



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part 6
<b>Date:</b>	19 September 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## Five Estuaries\_Wivenhoe\_19 Sept\_ISH1\_PT6

Created on: 2024-09-19 10:24:01

Project Length: 01:36:22

File Name: Five Estuaries\_Wivenhoe\_19 Sept\_ISH1\_PT6

File Length: 01:36:22

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:29 - 00:00:23:27

Good morning, everyone. Uh, the time is now. 11:20 a.m.. It's time for this, uh, issue specific hearing to resume, uh, resuming with agenda item 3.7, onshore traffic and transportation.

00:00:25:15 - 00:01:05:11

Um, this agenda item will follow the same format as the others have, uh, in this part of the agenda, in that we will shortly invite the applicant to give a ten minute update, um, on the current position on this issue and then invite IPS, um, to come back with their, uh, points, um, in sort of ideally less than five minutes. Um, but before we get on to that, I'm conscious with, um, probably got a couple of new faces, uh, at the table or, uh, online.

00:01:05:21 - 00:01:12:29

Uh, so starting with the applicant, um, would they like to introduce who's going to be speaking to this item, please?

00:01:16:17 - 00:01:21:21

Yeah, it's Danny Marone, um, from SLR consulting. Um, track and transport lead on behalf of the applicant.

00:01:24:06 - 00:01:36:02

Great. Thank you. Um, I think we've got, um, Mr. Bloom and Mrs. Marshall online, uh, for National Highways. Um.

00:01:37:16 - 00:01:39:07

Good morning, sir. Yes.

00:01:39:09 - 00:01:40:14

Thank you. Good morning.

00:01:40:16 - 00:01:51:18

Thank you. Good morning. Um, I think for Essex County Council. Uh, Mr. Woods, have you got a colleague on line? Thank you, sir. Mark Woods.

00:01:51:20 - 00:02:01:20

Essex County Council I have, um, I'd like to introduce the hearing to, uh, my colleague Joseph Huff, who works for KMC consulting. As you can see, Joe is on the line now.

00:02:03:01 - 00:02:04:27

Great. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Hough.

00:02:10:05 - 00:02:21:29

All right. Um, so if, uh, if I could invite the applicant, uh, to give their update on, um, onshore traffic and transportation. Thank you.

00:02:22:25 - 00:02:59:25

Thank you. Sir. Uh, so, first of all, the applicant has engaged with Essex County Council and National Highways since the start of 2022 to discuss, refine and agree the scope and approach of the traffic and transport assessment for the project. Whilst the majority of the assessment approach has been agreed, the applicant has continued engagement since submission and there are ongoing discussions with both stakeholders. The applicant has also met with Essex Police, East of England, East of England Ambulance Service and Essex County Fire and Rescue to discuss their relevant representations and has identified additional drafting within outline management plans to seek to address their concerns.

00:03:00:20 - 00:03:38:01

The applicant is in the process of updating a number of application documents related to traffic and transport to reflect this continuing stakeholder engagement, and these amendments do not change the conclusions of the assessment. So, coming on to point A road. Road traffic surveys and predicted traffic generation for construction and operation to inform the design of the project in terms of access, a desktop review of potential construction vehicle access routes was undertaken. This is followed by site visits to the study area, as set out in section 2.11 and 2.12 of the Traffic and Transport Baseline Report, part one, Application Reference 172.

00:03:39:12 - 00:04:17:07

The use of the highway network has been minimised as far as practicable by the use of long haul road sections, such as the route section three, which allows the centre of thoughtless open to be avoided by construction HGVs. With the exception of a section of Bentley Road, a section of Manor Road and a small section of Ardley Road. The construction vehicle access routes used by HGVs comprise a strategic road network and Am classified roads. Given the small number of HGVs associated with the construction of the projects that could possibly use the small sections of Ardley Road and Manor Road, no physical improvements are proposed and use will be managed through measures within the final construction Traffic Management plan.

00:04:18:14 - 00:04:44:02

Bentley Road is already used by some HGVs for access. However, given the anticipated increase in the number of HGVs on this road between the A120 and the construction accesses associated with the project, some improvements have been identified to safely accommodate the passing of two HGVs at the junction with the A120 and along a section of Bentley Road. Now HGV is associated with the project would travel through Little Bromley or other settlements to the north of the A120.

00:04:45:19 - 00:05:11:10

Baseline traffic surveys to inform the assessment was set out in a technical note in March 2022, which was issued to Essex County Council, which were discussed and agreed. An expert topic group meeting. And two National highways who agreed the approach in a briefing note. The speed data was also collected to inform the design of the construction, accesses and road crossings, all of which have been discussed and agreed in principle with Essex County Council and have been subject to a stage one road safety audit.

00:05:12:27 - 00:05:22:08

In terms of anticipated construction traffic. HGV trip generation forecasts have been derived based on the likely plant and quantity of materials that need to be delivered for the construction activities.

00:05:23:29 - 00:05:56:10

Construction work workforce estimates have been derived based on best practice and experience from other projects, and a target on average vehicle occupancy 1.5, which will be monitored through the final Workforce Travel Plan. The Traffic and transport Assessment is based on a maximum design scenario, using worst case parameters and combining the maximum anticipated daily number of HGVs and the maximum anticipated daily number of workforce vehicles, which are then combined for a robust assessment. It should be noted that the peak period is likely to be for a short period within the overall construction program, with lower vehicle movements.

00:05:56:12 - 00:06:29:10

At other times, the abnormal indivisible loads such as the cable trunks and the transformers for the substation, which would be delivered towards the end of the construction programme and low in number, are not included in the main assessment of percentage increases in construction traffic. The maximum anticipated daily HGV and workforce vehicles for each route section is based on construction of all route sections and the substation starting at the same time over a total of 19 months, when in reality the construction activities of some sections can start later the month one and therefore potentially a lower maximum overall daily impact.

00:06:29:13 - 00:07:00:00

Whilst the longer construction period overall vehicle movements associated with the project would be significantly lower during operation and was scoped out of the assessment. So, moving on to point B construction impacts for the proposed development on the local and strategic road network, railways and public rights of way, the applicant has assessed the potential impacts of the project on the road, railway and public rights of way network networks. Excuse me during the construction of the project. Details of the construction phase assessments can be viewed in the Traffic and Transport chapter.

00:07:00:02 - 00:07:36:19

Application reference 90. Based on the review of the construction access routes and using sensitivity of the environment criteria in table 8.6 of the Traffic and Transport chapter. Application reference 90. A range of sensitive receptors were identified from negligible to high, for the potential effects associated with increases in traffic to inform the assessment, as one level of sensitivity is assigned to each link based on the review of sensitive receptors for the assessment of a specific potential effect, where appropriate, sensitivity has been reduced or increased, such as for the assessment of vulnerable road users and road safety on Bentley Road, where the sensitivity was increased from low to high.

00:07:37:25 - 00:08:08:07

In terms of the potential effects on the local and strategic road networks, no significant effects have been identified. Taking the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Application Reference 257 into account, which sets out the measures to be implemented to manage and monitor construction traffic on the highway network, and also the outline work for Workforce Travel Plan application reference 259, which sets out measures to be implemented to minimise the number of single occupancy construction workforce vehicles on the highway network and how this would be monitored in terms of the potential effects on the railway.

00:08:08:09 - 00:08:41:21

There would be no disruption due to the proposed use of horizontal directional drilling or other trenches. Technique to install the onshore export cable under the railway, no significant effects were identified on the use of public rights away taking the outline Public Public Access Management Plan Application Reference 258 into account. This sets out mitigation measures to minimise temporary disruptions to the uses of public rights of way, such as managed crossings and short temporary diversions. The potential effects of the delivery of a transformer, which would be the largest abnormal invisible load from the Port of Harwich to the substation in line with National Highways.

00:08:41:23 - 00:09:14:17

Water preferred policy using the nearest port has been assessed in the Traffic and Transport chapter. Application Reference 90 and how this will be managed is set out in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. Application reference 257. So moving on to point C, any onshore port and transportation impacts arising from servicing the offshore works in the offshore works associated with the construction of the project will generate onshore vehicle movements. However, as the preferred base for the port for the offshore construction, operation and maintenance activities of the project is not known as it will be decided.

00:09:14:19 - 00:09:51:13

Post consent and assessment of these vehicle movements does not form part of the Traffic and Transport Assessment Application. Reference zero 90. Any port activity would be within the envelope assessed with the existing approvals report. When a port considered. Also, the large wind turbine components would be transported by sea and not by road and finally to point D. Cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments in the area. For the cumulative assessment with North Wales Offshore Wind Farm, a set of construction vehicle movements has been derived on the basis of a project and or force being constructed at the same time under a coordinated approach.

