

TRANSCRIPT_BRAMFORD_ISH6_SESSION 2_14122023

00:06

Welcome back, everyone will resume the hearing. Thank you. Okay, so continuing on Agenda Item three, just a few more topic points to be raised. I'm going to pose a question to the local highway authorities the in your deadline for deadline five submissions. You've raised requests for additional restrictions to be placed on HGV traffic on Sundays, and bank holidays. And you've also raised the issue of HGV movements through high sensitivity areas. I just want to could the local highway authorities just explained their position in respect of both requests. Thank you.

00:56

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, if I start at allow bringing Mr. Murray in a moment. So obviously this slightly dresses on matters that we were discussing yesterday in some detail, and I think our position in overall terms is that the controls and restrictions that we're seeking for Sundays and bank holidays is not because it's perceived that there is a highways capacity constraint during those days, because generally speaking, background traffic will be lower. Other than on bank holidays, there may be particular locations, particularly within the AONB, where there may be as it were honeypot, as it were destinations, but the concern is the environmental effect of traffic during those periods, and particularly the environmental effects of HGV traffic during those periods. And we've identified in discussions with the applicant, that it would be helpful, and we welcome their suggestion that they will try to identify some noise sensitive locations where they may be prepared to consider further controls. But we're concerned also, as again, we discussed yesterday about users of the rights of way network and users of the countryside more generally, including, as you will have seen from your many site inspections, the nature and character of the rural lanes along the Route corridor, and therefore the type of leisure and recreational activities cycling, horse riding, walking and so on that takes place on vehicular carriageways. And it's because those activities more tend to take place at weekends and bank holidays. And also they are periods where people reasonably are entitled to expect respite from normal construction activity, that we see that there is a need for control. So that's the background position. And if I'm just bringing Mr. Mary if he wants to have any further comment,

03:08

I think indeed thanking Mr. Mary.

03:13

Good morning state Mary's Suffolk County Council just maybe worth reflecting on on the fact that with the size we'll see and ScottishPower examinations, they both restricted HGV movements in certain areas overnight and on Sundays. I'd also add that the there are already a number of exceptions built into the ctmp. I'm afraid I can't remember the reference. But within that there are exclusions for vehicles doing specific operations outside of those areas anyway, so we've considered in our view proportionate

gives the local communities a break from HGVs. And finally, in terms of sensitivity, the key concern there would be while accepting this is a linear project that is spread out over time, there are certain areas where traffic does get sort of funnelled through in certain circumstances. For example, the A 1071 and Hintlesham. A lot of traffic will be sort of going through there from a multiple of accesses. And the same would be true of Assheton and Viewers as well.

04:16

As tomorrow. Thank you indeed, to Essex County Council.

04:21

Just off on behalf of Essex County Council, the only thing I would add is you probably have seen in our deadline five submission and rep. 5031 I think it was we submitted or identified a number of locations that are particularly rural and narrow nature. And I know that you've been you've driven around these places and there are some very, very, very rural narrow roads within the environmental statement. Their assessment of traffic the applicant, as far as I understand it doesn't have any HGV movements on a number of these routes for obvious reasons due to their character probably, but some sort of bro Since that ensures that to be the case is what we're looking for, particularly for those groups. And there's also obviously, a slight a connected issue around how many staff movements and going to them, you know, these routes, some of them, you cannot have two way traffic, essentially, it's almost impossible to pass. And so you can imagine a situation with a large number of LGBs, or staff workers arriving in the morning at a certain time. And if there was one local resident heading the other way, there would be a certain level of conflict and potentially between those movements. So potentially we've released managing that or looking to manage that would also be beneficial

05:41

to have Thank you indeed, perhaps to the applicant, if they wish to respond, is clapping.

05:49

Better clutter for the applicant? Thank you, sir. I'm just going to provide a very brief outline, obviously, in terms of the Sunday and bank holiday working, we've obviously dealt with that already, in terms of our construction cheddar schedule. And maintaining flexibility in it through the core hours, the set out in requirement seven, and I don't intend to go over that discussion any further. Again, I want to emphasise the very small number of HGV movements that this scheme generates it is it is modest. And that is the point that was just being made just then about reference to large numbers of LG V's large numbers of staff members, those that the numbers of, of movements from those persons, or from those vehicle classes just are not large, that is a really important point to get across. In terms of the construction routes, they are already secured through the ctmp. So that matter is addressed. And then just picking up on Mr. Mary's Point about sighs Well, and the Scottish power projects, Scottish power, we pay to have accepted that restriction. That doesn't necessarily mean that they were required to they may well not have had the urgency of delivery that we have for this project, which is driving our construction schedule, as we discussed yesterday. And sighs Well, sir, you will be well aware is a project of a wholly different scale and tight in a single location, totally incomparable to the kind of project that we're promoting hearing this DCO. And also one that wouldn't fall within the ambit of policy policy set out in NTSC and one in terms of substantial numbers of HGV movements. So I say no more about that. I'm

just going to send to my team to see if there's anything else that they want to add on those points. Okay, that's that's everything. Thank you, sir.

