



The Sizewell C Project

9.10.5 Initial Statement of Common Ground - Highways England

Revision: 1.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

June 2021

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009





CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Status of the SOCG	1
1.2	Purpose of this document	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground.....	2
1.4	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground	2

TABLES

Table 1.1: SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and Highways England	3
Table 1.2: Transport meetings held between SZC Co. and Highways England	4
Table 1.3: Statement of Common Ground between the SZC Co. and Highways England on traffic modelling and strategic highway impact	6
Table 1.4: Statement of Common Ground between the SZC Co. and Highway England on transport management plans	9

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND	3
APPENDIX B: MATTERS OF COMMON GROUND	5

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Status of the SOCG

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the application for a development consent order ('DCO') to the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') under the Planning Act 2008 ('the Application') for the the construction and operation of the Sizewell C nuclear power station, together with the proposed associated development (hereafter referred to as 'the Sizewell C Project').

1.1.2 This SoCG version 1.0 has been prepared by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') as the Applicant and Highways England, the strategic highway authority.

1.1.3 This SoCG has evolved through a programme of engagement.

1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the areas of agreement and disagreement between SZC Co. and Highways England on the transport matters in relation to the Sizewell C Project'.

1.2.2 This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the guidance published by the Department of Communities and Local Government (hereafter referred to as 'DCLG guidance').

1.2.3 Paragraph 58 of the DCLG Guidance states:

"A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."

1.2.4 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to inform the Examining Authority and provide a clear position of the state and extent of discussions and agreement between SZC Co. and Highways England on transport matters relating to the Sizewell C Project.

1.2.5 DCLG Guidance recognises and expects that SoCG's will continue to evolve during the examination period (if deemed necessary through on-going discussions between the parties). Discussions between SZC Co. and

Highways England will therefore continue to seek to extend the areas of common ground.

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 SZC Co. has submitted an application for development consent to build and operate a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C, along with the associated development required to enable construction and operation.

1.3.2 Highways England is the strategic highway authority and is therefore responsible for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

1.4 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

1.4.1 **Chapter 2** provides a summary of engagement undertaken to establish this SoCG.

1.4.2 **Chapter 3** describes the areas of agreement and disagreement between the parties, and provides a schedule which details the matters of agreement and disagreement between the parties.

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

- A.1.1. The preparation of this SoCG has been informed by a programme of discussions between SZC Co. and Highways England.
- A.1.2. Prior to the Application being submitted, Highways England were consulted through the public consultation.
- A.1.3. Since the Application was submitted in May 2020, SZC Co. has held monthly transport stakeholder meetings to progress the resolution of transport matters, which Highways England has attended. In addition, in July 2020 it was agreed with the transport stakeholders, including Highways England, to commence a programme of technical sub-groups to allow detailed conversations and more effective resolution of issues. The technical sub-group meetings that Highways England have attended are:
- traffic modelling; and
 - transport management plans.
- A.1.4. Details of transport meetings between SZC Co. and Highways England are shown in **Table 1.1** and **Table 1.2**.

Table 1.1: SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and Highways England

Date	Attendees	Purpose of Meeting
13 April 2021	Eric Cooper (Highways England) Mark Norman (Highways England) Simon Willison (AECOM representing Highways England) Kirsty McMullen (SZC Co.) Nick Cottman (WSP)	To discuss the written representation submitted by Highways England and the Statement of Common Ground
29 April 2021	Eric Cooper (Highways England) Mark Norman (Highways England) Simon Willison (AECOM representing Highways England) Kirsty McMullen (SZC Co.) Nick Cottman (WSP)	To discuss the written representation submitted by Highways England and the Statement of Common Ground

