

H2Teesside Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN070009

Land within the boroughs of Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees, Teesside and within the borough of Hartlepool, County Durham

The H2 Teesside Order

Document Reference: 8.25.12 Response to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation

Planning Act 2008



Applicant: H2 Teesside Ltd

Date: December 2024

H2 Teesside Ltd

Response to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation

Document Reference: 8.25.12



DOCUMENT HISTORY

DOCUMENT REF	8.25.12		
REVISION	0		
AUTHOR	DWD		
SIGNED	NC	DATE	18.12.24
APPROVED BY	DWD		
SIGNED	MS	DATE	18.12.24
DOCUMENT OWNER	DWD		

H2 Teesside Ltd

Response to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation

Document Reference: 8.25.12



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
	Overview	
1.2	The Purpose and Structure of this document	2
ТАВ	BLES	
Table	le 1-1: Applicant's Responses to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation	3

Document Reference: 8.25.12



1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared on behalf of H2 Teesside Limited (the 'Applicant'). It relates to an application (the 'Application') for a Development Consent Order (a 'DCO'), that was submitted to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero ('DESNZ') on 25 March 2024, under Section 37 of 'The Planning Act 2008' (the 'PA 2008') in respect of the H2Teesside Project (the 'Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2 The Application has been accepted for examination. The Examination commenced on 29 August 2024.

1.2 The Purpose and Structure of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this document is to set out the Applicant's responses to the Examining Authority's ExQ2.17 on Traffic and Transportation, which were issued on 28 November 2024 [PD-015]. This document contains a table which includes the reference number for each relevant question, the ExA's comments and questions and the Applicant's responses to each of those questions.



Table 1-1: Applicant's Responses to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation

EXQ2	QUESTION TO:	QUESTION:	RESPONSE
Q2.17.1	STBC	The Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-006] plan shows Huntsman Drive as a Private Road, which was confirmed as correct by STBC at ISH2 and again in their DL4 submission [REP4-024]. However, as highlighted by Mr Dagg representing Sabic, the national streetworks gazetteer shows this road as maintainable at public expense with a Unique Street Reference Number (USRN) of 38204763. Please can STBC confirm that the gazetteer is incorrect.	n/a
Q2.17.2	Applicant	The ES Chapter 15, Traffic and Transport [APP-068], at paragraph 15.6.3, gives details of the access routes to the proposed site construction compounds. Please provide a plan of these routes and detail if there will be a need to restrict access along any of these routes at any time, and if so please provide detail of such.	Figure 15-4 has been amended and submitted into the Examination at Deadline 5 to indicate the access routes to / from the compounds north and south of the River Tees. The routes now show the full journey to / from the A19 on the Strategic Road Network.
			At this stage of the project, the Applicant is still in the early planning phases, and it is too early to identify specific details regarding temporary closures or their potential impacts. However, the Applicant can confirm that there is no plan or intention to significantly alter or prolong restriction of existing access rights along any road, access track, or other means of access required by other parties.
			That said, there may be limited situations during construction where critical activities, such as lifting operations, require temporary closures to ensure safety. In such cases, closures will be carefully planned and timed to minimize disruption, and every effort will be made to provide viable alternatives. The relevant parties will be protected via the provisions of Protective Provisions for their benefit in the DCO.
			The Applicant remains committed to minimising impacts on access and ensuring that affected parties are informed well in advance to mitigate any inconvenience.
Q2.17.3	Applicant	At DL4, the Applicant submitted an updated plan of Heavy Goods Vehicle Routes to and from the Site [REP4-009]. Please confirm if this relates to the operational or construction phase. Please also confirm if these are the complete routes or only where they relate to public roads. If the latter, please update the plan to show the complete routes, whether on public or private roads.	Figure 15-2: HGV Routes to and from the Proposed Development Site [REP4-009] relates to the construction of the Proposed Development. The routes in REP4-009 indicate usage of public roads and an updated Figure 15-2 has been submitted at Deadline 5. The routes in the updated figure have been extended to show the full journey to and from the A19 on the Strategic Road Network.
Q2.17.4	RCBC	In their response to ExQ 1.17.8 and 1.17.9 [REP2-044] RCBC highlighted the appropriate construction route for route 4 via the A174. Please confirm that these are shown correctly in the Application documents.	N/A
Q2.17.5	STG	In the SoCG between the Applicant and STG submitted at DL3 [REP3-008], SoCG ID2 states that STG have concerns about the potential impact on the highway network and means of access to the Teesworks site. Please provide further details of these concerns and whether STG considers whether its concerns will be resolved by the close of the Examination.	N/A
Q2.17.6	National Highways and Local Highway Authorities	In its DL4 submissions, the Applicant has updated the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan, with the tracked change version [REP4-008] showing changes to the modelled Construction HGV traffic data (primarily in table 2-4) and a number of other	N/A

Response to ExQ2.17 Traffic and Transportation Document Reference: 8.25.12



EXQ2	QUESTION TO:	QUESTION:	RESPONSE
		changes. Please advise if this changes your previous comments or assessment about the impact of construction traffic on the strategic highway network.	
Q2.17.7	Applicant and National Highways	In the latest version of the SoCG between the Applicant and National Highways submitted at DL4 [REP4-021] SoCG ID 5 states that National Highways consider a Requirement in the DCO relating to mitigation of staff trips should be included. Can the Applicant please advise if this is considered appropriate and can National Highway confirm that if this were to be included, this remaining issue can be resolved.	The Applicant is considering the matter and will provide an update on this matter at Deadline 6, through an updated SoCG with National Highways (and updates to the DCO if ultimately required).
Q2.17.8	Applicant	Please confirm if any public highway is subject to CA powers and if so has the relevant highway authority agreed to this and are they protected via suitable PPs.	The Applicant can confirm that the following plots containing public highway are subject to compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers as follows:
			Subject to permanent acquisition of new rights: 1/5, 1/6, 1/7, 1/19, 1/20, 2/39, 2/47, 2/52, 2/53, 2/54, 2/55, 2/56, 2/57, 3/17, 3/25, 3/44, 4/1, 4/2 4/3, 4/15, 4/18, 4/19, 4/20, 4/21 4/73, 4/74, 4/91, 5/8, 5/12, 5/13, 5/55, 5/56, 5/57, 5/60, 5/61, 7/27, 7/28, 15/189.
			Subject to temporary possession: 1/3, 1/4 1/8, 1/9, 1/10, 1/17, 1/18, 2/40, 5/10, 5/11, 5/14, 5/15, 7/33, 7/34, 17/9, 17/10.
			The Applicant is currently progressing discussions with Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council (STBC) and the consensus reached by the two parties is that Protective Provisions are not required. The Applicant has agreed an approach for highways with STBC that highways works will be undertaken via the consent mechanisms already contained within the DCO (including the application of the New Roads and Street Works Act process). This will protect STBC's interests as highways authority, notwithstanding that the Applicant may later obtain an easement for the relevant apparatus.
			The parties have agreed that this is a sufficient approach, and that Protective Provisions are not necessary in this case.
			In respect of RCBC and HBC, the Applicant intends to take the same approach, and has received no request for Protective Provisions from those parties.