

# TRANSCRIPT\_BRAMFORD\_ISH6\_SESSION 1\_14122023

00:06

Okay, good morning, everybody in the absence Mr. Rowland's who's still trying to rejoin us. Can I just confirm that everyone can hear me?

00:15

Yes, sir. Thank you very much. I'll start the introductions in the absence Mr. Rowland said when he rejoins us, he can take over again.

00:25

So good morning, I'd like to welcome you to this six issue specific hearing in relation to the Bramford to instead reinforcement, which is now open.

00:35

At this afternoon's hearing, sorry, this morning's hearing, we're looking at access, transport and public rights of way.

00:43

Can I confirm with the case team that the live streaming and recording has commenced?

00:48

Yes, I see it has. Thank you.

00:51

My name is Andrew Mahan. I have a background in ecology and environmental impact assessment. I'm a chartered environmentalist and the chartered landscape architect. Could I ask Mr. McAvoy, Mr. Corsi to introduce themselves?

01:06

ology is one of those mornings, which like a good morning everyone my name is John McAvoy. I'm a chartered civil and chartered highways engineer. I have a background in major projects and local authority, highways and transport. Thank you.

01:22

Good morning. I'm Giuliana Corsi, and I'm a charter time planner. I have a background in appellate work, including major infrastructure projects, and the examination of local development plans.

01:37

And are right on cue Mr. Rollins will also introduce himself. Hello. Sorry for the technical hitch. Yeah, I'm Jason Robinson. I'm a chartered civil engineer and a chartered environmentalist. And I have a background in major projects for energy and highways. Now, would you like me to continue? Please? Okay. Sure. Thank you. Yeah. Apologies for that slight technical

02:06

glitch this morning. Together, we constitute the examining authority for this application. And following the examination, we will be reporting to the secretary of state's financial security and at zero with a recommendation as to whether the development consent order should be made. There are several colleagues from the planning Inspectorate assisting us today. Jake Stevens is the case manager for this project. He is accompanied by Jess Weatherby and Gina shoreland is assisting with online participants. If you have any general questions regarding the examination process, please email them to the case team who are always happy to help.

02:55

I will ask participants who are speaking today to introduce themselves next. But before I do, please remember that digital recording is being made of this hearing as a formal record of proceedings. If you take part, it is important that you understand of the formal record 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. Therefore, the examining authority will not ask you to put sensitive personal information into the public domain. Indeed, we would actively encourage you not to do so. So please, when you speak today, do not make any reference to personal information, such as your address, your email address, or your personal or family situation, including economic, financial, cultural, or health related matters.

04:05

I will run through the parties that are present today and who are likely to speak. So please introduce yourself in turn. So can I first start with the applicant?

04:20

Yes, good morning, sir. Rebecca Clutton. I'm counsel for the applicant. I'm joined by my instructing solicitor, Mr. Tom White of the CLP. And I'm also joined by a number of witnesses with expertise in the areas that we're covering today, but I'll introduce those or ask them to introduce themselves at the relevant times.

04:42

Thank you, Mr. Cotton. If we can then ask Suffolk County Council

04:52

Thank you, sir. I can't see myself on the screens. I'm not sure whether I'm visible

05:00

So anybody else I am well, that's good. So sorry. I'm Michael Bedford Kings counsel for Suffolk County Council.

05:08

And I will also be joined in terms of the presentation today by Mr. Steve Mary, who you met yesterday. He is the transport policy and development manager with the county council. There are other Suffolk County Council offices here but they don't expect they will need to speak. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Radford. though. Can I ask if people can lead Suffolk district council if there's a representative here? Maybe Liz Curtis.

05:42

Okay, if we can go to Essex County Council though.

05:51

Good morning, sir. My name is Mark Wood. I'm a principal planner in the growth and development team Essex County Council, and I present the planning lead in relation to this particular asset and I'm a member of the royal Town Planning Institute.

06:06

I have a couple of colleagues joining me today. I think it would be opportune for them to introduce themselves. They are Mr. Matt Bradley, and Mr. Joseph Hoth. If I can ask both to introduce themselves to you please. Thank you. Okay.

06:26

First of all, my name is Joseph cough. I'm a principal transportation infrastructure plan. Essex County Council.

06:35

Like the ones I'm Matthew Bradley, Strategic Development Manager, Essex going to council sort of representing the Highway Authority in conjunction with Joseph. Okay.

06:45

Thank you for joining us.

06:49

In fact, can ask if

06:52

Mr. Wilde is with us from Braintree District Council.

06:57

Good morning, sir. Good morning panel. Matthew wild charter tam planner, acting on a project for Braintree District Council. I just saw that Brian Curtis just joins him. I want to reintroduce her. Thank you, sir. Okay, Mr. Wilde. Yes. That was Curtis.

07:16

Morning, so apologies. slight technical. strangeness happening here. Turns out I wasn't plugged in. So that will be the reason. Bronchitis for baby district. Councillor midsummer for District Council. Thank you.

07:30

Very much. Yes, that Gremlins have been afoot this morning. But I've counted three strikes. So hopefully, that's posted to the gremlins.

07:40

Are there any other parties precedence who wish to speak today?

07:47

Thank you all. And welcome to this hearing. Oh, sorry.

07:51

Yes, certainly, if you would like to introduce yourself and who you'd like to represent. Is that Simon,

08:01

thank you very much. So on the panel, it's Simon Amstutz from the dead on bail national landscape, the new brand for area of outstanding natural beauty and Stour Valley project, and I'm representing that partnership. Thank you. Okay.

