

TEXT_Aquind_ISH5_Session4_18022021

Thu, 2/18 3:08PM • 1:17:37

00:02

All right. Good afternoon everyone. Welcome back. This issue specific hearing is resumed. And we pick up at agenda item seven on highways and transportation matters.

00:15

Question seven one on the agenda. Have any conclusions been drawn by the parties in relation to the use of the Lambeth method to establish a maximum 200 metre walking distance? Can the applicant advise whether 200 metres or 400 metres is considered a reasonable walking distance for retrieving displaced cars? provide a rationale for this and describe if and how this influences any of the assessments and documents in the environmental statement. Mr. Jarvis, please.

00:48

I'm going through this question to Mr. Williams. Please, sir, of course Mr. Williams.

00:57

Thank you.

00:59

So to start with it remains the applicants view that 400 metre distance is an acceptable maximum distance for the displaced parking, given that it will only be in place for a temporary basis where properties are impacted by construction of the onshore cable route. The 400 metre distance represents a maximum five minute walk at a speed of five kilometers per hour, which is the transport plan in industry standard approach to assessment of travel time for journeys made on foot. As stated as part of issue specific here into this is based on a distance of 400 metres being accepted within the transport plan in his industry, as an acceptable distance to walk to common facilities, such as shops in a town centre, location based on Institute for highways and transport guidance, the maximum distance for residents to walk to a mode of transport at new developments as based upon additional Chartered Institute of highways and transport guidance, and the public transport access level assessment methodology used by Transport for London, which assumes that people will walk up to 640 metres to a bus service from home. In addition to these points, the applicant notes that Lambeth methodology is a guide to the location of parking places to serve new developments, i.e. it is for permanent parking opportunities associated with new developments. It is not intended to address short term temporary disruption of parking. Also, even when viewed in this context, it's noted the Lambeth methodology indicates that it cannot be prescriptive, providing that while a 200 metre distance should be considered for residential development, a parking distance of up to 500 metres can be considered for commercial developments. It also states that people are unlikely to stop halfway along the road and imaginary 200 metre or 500 metre line survey should be extended to the next junction or taken to a suitable location along the road. This guidance therefore shows that there is flexibility in the measurement of parking

distance from a property and that distance is beyond 200 metres are acceptable when considering the location in question. It is also clear that 400 metres recognized distance for assessment purposes when considering the implications of journeys on foot arising from development. Based upon guidance mentioned already.

03:34

The assessment of displaced parking during construction of the onshore cable route is contained within the onshore cable route construction impacts on access to properties and car parking and communications strategy included in appendix one of the FTMS. This showed that the majority of locations where parking surveys have been completed, or displaced parking could be accommodated within 400 metres from residential properties, with very few residents likely to need to walk the full 400 metres. In addition, as a result of the revised strategy submitted at deadline six, the contractor will be required to plate the trench at all times except where construction is taking place at that location. This means that the requirement for displaced parking will generally be limited to three to four properties for a period of two to three days.

04:25

This is the disposition is considered acceptable, taking into account the limited duration of disruption and the commitment to provide access on demand to emergency services, mobility impaired and vulnerable persons and parents with children under the age of five years old. Plus the commitment to use best endeavors to facilitate access at all other times.

04:53

It is therefore our view that there's nothing more that the contractor could do when undertaking the works.

05:00

industry to mitigate the impacts of doing so, whilst delivering the works in a timely manner.

05:07

In response to the question on the ES assessment, the ES assessment of impacts resulting from construction of the onshore cable route is not sensitive to whether a 200 metre or 400 metre distance is used as a threshold. As stated already, whilst a 400 metre distance was considered as a maximum distance for alternative parking capacity. in the majority of cases, parking availability is found within this distance, meaning very few residents will be required to walk that distance. In addition, the strategy for providing access to properties means that the impact will be limited to three to four properties at a time for two to three days for each 100 metre construction zone.

05:48

The impact is concluded in accordance with the methodology

05:52

to not be significant and would not alter any of the residual effects and beyond those already concluded by the yes assessment. Thank you.

06:01

Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. And just whilst you're there, just to I know we'll come on to the animal Road Traffic Management situation later on. But just in specific to the access to cars, displacement of cars and the strategy to deal with that is the 400 metres again, still applicable in the rural area of Mr. Lane as it is in the urban area of Portsmouth please? Yes, that's correct. And I'll come on to it later. But the park and displaced are now Moroder I believe.

06:33

There are alternative locations available in 150 to 350 metre areas. Okay, thank you very much for that. I'll come first to Portsmouth City Council. Do you have any comments to raise on this Miss Calhoun? So yes, Mr. Mr. Hayward's dealing with it.

06:54

Hello, sir. While there remains a difference between ourselves and the applicant around the relevant walking distance to access displace vehicles.

07:03

There are no practical mitigations available for displaced residents parking. Rather, the contention is that residents will be able to find a place on street within a reasonable walking distance, which the applicant contends is 400 metres and we still contend is 200 metres. To determine that parking availability the applicant has relied on parking surveys using the London model or the London methodology. Whilst we have some misgivings about that methodology, which practically overstates the availability of on street parking, as it relies on a formulaic approach, not recognizing the impact of inconsiderate or indiscriminate parking.

07:44

Having said that, sorry, is specific that the walking distance to be considered is 200 metres, which is consistent with that considered by Portsmouth when considering the proximity of off street parking opportunities for new residential development when not parking cannot be provided on site.

08:03

Despite this, the applicant has applied the walking distance of 400 metres, which is more appropriate when considering the proximity of residential development to retail or employment or education or leisure uses.

08:17

Consequently, the approach understates the impact of the parking displacement,

08:22

both on residential amenity

08:25

its impact on air quality of people driving around hunting for space to park and the increased likelihood of vehicles being parked.

08:36

inconsiderately at junctions or obstructing footways or where parking is restricted.

08:45

Mr. Williams did say this will only affect a small number of properties at a time. But in the case of cable drum deliveries, there are very significant lengths of road where parking needs to be relocated to allow that delivery to be made, in some cases in power in the case of blocks way road that's more than 1.5 kilometers. So it there are occasions when it will certainly affect more than a limited number of properties. Although I accept that for the cable, trenching work,

09:20

that will have a will affect a limited number.

