

Audio_Bramford_ISH3_Session1_091123

Thu, Nov 09, 2023 11:22AM • 1:09:32

00:04

Good morning, everybody. This is the third issues specific hearing in relation to the Bramford twin standard reinforcement, and it is now open. At today's hearing, we will be looking at transports and rights of way. Before we begin, can I confirm that everybody can hear me clearly? Can I also confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording of this event has commenced? Yes, okay. My name is Jason Roelens. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the examining authority. I have a background in major projects for energy and highways, and I'm a chartered civil engineer and the chartered environmentalist. Today, I will be going through the management of the events and taking notes of any actions. I would like to ask my colleagues to introduce themselves.

01:16

Good morning. I'm Julie de Courcey. And I'm a charter time planner. I have a background in appellate work, including major infrastructure projects on the examination of local development plans.

01:32

Morning all my name is John McAvoy. I'm a chartered civil engineer. I have a background in major projects and local authority, highways and transport. Thank you.

01:42

Good morning. My name is Andrew Martin. I'm the Lead member of this examining authority. My background is in ecology and environmental impact assessment and I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect.

01:56

There are several colleagues from the planning Inspectorate working with us today. Jack Stevens is the case manager for the project. And he's sitting at the back there. And he's accompanied by Jess Weatherby. And Gina Shoreland is assisting online participants. If you have any general questions regarding the examination process, please email them to the case team. We'll be happy to help. Alternatively, you may be able to catch them in person following this hearing. I must first deal with the first few housekeeping matters. Firstly, can I ask that all audible notifications for electronic devices be switched off? Could participants online as well as those around the table? Please remember to switch your microphones to mute unless you are speaking. This helps to reduce background noise. No requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing. But I would just like to confirm that this is correct. Okay, I'm not seeing any show of hands. There are no fire alarms test you today. So if you hear something, it is the real thing. For those of us in the room, the fire exits to my right, where you will see the emergency green sign above the door. And also behind me to my left where again, you will see the green sign we should assemble in the carpark

outside. There are toilets at the opposite end of the corridor that you walk down to get to this room from the main lobby area. If you are joining us virtually on Microsoft Teams, please note that the chat function is not in use. So please do not send any messages via chat as is not being monitored. This at any point in the meeting you can't hear us or wish to speak. Can I ask you that you turn your camera on and use the raise hand function in teams. There may sometimes be a delay before we can acknowledge this

04:33

we will adjourn for a short break possibly around 11 o'clock. And if anybody has an urgent need, please let the case you know and we will do our best to accommodate you further the purpose of identification and for the benefit of those who may listen to the recording later. Could I ask that at every point as wishes Speak, could you please give your name and if you're representing an organization or individual who it is that you represent. For those precedents in the room, please ensure you speak into the microphone to ensure that your contribution is recorded. Does anybody have any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event? Okay, thank you. There is a digital recording the need of this hearing, and it will be available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. If you take part in the hearing, it is important that you understand that your comments will be recorded and that the digital recording will be published and retained, usually for a period of five years. From the Secretary of State's decision, the planning inspectorate is subject to the General Data Protection Regulation, the examining authority will ask you not to put sensitive personal information in the public domain. So please, when you speak today, do not make any reference to personal information, such as your address, your email, or your personal or family the situation including economic, financial, cultural, or health related notices. However, if for some reason, you feel that it is necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information, we would encourage you to speak to our case team, the first instance, they would then explore were with you whether the information could be provided in a written format, which could then be appropriately redacted before being published, I can reassure you that written evidence carries exactly the same weight as oral evidence. Please bear in mind again, that the only official recording of the preceding proceedings is the digital recording that will be placed on the project page of the national infrastructure, website, tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application. So this hearing will follow the agenda published on the Bramford twinset project page on the national infrastructure planning website on the 27th of October. It is also in the examination library and the references Evie dash zero 26. It would be helpful for you to have a copy of the agenda to hand please note the agenda is for guidance only. And we may add other considerations or issues as we progress. We will conclude the hearing when we have asked our questions and each has been responded to and we consider that all relevant contributions have been made. I would like now to take the names of those who wish to speak at this hearing. If you are a representative, please state who you represent and your role within the organization or group. And if I could start first with the applicant.

08:52

Good morning says madam I am Michael Humphries, barrister. And I appear on behalf of National Grid. And as you will see, I've got on my left various members of the highways team and on the far end, Mr. Fielding, obviously who's familiar to you? I'll get each of them to just briefly introduce themselves and

perhaps usefully just give you an indication of the sort of particular area that each of them deals with so that so that you know where to address questions.

09:26

That would be helpful. Thank you.

09:30

Good morning, John Hale for the applicant. So I'm a transport planner by trade and lead the development of the transport assessment in ES Chapter 12 On traffic and transport.

09:46

Thanks. Good morning. My name is Christopher Albers, Greenland. I am here on behalf of the applicant. My work chiefly in highway design and appraisal of operational road safety

10:00

Good morning, everyone, Ben Goodman for

10:01

the applicant, providing construction support to the transport assessment.

10:10

A good morning ally lead consents officer for National Grid and my specialisms planning policy.

10:19

Good morning rappelling from National Grid Lead Project Manager, engineering design.

