

TEXT_AQUIND_ISH2_Session1_14122020

Mon, 12/14 2:37PM • 58:21

00:13

Good morning, and welcome to this issue specific hearing, which is part of the examination the application for the aquent interconnector nationally significant infrastructure project.

00:24

Today's topic is traffic highways and air quality.

00:29

Before we proceed, Can I check with the case team that the recording has started and that you can hear me?

00:35

Good morning, Mr. Barton, having John's case manager confirm that recording has started and can hear you loud and clear. Thank you.

00:43

Thank you very much. Please could all participants ensure that they are muted unless invited to speak and please turn off mobile phones.

00:53

We would also ask you to keep your cameras switched off. While you are not speaking.

00:58

This hearing is taking place virtually online on the Microsoft team's platform. But the format content and procedure will be very similar to the traditional face to face issues specific hearings that have been held for previous dcl examinations.

01:15

There are many familiar faces and names in the virtual room. But for the benefit of the livestream in the recording, we will go through the usual introductions. I am Andrew Marr and I was appointed on the 12th of February 2020. Under Section 65 of the Planning Act 2008 under delegation from the Secretary of State has the lead member of a panel to examine this application.

01:41

I have a background in ecology and environmental impact assessment. And I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect.

01:49

My fellow panel members were appointed on the same date. And I'll ask them to introduce themselves starting with Mr. Wallace.

01:57

Good morning, everyone. My name is David Wallace. I'm a chartered member of the royal Town Planning Institute and have academic qualifications in environmental planning. I'll hand over to Mr. Roscoe.

02:10

Good morning. I'm Steven Roscoe. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I have a background in engineering and development.

02:18

Thank you, our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with us today are having gems the case manager leading the planning Inspectorate case team for this application, and two case officers Stephen Parker and Caroline hope well,

02:31

you will find information about the application and documents produced for this examination on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure website.

02:40

This has a landing page for the aquent interconnector project and further pages that set out examination procedure, the examination timetable relevant representations and examination documents. Our rule eight letter of Tuesday the 15th of September 2020 includes that web address.

03:01

This hearing is being held virtually on Microsoft Teams but please note that the chat function is not in use today.

03:08

The examining authority will invite participants to speak at appropriate times. Should you wish to make an urgent comment, you may use the hand up function. Though Please be advised there may be a delay before we see it. And please wait to be invited to speak.

03:25

Telephone participants and telephone participants should clearly state their name if they wish to make an urgent comment. But again, please wait to be invited before making your contribution.

03:37

Please speak loudly and clearly when you are making submissions, especially those on the telephone.

03:45

The applicant has arranged for this hearing to be live streamed on the website of production 78.

03:51

Please be aware that the chat function on the production centre webpage is not in use.

03:58

If you participate in this hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and live streamed and that a digital recording with subtitles will be published.

04:10

It will be made available on the project page of the national infrastructure website that I referred to earlier.

04:17

The planning inspector to practice is to retain the recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the development consent order.

04:27

Because the digital recording is retained and published, it forms a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the general data protection regulation applies.

04:39

Please try your best not to add information to the public record that you would wish to be kept private and confidential.

04:47

If there is no alternative to the disclosure of such information, we will agree a process to enable it to be made available without it forming part of the public record.

04:58

Mr. Roscoe will be taking

05:00

note of any post hearing action points that arise during the course of the hearing, and he will seek to agree these are the applicant before we close the hearing.

05:09

Mr. Wallace will now take us through agenda item two.

05:14

Thank you very much. This issue specific hearing is intertraffic highways and Air Quality Matters. The examiner in authority has issued a detailed agenda, to which I hope you all have a copy to hand or which you may download from the planning inspectorates national infrastructure website.

05:35

The agenda is set out in the form of questions that the examiner authority wishes to explore at the hearing. In most instances, these questions are aimed at the applicant for response. Once the applicant has given their answer. The examiner authority will invite responses to what has been said from participants. In other cases where the question is aimed at a particular interested party, that party will have a chance to set out their answer unfold before response is invited from the applicant. The examiner for two may ask questions at any time. In all cases, the applicant will be offered the last word

06:13

as with issue specific hearing into the draft development consent order last week, we are aware that a few of today's agenda items have been partially or wholly addressed in these documents submitted to us at deadline for and at deadline five. In these cases, and subject to after parties comments, were generally happy for the applicant to respond to those agenda items with a very brief summary of the situation and a reference to the relevant submission where the matter is addressed.

06:44

speakers will have the opportunity to provide us with a written summary of their own submissions to give any supporting evidence or references by deadline six in the examination timetable, which is Wednesday the 23rd of December 2020.

07:01

The applicant will also be invited to respond to points made in writing by the same deadline.

07:08

In terms of speakers for us, there are some familiar faces and names in the room for the benefit of the audio recording. I will be asking you all to introduce yourselves. When I call you please identify yourself with your name and your role at the organisation where there isn't clickable, starting in place with the applicant.