09:24

Okay, thank you very much. Just one quick question on that. You heard Mr. Williams say that the 200 metres in the Lambeth method was not prescriptive? Not No, it doesn't have to be that what are your responses to that the Lambeth methodology recognizes a walking distance of 200 metres and I think it's only common sense to say

09:50

if your road is another 50 metres longer, people will still looking at 50 metres of that road they might not head around the corner. So in some cases people will

10:00

I don't think people would ever stop at 200 metres. But where the woods a junction or a road or something defining something different, they may stop slightly short of 200 metres, they may continue slightly longer than 200 metres. So it's a it's a reasonable baseline assessment to use. And if you were plotting walking distances from individual properties, you would extend that along a route for 200 metres and say, Is this a sensible place to stop? Should I have stopped 20 metres earlier? Should I extend it 30 metres longer depending on where the where the road boundary is. Gosh. Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Hayward.

10:39

Mr. Williams, how would you respond to that with particular interest on that lock sway road point as well please?

10:48

Thank you. So just trying to take each of Mr. Hayward's points in in turn, with regards to the potential overstatement of parking capacity.

11:00

We consider that the surveys to represent a robust estimate of parking capacity.

11:08

We also know that the Portsmouth city council supplementary planning document

11:14

on

11:16

parking standards and transport assessments recommends the use of the Lambeth parking methodology for surveys of on street parking.

11:27

So, we do consider that to be robust in relation to the suitability of a 400 metres or 200 metre distance.

11:37

Again, this is a temporary situation it is not a permanent situation

11:42

in any cases. So it is a very different, very different to the consideration of parking for a.

11:54

Oh,

11:56

Williams, we may seem to have lost you there.

12:03

Give him a moment. I think we may have lost him. Hopefully he can rejoin us shortly. Mr. Jarvis in the interim, is there anything that you can take up an answer, perhaps, temporarily, whilst we wait for Mr. Williams to rejoin?

12:25

I'm not sure there is because I think they are matters that are best addressed by Mr. Williams as the as the transport specialist.

12:33

So unfortunately, I'm not sure there are points that I can address. I would also just flag that. Obviously the remainder of this section is transport focused. So it's quite important that we do have Mr. Williams.

12:47

I think he might be back home. We're just having a quick look. I'll do my best to get in touch with him in the meantime, if that's okay, sir.

13:00

Sir, I might be able to help not to put words in Mr. Williams mouth.

13:06

And bear with me one moment it appears that Mr. Williams may return Yes, indeed. Can you hear me Mr. Williams? Yes, I can. Sorry about that. Why if I dropped out as to right, we're on we're on your point to there about data's temporary not permanent.

13:24

And that and then you cut out so perhaps if you could just resume from there please sir. Okay. The next point I was going to pick up was with regards to specifically the situation on Kingsley road and lock sway road.

13:38

The suspension of parking on Kingsley road should only be required if cable drum deliveries are needed to the joint Bay.

13:47

Sorry, the indicative joint Bay location at the end of Kingsley road. The preliminary polling strategy for the delivery

13:57

of cable drums has suggested that wouldn't be required and instead they would be delivered to

14:03

joint bays along longshore way and at brands Bri Park instead.

14:09

On Rockaway road itself, we've identified the need to

14:15

suspend parking for potentially I believe 20 or 30

14:20

vehicles during delivery of cable drums should that be required for that location? Again, this will be on a on a temporary basis, the cable drums would be delivered during normal working hours. So the car parking suspension would only take place during the day when there was there was less demand. And there is there would be suitable alternative parking available for residents

14:49

that that can't park on those areas during the times of suspension.

14:56

Also, it's perhaps worth noting that in areas such as locks

15:00

Way Roden and Kingsley road, it's quite normal for residents not to be able to park outside

15:08

their own house, their own property because of the unrestricted parking

15:15

that is available. So it may well be in the existing situation, those residents already have to walk 500 metres, or sorry 400 metres in a five minute walk from where they parked their car. So, in reality, there probably wouldn't be a significant impact as a result of the temporary suspension of 20 to 30 parking spaces. And Mr. Right, Mr. Williams, I might have seen somewhere I might have got this wrong, that the suspension would only be for about an hour or so. Because that's how long the delivery would actually take. might have seen that somewhere. It could well be limited, there'll be a need to get the cable drum into the joint Bay offloaded and then back out. So it could well be limited if need be.

16:06

But then there is also potential to to make use of

16:10

of the time available when and deliver an additional cable drum should that be required on the same day. So it will be kept to a minimum wherever possible, but it should absolutely only be during the working day. Okay. Thank you for that, Mr. Haywood. How would you like to respond to that?

16:31

Mr. Williams has sort of put my hand up.

16:35

That was Alexi Hanson. Mr. Williams has helpfully acknowledged that people can't already often Park and vicinity of their homes

16:46

in that area, and as a consequence, introducing or displacing more parking from locks way road into that area makes it even more unlikely that they'll actually be able to find a place. I accept it for a limited period certain only likely to arise in that location during cable drum deliveries. I also accept that it's a daytime issue and won't impact residential parking overnight, which is probably the critical concern, sir.

17:10

Okay. Thank you very much for clarifying that. Mr. Hayward.

17:16

Whilst we're on this issue are now just quickly come to Hampshire County Council. Mr. Attorney, do you have any specific comments on this?

17:27

especially with regard the animal road situation?

17:32

bridge attorney for Hampshire County Council. So we on the specific agenda question. We don't have a particular comment on 200 versus 400.

17:45

But you will see from our deadlines, seven submissions that we have addressed in some detail, the mitigation measures that are required in appendix one to the F TMS. And the first observation that I just make. I'm going to hand over to Holly Drury in a moment. But the first observation I make on that is that we do need the applicants updated version of that document, and it's a theme that's going to be common to a lot of points on this agenda. We need those documents back from the applicant as soon as possible. So we have put comments in on the annual road issue. I'll hand over to Holly Drury, if I may. Yes, of course, his jury

18:31

on the agenda item is specifically wrong at the moment. It's worth noting that from Hampshire's position. And yet, we still need to understand the scale in which is 400 with impact on our residents. But we have increased the definition of vulnerable people within the current drafting to include any of our primary aged or below, given the type of road that the route is proposed on, which we do feel somewhat minimizes the impacts that may be felt by the by the increased walking distance.

19:01

And we've also improved residents noticing so that those that are directly affected will be contacted 24 hours before directly from the contractors. So they'll be aware of the night before rather than getting a knock on the door the morning on asking them to move their cars.

19:16

They with regard to them. All right. Again, we picked this up under our seven c response. I think we're comfortable that the displacement of animal road is only going to be for the movements of the abnormal movements to the to the animal rights site. And whilst I'm keen to when others I think support, support and explore alternative options to access to that area. We're broadly comfortable that it can be accommodated for short periods of time if needed.

