

TEXT_RAMPION2_ISH1_SESSION2_070224

00:06

If we're already we'll resume

00:10

resume this hearing.

00:13

We're now ready to move on to Item three, which has to do with traffic and access on a wider level. Dr. Morgan?

00:24

Thank you, Mr. Allen. Can everyone hear me?

00:27

Yep. That's good. So yes, we're moving on now to the onshore effects the post development and we started with three, which is transport and access. And the first agenda item is transport assessment methodology. So, Mr. Mail, we note from the covering letter to your pre examination deadline submission, which was p p d, Dash 001. The forager review of the environmental statement, learn reps, and route rule six letter, you carry out a further assessment in relation to the effects the proposed development from traffic and transport. Could you please just briefly outline the methodology you use as the basis of your original submission? And why explain why you consider further analysis is necessary at this stage.

01:20

Thank you. So, Paul male for the applicant. I'm going to ask Mr. Chris Williams to introduce himself and he will provide you with a response to that question.

01:34

Thank you. My name is Chris Williams. I am Associate Director at WFP. I'm a chartered transport planner between two years experience and I have an MSc in transport plan and engineering.

01:52

So,

01:55

the original assessment of traffic and transport effects was completed in chapter 23 of the environmental statement and it was aligned with the Institute of Management and assessment IEMA obligation guidelines on environmental assessment road traffic 1993. The construction sorry,

02:17

the assessment considered the construction effects of the onshore cable corridor. Primarily.

02:27

This considered consideration construction traffic routes associated with movement deliveries, equipment and staff during construction periods are the onshore elements the proposed development

02:39

the methodology used for calculating construction traffic estimates is provided in Appendix 23.2 of the yes the traffic generation technical note at 197.

02:52

Construction traffic estimates for the proposed development being calculated using project information available for the activity material,

03:01

plan requirements and size of workforce to determine the number of hcvs and lgcs required to support the construction activity. This methodology combined in combined with the construction programme for the proposed development allow construction traffic movements to be calculated. For all sections the onshore cable corridor, temporary construction compounds, onshore substation, and temporary construction accesses for every week of the construction period.

03:31

The construction traffic was then assigned the study areas in the LGV and HGTV access strategies detailed within section five and six of the outline construction traffic management plan, p dp oh three five A.

03:46

And importantly, this access strategy rates EVs included a requirement to use strategic elements of the highway network the A 27 na 23 as much as possible. This has stated in paragraph 5.2 point two

04:01

to inform the impact assessments contained within it as a comparison has been completed of traffic data with and without construction traffic associated with the proposed development. It's noted that West Sussex County Council in their relevant representation are 418. Notice that they were content with the baseline traffic data use within the year

04:22

to forecast future year traffic flows on the network. Department for Transport tool tempo has been used. This forecasts traffic flows for future years taking account of national local projections of population employment, housing, car ownership and trip rates.

04:40

With it within the ES.

04:43

An impact assessment was completed across eight different scenarios.

04:47

They were peak week 70 which was the peak which was the week of

04:53

peak construction activity across the entire network. So the week where the most a

05:00

the ATVs and LG V's were on the network section bass peak weeks. So Section One considered landfall.

05:09

So the a 27. And the peak week for this section was week 72. Section two ran from

05:17

the a 27 to the A 24. near Washington, Pete week for construction in this section was week 83 And section three runs from the a 24

05:30

to the 87. Two and

05:33

peak week for this section was week 125. Finally for further assessments, but doesn't take into account the annual average weekday construction traffic flow for years 1234 of the construction programme. This reflected that the construction for the proposed development was largely linear in nature, and provides a robust assessment of the impact across the study area.

05:58

The assessments also take into account embedded mitigation measures relevant the relevant traffic and transport as identified in table 23.3 A measures included within the outline ctmp, outline public rights where management plan, construction worker man travel plan and abnormal indivisible load assessment.

06:19

Okay, if I could just stop you there. So what were the main conclusions of that assessment? And why do you feel necessary now to actually do further analysis.

06:31

So, the main conclusions

06:34

from the original es chapter, whether there were no significant effects associated with the proposed development

06:43

as a result of the the impact assessments that were completed,

06:48

we have though identified that that a further assessment could be completed a further sensitivity test, noting the eight different scenarios that have been assessed already the new assessment provides a worst case assessment of every receptor on the within the study area. So, it is the individual impact of each receptor regardless and week. So that means that adjacent receptors could be

07:16

subject to peak construction traffic flows and different weeks with assess that worst case. Okay, so So I understand you're in the middle of that assessment now. Yes. What are your conclusions to date? Have you identified any links that need further analysis? We have identified some further links for analysis. This is partly in relation to the

07:41

the new peak week assessment of traffic flows, but also a review which I've undertaken of sensitive receptors that were included in the original es chapter. So we're taking forward for detailed environment assessment within that. Es addendum. Seven links they are the A 27th Heiser elvington. The BT 135 sales of ashhurst. He's 88, one south of Sherman Berry, the 87 to California road west of the A 23 bt on three, five, north of spit Andrew lane. So within ASHA has excelled. The ATA on High Street and field and Mitchell Grove lane.

08:23

Okay, thank you. Well, I know you're still in the middle of that analysis. But what are your interim conclusions with regard to your previous conclusions is not predicted at this time that this new assessment will generate any significant effects? Okay. And can you confirm when you'll be submitting that final analysis? We intend to submit that deadline one? Okay. So, when you explaining the analysis process, you referred to the environmental management's once you know you three publication, as you're probably aware, that publication was updated guidance will update it back in the summer by the institution with a new guidance for the environment assessment or road traffic. We should all 30 years of using the previous document and improved it. Have you applied that document to this project? We haven't applied that to the ES addendum that we're currently producing. The guidance which was published in July, unfortunately gave him in sufficient time to be included within the ES assessments as part of the application. We have completed a high level review of new guidance. My understanding that the methodology for triggering the need for assessment plus the methodology associated with several drivers delay, pedestrian cycle immunity and accidents remains the same as the previous guidance. But we will need to consider the the updated methodology for the assessment of fear intimidation.

09:56

We are keen that within the EF addendum it follows the same math

10:00

Knology as was used for the submitted application,

10:05

but we would we'll follow that up with a

10:09

technical assessment of, of the impacts of the new guidance and confirm whether or not that changes any of the conclusions that he so be great for you if you could take an action to provide us with a note on the principal differences between the two documents. And whether you consider the end result the outcome will be different if you apply that document.

10:32

Thank you.

10:38

Just on transport assessment methodology, if I could just ask national highways,

10:44

do you have any comments on the methodology adopted by the applicant?

10:52

getting by on national highways.

10:55

at the strategic level, we were largely content with the methodology but as our evidence now and later today will provide it's a case of it's the devil in the detail. And it's that detail that we need in order to be satisfied that they've complied with national policy in the form of circular 122 DFT and national planning policy framework Deluxe,

11:22

in terms of demonstrating compliance with that policy, and therefore the absence of any safety or other strategic road network concerns. So just to be clear, what is that detail that you need from the applicant?

11:36

It's just going down to the next level detail. So

11:42

in terms of the methodology that will then lead into the practicalities in the construction traffic management plan. So it's really having that level of understanding of where, what, when, how many, how often, etc, so that we can be sure that our road junctions and our road links aren't going to be overwhelmed in any particular location by construction traffic.

12:09

But it's my understanding that from the assessment,

12:13

that sort of information should be available now.

12:17

Who asked the applicant?

12:20

Is that available? And why hasn't it been shared with national highways? Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, we have had discussions with national highways following on from submission of the application. We are currently working up details regarding required highway accesses.

12:42

On the 27th as part of strategic network, we do intend to share that with national highways as soon as possible, or review. Okay, thank you. Yes, that's one dimension of it. So it's where they wish to do principally the trench list.

12:59

You know, directional drilling,

13:01

and therefore the compounds that will be close to it. So that's going to have a technical impact on the net that we need to sort out and agree to and then either side of it, there will be compounds and they'll have accesses directly off the SRN, but we haven't seen the details of those accesses. We also haven't seen the details of how the compounds will operate because obviously we need to be

13:28

aware of and content that the compounds themselves won't act as a distraction to people on the network, etc. So it's just getting that next level detail to satisfy us that the network will remain safe, reliable, operationally efficient, etc.

13:46

So that's that's part of the ongoing discussions between yourselves and national highways. And that information will have that information will be provided in due course.

