

Hearing Transcript

Project:	North Falls Offshore Wind Farm
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) - Part H
Date:	2 April 2025

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

File Name: NF_2APR_ISH1_PT3.mp3

File Length: 01:52:43

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:04 - 00:00:28:24

We are moving on. Still under item 3.2 of the agenda. Having looked at the first bullet point, I'm going to take the next two bullet points on that agenda as one that this relates to effects on conservation areas and heritage assets, and mitigation for conservation areas and heritage assets.

00:00:35:09 - 00:00:53:06

As they are conjoined items. I will then move on to the fourth bullet point, but due to time, will probably hold back any further questions on this topic and put them into next set of written questions. So this item.

00:00:56:12 - 00:01:10:12

Whether the effects on conservation areas and heritage assets have been adequately assessed. Historic England and a number of other IPPs. Raised a number of concerns about,

00:01:12:02 - 00:01:14:27

um, certainly non-designated heritage assets.

00:01:17:02 - 00:01:32:22

Historic England, for example, stated that Non-designated heritage assets are likely to be low heritage importance. That's the applicant's view, but Historic England recommended that the statement is reviewed as additional data is obtained, particularly as trial evaluation has not been carried out.

00:01:35:00 - 00:01:40:27

Other IPS raised a number of concerns around some significant heritage assets.

00:01:44:06 - 00:01:46:27

For example, Jennings Farmhouse and Ash House.

00:01:48:20 - 00:01:50:18

In terms of mitigation.

00:01:55:16 - 00:02:19:00

It's noted that the construction phase would be temporary, but there could still be a harmful effect on the significance of listed building by virtue of construction activities within the setting of the proposed development, and similar temporary effects may also cause harm to a number of heritage assets which have been identified, for example. Church of All Saints, Great Holland Conservation Area, Great Holland Mill House,

00:02:20:29 - 00:02:23:18

Barkers Farmhouse, amongst others.

00:02:25:19 - 00:02:30:25

The first question to the applicant and then I'll bring in other IPS

00:02:32:11 - 00:02:42:24

is given the concerns that have been expressed and that you'll be familiar with from IPS. How confident is the applicant that heritage asset assets have been adequately assessed?

00:02:48:29 - 00:03:29:12

Fair amounts for the applicant. Um, we believe that we, um, have adequately assessed the significance of the heritage assets. Um. Our baseline has been informed by desk based assessments. Um, uh, an aerial photographic and lidar assessment and geophysical survey. Um, as I said previously, across the majority of the last two areas and, uh, as well as trial trenching within two key areas, um, and we, we, uh, consider that that forms of proportionate, um, assessment, um, informing the, um,

00:03:30:29 - 00:03:46:29

historic heritage significance of, of the known heritage assets, um, and informing the, um, likely, um, perceived heritage importance of um, potential, um, archaeological remains.

00:03:48:16 - 00:03:49:01

Um.

00:03:54:06 - 00:03:57:13

Um, in terms of um.

00:04:01:03 - 00:04:21:18

So and so that's what it is. And it's sort of informing, um, the mitigation strategy, um, and uh, sort of assessing the, uh, establishing the significance of archaeological remains, um, following the trial, trenching, um, evaluation and informing the mitigation approaches.

00:04:23:16 - 00:04:31:00

Thank you. So in terms of Non-designated heritage assets as well,

00:04:32:16 - 00:04:43:25

how can you just outline very briefly how the impacts on those would be reviewed throughout the process in response to Historic England's comments?

00:04:47:02 - 00:05:48:19

Um, well, the applicant um, so the the archaeological mitigation strategy that we have drafted that sort of outlines the approach, um, to a further and ongoing consultation with Historic England, um, and Essex Play Services. Um, and following uh, the archaeological trial, trenching and lithic test fitting, there will be time to um, consult with, with those um parties, um, to um discuss the significance of of the archaeological remains, um, identified within the trial trenching, um, as well as those already identified through the pre consent trenching, um, and agree appropriate mitigation, um, as well as

informing the detailed design and identifying areas um which are considered to be of um highest significance and require preservation in situ where um practicable.