07:44

Thank you. That's most helpful. Thank you. Then on the theme of transport assessment, I've just picked up a topic issue in respect of I believe it's a commitment, or a request from Essex County Council for link by link traffic flow information processing is kind of counsel could explain the need for the information and whether you've made the request to the applicant for it to be provided to you. Thank you.

08:14

Just off on behalf of Essex County Council, I believe this was in reference to a query we might have had our last deadline where there were a couple of links that we couldn't see referred to in the ES is that part of the internet paragraph

08:29

15 point 4.6 of your submission rep. For 15 049. The council welcomes continued discussions wherever it is as opinion that there is a sufficient risks etc. Yes, council has not yet been provided with a link by link traffic flows. But welcome the commitment from the applicant.

08:55

Yes, I believe that might be the traffic flow. And that may well be a tight bow. From myself probably what we were looking for. I think this is in regards to this. The link by link sensitivities that have been used as part of the assessment of the IES for that and basically a map or plan of that. That's something that's come up a couple of times that was submitted at deadline five by the applicant and we have been reviewing.

09:21

Okay, I'll draw a line on that one. Thank you. Again, a further point raised by Essex County Council was in respect of the variation of no change in working hours during summer and winter it was marked as red on your prioritised list. Can you explain further please? Thank you.

09:39

Yes, yes, essentially. So whilst the applicant is out once before them, but they've indicated that chip pans to us won't change throughout the year. They people on on site will be working. It seems basically 12 hours year long. That obviously is You know? Unusual, obviously based on what they're saying about their projects, but a concern to us that actually, that if those shift patterns weren't realised, because you know, it's more difficult to work in, in winter conditions potentially than it is summer, then that would affect the hours in which vehicle movements will be on the highway network and their impact on the highway network as a result, might teeter more into the peak hours than has been assessed to date.

10:29

Thank you useful answer. Thank you. Can I ask Suffolk County Council if they have an opinion on no change in working hours during summer and winter? Mr. Bedford, thank you.

10:40

Thank you. So I'll ask Mr. Merrit. To comment on that just briefly before he does. So just going back to the point about link sensitivities. So we know that the applicant has provided information at deadline five, we welcome that. In our deadline six submissions, we will identify some additional locations where we think sensitivity may have been underestimated, but there's quite a detail, matter that particular roads, streets, etc. We'll put that in our written submission that says returning to return to your question if Mr. Mary wants to comment on the seasonality issue.

11:18

Thank you, Mr. Murray.

11:22

There's very little I can add. The only concerns we had were obviously with their darkness in the winter would be whether they'd be sure to shift patterns in those times. But the Africans is considered consistent to ensure just that their ship patterns consistent through the day on the Esri. So I have nothing further to add. Right.

11:43

Thank you to the applicant, Miss clutton Whether you want to reply to the comments from Essex and Suffolk County, Suffolk County Council. Thank you.

11:51

Thank you. Yes, Rebecca, the applicant, sir, Mr. Miss carpenter is going to address you on this. Miss Carpenter,

11:58

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, it's just to confirm shift patterns are the same year round, the nature of activities undertaken will vary between summer in winter, particularly reflecting the fact in the summertime, the nature of activities are linked to a project outage on the network, which is restricted to the time of year, because obviously, energy demand is higher in the winter, in the summer. So the nature of activities on the project determines the work undertaken at an individual time in the year, but shift patterns are the same. And it's just that the the actual arrangements for the locations worked on and the tasks worked on will differ around the year, but the patterns do not change. So hopefully that gives some reassurance around the impact of worker commuting activity on the traffic network.

12:50

Carpenter, thank you. That's most helpful. Thank you. My final question on this agenda item. It's again, a point raised by the Essex County Council and concerns a request for additional route analysis of accidents required for widely used routes. I wonder from Essex could have an explanation behind that. Query, please. As to how

13:15

often on behalf of Essex County Council, yes, I think it might be better. If Sofia cancelled this one. It was our kind of was in support, I guess their request on this matter.

13:34

Thank you so well, therefore, I'll go to ask Mr. Married comment on his concerns. I think he did mention this slightly earlier in a different context. But But Mr. Murray can give you a bit more flesh.

13:47

Good morning, Steve. Mary Suffolk County Council? Yes, this is the item that I've got earlier on is we have raised concerns about the commission rates long some of the sort of arterial roads, so the a 134, B 10 1508. And the 1071. And my understanding was the applicant had agreed to actually look into this. The example I raised was the bear street junction on the A 134. We've got staggered junction separated by more than 50 metres. And there are the individual assessment sets that was less than five over five years. So it doesn't trigger anything. But we're concerned that some of the, the routes do have higher than average collisions.

14:32

Tonight, thank you. Have you set out I've given the applicant a list of locations of concern to the county council in respect of casualty history.

14:43

Not specifically and I will do in deadline six but it is in effect the 1508 the a 1234 and 1071.

