

Our Ref: 20048269
PINS Ref: EN010115
Enquiries to: Mark Woodger

Via email to Portal

For the attention of Jonathan Manning

Date: 3 October 2024

Dear Mr Manning,

**FIVE ESTUARIES OFFSHORE WIND FARM EN010115
ESSEX COUNTY COUNCIL REFERENCE: 20048269
ECC DEADLINE 1 SUBMISSION**

Please find set out below and as attached Essex County Council's Deadline 1 submissions, as requested by the Examining Authority (ExA) on the 03 October 2024, which consist of the following:

1. Post-hearing submissions, including written summaries of oral submissions to the hearings. Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases and responses to any hearing action points arising from the hearings held between 17 and 19 September 2024.
2. The Examining Authorities Written Questions (ExQ1).

1. Post-hearing submissions, including written summaries of oral submissions to the hearings. Post-hearing submissions including written submissions of oral cases and responses to any hearing action points arising from hearings held between 17 and 19 September 2024

ISH1 Terrestrial Traffic and Transportation

Item	Notes
<p>a) Road traffic surveys and predicted traffic generation (construction and operational)</p>	<p><u>Volume 6, Part 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport [APP-090]</u></p> <p>ECC has some concerns with the assessment methodology applied by the Applicant, particularly the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 8.4.3 sets out the areas that the traffic and transport chapter has considered; clarification is sought as to why only pedestrian amenity has been considered, rather than all relevant non-motorised user amenity, as per the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) <i>Guidelines Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement (GEATM)</i>. • There are three locations where the highway authority does not agree with the link sensitivity applied by the Applicant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A133 Clacton Road / Main Road (Link 19/20). There are services and facilities along this route, including local shops, a school, employment and a public house in Elmstead Market and Frating. ○ B1027 St John’s Road / Colchester Road (Link 21/22). There are services and facilities along this route, including local shops and a public house in Alresford, and Thorrington Cross for information there is also a 7.5T weight limit due to a weak structure at Alresford viaduct on B1027.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ B1035 South (Link 33). There are receptors on this route at Tendring Green and Tendring.● ECC has the following comments on the key trip generation parameters set out at paragraph 8.6.1:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Core working hours result in impacts outside of the network peak hours (80% before 07:00 and after 18:00); no evidence has been submitted that shows that these working hours are realistic. This results in only 20% of traffic being assessed as impacting the highway network during the peak hours.○ The Core HGV delivery profile of traffic across the day is not identified. A flat profile is unlikely to be realistic and so might reduce the impact during any specific hour.○ No evidence is submitted to support the car share proportion of 1.5 people per car. The Travel Plan does not offer meaningful assurance of the development achieving this level of car sharing through commitments.● The result of the assessment method above means that a peak of 1,200 workers results in 95 peak hour car movements, which is a significant reduction in impact and does not indicate a robust assessment. There is little in the way of evidence or commitments that give confidence that this is a realistic assessment i.e. no controls on these work hours or car share proportions.● ECC do not agree with the absence of an assessment of the hour of greatest change, as per GEATM guidance. The assessment is based on daily traffic flows; consideration is needed towards assessing the hour of greatest change, which
--	--

is considered to be a requirement based on the following text, which is taken from paragraph 1.22 of the IEMA guidance ‘*Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic and Movement*’:

*“Traffic and movement assessments for EIA and non-statutory environmental assessments, present the impact of traffic and movement on people and the environment – which are initially undertaken with reference to daily traffic flows prior to assessing the **time period with the highest potential impact (i.e. degree of change from baseline conditions)**, which may not be the same as the time period with the highest baseline traffic flows”.*

The large proportion of traffic impact is likely to be in a short specific time frame (as a result of shift patterns), and only assessing the 12-hour impact dilutes this impact against a greater baseline of traffic.

