

# AUDIO\_RAMPION2\_ISH2\_SESSION7\_16052 024

Thu, May 16, 2024 5:00PM • 1:58:05

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

applicant, access, traffic, construction, deadline, west sussex, point, movements, assessment, relation, vehicles, required, junction, included, numbers, significance, update, proposed, highways, works

00:39

Okay, it's quarter past two and this hearing is now reconvened. Is the recording running. Thank you. Okay, we're now moving on to Agenda Item seven B, which is Mitchell Grove and Tama farm traffic management strategy. And I like to approach this in the same way as Ken street please. So if you could initially outline the strategy, and then I've got some questions. I'll then refer to West Sussex County Council for their comments and then open it up to other IPS

01:14

excuse me, we're not going to do the action points on 10th Street first after the way No,

01:20

sorry, I made a mistake in the actual agenda, the action points for this agenda item or at the end once we completed all the items into the agenda heading

01:38

if you could use that plan again that would be very very useful

01:52

think he should plugs the plugs sockets are in the way that that thing I don't know how Yeah, I don't know. It might have to move. I don't know. Yeah, there we go.

02:06

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant need to give us a couple of minutes to get a plan up on screen in relation to this act, this traffic management strategy okay thank you seeing if there is any if there is one which is is relevant and shows shows everything

02:42

sorry, so, just as a summary of of the traffic management strategy. So a 26 and a 28 are both located on a two AC long Furlong and they're approximately 2.5 kilometres apart. Each of the existing junctions does have constraints in relation to visibility splays and carriageway width to allow for turning off of HGVs but the proximity of the junctions allows for a combined strategy to be applied that takes counted

these constraints, but also makes use of the functional parts of our each junction. For example, at told me a farm access that has all visibility given its location in a visit near a browser Hill. So would require traffic signals to facilitate exit by construction traffic vehicles. But there is space available to accommodate traffic signals on the to 80 8080. In addition on Mitchell Grove Lane, the visibility splays are appropriate for a temporary 40 mile per hour limit which is proposed. So that allows for LTV, LTV to exit that junction and there are paths in places already proposed along Mitchell Grove Lane included in the order limits to facilitate two way traffic. So, going into bit further detail that the strategy is actually set out for enabling reinstatement stages of the project and and the cable installation process. So during enabling and reinstatement works access for construction HTV traffic will be from the A to AC and will be taken sorry, from SU AC we taken as a left turn into either a 26 or 828 with HGVs arriving from the north ATVs arrived in the North will therefore be required to travel to Clapham roundabout and U turn before accessing the relevant construction junction. Exit for construction traffic out Since the age of 80, long Furlong will primarily be taken from a 28 nodes and it will be necessary for some ATVs to access a 26. During enabling and reinstatement works, access a 28 will be controlled by temporary traffic signals to facilitate safe movement of vehicles out of the junction. LGV access will be taken via a 26 where possible with entry and exit permitted in both directions. Also where required LGBs will be permitted to enter a 28 but only from the south and exit in both directions under traffic signal control. Going on to the cable installation process this is going to work slightly differently. So access for HGV traffic from the A to AC will be taken as a left turn into a 26 or a 28. Exit for HCV traffic onto the two A's you will be taken solely from access a 28 which will be under traffic signal control. LG V access will be permitted to enter and exit a 26 from both directions. And limited Hu limited LDV entry and exit will be permitted via a 28 but only from the south and with exit controlled by traffic signal. In addition to that, the traffic management strategy proposes a temporary 1440 mile per hour speed limit in the vicinity of the access junctions. And as already noted, there's provision for up to eight paths in places to be installed along Mitchell Grove lane, as shown on sheet 12 of the onshore work plans.

06:38

Pay That's That's great. Thank

06:39

you. So as I said, I'm going to ask some questions then I'll ask West Sussex County councillors Highway Authority to comment and then I'll open it up to IPs. So can you just just as I did for Ken Street, can you please confirm that the land necessary for the passing places on Mitchell Grover lane is within the order limits. And then no additional land is required.

07:08

Chris Williams on behalf the applicant? Yes, that's confirmed.

07:11

And again, he's that highway land, or is it private land?

07:15

I believe it is highway land. But I need to take that away and confirm. So again,

07:22

if you could take an action in relation to this strategy to confirm whether it's private or highway land.

07:38

Okay, so I'd be right in saying that essentially, the strategy relies in the main on a one way system with HGVs. Making a left hand turn to Mitchell Grove Lane, the northbound carriageway, or the A to eight zero restricted to 40 mph and assisted and exiting a tomar farm and a traffic light control.

08:00

Chris Williams on behalf applicant. Yes, that's correct. Okay,

08:04

so can you explain why tipper HGVs need to exit Mitchell Grove Lane instead of tomar farm during enabling and replacing them works

08:20

Simon Nagel and on behalf of the applicant during initial kind of setup, enabling works, we won't have the right of way going up along the cable corridor to connect into a 28. So we will, you know, for the passing places, we will have to commence accessing 826 to an eight to start that enabling works there. And and similar for a 28 They'll have to be vehicles going in and exiting a 28. Okay, so

08:54

would the exit movements need to be supported by banksman? From a 26

09:03

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, the traffic management strategy as submitted deadline three includes the ability for ATVs. To to turn left and right it's noted that the left turn did take out take up the whole of the ATV AC carriageway at at a meeting we had with West Sussex County Council last week, it was requested that we applied a restriction to allow them only to turn right out of the junction, which is an easier manoeuvre. So we'll be updating the traffic management strategy deadline for to include that restriction and to allow them to turn without maximum control.

09:43

Right Thank you.

09:46

Moving on, then

09:47

I note the AC V cable low low loaders, but also require banksman support. And there's a possibility following detailed design that access may in fact not be feasible for the So he articulated vehicles at all, and he may have to enter via Tama farm from the south instead. So in that sort of scenario, how would you manage the potential conflict between HGVs entering and exiting pathoma Farm access?

10:20

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, it will be not too dissimilar to chemistry there needs to be communication between HGVs entering and exiting. So they are stopped on the access road where where there are where there is adequate width to do so, and ensure that they don't meet at the access junction.

10:42

Sort of the moment, basically, the movements at 26 You've done a desktop study, rather than actually going out there. And seeing physically on the ground, whether you can accommodate HGV movements, is that correct?

10:58

Chris Williams on behalf African yes, we've completed sweat path analysis of of the movements into and out of the junction based on available OS mapping.

11:10

Okay, thank you. And then the last question I got is how would safe passage of pedestrian cyclists and their questions be maintained along which will grow Lane itself throughout the construction activities?

11:28

Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, we're aware that there are public rights away that that meet with Mitchell Grove Lane, the numbers of HGVs that head up there are are not not too significant in terms of a few in our it the past in places and the visibility available on Mitchell Grove Lane essentially means that there is space available to avoid conflicts. But we'll we'll make provision for for HGVs to consider pedestrian movements in in the next update the traffic management strategy.

12:22

Okay, so it sounds like you've got to update the strategy anyway. Which deadline Are you proposing to actually resubmitted deadline for deadline for to come down back down in action? Of course. Thank you.

12:37

I'll go now to West Sussex County Council for their comments please. Mr. Gledhill?

12:45

Be in Glendale, West Sussex County Council. Yep, Mr. As Mr. Williams implies there was a meeting discussing formally the traffic management options for Mitchell Grove and wholemeal farm last week, in principle, West Sussex are supportive of the arrangements being proposed. Again, there are detailed elements that perhaps needs to be looked at that have already been picked up on by yourself, for example, the sweat pants with HGVs. In particular, the cable jumper vehicles, I have a very onerous wet path and it's whether those can be a common help how they can be accommodated within the existing highway. issues already identified with tipper HGVs. Turning out admits your group lane, as Mr. Williams implies can be resolved through sending those vehicles to the right as opposed to to the left. The extents of the temporary speed limit again, perhaps needs to be looked at I think we'd be keen to

keep that restricted in and around Micha Grove lane. For the record, West Sussex are proposing to instal a permanent 40 mile an hour speed limit from a point south at the Tomah farm access bandstand, that's due to be installed later this year having gone through the necessary statutory processes, it's just a matter of it being implemented. Only other point was regarding the traffic signals. I think we've asked the applicant to look at what options have been arrived at the fore settling firmly on the traffic signals as the permanent solution and whether if the signals are agreed, how they can be operated to avoid any impacts on peak hour traffic. That's it. Thank you very much.

