 50.

57:01

I'm thinking the problem here probably, is that you can be reasonably accurate in terms of construction months, but until you know when it's starting, that doesn't translate into a month of the year, Does It Really?

57:15

Yes, we can't. And again, that picks up on a number of points. We can't can't quote, real time, we can quote months in the programme. But exactly that exactly. That it's very difficult to pay.

57:31

So we're we're really going to be looking at trying to minimise the peaks interfering with other peaks once you've got a better idea of when your construction programme will start.

57:42

Indeed, and I think the point was made about potential additional hole away from sight relating to earthworks again, that there's adequate room in that profile without having to exceed the maximum assess the ADT average flows. And yes, it's pointed out it is good practice at DT are established by the DFT commonly used across the UK. In network management. The direction is to manage monitor the network for normal conditions and I won't go in to the deep detail but our reps confirm that sync compliant with DFT. standards. The thing to point out is the effects like severance and amenity and some extent road safety and inflating that baseline has the only unintended consequence of reducing the impact because we're looking at the magnitude of change. And so that's something to be guarded with the these the these comments in terms of driver delay and capacity. modelling techniques recognise there needs to be tolerance for junction capacity and not getting too techie capacity. Whether it's a signal junction or or a priority junction has a capacity flag at about 85% yes and 990 percent information someone submitted deadline for, um, with the the application documents show that there. Yes, but adequate, adequate capacity?

1:00:09

I don't think that's much of a pointed issue. To be honest, I think that's absolutely fine. The 85%. Indeed, we heard from people who said that the delay they experienced the present is probably greater than it's going to be when you put your lights in. So if that's what happens, so that's fine. Thank you.

1:00:31

And the actual traffic counts that were taken. Friday, three and in, in, in. In general, we're dealing with Friday St. The June turning counts, were utilised. The reason we chose am mpnp is we created a worst case scenario whereby the project's traffic demand would light commercial vehicles would overlap with the network peaks, although we've got this seven to seven period, and we all know we get dark nights and things like that. So we thought as extra sensitivity, we would model a junction with that demand on the information contained in the app 533, which a gentleman facies was referring to evidence that there is a morning peak, traditional, there is a traditional evening peak, and the flows are quite quite high, right right away from morning peak through two to four o'clock. I guess the key point is the project's peak traffic demand is not going to be mid day, or, or any other periods between a traditional network peaks. I think those are the big headline matters and less, Scott, any thinking wants me to, to comment on? There's lots of matters of detail.

1:02:39

Thank you. Yes, if you if you're able to include the detail matters when your deadline a wrap as well, that would be appreciated, as well as obviously the oral case you made now. And then we can be as certain as we can be that we've bottomed everything else, even if we even if there's agreement to disagree, as it were. Thank you very much. Is there anything more from the applicants on item three? Thank you much. Right now just on five o'clock. So we've got item four on cumulative effects. Now, we've already heard quite a few representations points from parties, which apply to both the points be already made, but it also applies in the cumulative scenario. Now the first item for a cumulative effects. Generally, I simply have some basic questions to put to the applicants, which I'm proposing that you make a note of and give us some answers as part of the Action List. I think that would be the best way to deal with it. So we'll be putting an action list out early next week. And we'll make sure that we've covered everything that we want to cover here. So in terms

1:04:07

of

1:04:09

the update to the outline, access management planet deadlines, six with EDF LNG nuclear generation limited size will be they'll be consulted in the development of the construction traffic management plan. That's noted. We also note that your sizewell projects cumulative impact assessment note for traffic and transport, which was submitted in redline six has been revised so that it now takes account both of the sizewell be relocated fees facilities project, so a bit of a mouthful, and the revised sizewell c project. So just to check that we've got that correct briefly with the applicants. If you could just confirm we have that correct.

1:04:56

That is correct. It hasn't obviously The the absolute traffic figures have been revised. But the previous note covered the size well be accommodation work. Yes,

