



Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited Triton Knoll Electrical System

**Appendix 9: Response to
Lincolnshire County Council
Highway Matters**

Date: 1st February 2016

**Appendix 9 of the Applicant's
response to Deadline 5**

Triton Knoll Offshore Wind Farm Limited

Triton Knoll Electrical System

Appendix 9: Response to Lincolnshire County
Council Highway Matters

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
4th Floor One Kingdom Street
Paddington Central
London
W2 6BD

T: 0845 026 0562
Email: info@tritonknoll.co.uk

www.rweinnogy.com/tritonknoll

Date: 1st February 2016

Drafted By:	TKOWFL
Approved By:	Kim Gauld Clark
Date of Approval:	1 st February 2016
Revision:	1.0

Triton Knoll
Offshore Wind Farm Limited
Copyright © 2016 RWE
Innogy UK Ltd
All pre-existing rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS MATTERS	4
Introduction	4
The EIA Evidence Plan process	4
Provision for traffic and access in the DCO	5
Appropriateness of indicative arrangements for traffic management	9
Lack of up to date accident data	9
Impact of slow moving and turning vehicles on the A17 and A158	10
Impacts on the interface between the A17 and Swineshead level crossing	12
Appendix 1 - Response from LCC on Traffic Matters (received 29th January 2016)	14
Appendix 2 - LCC Highway Authority Agreement to the EIA Evidence Plan	15

1. LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HIGHWAYS MATTERS

Introduction

- 1.1 During the Local Impacts Issue Specific hearing, held on 19th January 2016, LCC raised matters in relation to traffic and highways. A summary of the Applicant's position with respect to highways matters is set out in the Written Summary of the Oral Case, submitted as Appendix 1 to the Applicant's response to Deadline 5.
- 1.2 Whilst the Applicant's position is that, through extensive previous consultation, any matters relating to traffic and access had already been addressed with LCC, the Applicant has acknowledged the further matters raised by LCC at the hearing, and provided responses to these. The Applicant received further information from LCC on Friday 29 January 2016 (attached in Appendix 1), in relation to the matters raised during the hearing, and has therefore provided the following response with consideration to the points detailed in the note received from LCC. Given the short time for a response the Applicant reserves its position to add to or amend these submissions as necessary.

The EIA Evidence Plan process

- 1.3 The Triton Knoll EIA Evidence Plan [APP-132] provides an overview of the aims and objectives of the Evidence Plan process, as well as the roles of those involved.
- 1.4 The following Traffic and Access Review Panel meetings were held with the named attendees as part of the EIA Evidence Plan process:
- "15.05.14 Peterborough (Ian Wickett RSK and Phil Hughes LCC)
 - 02.07.14 Horncastle (Ian Wickett RSK, Andrew Ratcliffe LCC and Nick Marsh LCC)
 - 30.07.14 Horncastle (Ian Wickett RSK, Phil Hughes LCC and Andrew Wharff LCC)"
- 1.5 Section 5 presents a summary of the positions reached with stakeholders, with paragraphs 5.37 to 5.39 focussing on Traffic and Access:

"The study area extents, baseline traffic data, road crossing methodologies, access routes, locations of temporary construction compounds and assessment approaches for the assessment of traffic and access aspects of the Triton Knoll Electrical System have been agreed with all review Panel members, either through the scoping process or directly addressed through discussions and provision of evidence as part of this EIA Evidence Plan. It has also been agreed

that a traffic management plan will be adopted for the construction of the project.

