

# TRANSCRIPT\_BRAMFORD\_ISH6\_SESSION 3\_14122023

00:05

Welcome back, everyone, my Gremlin this time, I'm just checking the applicant has resolved it groundhog.

00:12

Yes, Rebecca clutton for the applicants

00:16

that I'm so would you like me to pick up? where I left off? Yes, please. Thank you. Thank you. So we were just dealing with carriageway condition and repairs. And I think I just started by saying that I thought that there were differences in the way that this needs to be approached in the examination and the way that it might be approached separately with the between as between the applicant and the local highway authorities. For the examinations purposes, we have the position that there is proposed to be monitoring and redress of issues arising from that monitoring through the ctmp. And in a moment, I can ask Mr. Carpenter to walk you through that a little more. And then in terms of cost recovery, there is the provision in Section 59. Now so so it will be well known to you that the examining authority and indeed the Secretary of State in this decision making is not supposed to duplicate controls that already exist. And it seems to us that that is a control that already exists, and it would not be appropriate for the examination to look to replicate that or to provide something that serves the same or a similar function. Now,

01:25

that I think means that to be examined for the purposes of the examination, you sir, can be satisfied that the issue of carriageway repair and the cost of the same are, are addressed. Now, as between the applicant and the local highways authorities, we remain amenable to discussions about how this might be addressed, it's very helpful to hear that similar arrangements have been entered into with other developers, the details of those haven't been shared with us to date. But once they are, we'll be very happy to continue discussions. And it may be that that's something that can be addressed through the framework highways agreement. So for the that's a, that can be an ongoing matter for discussion between the parties. But for the examinations purposes, you said can be satisfied that the ctmp together with highways that provide adequate controls. And I will just pass over now to this carpenter just to outline what the ctmp says, this pattern. Thank you, indeed, Miss carpenter.

02:22

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, yesterday, construction Traffic Management Plan sets out pre construction surveys, visual and photographic surveys of carriageway condition, and monthly reviews of territory condition so that any defects are identified properly, and that any defect defects that are identified, lead to the megawatts contractor engaging with a localised authority to resolve those defects.

So I hopefully that provides some assurance that that issue is provided for ctmp. So just before I, I hand back to you, if I were Rebecca Clemens the risk of sounding like a broken record, or do no skin National Grid is obviously a very experienced developer of transmission infrastructure projects. It's delivered many in the past, and it continues to have a number that are ongoing at present. As far as the team here is aware, we haven't yet had a situation where we have to have have had to have recourse to Section 59. And so we think the real realistic likelihood is that these matches will be resolved between the parties if they arise. So hopefully, that also just gives you some further reassurance

03:39

is clutter. Thank you indeed is most helpful. I just pass feedback to the county councillors to Suffolk and Essex with if any further comment to make based on the response from the applicant. Thank you.

03:51

Thank you, sir. microbead for Suffolk County Council. I think briefly, we certainly welcome what Miss Clinton said in terms of wanting to carry on dialogue. And we are subject to any commercial confidentiality matters, which I don't know anything about. If we can share whatever has been agreed with some of the other infrastructure projects that we've been involved in, we will do so I say there may be some

04:22

confidentiality matters. I'm not aware of that might limit quite how that information gets shared. But we can take that away. But I would say just in terms of the response,

04:33

that you don't need to worry about this. You don't need to think about this because there is a way section 59 The the issue for the council and we think also the issue for you is we want practical ways of working which do not end up in an adverse adversarial mechanism, which requires recourse to the magistrate's court

05:00

certainly not on a frequent basis, in order to deal with problems that may arise. We think that what we are suggesting isn't a duplication of the statutory regime. It's an improvement to the statutory regime. It makes the process quicker, more conceptual, and more effective. And so we're not asking you to, as it were, deal with something which is doubling up what's already provided for. We're asking you, in particular, we're asking the applicant to engage with us to do by agreement, something which will put a better regime in place than both parties were locking down into well, the statute says this. And let's go and have a contest in the magistrate's court about it. We think that's a substandard way of proceeding. But with that, because we're a general remark, I'd say we will see what we can share with the applicant about our experiences, and documentation, all the other projects that were familiar with, and see if we can collectively move forward on this. Thank you. And helpful. Thank you to Essex County Council.

06:07

Staff, Mr. Bradley.

06:11

Matthew Bradley Essex County Council, I totally echo what has just been said by Mr. Belford, that care.

06:18

Party. Thank you. Indeed. That concludes the discussion on agenda item four. So moving to Agenda Item five, which was the proposed temporary traffic restrictions, just again, the data information question to all parties just to understand what information has been exchanged between the parties since issue specific hearing three, related to the proposed traffic, temporary traffic restrictions. If I can ask Essex County Council first please.

07:00

Thank you, Matthew Bradley Essex County Council. In terms of the temporary traffic restrictions. I know that following I'd raised some concerns regarding the terminology and I understand some of the terminology changes have taken place. On somebody submitted plans this was about kind of stopping up as opposed to kind of closures of certain things.

07:24

Other than that, I've not really seen anything additional in terms of the temporary traffic management regimes.

07:32

Thank you, buddy. Thank you to Suffolk County Council.

07:38

Thank you. So I'll ask Mr. Murray in a moment, but I think we understand that the may have come out of the meetings rather than yet be reflected in the documentation. But we understand that the applicant has clarified that effectively what they're looking at are waiting restrictions, rather than parking restrictions. And that has some implications for the nature of what signage and or markings are needed to

08:06

enforce those. That's on the information side. So I'll just ask Mr. Mary, if there's anything else on the information side that he wants to bring in, there are some slightly wider points on this item. Thank you, Mr. Murray.

08:19

State Steven, Marisa can counsel. Yes, I currently have discussions and in initial responses, we were concerned about parking restrictions. And I can confirm they are actually waiting restrictions, which does mean we don't have the applicant doesn't need to paint lots of yellow lines everywhere, which is a good thing. And the issue the stopping up is also been resolved. It's it's a road closure prohibition motor vehicles rather than stopping up because that had impacts on potentially utilities. In terms of actions. As of yesterday, we were given an action to go through the schedules to check that they are compliant with the citric acid here. So we will should do that. Unfortunately, we don't have time to do that for the next deadline. So it's something we do for deadlines seven. So they are the actions lie with us. And we

haven't had any more detailed discussion about coming up position remains is that we've got no specific objections to the types of the parking restrictions I think our objections you might come back concerns about objections concerns, which we may come onto a bit more to do with consultation. And so we've sort of stared slightly concerned about the the scale of them but in conversations with the African we understand that they will be taking a proportional approach and only applying and where necessary

09:41

to know thank you, indeed, to the applicant if you wish to respond to those points. Thank you Miss London.

09:47

Yes, Rebecca Clark, and thank you, sir. Miss carpenter can give you the updates on this. Thank you, Miss carpenter.

09:54

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant. Yes, in respect of your agenda item in relation to date.

