

TEXT_AQUIND_ISH2_Session2_14122020

Mon, 12/14 2:38PM • 1:00:58

00:11

Good morning again, everyone. Let's resume this issue specific hearing. Turning back to the agenda item create. And the next question on that is, can Portsmouth city council explain its comment in the local impact report that the whole exercise needs to be repeated?

00:32

I believe there was some confusion as to where this phrase was used. It may not be word for word, but I believe it was in paragraph 5.6, point six of the Portsmouth city council local impact report.

00:47

Who'd like to answer this on behalf of Portsmouth City Council, please.

00:56

Hello, sir. Peter Hayward.

00:58

Yeah, I think this is a discrepancy in a table. There's a free text table included in the report that has figures in it. And we were concerned that those figures, those figures were wrong. And we were worried that they'd been using the actual model. It's subsequently been confirmed that the correct figures were used in the model, and it was a an error in the free text table. So that issue is gone away, I think.

01:23

So thank you very much for confirming that. Mr. Jarvis. Is that also your position? The issue has fallen away?

01:32

Yes, thank you.

01:34

Thank you very much. Does anyone else wish to make any points on this?

01:39

Nope, nothing had. Okay. Moving on to the next question, then.

01:46

We've referenced to the applicants responses to the local impact reports. Do the updated results for ports downhill and port speeds round about have any consequential effects on the modelled scenarios?

02:00

I'll start if the applicant Mr. Williams, do you have any comments on this?

02:09

Thank you, sir. We don't believe that they do.

02:14

And if possible, I would just like to set out a quick summary detailing why that is the case.

02:22

So as detail within section 1.2 of the supplementary transport assessment, analysis of portdown Hill, road and ports bridge roundabout are based on outputs from the srtm. And as Portsmouth City Council have already noted, the correction of baseline flows on portdown Hill Road does not impact on

02:42

the S modelled srtm scenarios.

02:46

So at ports bridge around about

02:50

itself, the applicant does accept that the srtm do minimum scenario, junction capacity analysis does not reflect the existing situation in regards to traffic cueing on the 27th westbound off slip. And further to this the applicant has completed some further analysis of traffic flow outputs from the srtm do minimum and do something scenarios. This analysis has shown that the westbound off slip to port bridge roundabout experiences and maximum increase of nine vehicles during the pm peak of the do something one scenario where the lane closure is modelled in the southbound direction on a 20 32nd Road. In all other do something scenarios the traffic flow on this off slip is anticipated to decrease

03:39

in comparison with the existing baseline the a 27 off slip is forecast to be operating with shorter queues and less delay and this is highlighted in tables 138 139 and 140 of the transport assessment, which show that queue lengths are comfortably accommodated within the westbound off slip with average delays in the region of 45 to 90 seconds across all scenarios.

04:05

Any further increases in delay that this junction would therefore reduce the forecast volume of traffic that the SL team is reassigned to the junction as your route becomes less favourable in comparison with other alternatives. Therefore, the forecast traffic flow increases at the junction or be at very low and only clickable to one scenario are considered to be robust.

04:31

Okay, thank you very much for that. And I had no specific questions to follow up from that. I'm Mr. Haywood. I see your hand is raised.

04:45

So I think the findings of that model are a little bit counterintuitive, in that all of the scenarios with the exception of one show reduced traffic from

05:00

Coming off at the ports bridge junction, westbound traffic coming off of the ports bridge junction. Given that the the effect of the work is to divert traffic off the road, and the next most likely option for them to come off the a 27 is the is the port bridge roundabout?

05:19

It does seem very counterintuitive that any of these scenarios would be showing a reduction

05:24

in traffic coming off this there. And that's something I think we need to do understand a little bit more.

05:31

Thank you very much, Mr. Haywood. Mr. Williams, how would you like to respond to that?

05:40

Thank you, sir.

05:42

That's noted.

05:44

I think important point here is that the srtm considers not only the impacts the the operation of the junction, but operation of the the downstream highway network. And whilst

05:59

the results for the junction itself may appear counterintuitive, that could well be the case that

06:07

they are reflective of downstream traffic congestion, therefore, meaning that the routes from ports which roundabout onto ports, the island are actually actually becoming less favourable, due to other traffic reassignment. That's clearly something we need to have a look at though in more detail and come back to you.

06:26

Okay, thank you very much, if you could.

06:30

Does anyone else have any points they wish to raise on this particular question?

06:38

Okay, nothing heard.

06:40

Moving on them. I think we've already covered this next question, in part, but nonetheless, I'll just go for it to ensure there's no outstanding responses. The transport assessment and supplementary transport assessment rely on the sub regional transport model. In order to understand the impact of traffic at a detailed level. Can the applicant explain why this model is appropriate for such an assessment? What assumptions have been applied to assess localised and detailed local effects? And what measures are in place to address any degree of uncertainty? Now, Mr. Williams, we have already touched on this earlier today I have your transcript as is anything further you wish to add at this point?