07:31

So I'd be on behalf of the applicant to go with Mr. Martin Jarvis. My name is Simon bird QC instructed by Herbert regal Mr. Martin Jarvis is an associate with Herbert Smith free hills and today's are our principal spokespersons will be Mr. Chris Williams, who is an associate transport planner with Ws p who's the transport lead. He has a Bachelor of Science honours degree in human geography, an MSc in transport planning and as a member of the Chartered Institute of highways and transportation and in relation to air quality, it will be Mr. Stewart Bennett of W SP, who is a chartered environmentalist, an Associate Director of air quality at W SP and he is the air quality lead for the application and they will be supported as necessary by members of the engineering team who have already been introduced to the examination. Thank you, sir.

08:22

Thank you very much and welcome all. Thank you.

08:26

May I ask who now appears and represents Hampshire County Council please.

08:33

Good morning, sir. My name is Richard tourney, I'm a barrister instructed by Hampshire County Council. And we've got on the call as well, three officers from the council. They are Holly Drury principal transport planner, Tim guymer, spatial planning lead officer and Ian Ackerman, the permit scheme and Traffic Manager.

08:54

Thank you very much. Welcome all.

08:58

I asked now who's here representing Portsmouth City Council, please.

09:05

Good morning, sir. I don't know whether you can see me and I hope you can hear me. Yes.

09:12

Selena Cahoon Council for Portsmouth City Council. I have three officers from the council who will assist with evidence today Firstly, Mr. Peter Hayward. Secondly, Mr. Steven Flynn. And thirdly, Hailey towers, who is going to deal with the air quality Mr. Heyman and Mr. Finn would deal with the highways issues. So we will be submitting full CVS as we indicated last week with regard to all our witnesses, as I call them, but obviously that those who are assisting so I have a couple of points, really with regard to how best to assist the the examining authority today because it builds on a point that you made earlier, which is that where we are with the evidence, there's a slight sort of

10:00

overlap.

10:02

Would you like me to deal with that now? So or shall I deal with it? After you have finished introductions?

10:10

Yes, sir, if you wouldn't mind, I just finished the introductions and then we'll come come back to you on that point. Thank you very much. It's very quick. That's okay. Thank you

10:20

may ask who's here on behalf of Winchester City Council, please?

10:27

Yes, good morning, sir. Can you can you hear me? Yes, indeed, I can. Thank you very much. My name is Steven cormo. I'm the lead officer on the project for Winchester City Council. Aloma come nearby the council solicitor, Catherine Knight.

10:45

Thank you very much and welcome.

10:48

And finally, may I ask who's appearing on behalf of the South downs National Park Authority, please.

10:56

Good morning, sir. My name is Mike Hughes. I'm a charter town planner at South downs National Park Authority. Thank you. Thank you very much. That completes my list of those who have registered to speak today. But is there anyone else in the room? Who has registered to speak who have not yet covered?

11:16

Okay, nothing heard. Thank you. Thank you to everyone for those introductions. Just to remind everyone that we do have a lot to get through today. And although we are under no particular time constraints, in order to make best use of hearing time and to ensure fairness, please do not repeat points that you have heard. Be reassured that the examiner 40 will have heard and understood the points being made. I should also point out that if you bring up matters which are not relevant to the examination, we may need to interject to explain this and ask you to move on to your next point. Please also refrain from interrupting or disrupting the event as this is unhelpful to you as it is to us. We will be seeking to adjourn for regular breaks to ensure that no one suffers from screen fatigue during this today's hearing. Lunch will be convened at an appropriate time.

12:10

I would encourage you all to keep connected to this hearing during the breaks and lunchtime to avoid confusion and the need to re-enter the hearing. If you're watching the live stream, you will need to refresh your browser after every break to ensure you stay tuned.

12:27

At all times. Please ensure your microphone and camera are off to ensure your privacy during the breaks.

12:34

Okay, before we move on to agenda item three Miss Cahoon you would like to raise a point about procedure, please. Yes, thank you, sir. They're more evidential points. But I hope it'll be clear while I'm raising them now. Firstly, there was an issue that was left over from the CH two which was a remark made by the applicant in terms of what Portsmouth City Council's overall view about traffic impact was, and they indicated that, that they understood the council's position to be that it wasn't severe. And that is not the case.

