

TRANSCRIPT_RAMPION2_ISH2_SESSION6 _16052024

Thu, May 16, 2024 2:10PM • 1:46:42

00:05

It's now half past 11 If we can resume the hearing outs

00:10

Genda items C six C.

00:16

So this

00:18

agenda item is about the application of r1 design principles

00:24

principally r1. design principle three.

00:29

Again, this

00:31

this agenda item was devised on the basis of some natural England's concerns

00:38

here, Natural England will be proposed questions directly on it.

00:45

So, really the questions in this agenda item are just a couple of clarification points

00:53

that

00:55

the essay really expected a simple yes or no answer rather than

01:01

a lot of detail on just to clarify

01:05

the South Downs and stuff downs National Park and the applicants position really just to check the essays understanding. So Natural England have concerns that the rampion the proposed development scheme must give due regard to the r1 design principles principally design principle three, because of their perception of a hybrid array of R one and R two views together.

01:34

Rep. 3147 from Natural England suggests that Southdowns National Park hold the same concerns as as them on seascape. The essay wishes to briefly clarify this.

01:52

The next day would summarise the applicants response to natural England on this issue

01:58

as the this particular principle is actually not appropriate or relevant to apply to the proposed development because the proposed development is not a hybrid scheme in itself.

02:12

evidenced by requirement to wear the dress DCO, which essentially restricts the

02:21

wind turbine generators to a uniform height and rotor diameter. So I just want to confirm with the applicant that the ESA is understanding of that issue, and their response is accurate.

02:41

Yep, Simon Martin on behalf of the applicant.

02:45

Yeah, fundamentally, I think I think that that's an accurate description of position, I think we can confirm that and have confirmed through the written representations that they're ramping to is an application for a uniform turbine height.

03:01

The only thing I would note there is that in terms of the the rampion one, design principle three in relation to the hybrid scheme.

03:11

I think, you know, the intention of that design principle was to avoid having bigger turbines in front of smaller turbines.

03:20

So, I think you know, we would know that we would have done that through the design of the spatial extent of the area boundary.

03:32

Thanks for that explanation that's, that's useful.

03:37

And simulated simulator South Downs National Park.

03:46

So no Natural England rep. Re 147. As I as I said earlier, suggested Southdowns National Park hold the same views. But

03:57

I just want to clarify that it's still the view of South Downs National Park Authority. That's

04:06

our one design principle three is not relevant.

04:18

Rich said if South South Central Park this That's right.

04:23

But thank you for that clarification.

04:26

Is there anyone else who wanted to make any comments on

04:31

on those who were the the agenda item was just to clarify their respective sides positions? Does anyone in the room are online so

04:41

we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is in respect of

04:49

the assessment of harm to special qualities and whether the statutory purposes of the South Downs National Park is compromised.

05:00

So,

05:02

Natural England say that the Hanse special qualities leads to the purposes of the National Park being compromised.

05:10

And

05:12

the South Downs National Park Authority in their answer to the essays written questions,

05:20

S I. V. 1.5. Say that the statutory purposes are compromised at the point of harm.

05:29

So the South Downs National Park frt.

05:32

Can you explain why you say that the statue purposes are compromised at the point of harm?

05:41

Originally only for South Downs National Park Authority Yeah. So,

05:46

the statutory purposes obviously, are about conservation and enhancement of particular aspects. And

05:57

specifically,

05:59

obviously, the

06:03

the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and then obviously, the other aspect of the of the statutory purposes are promoting opportunities for understanding and enjoyment of special qualities. So, where there is harm to natural beauty

06:22

that is compromising those statutory purposes?

06:35

Thank you for that explanation. So, again Southdowns National Park Authority.

06:43

The view that you've just expressed, is still relevant,

06:51

despite the applicant's answer to ESA wo Q one.

06:58

So the essay is written questions one s VL 1.5, Rep. 3051, in particular, Appendix F.

07:12

Which sets out examples of permitted and sips, affecting special qualities and the statutory purpose of the national landscapes

07:25

which

07:27

appears to set out that this Secretary of State has taken a more nuanced approach to this assessment.

07:37

And Richard Ernie, for South Downs National Park Authority, I don't think these are really just examples of where notwithstanding the identification of adverse effects on the designated the national landscapes,

07:56

which I think are all

08:00

areas of outstanding natural beauty rather than national parks.

08:06

Nonetheless, the centre of State has concluded that

08:10

development consent should be granted. So I'm not sure that this list of examples of other harmful development necessarily answers the question about whether the the purposes of being exposed to the National Park are being compromised by this development. They're just examples of where notwithstanding that compromise, development consent has nonetheless been granted.

08:34

But they are all I think it's important to know that the duties are different in respective areas of outstanding natural beauty. Not exactly the same for for national parks. And I think these are all examples of aonbs.

08:54

Does the

08:56

applicant have anything that they want to come back on those particular?

09:00

Points? Thank you. So Paul model for the applicant? I think you've correctly identified those linear questions to the national park there the references to those other orders and examinations that have considered and grappled with this issue. I think what I would say is that the applicant fundamentally disagrees with the National part that the threshold of compromise sits at the threshold of the identification of harm, I think it is perfectly possible to

09:28

harm without compromising the purposes. Those Those are two different things and where you have a policy aim as articulated in each one to avoid compromising the purposes that sits at a higher threshold and in by involves a wider consideration of how those purposes manifest themselves.

09:52

Then simply identifying whether there is any harm to

09:59

them.

10:00

A nationally designated area as its termed in policy terms comprising both national parks aonbs. And consequently, a finding that a particular proposal does not accord with that policy aim.

10:18

Also, I think it'd be worth remembering the limitations of landscape and visual impact assessment. And talking about significant impacts, they are only part of the story. They are basically a combination of assessing the sensitivity and the magnitude of an effect. But in addition to that, once we have that magnitude, that level of effect, and whether it's significant or not, we're also looking at consideration of duration, whether the effect is indirect or, or direct the nature of that effect and how it's experienced and other factors like what comes after, will the hedgerows regrow? How long will that take? Those sorts of considerations as well. And And as we've discussed earlier, considering wider aspects than just landscape and visual, thank you.

11:13

Thank you for that explanation. Just the South Downs, national pilot Park Authority wants to come back on any of those pilots. Are you

11:23

happy with the explanation has already been given from your rich to any for this outstanding National Park Authority? I think just a couple of points that

11:35

I understand the point that's being made about

11:39

things other things are being done to mitigate impacts. But that doesn't really answer the question about whether the project compromises the statutory purposes.

11:50

It's agreed that there is harm. It's agreed that it's significant. And it's agreed that there are harms and there's harm to the special qualities. And all of those things we say lead to a conclusion about to compromise. And the applicant says no, that's not enough in itself. You need more than that. I think the other point I'd emphasise is that

12:10

the majority

12:13

and shortlist available to me the ones that are in the AONB, but the majority of the projects that he's referred to in his submission in the list of things, list of projects, whether it's out of status found some harm, but nonetheless, granted development consent. They're not in the natural landscape.

12:37

Certainly in respect to a number of those offshore wind farms and in respect of Sizewell C, for example, it's not in the national landscape, it is in the setting of the national landscape, whereas this is a project which directly cuts through the national landscape.

13:02

Thank you for that explanation. Does the applicant wish to come back in on any of those points? Are you happy with the written submissions in terms of the explanation within? Well, Appendix F and?

13:21

Rep. Five one, the only any quick points that I would make is to reiterate that the assessment of significant effects is not equated literally into whether the statutory purposes are compromised, or the judgement on acceptability or otherwise.

13:43

That's just our job as landscape architects to complete the landscaping visual impact assessment. And also when we look at decisions like the Southampton and London pipeline project from 2020. The decision they're

13:59

very similar went through the National Park.

14:04

The inspectors there noted that on for example, tranquillity they consider the impacts will be largely transient and of short duration. And after their deliberations taken in a number of factors.