07:24

Thank you, sir. I'd like to just provide a quick summary of our response possible back Yes. So as stated previously, a majority of analysis completed in the TA and supplementary ta uses the srtm to assess the future year baseline and construction stage impact of the proposed development. The use scope and methodology of the srtm was agreed with Hampshire County Council Portsmouth city council pre application stage through the transport assessment scoping note and srtm coding note in Appendix A of the transport assessment

07:56

and the srtm is a strategic transport model, which is fully compliant, compliant with Department for Transport transport analysis guidance.

08:07

This was developed by Solon transport, and the model the srtm Model Model is capable of providing outputs that can robustly support the development of transport strategies and schemes provide information to support development of funding business cases and can inform land use strategies and importantly development transport assessments, as we have used it for critically, an important function of the SI tm in the assessment of the proposals is that it makes routing choices for vehicles on the basis of generalised costs Veatch available route, which differ according to journey time and delay experience on the route. The introduction of traffic management in the do something scenarios, therefore increases generalised costs of a route through reduction in traffic speed and increased congestion, lead into vehicle reassignment on alternative routes. This therefore demonstrates how the srtm is robustly considered the traffic impacts of reassignment across the wider network.

09:10

Thank you very much.

09:13

Thank you.

09:15

Would anyone wish to provide any further comment on this at this time? Mr. Hayward?

09:22

So we're comfortable with the approach to modelling and the use of the srtm that's the the best model we have to work with. Although we do need to recognise its limitations and in places step beyond it to consider

09:38

particular effects in furnace the applicant has done that sir through a number of localised junction models,

09:45

which look at specific junction performance in a number of locations. We've got a couple of outstanding issues the port's bridge round about being one and and some issues on alternative diverted traffic routes that we just need to bottom

10:00

out.

10:02

But on the whole third, I would confirm that we're comfortable with that approach to modelling.

10:08

Thank you very much. Mr. Hayward. Mr. Turney. Just turn into you. Is that Is there anything further you wish to add on? On that point? Are you equally comfortable? Richard Tony Vamshi. County Council, we're comfortable on that basis. I mean, the point is, we're content with the srtm. It's use, there's still issues about the outputs of the model.

10:31

Course. Okay, thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that.

10:36

Okay, in which case, we will move on if we can, to the next point, the last point on agenda item free a

10:46

question for the applicant. For those residents who cannot access their driveways due to construction. What distance does the applicant consider acceptable for residents to seek alternate parking arrangements? Would on street parking arising from the displacement affect the effectiveness of diversion routes? Mr. Williams?

11:13

Thanks, sir. Just so just as a starting point, I'd like to make it clear that the strategy for providing access to residential driveways is included in the

11:24

the onshore cable route construction impacts on access to properties and car parking and communications strategy which is included in appendix one of the F TMS if I may, I just like to start by providing a summary of the post strategy

11:45

noting that that some further information has has come to light since since its submission. So along the majority the onshore cable corridor, temporary lane closures will be required to facilitate construction and where this is required. Vehicle access will be unavailable during the construction working hours, except for emergencies.

12:08

And for vulnerable persons.

12:10

vulnerable persons for the purpose of this strategy, defined as those with locomotion seeing, hearing, stretching and dexterity and learning disabilities, which is as outlined in the Department for Transport inclusive mobility guidance. However, in addition to this, the applicant notes that contractors will also be expected to use best endeavours to provide access to properties were reasonable notice of such as given, noting that this may not always be possible and is dependent on the stage of construction at any given time. The applicant understands that this is normal practice, practice during completion of street works and is considered appropriate to mitigate

12:52

the continued the sorry, the restricted access to properties to individuals impacted by the construction works.

13:00

So going on the taken account of startup and shutdown periods, this means access to drivers will be unavailable on weekdays between approximately half seven in the morning and half four in the afternoon. taking account of the general construction working hours of seven till five and travel time by construction workers tuned from the converter station compound at the start and end of each day. On Saturdays access to drivers will be unavailable between 830 in the morning and 1230 in the afternoon, reflecting the eight to one construction working hours.

13:39

Given that construction will progress along the highway in 100 metre sections at a rate of 100 metres per week, it is estimated maximum of five to 10 properties will be impacted at one time and for a period of one to two weeks per second. However, as I stated as is normal practice, road plates will be installed across a trench once excavated and the cable and the cable ducts installed. And these will remain in place until reinstatement of the carriageway is completed at the end of the week. This means in the majority of cases properties impacted by construction, workers are likely to have driveway access restricted for approximately two to three days only. With access available crossroad plates all other

times. It also means that whilst five to 10 properties may be located within the 100 metre construction area. The majority of construction period only three to four properties will have driveway restricted at any one time.