19:47

Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that. Mr. Williams. Is there anything you wish to come back on those comments?

19:56

Thank you just know that the comments was

20:00

received today from Hampshire has been incorporated

20:05

into documents, we do intend to share those in draft with Hampshire as soon as possible for their review. And just to again, note that the issue on animal road, we're confident that displaced parking can be accommodated. And again, it will be a daytime parking suspension when there is less demand for such on street parking. So there should be no reason why that any displaced parking can't be accommodated on surrounding roads. Okay, excellent. Thank you very much. Does anyone else wish to raise any points under agenda item seven one.

20:47

Okay. Nothing heard.

20:51

As Mr. Attorney has said, the framework traffic management strategy, and probably also the framework, construction traffic management plan. And the the old camp will probably need, as you're aware to be circulated as soon as possible so we can get some constructive comments that deadline eight.

21:11

So all efforts would be welcomed on that from all parties. Thank you.

21:18

Moving on, then to questions seven to

21:22

the applicant briefly set out the outcomes of the road safety audit that's been shared with Hampshire County Council. And are there any remaining differences or concerns regarding this? Mr. Williams.

21:36

Thank you. So the

21:39

the road safety audit has been completed

21:44

and a designer's response submitted to Hampshire County Council.

21:49

The Road Safety Audit considered the proposed access junction at the converter station, along with the provision of the parking bays and traffic management along day lane to facilitate movement of construction vehicles on this link. Overall, the RSA raised only minor comments.

22:08

These can be

22:11

summarized as a recommendation that that traffic masking is used on the gated link pro to ensure that inbound and outbound HTV convoys do not block onto the carriageway

22:22

to avoid Rayshawn accidents.

22:26

This has been mitigated through coordination of traffic marshals each end of the link road to hold traffic general traffic and allow access into and out of the converted station access road should this issue be likely to arise. This approach is set out in the updated framework construction traffic management plan, which will be submitted at deadline eight.

22:50

The second recommendation provided in the RSA was that suitable visibility displays are achieved through repro flight reprofiling excuse me of the inside corner of the day lane Broadway lane junction. This is to ensure that adequate forward visibility is achieved

23:09

to vehicle movements on the western end of the gated link road as vehicles approach from day lane. This recommendation will be covered off through detailed design. And the note has been included to the access junction drawing, which is appended to the framework construction traffic management plan. Finally, there's a there was a recommendation in the RSA to

23:32

in order to further discourage vehicles from attempting to turn left in the converter station site from Broadway lane and no left hand sign should be introduced into the proposal supported by a traffic regulation order. Again, this recommendation has been accepted with a no left turn sign included in the updated version of the access torian. And added to the framework management plan. Construction traffic management plan sorry.

24:02

The accident as I said the Atkins designers response to the RSA was submitted to Hampshire on review for review on the 11th of February. And since then Hampshire have confirmed that these the recommendations and their mitigation to be acceptable.

24:19

Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. Mr. Attorney, I assume that's a fair summation of the positions. It is. Thank you, sir.

24:29

Thank you very much. Does anyone else wish to raise anything on questions seven to

24:38

mishpacha Please be aware that your camera seems to be on.

24:45

So thank you very much.

24:47

Okay, moving on then to item seven free on the agenda.

24:54

What is the status of negotiations with the bus companies are any further

25:00

mitigation measures being considered, and our outstanding objections likely to remain at the end of this examination. Mr. Williams, first of all, please

25:14

respond to this question in the first instance. Of course. Thank you, sir. And so, meeting was held with FirstGroup and stagecoach and Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth City Council on the 11th of February 2021. To discuss the impact of the proposed works and how mitigation could be secured in relation to

25:35

impacts sort of beyond those which have been assessed, but which is considered may arise in the future. In acknowledgement of the position put forward. The applicant has agreed in principle to providing a mitigation fund and that will be in relation to delay impacts, and also in relation to marketing in the future.

25:55

The birth companies so first and stagecoach have very helpfully with Hampshire County Council and Portsmouth city council put together a detailed noted proposal, which sets out how this can effectively be monitored and funds drawn down in the event of delays. And that was issued to the applicant on Tuesday. And it was confirmed, in principle yesterday that the applicant is agreeable to the general principle of delay impacts in marketing being covered that there's a need to work through the detail.

26:22

I am presently looking at that in terms of producing drafting and setting out what a trigger may be for that fund. And we are also looking to have a meeting on Monday with Hampshire to discuss that drafting. At this moment in time, I'm not sure that will involve the bus operators but a request was sent yesterday evening by Mr. Geithner of Hampshire County Council to the bus operators to understand when they would be available to discuss this. So in short, Sarah, it's expected there will be a mitigation fund secured, and further to the comments received. We're doing our best to work through that as quickly as we can. Thank you, sir.

26:56

Thank you very much. I'll come to Hampshire County Council first Mr. Attorney.

27:04

Richard tourney for Hampshire County Council. So this is a has been a difficult area for us, as you'll recall, I sh to the applicants position was that they weren't willing to engage in bus mitigation measures. And it was only in January this year at the county Council's instigation that there was a meeting to bring together the bus operators, the County Council and the applicant. And it's obviously now welcomed that the applicant agrees to the principle of bus mitigation measures. And that's an important step in the process. And we're very grateful for it, it comes very, very late in the examination.

27:50

And just to put it in context, the county council flagged the need for bus mitigation measures in response to the consultation on the preliminary environmental information long before the application was even made.

28:03

But there is progress. But what we need now from the applicant is really urgent progress. And the position is that they've said they agree in principle to an approach, but that they'll come back to us on the detail of the summer involved. But we're left with a matter of a couple of weeks for this to be resolved before the end of the examination period. So we need a response from the applicant on that urgently, by the end of this week. And then we need that to be resolved to the county council satisfaction and the bus company satisfaction within a few days after that. So it really is a huge amount of pressure on the applicant. And their scape for negotiating on this has now been substantially narrowed because of the time that they've taken to engage with the issue.

29:02

And if we can't reach a satisfactory agreement on bus mitigation measures, by the end of the examination, the county council is going to have to say something or thurity that it should recommend refusal on the grounds of a failure to mitigate for bus impacts. We don't want to have to make that submission. So it really is a case where the outcomes kind of get very late. And we now need them to move incredibly quickly to agree the terms that have been put forward by the bus companies and the county council together so that we can get this signed, sealed and delivered by the end of the examination. I know the bus companies are here as well. So it may be that they want to say something further on it. I won't I won't steal their Thunder or preamp they say. Okay, cool. So I'll come back to you shortly On a related matter. But yes, I understand the best companies are here.