- 1.6 *Although not specifically discussed at the Traffic and Access RP, there is a single aspect relating to traffic issues on which discussion is on-going with Boston Borough Council, relating to the utilisation of access routes by construction traffic required for the National Grid enabling works at the existing Bicker Fen substation.”*
- 1.7 Further information is presented in the traffic and access topic summary cover sheet (Appendix I, Annex E4), with detail provided in the accompanying EIA Evidence Plan log. The traffic and access cover sheet provides a summary of the areas of agreement as:
- *“Road crossing methodology*
 - *Construction traffic access routes*
 - *Location of temporary construction compounds*
 - *Sensitivity criteria and application to study area*
 - *Traffic assignment methodology*
 - *Traffic generation methodology*
 - *Baseline traffic data”*
- 1.8 The traffic and access cover sheet provides a summary of Agreed Management, Mitigation and/or Monitoring as *“Traffic Management Plan to enforce use of restricted access routes”*.
- 1.9 The Transport Briefing Note found at Annex E4_001_25-06-2014 of the EIA Evidence Plan provides an example of the level of detail provided through the EIA Evidence Plan process to the Traffic and Transport Review Panel on the 20th June 2014.
- 1.10 The Traffic and Access Baseline (document reference 6.2.5.9.1, [APP-086]) was also provided to EIA Evidence Plan Review Panel participants for agreement.
- 1.11 The content of the EIA Evidence Plan [APP-132] was agreed by Andy Ratcliffe by email received on 21st April 2015 (see Appendix 2).

Provision for traffic and access in the DCO

- 1.12 The Applicant has adopted an approach where an outline Traffic Management Plan (document reference 8.9, [APP-110]) and an Outline Access Management Plan (document reference 8.13, [APP-113]) have been drafted to provide detail of the mitigation that would be agreed with the relevant authorities prior to the commencement of the works to regulate construction and contractor traffic. The

management plans are secured through Requirements of the draft DCO (Revision F) (Appendix 22 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5).

Requirement 8 (Highway accesses and improvements)

- 1.13 Requirement 8 (Highway accesses and improvements) of the draft DCO (Revision F) (Appendix 22 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5) states that:

“8 (1) No stage of the onshore works shall commence until for that stage written details which accord with the outline access management plan of the siting, design, layout, sequencing and timing and any access management measures for any new permanent or temporary means of access to a highway to be used by vehicular traffic, or any alteration to an existing means of access to a highway, have, after consultation with the highway authority, been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.

(2) The highway accesses for that stage must, where relevant, be constructed or altered, and the works described in paragraph (1) in relation to access management measures must be carried out, in accordance with the approved details before the relevant highway accesses are brought into use for the purposes of the authorised development.

(3) No stage of the onshore works shall commence until for that stage a scheme of temporary highways alterations within the highway boundary has after consultation with the highway authority been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.

(4) The temporary highways alterations for that stage must, where relevant, be constructed in accordance with the approved details before they are brought into use for the purposes of the authorised development.”

Requirement 19 (construction traffic)

- 1.14 Requirement 19 (construction traffic) of the draft DCO (Revision F) (Appendix 22 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5) states that:

“19 (1) No stage of the onshore works shall commence until for that stage, after consultation with the highway authority, a construction traffic management plan in accordance with the outline traffic management plan including a contractor travel plan has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority.

(2) Construction and contractor traffic related to the authorised development shall only use Work No 48 or 49 to access Work Nos 50 to 55 inclusive and the timings for the construction of Work Nos 48 and 49 shall be included within the Construction Method Statement approved as part of the relevant Code of Construction Practice.”

1.15 It is the Applicant's position that the details provided in the Outline Access Management Plan and Outline Traffic Management Plan, secured by Requirements 8 and 19, are adequate and appropriate and that they will ensure that the concerns of the highway authority will be addressed during prior to the construction of the proposed development.

1.16 While maintaining this position the Applicant has responded to the points raised in LCC's written summary.

Routing of Construction Traffic

1.17 LCC have raised concerns about the restricted access routes for construction traffic and the level of detail currently provided within the Outline Traffic Management Plan (TMP) [APP-110]. In particular, reference has been made as to the scale of the plan showing access routes and the suitability of these routes to accommodate HGV and abnormal load movements.

1.18 Section 4 of the Outline TMP provides details of typical control measures for construction traffic, including vehicle routing and access routes. This highlights the hierarchy of roads to be used by construction traffic and notes specific exclusions. Figure 4.1 illustrates the road network that will be used by HGV construction traffic and paragraph 4.4 notes that there will be agreed construction access routes as part of each stage specific TMP. The stage specific TMPs will be developed in consultation with the highway authority (LCC), and submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority prior to the commencement of each stage.