14:37

It's also important to note that where storage of materials or plant is taking place in the construction zone. These are positioned where practicable to avoid blocking access to properties and driveways where vehicle access is not available to residential properties and driveways. It is accepted that residents will need to park at alternative locations

15:00

Such as

15:01

on adjacent or nearby residential streets or public car parks. In regards to the the 400 metres section, distance is noted this represents a five minute walk at a speed of five kilometres per hour, which is the industry standard approach for the assessment of travel time when travelling by foot isn't considered an acceptable maximum distance for displacement of parking on a temporary basis, this 400 metres is accepted.

15:32

Practice in numerous traffic and transport guidance.

15:38

It is an acceptable distance to walk to common facilities, such as Town Centre locations, as as noted in guidelines for journeys on foot by the institution of highways and transport. That it's the maximum distance for residents to walk to a mode of transport as stated in buses in the urban in Urban Development's, which recommends that all housing development is located within 400 metres of a bus stop. And it's also noted that public transport access level assessment is by Transport for London assumes that people would walk up to 640 metres to a bus service from home.

16:18

The assessment of available parking showed that in the majority of locations where parking has where parking surveys have been completed, or displaced parking could be accommodated within the 400 metre distance from residential properties. Overall, the proposed strategy therefore ensures that in the majority of locations, only a small number of residents will be impacted for a relatively short period of time. And when this does occur, alternative parking will be available within a five minute walk. Thank you.

16:51

Thank you very much before you go, and before we move on just a couple of questions if I may,

16:59

straying a little bit into the next agenda item on abnormal indivisible loads. I've noticed that in some locations for example, locks way road leading towards the public house at the end there that cars will be displaced temporarily whilst that abnormal indivisible load is making its way down that that highway, can you just confirm that the parking and communication strategy referred to takes into account that and necessary communication with those residents, please?

17:36

Yes, thank you is the intention that the residents will be kept up to date of the proposals in line with the information included in the communication strategy. It is noted that at the moment, it is not explicitly clear that that is the case. And therefore, we intend to update that document for deadline six and resubmission. Thank you. Thank you very much. And just one further follow up question before I open it to the floor.

18:05

In relation to the second part, the latter part of that question there about the on street parking effect and the effectiveness of diversion routes. I seem to recall a suggestion that a road safety audit was being carried out. And I just wondered if there was any update that we could have at this time as to when we're likely to see that place.

18:29

So thank you, a road safety audit has been completed of the construction access and permanent access junction for the converter station. So that's a separate issue.

18:43

We're also in the progress of preparing assigning strategy, which will look to ensure that traffic reassigns to appropriate routes

18:54

when diverting away from the works, its intention also bitness deadline six.

19:00

Thank you very much. Thank you very much Mr. Williams. If I could first of all turn to Mr. Haywood case your hand was up first.

19:11

So with regard to the 400 metre walking distance being a reasonable walking distance for people to access their cars, whilst that is the generally recognised walking distance for people accessing

19:26

goods, services, retail or bus routes, certainly where new development is reliant on street parking, it can't provide parking on its own site. Portsmouth and

19:41

generally nationally require a walking distance of 200 metres rather than 400 metres to access properties within a reasonable walking distance to home, sir.

19:52

Okay, thank you very much. Could you just point me in the direction Mr. Hayward of where that 200 metre requirement comes from? Is that a policy

20:00

Your practice anywhere, please. I will, I will let you have a No, sir. Excellent. Thank you very much.

20:08

There was something else when it's now all its safety assessments. You were talking about

20:14

those we have asked for safety assessments be done on the diversionary routes,

20:20

all the routes, which we think traffic will divert to.

20:24

And that's the thing that we're working with the applicant on at the moment.

20:29

Okay, thank you very much.

20:32

Before I go to Mr. Turney. Mr. Williams, is there anything you wish to raise on what you've just heard from Mr. Hayward?

20:40

Thank you, sir, just like to make the point that the residents that will be impacted by the work will be required to park elsewhere for a period of one to two weeks

20:55

at most.

20:57

And it will potentially only be a few residents in most situations that are impacted by the work. And also the the assessment we have completed is assuming a maximum of 400 metres and in the vast majority of cases, it showed that residents could park within that distance, it may well be that the majority, a lot of those cases, they are within 100 or 200 metres for example of properties. Okay, thank you very much for that. Mr. Turney, please.

21:35

Thank you, Sir Richard, Attorney for Hampshire County Council.

21:39

Just a few points if I may, we've commented at deadline three on the proposed strategy for dealing with parking. And the primary concern relates to the way in which those

21:54

private means of access are restricted during the working day and the exceptions being limited to those where requests be made in advance or particular vulnerability. The starting point, as we said is that measures should be taken to ensure that access is provided to properties throughout the day, and any interference with that, as an exception,

22:21

the 400 metre walking distance. The difficulty, of course, is that the substitution here is from direct access to a property with a vehicle to a walking equivalent. And the comparison with walking distances to bus stops or to shops for sustainability considerations is not necessarily the appropriate one because, for example, families with young children who would not be in the vulnerable category, would nonetheless not sensibly be able to walk 400 metres to their car, to get their children's school in the body, for instance,

23:02

the

23:04

the context here is also important within hccs area, because the interferences on the 83 were on road parking is not available, and therefore, it's likely that parking will be displaced some distance away to surrounding residential roads. So it's not the case of just parking at the other side of the closure. It could be some distance away where parking can be found. And on that basis, we've suggested a review of the strategy

23:37

to ensure that there's a clear notification strategy, that residents are aware of time slots when they will be able to cross the working area. And that essentially, there isn't an assumption in favour of interference rather than the assumption of in favour of maintaining access. So those are the core points. We have made comments on the on the detail of the strategy, which were the applicants in our deadline pre submission.

