



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Five Estuaries Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 7
Date:	30 October 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.

Simon Says

Transcript Export

<https://www.simonsaysai.com>

My New Project

Created on: 2024-10-30 16:17:10

Project Length: 02:09:17

Account Holder: Ryan Ross

File Name: Five Estuaries_ISH3_OCT30_PT7.mp3

File Length: 02:09:17

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:10:06 - 00:00:33:09

Well, good afternoon everyone. Uh, the time is now 2:00. Um, and it is time for this issue specific hearing three, uh, to resume, um, starting with agenda item 3.7 effects for terrestrial traffic and transportation of the project.

00:00:37:06 - 00:00:49:04

Um, perhaps turning first to the applicant. And, uh, Mr. Boswell, is there any additional members of your team that are either at the table or online specifically for this item?

00:00:51:08 - 00:00:54:00

Julian Bosworth, the applicant? Uh, one new arrival.

00:00:56:12 - 00:01:01:25

Good afternoon. It's Daniel Brown from SLR. Um, traffic and transport lead for the project.

00:01:10:21 - 00:01:11:22

Right. Thank you.

00:01:18:03 - 00:01:37:03

So, um, as with a couple of the other, um, items, um, we'll invite the applicant to provide a brief update to start with on any progress made or discussions that have taken place on traffic and transportation matters, uh, since ish one.

00:01:39:13 - 00:02:18:01

Danny Moran, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, so the applicant has undertaken further discussions with both National Highways and Essex County Council highways since the issue specific hearing one and has made progress, um, of addressing issues that have been raised during the examination. So firstly taking uh liaison with National Highways. The African National Highways have met a number of times to progress various elements, such as protective provisions. This has also included a meeting on the 2nd of October to discuss the comments raised in its Technical Note seven, and the applicant's response to this issue to National Highways on the 26th of September relating to the Traffic and transport Assessment.

00:02:19:20 - 00:02:49:22

Following the issue of the National Highways responses to the examining Authority's written questions at deadline two. There are six remaining issues to further resolve, three of which will require further clarifications from the applicant, with the other three requiring the applicant to undertake some additional work to endeavour to resolve these issues. The applicant and National Highways are progressing discussions on the Road safety audit for the A120 Bentley Road junction, and hope to be able to arrange a date shortly for this to be undertaken. And now coming on to Essex County Council.

00:02:50:24 - 00:03:24:11

A meeting was held with Essex County Council on the 24th of October to discuss the comments by the local highway authority submitted a deadline one and referencing the Essex County Council Local Impact Report. As a result of the discussion, as a result of the discussion, the applicant is updating the Outline Workforce Travel Plan, which is application reference, ARP 259 and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan um um Application Reference as 055, with a number of further measures, controls and monitoring regimes to endeavor to resolve the issues related raised related to these documents.

00:03:24:28 - 00:03:59:14

Draft of these updated documents will be issued to Essex County Council for review. Prior to submitting these, the Examiner Examining Authority, and therefore we propose to submit these at deadline 4 or 5. The applicant is also preparing a detailed response to the comments related to the Traffic and Transport Assessment, which will be shared with Essex County Council before a further meeting to endeavour to resolve Essex County Council's comments on these points and then an item relating to both stakeholders. Uh, the applicant submitted a draft version of the abnormal, indivisible, low technical notes to National Highways and Essex County Council on the 8th of October.

00:03:59:26 - 00:04:08:18

Early comments prior to this being submitted to the Examining Authority at deadline to. In response to the actions at issue specific hearing one. Thank you.

00:04:15:17 - 00:04:19:29

Great. Thank you for that. That update to start us off.

00:04:22:13 - 00:04:55:02

So, um, you've seen from the agenda again, um, various sort of sub items that we've proposed to, um, take in in order, starting with, um, issues around road traffic surveys, predicted traffic generation, uh, assessment methodologies and impacts on junctions during construction. Um, and I think the first set of questions under this, um, Relate to National highways.

00:04:55:05 - 00:05:00:22

Deadline two representation Rep 2062.

00:05:02:07 - 00:05:35:25

Uh, first question was, um, hopefully fairly quick. Question two. Uh, National Highways. Um, it was noted in, in your, um, representation that, um, National Highways had requested that discrepancies in the annual average daily traffic data shown in table three four of the uh to should be updated to accurately reflect the art data presented in appendix six.

00:05:36:00 - 00:06:10:27

Sorry, appendix C of the to um, and that you noted that the applicant had amended that in revision B of part one of the, uh, baseline report, which is Rep Two six. Um, I just I just noted your comment that, um, National High was a sort of still reviewing, um, what's been provided there in revision B? Um, just wondered what the timescale was for, uh, coming back to hopefully confirm that you're okay with what's been provided there.

00:06:12:20 - 00:06:29:08

Jeremy Bloom for National highways. Yes. So, uh, we're just reviewing the details. Um, uh, I expect that to, um, be resolved before deadline three, so we should be able to confirm it at the next deadline.

00:06:37:06 - 00:06:38:24

That's great. Thank you.

00:06:45:16 - 00:07:19:02

Um, obviously, as the applicant said, um. National Highways. Um, deadline to submission. Um, you know, it was very helpful and very succinctly just set out the, um, six, um, sort of remaining issues that they felt that needed to be resolved and, um, summarize those. And just for everyone's benefit, I just, I thought rather than take each one individually, I'll just run through them.

00:07:19:14 - 00:07:53:27

Um, so the first point was that they felt a summer sensitivity test must be assessed for all junction assessments. Secondly, uh, vehicular impacts of the construction activity must be assessed based on a worst case scenario at each junction individually, as opposed to network wide. Um, likely worst case scenario. Third point. Um. The further evidence is required to explain why a workforce occupancy rate of one and a half persons per car is a realistic assumption.

00:07:54:25 - 00:08:41:28

A fourth point, the method used to assign the vehicular trips to the strategic road network, should be clarified when assigning trips to the network. The temporary construction compounds must be used as the destination to inform that. Um. Fifth point, uh was quite a lengthier one, but, um, for junction capacity assessments at um particular um junctions involving the A120 that experience over 30 additional vehicle movements during the peak hour, um and the sixth point being that peak period growth rate should be used in the assessments of any junctions.

00:08:42:20 - 00:09:20:06

Um, uh, Mr. Moran, you, um, alluded in your helpful summary, um, that obviously ongoing discussions around those, those sort of six, uh, outstanding points. Um, and, you know, I think, um, you're seeking perhaps further clarification on three, but progress had been made on three, um, perhaps taking them as a bundle first. Um, are there any of those points that the sort of applicant is fundamentally pushing back on, or do we feel that there's, um, you know, room for progress on all six of those points?

00:09:22:13 - 00:09:38:16

Danny Moran, on behalf of the applicant and, um, not necessarily pushing back, but just providing some additional clarification on those three points, um, for further sort of evidence, I guess. Um, and then the other three we're, which include the capacity assessments we are looking at undertaking.

00:09:41:28 - 00:09:57:11

Right. Thank you for that. Um, just turning to national highways. Does that sort of, uh, chime with where you think the discussions are at, uh, at the moment? And is there anything sort of further you'd want to add on those six points?

00:09:58:12 - 00:10:28:16

Um, Jeremy Bloom, National Highways. Thank you sir. Um, I think that that's a helpful response. That sounds positive. We need to obviously meet with the applicant. Next week, I would suggest to to run through those happy to provide further clarification. And, um, I'm sure there's room for discussion on a few of the points. Uh, but pleased to hear that that on three of the, um, areas, the applicants, um, agreed to do some further assessment.

00:10:28:26 - 00:10:42:15

Um, we can discuss that next week. I don't think there are any showstoppers here. I think they're all resolvable fairly easily. Uh, I'm confident we'll get to that point. Uh, we need to have that discussion next week, I think.

00:10:44:22 - 00:10:59:02

But now, nothing further to add on any of those points. I think we've we've explained it in the in written question response, as you said. And um, any further clarification we can provide to the applicant when we meet with them?

00:11:01:21 - 00:11:13:14

Great. Thank you for that. And it sounds like it's fair to say fairly regular meetings have been happening and will continue to happen. I can see nodding heads, so that's good.

00:11:15:06 - 00:11:15:21

Um.

00:11:18:00 - 00:11:28:22

So I think for now, that was, um, just where I wanted to get to with National Highways. So perhaps looking, um,

00:11:30:13 - 00:12:02:14

now at, um, something that the examining authority picked up, but I noticed, I think Essex County Council have also picked it up in their deadline to representation. Rep 2044. Um, uh, obviously the applicant, um, you submitted an updated environmental statement, chapter eight. Um, which was reference rep 1018.

00:12:02:27 - 00:12:39:03

Um, and we did notice that there's um, now multiple references to, um, Little Bromley Road and Ardley Road. Um, so for example, for example, in tables 8.13, 8.26, 8.53, um, you know, I think we just appreciate some some clarity as to, um, you know, why that that's been added to, uh, tables. Was, was there an omission or has something, um, changed with within the Assessments.

00:12:39:06 - 00:13:06:02

I think the Essex County Council were sort of making an assumption that that would mean some movements coming of HGVs coming from the east. But if they ask probably quite rightly, the question, why would there be using the road and not the whole road to access substation? Um, so yeah, any further sort of detail or um, clarification that the applicant could give on this point would be helpful.

00:13:08:03 - 00:13:44:04

Uh, James Eaton, on behalf of the applicant, um, the the access point 12 is the sort of end of the whole road. Um, and in the change request, we included an access point 13 at the drainage where the drainage works will be for operational drainage. And in doing the sort of wider review, we we sort of noticed that the there would be vehicles that would move between access point 12 and the national proposed National Grid Substation ECN And whatever their access point is as part of the sort of unlicensed works, um, that would be required.

00:13:44:06 - 00:13:56:06

So there would be some limited HDTVs that would use that bit of roadway between the the two worksites that wouldn't transfer through our substation together. So that's why it was sort of included

00:13:57:24 - 00:13:58:09

in

00:13:59:24 - 00:14:00:09

it.

00:14:01:11 - 00:14:25:06

All right. Thank thank you for for that explanation that that's helpful. Um, just turning to Essex County Council. Uh, Mr. Wood, chair or Mr. Hough, if we've got him online. Um, does that help explain your, um, uh, sort of concerns or queries around that point, or is there anything else you want to question at this time?

00:14:26:10 - 00:14:49:03

Uh, just Essex County Council. I know, that's great. It's what we'd assumed, but it was only after we'd seen the submissions that came in with the change. request where there was an updated traffic and transport capture and documentation that we kind of put two and two together, which was after we drafted this text in our submission. So. So yeah. Um, it makes sense to us. Thank you.

00:14:56:15 - 00:14:58:21

Right. Thank you for for that.

00:15:00:13 - 00:15:00:28

Uh,

00:15:02:11 - 00:15:29:25

I think that that just brings me to the end of the questions that I'd got around, uh, road traffic surveys, traffic generation, etcetera, at this time. Um, just looking around the the room and the virtual room, perhaps starting with National Highways. Um, was there anything else that you wanted to raise at this time regarding this particular issue?