14:18

They decided that the project just attract neutral weight in the planning balance.

14:26

That's just another example. Thank you.

14:34

Thank you for that.

14:38

Does national buyer want to come back in another? Are they

14:42

okay, does anyone else wish to

14:46

make any comment on this particular agenda item?

14:50

Does anyone in the room or online so

14:54

we'll move on to the next agenda item. We're

15:00

She is in

15:02

respect of cumulative assessment.

15:08

So the assessment of current effects including rampion one.

15:30

If yes, Mr. Brown then if you'd like to

15:34

make your comments on, on that particular part.

15:39

Right. Okay, I was imagining this was going to be a three minute deadline. So I limited myself somewhat. But I mean, a few more things I'd like to include. But basically, I was referring to my deadline three representation, which is rep 3105. There's this reply to the comments made by our ED on the Protect coastal England community lead local impact assessment, which is rep 1145. And those two things between them do cover cover in detail, a whole lot of points that I'm just want to hit on

basically wants to deal with one thing here, here to start with. The main point is that the the local impact assessment Chapter Three covers in considerable detail, I'd say and try to produce a very balanced view as best we can alter local, of the local and innovate impact throughout the Sussex Bae of the of the new proposal. And, and then the my reply, in fact dealt with comments on most of the viewpoints, the pictures and the representations and the simulations of the viewpoints. And we're comments there in terms of our reaction or my reaction as well, to those. And in several cases. In fact, I found that my reaction to the looking in more detail at those representations, or those simulations was that it actually was producing a greater negative effect that identity dissipated. So I had to modify your view slightly on some of those. Anyway, I'm sorry, I don't want to interrupt you. But

17:17

of course, we'll have your written representations will already have seen those. And this isn't really

17:23

the place to just read those out. And again, what I would I mean, you can put something in writing a deadline for what I think the examining authority would like is for you to respond to the questions that have been asked and the answers that you've heard. So I don't want this hearing to turn into a read out of a prepared statements, which could have been done at the open floor hearing on Monday. So if you could, I'm very happy to read anything further you want to put in at the next deadline. But if you could confine yourself to just perhaps responding to

18:01

if you want to the points that have been made by the applicant in response to Mr. O'Sullivan's question, otherwise, I would ask you to put that in writing

18:14

very well, and it will, in fact, but basically, I suppose what I was saying here was I was making an appeal to the ESA that

18:23

we, then there are protections in place, legal protection in place for the National Park, we are saying that we are extremely concerned about the effect that it will have on that. Sorry, the effect that the visual effect will have on the National Park and we believe that it will exactly provide was almost we see we're saying

18:47

it the weather, indeed be negative effects that are going to go straight out the heart of its essential qualities and so on. So I was basically saying that you want to be assured that the legal aspects, that's the countryside, National Park legislation, offshore energy, strategic environmental assessment, for and the European Convention on landscapes and the levelling up.

19:12

Legislation is truly applied here and not relaxed, because we think there's, you know, the protections are put there for the future generations, not for us, particularly not for people of my age, but they're there for future generations. And we think there is a very, very great negative effect

19:29

as prices below Wilson. Thank you. Well,

19:33

this was I did want to move on on this and Mr. Evers

19:37

very quickly. Thank you for that. And I want to just pick up on something that the lady over there said I'm so sorry, I've forgotten your name.

19:45

It was regarding the temporary nature.

19:49

When you go to a national park. It's not just the ground you're walking on that matters, and that's obviously so important. But it's the views from in the setting of

20:00

of the landscape and in this particular National Park, what is so important about it is the seascapes and the dark eyes. And that's why it is such an impact on it. That's really all I wanted to say. Thank you. Thank you. I know that we've had plenty of representations on dark skies, which is again, why it wasn't on the agenda specifically, because we're because they have had responses in writing. Yeah.

20:35

Well, I think you've probably made responses to those in writing already. So I'm going to assume you nothing further to add on that. Okay. Well, thank you very much for those points that are raised.

20:50

So, agenda item six is the assessment of the cumulative effects including rampion. One.

21:00

First, first question is in saris to the South Downs National Park Authority. So

21:10

in answer to the x a written question questions, one SLV 1.4. Natural England confirm that is correct to include rampion one as part of the baseline.

21:25

Just wanted to understand

21:28

why Southdowns National Park Authority don't agree with Natural England on this point.

21:37

They assess Robin Blitzer for the SAP as National Park. And we would set out that a number of different items under this point. And the first one being at the planning Inspectorate

21:48

set out in 2020, that the cumulative seascape landscape and visual effects of the ramp into with other winch off link wind farm projects with the exception rampion. One could be scoped out at the SL BIA. That's the first point. The second one is that in the

22:10

special with when the special qualities were designated rampion one was not built. So the assessment of the effects on the special qualities shouldn't take ramping one is not was not part of the baseline at that point in time. So it's not right to consider that.

22:26

In terms of special qualities, it should be a cumulative effect on special qualities or close rampion one on ramp into. And the third point is that I know that in the GLBA there are a set out we've set out in our

22:41

response to the examining authorities questions a number of

22:45

clauses from the GL GL, FW EIA, three guidance that explain why there are different types of cumulative assessment and that where you're looking at projects that have a close relationship or close to each other or related, then you do have to take that cumulative assessment into effect that's all set out in that in our in our response to your question, sir.

23:09

All right. Thank you. Thank you for that explanation.

23:13

On that point as the does the applicant want to come?

23:18

comment on any of the things that have just been said? Or are the applicant content in terms of

23:24

the applicant submission on this point, in response to natural England's

23:31

concerns that they raised?

23:34

Simon Martin on behalf of the applicant, I think the detail is in that response to

23:39

natural England's crazy response to your questions. So I'll cover it briefly sir, and just highlight that.

23:48

Our our approach and our focus in the in the assessment has been to follow the planning Inspectorate advice note 17

23:58

which is relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects. In particular, this is a table which states that effects arising should be considered as part of the baseline and may be considered as part of the construction and operational assessment where projects are already completed and operational. And we've we've adopted that approach, essentially in the in the impact assessment.

24:23

It the table and advice note 17 doesn't, it doesn't it sets out a tiered approach to assessing cumulative effects. It doesn't include operational projects within that that tiered approach. It's very much focused on on future projects and

24:42

the applicants position on it, and it's set out in writing but

24:48

rampion one point is part of the baseline we've we've, I think, our understanding is that's a great and agreed position with Natural England.

24:57

So

24:59

the effect is essentially

25:00

factors accounted for essentially a ramp in one in our assessments because we've assessed the additional effect ramp into in the context of rampion, one in the baseline.

25:10

So we will evaluate factors like the spread of rampion. One, the

25:16

relationship and consistencies of scale between between the ramping one and ramping two turbines in the in the main assessment of the vs chapter.

25:29

And we don't think that further evidence is needed further assessment is needed to consider

25:35

consider further human to the facts and might arise.

25:42

Thank you for that explanation.

25:50

Yes, thank you for that explanation.

25:56

Do the National Park want to come back and on fly? Oh, yeah. Happy with the explanation that's given. So those

26:03

can I just say a couple more points please, sir. It's Robin butcher from safeness stands National Park. Adult draw your attention to a PP one to eight, which acknowledges that ramping one is the project with which rampion two may interact to produce a cumulative effect, cumulative effect that's also in our response to your questions. And also that the GLBA guidance sets out that

26:29

agreement should be reached about whether the cumulative effects assessment is to focus primarily on the additional facts of the main project under consideration or on the combined effects of all past present and future proposals together with the new project. So that's also set out in my the response in our response to question, sir.