24:07

Thank you very much, Mr. Turney. Mr. Williams, how would you like to respond to those points?

24:17

Thank you. So that repeats myself too much. It

24:22

comes back again, to a degree to the point that these these impacts will be temporary, for for one to two weeks,

24:29

at most and potentially two to three properties at a time.

24:36

we've noted that there needs to be a requirement now for the contractor to use best endeavours to allow for access where possible, but it's noted that won't always be practicable, given given the the nature of the works.

24:55

Okay, so just to confirm your position on that that phrase, you

25:00

Mr. Attorney was the the favour

25:03

is actually in favour of interference at the moment is in terms of in favour for access, in his view,

25:10

is your position that because these are temporary and in some cases unavoidable that, that that interference is an odd, no consequential hazard of doing of doing the works?

25:25

I don't think it can be entirely avoided, the access would be would be restricted at some times.

25:35

But But efforts will be made to ensure that

25:39

residents and businesses can gain access to their properties where where possible. Okay. Thank you very much. Does anyone wish to write anything further on this agenda item?

25:55

No, nothing hurt then unless there's anything further to add, we'll move on to agenda item three B,

26:03

which is in relation to abnormal indivisible loads. And, and likewise.

26:10

So the first point on that

26:13

question for the applicant? What are the intentions regarding the routing, timing and management of deliveries for abnormal indivisible loads?

26:24

I appreciate we have your transcripts. There's no need to go through that fully, but just a high level summary of what management arrangements are in place. Mr. Williams.

26:39

Thanks, sir. So normal indivisible loads will be primarily related to delivery of cable drums to join bays and transformer deliveries

26:50

to the converter station. These been assessed in the supplementary transport assessment with controls provided in the framework construction traffic management plan. It's noted in all instances, it will be a requirement of the appointed contractor to address the final arrangements for delivery of AI ELLs, or be it it's noted that these will have to occur outside peak hours, they will be accompanied by escort vehicles banksman will be used at joint Bay's to manage access or deliveries will use pre assessed routes which are included within the ctmp. And where required traffic, temporary traffic regulation orders will be used to restrict on street parking, and remove street furniture to allow for access. Thank you.

27:47

Okay, just a couple of points there. I seem to recall that in the documentation that a port for the arrival of these, the cable drums and the Transformers has been confirmed. Is that the case if you can confirm that probably place

28:05

I don't believe that has been confirmed. But we we use the port of Portsmouth as the most likely

28:13

location where where cable drums and Transformers will be delivered to. Okay, thank you. And then just in terms of the total number of AI ELLs, I seem to recall that for the 26 Joint Base, there'd only be half the number of cable drums, so 13 cable drums, and then I believe it's six Transformers for the converter station. So is that a total of 19 abnormal individual loads of Have I got that completely wrong?

28:45

That's not quite correct.

28:48

I believe there will be seven transformer deliveries required to the converter station.

28:57

The cable drums point is is

29:01

a slightly more complicated one to answer and will have to come back to you. But it's noted that there would be a requirement generally for for for

29:12

cable drums, it's a cable drum delivery for for each cable within each circuit that is delivered to a joint Bay.

29:21

And we can provide some further information on that.

29:24

Okay, and one final sort of point on on this would only ever be at one stage in time one abnormal indivisible load on the highway. Or could there be multiple loads going on, say two three Transformers in convoy or two or three cable drums being delivered simultaneously?

29:46

I don't believe it could be a case that there could be multiple

29:51

deliveries taking place at the same time.

29:54

Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying those points. Mr. Tony, I see your hand is raised.

30:02

Reach attorney for Hampshire County Council. I just wanted to say that our understanding was that there was a further technical note being provided by the applicant on AI ELLs. And

30:15

we'd be grateful to receive that so that we can comment further is necessary, I think it was going to address the likely required works in terms of changes to street furniture, traffic signals and delivery timings. And we still await that site and standard.

30:33

Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney. Mr. Williams, can you confirm that it's something that's been prepared? Thank you. So yes, I can that will be submitted at deadline six.

30:45

Thank you.

30:47

Does anyone else wish to raise any comments on on this point?

30:54

Okay, nothing heard. And we'll move on to the next question on the agenda.