00:09:51:20 - 00:10:32:20

This is based on the two projects utilizing the same construction accesses horror crossings, temporary construction compounds and roads, which would have a number of benefits, including a lower number of construction vehicle movements on the highway network and potential effects on road safety. The potential traffic and transport effects, and the scenario whereby the Project North was built separately, without the shared use of this infrastructure, would be much greater than the coordinated approach. Paragraphs 8.12 point 6 to 8 point 12.20 of the Traffic and Transport chapter. Application reference 90 describes the project scoped into the cumulative assessment, which includes North Falls, the Norwich Tilbury Reinforcement Project, Sizewell C, East Anglia two and the Green Energy Hub.

00:10:33:06 - 00:10:48:15

No insignificant effects in identified taking into account the mitigation within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. Application reference 257 the Outline Workforce Travel plan. Application reference 259 and the Outline Public Access Management Plan application 258.

00:10:50:07 - 00:10:50:22

Thank you.

00:10:56:18 - 00:11:43:17

Thank you for that helpful summary, Mr. Moran. And just ever so quickly before I, uh, turn to other interested parties. Um, one one immediate question. Um, at the outset of, uh, of your summary, um, you mentioned the ongoing engagement that was going on with, uh, um, and National Highways, Essex County Council emergency services, and that it was going to lead to some updates, um, to, um, some of your reports, um, would you be able to give us an indication of, um, at what stage in the examination process we might expect to see, um, any updates of, transport reports, please.

00:12:31:13 - 00:12:55:22

Uh, Paul McCartney for the applicant. So there's a number of different updates to documents going on. So there is, um, some information which is required to supplement the year that should have been included that will be submitted. There are updates to outline plans, which we think we will be in a position to submit before a deadline too, because we need to get the change request and the deadline one, and be able to reflect the change in the access in that request.

00:12:59:08 - 00:12:59:26

Thank you.

00:13:03:29 - 00:13:21:03

Okay. Um, turning, uh, first to, uh, National highways and, uh, Mrs. Marshall or Mr. Bloom or both. Um, if you could, um, sort of provide an indication of where you're at with this application, that would be great.

00:13:22:04 - 00:13:25:06

Thank you. Sir. Sarah Marshall for National highways.

00:13:28:01 - 00:13:36:13

At this stage. Um, all the all the matters are only related to the construction traffic, period. Um,

00:13:38:11 - 00:14:09:00

The demand. So there are three particular issues. So the demand forecasts for construction traffic are not yet agreed. Um, and we have raised a number of technical issues with the applicants about their modelling. Um, second issue, the junction um with Bentley Road. So the strategic road network A120 with Bentley Road. So this is where the construction vehicles will come from, the strategic road network into the local road network and onto the site.

00:14:09:09 - 00:14:39:12

National highways has not received the first road safety audit. Now these are normally submitted before an application is made. Um so this must be undertaken. It is particularly urgent. Um, the applicant has recently confirmed to Mr. Bloom they will be submitting um the the first road safety audit normally. So so that's normally what's under the the design manual for roads and bridges is there's that the road safety order is submitted before an application.

00:14:40:04 - 00:15:17:19

Um, that's the the road safety audit will then demonstrate to National highways, um, that the proposed mitigation by the applicant is sufficient. The the final issue, and this is quite a significant issue for national highways, is the abnormal indivisible loads traveling along the A20 to Port Harwich, um, down Bentley Road in the local road network. So they'll need to come down the the A120. What National Highways requires urgently is a formal proposal from the applicant, so we can understand the scope and the scale of the abnormal load movements using the SRN.

00:15:17:25 - 00:15:54:10

So it has been indicated in National Highways. Now this is from the, um the applicant for the North Falls DCO. Um, there's been mention of abnormal loads of 400, 400 tonnes or over 400 tonnes. Um, but we haven't had any details from the applicant of the abnormal loads proposed to be using the A120 at this stage. Um, National Highways view is that these these issues are all resolvable. However, as a a warning, the A120 is reaching the natural end of its lifespan.

00:15:54:19 - 00:16:33:27

But because the details of the third road investment period, um, risk three have not been settled and is still under review by the government. Um, it's a bit it's it we we can't be as yet certain. Now, we did understand with discussions before the new government that the renewal of the A20 was, was due to be deferred until the fourth road investment period is for. So the concern for National Highways is if the applicant is proposing a normal loads of, for example, 400 tonnes.

00:16:33:29 - 00:17:05:18

This risked serious damage to the A4 22 A4 A1 20 um, you know, and if that road breaks up, nobody's using it, it's closed. So we must urgently have those details as, as I've said, they in in our view they are all resolvable. Um, you know, um, but but please, can we have the road safety audit as quickly as possible? Um, my my colleague, Mr. Bloom, um, can provide further details if required.

00:17:05:20 - 00:17:06:11

Thank you, sir.

00:17:08:21 - 00:17:27:21

Thank you, Mrs. Marshall. Um, just before I move on and noting the, uh, concern and urgency in Mrs. Marshall's voice, um, could I ask the applicant to come back on when you are going to be providing the road safety audit to National Highways, please?

00:17:31:04 - 00:17:55:13

Paul McAdoo for the applicant just to clarify that the reason there's been a delay in that is because we have been looking at modifications to that junction in the in partnership with um, North Wales and National Grid. Um, following local stakeholder requests, for example, to try and increase the

separation from the dwellings. Um, we I am told we can submit the brief for that RAC to National Highways next week.

00:18:00:13 - 00:18:24:07

Okay. Thank you. And, um, I think Mr. Gould's got a question, but I'm just going to quickly, um, ask, um, around the, the, um, second point on the, um, sort of expected tonnage of the abnormal indivisible loads for the Five Estuaries project is, is the figure that was quoted for North Falls

00:18:25:25 - 00:18:27:19

similar for this.

00:18:28:28 - 00:18:31:08

Uh, Alison and not for the applicant? Yes.

00:18:31:10 - 00:18:38:24

Um, the projects will be largely similar. Um. And we are? Yeah.

00:18:41:26 - 00:18:45:06

Thank you for confirming that. Um, Mr. Gould.

00:18:49:12 - 00:19:10:29

Thank you. Yeah. For National highways. In terms of the current condition of the A120, um, and what might go forward into is for, uh, is the scheme literally a refurbishment scheme of the existing road or is it an upgrade to provide additional capacity?

00:19:12:02 - 00:19:49:22

Um, Jeremy Bloom for national highways. So the so the road is, is a concrete road and it's, um, it's a type of road servicing that is, is not favoured. Um, currently by National Highways, and there has been a program to replace all concrete roads across the strategic road network. Um, this particular one, um, uh, had been programmed for a, um, a complete, um, replacement of the road surfacing and pavement.

00:19:49:24 - 00:20:21:28

So it was a it was a major scheme which would be significant cost of tens of millions of pounds, um, which is required because the, um, the pavement has reached the end of its, um, asset life. Um, it was originally thought that it would take place during this three so in the late 2020s. However, um, whilst it's not confirmed, the indications are that, um, it's likely to be deferred until res four.

00:20:22:00 - 00:20:52:15

So post 2030, um, there is some funding. Um, provisionally allocated for some heavy duty maintenance work. So when I say heavy duty maintenance. So we describe that as patching to to keep it up to minimum standards. So it will be safe for general use. But the um, specialist advice is that there would be concern about particularly heavy, um, abnormal indivisible loads.

00:20:52:17 - 00:21:18:05



So, um, anything above the 320 tonne vehicles would be a concern. And what we require, um, is for the details of, um, how the applicant intends to run the abnormal loads and what kind of, um, size, vehicle and frequency is expected so that that can be assessed.

00:21:25:23 - 00:21:40:28

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for for that. Um, if I turn now to, uh, Essex County Council, um, perhaps Mr. Hough, who's gone to Mr. Hough, who's going to respond to this one?

00:21:41:25 - 00:22:14:12

Yeah. Thank you. It's okay. What I was planning on doing was just giving a kind of high level summary of where our issues are, rather than going into any detail around them. Um, it's that probably overrun the five minutes by quite a bit. So I'm just going to point out, um, where we have concerns and then we move through that. Um, so the first one is around the assessment methodology. Um, particularly around shift patterns, car share and the emission of the assessment of the hour of greatest change for the environmental statement. Um, this kind of feeds into our overall the overall impacts of the highway network's operation.