13:15

If you wish to ask Mr. Hayward directly about that point, and he is able to do so. But I just thought I would mark that down now because this is the time when we're dealing with traffic matters. Secondly,

and obviously matters have moved on since deadline five. And as you mentioned in your introduction, there will be responses formerly in writing from the council with regard to the applicants evidence that does include some very important documents, obviously, the ctmp, the management strategy, there's a supplementary traffic assessment and obviously an AI I tech, technical note. Those are clearly all important matters that will take your evidence further. But we understand that it is far better that you have that written response in writing, rather than trying to elicit the evidence from Mr. Hayward all Mr. Flinn, indeed, orally, but we will endeavour to assist as much as possible. I hope that that is clear. We don't want that there will be a time lag as ever with these matters. But I just wanted to make sure that you knew you would get the right answers and they would be in writing but then there may be a lot of conflict. But it may be a little bit odd that some of the things that are said in evidence today have actually been overtaken by events. Yes, of course. I appreciate the position we're in where the deadlines are moving and documents are coming in and back forth. But certainly any written responses following this hearing. By deadline six would be welcomed. And just before we move on, Mr. Bird, I see your hand is raised

15:00

So just in response to that just wanted to put down a marker. I mean, the documents referred to by Mr. Cahoon, there were submitted a deadline one.

15:10

And there has been time to respond to those deadline. Five.

15:16

But obviously, we'll wait to see what is said.

15:20

Thank you very much for that point. misko. Not necessarily on that. But in terms of the position, it might be a question for Mr. Hayward, terms of the position being severe could either Mr. Hayward or yourself just point to a submission that has been made where the word severe is actually used? just for ease of reference, please? Yes, sir. I will get that for you, sir. Okay, thank you very much.

15:51

Okay, then. all being said on that point. Let's move on to agenda item free for that day.

16:02

We have this of course, split into several sections.

16:07

Sorry, I'm getting some audio.

16:12

If someone could mute the microphone unless you wish to speak.

16:17

Okay, nothing had.

16:20

We'll move on then to the formal agenda item three A, which is in regards to additional survey work and classifications.

16:32

Read the first point on the question tree a. We've referenced to the applicants response to x q one, Question two t 116 18. At deadline one. Please can the applicant set out the assumptions and limitations made in respect of traffic generated from Fratton Park on football match days, and the predicted effects on the highway?

16:58

I appreciate Mr. Burdon Mr. Jarvis that we've got your transcript. And there's no need necessarily to read it verbatim. But if we could just have a summary of your position place. Thank you.

17:11

We're gonna ask Mr. Williams to deal with that. Of course, Mr. Williams afternoon.

17:19

Hi, it's Chris Williams here representing the applicant. Can you hear me and see me? Yes, I can do both, sir. Okay, so further to the transcript submitted at deadline five. The applicant wishes to update their position regarding traffic flows on the 2030 Eastern road on football match days. In light of additional traffic survey information which has now become available.

17:44

Today it has been considered by the applicant that traffic flows on the 2030s and rotor similar on match days to weekday, am and pm peak periods, which has been robustly assessed using the srtm traffic model and reported in the transport assessment and supplementary transport transport assessment. Due to covid 19 pandemic however, it was not possible to complete traffic surveys on football match days prior to the examination as the applicant had intended to prove this theory.

18:15

Therefore, within the transcript submitted at deadline five, the applicant provided review of data of the a 27 off slips at the a 27 820 30s and ready to estimate the southbound Easton road traffic flow prior to a football match. However, in the run up to the hearing today and post deadline five the applicant has obtained automatic traffic count survey data Thiessen road which was completed between the 22nd of February and the 16th of March this year. This is prior to the COVID-19 Uk lockdown, which commenced on the 23rd of March this year. The traffic survey was completed on Easton road between anchorage road and a 27 heaven bypass and contained a period in which Portsmouth FC played four weekday evening games at Fratton Park, we were the kickoff time of 7:45pm. The first of these was a league game against MK Dons on Tuesday the 25th of February with an attendance of 16 and a half 1000 a league game versus Rochdale on Friday the 28th of February with an attendance of 17,600 an FA Cup game against Arsenal on Monday the second of March with

an attendance of 18,839 and the league game versus Fleetwood town on Tuesday the 10th of March which had an attendance of 16,755. To test the assumption of matchday traffic flows on the eastern road. The applicant is therefore completed and assessment of these traffic flows recorded on Tuesday the second of March reports have played Arsenal in the FA Cup

19:57

as the attendance of the game was higher than the average

20:00

bridge attendance at Fratton Park over the last four seasons, the applicant considers that this is therefore very robust assessment and what over report traffic conditions compared to average attendances

20:13

should also know that this full assessment will be submitted at deadline six. But as a summary of the key points,

20:20

while the pre match southbound traffic flows

20:24

were comparable or less than those used in the SL tm assessments for weekday peak

20:31

periods, the traffic surveys recorded a much higher proportion of slow moving traffic, the non match days. For example, between six and 7pm 88% of traffic recorded by the ATC was travelling at a speed of between zero and 50 miles an hour.

20:49

This is after the general peak hour five to 6pm and suggests that significant traffic congestion was present along the a 2013 Road. However, it is also the case that due to coincidence with a peak hour This is likely but peak hour traffic.

21:06

Sorry, it's likely that there would have still been some peak hour traffic in the six to 7pm period.