31:04

This is, again, one for the applicant, what provisions will be made such as advanced notice to residents and businesses along the aihi delivery route? How would this be managed? And how will services affected by AI on deliveries be restored, including those affected that lie outside of the order limits? Now, I imagine that that's going to be covered by the technical note. So this may not be answerable now, but Mr. Williams, is there anything you wish to add at this point?

31:37

Thanks. I just like to point out, as I

31:41

said, said earlier, the

31:45

residents businesses will be informed through the methods Seto in the communication strategy

31:52

in relation to delivery of,

31:57

of AI ELLs.

32:00

Apologies, I'm just trying to find the relevant text on that.

32:07

I think it's that there'll be two weeks notice provided prior to any, any earlier AOL deliveries, but apologies are called quite place this time. Now, the problem is, as you're aware, you'll be able to do a post here and note on that for deadline six, just to fill in that information. So thank you on that. Does anyone else wish to make any comments on that particular question?

32:37

Nothing heard. Okay, that's all I had on that have no further points. So moving on, then, would the movements of no indivisible loads and the consequential road restrictions in terms of access and parking impact on the road diversions and traffic assumptions modelled on the highway network? And if so, have they featured in the assessment of cumulative effects? Mr. Williams

33:15

not hearing anything from Mr. Williams, Mr. Jarvis. Mr. We're gonna show that ology, so I lost my mouse, the all Ai L movements. So it will be completed outside of a weekday peak hours to minimise disruption to traffic.

33:34

It's also anticipated generally, these movements would be limited to one or two per day in any signal single location.

33:44

As a result, it's not anticipated that such movements would impact upon any of the assessed effects of the proposed development, all of which have been based on am and pm peak hour assessments, and therefore we do not think it would they would generate any, any additional significant effects. Okay. Just a supplement to that. You've probably already answered the question. But just as a hypothetical situation, could a situation occur whereby rows votes are being diverted as part of the normal construction works, but then a further road closure or diversion is in place due to the abnormal individual load being delivered? Could there be a situation where that occurs causing unforeseen disruption if you like?

34:35

I do not believe that would be the case.

34:40

It's something we perhaps they need to provide some more information on.

34:45

Going forward. I don't think we explicitly state that anywhere in the documents are at present. But clearly that would be a requirement

34:58

to ensure that isn't the case.

35:00

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Hayward, I see your hand is raised.

35:07

So the the effects of the aerals can't be modelled in the in the traffic model, because that is a peak hour model and the movements are happening outside of those peaks so that we don't have that background traffic model which we could put those on. That is not to say that they weren't have significant effect on the traffic conditions pertaining at the time.

35:28

And the the impact that will have will be largely

35:33

down to the scheduling of them when they occur during the day or whether they happen overnight, or how that might work. Of course, it's very difficult if you schedule overnight, asking people to move the cars out of the way.

35:47

And then the closer that they happen to the pigs during the day, the more impacts they will have, I don't think we should understate the likely effect of them. But I think it's very difficult to model that.

36:00

And there are limited options for getting these things in. And it's just an impact that we're probably going to have to live with. So

36:10

thank you very much for that. Mr. Williams. Any any points on what you've just heard

36:18

that thanks. Only the as stated will be provided notice to residents and businesses as required and the Jolla will be required to

36:32

agree the the routing and timing

36:35

of all deliveries with the local Highway Authority prior to those taking place. In terms of general impacts, it's noted that yes, that there still will be some but they will be limited to the area in which the al al al is travelling at that time, for example, if it is running through a junction or an on a link road.

36:59

And after that point point those impacts will no longer will no longer occur. Thank you. Thank you very much this. Does anyone else have any points to raise on this question?

37:13

Okay, nothing had. That brings us then to the last question on this agenda item. Again, one for the for the applicant in relation to abnormal individual loads. The specialist report by collet makes reference to full structural reports being made of any affected properties near the aim route and discussion with the relevant local authorities in advance to ensure the route is structurally suitable. Whose responsibilities this? How aware is it secured? And what compensation is available if damaged is cause two properties either within or outside of the order limits? Mr. Williams?

37:59

Thanks. So as stated all movement of AI ELLs will be the responsibility of of the whole year.

38:09

In terms of agree in the requirements with the local Highway Authority.

38:15

In terms of any any structural assessments, my understanding is that it's normal procedure for a whole year to submit a request notification for abnormal load movements, and then the Highway Authority to review this and

38:34

assess any any structural

38:38

impacts which may occur in relation to highway structures.

38:44

Otherwise, it's not expected that any damage will be caused to two properties.

38:52

And that in the unlikely event that damage has occurred, it would be up to the property owner or occupier

39:00

to seek a claim for compensation

39:03

as they would normally have to do so.

39:07

And just for clarity, who would that compensation who day if you like go for? Would that be the whole year? Or would that be tied to DCM process Aqua and

39:20

I

39:22

think yes, so Mr. Williams probably a bit of an unfair question that

39:29

the claim would be made against the undertaker on the basis that the hauler is contracted to them. It's not considered that it's something that's necessary to be expressly provided for within the DCR. Effectively the position is the same as it would be for any al movements with any other project. It's just that a claim that law can be made in relation to property damage, and that claim would be made against the person responsible for calling the damage which is explained at the beginning of my response would be the undertaker. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much. Mr. Jarvis. Thanks for clarifying that.