10:27

Thank you very much.

10:29

Sir, can I ask the council's to introduce themselves?

10:35

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford kings Council, barrister for Suffolk County Council. I'm joined today immediately to my right by the council's in zip highway manager, that's Mr. Steve Murray. Then to his right is Mr. Graham Gunby, who you have seen before he is the inset planning manager. Then to his right, as Juliet Cox, co X. She's senior engineer on ENSET and projects with counsel and then to her right, admins, Claire Dixon, and that's the IC K s. O N. She's the operations manager dealing with rights away and access matters began to counsel

11:29

begin to learn.

11:33

Morning, sir. Matthew Wilde from Braintree District Council don't tend to say too much on this other than support Essex highways. As you know, we're working closely with Mark probably come in now. Thank you.

11:52

Morning, sir. My name is Mark Wood. I'm a principal planner worked on the Encik projects throughout Essex. I'm joined this morning by two of my colleagues in the growth and development harvest and transportation section to invite them to introduce themselves. First of all, Matt Bradley, please. Oh, yeah, Biggie pond Joe Joe's online bullying jab.

12:17

When a Joseph Essex County Council, principal transport planner and my expertise tend to be around the transport assessment and environmental assessment of traffic impacts.

12:31

Good morning, sir. Matthew Bradley, Strategic Development Manager Essex County Council representing Highway Authority.

12:42

Thank you.

12:50

Hello, my name is Ron Curtis, principal planner for mid Suffolk District Council and baby District Council. And just here in support of Suffolk County Council on the highway matters. Thank you. Thank you.

13:05

And if I can ask if there's anybody else who wants to participate? And if you could introduce yourself, please. Ah, good

13:13

morning. I am Alan Hall. And I appeal on my own behalf here today. And I think I'm probably described as a person with an interest in land.

13:22

Banking, Mr. Hall. I can I just check virtually, if there's anybody else in the room? No, I can't see any show of hands. So thank you very much. So the purpose of holding this issue specific hearing is to explore the transport and rights of way. A summary of these was included in Appendix B of the agenda that was issued. If you want to refer to any information already submitted, we would be very grateful if you could use the examination Library Reference whenever possible. Furthermore, could I ask that the first time use an abbreviation or an acronym that you set out its meaning and fool us there will be people here today or listening to the digital recording that may not be as familiar with the application or the documents as you are? This is a public examination. And if there is an urgent point that you want to make, please raise your real or virtual hand at a time that you wish to contribute. But whether online or

in the room, please wait to be invited before speaking. I would like to remind everyone that this is an examination, not an inquiry. Therefore, unless the examination authority has specifically requested or agreed to, there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross examination or search. Any questions that you may have further parties must be asked through the examining authorities. So before we move on to deal with the items detailed in the agenda, are there any questions at this stage above the procedural side of today's hearing all the agenda? No, okay, good. So, without any further ado, I will hand over to my colleague, Mr. McElroy, to lead on the items three to seven on the agenda.

15:48

Mr. Owens, thank you very much. Good morning, everyone. I intend to stick to the running order of the agenda as published. But I'd like to beg your indulgence and make one exception if I may. And it's in respect of item six, which is the temporary and permanent measures that are sought for access to the proposed development. Just a question to the applicant. Is that okay, in terms of do you have the subject experts available to discuss items on an item six? Is time. So yes. This time, please. Thank you so much. Thank you with that. Okay, good. Okay, so the item in question I'd like to bring in at this stage, Mr. Hall, if I could, certainly attended yesterday, for the entire day. And you've also made a number of representations to the examining authority. Just for you to be aware of the examining authority on the 10th of October this year did visit Churchill, we conducted an unaccompanied site inspection to observe a proposed access point that has been put in the application, I believe it's access point a b, dash a P. Five. Mr. Trump is a few could have at hand your representation rep three, Dash 048. That's your response to the written representations. And if you can refer to Section 4.1, page 51. And it's respected Mr. Allen Hall. Because yeah.

17:32

So in relation to this one, I know that you asked us to have to hand the general arrangement plans sheet two, which obviously includes Mr. Hall's property. While I'm trying to find the document. Would it be helpful if we desperately had that put up as well? Thank you so

17:48

much. Yes, thank you.

17:49

I believe that an agent has been made to show the equivalent drawing actually from my written representations to Mr. Augustine following but thank you, Mr. Hall.

18:19

So I have it. stamp is thank you. And

18:35

he says, Sorry, just making sure that the relevant people have it. I'm probably the least important person. Yeah. Thank you. And thank you. We've got obviously the Shih Tzu on the screen and Mr. Hall's property. Well, you can see where Mr. Hall's property is maybe that that can be That's right. pointed out it's there's the bellmouth. Yeah. There and the bell mouth is the northern corner of Mr. Hall's property. I'm sure Mr. Hall can confirm that.

19:20

So my first question is to the applicant, if I may. Could you just set out give us summary to the examining authority of the reason for that particular access point and perhaps some background to its design or its design status to date? And its long term status, will it be a temporary or a permanent access points if that information will be helpful to the exam? Thank you, please. So

19:41

I think that'll probably be a combination of both Mr. Field and from the sort of project side but also Mr. Alvis Greenland as well so I'll leave it to them who wants to start?