30:00

Mr. Hodgson for stagecoach and Mr. Ready for first group, I thank both of you for your patience waiting to get to this point of the agenda. I would like to start by asking if Mr. Hodgson is here, if he'd like to address us and let us know any points he wishes us to consider at this time.

30:18

Yes, I'm here, sir. Thank you very much. I think just to support what has been said, on behalf of Hampshire County Council. Clearly, punctuality and reliability are fundamental to our customers. And it is really important that that service to the community is not interrupted during the course of these works. And if it is interrupted, that sufficient mitigation is in place to minimise any impact. So we very much support having a fund available to ensure that we can continue to provide a punctual and reliable service throughout these works.

31:00

Thank you very much. And just so I understand that are those funds to ensure the service looking at things like additional buses, or? Yeah,

31:11

exactly. That's the if we are seeing delays, and in the applicants own assessments, certainly one of our routes is quite badly affected with delays on Route, we would have to put additional buses into that service to maintain the existing frequency. Clearly, we still have the dis benefit of longer journey times for each of our customers crossing those areas. But we do need to be able to put additional resources in and we need funding to, to allow that to happen.

31:50

Okay, and, obviously the devils in the detail that we don't yet have, but just a hypothetical situation when the construction works, stop. And if you like service can return to normal, or those funds just for a temporary fleet higher, are they going to be permanent vehicles that are within your fleet, that then effect will become sort of partially redundant. If you like what one service resumes normal map normality. We're looking to be obviously very flexible, we hope there won't be any delays to our service. But when there are we need to deploy this additional resource, but we will work hard so that when it is no longer needed, it can be removed from our provision. So we just we need funding to cover for those times when the delays are impacting us. And in general, just it will be for a minimum of a week at a time. We aren't able to flex on a daily basis that that means we need to let our customers know what's happening.

32:56

But

32:58

we are getting to be flexible and work hard to minimise any impact. But we do need to make sure that funds are available. Should the delays transfer.

33:10

Thank you very much. Thank you for your time. Mr. Hodgson. Please, please do stay on the line because this is an a carry on for a little while. Mr. Reddy, and you've had the conversations. there's anything that you wish to add.

33:25

Thank you, sir. So I'm the MD for first class in Hampshire Dorset bar chair and I'm also the chairman for the South Hampshire bus operators Association. So I'm speaking on both accounts.

33:37

Just to echo what Mr. Mr. Hodgson said in regards to stagecoach.

33:42

Our customers number one priority is punctuality and reliability.

33:47

And it is accepted that the area is a congested area. One of the areas for the works to take places the 83 corridor, and there was a 35 million pound investment in that corridor for bus priority in 2008, from Hampshire County Council and private investment from ourselves the bus operator. So this clearly demonstrates that the area is congested for that bus priority to have to be introduced what some 30 years ago. It is also recognized further congestion by definition of the Department for Transport now awarding the local authorities money under the transforming cities Fund, which again will help by bus priority to improve journey times. So what I'm really saying is that we do have some challenges in operating bus services in the area. And the fundamental thing is that we have a mitigation fund that we can access only when necessary to the good governance that we have with our local authority partners to ensure that the bus services remain punctual and reliable, which is what our customers need and want at the end of the day. And the final piece is the

35:00

mitigation piece about recovering passengers because by definition, a longer journey times, some passengers will decide to choose other modes of transport. And it's important for air quality, public transport use, etc., etc., that we try and get as many people back on public transport as possible.

35:21

Okay, so that you'd be looking for funds for a marketing initiative. How would that be? Would that be leaflet dropping? Is that advertisements in signboards or what how do you envisage that would that might work? So we would work with our local authority partners on that it would be along the lines of some of the items you've just mentioned, digital media is another case, also, customer database emailing general awareness campaign about the buses, the use of buses and the green credentials and so on.

35:54

That would, those would be some of the elements. And as we said earlier, the devil is in the detail of the final piece in terms of the quantum and the trigger points for the mitigation fun.

36:09

Okay, thank you very much. Ready? Before I go back to Mr. Jarvis on this, I see mystery Your hand is raised.

36:20

Yes, Inspector, I wonder whether it was helpful for you to understand how we might envisage this working in practicality terms, and how hunters long fits with that.

36:31

Yes, well, if you just hold that thought for a moment, because I fear it might come out of the discussion. We're about to have Mr. Jarvis. If you bear with me one second, I may come back to you if you've got any points.

36:44

So yes, Mr. Jarvis, you obviously heard the comments there.

36:48

pressure on the applicant, so to speak in terms of coming out of this is this simply amendments to the current draft of a section 106 agreement, you are progressing with Hampshire? Or is this a separate legal agreement to secure the fund? That is so so co signed by first group and stage coach?

37:11

Thank you. So before I answer that question, I will just highlight that the applicant did speak with both first group and stage coach at an earlier stage. And our position put forward was based on the discussions we had with them, the minutes of which are agreed minutes, which are in the examination. Our position was based on those discussions, we were not provided with further information from the operator until deadline seven. And since then, we've really done our best to progress matters, having further taken into account what they said. So I do agree there's pressure on the applicant. I don't agree that it's the applicants fault. But it seems to have been stated to be that having said that, we are of course now working positively with all parties to reach a resolution on this matter, because we do recognize the point that has now been made, particularly explained by Mr. Hutchison and Mr. Redding. And so to go back to your specific question, the intention is that this is something that sits in the section 106 agreement with Hampshire County Council, essentially, there would be a fund. And we're just dealing with the mechanics of that and how it says that there would be baselines set with comparison routes used to determine when to lay impacts go above a certain level, at which point monies could be drawn down from the fund. And the way that we're looking to calculate the fund is based on a realistic worst case at the number of weeks that traffic management measures are anticipated to be on the roads on which the individual bus routes are located. So where there is a coincidence between the two on a pro rata basis, taking the annual cost of providing an additional berth, dividing that by 62 to represent the weeks in the year two a single week and then multiplying that by the number of weeks, that there's traffic management on those roads. And that in rd provides a realistic worst case because I think our assessment has shown in all instances, the delay that is to be experienced will not be such that there is a need for an additional birth. And therefore a funded that measure should provide more than enough amounts to ensure that delay impacts that do occur and where additional methods are required to address punctuality issues are provided for. And then there is also the request marketing which is understood as it has been explained by Mr. Reddy and Mr. Hodgson and we're just looking at the the value of the amount that marketing is for and there may be some further discussion on that. And it's drafting that is with me, and I will deal with it as quickly as I can, having received the information

with regards to how this is proposed to be set up on Tuesday. I haven't yet had the opportunity to draft that, sir.