00:22:14:16 - 00:22:46:14

So basically, if the development traffic doesn't exhibit the patterns assessed. Um, what will the effect on the highway be in that situation? So there's an absence of any junction modelling within this assessment, which is acceptable on the basis that the development exhibits the patterns that it is assessing rather than different traffic patterns. Um, secondly, we are of the opinion or the opinion that there are some locations on the network where there are impacts and that some proportional mitigation should be considered at those locations.

00:22:46:19 - 00:23:24:05

And in some cases, we don't agree with the dismissal of the rationale for dismissing impacts at these locations. That's within the. Yes. Um, they've already discussed the fact that there's going to be some minor updates to the documentation reflecting kind of discussions that we've had between the two parties. So I don't need to go into that. I just thank them for considering that they have some some separate documents to us that we reviewed, and we were happy that they addressed our queries. So that was all fine. Um, we do have some concerns around the absence of controls within the CMP and workforce travel plan, and which may result in impacts exceeding those assists.

00:23:24:11 - 00:23:38:13

Um, as far as we can tell, the only real control in the state is on HGV routing. And for instance, there's no control on HGV timings as far as I can see. So they may be en route in the routes on outside of hours of operation etc..

00:23:40:11 - 00:24:27:04

Um, I won't go into the one on the comment I had around protective provisions and that because obviously there's a discussion this afternoon on that. Just to note that we we have some groups around that, um, we have concerns around the repeated impacts on the communities of these different projects over an extended timeframe. The applicant's assessed scenario one, which is a combination of effects from from their projects and northwards, which is understandable and kind of the, I guess, the standard way of approaching this. But we we are going into situations here where, um, members of

communities will feel impacts repeatedly because of traffic management associated with the delivery of these different projects, because of the work associated with these projects associated with these projects, and those don't form part of these assessments, these repeated impacts on people.

00:24:27:20 - 00:25:01:04

And I do think that's something that generally needs to be considered. Um, and we have concerns around the, um, coordination between the three projects. Um, in particular, although is to do with the the access road that's being delivered as part of next project and the footway cycleway along Bentley Road. In the case of the footway cycleway in particular, um, that is as far as at this point in time, kind of needed for all these projects. We're kind of unsure about what happens in this scenario where, let's say this this project comes forward first and builds its its footway cycleway.

00:25:02:02 - 00:25:37:02

And at that point North Falls may need that footway cycleway. But are they going who's going. Are they going to remove it? Who's going to reinstall it? Who takes ownership of that footway cycleway in the gap between those two projects being brought forward because it's needed for both. Um, you know, county council do not want to be liable for the costs of removing it. We don't want to be liable for the cost of maintaining it. And it it'll it could sit there for a year at a time. So it's about how that issue is addressed between these different projects. Um, and just a couple of other points that are in response to the comments that were made.

00:25:37:11 - 00:26:07:11

Um, we do recognize that the HGV movements, uh, along A and B class roads. I do always think it's worth noting that some A and B class roads are better than others. They're nicer than others. Some of these go through rural communities, you know, with narrow footways. And that should just be borne in mind as part of this. But we do recognize that they are the A and B roads. Um, the statement around the actions being agreed in principle. I've spoken to um. S strategic development colleagues, and I would say that's a slightly strong way of wording it.

00:26:07:13 - 00:26:48:02

I think we're in the same ballpark, and I don't want to get hugely into semantics. I think what they've said is they've reviewed the accesses and they haven't identified any kind of showstoppers to these specific axes. And so I say I don't I think there's semantically two ends of the spectrum of the same point. But I just think that's worth noting. Um, point around the proportional, the peak, they've peak. They have. And I'll put this in more detail in our assessment. But there are impacts across the entirety of the project. A lot of the months are a high proportion in terms of HGV movements, of the peak of the peak month that they've assessed, and I do think that's worth bearing in mind is not a significant impact of a very specific moment in time.

00:26:48:28 - 00:27:19:11

And the only other point I was going to make that I just think is worth noting, worth noting. As part of East Anglia One North, they submitted, um, an outline port construction management plan, um, for that project. That was 1102 for and, and that included a commitment at that time to review the localised impacts of, of port traffic as well as specific travel, travel planning for for that in that case, it may or may not be that The poor element of this will sit within an existing permission.

00:27:19:13 - 00:27:28:24

I don't know either way, but it's something that could be considered. It's just kind of, you know, a commitment to review those impacts at that point in time. Um, yes. Those are the points we're going to make. Thank you.

00:27:34:01 - 00:27:37:15

Great. Thank you, Mr. Hough. That's very helpful.

00:27:40:10 - 00:27:40:25

Um,

00:27:42:07 - 00:27:42:27

Mr. Woods? Yeah.

00:27:43:29 - 00:27:50:26

Thank you, sir. Mark Wood, County counsel. Um, I wasn't intending to say anything and leave this to Mr. Health, but can I just follow up on.

00:27:50:28 - 00:28:27:22

The points that was made on the other side of the room, please? Um, we had reference to abnormal loads in particular. The weight of those abnormal loads had been 400 tons. And we've we've kind of concentrated on on the Bentley Road access in. So is it not your intention to use any other access other than Bentley Road to move abnormal loads into the site because I'm conscious those abnormal loads are going to have to go down an internal hall road. But 20 odd kilometres in length and a lot of those abnormal layers may well be needed at the landward side.

00:28:27:27 - 00:28:39:13

So I'm wondering if there are any controls in it to stop vehicles, hubs in particular, abnormal lives going through Clacton itself to access the the southern end of the development. Thank you.

00:28:44:11 - 00:28:51:11

Thank you, Mr. Wood. Chair. Um, does the applicant have an immediate answer to that? Do you want to come back?

00:28:58:07 - 00:29:29:29

Uh, I mean, not for the applicant. I think we'd like to make a distinction between the different types of ales. So the 400 odd tonnes. That's for the transformers. So they come specifically from the port? Uh, So cable drums are a lot lighter. There be sort of 100 ish, just under 100 tons, and they're sort of treated. They're counted in the normal TVs in the traffic because they're not like it would be different. So yeah, they follow the HGV routes.

00:29:32:06 - 00:29:36:06

Mr. watcher, did you have a follow up question to cancel?

00:29:36:08 - 00:29:49:28

That may well be the case, but if I look if I look on the street works and access plans okay. That HGV route seems to be taking the coastal path and towards the area where um.

00:29:50:21 - 00:29:51:15

At the landfill.

00:29:51:17 - 00:30:07:07

Yeah. So are you therefore proposed? I mean, you're obviously proposing HGV, some limited number like sheaves through the, through the settlement of Clacton and Holland and say a hundred tonne vehicle is, is quite big to get that residential road.

00:30:07:09 - 00:30:09:20

That wouldn't be the case. So for the um.

00:30:14:10 - 00:30:29:24

At the landfill. Uh, we have the we've got two options. So we've got a subtitle landfill, where we would, uh, not have any traffic and not require that or an intertidal landfill borne intertidal landfill. We would be we.

00:30:39:03 - 00:30:42:15

We're going to come back with more details on that. Um. Thank you. Yeah.

00:30:43:16 - 00:30:44:01

Thank you, sir.

00:30:47:08 - 00:30:47:23

Thank you.

00:30:49:18 - 00:30:56:07

Uh, Mr. Bedford, did you did Sussex County Council wish to say anything on this matter?

00:30:56:27 - 00:31:32:09

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford for Suffolk County Council. Um. Yes, sir. Um, obviously we're conscious that with the exception of the, um, LBW b g. Compensation area. Um, most of the um traffic is likely to be outside of, um, uh, the Suffolk County Council local road network. So, you know, that obviously limits the extent that we have, uh, issues.

00:31:32:11 - 00:32:11:29

However, we do, I'm afraid, have some issues. Uh, as uh, matters currently stand. Uh, and we would certainly welcome, um, some further clarification and or reassurance from the applicant, uh, to enable us to know that, uh, things which are at the moment to us, potential concerns can be suitably addressed and allayed. Uh, the the first point is that, um, um, notwithstanding the geographic location Of the works themselves being essentially within Essex.

00:32:12:01 - 00:32:49:13

Leaving aside that compensation area, there does remain the potential for a negative impact on the local road network within Suffolk. Um, we're conscious, uh, that um, at the scoping stage, uh, the applicant had suggested, um, a limited scope, which effectively confined the study area to within Essex. Uh, we submitted a representation at the scoping stage, uh, that suggested that needed to be kept under review.