19:55

Good morning rebuilding National Grid soon design there is in its preliminary stages, we have applied the generic Bell Mark design and standard visibility splay distances along the route there. It's a temporary access route route, but a construction of the overhead line tower that you can see RB four on the screen. Now it's an infrequently used access point, because we'll be going in in 24, to upgrade and put the access to the tower, but then come back in 25 to continue works on the tower. And then again, sorry, in 24, November, December to install the access route, then we'll go back in 25 Between March and May for the construction activities. And back again in June 26 were demobilization so it's a very infrequently used access point. That's why we've tried to utilize an existing access and existing track rather than create severance for the middle of the landowners field and disrupt farming.

21:11

It's good to kind of ask Is that a farm access or a public right of way or some form of right away?

21:16

It's a farm access. Just near our before, you'll see there's a little kink in the order limits that goes around a farm shed

21:31

Thank you might be worth pointing out so the the farm access follows the the the route until you get to where the cursor is at the moment. I think the existing farm access track at that point goes slightly further to the east and follows upside field and the proposed access to the tower at that at that point departs from that point to be there departs from the existing track in order to go to the to the tower position. And

22:16

somebody's thinking

22:20

could I just

22:22

I'll call you, Andrew. I will call you in thanking screen. So

22:26

yeah, sorry, Mr. Christopher was Greenland on behalf of the applicant. So yeah, just to support what my colleague Mr. Field said that is obviously under the on the general arrangement plan the access references in there but as you as you said before, that says Alpha Bravo, alpha Papa five, and that provides access to the to the tower or pylon RB, for which you can see on the general arrangement plans there. And as Mr. Feldon stated before the sort of three discrete time is where we'd like to use that improve and use that access. For for the for the operations that need to occur. RB for you will see. And we believe that sort of as that operates today with with minimal improvements to visibility for the sorts of vehicles likely to be using it. That is inappropriate access whilst working with Suffolk County Council to improve it. But there is also resilience and robustness where we have the other access the other side of the tower, which runs parallel with the 400 kV and purple there, which is called Alpha Bravo, alpha Papa for if when the detailed design is completed or in sort of being developed in consultation and ultimately with requirement 11 approval from the local highway authority and these parts, that the vegetation clearance although allows for in the DCO boundary is is unreasonable in terms of how frequently it's going to be used. Then there is the allowance for the northern or the Northwest access there, which obviously runs parallel to to arable sorry, runs parallel with the power line across arable fields, which, considering as we said, there's three discrete times where we would need to use that to deliver the project. But in fairly quick succession that would probably sterilize that land for 24 to 26. When in reality, we won't actually use it three times. So it's the robustness of we we have allowed for either to allow the detailed designer that access, the southern access to be provided. If the consequences of that are so severe, that we choose to use the ones at the north, then we have that flexibility. So that's why two are shown to the same tower or pylon.

24:53

That's helpful. Can I ask the question So are you suggesting as an alternative access road to the one closest to Rose cottage?

25:02

Yeah, absolutely.

25:04

That begs the question, is there a need for the access point? Nearest rose cottage? Is there a need for that particular access without the lowermost access road?

25:12

So just to be clear, the one to the north is not an existing route. Okay, thank you. Yes. So

25:19

then it is absolutely our preference to reuse, reuse existing infrastructure where possible. As I say, if that's not appropriate, given our use of our infrastructure and the works needed to improve it for our use, use then there is the open field today that exists that could also provide access.

25:40

In terms of the size of vehicles using the access road, do we know the size of vehicles that will be abnormal nodes, for example, or HGVs, or smaller vehicles?

25:48

Where we're talking normal road going vehicles? We're not talking any aisles to get to that tower? If that was the question, sorry. Maybe abnormal loads. And Aya was a legally discrete things. But I think that's what you're probably getting at

26:02

the terms of that the number of vehicles using Do you know the frequency of usage of the access point? On the times you set out? Do you know how often?

26:10

Yeah, so we're talking combine ATVs and LTVs in these numbers, but in the first period, so November to December 24, we're talking 210 vehicles. And we're talking around that ballpark for the other two periods. This is all obviously outlined, line by line, our access into ta but we're talking that ballpark figures for those three discrete periods.

26:37

Just to be clear, so in terms of the proposed alternative, which will be a new access, right, under what criteria would that come into play? So in terms of it's it's a decision to be taken up, and you would opt to use that or not? What are the criteria for making that decision? The

26:54

criteria would would be broad outlined by Suffolk County Council's approval process for alterations to their highway. So when a name works contractor is on board, and these are all designed in detail, sort of in the rolling Well, the works of being allowed under the permitting scheme back to design needs to be done to support that. The decision point will be made of we would design the bell mouth upgrade in detail design, look at the vegetation clearance needed to accomplish that in such a way that would be approved by Suffolk, if at that point, we collectively decided that we're talking a lot of vegetation clearance for three discrete times, then we would under successful granting DCO exercise our right to construct the temporary access to the north, there is a later decision point, which ties in my eyes to requirement 11, I suppose is probably what you're wishing to hear.