08:21

So can I just check if there's anybody else? If not,

08:26

no. Okay. So I hope everybody has had an opportunity to read Alex's A and B to the agenda prior to joining us today. And I see from the people presidents that you have experienced previous hearings. So unless I hear otherwise, I suggest we avoid the lengthy introduction.

08:54

So those requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing. But can I just confirm that this is correct?

09:08

Yes, not seeing any show of hands. For those watching the live stream cannot advise you that should we adjourn proceedings. Or if we have a technical glitch, which we've had so far, we may have to stop the live stream to get us clear recording phase.

09:26

So you will need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream at the point at which we recommend deleting. The hearing will follow the agenda published on the Bramford twinset project page of the national infrastructure planning website which was published on the fifth of December. It is

also in the examination library on the reference is Evie. Dash o 302 would be helpful for you to have a copy

10:00

P have the agenda to hand.

10:03

Are there any other comments anybody wishes to make under item one?

10:10

No.

10:11

I will then move on to item two, the purpose of this issue specific hearing. Today's hearing has been held by the examining authority to export the number of matters orally in respect of access to transport, and public rights of way. A summary of these matters is included in the agenda that we published.

10:36

Are there any questions on the purpose of this hearing?

10:41

No. Okay. Then we will turn to Item three of the agenda. And I will now hand it over to Mr. McElroy.

10:55

Mr. Lawrence, thank you, indeed. Good morning, everyone.

10:58

Just some additional points of housekeeping.

11:02

So the examining authority intends to keep it a running order, as set out in the published agenda for this hearing.

11:10

If we make good progress getting through the agenda, the examining authority considers that the meeting will conclude before by or before lunchtime today that said, it's unlikely we're going to finish in one hour. So it's our intention that we take a short 10 minute comfort break around every 60 minutes or so. And plus, one last point to the applicants person is struggling. Miss typing. Since the agenda was published, we've been made aware that there may be a question asked under Agenda Item nine and the other business related to the impact of construction on river navigation. Now must meant we did not put that topic in the agenda. So my question to the applicant is whether you have a subject matter expert, who could field or address the question relates to the construction impacts on river navigation. Miss Clinton, please.

12:12

Rebecca clutton for the applicant? Thank you for that indication, sir. I'm afraid No, we I don't think we do today. Actually, that would have been Ms. White, who was in attendance yesterday, but isn't in attendance today.

12:28

was noted. Thank you. Nonetheless, I think we will take the questions and endeavour to fill them during Agenda Item nine. Thank you, indeed. Okay, so moving on. For agenda items three to seven. The examining authority will raise data and information query for each of these agenda items. And to give some context, the examining authority understands that the applicant and the local highway authorities hold regular traffic and transport thematic meetings to discuss concerns regarding highways and public rights of way. At Issue specific hearing three, the examining authority got a sense that where there was an impasse progress on moving the dial towards understanding and agreement centred on the sharing of data and information between the applicant and the local highway authorities. So the purpose of the data and information question is two fold. First is to understand what data information has been shared between the parties since issue specific hearing three.

13:40

And second is to highlight any outstanding requests for data and to establish if the data exists, and if it can be shared between the parties. I hope that's accepted and understood.

13:57

Okay, so moving to Agenda Item three, which is the transport assessment, and its methodology.

14:06

At the last issue specific hearing on transport and rights await is h three. The local highway authorities were asked to prioritise the list of concerns they had related to the transport assessment. So my first question is to the local highway authorities and it's twofold. So firstly, can you confirm that those lists have been submitted and perhaps if you can, signpost, signpost and for the record, and secondly, if you can give an indication of the state of play of your discussions with the applicant concerning the transport assessment so to the log of highway authorities

14:54

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council perhaps if I start with Mr. Bucha

15:00

doesn't mind.

15:02

And so we provided as part of rep 5034, which was our response to action points from the earlier series of issues, specific hearings, and also there was a CH.

15:22

And as part of that response, in our section two, we responded to the action points from issue specific hearing three, and

15:37

we set out against what was action point three, which was the one dealing with a prioritised list of key missing assumptions and inputs. The material that we considered was outstanding.

15:55

Obviously, I am assuming you don't want me to set out all of that in detail. But if I just give you the headline topics, if that reasoning helps people, so I'm just taking it literally from the headlines in that document reference, there was abnormal, individual indivisible loads, ay ay ay ay ay ELLs, there was issues in relation to heavy goods, vehicles HGVs issues in relation to workers, issues in relation to road and public right away closures and issues in relation to traffic data.

16:33

So that was the position as at

16:40

at line five.

16:44

And I'm happy to bring Mr. Mary in now to tell you what's changed since then, all leave that to a later stage in your hands.

16:53

Mr. Berger, my intention was but perhaps to get a high level explanation of just to confirm those discussions have taken place. They are ongoing. And just a sense of whether progress you consider progress is being made. Is a good progress, perhaps is the progress not as you would have wished plans get from this question. So yeah, or it was I think it's still better, I'll bring this to marry him because he's the person dealing with the negotiations. But obviously, he'll be conscious that at the moment, you're just trying to get a high level feel for where things are going rather than get bogged down in the detail. So thank you, Mary. Thank you, Mary. Thank you.

17:31

Hello, good morning, Steven with Mary Suffolk County Council. In response, I'll try and avoid going into too much detail. But I can confirm we are having meetings every two weeks with the applicant on hiring matters. And as a result of that we have been provided with some additional information, but not all of the information we need. So the information we've been provided with is we've had an excess. Mr. Mode. Sorry, apologies. I'm actually going to ask that question a little later on, if that's okay, so just to confirm meetings are taking place, and you're done. Some progress is has actually been made? Yes, it is with tomorrow. Thank you. Thank you. So you

18:10

can hear from Essex County Council, please.