21:14

A high proportion of slow moving traffic also means it is likely that the ATC is underreported traffic flows during this period in the southbound direction. Therefore actual traffic flows may have been higher than those assessed within the srtm for weekday peaks in the northbound direction. After the match, the post match flows were comparable to the weekday peak hours assessed in the srtm. However, this despite the post match traffic, traffic flows being between 945 and 10:45pm. When background traffic flows on the eastern road on non match days are significantly lower than other times of day. It is also acknowledged that the profile of persons leaving portsea Island after a football match at 9:45pm would

be expected be higher than those leaving at 5pm on a Saturday choose at the time of day. Therefore taking this additional information to account.

22:09

A robust assumption for assessment purposes is that the addition of post football match traffic other times a day such as Saturday 5pm is likely to lead to higher traffic flows on the 2030 Eastern road then assessed within the srtm.

22:25

As a result, yeah, we can accept that the traffic flows on match days on Saturdays may be higher than those assessed in the srtm ordinate a peak peak hours. And with this in mind, and acknowledging that necessary mitigations must be secured. The applicant proposes that in the first instance traffic management on the 20 32nd road will be removed on football match days to mitigate potential impacts of such mitigation would be achieved through careful scheduling of works change overs between each 100 metre construction section, which under the proposed 24 hour construction working hours would occur approximately every three days.

23:05

This will also allow traffic management to be removed prior to football match and re installed on the same day therefore minimising the delay in the construction progress.

23:15

However, as the assessment work undertaken is based on evening traffic flows are higher than average attendance match, and noted limitations for undertaken for matchday surveys at the current time due to COVID-19 restrictions. The applicant also proposes the undertaking of further representative surveys to confirm the position when it's possible to do so, post grant to the DCA

23:38

should the surveys which will be reviewed and agreed reports with City Council identify the traffic flows comparable to those for weekday peak hour by the assessment

23:49

undertaken has identified an acceptable position for traffic management to be in place. The need to remove traffic management or football match days will be lifted service to assist with the efficient delivery of works in this location. Thank you.

24:06

Thank you very much, Mr. Williams, just before you go.

24:11

So that removal of traffic management on a Saturday is an additional mitigation measure, on top of the already tightened restrictions to make sure that construction doesn't take place on Easter fingers on Sundays during the and also during the summer periods. I seem to recall some restrictions on that.

24:35

Is that the case and will of course find its way into the framework construction transport management plan. Yes, that's correct. The ftms currently include restrictions that

24:48

prevent works from being undertaken for the majority of the football season, noting there may be a clash when two or three games may be played. This would be applied to

25:00

To the ftms restrictions. Excellent. Thank you very much.

25:06

I'll come over to Portsmouth City Council in the first instance. Notwithstanding the the additional data that we have heard today, obviously you will be responding more fully in, in writing when we've seen that written down.

25:25

But are Portsmouth generally happy with the way that the applicant has made the assumptions regarding traffic from Fratton Park on football match days, and the proposals for mitigation.

25:40

Mr. Haywood.

25:42

Hello, sir. Um,

25:44

the assumptions made about the the traffic generated from Fratton Park on on match days being similar to a weekday peak is is reasonable.

25:56

But it will be more directional and the effects will extend for a longer time during the day.

26:03

So whilst

26:06

the peak at the daily peak hour effects are, are limited in time, and for ordinary peak hours, the football effects will certainly be longer and more directional at the beginning and end of each match.

26:23

So we had taken the view that the the proposed mitigation

26:28

in the programme such that those words didn't take place when football matches were scheduled essentially resolve that issue. And I'm concerned to hear that there may be an intention to step back from that now, depending on the model defects because I don't think you can reasonably compare the duration and directional impact of

26:52

the matchday traffic with the peak hour traffic. Okay, I believe it was my understanding Anyway, there wasn't a stepping back from that original mitigation, but as an additional mitigation measure

27:07

to remove traffic management on a Saturday.

27:12

Was that not your same understanding? It was my understanding that Mr. Williams said that they were going to

27:20

determine whether or not with further surveys determine whether or not the football match day traffic was worse or similar to a weekday peak hour traffic, and if it was manage it in the same way as they were for the weekday peak. Right. Okay, thank you very much for that I will be coming back to you shortly. Mr. Jarvis, I see your hand is up.

27:47

Thanks. So now the position within the SMS has always been that there's the potential for an overlap in August with two to three football matches. The previous assumption with regards to traffic flows was that they were similar to the peak traffic flows. And the assessment work undertaken two days and before that explain today had identified that where traffic management was in place on the eastern road in those locations in the peak hour, the position is acceptable. What has been explained by Mr. Williams today is that further data has been obtained and considered and it's identified that there could be higher traffic flows as a consequence of football matches both before and after the match. So what is now proposed by the applicant is a requirement so as to why it is a requirement to remove traffic management in the build up to and following matches such that it is not there and cannot cause impact, and for it to be reinstated following to allow the construction to continue. However, because the assessment work carried out has been undertaken on an overly worst case basis, assessing a match against Arsenal where the capacity at Fratton Park was above 18,000. The intention is for the applicant to carry out further representative surveys of normal matchday conditions when they're able to post UK lockdown, such that it's then evidence that the position during sorry, the position before and after matches is similar to the PNP kalla. When it is acceptable to have traffic management on the eastern road, then it would not be necessary to remove the traffic management. But that would only be where the survey data is clear that the levels are the same as or less than what has already been assessed in the peak hour.