- No evidence is submitted that sets out how the HGV or workforce numbers used in the assessment have been determined, and so these cannot be corroborated.
- There are a number of junctions that result in noticeable increases in development peak hour movements.
 - A120 / Harwich Road roundabout: 62 vehicles
 - A120 / Bentley Road priority junction: 66 vehicles
 - A120 / B1035 roundabout junction: 69 vehicles
 - A133 Clacton Road / B1029 Harwich Road: 38 vehicles
 - A133 / A133 Main Road roundabout junction: 50 vehicles
 - A133 / B1033 Colchester Road roundabout junction: 56 vehicles
 - A122 / B1027 roundabout junction: 39 vehicles

If these movements occur outside of the network peak hour, it is reasonable for no further modelling assessment to occur; however,

ECC is concerned about impacts occurring during the peak hours without appropriate mechanisms being in place.

Additional Material

ECC have separately raised a number of points with the Applicant relating to the absence of some information within the submitted material. These include:

- That Figure (8.12) showing the Peak Hour construction workforce numbers is not included.
- There appears to be an error in the calculations for total vehicle numbers at Table 8.44 for Link 32.
- There appears to be an error in the calculations for total vehicle numbers at Table 8.45 for Links 9 and 10.
- There appears to be an error in the calculations for total vehicle numbers at Table 8.46 for Links 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 15.
- The HGV reduction factor applied based on Table 6-1 and Table 62 of the Traffic and Transport Baseline Report – Part 1 [APP-172]
- Some inconsistencies with Appendix U Traffic and transport Baseline Report – Part 2 [APP-173].
- The Council could not identify that General Arrangement drawings for all the accesses and haul road crossings have been included.

ECC have raised the potential errors with the Applicant, who we understand has addressed verbally and is looking to submit an updated chapter to address. The Applicant has separately supplied the Council with materials showing these issues being addressed.

b) Construction impacts for the Proposed Development on the local and strategic road network, railways and public rights of way

Volume 6, Part 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport [APP-090]

Timeframe of impacts

The project will have a continuous impact throughout the 18 month programme. For HGV movements, seven of the 18 months exceed 90% of the peak impact, and 14 months exceed 70% of the peak impact. For workforce vehicle movements, four of the months exceed 90% of the peak, and nine of the months exceed 60% of the peak month. As a result, whilst the impacts are temporal, they are significant for a considerable length of the project and not just focussed over a very short timeframe.

Location of impacts

The following Table identifies locations on the local road network where it is felt there will be more noticeable impacts, and in some cases where some form of proportionate, localised mitigation should be considered.

Location	Impact	Traffic	HGV
Link 23: Clacton (B1027)	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 14,523 Change: 233 (2%)	Base: 226 Change: 108 (48%)
Link 24: Clacton (B1032)	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 7,251 Change: 372 (5%)	Base: 127 Change: 108 (85%)
Link 27: Weeley and	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 5,955 Change: 188	Base: 153 Change: 77

	Weeley Heath (B1441)		(3%)	(50%)
	Link 30: Weeley (B1033)	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 10,041 Change: 204 (2%)	Base:245 Change: 83 (33%)
	Link 28: B1414 Harwich Road	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 5,561 Change: 189 (3%)	Base: 120 Change: 77 (64%)
	Link 29: Thorpe Le Soken (B1033)	Congestion, delay, severance, amenity	Base: 12,277 Change: 249 (2%)	Base: 225 Change: 77 (34%)
	Link 35: Bentley Road	Congestion, delay, traffic management	Base: 946 Change: 661 (70%)	Base: 30 Change: 212 (708%)
	Link 45: Waterhouse Lane	Amenity	Base: 428 Change: 158 (54%)	Base: 13 Change: N/A
<p>Whilst these impacts are generally on A and B class roads; these roads run through rural communities, often with limited facilities for</p>				

vulnerable road users, which is likely to result in more noticeable impacts.

AILs

There is no reference to cable drum AILs within the Traffic and Transport chapter [APP-090], but it became clear at ISH1 that there is a requirement for these to access the proposed accesses on the rural road network. There are concerns around the routes for AILs for these cable drums associated with all of the accesses on the route, particularly the number and frequency. Clarity is sought on what assessment has been undertaken of the routes, including whether a structural assessment has been undertaken to ensure the deliverability of their routes i.e. can the local road network accommodate these movements. If an assessment has not been undertaken of the routes, it may be that they are not deliverable, and so would have to use alternative routes with different impacts. This presents a risk to the project. We would request that swept path drawings are provided at key junctions along these routes, and structures pinpointed along the designated routes with assessments undertaken of those structures.

