

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:	Highways England response
Al.1.15 (Part 1 of 6)	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Freight Management Facility The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 8, sets out the site selection process for the Freight Management Facility (FMF). The representation of Highways England [RR-0468] points out that the facility would be located to the east of the A14 Orwell Bridge which is susceptible to periods of disruption and closures to traffic during inclement weather. It seeks clarity around the proposed FMF location including whether viable alternative locations west of the A14 Orwell Bridge have been identified, and the criteria used to select the proposed location. Please summarise the selection criteria and explain: (i) The consideration given to the likelihood of closures of the Orwell Bridge in the site selection process; (ii) the consideration of viable alternatives west of the Orwell Bridge.</p>	<p>Highways England awaits the applicant's response to ExA and will comment/respond if necessary by the 24th June deadline.</p>
Bio.1.149 (Part 2 of 6)	The Applicant, Natural England, SCC and ESC and Highways England	<p>[AS-263] (Two village bypass oLEMP "TVB oLEMP") para 1.1.6 – this says the oLEMP and LEMP will be "managed by SZC Co for a total of five years or until adoption by the Highways Authority". Presumably the ExA should read Undertaker for SZC Co but please will the Applicant confirm. Please specify</p>	<p>The section of the A12 where the proposed bypass will be situated is not the responsibility of Highways England and therefore this is not a matter for us to comment on.</p>

		<p>from when the five years commences. Is the proposed period the longer of five years or date of adoption? If not, please will the Applicant explain why it is acceptable to cease management prior to adoption. Is the reference to adoption to be construed as adoption of the bypass? What is to occur in the (presumably highly unlikely but, under a normal s.38 agreement, possible) refusal to adopt. Please will Natural England, SCC, Highways England and ESC also comment.</p>	
DCO.1.146 (Part 4 of 6)	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Art 17 – temporary stopping up of streets and private means of access. Please will the Applicant and highway authority consider whether “temporary stopping up” is the correct approach. Is not “stopping up” the extinguishment of public rights? Once the rights are extinguished the land ceases to be highway and the land that formally formed the highway (depending on the definition either about 1.5 to 2 ‘spit’ depths) reverts to the owner of the subsoil. Thus the Highway Authority who usually maintains public highway would cease to have any interest in the land (unless they were also the landowner)? Highway Authorities are not necessarily the owner of the subsoil. Landowners dedicate the surface of the land for highway purposes</p>	<p>Highways England offers no comment</p>

		<p>but usually do not give up their ownership of the land underneath. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the subsoil will belong to the landowners on either side, up to the median line. That being the case the Applicant would need to ensure all the land under any stopped up highway was under their control in order to do any work in that land and also to be certain the landowner would rededicate the land again as highway once they had finished, the work. This point was raised at the Southampton to London Pipeline NSIP examination. Highways England agreed with it and stated they would be seeking to change the approach on their own DCOs. Would the Applicant please consider this issue and propose revised drafting or explain why the current drafting is still appropriate.</p>	
TT.1.40 (Part 6 of 6)	SCC, Highways England	<p>Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Scoping Do you consider that the scoping process and the coverage of the TA reflect your preapplication input?</p>	Highways England considers the Transport Assessment scope and geographical coverage to be sufficient.
TT.1.48 (Part 6 of 6)	SCC, Highways England	<p>Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] / [AS-266] – Modelling Approach Are you satisfied with the strategic modelling scope and approach outlined in Section 6 of the Transport Assessment?</p>	Highways England is satisfied with the strategic modelling scope and approach as outlined in the Transport Assessment with regards to the assessment of impacts on the Strategic Road Network. We have been engaged in discussions with the applicant alongside Suffolk County Council to review aspects of the model.

<p>TT.1.74 (Part 6 of 6)</p>	<p>SCC, Highways England</p>	<p>Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 21: A14 / A12 Seven Hills Interchange. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?</p>	<p>The applicant has taken a layered approach to traffic modelling, with a strategic VISUM-based model providing an overarching view of the highway network over a wide area including the Seven Hill Interchange; a VISSIM-based microsimulation model covering the local A12 corridor including the Seven Hills Interchange; and ARCADY/LinSig-based models of the Seven Hills Interchange in isolation. Highways England is content with this layered approach because it allows for the operation and performance of the Seven Hill Interchange to be assessed at different levels of detail, with notably the VISSIM model assessing the junction and surrounding road links in some detail both in terms of highway capacity and individual vehicle behaviour.</p> <p>Highways England has reviewed the outputs of all these models for Seven Hill Interchange in the context of the Strategic Road Network and is satisfied that predicted traffic levels including Sizewell C traffic at peak construction, do not require additional mitigation on the A14 slip roads. However, it is considered important that the committed improvements linked to the Brightwell Lakes development, which broadly comprise the introduction of traffic signals across parts of the Seven Hills Interchange including most significantly for Highways England the A14 westbound offslip, are fully implemented in advance of Sizewell C peak construction.</p>
------------------------------	---	--	---

