

## ISH2 Pt2

0:01

Good morning and welcome back. The time is now 11:45 and we are resuming this hearing.

0:06

This is now session two of ICE H2

0:11

to moving on to Item Agenda 5, which is major accidents and has the substances.

0:17

So for this topic, what we're seeking assurance is that everything that needs to be in place from a risk control perspective, irrespective of whichever piece of legislation or contenting regime requires it is in place. So I've got four questions on this topic.

0:32

So the first one relates to risk assessment.

0:36

Now in Table 22-5, the Major Accident Hazards Chapter 8, P 064, which is the exam that I referenced. The top incident events, whether they be vapour, cloud explosions, release of toxic gas, etcetera,

0:51

which could occur at the Hydraulic Protection facility have all been identified.

0:56

However, the sequence of events that leads to these events hasn't been specified.

1:03

Now, using various techniques to identify these events is absolutely critical, crucial if you are to evaluate the full risk of a serious incident, as only then can you determine whether this is acceptable and whether or not the further layers of protection are needed.

1:19

So if I just explained so in the chapter that I just said, chapter 2225 of Library Reference number 064, you've got your top events, Toxic gas release, you know, major vapour, cloud explosion and so on. However, for those major incidents to occur, you need to have a series of events that lead up to that example

1:39

operator area, you know failure of a high level alarm, et cetera, et cetera. And then what you then do is you populate those events with failure rate data and obviously that's how you determine the likelihood of the major top event.

1:55

So has the applicant of this stage of the process listed or captured all of those events that could lead to that major incident?

2:04

So if I can turn now to Mr Fiona Kirkham, who's taken a seat on the front bench and asked her to respond to that, he said.

2:23

Fiona Kirk, I'm speaking on behalf of the applicant,

2:26

so consideration of individual scenarios such as these is regulated by the control of major accident hazards or coma regulations. In designing the facility and preparing the DCOM, application and assessment of major accident and disaster scenarios was undertaken and reported in ES Chapter 22.

2:51

These include credible hazard categories associated with process equipment failure, malfunction of equipment or instrumentation or similar and that's list. Those items are detailed in Table 22.4.

3:10

These could result in a release of toxic ammonia gas or flammable gas or liquid and these events are provided in Table 22.5.

3:21

Section 22.7 and 22.8 indicates the process safety studies completed.

3:30

The majority of those, as you have indicated, are covered by quantified risk assessment and this was prepared to support the DCO application. It involved the modelling of release of ammonia or the release of hydrogen based on the release being a representative at a representative pressure

3:51

and temperature, and for different credible whole sizes and locations. It is not concerned with the individual possible causes of those releases, except where it considers the frequency with which a release may occur.

4:07

However, these and many other possible scenarios were considered during the design of the facility prior to submission of the DCO application.

4:17

The facility has been designed in order to meet air product standards, but also to comply with the COMA Regulations, and the COMA Regulations are an entirely separate regime from the infrastructure planning hazardous substance consent regimes.

4:35

The COMA Regulations implement the Seveso 3 Regulations and Immingham Green Energy Terminal will be an upper tier facility under Coma and so subject to the highest levels of safety regulation.

4:50

The competent authority for COMA is both the HSE and the Environment Agency.

4:57

Coma regulations require us to undergo a number of steps, including submission of a pre Construction and Preoccupation safety Report and the Main Coma report, which must be updated regularly and remains an Evergreen document throughout the life of the facility.

5:15

The Coma Report is reviewed every five years whether or not there have been changes.

5:23

Underpinning the Coma Report is a series of studies and risk analysis and these studies are initially completed during the design of the facility, but they're also revised if anything is changed during the operation Operating phase of the facility and some are reviewed at regular intervals to ensure that changing regulations are accounted for.

5:46

There are 4 main studies I'd like to mention, but many more reviews are undertaken. The 1st is the Consequence Analysis and Quantified Risk Analysis. This includes Blast analysis, Building Risk analysis, Toxic Release modelling and these studies are completed early in their design and these studies have been undertaken and were used as the basis for the DCO application.

6:15

The second study is the Hazard and Operability Review, usually called the HAZOP. This is a formal, internationally recognised type of safety study which splits the process into sections and it uses set guide words and parameters for a group of experts to assess the potential causes and worst case consequences of hazards associated with the design and operation of all parts of the process.

6:44

The group assesses the available safeguards to prevent or mitigate those consequences and makes recommendations to add further safeguards if the existing design is considered insufficient.

6:57

The house up can also include a risk matrix which helps the group to assess whether the design meets the company or regulatory risk criteria.

7:08

The first phases of the HAZOP have been completed, but the process continues throughout the design phase. This is the principal review which would pick up all of the scenarios in the agenda question.

7:23

The third review that I'd like to mention is the Safety Integrity Level Review, sometimes referred to as a sill assessment. And again, this is a formal, internationally recognised and regulated safety study which

assesses the required reliability of those safety systems used as safeguards in the design of the process. The safety systems identified are implemented in a separate system in order to to the normal control system in order to be

7:53

entirely independent and they are regularly proof tested.

7:59

And finally, the final review I'd like to mention is the vent, an emergency flare dispersion analysis which models the dispersion of vapour from the controlled process vents and emergency events or flares and that ensures that they are safely located for both on site and off-site risk to people. The model may include assessment of the dispersion of radiant heat, toxic or asphyxiant vapour both in normal operation and at start up or shutdown of the facility.

8:31

The last two studies are completed during the detailed design phase for the facility and so these are yet to be completed.