00:32:50:07 - 00:33:26:28

Uh, and the scoping opinion from the Planning Inspectorate specifically drew attention to our representation in that regard, whether in the light of that or for other reasons, I don't know. But the applicant's study area as now Formulated in the relevant chapter of the environmental statement that's in app. 090 and it's figure 8.1 of that. You'll see it's a slightly expanded study area from the initial scoping, but not by very much.

00:33:27:00 - 00:34:01:02

I mean, effectively it follows, uh, the, the Sturt Estuary, uh, across the Manningtree. So there is a little bit of Suffolk in there. And then in terms of the um, suggested, uh, uh, um transport routes for HGVs, there is the inclusion of a corridor of part of the A12, but only up to as far as, I think, junction 29, which is not the well-known Kop dock interchange you'll be familiar with where the A12 joins the A14, but it's south of that point.

00:34:01:04 - 00:34:33:13

It's effectively it's it's known as the Ardley Crown Interchange. Uh, and there doesn't seem to have been any assessment, uh, of, um, traffic movements outside of the study area or that one limited HGV, uh, route. So we're concerned that there hasn't yet been a clear enough explanation as to why there won't be some impacts, particularly in terms of construction, uh, traffic impacts on, uh, the Suffolk Road network.

00:34:34:01 - 00:35:11:28

Uh, that that point is, as it were, compounded by the fact that the applicant has indicated, particularly in response to our relevant representation, that leaving aside, uh, the selection of Harwich as the port for the ale movements that you've heard about, uh, the, um, selection of a port for servicing the offshore construction activities has not yet been made.

00:35:12:00 - 00:35:13:24

That decision has not been made.

00:35:15:12 - 00:35:51:22

The applicant then advances. What we see is a non-sequitur, which is to simply say, well, we don't know which port we're going to use, but whichever the port is, our traffic will be within the limits of the approvals for such port. What we see no evidence that would support that. Um, and, um, in terms of the ports that might be in the frame, uh, effectively it will obviously you've got Harwich has been referred to that's within Essex.

00:35:51:24 - 00:36:29:06

But you then got Ipswich. Possibly. But we think possibly unlikely. You've then got Lowestoft at the northern end of Suffolk, and then immediately north of that you've got Great Yarmouth. Um, and both

of the latter two do have roles in servicing wind farm, offshore wind farm activity. Obviously, if any of the port either within or north of Suffolk were to be used, inevitably, uh, the um HGV movements to and from would be utilising the Suffolk Road network.

00:36:30:06 - 00:36:45:07

So I say we uh, we see that there is a need to, um, uh, assess at least, um, in high level terms what the potential impacts would be and ensure that the control documents

00:36:46:28 - 00:36:58:09

are drafted sufficiently, um, comprehensively to enable us to be satisfied that there will not be adverse impacts.

00:37:00:06 - 00:37:31:25

So far as the point on ales is concerned. Um, we certainly welcome, uh, the reference to the use of Harwich and the A120, uh, for, um, the corridor to, um, achieve Ailes for the um, substation sites. And if that were secured, then obviously that would mean that there wouldn't be a ail implication, uh, for Suffolk.

00:37:32:00 - 00:38:08:27

However, as we read the documentation at the moment, although, um, that corridor is referred to, uh, in the outlying construction, um, traffic management, uh, plan, uh, when you look at, uh, I think it is particularly at paragraph 4.1. 15 of that document. It says, well, this is the proposal, but it may well be post consent and at the detailed stage that other options may be considered.

00:38:09:22 - 00:38:42:10

Well, and since that's not good enough from our perspective, because it leaves open the door to the use of other corridors. And obviously we've heard the, um, National highways, particularly concerns about, um, the A120 corridor, and we simply don't know what the position might be at the time of implementation. Um, so that needs to be tightened up. And uh, again, similar reference, uh, to the point uh, referred to by Mr.

00:38:42:12 - 00:38:53:22

Hough for uh, Essex County Council in relation to ports, precisely because the location of the chosen port is at large.

00:38:55:12 - 00:39:49:22

We consider there is a need for an outline port construction management plan. Uh, we draw to your attention and we can obviously provide, uh, details as necessary. Um, that in the development consent orders, uh, which were made in 2022 for East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two both of those offshore wind farms include requirements for an outline port construction management plan to manage port traffic associated with the construction of the relevant windfarms, and we would be looking for the same, um, uh, in relation to this, uh, proposal as a given, particularly that the selection of the port is currently at large.

00:39:51:15 - 00:41:03:24

Uh, then I think the, uh, there is then one further point to raise, which is specific to the Suffolk issue, that's to say Orford Ness. Um, and um, I'm not sure whether your site visits have yet taken you into that part of. I see that that's not yet. Yes, I thought that was I certainly there isn't a, um, a site visit note, uh, in relation to that, um, obviously the works, um, in themselves are, um, in terms of construction activity, relatively modest, it's to say the construction of predator fencing, but because it's effectively on a, um, as it were, an island or a spit, um, and as you will see, as you enjoy the delights of the roads that lead down to Orford and Orford Ness, you're in deeply rural Suffolk in that location, so even relatively modest, um, amounts of construction traffic, and particularly if there's any need for the parking or storage of vehicles or equipment in the vicinity before they're taken over the water, etc..

00:41:04:04 - 00:41:35:15

I think what we're looking for is a bit more detail about how that is going to be envisaged. Um, there are some references in things like, uh, the um LBB g uh, Elvia to the duration and the nature of the works, but those are simply references in supporting documents. They're not in control documents. So I'd say I think what we're seeing what sorry, what we're wanting to see is a bit more detail.

00:41:35:17 - 00:42:10:27

And then if there is detail, for example, there's a reference to the works being likely to take about three weeks. Well, now if that was a commitment that it was no more than three weeks, we might take one view as to, well, there can be a bit of disruption and it can be accommodated. If it's potentially more open ended by that, we then that we would want to see some more control. So it's really wanting to drill down into the detail and then as necessary, having a control document which assures that the impacts are managed.

00:42:10:29 - 00:42:27:07

So I say they are not, uh, in any uh, of those issues, uh, anything that could be described as irresolvable. But it does require a bit more work, uh, by the applicant. And we're obviously very happy to have dialogue, uh, to iron out those issues.

00:42:29:03 - 00:42:29:21

Thank you sir.

00:42:32:01 - 00:42:49:23

Thank you, Mr. Bedford, for that helpful summary. Um, before I move on to my questions, I'll just ask the applicant whether it wanted to respond to any of the points that have been made by either of the local highway authorities there.

00:42:50:08 - 00:42:56:14

Sir Julian Boswell for the applicant, would it be possible just to have a moment to discuss whether we want to reply?

00:42:56:16 - 00:42:59:00

That would be fine. There are lots of points there.

00:44:13:03 - 00:44:26:07

Jordan Bosworth, the applicant. We think it's better to continue the dialogue offline. Um, but we did have 1 or 2 things that were prompted by, by, um, the different things that have been said, but we think it's better to do it offline.

00:44:29:02 - 00:44:43:03

Okay. Thank you. I'm sure all those points will feature in the local impact reports as well. Um, I noticed I've got Mr. Gold online with with a hand up.

00:44:45:16 - 00:45:17:17

Apologies. That was referenced by the last very useful speaker to Orford Ness. Can I just assure everybody that we have relatively recently created all the presence of fences, etc., for another wind farm nesting area, which would be adjacent, and that didn't cause any problems at all, either with traffic or movements etc. and adjacent to the key at awfulness is an on off. It is a massive great car park and there's no problems at all for that. So. But the applicant and I can deal with that separately.

00:45:20:03 - 00:45:21:06

Thank you, Mr. Gold.

00:45:27:19 - 00:45:43:03

I wasn't aware that there was anybody else who, um, any other interested parties who might wish to speak at this moment. So I'm not seeing any hands up in the room or online. So, um, I will.

00:45:45:13 - 00:46:03:04

Start some of the, um, examining authorities, uh, questions now. Um, I think some of which, um, may actually follow, um, some of the points that, uh, Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council made anyway. Um,

00:46:04:21 - 00:46:41:01

I think starting with the, the question of the sort of offshore activity, uh, and the, the use of a port as a base, um, I'm sure the applicant will have picked up from our draft written questions, um, that we were sort of a little surprised in, um, that the extent of the offshore work's the scale of it, um, you know, wouldn't have significant implications at whichever port is chosen as a base.

00:46:41:12 - 00:47:20:16

Um, and obviously why there hasn't been some sort of assessment of the onshore effects, um, of that. Um, you know, certainly for to choose an example, um, if Harwich was chosen as the base port for the activities, it's in the study area. Um, and we would have expected it to have, you know, more significant effects on the A20, a120, for example, uh, than if a different base port was selected, um, completely out outside the, the study area.

