

# Audio\_Bramford\_ISH3\_Session2\_091123

Thu, Nov 09, 2023 1:03PM • 1:26:02

00:05

Thank you very much. We'll reconvene. Thank you.

00:09

So moving on to Agenda Item four, which is construction, traffic and construction route strategy.

00:18

And this is a question in relation to monitoring and control of HGV and construction worker movements to Suffolk County Council in your local impact reports. That's our EP one dash 045 Paragraph 12.57. He states that there are no controls on the assumed peak staff number of 350 and the average of 180.

00:45

Can you set up your expectations on the methods of controlling staff numbers in terms of monitoring, reporting and enforcement? Thank you.

00:57

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, if I start now ask Mr. Murray to comment. Further.

01:06

We see this as a matter which is capable of being addressed through the construction traffic management plan.

01:15

But it would require

01:17

plan to set out parameters which could not then be exceeded.

01:27

And in terms of the County Council's experience of the practicality of doing that, I think I'd bring in Mr. Mary, because he's obviously been involved in a number of the other nationally significant infrastructure projects which are ongoing within Suffolk. So the county council does have some experience of as it were, the implementation of such types of controls.

01:53

It's better Thank you, Mr. Murray,

01:55

Stephen Marisha, Suffolk County Council

02:00

trying to think logically set this out. But as high as authority, basically, my main concern is obviously number of trips on the public highway when they occur, hence are interested in the big numbers of workers attending site. So for our view, is that the transport assessment and environmental statement, they both look at the impacts of this project based on those maximum numbers, the worst case scenario. And for example, one of the key things we'd be keen to see is how shift patterns can be secured. So one of the main pieces of mitigation, as we understand it, in terms of removing workers from the peak network times is the shift pattern is that they travel outside that shift pattern. But there's nothing we're happy to be corrected if it is there. But there's nothing we can see the secures those movements outside of that peak network, our that's one of the things

02:54

that's very thinking in terms of other project where Yeah, and also, in terms of other projects.

03:02

For example, we are starting to get plans back from AE three from ScottishPower, we will be getting things back from Saito. And what we are finding is that web developers have been assuming so carshare, one and a half, for example, they are struggling to achieve that. And also things as part of this application as reliance on mini buses to transport staff around. We've already had experience from another developments where they have actually failed to encourage people to use mini buses. And then instead what is the impact of that on the network, if they do not achieve it, hence why we would like those numbers secured. And the final point is that we are concerned. So going back to the fundamental part of they see this construction traffic management plan in particular, is that the the applicants have already said that that may change once they have a contractor on board. And we are worried about how that change is going to be managed. To us this is almost a draft or an outline cGMP rather than the full one.

04:02

Okay, Mr. Murray, thank you. So just the terms have actually given me

04:06

the actual methods of doing so you've said what you'd want to control. But have you said how that could be achieved.

04:13

In terms of controlling it would depend very much whether you went down measuring the trips, in which case it'd be some traffic surveys, or surveys of vehicles entering and leaving the site. The other way would be to basically applicant to count the number of people going to the individual sites, and then follow that with a survey to see what modes of transport they arrive in.

04:38

Mr. Murray, thank you for getting returned to the African please. This temporaries

04:44

Yeah, so there were sort of kind of multiple different points that are wrapped

04:50

up. So you started in

04:53

topic, four and about monitoring and control of HCP

05:01

And I'll ask Mr. Goodman to just deal with that the the part of the answer then went into peak numbers of HGVs, and the assessment, and 350. And those sorts of things. I'll get Mr. Hall to deal with that. Then some questions on the CTM issues on the ctmp. I think that's again, probably for Mr. Hale,

05:26

as well, and then I'm sure that Mr. feuilleton will want to say something. So I'll just

05:32

Just give him free rein. But I think the rest of the project things as well that he may need to mention. So I'll just start with Mr.

05:41

Goodman, because I think I think that was the focus of your original question is I can, you can,

05:48

sorry, I'm corrected, Sal is going to do everything, and precisely,

05:53

Mr. Hale, please.

05:54

John Hale for the applicant. So I think just the first point on controls on staff numbers. So the the assessment is obviously based on assumptions about the number of staff that would be used on the site. And that's no different from any other project. And we've set that out in the TA. I think the the point I'd make on this is that this is, you know, this is a fairly urgent, nationally significant infrastructure project. The ies sets out a reasonable worst case effectively in terms of what's required to to build the scheme. But I think we need to specify here that this is not it is not the essence and designed to capture every improbable eventuality that might crop up that results in the contractor changing their plans effectively. So I think, acknowledge the concern is our position, the numbers that we've set out, have been developed by an experienced contractor who, who's worked on a lot of projects like this one.

06:56

And has given that indication about those numbers, there is contingencies built into the forecast and I went into that at length that is used specific hearing one.

07:05

But we need to retain some flexibility here, there needs to be some flexibility to allow the contractor to change their plans in you know, there's There's any number of improbable events that may occur. And I think this is where this is where we're pushing back essentially on this, this idea that we should have some sort of fixed limit, you know, you will not build the scheme with any more than x number of workers, I think is just it's not clear to us how that could be enforced. And it's not clear how that would provide any kind of flexibility to deal with situations that might occur, improbable as they they may be. So I think that's the first item on controls. And I think Mr. Field and might want to say something further in due course, around the fact that we have a program that we have to stick to, to deliver this scheme, that program is built around network outages that we can't afford to miss. So I think, again, that flexibility on Stark numbers is something that we need to retain. But coming back to that point where there is the you know, it's the numbers are developed by inexperienced contractor there is a lot of contingency in them. We think it is highly unlikely that those numbers would be exceeded in practice. I think that's key point. First item.

08:18

Sorry, where are we going next?

08:21

The ctmp issue?

08:25

Oh, it's gonna hang on. I'll come back to that one. In the end. I've got a couple of the limiting staff members. I think the other there was a question about shift patterns that Mr. Mary raised, which I was going to deal with there. So we've assumed 7am to 7pm working in in the week. And it is true to say that the assessment is built on assumptions that effectively construction staff, most of them won't be traveling during the peak rush hour. I think again, the point around restricting a contractor to working at certain times is the same argument applies in terms of flexibility that we need to have that you know, some sort of

09:06

process where you forced the contractor, for example, to start work at 7am so that no staff were on the network at rush hour or very few stuff on the network at rush hour, it seems to us again, that that flexibility will just unnecessarily constrain the delivery of the scheme and the ability of the contractor to respond to

09:26

circumstances that may arise. But I think I just wouldn't make the point that with the working hours these these are standard practice it is standard practice in schemes to assume working hours around seven to seven. This is not an outlandish assumption. It's something that's been used on many other

projects. It's been used on the Hinkley connection for example, on the lower Thames crossing scheme that's going through examination at the moment that assumes 7am to 7pm working hours in the week and there is no at the moment suggestion the National Highway should constrain

09:57

constrain their activities within that time.