00:15:31:06 - 00:15:45:10

Jeremy Bloom, the national highways. Uh, no thank you, sir. Um, I'm content with, um, the position that we're in and, um, the discussions that we plan to have with the applicant. So nothing further to add at this stage.

00:15:46:18 - 00:15:54:16

Right. Thank you. Um, anything further from Essex County Council on these particular matters.

00:15:55:27 - 00:16:10:20

On behalf of Essex County Council? Uh, no, I would just, um, echo what Mr. Around did around the meeting last week. That was really, really helpful. And our point of view, we felt like we made a lot of progress. So we're quite hopeful. A lot of our comments will be addressed through that. Thank you.

00:16:11:15 - 00:16:23:04

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, anything that, um, Suffolk County Council would wish to, um, raise on this particular item.

00:16:23:21 - 00:16:54:08

Thank you. Sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk county Council. Uh, so, yes, there is, uh, I'm afraid there are the remains of concern on the part of the county council as to the approach that's been taken to the assessment of terrestrial traffic as set out in the updated chapter eight of the Environmental Statement.

00:16:54:20 - 00:17:44:08

So in rep 1018. But this position hasn't changed. Uh, paragraph 8.1.1 makes it clear that the focus has been on traffic to and from the onshore elements of the project, and not at all traffic, including that required to construct and service the offshore elements. Uh, obviously, we touched on this, uh, at the earlier issue specific hearing one, and we note that, uh, the examining authority initially had a question PT .101 on that in the, uh, initial draft of the first written questions.

00:17:44:10 - 00:18:24:25

But that then was, um, superseded on the basis that the examining authority considered that that, uh, had been addressed through what the applicant had provided. Um, whilst obviously we've looked at what the applicant has provided and obviously listened to what the applicant said at issue specific, uh, hearing, uh, one, um, we remain concerned that whilst the applicant has said, uh, well, there won't be any material impacts on the local road network within Suffolk.

00:18:27:10 - 00:19:10:18

There is not at the moment, so far as we see it. Measures in the control documents to deliver that outcome. In the sense the applicant might well be right, that if things happened as they've currently assessed that they may happen, then there would not be concerns, uh, in terms of impacts on the Suffolk, uh, local highway network and that traffic would either, as it were, stay within Essex or be using the strategic road network and therefore of concern to National highways, but not of concerned Suffolk County Council.

00:19:10:21 - 00:19:44:20

But I see the problem that we see is, is that that as it were, message in the supporting documents, is not carried forward into the control document. Uh, obviously I don't want to trespass on item A on matters which come up under items D and E, but we do have something to say on both of those, which is part of that picture. In a sense. We can say we can accept the applicants approach, provided that there are control measures to deliver that approach.

00:19:45:12 - 00:20:13:12

Um, and we think that given where we are at the examination, that is probably a more fruitful way to go then, as it were, uh, suggesting, well, the the wheel needs to be reinvented and further assessment work needs to be done. It's just that I think we would say that since the applicant has gone down this particular approach, we'd like to see that delivered in the control mechanisms. So that's our, uh, issue on that. Thank you sir.

00:20:18:06 - 00:20:30:00

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, turning to the applicant, um, is there anything they'd wish to say in response to Suffolk County Council's point there.

00:20:33:22 - 00:21:00:21

Uh, Paula McKee, applicant. It would be very helpful if Mr. Bedford, on behalf of Suffolk County Council, could provide more detail on what he he would be looking for in the control documents. We have absolutely no idea what he would actually be looking for in terms of controls or drafting or anything we could actually consider. So if we could possibly have, preferably in writing some suggestions of what they are looking for, it would be of a lot of assistance to us in responding to it.

00:21:02:21 - 00:21:08:01

Uh, Mr. Bedford, do you think that is something that could possibly be provided, sir?

00:21:08:05 - 00:21:51:25

Uh, yes, I would say that we think that we've already, uh, rehearsed the topics in the content of our local impact report. I appreciate, as we heard this morning, that the applicant saw that, I think, on Friday of, uh, last week, but we have rehearsed the topics and we have made it clear, in particular with reference to aisles, where we're looking to see some assurance that the applicant is going to deliver on what has been said, and also in relation to issues to do with the um, uh, traffic, uh, associated with the ports.

00:21:52:09 - 00:22:30:25

And we've indicated a request for a port construction traffic management plan, and we consider that there needs to be, uh, a reference in particular. This is quite a narrow point, but in relation to the Lbg lbg compensation area, uh, the, uh, apparent message in the, um applicant supporting material to the limited time duration of those works is nowhere then reflected in the construction traffic management plan.

00:22:30:27 - 00:23:06:01

So they are all, in a sense, relatively detailed points. We can obviously, in our post hearing submissions, provide some more flesh on those. Uh, it certainly is encouraging to have heard, uh, from the applicant that it's in dialogue with Essex County Council, uh, the immediate local highway authority on revisions both, uh, to the workforce um, travel plan and the construction, uh, transport management plan.

00:23:06:14 - 00:23:36:25

Uh, I think we were quite like to have some involvement in that dialogue, uh, because I say we're we're very conscious that we are sitting, as it were, on the A periphery of the scheme in terms of impacts. But we do feel that there has not been as much engagement as in an ideal world that there could have been, and that these sort of issues should hopefully be capable of being taken on board and satisfactorily resolved.

00:23:37:21 - 00:23:51:08

Um, but I say, I think we, we think that we've already set out the position reasonably clearly so far as the applicant could understand the points in the local impact report, but we will provide supplementaries in our post hearing submissions.

00:23:53:15 - 00:24:01:00

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Be helpful. Um, the applicant wants to come back on any of those points.

00:24:01:10 - 00:24:32:14

Uh, Paula McGeady for the applicant. Yes, please. So briefly, um, we would appreciate more detail. Our. To be entirely fair to Sussex County Council, they did actually send us there earlier before Friday. We have did have it before Friday. They were kind enough to do that. But our sort of read of it so far is that they were looking for measures to control aisles, not all workforce traffic, so further detail would be appreciated. Um, I suspect we are going to have to have a discussion about the request for reports plan at some item of this agenda.

00:24:32:16 - 00:25:03:03

We fundamentally don't agree. And on Orford Ness, the only works we are consenting are fundamentally the erection of a fence. You know how long that takes and how many people it takes as a function of what works we can actually do. We are not looking at any significant number of traffic movements there at all. And in terms of meetings, um, we're very happy to have a meeting with Suffolk County Council. My understanding is that the team reached out to them at the end of September to offer that meeting, and we just haven't had a response.

00:25:03:05 - 00:25:05:19

So if they respond to us, we are very happy to have it.

00:25:08:14 - 00:25:13:14

All right. Thank you for that. Um, it was anything further, Mr. Bedford?

00:25:14:10 - 00:25:33:26

Uh, not in terms of substance, obviously. We welcome what Mr. McCready has just said in terms of offers of media, I have to say I don't personally know what the current position is, but we will certainly take that forward. And as a dialogue, which I think be quite useful to avoid, as it were, matters being aired through the examination if they can be resolved behind the scenes.

00:25:40:09 - 00:25:43:12

Thank you. I think that that would be helpful. Way forward.

00:25:46:15 - 00:25:47:00

Um.

00:25:49:06 - 00:26:22:21

So if, uh, I think that that was all the, uh, I've gone around all the parties, um, for if anybody had any sort of further comments on the, um, sub agenda item A, so I'm not not seeing anybody jump in. So, um, I will move on to B now, which, um, is um, around the heading of assessment of cumulative impacts during construction of five estuaries with other proposed developments.

00:26:23:06 - 00:27:44:10

Um, I only really had, um, one question. Um, on on this, uh, it was picking up, um, concerns that Essex County Council had actually set out. I think it was deadline one uh, in there. Rep 1062 um, an interesting points around sort of, uh, temporal impacts. Um, and that, um, advancing a query that potentially, uh, construction scenario three, um, might would result in greater temporal impacts, um, due to removal and reinstatement of certain elements of the works, um, meaning that local residents, um, are subjected to the same Repeated impacts at certain locations of the project's um, and questioning, could that actually, um, uh, which could be worse than shorter periods of more intense

disruption that would occur under scenario one, which is, um, seen by the applicant as the worst case scenario, um, to to the applicant have any sort of comments or response to that query.

00:27:45:12 - 00:27:46:03

Ah ah.

00:28:13:08 - 00:28:13:23

Uh.

00:28:13:26 - 00:28:29:20

Well, let me give you for the applicant, fundamentally, it would be the same impact on on more days. Not necessarily new or better. We what we would like to do if we could come back to you on this in writing, with, with the references and with the benefit of having gone back to the chapter, if that's okay.

00:28:31:24 - 00:28:37:15

Yes. I think that that's acceptable to the examining authority. Thank you.

00:28:43:20 - 00:29:05:01

So I think, as I indicated, that that was the only query under this subheading that the examining authority had. Um, before we move on from sort of cumulative impacts during construction, um, is that anything under that broad umbrella that, uh, anybody wishes to raise? Uh, Mr. Bedford.

00:29:05:24 - 00:29:38:11

Thank you sir. Uh, Michael Bedford, Suffolk county council. So we have, um, some outstanding queries in relation to, uh, the assessment of, um, cumulative impacts of onshore traffic. Um, we provided a response to the examining authority in our response to question TT .1.03, uh, in response to the EQC ones.

00:29:39:03 - 00:30:12:22

Um, and essentially these are matters where, uh, first of all, albeit that we note that the cumulative, uh, assessment has included reference to East Anglia to offshore wind farm, and that is referred to in table 8.45 of section eight of the transport chapter of the S. There is no reference to its parallel project, which is East Anglia one North which was consented at the same time.

00:30:12:24 - 00:30:47:14

And it's not clear to us whether that's just a terminology issue that actually, since one umbrella reference has been used for both projects, or whether, uh, actually only the traffic from one of those two projects has been taken into account. Uh, secondly, we haven't seen a reason, uh, for not including in the cumulative, uh, effects assessment.

00:30:47:24 - 00:31:24:13

Uh, the Bramford twins did grid reinforcement, uh, which, uh, runs from effectively outside of Ipswich. There's a place called Bramford down to a place in the middle of nowhere, with all due respect to Mr. Woods, but in Essex, um, at a place called Winstead. Um, and, uh, that is not an adjacent, uh, to, uh, um, as it were, movement patterns that may be preferable, uh, to, uh, traffic associated with this project. And that was, uh, approved as a development consent order, uh, in, I think, September of this year.

00:31:25:17 - 00:32:10:27

And then we've not seen a reason explaining why, uh, in terms of tier two projects using the kind of terminology of the planning inspectorate's advice. Note, um, there are energy projects which are in effectively the tier two camp, either at the pre-application stage, uh, and we've referred to the Sealink, um, um, National Grid project, the Lion Link interconnector and the Nautilus um project, uh, which effectively either have landfalls in the vicinity and then cable corridors or similar.

00:32:11:17 - 00:32:12:13

And I say.

00:32:14:20 - 00:32:34:23

We think that there's a need to at least explain why they're not in a cumulative impact assessment. And potentially there's a need to bring them into a cumulative impact assessment. I say we set that out in our response to your XQ ones. Thank you sir.

00:32:43:04 - 00:32:48:07

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, is does the applicant want to respond to that?

