

ISH2_20 Jan_Part02

Created on: 2023-01-20 14:04:54

Project Length: 01:40:20

File Name: ISH2_20 Jan_Part02

File Length: 01:40:20

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:26 - 00:00:24:08

Good morning again. The time is exactly 1145. And I'm going to just take some introductions of people who've joined us in person. And indeed, if there are any other people who've joined virtually. So at least we've got people from Norfolk County Council.

00:00:26:26 - 00:00:47:02

Good morning. My name's John Shaw. I'm the Highways developer services manager for Norfolk County Council, and I lead on providing highway advice on exit proposals. And to my right, I've got Martin Dixon. And Martin Dixon is the network co-ordinator who leads on street works on highways.

00:00:51:02 - 00:00:56:20

Thank you. And thank you for joining us. Anybody new online who wishes to introduce themselves?

00:01:04:18 - 00:01:06:00

Hello, Mr. President.

00:01:09:20 - 00:01:12:26

I just thought I'd introduce myself. Tim Burton.

00:01:13:16 - 00:01:14:01

From.

00:01:14:03 - 00:01:16:25

Memorial has gone in the field. The noise and vibration and practice lead.

00:01:19:15 - 00:01:25:22

Thank you. Thank you for joining us. I'm going to hand over to Mr. Manning to resume with agenda item five.

00:01:27:18 - 00:02:14:22

Okay. Thank you very much. Agenda. Agenda item number five is in relation to land use. So we deal with point one, first place and the chapter for the Chapter 19, which is paragraph one four to the exam. So an action like that we reference for that is IP 105 notes that the impact on specific agreements I agree environment agreement schemes I should say, will only be known once the landowner agreements are in place confirming the extent and duration of impacts to specific land parcels to complete sets out what work is being done to reach agreements and and what confidence can the authority have.

00:02:15:18 - 00:02:18:16

Its any impacts can be seen to be mitigated or compensated.

00:02:23:01 - 00:02:35:21

Julian possible for the applicant? Is this a kind of landowner negotiation question, as it were, as to how that's fitting into the negotiations? Or is there a broader question as to what the starting impact might be?

00:02:38:03 - 00:02:56:18

You know, Simon is reference to paragraph 140 of the Chapter 19 of the. Yes. And it notes that the impact on specific agreements will only be known once the landowner agreements are in place. You know, this is a reference in the agenda item to the agri environment schemes.

00:03:00:25 - 00:03:01:16

So Jim

00:03:03:15 - 00:03:17:11

Evans Shields has come prepared with a sort of explanation of the position. And then I'm prepared to sort of then deal with how that's playing out in the context of the land discussions. So I suggest we deal with it like that. Okay. Thank you.

00:03:19:15 - 00:03:50:01

I'm Sir Alan Shields. I'm part of it. So just to set a little bit of context, perhaps, if that's okay, in terms of what that says. So as you've suggested, the U.S. does assess the impact on the agri environmental schemes, both from the construction perspective, but also operational perspective. And the study area does cross to hire countryside stewardship schemes and middle and countryside stewardship schemes.

00:03:50:13 - 00:04:23:28

It also identifies 16 entry level stewardship plus high level stewardship schemes and the effect on the landowners and the occupiers. With the macro environmental scheme, agreements in place would depend on the extent and the duration of the construction works within those land parcels and that are being managed. And as we said, the terms and conditions attached to the agreements in place primary mitigation, which obviously based off of all those land parcels which are subject to aggregate environmental schemes.

00:04:24:00 - 00:04:41:20

However, in some instances it's not impossible to avoid them and the level of impacts could range from no impact to a minor and temporary change, such as the need to make changes to grazing or cropping requirements or through to termination of the agreement.

00:04:43:06 - 00:05:18:22

And as I said, the impacts in relation to paragraph one or two, the impact on specific group agreements will only be known once the landowner agreements are in place and understood confirming the extent and duration of impacts to those specific land parcels and where the impacts of an agreement cannot be avoided. The affected landowner and occupier will be consulted to enable them to liaise with the rural Payments agency. And this will include compensation provisions to reimburse the landowner occupier financial losses where appropriate.

00:05:20:03 - 00:05:41:24

Moving on to the operational impact and obviously following the construction phase, land associated with with landfall in the onshore cable corridor that's located in those scheme agreement areas will be reinstated to its original position and conditions and would therefore be available once again for management.

00:05:42:03 - 00:06:11:14

During both of the applicant. I think the position going forward is that we we've obviously sought to understand the baseline, i.e. where we are now. It's a dynamic environment in that these schemes are in place and go forward and then it will depend what happens in practice in terms of the construction as to what the actual impact is. So for the points of mitigation that and Charles has just been referring to and then.

00:06:13:20 - 00:06:48:06

Then it's a question of compensation in terms of what the what the what the impact is. The landowner agreements that are under negotiation provide for compensation. They don't specifically deal with this because, as it were, they don't need to it's it's it falls under that that that head of that head of compensation and so that would that would either be provided for through voluntary agreements, assuming those are signed, which we very much hope they will be or if they weren't signed it, we be used compulsory powers, it would be dealt with through the compensation mechanisms for that.

00:07:14:01 - 00:07:20:24

Okay. Thank you for that. Moving on to question two of the agenda, item five,

00:07:22:09 - 00:07:56:08

D. S chapter 19, which is paragraph 267 and the exam lobby. References AP 105 which sets out is part of the cumulative effects assessment for land use states that the predicted cumulative impact significance during operation may represent a moderate adverse significance. As you set the context sorry in terms of this is in relation to the the onshore substation and whether it's in grade three or three B agricultural land.

00:07:56:10 - 00:08:22:03

So for those who aren't familiar with that section of the or that paragraph of the S that ultimately identifies a moderate adverse adverse impact of significance in terms of the cumulative assessments and states additional mitigation measures may be required, including an agricultural survey to determine whether the land associated with the onshore substation is grade three or three B

00:08:23:19 - 00:08:24:05

And

00:08:25:23 - 00:08:53:07

ultimately my question is, is if that would be determined to be land in grade three B and then ultimately in the best and most versatile banding, what's ultimately the impact of that would be? But initially the proposed survey would be in terms of the applicant and whether you intend to do that is part of the examination so that the overall impacts can be considered.

00:08:56:06 - 00:08:57:12

Impossible for the applicant.

00:08:59:03 - 00:09:36:08

The start, the starting point, just going back a couple of steps and that's okay. We obviously haven't done agricultural land set of a we did take so that there is high level data information that's available, but it doesn't go down to the level of three A versus three B. We made worst case assumption in the analysis that it was three that led into the overall site selection exercise. So I think the reference to this being mitigation perhaps isn't the right terminology in the sense that we're not changing our footprint.

00:09:37:01 - 00:10:10:15

We've committed to the footprint that we have for for the substation. All the survey would do would be to provide information as to what was three B and therefore, in that sense, having a smaller impact on the agricultural land quality position. I realize that we've said what we've said, but I don't think we

are we aren't intending to do that. Certainly we don't think it would add anything to to to the position. And simply doing a survey wouldn't wouldn't really be a form of mitigation.

00:10:10:17 - 00:10:41:00

It would simply be providing more information as to what the actual split was, assuming that there is both three and three B present. And I would stress that we we made the worst case assumption that fact it's actually three A and that's been plugged into the analysis. Okay. But the position of the applicant now is that no mitigation would be required on the assumption that it's grade three and that would be a moderate adverse impact in the sense. Yes.

00:10:41:02 - 00:11:28:27

And I stress again, it is our word mitigation. I think the. In terms of the EIA, we've we've we've made the worst case assumption that it's three and we've assessed it on that basis and that assumption was plugged in to the iterative site selection process. So I think as far as the planning balance is concerned, we we it's been taken into account on that basis in terms of how we analyzed and we presented the analysis and we're not proposing to do in theory, we could do a survey, but all it would do would be to update you and say in some ways all it could do is improve our position, as I think the text acknowledges that it might, if it turned out that it was all three B, I don't know whether that's a realistic possibility or not.

00:11:30:10 - 00:11:38:03

All that would do is then reduce the significance conclusion. So we've kind of made the worst case assumption against us selves anyway.

00:11:41:22 - 00:11:42:15

I think he.

00:12:00:09 - 00:12:20:27

Okay. Thank you. The interested parties would like to chip in in relation to land use. I'd be particularly interested to know from any help, from any local authorities in terms of whether you accept that there would be moderate adverse impacts in relation to best in my special type of cultural land.

00:12:28:23 - 00:12:31:10

Cllr Curtis, South Norfolk, Everton Council.

00:12:32:11 - 00:12:32:26

Thank you.

