

TEXT_AQUIND_ISH2_Session4_14122020

Mon, 12/14 3:45PM • 50:12

00:10

All right. Good afternoon everyone. I just you all suitably refreshed and ready for this afternoon session. We are moving on to agenda item for air quality and emissions

00:25

and just you're sitting comfortably. So, let us begin

00:30

referring to the agenda item for G, which should be on the screen in front of you now. The first question is towards Portsmouth City Council. How does Portsmouth city council envisage the instigation of a clean air zone would be affected by or indeed have an effect upon the proposed development?

00:53

Miss Kahoot?

00:58

Thank you. And Miss Calhoun is having a bit of a problem with her connection at the moment. So I'll take this one. And I'm Hayley trial. I'm a quality lead for transport at Portsmouth City Council. And so with regard to the question, it is quite difficult from the evidence provided to confirm the likely impact. As noted in our written submission, there could be impacts either way with traffic rerouting to avoid the cleaner zone, and equally rerouting to avoid the development. And so without any modelling to show the impact of the cast in relation to the development is quite difficult for us to assert what the impact is likely to be.

01:38

Okay, so if I'm correct, that it's only a hypothetical potential situation where traffic may reroute around it or reroute because of it and then end up in some way catered by the proposed development? Yes, that's correct. Okay. Fair enough. And just remind me when is the the Clean Air zone anticipated to be coming into effect? November 2021.

02:09

Okay, do do anticipate any, any information coming available between now and when the examination closes on March in relation to that cleaner zone that my may give extra certainty to your position at all? Yes, so on the 21st of December this year, we will be submitting our full business case to Defra that confirms our final plans for the cleaner zone.

02:37

Very much. Thank you for confirming that.

02:40

Mr. Jarvis, do you have anything that you wish to respond to at this time on that?

02:47

No. So we've given our submissions in the transcripts with regard to the measures that will already apply in relation to the development which would impact traffic that I anticipate to be impacted by the calendar. And we don't have anything further to add. Thank you. Thank you very much. And continue on the same vein, again, Miss Trower, if you could help with this, the next question, I assume has a very similar answer in that. Would the implementation of the Clean Air zone have a beneficial influence over the construction worker travel arrangements? I imagine you're gonna say again, it's unclear.

03:24

And bit more certainty on this one, because of the class of cleaners zone, it's unlikely that workers travel arrangements would be impacted because the zone will not charge private, private cars, the impacts likely to be on the construction vehicles. And I note in the applicants response that they suggest that construction vehicles would be cast compliant, so they'd be up 60s or but I query that because we know that they're special have specialist heavy vehicles and you often don't get those being your six compliance.

04:00

Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. Mr. Jarvis. Could you elaborate on that point, please about the the vehicles in euro six?

04:10

I can't sir. But I will pass the question to Stewart Bennett to make empty. Thank you, boss. Mr. Bennett. Can you assist us please?

04:23

Thank you. Yes, I'm Stuart Bennett, the quality lead for the application

04:29

and with reference to the

04:35

the framework construction traffic management management plan document. This describes the construction work and travel arrangements which we'll see the converter station act as the main site compound. And there is a commitment in the document for vehicles to have a minimum standard of the euro six for diesels for heavy duty vehicles and so all vehicles which emanates from the construction

05:00

compound will be euro six compliant. And by this point we can see that there is no no information around whether the will the vehicles which are non HDV will be will be complaints at this stage and were able to provide further information

05:16

at deadlines six.

05:19

Thank you very much that. Miss Chow, is there anything that you'd like to come back on?

05:28

Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

05:32

I have nothing further. It sounds like more information is going to become available at deadline six on that. So thank you, Mr. Bennett, for your response there. And Does anyone else have any further questions on those first two points on the agenda under item four g.

05:52

Mr. Hayward?

05:55

I Sarah, I think the issue isn't solely related to vehicles emerging from the transfer station.

