

TEXT_AQUIND_ISH2_Session3_14122020

Mon, 12/14 2:38PM • 50:54

00:09

All right, welcome back, everyone. It was a short break, but we are now resuming this issue specific hearing and we're resuming agenda item three d in relation to dateline Broadway lane and heavy goods vehicles.

00:25

Question for the applicant to start with and that is during the operation of the proposed development, how many and what sort of larger oversize vehicles will need to access the converter station site? Mr. Williams

00:48

Sorry, sir. So, during during normal operation of the converter station, it's not anticipated that any oversize vehicles would be required to access converter station site, these would only be required in the event of fault or to replace

01:07

equipment such as transformers.

01:11

Where where these are required, sorts of worth noting that these would need to go through the relevant risk assessment and method statements.

01:21

And the whole year would be responsible for for agreeing the arrangements with with the local highway authorities, as stated previously.

01:29

Thank you very much for that. Does anyone have any concerns in that regard?

01:36

The notification or delivery during operation?

01:42

Okay, nothing heard.

01:45

In which case move on to the next point.

01:49

At dateline and Broadway line. There were two options shown in appendix five to appendix F of the transport assessment. They were option one whereby limited on carriageway works were proposed to be undertaken. And then option two which of course has got the the HTV overrun area shown upon it. And the question in relation to that is, why can't normal construction vehicles utilise the existing highway network without modification in light of option one, which seems to suggest that even AI was may be able to use the existing highway with minor modification. If option one is not feasible, why not? Mr. Williams plays

02:45

Thank you, sir. So and in general terms, option one was not pursued, for the reason that it created an unsafe

02:56

layout from a from a highway safety perspective.

03:02

It would have been a confusing layout for traffic approaching from day lane, which would likely lead to vehicles either misjudging the existing bend

03:14

or overshooting into the access itself. It would have provided very limited forward visibility to oncoming traffic to the existing bend. And the presence of Scottish and southern electricity network infrastructure on the corner of day lane Broadway lane

03:34

would have prevented would have resulted in the risk of closure of an access

03:40

in this location at any any times where maintenance is required,

03:47

which is not acceptable due to the need to maintain access at all times to the converter station.

03:54

Okay. Thank you very much. Could the relevant authorities just confirm that they are in agreement with that and in the light of the evidence provided that the the option that has been chosen it represents a safer highway solution than than the option one that is discounted? Could I ask that question of first of all to Hampshire County Council place Mr. Toney?

04:26

Sir, I'll ask Holly Drury to answer this please. The cops.

04:33

We Yeah, we're in agreement with the assessment that Chris's team has undertaken.

04:39

amendments to the existing highway just wouldn't

04:43

work in a practicality sense for the usual traffic when traffic management wasn't in place. So generally, we don't have any issues with the layout that they're proposing. I personally think we're pretty much there with their construction access and maintenance.

04:58

Excellent. Thank you very much.

05:00

For confirming that, that does anyone else, Mr. Tonio back. So can I just raise a point of procedure just to know that there's a mindset is is an issue with the live stream at the moment? I don't know if that affects how you want to proceed, but those who are following this from my team on the live stream said they're disconnected.

05:21

Okay, bear with me one moment, I will just confirm that with my team how, what is happening with that.

05:34

But yes, as I understand it, there is an issue with the live stream that has not, is not restarting after the break. I just asked my case manager Mr. Jones, if he could just explain what the situation is and what we should do at the present time. Mr. Jones, please.

05:54

Hello, they haven't joined case manager I've spoken to Duncan act productions MBA, he was aware that the live stream didn't restart after the after the break, it's up then they are actively looking into to resolve ASAP. However, they have confirmed that the recording is not affected. So for those that may have missed the first 10 minutes or so there, it will still appear on the recording, when that's published in due course. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Jones. Thank you for that. What I propose to do is to keep going with our hearing session.

06:31

I'm asking and answering questions as we go on, and anyone who has not been able to watch the live stream to catch up on the recording later. That is my proposal. Are there any objections to that course of action?