18:15

Thank you, sir. Again, it's Mark order County Council. The meetings that are taking place between the applicant and the highway authorities, both insurance county council and Suffolk County Council are conjoined in attending and contributing to those meetings and also the receipt of the same data. And the information that Mr. Bedford has kindly provided to you at the start of this specific

18:40

item are wholly correct in terms of aisles, HGVs working numbers, roads and right and right away closures and traffic data. And as Mr. Mehra has indicated, those meetings are taking place for nightly thinking as to what you thank you indeed, perhaps if I can ask the applicant to respond. Thank you, Mr. Platon.

19:02

clutton for the applicant? Yes, I'm going to just hand over to Miss Kay carpenter who's leading on traffic and transport matters for us today. Thank you, Miss carpenter.

19:13

Carpenter, highways, traffic and transport matters on behalf of the applicant. So first of all, in your relation to your question of information that has been shared, the information shared into the examination that deadline five includes rep five, zero to six, that's temporary access route, asti 8131, on site design, and path assessment, and rep 5027 construction schedules with critical path

19:43

and so they answer specific questions that were asked the previous hearing. In addition to that we have shared directly a range of information with the local highway authorities, including spreadsheets of baseline flow, and traffic speed at 167 sites.

20:00

For two week periods providing indication of speeds and traffic flow classification on those links,

20:08

plus an explanatory note and plan showing the survey locations. So these cover all of the roads affected by construction traffic, unless traffic flow forecasts are extremely low, in which case the traffic impacts are deemed negligible. So we have a large amount of traffic survey information that has been shared. The second item is a spreadsheet of Excel format of traffic flow. So this is an Excel version of document rep 4006 that was previously shared, to provide a more accessible format to assist the local highway authorities in their evaluation.

20:42

A third item is a sketch of visibility display, or access AB AP five, that's the location near rose cottage that was discussed in a previous issue specific hearing. And that provides more detail on the geometry at that particular location, and visibility. And the final item shared are reports produced by winds, they are the specialist company dealing with abnormal individual load movements. And those four reports of



information about the evaluation of the routes likely to be followed by those abnormal indivisible loads on their way to construction site locations.

21:25

Then in relation to state of play, which is the second part of your question, if you'd like me to continue to that, please. Thank you.

21:32

So the we have received helpful information from both of the local highway authorities, Suffolk County Council have provided us with a helpful helpful spreadsheet of concerns. And those subjects, we understand to be broadly agreed by Essex County Council, as Mr. Richards previously confirmed, and they collect issues relating to the transport assessment. And they're mainly discussed in submission documents, and they relate to request for securing of traffic information. And numbers as discussed discussed previously, including yesterday's she's specific hearing. And they also make requests for additional plans and programmes I relating to concurrent closures of public rights of way and the potential for disruption for that, and clarification relating to closure of narrower carriageways. So that's a closure road versus a lane closure and keeping traffic moving on the other half of the road and relating to use of trenchless crossings and abnormal indivisible load movements. Essex County Council has in addition supplied a spreadsheet of accesses, access points for which the which the construction traffic review flexes the area defined by the order limits. And the applicant is working through both of these documents, discussing informatic meetings, we had a useful meeting on Tuesday of this week, working through the highest priority areas of those and agreeing progress on those and the the information that we have shared which I mentioned earlier, as closed out some of those areas or reduce them and we continue to work to resolve those areas of difference.

23:26

The in addition to written response to previous submissions, this examination, further information, public right of way sequencing was an area of concern. So this is where if multiple public rights of way are closed concurrently, there may be an additional compound impact on users of both right to flee. So, the reason for seeking that information is to understand how in practice use the formatting to be affected. We note these are lightly used accesses and only closed for short periods, but we recognise the concern of confined accesses and work to analyse that is extremely well advanced and will be shared into examination and the that will show that the the analysis which is undertaken looking for each quarter of the construction programme, the Indicative programme, so the works for looking for each quarter of the year in which activity is taking place, which rights of way are affected in each of those quarters, and shows that the likelihood of concurrent closures is very low. We couldn't say it at all, but it's a very low likelihood and the measures set out in the construction traffic management plan ctmp will provide the assurance because that includes for communication between the main works contractor and local communities and local highway authorities so that they can plan and anticipate the effects of closures on the data and so on.

25:00

We feel that is substantial progress on that. And the the in relation to access point designs, which was issue raised in previous hearings, and also in those submitted lists of questions.

25:16

The we have started releasing sketches showing access points with information around sight lines and design form. And additional sketches are in development, development and will be shared with a higher authority as soon as they are ready.

25:33

Hopefully, that's a useful summary of the current state of play.

25:37

Carpenter, thank you. Very comprehensive and very encouraging to hear that amount of information has been shared between the parties, it truly is encouraging.

25:47

So really, you've preempted my next question, you've essentially listed the information that's been shared between the applicant and the local highway authorities.

25:58

So it does seem that good progress has been made since issue specific hearing three, what I'd like to focus on in a constructive way is just to understand, are there any outstanding items of data or information that either party either the applicant seeks from the highway authorities, or vice versa? So just to get a sense, or an indication of any outstanding data request? If I can put that first to Suffolk County Council? Thank you.