00:12:33:12 - 00:12:49:15

I agree with you that the with the they agree with the assessment that there would be that impact but I think is in in terms of the it then put into the planning balance in terms of the impact on that land together with the benefits of the scheme being put forward.

00:12:54:07 - 00:12:56:14

Okay. Thank you for that. That's useful.

00:12:58:05 - 00:13:01:21

Mr. Line for North Norfolk District Council, please.

00:13:03:11 - 00:13:22:11

Yeah. Thanks, Jeff. I know not just for counsel, just to echo the comments itself, not important. We're not raising a particular concern about loss of best and most versatile land. So it's a planning judgment

for yourselves as examining authority to weigh the benefits against the loss of any notice from the applicant to set out the worst case scenario. So we're content with the position that's been established.

00:13:25:04 - 00:13:38:01

Okay. Thank you. That's useful. Okay. Okay. Anything else on land? Use from anything slightly wider. So just please. Thank you, sir. Is there a figure for the total.

00:13:38:03 - 00:13:38:18

Amount of.

00:13:38:20 - 00:13:58:08

Land affected with the easement that's been described earlier of. Of 60 metres or 100 metres in terms of agricultural land permanently affected and also agricultural land temporarily affected by compound's accesses and so forth. And it may.

00:13:58:10 - 00:13:59:17

Be in the documentation but not.

00:13:59:20 - 00:14:02:27

Able to find it. I was looking for a rough guide in terms of.

00:14:03:16 - 00:14:06:27

You know, is it 300 acres or 500 acres for.

00:14:07:10 - 00:14:09:03

A figure like that, please. Thank you.

00:14:14:12 - 00:14:18:29

Okay, Thank you. Again, with that question the applicant would be happy to answer.

00:14:24:01 - 00:14:32:20

Mr. Understanding, Is that it? Sorry. Maintaining the individual policies have been considered in the in the chapter.

00:14:40:01 - 00:14:54:03

Julian Bond for the applicant. I'm sure we got that information somewhere. I'm not immediately being given a signpost. And so I think if we respond in writing to that, that would be the best approach.

00:14:55:27 - 00:14:59:00

Okay. Thank you for that. That's another hearing action. Thank you.

00:15:01:16 - 00:15:05:15

Okay. Anyone else before we move on to item six, which is noise and vibration.

00:15:09:03 - 00:15:18:16

Thank you very much. Okay. Item number six, then. Oh, sorry. There is a another hand up virtually at Mr. Line again, please.

00:15:21:09 - 00:15:46:28

Thank you, sir. It's just really a question about leading on to item six. And just before the break, you asked a question to local authorities about their view on the outline kind of construction practice and environmental plans that form part of Table one one. At the moment, we are currently working with

the applicant on our statement of Community seven A Common Ground and of will be presenting our local Impact report for deadline one.

00:15:48:17 - 00:16:01:06

So I'm happy if you want you to put that as part of your written questions to local authority to confirm its position on those documents say We are establishing that as part of our response to the applicant on the other statements of common ground. Thank you.

00:16:02:18 - 00:16:06:00

I think that would be very helpful and we appreciate that. Thank you.

00:16:13:13 - 00:16:26:11

I don't think there's any more hands. I think that's the legacy handed from Mr. Lyon. Okay. Thank you. Moving on to item six then, which is noise and vibration, and we'll deal with point one and two together, please.

00:16:28:20 - 00:16:44:05

And my first question to the applicant, please, is what is the justification for not taking baseline noise surveys, sensitive receptors along the onshore onshore cable corridor rates and assuming a category eight threshold value for all of those?

00:16:45:21 - 00:16:47:03

Julian. Positive of the applicant.

00:16:49:28 - 00:16:59:15

Tim Britton is going to take the the noise questions. So unless I jump in, please, please assume that he's going to respond throughout this.

00:17:01:09 - 00:17:02:09

Welcome, Mr. President.

00:17:04:19 - 00:17:09:13

Thank you, sir. Yes. In Britain for the applicant. So I.

00:17:10:10 - 00:17:11:00

Think that.

00:17:11:26 - 00:17:20:02

The response on this point is really discussed in App one and nine, the chapter on noise and Vibration.

00:17:21:18 - 00:17:48:13

Paragraph one, two, two specifically. So as you say, receptors. Well, we haven't undertaken measurements at receptors along the cable corridor. These are rather assumed to be category 80 as per British standard 5 to 20 Part one which ally applies the lowest possible possible threshold value for the onset of potentially significant effects,

00:17:50:00 - 00:18:12:24

irrespective of what the baseline noise levels at those receptors are. So if baseline measurements have been undertaken at the receptors along the corridor, the only change to the assessment criteria would have been if high baseline noise levels were measured, thereby increasing the threshold value and making the assessment more onerous.

00:18:14:10 - 00:18:28:26

And this approach was agreed with an expert topic group during consultation as per paragraphs 59 and 1 to 2 of our application reference number 109.

00:18:33:06 - 00:18:46:14

Okay. Thank you. Could you just explain for our benefit if the baseline survey is that those receptions have been below the category a threshold, why wouldn't that have any impact on the assessment of effects?

00:18:51:10 - 00:19:10:17

So pretty standard 5 to 8 minimum threshold values that can be applied for the onset of construction noise effects. So if baseline noise levels are below. Those values, then those are the limits that are applied irrespective of how much lower.

00:19:24:13 - 00:19:25:18

Okay. Thank you.

00:19:34:23 - 00:19:45:09

Police in the area can explain why no surveys were undertaken or baseline service, I should say, were undertaken in proximity to the main construction compound as natural bridge base.

00:19:53:12 - 00:20:08:19

I had referred to my previous response, which is that construction compound noise effects are essentially construction effects, therefore assessed using standard 5 to 8, and we have applied the minimum threshold value.

00:20:10:09 - 00:20:12:28

Without the need for baseline measurements.

00:20:18:10 - 00:20:31:24

Mr. Burton just for our benefit. Can you explain when you say it's the lowest threshold value, what would you mean? The baseline value cannot be lower than what you already applied, lower than category A?

00:20:34:03 - 00:20:37:03

Is that industry practice or is that what happens?

00:20:40:28 - 00:20:54:26

So the assessment methodology described in application document 129, I mentioned the table from standard 5 to 8, which applies threshold values.

00:20:57:06 - 00:21:02:01

Apologies, but there's an extremely strong echo. Can you hear me? Clearly.

00:21:02:15 - 00:21:08:00

We can hear you clearly, but you can't hear us. I'll just ask. Our technical team can use my voice.

00:21:08:02 - 00:21:10:16

That's there. The I'm hearing as an echo. Oh.

00:21:11:21 - 00:21:14:13

Not on this end. Okay.

00:21:14:23 - 00:21:17:00

That's that's fine. Apologies for.

00:21:19:03 - 00:21:19:26

Interrupting.

00:21:22:16 - 00:21:38:07

So that standard or that table of values is around the values at which the onset of significant effect could occur in terms of how loud construction noise can be.

00:21:41:00 - 00:21:48:09

So it is not of value if the baseline levels are lower than the values in that table,

00:21:49:24 - 00:21:57:09

than the minimum values in that table apply as limits, irrespective of what the actual baseline levels are.

00:22:04:05 - 00:22:18:21

Okay. Thank you. Terms coming back to the the main construction compound. Can I ask? Given the length of time that it could potentially be in situ, is considering construction levels the appropriate?

00:22:21:23 - 00:22:23:14

In terms of what's the sector where noise tends?

00:22:30:05 - 00:22:38:11

So I predict we have predicted the noise that the cable current compound, sorry, the construction compound

00:22:40:00 - 00:22:42:03

is anticipated to emit.

00:22:45:11 - 00:22:50:07

That is described in the construction noise and vibration assessment. And that's

00:22:51:25 - 00:22:59:17

a yes. Appendix. I just find the document number. It's up to six six.

00:23:03:12 - 00:23:14:17

During the daytime or the evenings and weekends. The predicted noise levels from the use of the compound equate to an effect of low magnitude.

00:23:17:18 - 00:23:28:00

And. That does effectively apply for the is true for the duration of the compound as it is considered a temporary impact.

00:23:32:08 - 00:23:36:15

Should the compound be used during the night? We do predict some

00:23:38:00 - 00:23:40:07

high impacts without mitigation.

00:23:42:24 - 00:23:48:10

We are proposing screening around the compound and without screening in place.

00:23:51:08 - 00:23:52:27

The impact would be reduced to

00:23:54:14 - 00:23:58:07

low during the night, i.e. not significant.

00:24:00:13 - 00:24:03:06

Can I ask why that sets out in the documentation?

00:24:05:04 - 00:24:06:17

In terms of the proposed screening.

00:24:08:13 - 00:24:13:06

The proposed screening is described in its chapter in.

00:24:15:15 - 00:24:18:12

Well. Section 20 3.6..