1:05:07

yes. Yeah. Thank you. So the first thing to be asking is, does this latest cumulative impact assessment results in any change to the mitigation you already proposing? And if there's a change or lots of change, could you explain why that is? Also following the north of Vanguard High Court judgement, do you consider that any other project should be included in your cumulative impact assessment? And really, to cap that off, as the second part of our exam is question two, point 18.5, which wasn't really addressed, I don't think. But really, how will you ensure that all the impacts associated with all the relevant activities are all properly considered, assessed and mitigated within the draft decio? And I'm thinking, there's obviously the in combination between the two projects we're discussing here, but also in the wider sense of what is known about other projects. And then, if we move to abnormal individual loads, we've probably answered this already, because they're so infrequent. But whether you consider there's any potential for any cumulative impacts. I think Suffolk County Council raised the possibility of that occurring, but it is dependent on future construction programmes. And given that temporary improvements to structures may be needed such as miles for but once it's been assessed, there may be other improvements needed. Is there any benefit in undertaking several movements consecutively? Once your, your and other construction programmes are noted in more detail? I'm thinking that's in terms of transformers, you might well be moving one transformer per AI, I, but you've got four transformers. So whether it's worth thinking, right, okay, we'll shift all of them at once, one way or the other. I don't know if that's feasible, whether you could actually do that. But it's just something I wanted to get your view on.

1:07:27

And

1:07:29

then if we get on to item four, see on the agenda, we're talking about the possibilities of situation where along with other non EEA projects, each of your projects proceeds separately on different timescales. So the concern really here is how you envisage the separate contractors would cooperate and work side by side, in the event that both East Anglia projects proceed. But there are different and overlapping timescales, for instance, use of shared compounds, shared facilities, whether they really would be shared, would that be realistic? And, again, the issue about the Ai L movements, if you've got to have to make improvements to structures and highways, whether there's some merit in getting them all done at once, if that's feasible. And the same, again, applies if we look at the situation where both projects are constructed together on similar timescales, so maybe like both at once, pretty much. And again, the question is how you envisage separate contractors will cooperate and work side by side, in the event that both East Anglia projects proceed on the same timescales. And again, maybe used to shared compounds, and the effect that would have on the local highway network, how that would work, whether it's realistic, and how you'd manage major ai movements in that scenario. Finally, we come to the situation about other projects and timescales. on the radar really, for us, I suppose sizewell B. sighs well see. There's been mentioned made of the martlesham projects, possible other national grid projects at or near Freston. And also improvements to the a 12 between the a 14 at seven hills and the B or the a 1152. That goes around the north of Ipswich. You've been revised and take the counter sighs well be and sighs We'll see. But it's going back to the view earlier that you might want to express in in relation to the vanguard judges whether you think other projects also be included. And what mitigation measures you're considering. recognising that there's an issue with timescales, but just at least getting

the issue on the table so that we can have it add. What would really useful in connection with all of that, is if you can set out briefly your cumulative assessment methodology. So depending on what you decide to do as a result of the questions we're asking just now, you can set out your methodology for cumulative assessment, and how you go about it in on the basis of what you know, and what you don't know. Suffolk County Council mentioned earlier concerns about individual Gert fresh hours. And I understand that that's something you're considering already in the organ, give us a statement or joint statements that deadline date on that. So I'll leave that one for you to progress. We do have the issue with planning obligations, about how you might modify your methodology, hindrances of good design outcomes. And how this translates into cost sharing of mitigation in the cumulative scenario, obviously, in relation to your two projects, that's relatively straightforward. But it's how we go about cost sharing and mitigation in other scenarios, sizewell c sizewell b, and so on, as we've already listed. And if you can give us an update in terms of revised documentation about the planning obligations, I do know that you have submitted recently about planning obligations, but it might be that you need to revisit that for deadline date.

1:12:13

Okay. If other parties are consent, I'm going to leave it there, those will be on the action list for the applicants and the action this will be published. So if other parties want to make any comment, then that will save us time now. And we will get your comments at deadline eight. So if that is acceptable to parties, council fellows, you have your hand up.

1:12:49

If I if I can just briefly interject before counsellor fellows simply to say that, clearly. There are two important processes there is the immediate response by the applicants and indeed to the other interested parties to these questions at deadline aid. But also, then, crucially, there's the importance of then being able to comment on the positions that the applicant puts forward, or indeed for the applicant to comment on positions that the other interested parties put forward that deadline night. So we're still in a position where we can provide a full opportunity for comment in both directions. So I just wanted to make that observation there. So yes, apologies for that brief injection, and we'll return to the counsellor fellows.

1:13:42

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby and ladies and gentlemen, Moran fellows over town council. He was just to briefly assist really the applicant to answer your questions, sir. When we're talking about community of assessment, I really do think we must ask for the applicant to also put against their numbers, the assessment from tourism events throughout the year, so we can see what the year might look like. And also that the community numbers from size will be should include that outages, which occur every 18 months. So that could be at any time during that period of time or several 18 months worth. And that comment is also sought from Suffolk County Council resilience forum with regard to the traffic modelling they do that should be shared with the applicant and the examining authority. They have detailed modelling about numbers of cars needing to leave the area should there be an evacuation and emergency vehicles accessing sites. And then lastly, we must ask that the community of impact figures also include an estimation, which would be probably about the same as what they've got already but doubled up twice for Euro link and Nautilus. Should those projects overlap EA on one

north and EA two. So because we are including the approach, you know, the Rochdale envelope approach to the worst case scenario, I think we have to look at these be the worst case scenario. And these have to be demonstrated in the assessment figures that are provided to you. Thank you very much.