39:54

Okay, thank you, Mr. Jarvis. I'll come back now. Miss drew Was there anything

40:00

thing in terms of that those mechanics of working that you wish to raise or elaborate on please,

40:07

I need to point out, we are working with Martin to come up with an SEO compliant mechanism for securing this and, and the higher authorities rolling it is to be that regulatory buffer a few like between the money and the claims for the actual use to make sure that those triggers are met, and that we can assess and review what will be commercially sensitive information as our regulatory function. And we also have available to us a wealth of data, which can evidence where impacts may or may not have occurred. So just to give some reassurance on that skill component element and where he sees it within the process.

40:45

Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that. Mr. Attorney. Was there anything further you wish to add?

40:51

No, I don't think so. So you're not going to be assisted by me going back on what Mr. Jarvis has said about who did what when say. We'll leave it there. Thank you. Thank you very much.

41:02

For the bus companies. Mr. Hodgson, first, is there anything further you wish to add for the examiner authority to consider on this matter?

41:12

Bus routes and bus mitigation? Now, I think all the points I wanted to make have been made. I don't think I have anything further to add at this point. Thank you, sir. Thank you. And Mr. Reddy, the same question to you, please.

41:27

And that I can give you the same answer, as Mr. Hodge said, quite happy at this moment in time until we get to the devil in the detail as I mentioned earlier.

41:37

Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Jarvis. Any final thoughts from the applicant on this?

41:45

No, thank you, sir.

41:46

Okay, thank you very much. And thank you to those who have attended for that particular item, much appreciated for your input.

41:58

Moving on, then to

42:01

questions seven, four, on the agenda.

42:06

The joint Bay feasibility report, does it replace or supersede in full? The joint Bay technical note?

42:15

The second part of that question is should it be appended to a management plan? I've since seen it deadlines. Seven see that it said that this is an indicative document only, which is acknowledged although it does contain a fair bit of information about the routes that cable drums would take to reach the Joint Base. But if that question could be answered, I'll turn to Mr. Jarvis I suppose in the first instance. Yeah, thank you, sir.

42:44

So

42:45

just to clarify that the joint bi feasibility report does supersede in full the joint a technical note, I'm not entirely sure why they had different names, but one does supersede the other.

42:55

As you have set out the joint a feasibility report has been produced to establish the feasibility of construction of the onshore cable reusing a number of indicative joint days. And it's only possible to confirm the locations of these Joint Base during detailed design as the onshore cable routes. The reports and locations of the joint bays are not secured at this time. And it's not proposed that they are secured at this time. The relevant design and construction management principles are included within the design and access statement design principles and also in the onshore outline construction environmental management plan. And I would add to that that the traffic management would be provided in connection with the installation is to accord with the traffic management parameters set out in the framework traffic management strategy. More recently, we've engaged with Hampshire County Council on these design principles and they've provided further input which I do understand has been incorporated into the working final draft of the death. So I thank them for their input on that. And that input will be incorporated at deadline answer.

43:54

Thank you very much.

43:57

Although questions seven five is related and we'll go into that. Does anyone have anything specific on what we just heard in questions? seven four.

44:07

Okay, nothing heard. Moving on then to seven five and the supplementary transport assessment.

44:16

addendum lists the 17 Joint Base that it says may be taken forward. A number of joint bays are within the carriageway including within bus lanes or within the highway limits requiring single lane closures for cable john deliveries for all of those if maintenance is required at a joint Bay location. What are the implications for traffic management? For example, the type of closure that nature closer the type of vehicles attending etc. Have the effects of this being taken into account in the environmental statement. Will Joint Base in the highway require acquisition of highway sub soil? appreciate there's a lot of facets to that question. Mr. Jarvis.

45:01

In the first instance, I'll refer to Mr. Williams to address the Joint Base to be taken forward and the position regarding maintenance and repair and the position in relation to the F. Now, I will then address the acquisition of subsoil beneath the highway, sir. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams, then please,

45:19

thank you. So the reference to 17 to mbaise. included within the sta addendum refers to the indicative locations identified in the joint Bay feasibility report where cable drum deliveries would be needed

45:34

to those locations if they were to come forward based upon the preliminary assessments of cable pulling requirements. The joint Bay feasibility report therefore proves the feasibility of constructing the onshore cable route through detailing indicative locations for 35 joint Bay's of which nine or indicatively located within the carriageway or highway limits. The sta addendum then confirms how the cable drums would be delivered, if they were in the locations thereby evidence in the feasibility of the approach and the position on impacts in relation to those deliveries.

46:18

With regard to

46:20

maintenance, repair of joint bays and required traffic management, there is no requirement for maintenance on of the joint bays on a routine basis.

46:32

The only time that joint Bay would need to be revisited would be in the unlikely event of a failure either of the joint itself or a cable failure that would require the failed cable section to be replaced. In the event

of the failure of a joint or cable work to repair will be similar to the work required for construction that is excavation of the joint Bay. Firstly, removal of the failed joint or cable installation of a new cable joint of the new cable into the existing or installation of a new joint backfilling of the joint Bay. And then finally reinstatement of the carriageway. The type of plant and equipment required for these activities will be identical to that required for the original construction. And the traffic management required will be that that as prescribed in the ftms for the construction of the onshore cable route.

47:25

times timescales overall would be the same as the construction period. Because whilst works would be associated with only one cable or joint rather than to any time saving will be offset by the need to remove the faulty component before replacing it.

47:42

With regards to the position in relation to the as

47:48

the operational stage of the proposed development, was scoped out of the ES chapter 22 on traffic and transport as stated in table 22.1.

48:01

This was on the basis of the anticipated traffic impacts during the operational phase of the development are unlikely to generate significant effects, which reflects the rarity in which such maintenance would be required.

48:15

Thank you. Thank you very much. And just very quickly, it may also

48:21

best. Mr. Jarvis can comment on? But in terms of if that urgent maintenance was required, would you go through the permit scheme of either Hampshire or Portsmouth to book devoted space to be able to undertake that work? Or is this team some emergency work that would be enabled to take place almost immediately disregarding that?