10:00

To shared the traffic flow classifications feet data that I mentioned earlier, is relevant here. Particularly because in respect of speed limit restrictions, which is one of the elements of this agenda item, the where we can show that existing speeds are lower than the prevailing speed limit. So providing speeds are lower than the posted speed limit, which in many cases they are, that supports the the assurance for local highway authorities have a safe operation of access points to the works, because the need for reduction in speed to achieve access is less. So essentially, the lower the speed is now, the less we need to reduce it further in the works case, to achieve the safe operating arrangement for each access. So that's the data shared key area. And then in terms of state of play, which is the other item you'd noted on the agenda.

10:59

The specific restrictions will be a detailed design issue. So while restrictions have been included at the worst case, it doesn't mean we'll use all those restrictions provided for and in the thematic meetings that we have fortnightly, or indeed more frequently.

11:16

The both the applicant and the local hiring authorities are in agreement that the objective is to have the minimum level of restriction necessary to achieve efficient and safe operation of the works minimal application of signing and marking, partly because it's a cost of the programme issue. But equally, it has an impact on the network clutter and damage to the carriageway removing markings and so on. So I think it's fair to say we all agree what the objective is in that respect, and that the detailed design development will direct those specific requirements. And that links back to the point I mentioned earlier about as preparing some additional sketches of access points during the

12:05

taking the most difficult access points. Because looking at the worst case, it's always useful to examine a little more detail than we would ordinarily do at this stage in a project to reassure that local authorities, that those means of accesses can operate safely. So the restrictions set out in the draft DCO are not withdrawn, but the applicant expects that not all would be needed. And we're all aiming to minimise those restrictions to deliver the work safely. Hopefully, that's helpful in the state of play. And these are very much the issues we discuss in those thematic meetings. And I do know that the next one is due to happen between Christmas and New Year. So we'll be in contact the local highway authorities to identify an agreeable date because I suspect we probably won't be wanting to discuss those in the seasonal period.

12:55

It's covered a lot of information. Thank you indeed.

12:59

Just one question in respect of the speed information, how much? How many sites have you gathered? Speed data, and I trust that all been shared with the local highway authorities? Am I correct?

13:16

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, it's 167 sites where a fortnight of data is provided. So it's a very comprehensive set of data. And what's useful is that even in the few locations where we have access points where we don't have speed and flow information,

13:34

what you can infer is

13:37

behaviour behaviour of drivers on the network. And if we're seeing in a given route, with a given physical characteristics, the width of the carriageway, the form, the alignment, and so on. If we're seeing consistently a lower prevailing speed than the posted speed limit on a given route with a given driving population, it's reasonable to infer that at other locations, the same will be seen, we don't make assumptions that something is absolutely a certain speed or certain location. But it gives a very useful picture that scale of information is very large. And it gives very helpful guidance as to pay drivers are operating on the network, which in turn then determines the area does equal concern to the applicant and the local highway authorities which is those points of access to the works are all operate safely and effectively.

14:30

As carpenter Thank you indeed, it's really, really helpful.

14:35

It almost fits very nicely into my next question, which really is to the applicant request to all parties.

14:41

The discussion as far as we focused on if I'm correct, my interpretation minimising the application or the implementation of the various temporary traffic regulation orders. It's a question to all to all parties, the local authorities and the applicant

15:00

Is there scope at this stage to revise downwards? The number of temporary traffic restriction orders listed in sheduled 12 of the draft developer consent order? Thank you.

15:15

To the applicants that were willing to answer first

15:20

ah, Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, no. So, we we, we would aim to minimise the application of traffic regulation orders in the detailed development and approvals application in due course, but we do not consider it necessary at present time to reduce the

15:40

provision late in the job, DCM.

15:44

Carpenter, I just wonder that begs the question are all the orders listed in sheduled, 12 actually necessary.

15:55

A Carpenter on behalf of the applicant. The

15:59

the draft provision, as I say is the worst case. And the detailed design of each individual location would draw out the site specific detail in that detailed design is very much not something occurs at this stage in the project development. So, at the moment we have allowed for the worst case we think is potentially necessary. But our expectation is the actual implementation will be lower. So,

16:29

yes, we think it's reasonable to include those at this stage. But no, we do not expect them all to be needed.

16:36

In this cupboard is just one further question in terms of the actual lists that appear in sheduled, 12 as Wonder what what assessment frameworks were used to devise that list of those schedules and part one, part two, part three and part four. So they're put forward I presume, in good faith. But I just wonder what what form of assessment was used to devise each list of temporary traffic audit? Thank you.

17:06

Ed Carpenter on behalf of the applicant,

17:10

the contractor, the experienced contractor, supporting the applicant in the development of the draft DCF documents, looked at the individual elements of the works, including the works accesses, and the characteristics of the roots from which those accesses are gained, and use that experience to identify what they consider to be the worst reasonable case for the necessary restrictions that might be needed. So it was a sort of precautionary principle by a very experienced works contractor. And that that work with they'd be developed in the detail design stage of the scheme has come up with many, many thanks. If I can put that query. That was responses back to Suffolk County Council and to Essex County Council, please.

17:57

Thank you, sir. Again, I'll bring in Mr. Murray in a moment so far as shedule

18:04

12 is concerned, obviously, those are the locations which are,

18:09

as it were specified as being where a traffic restriction will be within the scope of the development consent order so that the applicant would be able to then exercise those powers. Obviously, you heard from the applicant, that they will seek to refine that if they can. But clearly,

18:35

those are that that's the scope of the powers that they're being given. And so obviously, you have to assess it on the basis that those are the breadth of the powers that they are capable of exercising, I think from the County Council's point of view,

18:50

there is a an issue as to whether actually, the consultation stage has allowed for those particular locations. Everybody who might be affected by the exercise of those powers to realise that that is something that is as it were potentially there and could happen. Obviously, we've got to take a view about that, in terms of the DCO goes through a consultation process and people are able to participate as interested persons. But we just have a question as to whether the breath has in fact been absorbed by those who might be affected by those provisions. You'll be aware obviously also that article 47, which deals with traffic regulation, as well as having the sheduled 12 locations which are as it were the identified ones. There is also the provision in article 47. Two

19:53

which allows with the consent of the Traffic Authority not to be unreasonably withheld.

20:00

would effectively the imposition of restrictions on any road, if it's for the purpose of the audit I outside of shedule 12. One of the protections that is there set out in article 47. Three, is that that those powers on other roads can't be exercised without having prior advertisement of the intention to exercise those

powers in such manner as the Traffic Authority may specify in advance. Our approach, as I understand it, is that we will expect there to be consultation, which mirrors the extent of the consultation, which is in regulation seven of the local authority orders, procedure 1996. In other words, the standard procedure for a standard to borrow, if we were operating under the road traffic Regulation Act 1984, we would expect there to be consultation in line with that, since it's for us to specify you could say, well, that that's that's up to us to do. But I just like it to be clarified by the applicant that they would they understand that that may be the level of consultation that they would be required to undertake, if they were to exercise the article 47 powers in relation to roads, which are not in sheduled 12. So that's, that's our consultation concern.