00:32:49:03 - 00:33:22:03

Daniel Moran, on behalf of the applicant. Um, in terms of the East Anglia one North and two flows. Yeah, that that should be in the referencing area. That should, should be both of those. Um, we've also included Sizewell C and actually those flows we've said, because we've just extrapolated all the way down. Um, so they should be robust. Um, in terms of the other projects mentioned. Um, the Brentford twist to insert grid. Um, we said that most majority of that traffic shared with um, five estuaries would be on the A12, which is the strategic road network.

00:33:22:09 - 00:33:41:00

Uh, there may be some shared routes with workforce vehicles on roads within Suffolk. Um, but we suggest that those numbers would be, would be small from, from our project's point of view. Um, and the other three projects, the Sea Link, the Line link and the Nautilus. Um, as far as we're aware, they're an early stage with no traffic data, so these haven't been included.

00:33:48:17 - 00:34:06:17

Thank you. That's a useful explanation for for this hearing. Um, just picking up on Mr. Bedford's point. Um, do you think it would be useful to, um, put that verbal explanation into writing in the document to explain why not included.

00:34:20:01 - 00:34:23:19

Did I pick up some sort of general nodding from the applicant there?

00:34:24:00 - 00:34:25:13

Apologies. Sorry. Yes, we can do that.

00:34:25:28 - 00:34:32:01

All right. Thank you. Um, Mr. Bedford, uh, do you feel that would, um.

00:34:34:02 - 00:34:40:17

Well, um, what was your reaction to what you'd heard there? And do you feel that would address, um, Suffolk County Council's concerns?

00:34:40:20 - 00:35:11:24

Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, certainly the first point in relation to the East Anglia. Uh, um, one or that's a helpful clarification, uh, in relation to the other projects, obviously, we'll look at what the applicants said and in relation to those where the applicant says, well, there may not be traffic data available. I think it's a question of it's a moving feast in a sense that those are projects which are, uh, progressing through the pre-application processes.

00:35:12:08 - 00:35:42:15

Uh, and we would consider that certainly for the duration of the examination. Uh, it's necessary to, in a sense, do a, as it were, a check periodically to make sure that things which where there is information that would enable them to be feed into a cumulative impact assessment, that information is brought into account. So I think it's a question of we'll see what the applicant said. And it may be that there's nothing more that could be done at this stage, but it's a matter that needs to be kept under review. Thank you sir.

00:35:44:01 - 00:35:55:15

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, on that moving feast points, um, and keeping things updated during the duration of the examination, is that something that's acceptable to the applicants team?

00:35:56:11 - 00:36:28:26

Uh, it could be for the applicant. Can um, as a point of principle, in accordance with the guidance, we do the environmental assessment based on information at ad date that allows us to prepare it, we can review it and you can ask us to update it. But I don't think it can be a moveable feast. And there does have to be a realistic cutoff to that, because it does take us time to do the work, and it has to be put into exam in time for other parties to be able to comment on it. So as a point of principle, yes. And the examining authority as per the guidance is entitled to request that we do do updates where they're justified.

00:36:28:28 - 00:36:40:03

But we would just like to to point out that it can't be done continually. It's a lot of work and it has to be. There has to be a sensible cut off in the examination where there is time to actually consider that.

00:36:43:08 - 00:36:45:00

Thank you. That's a fair point.

00:36:56:21 - 00:37:08:10

Sorry. We're just muttering between ourselves. We'll take that away and think about, you know, timings and potential cut off and, yes, um, accepting it can't be a sort of continuous exercise.

00:37:12:24 - 00:37:14:01

Okay. Thank you. Um,

00:37:15:21 - 00:37:29:00

anything further that Suffolk County Council wanted to say on the cumulative matter? Thank you. Um, and anything that any other parties wanted to raise on this.

00:37:30:24 - 00:37:49:00

I'm not seeing any virtual hands pop up, so I will move on to item C, um, which is, um, around the A120 Bentley Road junction. Um, mitigation works.

00:37:50:25 - 00:38:25:17

Um, and thank you, Mr. Moran, in your intro for the, um, helpful reference to the, um, road safety audit. Um, that's going on. Um, I just wanted to turn to National Highways on on that point. Um, I think my understanding of where we've got to, um, from what I've seen in writing is that National Highways received the road safety audit brief on the 1st of October, and that brief is currently being reviewed.

00:38:26:04 - 00:38:33:26

Um, is what I saw in writing is, is is that still the position or has further progress being made?

00:38:35:12 - 00:39:08:10

Jeremy Bloom, National highways. Uh, yes. I can confirm that further progress has been made. Um, we've responded to the applicant, um, and are broadly happy with the road safety brief. Very couple of minor issues were raised, but, um, nothing significant. um, and um, the the next um, action is for, um, a visit to the, the site, um, to, to undertake the road safety audit.

00:39:08:29 - 00:39:18:27

Um, so my understanding is the applicant is just currently arranging that, um, and National Highways will be represented, um, at that visit.

00:39:23:08 - 00:39:49:21

That's great. Thank you. Um, is there a sort of date or time in mind for that, for that meeting as a next step? And then if perhaps you could just explain, you know what? What then takes us on to actually having, um, a completed road safety audits, if you could just give me a very sort of high level, um, sorry, I'm going to say roadmap to to that. Thank you.

00:39:51:09 - 00:40:21:19

Thank you. Danny Moran, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. We're just doing a couple of minor updates to the brief, um, including some updates of CVS of the audit team, um, and trying to organize a date, hopefully in the next couple of weeks. Um, um, that site visit will be accompanied by National Highways, as Mr. Bloom said. Um, then the audit team will write up their report, um, and then that will get issued, um, and then National highways and issue to Essex as well. So considering it's on the road network as well.

00:40:22:03 - 00:40:38:00

Um, and that will get reviewed. Um, and then if there's any issues that come back from that, um, then there'll be like a designer's response to any problems which are either addressed or rebutted. So that would that. I'm not sure of the timescales of that, but yeah.

00:40:41:14 - 00:41:07:19

Thank you. Yeah. I'm pretty sure it's probably difficult to put, um, specific timescales on it. Um, but uh, does that, um, uh, sort of, um, response from the applicant. Uh, chime with, um, National Highways. Obviously you were very keen to, uh, receive the road safety auditors as quickly as possible. You made that very clear in ish one. So I'm assuming the clock is ticking.

00:41:08:24 - 00:41:10:14

Well, the, um.

00:41:10:16 - 00:41:53:04

Jeremy Bloom, um, for National Highways, the, um, the road safety audit and the completion of that's obviously critical to, um, to national highways being able to determine whether the proposed works,

um, are acceptable or not. And we assume that, uh, should be acceptable, but we need the road safety audit to confirm that. Um, so it's important that it's completed, um, within the sufficient timescales for us to be able to comment on that and for the examining authority to be able to receive that information, that feedback and and explore that further if it wishes to do so.

00:41:53:06 - 00:42:28:11

So that that's the that's the reason why it needs to be undertaken and completed relatively quickly. But I now that we've got the brief, um, assuming that we get a meeting in, um, in a couple of weeks to get the the road safety audit, it started. Um, I don't foresee that it the timing, the timescales to complete it. It should be a problem for the, for the examination. So, um, absolutely satisfied, um, with the description of the process and how it will work.

00:42:28:13 - 00:42:40:08

Um, that's standard and procedure. So, um, I think if, you know, if we can get started within the next couple of weeks, I. Yeah, National Highways will be satisfied with that.

00:42:42:27 - 00:42:51:18

All right. Thank you for that. Um, answer, Mister Bloom. Very helpful. Um, my colleague, Mr. Gould has indicated that he wants to come in.

00:42:53:10 - 00:43:44:19

Yes. Mr. Bloom. You may not have been aware yesterday that we had a little bit of a debate about the junction between the A120 and Bentley Road, and works that might be required at night time, in particular in the context of noise. Um, in whatever discussions that you and the applicant are having about that junction. Um, it would perhaps assist the applicant in particular if some indication could be given sooner rather than later as to what sort of works you might envisage would have to be done at night rather than during the daytime, because there is an outstanding action for the applicant to go away and potentially do some additional noise assessment work in connection with works that you may require be done at night rather than during the daytime.

00:43:44:21 - 00:43:51:07

So is that something that you can assist the applicant team in the dialogue that you're having about that junction at the moment?

00:43:52:14 - 00:44:16:27

Jeremy Bloom for National Highways. Yes, absolutely. Um, we do have a standard approach to undertaking work on the A120, but there is some flexibility as well. And particularly, um, when we need to consider, um, the sensitivity of, of, of noisy activity. So, um, yes, we can have that discussion.

00:44:18:16 - 00:44:30:26

Thank you. Presumably, um, either Mr. Boswell or Mr. McGinty, that would help the applicant side of things if that dialogue as part of the highway work can then feed into the the noise side of things.

00:44:34:18 - 00:44:40:06

Yes, sir. I think that dialogue is a request for that. Dialogue has already been sent to National Highways, so hopefully.

00:44:41:19 - 00:44:42:04

Thank you.

00:44:47:01 - 00:45:17:19

Thank you. Um, the examining authority just really had, um, one other, uh, question around the A120 Bentley Road junction at this time. Uh, to to the applicant. Um, uh, we, um, we received a deadline to, um, concerns from, um, what I believe are residents of the property immediately closest to that junction.

00:45:17:21 - 00:45:53:00

So that was, um, rep 2077 and rep 2090. Um, I know we did touch on this again yesterday around the the living conditions point. Um, I just wondered from a, um, a sort of engineering highway's points of view. Um, I don't know whether you've seen those representations, but, you know, it hinted at, um, there's been some engagement with those residents for for a while, so their comments probably weren't a surprise.

00:45:53:12 - 00:46:07:28

Um, is there anything further that that could be done from, from a sort of engineering point of view, um, to address their concerns around works to that junction? Ah ah.

00:46:10:14 - 00:46:41:16

Uh Alice Bernard for the applicant. So. Yes, uh, the applicant is aware of the properties and the residents and is been in dialogue with them. Uh, we are working, uh, on outlining mitigation measures and hierarchy. And that's related to also noise complaints procedures. And this that is, uh, it's an ongoing process. Um, we also would like to note that, uh,

00:46:43:01 - 00:47:11:26

the request to for collaboration between this project and National Grid and North Falls, um, this process is something we are working on. It does sometimes mean we're. It slows the things down. Um, but we think overall, given the timeframes before the work will be completed, there will be sufficient time to have an aligned approach to mitigation, mitigation hierarchies and working practices.

00:47:26:12 - 00:47:28:07

I thank you for that, Miss Maynard.

00:47:32:18 - 00:47:49:20

So, um, before moving on to the next sub item. Um, I would just ask whether perhaps starting with National Highways. Um, whether you had any other comments at this time regarding the A120 Bentley Road junction.

00:47:52:04 - 00:47:59:16

Um, Jeremy Bloom from National highways. No further comments. Thank you sir. Okay.

00:48:00:00 - 00:48:09:23

Thank you. Um, and just the same question to Essex County Council, if there was anything that you feel we haven't, uh, covered today.

00:48:11:18 - 00:48:12:03

Okay.