00:05:49:08 - 00:06:20:17

Um and those are of medium to low significance, requiring another form of mitigation, whether that be archaeological excavation or archaeological monitoring. Um, but I'd like to add that, um, the applicant is, you know, looking to avoid as much of the archaeology as possible, um, um, regardless of its significance, um, within the confines of engineering, um, and other environmental constraints.

00:06:22:06 - 00:06:22:25

Thank you.

00:06:26:28 - 00:06:45:10

Okay. So we've heard from the applicant again, briefly there about the assessment on heritage assets, conservation areas and the approach to mitigation. I'm going to turn, first of all to

00:06:47:00 - 00:07:09:00

Essex County Council. Who Whoo hoo! I believe the specialist should be available this afternoon. And then other councils and IPS to respond to. We are looking now at both bullet points two and three, or the second and third bullet points under 3.2. So Essex County Council.

00:07:11:10 - 00:07:12:07

Who do we have?

00:07:15:15 - 00:07:18:20

Could you. Yes. Could you introduce yourself and.

00:07:19:16 - 00:07:50:00

Yeah. It's Theresa O'Connor responding for Essex County Council and on behalf of Tendring District Council. I must apologise. I had a power cut literally as you finished your first sentence or question. Um, so I've been running around the house trying to reset my power, so apologies for that. Um, I guess as Sarah mentioned, um, the Non-designated archaeological heritage assets listed in the Cultural Heritage chapter of the year and Document reference.

00:07:50:02 - 00:08:21:24

App 039 have been largely identified through desk based research and non-intrusive methods, and in Essex and in most counties. This would provide an indication and dependent on the receptiveness of the soils and geologies, and a number of other factors. Um, but it wouldn't be able to provide any information on the significance of not as much information on the significance of the archaeological deposits and as at the moment, they're all below ground.

00:08:21:26 - 00:09:19:07

This is almost impossible to to state with confidence. So in terms of what they consider significant in terms of EIA terms, you can't really verify that without a level of trial trench evaluation. Um, so I mean, the two areas have been trial trenched. And in some areas it did correspond with To geophysics, but other areas there were features that weren't picked up by geophysics. So we don't have enough

information from the trial trench evaluations that have taken place so far to state, again, with confidence that the non-intrusive methods that they've, um, carried out so far are providing, um, an account to, you know, a reasonable account of, of what archaeology may be within the development area and what archaeology may be impacted.

00:09:19:18 - 00:09:57:17

So in terms of adequate assessment. We've had this discussion with the applicants. We are almost agreeing to disagree. Um, and that we still feel there's not been adequate assessment. And they think proportionally there has. Um, again, saying that they do propose as part of their mitigation project wide um, the trial trench Evaluation. And basically that's what we would have asked for before. Um, but as it is with project design and flexibility in their design, it's difficult to determine exactly where the impact will be at this stage.

00:09:58:10 - 00:10:26:10

Um, so the trial transition will be carried out post consent as their first form of mitigation. And once we have this information, then we'll have a much better, um, an adequate assessment of the archaeological deposits that may be within the scheme and how well they can be mitigated through avoidance, which is preferable, or through excavation.

00:10:28:14 - 00:10:29:05

Thank you.

00:10:30:21 - 00:10:33:14

And I can see that. Emma.

00:10:36:08 - 00:10:36:23

Woodley.

00:10:37:05 - 00:10:38:14

Emma. Woodley. Yes.

00:10:39:26 - 00:10:42:24

Did you have anything to add? And could you introduce yourself?

00:10:42:28 - 00:11:16:01

Hello. Um, my name is Emma Woodley. I'm principal heritage consultant, um, at Play Services, responding on behalf of Essex County Council and Tendring District Council. Um, on built heritage matters. Um, so regarding, um, the bullet points, um, two and three. Um, this relates to Jennings farmhouse, um, and the impacts on the setting of the grade two listed building.

