

ISH 3_22 March PT3

Created on: 2023-03-22 16:07:30

Project Length: 01:05:16

File Name: ISH 3_22 March PT3

File Length: 01:05:16

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:00 - 00:00:24:20

Okay. Welcome back, everyone. And it's cool to pass too, so we will resume the hearing. Please fill session three of issue specific Hearing number three. Um, can the case Kington confirm that everyone has a log back in successfully? If possible, please.

00:00:35:01 - 00:00:52:15

Okay, Fantastic. Thank you very much. Okay. Before we launched into our discussion on traffic and transport, there were a couple of matters that the applicant was kindly looking at over the lunch break in terms of air quality and noise. Is the applicant okay? Just to run through those now, please.

00:01:01:22 - 00:01:26:19

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Just in terms of the availability of our air quality expert, she is available after the end of this session online. Obviously, I think there were two other things. One was there was a reference that we were to provide to Mr. Aldous, which I'm informed that we have done. And then lastly, there was

00:01:28:14 - 00:01:31:11

a question or possibly two questions from

00:01:32:28 - 00:02:04:18

Alison Shaw, which we said we would come back on. Yes, yes, I'm reading out the answer if that's okay. At the break, we took away to consider a point made by Alton Parish Council discussed in relation to agenda item five, Little six, which related to cumulative impact of noise, accumulative assessment sorry of noise impacts. The applicant's position is that they have undertaken the noise impact assessment in accordance with the relevant British standards.

00:02:05:04 - 00:02:36:26

Mr. Britten had explained that the cumulative assessment in the environmental statement looks at the type of impact that might arise from the cumulative projects. Impacts from traffic noise are considered separately from construction noise, which is in line with best practice guidance, including the DMB. As Shaw made reference to specific assessment work that she says was done by Orsted relating to the delivery of cable drums at night to the construction compound near CCR 16.

00:02:36:28 - 00:03:19:01

C. The show referred to a couple of additional British standards RBS 647 two and RBS 8233 that they posted took account of our understanding of the question raised by Ms.. Shaw was whether we were going to undertake further assessment, applying those British standards or whether we considered any further assessment was needed. Taking account of Orsted's impacts at this site, including abnormal load deliveries. Our understanding is that Orsted's assessment at this location was done for a very specific reasons relating to the delivery of cable drums at that location and the duration, i.e.

00:03:19:18 - 00:03:51:27

we understand, exceeding 30 months of the use of the nearby construction compound. It was not an additional form of cumulative assessment of noise impacts. We're not in clearly we're not we're not entirely clear what further assessment Ms.. Shaw is asking if we will carry out and if that explanation has not if that if the explanation I've just given has not answered the point, we would welcome it being submitted to the examining authority and then we could address it if thought appropriate by the examining authority in second written questions.

00:03:58:06 - 00:04:05:13

Thank you very much, Miss Shaw. You put your hand up. Would you like to reply to what you've just heard from the applicant, please?

00:04:06:04 - 00:04:53:24

Hello? Susan Mather. Alton Parish Council. Yes. Appreciate the applicant's response. What we are further asking is whether at CC or 16 C, whether the horizontal directional drilling, which is going to be deeper and for 600m at that point, whether there will be any specific noise assessment of vibration at that particular point and whether that if an assessment is done, whether cumulative cumulatively it will impact that property with the or current involving ORSTED and Vattenfall traffic impacts.

00:04:53:26 - 00:05:08:02

So that particular property is being impacted by Orsted and Vattenfall, but now will be impacted by equinor on the horizontal direction or drilling and and any traffic impacts.

00:05:10:28 - 00:05:26:06

Okay. Thank you. You referred to vibration assessment. Did you mean noise and vibration? Yes. Apologies. Okay. No, that's fine. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you. Okay. Appreciate the applicant's previous response to a similar question, but is there anything you'd like to add?

00:05:41:03 - 00:05:51:04

I think I think we'll have made a note of that question and we can consider if we've got anything more to say in our post hearing summary or at D3.

00:05:51:11 - 00:06:05:24

Okay. That would be useful. And say it may be a follow up sort of written question. That could also be another way of dealing with that that matter. Okay. Thank you very much. We'll move on then and we'll cover the air quality matter at the start of session four.

00:06:07:10 - 00:06:26:24

Okay. We'll move on to item agenda number six, which is traffic and transport. And the first matter is the implication of the A47 North Tottenham and Eastern Improvement Scheme delay, including whether there is now a need to to include that scheme in the cumulative impact assessments.

00:06:28:16 - 00:06:32:12

So that question as it stands to the applicant first, please.

00:06:33:25 - 00:06:36:02

Hi, Sam Taylor. On behalf of the applicant,

00:06:37:26 - 00:07:22:03

we've been in regular dialogue with national highways throughout the process, and as part of that, we've sort of sought to understand what their programme was, but their schemes and is developing, developing the application documents. It was National highways position that the schemes will be coming forward. But nonetheless we we agreed that maybe a delay to the implementation of those schemes and therefore there was a need for a mitigation strategy. The approach we agreed with

national highways that was agreed with that our expert topic group three was that that could be dealt with via the construction traffic management plan, post consent if there if there was a potential overlap.

00:07:23:01 - 00:07:23:16

Um,

00:07:27:22 - 00:08:14:12

subsequent subsequent to that, the national highways have confirmed that the construction period for those schemes could potentially subject to the could potentially conclude in 2026. So there is a potential there for a cumulative but equally there is a potential that the projects could avoid each other. We've also undertaken a review of what national highways submitted in terms of into their application for the DCO. Um, and what that, that detail is that the, the risk schemes could result in an additional 300 heavy goods vehicle movements per day and that's the A47 North Tottenham application referenced zero 50

00:08:16:07 - 00:09:03:14

at a level of 300 HGVs a day. That's approximately 30 trips an hour, or when you consider the background traffic flows on the A47, that's approximately a 1% increase in traffic on that road. Now, a 1% increase is at a level where it would be indiscernible from day to day fluctuations in background traffic and therefore would be of a negligible if that impact and therefore, whilst we've agreed a mechanism through the construction traffic management plan for how we will deal with the overlap, we we believe that there is no cumulative impact because when you look at national highways projections for what additional traffic there would be from that scheme, it is negligible and therefore by definition would not have a cumulative impact with that project.