Dismissal of Impacts

ECC do not agree to the conclusions at Paragraph 8.10.9, and we would comment on the rationale for dismissing impacts as set out at Table 8.24.

- For link 11/12, 16, 18, 24/25 and 26: It is not understood why the baseline peak hour flows in the summer being higher is relevant. The purpose is to determine whether the additional traffic would result in an increase in delay, not whether that delay may already occur at certain times of the year.

- For link 13/14: It is not understood where the evidence supporting the estimate of negligible increase in queue lengths is provided.
- For link 13/14, link 15/16, 24/25 and 26: Whilst the assessment flows may or may not be robust, they are what the Applicant has provided as a worst case; using their 'robustness' to dismiss impacts is not considered to be appropriate.
- The Council do not agree that a less than 100% increase in total or HGV traffic is negligible, these thresholds no longer apply, however, when they did *apply* they only formed a starting point for assessment and as indicated by GEATM, should be used *cautiously in any assessment*. As such the blanket use of the threshold is not considered to be appropriate. Looking at the absolute changes and proportional changes, the impacts on Links 23, 24, 27 and 28 need consideration, given the sensitivity of the locations, and the increase of over 50% HGVs. As above, proportional localised mitigation should be considered, particularly in the form of pedestrian and public realm improvements, such as crossings, dropped kerbs with tactile paving, footway widening, public rights of way enhancement and vegetation clearance.
- The rationale at paragraph 240 of the Traffic and Transport Baseline Report – Part 1 [APP-172] is not agreed with; the Applicant has determined the figures used for their *worst-case* assessment; this should not then be used as a reason to dismiss their impacts. The use of 1.5 car person occupancy and the method for assessing of peak hours is not considered to be robust. Paragraph 240 also sets out that the vehicle

movements provided may change as a result of appointment of a contractor. There are no controls that limit the Applicant to these assessed impacts and so they need to be treated with caution. Stronger controls and management through the CTMP would help to address these concerns.

Controls and Mitigation

In order to ensure that the impacts remain as those assessed, the most pragmatic approach is to ensure that appropriate management measures are in place to control and monitor construction traffic to avoid exceedance.

9.24 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-257]

Under Section 5.2 'Checking and Corrective Action', no detail is provided on the programme of monitoring, reporting or enforcement. The CTMP should include strong commitments to monitor construction movements (through GPS and other surveys), report the outcomes of that monitoring quarterly to the local authorities and lead to meaningful enforcement measures that ensure that breaches of compliance are extremely unlikely. The process and timescales should be set out within the CTMP.

Data from the HGV monitoring should be reported to the local highway authority so that compliance with routeing can be monitored, with relevant enforcement. All, or at least a high percentage, of the HGVs accessing the sites should be equipped with GPS data, so that compliance on routeing can be checked. There are no proposals for controls on the number or timing of HGV movements; this brings risk to the assessment of the traffic impacts. Controls should be put on each section of the route so that peak HGV

numbers do not exceed the assessed maximum figure. This can be easily surveyed using the DMS and reported to evidence compliance. The CTMP submitted [REP11-017] as part the East Anglia One North, which included similar, albeit different, scales of HGV traffic included a commitment to limit HGV movements to the peak figure within the assessment.

To reduce the impacts on noise and amenity of the project the CTMP or Code of construction Practice should include a commitment that no HGV movements will occur outside of the core working hours (07:00 to 19:00), however, recognising that there may be a need for these movements to be on the local road network 30 minutes either side of the core working hours (e.g. a HGV departing the site close to 19:00 hours would still be on the local road network). Requirement 7 Part 2 of the recently granted Bramford to Twinstead DCO included the following:

(2) No piling operations may take place between 19.00 and 07.00, or on Sundays, Bank Holidays or other public holidays, and, unless otherwise agreed with the local highway authority, no HGV deliveries may be made to site between 19.00 and 07.00, or on Sundays, Bank Holidays or other public holidays.

9.26 Outline Workforce Travel Plan [APP-259]

Paragraph 3.2.1 of the WTP sets out the principal aim of the Travel Plan i.e.