14:29

Thank you, Mr. Gledhill. Any comments from the applicant?

14:36

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. So just picking up on on the traffic signals point. They were proposed on the basis that there was safe locations to instal temporary traffic signals in the vicinity of the access and overcame the plan. to health and safety issues with with using banksman to support HGV movements out of that access in relation to the operation of the traffic signals, we completed a LinSig traffic signal junction capacity assessment as part of the as part of the traffic management strategy that showed that they operated well within capacity in peak periods. And therefore we feel that there is at this stage now, no need to apply any peak hour restrictions.

15:35

Okay, that's great. Thank you. Okay, any other comments on the strategy this location? Yes, Mr. Attorney,

15:46

bridge attorney Southdowns National Park Authority. So Southdowns National Park authorities pretty concerned about this approach. And we're not happy with the proposals as they stand. Can I just start at the first point, which is the use of a 28 at all, and in the manner proposed. So a 28 is an existing farm access. But as soon as you pass the the bell mouth, the root is on a bridleway which is not formed as a track. So will require some significant upgrade one would assume it's overgrown. Most importantly, perhaps it runs on or immediately adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument of considerable importance. It's an Iron Age bought, which has been subject to later Roman development. And the route from a 28 northwards follows the line of the edge of sheduled entry monument. So it's an incredibly sensitive location. There's no existing road there. This is a new road that will have to be formed by the applicant to take access in that location. Obviously, the impacts of that use are of concern to us. I think the figures are that in the peak, this this circuit that's proposed will be up to 244 HGVs a week. And there's another peak, I think, around 200 HGVs per week during the construction process. And it's a access that's used in the long term, presumably also, you answer a question about how HCV interactions will be managed at HS eight. Presumably, whatever happened in the bell mouth, there will then also need to be passing places for HGVs. Further along the access route heading north woods, so it's going to be more than a single track lane that has to be created to get that two way movement. That's a 28. I think the short point is that the applicant should look to avoid the use of a 28 as a construction access, and instead it's alighted upon an outcome where which intensifies the use of a 28 as a construction access, Mitchell Grove and a 26. Setting aside the impacts on the 8060, the

main elements of the highway network, it's been explained obviously that that's route which is used for recreational purposes, as of course is a 28. Because that's a broad way. There is a concern about the interaction of construction traffic with that the provision of passing places we've explained in previous hearings and in our written representations, obviously leads to different impacts in landscape and ecological terms. So far as we can see those passing places would be outside of the highways boundary, although within the order limits I think has shown on the plans. So they're effectively new highway infrastructure being created in what is a country lane. I think the other points just on this proposal that would make our that obviously, the turning movements that are required involve a considerable extension to the roots, so the removal of the right turn on to a 26 for highways. safety reasons leads to construction traffic being routed southwards for about three columns. I suppose I think, to then turn to head northwards again. And obviously, that's a general intensification of the activity on that bit of the highway network.

20:19

Yeah, so just the final point on this about this, about this proposal is that whilst we're looking at two access points three kilometres apart, what the applicant is actually proposing is a 10 kilometre construction traffic route that provides a circular loop. And I think, to get a sense of the scale of it, to see this construction traffic route, you have to go through no less than eight of the onshore works plans to see the full extent of this loop that's being created. And effectively, you're bringing into a sensitive part of the landscape into a very rural and undisturbed location, that new traffic movement, almost entirely off road. So new roads being created to deliver that. So we said the scale of the impact here is unacceptable and the applicant needs to rethink the proposals.

21:18

Okay, thank you, Mr. Turney.

21:20

Mr. Williams, would you like to respond to those points?

21:38

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, I'm just going to pass to Mr. Nagle as a starting point in relation to access via a 28 V. Thank you. Simon

21:49

Nagel on behalf of the applicant. It'd be good to have the graphic up so we can see what we're talking about. But as we come off the road network onto a 28. And running north, it is true that we are just to the west of the ancient as scheduled ancient monument, we are outside that designated zone we the temporary haul road that will be placed in there will we're not excavating down similar to we are in the cable route in the trenches service has minimal impact on to the in that area in terms of with the boundary limits there is approximately 10 metres wide. So we have sufficient space to be able to put in passing places along there to to allow for to to a traffic as required. There is a bright away, as you mentioned along there, which following the initial there is closure as part of it whilst the road is constructed. However, that will be able to be be opened once that whole road is the construction of that already has been completed. And again, we will have passing places and we can look similar to as the

venture for chemistry to mount, adding in education for the whole road, the whole road users on a question and other pedestrian uses.

23:31

Okay, you say you're passing well to the west of the ancient monument? What about the effects of vibration?

23:44

And I can't comment on the effect of vibration on a human on the scheduled monument. I don't have any information of what what is in there, personally, so I can't comment on that at this stage. We have to take it away. And obviously

24:01

he's going to need to look at to prove the viability of that road.

24:06

I would suggest

24:08

Are you in a position to give me a note on that?

24:13

Yeah, we can Yes, we can resume Could

24:15

you take an action on that? Please?

24:21

Register for that? Because I think I don't know if you have the to hand somewhere. I don't know where is it where it says if anywhere in the application documents, but the the plan of the designation, I think is worth looking at because effectively the the scheduled ancient monument designation runs along the track, which is proposed to be used as the railroad. So it's right to say that on the plan, they're outside of the designation, but it's literally forms the line of the designation and Right. So I think that's an important point. The other point just sort of contextually is talked about closure of the bridle way and the management of users of the bridle way. But if you look at the plan on the screen from a 28, up to the woodland block, just before you you meet the cable corridor, that's about three kilometres of bridleway that is going to be used as the as the temporary haul road. And as we say, 244 HGV movements through that landscape. Peak construction. I think we've, I think, opposition or put it simply is think the applicant needs to rethink this, it doesn't look like a very good idea in terms of the impact on the National Park.

25:58

Okay, thank you, Mr. Turney. Any final comments from the applicant on that point? Okay, any other comments on this? Traffic Management Strategy? Is honey set, I think you had your hand up on stage.

26:16

Thank you, Chloe, honey set West Essex County Council. I just like to echo the concerns of South Downs National Park in regards to the potential impacts of the construction access upon the edge of monuments. Even in the best case scenario where there's no physical encroachment on the current boundary of the sheduled monument, there's a high likelihood of continuation of buried archaeology, that will be a continuation of the Shoji monument and therefore, of equal significance, and according to the relevant policies will be subject to the same policies and protections and as the sheduled area. I think it's important to note that sheduled the back the sort of boundary of a scheduled monument is quite often a sort of a somewhat arbitrary boundary. During the map in this case, it's it's sort of stopped at the edge of that trackway? You know, probably because that seemed, you know, that was where the, the limit of the assessment was at that point. Just need to be aware that although there's an agreement to undertake child trench evaluation along the route of the track widening there is there's likely to be a significant impacts upon buried archaeology.

27:23

Okay, thank you missed any set. Any comments on what you've just heard at all?

27:31

It just you just echo the point that will be trialled trenches along those those locations. So, we will understand what what is in that location. Okay.

27:43

Any other comments? Yes.

27:45

Kevin Brown national highways. Can I ask through you sir, that we be involved in the assessment of the implications of the use of the traffic signals a 28 Simply because a lot of traffic splits Findon to either go down the a 24 to join the A 27 serving turn, Darlington or goes down through Clapham to join the a 27 there. And therefore, if you've got traffic signals, that's going to affect flows. So we just need to understand what the implications are. Also, if we can understand the type of signals anticipated whether they be static or responsive, if they're responsive, obviously they can manage cues more readily. Okay, thank you. So you need to be consulted on those traffic displays. We're happy to work with the county in the applicant tripod

28:38

applicant like to just respond to on that specific point.