13:58

Yeah, we can certainly provide further information in relation to construction traffic flows associated with with individual accesses,

14:06

as required. And then obviously, for particular compounds, it's then a case of okay, is that access suitable for the type of traffic that's going to arrive at it in the quantity is going to arrive at so is that

14:20

one lorry at a time or 100 lorries at a time, you know, and therefore what are the implications in terms of any blocking back at the network, or the ability for vehicles to pass each other at an entrance so that one isn't hanging out, side onto the network etc. And then other junctions it's a case of the same considerations. Some of the

14:45

local road network connecting to the SRN the junctions are quite narrow. And again, it's just the safety implications to ensure that traffic can flow freely in both directions. It's not a case that if a lorry turns in one direction

15:00

Trying to meet safety coming the other direction

15:03

you get an impasse because they can't pass each other. Okay, thank you. So if I can ask if that information can be provided as soon as possible please.

15:15

Turning to West Sussex County Council, Miss Harrower, has West Sussex going he comments on the transport assessment?

15:29

See Mr. Gledhill

15:32

here on the screen so resume to detail you're gonna respond to that. If occurred here in Kyoto, West Sussex County Council, regarding the TA assessment methodology, we've been in extensive discussions with the applicant regarding the methodology

15:47

matters, there have been agreed, as Mrs. Mr. Bone has said, it's very much the detail matters we're looking at now, in terms of how the accesses to specific site compounds

15:58

to construction sites will be will be managed, and, more importantly, designed, I think it's that level of detail we are looking to

16:09

looking to see from the applicant going forward. Thank you. There's a bit clearer, you're happy you're content with the overall assessment. What's your position with regard to the new assessment guidelines on the use of those?

16:25

This is something we've flagged in Glasgow, again,

16:29

the needs for the applicant to use this updated methodology was identified in representations made earlier in the process. We're very much waiting the applicants response to those points. I don't think today I've seen anything. I think the position from West Sussex is to identify to the applicant, the upside updated methodology and the need for this to be taken into account in the assessments that have been presented.

16:54

Okay, thank you. And you will have the opportunity, obviously, as well, national highways to comment on that note that we requested on the new guidelines. I would very much hope so. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Opening up any other comments on Trump's road assessment methodology was attorney

17:12

rich attorney for the South Downs National Park Authority just to flag at this stage. And obviously, we'll set out some detailed points and written submissions in due course. But just to flag, we are concerned that the totality of the transport effects on the National Park and its purposes has not been properly accounted for in the ies. So there's a range of different effects that I won't go into. But it includes, for instance, the effect of the traffic for the offshore works, which will necessarily pass through the National Park. And then more detailed points about accesses their design and the number of accesses and the impacts on users of public rights of way through crossing points and haul roads. And there's a there's a missing piece, as we said to understand the totality of those transport traffic and transport effects on the National Park as a designated area.

18:12

Mr. Mayor, would you like to comment on that?

18:16

I think so what Mr. Tony is indicating there's that there'll be a detailed submission coming from the National Park in due course in in their written rap and possibly their ally are will obviously consider that and respond to respond on to that detail at the appropriate deadline. Okay. Is there anyone else who'd like to speak on transport assessment methodology on the parish council? Thank you, Nikki handily Barney parish council

18:39

only sits on the A 272 with the junction with the a 23, which is one of the main access points for HGVs in the construction traffic management plan. The same some ambiguity I'd like to have ironed out, please as to where the access point of the A 23 is going to be. It's not on your map, I can give you the

reference. Given the A 272 It's actually to North a site an access to the north, which would bring HGVs through the village of bolney, which is not appropriate.

19:12

I would also say that I can't see in your transport notice at all. Chapter 23 of of the environmental statement that you've acknowledged that the junction of the northbound a 23 Sip slip road with the A 272 is due to be signalised within the next couple of years and traffic lights put in place with the pedestrian crossing as well, which I think will have an impact

19:40

on your HTV route. And while speaking it might be too much detail, but in your

19:48

your assessment of wind and Elaine also within the parish of bolney and also intertwine them. You acknowledge that the number of HGVs to access the the site where they

20:00

extension of the National Grid substation is due to take place will increase HGVs on the section of road by 237%. But you in your assessment, you say that this will be a negligible impact on the lane. You don't acknowledge that this is a residential lane, there are 26 houses between the a 272. And the one on the national grid entrance. There are five public rights of way the crossover the section of wine and Lane. It's used by cyclists and by horse riders, there's no pedestrian pavement, there are blind caught their blind summits. And I think that it needs reassessment. I just cannot believe that it can be negligible to

20:40

increase the number of HGVs by 240%. In that case, thank you. Thank you, Miss Stanley. Mr. Valle, do you want to respond at this stage to that?

20:56

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. Just to confirm it is the intention for construction traffic to use the the main

21:06

junction between the 87 two and the a 23 that there's no intention for traffic to route through the centre of bolney routes and 272.

21:17

This plan be recommended then please. Yes. If you could find which plan Yes, it's figure it's two. It's within your construction traffic management plan, which is document

21:31

7.6 and it is figure seven

21:36

point 6.8 which is described as exit points from the Transport study area. Okay, so if you could take an action to review that document and updated if required, and submitted into the examination, please? Yes, of course. Okay, anyone else on

21:56

some twine and parish councils and he has a kind of parish council. Could you please explain why you will be requiring to use Bob lane. From the western end, Bob lane is incredibly narrow. And it has deep ditches on either side of it.

22:16

It is not an intention to use Bob lane. Again, unfortunately that isn't that is an error in a submitted plan. Access would be taken directly from Wyoming lane and substation. So there's two. So likewise, Could you review those plans and update when necessary? I can give you the figure number it's it's another document part of the ctmp which is 7.6. Point nine see.

22:41

It shows Bob Lane being used by

22:44

HDDs and LGBs. Yeah, and just clarify is not mentioned to us that so we'll we'll get that updated. Okay, thank you Mr. Henley.

22:54

Miss Smethurst

22:56

Hello, Miss Smith as council V rampion.

23:01

You say you're reviewing your traffic assessments that you're still continuing to look at. I think it's linked 23, the 87 to to the west of the a 23. And you're still continuing to look at that as one long continuum. And you still don't seem to have understood that the trip the behaviour of the traffic at the kaufhold end is quite different from the behaviour of the traffic at the other end. And part of the reason for that seems to be you haven't really understood the impact of mini roundabouts up there yet. And the fact that because of that restriction, the traffic is and the fact that traffic is practically at capacity, anything at that end tipsy it into into congestion, and queuing traffic all the way beyond Kent Street, heading towards the a 23. And that happens routinely twice a day, and anything.

24:01

So at peak times, that happens routinely. And you've got this complicated dance of traffic coming in and out of the to Oakland in compounds, and Kent Street, and going left and right from there. And as as the gentleman over there said,

24:20

to capacity for getting an absolute logjam, and it being so dangerous as traffic is going in and out of those various compounds just doesn't seem to have been factored into this at all.

24:33

It really is important that you get but it isn't just a percentage increase caused by your traffic.

24:41

Yeah, and the other thing is you've used the 24 averages, but actually, West Sussex traffic camera data shows that 80% of those vehicles actually travelled in the 12 hours between 6am and 6pm and 80% of those between seven and nine in the morning and

25:00

forensics in the evening.

25:02

And that just pushes congestion beyond its tipping point so easily. And then you are going to have traffic lights there as well potentially, which will further add to the, to the complete chaos. Your HGV numbers we were consistently told 8040 throughout what little bit of consultations molar if I just stop you there in this is a sort of on the general traffic assessment. We've got another item a bit later on, and driving for specifically about a 272. So had asked if you could leave more detailed questions on that to that stage. But the general, your general question about the way the four A 272 was analysed in the assessment, yes, perhaps we could put that to the the applicant and see if he wishes to answer that in this stage.

25:56

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. So the yesterday and and we have identified another receptor to the east of kaufhold village centre. So that will go through the relevant assessments and a further receptor between the A 23 annual Canadian compound so we'll be reporting impacts on those locations came down also doesn't seem to be any traffic impact assessments at all for Kent street or the whole road.

26:25

Yes, again, there's a specific item on the agenda rise and forth against Street. And that's one issue that I do intend to raise. And I think the the figure that Mrs. Hurst mentioned also contains an error or an anomaly about the bottom end of Kent Street, where it seems to not be quite clear as to whether traffic will be going up and down that part where we've asked the applicant to review those plans and resubmit amended plans. So hopefully that will that will cover that. Sandy.

27:00

Thank you. Apologies. Nikki Hanley, Barney parish council, I forgot to mention that within rampion. One, there was a holding area created by rampion. For the HGV vehicles, they had to check in to a point actually adjacent to the junction of the slip road from the northbound a 23 and the 272. To prevent bunching of HGVs on these narrow country roads.

27:26

We've asked repeatedly whether there will be a holding area, whether it has been considered within this because it worked last time they had to check in and then they were radioed in and it prevented multiple HGVs arriving too early, altogether blocking roads, and could that be included in the methodology and an explanation please as to whether or not and why not one is going to be included this time. Yeah. Thank you, Miss. Thank you. Again, that sort of pre-empting a little bit agenda item for when I've got a question around that that issue as well.