“to not exceed the worst-case daily and peak hour workforce vehicle (cars and Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs)) movements at each construction access for VE during the construction period”.

The Travel Plan does not look to minimise impacts of vehicle movements on the highway network and community, it simply looks

to achieve what the development considers to be the minimum acceptable impact within the ES. EN-1 sets out that the Applicant should set out the measures to improve access by active, public and shared transport to offer genuine modal choice. There is currently no commitment to offer access by non-car modes. In addition, the vehicle movement figures are worst case for a moment in the lifetime of the project where movements are at peak and so on that basis should be very unlikely to be breached, meaning that there is little or no incentive to achieve any form of sustainable transport credentials for the site for the majority of its build out as the number of workers, and subsequently movements, is lower (i.e. if the number of workers is 80% of the peak figure then they could exhibit much worse travel patterns and not exceed the figure).

The Travel Plan requires a commitment to monitor workforce shift patterns to ensure that shift patterns reflect those assessed within the Environmental Statement. All monitored information should be reported to the highway authority with reasonable management measures embedded that look to ensure compliance. The CTMP should set out responsibilities, timescales, and reporting, along with a list of potential actions to address non-compliance.

If the development fails to achieve its assessed shift patterns, then a review process should be put in place. It is recommended that through the WTP a monitor and manage process is embedded to check the shift patterns are commensurate with those assessed, and, if not, to either assess to see if the impacts are material or to identify additional management measures that can be put in place to address these impacts.

Given the transitory nature of the potential workforce, and the potential for cohabitation or utilising temporary accommodation,

	<p>consideration needs to be given towards utilising a minibus/coach to transport the workforce to/from site. It is recommended that use of the Park and Ride at Colchester is explored for operating a shuttle service between sites to minimise impacts of vehicle movements.</p>
<p>c) Any onshore port and transportation impacts arising from servicing the offshore works</p>	<p>At page 24 of Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport [APP-090] the Applicant sets out that the preferred base port for the offshore construction, operation and maintenance activities is not known and would be decided post consent, and importantly that port activity would be within the envelope assessed when the existing approvals for the port were considered. However, there is currently not any evidence submitted that supports this position. An Outline Port Construction Management Plan [REP11-024] was submitted as part of the East Anglia One North Development Consent Order. This included a commitment to review the localised impacts of the port traffic, as well as site specific travel planning at that time.</p> <p>A commitment towards a similar approach here appears to be sensible.</p>
<p>d) Cumulative impacts of this and other proposed developments in the area The ExA will invite IPs (five-minute each IP) to comment on the Applicant's position in respect of Effects for Terrestrial Traffic and Transportation.</p>	<p><u>Volume 6, Part 3, Chapter 8: Traffic and Transport [APP-090]</u></p> <p>ECC have concerns over communities experiencing repeated impacts as a result of numerous projects. The assessment method is based on Scenario 1, which identifies the greatest peak impact in traffic; however, further clarity is needed on Scenario 3 where there is a break between the delivery of the Five Estuaries and North Falls Projects, which has the potential to result in greater temporal impacts, due to the removal and reinstatement of elements of the works, meaning residents are subjected to the same repeated impacts at certain locations for the projects. In some ways repeated</p>

disruption might be seen as worse than shorter periods of more intense disruption.

With reference to Table 8.53, the Council disagree with the reasoning for the dismissal of impacts for Links 24, 25 and 35. The dismissal of impacts on Bentley Road refers to additional measures within the CTMP to reduce impacts. It has not been identified within the CTMP or WTP how these measures have been committed to, nor how their impact will be monitored and reported, as such it should not be treated as mitigation. There should be strong commitments to how to best manage traffic to minimise impacts.

Traffic and Transport Baseline Report – Part 1 [APP-172]

Paragraph 171 to 173 explain that the proposals do not require a private access road to be delivered. However, that NGET will deliver a private road as part of their Norwich to Tilbury proposals. The current road network cannot accommodate AIL movements to the north of NGETs private access road and any increase in HGV movements particularly on Ardleigh Road is undesirable due to its current width, as well as proximity of vegetation. Clarity is needed on whether the Project will be able to utilise NGET's private access road if that project comes forward and the need or otherwise for permanent access in the event that NGET's proposals do not come forward.