1.19 The appropriate use of all of the roads and accesses identified was discussed at meetings held with LCC highway officers on 28th March 2014 and 2nd July 2014, with agreement reached on construction access routes as part of the EIA Evidence Plan process. A summary of those meetings and discussions is provided at Appendix I, Annex E4 of the (document reference 8.16). The TMP contains an agreed form of management to enforce use of restricted access routes. These approaches are secured through the Evidence Plan, which was signed off by Andrew Ratcliffe on 24th April 2015.

1.20 LCC raise a specific concern relating to the scale of the routing plans submitted as part of the EIA Evidence Plan process and in the Outline Traffic Management Plan. The Applicant acknowledges these concerns and would be happy to discuss with the highways authority a different scale of plans during the consultation on the construction traffic management plan as secured by Requirement 19 of the draft DCO.

1.21 The adequacy of the Outline TMP for the purposes of the DCO was discussed at a meeting held with LCC highway officers on 11th November 2015, where it was agreed that it was fit for purpose and that the detailed aspects would be agreed at the appropriate time, pre-commencement of construction.

1.22 Updates made to the Outline Traffic Management Plan (document reference 8.9, [APP_110]), following discussions with the highways authority on the 11th November 2015, are set out in the Application Document Schedule of Amendments (submitted at Appendix 20 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 5), as follows:

- *“Paragraph 4.8 has been amended from "road condition surveys for minor roads will be undertaken and agreed with the Highways Authority" to "road condition surveys for minor roads, B roads and all road crossings will be undertaken and agreed with the Highways Authority".*
- *Paragraph 4.14 has been updated to ensure vehicles both enter and exit temporary construction compounds in a forward gear.*
- *Paragraph 4.17 has been amended to reflect that the details of road crossings, to be set out in the Access Management Plan, will be agreed with the relevant planning authority following consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.*
- *Paragraph 4.18 a new bullet has been added to read "• Appropriate wheel cleansing facilities at access and road crossing points"*
- *Paragraph 4.21 has been amended to reflect that arrangements for temporary works needed to accommodate abnormal loads will be made through processes with the relevant planning authority following consultation with the relevant Highway Authority.”*

1.23 As set out above, the TMP has been updated to include a commitment to undertake route surveys as part of each stage specific TMP. These surveys will identify where minor improvements may be required within the existing highway boundary to accommodate HGV movements, such as provision of passing bays and widening on bends. Alternatively, traffic management measures may be used to control the flow of HGV movements to minimise the risk of large oncoming vehicles meeting at pinch points on the network.

1.24 It should be noted that the largest abnormal loads will only be associated with the Intermediate Electrical Compound and the Substation, both of which do not require the use of minor roads to access these locations. Although it has been stated that cable drums being delivered in multiples will be classed as abnormal loads, these only marginally exceed the maximum standard width of 2.9m and are therefore of comparable size to other HGV traffic.

1.25 The Applicant refers the ExA to LCC's responses to TT 2.9 and TT 2.10, which state:

- *“TT 2.9 - Are you satisfied with the control measures proposed in the outline Traffic Management plan [APP-110] in respect of monitoring and enforcement of restrictions on construction traffic movements?*

- *TT 2.10 - Are you satisfied with the control measures proposed in the outline Traffic Management plan [APP-110] to mitigate the effects of the project on tourist traffic?"*

1.26 To which LCC responded *"The County Council is satisfied"*.

1.27 In light of these responses the Applicant is unclear why further issues that had previously been discussed and agreed are now being raised by LCC.

Appropriateness of indicative arrangements for traffic management

1.28 LCC are concerned that the indicative arrangements for traffic management and accommodation works at each of the access points is generic and does not comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). LCC raise a number of detailed points on access layouts provided

1.29 The Outline Access Management Plan (AMP) [APP-113] provides indicative arrangements for specific locations, namely the landfall (Figure 3.2), Intermediate Electrical Compound (Figure 3.3) and the Substation (Figure 3.4), with generic layouts for all other accesses based on an A road (Figure 3.5) and "other roads" (Figure 3.6).