14:52

Thank you for the commitment Thank you, perhaps to the applicant if they wish to reply

14:59

to the applicant so yes In short, we are looking into this matter as has been indicated, and there's a little bit more nuance around it. Miss Carpenter, address your

15:10

clapping Thank you, Miss carpenter

15:12

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, as we have undertaken to do a high level analysis of collision data on the particular x identified with local housing authorities have helpfully indicated some locations where they have known collision issues, there aren't full reach collision reports available. Looking at the details of those that would be looking sort of from first principles that the collision data at those locations. So you recognise there are locations and best street as an example where St. Mary mentioned that we have discussed and I've had a look at the data there and there is indeed an injury cluster at that location. The key from the applicants perspective is to what extent the traffic generated by the scheme might affect that pollution cluster. And at that location, vehicles would be travelling straight through the junction not turning at it, they do look like they're turning conflict collisions. And

therefore a very small increase in construction traffic associated with project is very unlikely to material effect. That behaviour, which is causing those injuries. So we recognise the concern recognise the the collision history. But the it's the need to separate the the network issue, which is obviously the local highway authority is concerned with the the impact that the project may have on individual locations. And I definitely agree with it the local highway authorities approach which is the route wide review, not just individual clusters, but that we need to separate existing baseline issues with the extent to which project may change those issues.

16:52

It's hard to say thank you. I've got no further questions on this agenda. I'm going to ask the examination lead to ask question. Thank you.

17:04

Thank you, McEvoy Mr. McAvoy taking you through a range of topics there in relation to the traffic assessment. And it was evident in at least two or three of those that the the impacts relating to the traffic X assessments extend into the environmental impact assessment. I appreciate the main parties probably don't have the relevant people with them today. And any, in any event, it's probably better to wait. I think it'd be helpful if when you submit your post hearing summaries. If you could include any observations in relation to those topics, to the environmental impact assessment as well as the traffic assessment. I particularly would like to hear from Suffolk County Council, Essex County Council and the applicant on those. But I will wait till your post hearing submissions. And it will be I think, helpful. Again, if that response could be framed in the context of the updated IEMA guidelines if that's possible. Is that acceptable to Essex and to Suffolk?

18:11

Off on behalf of Essex County Council, yes, that's fine. Thank you.

18:14

Yes. So that is also on the part of the county council. So I think certainly we're happy to look at the July 2023 IEMA guidance. I think the applicant had carried out a position that it didn't think that the that guidance ought to be being used at this stage. But I think that was covered in earlier representations. But we will obviously look at that in our submissions.

18:43

Thank you skeleton.

18:46

That's Rebecca Clemens, the applicant, sir, thank you, we're obviously happy to address those matters. It might just be helpful just so that we provide you with the information that you would find most useful to have a steer on any particular aspects that came to mind, as you've been listening to that discussion on which you would like us to comment. So whether there are any particular environmental topics that you would like us to address.

19:12

Clearly the ones that relate to to community impacts rather than traffic impacts, per se. So the very first one we discussed, for instance, in terms of the worst case hour rather than the peak hour that results in community impacts rather than traffic capacity impact. And whilst it wasn't the topic of today, I think is nevertheless relevant. And I wouldn't like to overlook those sorts of things. So any of those topics we've just been through if you could just perhaps consider whether they do extend into the realms of the environmental impact assessment as well as the traffic assessment that

19:45

will be useful.

19:48

Thank you, sir. That's very helpful.

19:49

Thank you and Chris McIlroy.

19:55

Smile Thank you indeed, my attacks are will now move to Agenda Item four. which is the construction traffic and construction route strategy. So at the last issue specific hearing on transport and rights way, the local highway authorities were asked to identify the basic parameters that are critical to the construction traffic management plan. So again, my question to the local highway authorities, which is twofold. Firstly, can each authority confirm that you have submitted a response to action point five of issue specific hearing three? And if so, can you signpost, your response. And secondly, perhaps just give a high level overview of ongoing discussions with the applicant at the thematic hiring meetings in relation to construction traffic and construction traffic management plan? Thank you to local highway authorities. Thank you.

20:56

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So again, it was repped by 034, which was our response to the earlier action points. And on page six of that, which was to identify the bass parameters that are critical for the ctmp. And again, the topic headings, slightly different from the ones I gave you earlier this morning, AI ELLs, HGVs. Then recovery of expenses, due to extraordinary traffic, you know, that's a point of disagreement between us and the applicant, about whether relying simply on section 59 of the Highways Act is sufficient or whether there should be a side agreement or some other arrangements. Then emissions was a topic workers, works accesses, and then importantly, monitoring and reporting. So those were the topics that we'd identified as the important parameters for the ctmp. Thank you, sir.

22:07

Mr. Madden, thanks to Essex County Council.

22:09

Just half on behalf

22:11

of Essex County Council. Our response to those comments was submitted at deadline for five rep 5031. Part section six of our comments on deadlines resubmission construction traffic management plan. I don't think you'd be surprised that those are our issues were the same as Suffolk just.

22:34

And plus just a comment from both authorities in terms of ongoing discussions with the applicant to address that high level explanation of how well they're progressing, please. Spread.