00:24:21:01 - 00:24:22:01

1.2.

00:24:26:00 - 00:24:27:08

On the mitigation measures.

00:24:32:16 - 00:25:09:02

But we will come onto the issue of the mitigation measures as is proposed in due course. But just just going back to my original question. I'm approaching understanding the guidance suggests that ultimately for construction noise, the thresholds may be a bit higher than in terms of operational noise because those would be permanent. And if so, given the duration of time, the main construction compound would be in situ. Is it still appropriate to use construction thresholds rather than to say operational thresholds given the length of time involved?

00:25:13:08 - 00:25:13:23

Mm hmm.

00:25:14:06 - 00:25:33:07

So we're down to 5 to 8 applies. Well, this provides a discussion on why the noise thresholds are what they are, and it is in part due to duration and the fact that the works are temporary. It is also.

00:25:36:02 - 00:25:43:03

Due to the nature of construction works which are. Outdoors and inherently noisy. So

00:25:45:02 - 00:26:00:02

that limits to a large extent what can be done in terms of their mitigation. In comparison to most operational sites where more controls are potentially available and the effects of permanent.

00:26:03:05 - 00:26:16:15

But I don't see any reason why the duration of works at the construction compound would reduce the applicable noise level limits.

00:26:18:23 - 00:26:19:10

I may not be.

00:26:19:12 - 00:26:42:23

Used to distinction here. The sensitive receptors around the main construction compound would be exposed to the increased noise for a considerable more period of time than for, say, every sector along the cable corridor where works would move past them quite swiftly. And is there a distinction between the two in terms of what should be assessed and what should be considered acceptable?

00:26:47:24 - 00:26:57:29

So there is the standard makes reference to durations of effects and what can and can't be considered

00:26:59:15 - 00:27:06:16

significant. So in general, we have two thresholds ten days and 15

00:27:08:21 - 00:27:15:07

days. That's a consecutive 15 day window or 40 days in any six months,

00:27:17:05 - 00:27:18:20

which can be non-consecutive.

00:27:20:22 - 00:27:31:13

But. Beyond the six month period. The standard is not specific. So I'm. The fact that the.

00:27:33:00 - 00:27:38:27

Construction compound will be used for more than six months doesn't affect the applicable limits.

00:27:48:23 - 00:27:56:15

So I think it comes back to my points about whether the years can be considered temporary and whether the selection of construction noise thresholds which.

00:27:58:04 - 00:28:02:20

Higher than operational noise thresholds is appropriate in this case.

00:28:05:02 - 00:28:07:18

And I'm sorry to label the point, but I think it's quite an important one.

00:28:18:11 - 00:28:22:22

Yeah, I. I take the point. Is this something that we can respond to in writing?

00:28:26:20 - 00:28:30:17

That would be very useful. Yes. Well, nature is a hearing action place.

00:28:32:18 - 00:28:47:15

I didn't know at that point in time. Perhaps times you'll have your hand up. As I said earlier, I will come and see interested parties once we sort of out of I. So my questions from the agenda items on noise. But rest assured, you will have a chance to have your say.

00:28:53:26 - 00:29:12:06

Okay. In terms of that last point, do you do any of the local authorities have a view on that matter? Are there partnerships using construction thresholds for the compound? So the main construction compound, given the amount of time that it could well be in place?

00:29:21:04 - 00:29:22:22

Yes, please, Mr. Lyon.

00:29:25:01 - 00:29:46:22

Sir. Ma'am, my protection officer isn't with us today, and I know that she would have comments on these particular points because we do have some comments that we're feeding back to the applicant via the statement of common ground on noise impacts. So we do have concerns about baseline data, but I don't have specific comments on the points you raised, but I'm happy to take those by written questions if you think that would be useful.

00:29:49:27 - 00:29:55:21

Okay. Thank you, Mr.. I will note that. Thank you. At Mr. Grima. I think you've also got your hand up.

00:29:58:24 - 00:30:08:13

It's grown from Broadland South Norfolk Base five 2 to 8 is, in my opinion, particularly applicable for the actual cable line vote.

00:30:10:23 - 00:30:38:01

However, when it comes to the compound, I would actually prefer to see some more information or a baseline survey to actually assess the impact to the actual residents that might be affected. I would note that I was not in the employed by Gordon Smith or the Council during the initial agreement and I have not been able to see the minutes for the meetings or the agreements that were actually made at that time.

00:30:43:23 - 00:30:52:22

Okay. Thank you for that. Okay. Thank you. We'll move on to point three of the agenda.

00:30:55:09 - 00:31:09:29

And the question is, what is the justification for the selection of noise resistance to LFR to what appears to be at the residence residential properties in close proximity to the landfill in that one. Thank you.

00:31:20:01 - 00:31:20:25

Okay. So you hear me?

00:31:21:11 - 00:31:23:04

Yes, I can hear you. So. So.

00:31:26:15 - 00:31:35:07

Alpha one is the. Worst affected except in terms of landfall works.

00:31:37:00 - 00:31:40:10

That's shown in environmental statement volume to

00:31:42:00 - 00:31:48:18

figure 23.1 Noise receptors Application Document 133.

00:31:50:19 - 00:32:02:16

Impacts from landfall works or at this end it's considered negligible during the daytime and evenings and weekends and low during the night. So not significant.

00:32:04:19 - 00:32:12:13

Construction noise levels. The other nestles further from the landfall works would be lower and therefore also not significant.

00:32:15:05 - 00:32:32:26

Okay. We want you to board a cable corridor. Have all sensitive receptors been identified and assessed and ought to be? We've used the reference that avenue from a bottom, which seems to almost border the corridor, but wasn't identified. And I just don't understand why that was based.

00:32:36:07 - 00:32:36:22

So.

00:32:38:10 - 00:33:01:10

The receptors that we've chosen to include in the assessment are those that we considered exposed to the potential worst case impacts in terms of Avenue Pharm specifically. We've identified that as being close to CCR eight. Both of those are shown in figure 23.1 sheet to, as I referenced earlier.

00:33:03:07 - 00:33:12:12

However, avenue form is further from the cable corridor than CCR eight. So impacts at Avenue Farm will be lower than we've reported.

00:33:14:24 - 00:33:24:02

The selection of CCR eight therefore ensures that worst case impacts have been assessed at this location, and the introduction of the new form would not change the assessment outcome.

00:33:27:11 - 00:33:48:05

Okay. So turning now to potential sensitive receptors which may be impacted by a cable corridor. How will mitigation be delivered if some receptors haven't identified or assessed? How would it be decided Which sensitive receptors along the corridor will receive noise mitigation?

00:34:00:11 - 00:34:07:03

So noise mitigation will be specified within the code of construction practice, which will.

00:34:09:13 - 00:34:10:00

Consider

00:34:11:24 - 00:34:17:28

the contractor will develop that noise mitigation and will consider all residential properties that

00:34:19:16 - 00:34:21:07

are potentially affected.

00:34:22:22 - 00:34:40:25

But it's quite likely that Avenue Farm is affected similar to the adjacent noise receptor, isn't it? So how when the noise mitigation plan is produced, how will the contract is no to noise mitigation in place for that property if it's not even being assessed?

00:34:44:27 - 00:34:51:15

Is the applicant saying that there would be basically another assessment post consent which would decide what mitigation was required where.

00:34:56:22 - 00:35:18:19

Well. That the construction contract does need to make that consideration. Yes. Within within their. Noise vibration management plan if they believe that has the potential for significant effects to occur as a location, then they they would specify the mitigation required.

00:35:31:06 - 00:35:31:21

In. What

00:35:33:11 - 00:35:43:10

comfort can the Examination Authority have examining authority to have this suitable mitigation will be delivered in every noise receptor which will be adversely affected.

00:35:47:04 - 00:35:52:18

Particularly based on the level of information in the noise mitigation plan as it stands.

00:36:05:06 - 00:36:09:27

So I think I think this is another query that we need to take away in writing. Apologies to the outset.

00:36:13:15 - 00:36:21:25

I think the general point I am trying to make is how can mitigation be delivered on adversely affected parties when they've not even been assessed?

00:36:26:08 - 00:36:32:06

So our standard approach within this assessment process is to undertake the

00:36:34:02 - 00:36:58:11

assessment at the worst case locations in terms of the environmental assessment, environmental statement, so that worst case impacts are predicted and reported in this scenario where we identify the potential for mitigation requirements. That does need to be looked at in more detail by the contractor as part of the code of Construction practice. And the end vamp that goes into that document.

00:37:03:02 - 00:37:09:19

We don't. The contractor will have all the information, a lot more information in order to make that judgment themselves.

00:37:11:13 - 00:37:17:28

But it isn't usual for us to identify every single potentially affected receptor along the cable corridor.