00:11:17:13 - 00:11:57:06

Um, I believe that in terms of the operational impacts, um, sort of. We're largely in agreement. Um, with the applicant. Um, however, there was, um, further clarification sought regarding the impacts of, um, construction activities. Um, and that whilst it's acknowledged that these are temporary and of short duration, um, it was difficult to understand the, um, sort of effects of the construction activities on the setting of the farmhouse.

00:11:59:19 - 00:12:06:13

Um, I believe that they're going to, um, prepare an addendum to the EES chapter to cover this.

00:12:07:07 - 00:12:20:00

Thank you. Okay. Is that does that cover your comments there on those two bullet points we will give we will seek a response in a moment from the applicant.

00:12:20:06 - 00:12:38:10

Yeah. Um, there's also um, we raised in the local impact report, um, further, um, sort of concerns regarding construction activities on a number of heritage assets, listed buildings and the Great Holland Conservation Area. Um, regarding the cable route,

00:12:40:02 - 00:12:45:03

which I'm not sure if the applicant is providing in the addendum.

00:12:45:23 - 00:12:51:17

Okay. Thank you. We we will seek some clarification around that in a moment.

00:12:53:04 - 00:12:53:27

Thank you.

00:12:54:11 - 00:13:24:12

Um, regarding bullet point three on, um, mitigation. Um, again, there were clarifications sought by the applicant on the impact of, um, mitigation on the setting of Jennings farmhouse. Um, acknowledging that landscape mitigation may have, um, integral adverse impacts. Um, in line with the historic England guidance setting of heritage assets.

00:13:24:28 - 00:13:43:24

Um, and I believe that they are looking at revisiting the landscape mitigation, um, to provide a sort of heritage, um led scheme on that. That succinctly, um, goes along with the landscape as she's raised.

00:13:45:00 - 00:13:56:28

Thank you. So that's the consequential impact of additional landscaping. Yes. Required for mitigation, which may impact on the listed building. Okay. Yeah. Thank you.

00:13:58:16 - 00:14:07:03

Right. I'll just see if any other local authorities wish to respond on these points.

00:14:10:22 - 00:14:11:28

Mr.. Yasmeen.

00:14:12:18 - 00:14:29:08

I'm Jacob Jarman for Tendring District Council. Um, we don't have anything to add to what our colleagues in EC at Play Services already said. But just just for the record, we we want to state that we we we support them and we are in agreement with everything that they've just said. Thank you.

00:14:29:10 - 00:14:30:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:14:33:27 - 00:14:50:19

In that case, having heard those points. I'll invite the applicant to respond to those points, certainly where there is current disagreement or disagreement of view. Um, if you could just clarify the position.

00:14:54:17 - 00:15:32:26

For the applicant. Um, just touching on the on the last point, um, mentioned by, um, miss, uh, Woodley there that that's I guess, another example of trying to seek the balance in the landscape mitigation plan that we were talking about before lunch in terms of trying to achieve a, a scheme that addresses, um, provides mitigation for certain impacts whilst not causing, um, too many adverse impacts on other types of receptors. I'll let Miss Mount's come back just in terms of, um, specific points which were in relation to the assessment of, um, the construction phase.

00:15:32:28 - 00:16:05:26

And just to explain, obviously, where the applicant had taken the approach, that if the effect during operation was the was the reasonable worst case, then that obviously been um, included as part of the assessment anyway. But um, some clarification on that approach. Um, is going to be submitted at deadline five, as was mentioned. But in terms of the other types of um, uh, receptors that were mentioned during um, construction, smells might want to come back on that particular point.

00:16:06:11 - 00:16:06:29

Thank you.

00:16:08:29 - 00:16:40:28

Fair amounts for the applicant. Um, yes. In terms of, um, the assessment of Jennings farmhouse, um, we we did not assess the effects, the temporary effects on the setting of temporary Jennings farmhouse during construction, um, as it was assessed that, um, what was considered that the the effect, um, would arise from the lasting change, um, to the setting as a result of the permanent infrastructure at the at the um, substation site.

00:16:41:18 - 00:16:42:03

Um.