27:57

Mr. Hall at this point, can I ask you please to concisely set out your proposal and why it is you making the proposal supposed to be as concise as possible. Thank you.

28:09

Just I'm still a little confused as to the use of these two accesses are described as temporary accesses one past my property is indeed seeking class for rights in perpetuity. And this was helpful. We discussed a little bit yesterday morning as to how that apparent anomaly arises. But it does support what I had been told informally, which is the access past my house was not in fact, for construction

purposes primarily. What was for use in perpetuity for future maintenance under the pier purposes, is that still the case or not? Going to respond?

28:50

Yes, because in the long term, however, over the next 1020 3040 years, they will obviously from time to time need to be maintenance. What we have done with the accesses to all of the towers is make sure that we have a legal right to go on the land to gain access and and Mr. Hall is absolutely right, that those rights would exist. They're not exclusive rights in the sense that nobody else can then you know that the farmer can't use his access, but they give us a right over those routes. But clearly, you know, the occasions on which maintenance would be needed over the long term would be very, very few and far between.

29:46

Thank you.

29:47

Thank you. So to be clear be for construction purposes, and you need her very large vehicles would be via the northerly access and normal road going vehicles. I think you're saying that the only ones you would utilize the path past my house. I'll

30:04

post it back to the applicant to answer.

30:08

I, the two accesses are in effect alternatives, I'll let Mr. Field and explain

30:18

Brookfield and national grid. So, AB AP five will be if under Section 11. Requirement 11, we get approval to build a bell mouth design at that location upgrade the bell mouth designer application that would be utilized for the construction of RV for now RV for construction will consist of lights, cars, vehicles, cars, and vans, and heavy goods vehicles. The largest item of equipment that will be coming in air in one visit is a crane for the erection of the tower or pylon. After that, it's it's what we call a line tower. So it's it's in a section that wouldn't have a machine sight at it. So it would just be conducted pulled from an oversight and going forward, then a temporary access route would be reinstated as we demobilize. Future access would be discussed with the landowner. And if he's given us agreement to come across that whole road for future maintenance, then that would be our preferred method rather than creating a new haul road across a field.

31:37

Building. Thank you. Thank

31:39

you. Yes. The reason I ask is that clearly, absolutely knob here is what damage will in fact be proposed to my property indication of foul mouth access. And I had hoped that my written submission would be

accessible on the screen so we can just see what we're talking about. And he could help to orient us. That's been

32:08

Thank you, sir.

32:12

In fact, we passed at stage nobody could scroll down to the bottom I think would be most helpful to a couple of photographs. So we're clear what we're talking about, sir.

32:21

Mr. Humphries. Apologies. So this was can you scroll back please, to you just pass an illustrative sketch. I think it showed a realignment if I'm correct. Mr. Hall, this really was something he asked you about in terms of is this your proposed? It's very

32:40

much illustrative. The point here, I think, is that the applicant needs some flexibility to move his access along should it turn out that it requires an extensive bellmouth and expensive visibility spoilers, and he's allowed himself no flexibility at all. In the design, I shown quite an extreme example of a bill Muth has moved to a wholly new location, it may be it simply needs to move a few meters, maybe 10 meters along the DCO plan does not currently permit that he's tied his hands. Problem being we don't have visitation or what geometry is required for Miss access, which is why I was asking about the size of the vehicles. And what assumptions seem to have been made in giving me an assurance, the minimal damage will be caused. And only a very small visibility splays of acquire, I don't believe that has been established with any certainty. And indeed the highways authority telling me they cannot do so until a detailed design is placed before them. Now the problem is, I will be delighted. If it does and go ahead in the proposed area, I not little confidence that that will necessarily happen. And what I asked really isn't made easy or plan should be stretched to the northeast. So it shouldn't be necessarily the flexibility is there to move the Elmos rather than plug in and destroy the mature trees and vegetation on my land.

34:18

Store. Thank you.

34:22

And to respond. Yes, I think again, it's probably Mr. Field and at the far end there to answer this one

34:31

to rebuild a national grid. So I think there may be some misunderstanding in the room. You require us to allow some flexibility in being able to modify and change this design if it cannot be accommodated in the existing belma. Exactly. So, so just off the screen on this particular image. The orange line that runs across is that flexibility that balance Off to the north. And next one up a B A P four, is that flexibility that you're requesting. So if we cannot do a B, A P five, A, B, A p four will be the access that we would propose to build.

35:18

But all on our own Oh, here are no specifics here, really, you have been unable to present to behaviors authority, your requirements to make when I think your suggestion would be small, they will most we simply don't know what you're actually going to do here.