06:47

Okay, nothing heard in which case I will, will continue on. If that is okay. In which point I'll now return back to the applicant. Mr. Williams, you've heard comments there from from Hampshire. Is there anything you wish to add on that place?

07:09

Thank you, sir. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. We'll, we'll move on to the next question. And as I do, I'll be just putting, hopefully, a diagram on screen.

07:22

What this diagram is, it's fun, nice.

07:26

supplementary transport assessment provided by the applicant.

07:31

Deadline one, and it shows the position on day lane boundary boundary line regarding Broadway lanes, sorry, regarding banksman positions. And the related question, Is this in the sense that with respect to management of construction traffic on day lane, can the applicant set out the predicted effectiveness of using banksman to coordinate HTV movements? Apart from the purpose built access on the corner with Broadway line? How does the applicant intend to prevent HDTVs meeting about non construction traffic and potentially waiting within the public highway?

08:11

Mr. Williams place?

08:16

Thank you, sir. So I'd like to start by by noting that following discussions with Hamish County Council, the applicant is intending to implement an amended strategy for the management of construction traffic on day lane. They're still uses banksman to coordinate HGV movements along the line itself as included fall within the supplementary transport assessment and framework ctmp. But it takes a more strategic approach to the management of arrivals and departures to help

08:52

remove the possibility of vehicles meeting on day lane itself.

08:59

So the the the proposed amended methodology aims to to hold ATVs on site until there are three ready to leave the site which reduces the incidence of vehicles travelling eastbound along day lane from once every 10 minutes to once every half an hour. And this would be controlled by by the banksman that we've set out in terms of hgvs arriving

09:32

its proposed the a a there is a requirement to pre book an arrival time at the converter station and also check in prior to the arrival, which would prevent conflicts occur in from with departing ATVs. So the the exhibit which we provided, includes details of of lay bys, mainly located on the strategic road

10:00

network that are within a 20 minute drive of the site. And, and it would be the intention that these could be used by hgvs

10:10

arriving travelling to the site sorry to to park and check in prior to their arrival,

10:19

it would be a case that, that these ATVs

10:24

would only about be permitted to to continue their onward travel to the converter station. If

10:33

it was not the case that ATVs had also been permitted to depart or about to depart, and also that another HTV had not been given permission to to, to access the site itself.

10:52

As I said, it's the intention to still continue to use stop go boards and banks when on day lane. But the revised strategy we feel is appropriate

11:05

to provide adequate mitigation and prevent vehicle conflicts from occurring on day lane. And key. Thank you very much just in terms of non construction related traffic, let's just assume a situation where HTV going to the converter station site has got its Pre Rup time, and it starts making its way to there. And someone else say in a tractor or a diverted HTV from elsewhere, unrelated construction, where attempt to use day lane, what sort of authority with the banksman be able to have over those other vehicles to ensure that they they don't get in the way of the HTV approaching

11:53

the the intention would be that

11:57

the banksman could in in similar circumstances to where

12:03

where you have for example, escort vehicles that are sometimes use with ATVs. They will be able to direct general traffic to stop at the locations which we have identified and those locations

12:18

provide adequate paths and abilities for for two vehicles on the lane.

12:25

Okay, thank you for that. And just in relation to the plan that's on screen now the the laybuy locations.

12:36

Whilst I'll be asking Hampshire County Council this in a moment our last ask yourself,

12:42

our highways England to the best of your knowledge happy with the use of lay bys on the strategic road network for the temporary holding parking of hgvs.

12:54

This is something we've not discussed with them today, but I would I would be surprised if there was any reason why it would generate concern noting the labels identified our

13:09

parking areas used by such vehicles on a daily basis already. Thank you. Thank you very much. Appreciate Mr. Hayward's hand is up. But first of all, if I could just ask that question to Mr. Turney with regard to the use of the labels on the ACM for the temporary holding vehicles, please.