00:37:20:27 - 00:37:27:16

Okay. I'll ask you just one more question. Well, we used to have a new farm. Is a a an example.

00:37:29:07 - 00:37:39:11

How would the the contractor know what mitigation to put around Avenue Farm if there's no idea about what the adverse impacts might be?

00:37:40:28 - 00:37:53:16

That to my question is, will the applicant do a post consent survey, noise survey to determine what mitigation might be required? Because ultimately that's not before the examination as it stands.

00:38:11:00 - 00:38:12:04

You might be on mute.

00:38:15:03 - 00:38:17:05

So I think you might find me, too. Mr. Pearson.

00:38:17:29 - 00:38:19:00

Apologies for that.

00:38:22:22 - 00:38:23:07

So.

00:38:31:20 - 00:38:33:11

As I say, the the.

00:38:36:27 - 00:38:56:21

I would expect the contractor, if required, to do additional predictions of noise. A survey is not required, but production predictions may well be required in order to inform the construction noise and vibration management plan, which will go into the.

00:38:59:24 - 00:39:01:20

This final cock up.

00:39:03:10 - 00:39:13:07

So could I just jump in to confirm why that construction noise management plan is secured? It's actually already in section nine of the outline code of construction practice.

00:39:13:25 - 00:39:32:22

That, as I understand it, a noise mitigation plan is secured. It's more about the contents of that and how a contractor would know what mitigation was required at certain noise sensitive receptors if there's been, you know, no assessment about the level of decibel reduction and it would be required.

00:39:35:04 - 00:39:45:18

I think maybe we need to do need to move on stage. Should we? I think you suggested that you would come back in writing. She was on that point. If unless there's something you can have with right now.

00:39:47:00 - 00:39:48:15

So he just would have taken, I guess.

00:39:50:05 - 00:40:27:00

What we're saying is that activities along the corridor will have will have a different level of noise. So normal activities in an open call will be different to the three inside, for example, of an incident. So the fact that a receptor is a sensible, sensitive receptor and is at a different position of the corridor doesn't necessarily mean that that will have a level of noise just because of location. It depends on the activity that will have been there. So on activities, like we say, the great initiative, then of course we have more machineries, we have more equipment there and there is where we have also the provisions of what sort of mitigations we will do.

00:40:27:10 - 00:40:32:01

So it's more related to activity that may produce a noise, if that helps.

00:40:35:09 - 00:40:51:14

Now, I do understand that that is also clearly linked to activity itself. My question is really in relation to how will the contractor to know what level of mitigation along that corridor, depending on the activity is required, when that risk for that risk factor is not being assessed?

00:40:54:05 - 00:41:11:29

And every time I see the point that you're getting a paragraph one, four seven and the outline code construction practice, it does say that there'll be a confirmed list of the plant and equipment that will be used by the contractor to inform that. But I think we can take that away and provide a bit more detail in writing, if that's helpful.

00:41:12:05 - 00:41:13:16

Okay. That would be very useful.

00:41:22:28 - 00:41:58:07

Think we want to see point four place for cumulative noise effects from construction traffic only the site that can concurrent scenario is being assessed. I just wanted to know why that was the case. When there are certain instances where greater levels of construction traffic on some links for the isolation scenario are in place as set out in Tables 24, 19 and 2420 of Chapter 24 of the year, which is ATP 110.

00:42:03:23 - 00:42:26:08

And it's important for the applicants again. So Section 20 3.3.4 of the appendix 23.2, which discusses road traffic noise assessment document 266 discusses the fact that there are only 63 links which will be used

00:42:27:27 - 00:42:38:12

by the projects considered in the cumulative assessment. Out of the 182, which will be used by Sep and or DEP.

00:42:41:00 - 00:42:45:00

Hence, cumulative impacts are only assessed on those 63 links.

00:42:46:26 - 00:43:09:11

The calculated road traffic noise levels due to CEP and depth construction Traffic on those 63 links were consistently higher in the seven DEP concurrent scenario than if SEP or DEP are constructed in isolation. So we have considered the worst case impacts by using the concordance or concurrent scenario

00:43:11:15 - 00:43:12:24

for the cumulative assessment.

00:43:13:25 - 00:43:25:08

I said the outcome checked every one of those 63 links to check that the concurrent scenario is the worst case for that link. Is that what you just confirmed? Yes. Okay. That's useful. Thank you.

00:43:31:10 - 00:43:40:10

Okay, We'll move on to item number five. So point five under item six and.

00:43:42:10 - 00:43:57:03

The Yes. Which is app 1089 sets out that to identify whether a significant fact is likely to occur. It is necessary to establish the length of time the works will be less than the maximum distance from each sensitive receptor.

00:43:59:04 - 00:44:32:15

The assessment uses an example of one activity as the worst case, which is cable dumps and installation works. Now the test finds that the exceedance of the threshold value with the receptor would only last for one week and therefore would be highly unlikely to exceed the threshold value for

more than 40 days in any six month period or ten days in any 15. The assessment concludes that the intensified moderate and major adverse impact sheets construction works along the cable corridor.

00:44:32:17 - 00:44:56:22

Rates would therefore be considered to be not significant. My question is, is should the consequential construction activities be undertaken that could in combination results in noise level over the threshold value for ten days in any 15 day period and therefore would be considered significant? Is looking at one element of the construction appropriate?

00:45:05:11 - 00:45:07:02

Tim Burton for the applicant.

00:45:08:18 - 00:45:22:03

There was a question we raised around this question. We are slightly uncertain by what you mean by sequential in this scenario. Where in this question are we referring to?

00:45:24:09 - 00:45:27:04

Like the sequential construction of step and depth.

00:45:27:19 - 00:45:56:09

Yeah. So I can understand how that would have been confusing. No, it was in relation to, for example, if a whole road was constructed and then immediately afterwards another construction next started. So in combination, the two different activities would result in, you know, noise impacts a ten day in a 15 day period threshold. Actually, that makes slightly more sense than.

00:45:57:27 - 00:46:04:22

Yes, it is. Thank you. So in paragraph 155 of the East chapter,

00:46:06:08 - 00:46:22:12

we make the statement that the works are expected to be undertaken in one kilometer sections, and that would require a construction presence for up to four weeks. The section, as we understand it, that's the entire.

00:46:24:09 - 00:46:35:27

Works on the. Along the cable corridor. So and that's that's what informs that assessment. So on that basis, we can't see a scenario where the works

00:46:37:13 - 00:46:49:08

would result in an exceedance of the threshold only for more than ten days. And then. 15. Because they essentially progress it 250 meters per week. That's the entire works. So.

00:46:51:14 - 00:46:52:12

That answers your question.

00:47:06:04 - 00:47:07:07

Okay. Thank you for that.

00:47:10:03 - 00:47:40:20

Okay. Moving on to our last point. Under item six, the IRS finds that there are many sensitive receptors where Montreal major adverse impacts during construction and activities are identified, including nighttime in the nighttime period from trench. This crossing works in quite a number of cases. The exceed the threshold is is fairly significant. And the assessment sets out that there's a number of generic mitigation measures, including the use of construction noise management plan.

00:47:42:13 - 00:48:02:27

And coming up can start out the typical noise reduction that such generic mitigation measures can feasibly achieve. And I think it might be useful to use an example here, which is one we viewed on the accompany sites inspection yesterday which was receptive CCR to see.

00:48:05:14 - 00:48:32:03

And for the trenches crossing, it's anticipated that there would be a noise level of 89 decibels. And based on the table, 2311 of the noise, this chapter, the construction noise magnitude of effect criteria to ensure no significant effects, there would need to be no greater than 50 decibels. So there would need to be a reduction of 39 decibels.

00:48:34:01 - 00:48:38:13

Ultimately, is that realistic in terms of delivering mitigation of that scale?

00:48:46:18 - 00:49:04:02

I believe that. But the assessment is based on a worst case assumption that trench less crossings would cause elevated nighttime noise levels, which more than last more than ten days in any 15 at any one receptor location.

00:49:06:17 - 00:49:17:06

The principal contractor will have more accurate information on the duration of the works, and it's anticipated that this the assumption that we've made may be overly conservative.

00:49:19:28 - 00:49:28:20

So in that scenario, the duration is actually significantly lower than we anticipate then.

00:49:30:22 - 00:49:52:12

The. Impact of the noise becomes substantially reduced, such that we wouldn't consider heightened high noise levels for less than ten days at any 15 to be significant. So obviously all works that can be done will be done to reduce noise impact as much as possible.

00:49:56:21 - 00:49:57:06

But

00:49:58:21 - 00:50:02:27

so what confidence does that give the examining authority that is achievable?

00:50:07:08 - 00:50:13:12

And ultimately the worst case is what's identified in the series is what the zoning authority has to consider.