35:39

I think I think I think in a sense, the, the point here, and Mr. Walters is helpful in sort of teasing out the, the particular issue because well, the potential Bell mouth, at the corner of your property, we would require approval for the design of that from the highway authority, if they do not consider it appropriate, they would not give us that approval under requirement 11, we would no doubt be discussing it before with them. But if it was clear that they were not going to give that then we would go for the alternative. And therefore, that that route that goes through the corner of your property would just not be used, that would just there would be no Belmar there, it wouldn't be used, we would use the alternative. Access to the north, clearly, if the bellmouth near the corner of your property can be designed in a way that is satisfactory to the authority. And obviously, they would, you know, want to take into account your own views on this, if it can be done in a satisfactory way, our preference is to use an existing access track rather than create a new one across the field. And so in that way, our our view is that, you know, the highway authority do have the necessary control here and recognizing, recognizing that you have obviously a legitimate concern here that that's why the alternative access was was identified. So, you know, our expectation is that one way or the other, that there will be a solution that is acceptable to you know, I'm

37:40

really still struggling

37:44

by correct and presuming that you will endeavor to minimize or eliminate the need to take any land from Mr. Hall. Is that like, my correct? Yes,

37:54

I think that and I'll be corrected, if I'm wrong on this, I'm not sure that we need land for any physical works, I think this is to do with a, you know, the, the the safety, you know, views into the John junction, which might require some work to be done to the trees now, because of the level of detail at work at this is a question of, you know, how much work is that acceptable? And, and, and what would it be in order to get the, you know, the viewpoints necessary, again, Mr. Field and may want to add something on that.

38:45

Thank you,

38:46

Mr. Fielding for building National Grid. Now, Mr. Humphries is correct. It's for sightlines and visibility splay. It's not physical work.

38:59

So just to be clear, so the land take, if required, will be to achieve the required sightlines for roadworthy vehicles only not exceptional. Those are abnormal loads. That's correct. So that's question number one.

39:17

Possibly, this is a time to maybe gauge feedback from the council. So what I'm gauging from this discussion is that particular access, especially if you're looking to exit from the access, and you're looking at the eastern boundary, there appears to be a need to maybe take down some vegetation. And that's dependent on the need for a visibility display. Now that that particular visibility space is probably dependent on whatever standards the Highway Authority has in place. Hello standards may rely on design space and so forth. So it would be interesting it is okay for us to have maybe some feedback from the highway authority on this particular access point.

40:15

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I'll bring in Mr. Mary, in a moment, because I think you'd probably rather hear it from the horse's mouth from me, but as we understand the position at the moment, Churchill in that location is an unrestricted road in terms of speed limit, but the intention, as we understand it, is that there would be a temporary 30 mile an hour speed limit imposed during the construction period, which obviously, therefore has an implication on the dimensions of our visibility splay, but even allowing for a 30 mile an hour limit, and that being effective, and obviously, the issues about enforcement of temporary speed limits, we still consider that would require a 2.4 by 90 meter visibility splay, which would have implications in terms of the amount of vegetation to be removed. I'll ask Mr. Murray to comment further on that. So as to indicating since where we sit on this, we have raised, I think this particular location in Annex F of our local impact report in rep 1045.

41:46

Good morning, Sarah, Madam St. Mary from Suffolk County Council. This is one of the junction of the accesses we have had a look at and the information that has already been provided to us today from the applicant is actually more than we're aware of, we weren't aware of the numbers of vehicles going to use it and we'd seek clarification, which we understand the applicant is going to provide us with in terms of how we retrieve the access in terms of approval and design is very much a sequential process road as Mr. Bedford has said is a de restricted Road, although the nature of the road is speed are likely to be less. So potentially, we would revise it to design based on safe stopping distances with that would have to be supported by traffic surveys to determine the speed has also has been mentioned, the applicant is coming forward with a temporary 30 mile an hour speed limit. For the Highway Authority concern aspect, we'd be concerned that while putting up temporary speed limits is a potential measure, there is no guarantee without enforcement or some form of calming that that the traffic will actually do that speed. So we need to build that into our assessment as well. What we have been doing on other handsets, is working with the applicants to see if there's a way that we can reduce the tree removal of vegetation removal through some working practices. So for example, having temporary traffic management. Um, I haven't got the data available at the moment to really make a decision on that. But the idea of 200 vehicles coming in into that as the access does seem as though actually having a management plan in place to cope with that number of vehicles is going to be problematic. And I would

add, we were aware this might come up today so actually called in there on the way through this morning to have a look. And in my opinion is there is a considerable amount of vegetation removal that would be needed to improve the visibility to the right, unless some form of other management plan are in place for Safe Access.

43:47

Thank you. That's really helpful. Just a point of clarification on a couple of things. I think Mr. Bedford initially mentioned something like 2.4 Was it yourself? So the 2.4 that's the sets Well, I'll let you

44:02

stay away from Suffolk County Council. That is our usual visibility, setback for the visibility. If it helps I can share with you we've got some guidance. So apologies to bore everybody but there's a tension between manual for streets, design in urban areas and design manual for roads and bridges. For high speed roads. This sits somewhere in between. As a county we have got some guidance that tries to fill that gap in this occasion because it's even with a temporary 30 mile an hour speed limit in my opinion it is more designed for roads and bridges design. So it'd be looking at 2.4 by 90 with a 30 mile that can be enforced. If it would be restricted to be 2.4 by 250.

44:46

Okay and the 90 meters splay that you mentioned as a stopping sight distance is stuck normal for A 30 mile an hour or because the specific criterias that decide if it's one step below or desirable. So

45:09

tell them that the steamboat for Suffolk County Council, if my memory serves me, right for dmr, that would be without a relaxation or a departure, the 2.4. And by 90, I think the 2.4 might be relaxation, because I think they usually asked for nine or four meters on out meters. I

45:27

think it would be really useful and helpful. The music the guidance for highway design that you have in Suffolk, has that been released, shared in the examination library?