21:40

identified and then if I just asked Mr. Mary, if there's anything further, he wants to comment on, in particular about whether he thinks there may be scope even at this stage to winnow down sheduled 12 to take out things or whether he's content with what Miss Carpenter has said about Well, no, it's not possible to do that at this stage.

22:00

That for Thank you, Mr. Murray.

22:02

State Mary's, again, counsel, there were a couple of speed limits, particularly 30 mile speed limits, if duplicated existing ones, which I understand now being removed from schedules. That's something we will be doing as part of that checking process.

22:19

I think in this process, we will be acting as a factory, a critical friend, is that while we may question the need for things, the final decision which lie with the applicants, because I'd be very concerned as an authority if we question imposition of a traffic regulation order, that forms part of the design for a safe set of roadworks, so we certainly wouldn't step into that realm.

22:44

Right. Thank you. Apologies to Essex County Council, if I can return to the applicant to respond to the point raised by Mr. Bedford concerning consultation. is clapping, please? Yes. Rebecca Clemens, the applicant? Yes, I can. I can confirm that. That is the level of consultation that we'd anticipate in relation to that article. So if the parties are of the same mind in that respect,

23:07

just like Maddie, thanks. Back to Essex County Council on your comments, please.

23:14

Yeah, Matthew. Council. Thank you.

23:18



Yeah, I've got nothing further to add beyond that, which is set by Mr. Bedford and Mr. Mary, and, you know, and the confirmation by the applicant, so thank you for that. Many thanks, indeed. Okay, so moving on to consider highway consents licences and permits. So my question will be to the local highway authorities, the applicant is proposing to use the permit scheme, which was introduced under the new roads and street Works Act 1991 to coordinate streetworks for the project. So to the local highway authorities, is each Highway Authority consent or content, that the payment scheme will provide a suitably comprehensive framework to coordinate all streetworks for the project?

24:07

By COVID, Suffolk County Council so I'm not sure that we think that the permit scheme that we have got is comprehensive. And perhaps I just asked Mr. Mary to comment on that because there are some activities which I think it wouldn't cover, but I don't know that we've got

24:28

a strong concern about the applicants approach

24:32

is to better thank you Mr. Murray.

24:36

Steven Murray, Suffolk County Council, while the permit system does cover most of the roads and streetlights activities, there are a couple of ones that we consider sit outside that sit into the Highways Act. So for example, controller scaffolding on the highways

24:51

and also the 278 works as well. And also section 178, which is placing things over and above the highway. So placing rails beams

25:00

etc over the highways. There would also be licences which we operate for, for example, or fixing signs to streetlights or existing highway infrastructure. We have a licencing regime for that. So, in summary, the permit system covers most of it's not wholly comprehensive. There are some other licences that were required. And that does exclude anything required for drainage. So flood consent or the like

25:26

to know, thank you. Can I ask have you been in dialogue with the applicant about those specific limitations of the permit scheme? Is the applicant aware of those limitations?

25:36

That's a good credit. I'm trying to remember if I want to play safe, I'd say no, I can't remember we have

25:44

to marry. Thank you. To Essex County Council. The question on permit scheme, please.

25:52

Matthew Bradley Essex County Council, yep. Yeah. Essex to run out run run a permit scheme. And I've not really, unsurprisingly, got anything to add, then there has already been said by by Suffolk.

26:05

To Bradley. Thank you.

26:07

Thank you, to the business club. I just wonder whether there can be dialogue between the applicant and the local hybrid authorities on the limitations of Annie with the permit scheme. Thank you.

26:20

Like your claim to the applicant, sir. Yes, we are aware of the limitations of the permit scheme. That's the purpose for which we have promoted the framework highway agreement. That that has been shared, the heads of terms that have been shared with both authorities, Suffolk have very helpfully provided their comments on those. We are still awaiting, I think Essex is comments which were promised that deadline five, once we have those we'll be able to progress the content of that agreement in a substantive sense. But yes, we're aware of that. And that's exactly as that's and that is exactly what that's intended to capture.

27:00

Many thanks. Much appreciated. Thank you. That concludes Genda item five. So moving to agenda item six, which is the temporary and permanent measures, being sought to access the project, somewhat asked the data and information question to all parties. And just to understand what data and information has been shared between the parties since issues specific Eric three, related to temporary and permanent accesses, if I can ask the applicant to reply first, thank you.

27:33

To the applicant, the data that's been shared that we've discussed already is the same data that's relevant to this item. So we have nothing further to add on that. If you want to jump into a restaurant state of play, she can but you may respond to that from the others first. I'm happy to hear from Miss Carpenter, please. Thank you.

27:51

Okay, Carpenter on behalf of the applicant. Yes, the ctmp related requests, which we discussed earlier from the legal hiring authorities to secure certain factors are noted as areas of concern. And we are working with them to see if we can reduce those areas of difference. And the somatic meetings that we've held, I've looked at relevant issues. And we've worked through those and most recently on Tuesday of this week, which was extremely helpful to start to continue to move towards positions of agreement far as we can.

28:27

One of the areas around sign design signs have not yet been designed. That will be a detailed design stage. But the same principle we mentioned earlier is the intention would be to minimise the level of

signing and marking to safely deliver the works. And that the framework has agreement will be the mechanism to provide any additional

28:52

consenting documentation of approvals that will be necessary in respect of the various issues that we've discussed earlier. So I think it's the a lot of these issues into interact. We've had constructive, very helpful engagement with both local hiring authorities, and we'll continue to do so. It's counter manufacturers much appreciated. Thank you to Suffolk and Essex County councils.

29:18

Thank you, sir. Michael Bradford, Suffolk County Council just on data information. The only point possibly to add I did mention earlier but I think we then deferred it, as well as the information which we've already rehearsed, which has been shared, some information has been provided in relation to the access for north of Rose cottage Birstall. That was a B, AP five, however, and whilst it is a point of detail, we find that that information is not yet sufficient because it doesn't include details of the existing vegetation, and therefore it's hard to identify to what extent and

30:00

A tree or hydro loss would be necessary to achieve an excess in that location. So that's a detailed matter where we would still like more information to better. Thank you. And the last point is the case that there'll be discussions at informatic meeting regarding specific access in terms of the progress with the survey work and so forth under design. If I say I would very much hope so. But I'll ask this to Mary to pick that up and give you a proper answer. Mr. Bedford, thank you. Mr. Murray. St. Mary's Suffolk County Council? Yes, it the is a B A P Oh, five as the rose cottage access? Yes, this is a regular discussion point in our thematic meetings. In response to the drawing that was given us I think I mentioned one of the the permissions we consider on it is there is no vegetation included within the plan we've been given. We would like to see more plans for similar access is given to us to give us comfort that the applicant has considered all the site specific issues that could relate. I think it made it clear that while the African supply development drawing, we can see that there's more to highway design and just a generic drawing. And insight is different.