00:09:04:26 - 00:09:33:04

We also discussed this matter with National Highways last week at a meeting on the 16th of March, and I think it's fair to say national Highways were in agreement with that approach and that it could be managed by the construction traffic management plan and that the impacts of the overlap of construction was not would not be significant. Um, national highways are seeking some clarifications in terms of how.

00:09:35:24 - 00:09:50:24

The two projects co-exist in how access is managed, and that is a more of a issue in terms of the drafting of the cooperation agreement or protective provisions and think is separate to this agreement, this this matter. I thought it worth mentioning.

00:09:55:18 - 00:09:57:03

Okay. Thank you.

00:09:58:27 - 00:10:27:25

Um, in terms of the, the transport assessment found that there were potential, the potential for severe impacts on two junctions. Ultimately, the two that would be removed by the improvement scheme. Um, ultimately, you just described there that there would be about a 1% increase in heavy goods vehicles, so there wouldn't be any concern about the effect. How does that tie in with the findings of the transport assessment at those two junctions which found there could be severe impacts?

00:10:31:05 - 00:11:08:03

I mean, I guess the that's our project and that's the traffic turning through those. Those, those junctions and that's that's our assessment. National highways there the numbers are it's 330 trips an hour, which is at a level where 30 trips an hour is where national highways or a local authority would typically not

request any junction modeling. It's like relates back to some old guidance, but it's still quite often used as a level where you would not undertake junction assessment because it's such a small level.

00:11:11:15 - 00:11:18:15

Okay. So in terms of the findings of the transport assessment, is the applicant now saying that those aren't valid?

00:11:22:09 - 00:11:45:27

Um, sometimes if the applicant know. We're not saying that that at all. Um. We're saying that for our projects, the increase in traffic through those junctions when we have modeled them is potentially significant and we've set out mitigation measures, um, within the construction traffic management plan to, um, as to how we would deal with them if those junctions weren't removed and they still existed.

00:11:50:15 - 00:11:57:05

Okay. Thank you. So so in terms of the 300 heavy goods vehicles that was on the A47 itself, is that correct?

00:11:58:03 - 00:11:58:20

The

00:12:00:17 - 00:12:20:10

it says 300 additional heavy vehicle movements, including have been included in the construction traffic assessment. And the assumption would be that those would be on the A47 but would because to service that project from. But guess that's a question for national highways.

00:12:21:17 - 00:12:32:26

Okay. We will come on to the proposed mitigation at those two junctions in the next question. But maybe if could get national highways Thoughts on the cumulative effects, please.

00:12:35:25 - 00:13:02:01

Thank you, sir. Could I just invite Andrew Cuthbert to turn his camera on? And also Jamie Heyward? Um, and just to remind you, sir, by way of introduction, Mr. Cuthbert is a consultant at AECOM who has been reviewing the scheme on behalf of national highways. Mr. Jamie Heywood is involved in the

00:13:03:21 - 00:13:14:16

national highways on projects of road safety improvement. So we can start, please, with Mr. Cuthbert to address the the issue of cumulative impact, please.

00:13:15:21 - 00:13:45:23

Yeah. So we take on recommended that the cumulative impact should be assessed. But having done so, the applicant responded by referring us to section 410 two of the outline construction traffic management plan, where it states that any overlap between the two schemes and their impacts should be addressed through their respective construction traffic management plans.

00:13:46:12 - 00:14:25:12

There's a commitment to a point of construction, traffic planning management plan coordinator, and that person would engage with their opposite number on the National Highway scheme and national highways would wish to see that set out as either a requirement or a protective provision. And my understanding is that provided that was the case, that national highways would be content with that approach to managing the cumulative impact of the two schemes, and that they were intending to formally confirm that at deadline three and think Mr.

00:14:25:14 - 00:14:37:06

Haywood has got some more detail to add from the perspective of the the people who are who are managing the construction of the risk scheme.

00:14:39:07 - 00:14:39:26

Thank you.

00:14:41:20 - 00:15:27:22

It could often Jamie Heywood Galliford try on behalf of national highways. So if mean the Tottenham scheme at the moment is is in delay, the scheme was going to be at the back of our programme. There is going to be some overlap. Now if if we get the the go ahead in May, but our our programme at the moment is two and a half year build starting in 2024, so towards towards the back of 2025, the new alignment will be, will be, will be active and the the area in question just to the north, the a47 eastern, most of the all of the proposed works will be complete in there.

00:15:28:03 - 00:15:44:21

So I don't see any issue with with Equinor coming in at the back of our programme. It shouldn't be an issue. We're we're currently in dialogue with with Orsted and we plan to do exactly the same with Equinor to assist delivering both schemes side by side.

00:15:48:09 - 00:16:23:00

Okay. Thank you. Could follow up with a question for national highways in terms of the potential impacts on the. Is a very worst case. For example, if the scheme didn't come forward, there was two junctions which the the applicant identified could ultimately result in severe impacts our national highways content that there is the potential for suitable mitigation at those two junctions if if worst case scenario they were required. I'm just thinking here about whether it's appropriate to leave it potentially post consent.

00:16:26:00 - 00:16:39:18

And thank you, sir. Think the short answer is yes. We are satisfied based upon conversations that have been had. But can I leave it to Mr. Cuthbert to address that point in more detail, please?