13:31

Sir Richard Sandy for Hampshire County Council and we're relatively recently in receipt of the latest information from the applicant on management of day lane. So we are going to have to come back and writing

13:46

in answer to your specific question. I don't know if

13:50

Holly Drury can assist right now in saying whether or not that's acceptable please switched on. So, she might be able to

14:00

No, it was one of the issues I was going to raise it is something that we need to circulate and discuss with the with highways England about whether their content their labels to be used for such use is also whether those labels have got the capacity to do so and how we ensure that there is the capacity to hold the lorries on on the way to de la if I may also so I've got some additional high level concerns for my original my my look that I still think may be outstanding from there additional information although I appreciate I haven't looked at it in great detail, but it's how the traffic is how the hgvs and and how traffic is managed at the loved the main daily junction. Obviously holding traffic at a junction raises some concerns, safety concerns for me with regards to increase versus jumps, etc. It's how the traffic is managed from the houses that are on the lane itself.

14:53

It was something that was missed on to the original submission

14:58

and my only other sort of high level

15:00

Priority concern is that there is only one location along day lane that we are agreed lorries can pass in the vicinity of the access to the solar farm.

15:09

Other than that the remainder of the route doesn't facilitate a lorry in a car being able to pass each other safely.

15:16

Very much, Miss jury. Mr. Tony, was there anything else? Just one further point? So I think

15:23

you asked a question about whether a banksman can direct traffic and of course, they can't direct traffic. So that they can ask nicely as it was put to me, but can do nothing more than that. So so there is a concern about this management, but we are in receipt of further information, I think which was sent on Friday. So we're going to have to go through that hopefully discuss with the applicant further and and come back at a later deadline.

15:49

Okay, thank you very much for that.

15:53

I'm going to ask Mr. Haywood, just to be patient a little while longer. If you don't mind, Mr. Howard. I'm just going to get Mr. Jarvis's or Mr. Williams response to that Mr. Jarvis.

16:03

Just one point. So in relation to banksman holding traffic, the development consent order does provide for temporary traffic regulation orders to be made which could be made and implemented by some tribesmen. So it is something that's already covered. I don't know if Mr. Williams has anything to answer Thank you.

16:22

Mr. Williams.

16:24

Thank you just in regarding in relation to the other other points

16:29

it's intention that traffic will be managed at the love Dean lane de lane junction through through the use of stop go boards, but they would be positioned on on love the name itself rather than day lane to remove the potential for vehicles to turn the corner and and be presented with a vehicle which had been had been stopped on carriageway there.

16:54

In terms of the width of the lane itself,

17:01

conscious that will probably come on to this in a moment.

17:06

We've completed some some on site investigations, and it is something which we are currently still looking at. But we have noted that the the actual highway width is actually wider in a lot of locations and shown on the on the OS

17:22

mapping along day lane. So we note that yes, the carriageway is still narrow in places, but it does provide more opportunities for for two vehicles to pass then than the LS mapping does suggest. Okay, thank you very much for that if there's a further question on the agenda, which we'll come to shortly, but Mr. Hayward apologies for keeping you waiting out. What would you like to say, sir? Sir, my interest was sparked by the the notion that banksman would be allowed to direct traffic back and aren't allowed to direct traffic on the public highway.

18:01

To do that, you would need a traffic Marshal specifically accredited see SAS accredited traffic Marshal rather than a banksman. Traffic regulation orders can be put into effect with banksman braking stop go boards and that sort of equipment.

18:15

But it may be a moot point. They specifically can't direct traffic on the highway without being formally accredited traffic marshals.

18:26

Thank you very much. Mr. Hayward. It's useful to know how the applicant wish to respond to this Mr. Williams.

18:37

Thank you that that that point is noted.

18:40

If it's the use of traffic marshals that needs to be referred to directly within our strategy, then I don't see any reason why we can't do that.

18:51

Okay, I mean, it certainly sounds like that there's work in progress on on that between the parties, and we're more than grateful for divers taking place, offline as the case would be.

19:04

But just moving on to a related closely related question, in that does the applicant consider additional passing Bay's or waiting areas to be required on day line and loved in line? If not, why not? Mr. Williams.