31:15

It's a very it's a very lengthy but very important point. Have you given the applicant a list of those access points you have particular concern with?

31:26

Not specifically, but what we have provided that pain appendix F of our local impact report, I think it's rep one Oh, 44. We did provide a spreadsheet with listening accesses.

31:40

And we have got that has been embellished over the last few weeks, so I'd be happy to share an updated version with them. And that is indicates junctures where I have concerns about vegetation.

31:51

That's junctions as opposed to access points.

31:55

For junctions during the accesses. It probably goes to the very heart of this agenda item six, but I'll ask Essex to reply first. And we can we can come back and examine this further. domestics county council

32:11

Matthew Bradley messy burly Essex County Council. Yeah, we're in a very similar position to suffer K A shedule, of kind of accesses has been sort of issued to the applicant, on our on our rag system effectively in terms of ones we see as being most important to sort of look at and deal with at this stage is this ongoing issue really about kind of the ability to deliver what's required in terms of visibility in conjunction with the order limits and the highway boundary?

32:39

And, and when Yeah, we're making, we're making some progress. But I think fundamentally, I think there's perhaps an impasse between the What the How Authorities are expecting at this stage and what the applicants prepared to provide, but I'm not sure they will enlighten me on that.

32:55

Nothing's supposed to add very surprised in terms of the impasse, what information is cancerous, okay. It's only in as much as in terms of, you know, we would like clarification that the kind of the disability is plays in that can be achieved for for each individual access. So I'm not sure that we're necessarily going to get down to that level of detail at this particular at this particular stage. So I think that's kind of where we were, we were sharing more information than we are, we're in a much better place than we would have been. And we understand your various events, vegetation plans, etc, where vegetation has been removed, and that kind of thing. So there's a lot more clarity on it. And we've recently been provided with some of that speed. But as you understand the speed surveys are not for each individual access site, but that they will give some flavour of speeds on the network. And we haven't had sufficient time yet to kind of analyse all that information in respect of each individual access because a significant piece of work to do.

33:53

But so we're heading in the right direction. But I think that, you know, we're not quite there, insofar as the highway authority would seek to be say if we were dealing with a more conventional planning application.

34:05

I think many thanks. That's extremely helpful. Thank you.

34:12

My question to the applicant really, and it's it goes to the heart of

34:18

finding temporary and permanent measures

34:21

to the applicant in terms of the DCO red line at each of the proposed temporary and permanent accesses.

34:31

Was the red line developed or devised based on professional judgement, or engineering, information and design? So I just want to understand how the red line at the DCR red line at each access point was actually devised to the applicant is clapping. Thank you.

34:51

Rebecca Clinton for the applicant. Thank you, Miss Carter. Miss carpenter is going to address you on that matter. I do just people

35:00

hand over to no want to say that, from our perspective. Whilst there is a, there is a difference between us and the authorities in the sense that we aren't going to be doing detailed designs for all access, we hope that there isn't an impasse in the sense that we are very much doing work to try and reassure them we are doing further work in relation to accesses that. I think Miss carpenter will out line for you now as well. Thank you, Miss carpenter.

35:29

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant, yes, I'll address the principles and sort of high level and then my colleague, the screen printer could come into the detail later, if that would assist you. So first of all, in respect to design development.

35:45

To date, the the the design set out in the order limits is based on the very experienced maintenance contractor, we supported the applicant in the development of event consent, all the plans, and the they included the available information at that stage, recognising that further detailed design continues at each of the locations as the scheme progresses. And that looks at a large number of components of the toolkit to assemble the final solution for each access looks at the geometry of the road on the approach. So for example,

36:23

tightly winding alignment on the approach to the location naturally restricts approach speed, and affects visibility. So we look at the geometry of the road, we look at the posted speed limit, we look at the available speed and traffic flow data, we just say we had 169 locations blew 67 locations,

36:46

which is very helpful in giving that picture. The bell may form to accommodate the nature of the traffic at each location for the works activities taking place, using those individual access points of vegetation clearance that might be necessary, which in most cases is trimming. hedgerows is a modest temporary

clearance. And then the last component, which is a last resort, but is a useful one is that in locations where for example, that vegetation clearance might be

37:22

deemed excessive for a location, particularly removal of trees, which is something that all parties would seek to avoid for temporary works for lightly trafficked accesses. There is the managed option which we have discussed in the thematic meetings, whereby

37:38

accesses which are staff from the security point of view, that individual who is part of the security components can also act as a banksman to assist entering and exiting works traffic. So although at most locations, that would not be necessary, it does provide an additional opportunity, particularly on those most constrained sites, where we would not want to do excessive amount of

38:07

work on vegetation, because of the ecological or other landscape impact of the site. And managed works might be a useful component. That's something we have discussed in those thematic meetings as one of the components of the toolkit sets lots of lots of individual elements together, if the design for each location. So we have done a higher level of work we might ordinarily do at this stage in a project to hopefully provide some assurance to the local hiring authorities. And we are continuing to do more of those access developments, which are being handed over as they become available and love to give more detail. Thanks very much. So Chris, Greenland of the applicant,

38:53

so that's fine. So yeah, as my colleague has stated, there's a toolbox of measures and we're going to speak in more detail about AB apt five as discussed

39:05

earlier, so the applicant has undertaken further design work backwards potential a BAP five to validate these assumptions,

39:13

by vegetation coppicing pruning, providing the DCM materials taking on board comments from from Mr. Murray and others about looking for further detail on vegetation primarily. We're now in the process of commissioning speed, topographical and outdoor structural surveys to further examine these assumptions and in fact, the topographical surveys are ongoing this week.

39:35

It's worth stating on the record that it's position that a bap for to the north as we discussed at the i believe i Msh for November has been allowed for within these your application should the assumptions of the detailed materials not hold as the design progresses. Then we're bringing this further work forward to provide assurance and to Unnai concerns raised

40:00

That's generally the point the case of the majority of accesses, which use existing infrastructure don't understand the vegetation tends to build up in these locations. In the majority of the accesses where he is absolutely the applicants position that we'd like to reuse existing practices where feasible where practical and where proportionate, there is typically

40:24

contingency in other accesses, and we've discussed other accidents. So, nature would suffer elsewhere in the area.

40:32

So this this further design was presented in these materials is being undertaken for further number of accesses identified in suffer. Sorry, I'm missing that word. Maybe, or

40:44

maybe asking me to wrap up.

40:46

Okay, brilliant.

40:49

expatriated design work is progressing at pace with information shared recently referred to earlier.

40:56

So I think potentially mr. Murray was unfair on the level of detail provided by Suffolk County Council where we are influenced by a Mac comments in their local impact or MCs tunes that we've shared our schedule of work that the most viewed as minutes, the most recent thematic piles meetings and hopefully that is amenable to to suffer. We've received similar feedback from Essex, which

41:27

hopefully come from from Mr. Haas. But it's mainly related to vegetation, chances are accesses and we're working our way through that, as I say it's more recent with

41:36

with the views provide further clarity on the assumptions made in this application. And we look forward to providing

41:44

this in a in a sort of

41:47

more structured way in writing ahead of ahead of the January submission, January deadline for local authorities to provide comments to yourselves, if necessary.