28:42

Thank you Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. The Lindsay assessments were included in the traffic management strategies submitted at deadline three but I'll forward those on to you so so you have a copy after the hearing the intention is for those signals to be detected based certainly for the toll on their farm access so they will only ever be called when a when a construction vehicle is waiting to exit



29:13

okay so final call for any other comments. Yes Miss Lightman

29:19

Yes, postpone like then speak and general matter. Excuse me HGVs maximum length 16.5 metres road trains maximum length of 18.75 metres. The outline construction transport management plan our EP three dash O two nine generically talks about HGVs and doesn't categorise the cable transporter which has a length of 26 plus metres, which is an extra ordinary load so covering HTV generically I think is disingenuous. These cable transporter shall be separately categorised and the numbers of these accessing particularly Kent Street and Mitchell Grove Lane should be should be included link separately. Okay,

30:11

thank you for that. Any any response on that?

30:16

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, we are providing an update on to the ctmp at deadline for that provides some specific commentary on abnormal load routes, so it will be picked up in there.

30:32

Okay, thank you. I'm moving on now to item seven C, and that's access a two four. So can you please display figure 7.6 point four B, or the latest outline construction traffic management plan, which is rep three dash zero to nine?

31:24

It's great, thank

31:25

you. So, West Sussex County Council, in response to the examining authorities first reading questions, is still crushing the need for this access, given the close proximity or constrict construction access a 22. Can you explain the requirement please for a 24

31:46

Thank you Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. We've noticed that acts as a 24 is identified as for operational purposes. Within works number 15. Shown on sheet seven of the onshore works plans. Given the proximity of access a 21 and a 22. It's agreed that construction access via a 24 will not be required. So we'll update the outline construction traffic management plan deadline for to reflect His correction. Okay, thank

32:14

you. Mr. Gledhill. Any comments, comments on that?

32:20

Letter West Sussex County Council now I don't think there's anything further to say that access is a 24 is being withdrawn from being used needed to be used for construction purposes that more than adequately addresses my point. Thank you. Excellent.

32:32

Thank you. Anyone else? Any comments on that particular agenda item? Looking around the room? I don't see anyone I don't think there's anyone online either. Okay, well, we'll move on. So we now are on Item seven D rook pit and crook Thorn lanes. Can you please display figure 7.6 point four A of the latest outline construction traffic management plan which is rep three dash zero to nine.

33:11

It's great. Thank you. So the governors of St. Mary's Primary School clamping a raise concerns about traffic or construction traffic using these two lanes near the school. Can you please explain the proposed use of access a zero for this location? And how would you how would you ensure the construction traffic would avoid these roads

33:39

Thank you Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. Group it Lane anchorage Thorn Lane provide a route to access a four as identified. This is again shown as an operational access on sheet one of the onshore works plans. This means that it would not be used during the construction programme. Instead, it would only involve very infrequent access by light, good vehicles such as vans and pickups as detailed in Section 4.8 of Chapter Four the proposed development and that's ap 045. Given the anticipated light use. The applicant is aimed to use the existing access for operational purposes, thereby reducing the environmental effects.

34:29

Okay, and how would you ensure that construction traffic didn't stray onto these roads during construction activities.

34:39

Construction access a 01 provides suitable access to activities to the south. There should be no need for construction traffic to use those routes that they're not permitted. routes for ATVs in the outline construction traffic management plan.

34:58

How's that conveyed to Who HGV drivers? How would you actually control that? So,

35:04

all contractors will be issued with details of permitted routes. As part of detailed construction traffic management plans will be prepared. Posts consent.

35:17

Okay, thank you.

35:21

There's West Sussex County Council have any comments at all about

35:26

internetowe West Sussex County Council? I don't think I've got any comments to add on this. I think it's our IT WAS West Sussex understanding that a 04 would always be an operational axis and as such HGV traffic wouldn't need to go in a facility of St. Mary's School. Okay,

35:40

excellent.

35:43

Okay, any other comments on this particular agenda item?

35:48

Just looking around the room.

35:49

I can see a hand up. Miss Honey said. Oh, sorry. can't quite see the surname starts with Hu.

36:02

It's Colin Humphrey and scrimping parish council. Sorry. Yes. Mr. Humphries. Thank you, sir. I think you've addressed one of the main concerns that the parish council had, we were going to make two comments about this. The first was a request as to whether there could be a commitment in the sheduled commitments that the road will not be used for construction traffic, whether it be HGVs or LGBs. And if it sounds like that isn't contentious, but that will be a valuable addition. The second point we wanted to make was that we're actually still intrigued about the use of a for, for operational uses. In any case, it leads to breadline, which is an unrestricted by way, by way 197. And the byway is, so it's unrestricted, so the applicant will be entitled to use it for occasional live vehicles. Anyway. It's a pretty bumpy road, but it's there. Our expectation, however, is the cable will come at the lines much closer through near the access a one. And it's interesting, the bread lane, as you can see on the map leads to south and it takes you straight to the area to the west of the cable line, which is most prone to coastal flooding, Tidal Storm overflowing overtopping and tidal seepage. So that area, from the edge on the west hand side of the boundary across towards the middle on that western side is probably the least accessible area of that that part of the area. And we can't understand why it would be surely better to use access a one for operational uses after construction and to continue using that off a Ferry Road.

37:58

Okay, thank you. Mr. Humphries. Could you please respond to that?

38:08

I think we'll consider it and take it away and respond. Okay. So

38:12

that's another action or Yes. So the line four would you be able to deadline for screening? Thank you.

38:19

Okay, thank you.

38:20

Any other comments at all on this agenda item? No, going online. Okay, moving on then to Agenda Item seven e tanking and vehicle movements to address water neutrality. So the examining authority notes and in response to his written question, w e 1.1. And water neutrality, rep three dash 051. The applicant has made a new commitment C 290. In the latest version of outline code or construction practice to improve water for construction activities from outside the Sussex North water resource zone using tankers. Nearly 4019 cubic metre or just over two and a half 1030 cubic metre tankers will be required over the whole construction phase of the proposed development. Based on these estimates, we note that you do not anticipate the additional movements of water tankers will change the conclusions of chapter 32 Yes, addendum Volume Two vs. Rep one dash 006 in relation to significant effects on users of the transport network. Can you please just briefly explain your reasoning for this?

39:38

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. Just before I do so I'd like to pass to my colleague Mr. Douglas just provide an update. Hi there.

39:53

I'm Guy Douglas on behalf of the applicant and yet there has been a have somewhat of an update in that. We have had some discussions with Horsham District Council about their deadline for the submission and their local impact report. And their of the view that construction what to use can likely be screened out from consideration on the basis that sort of prior to the position statement on water neutrality, there was about 1000 homes being delivered in the district. And that's dropped to about 400. Since then, sort of, in their view, there's a headroom capacity of water uses, which isn't being used by other development. And in their deadline free response, which and District Council suggested that the usage from rampion to would likely fit within that headroom capacity. We had a meeting with them following up on that on the first of May, a couple of weeks ago. And we as part of that we presented those volumes that we presented in our deadline for the submission. Upon seeing that information, they commented that they fought it likely that those types of usage would would indeed fit within that headroom capacity. And that as such, the abid form, essentially baseline water usage and could be screamed out. If that was the case, and Natural England also sort of form a consensus on that, then there wouldn't be a need to tank her in water to the to the main compounds. So for things like welfare facilities, concrete batching, cement banned sand, that sort of stuff that was presented in a in that table, which essentially was a worst case assessment. And we've got a meeting next week, next Wednesday with Natural England and Horsham District Council to see if a joined up. Consensus can be secured on that. If that was the case, then yeah, that water use for the for the compound wouldn't need to necessarily be tankard in and it could be connected to the mains. And then I'd probably just add that there's there's some locations like the HDD, trenchless crossings, which are more remote in their, in

their location. So, by virtue of that they they probably will need to be tankard and so that's that's just a bit of an update as to how things are moving along now. Okay, so

43:31

what will be the potential reduction in tanker numbers,

43:36

if I just

43:39

explained, is charitable.

43:42

So for instance, it's the welfare facilities alone, they, they are about 38,000 metres cubed in that table so that they represent over half. So I think it's over over half off the top of my head. But yeah, it's quite a substantial number and proportion of that. Okay.