19:23

Thank you. So, as I've just mentioned, this is something that is currently work in progress.

19:30

We are looking at whether there is potential to provide

19:35

parking bays an on day lane although noting as I have just done that the width is

19:43

is greater than than the OS mapping has shown in lots of places along the line.

19:51

With this in mind and the proposed amendments to the strategy, we do not currently feel that they would be required

20:00

To manage HCV access along this route. Thank you. Thank you very much. Does anyone else have any points to raise on this particular issue?

20:14

Miss jury, I see your hand is raised.

20:18

Yes, sorry. It's just to seek some assurance from us, which I think is something that's worth exploring, because I can't guarantee that the strategy that they put forward as an alternative is going to be acceptable. So the provision of pathways and understanding whether that is a possibility, that would be something that I thought it would work with welcome.

20:40

Thank you very much. Thank you for that.

20:43

Any last thoughts on that? Mr. Williams?

20:48

Thank you, sir. we'll submit our final thoughts on that for deadline six. Thank you.

20:55

Okay, thank you very much for that. Now, just before we move on to agenda item free, a, we are aware of a continuing issue.

21:05

With regards the live stream, it's not functioning correctly.

21:11

While you can be reassured that the recording of the event is intact, is unaffected, and parties will be able to catch up on any matters missed when the recording is published.

21:24

I suggest that what we might try and do is get that live stream back for the benefit of the general public watching this and any interested parties. And so what I'd like to propose is

21:40

Mr. Thompson, I believe you're from production 78.

21:49

Excellent. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you for confirming that. So it should be live. I was about to suggest an early lunch. But now that I know that that is on, unless there's any objections, we'll just move on to the next agenda item rather swiftly. Apologies. I'll keep you waiting for your lunch a bit later. Mr. Thompson, your hand is still raised. If you could allow that for me, please.

22:15

So on to agenda item free, he then question for the applicant with reference to the framework traffic management strategy. Could the applicant explain or provide insight as to whether any greater certainty can be applied to the weeks per circuit construction programme? Why are there differences and what factors would influence prolonging the construction?

22:42

Mr. Williams

22:45

Thank you. So I'd just like to point out that all estimated construction durations, included within within the F TMS are based on assumed installation rates of the cable ducts, the onshore cable corridor, taken account varying levels of services and other constraints which may impact upon the rate of installation. These have been derived using professional judgement and experience of similar projects. With review these completed in

23:13

ies addendum submitted a deadline one which provided a more detailed breakdown of installation rates by location in comparison with the original 2019 environmental statement. This included range of installation rate between 12 and 30 metres a day in highways and 50 metres per day in open country and cultural land

23:37

with the overall installation rate across the entire onshore cable cord are not changing from the original submission.

23:45

In terms of the the variations that have been noted in the ftms. These were related to either

23:54

optionality regards to final route alignment

23:58

or, or working hours. So in Section 4.1 along the bt 150 Hamilton road,

24:06

there is an option to route one circuit through Hamilton parade and southdowns Southdown view on the northern side of Hamilton parade,

24:18

which would would take construction off the the main Hamilton road carriageway, and thereby reduce the the impacted time to between 11 and 22 weeks that's okay. On

24:36

haven't rode within section 5.4. There is an option ality regarding work in animals with an option to either for construction to take place between seven and 10 over the course of a weekend or sunrise to sunset, over a weekend in Section 8.1 that the optionality working hours is related to either 24 hours

25:00

a seven day a week working or 10 hour, seven day a week working. And in Section 8.2, which is Easton road adjacent to Milton common. The,

25:12

the there is optionality there both in terms of the route alignment. And so far that circuits could be installed within Milton Coleman itself and the work working hours, whereby

25:25

there is a range of different working hours permitted for different sections of the route should it should that take place on carriageway itself.

25:38

These could take place either under 24 hour working, or 10 hour work and as it as itself from Milton Coleman.