8:39

All of these studies obviously contain highly sensitive and confidential information and as such are not put into the public domain. And not all of the details are required to be submitted as part of the Coma documentation, but the coma documentation has to prove that they have been completed.

8:58

The Examining Authority can have confidence that, as indicated in Chapter 22 of the Environmental Statement, all appropriate scenarios, they're safeguards and mitigations have been captured in a HAZOP or in a QRA. In any event, that is a matter that will also be considered by the HSE and the EA under the COMA Regulations.

9:24

Thank you. That was very useful. So just to confirm, so the various safety studies that need to be completed as part of your design have been done, the quantified risk assessments that has up and obviously from what you said the equipment will be able to ISIL standards two or three whatever they are

9:41

has have you actually submitted your safe report? Yes.

9:45

Can I ask the initial pre pre commissioning one has sorry pre you can check what the name of it is has been submitted.

10:01

Let me just find the right bit

10:11

in here.

10:20

No, can't find it. But yes, the initial report has been submitted but the the main, report has not yet been submitted. OK, so the notification is complete. So just waiting for feedback from

10:35

company and authority being the EA or the HSC, yes.

10:39

OK.

10:41

Let's find my second question again to the applicant. So this will be a a top tier facility for from perspective and obviously has all the inherent risks that are associated with that. Based on the chemicals and the production process that you intend to carry on.

10:59

What impacts do you envisage on the local residents living in close proximity to a top tier community?

11:09

Fiona Kirkham. For the applicant, the risk to residents are controlled both by the regime under coma, those are the regulations of 2015 and through the need to obtain hazardous substance consent under the Planning Hazardous Substances Regulations also of 2015, which is based on the Planning Hazardous Substances Act of 1990. These regulations are intended to ensure that residents remain safe,

11:38

but of course we also want to ensure the safety of residents and our own employees.

11:44

As explained in Chapter 22 of the environmental study, the HSE require that mitigation measures for risk events arising out of the handling and manufacture of toxic and flammable materials must reduce any risk to a level that is as low as reasonably practicable. Is always referred to as a LARP. Aside from the resident properties on Queens Road in respect of which a compulsory acquisition is proposed, we do not envisage that there will be any adverse effects

12:16

on local residents and their daily lives.

12:21

The potential risks to the public have been carefully considered. In order to assess those risks, we engaged an independent third party to carry out a quantified risk assessment.

12:34

As we've previously discussed, the QRA process uses not just the consequences of a release, but also includes the assessment of the potential frequency of different sorts of incidents and the mitigations that can be used to either reduce the frequency or mitigate the consequences.

12:54

It also uses population data and weather conditions to determine overall risk to the public.

13:02

It was the outcome of this QA which was used as the basis of the DCO application.

13:10

In terms of hazardous substances, we've applied to NELK for consent to store and handle ammonia and hydrogen on the site as a consultee on the application. The HSE will complete a similar quantified risk assessment to the ones I've mentioned to assess the proposal against their land use planning guidance.

13:34

The HSE Land Use Planning Guidance divides the risk contours from a facility into three zones, inner, middle and outer zones, the inner zone being where the greatest risk lies.

13:48

The Port of Immingham already contains a number of operating facilities with hazardous substances and therefore there are existing zones in place.

13:58

The new zones are used to adjust those existing zones and the HSE then has guidance based on sensitivity for which populations are permitted in each of those zones.

14:12

So if I just give you some indication of those sensitivity populations,

14:20

so there are no sensitivity level 4 populations permitted in any of the zones. Level 4 sensitivity populations are things like hospitals, nursing homes, schools and stadiums with large numbers of people indoor. Large public spaces like retail centres, leisure centres, outdoor public spaces with between 100 and 1000 people at a time are only permitted in the outer zone

14:52

and residential areas of up to 30. Houses are for density of no more than 40 homes per hectare,

15:00

and hotels of up to 100 beds or camping of up to 33 pitches are permitted in the outer and middle zones.

15:10

Workplace buildings with fewer than 100 occupants and less than three occupied stories, plus standalone car parks for warehouses, factories and offices are permitted in all three zones.

15:25

It should be noted that when I say permitted, it means that the HSE will not advise against this sort of development in these zones.

15:36

Now of course we cannot know exactly what results and zones the HSE will produce. However, the QA completed by our independent experts based on the methodology understood to be used by the HSE demonstrates that on completion of the adjusted zones, the residential properties on the Queens Road will lie within the inner zone. And it's for that reason that we've included the request for compulsory acquisition of these residences in the DTO application.

16:09

All other dwellings lie beyond the inner zone and therefore it is not considered that the HSC will advise against the application.

16:20

There are a few other commercial properties in the inner zone there, the Queens Road Cafe for instance, but we believe that these businesses are compatible with the land use planning zones.

16:33

And in terms of future development of the area, there are a number of areas around the port which have been allocated for development in the local plan. The proposed development types are all for employment rather than residential or healthcare. And none of these development types are of a highly sensitive nature. So we don't expect the allocations to be impacted by the anticipated changes in the land use planning zones.

17:03

Thank you, Mr Speaker. If I could just ask the question to NE Lincolnshire Council. So as Mr Kim has explained the facility will be built with all the required standards, all the necessary secretaries will be completed.

17:16

But in terms of feedback from residents, so I understand compulsory compulsory acquisition will look will happen first some of the residential properties but the inner zone was still contained a number of business premises. Have you had any feedback in terms of

17:31

those businesses really trying to gauge

17:35

their feeling in terms of actually living within a, you know, in close proximity irrespective of, you know, the facility being, you know, making the necessary safety standards. But just generally what they're feeling is, have you had any feedback from the residents,

17:51

Richard Lyman, NE, Lincs Council. We haven't, Sir, as far as I'm aware have received anything from those businesses.