27:59

Okay, so no more hands up on this agenda item. I'd like to move on to the next one then please. And this is Michael Grove lane. And the first thing I'd like to do is check the pronunciation. Is it Michael grow on Nicole grow? He could help me with that.

28:17

He will from my area. Mitchell go. I think it's Mitchell Grove

28:22

was the third. So it's Mitchell grove. Thank you very, very grateful for that. So, Mitchell great Grove lane is a single track road off the 420 which used to be used by construction tracking to access the onshore cable route and access 26

28:39

And it will itself be crossed by the cabling open cut trench. That's the proposal.

28:47

Mr. Williams, would you would you explain please how it proposed how you propose to manage traffic along that route and maintain access to the properties of businesses throughout the works.

29:00

Thank you Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant.

29:05

We agree that Mitchell Grove lane is a single track lane with occasional passing places within the DCO order limits we have identified

29:18

locations for up to eight paths in places to be provided long Mitchell Grove lane to allow for two way movement of traffic during the construction period.

29:31

Okay, and you haven't given a thought to HDD under that lane. So he's not totally severed during construction.

29:42

That's something that needs to pass to colleague

29:48

Richard Donner in return on behalf of the applicant, I'm the assistant engineering manager for RW E.

29:55

With with regards to access to the mitre group,

30:00

If HDD side, those have been considered in the construction truck movements accordingly

30:08

Hey, thank you productive IO to West Sussex County Council.

30:15

And if I can get your views on what you've just heard with regard to maintain access along which will grow Lane

30:24

in class, we've your thoughts on that course. In Connecticut, West Sussex County Council access long Mitch Grove Lane has been raised on a number of occasions by West Sussex don't believe the app to conserve concert. The question if I'm perfectly blunt,

30:38

disappointing that very much rain remains outstanding with West Sussex and it hasn't in any way been addressed at the current time. Thank you. Okay, how would you respond to that? Mr. Williams? Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. We are currently reviewing traffic management options for Mitchell Grove lane at the junction with the 8080. And that's going to take into account traffic surveys which have been completed this month swept path analysis and visibility splays. Once we have a preferred solution, we'll we'll be submitting that to West Sussex and discussing that with them with a view of reaching an agreement in principle to that solution, right to the end of the examination. So it's very much a work in progress and what you're saying is agreed. Okay, does anyone else have any comments on Mitchell Grove Lane they'd like to raise at this stage.

31:35

Sorry, if you could say your name.

31:38

All Lightbourne.

31:40

I just wonder if this might be the opportune moment to raise the issue related to the lane I live on.

31:48

Which is Kent Street. It's linked it's identified in agenda item for as kings and moat filled Lane under the effects of the proposed substation. But this is an access issue.

32:00

Very similar to Mitchell Grove lane, which was identified by West Sussex

32:08

in their principal areas of disagreement statement, that's document as double O eight under reference 34,

32:16

where they state that the applicant has not identified how private means of access will be will be

32:28

catered for during the construction.

32:33

Mix. Mitchell Grove lane is in fact a private means of access, not an adopted road as he's Kings Lane on which I live. And for that reason, I represent 10 households on a working farm in the applicant documentation. Yeah. Mr. lightburn. If I could just hold you there. As you pointed out, there is an item specifically on that and your agenda for so if you just hold hold that point.

33:01

Yes, I can do that. But it is an access issue rather than a fact. Yeah, no, I just want you raising it. Are you happy for me to do it under under agenda item for? Yes, I am. Yes. Thank you.

33:12

Okay. I don't think we have any more sorry, from the applicant. Simon eagle on behalf of the amplicon. I work for woods, which is the engineering company as subcontracted to our web, just on the just on the actual Myka growth. Miracle growth. So access.

33:32

You mentioned HDD under it. We actually go to the to the east and north of the of the main access, open cutting ran so we don't sever anyone's access to to local residents. We need that access to bring our construction equipment, materials and personnel into location. So there is no closure of the road, if you will for open cutting through. So that's why HDD hasn't been considered in this group over that. Understand, Mr. Turney you you want to say something?

34:10

Richard tourney for South Downs National Park Authority, just just two points. At this stage, we've just heard about passing places. Obviously, if Mitchell Grove is going to be subject to changes, we'll need to consider the landscape impacts of that in particular. And that's detail that we don't yet have as I'm

told. The second point is that in the same facility, there's the access from long Furlong lane, where there's a particular safety issue at its junction with the A

34:44

two at a 280 Sorry, my a race right, a 280.

34:49

And also an overarching question as to why both those means of access Mitchell Grove lane and long Furlong Lane are required because they seem to go to the same point.

35:01

Okay, thank you.

35:03

Mr. Williams, do you want to answer that at this stage?

35:07

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant.

35:11

Just to clarify the access on long Fern online, long Furlong Lane was is is operational only. So there'll be no need to for access during the construction period in relation to a 26 is worth noting that this access is going to be shared with a 28 there is optionality there.

35:36

So it will be the could total construction traffic

35:42

will be be shared between a 26 a 28.

35:47

Okay, reference to the contractor. Okay, thank you.

35:51

I'm going to move on now to item 333. Looks like caravan park. Construction access road a 12.

36:03

From A to A four dumpster road to the line of the onshore cable route is proposed along the northern boundary of Brookside caravan park. Now we heard yesterday from Mr. Rennie in the open floor hearing one, his concerns about the potential detrimental impact this will have on the business in terms of noise, dust, damage to foundations, and lost revenue.

36:29

Well, if the applicant could explain the rationale for locating the access road in this location, so close to the caravan park, outline what alternatives were considered including the use of on site all roads from other accesses, and confirm that there are no proposals for his subsequent use as an operational access.

36:53

Yes, Simon Nagel on behalf of the applicant. The proposed access just north of the caravan park for construction at AccessID.

37:03

It is really the only option here we're constrained to the south by a railway and also a black ditch, which is the

37:14

watercourse running to the South were constrained to the east or the railway running north as well. We're constrained to the north with the the hammer limiter with very narrow roads, which is

37:31

residence with parking on there, which is not

37:37

not applicable for HDB. Our many HDB's running through there, we're also constrained further to the north with bodies water ponds and forests. So to the only other option in would be coming all the way in from the from the north, that's crossing many watercourses through fields, that increases the whole road length, which therefore increases the number of HGVs required to lay the whole road and therefore more environmental impact traffic impact in the area. So this and this access is directly on the cable route as well. So they're not if we move this accessor there's no vehicles there, there is going to be vehicles that say HDD compounds there, there's so that we've got

38:28

vehicles in area.

38:30

Okay, Mr. Rainey also raised the issue of whether HGVs could safely make the turn from a to a four into that or road. He I think he was concerned about the width of the main road at that point and whether he actually then have to move into the path of oncoming vehicles. If you could just talk to that point, we will design the the access with to sufficiently allow HGVs to to turn into and out of that to have that entrance there to to avoid going into the oncoming traffic

39:09

Okay,

39:11

moving on. So, on the same issue though,

39:16

we know that the latest version of the outline code of construction practice as p p d sorry p p d dash 033 is new commitment C 287. We stayed for the duration of the construction phase in this location enhanced acoustic barrier will be installed on the southern edge of the works north of Brookfield caravan park, the barrier will be a suitable dimension and sited appropriately to manage noise impacts of this location. Can you please explain a little further what's proposed, how it will be approved? And how is it secured? Or how would it be secured? And the draft of a consent order?

40:03

only slow on behalf of the applicant, yes. So, the intention is to have the noise barrier on the southern side of the works between the caravan park and the works going on North in terms of the trenching and the whole road. That commitment has been as you mentioned added into the C OCP submitted at the procedural deadline a

40:28

further design off that barrier would be included based on the final detailed design of where the where the trenches will be and where exactly where the whole road will be. And that will be part of the construction noise and vibration management plan. That is the core secured under

40:48

22 Five Q requirement 22 Five Q sorry, I have to check that letter actually 22 Five of the draft DCO.

40:59

Okay, thank you.

41:01

If I can go to West Sussex

41:04

County Council, Mr. Gledhill? Thank you in CLECs. You just heard it was literally one comment regarding the eight to eight four and to highlight the the expectation is the eight to eight for downgraded later this year. Due to the anticipated opening of the limits to North bypass. A lot of the traffic will be taken from the existing eight to eight four onto the new bypass that should assist greatly with traffic management measures at the proposed access near the Brookside. Caravan Park. That's the only point I wish to make. Okay, thank you for that. Perhaps we could ask our own district council, if they've got any comments

41:47

at all.

41:49

Further comments at this stage?

41:52

Okay, any other person or any comments with regret with regard to Brookfield caravan park?

