

IMMINGHAM EASTERN RO-RO TERMINAL



Draft Terrestrial Transport Statement of Common Ground between (i) Associated British Ports, (ii) DFDS Seaways Plc and (iii) CLdN Ports Killingholme Limited

Document Reference 7.10

APFP Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5(2)(q)

PINS Reference – TR030007

October 2023

Document Information

Document Information		
Project	Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal	
Document Title	Draft Terrestrial Transport Statement of Common Ground between (i) Associated British Ports, (ii) DFDS Seaways Plc and (iii) CLdN Ports Killingholme Limited	
Commissioned by	Associated British Ports	
APFP Reg 2009	Regulation 5(2)(q)	
Document ref	7.10	
Prepared by	IERRT Project Team	
Date	Version	Revision Details
10/2023	Draft	First draft

DRAFT

Contents

1	Section 1 – Introduction	4
2	Section 2 – Agreed Matters	6
3	Section 3 – Matters Outstanding	7
4	Section 4 – Signatories	8
	Glossary	9

DRAFT

1 Section 1 – Introduction

Overview

- 1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (“SoCG”) has been prepared in relation to the application (the “Application”) by Associated British Ports (“ABP”), made under the provisions of Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“the PA 2008”), for a Development Consent Order (“DCO”) which if approved will authorise the construction and operation of the Immingham Eastern Ro-Ro Terminal (IERRT) within the existing Port of Immingham.
- 1.2 The IERRT development as proposed by ABP falls within the definition of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (“NSIP”) as set out in Sections 14(1)(j), 24(2) and 24(3)(b) of the PA 2008.

The Project

- 1.3 In summary, the IERRT development comprises two principal elements:
- (a) on the marine side, the construction of a new three berth Roll-on/Roll-off harbour facility and related marine infrastructure; and
 - (b) on the landside, the provision of a suitably surfaced area to accommodate a terminal building and ancillary buildings together with storage and waiting space for the embarkation and disembarkation of the vessel borne wheeled cargo.
- 1.4 The landside development will also include, within the Order Limits – i.e., within the boundary of the development site – a building for the UK Border Force together with an area for disembarked traffic awaiting UK Border Force checks prior to departure from the Port.
- 1.5 ABP will also be providing an area of off-site environmental enhancement at Long Wood, which is located close to the Port of Immingham’s East Gate.

Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.6 This SoCG is submitted on behalf of:
- (a) ABP – the promoter of the IERRT development and the owner and operator of the Port of Immingham;
 - (b) DFDS Seaways Plc (“DFDS”) – an international and shipping logistics company and one of the largest users of the Port of Immingham; and
 - (c) CLdN Ports Killingholme Limited (“CLdN”) – part of the CLdN Links group, a European integrated port, shipping and freight forwarding operator, and the owner of an existing port terminal located at Killingholme approximately 3km up river from the Port of Immingham

The Purpose and Structure of this Document

- 1.7 This document sets out the agreed principal outcomes from the meetings held between representatives of the Applicant (DTA), DFDS (GHD) and CLdN (Andrew Ross of RHDHV) to discuss terrestrial transport matters arising from ISH2 and following from that the various representations made on behalf of each party to the examination.
- 1.8 These meetings were held on 10 August, 30 August, 15 September, and 28 September 2023 and the agreed meeting notes are attached at **Annex A**. Further meetings were held on 13 October and 20 October 2023. Agreed minutes will be provided in due course.
- 1.9 Discussions are ongoing with the interested parties, and an update to this statement will be provided as appropriate.
- 1.10 In preparing this SoCG, the guidance provided in 'Planning Act 2008: examination of application for development consent' (Department for Communities and Local Government (as it then was), March 2015) has been fully taken into account. In addition, this SoCG has had due regard to the ExA procedural decision of 26 May 2023.
- 1.11 Section 1 of this SoCG is designed to act as a general introduction to the IERRT project and to the parties concerned. Section 2 of this SoCG sets out the matters which have been agreed. Section 3 sets out the matters which remain outstanding, together with any matters upon which it has not been possible to reach agreement.

2 Section 2 – Agreed Matters

Unaccompanied / Accompanied Ratio

- 2.1 This was specifically referred to under Action Point 14 (ISH2). The parties have reached an agreed position that, in isolation to other parameters adopted in the TA, (AS-008), sufficient evidence has been provided to support the ratio of Unaccompanied / Accompanied Freight units adopted in the assessment (72% / 28%).
- 2.2 It is further agreed that, in isolation to other factors, the unaccompanied / accompanied split has a non material impact on the Transport Assessment.

Transport Assessment Inputs

- 2.3 It is agreed that the 2021 survey data adopted in Transport Assessment are a reasonable and appropriate basis for assessment.
- 2.4 It is agreed that the base line traffic will be converted to PCUS using a ratio of one (1) HGV to 2.3 PCUs and presented for agreement.
- 2.5 A review of committed development and background assumptions adopted in the TA has also been undertaken. The list of committed development for specific inclusion within the TA was agreed with NELC, NLC and NH at a meeting on the 03/03/22. It is agreed that the approach to identifying committed development traffic flows in respect of junction modelling is considered appropriate and reasonable.
- 2.6 DFDS have requested further clarification on the way those committed developments have been applied to the modelling be provided. The Applicant has undertaken to provide this.
- 2.7 The approach to providing further background growth assumptions based on TEMPRO is also considered appropriate and reasonable.

Facilities for HGV drivers in the vicinity of Immingham

- 2.8 The response provided by the Applicant to TT1.2 (REP2-2010) are agreed.
- 2.9 However there are also private / third party HGV facilities in the local area which may affect HGV assignment. The location (and broad scale) of those uses are under discussion. A gravity model approach to considering gate assignment is agreed by all parties and a final view on the implications on gate assignment will be provided to the ExA in due course.

Daily / Annual Throughput

- 2.10 It is agreed daily movements from the terminal will vary and that peak day demand is likely to be c1.25 average daily demand.

West and East Gate Capacity and Assignment

- 2.11 The assessment of East and West Gate Queuing Capacity as described in DTA Technical Note 23325-28 is undergoing final review by the parties.

3 Section 3 – Matters Under Discussion

Sensitivity Testing and Modelling Updates

- 3.1 The Applicant has agreed that, subject to resolution of paragraph 2.9 it will prepare updated modelling to provide a sensitivity test.
- 3.2 Alongside this, there are a range of different data sets in relation to solo tractor ratios which are under discussion and it is anticipated that an agreed ratio will be incorporated into the appropriate sensitivity test.

Daily / Annual Throughput and Terminal Capacity

- 3.3 This matter is held in abeyance for review following Applicant's submission of change notification and supporting documentation.

Wayfinding

- 3.4 This matter is held in abeyance pending receipt of sensitivity testing.

4 Section 4 – Matters Not Agreed

- 4.1 The Applicant considers that although relevant background data, no weight in the decision making process should be placed on the various alternative assessment of wider capacity assessments (Docs REP2-047, 047 & 053) or indeed other historic assessments of the local road network in consideration of the DCO.

DFDS disagree. DFDS maintain the position that the current Transport Assessment (AS-008) prepared by the Applicant contains a material error regarding the PCU conversion factor. Therefore, the results presented within the Transport Assessment, including the limited need for mitigations and influences on the capacity of the network, are incorrect and require revision.

5 Section 4 – Signatories

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed:

On behalf of CLdN:

Name

Signature

Date:

On behalf of ABP:

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of DFDS:

Name:

Signature:

Date:

DRAFT

Glossary

Abbreviation / Acronym **Definition**
[to be completed]

DRAFT