06:04

It's all vehicles coming from the port with whatever deliveries they may have.

06:11

Okay, point point understood.

06:15

Mr. Bennett, do you have any comments on the the cause, presumably the abnormal indivisible loads coming out in support? And when they do?

06:26

Yeah, I don't have any further comments at the mall. And so we'll provide further information at deadlines six.

06:32

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

06:36

Moving on, then to agenda item four haitch.

06:43

Can the applicant clarify the conclusions made in respect of all the air quality management areas within and outside the order limits?

06:54

Mr. Bennett Ashu.

06:59

Thank you. So yes, I'll begin by providing a brief some brief background around the air quality management areas in Portsmouth for the benefit of the of the hearing, which is to say that the city has five quality management areas, which were declared in 2005 due to exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide and your main objective from Road Traffic emissions. So nitrogen dioxide is a key pollutant of concern in Portsmouth, and it's the main focus of the air quality Impact Assessment work.

07:35

Four out of five of the air quality management areas designated by the Council inside and outside the auto limits have been included in the quality Impact Assessment work. And a summary of the resources is can be found in chapter 23 of the environmental statement.

07:53

Quality Management Area number 12. In Western partners Asmath was excluded from the assessment work because it didn't meet the screening criteria

08:03

for traffic changes, which means that any impacts on air quality would have been imperceptible and this is best practice.

08:14

Turning to the air quality major areas outside the order limits firstly ad Quality Management Area six which is located in a city centre, along Fratton road and Kingston road.

08:29

The maximum predicted concentration in the dominium scenario is 13.9. And the maximum deteriorations in air quality were point three micrograms and point one microgram. And no exceedances predicted were predicted within Air Quality Management Area six. Without for judge the impact has been negligible adverse and the effect not significant.

08:58

For Air Quality Management Area number 11, which is located in the west of the city, and includes the air three m 275, and junction two RVM 275. The circulator affected by divert diverted traffic within the city and the highest predictions are made within this q&a of all the q&a is assessed. The maximum prediction in the do minimum scenario is 48.2. And we predict deteriorations 1.6. And point seven micrograms in the in both if something scenarios representing northbound and southbound lane closures on the eastern road. We did so in this has been a slight adverse impact and a net negative

adverse impact ng DS to the effects as being significant. However, I should point out that no new accent is produced which do

10:00

already exists in the do minimum scenario

10:05

for finally for air quality major area number seven, which is also outside the on the auto limits This is affected by changes in traffic flows as a result of diversions from traffic management and the maximum do something prediction is 27.6 micrograms, which is under the 40 micro gramme air quality objective and we determine those impacts has been negligible adverse and not significant.

10:37

Certainly turning to Air Quality Management Area number nine, which lies inside or partially inside the order limits in our in our modelling the maximum prediction within a qm and number nine is is 25.7 micrograms and under minimum scenario and 25.6 in the do something scenario,

11:03

and he determined this effect as being slight beneficial

11:09

and not significant.

11:12

We also tested completed a sensitivity test on particular concentrations in Aqa nine.

11:24

The change in effect recorded in in appendix 23.8 is due to the sensitivity tests undertaken using the supplementary transport assessment, which involves forcing less traffic to reroute away from traffic management or least it was previously predicted resulting in slower traffic speeds and Mark queuing on Eastern road itself.

11:51

Only a small number of receptors were predicted to experience impacts above negligible at the maximum do something prediction was 31.3 micrograms in the it was something to scenario which is under the under the air quality objective or 40 micrograms.

12:13

So it's my opinion that the air quality modelling reported in chapter 23 is robust and valid, including for the city of Portsmouth, Aqa 11, because my traffic is redistributed, done in the sensitivity test, as reported in appendix 23.8.

12:33

Okay,

12:35

thank you very much for that. Just a quick question in relation to aq ma 11.