42:01

Thank you. That's very, very helpful. Indeed. I just want to anybody has any comments to make on what they've heard so far?

42:08

Thank you.

42:10

Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Well, we obviously welcome the applicant undertaking further work. And clearly, you're not interested in questions of whether work should have been done as nearly a stage or not, because we are where we are. We will obviously respond to it when we say it. And we also can understand that we're a cascade approach, which I think is being implied that there will be different accesses where different treatments might be appropriate. I think what we simply want to avoid the scenario, which we did refer to when this issue was discussed in detail, that I think is specific hearing one

42:58

was

43:00

being compelled, as it were to approve a substandard access, and requirement 11. Because that's the best that the applicant can achieve within the red line of the order limits. And clearly,

43:19

we would not want to have to approve an unsafe access, just because the order limits had not been sufficiently thought through. And sufficient work had not been undertaken to know that a safe access could be delivered in that location. So that's our concern. And we don't want to have to compromise on safety in order to approve an access, which is substandard, which is why we want the reassurance that effectively, we can be confident that when the detailed designs come forward, they're not going to fail to provide adequate visibility splays. Or, as I think this carpenter is, indeed, not going to require the removal of mature trees in order to provide safe visibility space, etc. So that's that's really where we're at. But we welcome what the applicant has said about further information, and we'll respond when we say thank you.

44:12

I've just just a pipe. So I made clear that based on the feedback from the applicant, you are getting those assurances that those assurances are coming through to Suffolk County Council in respect of being put in a position where you have to accept something that is substandard. Are you getting those assurance that at this point, I'll ask Mr. Mary for specific comment. We're, we're moving in that direction. I don't know that. I want to say that we're getting there to the completion. Thank you. Mr. Mehta. Thank you. This mr. Murray, please. Thank you. State most of the County Council. We are moving forward on it. We welcome the fact that the applicant is now looking at junctions and not junctions, accesses. We still haven't seen a full list of the ones they are looking at for us to check that we're happy with it. There were a couple of points that if you don't mind me raising is one a



45:00

is one of the main ways to improve traffic management. That is, to some extent last resort because it impacts on the highway, but slightly concerned about one of the comments about using banksman to control traffic in and out of junctions that potentially could be unlawful if they're controlling traffic on the public highway. And having been an engineer delivering work on site, I'd have severe safety concerns about people in the highway directing traffic and case.

45:28

So we are working moving forwards, but the proof will be in what we get. And the final point I was going to make is while the applicant is also mentioned about using existing junctions, which we accept is a better use. There is a degree of intensification at a lot of these junctions which needs to be considered as accesses as part of this. So that is another thing we should be looking at when the designs come through.

45:53

Tomorrow. Thank you. No, too clearly, to Essex County Council.

46:00

Mr. Bradley.

46:03

Thank you, Matthew Bradley Essex County Council. I've got nothing further to add beyond that, which has already been said. Thank you.

46:11

Thank you. I didn't know that the applicant wants to come back only the points raised by Suffolk County Council. If not, that's okay.

46:19

Rebecca, thank you. The only points of clarification that I wanted to give is to confirm that we have indeed shared list of accesses with Suffolk County Council. And so it may be just the missionary hasn't had cited those but they have been provided. Otherwise, I don't think we need to spend any time in in this in this forum. Now ventilating these issues is plugged in. Thank you indeed appreciated. That concludes agenda item six, we moved to agenda item seven, which is a public rights of way. Again, my data and information question applies to all parties just to understand since issue specific hearing three, what data and information has been shared between the parties in relation to public rights of way? If I can ask ask the county council to reply please Thank you.

47:21

Mr. Bradley. Mr. Have

47:24

you go first charge if you'd like. Okay. Yeah. So as far as position is we submitted comments at deadline five. And I think it was by no deadline for us too.

47:40

Often that recommend minute for you.

47:43

The applicant responded that deadline five was addressed actually passed a number of our comments within that and left it only atom. I think two elements, one of the most important one was further clarity on the phasing of the public rights of way closures, and which is now I think also stuff that could be interested in. So I think that is essentially that is the piece of information that I think we are awaiting that has been indicated that it will be provided. But otherwise, I'm not aware of anything else. We're waiting to have many thanks to Suffolk County Council.

48:18

Michael Bedford stuff again, Castle, it's the same position there. I think that we have got.

48:24

You'll remember at

48:27

issue specific hearing through that was back on the ninth of November, it was being I think, indicated that the phasing or sequencing information would be with us, as it were shortly. But we are as it were over a month on and it's still being promised, but it's obviously not been provided. And I think that is a major stumbling block. I'll just ask Miss Dixon if she wants to add further comment. Mr. Patrick. Thank you, Miss Dixon. kradic Suffolk County Council? Yes, that is correct. We're still waiting on the sequencing information. I will note in the applicants responses in deadline five under rep 5025 which is their application submission for our comments made in deadline for that they have noted on there under 7.1 7.2 that they are preparing tables to set out the Indicative sequencing for the public rights away closures I have on a number of occasions over the last month chased for that information and tried to provide some clarity to them as to what we require it is just phasing information it is not detailed information that is required. In addition, I have provided to them copies of example, public rights away management plans and strategies as well to aid them with further amendments to the puppet breaks away management plan

49:52

stinks and thank you very helpful indeed. To the applicant Miss plugin

49:59

yes, we're

50:00

Okay, clapping for the applicant.

50:03

I think in previous hearing, it's already been indicated that that information, the phasing indicative information will be provided by deadline six. But otherwise, in terms of data, I'll pass it over to Miss carpenter again. Thank you, Miss Carpenter,

50:18

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant. I mentioned earlier in terms of sharing information, that last key piece of information, which is in the very final stages of collation and will be submitted at deadline six is that outline programme. And as I mentioned, it's a quarter by quarter evaluation, what activities are taking place in construction works in each of those quarters. And therefore, which of the rights of way are affected each of those quarters. So while in some quarters, several rights of way are effective, maybe three or four, because the closures are broadly four weeks or less, in many cases, much less likely traffic accesses.

50:57

And the

50:59

short closures together mean that the scope for multiple closes off right away is extremely small. So that will be submitted to Deadline six. And hopefully, we'll provide that assurance to the authorities. And, and, you know, assure them that the impact on users is small. And then the communication measures are set out in the ctmp Give the control where we actually come to the works of the impact on local people being able to plan their activities, and the local highway authority is being formed. Because we recognise other activities take place on the network, both inspected road closures and right of way closures. And the local highway authorities have to coordinate those so that other applicants or the local highway authorities themselves,

51:48

all of those works together need to be coordinated to recognise the liberal heavy authority is a key in that

51:54

overarching view on the network. But the information we hope will give them the assurance that for this individual project, the impact is modest and will not be substantial in respect of those users. Is Kent Thank you very helpful indeed. I'll just move on to some of the topics to examine under Agenda Item seven.