00:16:41:00 - 00:17:17:17

Thank you. Sorry, I should have introduced myself properly last time. Andrew Cuthbert from ICOM, appearing on behalf of National Highways. So the, the adverse impacts were set out in the transport assessment and these impacts happen if the construction of sharing and dudgeon goes ahead before the a 47 Eastern North Tottenham scheme and therefore the traffic has to use the existing junctions that buries Lane and Cunningham, the

00:17:19:04 - 00:17:51:13

applicant has referenced outlined construction traffic management plan sections 46 and 47, where it states that this is to be addressed through demand management by which we understand to mean hours of working restrictions, restrictions on the times of day when the workforce may arrive and leave the site, and where heavy goods vehicles may move materials on and off the site to avoid that traffic moving through those junctions during those critical peak periods.

00:17:51:24 - 00:18:26:25

Um, the they've pointed out that the requirement there'll be a requirement to require a detailed construction traffic management plan to be agreed with national highways. National highways will have the opportunity to examine and agree this and also that. Once a preferred contractor has been appointed, there will be an opportunity to go back and revisit the number of vehicles predicted and rerun those junction capacity models, which they assert have assessed a worst case situation.

00:18:27:10 - 00:18:35:27

My understanding is that national highways are content with that approach and again, that they will formally confirm that acceptance at deadline three.

00:18:43:03 - 00:19:09:02

Okay. Thank you for for that. The national highways just ran through a number of potential mitigation, which which I think from certainly my understanding of what the the outline construction traffic management plan says is probably slightly more detailed than what the generic measures are within there. Ultimately, should some of the detail which was just read out be included within that? So that's clear for all parties.

00:19:11:18 - 00:19:23:22

Sam Taylor on behalf of the applicant, the the outline construction traffic management plan which is I'm sorry, REP one zero 23

00:19:25:09 - 00:19:57:03

details those two junctions. And then what it sets out is quite a is the processes we we would follow. And so the process is would be initially to to engage with the contractor and understand what their demand for materials are. So obviously, the the environmental statement is based on a worst case in terms of and I'll run through a few, but in terms of material quantities overlap of construction program, all people driving themselves to site. So once the contractor is in board, we'll be able to refine some of those those assumptions.

00:19:57:05 - 00:20:26:24

And once we have details of those assumptions, we can then the outline construction traffic management plan outlines that we will then look to remodel those junctions. So would reserves, we would know what the the baseline traffic flows are rather than having to forecast forward. But also we will know like, for example, what other cumulative projects are doing in the area and whether those those schemes and then we would remodel. And then if there are significant impacts, it sets out that we would then

00:20:28:17 - 00:21:14:02

agree with national highways whether those are significant. Sorry, And then what what mitigation? And then we would say apologies. Then we would set out mitigation measures to to deal with that and that would be evidence through the modeling process. So we would um, and, and again, the construction paragraph 98 outlines a some of those measures. So for example, car sharing, spreading of arrival and finish times, but it's not intended to provide an exhaustive list, it's just intended to provide a detailed of the types of measures that could be employed and they would be developed through the construction traffic management plan and agreed with the the relevant highway authorities at the time.

00:21:16:01 - 00:21:49:16

Okay. Thank you very much for that. Um, we have sort of dealt with the next question two. But there was just one matter that Norfolk County Council raised. Um, that if the trunk road scheme are delayed and works or concurrent with this project, certain junctions and links the applicant intends to use may not be available to them. And if this proves to be the case, the applicant will need to seek alternative routes and given any such changes would fall outside the DCO consent.

00:21:49:27 - 00:21:59:02

The County Council can control any such amendments. I just wondered if it should say cannot control any amendments just as a starting point.

00:22:01:22 - 00:22:04:06

No, I think we were happy in saying that we could control it if it's.

00:22:04:08 - 00:22:09:19

Outside the DCO. Then we've got that ability to control what mechanism would come forward.

00:22:11:03 - 00:22:16:01

Okay. Could you explain just roughly how that would be done for the benefit of the examining authority?

00:22:23:25 - 00:22:28:25

Oh, yeah. Martin Dixon. Norfolk County Council. Any amendments to to

00:22:30:15 - 00:22:47:10

or even the final tmp? There should be a clause in there with any amendments that needed for operational reasons. There would need to be prior agreed with the local highway authority and that needs to be written in as clause. So we then have that ability.

00:22:53:24 - 00:22:58:14

Okay. Is such wording in the plan at the moment?

00:22:59:15 - 00:23:33:14

Somehow, on behalf of the applicant, the I mean the construction and traffic management plan, it sets out the routes we will use and the and therefore by definition the routes we won't use and the volumes of construction traffic that would would occur on each each road and that would need to be so there would need to be changes because because of a national highways, they put in a diversion, then that would obviously form part of finalizing the construction traffic management plan and that would obviously be agreed with Norfolk County Council.

00:23:33:16 - 00:24:05:04

But the the construction traffic management plan, once it's finalized, is not a final document. It's an evolving document that's maintained for the life of the project. And we've introduced the role of the construction traffic management plan coordinator, and that's set out in the outline construction traffic management plan. And they they are required or they will be required to engage, continue engaging with the highway authorities and other developers in the area to understand their program of works.

00:24:06:09 - 00:24:14:02

And yeah. And as as the to make sure that that document does what it says in is a living document.

00:24:14:19 - 00:24:34:09

Okay. Um is there the, is there the mechanism in there for the County Council to enforce a change if it was unhappy with a certain level of traffic on a link, for example, in that hypothetical situation, if the applicant said no, what is there a mechanism where that can be forced or.

00:24:36:06 - 00:25:14:05

Sam Taylor on behalf of the applicant, the the numbers that are in the construction traffic management plan the route are are they're from they have come from our assessments. We have undertaken an assessment and and therefore a level where we believe that the impacts are not significant. And that has been. And those the significance of that has been agreed with with Norfolk County Council as well through sort of confirmed within the statement of common ground. So the construction purpose of the construction traffic management plan is to control, ensure that we comply with what we've assessed and we don't deviate from that.