12:44

That's obviously where the the there's an existing exceedance, you said 48.2 with deteriorations of point six and point seven, although there are no sort of new exceedances caused, as you say, How long? Or what's the duration for those,

13:05

the additional deteriorations impacting this, Will those deteriorations be over within a year, two years or once the development has been fully constructed? The because of the inherent conservatism in in the assessment is apparent because we we've represented

13:25

divergence on Eastern road

13:28

as as lasting for a whole year rather than the seven weeks in duration, which it will be in the rear in reality. So we think this is this is a very large overestimation. And once once the construction works are removed, then we wouldn't expect to see such an increase in such an increase in pollution in Aqa 11.

13:49

Okay, thank you for that.

13:52

Miss Chow, you've obviously heard what's been said there. Are you generally in agreement with what you've heard? Or if not, where are the differences?

14:06

Yeah, I think generally, we are in agreement with the assessment and I just feel that more need more note needs to be taken of the latest annual status report for air quality. So for example, in aq ma nine, we're showing a very near exceedance this year in quality management area 11 we're showing a couple of exceedances one as high as 53.91 micrograms.

14:34

And in air quality management area six, we're also showing some exceedance and in yet there's a few in air quality management area 11 as well. So I just think more regard needs to be given to current exceedances as well as future projected exceedances. Okay, first of all, is that annual status report something that is been submitted to the examination

15:00

To date.

15:02

And yeah, I believe it was linked in my submission. Okay, so that information is available for, for us to view and for the applicant to respond to,

15:13

in terms of those exceedances this time round, do you know, immediately if the causes of that burn in mind? Obviously, it's an unusual year in terms of lockdown and whatnot, but there are early clues as to why there are now exceedances. Whereas in the report that we've had the environmental statement that there has there weren't exceedances in the past. Yes, a lot of these exceedances are pre existing and that we've got monitored data from 2015 onwards, and a lot of them are showing a continual trend for exceedances. And it should be noted that the data I refer to is from taken from 2019.

15:57

Pre and pre any impact from the pandemic.

16:03

Okay, thank you very much for that. Mr. Dewan. How would you like to respond this time? Thank you. Yes, I just like to make the point that the, the the annual submission to Defra of the of the 2020 annual status report.

16:22

Although that may have been made, it hasn't yet been published, and so it wasn't possible for us to consider any monitoring results contained within the 2020 annual status report for 2019. So I can't really comment, or we can't really comment on those results until we've had the opportunity to consider those.

16:44

Understood. And is there anything further either yourself or maybe even Mr. Jarvis wishes to comment on this particular question?

16:55

We would just like to clarify that the status report being referred to in the examination is apologies if we've missed it, but we don't think we have seen it in the submissions made by port deadline five.

17:07

Okay, thank you. Yes. similar theme, Miss Chow. Apologies if that has been overlooked. But could you point where in your submission that the annual status report was submitted?

17:27

Sorry, I couldn't get

17:30

it should have been linked to my response to question four Ah, embedded within the text. And if it's not, then certainly we can send it in for the next submission.

17:44

Okay, I?

17:46

Well, I'm sure we'll all check on that. And if something could just be a note provided just to make that clear, and explicit in deadline six on all parts. That'd be welcome. Thank you very much.

18:00

Okay, moving on to the next question. And assuming no one else has anything further to raise on that

18:11

to the question to the applicant, and whilst it is now recorded that apma number nine, would experience slight adverse effects fallen recorded additional traffic data? Are there any implications for other parts of this route?

18:27

Mr. Bennett,

18:29

Thank you, sir. Yes,

18:32

just just by way of background, I should say the air quality has been assessed at over 50,000 receptor individual receptor locations across parts of Earth, covering all areas for which Portsmouth city council is responsible. And this includes areas highlighted in the air quality local plan, which acts areas which exceed the limits in the local plan modelling those which do not exceed the limits what are above 37 micrograms in the local plan modelling and road sections on the strategic network, which actually do exceed 40 micrograms. And I can provide a list of of the actual predictions that there are a number of a number of resets. So I certainly couldn't go through all of the precepts that we've used to briefly summarise we we estimate or we predict that all impacts are either slightly adverse or slight beneficial, and no new exceedances are produced by the application.

