

# **Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects**

Traffic and Transport Discussions with  
Norfolk County Council

DRAFT

Title:	
<b>Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Projects Examination submission Traffic and Transport Discussions with NCC</b>	
PINS document no.:	
Document no.:	
Date:	Classification
<b>10.01.2023</b>	<b>Draft</b>
Prepared by:	
<b>Royal HaskoningDHV</b>	
Approved by:	Date:
<b>Sarah Chandler, Equinor</b>	<b>XX</b>

## Table of Contents

1 Introduction .....6

## Table of Tables

Table 1-1 NCC Comments on SEP and DEP DCO documents and the Applicant's response ..... 7

## Glossary of Acronyms

DCO	Development Consent Order
DEP	Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
ES	Environmental Statement
ETG	Expert Topic Group
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
LV	Light Vehicle
NCC	Norfolk County Council
OCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
SEP	Sheringham Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project
TA	Transport Assessment

## Glossary of Terms

Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP)	The Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension onshore and offshore sites including all onshore and offshore infrastructure.
Expert Topic Group (ETG)	A forum for targeted engagement with regulators and interested stakeholders through the EPP.
Onshore cable corridor	The area between the landfall and the onshore substation sites, within which the onshore cable circuits will be installed along with other temporary works for construction.
Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP)	The Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension onshore and offshore sites including all onshore and offshore infrastructure.
The Applicant	Equinor New Energy Limited. As the owners of SEP and DEP, Scira Extension Limited and Dudgeon Extension Limited are the named undertakers that have the benefit of the DCO. References in this document to obligations on, or commitments by, 'the Applicant' are given on behalf of SEL and DEL as the undertakers of SEP and DEP.

## 1 Introduction

1. This note has been produced in response to questions raised by Norfolk County Council (NCC) in relation to traffic and transport matters for the Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP).
2. A meeting was held on the 17 November 2022 between NCC, Equinor New Energy Limited ('the Applicant') and Royal HaskoningDHV to discuss outstanding transport matters following NCC's review of the relevant SEP and DEP Development Consent Order (DCO) application documents. During this meeting NCC raised a number of questions and followed up by email with outstanding issues where they required further clarification.
3. Table 1-1 provides a list of the issues raised by NCC and the Applicant's response to these, including appropriate references to the salient DCO documents (noted by the relevant APP-xxx numbers).
4. The Applicant's response to the issues raised was discussed in detail at a meeting on the 8 December 2022. During the meeting it was agreed to amend Table 1-1 to add an additional column which would provide a record of discussions and agreements.

**Table 1-1 NCC Comments on SEP and DEP DCO documents and the Applicant's response**

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
1	Chapter 24 – Page 59 – Table 24-10	<p>Sensitive Links – shows the forecast increase for each of the links for SEP or DEP in Isolation.</p> <p>Link 46 - if it includes HGV's we will require summer restrictions. You indicated during our meeting there would be no HGVs on the route, so we are looking for confirmation from you in an update to the document.</p>	<p>Table 24-19 and Table 24-20 of Chapter 24 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-110] outlines that no SEP and/or DEP HGV traffic would be routed via link 46.</p> <p>This commitment is contained within the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [APP-024]. Annex A of the OCTMP contains a table of the proposed numbers of daily HGV trips per link, it can be identified from Annex A that no HGVs are proposed via link 46. Section 2.3 of the OCTMP sets out how the assessed numbers of HGVs per link will be controlled.</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to control traffic via link 46 are appropriate.</p>
2	Chapter 24 – Page 70 – Table 24-20	<p>Link Screening – SEP and DEP Concurrently.</p> <p>Link 9 A149 Weybourne – 167% increase (92 HGV's per day). That level of use will require a summer peak hours restriction. Andy mentioned it would be achievable for example through use of stockpiling etc.</p>	<p>The numbers quoted by NCC have been extrapolated from Table 24-20 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110]. This table sets out the primary assessment of Sheringham Shoal Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (SEP) and Dudgeon Offshore Wind Farm Extension Project (DEP) traffic flows before mitigation. Table 24-33 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] outlines that for the impact of amenity, potentially significant impacts may occur and outlines mitigation to limit the daily HGV demand via link 9 and 11 to not exceed forecast average HGV demand, i.e. a reduction from 92 to 15 HGV trips per day for link 9 and 108 to 20 for link 11.</p> <p>This commitment is contained within the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024]. Annex A of the OCTMP contains a table of the proposed numbers of daily HGV trips per link, it can be identified from Annex A that 15 HGV trips per day are</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to control traffic via links 9 and 11 are appropriate.</p>