25:48

In all cases with a contract to determine the most appropriate approach to construction of the onshore cable route,

25:55

informed through detailed assessment and detailed design. However, in all cases, yes, assessment undertaken has accounted for a worst case rate, duration of impacts, and in all cases, regardless of Route choice, the construction of the onshore cable route needs to take place in accordance with the programme and calendar restrictions contained within the F TMS

26:19

with regards to

26:24

apologies, I think that was it on my partner. Sorry.

26:28

Not a problem. Thank you very much for that. I personally have no further questions for you on this. Is there anything from any other party on on on that point?

26:42

Okay, nothing heard. The last question within agenda item free. He then is what engineering challenges does the applicant envisage during onshore construction that would want the contractor deviating from the applicants own identified preferred working hours and routes? Is this period down to the scale or the ability of the contractor? I mentioned, the first point is for Mr. Williams. Maybe the latter point for Mr. Jarvis. But in the first instance, Mr. Williams, please.

27:15

I'd like to pass this to my colleague, Mr. baulch, please, of course, Thank you, Chris Oliver bolch w SP acting on behalf the applicant. So in relation to the question, the most common challenges faced during a project of this nature would be previously identified or Uncharted services. So we've got services in locations different to what's detailed on existing route records. We have other unknown obstacles within the presence of the highway itself, and also the presence of a high water table, which could lead to unforeseen ground conditions.

27:50

So deviations will not be based upon character skill level, but upon the challenges faced, all appointed contractors will be appropriately skilled and experienced, and any deviations will be required to comply with the mitigations. And controls provided in accordance with the assessment undertaken. Thank you.

28:08

Thank you very much on that. I have no further questions. Does anyone else wish to raise a point on this? Mr. Flynn?

28:18

Thank you. So I just wanted to raise that in Portsmouth itself, that we know that Milton common has the preferred route is is reclaimed ground and has lots of contamination issues. And so that's our main concern that that there's a high possibility that the route may well be diverted onto Eastern road itself. And that's, so we're our main concern about the cable route being deviated lies.

28:49

Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Flynn. Yes, there is retained optionality at the moment regarding that. Mr. bolch, would you like to just comment on that a bit further?

29:07

In relation to that question.

29:12

Would you be able to repeat that question, sorry. Yes, it was just in relation to the optionality at Milton common, even taking it across through the common compared to going through Eastern road. You may be your colleague, Mr. Jarvis is about to answer this for you. Thank you.

29:32

Okay. Thank you, sir. So just a note, we discussed the challenges at Milton con last week in some detail with regards to the ground conditions, why optionality has been retained, that it's the preference of the applicant to go across not uncommon to that it is necessary to retain the flexibility to route along east and road four in the event one or both of the cable circuits cannot be located across Nelson common, and just to acknowledge that further information with regards to feasibility and in particular

30:00

The potential need for loads spreading because of the main ground elements of motion common will be submitted at deadline six added to the post hearing or notes requested last week. Thank you.

30:09

Thank you very much. Yes, remember those? And does anyone else wish to raise any comments on agenda item three?

30:19

Okay, nothing heard.

30:22

I will move on then to agenda item free F.

30:27

Only one question on the section.

30:30

First of all for for the applicant. In the applicants comments on day one submissions. It is noted that there are ongoing discussions with the bus companies and that appropriate mitigation can be secured. Can the applicant provide the minutes of the meetings? I'm aware that you have already done so with your transcript with first group and stage coach to the examination and confirm the status of discussions with both bus companies is that any additional mitigation measures arising from the meetings with the bus companies to limit the impact on their services?

31:06

Mr. Williams.

31:11

Thank you, I just like to start by providing a brief summary of the assessments undertaken

31:18

and key. So, an assessment of the impact of local bus services was completed in the supplementary transport assessment using outputs from the the srtm. This assessment was based on a cross section of routes, which considered both those that routed along the onshore cable corridor and those which may be impacted by traffic reassignment across the wider highway network. The assessment included an assessment of seven routes, which is shown graphically on page 27 of the supplementary transport assessment and included bus services that that route across both the ports within Hampshire networks.