The removal of the footway / cycleway is a particularly complex issue. There are a number of proposals occurring in this area, and it might be that short term removal of the facility would result in additional impacts that are unnecessary. For instance who would maintain the facility in the period between Five Estuaries and North Falls projects coming forward and who would remove the facility if North Falls did not come forward. The interactions of the projects in this area and

	their timescales needs careful consideration around the absence or presence of mitigation.
--	--

ISH 2 draft Development Consent Order matters

Item	Notes
<p>3.1 Schedule 2 <i>“Requirements”</i> 1. Time Limits</p>	<p>Within Schedule 2 <i>“Requirements”</i> at 1 Time limits, the ExA questioned the period in which the development as here applied for commenced, this being given as <i>“no later than the expiration of seven years beginning with the date this Order comes into force”</i>. The question raised was whether this time period could be excessive and if studies done to support this DCO could be deemed out of date.</p> <p>To assist the ExA ECC has looked at the advice as is provided by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, which is attached at Appendix 1 (Advice Note: Lifespan of Ecology Reports and Surveys April 2019). Within this it makes it clear that for a period in excess of 3 years that: <i>“The report is unlikely to still be valid and most, if not all, of the surveys are likely to need to be updated (subject to an assessment by a professional ecologist).”</i></p> <p>Also, it is clear that following the decision of the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNEZ) to drop any additional funding to explore for an Offshore Coordination Support Scheme (OCSS) for an alternative to a landward connection to the Grid, this DCO proposal now relies solely on its connection at the as proposed Lawford sub-station. ECC have provided the letter from DESNEZ to the ExA and it can be found in the Examination Library at AS.011. It is also apparent that without this landward connection point, which itself will be sought by a separate Development Order submission for the Norwich</p>

	<p>to Tilbury connection project, which is expected to come forward to Examination in 2025, without this being in place the ExA were informed that this DCO proposal will not commence. Hence there is an absolute need to have this sperate DCO for Norwich to Tilbury being both in place, and implementable, prior to the commencement of works. Hence both ECC and Suffolk County Council asked for consideration be given to the phasing of the works as may be Consented here, this would mean that commencement would only come forward in a timely manner and be defined by recognisable triggers. This would prevent the commencement of this DCO on its own, which could give rise to considerable local uncertainty if the DCO was commenced in isolation.</p> <p>In response the applicants indicated that commencement of Five Estuaries would not make any commercial sense without the assurances that the substation could be implemented and connected to the Grid. The ExA are reminded that commerciality is not a weighted planning consideration within this DCO and hence such a suggested phasing condition is necessary. Alternatively, a Grampian style condition/Requirement could be used.</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 4 <i>“Stages of Authorised Development Onshore”</i></p>	<p>For Requirement 4 <i>“Stages of Authorised Development Onshore”</i> ECC remain unsure as to what the as stated “stages” mean, and a further explanation is asked for within the Order.</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 8 <i>“Code of</i></p>	<p>At Requirement 8 within Schedule 2 reference is made to the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), which has the reference APP-253, the purpose of which is as set out in paragraph 1.2.1 of the same. The</p>

<p><i>Construction Practice”</i></p>	<p>CoCP is a key control document by which the proposal, if consented, would be brought forward, and which would be necessary to comply with in all respects. Within this at 1.2.7 this puts forward pre-commencement works necessary prior to the implementation of any consented DCO. The question raised by ECC at the meeting was about what these amounted to and what controls are to be in place to ensure that such works, which would not fall to be controlled by any of the as proposed Requirements, have no environmental disbenefit to the local area or to local amenity. Without such controls the Local Authority would have limited resources to ensure compliance with respect of noise and disturbance.</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 7 “Provision of Landscaping” and 12 “Landscape and Ecology management Plan”</p>	<p>At Requirement 7 “Landscaping” and 12 for the “Landscape and Ecology Management Plan” ECC questioned the commitment within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) to place any landscaping to be agreed into aftercare. ECC explained that rainfall in Essex is low, and hence the take up of landscaping needs an extended period of aftercare to the same is not lost. In response it was said that at 5-year period of aftercare would be followed by a period of maintenance for the life of the proposed substation. However, ECC do not accept the applicants submission that “aftercare” and “maintenance” are materially different.</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 9 “Construction Traffic Management Plan”</p>	<p>For Requirement 9 a discussion was had, not only on the Construction Traffic Management Plan, but also on the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AiL’s) which would be brought onto any Consented scheme. This was stated to involve 400T vehicles delivering the substation component parts, and 100T vehicles delivering the cable drums. The impact of the same on the local highway network, which for the most part is rural in</p>