00:47:20:18 - 00:48:10:18

And I think we had noted the, the wording that Mr. Bedford had spotted quite a few times in document um app zero 90 um, which seemed to lean on um port activity would be within the envelope assessed when the existing approvals for whichever port were considered, and therefore there's no assessment. Um. Yeah, we just asked the applicant to, um, you know, respond to, to, I suppose those two points of wouldn't it have a, um, you know, an impact if the base part was outside the study area?



Um, and, uh, should there be, uh, as has been suggested by interested parties, uh, some need for a construction management plan for the port activity.

00:48:13:00 - 00:48:51:22

Uh, Alice Maynard for the applicant. I think I'd like to respond, uh, initially by explaining a little bit about, uh, the offshore activities. So it's not that, um, it's not the case that we select a port ship, all the offshore assets to it and then ship it out. So we'll select, uh, suppliers and the various components, the monopoles, etc., all the turbines will be shipped directly from their, uh, their key side to the area without stopping in, like say Harwich or a port.

00:48:51:24 - 00:49:22:19

So for example, if you know, we selected the car factory to make the monopoles, then it will go directly from there, you know, up in Tyneside to the site. So there would be no traffic associated with it. Obviously we're not in a position at the moment to select our suppliers. So that's why, you know, Siemens have a blade factory in Hull, maybe that could be used, but the blades would come directly from Holden. So that's the reasoning. Why for the construction we haven't been able to do that.

00:49:22:21 - 00:49:59:11

It's the same for, you know, the subsidy cables. It's the same for the turbines. They just they go by sea, um, and without stopping at another port in terms of O&M activities. So operation and maintenance. We are not able in the moment to identify a port. Um, we are in discussion with ports in the area for this, but a lot of the ports also have space constraint strengths. It's not just that we're not willing to commit, it's the ports also aren't able to save us space because we haven't we haven't even got planning.

00:49:59:13 - 00:50:32:20

We haven't even got DCO. So we're not in a position to make those commitments yet. Um, but when we think about the operation and maintenance, the, the numbers of traffic, it's, uh, it be the technicians who are going to the port from to get on to a CTV, for example, and then go to site, which would be in the, you know, 10 to 20 a day. People in there like going to the port and parking there. So that's during the operation, which is sort of why, um, it's within assessed within the normal activity of the port.

00:50:33:03 - 00:51:00:02

Um, so yeah, it's maybe it's a bit of a. Yeah, that's how we expect to do this. Um, getting. That's. Why wouldn't it have an impact? Um, and it also then that hopefully the examining authority can then understand why we're not able to do a CMP for this because, um, we would yeah. We're not doing a CMP for every potential supply of every potential port, which would not be in the study area. So

00:51:01:24 - 00:51:04:24

hopefully if that doesn't answer the question, please let me know.

00:51:05:00 - 00:51:36:18

No, I think that was that was helpful to understand. Um, I think from our perspective, it as an examining authority, it would be, um, interesting to understand what the difference is between, um, the offshore construction of this project, um, perhaps compared to East Anglia one North and East

Anglia two that were referred to by, um, Suffolk County Council, I think it would be um, useful if Suffolk County Council in the local impact report or any submission.

00:51:37:00 - 00:51:44:07

Um, could, uh, signpost us to the the wording of those requirements and why that was felt to be needed.

00:51:49:05 - 00:51:50:08

Um, applicants.

00:51:50:29 - 00:52:04:11

I am not for the applicant. Um, I don't think we're in a position to sort of comment on other developers, competitive developers, their reasoning, and why. Um, that's not really an yeah.

00:52:04:13 - 00:52:12:26

No, no, that's that's understandable. Um, I think, Mr. Gould, were you indicating you wanted to ask something

00:52:14:24 - 00:52:15:09

for.

00:52:18:10 - 00:52:28:29

A very high tech post-it note that's come across to ask the, uh, the applicant, what about offshore construction labor? Which is a very good point.

00:52:30:02 - 00:52:58:03

Uh, the main lot for the applicant. The offshore construction workers tend to they they stay on the boat all all the time. They they join vessels for months and months at a time, sometimes six, nine months, um, sometimes less, depending on who it is. But they they will live on the boat. The boats aren't coming in and out. Um, they're not driving to and from a port. Um, they just. Yeah. They're expected to stay on the boat.

00:53:02:03 - 00:53:04:23

Yeah. And wherever it set sail from and. Yeah.

00:53:06:27 - 00:53:09:21

Great. Thank. Thank you for confirming that.

00:53:13:02 - 00:53:44:00

Okay. Um, next question is, is really seeking, um, any views that National Highways, um, or Essex County Council would, would like to make um, in respect of the proposed junction improvement works where Bentley Road meets the A120. Um, obviously there's a helpful appendix W accompanying the, uh, Traffic and Transport baseline report.

00:53:44:04 - 00:54:01:22

Um, a p, uh, 173 that the applicant submitted with, with its application. Um, perhaps starting with National Highways. Do you have, um, any comments or concerns about what's proposed, um, as currently submitted?

00:54:02:18 - 00:54:43:01

Yes. Uh, Jeremy Bloom for National highways. So, um, our position is that the the junction arrangement with the, um, the A120, um, is broadly acceptable. However, um, some concerns have been raised about whether the, the widening at the, at the junction will be sufficient. For example, you know, if it's if it isn't wide enough, there's the potential for queuing back onto the mainline A120 if the traffic doesn't disperse quickly enough.

00:54:43:15 - 00:55:09:10

Um, and we have raised issues about the swept paths of, of, of large HGVs. Um, I'm not saying that is a concern, but until the road safety audit is complete, then we're not in a position to judge whether the proposals are sufficient. So that that would be the extent of our concerns, which hopefully can be resolved by the completion of the road safety audit.

00:55:11:15 - 00:55:23:19

All right. Thank you for that initial view. Um, and the Essex County Council have anything that they wish to add regarding that those proposed junction works at this time.

00:55:23:22 - 00:55:33:14

Thank you so much. As county council, I'm going to defer to Mr. Hough if he's got any detailed technical comments to make, which I suspect he may not have, but thought I'd ask.

00:55:34:11 - 00:55:37:18

No, we just, um, echo, um, National Highways comments.

00:55:37:27 - 00:55:39:10

Thank you. Thank you sir.

00:55:45:21 - 00:56:33:01

Thank you. Um, I sorry, I should have left Mr. Huff on the screen, because I've got a follow up question in that immediate geographical vicinity for Essex County Council. Um, something that you actually, I think alluded to, um, regarding concerns about the sort of coordination of, of projects and, and the sort of timescales, um, that, um, you know, there are a couple of references within, um, the s chapter in application document AP090, um, to there potentially being a need for a temporary Segregated walkers, cyclists and horse riders path on Bentley Road.

00:56:33:03 - 00:57:00:01

Because of the, um, the sort of widening works that are proposed. Um, and obviously it makes reference to the being ongoing discussions with Essex County Council. Um, didn't really want to put you completely on the spot, but, um, just wondered whether you had any initial views that you'd like to share with the Xa, um, on whether you think that could would be necessary?

00:57:01:04 - 00:57:57:24

Uh, yeah. So I've had on this is that we are of the opinion that the facility is necessary during the construction due to the increased HGV movements along the corridor and the impact on vulnerable road users as a result of that, essentially, um, with regards to the permanency of the facility, um, this is something that, um, we currently don't think it needs to be permanent beyond the construction movements. And as I said earlier, the problem is, is how long this may occur for as a result of numerous projects in this area and almost the permanency of the facility as a result of that, depending on how long that this all occurs for and what that might mean in terms of both, um, local perception of the facility, um, and also our ability almost to, um, well, as an example, obviously at the moment the root doesn't really connect to anything beyond it's the ability that it's mitigating the impact of that location.

00:57:58:03 - 00:58:23:17

But over a period of time, who knows what, what might come forward. And, you know, in the area or local through LC whips and things like that, it might actually mean that it it could form part of a joined up route at that point in time. But obviously the decision on its permanency is almost made now. And that makes it, uh, quite difficult in terms of that kind of long term of what the facility could offer versus actually the need for it now to mitigate a specific impact.

00:58:26:23 - 00:58:42:06

Thank you, Mr. Hough, for that answer. Um, I appreciate the applicant may just want to sort of continuing ongoing discussions with county council about that, but did you have any immediate comments regarding the, um, temporary, uh, path?