32:01

Generally the assessment show the increases in bus journey times were 10% or less in the am into pika and PNP periods. It's noted by the applicant that there are in some occasions increases above 10% in terms of journey time, but where these have occurred, they are on services that are either impacted by multiple sets of traffic management as assessed within the the srtm

32:32

or through traffic reassignment away from such works. Yep can therefore notes that the F TMS prevents such a scenario for McCarran through the programme restrictions along long aspect along adjoining parts of the highway

32:51

corridor

32:53

which would therefore limit the the level of delay to less than modelled

33:02

and reported in the supplementary transport assessment.

33:06

As a result of this, the conclusion from the applicant is that there is a generally minor impact on bus routes across the study area. And where these are more pronounced the impact will be for a short period. Why as I said mitigated through the ftms.

33:22

In addition to this assessment, the applicant has

33:26

has had meetings with both first group and stage coach in October 2022. To discuss to discuss the proposal, the proposals. During these meetings we presented the bus operators with details of the construction programme and the the traffic management and F TMS requirements. During these meetings near the bus operators expressed significant concerns regarding the proposals or impacts to bus services. It was also noted in these meetings in the limited circumstances where road closures are required to construct the onshore cable route. The diversions to bus routes associated with these could be implemented. Very simply, it was agreed with bus operators that further meetings will be held if required following their full review of the F TMS and road closure requirements which was shared after the meeting. Thank you.

34:27

Thank you very much for that.

34:31

I'll come first of all to Mr. Tony, and on behalf of Hampshire County count. So obviously some of these bus routes run up the AC corridor in their route seven and eight and the star routes. You've had what's been said I don't know if you've had time to read and digest the minutes of those meetings held with first group and stagecoach. But do you have any views on the impacts on the bus services and the mitigations necessary for them in place?

35:00

Sir Richard Tony for Hampshire County Council at the outset, I'll just know that Holly Drury may come in on point of detail here. But just to set out the county Council's position on this, there's also been county council engagement with the bus services, there is concern about the overall severity of the impact on the network. And that includes, of course, impacts on bus services. And one of the ways in which it may be necessary in due course to react to that will be through ensuring that the service level bus services maintained, potentially through additional resources for supporting those bus services. And essentially,

35:47

the county council is not content to rely on the assertion by the applicant that the impacts will be minor in nature.

35:59

The there is a need to mitigate any adverse impacts through the provision, potentially of additional funding to ensure that those services are maintained. The other point to note is that the 83 corridor is the subject of

36:19

a concerted effort by the county council and by Portsmouth city council to improve bus infrastructure and it's the subject of a TCF bid. And in light of all that investment, and the importance that's put on the corridor, or the delays that are created by these works, can have a potentially more significant impact on the overall strategy of trying to ensure bus service provision. So we don't think that the point is answered by the bus operators receiving

36:53

the applicants view that the impacts on them will be minimum, minimal. Of course, if the bus operator is told by the applicant, that they don't need to worry about the impacts on them, then they're not going to worry about the impacts on them. The county council as highways authority is concerned about the impacts on this part of the corridor, and does still seek further mitigation on that as in terms of the detail, I don't know if it's very wants to raise any further point.

37:25

Can't assist on the bus routes that would be effective. I'm not familiar with those, but I've had them territory has anything to add. Of course, Mitch jury,

37:36

I don't, I don't know that I've got any more detail than what's already been set out within the written documentation that you're in receipt of, it would just be a variation on interpretation of that detail, which I think we set out with an audit long five response. It's also worth noting that some of the impacts that are more significant on routes that aren't just the star seven and eight, there's quite a wide selection of routes that are affected by by the works that might not ordinarily be on that call.

38:05

That's it really, it's just reiterating my point about journey time and liability and the impacts of that might have on whether people choose to use the buses over the prolonged period of the works or not. And unlike car journeys, people who use buses can't just choose to use a different bus route, they're going to have to change to a different mode. And that could have quite a detrimental effect over the long term strategy for the air. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that. Before I go to Portsmouth, I'll just refer this back to the to the applicant, you've obviously heard the views, they're from Hampshire.