10:00

period, the A 12 Junction 19 to 25 scheme that's just gone through examination this year, that assumes 730 to 7pm working as standard practice, and that also sets out that in the summer, they're going to work from seven to 9pm. So it's again, it's that we need to retain the flexibility, but it's providing that assurance that these assumptions we're making, uh, not particularly outlandish. They are, they are standard practice for a construction project of his nature. And there's no reason to think that the contractor will do something different. So that's covering the points on shift, Patton's mini buses, mini buses, I think we should probably clarify on mini buses that we're referring to crew vans, actually, and I think that apology is doing some of the terminology we've used probably gives the impression that these are vehicles that contain 20 people or something like that, that's not the case. They are staff welfare vans that have an average occupancy of around four to six. And they are again, the assumption around that is based on the advice of an experienced contractor who's done this kind of work before it who has said that this is standard practice on a project like this, and I think worth noting, in the assessment, we've assumed that 30% of staff traveling to site would actually drive in general terms, a lot of contractors on projects like this, have a policy where they don't allow operatives to drive their own cars to site. So we might reasonably argue that actually the assumption that even having 30% of staff in cars is a is a worst case estimate. The aim will be the contractor provides welfare vans to ferry all the staff to and from site or a large proportion of them at any rate. So I think that's a position on on crew vans as we should probably start referring to them now. And then there was a final point on apologies, I've forgotten what the final point was on ctmp.

12:00

Nandita, in what

12:03

I think it was in the context of it's really an outline or a draft rather than a final see.

12:10

Okay, so I think on the

12:14

on the ctmp.

12:17

We are seeking to make it a final document. And we are seeking to make your final document during the examination.

12:25

And I think there's an ongoing discussion that with the highway authorities just to try and pick up issues that they might want to see included in the ctmp. So an example of that, for example, we've just submitted a new version of the ctmp at deadline three that includes the HTV routes, and we know that that's been a cause for concern. That's something we've responded to. We're aware that there's other issues that the county the continuities have raised. And yeah, that's an ongoing process at the moment is to try and understand where their concerns are, or residual concerns are with the document and what we can do to to accommodate those. So I think yeah, I don't think there's much further to say on that from from me at this point. I think it's very helpful. Mr. Fielding.

13:10

I think Mr. House stole my thunder. So thank you.

13:17

I see hundreds Mr. Bucha. Mr. Bucha, can you speak with

13:22

thanks so much for Genesis county council.

13:26

Two things I think here. Yes, we I think everybody agrees Following the meeting, there'll be the examination that took the hearing that took place yesterday, that there is an urgent need for this particular development to go first. But equally that has to be balanced against road safety, the free flow of traffic and the impact on immunity of these particular roads. And one of the things that did occur to me in the break is that we are going to go away and work with the applicants and Suffolk County Council in relation to this. But from where I am at the moment, I do see that there is going to be a need for an additional session, additional examination. And I do note that you've got some dates that we've got placeholders for in December moving forward, we will do as much as we possibly can to reach commonality and complete astir statement of common ground with the Africans on this particular matter. But obviously, it may well be that we need to come back and discuss this in a much wider open forum when we can condense those down into real issues for you to make the best use of your time.

14:25

My colleague Mr. Health wants to make an additional comment on this agenda item. So I just like to invite him to speak at my mesa. Thank you.

14:35

I just off on behalf of Essex County Council. I think just to point out that we're not necessarily looking for

14:42

absolute line in the sand controls I think was implied then that would completely limit we potentially just looking for that flexibility and management to be built into the ctmp so that we can respond to potential unassessed impacts or issues that arise as part of the developments build out. I would also say that

15:00

And the target within the ctmp is only for 1.3 staff per vehicle to travel to and from the site, as you just heard, then the standard practices for many buses or crew vans or for vehicles, so I don't understand why then that particular thing cannot be reflected within the target and aspirations and control mechanism mechanisms of the ctmp. Thank you.

15:25

Thank you, indeed.

15:29

Thank you. Thank you, sir. So I think the Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, the

15:35

issues that remain of concern to Suffolk County Council are that the on the one hand, the applicant says it's provided a robust assessment to inform the environmental statement based on information from an experienced contractor. And those inputs then been used in the assessments. But the applicant then says, Well, I don't want to be actually tied to anything that I've actually said in those assessments, because I need the flexibility for the ultimate contractor to do something in a different way. And it's that as it were, tension, which causes the county council concern. And we are

16:28

alive to the fact that one shouldn't seek through the control documents, to remove all flexibility.

16:38

Because there are contingencies and unknowns and events, and so on and so forth. But it doesn't follow from that, that the

16:49

absence of a mechanism to remove all flexibility means that there should be complete flexibility. And if I take, these are examples, and purely examples, if I'm looking at the latest version of the ctmp,

17:10

that's rep 3031, thinking it's track change version.

17:17

And

17:20

art of the

17:23

ctmp includes as a table 4.1, out where the applicant has responded to issues raised in Elia consultation.

17:35

And

17:38

one of those and this is page 13 of the document

17:42

deals with a concern expressed by the county council I suspect also by Essex County Council, the roots timing and numbers of HGVs should be embedded within the management documents with appropriate monitoring reporting and enforcement measures, such as excluding construction vehicles from the road network outside of normal working hours, accepting that there may be operations where exceptions are accepted. And the response to that from the applicant in terms of how this has been considered, is, firstly, to make the point which we welcome that construction routes have been included in appendix A of the CT MP.

18:26

And that is something we'll comment on the specific routes in our deadline for response, if there's any issues about particular routes, but the principle of identifying those routes in the appendix is welcome. But the same response then goes on. As a name works contractor has not yet been identified. The construction timing and numbers are subject to change. Therefore, it is in a it is not appropriate to include these details within the ctmp at this time. So yes, we've got the routes, but what we've not got is timing, and we've not got numbers. And similarly and this is page 14 of the same document.

19:09

County Council's comment the applicant sorry, the SEC would expect the applicant to provide data on the number of workers and visitors on site each day, together with vehicle movements, to which the response is simply it will be impractical and unnecessary for national grid to provide data on workers and visitors attending the site on a daily basis. But it's not

19:33

with respect.

19:36

So far as the county council sees it, it is not acceptable to go from the fact that well because there is a need for some flexibility. Therefore, the answer is there should be no controls at all on these matters, which seems to be what the applicant is saying on the particular issues that we have identified. And so what we would wish to see

20:00

Is specification within a further version of the ctmp of key parameters, but recognizing that those can be expressed in a way, which allows some flexibility. So allows whether it's a 10% Excess against the currently if there's an assessed need for a particular number of movements, that taking count Mr. Hales point, well, we can't predict what might happen in future, then that can be expressed as that is a number plus an allowance of a percentage which built in a contingency above that. But what we're not



seeing at the moment in the cGMP, is any of those parameters? I say other than yes, we do welcome the fact that routes are now being identified. As per thank you in terms of the parameters, can you list those? Can you identify those parameters? Or do you wish to, I suspect that that's probably better than in the

20:57

post hearing submission so that we have got a clearer picture for you as to what it is all the things that we think ought to be

21:07

specified, in terms of numbers in terms of hours, in terms of movement, most often this powerful, thank you.

