

Aquind Interconnector

Hampshire County Council response to Applicant's Deadline 7 submissions

Additional information was submitted by the applicant relevant to highway matters at Deadline 7. This included:

- Applicant's response to Deadline 6 representations;
- Updated Day Lane Technical Note;
- Anmore Road and Mill Road Management Strategy;
- Travel Demand Management Strategy;
- Supplementary Transport Assessment Addendum;
- Track Changed Joint Bay Report;
- Updated Design and Access Statement;
- Construction Environmental Management Plan; and
- Track changed version of the DCO.

Hampshire County Council's comments, as Highway Authority, on these additional technical documents are provided below. Comments on the dDCO set out in a separate document.

Applicant's response to Deadline 6 representations

Site Access Timing

It is noted within the responses to the Deadline 6 submissions that the applicant is proposing to access the converter station site through the existing farm track via Broadway Farm off Broadway Lane for the first 3 to 6 months of construction. No details of this proposed access have been provided by the applicant to the Highway Authority and its use is not included in the CTMP.

The Highway Authority have been in discussion with the applicant requiring those site access works to be included, and defined, as 'pre-commencement works' to ensure that the S278 works for the site access can be constructed prior to formal commencement of wider activities on site. This request has been accommodated in the DCO and S106 definitions. This will limit the need for access required from the Broadway Farm track and it is questionable as to why access via the Broadway Farm access is required.

If the access to Broadway Farm is to be utilised information is needed regarding visibility splays and any improvements required at the existing access in order to accommodate the proposed use. It is currently of a condition and design appropriate to facilitate access to private properties, not construction traffic. It therefore has not been assessed by the Highway Authority as appropriate for the intensified use by different vehicle types.

It has been acknowledged throughout the examination that Day Lane cannot accommodate large vehicle movements to the site without significant traffic management measures on Day Lane and alterations to the Day Lane/Broadway Lane junction. Therefore, in the absence of any further evidence to demonstrate that

large vehicles can be safely accommodated, the use of any existing access to the converter station site should be restricted through the DCO to vehicles no larger than 3.5tons. The Highway Authority strongly request that the Examining Authority require that no HGV movements can be undertaken to site until such point in time that the site access works including the Day Lane passing places have been constructed and the Day Lane operation strategy is in place.

HGV Construction Management Strategy for Day Lane

Further to the comments raised in HCC's Deadline 7 response, the applicant has produced an updated note to address the management of construction vehicles along Day Lane. HCC understand that a further updated note will be submitted for the Examining Authority's attention at Deadline 7C. Within the Highway Authority's previous response at deadline 7, confirmation was sought and/or further information required on the following points:

- Restriction to be applied on the maximum number of HGV movements along Day Lane within the DCO.
- Provision for the applicant to provide a TRO along Day Lane which reduces the speed limit to 30mph.
- Commitment to convoy HGVs in and out of the site in groups of 3 to reduce travel delay and a mechanism to do so.
- Engineering comments were made on the passing bays.
- Clarification of expected queue lengths at the Day Lane/Lovedean Lane junction

The Highway Authority have reviewed the latest traffic management document and wish to make the following comments.

HGV Management Strategy

Following ongoing discussions between the applicant and the Highway Authority, consensus has been reached on the management strategy which will be used to manage the arrival and departure of HGVs to the site.

Departures

HGVs waiting to leave the site will be released in groups when possible and no more than 3 times within the hour. The stacking capacity of these vehicles will be provided within the site access and the new link road constructed on Day Lane. The holding and release of these vehicles will be co-ordinated by the banksmen/traffic marshals proposed along Day Lane to manage the overall movements of traffic during the construction period.

Arrivals

Inbound HGV movements to the site will again be co-ordinated in groups of 3 when possible and with no more than 3 convoys to site within an hour. HGVs will be held at the existing layby on Hulbert Road, to the southeast of the A3(M) Junction 3, and released under escort control via communication between the escort vehicle and the banksmen/traffic marshals present on Day Lane. The northern section of the layby

would be barriered off for use by HGVs working on this project only to ensure that there is sufficient capacity at the Hulbert Road site. A parking suspension will be required to the northern side of this layby to provide these HGV's with a designated area. The escort vehicle used to convoy the inbound HGVs will restrict the movement speed of HGVs along Day Lane to a maximum of 15mph to allow time to halt the convoy at a dedicated passing place should this be required.