48:48

It's a good question. So I guess it depends on how we change the definition of

48:54

emergency works further to yesterday's comments. But I suspect if there was an outage of the interconnector as a consequence of the fault then that that would be classed as urgent and therefore the permitting scheme would be in the position of urgent work, so we'd obtain upon it but it would be under that on that basis, I expect.

49:12

Okay, thanks so much for clarifying. And please do continue.

49:16

Thank you. So I'll just address the position with regards to the acquisition of 72 Highway.

49:21

So there, there won't be any requirements, the acquisition of highways, so for joint relocation. And the reason why that is is because any joint they will be situated in an area free from services to allow a free unobstructed area for the jointing works to be carried out as required to ensure the quality of the work. The base of the joint day will therefore be constructed as a burial depth to suit the normal burial depth for the cable system. And this will be slightly deeper than the main cable trench to allow the joint Bay to accommodate the extra diameter of the joints. That will increase the depth of the Joint Base by approximately 200 to 300 millimeters compared to the main cable trench only. And therefore it's not anticipated as that would go outside of the zone of origin.

50:00

Are you on the highway? Sir? Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that. Mr. Attorney, I see your hand is raised.

50:09

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

50:15

So just on joint bays, obviously, the position is the joint Bay documents that have been submitted, provide indicative locations for joint bays and don't actually confirm that the locations are the ones where joint bays will be constructed. So, to that extent, the appraisal of what's proposed by the county council has obviously been fairly limited. And we accept the position that has just been described by Mr. Jarvis that there wouldn't be a need for subsoil acquisition for the reasons he's given. We agree that there has not been any assessment of the impact of maintenance of Joint Base. We, I think we just need to clarify what Mr. Jarvis said about the need for a permit. In circumstances where there were urgent works, and urgent works still require a permit, but they can be granted retrospectively in some instances. So the permit scheme would still apply,

51:21

even if there was a need for urgent work to the cable or to a joint. So those are the sort of main points on the agenda item more generally, on Joint Base because of the absence of certainty as to where the Joint Base will be located, we have pressed for further detail to be included in the design lab statement. And as I understand it, that is matter which is now agreed by the applicant. But again, I think we're waiting on drafting from the applicant in respect of that, if we can resolve that, then the concerns that we've expressed about Joint Base, that they still stand in terms of the scale of the works and the concern about their location on the highway. But they will be to some extent capable of future control by the Highway Authority, pursuant to the design that says statement and the approvals that are required.

52:19

Thank you very much for that. Mr. Jarvis. Would you like to respond to that? Or Mr. Williams?

52:25

Briefly that I will pass this as I will. Yeah, I would just clarify that I agree with Mr. Tally, the payment scheme would be applicable. And it was more of a question of whether their emergency works within the scope of the bank scheme, which I think they would be but I do agree that the payment scheme would apply as it would be maintenance to the authorized development and therefore caught through the order. And if I may, I just like to ask Mr. Williams to give an update on exactly where we are with the agreement of the additional design principles to be included in the das with Hampshire County Council in relation to joint a,

52:55

its place.

53:04

Apologies, I am not aware of the latest position on that.

53:11

I, I know that there have been discussions regarding the topic.

53:18

But I'm not able to add anything further at this stage. Apologies.

53:25

Okay, not a problem, per se. But obviously you'll need to work that out if there is another design principle to the deaths that will give the reassurance to Hampshire County Council. We'd look forward to seeing that in due course, for the other Highway Authority. With me one second. Mr. Attorney, you wish to come back before I go to Portsmouth?

53:49

Thank you. So just to say on this point about the das, there in our comments, a deadline. The detail is in the comments that deadlines seven sees that maybe the applicant hasn't yet picked all of that up, but it was something that was foreshadowed deadline seven as well.

54:06

Okay, thank you for that clarification. Mr. Attorney. Thank you.

54:10

Mr.

54:12

Mr. Hayward, is there anything that you wish to add on this particular item on the agenda?

54:19

Um, I haven't heard anything but Mr. Haywood.

54:22

Already, Peter Hayward from Portsmouth.

54:25

The revised joint Bay feasibility report did address the issue that we had around the joint Bay access to Fernand field and the obstruction of that vehicles not being able to turn on site. So to that degree, move this forward a degreaser, but we do recognize that they are any feasibility

54:42

stages. So the confidence that we can have in this degree limited.

54:47

Okay. Excellent. Thank you for clarifying that.

54:52

I see that a hand is raised.

54:57

Mr. Jarvis is that from yourself?

55:00

For myself, I have just had an update from other members of the team who confirmed that the and then to the design principles in relation to the Joint Base are agreed. And this was outlined and concerned to Hampshire County Council on the 12th of February. So I believe that matter is now resolved.

55:18

Thank you very much. Does anyone else have anything they wish to raise in respect of this agenda item?

55:26

Okay, nothing heard. We'll move on then to questions Seven, six. In relation to day lane. There's a question on the agenda with some supplementary questions to follow. But initially, how has worked progressed on the section 278 agreement to secure the facilitation of passing bays on day Lane? And is Hampshire County Council content with the traffic management measures on day Lane? If not, why not? Come to Mr. Attorney in the first instance, please.

56:00

Thank you, in respect to the 278, the draft is in progress between the parties. So hopefully that's going to be resolved soon. We've got a few points I think left over on management day lane. I don't know if

56:19

Mr. Murray wants to come in on that and point out what they are. But as I understand it, we are pretty close to resolving the technical issues between us on day lane.

56:32

Thank you, Miss jury, is there anything you wish to add there?

56:39

Yeah, the general principles are agreed obviously there is a use of Holbert Road lowboy and our highway there which requires a parking suspension. There is some question going circulating about who actually would undertake any enforcement of the policies mentioned a homework road. And if that's going to be a requirement of the traffic officers at having Borough Council, how that will be funded to ensure that it can happen if it's needed. I'm mindful at the moment that that Labour has capacity to accommodate the needs of liquid and otherwise I wouldn't have put it forward as a solution. But I am also conscious that debris Park is not currently built out. It will progress over the course of construction. And if demand increases, then we may be at a higher risk of people trying to utilize the area when it's not being used by quitting traffic during the day.

57:33

Okay, just to confirm on that, then, are you saying that this done spree Park has already sort of reserved capacity in that light bye for now the labor was constructed. As the dunks we access remove some of the existing lay byes on Holbrook road. So it was a light pipe replacement in terms of capacity at the moment is not being fully utilized. And that's not to say that demand might not increase there if you've got heavy industrial use on that site as it builds out.