26:50

So can I just briefly add to this well, rich terney for South Downs National Park Authority that I think the response from the applicant obviously is based on a sort of EIA methodological approach. But it doesn't really grapple with the point that we've been making throughout this, which is about the impact on special qualities. And I think the applicant, I suspect would agree with the proposition that when you're considering the effect on special qualities, you're not looking at them as diminished by rampion. One. But instead, you're looking at the total effect of this project together with rampion. One, on the special qualities. And that's that's the point that has just been made about the timing, the special qualities are identified and described with rampion. One not present. Until you're not saying what was special qualities are already diminished. You're saying? Where are the special quality? How do I judge the impact of the special qualities now?

28:01

Thank you for that explanation.

28:05

In your mind just

28:08

did the did the African one to come in back on our other again, a happy with the written submissions? I I simply say this, not

28:19

many because I can't quite remember the chronology of the issue of the sharing of indulgent decision and where deadline for sorry, where deadline three set a similar argument, an issue was considered during the sharing of induction explanation. If we haven't put that reference already in the submissions that we made a deadline three will do so in us the deadline force.

28:41

Thank you.

28:43

So

28:46

next question was going to be to the National Park.

28:52

Which

28:54

I think you've partially just answered, but I'm gonna ask it anyway, just in case. You want to add anything additional to it, Mr. Turney.

29:03

So in response to ESA written questions, one, again, SBL 1.4. South Downs National Park Authority saying clued in rampion, one within the baseline leads to the effects on the special qualities of the National Park not being adequately assessed. I was going to ask why. But you've

29:28

I think it is your previous answer complete in terms of that particular question or do you want to add anything to

29:39

what you've just said? I think it's complete on that point. Right. Thank you for that.

29:53

This agenda item

29:57

see anyone in the room

30:00

Oops, sorry, Mr. Turney, where you want to just before you move off,

30:06

six, fix entirely or go to the action points. Can I just add a further further point that that cuts across what we've been talking about this morning.

30:17

So

30:19

I think we heard before the break from the applicant that an acceptance, that aspects of the design of the array, which are to be settled later,

30:33

could affect the degree of harm to the special qualities of a national park.

30:39

As the DCA stands, there isn't any real control over that.

30:46

And given the statutory duty.

30:50

The National Parks position is that there should be some control over that. Because whilst there may be different designs for the array that could come forward that suit the interests of navigation to the interests of fisheries, see the interests of

31:09

maximising output,

31:12

the design factor in terms of its impact on the National Park is not going to be controlled in that process. And at the very least, that should be a factor. So

31:24

quite how it's done, I think could be a matter of for debate. But

31:29

our position is that the control of the design of the array should be subject to an approval, which takes into account the impact on the special qualities, the National Park, in other words, a design approval, whether that's is an extension to the DML de marine licence approval for the array, or whether it's as a separate approval by the Secretary of State for the design of the array.

31:55

We think that's gonna be an important component of securing the impacts of the National Park are minimised.

32:08

Thank you for that Mr. Turney.

32:13

thing that was

32:15

probably part and parcel of under the previous actions.

32:21

But can we just know that if that wasn't uncommon, just note that in addition, as an action point

32:29

I've just got one

32:31

final question. Just to sum up the general

32:36

seascape impacts.

32:39

And again, it's to the South Downs National Park Authority.

32:45

So if the Secretary of State were to accept the applicants need case, the alternatives case and that the seascape landscape and visual, so the seascape and visual effects of the proposed development have been reduced as far as possible. Would it be Southdowns National Park authorities contention that this issue alone

33:12

should result in a recommendation to withhold the DCO the proposed development?

33:22

Richard 25th southlands National Park Authority so sorry that my fourth not hearing properly, but do you mean the seascape impacts alone? So let's assume that it was connected to France rather than through the National Park? Is that the question or is it the the impacts on the national park overall impacts on the seascape associated with the impacts on the National Park? Not? Not not cable corridor, not cable corridor? Correct?

33:53

I think we'll take we'll take that way. And come back to you with a written a firm written response to that. I didn't want to say something I later regret.

34:06

Despite the fact they do it quite regularly.

34:09

We'd say that as a action point then, thank you, Mr. Attorney.

34:14

And so if there's Is anyone else who wanted to make any

34:21

further comments on the applicant side on

34:26

what we just heard and this

34:29

anyone else in the room?

34:34

At what point in the negotiations do we actually know what the final array and therefore its impact? And therefore decisions from that can therefore be reached? At what point do we actually get that? And will there be still anytime to discuss or will that just be an internal with the say

35:00

If the ESA

35:05

question to the applicant

35:10

does the applicant just want to come with a brief?

35:14

I think I think certainly so I think we can say where we are in the process is, of course, the way in which this application is proceeding is on the basis of a Rochdale envelope approach, which assesses effectively a range of possible turbine sizes and number on a worst case basis. And so we are seeking consent for any development within that envelope subject to the the controls that are secured through the various requirements in the DCO, the control plans and the conditions in the DML.

35:58

Thank you for that explanation.

36:02

So that concludes

36:05

item six.

36:11

If we now move on to

36:15

the action points.

36:22

Thank you, sir, if I could just

36:25

start by a point in relation to the sort of additional action that arose out of yesterday before I get on to the ones in in point six, which is merely to flag the following discussions with the applicant team in the break.

36:42

Last we're working on that request, it may not be possible to submit the plan that's requested at a deadline for because there's a certain amount of disaggregation and consolidation of various documents that needs to happen in order to be able to facilitate that in a in a coherent way.

37:02

What the applicant will certainly do it deadline for is explain how it's approaching that issue to give comfort to the examining authority of of its intent. And then it may be the case that if we can't get it done for deadline for the submission of the documents themselves have to follow it deadline five, but we'll we'll certainly do it as soon as as soon as we can. So just just no later than deadline five obviously will be quite close to the end. And if there are any questions that need to be posed from it, I would like the opportunity to do that.

37:40

Then other action points arising

37:47

various things considering how on the face of the DCO. And within control documents, references could be incorporated

38:01

to particularly highlight issues associated with the purposes of the national park. There were

38:10

obviously specific requirements that were referred to there but we'll think about that issue in the round and respond

38:19

in relation to the levelling up and regeneration act duty.

38:26

The applicant is going to make a submission at the next deadline in order to advise the examining authority how the application can demonstrate that that duty has been fulfilled

38:41

and then

38:43

the last action I have is for the South Downs National Park to confirm their position in relation to that last question on whether the seascape impacts alone would be one which they view would warrant withholding of the order

39:05

that's that's what I've got but I've got one additional

39:10

which is the one to do with the applicant consider the need for control of layout and design to be given to a body maybe on behalf of the South Downs National Park

39:23

otherwise Yes, the fall and all that thanks

39:46

Can I just clarify that I may have missed what you were summing up but you are also going to look at requirements 1216 and 22 in respect of of improving the wording to ensure that

40:00

that everything that you do has the South Downs National Park at heart. So I think was the point that Mr. Tony was making, you're going to go and review that. Did you? Did you mention that? Yes, sir. I thought I did. That's that's captured if I did not. Okay. I'm Thank you very much.

40:16

Mr. Chairman. May I just make make one point, I think there was an action to pull together three documents related to vegetation retention, hedgerow disruption. So as far as more coherent, yes. And Mr. mowdy mentioned that first. Sorry, I missed it. That's fine. It's, it has been covered. Yes. But, yes, that was covered as an action point. Thank you. Okay, let's move on to the next item on the agenda, which is traffic and access. Dr. Morgan?

40:50

Thank you, Mr. Allen.

40:52

Mr. Mayor, you're going to swap over your team or Yes, I think I need to otherwise we won't have the correct people sat here if you bear with us for a couple of minutes source.

42:05

So I believe we're ready. Hey, thank you.

42:09

So we're now on item seven, transport and access, and seven a Kent street traffic management strategy. Mr. Mail, in the latest version of the outline construction traffic management plan, which was rep three, zero to nine, you provided a technical note outlining the traffic management strategy for light and heavy goods vehicles to accessing a six, four and a six, one on Kent Street, and deadline three. So what I'd like you to do please is outline this strategy for everyone in the room. So we're all have a common knowledge and online of course,

42:48

that will inform the discussion. And please feel free to use any plans you think might be useful, as well that you submit in the examination.