21:17

I can return.

21:21

Yes, I'll get Mr. Hill to comment in a moment on what he thinks I think.

21:27

I think it's important in a sense to understand,

21:33

you know, the the nature of this flexibility and the difficulty of providing absolute limits or caps, the the concern of the applicant is that some unforeseen event happens, I don't know there is some weather event, that means that for a period, people cannot get on site, we still have to meet the outage deadline, and therefore the contractor has to bring in more people than is anticipated during a short period in order to catch up. And that clearly, for a period, there will have been less impact on the road network, because there won't have been anyone working but for a short period.

22:24

There is a catch up. What we've tried to do to, as Mr. Hill said, to make it clear that this would really be an exceptional event to say that we've looked at what we think is likely we've looked at a contingency of I think it's about 51% on top of what is likely to look at reasonable, worst case. But can we absolutely guarantee that something couldn't happen? No. Now, in fairness, I think to the county, I think there is some understanding, some realization on their part that we can't completely exclude that and we have to meet these deadlines. And it may be that we need to have a discussion with them about what would be acceptable to us, and what would perhaps give them some, some level of

23:16

comfort. But that is that's the sort of from national, great, that's the bottom line, they have to deliver this

23:22

project, and they could be exceptional circumstances. Please. Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

23:29

So I agree, I think there is a danger of in a sense of the party's positions being seen as polarized. In reality, they're not, we are not seeking as it were to nail down

23:44

matters, so that there is no flexibility. But what what we are seeking is that there are specified parameters. And those specified parameters can either include in the base parameter, as it were an allowance for flexibility, or you set a base parameter, but then you include an exception mechanism for as it were, the unknown events, etc, which will allow you to exceed the base parameter. In a sense, that's a matter of detail as to how you do it. But the applicants response has to seem to be along the lines of because we cannot be constrained in absolute terms, there should be no constraint. And that's where we part company with the applicant. So I say I think that there is a meaningful dialogue capable of being had. And it ought to be built around specifying certain parameters, which are critical to the acceptability of the traffic impact on the local road network. But making sure that the way that those parameters are expressed allowables either directly in the way that they're set as baseline limits, or through exceptions to those baseline limits, the flexibility

25:00

which we understand the applicant wants. And we don't have a problem with the principle of having flexibility. But we do want there to be checks on the nature of the impacts.

25:13

Could I encourage the applicant and the counselors perhaps to continue that dialogue? Settlement Agreement?

25:20

Very much, sir. Thank you, sir. Mr. Raja.

25:26

Sir, thank you. Yes, we are in agreement with that. Thank you very much. Thank you. Wonderful. Thank you. Okay. I'm

25:35

conscious of time, I think we'll move to Agenda Item number five.

25:42

And that's related to the temporary traffic restrictions.

25:49

Thank you. So my first question is to the applicant in this case in respect of the proposed parking restrictions, and the ESA really wants to get a sense of

26:01

personality in terms of the need for the temporary restrictions outlined in the draft development consent order. And I just want to understand from the applicants, what degree of

26:14

survey work or assessment has been undertaken to establish the need for the restrictions listed in the draft development, consent order. And I'm mindful of taking parking away in a sense of having restrictions in place that may or may not be implemented. So just want to be clear that the restrictions that are sought are actually required. And that requirement has been based on a survey, for example of some of the Means of Assessment. So be very keen to have your response. Thank you. Thank you. So I think this is going to be Mr. Alvarez Greenland.

26:49

Thank thanks very much, Sir Christopher. I was Greenland on behalf of the applicant. So it is our view that

26:57

the temporary traffic restrictions or temporary traffic regulation orders regarding parking are required for the safe delivery of this scheme.

27:08

arrived to come back at a later date to explain exactly what evidence what and what studies have been undertaken to arrive at that position, but his absolute position.

27:20

We understand that Essex and Suffolk hold reservation about the proportionality of that, but

27:27

based on the evidence that we have, as I say, We're of the view that they are helpful, they are required. And there is provisions within the order that if, as part of the permitting scheme, and the detailed design of these accesses, that these temporary temporary traffic regulation orders regarding parking are not required, then we don't simply sort of need to apply, implement them because they exist in the order, which I appreciate is a is potentially a concern raised and addressed at previous issue specific hearing. But regarding how we arrived at that position, sadly, I'd have to come back in writing for deadline for on that.

28:06

Screen. And thank you. So just to be clear, the restrictions implement or stated in the draft DCO are based on survey and based on some form of need assessment and my criteria based on an assessment. I can't tell you, sadly, right now, exactly the steps that arrived at the answer. But an assessment was undertaken by experienced engineers in this in this area of expertise. Yes.

28:30

It's green. Thank you, indeed, folks refer to the local authorities, please.

28:36

Thanks. Well, just in terms of the context, obviously, you're aware we've raised this issue in the local impact report, Rep. 1045, particularly at paragraph 1235, and 1236. And I've just asked Miss Mary, if he wants to add any further comment. Mr. Bedford, thank you, Mr. American. Steve, Marisa Ken's counsel, thing of her position still remains is we are somewhat surprised for the need for the parking restrictions. As a little bit of history, I was the Scenario Manager for Babor, covering most of this area, up until about five years ago. So I know the error fairly well. And I wouldn't have thought that parking is a specific problem on even some of the small roads. I guess we'll see the need possibly when you're trying to abnormal loads through there, but then that's a separate process. I'd also add is that if the applicant decided not to proceed with these the schedules, they still have the mechanism to raise temporary parking restrictions through the county council. Obviously, there was a cost to that. But they still can do, I would hazard to that we usually allow three months for that. Whereas if the arrangement for this is the same as other TCAS we've worked with, this would be very much a notification period of say four weeks, the applicant notifies us they're going to implement their powers under these schedules is tomorrow

30:00

Thank you indeed. Can I ask Mr. Bucha? For a comment, please?

30:07

Thanks, sir Marva trust is going to cancel. We concur with the views that have been that have been given by Mr. Merrick in this particular respect, and we will provide you with a written response should be an avenue additional details to raise with you at the next deadline. Thank you.

30:22

Mr. Bucha. Thank you, I just wonder is it means the scope for the parties to form a consensus in terms of sharing data is a possibility.

30:32

Two points. So,

30:35

first point, and this is not intended to be splitting hairs, but just being accurate, they are technically in in sheduled 12. Part one waiting restrictions, not parking restrictions, this is cars that would just come in waiting a low occasion. But the more important

30:52

point, as you've indicated, as Mr. buildin has just told me that that we are

30:59

actually discussing with the authorities means by which, you know, we can if necessary, refine what is needed, and you know, where appropriate,

31:11

cut it down.