00:25:14:07 - 00:25:24:04

If there was a need to use a different route, I'm not saying we do need to do that, but hypothetically, talking hypothetically, then that would need to be agreed separately with Norfolk County Council.

00:25:25:07 - 00:25:42:23

But say ultimately there would be that that agreement in place. But then if there was a change, say the A47 improvement scheme that we've discussed didn't come forward. Um, what would happen if the applicant in Norfolk County Council had different views on the level of impact that then created?

00:25:44:26 - 00:26:02:05

Because. So just before you answer that, because it almost sounded from the County council's point of view that they would seek a mechanism to be able to manage that situation should other links be used because they're not available to the applicant. Is that really what you were suggesting?

00:26:03:18 - 00:26:36:13

Martin Dixon Norfolk County Council. Yeah, absolutely. There could be many reasons why a route may become unavailable, emergency road closures and things such like which is something we deal with. There's going to be other activities on the highway. There's an awful lot of other people working at any one time. So there needs to be a mechanism that if a chosen link is unavailable, that we need to be able to discuss and alternate a suitable alternative. And that's part of the day to day coordination process. So there needs to be that mechanism in the TMP that facilitates that.

00:26:36:15 - 00:26:41:06

So that you can ultimately force a review. Yes. What you're suggesting.

00:26:41:08 - 00:26:54:13

It deals to say the day to day issues. We sometimes get on the highway. There needs to be something in writing that allows us to to agree a suitable alternative if the chosen routes are not available.

00:26:54:22 - 00:26:58:12

Okay. Is the applicant content to accommodate such a mechanism?

00:26:59:14 - 00:27:06:27

Taylor On behalf of the applicant, we'll we'll take that away and discuss that and come back come back to North County Council on that.

00:27:07:05 - 00:27:11:15

Okay. Can we note that as a hearing action as well, please? Thank you.

00:27:17:26 - 00:27:46:27

Okay. Just before we move on to item agenda number three, there was just one more question for National Highways in terms of the proposed approach of the applicant to deal with road safety measures at the A47 Blind Lane and Tavern Road Junction, which I understand the proposed mitigation there was proposed by the Hornsea Project three and the adoption of that. Whether that's still an appropriate method of managing such risk from this project, please.

00:27:50:26 - 00:28:13:00

So thank you. Ratio one A barrister for National Highways. Mr. Cuthbert, could you turn your camera on and. Please just explain to the examining authority the approach about maintaining, um, those at those measures from the from the other wind farm project.

00:28:14:09 - 00:28:57:26

Yes, certainly. Andrew Cuthbert of AECOM on behalf of National Highways. So the Hornsea three windfarm project has undertaken to close Blind Lane temporarily and to restrict the use of Tavern

Road to left and left out only as a safety remedial measure. Not understand from national highways that those measures are already in the course of being implemented. And the promoter of the Sheringham and Dudgeon Wind farms has agreed to maintain those restrictions so that they will effectively inherit them from the Hornsea three wind farm.

00:28:57:28 - 00:29:02:27

And we have advised national highways that that should be satisfactory.

00:29:05:08 - 00:29:09:09

Okay. Thank you for that update and clarification. That's really useful. Thank you.

00:29:12:22 - 00:29:24:23

Okay. We'll move on to agenda item three, which is in relation to the proposed caps on certain links. Sorry. Yes. Before we move on, there's a Savills, please. Thank you.

00:29:24:25 - 00:29:37:25

Thank you. Jane. Kenny Savills. It's really good to hear that you are now looking further into the potential impacts on the A47. I just wondered whether you're doing a similar process with Norwich Western Link.

00:29:40:01 - 00:29:42:13

Okay. Is the applicant okay to feel that one? Thank you.

00:29:43:27 - 00:30:26:12

Sam Taylor, On behalf of the applicant, it's I guess it has always been the case that we've considered the a47 schemes. It's just how we've considered that cumulatively. And we've taken a very similar approach with the Western link, albeit the Western link is a project that yet does not yet have planning permission. And there's not yet, as I understand it, secured funding for the implementation of that scheme. But nonetheless, we the approach we've agreed with with Norfolk County Council and National Highways was that again, that would be better dealt with by the construction traffic management plan if there is an overlap with that scheme.

00:30:26:14 - 00:30:49:07

We were also in regular dialogue with the promoters of the Western Link and sharing information with them on our traffic movements and all sorts of other issues to ensure that when they submit their planning application they are able to fully consider the cumulative impacts as part of that application.

00:30:56:12 - 00:31:27:14

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. We will come on to agenda item number three then, which is in relation to the agreed caps on some of the links which Norfolk County Council have said already said in the last hearing that they were content with. Um, but in terms of the discussions with other developers and how part portions of the pie may be is a good phrase of who would use what of that capacity. Has there been anything more since the last hearings? When asked a similar question please.

00:31:29:22 - 00:31:40:05

Sam Tyler on behalf of the applicant, I think at the last hearing we outlined our approach on this, that it's the applicant's position that we will

00:31:41:26 - 00:31:44:10

we will work within the

00:31:46:07 - 00:32:33:25

we will work with the other developers in terms of understanding what their, their requirements are, um, for deliveries along those roads. And we would fit our construction ground traffic movements in around those, those projects. And then for there and for that reason, um, those discussions don't have to happen at this stage and are something that would be, would, would happen if there is a cumulative overlap with those projects. As it stands, both of those projects are proceeding to construction this year and therefore may largely be complete or the peaks for those projects will have potentially passed by the time that Dudgeon and Sheringham potentially commence construction.

00:32:35:05 - 00:32:44:22

Okay. Thank you. Is it likely that that if a certain link can't be used, that ultimately traffic. Mr. BOSWELL Before move on to the next question.