00:50:17:16 - 00:50:21:12

So I'm surprised. I think someone else from your team wants to jump in. Thank. Okay.

00:50:23:10 - 00:50:59:22

It is for the applicant. During them the definition of the songs? No songs. We actually go see for each crossing of the age kids or as closely as we actually accounted for the possibility of having them. Actually the compounds on either side of the dream. But that is also it will not necessarily happen. So you will have it on one side of the other side. So that's another way to mitigate as well the noise to the receptor or the distance that you have from the receptor. So that's one of the other factors that maybe you consider, because in the assessments we have, look at it both sides of the dream.

00:51:00:04 - 00:51:22:07

So that's more conservative in that sense as well. Another point is about the course of time. So what we have accounted for is the possibility of working at night. But we don't believe that in normal crossings, a short process that would not necessarily be the case. So it's just and very long details are more complex than they might be able to build. But all depends, again, as we have said, on ground conditions, oxygen.

00:51:23:17 - 00:51:34:28

Is not necessarily a level of detail that you believe as an examining authority we need in terms of being able to ensure that there would be no major and moderate adverse impacts on those sensitive receptors.

00:51:55:00 - 00:51:56:09

Julian possible for the applicant.

00:51:58:07 - 00:52:04:10

We've obviously applied a Rochdale ombudsman approach here and we've assessed the worst case and

00:52:06:21 - 00:52:23:27

Harris Rodriguez has just made some comments about what may or may not be likely. I appreciate that. If we're saying we might do it, then we have to answer questions about if that does actually happen. What is it that you most want from us on this point? I think what may be useful is for the example that I've.

00:52:26:01 - 00:52:37:15

Outlines is a a a detailed mitigation scheme for that sensitive receptor to demonstrate that it is possible to.

00:52:39:24 - 00:52:42:07

Mitigate any impact students at school level.

00:52:52:02 - 00:52:53:09

Julian of the African.

00:52:55:22 - 00:53:02:06

Will respond to that in writing. Will either give it to you or we'll tell you why we shouldn't. Why we think you shouldn't have to give it to you.

00:53:03:27 - 00:53:04:12

Yeah.

00:53:05:05 - 00:53:14:29

It's just worth emphasizing that at the moment, the worst case scenario in the US we're not confident can be mitigated to an acceptable level.

00:53:15:16 - 00:53:21:12

So yeah, no, I've clocked that. And so we will we will definitely respond to that head on. Yep.

00:53:28:08 - 00:53:44:29

Okay. Thank you. That's all the questions I have. Specifics, Parties. Does anyone else wish to jump in on Mr. Grammer? You referred to the the noise levels at night from the area around site. Now is probably an opportunity for you to have your say.

00:53:49:00 - 00:53:50:03

Thank you. Yes.

00:53:52:09 - 00:54:24:05

When I first got brought into this project, I read through the noise mitigation and the noise assessments. I was significantly concerned about the lack of detail. Regarding potential for vibrations and noise, because with HDD, it's not just the noise aspects. You've actually got quite significant vibrations back from it. And it does happen at night.

00:54:24:23 - 00:54:53:26

Then the disturbance to the residence will not just be from high levels of noise, but will also be from the fact the entire house is shaking. And if that happens at night, they will not be able to sleep. Therefore, we will then start getting complaints which potentially could be justifiable as statutory nuisance. It will also be a distinct loss of amenity to those residents. But I have asked for further details, but I have received nothing as yet.

00:55:13:14 - 00:55:25:18

Okay. Thank you. We'll come to all parish council with all the parties, have their say, and then I will accept it to the applicants afterwards. Opposing counsel, please.

00:55:30:19 - 00:56:00:27

Mother. Alton Parish Council. I've got a couple of points. Firstly, Alton, we have eight receptors on maps on the app, one through three noise and vibration. A couple of short HDD crossings. But we do have one which is going across the river Bure. And the other one is under the solar farm, particularly the one that's going under the solar farm. There are two receptors there.

00:56:00:29 - 00:56:07:14

CC, 116, B and C c, r16c.

00:56:09:07 - 00:56:15:02

The proposed HD crossing will be right near to properties there.

00:56:16:18 - 00:56:26:21

Given that this the area is already impacted by Hornsea three and Vattenfall, there might be some cumulative impacts there.

00:56:29:01 - 00:57:05:15

The other point was going back earlier to your discussions about the construction compound. Well, Alton's in quite a good position to give you some information about main construction compounds because we are hosting the Hornsea three main construction compound and one particular resident who is impacted on the noise and vibration at the moment. CC of 16 C When it came to the Hornsea three construction compound, he had

00:57:07:02 - 00:57:46:26

noise assessments carried out at that particular property and that was in relation to the noise and vibration from traffic. Because one thing about a main construction compound is that it is in operation for the entirety of the Capel construction process and he that particular property has had to have quite a bit of mitigation work to mitigate against traffic going past his house in the form of acoustic fencing and acoustic windows and also the highway intervention scheme which

00:57:48:16 - 00:57:50:26

went along the length of the street

00:57:52:14 - 00:58:15:03

to be able to act so that HGV could access also required smoothing over a railway hump. So the tarmac was changed and I think a similar thing was done in Causton as well to try and mitigate some of the the sound issues with traffic. So I'll just give you some food for thought. Thank you.

00:58:18:10 - 00:58:24:06

Okay. Thank you very much for that contribution, Mr. Ly And I think you've got your hand up as well.

00:58:27:06 - 00:58:41:27

Thank you. Jeff Lyons from North Norfolk District Council. Just some observations on the noise, noise and vibration topics. As I said earlier, we're preparing our statement of common ground with the applicant and we will be raising concerns about

00:58:43:18 - 00:59:15:13

the baseline data. So the survey in a night survey, evening and nighttime levels appear to be quite elevated from my, my, my interpretation of that, as noted. Compared with the daytime survey and the very short durations of measurements were undertaken only about 15 to 30 minutes. And there's no sort of full noise survey data provided to give us sort of information about what was done and how that was how that was carried out. The main point there is there's a potential for an underestimation of evening and nighttime noise impacts.

00:59:15:15 - 01:00:02:04

That's that's a concern and indicate that indeed we have as the background noise levels may actually be lower than those that have been surveyed by the applicant. Now, in reality, this could mean that insufficient noise mitigation measures have been selected which could have adverse impacts on nearby receptors. So we'll be fitting into our statement of common ground, unlike the local impact report, but hopefully that can be resolved. It may need some work, more work from the applicant in terms of the baseline data, particularly at Weybourne, where we've got tickler concerns about noise receptors and LFR one and LFR two and say we'll put that in writing in our statement of common ground with the applicant and set a deadline one.

01:00:04:24 - 01:00:27:23

We also mined vital protection officers also raised some concern about the adequacy of mitigation. So weybourne and a bordering CCR road you referred to already in a discussion as some concerns about whether that would be sufficient and CCR nine also bottom due to the high potential of vibration impacts without mitigation at that receptor.

01:00:29:12 - 01:00:30:07

Okay. Thank you.

01:00:31:26 - 01:00:40:21

Mr. Land, first, a quick question for you. You said that you have concerns which you're going to raise in your statement of common ground about the underestimation of baseline

01:00:42:24 - 01:00:57:00

noise levels. If you have anything to support that in terms of a survey that you might have carried out, then it would be helpful to put that alongside either a written representation statement of common ground or as opposed to hearing action.

01:00:58:19 - 01:00:59:19

Okay? No, thank you.

01:01:05:13 - 01:01:09:26

Okay, but did you not reply to any of the interested parties we just heard from?

01:01:11:21 - 01:01:14:19

Sorry. Yes, sorry. Just before you did a place?

01:01:14:22 - 01:01:25:09

Yes. So I didn't get any samples. I just would like to reiterate what's been said this morning and my clients that affected the main compound share that's been raised.

01:01:29:11 - 01:01:57:06

Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. ODIs, I've come to you now. Thank you, sir. Just reflecting back on the conversation about the use of construction thresholds at the construction compound, is that same discussion applicable to the onshore substation area? The parameters are different. I think the principles are very similar. And could the response on this can be given on construction compound? Could that be extended to cover also the onshore substation, please?

01:01:57:20 - 01:01:58:05

Thank you.

01:01:59:00 - 01:02:09:10

In terms of the offshore substation, I'm sure the applicant will correct me if I'm wrong, but there was a detailed assessment of a baseline surveys around that in terms of operational noise.

01:02:13:02 - 01:02:13:17

He's not.

01:02:18:24 - 01:02:20:27

Okay. And like I said, I think from the place.

01:02:24:14 - 01:02:37:21

Julian possible for the. I don't think there's anything we want to say specifically on what Alton Parrish raised in terms of Mr. Lyon.