00:58:43:12 - 00:59:14:03

Uh, for the applicant? Yes. Um, our assessment as this is only needed for cumulative impacts during construction. We are not seeking consent or land rights to keep that in place permanently. We are proposing to remove it once it is no longer needed. In terms of multiple projects coming forward. Obviously, our consent only covers our construction, but we are in active negotiations with Northvolt and energy. Sorry, National Grid to come up with a joint proposal about how this could work in practice if it was needed repeatedly.

00:59:14:05 - 00:59:34:28

So essentially we didn't rip it up and put it back in every time with the additional disruption and could pass it on from one to the other. And how we can propose to the council that they they're appropriately notified as to who is liable for what when, so that they know who they are dealing with at any given time. The the three projects are trying to work that out behind the scenes so we can take a joint proposal to the council.

00:59:36:16 - 00:59:52:21

Great. That sounds like an eminently sensible approach. Um, I'm inevitably going to come back with the question of sort of timescales is there's a, um, a view of at what stage, um, that might be progressed during the examination period.

00:59:53:23 - 01:00:12:27

Uh, Paul McCartney for the applicant. So we've had several long legal calls on the on how this could work. And we are working actively working on the drafting. I have another call with those two parties

next week. I will try I will speak to them and try and agree that a date we at the moment we are working towards trying to do it before Christmas, but I realise that's quite late from your point of view.

01:00:14:22 - 01:00:15:10

Thank you.

01:00:19:17 - 01:00:52:16

Okay. Um. I'm. I'm going to ask the the next question. Um, as a town planner and unashamedly not an engineer. Um, that obviously there's, um, proposed horizontal directional drilling and pulling of cables proposed for a few trench crossings. Um, at various points, it felt to me like there are obviously sort of two more sensitive locations, the the rail where it crosses the railway.

01:00:53:06 - 01:01:20:28

Um, and also, given what we've just heard about the potential condition of the A120, um, that is as well. Um, as I say, I'm not an engineer, so this may be completely standard practice, but I'm just going to ask, um, particularly National Highways, um, for whether you have any concerns about the, the works that, that, that would involve in relation to the the A120.

01:01:21:20 - 01:02:10:22

Thank you, sir Jeremy Bloom, National highways. Um, so I have discussed this, um, with, um, National highways, uh, geotechnical specialists. Um, the proposal is for the cable to be nine metres deep below the A120, and we believe that, um, that that will be acceptable and that it should not affect the road. Um, however, um, as, as per protected provisions which will be discussed at this afternoon's hearing, we will obviously be seeking, um, uh, provisions in there to ensure that National Highways, um, is able to sign off the, the the detailed design and methodology for construction to ensure that it's safe and protects the asset.

01:02:10:24 - 01:02:17:25

But as things stand, we believe that a depth of nine metres um, the A120 should should be able to withstand that.

01:02:20:02 - 01:02:43:11

Thank you, Mr. Blum, for for confirming that. Um, and just just turning quickly to the the applicant. Um, I think you referred to, um, it also being acceptable in relation to crossing the railway. Um, I presume similar conversations and protective provisions are being discussed with, um, National National Rail.

01:02:45:26 - 01:03:03:18

And this may not for the applicant. So avoiding all the technical details about this, um, we're going through a similar process with Network Rail. They have a technical clearance that they require. We have um, we've submitted this, and we're in the process of waiting for them to assess it in detail. Um.

01:03:05:00 - 01:03:23:24



is that actually the assessment is putting these impacts outside of the peak hours. So in reality, as a result of that, the impact we're we're seeing, um, is not necessarily the one that might occur.

01:05:46:26 - 01:05:57:22

So if that was the one that did occur, we would expect modelling as at this point in time we don't because those impacts are said to be occurring in the peak hour, if that makes sense. Hopefully.

01:06:00:27 - 01:06:02:00

Great. Thank you.

01:06:03:17 - 01:06:10:13

Um, perhaps if I can keep you on screen as well for the next question. Um.

01:06:12:20 - 01:06:43:23

So again, um, within application documents, A090 um, paragraph 8.40.58, um refers to a temporary road closures, um, where the the applicant is proposing not to do the the trench less crossings. Uh, so that was Damon Farm Lane, Pines Lane and Berlin Road, um, for a maximum of, uh, seven days.

01:06:43:25 - 01:07:01:05

And, uh, mentioning a commitment to avoiding simultaneous, um, closures. Uh, just wondered, um, whether the county council had any concerns about, um, those proposed temporary closures?

01:07:02:21 - 01:07:25:29

Uh, not specifically those closures. I mean, we, uh, what we, I think want to see. And it might come on again to this afternoon's conversation. It's around actually, how that approval process works and giving the county council the, the, the right mechanisms and also the right time frame to go through those approval processes. But in terms of impact, which I think is what this question about. No we don't.

01:07:27:23 - 01:07:29:04

Okay. Thank you.

01:07:31:24 - 01:08:16:09

Um, so my next question, it obviously seems like there's been, um, quite a lot of, um, collaborative working going on. Um, but, uh, table 8.43, um, in application document 8090, um, sets out the projects that have been considered within the um onshore traffic and transport cumulative effect assessment. Um, and also goes on to set out reasons for three projects that were scoped out um, which were essentially in part because the cross uh, Tendring borders Tendring, Colchester borders garden Community and the A120 holds the cross to Wickes concrete road.

01:08:16:11 - 01:08:39:08

Reconstruction. Um, just just for confirmation. Just to check. Um, do, um, interest, uh, interested parties, consider that table 8.43 provides a comprehensive list, um, for the assessment of cumulative effects. Um, perhaps, um, start with National highways.

01:08:40:15 - 01:08:54:00

Uh, Jeremy Bloom, National highways. Uh, yes. No. National highways is satisfied with the list. And and the omission, for example, of the Wickes bypass, um, concrete road reconstruction as as mentioned earlier.

01:08:55:27 - 01:08:57:13

Thank you, Mr. Hough.

01:08:59:15 - 01:09:10:12

Essex County Council I know I haven't had any indication that we heard from colleagues that we are unhappy with this list. Um, the agreement of it sort of predates my involvement, but no one's challenged it. So I think we can say we're happy.

01:09:11:25 - 01:09:12:14

Thank you.

01:09:14:09 - 01:09:23:08

And just for completeness, I'll just check Mr. Bedford. There wasn't anything that Suffolk County Council, um, has concern with on this forum.

01:09:23:15 - 01:09:40:10

Michael Bedford, Suffolk county Council. I don't have any specific instructions to challenge the list, but I'll make sure that, uh, those in the county council's highways section review that. And if there is anything, we'll let you know. But I don't have anything to raise at this stage. Thank you.

01:09:40:26 - 01:09:41:14

Thank you.

01:09:44:27 - 01:10:15:28

Um, turning now to the abnormal. Turning back to abnormal, indivisible loads. Um, so paragraph 8.4. 31. Um, in document A, P090. Um, it seems to indicate that there could be 2 to 4 transformers and 8 to 12 oversized, indivisible plants.

01:10:16:13 - 01:10:32:19

Um, are we turning to the applicant? Are we effectively saying there. Then a sort of for this project, a maximum of 16 ail deliveries? Um. Ah, effectively a worst case scenario.

01:10:34:19 - 01:10:42:03

Alice may not for the applicant that. Yes, that is for the substation. Um, the cable route obviously has multiple.

01:10:45:00 - 01:10:58:07

Thank you. Um, and would that be expected a similar additional number for for North Falls as well? I know it's difficult to speak for their project, but, uh.

01:10:59:03 - 01:11:01:07

I mean, none for the applicant. Um,



01:11:02:23 - 01:11:08:02

The DCO documents are public. Um, but yes, I would imagine their numbers are similar.

01:11:12:05 - 01:11:12:20

Yeah.

01:11:24:20 - 01:12:00:20

I think I'll just for completeness, even though we've we've kind of covered this, I would just double check. Um, so sticking with, uh, ales, um, obviously paragraph, um, eight point 10.7, uh, sets out the assumed route from uh, Harwich International Port and therefore the, the assumption that ales will be coming in on the A120 from, from the east. And that's what the, um, sort of, uh, junction um, layouts on to Bentley Road are assumed to be, um.

01:12:02:08 - 01:12:28:11

I suppose. Um, what's the certainty of of this being the root? Um, and might there be any alternative routes, should they be assessed for sensitivity, or are they or for the substation sites and Bentley Road, are they always going to be, um, accessing from the, um, from the eastbound on the A120?