A question remains regarding enforcement of any parking suspension within the DCO. The DCO grants the necessary powers for the applicant to implement and enforce parking restrictions and suspensions. However, the requirements for enforcement are legally complex and at present it is not clear how the applicant is proposing to meet these enforcement requirements.

The management of HGV movements will be used in collaboration with the Day Lane banksmen/traffic marshals. STOP/GO boards will be used to hold traffic on Broadway Lane and at the Lovedean Lane junctions with Day Lane when convoys are approaching Day Lane and dedicated passing places (shown in drawing number AQ-UK-DCO-TR-LAY-008 Rev B) will give flexibility should it be required for a vehicle to be able to wait for the convoy to pass.

As requested by the Highway Authority, the applicant has undertaken a junction modelling exercise at the Lovedean Lane/Day Lane junction to understand the potential queuing caused by holding traffic at the junction while a HGV convoy approaches. The interpeak analysis demonstrates a maximum queue length of 4 and 5 vehicles respectively across the northbound and southbound approaches. The low level of queuing experienced during these times is not considered to have a material impact on safety at the junction; however, given the proximity of the vehicle queue to Lovedean Lane and that it can be considered unexpected for the location, appropriate warning signage should be provided on the junction approach within the Chapter 8 traffic management arrangements. This is a detail that can be agreed post planning on approval of the CTMP.

Whilst the principle of this strategy is now considered acceptable, there are a few points that the applicant has yet to address:

1. Implementation of a TTRO which reduces the speed limit on Day Lane to 30mph from Lovedean Lane to Broadway Lane south of the site access. The TTRO will be required for the life of the project.
2. Provision of the engineering details requested in HCC's D7 response in relation to the Day Lane passing bays.
3. Resolution to concerns relating the enforcement of the parking suspension requirements, in particular at Hulbert Road layby.
4. Commitment in the DCO to restrict the maximum number of HGV movements to the converter station as set out within Page 2 of the latest Day Lane Construction Management Strategy note. The report currently refers to the management of "project related" construction HGVs from meeting each other on Day Lane but actually the system prevents any "project related" HGVs meeting any other HGV traffic along the lane. This should be reflected within the note.

5. The report proposes that the management system is only in place during peak construction. This is not as agreed. The management system needs to be in place to manage all HGV movements to the site from the commencement of construction, hence the requirement for the site access works and Day Lane works to be implemented prior to commencement and the Day Lane operation to manage HGV movements to be in place.
6. The management of HGVs arriving to the converter station for the construction of the onshore cable route should also be subject to the same arrival process. The HGVs should be released in groups no more than 3 times in an hour to reduce the delays to other users of Day Lane during construction. This should be reflected within the note.
7. A note should be included which states that HGV movements will be controlled at a maximum of 15mph while travelling along Day Lane to provide the appropriate time to react to any traffic travelling in the opposite direction to the convoy.

The management strategy for Day Lane is to be secured within the Framework Construction Traffic Management Strategy and will be required to be approved within the relevant detailed CTMP and implemented as per the final agreed drafting of requirement 17.

Applicants Deadline 7C Submission

The Highway Authority have had sight of the applicant's revised submission of the final Day Lane technical note which is to be submitted at Deadline 7C. This has appropriately addressed all points above, except from numbers 3 and 4. As already set out, the matter of enforcement of parking restrictions or suspensions is outstanding and the control on HGV movements is not provided for within this technical note or the DCO.

Drawing number AQ-UK-DCO-TR-LAY-011 has been shared with HCC for the revised limits of the proposed 30mph limit and a commitment has been made within the Day Lane technical note to provide this reduction in speed through a TTRO for the length of construction of the converter station and use of the compound area at the site. Drawing number AQ-UK-DCO-TR-LAY-011 Rev A has been shared with HCC for the revised limits of the proposed 30mph limit and a commitment has been made within the Day Lane technical note to provide this reduction in speed through a TTRO for the length of construction of the converter station and use of the compound area at the site.

Anmore Road and Mill Road Management Strategy

Additional information has been submitted at deadline 7 by the applicant which reviews the access provision at Anmore Road under the report 'Construction Vehicle Management on Anmore Road and Mill Road'.