29:27

Thank you very much for that clarification there.

29:31

Mr. Hayward, obviously, you'll get a chance to respond in writing to this and don't necessarily want to refer in as such. But do you have any comments on what you've just heard?

29:42

No, sir. I was understanding that. I'm just wondering about the practicalities of taking traffic management on and off if we might have longer standing features in the construction in the highway, such as joined by chambers or something that needs to be in place for a longer period.

29:59

But I'll do that in Rome.

30:00

Yeah, cause Thank you. And then we'll come back to the issue of Joint Base later on the agenda. Mr. Jarvis. Is there anything you want to add on this point?

30:10

Just in response to Mr. Haywood, just to note that Chris Williams clearly mentioned that the changeover to the 100 metre sections on the eastern road because of the working hours that will be used will be every three days. And that's what therefore allows the ability to remove the traffic management and to carefully schedule so that when we are aware that as a matter of incoming, the works can be scheduled to allow for the removal during that time and to be reinstated thereafter without materially impacting the construction programme. Thank you. Thanks very much.

30:42

Just one point before I move on to the next question, Mr. Williams, could you just confirm again, those dates when the automated traffic counts were undertaken place?

30:58

So just bear with me, I'm trying to find where they are.

31:05

They were undertaken on between the 22nd of February 2020 in the 16th of March 2020. Excellent. Thank you very much. That's much appreciated.

31:21

Mrs. Jury, I see your hand is raised.

31:26

Morning, sir. Sorry. Um, yeah, Hampshire County Council really picked up on this issue beforehand. But obviously with the traffic taken back onto the a 27. There is a risk also that impacts on the a three corridor. So I think we just want to request that the future traffic surveys also cover the h3 and any mitigation that's identified as needed. It also applied to that element of the corridor as well.

31:49

Thank you very much for that. Mr. Jarvis. Anything further on on that point?

31:57

No, thank you, sir. Okay, thank you very much. Miss jury, your hand is still raised.

32:05

Excellent. Thank you very much. Okay, we turn into the agenda, then we'll move on to the next point. Next question. Can the applicant briefly set out the results of the additional survey work undertaken to inform in supplementary transport assessment? In particular, the technical note at Appendix A. For those of you looking at this on on the live stream, this is the exam Library Reference rep one hyphen, one for two.

32:35

Miss Jarvis Mr. Williams.

32:39

Mr. Williams again, thank you, sir, for sure.

32:48

Can I just start by asking,

32:51

Do you want a full summary of all the

32:55

survey information and assessment information completed within the sta at this stage?

33:01

At this stage, I've got your transcript and that transcript is available. So there's no need to read it verbatim as such, but just a high level summary of all the points that have been updated, and all the additional survey work done would be helpful place. Okay. In terms of survey information survey work, there was a an additional speed survey completed on Broadway lane in proximity of the proposed site access junction. This was completed in June 2020 and showed that the achievable visibility splays are appropriate for the speed of traffic recorded on Broadway lane. Also overnight traffic survey app sorry, overnight parking surveys are being completed in residential areas that are likely to be impacted either directly by construction of the onshore cable route, or through displacement of parking.

33:54

These surveys show that the majority of cases that any displaced parking could be accommodated on the surrounding residential streets.

34:03

The supplementary transport assessment also contained a number of additional assessments. These were completed to reflect new information or corrections with the original submission. However, in all cases, these additional assessments verify the robustness of the conclusions drawn by the original assessment. So, in terms of

34:27

the non traffic assessments,

34:30

at the converters for the converter station access and assessment of visibility splays was undertaken, and as a description of updates to the proposed access junction was provided. In addition, information was provided on the proposed management of hgv's on day lane.

34:48

For the construction traffic routes and update was completed to remove Milton road in Waterlooville from the permitted construction traffic routes.

34:56

an assessment of abnormal loads was completed with regard

35:00

To cable drum deliveries to indicative Joint Base along the onshore cable route, and a full update was completed to the past or injury collision analysis from that contained within the transport assessment to include a updated time period and wider study area.

35:18

In terms of additional

35:21

traffic capacity assessments that were completed. These included updates to information and completion of sensitivity tests. So the updated junction capacity assessments were undertaken where traffic signal specifications and not being provided by AMS county council on submission of the decio were updated additional junction and additional junction capacity assessments were needed to assess the impact of construction workers leaving the converter station in the pm peak.