31:15

As is often the case with powers of this sort, it's

31:22

it's, it's, it's, it's, it may be appropriate to take a power even if you don't ultimately use the power if somebody did, for example, decide, right, we're going to

31:34

park our car weight in a particular location,

31:38

it may be necessary to have the power to do something about that, even though you don't anticipate it happening. I think more important point, as I say, is that we're discussing that, as you've suggested, and we'll try and come back with, if not complete agreement, or at least greater consensus

31:56

of recycling, just to confirm there will be discussion between the applicant and the authorities on the need for the parking restrictions. There. There is discussion. And that will continue. Thank you to

32:09

the next question that comes on to the excuse me, proposed speed limit restrictions and the reliance on temporary speed limits to to manage traffic speeds. But my question is to the applicant in relation to how compliance with the new speed limits will be achieved? Will it be through engineering measures, engineering and enforcement or simply enforcement? Thank you.

32:38

The assumption of Mr. Humphries silence I think that falls to me sadly, as though yeah, there's Christopher our screen and on behalf of the applicant.

32:47

The speed limit itself, as Mr. Marion and others have indicated is only one part of a potential site specific package of design, which includes visibility, driver behavior, vegetation removal, the duration of the works, besides the vehicles undertaken the works, nature, the baseline traffic numbers, and other such things.

33:08

We we are, as part of obviously requirement 11, which I referred to earlier in today's agenda, we are happy to consider signage, engineering measures, and then engineering and legal controls to achieve what it essentially takes to ensure reasonable safety of access is required for the delivery of the scheme. It's not really

33:31

jack up some signs and sort of hope for the best. That's kind of another good question.

33:37

To Quinlan. Thank you, I'll pass on to the cancers to respond please.

33:42

Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So we certainly are of the view that speed limits purely in isolation may not be sufficient to be overly self enforcing and that therefore there is likely to be a need for other measures to be introduced in the locations where the speed limits are proposed. Obviously, the nature of those other measures will probably be

34:12

locationally. specific as to what is required or appropriate.

34:17

We would certainly welcome further dialogue with the applicant to see if we can achieve more clarity as to what is intended and how that's going to come forward.

34:29

Tonight thanks. Essex County Council police.

34:35

Thank you, sir normal jurists county council. Yes, we will. We will also continue discussions and dialogue both with the applicant and Suffolk County Council on this matter. Thank you, sir.

34:46

What's your Thank you.

34:48

My next question is in relation to the phrase stopping up and its relevance to

34:55

the need to prep a traffic. It's just a comment to the applicant whether you use

35:00

The phrase topping up is in fact, the correct terminology. My understanding that it's in relation to extinguishing highway rights, as opposed to prohibit in traffic.

35:12

And so I will, I would need to check what we have

35:18

said and then check back with the legislation that's easily done as a, you know, as a response. And in our summary of oral submissions, as I say, I mean, it sort of depends on the context and what we've

said in a particular place. I will go and check that and we'll come back to you, as I say, probably just in our past summary of this hearing. Mr. Humphries, thank you to the local authorities.

35:46

So yes, it's probably best dealt with in written submissions, but I think I had picked up that the applicant has made some changes to clarify that it recognizes the distinction between, as you say, sir, a stopping up of a highway and simply a closure, as it were, and as I thought that it followed through in the latest version of the documents, but it's probably as a best picked up in our respective most damning submissions list. Mr. Patrick, my thanks, as it's called Castle.

36:18

Logic scan to counsel. Again, we will pick this up in our, in our written submissions in relation to this. And we'll also have, obviously conversations in the biweekly meetings we're having with the both the Atkins, Suffolk County Council on this particular matter into

36:33

too many thanks. Thank you.

36:42

The move quickly to agenda item six, I have just one question remaining on this agenda item. And it's to Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council. The applicant has submitted an examination deadline three revised design and layout plan for temporary accesses that are EP three dash 005.

37:06

Could I please have your views on the revised design for the abandoned? Thank you.

37:15

Sir Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. So

37:19

we don't see that document is actually moving matters too much further on. Because it doesn't include dimensions in particular dimensions for the visibility space that are shown on there. I think it is an improvement that it measures the visibility space, as it were, in a way which is reflects the guidance, but I say without the dimensions, we don't consider that it's sufficiently helpful. So there is still an issue there. And again, that may be a matter that we need to have some further dialogue with the applicant on

37:53

to better Many thanks, Essex County counselor can help us please.

37:58

Thanks so much, we're just going to cancel that for just correct the dimensions that are found that are very difficult to ascertain. We would welcome national highways submitting a much more detailed plan

of that so we can assess what that means, first of all, in terms of site safety, vehicle safety, and also loss of vegetation along the a 131 to make.

38:21

Make the access. Good. Thank you.

38:25

Mr. Witter? Thank you.

38:27

Can I ask the applicant just to set up their reasons for the revised design and what to say? So thank you. I think this is Mr. Alvarez Greenland to to to respond to inquiries. Thank you very much. So yes, Christopher, I was Greenland on behalf of the applicant. So the updated typical battlemat sketch which was submitted as part of deadline for three rectified a

38:52

a drafting error, which was essentially the wrong impression to the viewers of where this visibility is measured to when looking left and right essentially out of the junction. That's the purpose of the updated drawing,

39:05

you may have sort of noticed are stressful or typical. It's how a visibility splay is constructed in terms of the principles that that dictate it. So the setback from the giveaway line is, is subject to sciences, specific criteria, and Mr. Murray explained that earlier, the widest sense or distance or longer the main the main road is again subject to site specific criteria, but it's this diagram shows the building blocks that arrive at the visibility splay that's been proposed at each of these locations where changes to visibility space have been that's been proposed. I appreciate that the various county council is asking for more details and Mr. Woods reference the A 131.

39:52

Yeah, we think we can take back sort of at specific locations what detail interval

40:00

and supplementing what we've already committed to send over to the County Council's at Thursday's highways meeting, we can sort of assess what further detail at site specific locations would be benefit. It just a stress on the record. This is an update of a typical sketch showing

40:17

what what

40:19

intended geometry, how visibility's playing Bell math is arrived at. Thank you.

40:26



I was green. And thank you, in terms of the worst case is unemployed implications for the worst case outcomes from the revised design you put forward.

40:35

Apologies. Sorry, Mr. Average screen and on behalf of the applicant? I'm not sure I quite followed the question sorry. Clarify the download arrangement understand what was the worst case situation. So it was intended to cover all scenarios for all the proposed access points?

40:58

Yeah, under pressure, this is sort of understood as a worst case in the respect of the visibility both left and right.

41:08

Out of the junction,

41:11

sort of sweeps through irrespective of what constraints may be there. Suffice to say, if there's a listed building that happens to be within that visibility display, the worst case may not be actually what's provided at that site specific location. But this diagram shows exactly as you in tonight, how the worst case of what may be needed is arrived. And then mitigation can be applied, depending on site specific constraints, the characteristics of the road, that worst case may not actually be appropriate.