42:01

And Miss Williams? Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. I just wanted to to clarify, in case I missed it from Simon Mr. Nagle, sorry, that access a 11 which is directly north of the caravan park that is intended for operational use only a construction access is actually located 60 metres to the north of the boundary of the caravan park. Also in relation to Mr. Glenn Hills point. There is optionality

42:32

on the accesses a 13 and a 15. Noting the downgrade of the A to a four and the opening and the limits to bypass it's anticipated that the contractor would use

42:45

access a 15 over preference in preference to a 13.

42:51

Thank you. That's very useful. Thank you.

42:54

Okay, any other comments? Yes. Just one minor point of clarification. It's a 22 five H rather than 22 Five key on the noise and vibration management plan. Okay, thank you for that.

43:10

Okay, sorry. I can see a handout. Unfortunately on my screen, I can't tell who it is.

43:16

Anyone very comments on it virtually.

43:21

It's Mr. Rouhani. From Britain. Hello, Mr. Rouhani. Not not not Brookfield. I'd just like to say that, regarding the mention of optionality that all of the options are presented at different stages of the plan submitted seem to be rolled into one right at the moment, therefore not really giving us any optionality whatsoever. And that's all I want to say at this moment. Sorry, Mr. Rainey. Are you specifically referring to the whole road? We are referring to the access road and the positioning of the

44:02

the pipe, the trenching?

44:07

You're referring to the actual onshore case

44:11

that the two variations as the plan that was submitted that we've had, everything seems to be thrown in together now. That's not really giving any optionality whatsoever.

44:26

Okay, can I just explore that a bit further? What do you mean by optionality

44:31

were originally we had the the first

44:36

times from ramping to was about the access road.

44:40

Secondly, there was the amended plan with the with the pipeline going through the middle of the field. Then we also had a third one where the access road would not necessarily be north of the

44:57

of the caravan park in the south of the field.

45:00

And there were options about where in the field the trenching for the pipeline would be as well. Nigel Abbott was saying to me that all the options were being kept open at the moment, but from what their representative has said, at this moment in time, it sounds like that. Everything has been decided. And there's including both aspects of what were originally suggested different points. So Mr. Rainey, if I understand you correctly, your understanding was that there was a number of different proposals for both the access road route and the router, the onshore cable. But what you're seeing now is that, that's, that's a done deal. Basically. That's, that's what it sounds like to me.

45:46

Okay, well, if you'd like to comment on that,

45:50

and the slow on behalf of the applicant. So at that point, I think the order limits are approximately 770 metres wide as a commitment in the outline, so CP, pe PD 33, that the working with the cable corridor would be 40 metres.

46:11

And in terms of the final detail where that is to be located, that will be secured or provided through the onshore Construction Method Statement. That's requirement 23.

46:26

to f.

46:29

So it's in summary, I suppose it is not.

46:33

Exact at the moment.

46:36

Okay, that's great. Thank you for that clarification. Okay, I'm going to move on now to number 434 construction hours. Now, we know that the core working hours 700 hours to 1900 hours Monday to Friday, and 800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays for the proposed development as set out in Section 4.4 of the outline code of construction practice p p d, Dash 033 rather than the requirements of the draft DCO. What's the rationale for this?

47:14

Why why are they set out in that code of practice instead of actually appearing as a requirement within the DCO to draft ECM?

47:26

While for the, the applicant?

47:29

I don't think there is any particular the rationale that simply lies behind it. So it's simply a case that all matters relating to construction practice are set out in the crcp. The the effect of the DCO is to secure

47:46

the detail in the CF CP in the same way as it had been set out in in a specific requirements. So it's simply a function of it being dealt with in that way.

47:59

Okay, thank you.

48:02

Paragraph eight point 4.13 of the current outline construction traffic management plan. And that's p p d dash 035. A says that construction HGV movements associated with the origin onshore elements of the proposed development will normally take place during the call working hours, which we've just heard, and for and for the hour before and after these calls in hours, due to the distances involved in reaching some of the road construction sites.

48:36

So this doesn't appear to comply with the restrictions on working hours set out in the outline code or construction practice.

48:44

And suggest that noisy and disruptive HGV movements could potentially be experienced by residents as early as six o'clock in the morning, and eight o'clock in the evening, Monday to Friday, at seven

o'clock in the morning and two o'clock in the afternoon on Saturdays. Why is there an inconsistency between these two documents?

49:03

And what's actually intended with the arrival of hcvs to site pscorps core hours?

49:10

Thank you, sir. I'll pass the Mr. Williams in a moment for details of what's intended and the differences between the two. But I don't I don't think there is intended to be any inconsistency. The the core working hours are the actual active working hours whereas the

49:28

the hours set out in the construction traffic management plan are related to the movement of traffic, either side of those core working hours so that effectively things can be in place for work to start at the appropriate time. So that's how those things two things are intended to work together. I'll pass to Mr. Williams on the substantive appointment.

49:53

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. As Mr. Male said the extension in

50:00

Working hours is to allow all deliveries of equipment and materials to arrive on site for the start of the day,

50:08

and avoid where possible construction traffic movements taking place during peak hours.

50:15

But the effect of that is that you're going to have noisy HGVs.

50:22

You know, arriving to sign next to residents earlier than the construction hours. And that can be quite disruptive as a thought being given to actually holding those ACV. Back perhaps in the laybuy. Until the construction hours.

50:42

Is the point I think that

50:45

his handle he made earlier about the use of lay bys on the control of HGVs.

50:53

Thanks. So I think I think what we'll do on this has been raised, obviously, in terms of HGV holding, we'll, we'll take that away. And we'll we'll we'll give you a note on the extent to which that's considered or indeed might be, might be considered. Okay, that's great. Thank you.

51:10

Yeah, go to us only. First, I know you asked to speak on this. I did, indeed. Thank you very much. Nikki Haley Barney parish council,

51:20

just on that point, about the arriving and possibly an hour before an hour after, during rampion. One, during the year 2017

51:32

rampion, applied for and obtained extension to their working hours. And they worked every single weekend, between January and the 20th of November 2017. And if you're going to allow HGVs to arrive an hour before in an hour after that means residents living

51:52

around the construction areas will have disruption seven days a week. And it's it's a lot can I say and at one point they also had permission to work till 10 o'clock at the substation in the evening. And also on the cable routes within the twining area between 7am and 9:20pm. So that extra hour could actually be very, very disruptive. And I would also say that, to me construction hours are exactly that construction hours. And within that comes HGV deliveries because what is the point in an HGV a ride arriving if the constructors are not allowed to unload it and that must take part take place within construction hours. I want to speak sorry, somebody I was going to raise but just what I was going to ask now was

52:42

Bonnie and twine them are particularly concerned about the extension to the national grid substation.

52:50

And the proposed as their of seven tools seven, as you've already indicated, the works on the national grid substation that needed to be carried out as part of the rampion one project where she dealt with the planning application to mid Sussex District Council, the applicant requested hours from 7am till 7pm and from 8am to 1pm. On a Saturday, mid Sussex declined that and the hours that they granted in the decision notice work Monday to Friday 8am till 6pm And Saturday nine till 1pm. And no works on Sundays and bank holidays. And the reason given was to safeguard the immunities of nearby residents. We would say that the works to be carried out to the national grid substation and the associated underground cabling from the National Grid substation to the Oakland in substation should likewise have their hours restricted.

53:50

If we're not very persuasive on that, I would say that within the rampion, one project,

53:58

the works carried out then within the time and bony area, what was called stage one, it was the construction of the substation there, because of the residential nature of the area. The hours were restricted in that between 7am 7am and 7am. And 8am, only quiet work was allowed to be carried out no unloading of HGVs or anything like that. And also between 6pm and 7pm. They were called shoulder hours. And it was to protect residents who live and back onto these fields. And we would say that 7am to 7pm is too much of a residential area and we'd ask for the hours to be reduced again in this project and for the for the benefit of residents living nearby and also put the roads and that sort of thing. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Hanley. I'll just go to twine and would you like to say something before I thank you very much. And it has turned in parish councillor. I would like to endorse everything that Mrs. Handley has said during the course of the rampion one construction

55:00

And we our eyes were made an absolute misery, especially during 2017 When we had all of this weekend work, which was unsupervised. And there was one stage on a really hot Sunday afternoon when we couldn't have lunch outside, because they were doing drilling right next door to us. And it showed a complete lack of consideration to local residents. And so maybe this is how you could enforce the mid Sussex District Council working hours Oh,

55:30

eight till six, Monday to Friday, nine to one on Saturdays and absolutely nothing on Sundays or bank holidays. I think during the course of 2017, they rampion had to go to West Sussex County Council to get permission for these works. And in the end, West Sussex County Council said the rest of the the local residents have had enough. You cannot do any more weekend working. Thank you very much. Yeah, thank you for that. Yeah, Mr. lightburn. Yes, poor light burn.