22:50

While I would be quite happy with Mr. Because I think they've all been at the same meetings. All I was going to do is to invite Mr. Murray to give you an update, but I'm sure Mr. Hoff can do so. And then if Mr. Murray needs to add anything, I'm sure he'll come in.

23:04

Mr. Half, please.

23:06

Yes. So we have made some progress. As I mentioned earlier, particularly in this most recent submission by the applicant at deadline five, in our issue 21.19, there was a what felt like a greater commitment to considering particularly around the work worker management and monitoring and reporting on that, in particular, which will hopefully address some of the issues we have we've obviously got this impasse around controls on construction vehicle movement as as a whole, which, you know, we don't need to go over again, at this point. But I would say there has been positive conversations on that the applicant also and I, again, I don't speak for them, but they did suggest they might be amenable to considering what can be done on these more rural routes that I mentioned earlier, and how that might fit in with the ctmp. But as said they were going to go in Think about that. So but that at least, maybe being progressed as well. So yeah, there has been been some progress. I guess that's a quick summary of

24:10

the staff. Thank you. It's very helpful, perhaps to be able to get this plugged in if you wish to reply to comments from Suffolk and Essex County Council's Thank you.

24:19

Yes, Rebecca Clinton for the applicant. And so in response to the comments that were received at deadline five, as I think misleader indicated earlier, a further update to the ctmp is proposed at deadline six to seek to respond to some of those comments. Obviously, she's already given an indication to you earlier about some of the matters that might be subject to that. Just on the point they're made by Mr. Hart about the rural routes, I think it would be we are very happy to look at those in those further meetings going forward. It'd be helpful to have a clear indication of the routes of concern And then we can and then we can look at them. But there are evidently going to be some areas where we aren't able to reach agreement. The things like said the the control on overall traffic, HGV movements, that's an area where we're not prepared to make any further concessions. But clearly there are areas where we

can continue to narrow the gap between us. And hopefully those. So we'll provide our further updates and see 10 ctmp at redline six and those discussions will continue.

25:37

Catherine, thank you. Oh, no, two. Thank you very helpful. I will ask this question, but I suspect there has been some, not retrace steps, but just in terms of data and information as to all parties, just to confirm what data and information related to construction traffic and ctmp the construction traffic budget plan has been exchanged between the parties since the last issue specific hearing. And if I can ask supercast to respond first. Thank you.

26:13

Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council that think the information that we were provided with on the seventh of December was leaving aside something to do with Rose cottage, which I think is separate, but was the there was a spreadsheet of the traffic movements. And then on the under speed survey with traffic volume data. And then on the eighth of December, were the AI I reports from winds, which again, have already been referred to that sort of feeds into the ctmp. But that that's the information. We're still awaiting some of the further information that Mr. Murray was describing earlier. Thank you, sir.

27:02

Okay, I can ask the question of Essex County Council please. Mr. Half,

27:08

as often on behalf of Essex County Council, nothing in addition to what was previously mentioned earlier, it's not part of this agenda item. But the winds reports that we have been submitted at them aren't submitted as the public realm as far as I understand. So I'm not sure whether it's appropriate first, or not to comment on what's in them at this meeting. And I guess it might be for the applicant, but I just want to flag so I've commented on anything that might be in them on that basis.

27:40

Thank you. Indeed, perhaps I can ask the applicant to respond to those points. Thank you, Miss Clark and

27:44

Rebecca clutton for the applicants just to indicate that we are intending to put the women reports into the examination deadlines set so we have no issue with the content of those being being mentioned during these hearings. Otherwise, I don't think we have anything to add on data

28:01

was clapping. Thank you. Very helpful, indeed. Okay. Let's move on to examine some some topics, particularly the feedback from the local highway authorities submitted a deadline for and deadline five, versus a comment that was picked up in from Essex County Council's submission rep five dash 031. Were a request for a further iteration of the ctmp, the construction traffic management plan, when more

information is available from the contractor for discharge by the highway authorities. I just wonder could Essex County Council provide further explanation of that comment, please?

28:40

Just off of our for Essex County Council. Yeah. So we want to shoot we understand today is that? Obviously they do. They don't have a main contractor on board, which means that the what we've heard has been assessed is a robust assessment of the of the worst case impacts. But if we were to potentially get to a later date, where the main contractor was on board, they'd be have a more detailed scope of what their HGV movements were likely movements were, as a result of that be able to estimate and updated ctmp with a realistic assessment of impacts that could be monitored against and reviewed against potentially maybe a requirement to assess to see if there was any additional impact as a result of additional vehicle movements on a certain length that may have not been picked up to date, which could be picked up through and address through the ctmp.

29:33

That's helpful. Thank you Pastor Suffolk County Council. Do you have any comment to make on that particular matter? Thank you.