42:58

Thank you, sir. I'll, I'll look to my left and let the various participants introduce themselves and then ask them to proceed to respond to that question. Thank you.

43:12

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. Before I get into detail, can I just make an apology I've got a horribly ticularly cough I will try my best to mute my microphone as and when I can feel that coming on. But apologies if I fail and it gets picked up particularly by those on teams with with headphones on. So the chemistry

43:37

traffic management strategy aims to deal with the fact that it's a single track lane and aims to therefore avoid the need for HGVs to pass each other. Sorry, it was if I could just check you're going to refer to a plan which might be quite useful.

43:55

Yes.

43:57

We like to have time together up on onto the screen please.

44:06

Yeah, so that is a plan that is contained in the the traffic management traffic strategy for Kent street.

44:15

So as I said, the main aim of the strategy is to avoid the need for ATVs to pass each other on Kent Street, noting it as a single track lane.

44:28

And the ability the location of the compound open deem means there is the option there to allow or to sorry, manage HTV access into

44:41

access a 61 and a 64. In addition to that,

44:47

to facilitate access, there is a revision of four paths in places on chemistry itself, and widening the junction of the A to seven to to help facilitate the left

45:00

Turn of HGVs out of the junction, these works would fall under work number 13 of the onshore work plans. So they will be temporary. And it would be intention to restore those to existing conditions at the end of the construction phase.

45:16

It's also worth noting that the past in places that are on chemistry, they are in close proximity to exist in informal paths in places. So we'll be aiming to effectively upgrade those to ensure they're

45:30

available for use by vehicles all year round.

45:36

Going on the

45:39

HGVs will be controlled via yoke Indian compound

45:44

and effectively called into the construction access when it's safe to do so. So at that point

45:53

HGVs LTVs were waiting to exit, the construction access will be held.

46:00

So not to move on to chemistry to ensure they don't meet HGVs coming in in the opposite direction. And banksman will be placed on Kent Street to stop any traffic travelling northbound at the point south of the access junction, but also to inform any pedestrians that walking up and down chemistry of earning income and HTV.

46:25

When an ATV is coming out again, that will be supported by banksman access banksman.

46:31

To ensure that it does it's not met by a by any general traffic coming in the opposite direction. So effectively the proposed passing places we are including those almost as a failsafe, the strategy is set out. So

46:50

there shouldn't be a need for HGVs to pass other traffic

46:55

when accessing chemistry.

46:58

If that does happen, those pass in places by inadequate wait for for two way traffic.

47:07

But you Thank you, Mr. Williams, I think we really need to understand exactly what's proposed to these accesses. So can you perhaps take us through step by step, the proposed access process, when the arrival of HCV at open Dean, West compound, to his final departure from the site is just that granularity to understand exactly how that ACV is managed. Okay, so it'd be the intention that that no direct access will be provided

47:36

for HGVs to to the country access is they would all have to be go via opened in compound, then wait their radio into the work site, confirm that there is no LTVs or HGVs. Due to exit the site. If there's not at that point, there'll be called into site. They will, as they as they are called in banksman will be placed on Kent Street.

48:06

And then now, there'll be able to complete their journey and then to the construction access side.

48:14

And then to complete the process, how do they egress. So on exit,

48:22

the management of income in vehicles by the compound will mean there's no HGVs coming in the opposite direction. When exiting banksman Will will be placed on Kent Street to stop northbound traffic south of the access and southbound traffic close to the junction with the 272

48:43

that will then facilitate Fitzy clear access north out of chemistry and then then away from the site.

49:02

Sorry, my microphone went off slightly. So I'll just repeat that. I've got some questions to ask you basically on that. And then I'm going to hand over to West Sussex County Council for their comments as Highway Authority before opening up then to IPs for further comments. So if I start with my comments first,

49:22

can you confirm the land necessary for the for passing places? And the local widening on the western side? Again, Street News junction with a 272 are within the order limits. And then no additional land is required.

49:38

increased volume above the applicant? Yes, that's correct. It's all within the order limits. So you don't have to change the order limits at all to facilitate this strategy. No, no, that's correct. And

49:49

is that the land that's going to be used both for the winding of the cane street access and the passing points? Is that highway, land or private land?

50:01

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, I believe it is highways land.

50:05

That's for the widening of the the bell mouth on the junction as well. I would need to take that away and double check, certainly the past in places are within highway land. Okay, you can take an action then to actually clarify

50:19

the status of that land that you need for that that widening.

50:24

Okay, going on to my second question, obviously, can Street is any improved single track lane, which is currently subjected to very low traffic volumes?

50:35

Have you made any assessment of whether the structure of the character itself can withstand the over 2000 HGV movements proposed in such a relatively short time?

50:48

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant,

50:52

no detailed assessment has been been undertaken at this stage. But it's noted that that Kent street doesn't

51:00

currently have any any form of weight limit on it. So our assumption that it is that it wouldn't be suitable to carry that carry the proposed construction traffic? Should work be required. They could be undertaken via their controls contained within the DCO.

51:20

Thank you. It's just

51:23

a lot of HCV movements are relatively short period. As you know, he movements and weights are what really damages highway casualties, which was why was asking that question. So you're not proposing any strengthening in advance of the works.

51:41

Chris Williams on behalf the applicant, we're not aware of the need for any any strengthen works. So not at this stage.

51:50

Okay, thank you. So if you're not going to strengthen the carriageway, what contingencies do you have in the event and the category fails during construction?

52:02

Chris Williams and half the applicant the outlines the ctmp does include a requirement for

52:11

assessment of carriageway conditions prior to start of construction, plus regular reviews of that during the construction period, and then a requirement to ensure that it's brought back up to a level which is at least comparable with the existing conditions at the end of construction. Thank you. But I think my question was more aimed at a sudden failure of the carriageway, right in the middle of your construction

activities. How would you respond to that? And what contingencies? Have you got to actually deal with that that scenario?

52:47

Chris, when he was bath, the applicant, I think we need to take that away and respond in writing. Okay, I can have a second action point then you to respond long that

52:59

you alluded to the fact that you're going to do a condition survey at the start of the works. And then presumably, any defects. At the end, you'd have an agreement with the Highway Authority, then to make good at the end?

53:17

How would those works be carried out?

53:27

Chris Williams on half African apologies. Can you just when you say how would how would they be carried out? Can you clarify what you mean by that? Well, it's just likely that after you spike to 1000s, ACV movements, there's going to be deterioration in the carriageway that you can actually have to put right. And when have you given any thought to any methodology around

53:51

remedial works, repair work, so the category

53:55

and whether you had any idea at this stage, I know it's fairly early stage, how long those that would take and what form

54:02

management you'd have to have to actually facilitate that. Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, I'd need to take that away in relation to timeframes for for completing the works, but but any such reinstatement would would need to be fully agreed with with West Sussex as local highway authority. Okay, thank you.

54:26

Moving on, then, what form of construction are you proposing for the for crossing places?

54:40

Chris Williams on behalf the applicant again, that's a

54:43

more detailed design point, we would ensure that

54:47

the carriage weighs is of a suitable strength to cater for the types of ATVs that will be travelling down there.

54:57

But otherwise, as I said, that's more of a de

55:00

Tell for detailed design. Okay, so so the next next question really follows on from that, and perhaps related to any remedial work she's going to have to do to our lane. How would you remove the crossing places and return the lane to his former nature and character at the end of construction?

55:20

Chris Williams, on behalf of the applicant,

55:24

my understanding is that the carriageways is removed, and then the Verge is returned. But again, as a detailed point that we'd need to take away.

55:36

Okay.

55:42

So looking at the times these HGVs will be moving along the lane. Is it your proposal that the movements will be allowed in the proposed shoulder hours?