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
		Link 11 A149 Weybourne – 313% (108 HGVs per day). As above, that level of use will require a summer restriction to move traffic away from summer peak hours.	proposed via link 9 and 20 via link 11. Section 2.3 of the OCTMP sets out how the assessed numbers of HGVs per link will be controlled.	
3	Chapter 24 – Page 70 – Table 24-20	Link 46 A140 to Thorpe Market – You indicated there would be no increase in use and you just need to clarify why that is the case.	The Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-268] outlines that HGVs are assumed to have an origin from one of three ports, Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft to the east and Kings Lynn to the west. To access to the north of the SEP and/or DEP onshore cable corridor, construction traffic would travel from Kings Lynn via the A148, whilst to access from Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft HGVs would travel via the A149. No HGV traffic is forecast to use link 46 (the A140). The Applicant’s response to ID.1 outlines how this routeing strategy will be secured.	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to control traffic via link 46 are appropriate.
4	Chapter 24 – Page 70 – Table 24-20	Link 76 Taverham – you indicated there would be no increase in use so again need to clarify why that is the case.	The TA [APP-268] outlines that HGVs are assumed to have an origin from one of three ports, Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft to the east and Kings Lynn to the west. Link 76 comprises of the A1067 Fakenham Road towards the centre of Norwich from the A1270 Northern Distributor Road. Noting the assumed origin of deliveries, no HGVs are forecast to use this link.  The Applicant’s response to ID.1 outlines how this routeing strategy will be secured.	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to control traffic via link 76 are appropriate.
5	Chapter 24 – Page 70 – Table 24-20	Link 84 Broadway – peak increase 4560% (97 HGVs per day) – you need to clarify the figures.	The numbers quoted by NCC have been extrapolated from Table 24-20 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110]. This table sets out the primary assessment of SEP and DEP traffic flows before mitigation. Table 24-33 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] outlines that for the impact of amenity, potentially significant impacts may occur and outlines mitigation to limit the	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within



I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<p>daily HGV and LV demand via link 84 to not exceed forecast average demand, i.e. a reduction from 97 to 23 HGV trips per day and 88 to 29 LV trips per day.</p> <p>This commitment is contained within the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024]. Annex A of the OCTMP contains a table of the proposed numbers of daily HGV and LV trips per link, it can be identified from Annex A that 23 HGV trips and 29 LV trips per day are proposed via link 84.</p> <p>Section 2.3 and 3.2 of the OCTMP sets out how the assessed numbers of HGVs and LVs per link will be controlled respectively.</p>	<p>the OCTMP to control traffic via link 76 are appropriate.</p>
6	<p>Chapter 24 – Page 160 – Table 24-44</p>	<p>Highway Constraints Magnitude of Effect Assessment – SEP or DEP in Isolation.</p> <p>Links in red (also certain amber routes) will need TM - S278 work and/or Passing bays; 15 minute day. A pointer is needed to identify the TM mitigation.</p>	<p>Table 24-44 and Table 24-45 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] set out an assessment of the magnitude of SEP and/or DEP construction traffic upon the impact of Driver Delay (Highway Constrains). It can be identified from Table 24-48 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] that all links in Table 24-44 and Table 24-45 assessed as experiencing a low (green), medium (amber) and red (high) magnitude of effect will require mitigation measures.</p> <p>The measures outlined in Table 24-48 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] are captured within section 4.4 the OCTMP [APP-301].</p> <p>Section 4.4 of the OCTMP outlines a range of measures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road/ junction widening;</li> <li>• Formalising existing informal passing places; or</li> <li>• Using mobile traffic management, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An escort vehicle to guide HGVs along roads and past oncoming traffic;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.</p>