39:58

Does anyone else have any points

40:00

They wish to raise on this particular question.

40:06

Okay, nothing heard. I have nothing further for you on that on that point. I'm happy of that. Moving on then to agenda item free See, we do have a couple of questions before we take a break on this particular point. But let's have a look at the first question here.

40:27

Given the applicants response to local impact reports, regarding the position of joint bays, and noting that the construction of a joint Bay takes 20 days, what confidence can the highway authorities have to the construction of joint bays will not take place within the highway? If I could ask that of Mr. Turney. In the first instance, please.

40:53

Sir Richard, Tony, for HCC, we have

40:58

made some comments on this previously, and I think there's a bit more detail has been provided and will be provided by the applicant as to the likely location of joint bays.

41:08

It's understood that the applicant does not propose to locate a joint Bay within the carriageway. And

41:20

we understand that also,

41:22

that there is some further detail that might be provided about the location of Joint Base. So it's really just getting that clarity from the applicant to this stage. At the moment, I don't think we've got the comfort that that you've referred to, but it's more important for the applicant to think. Okay, thank you very much.

41:43

Mr. Haywood. Do you have anything to add at this time before I go back to the applicant?

41:48

So all of the applicants commentary about joint pay locations is caveated. With where practical?

41:56

Was the the intent to locate the Joint Base off the highway seems clear? That is always caveated word practical. And it's our view that, that we can't have confidence that these won't be within the highway at the moment.

42:14

Sorry, I realised it's not a

42:17

question and answer session as such. But it would be nice to understand if there is anywhere where the applicant is of the view that the joint Bay will need to be located in the highway.

42:29

Okay, thank you very much.

42:34

Before I ask my questions, I'll get Mr. Williams responses to those and Mr. Williams.

42:44

Thank you sir. So, as as

42:48

noted in the onshore outline CMP

42:54

is the

42:56

intention that joint bays would be positioned in verges, fields, car parks, where possible to limit the impact of highway

43:05

into limit the impact on highway sorry, during the installation

43:10

was the exact location in the Joint Base cannot be addressed fully at this time.

43:17

The applicant is currently completing some further work which will be submitted at deadline six on the location of Joint Base this this will provide indicative locations and confirmation of the constructability of such locations and will provide further detail on areas where Joint Base will not be located along the onshore cable corridor. And this will be committed to within the DCU.

43:44

Okay, thank you just a couple of supplementary questions on that that just that you heard from Mr. Turney the use of the word carriageway. Now ultimately, the term highway encompasses not just the carriageway, but footpaths cycle paths alongside

44:03

Could you just confirm I might have missed it from the submissions? Is there saying that the Joint Base will not be positioned within the carriageway, or within the highway? If you could just assist me on that place?

44:22

My understanding is that they would not be positioned within the

44:28

the carriageway, but

44:31

I turned to my my colleagues to support on this possible

44:37

Yes, of course and Mr. Jarvis

44:41

is Hello, sir. And so I think Miss Williams is correct in saying that the intention is not to be located in the carriageway. I think I also acknowledge the comments made by Mr. tawnya. Mr. Hayward with regards to the need for more detail in this respect, and it is something that is confirmed earlier in the week. We are discussing with sorry, it is something that has concerned me

45:00

During the week, we are looking into further moviemaking further submissions at deadlines six.

45:05

I think in that regard, we'll also be looking to apply some form of wording or some form of test design test to identify where Joint Base can be and the sequential test to identify if they need to be on the highway where they can be in the highway without having an acceptable impact. And noting the commitment that wherever they're installed, they would not give rise to effect or rather, they would not require traffic management, which is more than what's provided for in relation to the installation of the cables. So I think we acknowledged there was a bit more work to do on this and there's more discussions that are required, but I assure you, we are looking to move forward with both Portsmouth city council and Hampshire County Council to resolve these issues so that they can have confidence that Joint Base will be installed in an appropriate manner where they are within the highway. Thank you. Thank you very much. And whilst we await that at deadline, six, just one quick question. I don't mind who answers it from the applicant. But in terms, I've noted that joint Bay will take 20 days to construct. Could you just confirm that there are consecutive days? It's not a few days here and then no few weeks later, another few days?

46:12

Mr. Jones, Mr. Williams,

46:14

I can confirm that the consecutive days

46:17

obviously within the

46:20

permitted working hours, so it wouldn't be on a Sunday, for instance, because workings precluded on Sunday, but it would be consecutive working hours a day. Thank you, sir. Thank you for confirming that. Mr. Tony, I see your hands raised.