55:55

That I set out in C 22. Of the outline Construction Code of Practice? i That's between 700 hours and 800 hours in the morning and 18 119 100 hours in the evening. Chris Williams and half the applicant? Yes. That is the intention?

56:14

As well as obviously the construction hours themselves. Yes, that's correct. Okay, thank you.

56:22

How will communicate communication be maintained between the holding area of HGVs for the open Dean West compound, and banks men in Ken St. In order to coordinate traffic movements?

56:37

Chris Williams and path African? I understand it's quite common for the for communication to take place via

56:46

via radio or

56:50

or something similar? I don't think that's it's an uncommon approach to to have

56:58

to have such a control to call in vehicles at constrained locations. So it's something that contractors, I believe, do quite regularly.

57:08

Okay, thank you. And how would you propose stopping vehicles heading north on Cannon Street to allow the free passage of HCV south to a six, four? Or north to the A to seven? Two? So what method of

57:26

stopping the vehicles or how are you going to stop them? Chris Williams and path outcome so that would be banksman they have a dual role of helping the vehicles turn out of the access but also holding traffic. So would that be a stop go board traffic lights? It's only when we be traffic lights, it would probably be a stop go board.

57:49

Okay.

57:52

Moving on, then what would happen if vehicles including non construction related light and heavy goods vehicles enter Kent street after he has started his journey for Oakland Dean West compound to site. So you've actually ACB GV has been given the green light to travel to site from Oakland in West compound, before it actually turns into Ken St.

58:18

ACV. Or like, like good vehicle, nothing to do with the construction has already turned into the access? How would you would you deal with scenarios like that? That that's in

58:30

its intention in those circumstances that those paths in places act as that

58:35

that kind of failsafe

58:38

provision to still allow two way traffic to, to move along chemistry if that's required. So there'll be enough wait for two HGVs to pass it using the passing? I believe so. Yes, that's the intention.

58:54

Could you perhaps clarify that for me? Yeah. No actual one.

59:05

So when the HGVs actually gets get to the works,

59:10

how are you going to turn them around and hold them ending their exit on the site backup industry?

59:36

Chris Williams on behalf the applicant, there'll be adequate space within in the cable corridor for vehicles to turn around and exit back out of the site. And again, that's within the current order limits. Yes, that's our extra land now or to amend the order limits. No, that's okay to view in the otter limit sure about that.

59:56

Okay,

1:00:00

Obviously chemistries use by pedestrians, cyclists and questions.

1:00:07

What method of control would use make sure you maintain a safe safe environment for them. So they can still use that that lane.

1:00:18

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, so the banksman would be there to to stop traffic but also inform pedestrians of all income in all, or exiting HGVs clearly they they can't hold pedestrians back if they wish to continue their journey. But there will be that warning to let people know that a construction traffic is either entering or exiting the site.

1:00:46

But what about horses are a bit more difficult to control to keep by large ATVs and with noisy styling them and

1:00:58

once you browse with regard to equestrian use?

1:01:04

I would think they could be

1:01:07

they could be held in a similar fashion suitable distance away from

1:01:12

the sight access if they're coming from the north. But that's a detail we can consider further and come back to you on Okay, perhaps Perhaps all these points can be swept up in one one document

1:01:28

as an action

1:01:35

so you've previously indicated that it's your intention to agree the design of the access to the substation site, a 63 with West Sussex County Council before the end of the examination. Can you just tell me what sort of progress there is on this?

1:01:51

Yes, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant we are we're just finalising our designs and we'll be starting raised safety audits and in the next couple of weeks before submission to to West Sussex. So which deadline do you envisage that submission will be made

1:02:08

the

1:02:11

road safety audits

1:02:13

themselves that they're probably not going to be available

1:02:18

ahead of deadline five but but we're confident we can complete the road safety audit process with West Sussex prior to the end of the examination.

1:02:30

Which which deadline Are you in? Sorry, so it'd be it'd be deadline five, Road Safety Audit itself. Okay.

1:02:40

So thinking now about the widening of Ken Street to the east as it meets the 272

1:02:51

and the design of that access into the substation site

1:02:57

there's quite a lot of planting on that corner and then along the A to seven two have you taken into account the removal of back planting and trees in all your other documents in your impact assessments on hedges and trees and es itself Chris Williams on behalf applicant So my understanding is that it has been taken into account so that so it's been taken into account in the latest documents actually submitted the examination deadline three Yes, I believe so. Okay.

1:03:39

Given

1:03:42

the amount of antique entries on the corner of Ken street that has to be removed plus the planting and trees removed from the actual access

1:03:54

does this give her a problem with the

1:03:57

screening of the actual substation site itself at least in the short term

1:04:11

per mile for the applicants are looking at that who we've got in the room I think that's that's one for okay, but I'd landscape consultant to will take it away and see if you could take that away another action point then. Thank you.

1:04:25

Okay, moving on.

1:04:27

If you recall, at the last issue specific hearing, there was an action point for you to consider the feasibility of servicing sections of the cable Route corridor from the substation site access a 63 instead of a 64 a 61. A 5687.

1:04:47

Your response to Deadline won our EP one dash 02 to rule this out on the basis that there were several barriers that made the operation a continuous haul road across this sector.

1:05:00

went and feasible and environmentally

1:05:03

undesirable.

1:05:06

Thinking about using this method of accessing a 64 and a 61, instead of Ken Street. Have you carried out an assessment of ways the potential impact of using a 63 substation plus haul roads against a proposed traffic management strategy against Street?

1:05:36

At Simon Nagel for wood engineering on behalf of the applicant will have to take that away and respond in detail. Yeah. Can I ask you to provide a statement on that? It'd be very useful if we can have that deadline for you're able to produce it in that sort of timescale.

1:05:54

Yeah, yeah, we can.

1:05:56

Okay.

1:05:58

Now looking. I mean, we've looked at the strategy proposed again, St. But obviously, it sits in within our overall traffic management strategy for the area of kaufhold and then the surrounding area.

1:06:13

Have you made any assessment of the impact of this proposed access strategy on the existing traffic management assessment model? Particularly given you got three accesses now, Kent Street, the substation site and open Dean West compound in very close proximity?

1:06:34

What does all this mean for you know, the traffic flows on the 87, two,

1:06:41

crucially, safely, on the 87, two junctions, and also on the unfettered access to open Dean industrial estate, because that's going to be sharing and access with open Dean West compound.

1:06:58

And by this, this method of working for Ken St. You're gonna have additional in and out movements of HCV vehicles.

1:07:08

So have you looked at that the overall picture you've looked at, you've looked at the specifics of accessing a 64 and a 61, on Ken street, but have you looked at the picture overall, and what it does for your traffic management model for the area?

1:07:24

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant,

1:07:27

we have and we're confident that this traffic management strategy won't lead to any

1:07:34

any concerns in relation to the overall construction traffic management plan

1:07:40

at peak construction, for chemistry, that there would be a an H and additional HCV that needs to come in and out the compound once every 12 to 15 minutes at most. So

1:07:55

in the scale of how the junction operates and

1:08:00

everything else. That's

1:08:02

that's not considered

1:08:05

significant. In relation to Oakland Dean industrial estate, the the access design that we're we're working

1:08:14

for that aims to

1:08:17

amend the existence spare road slightly. So it's it

1:08:23

essentially comes off the the main compound access.

1:08:28

So to ensure that we can construction access access, sorry, construction vehicles can say safely access the compound and vehicles that are accessing the open Dean industrial state can still still gain access.

1:08:45

Okay, thank you. You're able to provide me with a note on that by deadline for yes, that's fine.

1:08:52

Okay, thank you. Okay, so those those are the questions I have. I'm not going to pass over to West Sussex County councillors, Highway Authority for them to comment. Mr. Gledhill. I'd be really grateful for your comments please.