29:42

Thank you, sir. microbead for Suffolk County Council. It is a generic comment. I'm afraid so which you've heard from us on a number of matters in terms of a range of control documents what the applicant is putting before you our documents, which includes the cGMP which we regard is insufficiently detailed. The applicant, again across the range of control documents, including the ctmp includes a final section, which allows the applicant to initiate a change process in relation to the content of the control document. But it's at the applicants as it were behest. And then the local authorities will get an opportunity to review such a change. But the local authorities are not being given an opportunity for a review of the cGMP as a whole, once the contractor has been appointed, because the applicant is I say chosen the approach of these are final documents that will be certified documents. And then there is a an opportunity for the applicant only to initiate review of their content. So far as the authorities are concerned with me so far, oesophagus concerned, we consider given the limits of the current satisfaction with the level of information in them that this is more appropriate for an outline document, which would then be followed by a detailed document through a discharge arrangement. And that applies to ctmp, as much as it does for many other other control documents. So that's the generic point, thinking,

31:24

thank you, perhaps to the applicant, I'm going to put those comments to to fulfil your views, but also to the applicant just to confirm the discharge of the ctmp who is responsible for discharging the construction traffic management plan, in addition to your views on the comments from Essex and Suffolk County Council, thank you. Miss Slaton.

31:49

Rebecca clapping for the applicant just dealing with your last point first. So there is no discharge of the ctmp. It will be it is in we consider its final form it will be certified by the Secretary of State upon the

making of this decision on this DCO. So subject to the change process sets out within it what's been referred to by Mr. Bedford. That is the position in terms of discharge in relation to the other points, I'm just going to ask first, Mr. Hale to address you on the matters raised by Mr. Huff in relation to assessments and reassessment. And then miss lead is going to come back in on matters relating to the ctmp.

32:33

This type of money Thanks, Mr. Hill,

32:37

John Hale for the applicant. So just the it was just wanted to raise the point about what we mean by assessment. My take on what Mr. Hoff said, then suggested that the ctmp is somehow assessing the impact of that scheme. But we don't see that to be the case. That's not the function or the purpose of the ctmp. The CTM ctmp is to set out with management processes for managing traffic impact on the network, and is not to undertake an assessment of the impact of the scheme. The just to clarify as well, that there is no there is no intention on our side to revisit the transport assessment, all the environmental statement after the detail examination, we consider those to be robust assessments. And we don't see any requirement to revisit them after this process is completed.

33:31

Mr. Howe, thank you, indeed, Mr. Leader.

33:37

He has an anti construction traffic management is that we, our position is that it was sufficiently detail at present where we'll see exactly what was in the cGMP. And throughout the examination process. And if there is, the further detail or changes of wording they are they can be suggested by the highways authority at this point. And I think on some of these points is it's not so much that we think that the detail, it's that there is a difference in positions between the parties at what details should be secured, which isn't quite the same thing. And I think in terms of the main works, contracts are not being offered. I mean, we've emphasised that National Grid is a very experienced developer, that this application has been informed by input from a contractor who is experienced in delivering that grid project. So whilst constructor is not the following the ctmp with the team before you is one that is is that the MCQ is everything

34:45

I'm happy to start apologising, right good difficulty hearing this leader. I'm not sure if it's the microphone but I'm having to hear

34:51

it is a little difficult, but from this leader is also quite softly spoken so I'm going to ask you to to possibly Maybe just swap quickly with Miss carpenter just for a second. So that you could you can pick that up. Once this was this change of seating and just make the point that I was going to make, which is the approach that we've taken on the ctmp in this project is the same as the approach that we've taken on all other national grid DCO consented projects to date. And as far as I'm aware, there's no indication

that there has been any difficulties arising as a result of that approach in those other projects, many of which are now either under construction or completed. So now I'll hand back to Miss Linda, who can speak into the microphone. I think I literally the applicant. I mean, I think the main point, the we see this ctmp as being final as it is, it's been developed by an experienced developer National Grid, and obviously being the authority in the development of transmission projects. And we have had an instructor on board who has fed in to the ctmp, and indeed, into the application documents before you. So we are confident that the ctmp As for the rest of the application documents are robust, and we don't therefore see the need to revisit them. These documents are being examined in detail through this examination process, we are discussing the wording and we were very happy to continue to do so with the local authorities and other interested parties. And but we we believe that in some cases, it isn't a case of there being detail that is missing, it is more a case that there is detail that the local authorities would like to see and the applicant does not think is necessary or proportional to being included in the ctmp. And that is a different a different point. I think.

36:55

As leader thank you that that's very helpful. I'm stressed my colleague Mr. Rowland, perhaps to raise a question if he will please. Mr. Rowland, please.

37:07

Thank you. Thank you. Mr. McRoy. Can I just go back on that date to statements regarding the transport assessment, that it would not be updated? I just want to understand in the context of his requirements to under the DCO, which has time limits of up to five years. So if the proposed development did not start until year five, what effects would that have on the transports assessment? Thank you.