To understand the existing HGV movements along Anmore Lane, the applicant has provided ATC survey data from 2018. The survey data reveals that based on a 5-day average, two-way flow assumption, 69 and 74 HGV movements are typically expected across the course of a day at Mill Road and Anmore Road respectively.

This accounts for circa 9% and 8% of the overall traffic flow along these roads. The Highway Authority has questioned the accuracy of this data given that neither road serves industrial units which would lend itself to a higher proportion of existing HGV flows, nor do the roads act as suitable links for HGV traffic. There is some question therefore on whether this is a comparable base.

Based on the applicant's assumptions, a maximum of 8 additional HGV movements are expected along Anmore Road and Mill Road per day in association with the proposed development. Even with the question of the base data this level of HGV movement could not be deemed as severe although there remains a question of amenity impact on the residents living on Mill Road. The maximum number of vehicle movements to the Anmore Road access should be restricted within the DCO.

A TTRO will be required to temporarily restrict on-street parking during the delivery of cable drums to the site again impacting on residential amenity. It is noted that this is secured separately under the "Onshore Cable Route Construction Impacts on Access to Properties and Car Parking and Communication Strategy" which is appended to the FTMS. Parking on Mill Road is evidenced to occur on both sides of the carriageway and therefore it may be possible that construction traffic routing to the site would be obstructed. The DCO provides powers to implement TTRO's if needed to ensure parking only occurs one side of Mill Road and therefore ensure construction traffic movements are not prevented access. These should only be implemented to accommodate all construction movements to the Anmore Road access if situations arise which give rise to an issue.

During the course of the examination, it has not been possible to assess parking need during school drop off and collection times. The proximity of Mill Road to Denmead Infant and Primary however could make it an attractive parking location and walking route for school children. Therefore, in the interest of highway safety any HGV movements to and from the proposed site must be restricted to outside of school drop-off and pick-up hours to reduce the conflict with parked vehicles during this time.

The general HGV movements on Anmore Road will also be subject to traffic marshal control. Two marshals will be located along Anmore Road; one outside of 126 Anmore Road and the other to the east of the site access junction. The purpose of the marshals is to prevent the conflict between HGVs and general traffic along Anmore Road where the road narrows below an appropriate width to accommodate a HGV past a car. The system would work in a similar fashion to the provisions made for Day Lane whereby approaching traffic is held until the HGV has safely passed. This system is considered acceptable. HGV's on route to the Anmore Road access would be from the converter station site and therefore banksman/traffic marshals will be aware of approaching HGV movements and be able to mobilise to provide the necessary traffic management.

The latest note also comments on the potential vehicular accesses via the field to the north and Hambledon Road to the south. This would be the Highway Authorities preferred option. It is understood however that a vehicular access cannot be achieved to the north because an area of land wide enough to accommodate a haul

road does not fall within the DCO order limits. With regard to the access to the south it is understood that there are significant environmental implications in routing vehicles to the Kinds Pond Meadow cable route and as a result of wider discussions this access is being removed from the proposed scope of the works.

Traffic Demand Management Strategy

The applicant submitted a new document at Deadline 7 titled 'Traffic Demand Management Strategy' (TDMS). The aim of the TDMS is to supplement the FTMS by encouraging travel behaviour change and it provides a commitment to work with local businesses and those effected by the scheme during the construction of the cable with an aim of achieving modal shift away from use of the private car. By doing so, the applicant contends that the volume of traffic along the A3 London Road corridor that would otherwise be expected would reduce, helping to reduce the overall delays present on the network during construction.

The Highway Authority have reviewed the TDMS and consider the document as a useful framework in collaboration with the Communication Strategy. The relevant monitoring and approval fees for the document should be secured under the S106 agreement.

Supplementary Transport Assessment Addendum

The applicant has submitted a Supplementary Transport Assessment Addendum (STAA) to address concerns raised in recent responses by relevant consultees. Whilst HCC note that the majority of this document relates to Portsmouth City Council's and Highway England's highway network, there are points addressed which relate to areas under to HCC's jurisdiction, in relation to Converter Station Access and the HGV management strategy along Day Lane.

Converter Site Access

The Highway Authority have now been provided the Road Safety Audit (RSA) for the converter station site access works but are awaiting a designer's response.