56:07

Construction Work implies people on the ground doing work. But the other thing that needs to be borne in mind and it's a concern I bring from some of my neighbours who gardener is going to back on to the to the trenching work, equipment left running overnight. Pumps, lights and other equipment.

56:27

Yes, generators, all equipment, there must be embargoes and restrictions placed on such equipment, so that residents are not disturbed during the night. Thank you.

56:39

Okay, thank you. Mr. Williams, would you like to respond?

56:46

Thank you, this is something we need to take away and respond to in writing. Thank you. Okay, thank you.

56:53

Anyone else on construction areas?

56:59

This Marshal.

57:02

So thank you, Sarah Marshall national highways, just a small point on construction hours, national highways, we'll need to understand if HGVs are turning up early for their site slots.

57:13

Not highways will need to know if these HGVs are needing or any construction traffic or using the strategic road network lay bys. Where are they going to be parking if there if it perhaps a few turn up early? And we will need this detail in the construction traffic management plan? Thank you, sir. Yeah, thank you, Miss Marshall. Yes, yeah, good. Good point. You know, it all has to be thought out.

57:38

If the applicant could take that on board when considering construction hours and how to actually manage HGV movements on that. Okay. Yeah, just the point on the

57:51

the actual hours being within the Construction

57:55

Management Plan and not the DCO.

58:00

Then obviously, that's a issue for the local authorities to deal with, and manage, where, rather than having a framework set out within the dcl, within which the authority local authority can work. So I think that's that's the point I was trying to make at that stage.

58:18

I think I understand understand the point. So in terms of the practical, the practical enforceability, or my position is it doesn't it doesn't particularly change whether it's set out in a new sprint in an express requirement, or it's secured through

58:34

requirement 22 and the operation of the COC p as it's currently set out. One thing I would also highlight just just in terms of structure, which may be relevant to the way in which that issue is approached, is that a present we have an outline COC P, that's going to be followed by detailed COC pays for relevant stages of the construction of the construction works. And one of those things listed in requirement 22. Five in relation to those detailed COC Pease is hours of construction working. So there is within the mechanism of the requirement as it's currently drafted and ability for a detailed cicp for a particular stage to make some variations to to core hours. Okay, thank you for that. I can see that there's some people online, they would like to contribute to this site. And so I'm not sure who put their hand up first, but if I go to Mr Rennie yen

59:39

Hello there and can I just thank Miss Hanley for her words about construction hours and can I have it on the record that if amendments are made to shoulder hours, etc. For residential businesses, could we also extend that to the

1:00:00

Businesses that are adjacent to work because as a caravan park, we don't have residents but we have holiday makers.

1:00:11

And whilst they don't fall into the residential category, it is still a home away from home and needs to be taken into consideration the specific hours at which they will be affected.

1:00:25

Okay, thank you for that. Thank you I

1:00:28

think within the room, Miss Smithers, I think he wanted to contribute to this.

1:00:34

And first of all, I want to second everything Mrs. Hanley said about the working hours. And I would hope that that could be the same for open Dean and the construction compounds close to a container because that's also a residential area.

1:00:50

And people will be very much affected. And also, just to clarify, I don't think it was a layby that was used for rampion. One, it was a large compound, a large holding bay that was needed.

1:01:04

And

1:01:06

inconsistencies about that you highlighted, it isn't just that they wanted to be able to bring the traffic the HGVs either on either side, there are also other anomalies in that section, such as if there's a delay on the highways, then they'd like to be able to extend their working hours. Well, there are daily delays on the 272. So that's just a kind of carte blanche to expand even further. And it isn't appropriate.

1:01:35

And with regards to the point that Mr. lightburn raised,

1:01:40

and continuous overnight noise and the construction traffic.

1:01:46

I think the ecology on the whole road really needs to be under consideration for that because there are so many sensitive species that are sensitive to noise and light and vibration, and they just haven't been considered. Okay, thank you for that. supporter. I think I may have missed you. It's Matthew Porter for Horsham Council, it was just on the point. So when you mentioned about attaching it to the TCO, or keeping it within the Construction Management Plan, I think it's an issue for local authorities for transparency and enforceability. So welcome if it was putting in the DCO. And obviously, with our relevant reps are aware, there's a number of sensitive receptors in our district, sickly Washington village. So we'll keen within our mission submissions to advocate sensitive construction hours around those receptors, and to address the consistency currently in the documents. Okay, thank you, Mr. Porter. I can see there's there's at least two hands online. I can see. Mr. Neve, would you like to contribute anything? Thank you, James, West Sussex County Council.

1:02:56

We dealt with the discharge requirements for impairment to rampion. One sorry, and it's around the hours of construction, just say for rampion. One, the hours were contained within the DCR itself, and recognising what Mr. Porter says there's transparency of doing it that way. It's also to say that there were multiple requests for extension of working hours that that was quite frequent. It took place quite regularly across the route and and quite regularly at the substation site, in part due to contractor issues that happened with rampion. One, but there were regular requests. So at the moment, it does say it's all contained within the outline code construction practice. And it says unless otherwise agreed in writing by the relevant planning authority, which leaves it relatively open in terms of potential for impact. So it's just whether there could be any firming up, whether that's more around exceptional circumstances, rather than otherwise agreed in writing, which gives scope for a lot more approvals. The other part would be to say,

1:04:03

sorry, I just lost my point here.

1:04:06

Is is basic support for shoulder ours, that was the case for rampion. One. And, you know, I think there's a benefit of that and it was recognised what the applicant said that, you know, there is scope within the outline code of construction practices to make this you know, more specific person stage. But perhaps within that section 4.4 of that plan, it'd be useful to say that it will be reviewed whether there is a need for shoulder out depending on the number of sensitive receptors affected and such like so that would be the points I'd have to make. Thank you. That's great. Thank you, Mr. Neve. I can see it I think there's one other hand up but I can't see you that is

1:04:43

there anyone still left to contribute?

1:04:47

Hello

1:04:51

Hello.

1:04:53

I can't

1:04:55

mysteries. Sorry about that. Yeah. Hello, can you hear me? Yes.

1:05:00

So can you guess what, yeah, they didn't pop up on the screen. But I can give apology. Apologies. Yeah, I would echo the points made by colleagues of twine and Barney and California, California beg your pardon. I would also make the point about the underground drilling that I understand is for 24 hours a day. Is that correct? And if that is correct, I believe that's just totally unacceptable when you're looking at residents, so I think I just can't see how that should be allowed to happen. That's just totally unacceptable. That's without taking all the various, various impacts on wildlife, and everything else that's going on. So I'd like that to be responded to please like a response on that. Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Eve.

1:05:46

Perhaps the applicant would like to respond to the points you heard on the DCO. And working hours, and also that last point on drilling.

1:05:58

The Thank you, sir, I'll let Mr. Nagle respond on drilling in, in due course, I've heard also on the DCO, I don't think I have particularly anything more to say in terms of whether a specific requirement is, is is needed or not

1:06:16

seen on that point.

1:06:19

In terms of the need to work outside of core hours and delays on the network, obviously, there will be some time critical construction activities. And the point for providing for including those provisos it to deal with things such as concrete pouring, where you can't simply stop. And if if you need you need to get the concrete lorries, obviously to the appropriate location to ensure that those activities can complete in accordance with the construction process.

1:06:55

I think, also we we've heard from interested parties around a number of specific requests and specific locations around where traffic management might be considered in a different matter. And the applicant said it would effectively take these points away and consider them holistically.

1:07:17

But perhaps in order to do that, sort of most constructively it will be it will be better for interested parties to put those sort of specific points in detail in their written representations and for the applicant mentor make that holistic consideration at that point and, and reply in the round. Otherwise, we could get

1:07:38

a process where we respond to issues that have been raised today, but others raise other things, and it has has knock on effects that yes, my suggestion. Yeah, that's a good suggestion. I think if people who have made representations here, would would do so in their written representations as well, then the applicant can take account of those and the previous relevant reps as well, in data. There's a lot of detail in those as well. I'll just create Mr. Nagle to deal with HDD.

1:08:07

Okay, that's great. Okay, I'm going to move on now to item three, five, sorry, excuse Sorry, I'll just answer the point on the HDDs the trenches crossing sorry rounds are ahead please. So some legal but on behalf of the applicant, so, for the trenchless crossings, there are a number of activities associated with those setup of the compound and preparation and they can all be done within normal working hours, there is specific activities that will require 24 hour working on those now there are a lot shorter in duration compared to the overall duration of the compound setup and

1:08:48

completion of off the works, they will need lighting and there will be noise associated with that the compounds. The entry compounds which is where you'll have the drilling equipment have been cited as far away as possible within the within the area from residents we looked at different locations there so we've taken the the best possible location and as we mentioned earlier, there will be mitigations put in place in terms of soundproofing and things like that and the duration will depend on the length of the drills which will be determined during detailed design on the on each of these ones we've got geotechnical data, discuss with the likes of national highways, etc. Okay, thank you for that.