00:16:44:08 - 00:17:22:06

In terms of the list of those heritage assets that that you mentioned, um, I'd need to come back on that. But the the majority of them, I think, um, they are, uh, discussed within our settings assessment, um, which is at 148 and 149. Um, and that also includes a screening assessment, um, whereby whereby we looked at or designated heritage assets within our study areas, which included a one kilometre study area along the cable route and a five kilometre study area around the substation.

00:17:22:26 - 00:17:54:01

Um, and that was to, to identify which um, heritage assets, um, would likely be Um, impacted, um, from the construction activities. And so um, or a change in setting may occur. Um, and whether that change would affect the heritage significance of those assets, um, and those which were considered to be affected were taken forward into the. Yes. Chapter four assessment.

00:17:55:03 - 00:18:01:21

Thank you. Okay. So there was a point there from Miss Woodley about an addendum

00:18:03:12 - 00:18:05:09

to the ES chapter. I.

00:18:07:24 - 00:18:16:17

Don't know if you want to pick up on on that is this this relates to the ongoing work for submission by deadline five.

00:18:18:15 - 00:18:45:04

There amounts for the applicant. Yes. In recent discussions with Miss Woodley, um, we've agreed to, um, submit an addendum to the ES. Yes. Um, just, um, outlining our rationale in terms of how we've come to the conclusions identified within the, the ES, um, in terms of if, um, uh, construction, uh, effects and operation effects on the setting of Jennings farmhouse.

00:18:45:11 - 00:18:49:29

Okay. Thank you. In that case, um, I will.

00:18:52:04 - 00:19:12:05

We won't go through each of those those, um, listed heritage assets as they are all within contained within submissions. But it would be useful, I think, if you in responding at deadline for summarizing responses to this question. Um, just to highlight where.

00:19:14:10 - 00:19:25:21

Where the further information about those is set out so that we can cross reference back from the question to where you consider they have been addressed.

00:19:38:28 - 00:19:45:28

I will. Tent. Okay. Yes. Mr. Blythe Ardley parish council. Yeah.

00:19:46:00 - 00:20:14:08

Very quick question on mitigation. Um. Very well. There's going to be, um, experimental trenches dug to find what may or may not be there. The methodology of the actual trenching, will that be done with a trenching machine ultimately, or with a digger with someone actually keeping an eye on what's happening? Because the mosaic floor, if it's once it's gone, it's gone.

00:20:16:21 - 00:20:20:17

I will ask the applicant to respond to that individual point.

00:20:22:08 - 00:20:51:17

Amounts for the applicant. Um, yeah. So the archaeological trial trenching will be undertaken by an archaeological contractor, um, who will hire a mechanical excavator, um, who will be familiar with, um, excavating archaeological trial trenches. Um, and they will um wanted to the, the the sort of removal of the soil. Um and it will be in layers. Um, and

00:20:53:08 - 00:21:11:23

then the, um the procedures are outlined within the written scheme of investigation, which is approved by um Essex Play Services, which the archaeological contractor will work in accordance to. Um but the the layers of the the amount of soil removed at any one time will be sort of minimal.

00:21:16:14 - 00:21:29:17

I think the point is, is are your methods likely or do you anticipate any damage caused to anything that is found. How would you avoid that occurrence?

00:21:34:16 - 00:21:38:19

Mr. Blythe, if you'd like to correct me, please do. Sorry, James.

00:21:38:27 - 00:22:04:15

The question is, assuming this goes ahead when they are putting the trench in, how are they going to put the trench in? Are they going to use the trenching machine which will ignore everything that's in the ground, or are they going to continue along the lines of taking off layer down to archaeological levels, so that anything that is there doesn't get just mashed up with everything else?

00:22:04:17 - 00:22:07:28

Yeah, that was the concern. How to avoid the mashing of.

00:22:09:21 - 00:22:37:04

CloudWatch for the app. There's two points here. There's one. How do we undertake the archaeological trial trenching which Miss Mount has just explained the actual procedure for doing a trial trench. And then there is a separate point, I think, which is about how do we actually construct the trenches for the laying of the cables? Um, I think and it was at the second point that was being referred to in terms of the actual construction of the cable, I believe, rather than the actual.