44:10

So when you're going to be in a position to update ESA, which should

44:17

by deadline for we should have more of an update on that position? And wherever Natural England are in agreement, okay, so

44:29

can we have that as an action then to update us a deadline for on that specific issue? Yeah. Okay. You could take that as an action then. Okay, thank you. Anyone else have any comments about this? This is agenda item. Yes, Miss Smith.

44:49

Thank you, Mr. Smith, as to California rampion. Kind of thinking we should still discuss this as if it weren't going to be consented as he suggests whether that's wishful thinking of his or not? I don't know. Because I, I mean, the numbers quoted, they don't give the figures for Oakland Dean, but I'm assuming that most of these vehicles will be coming to Oakland Dean. So how they can say it doesn't make much difference to the traffic numbers? I'm not sure. And I'm presuming they are, in addition to the HTV numbers already quoted, they don't give the figures for Kent street, or say whether they're included in the plan they've only just produced so again, I presume not, and I presume most of those will have to go ahead, regardless of whether they get this agreement or not. How many will come through the AQ Ma? Presumably, they're also not included in the AQa figures. And the tanker in the picture is enormous. And please, can you tell us which, if that's the picture, which is it, the smaller tanker or the bigger one just so you can get an idea of what they look like? And just, regardless of whether they get this consent or not, about the water neutrality, the wheel washing of hundreds of vehicles every day, it will all and the welfare Well, some of the welfare. So we'll see we'll all go down into the California stream directly at a 62 and the tributary at a 63. And the implications for the California stream and the

ADA downstream, particularly in winter, or when the field is flooded or saturated. Where will all these 1000s of cubic metres of water go? Because there's no mains drainage?

46:32

With a thank you.

46:34

Yeah, with the applicant like to just respond to those points. Yeah.

46:39

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. I'd actually like to take this opportunity to note that there was an error made in our response to the examining authorities rescind question, we 1.1, which route three zero 50 in the context of Tonquin water compounds within this response. The app in stated that the Indicative estimate of tank movements required over the construction phase represented additional construction traffic movements over those assessed in ES addendum. However, that wasn't quite correct. The tanker movements associated with the construction of the onshore cable route have indeed been already been included in a traffic generation estimates. So this also covers tank movements associated with trenchless crossing drilling. Additional movements over those assesses within the ESA are therefore limited to the welfare facilities, should they be required. Bachelor's meant bound sand, were washing, site access and dust suppression on the haul road as required. The combined value of of those tanker movements is less than 20 movements per week across the entire cable route and construction programme. So on that basis, it's not considered that they would impact on any of the the peak week assessments included in the Yes. Okay, thank you.

48:17

Sorry, you can just go to Mr. Humphries online, and I'll come to you then. Me Sam freeze.

48:23

Yes, Colin Humphreys camping parish council. It's just a question of clarification as there's a massive compounding clumping, am I right to assume that there's no need to tank a water into the compound at clumping under the applicant has secured sufficient water supply to run that compound?

48:43

You'd like to answer that please.

48:53

Eric Ada was on behalf of the applicant. I think I'll kind of harks back to that sort of agreement that we're in the middle of going through with Horsham District Council and Natural England. If there was that agreement that it forms the baseline water use, and it fits within the headroom capacity, then

49:30

that compound with which connects up to the means in all likelihood. However, if there's Yeah, if needs be, then there's this suppose fallback position of commitment to 90

49:54

to ensure that water neutrality, so requirements with regulators would be adhered to while Wherever. So I suppose it will come out of the action point that were taken away. Okay,

50:07

can I just add to that, Richard tomorrow it on behalf of the applicant, I just would like to point out that the clumping compound is outside of the water neutrality zone that we've been discussing under this heading and therefore we would be strategizing to connect to mains water for any requirements there and not rely on bringing entangling waters through. Right? Yeah, right. Even

50:28

like clarification. Thank you. Yes, you're like, come to you next.

50:33

I'm only James Mosca a question which I might have missed somewhere within this. But what about the contamination of the free water that might come back from usage of what you have to use the water for? And will you be testing for that for in due course or from time to time?

50:56

Okay, the African lie to

51:00

Richard tanowitz on behalf of the applicant, in general, I think what's referred to here is is drainage from construction activities. And these will be managed through drainage control plans as per the construction method statements that will be sent out. And I think there is an outline of that included in our outline document as part of as part of the application.

51:21

That's great. Thank you. Mr. Porter. I believe you had your hand up.

51:26

As Matthew port orchard District Council,

51:28

it was answered by the applicants Alkalyn clarification. Okay. Thank you. Okay, any other comments on this agenda item? Yes, Mr. Ball. The

51:37

call vote on Ken Street is only 2.85 metres the road over that culvert there? Just pointed note, I'm not sure how wide the water tankers are. If they have to come down can Street. Okay.

51:48

You'd like to comment on that comment?

51:56

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf napkin. I don't believe there be be wider than 2.85 metres. Okay.

52:02

That's great. Thank you. Okay, I'm moving on now to Agenda Item seven air

52:13

as you're the traffic modelling so it's response to the examining authorities. First written questions are EP three dash 073. West Sussex County Council's still had concerns about the lack of detail provided on the assumptions, the applicant had adopted for the calculation project vehicle movements, on which the whole traffic assessment is based. So obviously a critical figure. Can I ask the authority whether it's had had an opportunity to review the documents submitted a deadline three by the applicant, and in particular, the latest version of the volume for appendix 23.2 of the ES the traffic generation technical note, our EP three dash zero to zero. So that's one for you, Mr. Gledhill?

53:04

Better West Sussex County Council short answer is I'm working my way through the documents as okay. So so unfortunately, I haven't good answer for you there. The answer is unfortunately, no, I haven't had chance to look at that. But okay, we'll come back and do because, of course, oil through written written raps. I will come back on that point. Okay.

53:24

Excellent. Thank you. And I was going to ask the applicant under this agenda item when you attend updating the traffic model, and all the yes documents that flow from it. To evidence what you've explained about Ken St. Mitchell Grove and Tom are farm strategies, and any other traffic survey data updates that you had since submission of the original documents.

53:55

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. We're working through an assessment of the outcomes of the the traffic management strategies and what that means to ies assessments, we will also take the opportunity to include results of the traffic surveys that have recently been completed because of timeframes. However, on the turnaround of that data, we wouldn't be able to submit that update a deadline for that it's usual for traffic data to take three to four weeks to reach us following completion. So our intention is to submit an update to the ES addendum at deadline five that incorporates everything okay,

54:44

and then eventually at the final deadline updated yes documents

54:49

themselves

54:53

sorry, because we named them healthy happy and when you say updated yes document



54:56

the primary traffic Doctor And the traffic.

55:02

Traffic Generation technical note. Yeah, yes, that'd be updating as well. Okay. That's great. Thank you.

55:10

I think the smothers I think you requested to speak on this item

55:21

about the traffic modelling in general.

55:23

Yes, that's yeah. If you want to talk about traffic modelling Yes, during that time,