35:57

And further assessments were completed of installing traffic management on the 2030 Eastern road as contained within the further the a 2030 Eastern roads further traffic assessments technical note, which is Appendix C of the supplementary transport assessment.

36:16

This technical note provided a review of observed traffic data which showed that in the context of such the srtm and the assess traffic management scenario is robust,

36:27

including an assessment of the srtm outputs, which showed the impacts of traffic management on the a 2030 East road have been robustly assessed through decreases in traffic flow and increases in journey time on this route. It also completed an assessment of the impact of installing traffic management adjacent to Milton common through the modelling of the East and road tanjiro traffic signal junction with single lane closures in place. This modelling provided similar results in relation to traffic delaying journey time changes on the 23rd east and road as those provided in the srtm, therefore confirming that the assessment was robust.

37:09

Further sensitivity tests are also completed of traffic management shuttle work in locations and locations where temporary traffic signals were required along the onshore cable corridor. These tests incorporated a 50% reduction in traffic reassignment way from the onshore cable corridor as assessed by the srtm, thereby providing a very robust assessment of traffic management locations.

37:35

The sensitivity low the sensitivity test showed that in some locations, temporary traffic management

37:43

and pre traffic signals are forecast to operate over capacity, lead into queuing and delays in the MMP and peak periods.

37:52

Finally, supplementary transport assessment provides an assessment of the impact on local bus services using outputs from the srtm.

38:01

This assessment was based on a cross section of routes to cover both impacts along the onshore cable corridor and through traffic assignment across the wider network.

38:11

Overall, this showed that the impact on bus services was minor. Thank you.

38:17

Thank you very much. That was a very useful Whistle Stop summary though of the findings that went into that.

38:24

I have no further questions on on this point. But is there anyone else who wishes to raise anything at this time on on that additional traffic survey data?

38:36

Mr. Tony,

38:40

rich attorney for Hampshire County Council, we've raised some detailed comments on this survey data.
So

38:49

whilst it's been explained by the applicant,

38:53

we do have ongoing concerns about the outputs.

38:58

And I don't know whether you need to hear that under this agenda item. I didn't even get anything to say about the detail of the survey work but about the outputs of that we do.

39:10

And we remain of the view that the mitigation that's proposed at present is not sufficient. But it may be that those matters to be dealt with. First in consideration of our deadline, five responses and secondly, later in the hearing.

39:26

Okay, if there is a particular point in the hearing, you've seen a question when you think it'd be more applicable than by all means raise it then.

39:35

Happy for that to be in writing as well. I will be asking one or two questions later on. So it unless there's anything that specifically wants to raise now, I'd say can we park that just for a few moments? Of course. Thank you. Pardon the pun on that.

39:51

Mr. Haywood, I see that your hand is raised. Hello. So yes, our position is very similar to hampshire's on on this so I just wanted to make sure that was

40:00

reflected in both authority areas. Okay. Thank you very much. We'll come back to some queries on that in a moment. But is there anything, either Mr. Jarvis or Mr. Williams wants to say at this point?

40:16

No, thank you, sir. Okay, thank you very much.

40:21

Moving on to the next question, then

40:25

we may very well come to these points. In light of the additional data, and the newly identified likely significant environmental effects are the conclusions made on the significance of effects both pre and post mitigation robust Mr. Williams in the first instance.

40:48

Thank you, sir. So following on from completion of the updated junction capacity assessments, and the sensitivity assessments that I've just just talked about, a number of new significant residual effects were identified in the ES addendum in relation to traffic delay.

41:05

The majority of these new identified effects relate to the sensitivity tests of traffic management locations, requiring temporary traffic signals or shuttle work in traffic signals to facilitate construction of the onshore cable corridor.

41:20

However, it is the African view that such effects are not likely to materialise in practice, and represent an absolute worst case due to the reassignment of traffic away from the onshore cable corridor during construction.

41:38

For example,

41:40

the modelling has originally been completed on using the srtm scenario, which provides a worst case

41:52

assessment or be it a representative snapshot of traffic conditions and impacts associated with construction of the onshore cable corridor. The sensitivity tests provide an additional assessment of an alternative scenario and provide a greater degree of confidence that the level of reassignment predicted by the srtm is robust.

42:15

In terms of the level of cueing and delay reported at some sensitivity tests,

42:21

it is likely that the likely that this would lead to traffic reassigning away from the onshore cable route, which is in a reflection of typical driver behaviour where drivers seek to find the fastest route between origin and destination and the situation which is forecast by the srtm. In addition to general drive behaviour, the proposed communication strategy of the F TMS will ensure that the travelling public are aware of the construction works and anticipated construction period, allowing drivers to make informed and alternative route choices to avoid the works. Therefore,

42:59

combination of these measures means that the results provided in the sensitivity tests are unlikely to occur and the junctions are and traffic signals are likely to operate closer to capacity, and were shorter queues and forecast. As such, they're not therefore likely significant effects.