19:40

And so we what we what we can do for information is provide

19:46

a subset of the other modelling results that we have produced focusing on these particular areas of concern, as reported in the airport's a local plan by the Council

20:01

So did someone else speak there?

20:06

Nope. Okay, Nope, that's much appreciated. Thank you for that. Mr. Bennett. Does anyone wish to may raise any comments on the answer to that question at this stage?

20:21

Okay, nothing heard. I'm content. With that. Let's move on into the final question within item for haitch on the agenda.

20:32

And this one's for for Portsmouth. And we've referenced to the answer to question x q one, aq 1.2. point four and works plans. Can Portsmouth city council clarified whether there are particular areas of concern relating to potential exceedances, and then oh, two, within the order limits, and whether such areas are covered by air quality management areas, or the air quality local plan?

21:03

Miss trowsers?

21:06

Thank you. Yep, this particular concern about the location on East and wet road waterbridge. So although this does not fall within the Clean Air zone, it's an area that Portsmouth city council is still responsible for. And in the local air quality plan, we identify this area as a near exceedance. So what that means is, it's almost at the the exceedance, level of 40 micrograms. And in the applicants response, they've noted that it's not within the cars, and it's not within the order limits. So it's not an issue. However, as a as a local authority, our responsibility is to address air pollution in all areas for which we are responsible, not just those areas inside the cleaners. And so this, this kind of brings me back to my earlier comment about it would be helpful to have a bit more information about the actual impacts of the proposed development in relation to the cars and the rerouting of traffic because that location on Easton road waterbridge is very susceptible to changes in traffic and queuing. And I suppose as well, it's linked to the earlier discussions we had about the mitigation for the traffic impacts on the roundabout as well. So they're all they're all kind of linked together.

22:25

Okay, I'm on that point, in terms of it being a near exceedance location.

22:31

What is the current?

22:34

notwithstanding the development, the proposed development before us at present? What are the intended steps that Portsmouth we're looking to do to address that? And how soon are they looking to address that new exceedance location

22:49

at this time,

22:51

so the new exceedances addressed through the cleaner zone, and although it's outside of the cleaner zone, you get the beneficial impacts of upgrading of the fleet across the city and people coming in. So that will have a beneficial impact on that lyric students location.

23:08

Right. Okay. Okay. Mr. Bennett, how would you like to respond to that?

23:15

Thank you. Yes, I'll just begin by

23:19

just making the point around the spatial extent of our modelling work, which covers over 50,000 unique receptors across the city, including those describing the headquarter local plant. So we certainly acknowledge the council's responsibility for air quality outside the Clean Air zone, air quality module areas. Okay.

23:44

I just also like like to make the point, in terms of trying to deal with some of the uncertainty in the modelling process that our model is is highly conservative for three main reasons. Firstly, the traffic deaths are going to do something scenarios is based on the assumption that road closures are an operational year, which I think we've already covered. And we don't have any allowance in our representation of vehicle emissions for the benefits that will be realised by by the Clean Air zone because the the emissions factor toolkit that we applied, which is version point nine,

24:20

doesn't represent those those emissions and it's not isn't reflective of the local fleet as described. We've also applied traffic flows for the 2026 Peak srtm model year to 2022 which means that the 2022 flows are overestimated by four years of growth. So in terms of the conservatism in the model, we think that it is highly conservative when it when in reality effects will be intermittent and, and transitory.

24:56

Okay,

24:58

sorry, just just to add in terms of the

25:00

The Eastern road waterbridge location

25:04

curien has been represented using vehicle link speeds on the Misha reduced on the eastern road was a bridge and receptors on the south side of the bridge in the blakesley Lane area. The modelling shows beneficial impacts on local equity as a result of northbound and southbound closures, which are both

which are slides are moderate beneficial. And that is the result of the reassignment of traffic away from the road rich in both road closure scenarios.