	<p>nature, as will be known to the ExA following their recent unaccompanied site visit. The construction of the substation site, if consented, would use the improved access from the A120 onto Bentley Road. However an additional point of access is proposed between Holland on Sea and Frinton, which would use both the primary network through Clacton and then on to residential and narrow roads to access the onshore connection site. It is of concern to ECC as the Highway Authority that the impact of HGV's and AiL's on the local highway network could be injurious to the road network and its condition, as well as the amenity of those living close to and being affected by such vehicles movements.</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 17 <i>“Control of Noise During Operational Stage”</i></p>	<p>For Requirement 17 “Control of Noise During Operational Stage” this would apply to the noise as would be generated by the as proposed substation. This would be the subject of a “noise investigating protocol” which is not with the ExA at this time. The applicants are asked if they could specify what it will do, so that it is clear what the protocol is. It appears that this currently is in draft format and not yet in a position to be shared?</p>
<p>Schedule 2, Requirement 18 <i>“Skills and Employment Strategy”</i></p>	<p>ECC thanked the applicants for Requirement 18 “Skills and employment strategy”. Discussions on the same made it apparent that they are committed to where possible look to the local area to contribute to the skills and employment strategy. It is correct that a large number of infrastructure projects are proposed within Essex, including the one to be considered here by the ExA as well as both North Falls and Norwich to Tilbury which we mentioned specifically in the Hearing sessions. ECC are vested in seeing the benefits in terms of economic/skills benefits deployed in ways most effective to ensure maximum local benefits.</p>

--	--

Item	Notes
3.1 c)	<p data-bbox="466 421 1225 454"><u>Approval of Highway Works / Discharge of Requirements</u></p> <p data-bbox="466 495 1382 645">In order to minimise disruption to the highway and public through delivery of the project, the Council need to be certain the appropriate processes are in place and relevant timescales.</p> <p data-bbox="466 685 1369 954">ECC are currently in discussions with the Applicant around Protective Provisions for the highway authority. However, in the absence of agreement of those provisions we need to have comfort that we are protected and able to undertake our statutory duties as the highway authority.</p> <p data-bbox="466 994 1385 1319">Under Part 3 Streets, Section 12, Construction and maintenance of new or altered highway. ECC does not agree that we would be responsible for maintaining the highway from completion, as per normal practice, any highway subject to paragraphs 12(1) or (2) would be required to be maintained by the undertaker for a minimum period of 12 months from its completion.</p> <p data-bbox="466 1359 1385 1684">Under Part 3 Streets, Section 14, what the proposed timescales of 28 days cover needs to be discussed as the standard process for permitting for a road closure takes a minimum of 12 weeks (see Appendix 2 Essex County Council Temporary Traffic Regulation Order). 56 days is our standard requirement. Conditions will be required, for example notices.</p>
3.1 d) Schedule 2, Requirement 10	<p data-bbox="466 1742 1366 1892">Requirement 10 relates to permanent highway accesses being required to be approved by the LPA in consultation with the highway authority, but this appears to be the limit of the approval process. It</p>

	appears from the DCO that there are very limited approval processes for highway works related to the temporary accesses. We recognise the aim is to address these through Protective Provisions but there has been limited discussion on this to date.
Overview	For the avoidance of doubt, it is required that all highway works covered by Part 3 'Streets', Section 10' Street Works', Section 12 'Construction and maintenance of new or altered highway', Section 15 'Access to Works' are approved by the local highway authority utilising existing processes.

2. ECC Response to the Examining Authorities Written Questions (ExQ1).

Questions:	LPA – ECC Response
GC.1.10 to GC.1.12	ECC confirms there are no substantive changes to the Development Plan or prior to 17 th March 2025.