00:32:44:24 - 00:33:16:24

Julian Boswell For the applicant, just to say that there is some press commentary by orsted that they are considering their position in relation to Hornsea three that the panel may or may not have seen. And I just wanted to. We don't have any special information. Our current under, you know, the headline position on the face of it is that they are proceeding. But at the same time, they are saying that they are thinking about their their position. So just didn't want you to think that we were asserting with any real sort of information beyond what is generally available as to what's happening with Hornsea three.

00:33:17:17 - 00:33:18:25

Understood. Thank you.

00:33:27:03 - 00:33:32:09

Okay. Okay. Is it possible to provide the press statement to to the examination?

00:33:35:06 - 00:33:38:03

I'm sure it is. I mean, it's in the public domain.

00:33:38:26 - 00:33:39:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:33:42:16 - 00:34:07:11

Okay. In terms of moving back to the impacts of the proposed links, the is there the potential that if a link can't be used, that construction traffic will simply use other routes to bypass that link? That's the concern of the examining authority and therefore the potential for impacts which haven't been assessed to occur.

00:34:09:12 - 00:34:55:13

Sam Taylor on behalf of the applicant, the the construction traffic outline construction traffic management plan, which is secured by requirement 15, sets out the the roads that we will use and therefore the roads that won't be used and how and the process is for monitoring, monitoring that and enforcing that and the construction numbers that would on each road. So in the event that the other projects are at construction and we need we cannot we can't we can't use those those links to off of all city, then we would look at other means and that may be that in that area we delay the works.

00:34:55:15 - 00:35:22:09

So I think I made this point last time that we may then just may work in a different area and just switch our construction program around. So rather than working, for example, in the middle, we would work in the north northern area, just move things around to to accommodate that. And that's not to say we would use different links, but we would only be using the links that we have assessed and that are set out within our outline construction traffic management plan.

00:35:22:27 - 00:35:29:20

Okay. Do the County Council have any concerns in regard to bypassing restricted links?

00:35:31:17 - 00:36:05:18

Martin Dixon, Norfolk County Council. It really goes back to to what I said at an earlier point is that if if a link becomes unusable for whatever reason, other other activities or, you know, physicality of that, and we have to look at alternatives. I know, Sam, you make the point that that you could transfer work if a link and and a section of work became unavailable, you could transfer resource and the like to another if you're working on multiple work fronts simultaneously.

00:36:06:07 - 00:36:36:18

That's one option. The other option is, again, as we've said before, if you needed to use an alternative link, perhaps an assessed 1 or 1 that's not in the TMP, then then that would need to be with the prior discussion, an agreement with local highway or local street authority. Before that went ahead, I think underlined the reason we need that mechanism in place to cover eventualities.

00:36:36:22 - 00:36:44:24

I take the point though, with that with multiple work fronts, you can always move resource if it's going to be a temporary problem.

00:36:45:16 - 00:36:49:29

Okay. Thank you very much. So did you wish to come back? Thank you.

00:36:50:03 - 00:37:20:24

Sometime on behalf of the. Yep. I gave what was one example of how we could manage that, and that was around just working in different areas. But there are there are multiple options for how we can reduce our traffic demand. And we set those out in our written questions, which was. Q 123 6.3 But that's things like programming, optimization of the fleet mode, share supply chain. So there's, there's a whole range of measures we can use.

00:37:20:26 - 00:37:27:11

And I was providing an example to demonstrate the point. The other part I guess is that

00:37:29:07 - 00:37:43:06

the use of roads that aren't within the construction traffic management plan by any of the vehicles would be would be a breach of that plan and would be subject to enforcement measures which are again outlined within the construction traffic management plan.

00:37:44:01 - 00:37:50:08

Okay. Thank you very much. Alton Parish Council, you've got your your hand up. Would you like to come in at this point?

00:37:52:14 - 00:38:28:02

Thank you. Um, as I'm sure council referring back to a previous point just made by the applicant, um, who was raising the issue of uncertainty around Orsted Hornsea three progressing. Um, that is only on the level of, uh, of a press release at the moment, and it was budget related, related to the government budget and the budget has passed. What will happen is still, um, obviously we do not know.

00:38:28:16 - 00:38:51:11

Uh, neither did the applicant, but, but ultimately, Parish Council would just like to register the point that the worst case scenario is the planning is the planning brief, and therefore this examining

authority and the applicant must continue to consider the worst case scenario, which would be Orsted and Vattenfall, Vanguard and Boreas proceeding. Thank you.

00:38:53:03 - 00:39:34:06

Understood. Thank you very much for that point. Um, do I suppose is your table thrown up from last time? No, that's fine. Thank you. Um, okay, we'll move on to the next point. Thank you. Which is item number four, which is whether it is appropriate to agree detailed access arrangements and necessary highway improvements or arrangements such as widening or vehicle escort schemes, post consent. And it's really a question for the County Council, please, whether from the evidence before you, whether you're content that in each potential case where one might be necessary, that there is scope, particularly within the highway boundary, to be able to accommodate such a scheme?

00:39:34:17 - 00:40:10:00

John Shaw Norfolk County Council. Yeah, we are content with that as a as a method of doing the works. Our concern is that things can get overengineered by doing it this way around. There's the opportunity to have the least environmental impact. So for example, if you look at a road at the moment, you could say, well, that's narrow to overcome the issues, you might need to put in ten passing places. The applicants design that the contractor comes along, it's that they can see it. Yeah, we can do it. We can work like that by doing it the other way round and trying to agree with the applicants later.

00:40:10:02 - 00:40:42:24

We can try to agree different ways of working. So it could well be the applicant. The contractor all say, I can hold my vehicles here, I can get 2 or 3 vehicles held. We can come forward, um, to escort arrangements. You can close the road. I'm going to look at is it 15 minutes in every every hour you can close the road for 15 minutes in every hour, and then you don't need all those passing places. So for us, it's a way of limiting that environmental impact. And that's hugely what we tried to focus on with this particular project.