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Stop-works’ signage to hold traffic back (for up to two minutes in any 15 minutes) whilst HGVs travel along routes; or</li> <li>• ‘Temporary obstruction’ signage to hold traffic (for up to 15 minutes with a subsequent gap of at least one hour) whilst HGVs travel along routes</li> </ul> <p>Section 4.4 of the OCTMP outlines that the final measures and details will be agreed with the Norfolk County Council (NCC) through the development of the OCTMP prior to commencement of the authorised project. The OCTMP [APP-301] is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024].</p>	
7	Chapter 24 – Page 167 – Table 24-45	<p>Highway Constraints Magnitude of Effect Assessment – SEP and DEP Concurrently.</p> <p>As above [ID6.].</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant’s response to ID2. which outlines additional mitigation measures to reduce peak HGV trips via link 9 and 11. Section 27.7.4 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] outlines that with the application of these additional mitigation measures, no residual significant cumulative impacts are forecast.</p> <p>Clarification for the adopted link sensitivity is contained within Table 27-17 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110]. The application of link sensitivity is used to assess the impact of SEP and/or DEP construction traffic upon the impacts of severance, amenity and pedestrian delay. It is not applied to the assessment of road safety and driver delay (whereby sensitivity is related to network operation).</p>	Please refer to the Applicant’s response to ID2.
8	Chapter 24 – Page 190 – Table 24 – 54	<p>Cumulative Assessment Link Screening.</p> <p>Links 9 and 11 – Clarification of [proposed] use - may need summer restrictions.</p>		NCC to confirm if further clarification in relation to the methodology for defining link sensitivity is required.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
		Clarification as to why this route is classed as low sensitivity?		
9	Chapter 24 – Page 190 – Table 24 – 54	<p>Link 52 Cawston – why is this route classed as low sensitivity?</p> <p>Link 90 Taverham Rd low sensitivity and 1275% increase! [Clarification required]</p>	<p>Clarification for the adopted link sensitivity is contained within Table 27-17 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110]. The application of link sensitivity is used to assess the impact of SEP and/or DEP construction traffic upon the impacts of severance, amenity and pedestrian delay. It is not applied to the assessment of road safety and driver delay.</p> <p>With regard to potential cumulative impacts via link 90, Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] recognises that there would be potential adverse cumulative impacts and outlines mitigation measures. Paragraph 605 of the ES [APP-110] outlines mitigation measures for link 90 to cap cumulative flows with Hornsea Project Three so that they do not exceed those peak levels assessed in the primary assessment for SEP and DEP (Section 24.6.1.3 of the ES [APP-110]).</p> <p>This commitment is contained within the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024]. Annex A of the OCTMP contains a table of the proposed numbers of daily HGV trips per link, it can be identified from Annex A that flows along link 90 would be capped to manage the potential for cumulative impacts. Section 2.3 of the OCTMP sets out how the assessed numbers of HGVs per link will be controlled.</p>	<p>NCC to confirm if further clarification in relation to the methodology for defining link sensitivity is required.</p> <p>With regard to link 90, NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to control traffic numbers are appropriate.</p>
10	DCO schedule 2, part 1 Requirement 19 and the	[The Applicant] Indicate that all A and B roads and 16 other local roads will be crossed by trenchless crossings but they don't say what those 16 local	Appendix 4.1 of the ES - Crossing Schedule [APP-178] provides a crossing schedule of those roads that will be crossed using 'Trenchless' techniques such as horizontal directional drilling (HDD) and those that would be proposed to be 'Open Cut'.	NCC noted that they would review the list of roads proposed to be crossed by open cut techniques and