I hope the above is of assistance, however, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or queries on the above.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Woodger, Principal Planner
Principal Planning Officer (National Infrastructure)

Email: @essex.gov.uk

Apply for a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO)

A Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) is made by us when it is necessary to temporarily stop or limit vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic along the highway.

Are you adding new apparatus under the highway with a Section 50 Licence?

Please send your completed TTRO application to Section50@essexhighways.org.

Related pages

[TTRO application advice and planning a road closure](#)

Additional advice for applying for a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order or Notice and planning a road closure

[Road Closures - making good provision for bus services](#)

Ensuring people can continue to travel by bus during road closures or streetworks is a safeguarding issue.

[Temporarily suspend a bus stop](#)

This procedure should be followed if you need to suspend a bus stop while carrying out works

Where are TTROs used?

TTROs can be applied to roads, footways or [Public Rights of Way \(PRoWs\)](#).

We can make a TTRO:

- to cover a planned situation, or an Urgent Notice if a restriction is needed immediately for an unplanned situation.
- to allow essential works to be carried out on the highway such as installation of, or maintenance works to, services for example gas, electricity or water
- for works next to the highway such as large developments.

Local District Councils apply for road closures under the Town and Police Clauses Act for events or street parties.

Common types of TTROs:

- Road closures
- Waiting restriction
- Weight restrictions

- One-way restriction
- Speed limit or
- Prohibition of entry

Process

When submitting your TTRO application you MUST also apply for a PAA (Provisional Advanced Authorisation) from the Permit Team. A utility company will do this via [Street Manager](#). However a private company, or individual will need to book road space, by using the appropriate road opening notice application form, depending on your activity.

- General [Road Opening Notice](#) (vehicle crossing, vegetation clearance)
- Section 50 [Road Opening Notice](#) (placing new apparatus under the highway)
- Development Management [Road Opening Notice](#) (works in relation to a development)

Once the PAA has been granted, please complete the application form below and submit to ttro@essexhighways.org along with a clear plan showing the extent of the closure marked in red with proposed alternative route(s) marked in green containing a key for clear indication. All road names must be clearly visible.

Please note that if the date you are requesting for the TTRO is different to that date stated on the PAA, the TTRO will not be processed and you will be redirected back to the permit team.

How do I apply for a standard TTRO?

The application form (below) should be completed and returned by email to ttro@essexhighways.org and you will be invoiced.

How much does a standard TTRO cost?

The cost is currently **£1,426.72**

The fee is made up of:

- Legal advertising costs
- Legal administration costs and
- Processing fee

The cost does not include any temporary traffic management costs associated with the proposed restrictions. Any traffic management or signing necessitated by the TTRO should be arranged and paid for by the applicant. ECC Highway Network Management cannot advise on temporary traffic management.

How long does it take?

TTROs are made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as amended, and take a minimum of 12 weeks to process.

- A consultation process is undertaken with the police, emergency and other services.
- The public must be notified by advertisement in the local press. A contractor applying for a TTRO is also required to notify the public in advance by local advance signing of the works and also by letter.

Duration

A TTRO can have a maximum life of 18 months for a road or six months for a [Public Right of Way](#).

Urgent (Emergency) Road closure - Temporary Traffic Regulation Notice (TTRN)

An Urgent Temporary Traffic Regulation Notice can be issued by us in the case of an emergency, for example a water/gas main leak or unsafe structure.

[Cookie Settings](#)

[Accept Cookies](#)

How do I apply for an Urgent TTRN?

Use the form below to apply for an urgent as well as standard (planned) road closure. It should be returned by email to ttrn@essexhighways.org and you will be invoiced.

How much does an Urgent TTRN cost?

The cost of an Urgent TTRN is:

- **£322.71**

Duration

An urgent (emergency) TTRN can be issued for a maximum time of 21 days where public safety is a concern or 5 days for necessary and expedited works.

Related pages

[TTRO application advice and planning a road closure](#)

Additional advice for applying for a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order or Notice and planning a road closure

[Road Closures - making good provision for bus services](#)

Ensuring people can continue to travel by bus during road closures or streetworks is a safeguarding issue.