00:22:37:16 - 00:22:38:05

All right.

00:22:38:07 - 00:22:44:04

The larger than sorry, I was assuming it was the way they were doing the trial trenching. Thank you.

00:22:45:02 - 00:23:17:00

Uh, for the applicant, I mean, I'm happy to provide some commentary very briefly on construction, uh, technique for the the cabling. But just to note that the design of the cabling, um, and the mitigation measures will be informed by the archaeological trial trenching, and that is the purpose of doing the trenching, because that will then inform the suite of mitigation measures that need to be put in place

when we come to do the trenches for the actual cables themselves. But, um, Mr. Reid can just provide a very brief, um, explanation of how they do the actual cable trenching.

00:23:17:29 - 00:23:50:28

David Reid for the applicant. So the main cable trench will be dug by a mechanical excavator with ducts laid in the bottom of the trench. But what we will do is we will use the information gathered from the archaeological trial trenches, from the g/fz side of things, to microsite the cable within our cable route to ensure that we avoid any of those archaeological features that have been identified. So the first process is really to avoid them, as has been expressed by Essex County Council. And so once we know where the features are, we can then use all our means to be able to avoid them.

00:23:51:02 - 00:24:16:13

Possible. So we're not going over the mosaic floor. I mean, one of the examples we've got is the Roman road that cuts across the top of our substation field. So again, we've got an offset of 50m or so to the edge of our construction compound associated with the substation to ensure that we are not impacting on any of the archaeology that we know about at this stage already. To ensure that that archaeology is preserved.

00:24:20:01 - 00:24:20:23

Thank you.

00:24:22:18 - 00:24:24:27

Okay. I'm going. Uh,

00:24:26:23 - 00:24:29:21

are there any further points before we move on to the penultimate?

00:24:30:09 - 00:24:44:01

Yeah. I just wanted to clarify that, obviously, where we can't avoid archaeology, that the that will be mitigated for in advance of construction. So there will be an archaeological excavation required, but prior to construction.

00:24:45:13 - 00:24:47:16

Okay. Right.

00:24:49:01 - 00:24:52:10

Mr. Blythe? One final point. And then we need to move on.

00:24:52:16 - 00:25:10:13

Dug down to find what's in the mitigation in the experimental trenches. You don't know it's there at all. So if you're not going to dig that bit in between, you won't find it until you're digging the trench. But the main construction trench. And by then, it's too late.

00:25:12:00 - 00:25:19:22

Thank you. Thank you. I think those points and concerns are noted and shared with other IPS.

00:25:21:08 - 00:25:54:29

I'm going to move on to what's the penultimate bullet point on the agenda, and will be the final bullet point under 3.2 today, with the remainder being taken through further written questions. I mentioned earlier that an additional submission has been accepted by the examining authority, uh, which Historic England has provided. That probably won't be available on the examination library until later today. Just because that's the timing issues about getting that uploaded.

00:25:55:12 - 00:26:07:09

Um, but it does coincide with this bullet point and provide Historic England's update on that. So that will be available for all to view and to comment on in advance of deadline for

00:26:08:26 - 00:26:20:13

Historic England. Marine concern is in relation to the lack of site specific geotechnical samples collected to feed into the geological baseline. Assessment.

00:26:24:14 - 00:26:41:10

Historic England made recommendations to address the matter. And had stated the wording of the Outline Code of Construction practice also needed to be updated. I think a key point within Historic England's written representation was at paragraph 4.6,

00:26:43:06 - 00:27:01:16

and I won't go into detail here, but it's regarding the identification of impacts of the project area. The application of embedded mitigation in all instances states that significance of effect has therefore been assessed as minor to negligible, and the effect is consequently considered not significant in EIA terms.