Table 1.2: Transport meetings held between SZC Co. and Highways England

Date	SZC Co. and Highways England Attendees	Purpose of Meeting
Monthly meetings on second Tuesday of every month. Ongoing.	Eric Cooper (Highways England) Christos Galanopoulos (Highways England) Simon Willison (AECOM representing Highways England) Richard Bull (SZC Co.) Kirsty McMullen (SZC Co.) Nick Cottman (WSP representing SZC Co.)	Transport monthly meeting – Overview discussion on all transport matters to provide an update and get feedback from the stakeholders.
Fortnightly meetings from 4 June 2020. Meetings in 2020: 4, 18 June, 2, 16, 30 July, 13, 27 August, 10, 24 September, 8, 22 October, 5, 19 November, 3, 17 December. Meetings in 2021: 14, 28 January, 11, 25 February. Ongoing.	Simon Willison (AECOM representing Highways England) Kirsty McMullen (SZC Co.) Sally Powell (WSP representing SZC Co.) Sian Loveday (WSP representing SZC Co.) Nick Cottman (WSP representing SZC Co.)	Technical sub-group: Transport modelling. Discussion of technical aspects of transport modelling – data collection, methodologies, application of software, model calibration and validation, review of model results and forecasts. Includes within scope the Gravity Model, strategic highway (VISUM), standalone local junction models and micro-simulation traffic (VISSIM) modelling.
11 August 2020	Eric Cooper (Highways England) Christos Galanopoulos (Highways England) Simon Willison (AECOM representing Highways England) Kirsty McMullen (SZC Co.) Nick Cottman (WSP representing SZC Co.)	Technical sub-group: Management plans. Discussion of comments on the draft transport management plans submitted with the DCO.

APPENDIX B: MATTERS OF COMMON GROUND

- B.1.1.** **Tables 1.1** and **1.2** provide details on the areas of agreement and disagreement between the parties with regards to traffic modelling and highway impact as well as the management plans:
- Traffic modelling and strategic highway impact (**Table 1.1**)
 - Management plans (**Table 1.2**)
- B.1.2.** Throughout this SoCG the phrase “It is agreed...” is used as a precursor to any point of agreement that has been specifically stated by agreement between the Applicant and Highways England. The phrase “It is not agreed...” is used as a precursor to any point that the Applicant and Highways England wish to clearly state as not yet agreed. Points that are “not agreed” will be the subject of ongoing discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties.
- B.1.3.** This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application documents.

Table 1.3: Statement of Common Ground between the SZC Co. and Highways England on traffic modelling and strategic highway impact

Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	<i>Highway traffic modelling approach including software, software versions, assessment years, time-periods, scenarios, calibration and validation approach.</i>	The transport modelling approach used to assess the proposed development is described in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)), and shown diagrammatically in Plate 6.2 and 6.3 of that document. Changes to the modelling methodology in the January 2021 DCO submission are described in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The proposed development was assessed through a consistent hierarchy of transport models including the gravity model, strategic highway assignment model (VISUM), detailed stand-alone junction models (Junctions9 and LinSig) and microscopic traffic simulation (VISSIM). The transport modelling approach follows industry guidelines (e.g. WebTAG), uses proven software and is proportionate to the scale and context of the development. The modelling methodology is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England is satisfied with the highways traffic modelling approach including software, software versions, assessment years, time-periods, scenarios, calibration and validation approach. A layered approach has been taken to assess different parts of the highway network in varying levels of detail. Highways England has undertaken additional checks on what are considered to be more sensitive parts of the Strategic Road Network, including key junctions, in order to provide additional comfort that the model approach and underlying data is suitable.	AGREED	
	<i>Gravity Model development, underlying assumptions and derived results.</i>	The Sizewell C Gravity Model is a spreadsheet model developed to assess the current labour supply and predict the residential distribution and mode split of the construction workforce. The Gravity Model has been run to produce workforce 24-hour home-to-work trips for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios, and to serve as the basis for the Sizewell C construction workforce travel demand in the strategic highway (VISUM) model. The development and application of the Gravity Model is described in Appendix 7A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The Gravity Model is agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessment of the proposed development.	The Gravity Model has not been reviewed in detail by Highways England however the broad assumptions and outputs with regard to where construction staff are estimated to live and travel from to reach the construction site have been sense checked and are considered reasonable as indicative assumptions and we agree that the model is an acceptable basis for the assessment of the proposed development.	AGREED	
	<i>Extent of the strategic highway model network for assessment.</i>	The extent of the highway network modelled in the VISUM strategic model is shown in Plate 6.1 in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The strategic model highway network scope is centred on the proposed Sizewell C main site, and extends to Lowestoft in the north, Ipswich in the south and the A140 to the west; including the A12 and A14 strategic routes. The strategic model (VISUM) extents are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England is satisfied with the extent of the VISUM strategic highway model network for assessment, which includes the A14 and a section of the A12 south of Ipswich.	AGREED	
	<i>Baseline traffic survey data</i>	A comprehensive traffic data collection exercise was conducted in May 2015 in accordance with DfT TAG guidance. Traffic data was collected using Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC), Manual Classified Turning Counts (MCTC), and supplemented by additional data provided by Suffolk County Council (additional ATCs and bus timetables), Highways England ('TRADS' link counts on the A12 and A14) and the Department for Transport ('TrafficMaster' journey times). The data collection exercise is summarised in the VISUM Base Model Local Model Validation Report (LMVR), in Appendix 8A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The observed baseline 2015 traffic flows are shown in Table F.2 (08:00-09:00), Table F.4 (15:00-16:00), Table F.6 (17:00-18:00), broken down by direction of travel and vehicle type. The observed baseline 2015 traffic flows for the additional hours modelled in VISUM are shown in Table D.2 (06:00-07:00), Table D.4 (07:00-08:00), Table D.6 (16:00-17:00), Table D.8 (18:00-19:00) of the LMVR Addendum (Appendix 8A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A))). The observed baseline traffic data is accepted by Highways England.	Highways England has not undertaken a detailed review of all baseline traffic data however we have been party to reviews that have been undertaken for the local authorities and we are satisfied that the baseline data has been determined as being suitable.	AGREED	
	<i>Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Base Year</i>	The development, calibration and validation of the Base Year (2015) strategic traffic model (VISUM) is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)) and Appendix 8A of that document. Further refinement of the Base Year	Highways England is satisfied with the strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Base Year (2015) calibration and validation. It is recognised that a large-	AGREED	

Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	<i>(2015) Calibration and Validation.</i>	VISUM model, which improved the validation of the Base Year model around Woodbridge, is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), and Appendix 8A of that addendum. The Base Year VISUM model is agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development on the Strategic Highway Network.	scale, strategic model will invariably contain some areas where calibration or validation could be improved, however the overall performance of the model has been demonstrated as meeting necessary requirements as specified by the DfT.	AGREED	
	<i>Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Reference Case assumptions, models and forecast traffic flows for 2023, 2028 and 2034.</i>	The Reference Case models for 2023, 2028 and 2034 forecast years are described in a series of technical notes provided in Appendix 8B to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). Reference Case model traffic flow forecasts (AAWT) are shown in Table 8.4 (2023), Table 8.6 (2028), Table 8.8 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The Reference Case model traffic flow forecast (peak hours) are shown in Table 8.5 (2023), Table 8.7 (2028) and Table 8.9 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Reference Case models, underlying assumptions and traffic flow forecast are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development on the Strategic Highway Network.	The strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Reference Case models, underlying assumptions and traffic flow forecast are considered by Highways England to be an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development on the Strategic Highway Network.		
	<i>Sizewell C trip generation, distribution and mode share assumptions for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios.</i>	The traffic generation, distribution and mode share assumptions used in the strategic highway modelling assessment are described in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). In response to consultation with Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and Highways England additional supporting evidence was prepared, and in some cases, assumptions were refined. The refinements are described in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), and further evidence provided in Appendix 7A, 7B, 7C and 7D of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The assumptions and evidence underlying the trip generation, distribution and mode share of Sizewell C traffic are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development.	The assumptions and evidence underlying the trip generation, distribution and mode share of Sizewell C traffic are considered by Highways England to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development. However, this will be contingent upon there being robust management plans and protocols in place to ensure Sizewell C traffic levels are aligned with the assumptions made in the Transport Assessment.	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP, CTMP and TIMP to Highways England
	<i>Sizewell C trip generation, distribution and mode share assumptions for increased rail and marine capacity resulting from proposed Changes 1 and 2 to the DCO application. Traffic flow forecasts derived from this scenario.</i>	The Change submission in January 2021 included two changes to the transport strategy, which would increase bulk material transported by rail and marine and reduce the number of HGVs on the highway network. The changes are described in Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14) and the updated Freight Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.18). The underlying strategic highway modelling assumptions for this scenario are described in Chapter 7 (Section 7.4) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The resultant change to Peak Construction (2028) highway flows in this scenario is described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.3) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Updated traffic flow forecasts are shown in Table 8.16 (AAWT) and Table 8.17 (peak hours). The derived traffic flow forecasts for the reduced HGV movements associated with proposed Changes 1 and 2 are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development.	The derived traffic flow forecasts for the reduced HGV movements associated with proposed Changes 1 and 2 are agreed by Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development. However this is on the assumption that rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable which has not been sufficiently demonstrated to date.	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide additional evidence clarifying that rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable
	<i>Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Sizewell C scenario. Traffic flow and journey time forecasts derived</i>	The development of the strategic traffic model (VISUM) forecast year models is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)) and updated by Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Forecast Sizewell C traffic flows, cumulative flows and total flows (AAWT) are shown in Table 8.4 (2023), Table 8.6 (2028), Table 8.8 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Forecast Sizewell C traffic flows, cumulative flows and total flows (peak hours) are shown in Table 8.5 (2023), Table 8.7 (2028) and	Highways England agrees that the strategic highway traffic models (VISUM) for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Sizewell C scenarios as an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development on the Strategic Road Network. However this is on the basis that that rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP, CTMP and TIMP and additional evidence clarifying that rail and marine

Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	from these models, including cumulative traffic flows.	Table 8.9 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Strategic highway model peak hour journey time forecasts are shown in Table 8.10-8.11 (2023 Early Years), Table 8.12-8.13 (2028 Peak Construction) and Table 8.14-8.15 (2034 Operational) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The strategic highway traffic models (VISUM) for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Sizewell C scenarios, are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development on the Strategic Road Network.	for which additional evidence is required, and there being robust management plans and protocols in place to ensure Sizewell C traffic levels are aligned with the assumptions made in the Transport Assessment, for which we await an updated set of management plans.		infrastructure is deliverable
	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor from the A14 interchange at Seven Hills to the A1152 at Melton. Validated Base Year (2019) model.	Suffolk County Council and Highways England requested a micro-simulation traffic model (VISSIM) of the A12 corridor between the A14 interchange at Seven Hills and the A1152 at Melton, principally to assess the impact of the proposed development on A12 journey times, as well as junction operations. SZC Co. developed a Base Year (2019) VISSIM model of the AM and PM peak periods and calibrated and validated the model in accordance with Department for Transport and relevant industry guidelines (e.g. Transport for London's VISSIM template). The development of the A12 corridor Base Year VISSIM model is described in Appendix 9C of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The modelling of the Seven Hills junction included in the VISSIM 2019 Base Year model is agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development.	The modelling of the Seven Hills junction included in the VISSIM 2019 Base Year model is agreed by Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development's impact in more detail than is represented in the VISUM model.	AGREED	
	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Reference Case and Sizewell C scenarios. Journey time, delay and queue length results derived from these models.	Using the validated A12 corridor Base Year micro-simulation model as a basis, SZC Co. prepared forecast year models for a Reference Case and Sizewell C scenario for the Early Years (2023) and peak construction (2028) and undertook a modelling assessment of the traffic effects of Sizewell C. The model development and underlying assumptions are described in Appendix 9C of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Model predicted journey times and queue lengths are also reported in that appendix for all scenarios. The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The modelling of the Seven Hills junction included in the A12 corridor VISSIM 2023 and 2028 Reference Case and Reference Case + Sizewell C models, and derived results, are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development.	Highways England has focused its review of the VISSIM model on the A12/A14 Seven Hills junction and accepts the model and results for assessing the proposed development at this junction location. Highways England does acknowledge the purpose of the model is to assess the wider A12 corridor however this has not been the core focus of our review.	AGREED	
	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor for Peak Construction (2028) Sizewell C scenario with additional rail and marine capacity (changes 1 and 2), and journey time and queue length forecasts derived from these models.	The A12 corridor VISSIM models were used to assess a scenario with additional rail and marine capacity (proposed changes 1 and 2), and corresponding reduction in HGV traffic. The assumptions underlying this scenario, and derived journey time and queue length results are described in Chapter 9 (Section 9.6) and Appendix 9C of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The modelling of the Seven Hills junction included in the A12 corridor VISSIM Sizewell C models with additional rail and marine capacity and corresponding reduction in HGV movements, and derived results, are agreed with Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development.	The modelling of the Seven Hills junction included in the A12 corridor VISSIM Sizewell C models with additional rail and marine capacity and corresponding reduction in HGV movements, and derived results, are agreed by Highways England as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development. However, further evidence is awaited that confirms that planned rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable.	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide additional evidence clarifying that rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable
	Highway impacts on the Strategic Road Network	The traffic modelling demonstrates that the Sizewell C Project will not have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and no physical highway improvements are proposed for the SRN. Sizewell C traffic will be managed through the transport management plans (Construction Worker Travel Plan, Construction Traffic	From the evidence presented to date, Highways England is reasonably satisfied that the Sizewell C Project will not have a material impact on the SRN and no highway improvements are required over and above	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP, CTMP

Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
		Management Plan and Traffic Incident Management Plan). It is agreed with Highways England that the Sizewell C Project will not have a material impact on the SRN and no highway improvements are required. Instead, Sizewell C traffic will be managed through the transport management plans.	the improvements committed as part of the Brightwell Lakes development at the A12/A14 Seven Hills Interchange. However, the predicted impacts will be contingent upon robust management protocols as defined through the CWTP, CTMP and TIMP which are not yet fully agreed.		and TIMP to Highways England

Table 1.4: Statement of Common Ground between the SZC Co. and Highway England on transport management plans

THEME: TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLANS					
Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	<i>General – Transport Review Group (TRG)</i>	The scope of the Transport Review Group (TRG) is set out in Section 2 of the Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) and duplicated in Section 2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The scope of the TRG is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England agrees with the proposed scope of the TRG as set out in the draft CWTP and CTMP	AGREED	
	<i>General – relationship between TRG and other groups</i>	The relationship between the TRG and other groups is summarised in Section 2 of the CWTP and duplicated in Section 2 of the CTMP. The relationship between the TRG and other groups is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England agrees with the proposed relationship between the TRG and other groups as described in the draft CWTP and CTMP.	AGREED	
	<i>General – Transport Co-ordinator and Delivery Co-ordinator</i>	The role of the Transport Co-ordinator is set out in Section 2 of the CWTP and duplicated in Section 2 of the CTMP. The role of the Delivery Co-ordinator is set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. The roles of the Transport Co-ordinator and Delivery Co-ordinator are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England agrees with the proposed role of the Transport Coordinator as described in the draft CWTP and CTMP.	AGREED	
	<i>Construction Worker Travel Plan – objectives and targets</i>	The objectives and mode share for construction worker travel to work are set out in Section 3 of the CWTP. The objectives and mode share targets are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CWTP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP with updated targets based on the TA Addendum modelling.
	<i>Construction Worker Travel Plan - measures</i>	The package of travel plan measures are set out in Section 4 of the CWTP. The package of travel plan measures are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CWTP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Worker Travel Plan – monitoring and review</i>	The mechanism for monitoring and review of the CWTP is set out in Section 5 of the CWTP. The monitoring and review mechanism for the CWTP is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CWTP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Worker Travel Plan – enforcement</i>	The mechanisms for enforcement of the CWTP is set out in Section 6 of the CWTP. The enforcement mechanisms for the CWTP are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CWTP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan - objectives</i>	The objectives of the CTMP are set out in Section 1 of the CTMP. The CTMP objectives are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England