55:27

thank you, Mira, Smethurst CalHFA we rampion. So, the original estimate of 8040 HGVs, we were quoted during the consultation along the 2002 has now become almost 20,000. The numbers quoted still seem quite small when considered against the figures given for rampion one. The remaining consistencies in the vehicle numbers they give to people, such as the figures they gave to Bali parish council compares pair to those they gave to Fred Tarak. In their response to questions that deadline three, the remaining consistencies in the number of HGVs, they say will come through the AQ MA and cow fold, which I can talk about if you want how can they possibly have done accurate modelling therefore, when they don't actually have accurate numbers, in assessing the traffic flows, they haven't considered the fact that the road is at capacity, only the 10% increase in traffic that's too complicated. Sorry, too simplistic. For a complicated junction like in the middle of California, they only even consider the percentage increase in flow for the bid between the two mini roundabouts, which I think they call receptor 24. We know that it capacity every vehicle counts in assessing congestion and pollution. Even the less polluting vehicles will affect this rampion do not include the passenger vehicles, or even LGV than their traffic assessment modelling only HGVs and certainly not the passenger vehicles. My argument to that they haven't considered the impacts of the complicated in and out movements of the three points so close together and accused this will cause a fact that was picked up by caliphal parish council at the open floor hearing the other day. They haven't included the tankers or the I've don't believe or the private vehicles arriving in the morning, only the passenger and leaving at the night and only the passengers, passenger vehicles going to the sights from the compounds are the additional movements. They haven't included the additional movements that they are now need to control Kent street going backwards and forwards to the compound. I don't I don't see how that can possibly be included in the figure since they've only just come up with that plan. The lack of a holding Bay is I really don't see how that's going to work. How can a compounds act as a holding Bay if one of the aims is to actually control the flow to the compounds, it just doesn't make any sense. And the proposed 40 mile an hour speed limit hasn't been factored into the traffic assessment or the consequent EIA modelling. And there's no assessments of how many vehicles currently going in and currently going in and out of the Canadian industrial estate or assessments of the danger of the clash with a new access token

dean. And it's clear from our EP 3030 that staff arriving leaving at the compounds aren't included in the congestion they might cause. With regards to air quality impacts, the Horsham District Council Dantec. A report that's already been mentioned shows that the traffic at the mini roundabouts is beyond capacity during peak hours, defined in their report as eight till nine in the morning and five to six in the evening. And in the morning, that congestion is the seventh worst in the whole district. The elands city traffic camera data produced for West Sussex for last year shows that the traffic peaks at this point, in fact begin around 637 o'clock in the morning and continue to 930 not not just eight or nine and in the evening from three till 630 or seven. And I've noticed the fact that the figures are actually only slightly lower than this throughout the whole of the day between the peaks. Perhaps explaining why it takes very little to tip the traffic intermediate congestion on this road to these slowly moving and turning vehicles could easily do that. That's all okay. Thank

59:41

you, Miss specialist. Historian. Would

59:43

you like to comment on that briefly?

59:45

Yes, thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. I tried to note those down as I went so I'll try and respond to each. So in relation to H TV numbers. We're confident that our estimates of HCV numbers are robust. They've been based on a number of inputs such as length of activity and volume of materials and plant required and the number of construction workers needed for the project. And my colleague, Mr. Nagel can speak further on that, if required. I'm not aware of inconsistencies of quoted number of AGVs. And we'll we'll take that away as needed. If that needs to be checked, in relation to consideration of peak hour traffic, it is noted that West Sussex have agreed our assessment methodology as acceptable, as shown in their response to two ta 1.2 of the examining authorities past recent questions, and they also confirm that based on our assessment of the new ES guidance, the technical note, rep 2017 that the conclusions of the originally asked chapter based on the older guidance remained valid and no further work was required. Further, all our construction traffic movements do include LGV movements, they do include estimates of construction worker movements, they have all been based on an assumption that every single construction worker drives themselves to site with with zero car share. And we're aware that actually, it's quite commonplace for these large construction sites for construction workers to stay at shared accommodation, hotels Bnbs, for example, and travelled to site together. So our assessments of the likely LGV movements to and from the site are considered very robust. I provided an update to say that we're working through the implications of the TMS changes and will provide an update to the ES chapter. At deadline 540 mile per hour limit, I don't consider that would have a negative impact on our assessments, if anything, it would, it would improve upon road safety on the 272. And in relation to vehicles moving in and out the accesses. And in relation to open deemed specifically the existing usage and potential conflicts with vehicles, they're in relation to the design of the access that will be fully considered as part of the road safety audit process. And that's it. Thank you. Okay,

1:02:58

thank you, Mr. Williams. Miss aborist. You got your hand up?

1:03:05

Yes, indeed. Good afternoon.

1:03:10

Would you like to comment on traffic modelling? Indeed,

1:03:13

let's try and unlock my camera. It appears not pious, here we are. Yes, I would indeed please. As we refer to serial seven A. Obviously the applicant has already made reference to enhancing their traffic modelling their road traffic model their modelling. However, on behalf of council parish council, we would actually like to request that the applicant makes a commitment in respect of both the Kent Street and Oakland Dean junctions to provide turning traffic data, both current and as they believe will be enhanced during the project. In respect of turning at junctions, we've heard quite a lot about obviously, vehicle movement moving straight through which is of course, equally important. But the as has been alluded to both by the examining authority and California V rampion. The slowing and turning data can street oak and Dean and also looking at the Asics two and a six, three proposals is something I don't believe at the moment is transparent. So we are asking as I say that the applicant makes a commitment to provide this data and using the same traffic modelling for the A so to seven to all of the four Kent street junctions i 87, two east into Kent street, a 272 west into Kent Street, and then in river US can street into the ages seven to West and Kent street into the A to seven, two East because that we believe will have a significant effect on the enhanced traffic management modelling.

1:05:15

Okay, thank you. Miss Everest would like to respond to that request, please.

1:05:20

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf the applicant, we will be happy to provide details of construction traffic turning movements at that at those juncture. Okay.

1:05:29

Can we please take that as an action, please? Thank you. Would that be a deadline for that? Yes, that should be fine. So deadline for action. Thank you. Thank you, Miss aborist. Thank you, Mr. Humphries. Have you got your hand up?

1:05:46

So thank you, sir. Colin Humphreys clumping parish council. Obviously, we recognise that the applicant has to make estimates of the moment and they will have been going through making a lot of assumptions. But when I see a number, like 9342 HGV movements that access a five, it immediately poses the question to me, plus or minus what? There must be uncertainty in these numbers. And I wonder how the project is taking into account those sorts of uncertainties. We've heard a lot today about the need for further detail in many aspects of this project, as they move through the various deadlines and everything else, and it seems likely that there will be change. So the first question is one

of accuracies of estimates. And the second is, what account is being taken of likely changes to road capacity. Because at access a five, the inspector will be aware that there's a strategic housing development just across the road, it's been approved, and it is going to be changing the line of Church Lane, which is what the a five is coming off of. And there's a proposal within the first phase of that housing development to redevelopment redevelop the Church Lane roundabout, which will have a major impact on the capacity of the a 259. So I'd be interested to know what account or what allowance the projects is making for predicted and largely expected changes in the highways infrastructure over the next few years. Thank you. Okay, thank

1:07:31

you, Mr. Humphries. Who'd like to respond to that those problems as well, please. Thank

1:07:35

you, Simonik. On behalf of the applicant, I'll pick up the first point and my colleague Chris will pick up the second point in terms of accuracy of s of estimates is correct that yes, it is an estimate at this stage. It is based on volumes of construction materials. And we've taken the approach of being conservative in those so where we have haul roads, we have estimated more than them, and we have them we have allowed them than what is required. And allowing for more passing places than we anticipate to ensure we are over the value. We can provide some more details of how we how we've assumed other aspects of the traffic numbers, workforce, it's based on typical spread numbers, equipment, the vehicles coming in and out are based on say conservative load amounts. Each each vehicle type be slightly different and you know we've we've taken on a smaller amount so that it's a conservative estimate. Can

1:08:54

I go into that can Richard town on behalf of the applicant? I just want to like to point out that these material movements and requirements are based on the proposal on the parameters of the proposed development and therefore are limited to the to any deviation in that respect. Thank you.

1:09:11

Okay, thank you.

1:09:12

Miss Smethurst.

1:09:14

Thank you Mira Smithers to California rampion. The applicant asked for examples where there's discrepancies between their numbers well, just a couple of instances to bring to mind although there are many more in our EP 2028 table two dash nine responds to Fred Tarik at peak construction access a 62 and a 63 will serve approximately 600 to LGV movements a week. Then we have responded to Bonnie parish counselling are up to her one four. And the numbers given are 456 for a 62 and 564 for a 63 which obviously adds up to a lot more than 600. But then, in regards to the age GMA several conflicting statements here 25% of HGVs to the A 63, a 62, Kent Street and wine and lane will have to come from the a 24. And therefore three caliphah That's in our EP 305 o in response to written question

aq 1.2. And yet, we have in O three o routing through Cal fold will only be for access a 56 and a 57. Or where the use of locally sourced materials makes it makes avoidance impractical. And then yet again, we have an though a requirement for articulated HGVs and low loaders to access, a 56 and a 57. From the south by a to eight, the ATA one the a 2037. And the ATA three or he they're actually going to be coming up through Henfield. We don't I mean, is there even any evidence that they can fit through the high street in Henfield? Those three statements are not compatible with each other. And again, I wish if the applicant could actually simply confirm whether or not in these modelling studies they have turned taken the turning traffic into these various compounds into account whether they've taken the 40 mile an hour speed limit into accounts. And whether they've taken the complicated junction in California into account as as described in the different a, a la QM TG 22. Thank you.