01:12:34:01 - 01:12:59:24

Uh, others may not for the applicant. I think we need to make the distinction here between, um, which ales coming from where? So, um, coming from Harwich would be the, like the big ales, the Transformers. Um, so, yeah, they will be coming from Harwich. Um, obviously the smaller ales, uh, may not. And they would their clusters, you know, the HGV routes.

01:13:02:21 - 01:13:04:15

Okay. Okay.

01:13:07:06 - 01:13:19:05

Uh, we can provide more detail, um, if necessary. Um, we can also confirm that, um, cable drums will not be going onto the beach to Clacton.

01:13:21:28 - 01:13:24:00

Okay. Thank you for that confirmation.

01:13:27:23 - 01:13:32:03

Um, I can see there's a hand up online stuff.

01:13:33:09 - 01:14:05:27

Yes. Thank you. I guess it's worth raising in. Um, my colleague colleagues who work in structures would absolutely want me to raise this. Were there any assessment has been undertaken of these routes and the structural integrity, particularly of them, for them to accommodate these potentially quite large vehicles for the cable drums on the local road network? Um, I if not, it's something we would definitely recommend because, you know, it could challenge actually whether these routes are usable, I don't know. I'm not aware of specific structures along these routes. That is something that I think is worth investigating.

01:14:10:16 - 01:14:15:21

Okay. Thank you. Um, I was just going to say that whether the applicant wishes to respond. But I saw a light. Come on.

01:14:17:19 - 01:14:27:27

Perhaps. Sorry. Perhaps before the applicant does say so. Michael Bedford, uh, Suffolk County Council, if I could just put down, um, a, um, a marker.

01:14:29:20 - 01:15:02:10

I'm understanding, in the light of that last, um, response from the applicant that a distinction is being drawn between different types of I ls and not all ales will be sourced from Harwich um, to, uh, the, um, substation sites and that there will be other, um, movements which would fulfill the definition of being abnormal, indivisible loads.

01:15:03:02 - 01:15:27:23

Which would not utilize that root. If that is the case. Well, one it calls into question whether there needs to be some correction to what the applicant has said in its response to our relevant representation, because there was no qualification apparent in what was said. Uh.

01:15:38:26 - 01:15:42:03

H sorry. Page 60.

01:15:46:12 - 01:16:25:17

Yes. Page 62 of, uh, the applicant's, uh, response to our relevant Representation, which was PD 4006, and that simply had said that ales would originate from the port of Harwich and would not utilize roads in Suffolk. Obviously, if that is not now the case, then that reinforces our concern about needing to understand what the position is for those other non Harwich ales, what routes they would use and being sure that that is they are fit for purpose.

01:16:26:17 - 01:16:32:09

Thank you sir. So I thought I would jump in before the applicant then commented on the point raised by Mr. Hough.

01:16:32:28 - 01:16:45:11

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, this points on ales. Is it something the applicant wants to respond to now, or would it be, um, would a post hearing notes be helpful?

01:16:45:13 - 01:17:04:17

Yeah. So the applicant would like to currently make the distinction that there are special order and non special order types of ales as different subcategories. and which will explain this. But yes, the applicant is willing to provide an informative sort of technical note on this subject explaining the different categories of ales and what's coming.

01:17:05:29 - 01:17:34:19

Yeah, I think it might be helpful to have clarity as to what. So the Transformers are obviously in the very large category. Um, but the cable drums perhaps sit somewhere else and do cable drums always come in a standard 500 meter length, or do they vary, which might mean they they would come into different categories? I think, yeah, we usually have some clarification that that might assist the highway authorities as well, the various highway authorities.

01:17:43:02 - 01:17:44:07

That Mr. Blume.

01:17:44:29 - 01:18:23:24

Yeah. Just I, I agree with uh, Mr. Huff's um, the point he raised. Um, and um, I think more detail concerning the, um, the, the proposals is important. Um, structures are one aspect, the other is, um, being able to navigate the roundabouts, some of which have quite tight geometries on the A120. But um, as I said earlier, just to reiterate, our main concern is the ability of the concrete, um, road surface in the Wickes area to to be able to accommodate those very large, abnormal, invisible loads.

01:18:23:26 - 01:18:34:14

And so at this point, we can't be absolutely certain that we would be able to accommodate them from Harwich. Um, and, you know, the sooner we can resolve that, the better.

01:18:39:15 - 01:18:40:14

Thank you, Mr. Bloom.

01:18:43:10 - 01:19:24:17

Um, I just just got one question. One further question for the the applicant, which is actually a sort of carryover from yesterday's, uh, landscape, seascape and, uh, visual impacts session. Um, we made an inquiry, uh, during that session about the, um, sort of emerging King Charles third England coast path. Um, and we sort of inquired whether there were had any surveys of, um, you know, numbers of users, walkers on the coast has been undertaken, uh, to inform impacts during construction.

01:19:25:05 - 01:19:41:01

Um, and we were we were told that we couldn't have an answer to that yesterday because the transport team were not there and here today. So with the transport team here today, were just, um, asking if there have been surveys of the of the sort of coastal path.

01:19:42:27 - 01:20:01:23

Daniel Moran for the applicant. Um, no, we haven't had any surveys undertaken. Um, on the coast path. England Coast Path. Um. But should construction vehicle access be required to the beach? The movement of those vehicles, which be very low in number and will be managed as outlined in the Outline Public Access Management Plan application reference T5 eight.

01:20:07:07 - 01:20:19:24

All I'm asking you for that, and I think the point we're trying to make about that path and why it wasn't an issue was that path as at landfall. So the works that are underground, it's only traffic movements and marshalling that would actually affect the use of that path.

01:20:37:13 - 01:20:58:12

Right. Thank you. I think that that's brought me to the end of my, um, questions at this time. Um, but before we close this, uh, agenda item. Is there anything further that, uh, any, um, interested parties would like to comment on in relation to traffic and transport that we haven't already covered?

01:21:03:12 - 01:21:03:27

Um.

01:21:04:16 - 01:21:05:28

Mr. Bloom? National.

01:21:06:00 - 01:21:06:21

Oh, no.

01:21:07:28 - 01:21:14:06

No, no, I was just going to just shake my head and say, no, thank you, sir. Um, I think we've covered everything satisfactorily. Thanks.

01:21:14:15 - 01:21:15:05

Thank you.

01:21:18:00 - 01:21:23:06

Thank you sir. Nothing further to add. Um, for my part, Sarah Marshall for National Highways.

01:21:24:23 - 01:21:30:02

Right. Thank you. Thank you all for your contributions to this agenda item.

01:21:32:09 - 01:21:48:11

So I think I, um, I think that closes item three, and I'll be handing back to Mr. Gould, I believe, to, um, close the session and, uh, check that we've got action points covered.

01:21:54:10 - 01:22:25:05

Yes. I was just shuffling paper by the end of a session. Like a day and a half session. There's a lot of paper. And trying trying to find the right bits. Um, sometimes is a bit taxing. Um, I think really, we could move to the review of actions that have arisen over the last day and a half, and hopefully somebody from the Atkins team can, if you like, give a headline of what you've got on your your list, please.

01:22:28:23 - 01:22:52:21

For the applicant. Um, so the first one was first submit the notes that we spoke to in our summary. And I've taken that as a global action across all the items rather than, yeah, um, to provide any update on any engagement with NatureScot. the applicant to advise, um, what deadline? We expect to be able to provide an update on agreement on the Kittiwake tower.

01:22:54:08 - 01:23:16:20

Uh, the applicant to provide a technical note on the maximum design scenarios. Um, and there was discussion of that being at deadline one. But I'm hoping we're about to have a wider discussion on deadlines. Uh, the applicant to provide a technical note on the nature of decommissioning and why noise would be similar to construction applicant. To provide a technical note.

01:23:18:24 - 01:23:23:20

Uh, sorry. It figures on the use of the sunk teeth. SAS East,

01:23:25:16 - 01:23:31:00

uh, the applicant to provide an update to figure 9.5 EP 078 for

01:23:32:18 - 01:23:45:15

the applicant to provide a note on the background to the call. Risk modelling used in the navigation and shipping assessments to the applicant to provide a third party document is referred to in chapter 17 of the NRA.

01:23:51:27 - 01:24:18:10

Um. From today. You didn't ask us to provide a sort of summary of who was instructed when on looking at farming impacts. I can provide a very simple headline on that, which was it was pre scoping, but we will provide more detail on that. Um, and from this session, our technical note on the eels, the different categories and what we think we mean by each to assist everybody in understanding what we are trying to see on those.