25:37

modelling of the impact of the cable installation on the a 2030 was not completed, at least in World War Two bridge in our impact assessment work because it's unlikely that queing will extend seal kilometres from this road closure backup to this, this location.

25:54

I saw back to the assembler point we need to have a look at the the monitoring data for 2019 in the in the in the ASR as reported if we can if we can see that to consider the impacts of the the waterbridge in more detail. Thank you.

26:13

Thank you.

26:17

One question perhaps for for you both. I'll come to miss Chow. First. In terms of reaching common ground, not that I wish to start entering into that too much present. But where do the differences remain between Portsmouth City Council and the applicant in terms of of air quality? And are they likely not wishing to prejudice? any discussions? Were they likely to be agreed upon or move forward to at this time? Mr. Chow?

26:54

Thank you. Um, I think the main differences are just understanding what is within scope and what's out of scope in terms of where we're saying that there's likely to be impact. And I think also, there's still a bit of difference in terms of what we're saying about the impact of the cars and the impact of the development and vice versa. And I don't think we're a long way off that. And I think we've got a meeting in the diary next week to kind of get to the bottom of everything. And those are the main bits for me at the moment. Excellent. Thank you very much. And Mr. Bennett, Is that your understanding as well, that is my that is my understanding. And I look forward to the meeting in the next few weeks.

27:39

Okay, thank you both. It's good to know that that's progressing in the background. So unless anyone else has any points at this stage,

27:50

okay. Oh, Miss Cahoon.

28:00

You, I'm really achieving well. So I was cut off and then I've cut myself so that I had two very particular procedural points as it were, just for your note, the reference to the ASR. 2020 ASR is paragraph 412 bullet point one, and it was not linked. So we apologise for that. But we will sort that as soon as

possible. Thank you. Well through, I think through the ideal six response. And also forgive me, sir, but there was a point that Mr. Heyman wanted to raise

28:43

and he had his hand up at the end of and just before lunch, and I just wondered whether he might be able to, to clarify, it's a point of clarity, but I didn't want him to do and today without actually having made the point. Would it be acceptable to have that our case that's in relation to the highway session this morning? Yes. Okay. I apologies, Mr. Hayward, I didn't realise that you're looking to make the point at that time what I would do with

29:15

it with your approval of course is our look to get agenda item four I complete and then before we move to agenda item five our asked for any other comments and you may address this with your your point then if that's okay.

29:30

I'm very grateful sir.

29:33

Thank you very much.

29:36

Okay, so moving on then to Agenda for I question for the the applicant. In terms of no more than six gangs working on the cable Commodore at any one time is the prescription as to how far the gangs have to be away from each other. And how is the management and separation of gang working secure

30:03

Thank you dealing with construction traffic first, paragraph 22 318 of the framework transport management strategy document states that construction of the onshore cable routes on carriageway will be undertaken by a maximum of six guns working on currently.

30:22

The management and separation of working gangs include a series of working restrictions stipulating for each subsection of the unshockable coder when works cannot take place.

30:34

Restrictions include the identification of which subsections of the onshore cable corridor cannot be undertaken concurrently on subsections of the onshore cable corridor, which are in close proximity to one another.

30:46

These are designed to prevent multiple construction zones in the same area, and the cumulative traffic impacts that will be generated by such works.

30:58

Restrictions also include the prevention of works being undertaken concurrently on proposed diversionary routes at the same time as a real issue which switch diversions are required.

31:10

And we provide an example, which is issue specific to exhibit six from the ftms which shows a subsection of of Hambledon road north of silk road

31:25

excuse me, which shows restrictions of concurrent working

31:30

preventing works being undertaken in this location. And they are also being taken on any other location on the beat to 150 are on our on the three are on any other subsections of the three London Road that require shorter working traffic signals are road closures.