1:09:41

For moving on, just like to check Mr. Reiner, your hand is still up.

1:09:46

Is there anything further you'd like to add? No, sorry, a Luddite can't work out how to put it back down.

1:09:53

Sorry. Okay, that's that's fine. Okay, I think we'll move on then. To item

1:10:00

Three, five.

1:10:02

And this is national highways issues update. So in its principal areas of different statement as dash 007 national highways have a list of lists a number of issues still to be resolved with regard to the potential impact of the proposed development on the shishi road network, including most other things protective

provisions, acceptability of horizontal directional drilling, and the eight and a 237 in the vicinity of hammer pot. I wonder if the applicant could just provide a quick update on where you are with resolving those issues. We were talking about a few earlier.

1:10:42

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant will need to split this into three three responses. I'll just deal with the kind of traffic and transport elements to start with. So our understanding is that national highways have raised concerns, as already mentioned about traffic generated on being routed around the SRN. We understand from the correspondence received that

1:11:11

this primarily relates to impacts on decoy lane, and at polling crossroads. It's just to clarify that access a 20. On decoy Lane south will be used for light construction vehicles only on a very occasional basis.

1:11:28

Holding Crossroads

1:11:31

provides a route to access a 25 to the north the a 27, an access a 17 and a 18 to the south of the a 27 access a 25. Five is for operational and light construction purposes only. Whilst access a 17 and 18 are for operational purposes only. Therefore, we don't feel there should be any safety concerns associated with use of these access by construction traffic, where that is appropriate.

1:12:04

On the second point, we've discussed it briefly, but we are looking at construction access designs that a 21 and a 22. At hammer pop, similar to the response I gave to

1:12:21

the comment on Mitchell Grove, we are looking at options to achieve safe access of construction traffic

1:12:29

at that load at those sorry at those locations, taking account of visibility splays swept path analysis. And we will be working up designs in accordance with

1:12:42

guidance contained in design manual for roads and bridges. Once we have that, and we have a preferred solution, we'll submit that to national highways for review and comment.

1:12:54

Okay, thank you.

1:12:56

Anything else? Yes. So thanks, Phil, I just pick up on the the protective provisions point, obviously, with national highways.

1:13:05

I can say that

1:13:07

national highways meetings have been held to discuss protective provisions. national highways have provided their template or protective provisions to us, which we've considered and recently provided comments back to them. We've no reason to think that those protective provision negotiations and discussions won't be concluded within the examination and we look forward to

1:13:32

further meetings with national highways in order to resolve those issues. Okay, thank you, Mr. Male. Miss Marshall, you'd like to respond to what you just heard from the applicant.

1:13:44

Thank you, Sarah Marshall national highways.

1:13:50

I had looked to respond by reference to the national highways, areas of prints where's the disagreement, which is document as dash 007.

1:14:03

The update on the protective provisions. We received an email yesterday with comments on the protective provisions. National Highways now have a standard form of protective provisions because once the highway always the highway, we then have a negotiate project specific protective provisions. So that will be that will be negotiated and discussed with meetings and then that is dealt with by way of a signed agreement.

1:14:31

We do expect to progress those and I'm waiting to hear from the applicant well arranged meetings.

1:14:38

The trenches drilling.

1:14:41

We've had correspondence, but we've not had the details yet. And this does seem to be a theme running through the third file refer to pages on the principal areas of disagreement pages 31 to 33.

1:14:58

We just haven't had sufficient data

1:15:00

To demonstrate the proposal don't adversely affect the strategic road network. So until we get those details, it's its engineering details plans, geotech geotechnical details, works at this junction drawings, we need these details to be able to respond.

1:15:21

You know, our priority is the safe is the safety of of us, for users of the strategic road network. It's a high speed road.

1:15:31

So

1:15:35

interaction so I know there is this sort of thought that it's some cabling under the SRN. But it's not this, the location, I mean, where the where the location is, where the cabling is, may impact on our ability to maintain and improve the the SRN da 27. So we do need to have this huge amount of detail to be able to

1:16:02

deal with that have that through the development consent order,

1:16:08

potentially has an impact to drainage of the strategic road network. So you know, we can't have the A 27 dropping, you know, levels dropping with the road, which is why we need that, that that information. You know, we're concerned about flood risks, climate implications, climate change recently, I know this, you know, with with the weather, but

1:16:33

we're very mindful of that. And again, we would expect this detail. And I have asked my after the preliminary meeting yesterday, I did ask that we have a high level meeting. So we can start getting this information, getting this detail. And dealing with all these issues. So we can provide the examining authority, all of you with with progress. And I would expect resolutions

1:17:00

or works to the strategic road network must be dmrbr compliant. So that's the design manual for roads and bridges. And that's the maths, it's not optional, it's the maths, and that sits under the Department of Transport circular 01 2022.

1:17:20

The traffic generated traffic generation now we did receive a list from the applicant through the outline, constructive,

1:17:30

construction traffic management plan. So that is P E, P, D, that, Oh, three, five days, so that's revision B, that was January 2024. But we haven't got sufficient D we haven't had any detail since that. So it's just seems to appears to us to be a list.

1:17:49

So again, that goes back to what I previously said. Pay, you know, though, the various,

1:17:54

the list on 31 to 33 of our prints Where's a disagreement? We need to detail.

1:18:02

I understand from my my clients that the second common ground there is a meeting with the applicant National High was a meeting with the applicant on the 14th of February.

1:18:13

And the book of reference,

1:18:17

there are five plots where they are seeking acquisition rights of highway land.

1:18:23

They may think, well this is verges but that is still highway land, we still need access to the SRN to be able to maintain and or improve if required.

1:18:33

We've got nine plots of land seeking temporary possession.

1:18:38

We need again, to meet with the applicants we need to discuss what their uses are why do they need particular acquisition rights? We may not be able to allow that. Why do they need think temporary possession but again, I would hope meeting with them we could resolve these issues.

1:18:58

I understand from my clients, the applicant is not a salary Undertaker, so they don't have any rights and a nurse where I mean if the applicant could confirm, but that's what we believe to be the position.

1:19:11

This means it's a question a liability. So if an incident occurred around the area of works, we would require the applicant to demonstrate to us that they have mitigated any risk.

1:19:25

And I generally add a broad view is that at the moment, it's all rather too vague to be clickable and we need to drill into the detail we need that certainty. Thank you, sir. Okay, that's that's very helpful. You know, there seem to be a bit of a common theme there that national highways are waiting for a lot of

information to ask you to expedite that. To move things along as quickly as possible, as you'd like, like to respond no suddenly. So I mean, I think also I'd say that, obviously you can tell by that response that there is

1:20:00

to an active dialogue that is in progress, the applicant is working out details, we're cognizant of the requirements of, of the Dr. dmr standards. So to which national highways have just referred and having regard to experience on other projects and similar crossings in other areas relating to the strategic road network. I don't see there's any reason why these are these issues can't be resolved. And we look forward to meetings with national highways in order to in order to do that. Yeah. And we look forward to seeing that progress quickly, over the next couple of deadlines on that.

1:20:43

Okay.

1:20:46

So before moving on now to Agenda Item four, I'd like to just go through the actions for Item three, to Mr. Male, if you could just read them out.

1:20:57

I'll try my best sir. And also, Mrs. Martin in my team may well add, so the ones that I may have missed them, hopefully between us, we may, we may get through them.

1:21:12

So firstly, I've got that the applicant will produce an updated note, which takes into consideration the new IEMA guidance that was referred to that was published shortly before the application

1:21:28

was submitted.

1:21:31

Now national highways, as we heard earlier, have asked for further details to be provided. And we will take forward those discussions with them across a variety of areas where those details have been requested.

1:21:47

We will also review various figures related to traffic routing. I think we'll do that comprehensively. Sir, given a number of anomalies were identified and confirm them update and update as necessary

1:22:05

to you.

1:22:08

Then there were various discussions related to construction hours and construction traffic management

1:22:16

around construction hours. And we agreed that we would respond to that, but that will be something that will be held over until after the submission of written representation so that we could do that. Do that holistically. Okay, those are the notes that I had. Did I miss anything?

1:22:34

Doesn't Mr. Rainey

1:22:38

there was just a couple others I noted. There was I think, an agreement that further information will be submitted to the traffic management for that Mitchell Grove Lane after the surveys.

1:22:56

And on the HCBS and construction hours that just the notes as well about potential use of holding areas.

1:23:07

Yes, thank you. So I think I think on that last point on holding areas, we will look to wrap that up if that's okay, in that in that more elastic response. Yeah, I think it's it's all tied up. And in what products I should have confirmed on the last item and this with the exception of the the item, you're going to wait till after the written responses. We agreed that this will be a deadline, one response for everything so far.