38:38

I wonder if there's any response that you'd like to give at this stage, and without prejudice to anyone's positions that in respect to the comments about additional funds or resources for the bus companies, whether you consider there's any merit in exploring them. And perhaps the first point to Mr. Jarvis case.

39:01

And before I get into that, I've just outlined that the applicant has assessed what the impact would be. And he has explained the outcomes of the assessment to the bus companies. And it's not the case that the applicant is have discussions, downplaying what that assessment outlines, it has clearly explained the assessment undertaken, explained what the impacts are assessed to be, and therefore identifies that the impacts are minor. So it is somewhat more than an assertion as was put forward there. And we would not accept the suggestion that we have just told the bus operators that they do not need to worry about any of these issues with regard to the provision of mitigation, any funding. It's only required where it's necessary to mitigate an impact. And as I've just explained, we've assessed the impacts, and we've identified that they're minor, and based on the journey time increases that we've identified over the temporary transit periods that the works will be undertaken is not considered at a service level agreement is necessary.

40:00

We will continue, we will continue to discuss this with Hampshire County Council. But unless we get some clear evidence as to why mitigation is needed, it's not proposed that mitigation has to be put forward. And then just the last point I'll make before I pass to Chris Williams to see if he has any further comment. The comments made with regards to the three corridor and the improvements to be made with bus infrastructure on noted, it's not expected that the temporary impacts of the works over that period would have any lasting permanent impact on the reasons for which that infrastructure is provided. It's not entirely clear what the point is that's being made there by Hampshire County Council. Thank you, sir.

40:37

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Is there anything you wish to add?

40:43

Yes, thank you, I just like to make the point again, the

40:48

the the restrictions within the framework traffic management strategy,

40:54

limit the periods during which

40:58

shutter work in or temporary

41:01

traffic signals could be implemented to facilitate construction of the onshore cable route along the a three London Road.

41:09

And that is these instances that create the most significant delays to bus services, they are very limited in time period, across the the

41:23

the entirety of the construction programme and in in cases, for the a three London Road, they are limited to the school holiday periods. And June and July when General traffic flows are generally lower

41:39

than other times a year, thereby mitigating the delay at these locations. Thank you. Thank you very much.

41:49

Just before I hand back to Mr. tunic, I see his hand is raised just like to say for the we've obviously got the minutes of the meetings with first group, I understand for my records, that first group are a interested party, they submitted a relevant representation to this examination. And I just like to extend the invite to them. Rather than have the applicant and Hampshire County Council speaking on your behalf, if there's any of us that you wish to put forward to the examination for us to consider then by all means, please do so. That's not downplaying the roles of either the parties have mentioned. That's just if you have anything further to add, as your own organisation would be much appreciated to have those.

42:37

Mr. Tony wish to come back and appoint

42:41

the rich attorney for Hampshire County Council. And I know it will, Mr. Jarvis says, but it's helpful that he starts by saying they'll continue to discuss these matters with us. I think there are points of interpretation here about the extent of the impacts on the bus services. And certainly, the county council is not content to say that these are impacts which can be tolerated without further mitigation. And that's really the position and we'll take it away with them. Obviously, the longer term aspirations for the corridor are particularly important when one is considering whether these works will have an impact on bus services and the extent to which those will be mitigated. So it's not the case that those points can be dismissed. And of course, they remain quite considerable uncertainties about the impact of this scheme. We've already dealt today with two instances where the likely joint pain location is identified as being in a bus lane. And those are the sort of impacts which, whilst uncertain at the moment may cause material impacts on bus services. So there's more work to be done, as we said, but I think for the purpose of today will be better if we take this way. Mr. Jarvis has agreed that that they'll continue to discuss with us and of course, we can listen to what the bus company says. Well, of course, it certainly sounds like something where maybe the parties have reached their respective positions on it, but we do welcome ongoing discussions to resolve any, any issues. Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Williams, anything further on this point?