01:24:42:18 - 01:24:46:17

Thank you, Mr. Lee. Have you got that in a typed form?

01:24:48:21 - 01:24:52:20

Uh, we will do. I would like to have a quick double check of it against the notes.

01:24:52:28 - 01:25:29:02

Well, I was going to suggest is if you could submit that, um, to the the case team, that will then also give us a chance to check the various notes that we've got. Uh, and then when we come to issue things early next week, um, we can make sure that we've tallied up what we've got on our list. Um, and hopefully it's all consistent. I know I've got various notes in different places. I don't think I've necessarily got all of my notes in, in a nice, convenient spot, and I suspect my colleagues will be similarly just in the way they prepared their, their notes.

01:25:29:04 - 01:25:44:18

So yeah, if you're able to arrange uh, have that perhaps sent tomorrow so that we can have a look at it and prepare our notes. Is there anything Amongst my colleagues that you think may have been missed from the applicants list at this point?

01:25:52:15 - 01:26:09:12

Yeah. Uh, Mrs. Webb raised the point about Mr. Fell's point, but I think he he will be aware that the the various bits and pieces that he was going to deal will be picked up through his, um, written rep on behalf of his client or clients, I should say.

01:26:11:12 - 01:26:14:24

Yes. Sorry, sorry. I thought that was coming in as part of his written report on an action point.

01:26:15:00 - 01:26:15:15

Yeah.

01:26:17:04 - 01:26:40:07

I think I think we will be able to go through our notes, identify what those points were, and make sure that they also appear on the list as actions for for Mr. Phil and to follow through in his written report. Is there anything, um, from anybody else that's been present over the last day and a half that they think might be missed from the list that the applicants just read out. Looking at Essex first.

01:26:42:18 - 01:26:52:27

And like, uh, sir Mark. Essex County Council like you, I have a number of notes in many different books, but, um, I'm not aware there's anything really missing at this time. Thank you.

01:26:53:06 - 01:26:54:14

Mr. Bedford, for Suffolk.

01:26:54:23 - 01:27:18:01

Thank you, sir. Mike Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I wasn't envisaging that the various areas of dialogue, which have been referred to as going on between the parties to address some of the issues, would feature in action points. So obviously that dialogue and the indication from the applicant they want to engage in, that has all been said and we're taking that forward. But I say I don't think those are the sort of things you'd put into an action point. No, I think.

01:27:18:03 - 01:27:46:11

We'll take that as read. And we know that there must be dialogue going on because of what, if nothing else, what we've said about staying on common ground and things need to be moved on in that regard. And the local authorities variously have said in terms of your local impact reports, being mindful of the likely deadline for their submission that there needs to be engagement so that hopefully you can make those as full as possible. So hopefully the applicant takes that as a read that the various points of engagement are accepted.

01:27:48:12 - 01:28:03:09

Is there anything else from any of the other parties, perhaps those still online? Um, in terms of actions that they picked up on that weren't included in the list that the applicant just read out a little while ago?

01:28:04:25 - 01:28:05:12

Mr. bloom.

01:28:06:26 - 01:28:26:02

Thank you sir. Jeremy Bloom, National highways. Um, the only other point, um, was the road safety audit for Bentley Road junction. But I recognise the applicant were planning to do that. In any case, I

don't know whether it's appropriate to include it as an action, but just to recognise the the importance of that, that happening.

01:28:26:20 - 01:28:40:20

I think it might be important only in us putting as an action that we'd like the applicant to respond as quickly as possible to national highways. So because that no doubt will assist National Highways in formulating their written rep.

01:28:42:02 - 01:28:59:18

Um, thank you for that. Um, we don't have a problem with doing it. The only the slight hesitation I have with being as an action point is an action point is normally something that is submitted to you, whereas these will be documents that are submitted straight to National highways and possibly SEC. I would suspect, rather than coming to you.

01:29:02:16 - 01:29:03:01

Um.

01:29:03:16 - 01:29:18:11

I think we can craft an action that makes it clear that we expect dialogue between, um, National Highways and the applicant. And in that regard, it's the transmission of of the the note. So the audit two national highways.

01:29:19:09 - 01:29:29:23

Uh, um, I have no objections to an action point that asks us to either update or confirm that we've done it. But I want to be very clear. It's not the audit is the briefing for the audit that's being done next week.

01:29:56:05 - 01:29:59:09

Mr. Bean, would that pick up the point that you you raised?

01:30:01:20 - 01:30:09:14

Jeremy, blame National highways? Yes, sir. Um, that would be, uh, that would, um. Yeah, with that point satisfactorily. Thank you.

01:30:13:10 - 01:30:38:24

Yes. Thank you, sir. Sarah Marshall for National highways. Um, it if I can stress, I think you have picked up the this road safety audit. The briefing. This is it's very urgent. Um, you know, and National highways require that information. We will obviously be, um, putting in a detailed submission for deadline one. Um, so yes, please, sir. Thank you.

01:30:51:22 - 01:30:53:20

And anything from any other,

01:30:55:12 - 01:30:57:00

um, online participant.

01:30:59:02 - 01:31:00:09

Not seeing anything.

01:31:06:24 - 01:31:07:17

Timings.

01:31:16:28 - 01:31:50:22

Uh, for the applicant. Um, given that it's effectively two weeks until deadline one, we have a number of notes to prepare as well as our deadline submissions and our change request. We would propose that the further technical notes are scheduled or deadline to and the action points, which are essentially submission of documents or a short update, such as the engagement with nature's goal. We can do a deadline one. But we are starting to get quite a big workload for deadline. One of the technical notes are also added to the ones we've also agreed to earlier this week, so we'd request that they were deadline to.

01:32:12:15 - 01:32:15:16

Yeah, that seems reasonable from this side of the room.

01:32:23:11 - 01:32:23:26

Not with.

01:32:24:14 - 01:32:24:29

Bedford.

01:32:25:23 - 01:33:01:16

So I, I think I just need to check, but I don't. What I'm concerned about is if any of the technical notes have a bearing on the content of the local impact reports, and this may be more a matter of ethics than it's directly a matter for Suffolk. But insofar as the technical notes are providing information which might resolve issues if we don't see those until deadline two, it necessarily means that the local impact reports, which also come in at deadline two, will have to be prepared without sight of those technical notes.

01:33:01:18 - 01:33:26:01

So you may find that the issues being raised in the local impact report, which ultimately get overtaken by events, but in the sense that that just goes with having a phase sequence of dealing with things. And I can understand the applicants workload. So I'm not necessarily saying they need to submit the technical notes early, but I'm just pointing out that if they don't come in. So deadline two, we'll obviously have to take that into account.

01:33:26:03 - 01:33:59:01

What the ramifications might be. Yeah, I think if there are any instances of that sort of scenario, then the local authorities will just potentially have to put this is our position at this point. Potentially it might change, um, subject to submission of further information on the Llii submission, um, are those requiring members approvals? Are they progressing under delegated approval? I have seen some instances where member approvals, and that seems to make the process really quite difficult.



01:34:00:11 - 01:34:11:15

Mr. Uh, Logistics Council, um, we have full delegated authority to respond to all matters in relation to the censorship, uh, which we are holding on for dear life. So.

01:34:15:22 - 01:34:25:12

Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk councils, I'm not prepared to say that our delegated authority is quite as extensive as Mr. Wood used, but certainly the local impact reports don't require member, endorsement.

01:34:25:18 - 01:34:26:06

I said.

01:34:40:22 - 01:34:57:06

I'm getting a message from the the right hand side of the table in terms of the highway technical notes. Would there be scope for those to be produced by deadline, one which might then assist, particularly the three highway authorities?

01:35:06:02 - 01:35:24:24

Paul McAdoo for the applicant, we're very reluctant to commit to that. What we would commit to is prioritizing it in amongst the technical notes and in and sharing it, especially as a draft with the councils ahead of deadline to, if we possibly can, submitting it ahead of deadline to as we can, but we really don't want to commit to deadline one.

01:35:25:00 - 01:35:25:15

Yeah.

01:35:26:11 - 01:35:33:15

That seems a reasonable way forward. And I presume the three high authorities in particular would welcome that.

01:35:38:02 - 01:36:03:05

Right. I think, therefore, if there's nothing else on action points that can bring us to the close of the hearing. I'd like to thank everybody for your forbearance over the last day and a half. Um, this issue specific hearing one is therefore closing. And I'd remind everybody that those who are attending issue specific hearing to which will consider a

01:36:04:29 - 01:36:11:24

draft of a consent order, matters that will commence at 2:30. Thank you very much.