31:50

With respect to fugitive dust, the number of gangs working within the order limits does not affect the construction cost assessments as the accepted Institute of air quality management methodology followed does not carry this level of detail. With proper implementation of the mitigate mitigation measures determined then any any fugitive dust impacts will be largely eliminated with sources no longer remaining.

32:26

Okay.

32:30

So I'm getting a bit of feedback that that seems to have solved it. And just a quick question on that. Mr. Bennett,

32:39

it in terms of the six gangs are writing also saying that works. At HDD, horizontal direct drilling sites are excluded from that definition of six gangs as our deliveries i o deliveries and the like they are separate from the the six gangs at any one time. Is that correct?

33:03

I believe that's the case. But I think Mr. Jarvis would be able to confirm.

33:09

Okay.

33:11

Yes, I concerned that it's definitely the case that haich d d, and gangs off the highway are not restricted by the sixth constriction. It just relates to the highway. I think as we discussed with Mr. Williams earlier, we are going to clarify the position with regards to I was in the locations where work being undertaken.

33:30

Thank you. And just for the the benefit of the examination. Obviously, we're looking at six gangs, potentially not saying exclusively but potentially up for six different contractors operating knows who is ultimately responsible for coordinating the contractors.

33:56

I will need checks that will be I believe the hierarchy is explained in the CMP. In any event, all of those six guns would be subject to the same overarching framework of controls, which would ensure that they're acting in accordance with the framework document that provides the mitigations we will clarify exactly which person has control over the overall construction programme based on the information that's in the CMP. Sir, thank you.

34:21

Such much appreciated. Mr. Hayward, I believe it's your hand that's up.

34:27

So we all have control over which gangs or not which gangs work where but where work happens through the permit scheme. Ah, right. Okay. And with that, just for my clarity, would you then work with Hampshire County Council on your joint sort of permit scheme arrangements to ensure no, there's no more than six across both authorities to ensure there's no impacts at the boundaries? Certainly, sir. Of course. No. Okay. That's that's thank you for that clarification. Anything further from the applicant on that?

35:00

Just to confirm that the permit scheme, as we've discussed is drafted so that it applies the fdms and is in accordance with it. So it's the sdms that sets out the controls that need to be complied with. So thank you very much. Thank you.

35:15

Mr. Haywood, your hand is raised.

35:18

So this seems like a quite an opportune time to reinforce that the ftms is not something that we've yet approved, we're not yet comfortable, necessarily that we even understand the impacts, nevermind the mitigation that's coming forward through the sdms. To deal with that. Certainly in respect of safety. Of course. Yes. No, I remember recall, you made that point earlier. And that is certainly something that will be ongoing outside of this hearing to resolve that, I'm sure but thank you for reaffirming that point.

35:49

Moving on to the next couple of questions, they are interrelated. They relate to the same point. So I'm happy for them to be taken together. The questions are, has a scenario being tested whereby gangs were associated lay down and work so areas combined with traffic management measures would have a cumulative effect on air quality. And related to that could gangs work in one area and succession for continued effect? Mr. Bennett?

36:27

Thank you, sir.

36:29

I'll just begin by saying that the amended chapter 23 presents what we describe as amalgamated air quality results, which combines the impact of diverted traffic construction traffic and on site power generation at HDD killing locations.

36:49

So, so, we we presented additive air quality impacts from these different aspects of the works due to the contribution of pollution from amalgamated sources when added to background pollutant concentrations. So we have cumulative effects are reported in the chapter.

37:07

The maximum background pollutant concentrations within the order limits

37:14

for for nitrogen dioxide 23 micrograms in comparison to the objective of 44 particulate matter, pm 10 17.2 micrograms compared to an objective of 40 and for the fine of Pm 2.5, particular fraction 11.9 micrograms compared to an objective of 25 micrograms.