18:01

Thank you, Mr Limmer. OK. If I can ask,

18:06

I believe the Environment Agency is joined or do they have any comments at this moment in time regards to what we've just heard

18:17

speaking clock, environment, transition,

18:20

no comments at this time. Thank you, Mr Clarke.

18:30

My third question, this is again to Mr Clarke on behalf of the competent authority of being the HC and the EA

18:38

before the applicant brings and he has this chemicals onto site. And we we touched on commissioning earlier this morning and you've completed your mechanical commissioning and you've completed your water commissioning and then you you're about to start your chemical commissioning

18:50

of the housing production plant. What needs to be in place from a legislation and enforcement perspective before this can go ahead?

18:59

Mr Clarke from the Environment Agency, please and Clark Environment Agency.

19:05

In line with Regulation 5 of the Coma Regulations 2015, all measures necessary should be in place.

19:13

The definition of what that means in practise is set out within the HC's Guidance L111, which is guidance on the regulation of the proposed regulations and I'm going to paraphrase here for simplicity and and reverse slightly to the previous speaker. So almost necessary to me means that the services has demonstrated its lap, therefore it's reduced the risk to as low as possible.

19:47

As part of doing that it needs to undertake a risk assessment, understand the likelihood of that particular event occurring and then put in place measures to reduce that likelihood to a level which is either broadly acceptable or tolerable. If alarp tolerable, If alarp would be seen as all relevant good practise plus any other measures that are reasonable.



20:11

The definition of reasonable becomes a very technical assessment. Um, but in

20:16

summary, as an incompetent authority would expect that the operator can demonstrate those, it is not normally explicit that we expect that they will do a specific set of items because it's a goal setting regime. So there is scope for the operator to demonstrate they've met

20:41

the required level of risk reduction through different measures. However,

20:47

Ah,

20:48

there are a number of

20:50

standards that would be expected and typically met. But at this current time, as they say the report has not yet been submitted, we can't say exactly what they will be.

21:04

And just to add UH to the discussion that happened earlier around UH received the SAGE report there for

21:13

the information of the panel. UH WE the competitive Parity met with the applicants on the 29th of January to hold a pre receipt meeting which is part of the standard process set out on the HC website for submitting safe reports. UH, and that it was agreed that a nominal submission date of the 5th April would be

21:35

met by the applicant.

21:42

Thank you Mr. Clark, if if you could just stay there for just a second. I understand you're a Comer officer, but from my experience most commonly, officers are also EPO installations offices as well. So you've explained what's needed from a coma perspective. Are you able to comment on what's needed from an EPR permits perspective in terms of bringing chemicals on site?

22:08

So my comment would be that they will need to meet the requirements of their permits, and as I'm not a permitting officer, I can't say explicitly what will be the case for this site.

22:18

Um ohh, I'd rather not comment. I could comment in general, but I'd rather not in case it prejudices anything that happens in the future.

22:29

But from what you're saying, they would need their E PR permit in place before they could bring chemicals.

22:40

If you're not able to come, I'm just fine.

22:45

The permit covers an activity in an operation.

22:51

There's scope for discussion around that, but I would default to. Yes, they would do.

23:01

Thank you, Mr. Clark.

23:07

So any comments from the applicant on what we've said? Thank you Sir Harry Wood, Phil Park, KC on behalf of the. I'm just going to ask Mr. Allen Lewis to provide the applicant's understanding in relation to the environmental permitting point that you've just raised

23:22

on loose for the applicant. Hello Sir. Just very briefly in relation to the environmental permit and we have been in pre APP discussions with the Environment Agency over the past six months to 12 months. In relation to the permit, we anticipate the application being made in the next month or so, although I can get a date for you. And it's my understanding that the plant at the hydrogen production facility cannot be operational, cannot commence operation until that permit is in place.

23:54

That's my understanding, Sir.

23:57

I think you. I think from my understanding I'm I wasn't a player if you're COBRA officer before I joined pins. So I I think you'll need to check with the environment or whether you're allowed to bring chemicals before you can start chemical machining in place.

24:16

Would I OT operators like to make any comments or questions on based on what we've just heard, address them to us please?

24:26

Uh, so good afternoon, Alex Minhinnick. For the IT operators

24:33

to to observations, I think at this stage from the IT operator Sir, rather than

24:42

questions as such. The 1st is to observe that in the question that you asked earlier around any concerns being raised by businesses

24:51

which might be in the vicinity of the proposals, that would obviously include the operations run by the IoT operators who, as we've outlined in the the relevant representation that has been submitted, do have some concerns around these areas. So that's observation #1. Observation #2

25:14

would be that I'm pleased to say that the applicant and Air Products is actively engaging

25:22

with the IT operators to address their concerns and we are hopeful at this stage

25:30

the the outcome of those discussions will be to address the concerns and issues that the IT operators have.

25:41

Can I ask what your concerns are?

25:45

I'm sorry, can I just ask, are you in terms of the operations that you carry out? Are you at your terminal?

25:53

Are you also a top tier Coma facility?

25:59

I'm just trying to gauge in terms of your understanding of of the risk posed by another facility adjacent to yours,

26:07

Sir Alex Minhinnick for the IT operators. Yes, that is correct. The IoT is an operator facility

26:16

and in terms of your concerns, is it regarding Domino effects? Possibly.