THEME: TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLANS					
Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – HGV and AIL routes</i>	The proposed HGV and Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) routes are summarised in Section 3 of the CTMP. The HGV and AIL routes are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – HGV management measures</i>	The measures to manage HGV movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. The HGV management measures are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – LGV management measures</i>	The measures to manage light goods vehicle (LGV) movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. The HGV management measures are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – AIL management measures</i>	The measures to manage AIL movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. The HGV management measures are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – Role of the FMF</i>	The freight management facility has two functions. The primary day to day function of the freight management facility is to both control the release of deliveries onto the local highway network and the subsequent arrival at the main development site, and to provide welfare facilities for drivers and a space where driver inductions can be undertaken, and compliance checks of paperwork, vehicles, and goods undertaken prior to delivery to site. The secondary, and far less frequent function of the freight management facility, is to enable HGVs to be held in the event of an incident on the highway network, which forms part of the management measures included in the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP). The use of the freight management facility to hold HGVs is only one of the control mechanisms in the event of an incident on the highway network. In addition, depending on the incident, deliveries would be able to be cancelled at source via the DMS and HGVs are proposed to be monitored via GPS on their approach to the main development site. The TIMP has been updated to provide potential locations for HGVs to stop en-route to the FMF (west of the Orwell bridge) in the event of an incident. The location of the FMF is accepted by Highways England as being appropriate to meet the various functions of the facility.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP and TIMP.	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – monitoring and review</i>	The mechanism for monitoring and review of the CTMP is set out in Section 5 of the CTMP. The monitoring and review mechanism for the CTMP is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan – enforcement</i>	The mechanisms for enforcement of the CTMP is set out in Section 6 of the CTMP. The enforcement mechanisms for the CTMP are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the CTMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to Highways England
	<i>Traffic Incident Management Plan – scope and traffic incident management area</i>	The scope of the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) is set out in Section 1 of the TIMP as well as the Incident Management Area (IMA), within which the TIMP protocols will apply. The scope and IMA are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the TIMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to Highways England
	<i>Traffic Incident Management Plan – roles and responsibilities</i>	The roles and responsibilities of SZC Co. Suffolk County Council, Highways England and the emergency services with regards to the TIMP are summarised in Section 2. The roles and responsibilities are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the TIMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to Highways England

THEME: TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLANS					
Ref	Matter	SZC Co. Position	Highways England Position	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress	Further Action
	<i>Traffic Management Plan – Incident measures</i>	Measures to be implemented by SZC Co. to manage SZC HGVs and buses in the event of an incident are summarised in Section 4 of the TIMP. The measures to be implemented by SZC Co. to manage SZC HGVs and buses in the event of an incident are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the TIMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to Highways England
	<i>Traffic Management Plan – protocols for planned and unplanned incidents</i>	Protocols to manage SZC HGVs and buses in the event of specific planned and unplanned incidents are summarised in Section 5 of the TIMP. The protocols for managing SZC HGVs and buses during specific planned and unplanned incidents are agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the TIMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to Highways England
	<i>Traffic Management Plan – review</i>	The proposed review mechanism of the TIMP is set out in Section 6 of the TIMP. The TIMP review mechanism is agreed with Highways England.	Highways England awaits an update of the TIMP	IN PROGRESS	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to Highways England