45:44

I think it may have been referenced in our local impact report. But regardless, I will make sure it's in our deadline for response.

45:51

So if we capture as an action, and if you could maybe also confirm if you were trying to recollect from memory, while deciding what the stopping sight distance was related to the design speed. So probably, if you could confirm that as well, that would be appreciated. Sorry.

46:16

It's not as Thank you, Mr. Mayor, if I may. But one further question, you spoke of putting in temperature measures, even if such measures were implemented? sufficiently? Is there scope, therefore, to reduce the required sightlines? Below 90 meters,

46:39

that would very much depend on the use. The starting point would be I'd be reluctant to would reduce it if we convinced the use didn't justify is a balance between use and complying with the design. So it's not a straight answer, but it's an engineering judgment.

47:03

And prescriptive conduct to the point made by the applicant in terms of decision to be taken as to whether the alternative road is used or not, are considered for construction. And the discussion focused on your acceptance of the design. So if it is the case, it's 2.5 by 90 meters, that will require presumably some cutting back of vegetation.

47:27

Steve berry from Suffolk County Council, yes, and one of the apologies for making points and may come up later. But one of the other concerns we have is the plan has been provided making it very difficult for us to actually assess the visibility splays that are being provided for the junctions. Looking at this junction in detail. I don't think that the 2.4 by 90 has been provided on the landscape clearance plans.

47:56

And Mr. Murray, thank you, to him for his default response.

48:00

I'll let others respond in detail if they want to, I just sort of make the point that the 200 that was spoken about this is obviously over the course of two months, this is not 200 on a particular day, so on, you know, on average, and of course it wouldn't be an average. But on average, we're talking about between three and four movements a day and these are obviously pretty low levels. This is an existing, this is an existing access, but But clearly, obviously the county will have its standards. And we completely understand that. I don't know whether anyone wanted to add anything as to what's been said.

48:48

Yeah, sorry, Chris Roberts, greener and on behalf of the applicant is just to say obviously, I appreciate Mr. Murray's concerns about the evolved network. When the dmb started the design manual roads and bridges and manual districts are typically achieved with more sort of housing developments or planned works. This is an isolated location on a on a not too not too insulated but a low quality route where you'd have any assertion that if it's national speed limit, and we're unable to achieve enforcement down to 30 miles an hour, the full, full application of the 215 meter stopping sight distance is quite discouraging to hear considering the vehicles themselves. They will not achieve to you on June 15. Something's like distance anyway, which is what dictates the speed is why typically on most of this nature, you'll see the survey of traffic speeds well below the posted speed limit. So that's why I was just going to say sort of man I appreciate the concerns about maybe the the accessibility of information dictating the sightlines and location by location assessment has been undertaken for the governing the sightlines the assumptions that have led to essentially the redline boundary and the vegetation clearance here. That

is an internal document from some time ago. We are, we have actually, highways thematic meetings recently discussed getting CAD versions of the redline boundary, the land uses the shapefiles, all to the relevant local highway authorities. I've also spoken with my team about producer, essentially topping and tailing this historic document informing the redline boundary for external consumption at chief locations that, understandably are causing concern where our working is not present, if that makes sense.

50:44

Thank you, Mr. Hall, do you have any final comments to make?

50:49

Yes, I'm very far from the assured quite the opposite. In fact, from what I've heard here today, the highways authority are ultimately the arbiter of what must be done to provide access at this point. And they have told us, and they should know, the very best we can expect is a 90 meter, visibility spwhy Could even be worse. Now 90 meters is virtually the entire length of my property between the proposed access down to my house, 90 meters will spill, the depth of what has been described as vegetation. But I would point out on multiple 150 year old oak trees, that is a consequence of a site's way of that sort, I think we have the feet on the ground, the applicant, have to say as always seeks to play things down and does so without presenting any evidence to support it. And in response to my written representation, for example, they say that we expect a worst case sight line of 40 meters, that's a long way from the best case of 90, an even at 40 meters today, they have spoken have to cinema waffly fashion of own the idea or where we want to have to do very much it's late. It's small vehicles, we want to do very much of it at all. And that has been my frustration and experience with the applicant throughout the always seek to play things down. There's nothing to see here move along. In fact, the situation I think is much more serious, and very worried about the disruption will be caused to the environment and my property. I have just quickly return to my original point. Why can we not have an altered DCO access now after see what we've heard? No, it might have to be altered more than I imagined. But anyway, we can move that access along the road avoids the catastrophic damage to my property. And I very much hope that it will be possible to do something like that. I would also just fit Can I just finally say the applicant has maintained? Well, he offers no reason why we cannot do that. They hint. But changing a DCO would be apparent at this point, it would be virtually impossible for them to do my understanding of the situation that is not the case, even at this late stage. And it will be very helpful to me to know whether that is in fact the case. In other words, is it possible at this stage still just change with dcl? Plan?

53:10

This tool? Thank you. Thank you. Because I just wonder if I could ask the question whether at this stage, there could be some work to do in terms of a survey of some sort at this particular point to establish what is feasible and practicable.