00:27:03:28 - 00:27:18:21

At that point of the written representation. Historic England had considered there to be insufficient evaluation, having been undertaken to address the point and a program of further works will be required. I'm quoting from

00:27:20:11 - 00:27:30:20

Historic England's written representation. So I would like to hear briefly if, in your view, things have moved on with relation to

00:27:32:06 - 00:27:54:29

Historic England's written representations. To address the point that's been made and confirm how it is intended to accommodate programme of archaeological assessment into the development, and how, if any, progress is being made on an agreed wording or protocol to address unexpected finds of an archaeological nature.

00:27:58:02 - 00:27:58:17

Well.

00:28:01:00 - 00:28:20:04

Applicant um, in relation to offshore matters, um then um Victoria Boothby, who is joining virtually is able to answer the question. So I'll just, um, And let her introduce herself, and then she can proceed to

give you an update on where discussions have got to with Historic England on those points. Thank you.

00:28:21:12 - 00:29:11:06

Hello. Yeah. Good afternoon. I'm Victoria Boothby. I'm a principal marine heritage consultant at Royal DHV, and I'm talking on behalf of the applicants. Um, so just provide a bit of clarification on this. Um, so the chapter on offshore archaeology and cultural heritage does assess and recognise that without mitigation, there is potential for impacts on geo archaeological deposits with paleo environmental potential. And it also recognises that although there hasn't been any geotechnical survey or geo archaeological assessment to date, this potential is described within the chapter with reference to the interpretation of marine geophysical data which has been carried out and which has allowed us to map features and horizons of potential interest offshore that are relevant to this understanding of geo archaeological potential.

00:29:11:22 - 00:29:42:09

And this has actually allowed us to set out some very specific objectives for geo archaeological assessments and for the further assessment of geophysical data, if it's required and relevant further down the line. And this is with the aim of both understanding further the sub seabed potential for deposits of geo archaeological and paleo environmental interest, but also with the aim of contributing further to the sort of scientific data available for the study of seabed prehistory within the Tens region.

00:29:42:24 - 00:30:17:29

And this process, and this commitment is all captured in the outline written scheme of investigation for the offshore, which is secured through a condition that requires that the seas produce post consent in accordance with the outline WSI and the approach to this assessment, this further investigation and mitigation. And as I said, it's both informing the understanding and mitigating potential effects is all set out in the WSI. So to this end, this is this is kind of in accordance with standard industry approaches.

00:30:18:01 - 00:30:49:12

We're not departing from anything that we wouldn't normally do for any similar project. And the only difference being is that we haven't undertaken any geotechnical survey to date. But the benefit of this is that we have got some very specific research questions and objectives that we will be that we've set out in the WAC to make sure that these are taken forward post consent. So in terms of kind of how that's being captured with, with Historic England, that we have got a statement of common ground in process and we are in discussion on this fact.

00:30:49:14 - 00:30:56:02

So, um, hopefully that provides enough information to respond to your question.

00:30:59:05 - 00:31:00:12

Thank you. Yes.

00:31:02:14 - 00:31:32:16

I on. Okay. I I'm now informed that Historic England's submission has now been published, so anybody with an interest in that can take a look on the examination library. However, there will be a

slight delay in getting that onto the examination library in terms of the outline written scheme of investigation. The Outline Offshore Britain scheme of investigation.

00:31:32:18 - 00:31:56:12

Are you able to confirm progress on that? It's my understanding that that is a document that's now been shared with Historic England. Okay. And the timescales envisaged for submitting that into the examination would be presumably deadline for if we could have an update.

00:31:57:10 - 00:32:19:16

It's been updated. Um, it's been uh, I'd have to check whether or not the updated version has actually already been submitted. It has been updated and submitted submitted at a previous deadline. But I would have to go away and check that. That's definitely the correct version that's had the requested information added into it to do with the geo archaeological assessments.

00:32:19:29 - 00:32:21:16

Okay. Thank you.

00:32:25:09 - 00:32:35:28

In that case, just checking my notes. Do any other I have comments to make on this point?

00:32:40:08 - 00:33:17:03

Um, Theresa O'Connor, Essex County Council. Okay. Um, it's just it seems such a tiny area. Um, largely most of the offshore, um, cable corridor will be dealt with by Historic England. But as the advisor for Tendring District, we are actually responsible for providing advice landward of mean low water, which does mean basically interpreted as the intertidal area, I would say. And it's our understanding that there will be a cable going through the intertidal area, but it will be horizontally directionally drilled.