1:11:45

Okay, would you like to just respond briefly to those points?

1:11:54

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant, thank you for confirming the the discrepancies in relation to a 62 and a 63. I don't have those responses in front of me. So I'll need to take that away and, and confirm the issue there in relation to the HCV numbers through through the AQ Ma. Our assessments within the EAS, that they have always included a proportion of HGVs routing through kaufhold to ensure that we're being robust as as possible. And check into looking to confirm what impacts under a under a kind of worst case scenario might be possible. It's worth noting that however the ctmp and commitments in relation to hcvs Bruce into California were updated at deadline three to make them more stringent. So again, I don't have the exact word in open in front of me, but but that that should reduce the number of vehicles routing through the AQ EMA to only where they can't be avoided and to access a 56 and a 57 to the south.

1:13:23

Okay, thank

1:13:24

you Mr. Williams. I think we we are sorry, would you like to make a comment?

1:13:31

Thank you, Sarah Marshall for national highways. The point we wanted to make was in a round covering all the points so not particularly on just on traffic modelling. So would you like me to speak now or wait till conclusion

1:13:45

of processing to

1:13:46

conclusion

1:13:53

what do you mean by conclusion

1:13:55

when when you be

1:13:57

the points, national I always wished sorry, Sarah Marshall for national highways the point national I always respect sort of cover everything within this agenda item is only a very brief point.

1:14:09

Are you meeting the traffic agenda? Yes, yes. Sorry. I thought you meant Oh agenda. So yeah, please, please go ahead.

1:14:16

Thank you. So national highways. They have concerns about the impact of the safety of users of the strategic road network, the SRN, the signage impact on junctions a 27 and the 823 arising from additional traffic diverted from the local road network. National Highways is now working with the app contam West Sussex and understand from my clients progress has been made regarding the local road issues. The information given to national highways in assessing likely impact has been promised so the applicant has promised to provide that information to national highways has been discussions this morning. So on the basis that information is provided national highways would be broadly content that their outstanding concerns regarding construction traffic and diverted traffic using the SRN can be addressed before close of examination regarding the proposed works for the a 27 to provide access to the hammer pot, I call it the hammer pot construction compound. The road safety audit process the RSA process can commence in the next few days. So barring no surprises and and we're reliant on the fact the applicants documentation will be in the correct form, provide the right information national high with expect the RSA process to that will be completed by deadline five. Excellent,

1:15:52

very helpful. Thank you. Anything the applicant wants to add to patch all?

1:15:58

Thank you, Chris Williams on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, just to say it was agreed this morning that we provide further information to national highways on on the impact of of the SRN. And we're now in a position to work through the road safety audit process for access a 21 and a 22. It will be it will be difficult to get that process fully completed, I think for the end of the the examination in terms of road safety audit designers responses and and sign off or anything else. But we are of course more than willing to work as hard as we can do that. And I know that national highways have also expressed your ability to try and speed up their internal processes in responding to the the Road Safety Audit one once we get that back is just a point to note that whilst we have now received comments, they were issued to national highways on the 29th of February. So we've not been able to press go on those audits, until receiving those responses today.

1:17:21

Okay, that's great. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, so I think we'll conclude this item with a review of the actions Mr. Male.

1:17:32

Thank you. So quite a few. So bear with me, and we'll see how successful I've been. Starting off in relation to matters related to Kent Street, the applicant will check and confirm that the widening works at the bottom of country in the A 272 is within a highway land. The applicant then agreed to provide further details of what its response would be in the event of a sudden failure. Can street Yeah, that's really good instruction activities. But in those terms. And the applicant also agreed to set out its methodology and timeframe for completing any remedial works. And I think at the end of the at the end of the construction phase, yep. The applicant was going to confirm that two HGVs could pass on 10th Street using the passing places and further clarification on how equestrian users on can Street will be will be dealt with and held pending movements of HGVs. There was a matter related to the removal of vegetation around I think the the country a 270 junction and the opening access and whether that had been taken into account within the the landscape and visual assessment insofar as screening effects are concerned

1:19:33

the applicant was going to submit a statement on the possibility I think of using a 63 and the whole road in instead of contract yet.

1:19:56

To that one because it's captured by some wider some more Other points that's all I have in relation to Kent Street. As far as Mitchell Grove and told me farms concerned, again, there was confirmation that the passing places sat within highway land. There was the applicant agreed to update the traffic management strategy in relation to turning movements, a 26 to reflect the right turn, and a number of other related updates concerning the management of interactions potentially with pedestrians, cyclists and Crestron users on neutral Grove lane.

1:20:55

The applicant was going to confirm how the potential effects of vibration on the church related monuments arising from the use of the track associated with a 28 had been considered. In response to a query from national highways about the potential impact of traffic signals at a 28 on the strategic road network, the applicant was going to supply the LinSig model that form part of its deadline three submission to national highways and the applicant also agreed to or clarified that it will be updating the outline ctmp at deadline for to address movements associated with abnormal loads. Moving on then to exercise 24 The applicant will update the airline ctmp at deadline for to reflect that a 24 will be an operational access only. And then in relation to pregnant Brook pits and crook Thorn lanes. The applicant is going to consider whether it's possible to use access a one four operational access in place of access a for and to respond a deadline deadline for more generally on water neutrality. The applicant will be meeting with Natural England and Horsham District Council prior to deadline for and will provide an update on where water neutrality issues sit at following at that meeting in relation to traffic modelling, the applicant confirmed that it would provide updates to the environmental statement and the the associated technical note deadline five and then there will be a commitment to provide data relating to

the turning junctions that can Street and open been at deadline for yes. And then finally in response to think alleged discrepancies with the numbers associated with a 62 and a 63. The applicant will investigate that and respond to those.

1:23:51

Okay, thank you.

1:23:56

I have noted a few more. So there was one for design access for a 63 the proposed substation site to be completed and submitted at deadline to five. Never another one to provide a note on the impact of Kent street strategy on the overall traffic modelling deadline for Yep. And to provide a note on how the proposed works app accesses a 64 and a 61. may impact landscape setting. Yeah, and the applicant to provide evidence that the swept analysis includes a 64 and a 61. I wasn't sure if you'd mentioned that one as part of your list. And the last one I noted all above points swept up and contained and explained clearly in one document.

1:24:54

Yes, we could. You could do one document relating to the chemistry strategy. I was thinking you know Oh,

1:25:01

if that would be helpful

1:25:13

okay

1:25:19

okay, so that concludes Agenda Item seven. I'll now hand back to Mr. O'Sullivan for Item eight, which is onshore archaeology.

1:25:31

Thank you Dr. Morgan.

1:25:34

If you could bear with us again for moments such as while we change personnel.

1:26:38

So the first item on the onshore archaeology agenda has to do with the level of field evaluation and the assessment of the significance of archaeology primarily within the National Park. So, the first question to the applicant is given historic England's and Westchester County Council's the Southdown National Park of art is responses to the examining authorities written question one he 1.8. Can you explain how the level of significance of the buried archaeological features have been understood, described and characterised, particularly in relation to the absence of prior field evaluations?