1.30 Due to the number of access points being proposed and the fact that the detailed design of the project has not been completed, it would not be reasonable to undertake a detailed design of each access location at this stage. Therefore a generic layout of the access arrangements has been provided such that detailed arrangements for each individual access, including provision for temporary speed limits and other traffic management measures, would be agreed and approved by the highway authority as part of each stage specific TMP. Detailed arrangements for access would be designed in accordance with DMRB where appropriate and with signing complying with chapter 9 of the Traffic Signs Manual..

1.31 This approach was discussed at the meeting with LCC on 11th November 2015 and was agreed by all parties that this was appropriate and fit for purpose and that the detailed aspects would be agreed at the appropriate time, pre-commencement of construction.

Lack of up to date accident data

1.32 LCC raised a concern in the Local Impacts issue specific hearing on 19th January that the accident data contained within the EIA is not up to date and therefore not representative of the current level of road safety. This concern was not clarified further, or noted, in the information provided by LCC on Friday 29 January 2016 (Appendix 1).

- 1.33 Accident data was submitted as part of the Traffic and Access Baseline Study (document reference 6.2.5.9.1) to inform the baseline of the assessment. This data was gathered in May 2014 as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information. The baseline relied on the most recently available data for personal injury collisions, which covered the years 2008 to 2012. This data must be examined on the basis of a minimum 3 year period, with 5 years being preferred, in order to statistically identify trends.
- 1.34 The review identified four clusters of accidents that could be considered for further assessment as part of the EIA. These four locations were considered in the EIA in relation to the impact of increased traffic flows on the potential risk of collisions. The baseline study was agreed as part of the EIA Evidence Plan.
- 1.35 Although the EIA was prepared in April 2015, the most recently available data at that time in comparable format was up to the end of 2013 as the annual release of data by the Department for Transport typically occurs in August of the following year. This data would have only provided an additional year of data, which is unlikely to change the results of the baseline study. Furthermore, the baseline study identified specific locations for further assessment in the EIA. The Applicant considers that additional data would not have changed the locations carried forward for further assessment. In addition, the Applicant considers that in the absence of a significant change it would be unreasonable to review and update a series of documents and assessments that have already been agreed, in order to take account of the new data. As such, the Applicant considers that the accident data used to inform the assessment is appropriate and can be relied upon.

Impact of slow moving and turning vehicles on the A17 and A158

- 1.36 LCC consider that the impact on the A17 and A158 is high due to slow moving and turning construction vehicles. This is principally through concerns about the potential for the impedance of traffic flows resulting from accesses to Temporary Construction Compounds, particularly those associated with the new permanent haul road serving the Triton Knoll Substation and the temporary haul road serving the Intermediate Electrical Compound, and through imposed speed restrictions or traffic lights.
- 1.37 Section 2 of the Outline AMP provides details of access arrangements to temporary construction compounds and indicative layouts of the access arrangements onto the A158 for the Intermediate Electrical Compound (Figure 3.3) and the A17 for the Substation (Figure 3.4). Furthermore, paragraph 2.9 (of the outline AMP) states that “*Finalised drawings, showing the full detail of access improvements, including measures to ensure safe access from the highway onto the Onshore Cable Route via the TCC locations, would be agreed as part of the detailed AMP through consultation with the Highway Authority.*”