52:18

The first one is respect of the deadline for submission from Essex County Council. I think the council raised concern regarding the community engagement and public information stated in the applicants public rights of way management plan could ask Essex County Council to provide more commentary on that point, please. Thank you. Mr. Hart. Thank you. On behalf of Essex County Council, yes, we, the applicant, I believe responded to that deadline by asking for us to provide a sort of bit more information on who they want us to, to include in that we've written up a list as part of our deadline, sixth response that we will provide them in liaison with Suffolk about what who they are but I also think it should be

included in that. So we can vital that I don't think there'll be I don't expect there'll be an issue with regards to including that. But obviously that's for the applicant to decide. It's standard user groups that you might expect around Association, etc. So, in summary, if I can take away that you are in dialogue with the applicant, and this matter is being is being moved forward.

53:30

Yes, hopefully. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Pascal Fabrika, the applicant to respond, please.

53:39

Rebecca Clinton to the applicant? Yes. Thank you. Well,

53:43

we will we await the information has been provided, but there shouldn't be a

53:49

clock. Maddie, thanks. I just wondered why the Suffolk County Council want to respond?

53:56

Or whoever I'll just ask mistakes. And if he's got any further comment, Mr. Pepper. Thank you, Miss Dixon. That will be provided at the next deadline. I have been a liaison with Essex County Council and shared the information that we provide as part of our temporary traffic regulation orders communications plan on there. So that will be provided to the applicant. For Miss Dixon. Thank you. Indeed, I was going to discuss the issue of the phasing of the public rights of way but I can take it that that matter is in hand and has been dealt with

54:28

moving on to the next topic, then it's going to point raised by Essex to cancel a deadline for and it's just surety or certainty that separation between users and construction traffic must not impact on the definitive width of the public rights of way. I believe that the county council is seeking for the certainty or clarity to be stated in the applicants public right of way. Management Plan. If I can ask Essex County Council to comment please

55:01

Yes, thank you. Just an offer on behalf of the County Council. Yes, this essentially, that's what we are looking for. I believe the applicant, again has responded to this in deadline, five response. But providing a bit more clarity on the matter.

55:17

That yes, I'm gonna say we'll respond to deadlines six to confirm whether we are content or not.

55:24

Staff, thank you, if I can ask the applicant to provide their positions, please. Miss Clinton, thank you

55:33

for helping to organise the applicants.

55:36

Yes, I confirm that the,

55:40

again, this is an area where the detail is developed as the scheme progresses. But in those locations were

55:48

at right so where are you users are using an area in conjunction with traffic at the the the minimum which would be maintained, we couldn't maintain a minimum with such that we felt was safe and usable for those users of the rights of way, then there would be a closure of that right of way. So there's no ambiguity in respect of either whether it's open or not, or whether it's safe or not. We provide clarity, it's better to close it if we can't maintain an appropriate width. And again, the communication is as important as the actual closure itself, so that users know when something is closed and can make provision whether it's a journey, or leisure, use of those rights of way that they can plan their own activities appropriately. compensated, you can always post one point which did feature in one of the deadline for submissions from I think, I think Essex County Council, the county council requested that alongside the public notice indicating the closure of the right of way that a map of the closure is also put in place.

56:58

Is that something the applicant is contemplating doing?

57:02

Was carpenter

57:04

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant? Yes, again, we refer in ctmp. To

57:12

that level of information that is sorry, in the public rights of way management plan, the pro MP to the information is provided to users. Again, this is a test of proportionality and a case by case basis. If a right of way is closed for an hour, it's a different scenario than if it's closed for a number of weeks. And so provision is made for maps to enable user to find the alternative route. But the nature of the closure will determine whether a map was necessary. In a managed flows, for example, the user might be very little diverted from their normal route. If they're diverted on to a different route for a closure of a more significant period, then that would be appropriate. So thing in the detailed development, engaging with local highway authority. That's the kind of detail that can get established with what's an appropriate

58:10

level of detail for each closure. has come to many thanks, if I can ask Essex County Council to comment please.

58:21

Mr. Hart, thank you. Let's talk about Essex County Council. Yes, we know they're responsive. Five the covers that map will be

58:33

or our basis depending on the extent of the closure. We're I think we're content on this issue.

58:39

Now, thank you just the same point as Suffolk County. Cassidy have any comments to make, please?

58:45

Thank you, sir. Michael Webb, for First of all, ask Miss Dixon to comment in a moment. But just to remind you, I'm sure you've seen it in rep. 4046, which were our comments on the submissions received at deadline three. In Table four. We did set out specific comments on the PRA management plan, and what we saw as being the emissions from that. So we're hoping that if further work is being done on the PIO management plan that a further iteration of it will address our concerns and comments. But on this particular point that I'll ask ballistics and for any further comment.

59:26

Thank you. Thanks, radix. And Suffolk County Council? No, I am satisfied with the response provided in deadline five that they will be looking at appropriate maps and working with the highway authority on that as part of the the communication elements of that has been covered in the applicants deadline five submission to our original comments.

59:49

Excellent Many thanks indeed. Much appreciated.

59:53

That concludes Agenda Item seven. I'm just mindful that we've reached one o'clock we have

1:00:00

Agenda Item eight and then Agenda Item nine any other business to deal with? My proposal is that it should take no more than 15 minutes I trust to complete agenda item eight and Agenda Item nine. Are the parties willing to continue until about a quarter past one, or would you prefer to break and resume at 145

1:00:25

protected cluttons. So we're consent to press on. I think that makes sense. Mr. Slaton. Thank you. Other parties?

1:00:34

Yes. So you will have noticed a yellow hand from yesterday.

1:00:40

Mr.

1:00:43

Simon Amstutz representing the Dedham Vale national landscape and stir Valley Partnership.

1:00:51

If no were pushed for time, and we could just take you back to item seven on on the agenda.

1:00:59

And if we could, what I didn't see in rep 3056 Was any acknowledgement of the stur Valley path, which is a 63 mile regional route from new market to Cat await that is likely to be impacted by the book by the works. And I consider this to be a different status of public right of way, because it will attract people from a region or even a national

1:01:34

distance to enjoy that. footpath. And I wondered how notification

1:01:41

for those potential closers will be communicated with non local users and users for that regional route?

1:01:55

Just to just to check it, is the path in question a public rights of way? Or is it a non public identifier? Just to clarify its status, please? Yeah, the vast majority is on public rights of way. And it's a regional route that is promoted through the Denver national landscape, and stir Valley Partnership and others.

1:02:18

Thank you, indeed, plus to the applicants whether you need time to provide a structured response, whether you can respond during this hearing, Miss Clark, and please refer back to the applicants. If the if that particular route is not identified in the management plan, that we have to take that way, and we should be able to include that we have done that for other similar routes. So we'll just take that point away and update the management plan holdings.