37:43

So, each of the maximum background concentrations leaves substantial headroom for emissions until the objective value was exceeded. And these results are reported in in that chapter.

37:56

With respect to emissions from non road mobile machinery, types typically used during construction operations. These were scoped out of the assessment following the guidance provided in the Defra local Air Quality Management guidance Tg 16, which states that with suitable site management and controls in place, long road and mobile machinery are likely to have a significant impact on local air quality.

38:31

We also know that the the rate of progress, as reported within the ftms will be 100 metres per week, which could lead to a continued continued effect for more than a week what sauce will be largely eliminated with the implementation of the measures secured in the outline.

39:00

Mr. Lau, is there anything you'd like to come back on that point?

39:05

Thank you, nothing for me. Okay. Thank you very much. Does anyone else have any questions or queries in relation to the use of gangs and their operation?

39:19

Okay, nothing heard. Then that brings us then to the end of agenda item four. I there's no further points on that. However, it was just flagged up to me that Mr. Haywood had one final point before lunch on a highways related matter. Mr. Hayward?

39:37

What would you like to raise?

39:41

Sorry, so I managed to deal with that in the in the comments on the ftms at the same time anyway. Okay, so that

39:49

was simply that we still don't have understand the impacts on safety on the diversionary route, so aren't in a position yet to conclude a view on the htms

40:00

Okay, thank you very much and not wishing to put words in your mouth, Mr. Jarvis or Mr. Williams is still with us. But that is something that is being looked at. And yes, it will be resolved offline.

40:15

That's correct, sir. Thank you. Thank you very much. We'll be pleased to know that that's all for me today. I hope you haven't been too

40:25

bored with my voice. But I want to now hand over to my colleague, Mr. Man for the completion of today's agenda.

40:33

Thank you, Mr. Wallace. And thank you, everyone for today's contributions. And before I close today's hearing, Does anyone else have a burning question related to the content of this hearing, or what we have heard today?

40:48

Nothing heard. So before we do close, Mr. Roscoe, please recap. Compare note to the applicant on today's post hearing actions and notes.

40:57

This demand Thank you. I'll just work through the hearing agenda items in that order. just referring to both post hearing notes and action points. In terms of agenda item to Portsmouth offered to get back on the severe impact point. I believe that was Miss Calhoun. In terms of the first bullet point of agenda item three a. The applicant

41:23

said Mr. Williams said that they would come back with the full assessment concerning football match days, and that that would be submitted at deadline six.

41:36

And that that would include the additional restrictions going into the ftms.

41:42

In the same bullet point, Portsmouth Mr. Haywood said that they would be responding in writing on their ongoing concerns in relation to football match days.

41:53

Going on to the third bullet point of agenda item three a.

41:58

The applicant offered a signage strategy to be submitted a deadline six that came through Mr. Williams.

42:06

In terms of the fifth in terms of continuing on with the fourth bullet point of agenda item three a.

42:16

There was a point relating to the fact that certain routes were less favourable joined the works, and that this could relate to reduced flows. Mr. Williams agreed to come back with further detail on that point. At deadlines six, I believe that was actually the fifth bullet point to agenda item three a.

42:36

Going on to the seventh bullet point, agenda item three a there was a matter relating to locks way road and the aibl communication strategy. Mr. Williams, on behalf of the applicant said that that would be updated in terms of the document, a deadline six

42:58

that was mentioned then of a road safety audit. And Mr. Williams then said that that was being completed on the converter station access. And that in conjunction with the signage strategy to be submitted a deadline six which I've mentioned before, that will be submitted as well at deadline six.

43:19

In terms of that bullet point, as well. That's bullet point two. So that's bullet point seven of agenda item three a

43:27

Mr. Hayward of Portsmouth

43:30

agreed to provide a note on the point that residential development parking was generally provided 200 metres from the residences.

43:40

Going down to agenda item three B and the first bullet point.