26:23

26:25

Sir Alex Minhinnick For the IO2 operators,

26:31

the so the principal concerns were set out in the relevant representation and they

26:39

there are, there are two elements to that. There is firstly, the direct effect on the IoT of any emissions that may emerge from the proposed iget facility and the IT staff. And then secondly, say yes, domino effects would would feed into that.

27:01

Thank you, Mr Nick.

27:09

Yeah, sure.

27:12

So yeah. Can if I can ask a question if I may.

27:17

It comes actually sort of something that that

27:20

lock sort of raised in in their relevant reps and which is sort of whether the the coma as a result of the zones would end up sterilising any land that may be available for future developments. And and something that might sort of come forward with through the local plan whether it's through whatever. So whether as a result of of the Comma

27:43

designations in those zones, it has any sort of consequential effects on other strategic plans and objectives that the Council may be looking to deliver

27:53

Sir Harry Would Philpott Casey on behalf of the applicant. Obviously no will have their own views on this, but as Miss Kirkham has explained, our understanding is that because of the nature of this area and the nature of the designations coming forward, we don't understand that there would be an adverse effect on any

28:14

current or anticipated designations. And for the reasons I've been that have been explained, I don't know whether Moscow wants to add anything to that or whether that captures the position.

28:27

Yeah. I think the only thing I would like to add is that the the future development locations are are all

are none of them are residential, they are all business allocations, which means that they are unlikely to be impacted.

28:48

OK, thank you. Perhaps my my question perhaps I should have started the other way around with asking the council if there are any designations that they've forced. So perhaps I'll sort of go back to that and sort of say there's anything in your ways in the adopted local plan, emerging local plans or anything like that and just sort of pressuring me, where are you with the local Plan? And and that side of things would be helpful as well,

29:09

Richard Lemon, NE Links Council perhaps answering your last question first. So the Local plan was adopted in 2018 and we've currently undergoing the review of the Local Plan and that's out to consultation at the moment there. So that kind of answers that question. In terms of specific sites, I think in terms of this comment, it's not necessarily to a specific site. It's trying to understand what those zones are going to look like in case it does impact any sites,

29:40

any future plans. And we've got we're sort of working with the applicant to understand that as soon as possible and it may turn out that we don't have any concerns over that there. Thank you.

29:55

That might be sort of just a helpful point to to to keep discussions going on and and something to sort of keep us updated on in terms of you know where that forms part of the statement of common ground or something that we can at least sort of see how how those discussions progress. I think So, yes. Harry with Philpott on behalf of the applicant that that's certainly our intention as as as hopefully you'll have picked up from today. We have been

30:18

in active discussions with all of those who have a, a, a stake in this and clearly consideration of the potential land use impacts is a relevant part of that and we're in engaged and will continue to engage with milk on those matters.

30:37

One from me for the applicant

30:40

would there be cumulative considerations in terms of the coma zone. So the OIOT coma zone and this one obviously you've assessed you know the the proposed development as it's put forward but I want to understand whether those cumulative effects would impact on land use as well or was it been taken care of.

31:04

Thank you it's a Harry would fill part on behalf of the applicant. I'm going to pass that over to Miss Kirkham because as I discern the, the nub of the question, it, it concerns how one goes about assessing the

31:20

the impacts for the purposes of coma, having regard to the proximity of other facilities that are subject to the same regime and and similar risks. So I can, if I can pass that over to Miss Kirkham to to deal with, Yeah, yeah, that's right. And also any domino effects that might occur in that context. Thank you.

31:43

Yeah, Fiona Kirkham for the applicant. The HSE land use planning zones do have they do consider a cumulative effect until the HSE has completed their work. We don't know what those zones will be, but the zones from the new facility would be added to the existing zones. So in the for the example of the IT operators

32:14

area which is an existing upper tier coma site and the new site would would overlap that and would almost certainly increase the zones. But it wouldn't have a a great deal of impact on any of the businesses and so on in that area because they're already in an inner zone.

32:40

Whilst it might not affect the existing situation, might it

32:45

changed the complexion of future development in terms of what might come forward in those zones.

32:53

So it might be might be constraining from that perspective

32:58

it Fiona Kirkham for the applicant it would not impact the zones that are currently in the Nelk plan.

33:12

I think we will probably be seeking a response to some of these questions or confirmation from NE Lincolnshire Council. If you've got something to say perhaps add to this now that be helpful. Otherwise we'll probably direct some of these questions

33:28

to NE Lincolnshire Council as well, just to confirm in writing.

33:34

All right, yes. Richard Lyman, NE Lincs Council. I don't think got any further questions at the moment but happy to answer the in writing questions.

33:49

OK so the final question on this topic. So every consenting regime or licence has a part to play in in terms of ensuring that what needs to be in place is in place.

34:00

My question is probably to to to the Environment Agency on behalf of the Company authority.

34:07

Would it assist

34:09

you know the the competent authority in terms of you know, making sure that something that needs to be placed is in place? With regards to the draught DCO,

34:18

does the draught decision need to contain any conditions, conditions or restrictions to help manage the risk? Or was it or is it the case that everything that needs to be put in place from your perspective will be enforced through the Coma Regime

34:34

8:00 Environment Agency?

34:38

My view would be that the common regime should be sufficient on its own,

34:44

and particularly as at this time we haven't reviewed the preconstruction safety report, it would be,

34:50

uh, preemptive us to provide comment or suggestion without having the full facts.

34:57

Thank you, Mr. Clark.

34:59

So that that concludes with the agenda Item 5 on major accidents and hazards to any of the parties ever. Any comments or or questions with regards to that topic?