1:23:34

Aside from the one where you're going to wait for written reps first.

1:23:39

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, we would like to submit the technical note on the new ES guidance and deadline to just to allow submission of the ES addendum as a starting point. And then follow that up. That's reasonable. Yeah, thank you.

1:23:57

Okay, moving on then to Agenda Item number four. And that's the effects of the pro substitution of kaufhold and open to you. But initially, we're going to stay on the topic of transport access before broadening out into other other areas. So firstly, I'd like to discuss potential traffic and can Street and the a 272. So be quite helpful if the applicant will display figure 23.13 C of a p P dash 108 on this on the screen. Hopefully you've got that. Ready.

1:24:33

Thank you so well, Mr. Round is finding that can we play some musical chairs please on the applicants team so that people who need to speak to this agenda item and

1:24:43

I'll then explain who they are. And by that time hopefully we're in a position to to respond to this figure.
Thank you

1:25:06

Great, so we got the that plan

1:25:09

up on the screen.

1:25:13

So yesterday at the open floor hearing one, we heard concerns from several residents about construction traffic causing congestion on the A 272 kaufhold. And there was a particular concern about the safety of the proposed open Dean West compound and Oakland Dean substation, compound junctions. Those are a 62 and a 63. On the figure on the on the screen, which is in close proximity to each other,

1:25:43

be grateful if you respond to those concerns.

1:25:50

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant.

1:25:56

So just starting at the open DNS substation access a 63.

1:26:03

That is going to be designed again in accordance with dmrB requirements in relation to visibility splays taken into account sweat path analysis

1:26:13

and, and anticipated traffic flows to ensure it's it's designed appropriate, appropriately to cater for construction traffic opened in compound is noted that it does already serve a a

1:26:29

a industrial site there. So there is his already existing news by construction traffic. It's also worth noting that that looking at peak levels of construction traffic at each junction,

1:26:45

as we're estimating that we'll be looking at around 11 to 12.

1:26:50

Two HGV movements per hour, so that'd be six vehicles in in an hour, six vehicles out at each junction. So it's approximately one one vehicle every 10 minutes.

1:27:02

Okay, I think I think the concern was the fact that you've got two junctions in fairly close proximity with with movements, cutting across the carriage ways turning into those new new accesses and the safety of that. So with that in mind, and this is for all accesses right throughout the scheme, during intend carrying out road safety audits.

1:27:30

The open Dean substation junction has been subject to design

1:27:36

for submission to West Sussex, after which point we will complete a road safety audit on that junction and then carry out any recommendations that come from that. Yes, yes, that's kind of well, what about departing from this particular area, but it is appropriate? Talking about safety? What about other accesses? Existing, modified or new? Do you intended to do road safety audits? Those locations, we have had some discussions with with West Sussex County Council over where the need for for designs and road safety audits are required. We're also completing

1:28:17

preliminary designs and rotates the audit

1:28:22

at Washington, Washington compound

1:28:26

president I

1:28:30

don't believe there's any any others off the top of my head, but we can we can confirm so sort of a position as I understand it from what you've just said is that where the Highway Authority requires it requests it's you you'll be carrying out road safety audits

1:28:48

assuming it's it's a reasonable request

1:28:53

I think I don't think it'd be possible at this stage to do develop designs and complete road safety audits on every access junction given the number there is a requirement for designs to be agreed as part of the detailed design element but certainly those junctions where where there are concerns and when there is a high level of traffic generation we will be looking to do so.

1:29:17

Okay, moving on a little bit.

1:29:22

The issue of construction traffic using unsuitable routes such as picks lane to avoid incidents or congestion on the A 272 was also raised by residents and in relevant representations as well.

1:29:37

How what is your strategy for avoiding that

1:29:45

sorry, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant can you confirm which lane that was sorry, but that was picks lane. And I believe that's to the north of the a 272 which is a single track lane

1:29:59

which

1:30:00

I cannot, on occasion, I understand be used as a rat run to avoid congestion on the eight to 17. Okay, but it's not just picks lane, it's, whenever there's an issue, I understand from the reps, that those small lanes either side get congested.

1:30:19

And obviously construction traffic would add to that congestion and cause much more problems during the construction period of the substation. So what I'm asking is, what's your strategy for avoiding that? Okay, so I can van those lanes to the north are not part of the prescribed access routes. For construction, traffic access does, access is taken from the 272. And then into construction accesses.

1:30:50

As as required. In terms of other avoidance, there'll be there'll be monitoring of construction traffic movements throughout the period, the construction period and the ability to apply enforcement and correct two measures through the ctmp.

1:31:09

Okay,

1:31:11

okay, we'll move on then to Kent Street.

1:31:17

To we talked earlier about the transport assessment methodology. And the fact that the study areas were divided into two study areas.

1:31:28

You had the traffic routes use for onshore construction activities, you have the traffic loose routes use for onshore impacts of offshore offshore activities. And the roads are set assessed for city area one are listed in table 23 Eight of the transport chapter of the environmental statement, which is a PP dash 064 and paragraph 23 point 4.37 are that document indicates that these are being identified on the basis of

their use to access onshore construction activities. The figure that we got on the screen shows that two construction accesses for use by all vehicles including hcv's 61 access 64 proposed off Ken Street.

1:32:15

Ken Street is also included in the access strategies containing the latest outline construction traffic management plan p p d, Dash 035. A. So can you clarify the proposed nation extend to the use of can Street for construction operation activities outlined what traffic management is proposed for this road during construction, and explain the rationale for not including it in the list of highway links that you considered in the transport assessment?

1:32:45

Because it seems quite a key link to me.

1:32:50

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant.

1:32:54

So chemistry will be used to access

1:32:58

construction access as a 61 and a 64. should clarify that access will only be taken from the a 272. So it's not the intention for any construction traffic to route past residential properties that are located to the south of those access junctions.

1:33:19

In terms of traffic management, given

1:33:24

comments raised relevant

1:33:27

as part relevant representations. We are looking at traffic management strategy to support safe access by construction and other traffic along Kent Street. Again, similar to Mitchell Grove, Lane, that's something we are looking into. Once we have a preferred solution. We intend to submit that to West Sussex County Council for discussion with a view of reaching and greed agreement on the strategy as soon as possible. Okay, in looking at that strategy, are you considering the use of haul roads, basically, to act to service those access points along a road from the open Dean substation site?

1:34:16

It's not something I'm aware of, I'd have to take that away in case you didn't, right and just seems, you know, just one measure that perhaps could be taken to reduce the movements along the street.

1:34:30

So Simon Nagel on behalf of the applicant, the the access is off Kent Street, both the east and west cable routes. There is no possibility to access through haul road through the substation, from the substation, compound area south so we have to come down can Street to then enter onto the cable route. So we can't we can't access from the other

1:35:00

The other direction coming along. We are

1:35:03

we access going east going west down to HDD location, which then is under river. And so we we can't access from from further from the west towards chemistry going and running east. We also

1:35:22

run along the cable route

1:35:26

to again another HDD. So these are the only two accesses to the cable route running Eastern east and west. Could you perhaps provide a plan that sort of indicates that if you could take an action

1:35:40

on this be yes. Or a plan that illustrates that issue that you've just decided that the cable route these access centres explains why that you can't access it from the substation site.

1:35:56

Thank you.

1:36:01

Okay, I think I'll go to Westchester County Council, just to ask them if they got any comments on what they've heard from the applicant with regard the 8272 Ken Street

1:36:16

in Gledhill West Sussex County Council with regards to Kent street, I think a lot of matters are detailed aspects that will be considered through face specific construction management plans. I think there has been some, perhaps movements

1:36:32

through discussions from the applicant today that we perhaps need to take away and consider further as well. So I think it would probably appropriate for West Sussex to provide a further response in writing the appropriate stage.

1:36:46

Okay, thank you for that. I think, the smartest

1:36:53

Thank you. I start with Kent Street. I just to reiterate, this is largely used by dog walkers and people on horseback people going for walks. And it is a single track lane. And I mean that it's not like Bynum, Lane, it is only three metres wide at its maximum point. There are no

1:37:15

paths, simply things and great baggy ditches either side. When they started this consultation, their own scoping report said it was a single track unsuitable for HGVs. Then, after the consultation, a resident got an email to say that they were planning to use the cable construction traffic, including HGVs. And they would produce some kind of traffic measures to input to make that safe. Well, it difficult, frankly, to imagine what possible traffic measures could make this acceptable on such a very narrow route. And everybody knows that, if any. If there's anything wrong with the 272 and traffic numbers go up on that road, then the absolute chaos ensues. And Cushing District Council assesses the road as unsuitable for a wedding venue, which require just a small amount of increased traffic, a fraction of what's proposed by rampion. And now since the DCO

1:38:13

has been submitted, we see something that really hasn't been in the consultation up to now which is the intention to use Kent Street to avoid the AQa MA in California, and send everything down that way. And the numbers of traffic are enormous.