26:30

Thank you, sir. Yes. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, I'm going to with this in two parts, because based on what Miss Carpenter was saying, she was covering the rights of way position as well as the as it were the carriageway position. And so what I'm going to do is, first of all bring back in Mr. Mary, to deal with the highways in terms of vehicular issues. And then I'm going to introduce as Claire

27:03

Miss Claire Dixon, who is the right away manager, I think somebody's coughing, but it's not somebody in my room. So I'm not sure where that's being picked up from, but there we are.

27:14

So, Mr. Marriott, Mr. Pappas, my apologies. I'm just as it's entirely appropriate thing to do. But what I'd like to do, if appropriate is for each agenda item, if we could focus on the data that's outstanding for, in this case, transport assessments that we'll deal with the right of way. And Agenda Item seven. So we'll ask the same question that in respect of the rights away, what I'm trying to do is to narrow down the information that's outstanding in relation to each agenda item. So for now, we focus on the transport assessment, We'll then move on to the construction traffic management plan, then the private access points or the the access ways, then the right way. So it's not a catch all question, if you will. So what well done was that that's what I had understood from your agenda. But the way that Miss carpenter dealt with it was obviously more comprehensive. And since there are some issues, but I'd say we'll deal

with them under agenda item seven, there are issues about rights away, but I'll defer Miss Dixon to that stage.

28:14

Because I think she will want to come back on some of the things that you've heard from Miss carpenter. Alright. So in that case, an absolutely understanding that you would find it more helpful to stay with the agenda structure are just asked Mr. Mary to focus please, on issues where further information is sought in relation to understanding the transport assessment and its methodology rather than other issues. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Americans better thinking.

28:47

Good morning, St. Mary's suffocated cancer. I'll start with the abnormal loads, inflammation, so sizzling

28:55

can confirm on the eighth December we did receive, there are actually four wins reports, although one specifically deals with issues in Essex. So I'll only briefly mentioned that one. So we've heard a very high level review of them. And whilst we welcome the fact we have the report, and they are very useful, and generally very comprehensive in terms of a contractor looking at

29:19

the sort of highway infrastructure is impacted. It doesn't include high restructures, which is another matter, which we may discuss later on. But one of the key things that have noticed that isn't within those reports, these Firstly, they were undertaken in 2022. And some of the road network has been modified since and that doesn't appear to be picked up. Which leads me on to the second point is that there is no sweat path analysis undertaken on this and looking at particularly the cable drums, which is the main impact on Safak. There is a concern remains that some of the minor junctions are not

29:57

conductive to some of these loads part

30:00

Passing through them. And we are concerned, firstly that the load stays within the carriageway. But secondly, that the load doesn't overstay on the highway boundary. And I did also mostly notice and a very brief check is that some of the the areas where, for example, rams road, we don't actually appear to have full highway boundary of the nation, which is a concern, so I'm making need to be determined.

30:25

And so on that subject about overrunning one of the wings documents does, actually so the tractor for one of the heavy loads to Branford actually running on the verge, which was again, a sort of concern.

30:39

I would also add, although it's not specifically to do the abnormal loads, the concern of over running also applies to articulated HGVs on some of the minor roads. So for example, in the chatter chashme area, or ashington area, where they're having to turn on and off minor roads.

30:57

That covers the assessment of the MMR loads information, we've provided the other main set of data as we have received one plan for find references, APC, cigar AB AP five, which is the rose cottage access, we have received a scale plan for that, whilst again, it's useful information is helpful, what it doesn't include, it doesn't include the vegetation. So as you're aware, one of the main concerns about that location is this interaction of the visibility splay with the vegetation, and also have the well

31:39

mr. Mossad and job two, I think we'll do what a B, A P five pups agenda item six, that's okay. So I've just focused on the transport assessment, please. Thank you.

31:49

Thank you, okay. In that case, if we're going to concentrate on access on prayers a high level as part of transport assessment, I would just say that is the only so plan we have had to date. So that probably the high level pieces of information that we feel we haven't received, I would also just add, there is an ongoing matter of whether or not road safety audits are undertaken as part of the transport assessment, and then finally,

32:20

gone from my mind.

32:23

So I've got one sort of saying next.

32:27

Essentially, that's, yeah, apologies. There was a third thing, I've got an article agenda written representation. So that if you want to come back at some later point this morning, and you've remembered, please, please do if it ever comes back to you, Mr. Mayor, I'm very grateful. Thank you for those points concerning the transport assessments. Can I ask the same question, please, to Essex County Council in relation to the transport assessment? What are other any outstanding data request of the applicant?

32:56

Joseph on behalf of Essex County Council that

33:00

nothing beyond what Suffolk haven't just covered in their comments.

33:05

Mr. Howe, thank you. I'll pass it back to the applicant, Mrs. Clinton, misled, and I've just made a list of the items raised by Mr. Mary that are

33:17

considered outstanding for my list are it's

33:23

over running. So from the winds reports in terms of the

33:29

swept path analysis,

33:32

the addition of overrunning the issue of highway boundaries,

33:38

perhaps an incomplete and incompleteness and the swept path analysis. And

33:47

the final point is in relation to the undertaking of road safety audits as part of the transport analysis. Whether you want to reply now, or perhaps provide a detailed, structured reply after this hearing.