35:13

That's right. I guess if there's any comments or raise hands from there any other part can't see any. So

35:20

as the applicant, thank you Sir. Just just to reinforce the point that was made on behalf of the Environment Agency, you'll also have seen in the relevant representation that's been put in on behalf of HSE which is R Zero 11. But at paragraph 17, they confirm that they would not expect the DCO to include additional matters relating to health and safety and and. And that is consistent with the

35:51

normal position that where you have existing statutory regimes, you don't duplicate them for obvious good reasons. I can expand on that if necessary, but it doesn't seem to be controversial at the moment.

36:04

Thank you, Mr Fulfil Part. So that concludes Agenda Item 5 is now moving on to Agenda Item 6, which is Traffic and transport.

36:12

So I've got five questions on this topic and I'm conscious that all before lunch, so we'll try and keep focused.

36:20

OK. So my first question is regard to modelling of traffic impacts.

36:25

So Chapter 11 of the ES dates that vehicle numbers during states of various various vehicle numbers during different phases of the project. And I think we sort of touched on this either in the morning we went through construction effects.

36:39

Can the applicant explain how these numbers were derived, particularly the figure of 71 of you know HGV vehicle movements One way, which I understand possibly represents the worst case. It's really a case of how you determine those numbers.

36:56

Sir Harry would philpot on behalf of the applicant and for these questions. So as you might anticipate, Mr Simon Tucker will be providing the answer. So I'll hand over to him unless any of the questions you have engaged the expertise of anyone else.

37:12

Thank you Simon Tucker on behalf of of the applicant. So it might be helpful if you could pick up a P223 which is the construction outline, construction traffic management plan.

37:33

And then to answer the question if if you like, table three is probably your first reference point.

37:42

Sorry, table one which is on page 7.

37:52

So that that that's the table that we we saw this morning in terms of the phasing of of the development and as Mr Robson described, phase one is going to be the most intensive period of of

38:03

construction. You repeat the exam library reference number again. Ohh sorry. I've got a PP223. It's the outline construction traffic management plan.

38:20

OK, and it was table table one which is on the screen on the left. So you know, OK,

38:34



yeah, yeah. So this was the the, the graphic that was put up earlier on this morning and shows that the overall phasing for the construction of the project and and as was described this morning, phase one is the most intensive period of of construction Phases two to seven or six, sorry after that are much less intensive in terms of

38:59

traffic generation. And broadly speaking

39:02

the combined intensity for want of a better word for phases 2 to 6 or about a third in total of phase one. So phase one is is the main period of activity and therefore that's the period that has been assessed in terms of the environmental statement for traffic generation

39:22

an impacts. And then in terms of how that's been derived into actual numbers, if I could, if you could scroll through the document to Table 3

39:34

entitled Landside HTV

39:37

Trip generation. One way, and the way that this has worked, is that the engineers have looked at the construction of Phase one in its totality and including

39:47

how much material. And as you see through that table, concrete reinforcement, bar and pipe work and other equipment,

39:55

that's all been set out in terms of quantities derived from the design of the scheme. That is then broken down into either tonnage or metres or or units and then quantified into how many HGV's that would take. So for example concrete.

40:13

Deliveries. Generally

40:16

the concrete. Lorry carries 8 cubic metres of concrete, so

40:20

total 53,341 cubic metres of concrete equates to just under 7000 concrete HGV's. And then that's broken down per month, per per week and then per day. So if you go to the bottom of table three, that's how we've calculated a total of 95 HGV's,

40:43

I that's deliveries per day and obviously they come back out again empty. The 71 that you've referred to just relates to the construction material. It doesn't include waste.

40:55

So if you see at the bottom penultimate line of Table 3, there's a column A row there sorry for waste, which is 24 movements. So that's the discrepancy between your 71 and the and the 95.

41:07

In addition to that we've done the same process for the jetty construction. That's a lot less impactful in terms of HGV movements because majority of the material is coming by by sea effectively.

41:19

So that gets us to well 3 1/2 HGV's which we've rounded up to four. So in total that's nine and eight HGV's. So the total land side and jetty construction for phase one equates to a total of 99 HGV 1099 out. So total of just under 200 HGV's per day

41:43

and that that is based on on a a a sort of a robust assessment of a compressed phase one if you like. Obviously, there'll be days when traffic HV flows will be a lot less. That's a that's a peak

41:57

and that's what's been carried forward into the overall environmental assessment. And the conclusions that I took took you through earlier on today in terms of staff numbers and construction worker numbers. That again, is set out in the same document, but in Appendix A, which is the

42:15

construction workers.

42:18

Get the terminology right, outline construction work at Travel Plan

42:23

and you'll see if you could scroll through to page 5 of that document, which is page 43 of the PDF.

42:48

This is the

43:04

still trying to locate page 43.

43:12

Just double check I've got the right Yeah, AP223, yeah.

43:20

You don't have a page 43, so

43:23

I don't.

43:28

OK,

43:34

OK, I'll, I'll now I've got it. You have got it. Sorry.

43:38

And so that that graph there shows the build up for phase one in terms of the construction workforce and again that's based on the engineering schemes scheme for the for the phase one construction and based on basically project

43:55

labour hours required for different individual operations on the site and that's correlated with the construction materials. And then that provides the profile across across the three-year. For phase one. And what you can see there is that early months sort of 300 ish construction workers on site and that gets to a peak at month 23 of 919 workers on site. So that's based from first principles of how we're actually intending to construct the facility.

44:28

So that deals with the land side works. There's also an allowance for 220 construction workers in relation to the marine facility as well. I won't take you to that, but the reference for that is paragraph 3.2, point one of that same report.