00:40:47:27 - 00:40:54:09

Okay. Thank you for that. National highways. You've got your hand up on this matter. Would you like to jump in?

00:40:55:17 - 00:41:11:02

Thank you, sir. Horatio Wallace for National Highways. Can I ask Mr. Andrew Rosamond to please address the examining authority on the issue of direct access from the Strategic Road Network?

00:41:13:16 - 00:41:55:20

Good afternoon, sir. Andrew Rosalind here for National Highways. In respect of the direct access, we would be looking for a preliminary design to be submitted along with an A1 and then we would look for the detailed design to be presented and we would then do an in-house check on the detailed design followed by an A2. The purpose of being of receiving the preliminary design with the A1 is for us to make any comments that we consider may need to be taken on board for the detailed design.

00:41:55:22 - 00:42:04:05

So hopefully that will give us a smooth end to end delivery for the direct access. Thank you.

00:42:07:08 - 00:42:12:24

Okay. Thank you. Anything from the applicant in terms of national highways points?

00:42:16:09 - 00:42:49:13

No. Okay. Thank you very much for that. Okay. Swiftly. Moving on to the next question, which is whether the county council are content with the list of roads proposed to be crossed by open cut

techniques. Um, and the County Council advised in their reply to our first round of written questions, which was within the supporting sort of document that was provided alongside which summarised discussions which have taken place, that it would review that list to see whether it was content.

00:42:49:15 - 00:42:53:17

Just wondered if there was any update in terms of whether you've had the opportunity to do so yet.

00:42:54:20 - 00:43:33:12

Johnson County Council. Yes, we're content with the list. Our point is that if you look at different documents, it says different things. So I think for the code of construction practice, it said all of the roads would be crossed by Treacherous Crossing plus 16 other roads. The CTM says 22 roads and I think our point was a lot of the cross references can get things can get updated and all the cross references do not get updated. So what we would like to see is the the roads listed by name within the map and that way the certainty on all sides as to exactly what's going to happen.

00:43:33:14 - 00:43:51:09

So our understanding of it is, is the actual only place at the moment that we could see where they're really identified is in the drawings. And I don't think that's the most suitable place for it. We'd like to see it within the map and subject to that we'd be quite content. Thank you.

00:43:52:08 - 00:43:55:12

Okay. Thank you. Is that something the applicant is happy to accommodate?

00:44:13:17 - 00:44:27:26

Sometimes on behalf of the applicant, I'm advised that there's the roads are listed within the crossing schedule, but if it helps, we will. We're happy to include those within the outline. An update to the outline construction traffic management plan as well.

00:44:28:14 - 00:44:30:28

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

00:44:34:11 - 00:44:58:28

Okay, Moving on to agenda item number six. Um, whether the County council will content with the assessment of links 911 and 52. In a similar manner, there was reference within the supporting table to your written question response that you were seeking further clarification on the methodology for defining those link sensitivities. Is there any update on that position please?

00:45:01:06 - 00:45:08:00

Martin Dixon, Norfolk County Council. It's easy answer We are we are satisfied with the current assessment on those three links.

00:45:13:22 - 00:45:14:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:45:19:14 - 00:45:21:22

Okay. We'll move on to item number seven.

00:45:23:15 - 00:45:52:00

And again, question for the county Council. In terms of the concerns raised by Alton Parish Council in relation to the number of the proposed accesses along the B1 149, which are in quite close proximity to each other as a result of the proposed development and the Hornsea Project three and Norfolk Vanguard in both projects. Um, do you have any potential concerns in that regard cumulatively?

00:45:52:21 - 00:46:25:10

You're not sure? Norfolk County Council Our position on this is contained within the appendix document to our deadline one submission, which was 1-078 and it's contained at column 11. So I can understand the reasons why Alton Parish Council have raised this. When we looked at Hornsea three windfarm proposal. Hornsea three wanted an access, a very similar location and we said no to it.

00:46:26:02 - 00:46:56:25

And the reason for that was that Hornsea three wanted an access for something like eight years. It was going to be used intensively for quite a considerable period of time, almost every day, and there was going to be a lot of heavy kit to go through that access. I think it's like 1200 abnormal loads. And we said, no, that wasn't suitable. In terms of Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas, we had slightly different concerns. Our concerns with those projects.

00:46:56:27 - 00:47:27:20

They also wanted access on a similar section of this road and we said no. And the reason for that was to do with cumulative impacts. Equinor is slightly different. Our understanding of what Equinor will want to do is to have an access that would be used for 12 weeks only. It'll be used to get a drilling rig onto the site. So it's a very specific activity and then that access would cease to be used. So it's a different proposal.

00:47:28:09 - 00:48:23:24

So the scale and nature of it is very different to the other applications that we've looked at where we said no. So what we've said is there's the opportunity to do that and the traffic management and the traffic management would be temporary lights. And as I said, within the supporting document that we sent at deadline one, it's got a number of conditions about how that would work. So we've said that we would like the duration and use being for a limited period, the traffic signals not to be operating between 730 and 9:00 AM and 1630 to 1730 and no active, no traffic movements between 730 and 9 and also 430, 1630 to 1730 and also advanced warning signs to advise the presence of the part time traffic lights.

00:48:23:26 - 00:48:51:00

And the applicants have agreed to that and they've agreed that that would be captured within the outline construction traffic management plan. So subject to all of that being included within the outline construction traffic management plan. We wouldn't have an issue. So as I said, I can understand Autumn's concerns, but it's of a different scale to the other applications that we looked at. And that's why our position on this application is different to the other ones that we've looked at.

00:48:51:20 - 00:49:20:15

Okay. Thank you. Um, in relation to those additional measures for the accessing question, a revised construction traffic management plan was provided which included three of those measures but didn't include advance warning signs to advise the presence of part time traffic signals. I just wondered why that one had been omitted, if that was just an error or whether there was any reason the applicant wasn't happy with that one some time.