34:05

Rebecca clutton for the applicant? Thank you, sir, I can ask Miss carpenter to just give you a high level response. Now, if you would find that helpful, that kind of thing. What I would notice, I think the the original questions specifically related to Trump matters, information outstanding in relation to the transport assessment. And I don't think we have any matters that specifically relate to the transport assessment. And I wonder if I appreciate there are other matters on which it's being said that further information is required. But perhaps if we just have some clarity, that's my take away and I'm sure we'll be told otherwise if that's wrong, but I'll just pass over to Miss carpenter just for a very high level of service the points

34:48

just pick up until on behalf of the applicant. Irrespective of running and sweat path. The detailed design will develop those abnormal individual loan specific route proposals and

35:00

They will be submitted to the highway authority for approval. So that's a process that takes place in the late stage of the project. The the large amount of information that has been shared is to reassure the local highway authorities in respect of those specific loans. But we consider the amount of detail provided is

35:19

at or beyond what would be expected in proportion to the stage. In respect of Jaime boundaries, we note useful discussions we've had in the thematic meetings relating traffic and transport around determination of highway boundaries. And the fact that these aren't always entirely certain, but we have included the information that we have available. And irrespective swept path analysis for heavy goods vehicles, the same issue would apply proposals, these proposals at the detailed design stage after the

submission of documents, who's like hiring authorities, and that links also to the road safety audit, we have amended the Justice Department consent order to include provision of road safety audit to be undertaken to the Highway Authority satisfaction, and to demonstrate that commitment to reassure the highway authority. So that is a commitment that has been secured into the

36:17

draft this year.

36:20

Carpenter Thank you indeed. Does anybody wish to reply to those responses from the applicant?

36:27

Sorry, sorry, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk. County council. Sir. Yes, I think one of the difficulties is, in order to be satisfied of the robustness of the transport assessment, we need to know that the distribution of traffic and in particular, the HGV traffic is appropriate to enable the routes which are claimed to be used to be used.

37:03

Because if they can't be used, then one would need to then test well actually is the distribution of traffic realistic. And in order therefore, to assess whether or not the routes which have been identified as being the routes that the applicant considers the traffic will be using are in fact available, or needs to have an accurate understanding of the highway boundaries to know what is the limits that the applicant can properly use within the extent of the highway, one needs to have the swept path analysis to know to what extent where there are either tight bends or other restrictions on the highway. The types of vehicles can manoeuvre along those particular routes, as opposed to having to use a different route. And one needs to understand what the swept path position is at the proposed access points in order to understand whether the

37:58

traffic can make those manoeuvres. So albeit that the applicants position seems to be that that's a level of details that can follow at a later stage. I'm afraid we are taking the view that in order to understand whether the transport assessment has effectively or robustly assessed the transport impacts, we need more information than the applicant either has so far shared, or it would seem is proposing to share. So there is something of an impasse there in terms of approach as to what level of information is needed.

38:35

Can I just back briefly bring back in Mr. Mary, in case there's anything more he wants to say just to respond on what we heard from Miss Carpenter, I should say I think he has also recalled the outstanding query that he had. So he might just briefly mention that as well. Thank you. Thank you.

38:54

St. Mary's Suffolk County Council. Yes, the alternative I forgot to mention was is assessment of collisions along the whole road corridor. So this is the road such as the a 1071 and a 134. We've raised some issues that are some concerns that just an out analysing the clusters might miss some of the

impacts. The example we gave was the a one three for their street where there's a staggered crossroads, with collisions on each arm of that staggered crossroads, that they're 50 metres apart, so I won't go into too much detail.

39:30

As regards I would fully endorse

39:33

what Michael Bedford said in terms of the information provided is that we are finding a lot of issues when we are coming to deliver and tips where things have been missed at this stage which then causes us problems at a later date. They are quite often access specific, but in terms of normal loads, we are having issues where no reviews are undertaken, but we actually start moving the load and we

40:00

As you find problems on site, I would also refer you back to the selector examination where your order limits at one particular junction had to be extended to allow oversight of the loads, which was missed in the initial assessment, and only revealed when they the applicant swept past for that. So all I can do is endorse what has been said is that, in our view, this is a very much front loaded process is to have that information at this stage, so that we can make sure that when we actually come to delivery, there is nothing that slows down delivery of this project.

40:37

Thank you very much. Mr. Murray. Thank you, it was something that we intend to discuss our agenda item four in terms of the construction traffic management plan. But it does seem to be quite quite a fundamental point. As to the applicants.

40:51

Mr. Slaton. We can discuss this at Agenda Item four, or we can continue the conversation. Now I'm very much in your hands as to whether you want to continue to develop discussion now. Or leave it till agenda item for

41:10

clutton for the applicants or whatever you would find most convenient. I mean, we were happy to deal with it. And we were ready to deal with it now.

41:19

I'm conscious that you've set out your agenda and the way that you would wish to hear these matters. I think if we leave it to agenda item for one of the points to be discussed, then is the approval of the construction route shedule. And I think that's probably a key point of discussion at that point. So if we can leave it to Agenda Item four, and we'll revert back to the transport assessment discussion. Thank you. Okay. To all parties. Thank you indeed for your inputs.

41:48

For us moving on to examine the transport assessments, based on the deadline for and deadline five submissions from the local highway authorities. I've got nine points I'd like to discuss in terms of the transport assessments. So I'll run through them topic one, topic nine. At the end of that discussion, if there's anything you consider I've missed and we can certainly consider having a discussion around that but topic one, I'm going to discuss the hour of greatest change topic to its worst case concerns around the worst case numbers for total staff numbers, peak construction, peak construction, vehicle numbers, staff shifts, use of the crew bus and the assessed proportions of car shares. Public three its provision of material quantities and housing and form vehicle movements. Topic For link by link traffic flows. Topic five

42:50

it's in relation to the information provided by the applicant the deadline for and its completeness, topic six

42:59

whether there should be a change in shift patterns to reflect seasonal variations. Topic seven is the origin of workforce I overnight location of staff topic, eight assumptions around outbound and inbound HGV movements, PR O W closures and also the movement of abnormal indivisible loads. And topic nine will discuss non compliance and the implications of reporting and monitoring on the transport assessment. My apologies, there's also topic 10,

43:36

which is a discussion around additional restrictions on Sundays and bank holidays, impact of HGVs on high sensitivity receptors. And finally, additional route analysis of accidents required for widely used routes. So those are the 10 topics I intend to raise this morning. So under this agenda item. So back to topic one, which is the hour of greatest change. And it's a question to the local highway authorities. I just want to understand your views of the significance of determining the hour of greatest change in the transport assessment. Thank you.