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
	Code of Construction Practise	roads are. The CTMP at para 82 says that 22 additional minor roads will be crossed by open trench – so we need clarity as are HDD and which open cut.	<p>For clarity roads that are proposed to be crossed using trenchless technology include all A and B roads and the following local roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holt Road (south of Weybourne);</li> <li>• Station Road (south of Weybourne);</li> <li>• The Street (south east of Bodham);</li> <li>• Marple Lane (east of Baconsthorpe);</li> <li>• Northfield Lane (north east of Plumpstead);</li> <li>• Matlaske Road (east of Plumpstead);</li> <li>• Spa Lane (north west of Oulton);</li> <li>• Spinks Lane (west of Oulton);</li> <li>• The Street (south of Oulton);</li> <li>• Norwich Road (south of Cawston);</li> <li>• Reepham Road (south of Cawston);</li> <li>• Old Fakenham Road (Attlebridge);</li> <li>• Ringland Lane (east of Weston Longville);</li> <li>• The Broadway (Weston Green);</li> <li>• Taverham Road (south of Ringland);</li> <li>• Colton Road (west of Marlingford);</li> <li>• Chapel Street (east of Barford);</li> <li>• Melton Road (north east of Wymondham);</li> <li>• Hethersett Road (south of the A1);</li> </ul>	revert with any further comments.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intwood Lane (west of Lower East Carleton); and</li> <li>• Hickling Lane (north of Swainsthorpe).</li> </ul> <p>This list includes all roads that NCC have previously advised that SEP and DEP need to cross using trenchless technologies (13 July 2021). Those roads that are proposed to be crossed using open cut techniques (and the associated traffic diversions) are shown in Figure 24.5 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-134].</p>	
11	Document 6.2.24 Chapter 24 traffic and Transport – figures	You are showing an access opposite Heydon Road (Access 25b) against which we have previously raised safety concerns. We prevented Hornsea from using that access (albeit likely to have been a different level of use). We need a better understanding of the traffic volumes and potential mitigation before we can agree to its use. However at the same time you also need to consider alternative access proposals as there is no guarantee at this stage that we will agree to its use.	<p>The Applicant can confirm that access ACC25b (shown on Figure 24.6 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-134]) is required to allow SEP and DEP to HDD under the proposed solar farm in this area.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out measures to manage the safe movement of traffic to access ACC25b through the provision of temporary traffic signals. These temporary measures are shown in Annex 30 (pdf page number 1355 to 1357) of the TA [APP-269]. Noting NCCs safety concerns at this location, the Applicant is willing to limit the use of the traffic signals (and associated vehicle movements) to outside of peak hours. It would therefore be proposed that the traffic signals would not be operational between the hours of 07:30 to 09:00 and 16:30 17:30 and that no vehicle movements to and from ACC25b would be permitted during these hours.</p> <p>During these hours the following traffic flows are forecast to ACC25b. Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily HGV trips that could travel to ACC25b could be up to 54 HGV trips per day, equivalent to four arrivals and four departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 48 LV trips per day, equivalent to 24 arrivals in the morning and 24 departures in the evening. It is proposed that the approach to access in</p>	<p>NCC agreed that access at ACC25b would be acceptable subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The duration of use being for a limited period;</li> <li>• Traffic signals not operating between 07:30 – 09:00 and 16:30 – 17:30;</li> <li>• No SEP and/or DEP traffic movements to ACC25b between 07:30 – 09:00 and 16:30 – 17:30.</li> </ul>

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<p>this area is discussed further with NCC and any agreements captured within a revision to the OCTMP [APP-301].</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advanced warning signs to advise of the presence of part time traffic signals.</li> </ul> <p>It was agreed that these measures would be captured within an update to the OCTMP.</p>
12	The [O]CTMP - para 32	<p>This [The CTMP - paragraph 32] indicates that “Links 91 (Blind Lane), 48 (Horsford), Cantley Road and as well as Attlebridge Village, Barford Village, Cawston Village, Oulton Village and Weston Longville Village are prohibited for use by SEP/DEP HGV traffic at the request of highway stakeholders and the local community – however you also need to consider the following: [outlined in ID. 13 to 21].</p>	<p>OCTMP [APP-301] (secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024]) includes a commitment to not route SEP and/or DEP HGV traffic via the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attlebridge;</li> <li>Barford;</li> <li>Blind Lane;</li> <li>Cantley Road;</li> <li>Cawston;</li> <li>Horsford;</li> <li>Oulton; and</li> <li>Weston Longville.</li> </ul> <p>Figure 1 of the OCTMP [APP-301] details the permitted HGV routes, it can be identified from Figure 1 that no HGVs are permitted via the locations</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate. It was agreed that measures to restrict HGV traffic via Weston Longville would be captured within an update to the OCTMP.</p>