1:27:39

I'm Simon Atkinson, to the applicants on onshore archaeology. And just to explain a bit about the approach that we've taken to the specimens, this characterization of the archaeology, which started with a desk study, including remote sensing, looking at evidence such as Lidar and our photography and that was followed by a geophysical survey, which was completed over as, as much as the proposed order limits, as we could we could possibly do take into account some of the land was not suitable survey. And were within the order limits within survey. We've you know, there was a there were areas of complex archaeology, where we further further further evaluation was quite a rare undertaken targeted trial trenching. But the work that we've undertaken is following policy requirements and to be proportionate to to ident to understand and describe the significance of the Heritage assets will be affected. Throughout and particularly within the area of Southdowns mentioned, the geophysical survey lingots There is concerned in documents p dp 31 and PDP 1132119. The the actual results of the geophysical survey show isn't quite limited results in terms of in terms of archaeology and nothing showing up in that area which couldn't be sufficiently understood based on using using the information from the from the From the desperate to collect your journey to database, so they've decimated assessment. Now, that's not that's not to say that there isn't a sense that we're not recognising that there's potential for as, as, as yesterday discovered archaeological heritage assets, as they're, as they're always wielding. What we've used the database that information in considering this camp potential and accounted for it in the in the MDS assessment, they can precautionary approach.

1:30:41

Thank you for that explanation. And the question was directed, really of how you understood and describes and characterise the particular archaeology without doing any essentially, prior failed evaluations, i in terms of perhaps it's a way that I've failed in terms of sort of physical intrusive works

1:31:08

well, the the approach to it, assessments on a on a linear schemitsch such as this, we've taken an approach which I think is comparable with other linear projects such as you know, Southampton to London pipeline project, which cost the South Downs which she undertook with GF desta dust study under geophysical survey and then secondly, trial trenching. The application stage, it's a comparable approach where we've where we've where we've used the database information, and the geophysical survey results to make judgments about where where further information is required. It's always good in this approach to reflect in policy on what is the proportionate approach to data collection.

1:32:11

Okay, thank you for that explanation. Does the Western Sue's county council wants to come in and make any comments with what you've just heard in terms of the job description.

1:32:31

Chloe honey set West Sussex County Council Yes. So this topic has been obviously covered in our our response to the first set of written questions question he 1.8. Firstly, obviously, West Sussex has absolutely no issue with the level of non intrusive survey work undertaken to date it's been sort of the geophysical survey, LIDAR data services estimate has been thorough and comprehensive and it's added useful information to the assessment process, but opposition remains that it is it is not possible

to adequately describe archaeological significance in the absence of field evaluation, especially when dealing with an as yet unidentified or potential archaeological features. And obviously, with the exception of extremely small quantity of shortages, this has not yet been undertaken, despite West Sussex asking for this to be undertaken from the earliest stages. Obviously, the relevant Planning and Policy places a duty upon the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected whilst the applicant does state that they've taken a worst case scenario approach in the ES, and this is the case in terms of the magnitude of significance and magnitude of harm that they have used in the assessment. So, you know, assessing any potential Archeologia was as of high potentially high significance, this does not equate to an adequate description of significance as required by the policy. And as highlighted in the relevant Historic England guidance notes, which which will highlight the need for a much more in depth understanding of significance, and then the necessity to characterise the presence, nature, extents. Depth, dates, Rarity, preservation, all of these factors are required for an understanding of significance. And those can only be achieved through intrusive field evaluation. In this case, not just charged trenching, but in the in the area of the South Downs to which we are referring, it would require test pits evaluation as well as potentially field walking due to the nature of the archaeological features that we we know that we can anticipate the reference to the geophysical survey results. Whilst that is noted. On the one hand, West says raised previously that there are results within that section of the geophysical survey that are large anomalies, large like anomalies indicative of Mining are extracted features that are stated as being a possibly pressed start date within any mining landscape. The obviously, the main issue being the results of the geophysical survey have not been ground truths. It's very common that for whatever reason, the results are not always as accurate as we would hope there would be. And then the other very important point in relation to geophysics is that one of the key key sort of categories of archaeological features we might anticipate is very ephemeral. Prehistoric and early, other Neolithic features, including fence scatters ephemeral traces of structures and habitation, Flint working floors, it would be impossible to expect to pick these up on geophysical surveys. So the absence of of those within the geophysical survey results is not really relevant in this case. So yeah, as it stands, the absence of field evaluation means that the applicant cannot currently describe the significance of effected assets to the level required by the policy. This has been highlighted by a recent planning judgement of low carbon Solar Park six and Pelham, where the High Court found that the absence of prior field evaluation was a sort of direct contributor to the inability of the applicant to describe the significance effectively. And the I believe the, the appeal was was was overturned as a result of that. So yeah, that's that sort of opposition on that.

1:36:35

Sorry, thank you for that explanation. So the South Downs National Park Authority. Essentially, the same sort of responses or just something that you'd want to add to that

1:36:51

rich 10 if South and Central Park Authority now we completely endorse what's been said, the reference that Mitanni set gave at the end of her contribution, then was the same reference that you'll find in our answer to question he 1.8. And just invite the examining authority. I don't know if the case is in the is in the examination yet, but we can provide it, but just invite the examining authority to consider paragraph 49 of that judgement, which is where the High Court say, as you've just heard, that, effectively, the applicant in that case, got it the wrong way round, you can't make a judge, you can't lead to mitigation,

you've got to make a judgement of significance. And if that means that you've got to do some physical works trenching in that case, to understand the significance of the assets, then you have to do that first before saying, Don't worry, we'll be able to mitigate in any event, it's a similar position here. The applicant says how they will manage archaeological discoveries should they should they arise during construction, but that they can't take that approach consistently with national policy, they instead have to understand and record the significance. I think the final point would emphasise which has already been reflected on by West Sussex is this is a really important historic landscape. You can see it just on the OS maps the line of sheduled ancient monuments and the applicants route cable route. And as we've seen earlier, just looking at Access 828, and its construction accesses thread between the line of sheduled ancient monuments. So there there really is significant historical interest here, which needs to be looked at in the in the, in the framework of the cultural heritage elements of the special cities.

1:38:55

Thank you, Mr. Attorney. So can we take an action point then to submit that judgement into the examination? And can I also suggest that we've got commentary from West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park on that authority on that judgement? Can I suggest that I think the the examining authority would find it useful if the applicant were to also explain the implications of that planning judgement for the proposed development. As a written submission, I suggest, would that be possible?

1:39:52

It certainly, sir, is something I envisaged that that we had to do and that we will do a deadline for I'm think that the circumstances of that particular case and the development concerned in that particular case and the way in which the effectively the the legal challenge was bought can be distinguished from the current proposals and some of the comparable schemes which Mr. Atkinson referred to, that will provide you with some comprehensive reasoning in writing by deadline for

1:40:29

Thank you. Can we take that as an action point then for the submission of the judgement into the examination and the applicants explanation of the implications of the judgement as described?

1:40:51

There is, is there anyone else who wants to make any comments on the points of did though just been made in the room online now. So, if we move on to the next part of the agenda,

1:41:12

which

1:41:14

is in relation to the commitment register and the outline RINs game of investigation?

1:41:26

Which

1:41:28

in a similar way that we've done earlier on today, we're looking to address the adequacy of those

1:41:40

whether whether they would they would go some way to address any of the concerns that have been expressed. Which I think we've probably already answered seven the only other question well.

1:42:26

Sorry, I was just confirming, I think the next question is really to do with the adequacy of the commitments and the requirements and matters such like that we'll need to consider once we've got those that judgement into the examination and the applicants response to that judgement. So I don't propose that we ask those questions today.

1:42:56

I just say, Richard, any further south and central box or just to say that we're grateful for the written scheme of investigation that's been put in a deadline three, with West Sussex actually, I can see it's now put her hand up as well. With West Sussex, we're reviewing that and we'll provide comments on that a deadline for into the applicant.

1:43:20

As if you could have had sight of the question I was just about to ask Mr. Turney. It was it was simply that that was the issue record. Regarding requirement 19. I was going to ask me, Sonny said that in her response when the County Council's response deadline three, they expressed concerns with wording of this requirement but noted that they were liaising with the applicant on an updated outline written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to Deadline three. And I was going to ask whether or perhaps I will still, if you're still reviewing that document, presumably you're not in a position to let me know whether the document has addressed your concerns. In respect of requirement nineteen's wording or not.