00:49:20:17 - 00:49:50:25

On behalf of the applicant there, those are shown on the drawings. So within the transport assessment we've got outline drawings for that access 25 B and on that it shows the, the signing arrangements and the outline construction traffic management plan has a separate section on how the access access designs will be agreed. And and therefore, we didn't feel that it was necessary to list that as a further item because that's already within that.

00:49:52:01 - 00:49:55:01

Those drawings on the design of the access.

00:49:58:23 - 00:49:59:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:50:02:22 - 00:50:13:24

Okay. Maybe I could ask Alton Parish Council if the potential mitigation that we've just discussed for that particular access, whether that overcomes any of your potential concerns.

00:50:15:07 - 00:50:27:02

Susan Mather Alton Parish Council. Yes. We've we've made note of the mitigation. The only issue that we have is that that particular junction at

00:50:29:10 - 00:50:51:00

C, A, CC 25 B, which um, goes to um, the solar farm site is a very awkward junction just there. So I'm assuming that the traffic lights will be there and will they be three way

00:50:52:27 - 00:50:53:12

forward?

00:50:54:17 - 00:51:03:11

Okay. I wonder if that might be a level of detail that's not quite known yet, but I will in the County Council. Happy to, to answer that one. Yeah. Thank you.

00:51:04:23 - 00:51:59:16

Martin Dixon, Norfolk County Council. Yes. We've looked at these proposals prior. There's a possibility using suitable signing and guarding to probably make these lights a two way, and they would be on the main road to be 1149. And there is a facility within Chapter eight to use what we call sub plates on the side roads. They're much lower use. And what you tend to get if you if you signals all four is minor road traffic ends up controlling the traffic on the major route and there is a facility built in to if it's at a very low level to just signals the main route and and advise traffic joining from the side routes, the lower use routes that there's traffic control ahead.

00:51:59:27 - 00:52:01:08

It's a standard practice.

00:52:03:29 - 00:52:05:14

Okay. Thank you. That's useful.

00:52:08:18 - 00:52:40:18

Okay. Just on a related matter, whilst we're dealing with with things in Oulton Parish Council area, the parish council ruled the view that link 57 should have been considered cumulatively with the Norfolk Vanguard project. I believe they refer to that being linked 75 of that project as ultimately both those links will be used. Um, can the applicant maybe look into that one a little bit further in terms of whether that's correct.

00:52:42:15 - 00:52:55:16

Sam Taylor on behalf of the applicant. We have provided a response to that in our in our response to sorry, in our comments. Let me just find enough apologies.

00:52:59:09 - 00:53:21:02

Sorry. It's the applicant's responses to the first written question. So that's REP 240. We have provided a response to that. I guess in summary, the the answer is that for that link are our projects traffic results in a negligible impact and therefore we haven't considered it cumulatively because

00:53:22:17 - 00:53:25:20

by definition it's a negligible impact.

00:53:32:12 - 00:53:48:23

Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Okay. The final agenda item was seeking an update from Network Rail on a particular access issue that they raised that as they're not here today. I will ask that in written questions. So, um.

00:53:50:09 - 00:53:52:17

That's okay. Yes. From the applicant, please.

00:53:53:01 - 00:53:57:01

Mean, I'm happy to provide a bit of background on that if it's. If it's helpful. Yes.

00:53:57:03 - 00:53:59:00

Yeah, absolutely. If you're able to please.

00:54:01:24 - 00:54:36:06

The during the sort of development of the application, we were we were looking for potential options to access the onshore substation. And one of those options was to use Hickling Lane which would have required us to go over the Overbridge which goes over the railway line. Um, consequently, consequently we engaged the applicant engaged with network Rail to understand the capacity of that bridge to accommodate our project's traffic. But prior to the submission of the application, this this option was rejected and no access is proposed by Hickling Lane.

00:54:36:24 - 00:54:45:27

Um the and therefore and the other options are set out within our construction traffic management plan.

00:54:47:17 - 00:54:54:02

I'm just had also had a note that confirms that Network Rail has said that they will confirm this at deadline three.

00:55:00:19 - 00:55:06:16

Okay, that's useful. Thank you very much. Okay. Mr. Aldous, please.

00:55:07:27 - 00:55:53:01

Thank you, sir. For on this agenda item, is it correct that where the increase in traffic is considered negligible or where the previous project, be it Hornsea three, Vanguard or Boris, that is also considered negligible? Then cumulative impact assessments are not carried out for things like air quality, noise, vibration, etcetera. And the question I was trying to probe earlier is the quantitative or numerical threshold that is defined as negligible, for example, on a rural road, if it is the case that a doubling of heavy goods vehicle traffic is still classed as negligible, then there'd be no cumulative impact assessment of either noise, vibration or air quality.

00:55:53:07 - 00:56:18:13

From a resident's point of view, doubling the number of HGV movements is not negligible. If you take the baseline as being for a rural area, a doubling is a doubling. Although from a highways design point of view, that may be negligible. Is this what what I'm hearing from the applicant that in those

cases there is no cumulative impact assessment? Or have I misunderstood? The points have been made today. Thank you.

00:56:19:00 - 00:56:24:25

No, thank you, Mr. Aldous. Is the applicant able to provide clarification on that?

00:56:27:08 - 00:56:37:02

Where is that in relation to ultimately the the magnitude of effects sort of assessment criteria for each of the individual impacts which is set out in the US?

00:56:38:11 - 00:57:08:05

Some say a little bit half of the applicant. Yeah. Can talk on behalf of transport and I think you've summarized that quite well. It's yeah. The, the impact assessment sort of thresholds are set out within the environmental statement and it varies depending upon which impact we're looking at and that will then inform a judgment of, of significance so that those, those thresholds are set out within the environment. Traffic and transport environmental statement, which is app 110.