37:46

Rebecca Clinton for the applicant, I think so that's an issue that will not arise in practice on this particular case, because we cannot read, as you're aware from the other. Rebecca Flucht about, remember I said that punches. I veer away from the discussions that we had yesterday in relation to the construction programme, we have to get on with delivering this project in order to meet the net zero obligations and other targets that have been placed on us by government. So I think in practical terms that simply will not simply will not rise. I mean, what I would say, of course, is that it is normal for DCS to be granted for a period of five years. And the transport assessment is done in the same way as it is on all other VCO. So I think it's an accepted part of the process. Now that the TA is a reflection of the position at a point in time, obviously assesses future baselines, it looks at what's happening going forward, and that it should, nonetheless, capture any likely any any effects on network effects for the transport assessment that are like reasonably likely to arise. But I'd say in practical terms on this project, it just won't, it will not happen that we waited five years.

39:03

I just follow up on that particular thread, that there isn't anything to safeguard that the proposed development would not go commands here five unexpected events can happen that can be beyond our control. So are there or is there any controlling measures in the application with Safe Guard needs to update the transport assessment, if unexpected events which could be something worldwide, such as

we had with COVID? Is there anything in place that would then necessitate the need for the transport assessment to be updated to reflect? Because currently, what I'm understanding is that there there isn't anything. Okay?

39:59

Rebecca clutton For the applicant, sir, in that respect, we are no different as I say to any other DCO that goes through this process five years is a standard period. Indeed there are terms tideway had a period of 10 years. And certainly, the Luton Airport application that's going through has a period of 10 years, it's certainly a compulsory acquisition. These are long projects, that the approach that we've taken in relation to the transport assessment is a standard one, there is no expectation upon applicants to assess any the fact that the development night might not commence until year five, that is just part of the process. So I don't think we need to do I don't think we need to do anything transport assessment assesses a scenario in accordance with the standard guidance and standard practice.

40:52

Thank you, clutton. I think it would be useful, just very briefly, just to have a position statement. I certainly work on Essex County Council on this point is to look at it. So if we could ask her Suffolk first and then so as long as I agree.

41:14

Thank you, sir. I think given that it wasn't a point that we'd raised. I'm going to take it slightly cautiously and simply say that I think what we would want to do is just review what the applicant has said in the transport assessment about the range of permutations moving away from the assessment year, to satisfy ourselves that that is robust to cater for, as it were a delayed start time and therefore construction period. And obviously, the Rochdale envelope approach should include, as it were all of the parameters, which will include the timing parameter that the applicant has asked for in the DCO. But I think rather than give you a complete answer now, if you don't mind, prefer that we actually look at the applicants material now with your question in mind. So that then we provide you with a proper considered response that deadline six?

42:19

Sure that's acceptable. Thank you. Mr. Pettit, can I just check it a six got any comments to make as well, just

42:27

off on behalf of Essex County Council and the economic prep, we arrived, I believe they assess the year of 2025 in their transport system. So obviously, five years from from permission, whenever that would be would potentially put you into 2029. So you could argue that there may be some potential that the impacts during that period for the transport assessment side, that baseline of traffic might be slightly slightly higher than is being currently assessed in the transport assessment. But I, the other candidates have pointed out is that they, as we previously mentioned, the assessment will reduce his traffic based on certain elements within the management plan. And that and within the shift patterns, which mean that I, at that point, I still don't think you'd probably see an impact based on that assessment method. Early position,

43:24

if you could maybe just confirm your position in the seminary. From this particular hearing, that would be appreciated. Thank you. Okay. And then finally, if I just go back to the applicant, Miss clutter, if you've got anything further to add, before I hand over back to Mr. McElroy.

43:49

Rebecca Clanton to the applicant? Thank you, sir, for that. It's I mean, like, like the other parties and for your reassurance. We're happy to just cover this point off. In our post hearing submissions, we'll make sure that you've got to a clear statement of the position that I've already set out. But just in terms of the substance, Mr. Hale is just going to give you a very high level reassurance that it's fair to say.

44:21

Mr. Hale, for the applicant. So yeah, it was just a really make the point that the TA assesses as we've said, reasonable worst case. The volumes of traffic generated in peak period of construction are minor. In fact, on all but three roads in the study area, we are facing at peak times with significant contingencies in the numbers less than or unfit calls per day for a very brief duration. So this is a temporary impacted because for a short period of time, the numbers are very, very easy that I can't see any grounds for which you would undertake an assessment of sort of multiple programme length starting at different points. That to me would just seem completely disproportionate to standard practice disproportionate to guidance would see no grounds at all for doing it. And I think with the volumes of construction traffic that got on the network, you could start the programme in any number of the five years that we'd have an allowance to start works and the conclusions would be the same. That we don't cause any significant effects on on the road network. But I've not encountered another project in over 20 years where there's been a consideration of a requirement to assess multiple programmes starting at multiple points that yeah, as I said, that just seems to be completely disproportionate.

46:00

Thank you. Again, just to be clear, we're not looking for the scenario that you described, but I'm trying to understand this that that he transports is assessment will not be updated. This is the final transports assessments and what potential effects that could have if the time limit is in bulk. So yeah, I look forward to the post hearing submissions, and how now handover to back to Mr. McCauley. Okay.