41:40

Greenland, thank you, if I can ask the authorities for the views, please. Thank you, sir. So I thought I'd just start by saying it was referred to earlier by the applicant that they have done a location by location assessment

41:59

of the accesses, and the sight lines at the vacancy that they need. And that was one of the things which I think they were looking at sharing with us. So that would be helpful information on this point. But then I'll ask Mr. Mary, to comment further on what FFP he would wish to see

42:19

more provided in terms of information to satisfy himself, but the temporary access locations and spell miles would be a workable way forward. As to thank you, Mr. Murray. Steve, Mary, sup, again, counsel? Yeah, we would regard this as sort of a generic design.

42:40

It's worth going back into actually just principles, how you design and access, it depends on the site in itself. In particular, one of the things that this this plan doesn't take into account is the road widths. So Nora has, as far as I'm aware, has it been tested through a sweat path for the largest vehicle that it's likely to take, presumably WsL 44, articulated vehicle, but again, in be certain needs to be tested with that. If it helps the panel we did in AP analysis, Rep. 1044, which was the appendices, the annexes to local impact report, we did provide a spreadsheet where we did a very high level review of the

individual access points. And within that we did try and sort of flesh out some of the issues. But it really is a very much a detailed examination, as you've heard first thing this morning for that specific access.

43:35

Tomorrow, thank you, Essex County Council.

43:39

Thanks so much. We're just going to go so I've got nothing further to add from what Mr. Mehra has just indicated. Yes, it apart from the the obvious, the obvious the the generic design is one thing, but that generic design has got to be looked at specifically to the road classifications, the road weights and vehicles using that access. But again, we look forward to discussions with national with the school on that going forward.

44:06

To thank you could have put it all the parties perhaps if there are discussions in relation to highways teams, could this also be included as part of the discussions, please in terms of the suitability of the generic designs, one of the shortcomings the sharing of data in relation to individual access points? Is that acceptable?

44:25

Yes, I'm sure that will be included in the comments and as soon as Greenland has stressed the purpose of the particular drawing is to update a drawing which was appended to, you know, other documents showing a typical Bell Mouser that one could understand what the criteria is. It's not intended to be a design for a particular battle nerf,

44:51

but we can discuss these things.

44:53

Too many thanks for the comments. Okay, that concludes agenda item six.

45:02

Agenda Item number seven. Thank you

45:11

Okay, so in terms of Agenda Item Seven is in relation to construction traffic impacts on walkers, cyclists and horse riders. I want to preface the first question in relation to severance of rights away.

45:28

Table 2.1 of the environmental statement appendix 12.1. That's application aipp. Dash 134 sets out the significance and effects on walkers, cyclists and horse riders in terms of Journey length, should a diversion be acquired?

45:51

To the applicant, I'm just referring to table 2.1 of that document is a p P dash 134. Table 2.1.

46:10

Okay,

46:13

thank you. I've got three questions, which I'll ask the three questions, and I come back to the authorities for the comments on the replies given. So Mr. Hill,

46:23

in terms of the assessment was the assessment of the receptors based on a survey or was it a desktop study?

46:33

John Hale for the applicant. So the assessment of receptors is largely desktop based. So it's based on it's based on the identification of particular facilities, and an assumption around the types of users that would be present on public rights of way linked to those facilities.

46:54

So for example, if a route is next to a school, you make an assumption that the route could potentially be used by schoolchildren, vulnerable users, that would affect the sensitivity rating. So that was the first part of the exercise. But the we've also done grout surveys at various points throughout the study area.

47:15

And particularly the 2023 Proud surveys that were submitted to the examination. I think it's the action points underpinning issues specific hearing one, Appendix C policies, I don't remember the document reference

47:34

there. But hopefully, that's easy enough to find. So those surveys were all done at locations where we were expecting individual closures of longer than four weeks, or where the sensitivity rating was initially given a A rating of higher than low, I believe.

47:48

So in those surveys, we recorded things like the number of elderly users on the routes, the number of children, that kind of thing. So there was desktop based but followed up with some data from surveys to to look at

48:03

whether the users on the roads were vulnerable or not. And that obviously affected the sensitivity racing as well. As to hell. Thank you. My second question is in relation to the term no notable that features heavily in table 2.1. Can you explain the phrase no notable please.

48:22

John health for the applicant. So that's that's just terminology that's used to help identify the sensitive sensitivity of the receptor. So that's basically just saying we've, we've looked in the vicinity of the root.

48:38

And if we can't see any kind of notable land uses, or that might generate significant power use by certain groups it? Yeah, no notable locations, I think. I mean, we're trying to avoid using the word significant there, I think. So it's just another terminology for saying that we're not seeing anything in the vicinity of the route that that would lead us to believe that the route would be heavily used by by users and vulnerable users, particularly. Mr. Hill. Thank you. That's, that's helpful. Thank you. And my final question on this topic is in relation to the diversion lengths, shown in table 2.1. They range from 1.6 kilometers to 6.5 kilometers, there are some under less than 1.6 kilometers. But for those in the range 1.6 kilometer to 6.5 kilometers, they're given a significance of Effect value of neutral, or minor.

49:38

If I were walking, cycling or riding a horse, those phrases may not come to mind if I'm facing a diversion of 6.5 kilometers. It could you explain the rationale for these values. And I wonder if you can keep in mind, road safety considerations were they factored in the time needed to travel the diversion route?

50:00

Was that factored in? And the likelihood that somebody walking, cycling or horse riding could be dissuaded from making the journey of facing a 6.5 Kilometer diversion route, for example, is to heal. Thank you.

50:21

Jonah Hill for the applicant. So, yeah, so in the

50:26

diversion, those diversions in terms of magnitude of impact would obviously be quite substantial.

50:34

And the starting point for the assessment is to it, the assessment is of WC H journey length. So the starting point for the assessment is to say, what is the length of the diversion? Clearly, if it's above 1.6 kilometers, it's going to be welcomed in the top category, essentially. But we have made an allowance for the fact that the closures are a very short duration. And where we have survey data, the survey data essentially indicates that there's very little use of those routes. So there's, you start by looking at the journey length, and then you look at factors like the duration of the time that the root is going to be closed for expect it to be closed for the number of users on that route, or the likelihood of use of that route based on review of the surrounding land uses. And, yeah, so in this case, that a lot of those effects are effectively downgraded in the in the assessment, it's saying that we recognize that a diversion of that magnitude would be well, to be honest, a diversion of that magnitude is probably tantamount to not having a diversion, because in reality, a lot of pedestrians wouldn't want to walk that extra distance. But on a lot of those routes, the routes are closed for a duration of, say, four weeks. And the surveys indicate that there's there's very little usage of them.

51:48

So the there's the assessments adjusted in that in that way.

51:53

As to thank you in terms of the four week period, is that a certainty? Is it is it the case that there will not be a closure beyond four weeks of a particular right of way.

52:04

It's sorry, John, for the applicant.

52:09

That's the assumption in the assessment. So that's the that's the best information that we have at the moment about the expected duration of closure.

52:18

To heal. Thank you, indeed, I moved to the local authorities for the views.

52:24

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So are you intending to come back in any way to the first bullet point in agenda items on the sequencing of closures and diversions?