01:02:40:06 - 01:03:11:12

I'm just I'm just clarifying at this end that I don't think I'm going to come back as to whether the baseline points are new points or not. But I think it's probably best that we resolve that issue or take that issue forward through the same common ground discussions that he that he referenced so that we can assist you in understanding what the what the combined position is once those points have been talked through.

01:03:12:28 - 01:03:13:22

Okay. Thank you.

01:03:26:15 - 01:03:59:04

In that case. That concludes our discussion on noise vibration. And we'll move on to item number seven, which is traffic and transports two dealing with point one. First, the S adopted methodology of looking at sensitive links on the local road network. And my first question for the applicant, please is those looking at links only potentially impacting sensitive junctions that are on the local road network and the need for any potential mitigation at those.

01:04:01:21 - 01:04:20:01

Some seller on behalf of the African lobby, Newswatch said that context for the assessment. So the assessment has looked at a number of different effects or impacts. The first is deference, amenity protection, and they relate to sort of human factors. So when we

01:04:22:10 - 01:04:32:11

assess those, it's looking at things like all their communities or on their other schools. They will inform for me assessment that those

01:04:35:18 - 01:04:41:24

are not well informed assessment as to for those for those impacts.

01:04:43:18 - 01:04:50:08

We then also looked at the effects of trauma delay, which I think is what you're referring to.

01:04:52:16 - 01:05:23:19

And for the driver, like we've looked at junctions, so we engage with national highways and identify those junctions which they consider sensitive, and they identify 11 junctions which we have undertaken as an assessment of the local road network. We've engaged with Norfolk County Council in their role as traffic manager and sort of reflecting the extent of the study area. They identify those roads where they've got some.

01:05:25:17 - 01:05:51:25

The concerns that accounts for approximately 59 of the 125 local links with students, almost 50% of the network. So we've looked at those those roads and we've undertaken assessment of the potential impacts of driver delay on those of those roads and an outline mitigation accordingly.

01:05:53:12 - 01:06:09:27

And within looking at those parts of looking at those roads and clearly you'll see the junctions along that and it reflects the sort of significant extent to the study area. And that was the approach we've discussed and agreed with Norfolk County Council today.

01:06:11:16 - 01:06:26:15

And mitigation measures where where appropriate, and then set out in the construction traffic management plan and. Which is an app thread which is secured by Quantum 50.

01:06:30:19 - 01:06:58:15

And I think in terms of the you referred to the assessment of the junctions, is that is that correct? My understanding is that the assessment percentage increase of traffic on those links with a view of coming to a view on drive in delay, it didn't look at queues at the junctions at each end of the links or anything like that. Is that correct? Yes, I'm telling you there's a difference in methodology between

01:07:00:05 - 01:07:37:12

the strategic road network and the local road network, and that reflects the different characteristics of the two networks. So for the Strategic Road Network, which is the network managed by national highways and we've done junction modelling and the delays stop taking that approach. The local road network undertaken a different there's a different approach and that looks at what the what the date changed. Well, the hourly changes in Tropico and whether that's material or not, that's, that's why there's a difference in approach.

01:07:37:18 - 01:08:02:09

Yes. So my question really is in relation to the local road network, I understand in terms of the strategic road network, the modelling that was done. I guess ultimately what I'm asking the applicant is whether a similar assessment in terms of the strategic road network of junctions should have been

done for the local road network. And does the methodology adopted by the applicant essentially ignore impacts at sensitive junctions on the local road network?

01:08:04:24 - 01:08:12:22

So the central part of definitely the approach we've taken to local road networks is to look at the the change in traffic and

01:08:14:13 - 01:08:24:29

a trace rate that reflects to a certain extent, the extent of that study area. So the area is in total over 350 miles of the road network.

01:08:27:08 - 01:08:53:27

And we've we've we've discussed the approach with North, the county council, who are the local authority. And so we have a a role as traffic management manage to sort of ensure the expeditionary movement of traffic through that network. So by looking at the links that is inclusive of the junctions along that link, it is an extent that it reflects that the extent of the study area.

01:08:57:18 - 01:09:02:01

National accounts were to come in at that point in terms of the queries of rice, please.

01:09:05:12 - 01:09:42:17

Yeah. John Shaw, Norfolk County Council. We're pretty happy with the approach that's been undertaken by the applicant. Starting point was that with this was to do a census check. So I've worked for Norfolk County Council Highways three years dealing with this stuff, not in next to me even longer. So he deals specifically with the area so we know where the issues that are in those network issues. So our starting point was to look at the data. You know, there's the huge amounts of data and it's looking at that to make sure it ties in with our expectations and it does.

01:09:43:00 - 01:10:14:11

So I think that's a comfort there. There are certain roads that we've asked the applicants not to use at all. And so I think what we're saying is we agree with the applicants in the methodology that the approach has been undertaken and it does toy with the expectations that we'd got. We have been talking to them about sensitivity as late as this week to overcome some of the sensitivity issues because there are certain things that they use that we didn't understand why they were using certain things and not others.

01:10:14:20 - 01:10:37:00

And we now go at approach, and I think we'll pick up on that in the statement of Common Ground in relation specifically to junctions. I think if you look at any accident statistics, you will always find that you get accidents at junctions. It's there, it's their nature. But certainly the junctions that are being used, we're quite comfortable with with the levels of traffic that are proposed.

01:10:39:00 - 01:10:42:12

Okay. Thank you. That's really useful to see to get that input from you.

01:10:44:17 - 01:11:06:28

Okay. Just a related question. Table 2410 of chapter 24. I was just trying to transport of the plates links that have some sensitive periods. I just wondered what has been done to assess these. And I will come back to Norfolk County Council in terms of whether they're content with the approach. But I just have to confess placing.

01:11:09:14 - 01:11:09:29

Sorry.

01:11:10:01 - 01:11:10:16

That's long.

01:11:11:06 - 01:11:23:29

Sometimes. On behalf of the applicant, the. Yeah, the we as part of the engagement with Norfolk County Council, we do identify those roads that are sensitive to traffic, but also those those that are sensitive to

01:11:25:28 - 01:11:49:10

increases in seasonal traffic. And they are they form part of the same assessment that we've been talking about in terms of magnitude of change. And when we look at what the changes are, they. They remain within those day to day fluctuations and that those conversations with them be ongoing with the Norfolk County Council. And we've we've looked at several things

01:11:51:12 - 01:11:59:21

to ensure that some. So that has been applied. So they have been they are included as part of that settlement to try to delay.

01:12:02:17 - 01:12:29:04

So is that something we should expect in due course, given this discussions happening in terms of sort of 70 sensitivities, check of seasonal variations? I'll be clear, the assessment has already been undertaken. I'm referring to the ongoing consultation with Norfolk County Council and post consensus in relation to their review of the document, and that will be part of this ongoing statement of common ground.

01:12:33:12 - 01:12:37:15

Okay. Thank you. I'll come to the county council now. Place on that matter.

01:12:39:19 - 01:12:42:17

MARTIN You get most traditional kind of network.

01:12:43:20 - 01:12:45:17

Yeah, we're broadly happy with.

01:12:45:19 - 01:13:18:01

The approach at the moment. And it's the applicants have identified reasons for forward sensitive receptors. And it's particularly important in the north of the country with the summer season. And that like so we're broadly at this stage happy with their approach that the appropriate. Identification has been made. And as he says, we will take it for granted. There are many factors that will make a road traffic sensitive.

01:13:18:23 - 01:13:22:01

And as I say, it's part of the ongoing discussion.

01:13:24:13 - 01:13:25:24

Okay. Thank you for that.

01:13:28:05 - 01:13:28:22

Thank.

01:13:31:08 - 01:13:42:08

You're not 2.2. I know it's national highways on here today in terms of being able to provide an update on their highway improvement schemes along the a47.

01:13:44:00 - 01:14:20:18

So I will skip over the update. In fact, in the written question, in terms of. A scenario where maybe those improvements may not come forward. And then ultimately a fallback position in terms of what mitigation may be required. I'm mindful that the the traffic is that the transport assessment did identify potential impacts at some of the junctions on the A47 and there was some mitigation referred to. I just would be interested in the applicant's further thoughts on the whether those would be sufficient to mitigate those impacts.

01:14:20:20 - 01:14:51:27

And I would ask the question in writing to National highways when we released a first round of questions, but I'll be trusting the applicant's thoughts now, please. Yes, some time of the applicant. So the the approach we we took from the start is that we could not rely upon the highway schemes coming forward for approval in time for our project. And that's also borne out in the delays that have been announced in the judicial review for for those schemes.