46:35

Sir Richard, Tony, for Hampshire County Council. And just two points, please. The first one is that as we understand from the supplementary traffic assessment,

46:46

join bays six and seven or six strokes seven and seven stroke eight are proposed to be located within a bus lane.

46:57

And again, it may be there's more clarity to be provided on that by the applicant. The second point to note is that location within the highway, but outside the carriageway does not necessarily mean that they're not appointed considerable concern, because obviously, if for example, they're in a footway, they'll need to be measures taken for the footway to be re provided during the construction period. So the the carriage, no carriageway joint Bay is, is a step in the right direction, but it doesn't obviate the concerns about the prolonged an intensive construction period associated with a joint Bay in in the highway. But I think Miss Jarvis's acknowledged that there's more information to be provided. And it probably is the case that for the purposes of this hearing, we need to leave that where it is. And we can look at this further information. There comes a deadline six and provide a fuller response then.

47:59

Thank you very much, Mr. Tony, thank you for that. Mr. Jarvis should not respond.

48:05

It's just a point of clarification really, sir, just to acknowledge that with regards to the Joint Base, once they're constructed, they will be below ground structures, and they'll be completely covered. So if they're constructed below sort of way that the subway would be reinstated. It's only the case that where there's a cable fault, which is very rare, there'd be a need for any further excavation to get to the cables to pull one out. And so really, the positions even when they are in footways, they would be completely covered over albeit a direct honest the points made by Mr. Attorney and the need to go through the design detail and to make sure that how they are installed is appropriate in a highway context. And we will seek to do that, sir. Thank you.

48:41

Thank you very much. Does anyone else have any points to raise on that particular question?

48:49

Okay, nothing heard.

48:51

We could probably take the next two questions under agenda item three see together then, in light of what's just been said. But I'll say them for completeness has the applicant models the worst case scenario of all joint bays needing to be constructed in the highway on portsea Island? And also, given the extent of the order limits? How does the applicant intend to provide lay down areas adjacent to construction works without encroachment onto the public highway?

49:21

Mr. Jarvis perhaps?

49:25

will be Mr. Williams addressing those questions. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

49:32

Thank you, sir. In regards to the assessment of Joint Base.

49:38

No, the applicant has not specifically modelled a case where all Joint Base are constructed within the highway imports the island. This reflects the location and alignment of the onshore cable corridor. Which means that all joint bays will not be within proximity of the highway and therefore it's not necessary.

50:00

to model the effects of such,

50:03

in all cases, construction of the Joint Base would be facilitated by similar or less disruptive traffic management when compared to the installation of the cable ducts. And this position has been assessed by the applicant as part of the

50:18

traffic modelling exercise completed and reported in the transport assessment and supplementary transport assessment.

50:26

This is also secured by the the framework traffic management strategy in terms of the the traffic management requirements to construct a joint Bay in any part of the highway. It's also noted the construction of joint bays will be completed using the same construction working hours and will generate a similar number of construction traffic movements as the installation of the onshore cable route. And as a result of this, the assessments and traffic management

50:57

required to construct the onshore cable route have already provided a robust assessment of likely impacts. Thank you.

51:06

In terms of

51:09

the

51:11

question regarding lay down

51:14

areas, I'd like to

51:16

refer to my colleague.

51:20

I believe it's Ali baulch.

51:23

Who can help answer that point?

51:26

Okay. I'm willing to speak.

51:36

I'm not hearing anyone at the moment might be on mute. I Oliver bolch. Sorry, gone.

51:45

Happy, please continue.

51:48

Mike, would you be able to follow up on this one, please.

51:53

Happy to do that. Also.

51:56

The areas that are required for the constructions of the Joint Base around the mall not dissimilar from the actual construction work and the required for the cables. Obviously, those areas will be less on the

highway as we're seeking to avoid that. The third work that's being undertaken currently will confirm the extent of the working areas required and will show based on the indicative joint by locations, what those areas would be such that it can the feasibility of constructing off the highway and whether lay down areas would be can be seen, it will be for detailed design to confirm where they will be constructed. And that will take into account the working areas. And that is a matter that we will look to address within the updated information that we're going to submit and the design principles that we're looking to agree with the highway authorities in this respect. Thank you, sir.

52:40

Thank you very much. I have a couple of hands up, I'll come to Mr. Hayward first place.

52:49

Thank you. So whilst I understand the intent to have the same traffic management or something less disruptive, should join bays need to be installed in the highway. It's probably important to recognise that that disruption will extend for a longer period given that the Joint Base are required for 20 working days compared to the the highway itself which moves forward at a rate of between 12 and 24 metres a day depending on the structure of the road that is being constructed in

53:21

so whilst the the impacts may be the same, they will extend for longer periods.

53:28

Okay, thank you very much. Bear that point in mind before coming back to the applicant. Mr. Turney, I see your hand is raised.