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<p>identified above. Section 2.3 of the OCTMP sets out how the routing of HGVs will be controlled.</p> <p>The Applicant however wishes to highlight an error with Figure 1 of the OCTMP [APP-301] which incorrectly shows HGVs being permitted through Weston Longville. The Applicant can confirm that this error will be corrected in a revision to the OCTMP and that no HGV traffic will be permitted to route via Weston Longville.</p>	
13	The [O]CTMP - para 32	Link 133 has a tight bend over a bridge and the crossroads/Link 150 are a nightmare in the peak times though not necessarily a reason to avoid. You need to demonstrate its suitability for use by HGV's	<p>Table 24-20 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] sets out SEP and DEP could result in a peak increase in all vehicles and HGV traffic via link 133 of 5% and 17% respectively.</p> <p>It can be identified from Table 24-48 of the Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] that due to the width of link 133, mitigation measures will be required to accommodate the forecast increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>The measures outlined in Table 24-48 are captured within section 4.4 the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024].</p> <p>Section 4.4 of the OCTMP outlines a range of measures, to manage the passage of SEP and/or DEP traffic along narrow roads, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road/ junction widening;</li> <li>• Formalising existing informal passing places; or</li> <li>• Using mobile traffic management, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An escort vehicle to guide HGVs along roads and past oncoming traffic;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Stop-works’ signage to hold traffic back (for up to two minutes in any 15 minutes) whilst HGVs travel along routes; or</li> <li>• ‘Temporary obstruction’ signage to hold traffic (for up to 15 minutes with a subsequent gap of at least one hour) whilst HGVs travel along routes.</li> </ul> <p>Section 4.4 of the OCTMP outlines that the final measures and details will be agreed with NCC through the development of the CTMP prior to commencement of the authorised project.</p>	
14		<p>Link 50 – avoids the other 2 Orsted and Vattenfall routes, though [link] 52 is used by them so we are seeking clarification of use.</p>	<p>Link 50 is proposed as a means of routing to ACC29 and ACC30 located on link 132. The proposed location of these two accesses is shown on Figure 24.6 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-134].</p> <p>To allow HGV traffic to travel west from the A140 towards these two accesses, it is proposed to use link 50 as opposed to link 52 as the use of link 52 would require HGV traffic to travel north towards Aylsham before heading west and then travelling south along the B1149 (a diversion of an additional 3.2 miles). Link 52 is however, proposed as a means of allowing HGV traffic to route from the A140 west to those accesses north of ACC29 and ACC30, namely ACC14 to ACC28.</p> <p>It can be identified from Table 24-48 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] that due to the width of link 50, mitigation measures will be required to accommodate the forecast increase in HGV traffic.</p> <p>The measures outlined in Table 24-48 are captured within section 4.4 the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024].</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.</p>