1:44:15

Kenny said West Sussex County Council? Yes, if I could just respond briefly, as you say we obviously are still working on the full written response to that updated documents. But I think obviously because it does tie into the previous agenda item relating to archaeological significance and failed evaluation. The amendments to the WSI are very much welcomed, especially the addition of the specific reference to the relevant commitments. And obviously, that's I'm satisfied that it's now much more robustly secured, and especially the initial two commitments set C 79 and C 80. There are potentially some minor wording amendments we would like to propose to C 79 C Two to five. It relates to the issue of if if field evaluation had been undertaken, and we had a more comprehensive understanding of significance at this point, the current, the current iteration of the documents, and the commitments register as secure by the DCO would represent a sort of robust package of mitigation that would quite effectively safeguard against harm to the historic environments. However, in the absence of that prior field evaluation, the applicant is essentially relying fully on the option of mitigation by avoidance ie preservation in situ, to avoid harm to any nationally significant remains, which might be identified during the evaluation, the future evaluation phases. And obviously, that requires that realise it's it, the updates

to the WSI, are very much welcomed. And it provides more understanding and and sort of consideration from the early phases that were still very positive. But the fact remains, they're still reliant on design and engineering solutions. And as well as the sort of the archaeology itself, the extent depth preservation, the the character. So there are so many variables that we don't currently have the information available that it's there is there's just too much uncertainty. And so my position is that the preservation by record, by in situ of high significance, archaeological remains can still not be assured based on the on those commitments. So if in the absence of prior field evaluation, we would be looking to have the wording of commitment to 85 tightened up removing words such as where possible, or, you know, if possible, and where appropriate, and potentially, would still be requiring that addition or amendments to commitment 19 as well, just because that is currently the only sort of safeguard available. I

1:46:55

was about to ask you whether you could deadline for put in the suggested changes to commitments, two to five and commitment 79 I think you said as well, yes. But are you saying they are essentially removing the uncertainty words listed on the web? Where possible, where relevant, that sort of thing? Or is there more substantive changes? Because I wasn't gonna put it to the outcome right now, then. It's

1:47:21

as such I mean, yes, it would be as little as removing the uncertain wording I've had highest is somewhere here. It's where possible and if possible, but the fact is, I'm not convinced that that that is feasible, that basically requires the applicant to fully commit to preservation in situ or avoidance of significant archaeological remains, if they're uncovered within the order limits. My concern is, it's not clear that that can be delivered, you know, if if, for example, there is there is a Neolithic Flint mining shaft within within within the Route Corridor, or, alternatively, very extensive, ephemeral Flint scatters. You know, it's whether whether changing the wording of that commitment can actually deliver that guarantee, if that makes sense. And that that mitigation can can be putting into practice in reality,

1:48:11

just as an aside, Missoni said, if they if this commitment wording had, let's say, took out that wording, relevant where feasible wherever, and replaced it with something along the lines of a commitment, unless otherwise agreed to by West Sussex County Council or something like that, whereby the applicant would come to you and say, Well, okay, we wanted to do this, but actually, we can't because of these reasons, and would have to seek your approval. Would that is that something that would alleviate your concerns?

1:48:48

That's something I'd have to go into. My main, my main concern would be due to the changes to requirement 19, whereby West Sussex councillors is not going to be the discharging authority for archaeological matters, that would then potentially fall to the relevant local planning authorities. And obviously, then that's, you know, potentially several authorities involves and it couldn't be necessary secured at this stage, but I will, then I consider that further.

1:49:18

Yeah. And again, thank you, Miss Anisa. And if I could just ask the applicant for a response on that in respect to changes and another point which Missoni says you touched on, which is Historic England, in their response to Deadline three, have suggested that West Sussex County Council should risk return as a consequence, I think they're suggesting that they were a constancy and that requirements have been taken out. And they they believe that this restaurant is characterised should be added back into requirement 19 as as as a console T and the relevant planning authority. So do you just want to sort of wrap up? What you've just heard and and the response to Historic England.

1:50:05

Thank you. So I think I think there's a few points there. Firstly, in relation to the general assessment of significance, what we're talking about here is unknown, undiscovered archaeology. And the applicant has made an assessment of the significance of that within its es chapter based on the information that it's been able to uncover from historic records from the geophysics. assizes going undertaken under Related trial, trenching, that it's done in respect of any anomalies revealed by that, by that exercise. So, so what we're doing here is really having a debate around the extent to which further trial trenching should be done on will use a speculative basis in order to identify further unknown, undiscovered archaeological assets. And the applicant basic position is that the exercise the disease that it has undertaken is a proportionate one, and one that you'll find used commonly on linear projects of, of this nature. So that I think is its overarching point. Secondly, in relation to requirement 19, you're quite right. The West Sussex County Council was originally there, the reference to them was removed at their request the council's request, so that's something that the the applicant has done there and are passed to Mr. Atkinson, in relation to points picked up by the WSI.

1:51:48

Yes, just, I mean, I think it's just to summarise really what the purpose of the WSI is to is to ensure the the treatment of archaeological remains in the development process and it includes provision for additional survey to inform detailed design, which is a you a normal process in construction of cable cable connections such as this, I think, you know, for example, Eastern greenlit for National Grid, they're starting trial trenching, soon, so, in their detailed design, and then also so that it makes provision for for detailed design measures and also for archaeological recording, disseminate and the archiving dissemination of the results and those sort of outreach activities for public benefit as well.

1:52:55

If I answer Thank you. You want to come back Mr. Turney

1:53:00

rich centre, Representative South trans National Park Authority, just Mr. Male tried to characterise this as sort of unknown. And as though there was some sort of speculation going on here. I think I just want to be absolutely clear. The National Park authorities position is that the cable corridor in this location goes through an area of at least national and possibly international archaeological importance. So we're not talking about an ordinary set of archaeological measures. We're talking about a very rich history that is already been recognised where ever there has been archaeological investigation in this area, it has discovered a very rich history of going back to Iron Age and earlier mining and early

industrial activity. It's really important. So if there was any suggestion what Mr. Mill's that what we're saying is sort of speculative. It's not this is this is through the heart of the historic interest of the National Park.

1:54:12

Thank you, Mr. Manager. You want to come back on that?

1:54:17

Certainly, I don't think for clarification, I was being speculative about the potential for there to be assets and fines of the nature described by Mr. Turney. What I was describing a speculative would be the trial trenching exercise, in order to discover as yet unknown, undiscovered finds. We take the point about the nature of the potential assets that you might find here. We've recognised that in the assessment, and we've made an assessment of significance on that basis.

1:54:53

Thank you. I think this is a matter that the examining authority needs to take away now and We look forward to your deadline for submissions on it. Okay, can we do the action points? Oh, sorry that not on my screens not. Oh, besides

1:55:17

West Sussex County Council? Yes, just very briefly and to echo Southtowns National Park, just just to say that I think Mr. Mill's position sort of shows a sort of a misunderstanding of of the process of occupational assessments, the ES has assessed a very high probability of higher national significance archaeological remains. This isn't just a sort of standard sort of field anywhere in the country, therefore, the assessment has to be proportionate. The fact that other similar schemes may or may not have done various levels of evaluation is sort of not not especially relevant, I have to take it on its own merits and look at what is proportionate and required in this situation. And the fact that it's being referred to as sort of speculative and uncertain. That is the literal purpose of evaluation. It's to, it's to further understand the presence and significance of what we're dealing with. At the moment, we are being forced to assess it on a worst case scenario basis, it might very well be that the archaeological potential is is lower when we when we do the evaluation, in which case, we can adjust accordingly. But yes, just want to clarify that.

1:56:32

Thank you. I think this this test of proportionate proportionality is the one. That's a question here. So I think we understood standards the next day, and we will take that away. And as I say, we'll certainly see what comes in at deadline for and how, and what further questions we may need to thank you all for that. Can I just get now the action points, please?

1:56:57

I think I've got two broadly served the first, the first will run relates to the the case that Mr. Toney I think it's the low Solar Park case. That was going to be submitted and we will respond to that at deadline for and then we await the comments of the County Council and the National Park in relation to the updated

WSI that was submitted at deadline three, and any further comments they may wish to make in relation to requirement 19.

1:57:34

Okay, thank you. Can we take a break at this point? Can we just take slightly less than 20 minutes I'd say can meet and be backed by her past a plus four, where we'll go through the remaining items on the agenda which I hope we're able to wrap up reasonably quickly. But yeah, help us all please.