52:39

If time permits, we intend to finish at half past two hours. If there's time, we can certainly ask that question as well. So certainly the county council does have things that it wants to say about the sequencing issue. So if there is an opportunity, it would be helpful to have that. Yeah. I can then on your specific questions, which related to the assessment of severance in the light of those three topics that you've just raised? I'll ask Miss Dixon, if she wants to comment on anything that she's heard from. Mr. Hale.

53:09

Thank you, Miss Dixon. Critics in Suffolk County Council.

53:14

Just on the receptors, it was interesting to hear that this was a desktop assessment we have raised previously. Also regarding the surveys of routes that there was only a limited amount that were were carried out over over the period and less during the 2020 free surveys. This is a very rural area. And the main part of access for the people who live in this area is on the public rights away network, I just want to also specify that the public rights away network is open to all it open to all members of the public. And the assumption on there about sort of

53:54

the vulnerable users on there. It is, you know something produced available freely to all members of the public.

54:04

Thank you. Just a query with the Canada Council of data on usage of public roads away.

54:10

We have three clinics in Suffolk County Council we only have limited data. Unfortunately, we're quite a small team. There are additional information that we do have through the likes of the Strava app on recreational usage that this is recorded. However, this is a main community for most local local parishes, a number will have footpath wardens that are part of the parish council. And in addition, we have a number of local walking groups in within the vicinity of the DCI

54:45

Dixon, thank you to Essex County Council, please.

54:50

Thank you against mom, which Essex County Council. I think it's absolutely correct that the applicant has carried out a desktop survey for its potential impact on them.

55:00

Passing in, in Essex in relation to this particular scheme, Russia, your comments as you

55:08

rightly raised in terms of a six kilometer diversion is hardly diversion. But on the footpath in its entirety. I am somewhat comforted by the fact that those diversions will only be taking place to repair to four weeks, as has been indicated. We've made comments back to our local impact report in relation to

55:29

past and the implications of the impact on footpaths and that a wasn't rep. 1039. Sir. And I'm not asked to say anything else on this particular matter at this hearing, thank you.

55:45

Thank you very much, indeed,

55:47

a bit of an enclosed comment.

55:57

John out for the applicant. I think the

56:00

points are all noted there. The only thing I'd add a condition is obviously a deadline three, we have submitted now a public right of way management

56:10

plan. And I appreciate that only went in a deadline three. So with local authorities will no doubt be digesting that. And coming back to us on that.

56:19

Just picking up SOFEX point about the sequencing of closures in there just to make clear that there is a specific statement in the prowl management plan about working with the council's proud offices to make to reduce any impacts associated with concurrent closures. So that kind of the the concern around sequencing of closures is the aim is through the project management plan that we we look to mitigate that.

56:48

And so you'll may have had a chance to notice that the public rights of way management plan is now added as a fifth management plan in requirements for

57:00

and obviously is, is defined in article in Article Two.

57:07

It's time for his many thanks, I'm grateful. You've both stolen my Thunder Thunder. My final question was what's the catch all in terms of public rights? When was it to be addressed to the local authority as a catch all question on terms of rights away? So it was to Essex County Council and Suffolk County Council, the applicant has submitted an examination deadline three a public rights away management plan, which you now know,

57:32

kind of have your comments on this plan and your views on whether the plan satisfactory addresses maintaining legal minimum width of PR o Ws, public rights of way closures and diversions and the sequencing and implication of proposed working hours and 70 working week

57:52

to address this matter. Thank you. Thank you, Sir Michael Burke for Suffolk County Council. Sir, obviously, we were proposing to respond in writing a deadline for to the rights away management plan. We welcome the fact that it's been produced. But we're not yet satisfied that the contents are sufficiently comprehensive.

58:16

And I say, you know deadline for comments, we'll provide a bit more detail. But given that sequencing has been mentioned, obviously both by me initially by Mr. Hale in his response, I know that Miss Dixon has some particular concerns about that. I'm going to invite her to comment on that. And I think it's worth making the point that it's not just a question of understanding where there may be

58:42

concurrent closures of particular rights away in the same locality. It may be a question of also needing to consider consecutive closures in the same facility. And so with that, perhaps introduction, I'll ask

Miss Dixon to comment further on what she really would like to see at this stage in order to provide some reassurance. Thank you, Miss Dixon, Haddix and Suffolk County Council. And I very much I just want to reiterate, we very much welcome the addition of a rightaway management plan, it has answered a number of queries that that I have over the beginning of this examination. However, the sequencing of the closures is vital for me to carry out an assessment on the public rights away network.

59:29

There are details in the management plan that cover duration. So we now know a number are are less than 12 weeks and the reasoning rationale for those. However, what it doesn't provide me is when they will be closed and the even the period of time.

59:47

So where are they? You know you've got 10 closures in at the same time and that has a major impact on the rights away network. And for those those users to in that

1:00:00

facility. So I am aware that the applicant does hold a number of that information. And I would actually require further detail on the sequencing to be to be included. To take some Thank you very helpful. Thank you to Essex County Council.

1:00:19

Thanks, Mom, we're just going to council, we will respond to the applicants.

1:00:26

Manage footpath management plan my deadline for thinking.

1:00:31

What's your thank you to the applicant? Did I think to respond to?

1:00:36

I don't think so. So obviously, it is inevitable with a an extremely long linear project of this sort in order to ensure public safety with

1:00:48

cables and and overhead lines being put in that places where the public might have access to those works areas or are secured for poor poor the period. Obviously, it's the objective to try and minimize that both councils are not objectors to the scheme, they understand the need, I think the importance of the management plan, which we can certainly continue to discuss is just to ensure that

1:01:17

you know that those closures and not all of them are temporary closures. Some of them are just sort of impacts where access through a site would need to be managed to ensure public safety. That that is done in a way



1:01:33

which causes the least disruption consistent with delivering the project and insofar as it's suggested that

1:01:42

there may be feedback on the management plan, then we welcome that and we can discuss that with the authorities. And please, I'm very grateful. Can I be assured that I'm burdening your thematic highways meetings that will be discussions regarding the pow rights away? Plan? Can I be sure from the applicant? I'm sure you will. And the County Council's

1:02:05

very much welcome. Thank you.

1:02:09

Think Mr. Fielding just needs to answer sorry, repelled Oh, sorry, just wait for Mr. Witter. Sorry, please. Go ahead. Sorry. Go ahead. Thanks so much. It's just going to cancel? Yes.

1:02:21

As to what you're thinking, feeling

1:02:24

fulfilled in National Grid, I was just gonna say what Mr. Humphrey said we are working very close.

1:02:29

These dramatic reads. He beat me. That's very reassuring. Thank you, Mr. fiddling.

1:02:41

To my questions and handing over to my colleague, Mr. Rollins, thank you.

1:02:47

Thank you very much. So shall we press on to Agenda Item eight, which is any other business? So I'll open up to the floor and virtually as first of all before I ask the examining authority. So has anybody got any other business?