53:24

So thank you, I'll, I'll certainly inquire about that. If that can be done. Like I have no reason to know that it can't be done. But obviously, I don't know, then then I'm sure that can be done. Again, you know, I understand that Mr. Hall is not reassured by what I say. But but, you know, if the impact of the sidelines

was unacceptable, and that Philomath was not approved, then that will not be used. And we have included an alternative further along. Further along the the road. I don't think there's anything else you need me to add at this stage?

54:10

I think so it was time to think indeed, it may, perhaps allow us to make a more informed assessment of the issues at that location. That may be the reason I'm asking for the survey.

54:20

Yes, no, I can quite see that. And it may be that we, in that context, could then have offline discussions with the county of their views of that and see if we can come to some sort of common ground with with them that either will or won't satisfy Mr. Hall.

54:40

Thank you. I think we'll take that for his action point. This meeting. Thank you. We'll draw that particular point to a close Mr. Thank you for coming along. Thank you

55:00

Okay, so we'll resume back on the agenda. We'll start at Agenda Item three, which is the transport assessment and methodology to use to assess traffic impacts. I'm going to look to the local highway authorities first. I did put in the agenda and number of points I intended to raise this morning. I think for reasons of time practicalities, I'm not going to quiz the applicant on each one and ask you to respond in kind. One thing on reading the local impact reports, and they were highly informative. I didn't get a sense from those li Rs. And forgive me if I'm misreading of what was the fundamental issues of concern to the highway authorities in respect of the transport assessment. So a number of points were concerning you. But nothing leapt out to me in terms of what are the fundamental issues that you have, with the transport assessment may take some time to do but my request to the highway authorities to whether you could either this morning or outside this forum, work together, join together and come up with a list of those fundamental issues. And if possible, settlement some order of priority. I think that may be beneficial to the ESA, and also to the applicant to allow us to draw some consensus if possible.

56:23

Exit Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, I suspect that that's probably better done as a structured written response to you to highlight those. But in 70, in headline terms, I think that what we had hoped had come through from what we were saying in the local impact report is that we weren't at the moment, sufficiently reassured or satisfied, that we had been given by the applicant enough information to justify a number of the assumptions and inputs that gone into the transport assessment. So that, then, obviously, the outputs of the transport assessment, throw up a number of conclusions. But that is critically dependent on the robustness and adequacy of the input material. And it was those that were points where we were parting company from the applicant. And therefore when you then get further down the line, obviously, we're not on the same page, because we've not been satisfied as to the level of information. Now, it may be that the applicant has got further information that is capable of being shared, that might enable us to get closer together on where we are, it was, in a sense, reassuring to hear just a moment ago under previous discussion about rose cottage that there has been a location by

location assessment, undertaken to identify what the applicant considers is needed for sightlines but as the applicant accepts that has not yet been shared, because presumably the format of it, but that's the sort of thing which I think if we had more sharing of information. I'm just wondering, therefore, in terms of responding to your points, whether given that the applicant does have information that has been constructive engagement with the applicant, obviously, outside of the examination hearings, in terms of transportation dialogue meetings, I'm just wondering whether we're going to be in a position to give you our fundamental points, a deadline for or whether it may be more realistic to think about further engagement with the applicant to as it were flush out, well, what is the further information they can give us? Allow us to assess Well, actually, is that nail reassuring enough? Or does it leave us still with serious concerns? So it may be that it's a later deadline, where we're able to provide you with that, as it were, clear a position of well, what are the fundamentals? What are the critical points that you're going to have to effectively adjudicate on?

59:35

That's very, very helpful in terms of the meetings to know how frequently they're held or how cylinders meetings can be held.

59:41

Perhaps Mr. Mehra is better placed than me thinking Mr. Merrick stay

59:45

married Suffolk County Council they're held a roughly monthly intervals

59:53

so in terms of current timelines, the next meetings to be held to

59:58

stay very separate. Thank you. So I can tell you on so check my diary, but we had one about two weeks ago, so probably another two weeks.

1:00:08

So if Claire was to benefit you by agreement with my request to drop that that list of fundamental issues in a priority order. Yep,

1:00:15

was certainly set. I mean, if it's not obviously, obviously isn't otherwise you wouldn't have raised the point. If it's not clear from what we said in the local impact report at the moment. And we need to therefore make it clear for you, then certainly, we will do that. I'm just indicating it would be probably sensible, for there to be a bit more dialogue with the applicant first, to see to what extent there are things that we have identified where we don't think we've got enough information. And it may be the applicant is able to reassure us and provide us with that information. Or there may be reasons why either it's unable or unwilling to do so at this stage.

1:00:49

Mr. Buffett, thank you. Indeed, if I may, please, can I ask sorry, Essex County Council to respond?