44:25

No, sir, we will continue discussion. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. Just on that question in agenda three F of conscious have heard from Hampshire County Council. Is there anything that Portsmouth city council would like to raise at this time in relation to that question, Mr. Hayward,

44:44

Lester. Within Portsmouth, the route is largely not located in

44:51

areas where buses would have priority. So the effect of the works is on general traffic is largely the same.

45:00

same effect,

45:01

experienced by buses in that there'll be caught up in the general traffic delay rather than having their advantages undermined. And

45:12

so to that degree, we're not expecting to have more people travelling by bus or need more capacity on the route. The effect will be on the bus headway and the the journey time. And the the time between buses rather than the capacity or the ability to get there any quicker.

45:30

So I don't think we're of the view. I mean, think so we're not of the view that we would need to put additional buses into that network to reduce that headway.

45:43

Because we're simply simply dealing with we're not dealing with more capacity. It's just a journey time issue.

45:51

It's not a not a good outcome, but I think is where we are.

45:55

Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Hayward.

45:58

Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Williams, who wishes to respond on this?

46:06

I don't have anything to add to that. But I will just check, Mr. Williams, whether you do thank you.

46:14

Thank you, Nelson, for me. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you very much all for that.

46:23

We are now at the end or nearly at the end, I should say of agenda item three.

46:30

At the start of this meeting, Mr. Attorney, you raised several potential points regarding highways and highways issues. I trust that we have covered them all throughout the course of our morning's discussion. But there any further points on highways matters that you intend intended to raise that we've not yet covered?

46:54

I think there are a couple of points if I just hand over to Holly Drury, please is of course,

47:04

sorry, was frantically trying to message him this too. I think I'm really caught up in the round, wants to sort of just flag about the work travel plan for the construction site on the cable workers. And we've requested within our deadline fibre sort of re review of that travel plan and the way that it's built into tying, engaging the more bespoke way of dealing with the travel plan and situation moving forward with the lack of certainty on where the contractors will be coming from. That makes it very difficult to secure a decent travel plan with appropriate measures. And I think it's quite key in securing the something that is meaningful in order to mitigate the impacts to the residents of London.

47:48

There's quite a significant number of movers going through the night in particular, which

47:52

does concern me see if we can put measures in to minimise those they'd be welcomed. And the other thing that is a major concern Hamish county council is where it's coordination around ladybridge roundabout, we've got a TCF project there, which I think comes from moving forward to try and instal prior to

48:13

a Queen's programme. But there are no guarantees to that. And there's also the implementation of the water, legal, MDA Southern access, the assumptions for their modelling has all been done based on the fact that that scheme will be in place. But I don't have high hopes that that will be the case. And I think there's likely to be some real need for words, coordination and detail matters to be dealt with there. There's quite a few engineering difficulties around that location, litter box culvert

48:43

that goes across the carriageway. So it's just how those are going to be managed by the applicant and how we secure that that is the case within the DCA, especially given the weight of housing need within the area.

48:56

Thank you very much, Frank factionless. Jury and Mr. tonin. Anything else to add?

49:02

No, sir, just to note, procedurally though, that, as I understand matters,

49:08

you'll be moving on to deal with air quality issues, and therefore I would keep my whole traffic team on online. If there are further questions for us. Could you raise it now? Yeah, of course. No, I, I have no further questions for you. I'm just going to put those most recent points made across to the applicant.

49:30

Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Williams, you've obviously heard those two points raise their I am content if you wish to answer them now or more or content as well if you wish to respond in writing at deadline six. But do you have any comments? I've review at this time on what's just been said.

49:52

I think we'll respond that deadline six if that's okay, sir. Thank you. No problem. Thank you very much and

50:00

That brings us to the end of agenda item free. For those of you watching the live stream, you may have realised an apparent skip of some of the content. There was about 20 minutes there where the live stream was not working properly, but please be assured that the recording has been made. And you'll be able to catch up with that later on. Hopefully this won't have inconvenience you too much. We apologise for that brief break in our transmission. What I propose now it is one o'clock. I propose that we resume and continue with agenda item four on the agenda after lunch, which will be up until two o'clock if I could see or at two o'clock, please. That'd be much appreciated. Thank you.