The Highway Authority acknowledge that the issues raised by the auditor and the subsequent designer's response indicate that all outstanding matters are capable of being overcome at the detailed design stage. We can therefore confirm that we are content with the principle of the works shown in drawing AQD-WSP-UK-OS-DR-Z-200215 Rev 05. The Highway Authority therefore expect to see the site access delivered via a S278 agreement prior to the commencement of works. This matter will be secured via the S106.

There are detailed matters outstanding on the drafting of the DCO in relation to the trigger for the site access works, including the Day Lane passing places and the relationship with associated requirements. This is covered earlier in this response and is to be dealt with as a separate drafting point at the DCO hearings.

Ordinary Watercourse Consent will be necessary for both works at the site access and the provision of the Day Lane passing places. This is a separate statutory process for the Lead Local Flood Authority and will need to be complied with, and

approval secured, prior to detailed design check approval being granted by the Highway Authority.

Strategic Road Network Junction Assessment

Further to the comments received by Highways England during the examination process, the applicant has also addressed personal injury accidents and the forecast junction capacity at the A3(M) Junctions 2 and 3.

HCC note the findings of these reports and will leave Highways England to comment on the detailed findings as appropriate.

Joint Bay Report

As outlined in HCC's Deadline 7 response, there remains a number of concerns over the proposed location of the suggested locations of the joint bays within HCC's network. The concerns raised in the previous response are as follows:

- Consideration of the traffic impacts during construction of the joint bays.
- Further information on joint bays 6 – 16 which are predominantly located within the highway.

An updated report has been submitted by the applicant which has considered some of the points raised at Deadline 7. The revised report confirms that access on Hambledon Road service road shall be maintained throughout construction and managed through the construction process. Primarily the Highway Authority are waiting for revised versions of the FTMS and to be satisfied that the construction of joint bays has been properly considered.

Ultimately it is understood that the Joint Bay report carries no legal weight and therefore review of the detail is of limited benefit at this time. The locations are indicative and do not set the parameters for where joint bays may or may not be located. Therefore, the Highway Authority have sought to seek design criteria within the design and access statement to protect the Highway Authority's position regarding the engineering design of joint bays and where they can be located within the highway boundary limits. These parameters are covered earlier in our response.

Section 2.5 of the STAA provides further information regarding joint bays. This predominantly focusses on the routing of cable drum delivery vehicles to individual joint bays. Appendix 3 has been updated to provide tracking for all joint bays which need to be accessed by Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs). This has been reviewed by the Highway Authority who are content that manoeuvres can be undertaken and that banksman control will be available and agreed for those more constrained movements through the detailed CTMP

S106/S278 Progress Update

The Highway Authority and the applicant are proactively working on drafts to the s106 and associated framework s278 agreements with a view of these being finalised in advance of the 8th December closure of the examination.

Design and Access Statement

It is noted that the Design and Access Statement secured through the DCO will set out the design parameters for the cable route and joint bay locations and with matters relating to Arboriculture. The Highway Authority have therefore reviewed this document and are requesting the following additions/amendment to section 6 of the document.

- Section 6.4 should include an additional section on cable design principles which is also relevant to joint bay design. This should include the following:
 - For the design of the cable location and joint bays to not negatively impact on any highway drainage infrastructure unless changes can be agreed through the detailed design that are acceptable to the Highway Authority and that these changes don't place any additional maintenance liability on the Highway Authority and for costs of any changes to be covered by the applicant.
 - For the design of the cable location and joint bays not to impact negatively as determined by the Highway Authority on any infrastructure on the highway such as Street Lights, ITS equipment, bollards, fencing, vehicle restraint systems and the like without the written consent of the highway authority through approval of the detailed design.
 - To avoid where possible laying the cable or joint bays in locations which require traffic management measures above those stated in the FTMS.
 - To locate the cables and joint bays in a manner which limits the requirements for significant traffic management for any future maintenance.
- Section 6.5.4 we would like some clarity on this section. It is unclear what this means in practice. It should be made explicit here that noise generating activities will only take place between certain hours and how noise will be monitored.
- Table 8.1 under the Human Health section talks about trees. This should be moved to the 'Trees' section. Wording changes are also requested as set out below in order to ensure the Highway Authority are protected from being required to mitigate private tree/hedge loss in the highway.