1:03:08

No,

1:03:10

I'm not seeing any

1:03:12

and the examining authority, my colleagues here.

1:03:16

Okay.

1:03:18

Thank you. This comes under under any other business, and it's just a query related to the subject of extraordinary traffic.

1:03:27

I just like to understand in terms of Suffolk County Council, I think you've put this into an LIRR. I just like to understand what's your expectation of defining construction traffic as extraordinary traffic. Thank you.

1:03:43

That is, so Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. So I think the

1:03:50

issue here is that we were

1:03:59

wishing bide preference times on my relevant note.

1:04:16

Well

1:04:25

yes, we there is a mechanism in Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980 in relation to the recovery of expense for damage caused to the highway from extraordinary traffic. But obviously, that's as it were, a

1:04:47

route which potentially involves not only certification, but if there's a disagreement about that.

1:04:56

Proceedings potentially in the magistrates courts to take that for

1:05:00

Word, we don't really see that as a particularly desirable way of proceeding. And so what I think we are wishing to see through the

1:05:14

discussions that we're having with the applicant, that we can achieve a result that we don't need to use the section 59 process,

1:05:28

because we're able to reach an agreement through, hopefully a side agreement, that there is adequate provision made for the survey and repair of the highways that are affected by construction traffic. And that will be a matter that we can pursue, hopefully, through agreement with the applicant in the

discussions that are taking place on a proposed highway agreement. So I think that's in since our position, we do think that there is the potential there for extraordinary traffic to arise from the construction of this project. But we'd rather not end up in Section 59 situation. I think that was our concern.

1:06:11

Many thanks. Thank you

1:06:15

have the aptitude to respond? Thank you.

1:06:18

Yes, I'll say something, and it may be that others need to pinpoint obviously, section 59 recovery of expenses due to extraordinary traffic in the Highways Act 1980 is an existing provision that allows for exactly these circumstances. And

1:06:39

I think in the first instance, we

1:06:41

don't think it's necessary to replace that. That's that's why it is that's why it is there. I think there is a slightly different

1:06:51

sites sort of preceding issue just about surveys, and certainly my understanding fears, and it may be that most leader or others will want to comment on this, that national grid will want to undertake its own

1:07:08

pre and post construction surveys of traffic for his own purposes to make sure that no one can say that it has damaged the road surfaces due to

1:07:22

AI ELLs.

1:07:24

Now, you know, the maybe a discussion that we need to have, through the

1:07:32

framework agreement, discussions about whether or not we

1:07:38

share that survey data and how that is being done. But at the moment, we're not convinced that

1:07:47

that that needs us to then replace section 59. In a sense, obviously, there's a potential section 59 viability there, it's a legal liability, we wouldn't anticipate unless there was a dispute about it, needing to go to court, that's exactly the sort of thing that would then be just and would typically be discussed and resolved between the parties. Now, that's my understanding of the position. I'll just look to my left, just to see if anyone else wants to add to, to that. But as I say, I think there is this sort of slight distinction between

1:08:29

surveys and the provision of informational surveys, on the one hand, and a legal mechanism for recovering any damage that may have been caused, which which already exists, on the other hand,

1:08:43

are priests Thank you.

1:08:48

You don't have

1:08:51

ally leader for the applicant, it was just to reconfirm that we, we have already carried out structural surveys that the AI routes, and the construction traffic management plan in Section 5.2 commits us to carrying out condition surveys of the roads of the local road network that we're using, and post so we we do have that requirement in there for surveys in the ctmp.

1:09:27

Thank you, sir. Well, I think we

1:09:31

really

1:09:33

recognize that the statutory provision exists. I think we're not seeking to as it were disapply, the statutory provision, we're just saying we don't think that that's necessarily the best way forward. And we do think that this is a matter which is more appropriately dealt with in a more collaborative fashion, which is why I say we are hoping that the applicant will agree with us that this ought to be brought into the scope of the discussions all

1:10:00

On a framework agreement, and similar rather than falling back on what would be a perfect

1:10:09

a potentially adversarial process if measures had to be pursued through section 59.

1:10:19

Sec, is that correct?

1:10:24

I've been told yes. That is correct. Mr. Batra. Thank you.

1:10:27

Mr. Bucha. Please.

1:10:31

Thanks, Mark Essex County Council. Similarly, we don't want to be in adversarial position with the applicant in this. And I note their commitment to carry out road surveys in relation, which have just been mentioned in the meeting today. And again, we look forward to discussing this with the applicant moving forward. Our preference would be to do this by agreement and not by conflict. Thank you.

1:10:55

Which many thanks, thinking.

1:11:00

I just double check if the applicant wants a final word or less before I move on? No, sir. I mean, I think you've got great people's views. Thank

1:11:13

you.

1:11:16

Okay, just before I go on to action points, just under any of the businesses as well. We've heard a lot today about access points. And an assessment has been undertaken. We've heard reference to the TRL traffic regs, auditors hand sheduled, 12, and also to requirements 1211.

1:11:42

And if I could maybe paraphrase the applicants particular phrase that's come throughout this bodies, it's that it's required for safety, which I fully understand. Now, normally, an example of capturing risk to the road user,

1:12:02

because of changes to the highway would be something like a good practice, like a road safety audit. So if maybe the applicant could give me an update on that position on road safety audit.

1:12:20

Yes, that once again, is Mr. Albert Screenland.

1:12:25

Thank you very much. So Christopher, I was going on behalf of the applicant. And I appreciate sort of my understanding of this this project that the issue was raised at issue specific hearing one. And just to

sort of refresh our memories of that a developer in consultation with the local highway authority can agree to undertake both stage one which is a preliminary design in sort of highway parlance

1:12:49

or a stage or a separate stage two or stage and a separate stage to detail design, highways, parlance Road Safety Audit, at the end of the detailed design stage, or a combined one slash two Road Safety Audit at the end of the detailed design skew. It's the applicants view that on schemes of this nature and and appreciate that as a as a energy transmission scheme. It's a very large scheme, but we're talking about a number of localized accesses a stage a combined stage one and two, Road Safety Audit at the end of detailed design based on the works undertaken by the main works contractor is the most appropriate way of dealing with the independent Road Safety Audit. Understand that that isn't a source of consternation to either local highway authority here. But we are of course happy to discuss that on. That being said the preliminary design of the highway has been submitted in terms of how it influences the redline boundary. So it'd be sort of a bit of a reverse engineering of that is far better, in our view to

1:13:54

do it all in one go at the end of detail design. Thank you for that explanation. Now. Is that captured and secured anywhere in the dcl?

1:14:07

Sir, I don't think so. I'm not sure that it needs to us as

1:14:12

a requirement to do this, but

1:14:15

I'm not aware that it is that doesn't mean it isn't. It just means I'm not aware that it is.

1:14:22

Thank you Mr. Humphries does

1:14:36

Yes, I I don't know whether you heard that. But

1:14:40

you know, because this is a

1:14:43

requirement it would have to be done on on on any adopted highway I think. I think we're just assuming that the normal procedures on that would

1:14:51

would apply. Can I just briefly maybe ask Suffolk. First of all, maybe SX afterwards. Just a

1:15:00

position statements on them.