44:46

So with them we've got a total of

44:50

just over 1200, sorry, just over 1100 workers on site during the construction phase at the peak

44:59

shortly after that peak return to three months, it drops down significantly because the bulk of the civil works has been has been completed and most of the work will be implementing and finalising the processes basically. So.

45:14

So those are the numbers in terms of the 200 HGV's per day and the 1100 workforce per day that have been included in the assessment in the environmental statement for the worst case peak hour, peak peak day or peak month of the construction of phase one.

45:32

The terms of those construction workers are treated at the peak would be in the region of about 1100.

45:38

What would that equate to in terms of number of vehicles, just looking at the peak, you know, volume of vehicles passing through

45:47

in addition to. So that's the numbers. We then have made an assumption, based on observations elsewhere that each worker

45:58

has a sort of car ratio of 1.5. So in other words there there's car sharing and many buses which are included in the travel plan which we might come onto in a moment. So the number of car vehicles per, sorry, the number of car movements I work as travelling to site per day is 760 and 760 out.

46:20

And that's just for the reference that's in section 3.3 of that that same report. And then what has what what where that's taken next is to split

46:34

how many are using the western site which is 80% and then how many using the eastern site which is 20% of the land side workforce and all of the marine workers. And then it's distributed across the network based on journey to work data effectively. So then that traffic is split out across the network

46:51

based on those those proportions.

46:55

Thank you Mr Speaker. I don't believe we have national highways joining the do Does North East Lincolnshire Council have any comments regards to the traffic movements?

47:05

Yeah thank you Sir Richard Lemon NE links council and not at the moment as sort of outlined earlier, our highways team are still in discussions with the applicant over various details. Thank you.

47:21

Just a, a quick question from me really sort of taking one step back. In terms of the actual assessment that you've done, can you explain sort of what modelling you've done, whether you've done sort of actual sort of traffic surveys, what dates were those taken? How have you factored in effects such as COVID for example? And have they been sort of factored into the assessment because it had to ensure that it is the worst case scenario? And what have you done about sort of future baseline and future progression?

47:50

Thank you Simon Tucker for the applicant. So taking those questions in, I think in turn

47:58

dealing with the baseline traffic surveys first of the applicant or part of the applicant here is the same as the IT application. So the the traffic counts that were

48:10

obtained for for that development have have been carried forward into the assessment. For for I gets there was a a discussion as part of the IT examination relating specifically to COVID which is your your

question and and some further survey work was done. It's not in this examination, I don't believe, but it could be there. There's some further survey work was done in 2023

48:37

which sought to validate the 2021 surveys that Iraq was based on, which was. So just to be clear, the UK was out of any COVID

48:49

restrictions at the time of the surveys and it all gets a bit blurry about what happened when it doesn't it. But we were all back at work basically. But the criticism or the suggestion at the time was that we might not have got back to the new normal if if you like what those 2023 surveys those showed actually was less traffic on the network than we had surveyed in 2021. So the position was that those adopting those

49:18

adopting those numbers was robust and and and and effectively appropriate for the assessment. So that that debate has been had elsewhere. We can put that information in if you think it would be helpful, but I don't think as there's any

49:36

dispute amongst the highway authorities about the the efficacy of that baseline data and NE Lincolnshire, Mr Grimmer shaking, nodding or agree with me one way or the other across the table. And and just to pick up your question about national highways, they obviously have put a relevant representation in the R A-Team where they've asked for

49:58

various things. I think it would just just while it's fresh in my mind just to be clear, they they have agreed that the principles of the traffic generation that I've described to you. They've got some questions on mode share I how many cars per or how many staff pack construction workers per per car which we we are clarifying with them And they've also asked for an operational assessment of the A160A1173 JCT which again is in hand and we are in discussion with them

50:30

about that.

50:33

Other than that junction as I described earlier, operational impacts of the IGET scheme have been scoped out of further environmental assessment. They're well below any level that would cause any, any harm. The operational, sorry, the construction traffic levels, as I took you through those tables this this morning,

50:58

the conclusion of of the environmental assessment was that there would be no significant impacts arising. So on the basis of that conclusion, no

51:08

junction modelling was undertaken. So the purpose of the baseline traffic that you asked me about

was was to provide that EIA assessment if you like of the proportional changes. And it doesn't hasn't to date led into any

51:24

traffic modelling per se other than the one that we're about to do for, for national highways.

51:31

And I didn't write it down, but I think there was a third question in there, so which I am pretty sure I haven't answered.

51:38

No, I think you've sort of in a roundabout way sort of picked it up. So that that's fine. The only thing I would just say and you're probably aware of this, we don't see anything from the ART examination that is not in front of us. We can only consider what's in front of us. So if there's stuff that you did submit to them then we haven't seen, It might well be helpful to to resubmit that in terms of that COVID justification in the modelling side of things, unless it is already in and we just need the reference number Simon Tucker for the applicant. So I think rather than bore you with 500 pages of data,

52:09

provide a short summary of the position in in writing at deadline one. That should cover that off. I think that would be preferable, yeah. Thank you.

52:21

OK. So my second question relates to St works on the access plan which is Examiner library reference number as AP's dash 016.

52:31

So this is sort of somewhat was covered earlier in the construction section here in the morning.

52:36

Can the applicant sort of explain how they intend to manage the traffic so it adheres to this plan? Just trying to gauge how the

52:44

plan was sort of put together and how they ensure that you know everyone that needs it for other plan follows the plan.