1:09:09

England Hill West Sussex County Council thanks for inviting my comments on this where Sussex will be commenting in detail through the written reps at the next the next appropriate stage but in principle there the arrangements appear workable. See we are taking the applicants expertise

1:09:30

and experience on on this in terms of coming up with a strategy for chemistry in particular. I think Mr. Williams

1:09:38

released I neglected to hear him say mentioned the temporary 40 mile an hour speed limit that is proposed also on the 87 to in the vicinity of the Kent Street,

1:09:47

oak and Dean and the substation access so taking that on board as well that will help to lower traffic speeds and it will assist in vehicles exits

1:10:00

Seeing these these various access points along the way to 70 in this area,

1:10:04

in principle that oh West Sussex, our highways, at least should I say are satisfied the arrangements for Kent Street are workable, in principle may need to look at some more granular detail through the face specific construction management plans. But the general principles I believe, are are appropriate for this. For this for this section of road, I mean, the other thing I would probably add before I sign off is that it's quite noticeable from the note that's been provided by the applicant there are quite defined peaks of vehicle movements associated with chemistry. I think that's important to acknowledge as well. It's not going to be dozens and dozens of HGV sundry along that road, we can we count there are very well defined weeks where there is going to be a significant increase, but generally it is a relatively low number of HGVs that will need to be managed. Thank you.

1:10:59

Thank you, Mr. Gledhill. So the vision of West Sussex County Council is that you think that

1:11:07

the plan as it stands is feasible, but needs slightly more development.

1:11:13

You you're happy that the council will actually progress the 40 mile per hour speed limit traffic order

1:11:21

and you're happy with the safety of the use of cancer eat pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians

1:11:30

in our school, English, Westchester County Council yes in answer those questions with regards to the 40 mile an hour speed limit, the exact extents need to be determined. I think the West Sussex view is at the moment the the extent is too long. And I think that would would that would result in compliance issues. The general thinking is the 40 mile an hour should be constrained to the area where there are kind of visible, visible HGVs turning

1:11:57

to make it quite obvious to drive as why that 40 mile an hour speed limits in place. But in all other respects. We believe the works are in principle acceptable. Thank you.

1:12:07

Thank you, Mr. Gledhill. Okay, I'm not going to open it up to other IPs, who might want to speak on this topic.

1:12:16

You Mr. Paul, Hello, Daniel ball from Ken Street, and also careful and rampion. Is it possible to have a plan put up of Ken Street, which I think is what the panel asked for before. So we can see a 64 a 6159 and 60. All together? There is a plan. I've got it here. I got a reference number. I think Lee knows which one it is.

1:12:45

While they're looking for that, is it possible to discuss something about the site visit and his access points, as I think some mistakes may have been made on that visit? While they're bringing the planet in so far that they relate to this this? Socially? Yeah, yeah.

1:13:02

First of all, what when we got onto Ken street from the field, the examining authority walked south to look for an access point. That's access a 59. The rampion representative says that was not an access point of Ken street. But you are correct. It is marked on the plan, we'll hopefully see things at 59. I think the applicant clarified on the day that that was an operational access. It is but there will be head for last probably. And it does affect the overall landscape and setting of Ken Street.

1:13:38

We then stood on an access point

1:13:42

near that large tree, which is when we sort of separated at that time the applicant said that was an access point. But it's not as incorrect as those access points on the plan. That is an access point for the Enzo storage battery storage site, not for rampion.

1:14:01

So I'm not sure why they said that because that land is not actually within the DCO Mark land so they can't have an access point there. I then mentioned

1:14:12

that access 61 was the access point, which is due north. The applicant then said it could be anywhere between Matt a 61 and where we were standing. So we're not sure why that is that has changed because the applicant respond to those questions about the changes on came straight from the site visit or should we do that through return reps later?

1:14:40

No, I think I think we could ask the applicant for a recent response on those points.

1:14:53

Simonik on behalf of the applicant, you mentioned access a 59 That was a

1:15:00

And that's an operational access. So there won't be any headrow loss at that location. So that's that's that won't be used during the construction period.

1:15:10

A 61. So I might be not doing these in order at 61. As marked on the on on the diagram we can see on the screen now.

1:15:21

It's just south of that

1:15:26

island in within the redline boundary.

1:15:30

I apologise. I was not on the site visit that that was,

1:15:35

if I could address the gentleman to your left was maybe he would know what he said on that day.

1:15:44

Yeah, thank you, Richard Tanner, it on behalf of the applicant, I think I clarified the location of a 61 as a construction access to the examining authority on after I'd been asked the question.

1:15:57

Okay, I think given that X explanation, I think you can move on with your substantive points, I think, okay. I'm not sure how we've got here so late in the day, because the NSA did ask for this evidence and Isa h1, then deadline two, and now deadline three, they had asked for full survey data for this deadline. What actually happened is rampion use survey data from Enzo energy for this submission, and I think we will be submitting there in the June deadline, that that data is incorrect, as most of the vehicles listed were class one and two, which is not true.

1:16:40

There was only in May, that they suddenly put traffic count surveys, those pipes down on Kent street, they will they were laid on the night of the seventh of May. The odd thing is these tubes are so far up Kent street, they won't capture any traffic flow figures for Kent Street for access 64 and 61.

1:17:04

So we just don't know how they're assuming, rather like with such as national park yesterday, and ecology, baseline figures, there's no baseline for traffic flow as of yet. So how can they have a traffic management plan and proposed mitigation when they don't have any baseline figures for traffic?

1:17:25

And they must be wanting to do that because they suddenly laid pipes in May of this year. So could I address that to the applicant?

1:17:33

Okay, thank you for that. Can you perhaps comment on on that in the traffic Suey at issue? Yes. Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. It's correct that we use traffic data from the Enzo battery storage CCMP to inform

1:17:53

the traffic management strategy. And indeed we are we have recently conducted surveys. I think they ended on Tuesday this week. Unfortunately, we were let down by a supplier which meant they were pushed back later than we intended. In relation to the query on the vehicle types.

1:18:16

We were confident on on the numbers that are provided we for example, we deliberately excluded the days where the A 270 was closed and in relation to the the data collected as part of the the Enzo application

1:18:34

and also in relation to vehicle categories. The equipment it doesn't provide a one of a better term a perfect

1:18:46

split of larger vehicles, other goods vehicles while the goods vehicles one which are categorised in the

1:18:55

US in the Enzo traffic surveys that they can actually include

1:19:02

anything over seven and a half tonnes which which is would be classed as an HCV.

1:19:10

Okay, thank you for that as a agenda item on traffic modelling a bit later. So I'll probably come back to that with regard to refreshing the traffic model and submitting crash documents into the examination on that basis. But I'll come back to that later. Collect a few more points obviously can't Yes, please go ahead. country it's such a it's come along so late. Just looking at their sort of can street plan. The common passing places we believe and not in highways they are in private ownership. One of the landowners already has a large skip on one of them which has been there for a few months. They could be coned off, which could stop them being used and they're not within the DCO land.

1:19:59

We also have a lot

1:20:00

have vehicles and horse boxes that do Park in those passing places, and then use the public footpaths locally. We don't believe that passing place for is large enough.

1:20:13

It also has a water ditch up against it and a culvert so that wouldn't be able to take a large lorry in the passing place. We saw that understand, as you said in the granular detail of how this is going to work, if you've got a car travelling along the A to seven to west towards kaufhold, and wants to turn right into King Street, King Street can straight well have to wait on the eight to seven to until the entrance to Kent Street is clear. Also, if the Enter can Street and suddenly see a large lobby coming towards them, there's nowhere to go except to reverse back towards the A to seven two. We just don't see how that works.

1:20:54

Again, we'd like a bit more granular detail on their point two and three, when they talk about this controlling fire the Oh continuing construction compound. We had no idea until today that the lobbies will go to Oak and Dean first and then go back to Ken street. So why wasn't that on the original document?

1:21:15

We are highly suspect of the use of banksman. I do believe in traffic terminology. They usually a temporary measure for days or weeks.