58:02

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

58:05

Mr. Jarvis. Obviously, we touched on requirements 16. Yesterday, briefly, which secures the use of the hell but road layby. This matter of enforcement and enforceability. How do you see that working in in practical terms?

58:25

It's a question that was raised with me on Monday. I, for reasons of really being involved in these hearings, haven't had time to fully consider it. However, I can say I am looking at it further and where there are resource implications, we will work to ensure that they are addressed that we recognize that the use of those for purposes in connection with the authorized development is not a matter that should be charged to the local authority.

58:51

So thank you very much for that. Is there

58:56

before I go into my supplementary questions, is there anything anyone further wishes to raise on that particular point?

59:04

Okay, thank you very much. I noted from some of the

59:11

responses from Hampshire County Council received at deadlines seven see that

59:19

the

59:21

whole another day lane management system may only be in place during peak construction.

59:28

Is that St. Mr. Tony, you could just elaborate on to about where that point comes from please.

59:38

So I might have to hand that over to Holly Drury or somebody else on my team. I don't know the source of that comment.

59:47

I think I can I can compliment them in the in the dating management strategy it had. It was a direct quote from their draft strategy that they had taken at the previous deadline. I understood

1:00:00

And from drafting that, that's going to be removed.

1:00:05

I can't recall off the top of my head because my colleague is looking at the detail that we've seen that and it's been done. I don't know if Chris can, because we might be able to confirm. But I think we were agreed on that that's not appropriate, and it will need to be in place from the start to the finish, or until such time as we agree otherwise.

1:00:24

Thank you very much. Mr. Jarvis. Is there anything you can add on this one?

1:00:31

I think it's probably a question best directed at Mr. Williams. Cos Mr. Williams. Thank you. Yeah. Just to know, the update to the Daily Note that was submitted at deadline, seven c remove the reference to peak construction, and proposed that their strategy is implemented from the start of construction to the end unless it is agreed otherwise with the Highway Authority.

1:00:57

Excellent.

1:00:59

Thank you very much.

1:01:01

Another supplementary question on this. It is interrelated, I guess, from Hampshire's do seven see submission, it was referenced about the farm track of Broadway lane being used for the first three to six months of construction. But that doesn't appear in the construction transport management plan.

1:01:21

Can the applicant just confirm what the situation regarding that access is, whether it has been accounted for an environmental statement, and where it's useful operation is accommodated in a appropriate controlling management plan.

1:01:39

So if I may ask Mr. Williams to comment on the first points regarding how it's used and in relation to the environment statement, and then I'll probably pick up on that second point as well and deal with how the matter is proposed to be controlled. Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

1:01:55

Thank you. So, the use of the Broadway farm access is to

1:02:04

is to bring plant machinery and materials onto site.

1:02:10

In relation to construction of the

1:02:14

Broadway lane access junction and haul road.

1:02:21

It is being proposed to allow the safe construction of that route of that junction offline.

1:02:29

With the alternative being the vehicles would need to

1:02:35

stop on carriageway effectively to offload.

1:02:40

Under traffic management,

1:02:43

in terms of how it's covered in the ES assessment, our assessments are based wholly on the peak construction period.

1:02:53

And use of the

1:02:56

the proposed access junction that we've talked about previously. So as this falls outside of the peak construction period, it's not being picked up within our assessments today.

1:03:10

Okay, thank you very much, Miss Jarvis.

1:03:14

Thank you. So, as Chris Williams has just explained, we have assessed the peak impacts and the impacts associated with the construction of this access, and the access road access road would be far less than the peak. So we're currently going through an exercise to confirm the number of vehicles that would be required in order to facilitate the construction of the access and the first 100 metres or so as the access road is using the soundtrack is only appropriate for that because it then goes off in a different direction. So it's not entirely helpful for constructing the access road. So the secrets will be that the access is first constructed, along with the first 100 metres of the access road, and then the access road will be constructed from that point using the main access with the whole road in place. And with regards to how this has to be controlled. It's proposed to include an additional sub paragraph to the requirements 17 of the construction traffic management plan that requires a traffic management plan to be approved in relation to the site access works, which are works number two BB, and then that will that will be secured and set the limits on the number of vehicles and how those vehicles will be managed through the use of marshals similar to the proposals in relation to how marshals will be used for the more for the construction access I just described during peak construction. So taking all that into account, the view is that the the worst case impacts have been assessed. The assessment that has been carried out is sufficient to assess the impact of using this area that this number of sick would also therefore new no new environmental impacts arise and appropriate mitigations will be confirmed within the management plan that's going to be secured three requirements. 17 sir, thank you.

1:04:55

Thank you very much. I think I get all of that Mr. Turner.

1:05:00

Your hand is raised.

1:05:04

For Hampshire County Council, I think, really this is a quite a serious issue which the applicant has overlooked. The basic position from the county council is that the applicant hasn't assessed this access. And we're concerned generally, about its suitability. And there are identified concerns in the ctmp. in respect of the

1:05:33

junction between Broadway lane and day lane, you see that at paragraph 6.2, point two of the ctmp. As it stands today,

1:05:46

the wording which is proposed as an addition to the ctmp to address this farm access road being used is extremely limited. It doesn't address the fundamental issue of Highway Safety.

1:06:07

The access that currently is a private farm access, which also forms a public right of way,

1:06:16

there is no evidence about the existing or indeed the proposed level of use of it. And we haven't seen any evidence to show that the existing access can safely accommodate vehicle movements, including hgv's, particularly with regard to visibility splays. And we haven't seen any evidence that the access can be upgraded to accommodate those sorts of vehicles at the moment, it is not a made fully made road, gravel and with concrete stripping it.

1:06:52

So essentially, this is something which is really unassessed and which we're very concerned about, to say it's all going to be dealt with in a management plan later down the line is only satisfactory if the applicant is required to demonstrate the suitability of that access. And if the Highway Authority has the power to stop that access being used in the way proposed, because we can't say to you, and you can't advise the Secretary of State, that this is a safe or appropriate means of access to the construction site. And the reason we can't do that, and the reason you can't report on that is because the applicant hasn't assessed it. So it's a huge oversight on the applicants part. If it's going to be resolved, they'll need to either do that assessment now to demonstrate to us the suitability of that access. Or they'll have to remove that access from the proposals, or subject it to what we've proposed, which is that it is an extremely, it's limited to vehicles the less than three and a half tonnes, which is an expedient, rather than a particularly satisfactory position to reach. But simply the excluding HGVs will address

1:08:14

that a large proportion of the county Council's concerns here. But really, if they're going to knock this off into the latest age in the process, then we need to look to drafting which would allow the county council to simply say no, that is not satisfactory. And therefore you cannot use that means of access in the way proposed. And I'm sure Miss Jarvis will say well, that might help hold up our scheme and stop us from delivering the scheme. But that's consequences then not being able to prove its suitability at this stage. So hope that makes our position clear. It's a point of real concern for the county council.