1:15:35

Thank you very much counsellor fellows. And I see also Michael Marley's hand up and I did he did say he had something to say on this item briefly following on from the previous item. So I will briefly here Michael Murray, before we move on.

1:15:52

Yes, don't worry, I'm not going to rehearse the the argument about other projects. We all know what the issues are that it was just it will be helpful for the applicant could clarify a point on the sidewalk projects. clarifying that clarification note is paragraph 80. Which says that the this is the round about this the forearm round about four round about it says it would be delivered offline, which my understand what that means it's not going to be on a site next to the 12. That does say the existing Friday street junction would be largely unaffected. Now that sort of both reassuring and worrying at the same time because Okay, good. It's not going to fade, but there clearly is going to be an effect. And largely as an adverb is not very helpful. So I think we need to understand the bit that will effect and what the consequences of that might be, I just don't think saying largely is good enough. Because the consequences of the bit that isn't within largely could be quite that over, over being over dramatic, quite catastrophic. was any point to wish to make Thank you.

1:16:57

Thanks very much indeed. So yes, if to the applicants, if you could make clear your responses to those points that have just been made. And also Suffolk County Council, they were very useful, particularly if you're in conference with the applicants between now and deadline aid. The more of this you can bottom out before deadline date in your joint document, the better. So I would welcome up submissions from both of you. And from any interested parties who have anything they wish to add. So thank you very much, everybody. We've covered a lot of ground today. So if anything slipped your mind and you're listening on the live stream or to the recording, do remember to put your submissions in by deadline eight, so long as it's stuff we haven't already heard. And that's the 25th of March 2021. I see Mr. Bedford and Mr. Cooper have their hands up. Mr. Bedford, please.

1:18:00

Thank you, sir. So I'm assuming from all of that, that what you're expecting is that obviously, the written submissions from all of the parties will cover effectively the the meet in agenda item for in their deadline eight submissions. So that's, that's what I've understood what we're expecting to do. Yes, that's

1:18:18

correct. Just because the way the times gone? Yeah, no, absolutely to address it, your action list will make it clear what we're after. And that will be published as soon as we can get our heads around it, basically.

1:18:30

Yes, I'm grateful than that. That's quite big. Now. Thank you, please, there is a procedural point, which I think I probably need to formally raise under item five, but it is it does relate to this cumulative impact assessment. So I've just put down a marker. And then the second point, which does relate to item four, and it may help other parties, we think, from our discussions with the applicant. Third, in relation to that part of the cumulative impact assessment in the sizewell C, cumulative assessment update report, that where they have looked at the scenarios of the worst case, or they have looked at as it were both projects, EA, one n and EA two together, plus size well, and the mitigation that's been referred to particularly at Oxford, and malford has been identified in that scenario. But what we understand from our discussions with the applicant is that it's the applicants intention that even if only one of the two EIA projects proceeded, at the same time as sighs well, that the same mitigation would be put forward. And obviously we just welcome some confirmation of that because instance that's reassuring those who may be interested in that that mitigation? Yeah. So those were the only points I want to make on item four. And then I thought, what a separate procedural point on item five.

1:20:08

Thank you very much. That's that's very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Bedford. And very quickly, Mr. Cooper, you're not? Is it a point of clarification you want to make? Because otherwise, we're down.

1:20:21

Yet, just very quickly. So can I just ask item for G mitigate legacy, the formerly bypass scheme? I'm not aware that we've discussed that. And I just wondered what the motivation of the examination examining authority was including that on the agenda,

1:20:43

it was only put there because in certain of the cumulative scenarios, it might be something that happened as a result of one of the other projects going ahead,

1:20:53

okay to follow,

1:20:56

he would, we wouldn't be triggered by this project. But if a load of other stuff goes on, then the sum total might well be that that actually happens. And I was looking for a view, principally from the county council, but from anybody else who can assist us with that. So we've we've covered the situation,

1:21:13

I am very conscious of time, are we going to get another opportunity to revisit that issue?