00:48:13:24 - 00:48:17:21

So I think I just I just lost my headset. Uh, can you hear me? Okay.

00:48:18:27 - 00:48:20:25

Yes, we can hear you now. Thank you.

00:48:22:05 - 00:49:00:26

Just for Essex County Council. Uh, there was it's a point related to the stage one RSA for Bentley Road. And I should say, before I say this, that the the applicant did give us the opportunity to comment on the stage one RSA as part of the process. But, um, I state we haven't identified, um, an RSA for the works themselves along Bentley Road. And just whether there was the potential actually to tie in this, um, RSA given it runs along it into one that would include the entirety of the works along the road, given it includes, um, crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists, etc..

00:49:01:11 - 00:49:04:25

Um, so that is more of a request than anything at this point in time.

00:49:09:13 - 00:49:17:00

Thank you, Mr. Hough. Um, just just turning to the applicant. Do you think that might be a request you could accommodate?

00:49:29:28 - 00:49:43:19

Uh, for the applicant? Um, we are very happy to consider that suggestion. Uh, right at this moment is that we take that away and speak to Essex County Council and come back on our proposal on that. We don't particularly want to commit on the spot.

00:49:44:20 - 00:49:49:15

Okay. That seems like a reasonable approach. Is Essex County Council happy with that?

00:49:50:13 - 00:49:55:12

Yeah, no, I realize that. Put them on the spot. Probably slightly unfair. Yeah. Yeah, fine. Thank you.

00:49:57:22 - 00:49:58:21

All right. Thank you.

00:50:04:06 - 00:50:36:23

I think that's everything around that particular junction for for now. Um, so it moves us on to sub item D, which is around the routing of abnormal indivisible loads. Um, I should start this item by, um, thanking the applicant for the, um, really helpful, uh, technical note deadline to, uh, rep to 029. Very helpful to the examining authority.

00:50:37:19 - 00:50:38:04

Um.

00:50:40:11 - 00:51:21:24

So I think, um, perhaps first questions to, um, National highways. And it was, it was just picking up, um, it may be something that you've resolved between yourselves with, with the applicant during discussions, but obviously we can only go on what we've seen in, in writing. Um, I think the, the applicant in writing in rep 2029, uh, paragraph 5.1.6 um was was um, quoting that National Highways were talking about a 300 ton limit on the A120 due to its condition.

00:51:22:10 - 00:51:34:12

Um, and I think the question was, um, is that total tonnage, um, the load plus the vehicle that it's on, or are we just talking about the load?

00:51:36:07 - 00:51:41:05

Um, National Highways, would you be able to sort of clarify that point?

00:51:42:04 - 00:51:52:05

Thank you, sir. Sarah Marshall for National Highways. Um, uh, after further discussions, um, it it would appear that the, the,

00:51:53:22 - 00:52:13:10

the 300 tonnage is total load. Um, and we've now been given to understand that the, the loading. So again, the total tonnage for the loading proposed for the A120 is 585 tonnes. Uh, Mr. Bloom can confirm, but that's.

00:52:15:19 - 00:52:18:09

That that's the vehicle plus the load, isn't it.

00:52:19:09 - 00:52:32:21

Um, I'm not sure the accurate figure. It's over 500 tonnes. Certainly. I don't think it's as high as that, but the applicant would probably be able to confirm that. I think it's somewhere between 500 and 550 tons. I think the total load.

00:52:35:21 - 00:52:40:05

If it were to help the examining authority. Um,

00:52:41:23 - 00:53:21:28

I can confirm that National Highways have been meeting with the applicant. So there are there are discussions now taking place, um, concerning the concrete road issue for the A120, which, um, as we had explained in, um, a specific hearing one, um, that that there is a high risk in National highways view, um, for the the very heavy abnormal loads, abnormal indivisible loads. So National highways, the applicant um, has confirmed to National highways that they will be doing a piece of work to investigate and, and look at the various options.

00:53:22:05 - 00:53:56:27

Um, and National Highways have offered to provide any information the applicant Applicant will require us to provide this piece of work. Um, I can't, um, I can't as it's for the applicant to confirm timescales. Um, but obviously national hires will be working with the applicant providing the information, um, on these issues. So, so the, the applicant is then clear of options, um, and can look at we obviously look at solutions to deal with the concrete out road issue.

00:53:57:29 - 00:53:58:18

Thank you sir.

00:54:00:29 - 00:54:32:13

Thank you, Miss Marshall. Um just quickly whilst I've still got National Highways on, on the screen. And before I go to the applicant, just to, um, check their understanding of the sort of investigation of options that that you discuss. Um, so in terms of sort of confirming the, the tonnage, just so that I've got this right in, in my mind, Um, you know, you're talking 300 tons total load with the vehicle.

00:54:32:15 - 00:55:06:27

It could be a over 500. And I think my understanding from reading the applicant's, uh, technical note is that their total total tonnage load plus vehicle, um, of the sort of worst case, biggest piece of kit would get to about 400. Um, is looking to Mr. Bloom or Miss Marshall. Is that is that right? That it looks, um, yeah, it looks on the face of it, like even though the roads in it's got problems, poor condition.

00:55:07:03 - 00:55:15:24

Um, it could probably cope with, um, what the applicant is talking about as it's worst case scenario in terms of heaviness.

00:55:17:24 - 00:55:49:06

Um, Jeremy Bloom for National Highways. Um, I don't think we're in a position to to say that that's the case. Um, I think, uh, we need to, uh, understand that a bit more, um, in a bit more detail. But at the moment, we've sort of talked about a total, um, load of 300 tonnes as being probably manageable. But in advance of that, I think we'd have serious concerns.

00:55:49:08 - 00:56:07:09

And the further discussions that I have had with our specialists over the last few weeks have confirmed that there is a high risk with any of the the heavier loads, probably. I'll say probably because it's not an exact science, but probably in excess of 300 tonnes.

00:56:09:18 - 00:56:35:10

Okay. Thank you. And hence moving us on nicely to, um, the the points about, um, investigation of, of options. Um, and just turning to the applicant, um, does what National Highways have just said there. Does that reflect your understanding that you're going to be doing some further work with their assistance? And I'm going to ask the inevitable question around timescales.

00:56:36:07 - 00:57:07:29

Uh, Alice Amos Maynard for the applicant. Uh, yes. I concur that we are looking at where, you know, we're going to be doing a piece of work. We have discussed the approach to the work with National Highways. Um, from a high level, we sort of we need to make sure we understand the existing conditions, the constraints, as the examining authority will have picked up. It's not simple to define total load. There's also considerations about pressure, a number of axles. And it's not just as simple as one number.

00:57:08:11 - 00:57:39:24

Um and then we'll be looking at identifying options. Um both physical options if, if they're needed for interventions but also management options you know, identify like surveys and you know management of these risks, looking at that, um, to identify what is what are the available routes to us, um, to manage this, um, moving forward, we don't we currently don't envisage it being a showstopper. Um, from the work we've done to date.

00:57:42:01 - 00:57:44:08

In terms of timescales, um.

00:57:47:06 - 00:57:52:07

Are we able to come back to you on timescales when we review the action points?

00:57:53:23 - 00:58:25:00

Yeah, that that seems seems reasonable. Um, so I think I think you, you, um, towards the end sort of answered what were my follow up question was going to be? I was going to ask whether, you know, in terms of scope, was this looking at options of ways of only making sure that you can use that section of the A120 safely, or could it be options for other routes? And I think you mentioned potentially other routes. So it might be a wider scope or or not.

00:58:25:14 - 00:58:52:08

Not for the applicant. Um, primarily we, we think we, we can use the safely. It's the question about how um, so there can be physical measures. There can be, you know, management of how you're actually progressing over the roads, how you use the ale. You know, we have options in terms of different ales and different things like that. So we'll be looking at it in around holistically, but we don't see it as being a showstopper for us using the route.

00:58:54:14 - 00:58:57:00

Right. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that.

00:59:03:05 - 00:59:03:20

Um.

00:59:04:16 - 00:59:39:22

So just turning to other parties. Um, I appreciate obviously the, um, ale technical note was, um, only published at deadline two, but I'm fairly sure from the, um, ish. One action point that would sort of ask the applicant to share drafts. So I'm assuming that, uh, National Highways and the two county councils probably saw it, um, perhaps a bit even a bit earlier than than we did. Um, so I was just going to ask quite a, um, a wide ranging question, perhaps starting with the two county councils.

00:59:40:04 - 01:00:09:27

Um, obviously we spent quite a lot of time at issue specific hearing, one talking about, um, ales, um, routing, etc.. Um, perhaps, maybe starting with Essex County Council. Um, do you having seen the technical notes consider that addresses the concerns that you may have had um, earlier at ish one, or was there something else or something more that you were looking for?

01:00:11:13 - 01:00:12:13

Um, Mr. Hough.

01:00:13:01 - 01:00:53:10

There's a forth on behalf of Essex County Council. It contains the, um, I think the information that we we would have had expected it to. Um, we do have concerns still around ensuring that the structural adequacy of the route and um, but potentially that we've, I think I don't want to speak for anyone, but in regards to the applicant, but we had some discussion around the potential that that, um, work stream could be post required post examination, which I don't think we're against in terms of undertaking that structural review. Um, one thing I think that would be helpful in our point of view is there's reference to obviously, road condition surveys, and that's set out in the TNP at 1043.

01:00:53:19 - 01:01:30:00

And it um, the wording in there is, I believe, um, some roads or some uh, or wording similar to that. And I think it would be useful for our point of view if we could agree exactly what roads would be, um, surveyed within that, that draft document. Um, but apart from those two points, I don't think we had anything in addition, at this point in time, obviously, um, whilst we did receive the draft earlier, it

probably worth just for your context. We didn't either, um, within that draft to see the numbers or and the PA assessments, which obviously are the sweatpants probably the thing that's going to take the most review in terms of these sorts of documents.

01:01:30:02 - 01:01:36:02

Um, so just with regards to that, um, you know, we'll be on the next deadline. Thank you.

01:01:40:06 - 01:02:11:19

Thank you. Um, you actually picked up my, uh, my next question, which was going to be around mitigation and whether you were sort of happy with that proposed approach of the sort of road conditions surveys and then, uh, undertaking any necessary repairs. And it sounds like in principle, you're okay with that approach, but would, um, make the ask of the applicant whether they could sort of specify which roads, um, might be within the scope for the road condition surveys.

01:02:11:29 - 01:02:12:14

Um.

01:02:14:08 - 01:02:23:08

is that something that in principle, the applicant would be happy to, um, specify?

01:02:27:05 - 01:02:30:01

Not not right now, but in some future revision.

01:03:02:12 - 01:03:04:25

Um, for the applicant. Um,

01:03:06:22 - 01:03:27:08

the reason for some hesitation on our end is that while we could put something in the outline plan at the moment. It would be subject to change and review at detailed design, and when we had the details of the proposals. So it's not and it couldn't in any way be a final list at this time. It could only be the ones we think are most likely, for example. So we are willing to take that away and look at it under that quite heavy caveat.

01:03:29:21 - 01:03:42:20

Yeah, I expected that was going to be the answer to that. So um, yeah, maybe if you could take that away, um, and discuss with Essex County Council what might be a sensible way forward on that.