1:38:30

And to say that you can't you're not going to impinge on residents down there, the residents, residential, you know, access 64 is some considerable distance down that road. And you you will be severely impinging on the residence of Kent Street and mostly on Kings Lane.

1:38:52

You don't understand why it's not being included in the highways at all.

1:38:59

That is the issue of the haul roads.

1:39:02

And just to clarify about Ken and I can go on to numbers on that road are we going on to that later we will have some traffic data for that road.

1:39:14

Well perhaps you could just apply that into the examination with your written

1:39:20

evidence and then that will allow the applicant to actually respond to that. Okay, and the winning thing is we are

1:39:27

ranking keep linking this to

1:39:31

to comparing it to wine and Lane we've got a we can't use wine and lane because it's the single track road. It's not it was actually designed in the 1960s to take the construction traffic for the original substation. This is genuinely a single chat lane. And it shouldn't be used in this way. It's completely unsuitable. Okay. Thank you for that. And just go to Mr. Lightbourne and then Miss Hanley. Yes, Mr. Smith is actually Sorry Paul. Like don't miss those

1:40:00

erase the points eloquently as I was going to raise. But I just want to reinforce that. I'm here representing a number of householders on Kent Street and adjacent lanes. And they are very, very concerned about

1:40:17

the proposed traffic who's going to use Kent street, you say make representations, I think there will be something like 40 Plus representations already made in the previous round of representation, so the applicant should be well aware of the concerns. But today, nothing really is coming back to us to suggest that anything is being done about it. Thank you. Thank you for that. Miss Sandy.

1:40:44

Thank you, Nikki Handley, Bonnie parish council. Just a couple of things about access of the 272 Bonnie is very concerned because the access to the proposed access to the open DNS site is not far from the parish and the junction with a 23 which is already congested. For another planning matter, I had to look at the transport for sorry, the Department for Transport, transport, Department for Transport. So recent surveys on traffic flow for the section of the 272 between kaufhold and the A 23 Junction. And at the last count in 2022. The daily flow there was 18,546, which is a significant number for what is not a very wide road, and having multiple accesses up for the substation, the substation compound area, and any potential traffic lights up of Kent street, I think will cause enormous problems and our experience in rampion. One is that when there were problems on the 272, the drivers simply reprogrammed their Sat Navs and we had use of small roads like picked, picked lane. And around bolney We have multiple small loans and entwine them. At one point a truck managed to get itself stuck on Bob lane and trying to reverse out he got himself stuck and had to be towed out. And the consequence that was enforced through the DCO was a toolbox box talk the next day, it's not enough, not enough that this needs to be serious enforcement around the use of HGV routes.

1:42:25

And just while we're on this, I'm somewhat disappointed that in this ctmp that the construction workers vehicles have been removed from the LGV requirements last time they were included. And the CTP ctmp specifically says that

1:42:46

the

1:42:48

the construction traffic have no routing restrictions, which means that they use the small roads. And they're not appropriate for traffic. And it's not just the arrivals of the construction workers at seven or 8am or whatever. They then go out to find coffee, they come back again. They go out again to find a sandwich and they come back again. They're constantly on the road. And it's just you know, this is a rural area. Last time in the cGMP certain roads within bolney and twine were removed and marked as prohibited use and I would ask that this time the same happens again for the small rural roads around bolney into item

1:43:34

caliphal parish council can speak about their

1:43:38

small rural roads, that

1:43:41

Foxhall Lane Chapel Road Ryecroft road to the street are all completely inappropriate for any construction traffic. And that includes construction workers. Thank you. Okay, thank you, Stanley.

1:43:53

Is there anyone else who wants to raise comments on this issue? This twining Thank you. He has twine and parish council. Yes, we're extremely concerned about the prospect of traffic coming off the a 23 going down hosted lane, only Chapel Road and Bob Lane in order to access wine and lane.

1:44:15

It becomes a rat run parts of Bob lane you have to reverse it if you meet another vehicle.

1:44:25

In the event, there are accidents on the AQ seven to these roads that are used as restaurants or alternative routes. And it was whilst they were pouring concrete at the only substation, but all the concrete vehicles were rerouted down Bob Lane one day and we had complete chaos.

1:44:47

I pulled out quite a lot of stuff from the hedges after people had tried to overtake each other pass each other. So we would be very grateful

1:45:00

Oh workforce could be instructed that they cannot use these small rural lanes. And just as a bit of local knowledge, the holding area last time was at merrylands, which is on the A to seven to a 23 Junction. And that is no longer available because it's been built over. Okay, thank you. That's very useful. Am I supposed to have you got anything else to add? Didn't she? Well, yes, I really just, I completely agree with what they say. But Ken st is only the same size as Bob lane, how can it be accepted, acceptable to use that in the way that they're proposing.

1:45:39

And also some of these wraparound roads ticularly around Cal fold and actually in the AONB in the high Weald, and it will have a significant impact on them in the state of them. And with regards to the accident, we were talking about the at 17 as well, those ins and outs areas with further compounds.

1:46:00

There are real clusters of accidents already occurring at the Oak Indian industrial estate, which by the way, is not already used for construction traffic. And as you said, it isn't it's not that kind of industrial estate. So there are clusters of accidents, there are clusters of accidents where you want to put the access to the oak and Dean compact substation site, clusters of accidents at Kent Street, and the pigs Lane junction, which is horrendous. And I would just like to point out that where you want to put the construction access to the substation site is very close to where the original access to open D Manor was. And it was removed and moved on to the industrial estate decades ago because it even at that time when the traffic was as it was, it was deemed too dangerous.

1:46:54

Okay, thank you for that.

1:46:59

As Matthew Porter Horsham Council is just to revise the panel and we will be making representation now local impact reports about impact on the local road network.

1:47:10

And in the vicinity of a substation, also chemistry, particularly around the new planning application has been submitted on chemistry, the access or a five, nine and a 16 as well.

1:47:25

Okay, thank you. That's very useful. Does the applicant want to respond very quickly or

1:47:31

at this point? Thank you, Chris Williams, on behalf of the applicant. A few points just to respond to apologies on relation to open Dean compound I was referring to that it was used by ATVs rather than used by construction traffic in any in in relation to use of traffic signals. We don't believe at this time, there will be a need for traffic signals on the 87 to based on the construction traffic associated

1:48:02

with with Oakland in substation

1:48:07

the prohibition of construction routes that were used as part of rampion. One.

1:48:13

That's something I'm not aware of. But it's something that we'll take away and we'll we'll have a look at and consider.

1:48:20

And finally, just on Ken's do in general, it's just just to make the point that we do agree in its current form, it's not suitable for

1:48:32

for use by construction traffic, hence why we're looking at appropriate traffic management measures to ensure that it can be accessed safely. Okay, that's great. Thank you. Okay. I think at that point, I think we'll

1:48:47

see Mr. Otto.

1:48:51

Oh, it's too early.

1:48:53

Yeah. Yeah.

1:48:59

We've got

1:49:02

equity management.

1:49:10

Oh, sorry. Just before we adjourn, then, Miss Davis.

1:49:15

I just wondered if I could just mention something. You've said that you don't plan to have any traffic lights at this particular point outside Oh, condemned. But from what we've read the 8000 ATVs that you've told us that that would go they would go along Oh, contain we've now found out that that's going to be near a 27,000. Then there's going to be about 75,000 the Igps. And then looking into the documentation, it seems the personal vehicles or workers vehicles is nearly 350,000. So how exactly are all those vehicles going to come in and out or particularly out across two lanes of fast moving traffic to six, on average? 60 to 70 miles an hour.

1:50:00

And you've heard how busy that road is. So I'm, we've been asking for these sorts of plans, or your proposals and your your set telling us this morning. That's,

1:50:11

you know, you haven't got that in mind. Also,

1:50:16

we've not seen any sort of traffic modelling at all, we've heard nothing about your transport plan for this area.

1:50:26

And nothing with regard to the traffic management, or how many vehicles will be at the peak weeks. And how many peak weeks will there be? There's so much so much missing data. And although you refer the reader to different chapters and volumes, the information simply isn't in the documentation.

1:50:49

Okay, thank you, Miss David. Thank you. You want to respond to that? Mr. Mel?

1:50:58

Certainly, sir, I think

1:51:00

we might be able to provide some assistance, because I think some of that information that that is alleged to be missing is actually in the application. So we'll have that discussion outside of the hearing. I'll be very helpful and I think we might be able to assist there. That's great. Thank you very much. Okay, so at that point, I think we'll adjourn for lunch. If people could come back at 10 past two, and we'll reconvene then.

1:51:24

Okay,