00:33:17:08 - 00:33:47:13

I think is the term. And obviously there's been no. As far as I'm aware, no investigation in the intertidal area. The onshore um assessment was a walkover I think, but not possibly during low tide. Um, and in the nearshore environment, there's some of the marine geophysical survey has identified, um, I think as Victoria has referred to some possible paleo channels with organic sediments and things like that.

00:33:47:15 - 00:34:18:25

Well, any channels of that type will have originated from onshore. Um, so I was a bit concerned that there's no well, in the original sea. There was no mitigation proposed in the intertidal area. But I do understand it's a bit of a crossover area between onshore, offshore, and we have raised this issue before. So we would like to see or understand possibly better, um, what depths the cable will go through at this point.

00:34:19:06 - 00:34:45:12

And because there is in the WSI, um, I think the offshore, it's actually one was submitted at rep 3015 document reference. And it does state that there is some potential in the intertidal area at depth. So we

would really want to know what depth the cable is going through and if this will be in areas where there is some potential. And if so, what mitigation is proposed in those areas?

00:34:46:03 - 00:34:56:27

Thank you. Um, Miss Boothby, are you able to respond to that now or provide or and or provide some further information to that? Yes.

00:34:57:07 - 00:34:57:27

Thank you.

00:34:58:00 - 00:35:38:05

So the the final depth of the installation of the cable beneath the intertidal zone, but potentially through deposits of interest, would be determined post content as part of that final design, and inherently that will be informed by geotechnical survey and understanding of what deposits that need to pass through. So our ultimate aim would be to make sure that that cable passes beneath any deposits that have relevance for archaeological interest, i.e. sort of pre prehistoric deposits, um, and any approaches to mitigation that would need to be determined under the terms of the WSI, which would be developed at that point.

00:35:38:07 - 00:36:08:14

So the WSI also allows for what it allows for. It ensures that any detailed survey will be set out in a method statement, a sort of site specific survey specific WSI. And that would, for any works above mean low water that the where Essex County Council would have an interest that would make sure that they would also be consulted on any documents and any documents that are related to works that cross over that intertidal boundary were to do with the HDD and where that enters and exits.

00:36:10:07 - 00:36:10:26

Thank you.

00:36:15:03 - 00:36:17:08

Thank you for that confirmation. Um.

00:36:20:25 - 00:36:28:19

Just looking around to see if there are any other comments on this final bullet point. Under 3.2.

00:36:31:13 - 00:36:32:08

If not.

00:36:40:01 - 00:36:41:04

In which case.

00:36:43:22 - 00:36:53:00

I think we will move on from item 3.2. And I'm going to hand over to Mr. Johnson to take us through remaining item.

00:36:53:08 - 00:36:54:06

Are you going to.

00:37:08:03 - 00:37:28:09

Apologies. Yes. So so the, um, the final bullet point related to whether amendments are required to the draft ECA requirements or associated management plans. This was an item on, um, on the agenda. But we are we are going to receive comments in writing.

00:37:32:07 - 00:37:55:00

First point again relates to Historic England's written representations. And it's appreciated that with the additional submissions and ongoing work, these may have moved on. Key point is, Historic England is not satisfied that in consideration of the geo archaeological potential within proposed development areas, the capacity should be allowed for dedicated cores to be obtained.

00:37:57:08 - 00:38:18:27

The question was regarding changes to the of the outlying offshore written scheme of investigation. Whether or not the actions need to be formalized in the DCO on the Code of Construction Practice. Essex County Council had expressed concern with it in its Local Impact report.

00:38:21:02 - 00:38:26:18

The council is concerned that the mitigation requirements are not appropriately represented within the Outline Code of Construction Practice.

00:38:28:29 - 00:38:31:09

And had provided a suggested wording.