46:37

runs. Thank you, indeed. Thank you. Just continuing with the topics on agenda item four. Just I'd like to understand the status of the review of highway structures B, the retaining walls or bridges, to accommodate normal, indivisible loads. I'm just curious to know how much work has been done respective understanding the capacity of those structures to withstand or carry such loads. So my question will be to the local highway authorities first, and then to the applicant. Thank you.

47:15

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council are bringing Mr. Mary on this to explain what our opposition is thinking. Mr. Bentley, thank

47:23

you, Mr. Murray.

47:25

State Marisa sub account came so other than the winds reports we mentioned earlier on which do not assess structures. The only other action is we're having an internal review, which we do regularly anyway to look at the roads in the air of this project to identify any structures we have concerns about.

47:46

No, thank you. Will that information be shared with the applicant?

47:50

Yes, it will make it

47:55

thank you. To Essex County Council. Mr. Half.

48:01

Thank you for hopping off Essex County Council. Matthew Bradley might want to come in and add on anything additional here. Or say that they submitted the that wins document. It's I guess at this point worth mentioning that there's a bridge that's specifically mentioned in that document that runs through Halstead getting its name something that that is referred to as specifically needing a review the app, it'll be in a better place to describe where where they are on that process around the review of that bridge. But that at this point, has been indicated it subject to the review, it can't cope with the weight limit, albeit it's going under this check, see whether it actually can. So that's about as much as I can add on that. Matthew wants everything. Just to have

48:47

Thank you, Mr. Bradley.

48:50

The morning Matthew Bradley is just going to cancel. I've got nothing much further to add to that situation. I've tried to contact our structures team this morning, but have been able to sort of provide us up to date this opposition statements I think you'll probably be better come from the applicant who have been lazing with them. They've been doing that through kind of Ringway Jacobs who are term consultants for such matters. So they'll prompt and provide a better update

49:15

to Bradley, thank you, just to the applicant, it would help to exe if we had presuppose a high level statement on the work being done to satisfy the local highway authorities and the applicant that structures that will be used by the abnormal loads are indeed fit to take those abnormal indivisible loads. Thank you.

49:37

Yes, Rebecca clapping for the applicant. Thanks. I've now got some more musical chairs. And we've got Mr. Jones here who you met yesterday Senior Project Manager for National Grid, and he can provide that update for you.

49:54

Thank you, Mr. Jones. Rob

49:56

Jones for the applicant the structures have all been inspected. And the winds report actually includes statements to say that they have had the discussions with the councils and they've been signed off. The one from Essex, the town, Bridget Halsted that was subject to a inspection, which was funded by National Grid and has been signed off by Essex. And that is supplementary to the aibl report for the Transformers going to the twisted green side. The only structure that these that we are aware of in Suffolk is on the 1214 coming word, which is a rule to culvert. And I've spoken to other colleagues of mine who have other aihl projects in advance of ours. And their intention is to make sure that that is actually inspected before they deliver their works. In the next year, 18 months.

51:08

Mr. Trump, thank you that that that is indeed helpful. Thank you. My next question revolves around the control of emissions. And it's in response to a submission from I believe Suffolk County Council at Pacific Suffolk County Castle ridge to explain their acts to explain the requirements that emissions are controlled, taking them. HGV vehicles. Thank you.

51:32

Thank you, sir. Bringing mr. Murray to explain the particular concern in relation to emissions.

51:38

So thank you, Mr. Murray.

51:42

Good morning, Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council. It was the we understand and reading threads that that is the data is collected in the same line understand the construction, the cicp construction, so is collected in what it doesn't appear to do is have a mechanism for that to be reported. So at the moment, they're concerned about the visibility of that control.

52:14

Scenario. Thank you, indeed. Essex cutter Castle, have a comment on the control of admissions staff. Thank you. Nothing

52:21

beyond the just the need for reporting of it as the

52:29

staff thank you to the applicant in respect of the responses from Essex and Suffolk County Council.
Thank you.

52:49

Becca Clinton for the applicant, sorry, sir. That little technical glitch, then, yes, Miss carpenter can deal with this matter is a point that is already addressed buyers.

53:00

just happen. Thank you, Miss carpenter. Thank you.

53:03

Miss Carpenter on behalf of the applicant. Yes, the the proposal from the local area authorities was that HGVs should be Euro four compliant. The ctmp secures the that all vehicles will meet appropriate levels. And in fact, the level set out in cpnp is higher than that set, it's a more recent more stringent requirement, and therefore we consider that request to be met.

53:32

Is I'm just not clear. So in terms of the reporting, what was the reporting of the monitoring of emission standards to the applicant

53:44

KeepCup into on behalf of the applicant the among the CMP and ctmp commitments is the recording of vehicles used on the project and their compliance with all commitments made in those plans. So the main works contractor will be required to ensure that each vehicle is compliant with those standards. And that's that's normal practice.

54:10

I'm so sorry. I'm not clear on the reporting. will the information be reported to the local highway authorities? Forgive me for pushing?

54:21

What is Kate Carpenter on behalf of the applicant? Yes, we had that confirmed in a previous written submission. Apologies I can't remember the number. But we had confirmed Yes, we will be the applicant is happy to share that information with the local highway authorities.

