

To:
Planning Inspectorate

Memo

Subject: Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) and Transportation

Overview

This note provides a response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) Rule 17 Letter, dated 5th February 2020, requesting further information from the Applicant, related to Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and Transportation, which stated the following:

"The ExA notes that the Traffic and Transport assessment provides, as stated by the Applicant, the worst-case scenario. However, he also notes that paragraph 5.13.10 of National Policy Statement EN-1 sets out that water-borne (or rail transport) is preferred over road transport at all stages of the project, where cost-effective. Noting this and the submissions which refer to Highways England's publication 'Water preferred policy- Guidelines for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads' including by CRT [REP2-022] and the Commercial Boat Operators Association [REP4-018], can the Applicant:

- 1. Provide its view on the importance/status of this publication; and*
- 2. Provide its view as to whether there is scope to strengthen its commitment to the use of water transport for AILs, where possible, within the framework Construction Traffic Management Plan, and if so, amend it accordingly."*

Each of the points raised by the ExA are answered in turn below.

1. Provide its view on the importance/status of this publication

The Applicant recognises the Highways England's publication 'Water preferred policy - Guidelines for the movement of abnormal indivisible loads'.

The requirements of the publication are as follows:

- i) use the nearest coastal port facility to the site for the delivery of AILs;
- ii) consider the possibility for moving the AIL by inland water to avoid road transport as far as possible; and
- iii) to undertake a cost comparison of road vs inland waterway AIL delivery options.

It is consistent with EN-1 that a cost-benefit analysis is required to identify the most appropriate route for construction deliveries.

Construction of new jetty at the West Burton Power Station site for the Proposed Development construction period would be disproportionate for this project based on the relatively low construction volumes. However, the potential for AILs to be transported as close as possible to the Proposed Development by inland water using existing jetty facilities has been identified. This requires delivery to the nearest coastal port in the Humber Estuary, use of the navigable River Trent to the jetty at Cottam Power Station (which is owned and operated by The Applicant and has been used in the past for the delivery of AILs associated with West Burton 'B' Power Station) then transported by road for the last 6 miles of the journey, via the designated construction route. Use of this AIL route from Cottam Power Station to the West Burton Power Station site has therefore been successfully used during the construction of West Burton 'B' Power Station and did not result in any significant environmental effects. This AIL route is therefore considered suitable for the Proposed Development with lessons learnt from WBB project experience.

A high-level cost comparison of road versus inland waterway, for AIL delivery will be undertaken to assess the most appropriate delivery option for AILs. This review will be undertaken when further information on the origin of AILs is known, and the decision as to which delivery option will be used will be made through the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan.

2. Provide its view as to whether there is scope to strengthen its commitment to the use of water transport for AILs, where possible, within the framework Construction Traffic Management Plan, and if so, amend it accordingly

Section 3 of the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been updated to provide a cost comparison of delivery options by road, inland waterway and rail for construction deliveries including AIL once further details on the origin of the AILs associated with the Proposed Development are known.