1:21:20

The opportunity you've got, given the examination timetable, is that you can put in anything that's not already been put in at deadline AIDS. And there's an opportunity and deadline nine to comment on that before the examination closes. So yes, it's in writing. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, indeed. So with all that, I would say thank you, everybody. It's been another hard Friday. It's the weekend coming.

1:21:48

Hey,

1:21:50

I'll hand you over to

1:21:52

Well, sorry, good

1:21:53

African.

1:21:53

Did you wish to say something else

1:21:54

before? Yes.

1:21:57

Please, please. Go ahead.

1:21:59

Yeah, calling on behalf of the applicant. Just as a thank Mr. Bedford for for raising that last issue of buy the cumulative scenario when the mitigation would be delivered. And effectively, we obviously did a an undertaking of a worst case scenario of both East Anglia projects, and sighs we'll see proceeding and then working out what mitigation would be required, arising from that combination arising from that. It is correct to say that should sighs well see proceed at the same time of of either of the estanque projects. The first would make sure the mitigation measures were delivered, we haven't sought to try and do a distinction between those two East Anglia projects. If, if the if a project goes forward, the cumulative mitigation will be provided. I just wanted that clarification to be put before we close today, so that people are very clear on that point. It is, whilst it was assessed on both projects being built at the same time alongside sighs we'll see the mitigation were provided if only one East Anglia project was proceeded with, in conjunction cumulative sense for size. We'll see. I just wanted to give the county council that confirmation, but also make sure that there was no misunderstanding about that, that that point before we leave. Thank you.

1:23:25

Thank you very much. So with that, I will hand over to Mr. Smith, as the concluding items.

1:23:37

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. Now, we will move to agenda item five any other business relevant to the agenda. And there are no other matters that the examining authorities directly need to raise during today's hearing, as you've heard from Mr. Rigby on orally managed matters in relation to the previous

agenda item are going to be set out in full in our Action Lists. And they will be a process where they can be responded to by deadline eight. And then comments on the responses as submitted can be made a deadline nine as we've indicated. And now I'm very conscious in terms of the need to provide for Mr. Michael Bedford Casey for Suffolk County Council to raise his procedural point. I will ask him to do that. And once we have heard from him, if there are any other equivalent requests, those will also be dealt with in this item. So firstly, Mr. battlers. Thank you. So

1:24:42

Michael Bedford for Suffolk County Council. And it's a point on the information that the examination has been given during the course of this week about other projects and the extent to which they should or shouldn't feature in a cumulative impact assessment. So you know that you've already got as part of the examination material and update of the position in relation to the north falls project. And although I wasn't present at SU, specific hearing 10, I've obviously read the AI notes and I've been briefed by the team. That reference was made there by the applicants to updated information that they had received in relation to five S series, which they said they were happy to make available. It was an email, I think was referred to by Mr. In his. And then what as I understand is, the current position is the in your actions following on from issue specific hearing 10. Your action number one includes reference to that and effectively says correspondence relevant to the five estery scheme, no longer seeking connection at Friston should be submitted at deadline eight, as I understand that, but the point, and it's really packed to matter more for the applicant to consider if this documentation already exists, I don't see why as it were, in a practical sense, there would be any difficulty were they to submit it to the examination before we get to the 25th of March, so that it can be put onto the website, obviously subject to your discretion, to receive it out of sequence, as it were, it would probably assist all of the parties including obviously, those who have not seen that information, because they can take it into account in their deadline, eight submissions, rather than it appearing for the first time deadline eight and then only being able to comment on it at deadline nine, which is you know, is very close to the end of the examination. So I was just going to instead invite if the applicants were willing to do that they could provide that information which apparently they have got ahead of, then it would I would have thought help all parties in terms of being able to comment it out deadline eight and therefore help you to be better appraised of the position in the deadline eight submissions.

1:27:17

Before I turn to the applicant on that point, Mr. Belford, I'll just make a couple of observations on it. The first being that normally for very good reasons, which is maintaining an orderly information flow, which in examinations as large as these you'll be conscious can be an extraordinarily difficult task. And we are anxious verging on strenuous not to solicit out of sequence submissions other than that specific deadlines. And of course, we exercise discretion over the submission of any material that comes out of deadline sequence. But there are circumstances where we do exercise discretion to enable something to be published out of deadline sequence, and they will be published as additional submissions. Now, clearly, there's also another very strong consideration here, which is that to ensure compliance to the rules of natural justice to ensure procedural fairness for all parties, it is important to allow cases to be stated and also cases to be responded to. And there would therefore seem to be very considerable value in circumstances where if they complete position on the relevance or not of another development for cumulative impact assessment purposes, can be settled before sufficiently before deadline eight, so

that relevant parties can make responses that take that into account at deadline date, which then in turn means that other interested parties can respond, knowing that say, for example, the five asterik scheme has been essentially removed from the table for these purposes, there is immense benefit in that. So I'll flag up that this is not a general invitation on parties to pour unsolicited information into these examinations, because we will resist that. But on this occasion, for this purpose, because we are so close to the end of the examination and in the interests of allowing the conclusion of discussions that otherwise would be at risk of not properly concluding. Yes, if the applicant is willing to put this early, we will exercise discretion and we will accept it as an additional submission. So I'll then go to the applicant and ask are you prepared to put it in early