1:21:25

I'm not sure if the NSA when they I don't think they went from Ken street on to a 270 yesterday, but I certainly wouldn't like to walk out into 40 or 60 mile an hour traffic as a banksman. That's a very dangerous job on that stretch of road.

1:21:42

We still want to hear from West Sussex about the speed reduction from 60 to 40. I think we are looking into that with another consultant with the pinch points in California. And California has two overcapacity junctions. This was stated by

1:22:02

kaufhold parish council, and I don't think the applicant has looked at it yet. This is the Horsham Transport study in December 2022. Those two roundabouts in Horsham are 100% overcapacity. And that's without taking Ambien to and without taking the subcontractor vans into consideration.

1:22:26

Regarding Ken street,

1:22:29

I don't see how lorries are going to be able to come out of access a 64 and a 61.

1:22:38

Even with a banksman. Because if you're saying that to come out of Kent street, you need to stop the traffic on the A to seven to the banksman. Because your sweat path analysis shows two lines of carriageway being used. How will you be able to turn out of a 64 and a 61. And go to North because there isn't two lines of carry twice a single carriage rule lane. So we're not sure how those junctions are going to work. Also, we'd like to see more, I think was picked up by the ESA a bit more detail not after consent. But now of those two junctions, the a six, a six, four and a six one that will definitely change the rural nature and landscape setting of that lane. So there's no details on that as of yet.

1:23:29

I think I'll hand over to mirror but before I do I just ask Mr. Williams, do you want to respond those individual points? Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant

1:23:43

as already stated will provide a response in relation to the

1:23:49

the construction of past in places but But to the degree that that will be a detailed design point.

1:23:57

The width of chemistry in vicinity of the access of the a 272 that the plans do provide for widening of the chemistry carriageway and facility of of the 272 access junction to ensure that there is space for an ATV and a vehicle to pass each other.

1:24:19

The Oakland in control point that that is included in traffic management strategy. And when we're not proposing that banksman are needed on the 272 to facilitate access out of chemistry.

1:24:35

Simon they go on behalf of the applicant just to add to that the access is long chemistry a 64 and a 61 are being designed at an angle so that vehicles can turn out onto that term vehicle without going to the hedgerow or tree line on the opposite side. Great to see those because if that

1:25:00

follows the sweat path analysis of chemistry to the A to seven two. I'm not really sure how that's gonna work on chemistry when the In of carriageways single.

1:25:09

Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. As we can move on to Miss Smith, just to kind of just say one more thing. Sure. I do agree, we say that the whole of the traffic needs to be seen as a whole. So you've got Ken St. The a 272. kaufhold And those two and debates. I don't think the applicant has done that. The applicant has said, there's no problem and kaufhold. No need to investigate and propose mitigation that they need to have better baseline figures for kaufhold, especially those two roundabouts

and how the whole area will be affected. Because we all know that with two pinch points on the two roundabouts in Kaufhold, and also the junction of the a two, three, and a 272.

1:25:56

If you have a little bit of stoppage or those two pinch points, you get a traffic jam all the way down here to 70.

1:26:04

Okay, thank you. Thank you, Miss first, thank you Miss letters to California the rampion. First of all, I'd like to take a little bit of issue with Mr. Williams about the main aim of this management plan. It isn't to avoid the need for HGVs to pass each other it's to to make this compatible with daily life on the lane.

1:26:25

We've already submitted a detailed, some detailed comments about the can street proposals at deadline 330 p 3099, Appendix five, so I won't go into all of that in too much detail.

1:26:41

But obviously, since they published the plan, we've got some more issues. I'd like to reiterate what Daniel said about the parking places they actually used by people, they park there.

1:26:55

There are numerous equestrian properties on Kent Street and Kings Lane, and they need to walk their horses daily. And any plan to work, it must be all right for them as well.

1:27:08

It's not a case of them being able to go somewhere else.

1:27:11

The Enzo traffic data, we believe is flawed. And I can go into that in more detail. Or perhaps you'd prefer me to wait till the traffic modelling stage. Yes, I would.

1:27:25

And

1:27:28

the peak weeks,

1:27:31

I feel like the misleading suggestion. Because it it suggests that after the peak week, there won't be a problem. But as annex theme, our EP 3022 shows there are actually 30 weeks when the traffic will be more than 50% of the peak week, which is a significant amount of vehicles. And a similarly the peak times. Again, the implication is that for the rest of the day, there'll be much quieter. But if the Enzo survey data is to believe be believed, that's actually very little different. At any time of the day into anything, it's busier in the middle of the day, with regards to the 40 mile an hour limit? Well, four and a

half years is not very temporary. And it will have to be continuous, otherwise people will get confused. And that will be dangerous. I mean, on the plus side, if it were permanent, the visibility splay at Oak and Dean, a six, three could be reduced. But I feel fundamentally we need modelling to understand whether it would just create a backlog on the two seven to normally reducing the speed limit just reduces the gaps. But the area is continuous with the congestion points in California. And surely that will just increase increase the congestion. And similarly, it will cause backing up coming in the other direction into the APMA because it won't be able to get away.

1:28:56

Not only that, but you have to consider the proximity of the other access points. And will it simply as people put their foot down at last increase the accident rate on the western side of California on the 272.

1:29:10

With regards to the banksman

1:29:14

people will need to stop some different distance away to allow these huge vehicles to turn to some extent on the wrong side of the road. Traffic lights will be far safer, people can't reverse if they're caught out. And I don't think when you consider bringing people from the Asics. Three, what happens to the people who are caught up in that between there are lots of little side roads in that distance between a 63 in chemistry. What if people have already come out of there? What will happen to them there's nowhere for them to go.

1:29:47

Similarly, I think PICC line hadn't been considered nor that immediately nearby access points at Cooper's farm wielding barn and Apple cross

1:30:00

In addition,

1:30:02

will there be additional movements to control the traffic on Kent Street? Have you looked at the

1:30:08

the visibility splays and the turning arcs.

1:30:12

And the opposite will totally alter the the character of of both Kent Street and and the 80 sevens who were huge amounts of vegetation will be removed. All along that stretch.

1:30:28

We'd like to see some evidence that you can actually access a 61 and a 64. And that you can turn around in the cable routes.

1:30:39

If if things hadn't been set in stone, how can you be telling us with any degree of certainty that oh, you need another, you know, 25 metres of heads for the ace 62 and another 10 for a 61? That's just not compatible? And again, what is the evidence that you that those figures are actually meaningful in any way,

1:31:00

just for reference here is regarding the site visit a 61 is in fact, the field immediately south of the substation site. And it does include it is included in some of those photographs with wellies and measuring sticks, because it was underwater at the time.

1:31:25

I think you need to consider it's to consider the disruption caused by the strengthening of the road, the widening of access, both to Kent Street and the A 62 and a 63. None of that is factored into these plans, nor the disruption to Kent Street and the a 272 by the diversion of the UK power network, which is probably going to have to go across the road. Not in order for this to be manageable. You need to factor those things in otherwise, they're just going to be so many things that get catch people out.

1:31:57

And again, if you have indeed taken into account in your other documents, then how come the design and access plan shows reinstatement of that corner in at the end of the first year? Again, that's not compatible with you having taken it into account, nor your new tract, hedge and tree plan. It doesn't include

1:32:20

the extra 35 metre that can street that you're now sending this necessary.

1:32:25

Okay, I'm sorry. Is it possible afterwards for Mr. Lightbourne to speak as well if he wishes to Yes. Yeah. But I have got someone virtually to comment on that post.

1:32:38

So have you finished? Class, the applicant? Is there anything you want to quickly come back on that?

1:32:47

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant?

1:32:51

I've probably already or maybe responded to some of those

1:32:59

some of those points.

1:33:02

So

1:33:05

in relation to visibility splays and turning swept path analysis yet? Yes, they have been

1:33:13

fully considered in the design work, the

1:33:18

traffic management strategy that we've we've put forward.