1:08:46

Okay, and just two quick questions for Mr. Attorney coming off of that. The first one in relation to highway safety, would the use of this access required to have been assessed in the road safety audit, does that need to happen? Or should that have happened? or indeed does it happen?

1:09:08

I'll check. Perhaps mystery can help on that one. And it would depend if the junction form in any way has to change the road safety or it will be required if there's any structural changes to the highway form there. So if it needs to be widened, etc, or visibility space needs to be secured and it will be subject to safety.

1:09:29

Thank you very much, Miss jury. And then the second question, Mr. Turney. You said how the examiner authority may progress that if the access remained

1:09:41

I don't wish to put words in your mouth. I just wish to understand the position with regards the bus companies earlier used to turn a phrase similar to

1:09:53

a recommend refusal due to failure to mitigate the effects.

1:09:59

Not wishing to

1:10:00

To put words in your mouth, you might have something different on that. But would that be Hampshire County Council's position, if the access remained in that, in your view remained on assessed?

1:10:13

Well, so to be frank, I don't think that is ever going to be the most

1:10:19

as a necessary step, to refuse if that was the only issue with the application to refuse on those grounds, what I think the applicant would have to do is, is accept that it cannot use that access. And then it may be that it would have to secure another access, or alternative measures for the early construction works in that location.

1:10:41

But I didn't go so far as to say this is a point where we can't see any way in which it could be remedied the simple remedy, I think, would be to exclude that access from the provisions in the order.

1:10:55

But we've also suggested, you know, trying to be as reasonable as possible, another expedient, which is to impose a weight limit on that access. And as I say, it's not it's not entirely satisfactory, but as an expedient, it means that we know that HGVs will not use that access. And if that's the case, then our particular concern is going to be addressed.

1:11:20

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Attorney. Thank you for clarifying that.

1:11:25

Who from the applicant side would like to go first? Mr. Jarvis and Mr. Williams in just responding to those, those points there? I can go first there, and then I'll just pass across to Mr. Williams, if that's okay. And yes, I would just like to clarify the points I was explaining with regard to confirming the number of vehicles, the types of vehicles and you sort of relying on the tracking diagrams that have been carried out all of that information is proposed to be sort of confirmed now. And the included in the framework construction traffic management plan, such that any traffic management plan in the future needs to comply with that I completely appreciate that HCC will need to review that and confirm whether they're happy with that information. And as to whether or not they consider that addresses the problem or if their position remains that the way to address it is to impose a three and a half ton weight limit or otherwise seek to deal with this separately.

1:12:17

I would if I made it past it Mr. Chris Williams, who I think can provide a bit more information around the suitability of the access and its existing use in the context and what the proposed use is in connection with the construction of the conversation access.

1:12:31

Okay, Mr. Williams.

1:12:35

Thank you. So just in terms of some detail on the existing use, we're aware that the farm access is currently used by large tractors and trailers of up to 20 tons in in weight to deliver grain to the grain store which is located to the west of Broadway lane. It's also used regularly

1:13:00

by agricultural machinery, large tractors for seeding and harvesting.

1:13:09

In addition to those deliveries to the grain store.

1:13:15

With regards to its suitability, as Mr. Jarvis said we are working through

1:13:21

swept path analysis plans

1:13:25

of the access we are we are confident that

1:13:29

large vehicles can gain access to in from the existing layout without any modification. However, we also do propose that a similar management strategy would be employed as to the overall site insofar that any HGVs in and out the site would be led

1:13:50

with

1:13:52

vehicles in and out and the traffic marshals would be placed both south of the access junction and under the day lane, Broadway lane junction to effectively stop traffic

1:14:06

anytime when a vehicle were to enter or exit

1:14:10

the farm access. There's also no reason why the whole bit road layby couldn't be used in a similar way. So it is for the main site for vehicles to need to check in and then be escorted to site from there. Thank you.

1:14:26

Okay, thank you. Just

1:14:29

a quick point.

1:14:31

In terms of the information that's now being put together, as you said, the tracking for the access the existing use, and the number of vehicles coming forward.

1:14:42

believe Mr. Williams said there wasn't any assessment of this obviously the it fell out of the peak period.

1:14:50

Assessments just harken back to an earlier point on the agenda is this additional information. A simple technical note to the

1:15:00

supplementary transport assessment, or is this new environmental information to the environmental statement? Or what? How does this new information standard with respect to this examination, please

1:15:13

anticipate that it will be a technical note, sir.

1:15:17

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney, he wish to come back.

1:15:23

Thank you, sir. Sorry to come back again. But can I just raise the point? I did. I did touch on it. But I don't think it was addressed by Mr. Williams that there is also an issue with the junction between Broadway lane and day lane for this proposed access. So it's not just the junction between the farm access and Broadway lane, I think it is. It's also the previous junction, the prior junction that we need to be the subject of assessment. There's an identified problem there.

1:15:54

The other point to note is really just a timing one, if this is going to be produced.

1:16:00

The county council has spent a lot of time assessing the applicants proposals and do so with great care. They've also got their own deadlines in this examination to meet. We need that really very soon. And perhaps we can come back at the end to when the applicant is going to provide all these things because there's a growing list of the documents relating to highways.

1:16:24

Understood, understood, Mr. Attorney on that, Mr. Williams, do you have any points to come back on the assessment of the accesses?

1:16:35

Yes, that's just to confirm that the assessment will include the

1:16:41

the Broadway lane day lane junction, we are confident the vehicles can negotiate that that junction

1:16:52

in its existing form.

1:16:55

And we will clearly provide the information as soon as we possibly can to Hampshire for review.

1:17:03

Thank you very much. I'm conscious of the time is quarter to three. I propose that we take a break shortly. But does anyone else have anything to raise on item seven, six on the agenda at this time?

1:17:18

Okay, nothing heard. I propose then that we take a short break. If we could be back here at 1455. That's five to five and we resumed from then thank you very much.