44:15

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. I'll ask Mr. Mary, to comment on our position on that. Thank you. Thank you.

44:26

Hi, good morning, Steve. Mary Suffolk County Council. Very, very briefly, the concern is that the Africans assess the peak hours. So the morning peak in the afternoon peak, and obviously you do the baseline then the network at that time is at its highest. We understand from information supplied that particularly GBS will be stretched consistently across the day. Therefore, the proportion ratio of ease in the interview carers may actually be the proportion of greatest impact on us process brief

45:00

For years, I can summarise it.

45:03



It was to Mary, thank you, perhaps to Essex County Council whether you could comment on the significance of the our greatest change. Thank you.

45:12

I just have half on behalf of the Essex County Council, from our point of view. So the Atkins shift patterns are set out in paragraph six point 2.9 In the transport assessment. And they've distributed workers travelling between six and nine in the peak period. In their assessment, the majority of traffic is set out as travelling in the seven to eight period of time. And only actually 4.5% of workers travelling during the assessed hour, or eight till nine. So so as a result of that, we have an impact occurring in one hour or greater impractical in one hour, which probably has a lower baseline. But the assessed hour is actually the 2.5%.

45:57

Now, as I understand it, we're only talking about the transport assessment here rather than the environmental assessment traffic. And so

46:05

I'll leave it there.

46:08

Because forgive me, I haven't quite good clarity on from both authorities as to the significance of you understanding the our greatest change.

46:21

Or give me a fact of not hearing correctly. But what I want to understand is why do you think the earthquake has changed is significant? Why is it important to know how physician in the transport assessment

46:35

I chose to hop on behalf of the Essex County Council transport a sense assessment. It's self normally obviously you assess a peak hour where you are having a specific or great impact.

46:48

In my mind, the error of greatest changes is more than an effect that we particularly look at in the environmental assessment of traffic and transport, which we aren't discussing here. But I would still expect a transport assessment to look at potentially where it's when it's impacted occurring, and then assess its impact on the network at that time. Obviously, dependent on

47:10

the difference between that and whether the level of impact during the peak hour is comparable or not.

47:17

It was to her Thank you.

47:19

My question to the applicant, and I'll phrase it like this.

47:23

Can the applicant provide a justification or reasoning for a meeting and assessment of the our greatest change in the transport assessment? The question to the applicant. Thank you.

47:38

Rebecca clutton for the applicant at this point, sir, I'm going to introduce Mr. Hale, this is Jonathan pails, who is providing expertise and transport planning for you this morning? He'll address you on that question.

47:53

John out for the applicant. So the question is relating to the transport assessment and not the environmental statement?

48:03

Transport says, yes, yeah. So I mean, the transport assessment looks at a network peak hour, which was standard practice.

48:15

In production with transport assessments, there's no reference to any current guidance covering transport assessment. And that requires you to look at the hour of greatest change, I think, as Mr. Howe.

48:29

That's, that's guidance that specifically relates to the environmental statement that that has been referred to.

48:36

Another thing on a project like this, where the the traffic generation is very, very modest. And the TA is primarily concerned with understanding impacts on road network performance.

48:53

It's standard practice to look at the network peak hours, because the level of background traffic is really the dictating factor that determines whether you're going to have an impact on road network performance. And I think

49:08

what I'm not clear about from the authorities is in if there's some proposed alternative methodology, exactly what that is, is the implication that we have assumptions in the TA that most of the staff are going to be on the road network.

49:26

Before the peak, are they suggesting that those assumptions should be ignored? And that we pretend that the traffic is going to be on the road in the network peak hour? So I think I don't Yeah, I'm not understanding where the concern is coming from. What we've done is standard practice. We look at the network peak hour. That's the that's the hour when you're most likely to get impacts on road network performance. And the TA is fairly comprehensive in terms of suggesting that the project with modest level of traffic is going to generate it

50:00

He's not going to do that.

50:05

No, thank you. I press wondered whether if there are ongoing Matic having meetings, I trust that they are whether this this point could be discussed at at a future or the next highwaisted thematic meeting between applicant of the local highway authorities is unacceptable to all parties.

50:25

For the applicant, yes, we're happy to have that discussion.

50:30

Sir. Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County, because we are equally happy to have that discussion. But I do notice that

50:38

we went from Mr. Huff's explanation on behalf of Essex County Council, to the applicant for a response. And I think Mr. Murray had wanted to come in my apologies. I just if I can just give him that opportunity. So if Mr. Mary, just this is just on the point of what it says, why does it matter, to assess the hour of greatest change, as opposed to the conventional peak hour that Mr. Hale was talking about? It's better. Thank you, Mr. Murray.