53:40

So Richard, Tony, for Hampshire County Council. And I just want to raise a point which is related to this and it may be that this is the right time to make it but we do have a general concern which is probably particularly acute for the joint Bay intervention interventions, about the hours of working and making sure that the county council can manage those hours of working to include nighttime and weekend working where appropriate. So if there are major works within the highway, and this also applies to some of the cable laying on the a three but if there are major works, Hampshire County Council will on occasion, press for nighttime and weekend working to ensure that they are completed as soon as possible and that the disruption is minimised. As things stand under the Act TMS we understand that that's not possible. And that's the point which which we want to address. So it arises in respect of Joint Base but also in respect of other construction works within the highway.

54:46

Okay, thank you very much. Just stop on that. I seem to recall that the reason for not wanting night time or weekend working was many relation to noise and the effect

55:00

Have road cutting braking and what not to appreciate this is not a noise hearing that is tomorrow. But

55:08

what would you have to say about that Mr. Turney? Well, Sir Richard, Tony of Hampshire County Council that that's firmly understood and the starting point, you should be looking to ensure that highways impacts can be managed in a way which is consistent with residential immediacy. And that's the way in which the highways authority works at the moment and would do for other works, a balance needs to be struck, we would.

55:35

In any particular case, we would consult with the Environmental Health Officers to ensure that nighttime works, if they were to be carried out were carried out in an appropriate fashion. But there is a balance to be struck between the two without seeking to diminish the weight that should be given to residential noise impacts, of course, and just one further supplement on that you may not have a question and answer this at this time, in terms of the permit scheme for Hampshire county councils is that already allow for such nighttime and weekend work in to occur with relevant management in place?

56:15

And I might ask Mr. Ackerman to answer that, but before he does just know that the way in which the applicant proposes to incorporate the permit scheme is that it is subject to the parameters within the app TMS. So, in a sense, if the ftms prevents it, it doesn't much matter whether the permit scheme should permit it. Mr. ackermans just sent me a note say yes, it does within permissive does allow for nighttime works, where appropriate, and that sort of thing that we might seek in a particular case. But the issue is not with the permit scheme. It's with the with the ftms, as I understand that, okay, thank you very much for that clarification. Unless Mr. Ackerman wishes to add anything, I'll go back to the applicant on this.

57:05

Thank you, sir.

57:07

First point that was made by Mr. Haywood about works being in place for a longer period. And I don't think that is necessarily correct, obviously, the construction area for joint buyers not 100 metre stretch of road and it wouldn't be consecutive along that road. So I think what you would find is that the direction disruption causes less but we will further confirm that point

57:28

in relation to the points made by Mr. Turney and with regards to working out of hours. It is of course, the case that we are assessing the noise impacts of the work at this stage, and identifying where it is appropriate to undertake work during the nighttime, which is the particular focus, the applicant has undertaken a robust assessment of noise and we will turn to that matter in more detail tomorrow.

57:50

But I think the applicants key concern is that they don't want to be in a position where they're being forced to do work during the nighttime which gives rise to more significant, slightly significant effects which way and the balance of their application for a development consent order. Albeit, I would

acknowledge that the discussions to date with regards to nighttime working with Hampshire County Council have focused on cable installation, where there is more of the need for road cutting, embracing which allowed our activities. And I understand that it wouldn't be possible for us to look further at joint installation to understand this a different principle could be applied, where it's confirmed the impacts that noise impacts on immunity will not arise. And then just the final point in relation to the permanent scheme and the explanation of how that is to be applied to limit that to the ftms. Just to confirm that is correct. And that's because the F TMS has been assessed as identifying the mitigations required in accordance with the regulations. So it is extremely important that that is recognised within the application of the permit scheme to these works. Thank you.

58:54

Mr. Jarvis. Does anyone else have any points they wish to raise on this at this time?

59:02

Okay, nothing heard. The

59:06

out of Peter Hayward. I see your hand is up, sir.

59:10

Sorry, sir. I was late with my mouse.

59:14

was something Mr. Jarvis just said then about the ftms having been assessed and found to be

59:21

necessary to mitigate the impact of the work. So we've not yet been able to complete the assessment of the TMS because we don't understand yet. The safety implications on some of the diversionary routes, and I've only recently understood the safety implications on Easton road itself. So I don't think so the Portsmouth good. GRI tacitly that the F TMS is yet sufficient to address or provide the mitigation necessary

59:49

for the delivery the scheme, sir.

59:51

Thank you very much, Mr. Hayward.

59:54

Mr. Jarvis. I imagine it's a work in progress. But would you have anything you wish to add at this time?

1:00:01

No nothing further. Obviously, it's acknowledged ftms in the mitigations are still being discussed, but it's expected that a agreed position will be reached in relation to those mitigations. And that's why it's referred to in the payment scheme application. Thank you, sir.

1:00:15

Thank you very much.

1:00:17

And looking at the time, then it is now 1205.

1:00:22

I will be looking for lunch around about one o'clock ish, depending on how we go to remain answers. But let's take a short break now, just to come for a break. If possible, I'd like us to resume at 1210 that's 10 past 12 please. Thank you.