01:03:47:01 - 01:04:02:07

A um, so turning to, um, assuming, um, Essex County Council don't have anything further to say on the points of aisles at the moment. Great. Thank you for confirming. Uh, so turning to Mr. Bedford for Suffolk County Council.

01:04:02:12 - 01:04:44:00

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So obviously the document uh, rep to 0 to 9 is helpful in terms of the information that it provides, but it doesn't seek in any way to function as a control document. It's an information, uh, document. Um, and whilst, uh, it seems to be giving the message that there would be no, um, expectation of utilising the Suffolk local road network that isn't actually, as it were, copper bottomed, uh, in the document.

01:04:44:13 - 01:05:23:22

Uh, so that if you look at, for example, paragraph 2.2.3 that recognises that the large electrical equipment could come via the strategic road network and not be limited to Harwich. And so then there's a question of, well, where may they, um, be coming from to access the strategic road network. And then paragraph 4.3.2 notes that in relation to the cable drums, which would be category three, the largest category of the special types general order SDG.

01:05:23:27 - 01:05:57:07

So it says they could arrive from the A12. And again there is an issue as to, well, what is happening to them before they get to those parts of the A12 which are the strategic road network. So, I mean, our simple point is that if we've got in the control documents, clearly written controls, which make it clear that ales are not going to be utilising the local highway network, which is the responsibility of the county council, then we would have no concerns.

01:05:57:09 - 01:06:22:10

But at the moment we don't think that the applicant is committing, uh, to those um, uh, positions. And so I say the the mood music is there, but we want to see more assurance and delivery so that we can be confident that there won't be those impacts through Ale movements on the Suffolk local highway network.

01:06:22:16 - 01:06:23:01

Thank you sir.

01:06:28:19 - 01:06:42:27

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. I'm pretty sure that comes back to your earlier point about, um, uh, control documents. Um, I don't know whether the applicant wanted to say anything, um, you know, more specific to this point or.

01:06:44:15 - 01:07:13:07

Uh, ambiguity for the applicant. We will be very brief. Um, the two points we would like to make is that the CMP does have controls on aisles, and aisles are subject to as set out in. There's no the need for particular kinds of order to be obtained before the moved on the highway network. We don't think that there is any need for the DCO to start duplicating, for example, a special types or the special movement orders regime because they exist to serve that purpose and protect the highways from ISIL movements. So.

01:07:15:07 - 01:07:17:10

That's what that's all I think we can see in the morning.

01:07:23:27 - 01:07:31:11

Thank you. Uh, miss McGeady. Um, Mr. Bedford, did you want to respond to that response? Yeah.

01:07:31:19 - 01:08:06:22

Thank you sir. Yes. What we want to see made explicit in the TMP is what in theory ought to be implicit, that there will not be a I l movements using the local highway network within Suffolk. Now, if that is the applicant's intention, it's actually very easy to write that into the documentation. But at the moment we don't see that it is written in in a way which is explicit and therefore we continue to have a concern.

01:08:18:08 - 01:08:26:19

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Um, anything that the applicant wants to say. Um, in response to the response to the response.

01:08:27:24 - 01:08:54:04

Yes. Sorry, sorry. Um, Paula McAteer for the applicant. Um, we don't think we need to get into a massive debate on this, but as a point of principle, we just don't see how it's reasonable for Suffolk to say that we should not be allowed a single movement and thereby we don't work, regardless of the circumstances or where one thing is coming from and the controls and regulations that are in place in such movements under legislation. Just as a point of principle, we don't think that's a reasonable position.

01:09:02:10 - 01:09:02:25

Um.

01:09:03:28 - 01:09:08:06

We will move on from this in a minute. But, Mr. Bedford, did you want to, um.

01:09:09:01 - 01:09:09:16

Uh.

01:09:09:27 - 01:09:11:02

Counter that at all?

01:09:11:05 - 01:09:41:10

Well, so. Yes. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, uh, the applicant puts forward to a, um, assessment of the, uh, traffic control support effects of the scheme, and that proceeds on the basis of assessing certain things but not other things. And the applicant hasn't assessed the suitability of routes within Suffolk. In terms of the local highway network, their suitability to cater for ales.

01:09:43:05 - 01:10:17:21

There is certainly, as we think we've answered in, um, the local impact report. Uh, there is a particular corridor, the A1 37 south of Ipswich, which is a particular concern, but there are routes within Suffolk which are sensitive, which we would not wish to see. I ls utilizing without there being a proper assessment of them. And since the applicant hasn't assessed them, we consider that if the applicant wants to, as it were, continue with the position that they don't require to be assessed, then it follows.

01:10:17:23 - 01:10:26:04

We would suggest that there needs to be a control which ensures that Ales do not utilize the local highway network in Suffolk.

01:10:37:10 - 01:10:38:08

Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

01:10:40:01 - 01:10:40:16

Um.

01:10:43:06 - 01:10:50:10

I don't know whether it's sort of much mileage in going further on this point, uh, right now. Uh, Mr. McGeady.

01:10:50:21 - 01:10:54:20

Uh, Paul McGuinness. No, sir. I don't think there's anything you could say that we've moved this on.

01:10:59:01 - 01:11:29:28

Um. Could I just ask a perhaps a naive question as, um, um, not being a sort of highway engineer in terms of the, um, sort of permissions that are required for rail movements? Um, and your comments about not trying to duplicate another regime. Um, presumably it's going to say presumably the local highway authorities are engaged with that process drawn into that process in some way.

01:11:30:03 - 01:11:38:17

Um, that's a slightly open question to either the county councils or the highway or the applicant.

01:11:57:15 - 01:12:06:10

Uh, well, we could do that. We don't have that detail our fingertips. So we do know that they are notified through the process. We would need to check on quite where all the approvals set for the different kinds.

01:12:09:03 - 01:12:18:26

That's fine. Um, perhaps if would you be able to just follow up on it with a quick note after the, uh, the hearing on that, that point, that would be helpful. Thank you.

01:12:23:14 - 01:12:25:18

Okay. I think.

01:12:27:23 - 01:12:30:24

My colleague, Mr. Gould, has indicated he wants to. I just think.

01:12:30:26 - 01:13:03:02

Just wondering on this particular point. Suffolk has a concern about roads that may or may not be used. There potentially needs to be an identification of which ports, perhaps in Suffolk's area, might be used. If Harwich wasn't available there, then perhaps needs to be a consideration as to which routes from whichever ports in Suffolk might be used as an alternative, um, would or not be suitable.

01:13:03:05 - 01:13:53:14

I'm just wondering whether this is a topic that might more useful be covered in the statement of common ground that no doubt is being worked on in the background, or will shortly be worked upon in earnest. Um, and perhaps that might be a more useful way of trying to crack this particular nut. Um, otherwise we could potentially go around in circles for a little while trying to work out which roads in particular are of concern to suffer, because presumably, if the applicant was potentially having to look at some Suffolk ports as a fallback, you will already be looking at some roads, perhaps, and deciding they wouldn't be suitable for loads of 300 tonnes, 400 tonnes or whatever.

01:13:58:02 - 01:14:28:12

You do without looking. Just just to be very clear, we're only looking at maximum of four loads at that size. That is not the majority of our URLs. We do not have ports and we cannot commit to ports at this stage. What we would see on ports. And again, we suspect there is going to be more discussion on pause. We would be going into an operating commercial port. We would not be adding new traffic to that port. We'd be using a berth in that port. So we would just be part of the normal traffic flow in and out of that port to most likely the nearest point on the screen.

01:14:28:14 - 01:14:44:11

So our vehicles are not anything new or different to what it's already going in that port. So not knowing the port, and given that we don't accept, we are creating additional traffic to and from that port, we don't see the utility in providing any sort of assessment.

01:14:44:13 - 01:15:21:06

I think there is a difference that there may well well, there are a number of ports in Suffolk that are Um, handling cargo, but that's potentially normal road going cargo rather than abnormal indivisible loads, which at the scale that are being talked about, um, are quite substantial. There is then also the potential issue on a cumulative side of things, that, yes, five industries may have two loads, four loads, or however many North Falls might similarly have a number, and then National Grid might also have a number.

01:15:28:10 - 01:15:52:27

On that. And fundamentally so we will be limited where we can take carriers by what the port can handle, and that is what the port can handle. So if they are able to take our heavy loads, they're able to take other people's heavy loads. We're not going to be outside what that port can handle, which is struggling a little bit just to understand why our traffic going in or out of port is any different to anybody else's.

01:16:00:00 - 01:16:39:10

So so if I if I can Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council if one can sort of step back slightly from this, the applicant fully accepts that in relation to the Wan port that it has identified as the primary um arrival port for particular I ls, that's to say Harwich, that it needs, if it is to utilize that port to ensure that the um highway network that connects that port to its uh center of construction activities is suitable for the purpose.

01:16:39:23 - 01:17:35:21

Uh, the the applicant doesn't seek to advance a proposition that any traffic that goes into Harwich is within the capacity of Harwich and therefore, uh, as it were, it is of no account. The applicant recognises that in relation to that it needs to carry out the assessment work which obviously it is presented. We are in, uh, no different positions, save that the applicant is not at this stage identified an intention to use either ports in Suffolk or I should add, because Great Yarmouth is a port that would be also in the frame, but is effectively only accessible from Great Yarmouth to the construction sites of relevance to this scheme via using um Suffolk's local highway network.

01:17:35:23 - 01:18:06:09

And you'll be presumably aware that the A12 to the north of Ipswich is not part of the strategic road network. It's part of the county Council's uh, local road network. Um, and it's not, as it were, an issue of what can the port accommodate the traffic? It's once one's left, as it were, the environs of the port. The only place one goes to is the local highway network.

01:18:06:24 - 01:19:20:01

Before long, then gets to the strategic road network. So that's why it's of concern, uh, to the county council as local highway authority. Uh, and we also absolutely echo your observation that there is a cumulative issue to this from the number of Nip projects happening within or adjacent to Suffolk, which may also generate a need for, um, abnormal indivisible loads. And I say we don't see this as an unreasonable, uh, request that if the applicant wishes to continue with the approach that its ales would not utilize the local highway network in Suffolk, then we say simply what can we have that secured through a control document? Alternatively, the applicant, for whatever reason, wishes to maintain, as

it were, the flexibility or the fallback of potentially utilizing, uh, the um, local road network in Suffolk for abnormal indivisible loads, then there ought to be an assessment of the suitability of those roads.

01:19:20:03 - 01:19:57:22

I say we have already mentioned the A1 three seven south of Ipswich has particular constraints, and it may be that what one does is one assesses it and then excludes, as it were, particular routes which are particularly unsuitable. But either way, if the applicant wants to maintain, as it were, the flexibility of, well, potentially using Suffolk's Suffix root, then there ought to be an assessment of the suitability of that for abnormal, indivisible loads. So perhaps then the final point is, yes, we're very happy to explore, as it were, the debate and discussion on that through the statement of Common ground.

01:19:57:24 - 01:20:13:27

But that might simply, uh, certainly at this stage of the process, might simply be a way of taking the disagreement out of the examination room and into meeting rooms elsewhere, because at the moment there doesn't seem to be a common meeting of minds.