- 1.38 Figure 3.3 illustrates deceleration and acceleration lanes for the temporary access onto the A158, which will minimise impacts on through traffic along the A158. Potential revisions to Figure 3.4 were discussed at a meeting held with highway officers on 11th November 2015, including provision of an under-passing lane. This would consist of widening on the southbound nearside so that a vehicle waiting to turn right into the temporary access would not impede the flow of through traffic along the A17.
- 1.39 The adequacy of the Access Management Plan for the purposes of the DCO was discussed at the meeting on 11th November 2015, where it was understood to be agreed that it was fit for purpose and that the detailed aspects would be agreed prior to the commencement of construction.
- 1.40 It is also noteworthy that the level of HGV movements assessed as a realistic worst case scenario is based upon the peak volumes of traffic for all elements of the Project occurring at the same time. These figures include a 20% contingency at the point of calculating volumes of materials to allow for daily fluctuations and therefore represent a robust assessment of traffic movements. For the majority of the construction phase, traffic movements at each access point and surrounding roads will be significantly less, with a corresponding reduction in impact on existing traffic volumes and road users.
- 1.41 The traffic and access assessment sets out in Table 9-17 (Volume 3, Chapter 9 *Traffic and Access* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.9, [APP-050])) that the section of the A17 on which the substation permanent haul road and Swineshead level crossing is anticipated to experience 401 HGV's which is an increase of 12.0% and an increase in all vehicles of 2.3%.
- 1.42 The assessment of temporary changes to accidents and road safety is set out in paragraphs 9.157 – 9.160 of Volume 3, Chapter 9 *Traffic and Access* of the ES (document reference 6.2.3.9, [APP-050]):

“9.157 The IEMA guidelines at paragraph 4.42 suggest that where a development is expected to produce a change in the character of the traffic (e.g. HGV movements on rural roads), then data on existing accident levels may not be sufficient. Professional judgement will be needed to assess the implications of local circumstances.

9.158 The baseline information contained at Annex 9.1 (Volume 5) provides information on accident records for the study area, and focuses on four specific locations where a cluster of accidents could be exacerbated by an increase in traffic flows. Links AZ and BA, which will experience an increase in HGVs greater than 30%, represent the north and south arms of the A153/B1192 junction where a cluster of accidents has been identified. These accidents have occurred as a result of vehicles turning in or out of the B1192. However, the additional HGV movements are along the A153 and do not carry out a turning

movement at this location. Therefore, it is considered that the increase in HGV movements in this area will not lead to a worsening of highway safety.

9.159 The temporary and permanent access arrangements that will be constructed to serve the TCCs, Substation, Intermediate Electrical Compound and Landfall will all be designed to current highway standards, be subject to a road safety audit and will be approved by the Local Highway Authority. Details of these access arrangements will be secured through the Access Management Plan.

9.160 On this basis, the effect on accidents and road safety would be temporary and negligible.”

- 1.43 The Applicant notes the point made by LCC highways authority at paragraph 3.4 (Appendix 1), noting that they “*expect some disruption caused by the works the methods and control need to minimise this whilst ensuring safety and compliance with traffic management regulations.*” The Applicant agrees with the aspiration to minimise any disruption and considers that the outline TMP and outline AMP are the appropriate plans to ensure that these aspirations are realised through to the construction of the proposed development.

Impacts on the interface between the A17 and Swineshead level crossing

- 1.44 LCC highways are concerned that any impedance to traffic flow in relatively close proximity to the Swineshead level crossing could have serious implications. It is recognised that there have been a number of incidents at this level crossing in recent years and that Network Rail has identified it as one of the highest risk crossings in the country. The Applicant notes that a safety camera was installed in April 2015 to reduce the risk of a fatality by recording drivers who fail to stop at the lights when activated.
- 1.45 The Applicant welcomes the statement by LCC that it has “*no issue with the location of the access*”.
- 1.46 It is the Applicant’s position that appropriate mitigation can be developed in consultation with the highway authority and Network Rail to remove any risk of traffic standing on the crossing.
- 1.47 When these issues were raised during the meeting on the 11th November the Applicant responded that mitigation for any impact on traffic flows would be a key element of the traffic management plans and access management plans, which must be approved by the relevant authority, after consultation with the highway authority, prior to the onshore works commencing.
- 1.48 It is the Applicant’s position that the appropriate time for the development of detailed mitigation is post consent. However the Applicant outlined in its

meeting with the LCC highways authority on 11th November 2015, that a likely measure for the mitigation of traffic flow would be the construction of a temporary under-passing lane on the southbound nearside to allow construction vehicles to turn right without impeding through traffic.