Where practicable, any mature trees and hedgerows which are within the site boundary will be retained. Highway trees will only be removed as a last resort, where retention in the presence of the scheme would be contrary to sound arboricultural practice as confirmed in writing by the relevant local planning authority-in consultation with the Highway Authority Arboriculture professional and with prior agreement on compensation / mitigation (dependant on LPA/HA position) values for each highway tree prior to its removal. There will be no third-party tree planting within the highway without express permission from the Highway Authority. Where agreed, the Local Highway Authority will undertake any highway tree mitigation planting required, to be funded from the highway tree compensation monies; There will be no third-party tree planting within the

highway without express permission from the Highway Authority. ~~Where requested,~~ **Highway** tree mitigation planting will be undertaken by the Highway Authority through CAVAT funding.

Additional Technical Points Noted at this Time.

Collett Report

The Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AiL) details have been assessed and set out within this report. It appears however that compliance with the information provided within this document is not explicitly secured anywhere. This includes details on the required infrastructure changes at Dell Piece signal junction and the Lovedean Lane/A3 junction along with vehicle routing and AiL process and procedures to be followed. This document should be appended to the FCTMP to ensure that the measures within it are secured within the DCO.

Phasing Plan

The onshore cable laying works within Hampshire are all included in area 4 of the works plan (reference EN0200022-2-4-WP Sheet 1 to 6). The site access works are in works area 2. The Highway Authority remain unclear on how phasing of the works will break up works area 4, which is of considerable duration.

Approvals of relevant requirements such as requirement 10 should be restricted in the DCO to the submission and approval of each phase to ensure the Highway Authority have the ability to review and approve the information within the timeframes secured within the DCO. The need for a phasing plan is set out in requirement 3 of the DCO and it should refer to approval of the phasing plan by both the planning and highway authorities to ensure that approval can be granted for each phase. There should also be a limit to the number of phases which can be submitted at any one time for approval to ensure that sufficient resources of the authorities are available to respond within the timescales set out.

Access and Rights of Way Plan

Amendments were asked for in HCC's Deadline 7 response to the access limits at the site access given the detail is known and these have not been actioned to date.

The plans still refer to temporary stopping up rather than closures which was a matter agreed by parties at the hearings to be an incorrect use of terminology within the DCO. This should also be amended in the Access and Rights of Way plans to avoid misunderstanding.

HCC are now able to provide further comments on some of the temporary access arrangements which were not mentioned in the dDeadline 7 response.

- **AC/3/c - Hambledon Road/Darnel Road signal junction** - Any vehicle access should be located to the far northwest of the blue line shown on the plans. This will avoid having to relocate the traffic island and the existing signal poles on both the far side and the island itself. There is existing signal ducting running along the footway across this proposed access. The cover to

these ducts will be insufficient for a proposed access. The scheme would need to enhance the protection to these ducts to avoid damage which can be a concrete overlay.

- **Access AC/4/a London Road near Mill Lane** - The access should avoid being located in the far southwest section of the blue line. This is due to clashing with the Toucan crossing. This will avoid the need to relocate the crossing and equipment.

Generally, the Highway Authority are content that the above matters are those of detailed design and should be overcome through the design process to avoid unnecessary works to the existing signal infrastructure.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been updated by the applicant following the Deadline 7 submission. The Highway Authority have agreed a schedule of changes to the CEMP in relation to Highway Trees and these are as follows:

HCC Deadline 7 submission	Subsequently agreed changes to CEMP
<p>The following wording within the CEMP: “it is agreed in principle that CAVAT payments will be made to mitigate the impacts of the loss of trees and hedgerows in HCC ownership where these are not otherwise replaced” reads that where lost trees are not replaced, a CAVAT payment will be made. This may be a misunderstanding, but this assumption is not correct. Where any trees/hedges are removed, HCC Highways Arboriculture will require a CAVAT compensation, regardless of whether the trees/hedgerows are replaced or not. The applicant is asked to confirm that this will be the case and amend the wording as appropriate.</p>	<p>It is agreed in principle that CAVAT payments will be made to mitigate the impacts of the loss of trees in HCC ownership. In instances where hedgerows within HCC ownership are to be removed, in whole or in part, then financial compensation will be agreed on a case by case basis. Payment will be made in lieu of any obligation to replant or otherwise replace</p> <p>HCC (as Highway Authority) will retain responsibility for any mitigatory planting deemed to be required. HCC will undertake mitigatory planting using the compensatory monies provided through CAVAT or, in the case of hedgerows, as otherwise agreed.</p>
<p>It needs to be made clear within the CEMP that no highway tree/hedge will be removed unless agreement with HCC Highways Arboriculture has been reached (including the agreed compensation). Again, this is likely to be a minor wording point.</p>	<p>No highway tree or hedge shall be removed unless it can be clearly demonstrated that:</p> <p>The application of protection measures described within British Standard BS 5837:2012 does not provide sufficient mitigation for sustainable retention; or,</p> <p>The costs associated with sustainable retention exceed its agreed CAVAT value.</p> <p>Highway trees and hedges shall only be removed with prior written approval of HCC Highways Arboriculture.</p>