1:29:43

corners on behalf of the applicant? Rick, delighted to do so and will tend to that next week. And that will ensure that parties have that for deadline eight. So yes, the applicant will do so at the beginning of next week.

1:29:57

I'm very, very grateful. I think that's a very sensible result. I'm also grateful to Mr. Bedford for making the proposal. Okay, on that basis are that I will check hands. Are there any other requests for the settlement of procedural matters before we move on to item six of our agenda, and I'm casting around the room, I'm trusting with electronic hands the property working now. And I'm seeing none. So on that basis, ladies and gentlemen, I will move to agenda item, six procedural decisions, review of actions and next steps in terms of procedural decisions. With the clear exception of that guidance, I think, is the best way of describing it on the best way to deal with an additional submission to facilitate clarity around the five estery scheme. We have not made any formal procedural decisions or none, none that we will formally issue in writing. So yes, there's no need for us to make any formal procedural decisions today, in terms of actions, and we have a reasonably comprehensive list of actions now, because we have three primary actions that arose from agenda items two, and three. And then we have a considerable list of actions essentially a mounting to the agenda points for agenda item four, I would flag that the Action List now will need to be checked over over the weekend. So the earliest that it will now be published is at some point on Monday. And what I would then also flag is that audio recordings and action points for issue specifics here, issue specific hearings, 1011, and 12. have now been published. And in relation to the action list for issue specific hearings. 12. If you get you won't find these in the examination library, it takes a few days for these to catch up, just go to the Documents tab on both websites. And the most recent documents are at the top of the tab, you'll find the Action Lists for this week's hearings there. And what we would advise all participants today and for the previous hearings this week to do anyone also not in attendance with an interest in the matters covered by these hearings to review the Action Lists as soon as they're published and act accordingly. Now, in terms of next steps, this has been issued specific hearings number 13. And having reached this point, and with all of the substantive business done, or alternatively in relation to the action list or mechanism found transferred into a written process, we will cancel the reserved hearings issue specific hearings 13. A set to occur in the period between the 23rd and 26th of March, there's a safeguard where we might have agendas hearing had there been serious technical difficulties, this reserve hearing will not be required. And the website banners will be updated in due course early next week to confirm the cancellation of that reserve hearing and all of the other reserve hearings from issue specific hearing 11 onwards. And

next hearings in these examinations will be on Tuesday, the 16th of March 2021. There will be issues specific hearings number 14 on the topic of biodiversity and habitats regulations assessment. So for those of you who are involved or interested in those topics, we look forward to seeing you there. And other than that, ladies and gentlemen, I will move to agenda item seven, and the close formally of this hearing. And once again, I would like to thank all of our speakers today for your attendance and your contributions. And again, the contributions that have been made on highly technical matters have been very valuable indeed. And we also strongly welcome all of the contributions from interested parties. And we thank you for your forbearance, whilst the experts debated often at some length matters that we did need to hear them settle before we move on to the hearing of interested parties on an individual basis. And we're hugely appreciate everybody's time today. Now, I would also like to thank our case team led by Mr. Williams for supporting these hearings so ably I will have a final check to make sure there is nothing else as anybody needs to raise before we end this hearing. And I'm looking around once again for yellow hands. And I'm seeing none. And on that basis. I'm going to call on colleagues now to say their goodbyes, starting with Mr. Rigby.

1:34:56

Thank you very much, everybody. It's been another long but very useful day. Good afternoon.

1:35:03

Thank you very much, everyone for your contributions today. And for the rest of this week. Have a good weekend. We'll see you next week.

1:35:12

Thanks very much for your help. today and this weekend. Have a good weekend everyone.

1:35:16

Indeed, and for me, Ryan Smith, lead member of these examining authorities. Thank you very much. Once again, enjoy your weekend. And for those of you that will see very shortly. Ladies and gentlemen, the time is now 35 minutes past five. And these issues specific hearings number 13 are now closed. Thank you