54:34

Thank you biscuit and many thanks. Thank you. That's that's myself. Thank you. Again, staying on theme of agenda for agenda item for it's in relation to the condition of the highway during the course of the project. And it's in respect of number one, we are watching. And number two, the timely repair of deterioration of The road surface attributed to project vehicles. My question will be to both local highway authorities. I'd like to understand the highway inspection regimes that you currently have in place. Whether the information gathered from those inspections will be shared with the applicant or the main contractor. And also in respect of repair of the highway. What systems will be used to differentiate

damage caused by non project traffic damage that's linked to the project? I wonder if I can put it to both County Council's Thank you

55:48

are bringing mr. Murray on that and ask him to deal with them in those two stages? So first of all, just describing the existing highway inspection regime? Secondly, what mechanisms are envisaged to identify what is project damage as opposed to everybody else's damage? Mr.

56:09

Mr. Murray.

56:12

Good morning, Steve Mercer County Council. In terms of the regular home inspections, they are visually driven inspections on the whole with different frequencies, depending on the character and use of the road. It is all based on our how I was mentioning that the highways maintenance operational plan, and I'd be happy to share a links to a copy of that to you, which sets out intervention levels inspection frequency, in terms of recording is recorded on one of our large databases. It is not the sort of information that is easily shared. basically consists of comprises of when inspections are done and what is found from those inspections. The other set of data that we do record is we do machine surveys on some of the larger roads. So you're looking at things like screening testing for skid resistance, tracks stroke scanner for sort of rutting visual condition, and the like That's again done on the main roads, that is for asset management purposes rather than for safety purposes. So again, I can steer you towards our asset management plans, it gives you that information. And again, machine data is easier to share, but there will be quite large databases. Moving on to the second question, and this refers back to the concerns we've raised about section 59 and extraordinary traffic is we are concerned that the level of traffic particularly on the minor roads, but also potentially on some of the the major roads will have a detrimental impact on the highway fabric. And for the whole these revolve roads often quite narrow. So we consider it not unreasonable to recover such costs, we I would add that they will be proportional. So we have reached agreement in society agreements with ScottishPower and sizewell about a methodology to recover it. In our view. To agree the methodology at this stage through a highway agreement is certainly more preferable than the adverse or adversarial method of going through magistrates courts recover this at a later date. And I can go no further than it would be very much tailored to the specific roads. So machine surveys are would be effective on the A in some of the V roads. But it would be a case of a visual surveys on some of the minor roads, which I understand the applicants have already actually committed to the cGMP.

58:41

Thank you, I guess, forgive me for not being clear. But I'm not clear how distinction will be drawn between the damage caused by so non project traffic and damage caused by the project traffic. I suppose what I'm thinking about is the case there'll be joint inspections with the highway inspectors and the applicants or the contractors inspectors, just to try to understand and come to agreement on what damage is linked to the project and what's not?

59:12

The answer is yes, you can be on it. This is part of the rationale of having the agreement upfront at this stage is that we can actually go through those them. Personally, I would expect the visual surveys, yes, there will be joint inspections. And again, we've done this with site as well, for some visual inspections for that the machine data would be very much a case of agreeing what data is collected, and then what interpretation is placed on that. And then how about any damage can be proportions. So for example with Gallup there, there's an agreement where we measured the amount of traffic overall traffic on the road to be an intensity, and we knew the amount of traffic that their development had created. We ended up with a cost for the repairs to the road at the end of their project, and the factory was pro rata The impact of HIV traffic from their development against the HIV traffic that natural use that road the background traffic

1:00:08

is tomorrow. Thank you. Same question to Essex County Council. Mr. Half please.

1:00:19

Bradley, thank you.

1:00:20

Yeah. My nephew Bradley, it's kind of counsel. I think really ethics are would follow is almost to a tee. That has been said by a Steve from from Suffolk on on this matter. Yeah. But by way of example, va 131 is a priority one route on the Essex network and will be inspected on that on a monthly basis, which is one of the key routes coming to the site. Everything else, I think forms part of the local road network, and will therefore typically be on an annual inspection. And again, here we've got highways of highways Operational Plan, which we could provide, if it if it helped you in any way along those lines. I think, you know, I think that is something that again, I wouldn't want to end up having to go to Magistrates Court to recover costs, that seems very unreasonable on such a large extensive project, which is going to have significant impact on the on the on the sort of the fabric of the local road network. And we'll do that, again, as software sector, you're worked with the applicant to try and route some side agreement in in those matters. In terms of actual survey work, it would follow along the lines of Shafique have suggested and I'm also exploring avenues with some sort of mobile phone technology that our current inspectors use and whether that can be used in conjunction with these sizable projects. But I haven't progressed that to its conclusion yet.

1:01:43

Mr. Badger, that's very helpful. Thank you. Indeed. I can pose ask the applicant to respond to the points raised by Suffolk and Essex County Council. Thank you,

1:01:54

Rebecca. Thank you. And I think there is an important distinction here to be drawn