01:14:51:29 - 01:15:20:28

So the assessment is based on a from a transport perspective, a worst case in that the highway improvements have not been implemented in time for the commencement of our projects and therefore the assessment is based upon based upon those principles. And as you as you point out, there are a number. In looking at drive delay, there are two junctions which were identified to have potentially significant impacts

01:15:22:19 - 01:15:36:23

of save the schemes come forward the national highways are promoting in time. Then they would remove those two junctions and there would be no delay and such in the event that those schemes do not come forward.

01:15:38:20 - 01:15:59:03

We set out within our. Construction traffic management plan, which is up 3.1 and is secured by requirement 15 measures to ensure that all impacts would not be significant through those junctions and that those would focus upon measures such as demand management measures, which I can explain for review. So which is.

01:16:02:05 - 01:16:07:24

Okay. Thank you for that. And so I will be asking the same questions to national highways emerging.

01:16:13:23 - 01:16:15:22

Just so you know. County Sheriff's Office.

01:16:16:03 - 01:16:40:09

You know, if we could just come in on that point, I think the answer we've got isn't the question that you raised. Our concern is more the question of what happens if the works are concurrent and cumulative so that you've got the works on the a47, etc., on the trunk road at the same time as the original project. Because what it can mean is that certain roads that are intended to be used won't be available.

01:16:41:28 - 01:16:53:19

We're satisfied that it isn't in the assessment that it can be managed. So we thought we would just raise that point to say something that isn't in the assessment, but it is something that we've looked at and considered.

01:16:58:02 - 01:17:00:20

Okay. Thank you. I suppose. Thank you. Can.

01:17:01:13 - 01:17:21:13

Jane, can you suppose impulsive London is affected by the main compound? Just picking up from the proposed a47 improvements. There is also the Norwich Western Link that is proposed in a similar time frame, and I have not seen any reference of how that's going to be considered.

01:17:25:12 - 01:17:59:19

Okay. And key. Anything from the applicant on that? I'll come back on the similar points in relation to potential for overlap of construction impacts. So the just deal with the Western link is we've been dealt with it in a similar way to the other highway schemes. And from an operational perspective, we've, we've worked on the basis that the, the Western link is not implemented and therefore we use we'd have to use the local road network from a construction perspective.

01:17:59:21 - 01:18:11:00

The approach that we discussed and agreed with the highway authorities today was that that is best dealt the potential cumulative is best dealt with through the construction traffic management plan

01:18:12:25 - 01:18:28:03

and let's see that secured by requirement 15. And the default position is that the impacts would be significant impacts would be dealt with through collaboration between the schemes in the event that there was an overlap

01:18:29:18 - 01:18:41:19

and that recognises the uncertainties in those schemes in terms of when they would come forward and an increase in that need to be a refinement of the logistics strategies.

01:18:44:25 - 01:19:08:26

We've also been run away. We have ongoing meetings with national highways and also the Western link sort of discussing programs and how we can coordinate our works. And they are at the moment working towards that planning submission and will be including our traffic data within their submission. So they will be undertaking that assessment when they come forward.

01:19:13:07 - 01:19:17:14

I think. Yeah. Should go for follow up questions. I'll leave that.

01:19:19:27 - 01:19:35:06

I think we will come onto this cumulative agreement of caps and cooperate cooperation between the different developers very shortly at the next. On that point before we move on. Okay. Thank you.

01:19:37:18 - 01:20:09:28

Okay. Yes. Which is IP 110 at section 20 4.6.1. .7.2. Point two is a bit of a mouthful that sets out that on sets and links through page mitigation to minimize the effects of construction. Traffic is to ultimately agree a cap on vehicle movements on some of the links. So to me does require agreement with other existing consented projects in relation to construction traffic.

01:20:10:26 - 01:20:26:01

And the first question is how will the developers, which are already consented and able to operate within that terms of their roadshows to meet their own construction programs, be compelled to enter into such agreements?

01:20:27:28 - 01:20:51:09

Some say that on behalf of the applicant. So these these are caps which were agreed between the North and north of Boreas and Hornsea project three in relation to and I agree with North County councils as a mechanism of managing the potential for cumulative impacts along a number of roads within the local road network.

01:20:53:14 - 01:21:37:05

The rest of the application process. We we are aware of those caps and we've made a commitment that we would work within those caps. So those are already agreed caps and that we are then taking forward in terms of how that would be managed, that is set out within our construction traffic management plan, which again is up through A1 and is secured by requirement 15. But in answer to the second part of your question, the mechanism, the onus will be upon our projects to coordinate with the other projects to manage our traffic demands, recognising that we've come after them.

01:21:37:20 - 01:21:38:16

And I'll say there is a

01:21:40:03 - 01:21:50:18

those projects are commencing construction, so the potential that there will be no overlap. But in the event that there is an overlap, then we would, we would need to coordinate our work and.

01:21:50:20 - 01:21:51:05

I can.

01:21:51:21 - 01:22:44:26

Perhaps provide you with a if somebody doesn't provide you with the sort of explanation of how we think that might work. They'll be useful, I think. So my next question was ultimately what discussions have taken place with those developers at the moment? Yeah. Okay. So in terms of we are ongoing discussions with with Hornsey. But again, as I say, the onus is upon us of the project to to fit in around them. So the way that we've outlined that it would work within the construction traffic management plan is that there's an agreed cap on a road and our contractor would appoint a liaison officer which would then reach out to Hornsey in Bangalore if they were still in construction, to understand their forward track programme with traffic movements.

01:22:46:04 - 01:23:16:12

And then we would work. Then we would develop our programme of traffic movements to ensure that we are below that cap. So it's about us potentially doing things like working in a different area. If we know that, we can say there's going to be an acceptance of that cap or extending the work duration for a particular activity or stockpiling materials, those kind of measures. And that's that is outlined within the construction traffic management plan. Okay. Thank you.

01:23:16:16 - 01:23:27:00

Can I just ask Norfolk County Council? Those caps seem to have been agreed a little while ago as part of previous developments. And do you still consider those caps to be appropriate?

01:23:30:11 - 01:23:45:09

Martin Dixon, Norfolk County Council. You have the current caps in place, which has previously approved the previous contracts for the Boreas and the Hornsea projects are upper limit caps is also being discussed.

01:23:46:29 - 01:23:51:17

They are currently we would consider they would not increase

01:23:53:05 - 01:23:57:11

as a result of ongoing traffic conditions.

01:23:58:29 - 01:24:06:05

They were also assessed with consideration to major pre and post COVID traffic levels, so they are upper limit caps.

01:24:08:10 - 01:24:26:17

I suppose the only comment we would make is we're happy with the approach of their assessment. And the thing you find is that if you're coordinating works to ensure traffic cap is not exceeded, you may find a loan or a lower but longer operational.

01:24:28:19 - 01:24:43:16

Period. Because if you go to court and they have reason to like to keep below that level cap, you're obviously going to extend an operating period. But we're happy with the approach at the moment and confirm that the caps are.

01:24:44:28 - 01:25:02:12

I still think I'm sure for local county councils I will not have an effect in saying if you imagine a traffic profile where it's kind of got a peak, you sort of having a peak, it'll be flat at the top. So the impact of that happens for longer. So that's the main impact on the traffic profile.

01:25:04:29 - 01:25:27:10

Okay. Thank you. Just one more question for the applicant. I think in possibly hinted that if if the other developers didn't play ball on the caps, that you would ultimately adjust your construction around them. So I just wanted to just clarify that that was indeed what you were suggesting there. I mean, sorry. Sorry. I'm Tyler. On behalf of the applicant. It's less about them playing ball, but

01:25:28:29 - 01:25:59:26

in a similar and similar approach to ourselves. They are required to have they will be producing and construction traffic management plans and they will be required to forecast their deliveries to ensure that they are within those those caps. And it may be just useful to kind of provide a little bit of context as well in terms of the traffic movements. So all of the assessments are based on the peak increases in traffic along the road. So we've assessed all our projects peak as.

01:26:08:00 - 01:26:20:20

The works is such the so the the average flows are considerably lower than the peaks. There is significant headway within those programs to allow what sort of thought work to be accommodated

01:26:23:16 - 01:26:54:14

in terms of. I can give you an example. The B 1149, which has resulted in the cap was agreed at 2898 sheaves. Now our project is a peak at 2 to 3, so we would always be below that cap. But on average where some 85 HGV trips a day. So you can see there's quite a considerable margin within that to allow us to to move around and manage our works accordingly. Mike.

01:26:54:16 - 01:27:25:22

I understand. Thank you. Well, just before I can have you any interested parties for, I think transport related the cumulative assessment point from item 12 O to me for from our perspective was it doesn't appear that the Borealis traffic figures are included in the cumulative assessment, despite being identified as a project where there could be some overlap. I was just interested to know from the applicant why that was placed, some say on behalf of the applicant.