1:02:47

Miss Clayton, thank you, indeed. Mr. Hamster. It's satisfactory.

1:02:53

Yes, I'm in Dedham Vale national landscape and stew Valley Partnership. Yep. I'm content with that. And I will follow up a perhaps more coherent comment in post here in summary,

1:03:06

to answer Thank you, indeed. Thank you.

1:03:10

So that does conclude Agenda Item seven. Thank you for your contributions, just pressing on to Agenda Item eight, and it's a topic traffic management plans. And this agenda item really is just to give some focus to a request

1:03:28

for additional management plans made by Suffolk County Council.

1:03:34

I understand that they're included in the deadline one submission and a deadline for submission under the title under other controls and mitigation. The title of the plans are the detailed abnormal individual loads management plan, a detailed port traffic management plan, and a decommissioning traffic management plan. So my question to Suffolk County Council, can you explain why you're proposing each of these additional management plans? Thank you.

1:04:09

Thank you. So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. I think I can hope to take it shortly. I'll bring Mr. Murray in to talk more about the a i l management plan because that is a substantial issue. So far as the port's is concerned, we've reviewed further our position and the information that's been provided by the applicant and we no longer pressing for a detailed ports traffic management plan. And so far as the decommissioning management plan is concerned, the issue is in terms of requirement 12 whether there should be

1:04:50

a specific mention of that plan out part of requirement 12 or whether it's implicit in what comes forward there. Think we

1:05:00

Just like to see some more as it were acknowledgement that there's a need for traffic management in the decommissioning stage. But that's I say that's a secondary matter. So then can I bring in Mr. Mary to explain a little bit more why we have concerns about the level of A I I information? And why we would like to see a detailed A I I management plan. Mr. Batra? Thank you. Just Just one question. If I could, just to clarify, you're not requesting the port's traffic management plan that's off the table. Yes. Thank you. That's better. Thank you, Mr. Murray.

1:05:34

St. Mary's Suffolk County Council. Before I start, could I just make an apology in a correction? I didn't mention when we talked about the winds reports they didn't include any information on structures. I was incorrect. They do. Certainly the ones that refer to the accesses between Ipswich port and Branford and that's what brings us on to the requirement for the detailed, invisible abnormal loads movements. So we are concerned and we have recently already in this hearing, is that the applicant has not yet demonstrated that abnormal loads, and we're talking specifically in Suffolk about the cable drums can specifically access is to sort of facilitate their project.

1:06:15



This is both from a structural perspective, is there are a number of small structures around the county. And having had conversations with my colleagues and our structures team, we are preparing a list of the structures affected. And also to identify those where we consider there may be issues that with that the inspections haven't been undertaken, or their pending review, or we do have some significant concern about the weight it can carry.

1:06:42

Then, the winds report goes some way to identifying the street furniture that may be affected by this. But as expressed earlier, concerns still remain about swept path analysis, both on some of the junctions have been revised since 2022, when these reports were done. But secondly, some of the minor junctions in particular, just to ensure that the loads can actually safely manoeuvre around them.

1:07:07

And

1:07:09

I think that's, that's summarises it.

1:07:12

So thank you, I guess my question to you is, why is there a need for a separate plan if these matters are being dealt with through the ctmp? The construction traffic management plan, as I understand they are? What Why do you think there's a need for a separate, abnormal indivisible load management plan? Thank you.

1:07:33

We would be happy if to to drop our request for a separate plan. If we have sufficient

1:07:43

processes within either the side agreement, I would argue that we're not content with what is in the cGMP at the moment. So it's getting that process embedded by which we can work together with the applicant to confirm that there are feasible routes for the locations they want to access. Tomorrow. Thank you. Let's appreciate it. Thank you.

1:08:05

If I can ask the applicant to respond, please. He's clapping

1:08:13

for the applicant, sir, I'll take the batters in. Well, first of all, I'll take the slightly out of order. We're grateful for the confirmation that the port traffic management plan plan is no longer. So that's good news. In relation to the decommissioning Traffic Management Plan and the

1:08:31

proposal for that within the DCO. I can confirm that it is our view that the need for traffic management planning within the decommissioning plan that's already provided for within the DCO is something that

we would expect to have to provide we consider it's implicit within that requirement because traffic management will be a critical part of the commissioning process generally. So we have no, we just don't think it's necessary to specify that out separately.

1:09:00

And then, in relation to the aihl management plan that's just been discussed. I'll just pass you over to Miss carpenter.

1:09:09

was planning Thank you, Miss carpenter.

1:09:12

Carpenter on behalf of the applicant? Yes, the the the level of information supplied already is greater than we normally provide at this stage, we do believe consider contains a large amount of useful information showing the level of rigour that's been undertaken. The AI routes have all been identified and are secure, they're in the construction traffic management plan. In the update to this that ctmp. We are actually going to split bigger one which shows the construction routes and the AI routes into separate figures, because we think that will provide more clarity

1:09:48

where some roads are on both sets of routes. We think that will be clear. So we will be providing that which is relevant to the ARL routes.

1:09:59

Those routes have

1:10:00

already been subjected to a site visit by the applicant in conjunction with Essex police who represent both constabularies for the scheme.

1:10:09

So Norfolk and Suffolk constabulary is for scheme. The four reports have been shared with Oklahoma authorities. And the aim management plan will be done taken a detailed design stage of the project once the main works contract was in place. And they will be looking at the sourcing of plant materials for the deliveries to the site, including transformer and cable drum deliveries. But at the moment, the applicants view is that an AI our management plan is not necessarily at the stage because the other elements of the toolkit together provide that assurance. It has specific information that is sought that isn't in there, we would we would seek for those local authorities to to identify that because we do consider that the proportionate information necessary to stage has been provided.

1:11:03

As carpenter Thank you indeed press Return to Suffolk County Council.

1:11:07

Is there additional information that Suffolk County Council would expect to have that's not already been considered or in the pipeline, so to speak,

1:11:18

in respect of the abnormal interest modes, is to marry. Thank you, Steve, Marisa, again, counsel. I think it's the onus is on ourselves to actually provide the Africans with the list of the structures and where our concerns are with individual structures. In terms of the other information, I will review it and if we consider extra information is required, then I will detail that at deadline six or deadline seven. Many thanks, Anthony. Do Suffolk have any further comments or? That's

1:11:49

no more comments. Okay. Thank you. Sorry, I was

1:11:55

just I was a bit slow with my mouse. But yes, she was I had no further comments. Thank you, sir. Thank you. I just wanted to buy the Essex County Council any comments on what we spoke about?

1:12:07

And nothing

1:12:10

is not thinking. That concludes Agenda Item eight as moving to agenda item nine, which is any other business and I thank Mr. Amstutz for for his patience. Mr. Hamsters, I understand you have a query for the examination authority concerning navigation on the river star. I wonder if you could ask your question or questions, please. Thank you, Sir Simon Amstutz, the dead of our national landscape, and still very partnership. I think we discussed earlier that the applicant hasn't got the necessary expertise in the room. So I'll ask the question, but we'll follow up with a post hearing summary. But the question is, as I understand it, the style of navigation will be closed during the construction of the Bailey Bridge, which will be part of the temporary haul road.