52:53

Thank you Simon Tucker for the applicant. So in in principle on the on the works plan as I described or partially described earlier, I should say there are. There are

53:07

123 main elements to the works. One is the construction of

53:13

accesses be temporary for construction or permanent. Second one is a provision of utilities either to

cross between the northern and the east and the western side and or to connect to facilities that are already in the public highway. And then the final one is, is, is the works related to temporary modification of of some of the road on Kings Road to accommodate

53:40

abnormal loads which is those shown on the screen now AG, AF and works around that. So those are the three elements of it. The physical highway works in terms of accesses as I described this morning. The processes that we will need to agree a detailed design with Nelk. All of the accesses are on Knelt Hwy rather than any other highway authority. We'll need to agree the detail of the access

54:09

with them in terms of construction details. So that's the fine detail if you like and and that's secured within the DCO as a as a requirement on us as part of that

54:23

detailed design we will also need to produce a detailed traffic management scheme as a sort of headline terms described this morning traffic lights stop go boards and and the like and then that will that will form part of the package that's approved and signed off by now for the contractor then to deliver the the works. In terms of the sorry, I'm I'm I'm the same applies in that basis for any temporary accesses to any permanent accesses and the two might be the same

54:54

ultimately depending on how how things pan out. In terms of access to statutory undertakers and and plant in the public highway, a similar process would would apply albeit that would also involve engaging with the undertaker to whom you're connecting the whatever it is to

55:15

and then the final one. In terms of the the temporary works to deal with the abnormal loads are set out again as a in the DC O and will be subject to particularly the the the movement of the overhead lines. That's a temporary thing that will occur when an abnormal load is travelling through there, and then it will be reinstated

55:36

after the event. So the process for the abnormal loads.

55:41

Two things to say. One is that it's

55:45

notification and advertising of abnormal loads is dealt with by a different

55:49

regime than the DCOM and the the reference for that, just so that we've all got it

55:57

is in the consensus and agreements

56:01  
position statements

56:04  
and I can't find the

56:10  
reference. So it's a PP236,

56:15  
don't necessarily need to turn it up, but it's under item 12, which confirms that

56:22  
the movement of abnormal loads requires notification under the roads, Vehicles, Brackets, Authorisation and Special Types General Order Act of 2003. So there's basically a separate process to require you to

56:37  
notify those loads and and that that process will pick up

56:40  
any requirement for

56:45  
timing of the of of the movement, whether it needs a police escort for example or some other escort vehicle and what what's actually going to happen on the day in terms of moving it.

56:55  
So that's not specifically covered in the DCA because it's covered elsewhere by by by other legislation.

57:07  
Can I ask you, in terms of, you know, indivisible loads which you just talked about, how many of those lows do you envisage throughout the construction phases?

57:20  
So Simon Tucker for for the applicant. The reference there is back to my favourite document AP223 and there's a section 4IN there which sets out the numbers of lows and is expected to be up to 30 abnormal loads during phase one.

57:50  
So just to confirm, So in terms of traffic management plans that's secured in the draught ECO with regards to indivisible loads that's under a separate consenting regime and you will need permission from wherever grants that particular licence or permit as it is

58:07  
Simon Tucker for the applicant yes in principle although the so there's two the the the main document



that have been referring to the outlying construction traffic management plan has a requirement 7 I believe or 8 which secures its final approval prior to to construction commencing

58:29

and that's an approval that will come from Now it does include within its reference to how abnormal loads will be dealt with. So it's it's written into the the documentation, albeit the actual process of agreeing an abnormal load movement requires notification to the police and and national highways as as well as what's in the IS as well as what's in the traffic management plan as drafted.

58:55

Any comments from NE Lancashire Council with regards to the plans?

59:00

Thank you Sir Richard Lemon. NE links Council No, other than obviously Mr Tucker is in discussion with our highways team to go through those bits and pieces.

59:22

So you've answered my third question anyway, so I'll move on to my,

59:26

my question #4. So in terms of enforcement measures, so taking the HGV vehicle, you've submitted a designated route. So

59:37

how would you ensure that lorry drivers or HD vehicle drivers will follow that particular route that you've designated and they don't

59:44

take another route or shortcut as such?

59:50

Sorry, question for the applicant.

59:54

Thank you. Thank you. Sir. Simon Tucker from on behalf of the applicant. I'm just trying to find my notes on that. I think it takes us back to AP.

1:00:03

P223

1:00:06

again, excuse me, just bear with me.

1:00:20

So yes, sorry. So you've referred to the figure 11.5 of a PP102 which is a designated route for HGV's. Just to give you if I made some context on

1:00:32

on that. The intention for the construction of the facility is to make use of the port where possible. So materials being brought in by vessel and then through the port of Immingham and to the site. The numbers that we I took you through earlier an HGV movements which are going to take place external from that so on to the highway network and the intention is that they should be focused on the A1173 and then direct to the strategic Rd network

1:01:03

which is the purpose of that that plan that you've referred to. In terms of enforcement of of that that set out in the outline construction traffic management plan. Sorry, that was the reference I I was looking for. Section 2.5

1:01:20

is is the reference there, and what that proposes is that it will be a condition of contract between the applicant and the appointed contractor and therefore and he appointed subcontractors that firstly they're made aware of the plan and the routing. So there's a process of

1:01:38

UM training and induction that needs to go on in terms of the interaction between the the developer and the and the contractor themselves

1:01:48

and that purpose of that to make sure that all four drivers are aware of that requirement in the first place. In terms of non compliance, we've sort of set out a three strikes and you're out process and within the construction traffic management plan that if there is a driver who doesn't use that route, they then get basically firstly told off and then secondly if they if they are a repeat offender then that they're in breach of the contract basically. So there is a process set out there which is fairly

1:02:19

firm in terms of ensuring you can't stop a driver. You can train them not to, but if someone chose to do it once and then then you get that sort of enforcement process that triggers on after that.