1:01:02

Sir, thank you, Mark, would you assist county council growth and development team, we concur with the views that's been made by the League representative for Suffolk County Council and three are information. The next available meeting that we got in our diaries to discuss highways and transportation matters is on Wednesday, the 29th of November. So obviously, that would make it extremely difficult for us to make any comments in relation to Deadline five, which is only 48 hours after that. So it will be something that will mean we may have to take the next available deadline. As Essex County Council, we've put together a number of detail, a number of detail points in relation to Item three that we can make to you in our written representations following this particular hearing, and take those forward for the meeting on the 29th as as as has been suggested. And we think that's a very sensible and adequate way to approach this

1:01:59

is to Bucha Thank you. So just to confirm with Suffolk and SX, you'll prepare a joint document setting out the list of fundamental concerns in a priority order. My correct, sir, I'm

1:02:09

i So microbead for Suffolk County Council. Whilst I'm sure it would be helpful to the examining authority. If it were a joint document, I'm just conscious that it may be that there are matters of concern to Suffolk, which are not matters of concern to Essex because of the different road network in each county, and vice versa. So it may be that actually a joined document isn't the best thing. But certainly, we would start on the basis of trying to prepare a joint document. And if it became clear that there were divergent points, then that may be better presented to you as two separate documents. Especially Thank you, it's

1:02:50

very helpful to the applicant to respond.

1:02:57

Thank you. So that's all been very helpful, I wonder if the most appropriate way forward is almost a sort of combination of these two things. I mean, we agree with your helpful suggestion that look, it'd be really good to know what the key points are. And in a sense, if that can be supplied to us, as soon as possible doesn't have to go in at a deadline, just let us know what the really important points are, then we can make sure that we are identifying the correct information. And at the meeting in two weeks time and other meetings, we can supply it, discuss it, you know, and trying to actually use the meetings to come to resolution my slight concern, because obviously of the examination timetable is that it keeps getting batted back and forth. And we don't actually drill down into what's what's important. So perhaps a combination of those things, they both counselors will clearly know what their fundamental points are, because their their points, they can, you know, let us say, Look, these are the five points, fixed points, however many points that we really need to understand because this makes a difference. And then and then our team can can identify the information and then we can have actually useful meetings. So and that will be my suggestion. So

1:04:20

somebody that's eminently sensible, quick response from the council's please.

1:04:28

Sorry, sorry, was just taking instructions. Sorry, are clearly, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. It's not terribly productive to get into a debate in a sense as to why things aren't further progressed than they are. I think there is a certainly a perception on the part of the county council that he it has previously asked for information to be provided. which has not been forthcoming from the applicant. And it's it's that I say it's the lack of the level of detailed information, which is then hampering the ability of the county council to satisfy itself that matters can be satisfactorily addressed. So whilst we will certainly take from today and take up Mr. Humphries suggestion of providing a head of the meeting, a list of concerns, it's effectively a two way street, I think we would also very much welcomed from the applicant, the provision of information, which it does have, which we have previously requested, which could then address those concerns. So as I clearly I think both sides want to be constructive, so that we're best able to help you through the process. But I just would make that point, I say, we don't think it's, as it were simply a case of the council's haven't been specific about what it is that they want. We think it's a case that I say, we've been asking for information, which hasn't been forthcoming to enable us to move things along. So perhaps, in a sense, both sides take from that, that they need to do a little bit more to achieve things, that's probably the best position

1:06:22

to better, very instructive. Mr. Roger, please.

1:06:28

Thank you. So marble just came to council, we concur with that approach, we've got some points that we'd like to make direct to the applicant in relation to this. And as you quite identify, you know, if we go into all those matters in relation to this specific item on the agenda, we could be here for some considerable amount of time. And as Mr. Buffett has indicated, yes, this is very much a two way street. In fact, it's a three way street, because we look forward to also working with colleagues and Suffolk County Council because a lot of the matters that they want along the amount of that we want, are going to be common. So we will be able to progress that as as quickly and efficiently as possible for ESA,

1:07:06

which I'm very grateful. Thank you. I think, if I

1:07:08

were to miss it, no, I think we're nearly there on this, I was just going to invite Miss leader who's further down the road or me just to just who's I think being involved in these things, just to make a comment, and then we'll very happily draw to a close.

1:07:24

Thank you. Thanks,

1:07:25

Ali, leader for the applicant. Yes, we've very much welcomed the engagement would have with both local authorities, it has been very productive. And we had to have fortnightly meetings at the moment. So we did have a meeting last week. And we do have one scheduled for next week as well. And another last meeting last week. And there were two things that were we agreed to provide one of which was construction, traffic numbers per access, which we're almost there with, we're tidying up a spreadsheet basically, so that it's legible to you and because it's that just needs a little bit of tidying to be understood by a third party that that's that's nearly there. And we're committed to providing that to you. And the other thing was files in GIS to enable the local authorities to take a more closer look at each access. And then we do expect to be able to provide both of those things by the time we have our next meeting. So we are hoping that these matters can be resolved relatively relatively swiftly. And we can get to a point where we understand whether there are still points between us and what more we need to do to provide that reassurance.

1:08:36

And I think so, you know, and it goes without saying obviously, the examination has deadlines for certain purposes, but that shouldn't prevent the parties, both parties, all the parties, including us from actually supplying information before deadlines, just to get things to get things moving. And I think we've all got the message that you've very clearly articulated that you want to identify key things and try and cause the parties to at least narrow differences or indeed resolve things loud and clear and Understood, sir. So please, many thanks. We'll

1:09:13

draw a line on that agenda item for me. It's time for a 10 minute break. Can we reconvene, please at 1120 Thank you