<p>No tree planting will be carried out within the highway without the approval of HCC Arboriculture. This point needs to be made clear as third-party trees will still need to be replaced by the applicant. The current wording requires repositioning at least 5m away from the Onshore Cable Route within the Order Limits. However, given that the Order Limits will comprise mostly highway, it is currently unclear whether this is achievable in practice without third party mitigation planting within the highway, which HCC Highways Arboriculture will not support.</p>	<p>Third-party mitigation planting will not be undertaken within the Highway Boundary. In instances where third-party trees are to be removed then suitable opportunities for mitigatory planting will be agreed as necessary with landowners. Planting sites will be determined once the scope of third-party tree removal has been confirmed.</p>
<p>HCC have previously supplied a mitigation hierarchy which should be inserted into Section 6 of the CEMP to reflect how mitigation should be considered. This hierarchy is as follows:</p> <p>Unless a tree is structurally impaired, dead, or diseased, such that it would need to be removed for sound arboricultural management within the next five years. Then,</p> <p>Ensure that cable trenching and any associated construction work, storage and traffic is excluded from the Root Protection Area (RPA) as recommended by BS5837:2021[1] or canopy spread, whichever is largest. If this is not possible then,</p> <p>Work within the RPA must only be done in accordance with an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) prepared by a competent arboriculturist and approved by HCC Highways Arboriculture. This AMS must include details of special methods and techniques that will be used, such as micro-tunnelling or air spade excavation, for example, and any methods of ground protection and physical barriers that will be needed to avoid root damage, canopy damage and soil compaction, which will cause subsequent root damage. If this is not possible then,</p> <p>As a last resort remove the tree(s) and provide compensation for the loss at the appropriate CAVAT value. This must be agreed with HCC Highways Arboriculture prior to tree removal.</p>	<p>Unless a tree is dead or is so structurally impaired or diseased that it would need to be removed for sound arboricultural management within the next ten years. Then;</p> <p>Ensure that cable trenching and any associated construction work, storage and traffic is excluded from the Root Protection Area (RPA) or canopy spread, which is largest. If this is not possible then,</p> <p>A precautionary approach to tree protection will be adopted and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) provided which clearly demonstrates that construction activities can be undertaken with minimal risk of adverse impact to trees which are to be retained. The AMS shall adhere to the principles described within BS 5837:2012, shall be produced by a suitably qualified and experienced arboriculturist and shall be approved by HCC Highways Arboriculture prior to commencement of work. The AMS shall be implemented in full and shall only be varied following technical review by an arboriculturist and approval by HCC Highways Arboriculture. The AMS shall be supported by a Tree Protection Plan where required. If this is not possible then:</p> <p>As a last resort remove the tree(s) and provide compensation for the loss at the appropriate CAVAT value. The CAVAT value must be agreed with HCC Highways Arboriculture prior to tree removal or the commencement of any construction work within the Root Protection Area (or crown spread where this is greater). Construction work includes enabling activities, site clearance and storage of materials or machinery.</p>

The final outstanding matter in relation to Highway Trees relates to the drafting of the DCO where the Highway Authority require *'in consultation with the Highway Authority'* to be included within article 15 in relation to the discharge of the CEMP for any phase. This is to ensure the Highway Authority is consulted on the assessments undertaken for any loss of highway asset and agreement to any detailed assessments undertaken through the CEMP requirements.

Framework Construction Traffic Management Strategy and Framework Traffic Management Strategy

The applicant has not submitted updated versions of the FTMS and the CTMP for HCC to review. These documents are required to ensure that all of the points raised in previous representation and correspondence have been reflected within these documents.

HCC intend to provide a summary of any outstanding wording matters within these documents for the Deadline 8 submission.