00:57:09:04 - 00:57:31:17

Okay. Thank you. And say there are different thresholds in each of the chapters for the different subjects. So yeah, I appreciate it's quite a wide, broad lot of documentation to try and get to grips with in terms of what's saying what. But they are there. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Um. Okay. Bear with me. Two minutes is we're sort of running ahead of schedule, so we'll decide quite what to do.

00:58:57:24 - 00:58:59:22

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Boswell, did you.

00:58:59:24 - 00:59:01:15

Did you wish to jump in?

00:59:01:19 - 00:59:11:09

Julian Boswell. For the applicant, just to say that our air quality expert is, has dialed in. So if you wanted to do air quality now, see what she's available. Okay.

00:59:11:11 - 00:59:14:18

Yeah, absolutely. We were just about to take the break so we would.

00:59:14:20 - 00:59:23:20

Allow the applicants team to swap around for water quality. But we can deal with that issue now before we do so, if that's possible. Please. Thank you.

00:59:26:03 - 00:59:28:03

Is that he's waiting in the lobby? Potentially.

00:59:33:25 - 00:59:34:28

Charlotte Goodman.

00:59:35:00 - 00:59:37:11

Okay. Yes. I think just being allowed in.

00:59:39:25 - 00:59:44:01

Okay. Is Ms.. Goodman aware of the question so that she's suitably prepared?

00:59:44:22 - 00:59:59:27

Sarah Turner For the applicant? I think it would be helpful for Ms.. Goodman just to revisit that point so that she's got good understanding of the clear question. She's briefed on the general topic, but obviously she missed this morning, so perhaps Mr. August can repeat his question.

01:00:00:19 - 01:00:03:24

Yeah, absolutely. Mr.. So you're happy to do that? Please. Thank you.

01:00:04:17 - 01:00:36:22

Yes, Thank you, sir. If my memory stretches back that far, when the air quality assessment is made on a rural road, it sounded as if the upper limit of acceptability is determined by reference to a more urban situation. In other words, since it's a rural area, you can do what you like because you're below the thresholds. Whereas as similar to the point, I've just made, a doubling of negative impacts from the point of view of a resident is a doubling. It may still be below some specified upper limit on the standard.

01:00:36:24 - 01:00:59:11

But from our point of view, it's a doubling of the impact. And the specific question is in terms of air quality, when the assessment is made for a rural road, is it compared against a limit that is an upper limit set by a standard, or is it compared as an increment above the existing baseline that's actually there in reality? I hope that question is clear. Thank you.

01:01:00:27 - 01:01:02:19

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Walters.

01:01:03:17 - 01:01:06:29

Ms.. Goodman, are you able to jump in and answer that question, please?

01:01:08:23 - 01:01:43:21

Yes. Charlotte Goodman for the applicant. Firstly, thank you for deferring this question to the afternoon to give me the opportunity to respond. Thank you, Mr. Aldous, for repeating the question. Um, to answer your query, um, there's two things that we look at when we're looking at the air quality impact. First is the change, as you rightly mentioned, from the baseline. So the impact of a project or in this case we're talking specifically about cumulative projects and what impacts or change that brings about, um, at a particular sector.

01:01:44:00 - 01:02:21:11

And also we're looking at the total concentration in relation to the government's health based air quality objectives. So there's two factors at play that we look at when we consider whether or not an effect is significant or not. So with regard to your query about the rural area and whether or not we're using the same benchmarks as we are in an urban area, yes, we are to an extent, because all the assessment is inherently considered in terms of whether or not any of the air quality objectives are breached, their health based, their set out in our legislation.

01:02:21:13 - 01:02:58:03

And that's what we need to look at of whether or not there's a likely exceedance of those. But we do take into consideration as part of the assessment by how much the baseline air quality is going to change as a result of the project. So that is obviously location specific. It depends on exactly how much traffic is going to be increased on any particular road link and that is obviously going to be different depending on the area. Um, so we have taken into account the specific impacts within an area, whether or not they're rural or urban.

01:03:01:09 - 01:03:06:07

Thank you very much, Mr. Ward. Does that answer your question?

01:03:07:01 - 01:03:40:19

Thank you, sir. It probably does. I may want to come back into it later. I was related to this. I struck by one of the other points in the traffic and transport document. I'm not quite sure which document this is, but it essentially says that the cumulative impact assessment excludes links where the primary assessment of schemes has identified the increase in traffic flows to be negligible. Does that general statement carry across to all the different types of cumulative impact, including air quality? But if the original scheme says the impact is negligible, then therefore there is no further assessment done.

01:03:41:06 - 01:03:45:04

Does that read into this present discussion or not? Thank you.

01:03:46:27 - 01:03:47:19

Thank you.

01:03:49:02 - 01:03:52:11

Is the applicant happy to fill that more generic question?

01:03:59:03 - 01:03:59:21

Let's get.

01:04:02:16 - 01:04:27:21

Julian Bosworth, the applicant. Think. Because on the face of it, that's quite a broad question covering multiple topics. Firstly, do you the examining authority actually want us to answer that? Because that is an examining that is a kind of EIA sort of fairly on one level, a basic EIA methodology question. If you do, then I think we we would we would want to deal with that in writing if it comes out as a, as an essay.

01:04:27:24 - 01:04:33:02

QUESTION Okay. Thank you. We'll consider that in terms of a written question. Thank you.

01:04:34:19 - 01:04:40:00

Okay. Thank you very much. We're running slightly ahead of schedule, so given I.

01:04:40:02 - 01:04:51:14

Know the applicant will want to swap their teams around for the water quality session, We'll have our hour break slightly early, so we will adjourn until 25 to 4, please.

01:04:54:19 - 01:04:56:13

Sorry. We need to.

01:04:56:15 - 01:05:08:21

Talk about our hearing actions. So we'll take the opportunity to do that as part of this afternoon break. So we will adjourn until 345 to give us a bit more time to do so. Okay. We'll see you then. Thank you very much.