1:33:23

We appreciate the comment too. Regarding the

1:33:27

the statement on on allowing

1:33:31

ATV access

1:33:34

it the traffic management strategy is of course about ensuring that there is safe access for all during the construction period.

1:33:44

We're confident that it can do that.

1:33:48

As Mr. Gledhill pointed out, the peak weeks are very defined the very short term outside of those those peak periods, there are large periods of time where where the flow will be one or two vehicles per hour.

1:34:06

Which is, which is much less than those peak weeks. Okay, thank you for that. I'm gonna go to Miss aborist. Online, and then Mr. Lightbourne. So Miss Everest.

1:34:21

Good afternoon, done Everest on behalf of council parish council. I would like to make some points, some of which have already been alluded to

1:34:33

by the examining authority. And

1:34:39

my camera's just reappears. Sorry, I was just gonna say if you could just confine your representation to points perhaps that hadn't been made ad on the examination to provide context I am going to have to refer to one or two general points but then they will be specific to Ken Street, and there will be some

1:35:00

and further points to be made under the traffic modelling item a little later.

1:35:07

So one thing we would like the examining authority to consider and although this may seem a little to one side initially is the growth in traffic volume between 2015 and 2019, there was a 4.6% increase in traffic volume, taking the traffic up to some 18,500 vehicle movements per day, excluding the 21 COVID period 2022 saw a similar level being regained. However, 2023 saw an additional 6.7% increase in traffic levels and these are the first three months of 2024 have seen a further 3.5% increase. Now, this is obviously completely separate from rampion too, but this puts context

1:36:06

into the situation. The parish council has significant concerns over flow which we will expand upon at the traffic modelling. In essence, every junction, we believe is a possible accident point.

1:36:26

There have been some five accidents per annum which have been required police investigation, and that is where Sussex County Council data and we believe that increased junction traffic will directly result in more accidents.

1:36:46

There is ongoing concerns with the fact that the areas in question Can street etc. Oak and Dean they are on lit the roads have no lighting, and particularly looking at the proposed operating hours throughout the winter months. that I believe will be an enhanced possibility of this accident risk. As has already been alluded to California 82728281 junctions are over capacity. So therefore, again, any increased flow either through what I'll call natural growth, or indeed enhanced issues as a result of traffic turning into the Canadian compound turning into Kent Street, etc, will only exacerbate this issue.

1:37:44

So these are the overarching concerns of California parish council. And as I say, I would like to enhance some of these points under the traffic modelling agenda item. Thank you. Okay, that's great. Thank you Miss Everest and go to Mr. Lightbourne. You could be Yes, Paul light, representing residents of Kent Street and Kings Lane. I'll endeavour not to repeat what's already been said. Although I will probably have to reiterate reiterate a couple of points. One of them is that yesterday, I actually witnessed

1:38:18

two of the proposed parking places being occupied for more than an hour, one by a car of dog walkers and the other one by a horsepox, which unloaded horses for for exercise purposes, going up and down Kent Street.

1:38:35

And I also saw a don't walk out there is a professional Walk, walk, dog walking business on Kent street walking 10 dogs up the middle of Kent street and I think those on the company site visit would recognise the hazards of actually walking out Kent Street in groups. So that is that is an issue related to usage. Similarly, I mean, the applicant did say the objective of this strategy is to avoid HGVs coming together. But this road this lane is the residents and the means of access placing residents and means of access for 30 Plus houses that look first places of residence and to farms. So it's not just HGVs we need to avoid but also provide the means of access. And I think it's been well explained by previous speakers about how hazardous it's going to be.

1:39:34

I'd like to just refer to the condition of the road, the applicant so they will do a take or make some assessment of the current condition and then reinstate it.

1:39:47

Kent Street is in a very poor state of condition. It also has a very fragile bridge over which these HGVs are going to travel.

1:39:56

I'm a little disappointed the rather bland

1:40:00

was a statement by West Sussex County Council I hope they're going to do a full survey to so they have an understanding of how fragile this road is.

1:40:11

It's being further compromised because about five years ago, a duct was placed along the whole length of the lane installed by Karelain. At the time they were going into administration, the work was not completed satisfactorily, and a survey will note that they that coat that ducting that zigzags its way down the lane is collapsing in places. So the road is going to have to be made good before I think any HGVs can make use of it. And we'd like to think that it's going to be reinstated to a proper standard rather than just the condition it's in now.

1:40:51

They talk about removing the passing places, after construction workers finished, I'm not sure how that would happen, because these passing places,

1:41:03

some of them actually are on private land as it stands. Maybe some benefits come out of this and through due process of consultation. In some places lacking to date, we'd like to think they would consult with the residents and maybe leave those passing places in place because it would enhance the road and provide a safer means of access.

1:41:26

This information I won't go into detail, but I am referring to our EP three dash O two nine, which I think has been well noted. There are tables in there which talk about traffic movements, limited to about eight weeks for peak traffic traffic peak HTV traffic

1:41:45

with other minimal quote minimal traffic HGV traffic over a period of 38 weeks. This was the sort of information which provided by rampion one when they were accessing wine and lane.

1:42:00

It didn't end up being that

1:42:03

short period of time winding Lane suffered from the imposition of traffic lights for a period of over three years, which were left on for seven days a week even though agreements were made with the local parish council to help those traffic lights removed at weekends when there was no no movement. So we'd like that. I think it's been mentioned earlier, there's a lot of detailed design going to take place after and if any consent is granted. So what worries people I think is that detailed design work will take place and then contractors will be appointed and they will make different decisions, they will want different requirements. And they'll start imposing other requirements and things will get changed. So some sort of control needs to be applied to post consent granting to ensure that any detailed design is actually goes through due diligence and do checking.

1:42:59

I just want to make one further point related to the equestrian usage. It is extensively used for equestrian purposes. The document I referred to includes a section called training and competence, which says that HGV drivers will be trained in how to access and egress from these sites and compounds. We would like to think that that training competence will include training and awareness provided to all construction drivers about how they should behave when they meet equestrians, and pedestrians. I think many of us particularly those of us in the equestrian world know how hazard it is to ride a horse along a lane or a road and therefore some sort of control needs to be put in place. And I think when you are looking at the objectives that are going to be applied to this strategy, walkers, dog walkers, and Ramblers, and the questions need to be considered a lot more strictly and severely than you actually have addressed it. I think, I believe it's been omitted. And it's only today when the examiner when the member of the of the examining authority mentioned it that had actually been thought about.

1:44:21

We could go on but I think in us being said, the chemistry strategy is weak, poor and woeful and needs to be revisited and strengthened extensively. If in fact chemistries is a suitable means of access for HGVs at all.

1:44:38

Thank you Mr. Lightbourne only if the applicant would like to respond very, very quickly to that because we're overdue lunch now.

1:44:47

Thank you, Chris Williams and on behalf of the applicant, I just like to just reiterate the point that any streetworks that are required to fill, facilitate construction on chemistry will be covered by art.

1:45:00

are nine of the DCO.

1:45:04

We've already said we'll take away and consider a question use further. So, thank you for the information

1:45:13

on that

1:45:15

in terms of the the past in places and provision of those permanently they are noted as temporary works

1:45:24

at the moment, keeping those on a permanent basis is something that would would need to be considered and and agreed also with with West Sussex as Highway Authority that would need to maintain them the future. That's great. Thank you. Is your point relatively brief?

1:45:42

Okay, please go ahead.

1:45:44

As Matthew Porter Horsham District Council, keep it very brief appreciate the submissions sweets yet to be updated perusing the LVA but our initial concerns that arise issue with the removal of vegetation with a junction 87. Two, it's an important part of construction and operational phase mitigation for visual effects and also rural character of chemistry. Okay, thank you, Mr. Porter. So I think we'll take review the actions for this item after lunch. So we will break now for lunch and reconvene at quarter past two. Thank you