

Response to Examining Authority’s Written Questions (Issued 8 October)

Ref	Question to:	Question	Response
TT.1.03	National Highways, Essex County Council, Suffolk County Council and any other IP	<p>Assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts</p> <p>Do you consider that the assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts for the Proposed Development, as set out in Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-090] and the Traffic and Transport Baseline Report [APP-172 and APP-173] addresses all relevant issues? If not, what are your concerns and how might they be addressed?</p>	<p>The Council’s Local Impact Report outlines all of the concerns we have raised with the assessment method (some of which have been addressed by the Applicant in the most recent iteration [REP1-018], which is appreciated). Generally the assessment method includes most of the information we might expect, and is comparable to other similar projects, albeit with the following concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The absence of controls and management processes that would result in the assessed impacts being those that are actually experienced (the most obvious example here is the assessment of the vast majority of workforce traffic travelling at off peak times, which results in the order of 1,200 workers being reduced to 95 peak hour car movements). If these movements were not to impact the highway network in the manner that has been calculated, it would require more thorough assessment of impacts, such as junction modelling. • The absence of assessment of the hour of greatest change (however, for clarity, other similar projects have also omitted this

			<p>assessment). It is not envisaged that an assessment of the hour of greatest change would necessarily result in alternative conclusions, but would give a better sense of the scale of change during these hours, which may or may not result in the need for stronger management measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No details were included in the reports on AIL movements associated with the cable drums (nor reference to these movements). This should have been included.
TT1.04	Applicant and National Highways	<p>Routing for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) During the course of ISH1 there was discussion of the use of the A120 westbound (from Harwich) as part of the route for AILs (of up to 400 tonnes) needing to access the proposed onshore substation site via Bentley Road. National Highways in its post ISH1 written submission [REP1-066] has commented (paragraph 1.4) that AILs travelling from Harwich on the A120 would need to make a 360 degree turn at the “next” roundabout (presumed by the ExA to be the A120’s junction with Harwich Road) in order to enter Bentley Road. In section 4.3 of [REP1-066] National Highways refers to AILs switching carriageways at the Horsley Cross Roundabout.</p> <p>a) For National Highways – Clarify what your understanding of the Applicant’s AIL routing proposals for accessing Bentley Road via the A120 are, ie making 360 degree turns at the A120’s junction with Harwich</p>	<p>As per the Council’s Local Impact Report, there are concerns around the access for AILs for cable drums associated with all of the accesses on the route, particularly the number and frequency of AIL movements. As well as 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.</p> <p>The AIL route investigations and swept path drawings at Appendix Y of the Transport Assessment are unclear, and further clarity is sought on the swept path that has been undertaken, and the movement being proposed.</p>

		<p>Road or undertaking lane switches at the Horsley Cross Roundabout.</p> <p>b) For Applicant – In light of what National Highways has said about the AIL route to Bentley Road in paragraph 1.4 and section 4 of [REP1-066] clarify:</p> <p>i. whether the intention is for 360 degree turns to be made at the A120’s junction with Harwich Road or lane switching at the Horsley Cross Roundabout.</p> <p>ii. whether any physical works would need to be undertaken to either of the roundabouts referred to in b)i to accommodate an AIL of up to 400 tonnes and how the undertaking of any such works would be secured under the provisions of the dDCO.</p>	<p>The AIL route from the east for cable drums is likely to require some form of U-turn movements on the Strategic Road Network; depending on the frequency of these AILs, there are additional impacts on the users of the road network as a result of repeated increases in delays. They will also have impacts on users of the local road network such as through Clacton.</p>
TT.1.05	Essex County Council	<p>Construction vehicles crossing roads</p> <p>Are you content with the measures suggested by the Applicant in Section 3.5 of the Outline Construction Management Plan [APP-257] to ensure the safety of all road users at the identified locations where construction vehicles would cross the public highway?</p>	<p>As the highway authority will be a consultee on the final version of the CTMP, it will be able to influence any management measures, as set out at Paragraph 3.5.4. However, road safety is of paramount concern, and the final design of each temporary access will be required to demonstrate that it can achieve adequate visibility and safe design / implementation.</p>
TT.1.07	Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council	<p>Transport impacts at ports</p> <p>During ISH1 you made the case that the Applicant should prepare and submit an Outline Port Construction Management Plan to manage the impacts of traffic at ports during the construction and operation of the offshore elements of this proposed development. Given the Applicant’s comments on their offshore activities and resulting onshore traffic</p>	<p>It appears reasonable that a Port Construction Management Plan would not be required for construction; however, it does not appear unreasonable to have a Plan in place for maintenance and operation, given that the port is unknown, and its existing permissions are unknown. Such a plan would just require the Applicant to review the localised impacts of traffic, as well as implement</p>

		impacts at ports in paragraphs 2.7.4 to 2.7.7 of [REP1-059], do you still consider such an Outline Port Construction Management Plan should be submitted?	some site-specific travel planning, which does not appear to be particularly onerous and would accord with the principles of EN-1 i.e. managing impacts and achieving sustainable travel behaviours.
--	--	---	--