01:27:26:17 - 01:27:53:02

It's less that it's less that they weren't included and more that that's the approach we've taken to sort of try to produce a proportionate environmental statement. So for the North at Vanguard, North and Boreas, the projects effectively there, that they're just the projects and as outlined within our environmental statement, which is 110,

01:27:54:23 - 01:28:26:22

we have adopted a worst case which is whereby just north of Vanguard is installing as it projects cables and at the same time it's installing the ducts for north of Boreas. And that represents the worst case in terms of overall traffic movements. So if not for North Burroughs, then come afterwards they would then be including cables and the traffic movements associated north of Pass would be significantly lower than what we've assessed, which is north of.

01:28:26:24 - 01:28:35:18

They've got installing its cables but also installing the ducts for north of us. And sort of as a post application update, North Bangor

01:28:37:18 - 01:29:04:20

negotiated judicial review and is commencing construction in 2023 and it's confirmed, I believe that that is for north of Dungog and that they will be installing ducts and off of bar. So that's, that's why it's not explicitly done as a separate assessment, but it's included this worst case by looking at the north of got worst case scenario. Okay. But the assessment at the moment assumes no construct, no construction traffic and boring, is it not?

01:29:06:28 - 01:29:19:12

It adopts the worst case, which is the peak traffic from North Vanguard, overlapping with our four objects peak and the peaks and off a bank. It is

01:29:22:02 - 01:29:24:08

the installation of the cables and the ducts.

01:29:26:18 - 01:30:06:15

The. And the I believe the controls in terms of north of that God is within that construction traffic management plan. And they they have caps. So that's another project. But in terms of how that works, they would that would the control was effectively that construction traffic management plan. So they those two projects would go have got to coordinate in terms of that mister not exceed those caps within that traffic management plan and those the traffic those those traffic flows within that traffic management plan as was informed on cumulative assessment trip.

01:30:06:17 - 01:30:07:27

Sorry. Control. That was clever.

01:30:09:24 - 01:30:30:21

Yeah, well, with the applicant, be happy to provide a note on exactly how it's integrated Boreas into the cumulative assessment. This is very clearly what has been considered and what hasn't yet. We can for clarification on that. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. And in Norfolk County Council. Content with how Norfolk Brass is being treated in the cumulative assessment.

01:30:32:18 - 01:31:04:25

Contradicts Norfolk County Council. It was with the Norfolk or National Bank. Our big sister projects. The big the secondary project would always become more of a cable pull exercise, if you like, rather than full construction. All the major impacts are going to be in the construction of the original cable ducting installed. So. And the applicant is correct in in applying the limits to the major project. As quite rightly say that the.

01:31:04:28 - 01:31:18:21

The following project the borrowers project will be significantly significantly lower in impact. And so the assessment must be made on the on the greater project, which is the construction stage, initial construction stage.

01:31:20:09 - 01:31:43:08

Okay. Thank you. I think maybe it may be to say possibly a presentational issue in the. Yes as well, because, for example, air quality not before. Yes. Has its very own consideration and where it's not clear how various features into the figures in the transport section. So it's just understanding how that is. So that be much appreciated. Thank you.

01:31:45:08 - 01:31:52:21

Okay. Anything from interested parties on traffic and transport before we break for lunch, please? Sorry. Yes, Thank you.

01:31:52:29 - 01:32:08:17

Thank you. Jane, can you suppose representing London was affected by the main compound? There's real concern with regards to the traffic movement and safety at the junction of the main compound. And we have.

01:32:10:18 - 01:32:24:25

Which is yet to be provided, how that's going to actually work. And also taking into account the traffic movements for the adjoining business units that are next door to the proposed main compound location.

01:32:32:09 - 01:32:36:02

Thank you very much. Yes, he's back. So you got your card?

01:32:38:03 - 01:33:14:17

Thank you. So it's not. I am not a patient in the conference, and the resident cannot comment on the input of displaced traffic. We've heard about major roadworks. That will work coming up. I believe the 47 north north eastern Road during has started. We've got the 47 year fixed junction which has been approved by DCO. We've got the wind farms or stood back in full body so or well started, but it's not far behind.

01:33:15:03 - 01:33:39:25

We've got the DCO to be submitted for the Norwich Western Link, which would start in late 2024, I understand. And the current DC order which is being considered. Now this causes a huge displacement of traffic for quite long period of time, to say the least. And it's a real problem on our country roads. Some of it you might have seen yesterday.

01:33:41:12 - 01:34:15:17

It's major disruption. People will not on the diversion signs. We know that from the A11. We have problems at the moment. People look at their phones and this is not to be the go. That's understandable. So is this something that the applicant can do or is it even appropriate that this application is allowed when it adds to the horrific disruption of traffic through our country roads at this time? And I suppose I come back and I'm not sure if this is the appropriate place to see it, because I'm I'm new to this.

01:34:16:05 - 01:34:27:15

But it comes back to why is national we're not here to explain why they don't go in to Walpole, which would take that little bit of the problem away. Thank you.

01:34:29:15 - 01:34:38:11

Okay. Thank you. I would just ask if there's anyone else virtually he may wish to. Contribute anything before I ask the applicant to reply.

01:34:40:07 - 01:34:42:19

Auto parts. So your hands just gone up. Thank you.

01:34:45:13 - 01:35:17:12

Susan, Mother. Alton Parish Council. Yes. I've got a couple of concerns with the b1149. There are two well, actually three access points along there. One access point is for early works construction. And then there appears to be an access into the temporary compound, which I wasn't particularly aware of until recently. And then there is an access point which goes to

01:35:18:28 - 01:35:43:00

Bluestone Cottage and the solar farm where the HDD will be going through. I was sort of concerned as to how these access points will work and how they would interact with the existing traffic from cumulative projects going along the whole road. b149. Thank you.

01:35:46:07 - 01:35:55:24

Okay. Thank you. There's consensus testing noted by by the examining authority, the applicants. I'm sorry, Mr. Bashir. The night security? Yes.

01:35:55:26 - 01:36:08:09

Just to add one query concerning the caps, how is it clear within the application how these caps are monitored and enforced?

01:36:10:25 - 01:36:59:07

Okay. Thank you. I'll pass over to the applicant to go through anything that they wish to interview all of the interested party. Just so thank you. Sometime half that and I'll try and deal with each of the points and say, please, please remind me in terms of a couple of points in terms of the compound and also also in terms of access. So our own access concept loans are provided for the main compound. And also in terms of the access is from the B 1149 in the sentence evolves and they include measures to ensure the safe access and egress from those and they will be they've been shared with Norfolk County Council and I think the compound is being agreed in principle.

01:36:59:25 - 01:37:08:03

The BLM 49, where we're in discussions about and hope to reach an agreement on the measures for that.

01:37:10:12 - 01:37:30:24

In terms of the compound, the nearby traffic movements are taken into account, so they are included within within our baseline. A lot that's been that's been included. So sorry, I should have said those drawings in terms of the access are included within the transport assessment, which is out to six eight

01:37:32:14 - 01:38:00:00

and they will be subject to an independent road safety audit when it comes to construction that they would need to be agreed with Norfolk County Council as a local authority. In terms of diversions, I think generally we can come back to my earlier point in relation to how we propose to manage the potential for cumulative impacts that overlap with the construction project, and that's through the respective construction traffic management plans.

01:38:02:03 - 01:38:22:22

So if national highways potentially need to implement lane closures or road closures and that leads to diversions to the local road network. Then we would work. We would work with them to make sure that we're not exacerbating that by how we programming our works and accordingly.

01:38:27:08 - 01:38:47:17

In terms of the the caps and how that would be monitored, The the construction traffic management plan sets out in detail the sort of the approach to monitoring. So we will. The contract would be required to have a full program of deliveries and

01:38:49:10 - 01:38:59:18

then there would be required to monitor the number of deliveries arriving. Access is about work that way and that would be reports it and countries with an interim plan.

01:39:04:28 - 01:39:07:06

Okay. Thank you very much for that,

01:39:08:24 - 01:39:25:09

Mr. Boswell. You might be pushing your microphone to you. Julian Boswell For the and just to say the ultimate enforcement in the DCO regime is is a criminal process. In other words, if you're in breach of a requirement, you're committing or potentially committing a criminal offence.

01:39:30:06 - 01:39:31:05

Okay. Thank you very much.

01:39:37:25 - 01:40:09:18

Okay. Thank you very much. That is our discussion for the session. We have overrun slightly, but I do propose we still come back a 2:15, as we still do have lots to get through this afternoon. So thank you to those who have made your contributions this morning. And again, for attendees online, and if you do decide to leave during lunch, please rejoin with the invitations that you've already received. And if you're watching the live stream and refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session.

01:40:10:06 - 01:40:12:27

I think it will adjourn until a 2:15. Thank you.