43:21

In addition to this on the basis on this basis, all estimates of pre mitigation significant are considered to be robust. Pre mitigation includes the traffic management requirements included in the fms and construction, traffic control set out within the framework ctmp is a fine post mitigation effects and traffic delay include the benefits are so to say associated with programme restrictions contained within the F TMS and the communication strategy. And they've all been determined using a precautionary approach in order to maintain a robust and worst case assessment of impacts associated with construction of the onshore caper. applicant therefore maintains all assessment is used a robust and agreed methodology to assess the impact through worst case assessment. Worst case traffic management srtm scenario. In addition, the applicant has undertaken a series of sensitivity tests covering alternative assumptions on the level of reassignment away from the corridor, as just described, on this basis, conclusions drawn regarding pre and post mitigation effects are very robust.

44:35

Okay, thank you very much for that.

44:39

I'll turn first of all to Portsmouth City Council. I see Mr. Haywood Your hand is up.

44:47

My first sort of a question obviously is is for you to respond to what you've just heard. But building into that I've believe I've seen from some of your submissions that they

45:00

His general acceptance of the sub regional transport model in the the assessment methodology, but there are some limitations to it that you're concerned about. I just wonder if you could just flesh those out as well and just explain your your position on that.

45:18

And in light of what you've just heard place, Thank you, sir. I might ask Stephen Flint to jump in as and when I get this wrong, sir.

45:28

But hopefully I'll get it right.

45:30

In terms of the robustness of the approach, the srtm model has some limitations. There are some junctions, where what we observe actually occurring isn't reflected in the model. That's specifically at the ports bridge, roundabout junction, sir.

45:49

I've discussed this with Mr. Williams. And there was a bit more work being done to confirm that that detail.

45:59

The other element that I was concerned about last week, largely accept and agree with the model findings as being the best that we can do with the modelling capability that we have available.

46:13

It doesn't sort of address the safety impacts of

46:22

the effects. So whilst it may predict an increase in Q, or may predict traffic diverting via the routes, it doesn't then go on to assess the safety implications of that extended queue length, or without additional traffic on on diversionary routes. There has been a subsequent paper provided that looked at the safety impacts on the eastern road corridor. But that hasn't yet been extended to look at the effects on the diversionary routes.

46:54

Okay, thank you very much for that. Mr. Finn, was there anything you wanted to jump in on on there?

47:03

No, I think Peters covered it. Thank you, sir. Okay, thank you very much.

47:10

Mr. Williams, anything to come in at this time on that point?

47:19

apologies.

47:21

As Mr. Haywood said, discussions have been being held with the City Council

47:28

regarding assessment of road safety impacts, and

47:33

we're looking to provide some further information on that as soon as possible.

47:40

Thank you very much. Miss jury, I see your hand is raised

47:47

the jury how to carry out. So I think ultimately, we're in a very similar position to Portsmouth. And whilst we're satisfied with the use of the srtm, we all agreed on the analysis of the outputs at this stage and the assumptions made on the severity of those impacts. I think we've made it clear within our deadline, five additional information in response that we're seeking a lot further mitigation from the applicant in relation to the matters relating to buses.

48:16

The impacts for accident analysis, we've got a number of the diversion routes go through some known accident locations for us, significant increases as a result of the diverted traffic.

48:27

They refer to the communication strategy that we're seeking that to be made a lot more

48:34

clearer at this stage about what they're committing to do with it at that point in time. It's just high level. And there's some real commitments that they can make within that to make it a more meaningful document within the decio process.

48:48

And with regard to the ies, I know that they have done an addendum to it to update it based on the sta document and the additional assessment, but it's a bit tricky to follow. And again, we're not agreed on those matters, and that the assessment really affects what the reflects what those impacts are, it seems from my review, that they rely on the fact that the impacts are short term. But when we're talking two years, and we're only assessing a short element of that process, we have to assume that there will be impacts on that corridor for that whole two year process, timeframe. And therefore, we have to make assumptions based on what they're showing us today. And that there will be impact on that corridor throughout the life of the project.

49:30

Okay, thank you for that. I don't know where the before I go back to the applicant. I don't know whether either yourself, or Mr. Tony just wishes to flesh out the other sort of issues that were that Mr. Tony alluded to earlier. Just in terms of the the vastness and the additional mitigations you're seeking. Would you like to take that point or Mr. Tony, I'm happy to I I think a lot of that has been included in our deadline five response.

50:00

And they are in relation to the matters that I spot sort of raised already. So we suggested some form of bus mitigation to make sure that the bus companies can maintain a reliable service. Our main concern is the impacts on during time liability, due to the delays along the corridor.

50:19

discussions on that I believe are still ongoing. Again, we're seeking some further clarity on whether there's mitigation for accident analysis, accidents that they can do. Whether there's an ability to commit

to ongoing review, we have a quite well adopted process for being alerted to accident locations which are emerging. And it's about sort of securing some sort of engagement process with the queen

50:43

to provide funding opportunities to mitigate those accident locations, if they they start to happen

50:50

through low cost measures of some form.