51:08

State marriage counsellor, I'll make two very brief points. One is, it is correct is that the concern we have about HGVs. And the peak of those being higher and the intake or the number, the proportion is more of a Environmental Assessment issue. And we were happy to discuss with the applicant. The other concern is that by introducing significant numbers of workers travelling in shifts, you could effectively be shifting the network peak to earlier hours, because we prefer the peak of the workers arriving, and the peak of the background background and network flows. And that might affect the shift the peak, particularly the morning to say, for example, seven to eight. So that was one of the concerns we have. I would also like at a later date to come on to, I think your talk wants to talk about this in the construction traffic management plan about controls on shift patterns as well. I do correct. Yes, thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, withdrawal, I think thank you so much. Indeed. The next topic then on this agenda item is in respect of concerns raised in the deadline for submission from Essex County Council in respect of worst case, and it may apply to both local authorities and have concerns around

52:26

are the total staff numbers, peak construction vehicle numbers?

52:34

The use of the crew bus and the assessed proportions of cars shares, are they the worst case assumptions? Perhaps I can ask the authorities to set out their case. And we can ask the applicant to respond thanking

52:53

Michael Bedford for Suffolk. So if I can defer to Essex on this, and then ask Mr. Murray, if there's anything he wants to add afterwards. So it's probably going to be more efficient to split the thinking plus six can cancel is to have Thank you. Soften behalf of Essex County Council. Yes. So there's, there's, I guess, two points here. And one will relate to the construction traffic management plan, which we're going to come on to but they in my mind, the the documents are sort of intertwined.

53:23

In that one is the assessment, and one is that the mining plan to reflect the assessment, so apologies if I sort of stray into it on that basis. But to me, they kind of interrelate in that way. So worst case, assessment wise, we have been provided with,

53:38

basically with with numbers of vehicle movements for HGVs. And there's no

53:44

real way there's nothing that kind of goes back through information of quantities or isn't actually gets you to those numbers. So to a degree we are

53:54

you have to treat them with the faith that they're presented in that sense, which is why we look for the ctmp to kind of respond to those numbers that are assessed because we are being told that they are worst case by the applicant in that sense.

54:10

With regards to shift patterns and crew bus, I think in particular, so the applicant have put forward their assessment which apologies might not get this exactly right. But 70% of staff will travel by crew bus crew bus is assumed to be four people per bus and then the other 30% Travelling one per person, I've already kind of gone over the fact that they will be travelling across an earlier peak period. But there's nothing in the ctmp to date anyway they had there wasn't the most recent Deadline deadline by the applicant did submit some responses that 21.19 of rep five zero to five with regards to some potential changes in ctmp, which might address some of these issues, but

55:00

There's nothing in at the moment that commits them to those car share proportions. So it comes difficult to assume that that those proportions or work bus crew fortunes, as we might call them, are worst case on that basis. In fact, the actual ctmp today

55:16

as a car share target only, not it not a commitment of 1.3 people per vehicle, which isn't reflective of the assessment at all. And to a degree suggests to me that that isn't a worst case, albeit that, you know, that could be reflected in an updated ctmp.

55:33

With a society. So it didn't take us to how it was also total staff numbers, because the numbers, okay, yeah, no, again, and again, this is these figures to a degree are presented to us, we don't have a link between like a full link between them. And the work there is the the document that was submitted deadline for that is the

55:57

vehicle profile data rep. 4006. But again, that is just essentially

56:05

LGB and HGV movements linked to an activity, and it's very difficult for us to meaningfully say

56:12

that is those vehicle movements. So staff movements are specifically are correct for that activity. So, in our sense, again, the ctmp is the useful tool here and ensuring that that is the is the case, essentially, that those numbers that are assessed, and we are told a worst case are actually reflected in what occurs.

56:34

To have Thank you could ask further. Are you looking for additional evidence? Am I correct in saying that you're looking for additional evidence, for example, on the

56:43

the number of construction vehicles moving? Do you want to know by the moving how much material and moving AI? Are you lacking based information in terms of that? Well, I guess there's a

56:58

debate here, I mean, the more evidence that we provide and get more confidence that actually those numbers that have been assessed are reasonable. But what we've tended to look for because to degree, it's a very difficult, the applicant itself is a difficult set, that is the correct number of vehicles. And in any case, what we tend to how we tend to respond to it is to look for the way of managing it so that we don't exceed those peak numbers instead, rather than actually

57:24

a

57:26

report that sets out exactly how they've been calculated. But that, you know, said it wouldn't be unhelpful. But at this point in time, I'm not sure it will be carried.

57:35

And I'm straying into Agenda Item four, but I think it's important. Are you more concerned with the source of the information or the control of the movements? So I've mentioned the point that you're taking figures on faith and good faith, which indicates to me, you don't have the information need to indicate that you believe them? Shall we say that they've been taken in good faith? So is your desire or concern to have additional evidence to back up the numbers in the transport assessment? Or are you more concerned about the controls in the construction traffic management plan? So if the status numbers are x, you want to ensure that the controls are in place to ensure that they're X? Yes, that would be, to me a far simpler way of approaching it. Because in the end, you know, we're also we're talking about forecasting here anywhere in assessment. So there's likely to be a degree of

58:29

inaccuracy as a result of that. So putting a control in place seems like a far more sensible way. We're basically presented with an assessment and we are then just

58:39

asking the applicant to commit to that assessment.

58:43

Tool. That's very helpful. Thank you. If I could take comments from Suffolk County Council on the point please.