I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
15		Link 64 and 65 – clarification as to why you need to use both of these routes. Link 64 runs through the tight village centre and without demonstrating a very sound case for its inclusion, we will ask for it to be removed.	<p>Link 64 is proposed as a means of access to ACC16 and ACC17 only. The proposed location of these two accesses is shown on Figure 24.6 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-134].</p> <p>HGVs approaching from the south would not route via the built up area of Plumpstead, noting that the village is located north of the proposed access locations; however, any HGVs routeing from the north are currently proposed to be routed via link 64 rather than around via link 65. The Applicant is willing to amend the routeing strategy in this location and route HGVs to ACC16 and ACC17 via links 65 and 63 (thereby avoiding Plumpstead village).</p> <p>It is proposed that the approach to access in this area would be discussed with NCC and any agreements captured within a revision to the OCTMP [APP-301].</p>	It was agreed with NCC that the Applicant would submit an updated version of the OCTMP to show that HGVs would route to ACC16 and ACC17 via links 65 and 63, thereby avoiding Plumpstead village.
16	Transport Assessment	Page 106 states no significant delay - that very much depends on levels of SEP/ DEP traffic to the compound and accordingly-	The OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024] outlines that assessment of driver delay (capacity) presented within ES Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-134] is predicated upon industry experience that highlights that the majority of the construction workforce would arrive before the morning network peak defined by NCC as (07:30 – 09:00) and depart after the evening peak hour (16:25 -17:25). The OCTMP therefore outlines that the Construction Traffic Management Plan Co-ordinator (CTMPCo) will encourage staff to arrive prior to 07:30 and depart after 17:25 in the evening. Notwithstanding, there may be some employees who would work a shorter day, or trips outside of the standard hours. To ensure that there would not be an adverse impact upon capacity, the CTMPCo would limit these movements to no more than 25% of the peak daily LV demand (outlined in Annex A). The following	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			responses (ID17 to ID21) present peak hour traffic flows for each of the identified locations in the context of this commitment.	
17		Sheet 5 Bodham Compound at A148 – need restrictions on traffic levels in the summer. In a 40mph.	Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily vehicle trips that could travel to ACC10. This identifies that at peak, there could be up to 49 HGV trips per day, equivalent to three arrivals and three departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 64 LV trips per day, equivalent to 32 arrivals in the morning and 32 departures in the evening. When considering network peak hours and applying the existing commitments in relation to LV movements (detailed at ID.16) there could be a peak of eight LV and five HGV trips during the defined network peak hours. The Applicant considers that the existing substantive commitments in relation to managing LV trips would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon capacity at ACC10.	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.
18		Sheet 15 Oulton on B1149 – We may ask you to restrict access times dependant upon clarification of use.	Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily vehicle trips that could travel to ACC25. This identifies that at peak, there could be up to 50 HGV trips per day, equivalent to three arrivals and three departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 40 LV trips per day, equivalent to 20 arrivals in the morning and 20 departures in the evening. When considering network peak hours and applying the existing commitments in relation to LV movements (detailed at ID.16) there could be a peak of five LV and five HGV trips during the defined network peak hours. The Applicant considers that the existing substantive commitments in relation to managing LV trips would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon capacity at ACC25.	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
19		Sheet 23 Attlebridge compound near A1067 – need to restrict activity at peak traffic times – in particular HGV’s	Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily vehicle trips that could travel to ACC33. This identifies that at peak, there could be up to 77 HGV trips per day, equivalent to four arrivals and four departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 208 LV trips per day, equivalent to 104 arrivals in the morning and 104 departures in the evening. When considering network peak hours and applying the existing commitments in relation to LV movements (detailed at ID.16) there could be a peak of 27 LV and eight HGV trips during the defined network peak hours. The Applicant considers that the existing substantive commitment in relation to managing LV trips would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon capacity at ACC33.	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.
20		Sheet 28 Easton compound – need to factor in the Blind Lane closure for the A47 Tuddenham works	<p>Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] outlines that access to ACC49 will be provided from the unnamed road (link 93) that heads southwest from the A47 roundabout. No HGV traffic would be routed via Blind Lane. This commitment is contained within the OCTMP [APP-301] which is secured via Requirement 15 of the draft DCO [APP-024]. Figure 1 of the OCTMP contains the permitted HGV routes and it can be identified that no HGVs are permitted via Blind Lane and that HGVs will instead be required to use link 93. Section 2.3 of the OCTMP sets out how the routing of HGVs will be controlled.</p> <p>Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily vehicle trips that could travel to ACC49. This identifies that at peak, there could be up to 37 HGV trips per day, equivalent to two arrivals and two departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 40 LV trips per day, equivalent to 20</p>	NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
			<p>arrivals in the morning and 20 departures in the evening. When considering network peak hours and applying the existing commitments in relation to LV movements (detailed at ID.16) there could be a peak of five LV and four HGV trips during the defined network peak hours. The Applicant considers that the existing substantive commitments in relation to managing LV trips would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon capacity at ACC49.</p>	
21		<p>Sheet 34 Hethersett compound – B1172 – restrict activity at peak traffic times?</p>	<p>Annex 19 of the TA [APP-269] outlines the forecast numbers of peak daily vehicle trips that could travel to ACC61. This identifies that at peak, there could be up to 64 HGV trips per day, equivalent to four arrivals and four departures an hour. In addition, Annex 23 of the TA [APP-269] identifies that there could be a peak of up to 112 LV trips per day, equivalent to 56 arrivals in the morning and 56 departures in the evening. When considering network peak hours and applying the existing commitments in relation to LV movements (detailed at ID.16) there could be a peak of 14 LV and seven HGV trips during the defined network peak hours. The Applicant considers that the existing substantive commitments in relation to managing LV trips would ensure that there are no significant impacts upon capacity at ACC61.</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided and that the measures outlined within the OCTMP to manage traffic movements are appropriate.</p>
22	<p>Additional Points to consider</p>	<p>There may be links where we need to restrict HGV movements further at peak or other sensitive times, dependant upon the Traffic Sensitivity banding of the routes, see Ch24 P100 which</p>	<p>The Applicant is cognisant of traffic sensitive routes as set out in Table 24-10 of Chapter 24 of the ES [APP-110] and has proactively applied primary mitigation to ensure impacts are minimalised.</p>	<p>NCC confirmed that they are content with the clarification provided.</p>

<Doc Name>

Doc. No. C282-RH-Z-GA-000XX

Rev. no. 1

I.D.	NCC identified document, page, section number, etc.	NCC Comment	Applicant Response	Record of discussions with NCC
		identifies this – Martin can assist if needed.		