43:46

The applicant through Mr. Williams

43:49

wants to submit a further technical note on AI ELLs,

43:54

and that this would include drum delivery numbers,

43:58

a two week notice period for AI deliveries

44:03

and the effective road closures for AI ELLs onto in terms of diversion and routes.

44:11

going on then to the first bullet point of agenda item three see

44:16

the applicant offered to provide details of further work on indicative locations for joint bays and the identification of areas where Joint Base would not be permitted in terms of the decio and also identification of a sequential test and all that be to be provided at deadline six.

44:37

In terms of the second and third bullet points, this is the agenda item three see

44:43

the applicant then offered that work on the indicative locations, the joint bays etc. would include design principles

44:58

going on then to

45:00

bullet points two and three. Again, agenda item three see that that work concerning joint bays would also include the work that's been done on the assessment of construction hours, and also noise levels.

45:17

Turning now then to gender item 3d.

45:21

bullet point for this was an item concerning Mr. Turney and Hampshire County Council. It referred to the recent receipt of information on day lane, I believe it was said on Friday, and this attorney agreed that Hampshire County Council would come back in writing on that particular point.

45:41

Continuing on in terms of a lane an agenda item 3d bullet point for reference was was made to work to consider the width of day lane. And Mr. Williams on behalf of the applicant agreed that a deadline submission will be made deadline six submission would be made in terms of that work and in particular in terms of the need or not for additional passing bays.

46:08

Coming now to the end of the small x this morning session

46:13

is determined Turney

46:15

identified through him identified three points relating to construction travel plan ladybridge roundabout, and the southern Waterlooville access. And Mr. Jarvis agreed to respond to those at deadlines six.

46:32

Going on to this afternoon's items, item 4g second bullet point.

46:38

Mr. Bennett agreed to come back on details of non HGV vehicles and Port Access vehicles in relation to euro compliance and euro six have been mentioned previously in that set.

46:56

Going on to agenda item four H and the first bullet point

47:01

is tre agreed to send in deadlines six, the Portsmouth 2020 air quality ASR.

47:10

That's the status report.

47:13

The second bullet points Mr. Bennett agreed to provide the subset of modelling in relation to Portsmouth concerns. Again, a deadline six.

47:27

And finally then on agenda item four, I the first bullet point, Mr. Jarvis agreed to provide

47:35

information details of how the camp explains the hierarchy in terms of the carrying out of works by various gangs. And that was again, offered at deadline six. And that completes those. Thank you.

47:52

Thank you very much. Mr. Roscoe. Does anybody have any comments on whether there were other matters that were raised? Mr. Williams?

48:03

I just a point for clarification, please. The reference to a road safety audit for the converter station whilst This is being completed. This is something that we need to engage a third party on and it's not going to be something that we are able to respond to in time for deadline six. What we are

48:25

going to submit it deadline six is consideration of the road safety impacts on routes used by reassigning traffic across the network. Thank you. Mr. Williams. Thank you.

48:37

Thank you. And I was there any other comments on Mr. Roscoe his recollections?

48:46

Non heard?

48:49

Mr. Hayward your light is on did you wish to make a comment?

48:53

Sorry, similarly to Mr. Williams the

48:58

extra concern for matchday traffic with the lesser concern for matchday traffic and more a broad reflection on the ftms

49:10

objects. Thank you. When taken any final comments, please.

49:19

Then we shall move on to agenda item six,

49:23

and the close of the hearing. Please remember that the next formal deadline is deadline six, which falls on the 23rd of December 2020. And we'd be grateful if today's speakers could ensure that any written summaries of your submissions reaches by that date.

49:41

Thank you, everybody for your attendance and contributions today. And just to repeat our apology about the drop out of the livestream between approximately 1210 and 1230. I understand it was a much wider issue affecting a range of streaming services. Nevertheless, the recording of this hearing will be made available as soon as practicable afterwards.

50:00

So that the missing 20 minutes can be reviewed. This issue specific hearing is now closed. Thank you