01:20:42:23 - 01:20:51:23

Not wishing to prolong the discussion unduly further. Is there anything the applicant wants to comment on in terms of what Mr. Bedford has just said?

01:20:59:04 - 01:21:07:23

All I'm asking you for that, I think so fundamentally, we are just not going to agree on this point and that there is not a whole lot we could say that would be useful to you in particular at this moment.

01:21:11:27 - 01:21:26:23

Okay. I think the best way that we can address this is the examiner authority will have a think about how it thinks it might be necessary to progress this matter and potentially address it through written questions that will be issuing in just over a week's time.

01:21:30:23 - 01:21:31:13

Thank you.

01:21:33:27 - 01:22:14:21

So, um, moving on to the, uh, fifth and final um, of the subheadings e um around control and mitigation measures. Um, set out in the construction traffic management plan. Uh, workforce travel plan. Um, I think, um, Mr. Moran, in his introduction, uh, helpfully answered my first question as to whether, in light of, uh, deadline one comments by Essex County Council, uh, the applicant considers that the outline c tmp and or um, uh, UTP uh, needs updating.

01:22:14:23 - 01:22:21:17

I think you've, um, indicated that that's that's happening. So thank you for that. Um. That's helpful.

01:22:23:19 - 01:23:13:13

Um, and yeah, I guess, uh, my other question is sort of taking us back to back to ports. Um, and, uh, so, uh, I think the applicant's already alluded to it, that you're aware of the responses that came back from both Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council in Reps to 045 and Rep 2047, in answering exc T107 that both um councils came to review that they still consider that an outline port construction management plan or something titled similar, um, would be required.

01:23:14:06 - 01:23:44:21

Um, I think perhaps Essex um, if I'm not misquoting um said perhaps potentially more for operation. Um, more for operational and maintenance traffic. Um, and I think Suffolk County Council, uh, helpfully pointed out a potential benefit, um, that such a document might further support the use of sustainable transport, where provision is likely to be greater than for workers that are employed on the onshore cable route.

01:23:45:16 - 01:23:46:01

Um,

01:23:47:11 - 01:24:02:29

I think, I think I heard the, um, what the answer was going to be earlier from the applicant. Um, but, um, what what are your views on the necessity or otherwise for a port traffic management plan of some kind?

01:24:04:24 - 01:24:40:07

Uh, Parliament for the applicant. Our view, sir, is very firmly that there is no necessity for it. And it would not meet the planning tests to be imposed of us. Because of that, any space we are not, we are not consenting. New port, berthing space, any space we take within a port is a space that already exists and is being used by ships. We do not see why if we took this based on for as a complete example, a Tuesday, our traffic should be treated any differently to the traffic generated on the Monday or the Wednesday or the Thursday, because there is only so many berths within that port that it's only so much that port can deal with.

01:24:40:09 - 01:24:55:00

We would be buying some of that port space. We are not building new port space. We do not see that it would be justified to impose on us a control of our traffic that's not imposed on the traffic generated by the other berths on the other days.

01:24:58:02 - 01:25:12:08

Thank you for that succinct response. Um, having heard that response, perhaps turning first to Essex County Council, um, did you have any, um, comments in response?

01:25:14:21 - 01:25:52:03

On behalf of Essex County Council? Um. Thank you. Yeah. Um, mostly, I think from our point of view, the aim was to try and achieve a sustainable transport behavior in the locality, potentially review the impact to see whether they might have, um, exceeded those that are within that existing permission. Um, I appreciate the point that we made around existing use, etc., and that it has potentially an existing permission within itself. But that was the aim. It was more of a a document that would help kind of reduce impacts on the local highway network and beyond what might occur without some form of travel planning in place, that sort of thing.

01:25:52:15 - 01:25:53:00

Thank you.

01:25:55:23 - 01:25:59:25

Thank you, Mr. Hough. And, um, Suffolk County Council.

01:26:00:24 - 01:26:27:09

Thank you sir. Mike Bedford, Suffolk county council. So we consider that the applicant is misconceived in its approach. Uh, the starting point is in, um, the, um, 2017 environmental impact assessment, uh, regulations. And in schedule four, paragraph five,

01:26:28:27 - 01:26:51:18

uh, there is a, a requirement on the applicant to include in the environmental impact assessment and assessment of the effects of the project. And that should include the direct effects, the indirect effects, the secondary effects, and so on.

01:26:53:17 - 01:27:13:27

What the applicant is not able to say is that the traffic, which is associated both with its construction activities and with its operational activities, is not an effect of the proposal.

01:27:17:06 - 01:27:32:10

Therefore, in principle, those effects both should be assessed and then to the extent that they give rise to any material impacts, they should be mitigated.

01:27:34:06 - 01:27:40:28

And what the applicant is suggesting to you is effectively a substitution argument,

01:27:42:24 - 01:27:49:16

which is to say, yes, we are having an effect, but we are substituting for something that would otherwise happen.

01:27:52:18 - 01:28:04:19

That needs to be demonstrated if the applicant is to assert that there is actually no net effect on a highway network.

01:28:11:25 - 01:28:59:29

And that has not been done. And the purpose of a port construction traffic management plan is not simply to regulate, as it were, activities within the port. It's the interface between the port and the wider um, highway network. It is not clearly unprecedented, as we have identified in our local Impact report. The offshore wind farms that East Anglia one North and East Anglia two, which in in overall terms are not dissimilar projects in that they are offshore in the North Sea, providing a series of wind turbines which then have to be constructed and then have to be operated and maintained.

01:29:00:07 - 01:29:35:17

And there clearly was neither an issue raised by the promoters of those projects, nor by the examining authority, nor by the Secretary of State in approving those requirements with the principle of a um port construction management plan. And it is with respect, uh, not, um, a relevant consideration in determining as to whether this is an effect of the development or not.

01:29:35:19 - 01:30:09:20

To ask. Well, does it itself require any separate development to be carried out, i.e. are we, as it were, going to build a new building within the port or a new berth within the port? That is not the test of whether or not something is a direct or indirect effect of the proposal. Uh, what is the effect? Is the traffic that is generated, and that is something which I say needs to be assessed. And to the extent that it has material impacts, it needs to be mitigated. So so we see that there is clearly a need for such a a plan.

01:30:10:00 - 01:30:49:06

The position is in a sense compounded in this case because the applicant for um its um reasons, as previous explained, has not settled on a port that it would use, leaving aside the particular reference to Harwich. So the applicant's not able to say, albeit this is something that it has advanced in its written submissions, the applicant is not able to say that whatever the traffic effects are, they necessarily sit within the umbrella of the original consent for that board because they may or may not want to.

01:30:49:08 - 01:31:25:02

One simply doesn't know because one doesn't know which port one's talking about. And some of these boats clearly have a great deal of black history. And I suspect that many of them don't actually have a up to date planning permission which regulates them because of that back history. So so I say we consider continue to consider that there is a need to do this. We consider that the applicants approach is misconceived. I appreciate that at the moment we are apart, but we would hope that with sensible dialogue we can come to an agreed position.

01:31:35:00 - 01:31:36:16

Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

01:31:39:05 - 01:32:03:27

I appreciate that. Um, you know, perhaps, um, similar to the previous item where there was, um, quite a long way between parties. It might be something that we, as an excise need to follow up, uh, in writing, uh, our next round of written questions, but, um, uh, I don't know whether the applicant wanted to come back on any points in the hearing now.

01:32:10:09 - 01:32:46:17

Uh, well, let me give you for the applicant. Um, I suspect this is probably better followed up in writing. Um, we are aware that other, other offshore wind farms have these poor conditions, but we are also aware that some of them are just not working and just not serving any useful purpose. And and we can we can provide examples of that from industry knowledge. We would also just note that the EIA regulations, um, do recognise that there will be data gaps, that every single little item cannot be assessed to the nth degree, and we do not know which ports we are going to be using.

01:32:46:24 - 01:32:56:01

Um, there has to be a limit somewhere. But fundamentally I think this is going to have to be put into the written submissions. So there's not a whole lot further I can take this today.

01:33:01:25 - 01:33:03:09

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. McGeady.

01:33:10:00 - 01:33:37:00

So I think possibly at this stage, um, certainly that's that's all the questions that I had at this stage around sort of, um, control documents. Um, don't know whether any other parties, either in the room or online, had any further points they wanted to make in relation to this particular item. Oh, uh, Mr. Bedford.

01:33:37:21 - 01:34:20:24

Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So the only point is perhaps just to draw it into, uh, this agenda item is I did mention previously the issue about the construction traffic associated with the Lbg mitigation area and notwithstanding the applicant's position that it's not a great deal of work and therefore not a great deal of traffic. We consider the sensitivity of the corridor that gives access to that

part of Orford Ness is such that there is a need, if the applicant is right, that it's not going to involve many weeks of work and not many vehicles for that to be secured through the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

01:34:20:26 - 01:34:26:01

Presently. At present, there is no mention of the works at Orford Ness in that document.

01:34:35:09 - 01:34:36:09

Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

01:34:40:00 - 01:34:46:15

I can see the applicants teams got their heads together. Any anything you wanted to respond on that point?

01:34:50:12 - 01:35:26:03

Well, I could if the applicant. Um. Two very short points, sir. Firstly, the KTP covers the main onshore works. It doesn't. It was never intended to cover our furnaces there to regulate our main works and our bulk of traffic. And our second point is you do not mitigate for effects which are essentially negligible. We are. The traffic generated by these works is essentially negligible. We are talking about six people We expect to be working on these works, so we do not we do not concede that it is necessary to secure medication for that because it is not a significant impact.

01:35:32:26 - 01:35:33:24

Thank you for that.

01:35:36:16 - 01:35:39:21

Mr. Bedford, did you want to come back at all on that negligible point?

01:35:40:28 - 01:36:12:21

That is not our assessment of the sensitivity of the corridor. And the point is that what the applicant is saying is effectively not something that the applicant is prepared to commit to, that the works will be of the limited scale. If the applicant is prepared to commit to that, then. Matters may be different, but there is no control document that limits the applicant either to the numbers of persons that have been referred to, or to the duration that has been referred to.

01:36:12:23 - 01:36:17:16

So one isn't, with respect, able to say that the impacts are negligible.

01:36:31:10 - 01:36:39:03

Thank you. Um, I'll just give the applicant one last chance to come back on this point. But I suspect again, it'll be something we'll be following up in writing.

01:36:41:13 - 01:36:44:19

Well, thank you for that. There is nothing we can usefully add at this time, sir.

01:36:45:27 - 01:36:47:15

Okay. Thank you. Fair enough.

01:36:49:12 - 01:37:10:09

Um, so that brings me to the end of, um, my questions generally on, um, onshore traffic and transport. Um, is there anything that anyone, either in the room or online, um, thinks that we haven't covered today in the hearing that we usefully should.

01:37:13:28 - 01:37:22:06

Okay. Not seeing any actual or virtual hands up. So thank you all very much for your contributions to.

01:37:22:08 - 01:37:22:25

That.

01:37:23:10 - 01:37:33:23

Agenda item. Um, I will now hand over to Mr. Gould for agenda item four, which is any other business.