58:52

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, if I just start and then I'll ask Mr. Mary B, say, Yes, we are, if I can put it this way outcome focused. So if the controls were robust enough to reassure us that what they have said, will be the traffic effects can't be exceeded without some further check, then we incense will be less concerned to satisfy ourselves that we understood all of those ingredients that have made up the figures. At the moment, we don't feel that we've got either, we don't feel that we've got the ingredients that have then fed into the figures that are presented, and we don't think we've got the controls. I say we are concerned with regulating the impacts. And so if the easiest way to solve the problem is better controls, we'd be content with that. But obviously, if the applicant does feel that they can provide the background information to support their assessment, so that we can see that it's robust, then we may be able to take a different view. So that's our position in summary

1:00:00

And I'll just ask Mr. Murray if he wants to add anything. That's perfect. Thank you very helpful. Thank you. Mr. Murray. Steven Mary Suffolk County Council. I concur. concur with Mr. Bedford and Mr. Half is control. So the important thing Mr. Hale did mention about

1:00:18

the concerns we have about the assumptions made for shift patterns. But if that can be controlled, that gives us the confidence that the number of people travelling in the network peak is as forecast, it all comes down to sort of monitoring and controls and reporting.

1:00:36

That's tomorrow. Thank you very much, indeed. Perhaps I'll get back to the applicant. Miss Clinton. I appreciate him stepping on to Agenda Item four again, inadvertently. I think you've heard the points from the local highway authorities in terms of the so called ingredients versus the controls.

1:00:53

Can I ask you to reply to the points made by both Suffolk County Council and Essex County Council? Thank you.

1:01:00

That's exactly flattering for the applicant, I'm going to just pass over again to miss carpenter. And then possibly also, give me a second, someone's just looked at me slightly differently to sample.

1:01:25

ologies for that Rebecca clutton for the applicant, I'm told that Mr. Hale will just deal with the substance of the assessment points. And then I'm going to introduce Miss ally leader who is going to talk to you about controls

1:01:39

this track and thank you. Thanks, Mr. Hill. John, now for the applicant. So I think, well, my response on this was just going to be the second response that you heard issues specific hearing three, around the controls of numbers, then just a reminder is that the TA and es are sets of reasonable worst case, they don't assess an absolute extreme worst case accounting for improbable events. And I think this is the applicants position on the on securing the numbers is that the TA and EAS are based on a reasonable worst case, they include a lot of contingency.

1:02:18

I think we've made reference before to the seven month review, that increases construction vehicles assessed by over 40%. Compared to the actual August 2025 peak, the staff numbers are inflated by 50%, above 50%. Compared to the August 25, estimated number of staff, it is a reasonable worst case. But as it explained that issue specific hearing three,

1:02:47

you there has to be flexibility to allow for unexpected events that results in the contractor being able to respond. And I think I think one of my colleagues is going to come on to a bit more detail the measures in the ctmp. But there there is a process in ctmp to actively. So just before

1:03:12

just before I pass on to miss leader, I do just want to

1:03:17

remind examination of the content of of en one currently and one and the policies that are set out there and in relation certain to the control of HGV movements. That paragraph five point 13 point 11 It indicates that the the IPC may attach requirements to a consent where there is likely to be substantial HGV traffic, and in those circumstances, you may attach requirements to consent to control numbers of HGV movements, to and from the sites and also on routing. Now routing is a matter that we secure through the CTN even in terms of numbers, the expectation and policies that they only may be secured and where they aren't substantial numbers, I think it's it's a really important point of context to bear in mind with this project that the numbers of HTV movements in particular the generated are in relative terms very low. And also because of the nature of the project and long linear nature of the project. They are spread out across the network and of course temporarily spread out as well. And that's why in this in this instance, and indeed in all other national grid projects that have secured development consent to transmission infrastructure over a new scheme in those circumstances that controls haven't been imposed, but just wanted to make that point of context. Before I pass over to Miss leader. He's going to introduce yourself properly. Miss platen, thank you for that misleader.

1:04:45

Thank you, sir. Leader, Ellison leader for the African Associate Director Tarik, just coming in on the ctmp side.

1:04:55

I think just to just follow on from what Mr. Hutton says I'm that

1:05:00

same policy on HIV and substance, the need for that to be substantial traffic before you have controls is also repeated in en. One that is to be designated and early next year. So that happens is that system approach is being followed through latest policy. That's in paragraph five point 14 point 14 of the revised policy. And I think it is quite clear that in terms of HGV traffic, there isn't the necessity to be secure those numbers both assess the worst case. And because we use that worst case doesn't get to that restaurant of substantial. And I think what we where we are into new discussions with local authority and where where we do see that things could be strengthened is around the ctmp the travel plan elements. And so we have already cemented sort of in Section six of the construction traffic management plan. They've set out standard practice of using approve and and we have described with that that is the way we intend to work. And we have committed in Section 6.3 to a staff travel survey carried out prior to construction and to the monitoring of the as we go through the process and to speaking to the contractor to keep those those levels as low as we can do and that's looking at the traffic that isn't HTV traffic but the LTV something that can help the staff get assigned. And we have also committed to staff assigning units each work location and the target personnel for the vehicle.

1:06:41

We have committed that where the sharing is encouraged to have a guaranteed lift phone which sometimes we know can be a barrier to car sharing.



1:06:51

We have committed to DHCP routing and keep those deliveries outside peak times through through management. I think where when this stuff was going and where we have been having internal discussions is there is a figure of personnel per vehicle in the construction traffic management plan of 1.3. And this point around Can we can we commit to something a target that is higher than that and we are taking that away and we are we are

1:07:22

simply because the we are already committed to the use of proof and we are already committed to those higher number of people and we think we can provide a higher tomorrow.

1:07:36

So I think that is one area that

1:07:41

lead to value. Thanks indeed. If the no further submissions partake we'll take a five minute recess.