1:02:32

I think in in practical terms

1:02:35

knowing the area as I do the the route that we've chosen is in any event the most

1:02:40

obvious and attractive route for HGV drivers because other routes involve sort of more junctions, more windy roads or whatever. So the the general expectation is that that would be the preferred route in any in any event.

1:02:54

Thank you Mr So just to confirm the policing of that we're enforcing that particular route will be done by a third party that you're subcontract to

1:03:05

Simon sucker for the applicant no no. So the the enforcement of of that will be the responsibility of of the contractor as part of their obligation to the to the developer basically. So if it's a

1:03:20

directly employed

1:03:22

driver for the for the contractor then they will have direct

1:03:26

ability to

1:03:29

in in force or to to to penalise. If it's a subcontractor, they will have a contract with them that will include that clause so they'll have control. So it will ultimately be the, the client who has the overall management of it, but enforced through the contracts within

1:03:45

with with their contractors and with their subcontractors. Thank you, Mr Speaker,

1:03:54

after the crash for the applicant, please. So I'm looking at

1:03:59

of relevant reps representation are R Zero 20 from Network Rail

1:04:06

and they say the designated route providing HGV access to the site of the scheme includes Queens Rd Overline bridge which crosses the railway line. And they say if Queens Road bridge is closed for any reason, traffic may route over the nearby kill lane level crossing and South Marsh level crossing. And they say they have concerns about the suitability of this alternative route. Wondering how you would respond to that and whether there needs to be any contingencies.

1:04:37

Thanks

1:04:41

Simon Tucker for for the applicant. So the the position with the kiln lane level crossing is that Network Rail have have sort of fairly consistently raising

1:04:52

concerns about the use of that that route. It's just in terms of their general policy of reducing the use of of level crossings in the event that

1:05:07

that that route, the route that we've chosen obviously avoids that level crossing for partly for that reason. There are always going to be occasions when roads are closed in the time that would occur, it wouldn't occur as a result of our development. It would occur as a result of a road traffic collision or or something like that, which would be a very short lived temporary impact. And that the impact then of whatever it takes

1:05:36

30 minutes to clear the road or whatever would potentially mean that vehicles are using the kiln lane level crossing. But that wouldn't be material in a safety perspective. If necessary, I guess we could have some sort of contingency plan for improved signage or or things to that effect, but I don't see it as a

1:05:58

as a fundamental issue. It is. It is a very short would be a very short lived

1:06:03

event which might happen anyway to be honest with you know as a result of any anything on the on the network.

1:06:10

Thank you.

1:06:13

OK. So my my final question was actually to national Highways, but I think they're they're not not here today. So I think we've touched on it earlier which is regarding the their concerns which they sent in via relevant representation in terms of the volume of construction, in particular the capacity of the A180 and a 173 junction. I think from what you said those discussions are ongoing between yourselves and national highways in terms of modelling and what the actual impacts like to be. But is there anything further you'd like to add

1:06:44

with regards to those discussions? Thank you, Sir. Yes, Sir. Simon Tucker for the applicant. So we are in discussion with them. We've working up as I'm sure you'll be expecting a draught statement of common ground with them as well.

1:06:59

We've agreed a a process for providing them with that assessment of the of the junction and that will be with them shortly that that includes is is basically a junction model of of that of an operational model of the junction. And that includes committed development And the debate that we had on Ayotte.

1:07:22

The modelling that we've produced isn't with them yet. So they haven't seen it, but the conclusions of it are comparable with the conclusions that which is that the junction is operating within capacity

1:07:34

that the change in flows as a result of the peak construction. Phase one doesn't have a material impact on the operation of that junction. And therefore we're not anticipating any adverse impacts. All of for example, the need for any mitigation over and above what's already in the management plan itself.

Obviously I can't speak for them and they'll they'll need to see that information when they get it. But the indications from the data and the information that we've done is that that will be resolved through a technical note that we'll prepare

1:08:06

and provide to them and then once they've agreed it, we will provide it to the examination as well.

1:08:17

Yeah. If I if I could, going back to AP223 and the the outline construction traffic management plan, I can see in the appendix there there's an outline construction workers travel plan in there,

1:08:31

which is OK. Is there any indication or any travel plan with regards to the operational stages given so the drive for sustainability etcetera reducing the reliance on private cars and is that something that you're intending on undertaking and submitting

1:08:48

Simon Tucker for the applicant. So the

1:08:51

the short answer is yes, we are looking at a a travel plan for operational staff as well. The reason it wasn't done was I think mainly because of the low levels of of staff that we're we're forecasting and the where that would take us. But that's that's something that's in hand and we'll will emerge as the examination progresses. I suppose the obvious question which is when do you know that be submitted to us

1:09:19

Simon Tucker for for the applicant. I will need to check that, but I I imagine it would most likely be deadline two rather than deadline one.

1:09:30

OK, that's that's helpful. Thank you.

1:09:38

So that's that was my final question. I've got no further questions on this agenda item. Are there any comments or questions from interested parties, either online or in this room?

1:09:52

Can't see any hands? OK,

1:09:57

OK. In that case, that concludes agenda Item 6, Traffic and Transport.

1:10:02

We will now close this session of the issue specific hearing 2 and reconvene at 2:00 PM and the time now is 1255. Thank you.

1:10:13