01:37:36:14 - 01:38:10:14

Uh. Thank you. I'm conscious. We've been sitting for an hour and a half. Um, I've got a couple of points on any other business. I don't know what others may have. The. It's really in your hands as to whether you want to sit through, perhaps for another 20 minutes, and then we adjourn. Well, in fact, we don't adjourn. We close this hearing, and that will be the end of the day's business. Or whether parties want to adjourn for 15, 20 minutes. And we come back to finish off what might be around 20 minutes worth of work.

01:38:10:29 - 01:38:13:18

Looking at the applicants team. Any thoughts?

01:38:14:02 - 01:38:18:00

Oh, I'll make it up. Can we be content to keep setting and try and get to the close of the hearings.

01:38:18:18 - 01:38:19:03

And.

01:38:19:05 - 01:38:19:27

For the local authorities?

01:38:21:02 - 01:38:21:26

So thank you, Mark.

01:38:22:04 - 01:38:23:05

I agree.

01:38:23:27 - 01:38:34:15

Carry on. And for those partaking, uh, or participating online, any observations as to whether we just carry on for probably another 20 or so minutes?

01:38:36:09 - 01:38:43:06

I'm not seeing any indications that we shouldn't. So I think that's perhaps the way that we should progress.

01:38:52:12 - 01:39:40:23

Okay. Well, if I, if I deal with my couple of points of, um, other business first and then I'll ask anybody else if there's anything they wish to raise. Um, for the applicant, it's really, um, a clarification in respect of the deadline two submission that the Ministry of Defense made, which is Rep 2055. The Mod in that representation are maintaining an objection to the proposed development on the basis of interference with their radar system, but they seem to be doing it on the basis of the turbines having a height, uh, or maximum height above mean high water of 395m, which I actually think is 399m, because that's what was originally proposed.

01:39:40:28 - 01:39:59:00

Um, can the applicant advise as to whether or not you understand the Mod are working off the right information or not? Because certainly their representation suggests that perhaps they hadn't caught up with the change made to the DCO or the draft DCO at deadline one.

01:40:00:12 - 01:40:07:16

Uh, well, I could if that. And yes, sir, we have been in contact with the Mod in our understanding is that they simply hadn't caught up with that change.

01:40:19:18 - 01:40:33:05

So it potentially will be for us then, I think as a secondary in question, to go back to the Mod and ask for an update on the basis of the amended DCO and see where that takes us.

01:40:35:09 - 01:40:35:24

Thank you.

01:40:39:27 - 01:41:20:08

Um, and then also picking up, um, a deadline two submission that was made by East Anglia, two in rec two hyphen zero 79, which is the issue of weight cloths that they've raised in their representation. Um, and this examining authority is aware that this is perhaps something that is now cropping up in other live examinations because we are now at a situation where there are a number of windfarm farm extension projects also taking place close to other existing, um, wind farms.

01:41:21:00 - 01:41:21:15

Um.

01:41:24:11 - 01:41:35:02

Has the applicant considered undertaking an assessment to address the concern that's been raised, or can you indicate why you think an assessment may not be necessary?

01:42:00:11 - 01:42:02:14

Julian Boswell for the applicant

01:42:04:08 - 01:42:25:12

The applicant is still considering the E2 rep that has been received, but would make the observation that, um, in the absence of considerable detail from E2, it wouldn't be possible for the applicant to conduct a meaningful assessment.

01:42:27:13 - 01:42:43:04

All too well, it could conduct. I'm trying to choose my words carefully. Yes. The quality of the assessment is affected substantially by the information as regards the project that the Wak effects is being impacted on.

01:42:46:01 - 01:43:02:28

And that information would normally be regarded as confidential. And yes, this is playing out sir, as I think you realise across multiple projects, um, in real time and that's all we want to say at the moment.

01:43:07:22 - 01:43:15:26

Okay. I think what the examining authority again on this point will reflect on it and potentially, um,

01:43:17:23 - 01:43:26:17

raise some question or questions of parties, uh, in act two to, um,

01:43:28:06 - 01:43:32:24

I mean, you indicated a minute ago that you would need information from.

01:43:34:27 - 01:44:24:27

East Anglia to, um, is this something? Because if I recall correctly, you're due to be entering in a statement of common ground with East Anglia two. Is this something again, because there might be commercial sensitivity around the information, um, that through those, those discussions, you may be able to get to a point where at least they can provide the sort of information they think you need to assess to be able to understand what effect there may or may not be, because presumably this is all really down to what is the distance between the two wind farms and how the two sets of turbines might interplay with one another in terms of one drawing upon the wind that another might need to operate effectively.

01:44:26:07 - 01:45:01:19

Julian puzzled the applicant two things, because I don't think it makes sense for us to get into a big discussion about this today. It is our current position that we are not intending to conduct an assessment. And in terms of what this is quotes really about. Um, I would venture to suggest that it's really about the fact that the Crown Estate set buffers for each of the different rounds that there were, which until very recently were generally accepted as resolving this issue.

01:45:16:14 - 01:45:21:09

Take it from what you just said about the criminal state. They have changed the rules of the game.

01:45:21:11 - 01:45:22:08

No, not at all. No.

01:45:24:00 - 01:46:08:10

The trigger for this. So up until the hour and more application, which is not very long ago, weight class was never raised in the context of examinations. And there was an acceptance that the interpretation of the relevant wording in the national policy statements as regards impact on other sea bed users did not include the impact on other offshore wind farms And in the context of our lawnmower, the neighbouring wind farm Real Flats chose to, in effect, challenge that approach.

01:46:08:12 - 01:46:20:22

And without taking you through everything that's followed, that is the the trigger, as it were, for this becoming, um, a topic of,

01:46:22:09 - 01:46:25:02

yes, a, uh, a new topic.

01:46:34:19 - 01:47:06:01

As you indicated earlier, in responding to the deadline submission, you'll clearly be making, uh, five estuaries position. Um, I won't be committing that to writing. That's fine. Um, we'll consider, um, what we think may or may not be necessary as a response. Um, but at least this afternoon, we've got some clarity on what what the applicant applicant's approach, um, to the issue is at this point. Thank you.

01:47:07:16 - 01:47:16:14

Um, are there any other matters of, um, other business that anybody wishes to raise? Turning to the applicant first. Anything from your side?

01:47:19:09 - 01:47:19:26

No, sir.

01:47:20:15 - 01:47:23:02

Anything from the council's Essex?

01:47:24:02 - 01:47:24:17

No, sir.

01:47:24:28 - 01:47:26:10

Anything from Suffolk?

01:47:26:14 - 01:47:27:13

No, no thank you, sir.

01:47:28:18 - 01:47:38:04

And anything from anybody who is still on line representing, um, any other party. Not seeing anything.

01:47:40:24 - 01:47:41:09

Okay.

01:47:43:10 - 01:47:52:01

That then I think takes us on to agenda item five, which are action points.

01:47:56:11 - 01:48:05:21

Is somebody from the applicant team, and I've got a very rough notes and it's been getting ever rougher, but hopefully they're going to tally up.

01:48:13:11 - 01:48:13:26

Um,

01:48:15:15 - 01:48:24:00

just before we start. So can I just confirm that the first one I had noted down was directed to Brooks leave you whether or not you intended that to be an action point on this list?

01:48:24:06 - 01:48:37:04

Well, it is, but it's a matter that has already been addressed. So we we we can actually park that one. Okay. We received, uh, what was required overnight. Uh, so that will be published shortly.

01:48:37:10 - 01:48:37:25

Okay.

01:48:38:13 - 01:48:53:20

Um, so the next one I have is the applicant to advise on progress and meeting with the Environment Agency. And when will we be in a position to update on groundwater and hydraulic connectivity? Um, we are to provide that I believe, as soon as we possibly can.

01:48:59:14 - 01:49:03:22

Is that likely to be a deadline three or a deadline for response?

01:49:09:22 - 01:49:19:14

It's somewhat out of our hands because we need the Aeaeea to come back to us, or so we are happy to provide an update on our on where we have got to it deadline three. But we cannot necessarily answer all of the questions.

01:49:19:19 - 01:49:37:01

Yeah, I mean, it's more useful for the examining authority and everybody else. We actually get the final product. I think if we say deadline for that ought to be sufficient time for things to be progressed and, uh, addressed with the Environment Agency.

01:49:42:14 - 01:49:51:14

Next one I have is applicant to submit the drainage plans provided to us by DNR. Fairly farming partnership. Uh, I'm assuming that's a deadline three action, sir.

01:49:52:00 - 01:49:52:17

Yeah. Thank you.

01:49:54:14 - 01:49:54:29

Um.

01:49:57:24 - 01:50:08:12

The next item is to provide a technical note on the whole roads between Bentley Road and the önce, and there's quite a long list of what that's to cover. If you don't know if you would like me to run through that list or not, sir.

01:50:30:04 - 01:50:37:13

Yeah. We were certainly seeking clarity as to what the routes were, what what the purposes would be.

01:50:40:07 - 01:50:41:11

Instruction.

01:50:43:26 - 01:50:46:22

With the duration of use.

01:50:49:01 - 01:50:51:26

And I really don't know what I wrote at the end of that note.

01:50:51:28 - 01:51:13:09

The additional items I have. So it would be the surfacing options. Um, the clarification of the operations as and what's included, the, um, consideration of going around field margins and headlands and reinstatement and what the approach to discussion with landowners would be around the particular routing within the red line of these routes.

01:51:13:20 - 01:51:14:05

Yeah.

01:51:14:08 - 01:51:17:08

Yeah. The bit I couldn't read was reinstatement.

01:51:18:00 - 01:51:18:15

Um.

01:51:18:24 - 01:51:32:22

We would like to suggest, sir, that we could combine the next point into this note as well as that was to do with the the maximum weight that, um, these temporary routes can take. We think that would be just sensible consolidation.

01:51:35:05 - 01:51:35:20

Yeah.

01:51:43:13 - 01:51:47:12

Um, in terms of timing. So we would suggest the deadline for for that note.

01:51:57:25 - 01:51:58:10

Yeah.

01:51:58:20 - 01:52:00:14

Yep. That would seem reasonable.

01:52:02:26 - 01:52:15:00

Sir. Um. The next point I have is the applicant to open discussions with Harwich on a statement of common ground, including how the various associations that they work with can be picked up through that process.

01:52:16:25 - 01:52:18:29

Um, the applicant to prepare a note.

01:52:19:08 - 01:52:19:23

Uh.

01:52:19:25 - 01:52:22:06

Just one other point on that. Um,

01:52:23:29 - 01:52:39:08

we've said all, um, statement of common ground to be submitted in their final form for deadline five as we sit here. Uh, is there any reason why you don't think that one could be concluded by deadline five?

01:52:40:24 - 01:52:41:09

I'm.

01:52:45:20 - 01:52:46:27

Happy to try, sir.

01:53:01:21 - 01:53:03:05

And next item.

01:53:03:20 - 01:53:16:19

Uh, the next item is the likelihood of the need of nighttime working on the A120 Bentley Road junction. What activities that would involve. And the noise impacts. And what's been assessed for those noise impacts? Yeah.

01:53:26:25 - 01:53:27:10

Um.

01:53:34:19 - 01:53:38:22

But again, we're going to suggest that line four. But because we need to engage with national highways.