- 1.49 It was the Applicant's understanding that LCC highways authority confirmed at the meeting on the 11th November that they were happy with this approach and recommended that discussion with relevant parties, including Network Rail, commenced very shortly after any consent was granted, so as to avoid any potential delays to the approval of the construction traffic management plan.

Appendix 1 - Response from LCC on Traffic Matters (received 29th January 2016)

1

Lincolnshire County Council's response to issues raised in relation to highways and traffic management at the Issue Specific Hearing on 19 January 2016.

1. At the hearing on Tuesday 19th January in response to a question from the Examining Authority, Andrew Ratcliffe Area Highways manager for highways North Division raised four matters to which the applicant raised further questions.

A Routing of Construction Traffic to the access points and the access used for the landing point.

B The indicative arrangements for traffic management are not appropriate for the locations identified

C The A17 and the A158 are main holiday routes and the impacts of slow moving and turning traffic have not been identified to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority

D The Highway Authority consider that the impact on the interface between the A17 and Swineshead level crossing of the construction works has not been appropriately considered in relation to the access point on the A17

1.1. The routing plan is very small scale and this makes identifying the routes that the applicant has identified away from the principal road network imprecise.

1.2. The access roads that have been identified in the outline Traffic Management Plan [APP-110] indicate that away from the main roads some of the access points from the adopted highway network are via narrow single track lanes which are unsuitable for large number of heavy commercial vehicles (HCV) and without upgrading would not be suitable for abnormal loads as described by the Road Vehicles (Construction & use) Regulations 1986 (SI 1986/1078)

2

The Highway Authority would need to be provided with further information in respect of the routing arrangements and confirmation of route surveys for both the HCV and abnormal load vehicles using these routes (TCC1, TCC7, TCC8, TCC9, TCC10, TCC14, TCC16, TCC17, TCC18, TCC19, TCC20, TCC21).

- 1.3 Whilst improvements have been shown at the access point from the maintainable highway to the landfall site (TCC1) there is no evidence that the route has been surveyed for any other pinch point locations.
- 1.4. The access from the A52 through to Anderby Creek is narrow and of suitable construction for occasional HCV but is not constructed for sustained heavy traffic flows. Proposals for improvement prior to the use of this route would be required to ensure the continued use of this route for holiday visitors and local population in safety.
- 1.5 If the Highway Authority is not satisfied that the access routes are suitable then we would require alternative access arrangements to be proposed which could be changes to local routing or access from suitable routes along the length of the haul road.
- 2.0 The indicative arrangements for traffic management and accommodation works at each of the access points is generic and does not comply with the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridge works for all the sites.
- 2.2 Signing for all access points will need to be agreed with the Highway Authority and must comply as a minimum with Chapter 9 of the Traffic Signs Manual 2009 and the code of practice Safety at Street works along with any further arrangements required for the specific location by the Highway Authority.
- 2.3 The arrangement identified in the Outline Access Management Plan [APP-113] at figure 3.3 to 3.5 for A roads will need to be individually designed and approved by the Highway Authority.
- 2.4. The majority of the access points identified are onto unrestricted speed limits and therefore the individual acceleration and deceleration lanes would need to be designed for length and width to enable access and egress onto main traffic lanes for all