1:15:03

So yes, I'm going to bring in Mr. Murray to deal with this. But I think, essentially, we think that they level one road safety audit should be carried out at this stage. Rather than leaving all the road safety audit matters to a later stage.

1:15:23

Steve Murray, Suffolk and council, our usual procedure in planning these days is to ask for Road Safety Audit at the planning stage, just to make sure what the police will design is actually safe. There will be opposition, we may noting that this is temporary works and has low levels of traffic, we may on some occasions be happy to waive that have a joint one to audit at a later date. But that'd be through negotiation, once we know what the traffic is. And I just point out this, this does bring us full circle to where we started, is the lack of detail on on individual accesses. And the difficulties is posing as a local authority to say whether the proposals are safe or unsafe. Thank you. And Essex County Council, please.

1:16:07

Thank you, sir. Well, Justice came to council and you're probably aware that there's a significant degree of commonality from what we say and what Suffolk County Council is going to be saying on this particular matter. But for us to be able to assess impact, how can we assess impact if we don't know what that that safety audit is at this particular moment in time, so we would like to see both demonstrated by the outcome. Thank you. Thank you. Finally, if I can ask Mr. Humphries, if you want to address any of the comments that you've just heard? No.

1:16:40

Okay. Thank you. We'll move on then. And I've got some action points if I can very quickly as swiftly run through them.

1:16:53

And if we could confirm which deadline those particular actions will be addressed. So first one is poor Suffolk. And it's to do with a highway design standards that you have. If they're not already in the examination library. You were going to submit them for deadline for is that correct?

1:17:18

Okay.

1:17:19

So just be clear, in terms of the documentation you're expecting to receive?

1:17:26

As I understand it, this issue arose in the context of visibility splays. And do you wish to have the highway design standards that relate to visibility splays? Or do you wish to have the highway design

standards? Full stop? Because one might be a greater amount of information than the other? I'll probably leave that for you to decide, but it's what I said the relevance to the proposed developments. Okay. Thank you. So where was that guidance, we'll take a view as to how much we think we need to burden you with.

1:18:00

Second action.

1:18:03

Again, Pacific. It's to do with the proposed bail analysis to show

1:18:12

you we're going to confirm the stopping sight distance and design speed for what you would determine is for the for that access points.

1:18:22

It wasn't I wasn't sure if it was 90 meters as a stopping sight distance or was based upon 50 kph and whether the stopping sight distance would be plus

1:18:36

or stay married for Suffolk County Council, shall I answer that one here now.

1:18:41

The process would be is a D restricted road at the moment. So in our view, it'd be 2.4 by 215 meters visibility spray. If the applicant were to undertake speed surveys, and we can determine a safe stopping distance to design the junction based on actual traffic speeds, that would be the next step, then the applicant is proposing a for 30 mile an hour temporary speed limit if they implemented it, and we were happy with the traffic speeds actually doing 30 miles an hour visibility splay would be 2.4 by 90. But we may be depending on the amount of traffic, be prepared to relax that still further, if there was a super management plan in place, that safety controls the traffic in and out of the X. Okay, that's clear. Exactly. Yeah, that's clear. Thank you.

1:19:31

The applicant apparently have undertaken a survey or will be undertaking a survey as Churchill

1:19:38

for that particular access point. Are you able to provide that detail into the examination?

1:19:47

I think this is for Mr. Hilton to

1:19:55

deal with what survey work we've done and we I think you also



1:20:00

Maybe this action point or a different one, I think you asked us to

1:20:04

undertake some work there and look at

1:20:07

this. Is this in relation to

1:20:12

Rose cottage the access point AP AB fi? I think that's right. Yes. Building property but yes, yeah. Rob build on on behalf of National Grid. Yeah, we will be working closely with our design team and Suffolk County Council to do some some work around that access point and come up with

1:20:31

when do you think you would submit that into the examination?

1:20:38

When is the latest I can be offensive?

1:20:45

Are you able to do it this year?

1:20:49

I think this year is going to be quite tight. We will give it our best endeavours. Okay. Failing that, shall we go for the first state? Why in January? Thank you.

1:21:06

Suffolk, and also possibly Essex County Council, if you can provide key points related to missing assumptions and inputs, I think you are going to provide a list and the applicant was going to provide information and assessments

1:21:27

that you have currently in hand and that you will be sharing. So for example, you mentioned traffic numbers per access and files in GIS. In terms of deadlines is the deadline five you're looking for.

1:21:45

Which would be about the first December

1:21:49

or deadlines for that would be the 16th of November. I think I indicated Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council deadline for wouldn't be practicable because there is I say a need for some further dialogue with the applicant see what information they can provide.

1:22:04

Whether we can achieve a clear position to you by deadline five, beginning of December, I think we can certainly work towards that. And it might help crystallize

1:22:17

the party's dialogue, if that deadline, okay, is the starting point. But I'll just say I don't know, because I don't quite know how long this dialogue is going to take place as to what can be provided, when it's provided in terms of how much time it needs to be assessed. But sir, can I can I put it this way that we will respond to you at deadline five, with what is then the current state of play, which will either be a position statement, or it may be that because of the amount of material that needs to be assessed? We'll have to provide you with that position statement at the next deadline. That's acceptable. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

1:22:58

Next Action twice again, it's for Suffolk County Council, you're gonna identify bass bass parameters that are critical for the ctmp.

1:23:10

I don't know if maybe a six county council could provide that information as well. It could be helpful,

1:23:21

then

1:23:24

I think you mentioned as well, Suffolk County Council that you tend to take in high level access assessments. And that you could provide that if it was requested. I think it might be useful.

1:23:37

Stay most of again, cancel that's already been provided. Okay. So annex F of rep 104. Okay, thank you for that confirmation. Those are the actions that I captured. Has anybody else got any actions?

1:23:56

Six County Council.

1:24:01

Thank you so much for joining us this county council,

1:24:04

screen conversation and my colleagues and hobbies and transportation team. And although we'll endeavor to make that first to December deadline for those two issues that you've mentioned, one of which is providing the key points and missing points and assumptions within the ctmp. And the second one is the base parameters of the same. We'll endeavor to do it by the first December.

1:24:25

But we will give you a least a brief position statement by that date. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:24:36

I'll now move on to

1:24:40

agenda item 10.

1:24:42

As there are no other items that are relevant to this hearing. May I remind you that the examination timetable requires party to provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline for which is Thursday the 16th of November.

1:25:00

May I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspector website as soon as practicable after we close?

1:25:11

Can I thank all of today's participants for their time and assistance during the course of this hearing. We will consider your responses carefully. And they will inform the examining authority to second written questions and our decision as to whether further hearings will be necessary. Can I remind everybody that issue specific hearing for consensus this afternoon at 130 at 130. So the time now is 1245. And this issue specific hearing three is now closed and killed.