1:13:05

And I'm asking to see whether if all options for a portage around that whether that would need to be have some sort of banks person or accompanied Portage if that would be possible to keep the navigation open as it's an important way for people to experience the Stour Valley and national landscape and also a driver for economics, but I suspect that the applicant will need further time and others are but questioning post hearing special

1:13:41

thank you to the applications clapping Can you provide any response at this stage? Or do you intend to come up with a structured reply? Post hearing? Mr. Levin, thank you.

1:13:51

For the applicant, we will come back on with a reply on the points about banks loans or Portage but I do just want to emphasise now. But the duration of the closure that's anticipated is very short. It will be a

few days when the bridge is installed a few days when the bridge is removed. That's the that's the realistic likelihood for those timeframes. So we will come back on the on the alternatives point effectively but but the duration of the closure will be very short.

1:14:23

was travelling Thank you just to confirm a few days it does that is under a week or up to a week sorry miss clapping for further clarification.

1:14:33

Rebecca cartons of the applicant

1:14:35

it could be up to a week but the expectation and practice is that it will be less than that. Let's clap Many thanks mr. Hamsters do you any further comments to make? Yes, I'm an absolute stud unveil national landscapes to any partnership. Just to make everyone aware that there are some events that use the store navigation that can attract up to two or 300 vessels.

1:15:00

Who's and yet avoiding those dates of the scheduled I think it's good to suddenly to see events would be very much appreciated by those taking part. Thank you. And thank you kindly, the applicant I presume you've noted that?

1:15:18

Yes, we've noted that and we've liaised to seek to ensure they can be avoided. Many thanks.

1:15:26

Does anybody have any other points of business?

1:15:30

I'm looking for hands up on screen.

1:15:33

I'm not seeing any side take that as no further business to be discussed under this agenda item. That concludes agenda item nine, and handed over to the lead inspector, Mr. Rollins, thank you.

1:15:55

Okay, thank you very much, we can maybe just briefly go through the action points that I've captured. And then from that, if anybody's capture something else, if you can maybe flag it for us, please. So I'll run through these. So the first action point is for the applicant, and that you're to submit all relevant information that you've shared with the local highway authorities, they will share them into the examination. Now, all of these actions due on deadline six, unless you say otherwise, that you find that there's a need to have additional time to compile the information.

1:16:42

Second action is, again, the applicant and the local highway authority. So it was unclear to me when we were discussing peak hour if

1:16:55

all parties had agreed, what the peak hours. So I think it would be useful

1:17:02

if we could have some sort of confirmation on that if parties have agreed peak hour and if not what party is perceived to be the peak hour.

1:17:13

But action points to the applicant.

1:17:18

So the applicant is to review the coalition data

1:17:22

that is to be submitted deadline six by Suffolk County Council. And then to advice on the impact the proposed developments could have had such locations. Now, this obviously can be provided advice XP if you can provide as deadlines. The applicant is acceptable.

1:17:48

Rebecca, for the applicant? Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

1:17:51

Thank you.

1:17:53

The next action point I have is that the post hearing submissions by the applicants and local highway authorities would give summaries in relation to the environmental impact assessments as well as the transport assessments and will be based on a July 2023 guidelines. So an example that was quoted by Mr. Lang was the worst case our and attacks on the community.

1:18:26

If I can go on to the next action points.

1:18:29

I think this was from our two assets county council that you were going to highlight routes, rural routes that were of concern to the applicants. And can you do that by deadline six.

1:18:47

The next action points. Again, this is to the applicants and local highway authorities that your post hearing submissions

1:19:00

regarding the transport assessments being final, so yeah, so parties to include post hearing submissions regarding your positions on transport such as sort of being fine, you know, the potential impact of requirements to time limits. And what that means is the proposed development commencing in year five

1:19:25

next action points local highway authorities that you would submit relevant highways, operational plan inspection, asset information, and are you able to supply that information by deadlines seven

1:19:45

action points to Suffolk County Council.

1:19:51

You were going to I believe you've updated access information and it's feasible that you will

1:20:00

re submits that data. And can you do that by deadline seven.

1:20:07

The applicant is the next action point for the phasing programme to inform rights of way. That's the piece of submitted at deadline six

1:20:21

the

1:20:23

Adam Valle, EO N D and Stour Valley Partnership, the applicants, so in your post hearing submissions that unveil AONB and stir Valley Partnership, you'll include the rights of way that particular points you raised on the river steward, and the applicants, obviously, to check its public, right avoid management plan, and to response to the comments received on with regard to river steward.

1:20:55

And then, finally, the last action point I captured was that Suffolk County Council would provide further relevant information rates related to structures that are on the aibl routes. So we all in agreements, and are there any other particular action points that suddenly is captured over this?

1:21:21

Sir, can I just clarify?

1:21:24

I think it was number eight on your list, updated access information to be provided by Suffolk County Council. And I just wasn't completely clear. What that related to I got the separate point about structures, which Mr. Murray referred to, and I'm just wanted to be clear, I've captured what it was that

you wanted under that item. Sure. Mr. Bedford, I understood when Mr. Berry was on. He mentioned that, that you've provided

1:22:00

previous deadline, a list of accesses and information regarding the setting of those accesses. But apparently, you've got additional information, which means that particular spreadsheets has been updated. So that,

1:22:17

you know, yes, it was it was updating the spreadsheet that we've previously provided. Yes, I understand that. Yep. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

1:22:26

So can I just then add also, and this may be a matter that we can pursue outside of the examination with the applicant, at the moment we're struggling with the applicant have indicated they've shared with us a list of accesses. And we're struggling to be clear that we've identified what they shared with us. So I don't know. It's a matter that I can ask you to rule on. But it's a matter of I just raise it now, publicly, that we would welcome some clarification from the applicant as to what they think they've shared with us. Because we're at the moment not completely on the same page as them as to what has been shared. Thank you, sir. Yeah, it might be best that you do it outside examination, just in case there's commercially sensitive information that you've did relate to. So if we agree between yourself what the list is, and then we've got a common point. Thank you. Thank you. Okay, great.

1:23:28

Okay, so I'm not seeing any other show of hands regarding any list action points. So

1:23:36

if no other highlights that are relevant to this hearing, may I remind you that the examination table timetable requires parties to provide any post hearing documents on up before our deadline six, which is the 20th of December.

1:23:53

We I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectorate website as soon as practicable after we close. And I thank you all of today's participants for their time and assistance. This today, we will consider your response carefully. And they will inform the examining authorities first, not the first. They may

1:24:21

inform our questions if we have further questions, and whether we hold further hearings in the future. So can I wish you all an enjoyable and safe Christmas break? The time is now 1326 and this issue specific hearing is now closed.