[Temporarily suspend a bus stop](#)

This procedure should be followed if you need to suspend a bus stop while carrying out works

Documents

[TTRO / TTRN Application Form - April 2024 - DOCX\(469.8KB\)](#)

ON THE LIFESPAN OF ECOLOGICAL REPORTS & SURVEYS

APRIL 2019

It is important that planning decisions are based on up-to-date ecological reports and survey data. However, it is difficult to set a specific timeframe over which reports or survey data should be considered valid, as this will vary in different circumstances. In some cases there will be specific guidance on this (such as for the age of data which may be used to support an EPS licence application). In circumstances where such advice does not already exist, CIEEM provides the general advice set out below.

For some projects the time taken between commencing the scoping or design and submitting a planning application can be several years, and this can result in the early ecology surveys becoming out-of-date (based on the advice set out below); this can lead to additional costs for developers associated with updating survey data. Nevertheless, there are considerable advantages associated with undertaking surveys early during the scoping or design phases of a project.

Ecological consultants should give careful consideration to which, if any, surveys need to be updated; design their data collection in a way which maximises the benefits of early surveys whilst minimising the costs to developers; and provide clarity on the likely lifespan of surveys in their reports.

AGE OF DATA	REPORT / SURVEY VALIDITY
Less than 12 months	Likely to be valid in most cases.
12-18 months	<p>Likely to be valid in most cases with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a site may offer existing or new features which could be utilised by a mobile species within a short timeframe (see scenario 1 example); • Where a mobile species is present on site or in the wider area, and can create new features of relevance to the assessment (see scenario 2 example); • Where country-specific or species-specific guidance dictates otherwise. <p>Report authors should highlight where they consider it likely to be necessary to update surveys within a timeframe of less than 18 months.</p>
18 months to 3 years	<p>A professional ecologist will need to undertake a site visit and may also need to update desk study information (effectively updating the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal) and then review the validity of the report, based on the factors listed below. Some or all of the other ecological surveys may need to be updated. The professional ecologist will need to issue a clear statement, with appropriate justification, on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The validity of the report; • Which, if any, of the surveys need to be updated; and • The appropriate scope, timing and methods for the update survey(s). <p>The likelihood of surveys needing to be updated increases with time, and is greater for mobile species or in circumstances where the habitat or its management has changed significantly since the surveys were undertaken. Factors to be considered include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the site supports, or may support, a mobile species which could have moved on to site, or changed its distribution within a site (see scenario 1&2 examples); • Whether there have been significant changes to the habitats present (and/or the ecological conditions/functions/ecosystem functioning upon which they are dependent) since the surveys were undertaken, including through changes to site management (see scenario 3 example); • Whether the local distribution of a species in the wider area around a site has changed (or knowledge of it increased), increasing the likelihood of its presence (see scenario 4 example).
More than 3 years	The report is unlikely to still be valid and most, if not all, of the surveys are likely to need to be updated (subject to an assessment by a professional ecologist, as described above).



EXAMPLE SCENARIOS

1

- Trees or buildings on site have been surveyed for evidence of bat roosts and none were found; new roosts may be present, and trees or buildings may have developed new features which were not previously present. An update bat roost survey is likely to be required.
- One or more potential otter resting sites have been identified, although there was no evidence of use at the time of the survey; such features may have been used by otters during the intervening period. An update otter survey is likely to be required.

2

- A badger survey confirmed the presence of badgers on site; new setts may have been excavated within the site. An update badger survey is likely to be required.

3

- An area of grassland was heavily grazed by cattle at the time of the original survey and was considered to be unsuitable for reptiles, although slow-worms were known to be present in the wider area; grazing has since ceased and the grassland has been cut once annually, which has encouraged the development of a tussocky sward which provides suitable habitat for slow-worms. A reptile survey is now likely to be required.

4

- A water vole survey confirmed their absence from the site but identified them as present in the wider area surrounding it; a recovery project is underway in the local area through a mink control programme, which is encouraging the spread of water voles.



43 Southgate Street
Winchester, Hampshire SO23 9EH

t: 01962 868626
e: enquiries@cieem.net
www.cieem.net