- 3
- traffic. 3.0 m lane width is not suitable for HCV, and the length would need to be designed for the individual situation. The Highway Authority will need to see detail of the design for each location.
- 2.5 The routing and arrangement indicates no HCV traffic using the A158 east of TCC5 however the arrangement does not seem to restrict this manoeuvre.
- 2.6 There is no indication of the typical or detail access at any of the access points referred to in 1.2 (TCC1, TCC7, TCC8, TCC9, TCC10, TCC14, TCC16, TCC17, TCC18, TCC19, TCC20, TCC21). Each of the access points will need a detail design appropriate for the individual locations to be approved by the Highway Authority prior to use by any vehicles associated with the cable route construction. Figure 3.6 referred to as the typical layout is not included in the Outline Access Management Plan.
- 2.7 The indicative arrangements for A roads do not include any measures to allow for the construction traffic to safely turn right into the individual sites such as a protected right turn or an undertaking lane. Whilst it was indicated by the applicant at the hearing that consideration was being given for an undertaking lane on the A17 at Swineshead Bridge the applicant and LCC Highways also discussed this for the A158 accesses during a telephone conference on Friday 15th January 2016. This arrangement should also be pursued for the A16 as well.
- 2.8 Temporary speed limits can only be provided for a maximum period of 18 months and a Traffic Regulation Order will be required for each location. The signage indicated in the typical diagrams is advisory not regulatory and so is not acceptable for these locations. Control mechanisms such as chicanes or other forms of speed control may also be required for these situations, which would not be appropriate for the A17, A158 and A16.
- 2.9 The A17 is one of the main routes for heavy freight and holiday traffic from the Midlands to East Anglia. Traffic flows here are relatively constant throughout the year with a very high proportion

of HCV's (around 20-25% of total traffic flows)

3.1 The A158 is the main holiday route to the east coast resorts of Lincolnshire. Traffic flows here are more variable throughout the year but overall are similar to the A17 at Swineshead Bridge. The proportion of HCV traffic is much lower (in the order of 5% of the total).

3.2 Restrictions to the flow of traffic by control eg traffic lights would not be acceptable in these locations as the impact on traffic flow would be extremely disruptive. The impact of restrictions can introduce tailbacks in the region of 10 km or more.

3.3 Speed restrictions for extended periods of time can also introduce tailbacks that could adversely affect the local economy in peak periods.

3.4 Whilst it is expected that there would be some disruption caused by the works (including access by HCV and abnormal loads) the methods of access and control need to minimise this whilst ensuring safety and compliance with Traffic management regulations.

4.0 Swineshead Bridge level crossing has been identified by Network Rail as one of the highest risk crossings in the country. The crossing has a history of fatal and severe incidents some of which have been linked with road works and traffic management.

4.1 Traffic management at the substation access from the A17 was (along with other matters) discussed with the applicant on Friday 15th January 2016. The Highway Authority has no issue with the location of the access however no traffic can be allowed to stand on the crossing and all measures possible must be taken to ensure this throughout the works and once constructed during maintenance activities in relation to the substation or cable route.

4.2 The use of the undertaking lane was discussed and is a measure that the Highway Authority has some comfort in the use of.

4.4 The applicant must discuss and agree the access arrangements

with Network Rail prior to the design and the construction of the access. The applicant has been advised that agreement with Network Rail could be a long duration process and until Network Rail's requirements are agreed the Highway Authority can not agree the access arrangements onto the A17.

50. Lincolnshire County Council Highways has engaged with RWE in trying to identify issues and concerns raised by these proposals with meetings and discussions throughout the process. In particular, meetings took place in May 2015 where the County Council discussed the project and to agree overall highway issues. In December 2015 where issues identified within the statement of common ground were discussed along with these issues raised in this document. The issues raised within this document were raised again at the meeting 15 January but not in same detail as in this document.

In relation to the EIA Evidence Plan process, Lincolnshire County Council have been involved with the process and confirmed their acceptance or otherwise to the Evidence plan in relation to highway issues in an email dated 21 April 2015 from Andrew Ratcliffe.

The Highway Authority does not object to the route or the access points per se but requires more information and clarification as detailed above to be able to feel comfortable with the proposals.

Appendix 2 - LCC Highway Authority Agreement to the EIA Evidence Plan

Emails from Lincolnshire County Council highways

From: Andrew Ratcliffe [REDACTED]

Sent: 21 April 2015 13:4 [REDACTED]

To: Gauld-Clark, Kim

Subject: RE: Triton Knoll EIA Evidence Plan Final Sign-off

"I can confirm that the Evidence Plan document, relevant summary sheet and relevant log(s) with respect to Highways issues, represents a fair and reasonable record of the Evidence Plan process and an accurate summary of the agreed and/or disagreed status of the issues discussed with me."

Andy Ratcliffe

Area Highway Manager
Lincolnshire County Council