		<p>Highways England has undertaken additional checks to consider how and to what extent the Sizewell C development is reliant upon the Brightwell Lakes improvement works. It has been concluded that these improvement works are important and will provide additional mitigation in terms of traffic queue levels on the A14 westbound offslip.</p> <p>It is important to note that the applicant's forecast year modelling incorporates a range of assumptions regarding the movement of traffic associated with the Sizewell C development, underpinned by a strategy which assumes a split between road, rail and marine transport. At the Seven Hills Interchange the applicant's mode strategy results in an estimated number of construction HGVs and construction workers travelling by car to/from Sizewell C/Freight Management Facility.</p> <p>Highways England's acceptance of the models and model results from the perspective of the Strategic Road Network at the Seven Hills Interchange is predicated on there being sufficiently robust controls and management processes in place to ensure that Sizewell C traffic volumes do not exceed the estimates which have been incorporated in traffic modelling. Any exceedance of predicted Sizewell C traffic volumes will place additional pressure on the Seven Hills Interchange (and</p>
--	--	--

			<p>other parts of the highway network) which may therefore warrant additional mitigation.</p> <p>Highways England has reviewed draft copies of the applicant's Construction Worker Travel Plan, Construction Traffic Management Plan and Traffic Incident Management Plan and has provided comments and recommendations to the applicant in response. Highways England also requests additional information which confirms that rail and marine infrastructure is deliverable. Highways England awaits updates this additional information. The additional information including updated draft management plans could provide additional confidence that suitably robust controls will be in place, and that the traffic conditions as estimated by the applicant at the Seven Hills Interchange, and other parts of the highway network, are realistic and can be achieved.</p>
TT.1.82 (Part 6 of 6)	SCC	<p>Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling A12 Corridor Assessment.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.6.20 states that “Based on the VISSIM assessment, no perceivable impact is predicted and therefore no mitigation in the form of highway improvements is considered to be required for the A12 corridor between Seven Hills and Melton. SZC Co. will implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Worker Travel Plan to monitor and manage the impacts of</p>	<p>Highways England has no comments to make. However depending on Suffolk County Council's response to ExA, we may wish to provide comment/respond if necessary by the 24th June deadline</p>

		<p>Sizewell C freight traffic and workforce movements during the construction of Sizewell C. A Transport Review Group (TRG) will be established to review these plans and review the monitoring report produced each quarter. A transport contingency fund will be made available to the TRG to be used if necessary, to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions.” Do you agree with this analysis and the suggested approach to any necessary mitigation?</p>	
TT.1.109 (Part 6 of 6)	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility (FMF) Several Relevant Representations comment that closure of the A14 Orwell Bridge is a regular occurrence and this site would be severely affected by such a closure. Explain how this was considered in the analysis of the suitability of this site?</p>	Highways England awaits the applicant’s response to ExA and will comment/respond if necessary by the 24th June deadline.
TT.1.110 (Part 6 of 6)	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility (FMF) Also, in relation to the FMF provide: (i) The peak times of activity for HGVs entering and leaving the site; and (ii) The anticipated direction of travel of the vehicles entering and leaving the site.</p>	Highways England awaits the applicant’s response to ExA and will comment/respond if necessary by the 24th June deadline.
TT.1.111 (Part 6 of 6)	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility (FMF) – Temporary Construction Access Paragraph 2.4.11 [APP-511] states that “It is anticipated that a temporary construction access point would be</p>	Highways England awaits the applicant’s response to ExA and will comment/respond if necessary by the 24th June deadline.

		<p>provided to the site off the A12 until construction of the site access road is completed.” This infers that there will be two accesses created, one for the main road and a more temporary construction access. The Schedule of Accesses submitted [AS297] identifies only one access for the FMF.</p> <p>Explain: (i) This anomaly and if necessary, update the Schedule and any related plans; and (ii) Confirm whether similar temporary site access arrangements will be in place at other Associated Development Sites and if so, identify the sites and amend the Schedule of Accesses and relevant plans.</p>	
--	--	---	--