50:54

Or else.

50:57

The communication strategy is the key for us, we're seeking a lot more clarity,

51:02

a wider signage strategy, how that's going to work in practice, whether there's the ability to

51:09

make sure through traffic remains on the ACM, rather than diverting onto the a three, and try and make what their original assessment assumptions for diverting traffic away from the Commodore, that situation to us wasn't as severe. So if they can adopt the measures, which keep the traffic diverting away from the main corridor,

51:30

then it may be that that's more acceptable to us design authority. And at the moment, the measures that they're proposing with the ctms, and their communication strategy, are robust enough for us to be sure that what comes forward in reality will be sufficient.

51:48

Okay, thank you very much, Miss jury. Thank you for that.

51:52

Back to the applicant, we will obviously be touching on buses and bus services later in this agenda. But I just wonder if there's any points that you wish to respond to, at this time notwithstanding? Of course, the discussions are, of course ongoing. Mr. Williams.

52:12

Yes, thank you. I just like to make the point that the the signage strategy, which Mr. Suri mentioned, is currently being drafted, and we're hoping to have that ready for submission by deadline six, we're confident that that should overcome a lot of the concerns that have been raised. And I'd also just like to make the point also that

52:37

a lot of the urea Simon traffic effects relate to locations where temporary traffic signals are required to facilitate construction of the onshore cable route.

52:51

By no means are they required for the entirety of the two year construction period

52:56

on a three London Road, for example, they are they are required for

53:03

a week or two at the top end of the a three London Road, and then a few weeks down towards purbrook Avenue. And then I think another two three week period

53:14

at the southern end of the a three London Road towards the Portsmouth city council boundary. In all cases, those traffic signals will only sorry, construction of the cable corridor in those sections will will only be permitted during the school holidays. And June and July periods to mitigate the impacts of that and to to mitigate the impacts of of traffic reassigning on to other routes. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Jarvis, your hand was up and then it's down. I don't know if you've got anything further to add.

53:53

Support Mr. Williams ready that it is completely inappropriate to assume that all of the impacts will be for the whole duration of two years. And clearly there's programme mitigations in place to avoid that the works will be authorised to a permit scheme, which will also set out the periods of time that the work can be in the location for so it is of course entirely appropriate for the programme to be taken into account where it's reflected in secured mitigation.

54:18

Okay, thank you very much. And, anon that point, then just before we leave this question, I'll come first of all, to Hampshire County Council. We've asked him this question. I'll come to Portsmouth momentarily. But the applicant has now incorporated the traffic permit scheme.

54:40

They're no longer dicipline that and my question really is what effect if any, or what

54:47

change does that have in regards to the highest authorities respective positions? And does that give any reassurances and reduce the severity of these effects

55:00

Come to Hampshire County Council first, Mr. Tony?

55:06

Sir Richard, Tony, for Hampshire County Council, we obviously welcome it in, it gives us more capacity to deal with the management of traffic, as the detail of the proposals becomes clear, and that is obviously welcomed. There are still on the applicants assessment,

55:30

residual effects. And we are still concerned about those but certainly improves our ability to manage manage them, and to minimise the impact.

55:43

And I think the main point would want to make is that these measures in the permit scheme do not fully mitigate or

55:56

completely address the wider concerns about what will be really quite severe traffic disruption arising from the implementation of a scheme of this nature.

56:07

If you need further assistance on how that permit scheme will operate, we've got Mr. Ackman on the call. But it may be your question is yes, on the call to principle?

56:19

Yes, at this time, it was just really what changed that had to your position, the fact that's been incorporated, and I think you've set that out, much appreciated as as anything further you wish to add?

56:31

Okay, thank you very much. And for Portsmouth City Council. So Mr. Haywood, you're ready. So the compliance or working with the permit scheme doesn't reduce the severity of the effects at all, it just allows us better opportunity to manage in and try and mitigate those.

56:50

So it's welcomed, it's certainly welcomed and, and something which we're we're very pleased the applicants move to,

56:57

to incorporate and work with, but it doesn't matter. It doesn't change the severity of the effects. Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Williams, who wishes to respond to that point place?

57:14

I was just, I don't think there's anything really further to acknowledge that the pilot scheme is essentially a management tool and the mitigations will be secured by the ftms, the framework construction traffic management plan and the communication strategy, which will be reflected through the permit scheme management measures. Thank you, sir.

57:33

Thank you very much. I had no additional queries on this point. Does anyone else wish to raise anything at this time?

57:44

Nothing heard. I'm conscious that you've all been through the arrangements conference, and it's now 1057.

57:52

I would suggest that therefore we take a short comfort break before moving on with agenda item three a.

58:00

I would like to take that break and seek to resume this hearing at 1105. That's five past 11.

58:08

Thank you very much.