01:53:47:01 - 01:53:47:19

The

01:53:49:14 - 01:53:58:08

applicant to update on the progress on the noise investigation protocol. And when we think we can submit and where we will be able to submit that. Um.

01:54:02:23 - 01:54:14:16

Um, in terms of when we think we could submit that, we, we think we will be in a position to submit at least a draft of that protocol to your deadline. Five, sir. So I don't know in terms of the action point to update you if there's actually any action outstanding.

01:54:28:04 - 01:54:32:18

I didn't just catch the the end on timescales. What sort of timescale do you.

01:54:34:27 - 01:54:40:03

Um, what I'm saying sir, as we think we'll be able to submit the actual protocol, not just an update around five.

01:54:40:18 - 01:54:41:03

Okay.

01:54:41:05 - 01:54:43:21

And when did it by deadline by five.

01:54:57:00 - 01:55:10:13

The next section I have, sir, is to provide the citations for, um, all of the designated sites and if necessary, their, um, confirmation that this the screening matrices have considered all of the species in those days organizations.

01:55:31:04 - 01:55:33:17

But we propose that could be submitted at deadline three. So.

01:55:38:05 - 01:55:43:26

That before that it may be. You come in with your next point because we may be out of sync.

01:55:45:20 - 01:55:46:05

Um.

01:55:47:20 - 01:56:04:14

The next point I had started was to look for any current evidence for birds learning to avoid wind turbines, and whether or not there's differences between species and that behavior. Um, again, that's a essentially a quick literature review to see if there is any evidence out there for.

01:56:05:16 - 01:56:06:01

That's fine.

01:56:06:03 - 01:56:07:12

We were out of sync. So that's.

01:56:07:14 - 01:56:09:07

Okay. Okay. Um.

01:56:10:25 - 01:56:25:02

The next one I have is the applicant is to add one viewpoint to represent further into the didn't feel O and B, which viewpoint is to be agreed with. Um Essex County Council and Beaver District Council.

01:56:28:03 - 01:56:36:01

Um the the applicant to submit a copy of the National Grid substation safety fencing rules.

01:56:38:02 - 01:56:45:15

Which can be deadly. Three as well. Sorry, I've realized I just skipped over the the viewpoint visualization deadline.

01:56:48:15 - 01:56:58:00

Oh, I think Mrs. Phillips advised earlier today that it would she would like to the end of the year to do that because of the need for a weather window to take photographs.

01:57:00:17 - 01:57:01:02

But

01:57:02:18 - 01:57:04:19

that that means deadline five.

01:57:05:09 - 01:57:07:09

Or earlier if it's available. So.

01:57:07:11 - 01:57:07:26

Yeah.

01:57:10:23 - 01:57:15:09

Um, the rules on the substation fencing. Sorry. With deadline three.

01:57:18:05 - 01:57:31:28

Uh, the next one I have is on traffic, and it's about the temporal impacts and scenario three of the cumulative impacts on residents from multiple species of works.

01:57:34:24 - 01:57:36:22

Again, we proposed deadline three, sir.

01:57:42:11 - 01:58:00:11

I think I may get a out of order now, because the next one I have is on the Q2. Sorry, sorry. Um, to put in a note about, um, the tower maintenance and how and when that would be undertaken. Um, we will need to speak to another company about that. So if we could suggest, um, deadline for sorry, we would be grateful.

01:58:01:27 - 01:58:30:24

Yeah, I think, I think the, the point there is more about it's maintenance of the time bridge, because that apparently seems to have become quite a popular location for kittiwake. And if the because the bridge I think is due for fairly major refurbishment. Um, and it's what the implications might be while those works are ongoing as to what what effect that has on the kittiwake.

01:58:35:04 - 01:58:43:13

Because they might suddenly be an influx for the structure that is the substitute structure at Gateshead.

01:58:44:18 - 01:58:49:01

That is somewhat more challenging for us, sir. Um.

01:58:52:17 - 01:59:01:06

Could we possibly come back with a proposal on that? Because, frankly, I'm not in a position right now to know if we could even get our hands on the information we would need.

01:59:01:13 - 01:59:12:04

I think what we'll do with that one, then, is we'll pose a written question. Um, and then you can see how best to handle it. So we'll take that one out as an action.

01:59:22:25 - 01:59:35:25

Uh, the next one I have. Sorry. Back to traffic. I got out of order. Apologies, sir. Um, to add an explanation of the cumulative projects considered into the traffic chapter, and we can do that by deadline three. Yeah. Um.

01:59:38:05 - 01:59:51:22

To, uh, progress dialogue with Essex County Council regarding, um, road safety audit with the Bentley Road works. Um, and we can we we will seek to do that. And so of course we can provide an update on that deadline. Three.

02:00:02:09 - 02:00:16:03

Uh, the next item I have is to provide the work being done on the very heavy abnormal loads which work is being done in partnership with National Highways, and how we are going to identify options to use the A120.

02:00:23:00 - 02:00:27:04

Um, we have we're seeking deadline by for that, sir.

02:00:42:18 - 02:00:43:05

Yeah.

02:00:43:07 - 02:00:44:29

Deadline five or sooner that.

02:00:47:18 - 02:01:05:00

Uh, uh, the applicant review what we could, um, offer to Essex County Council in regards to specifying which highway should be subject to road condition surveys. Um, we will need to set up a discussion with Essex County Council, and that's what we're proposing deadline for, sir.

02:01:21:24 - 02:01:42:23

Uh, the last one I had was just to confirm which body approves the special orders for ales. Um, fundamentally sorry, it's the highway authority. So if they were on Suffolk's county's highways, it would be Suffolk County. I'm not sure that we particularly need to provide any further confirmation that, but we can do so if it would be helpful. If it's whoever the highway authority is, what we want to use is.

02:01:45:21 - 02:01:53:23

Yeah, I mean, I, I hadn't got that down in the list. So I kind of taken that for read. And I think Mr. Harrison is confirming that as well.

02:01:59:00 - 02:02:05:25

In terms of actions, is there anything that anybody else thinks that might have been missed?

02:02:07:25 - 02:02:09:15

The local authorities, Mr. Wood.

02:02:10:09 - 02:02:44:15

Sir. Thank you. Mark Wood. Yes, Council. Um, we did have a conversation yesterday about noise impact, and we agreed to set up a conversation between ourselves and the local environmental health officer to look at a number of topics, um, one of which is the noise implications for the substation, The cumulative effects of noise in relation to those substations. And you're also asked yesterday if we if we wish to, uh, request a vibration disturbance impact document on the residents of Bentley Road.

02:02:45:18 - 02:02:51:18

These are matters that, um, will raise in a discussion of five estuaries and Tendring District Council's environmental health officer.

02:02:51:20 - 02:03:00:29

Yes, there were a number of questions which we kind of part what we're going to do with those is put them in, put them in the written question, and then we'll see what flows out of that.

02:03:01:06 - 02:03:03:26

There were there are others. But I was just going to say that. Thank you.

02:03:05:28 - 02:03:06:15

Mr. Bedford.

02:03:07:07 - 02:03:38:04

Thank you, sir Mark for Suffolk County Council. I was only going to say that we will make sure in our post hearing submissions that we address our understanding of the relevant approval bodies for special, um, order or special movement orders. And at the moment, I think we think that the constabulary may have more of a role than perhaps the highway authority. So I say we'll make sure that in our post hearing submissions, we provide you with our understanding of the position.

02:03:54:18 - 02:04:00:15

Can I then just mention a timetable point, which, uh.

02:04:06:07 - 02:04:46:06

I don't think particularly, uh, in terms of the action points directly will bear overmuch on the county councils, the Suffolk County Council concerns. But I just notice, uh, that a number of actions have been placed at deadline five. And your timetable indicated. Reserve dates for a third round of hearings is the week commencing the 20th of January, which is only within ten days of deadline five, which would suggest that you've got to have made a decision and there's got to have been publication of notice of those hearings before we get to deadline five.

02:04:46:08 - 02:05:06:06

And I'm just wondering about how that might feature in your thinking. I say I'm more interested in the fact that, are there going to be such hearings, and if so, what's their content going to be? I'm not obviously over concerned about things that the applicant has indicated it needs to do to meet the action point.

02:05:06:08 - 02:05:50:18

We if we are going to have a third round of hearings, we may at least in giving notice that those hearings have to take quite a precautionary approach, and that might involve us Assuming there is less agreed than might actually be the case at the point that we get round the table, if that's what we're doing. Um, there is a further complication anyway, in terms of timetabling as we go forward because of the change request, we may have to rejig those hearings in January to potentially accommodate anything that might arise out of the change request.

02:05:52:06 - 02:06:21:24

So there are a few balls in the air at the moment. It may well be that the examination timetable does get changed. Um, not too much, but a little bit. And that might mean those hearing dates get pushed out, um, because it's the applicant in terms of the change request, still looking, um, at a six week publication and notification period.

02:06:23:13 - 02:06:28:12

We have, we have no choice. So because the period cannot run until the publication of the second press notice. Right?

02:06:29:02 - 02:06:32:18

So yeah, although the regulations say 28 days minimum. Yeah, it's

02:06:34:12 - 02:07:08:16

I suspect those regulations will be changed more. They have been changed. But of course we're still governed um by the old set because yeah, that that needs creating in this day and age when there's a lot more reliance on electronic transmission than people reading newspapers. Yeah. Um, so yeah, that that may well mean that if we are in the territory of having a third round of hearings, um, we may have to consider those dates anyway, because, um.

02:07:10:23 - 02:07:20:22

Six weeks on from where we are now or, you know, we will be very tight to being able to decide issue, um, notices of those hearings?

02:07:21:10 - 02:07:33:21

Yes, sir. If we could, if we can get the notices and the first available publication dates are the constitutional rights period. Wouldn't actually close until the 13th of December. So it would be very tight for you to have time to issue an agenda.

02:07:38:27 - 02:07:39:12

As the.

02:07:39:14 - 02:07:44:13

Muddying the waters in that regard, Mr. Bedford, help in terms of the point that you raised that.

02:07:45:05 - 02:08:07:00

Well, it's certainly useful clarification. It doesn't particularly help in terms of direct commitments and the possibility that the hearing date weeks, uh, may change. Uh, but, sir, it is what it is. And clearly as a we're very conscious of our limited role in this examination. And you have some bigger issues to deal with. So so I've just raised the point, but it's, it's helpful to have a helpful.

02:08:07:02 - 02:08:14:25

Point to area because, um, yeah, there are a number of things coming in different directions which may affect the timetabling of this, this case anyway.

02:08:18:00 - 02:08:24:15

Was there anything else from any other party before we head to a closure?

02:08:26:03 - 02:08:29:03

Not seeing anything on the room. Anybody online?

02:08:33:07 - 02:09:06:20

Nope. Not seeing anything there either. Thank you very much. Um, I'd like to thank everybody for their participation over the last couple of days. Um, issue specific hearing three is therefore closed. Um, and no doubt we'll some of you will be seeing tomorrow for compulsory acquisition hearing to which will commence at 10:00. Uh, for those of you who may not be attending that hearing, we may be seeing some of you later on in the day at 3:00 for issue specific hearing for which relates to DCO matters.

02:09:07:22 - 02:09:08:22

Thank you very much.