00:38:32:27 - 00:38:49:17

So there is a question to the applicant to provide information on updates to the Code of Construction Practice and whether or not Essex County Council's concerns have in any way been overcome.

00:38:54:02 - 00:39:03:22

And again, Essex County Council's proposed wording within the Code of Construction Practice of five estuaries. As the field work is likely to overlap.

00:39:05:19 - 00:39:30:10

Essex County Council were seeking to ensure a coherent, unified approach to the archaeology throughout the process. An update on that Act deadline four would be welcomed. I won't go on to hear anything on those now, and at this point, I will now hand over to my colleague, Mr. Johnson, for questioning relating to traffic and transportation.

00:39:31:28 - 00:39:39:04

For the applicant. We're just going to change. Um, the members of the applicant's team for this one. So just bear with us. One moment, please. Thank you.

00:40:31:26 - 00:41:04:17

Thank you, Mr. Medlin. So we'll now move on to agenda item 3.3 Traffic and Transportation. Um, the first bullet point is whether there are any onshore port and transportation impacts that would arise

from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the offshore works. Suffolk County Council in its response. Rep 20592XQ 17 .1.2 has raised a concern about the need for an assessment of the proposals.

00:41:04:19 - 00:41:38:19

Onshore traffic and transport impacts resulting from offshore activities. In lieu of such an assessment, they have recommended a requirement for a port traffic management and travel plan, with examples from the consented East Anglian one North and East Anglian to appended to their Local Impact report. Rep. 1074. With reference to the applicant's written response to written questions. Rep 2020 to excuse 17 .1.1.

00:41:38:21 - 00:42:12:00

The applicant has set out their justification to scope out of the assessment of the onshore impacts of traffic and transport associated with offshore activities and does not consider a port traffic management plan requirement is required. Furthermore, Suffolk County Council's comments on any submissions received at the previous deadline. Rep 3068 states that Suffolk County Council notes the applicant's comments regarding construction materials for the wind turbine generators typically being delivered offshore.

00:42:12:14 - 00:42:47:02

Suffolk County Council would be satisfied that a port traffic management plan would be unnecessary if heavy goods vehicles would not be involved in offshore construction. However, Suffolk County Council notes that the applicant has made these comments on a without prejudice basis and is not committed to this method of construction in any control document. Suffolk County Council therefore requests clarification as to what the applicant's course of action would be if heavy goods vehicles movements were to be required for the offshore construction Aspect of this project.

00:42:48:18 - 00:42:58:24

Could the applicant provide an update on the. Approach to resolving this matter, and also provide an update on the progress of the Statement of Common Ground?

00:43:03:03 - 00:43:08:27

Project for the applicant. I'll just let Mr. Taylor introduce himself and then he can provide some more information. Thank you.

00:43:11:11 - 00:43:50:24

Good afternoon. My name is Sam Taylor. I'm an associate director and transport planner with the Royal Household in DHV. Um, I think it's maybe useful if I sort of start by setting the scene, if that's okay. Um, through through the sort of pre pre submission stage, we, um, set out our rationale for why we believe that, um, effects from offshore construction and operation and decommissioning could be scoped out. And that's um, essentially that those facilities would be provided or brought into means, um, by use of um, one or more planning applications.

00:43:51:23 - 00:44:18:04

And on that basis that has been agreed with both National Highways and Essex County Council. And um, that is a matter still of agreement. This approach also follows that that has been accepted by the

Secretary of State for multiple other offshore wind farms, um, examples of which include Hornsea Three, Norfolk Vanguard Railway, more, Hornsea Four, Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon extension projects.

00:44:20:24 - 00:44:37:18

Um, in terms of the applicants latest position on this, um, it remains, as has previously set out, that there will be no decision made upon the preferred base port until post determination and that, um, any port could be anywhere within the UK or potentially mainland Europe.

00:44:39:16 - 00:44:40:28

The, um.

00:44:43:03 - 00:44:52:24

In terms of sort of trying to provide some context. Um, the applicant has provided, um, and we're without prejudice, um, response to this matter.

00:44:54:14 - 00:45:43:15

Um, but equally have undertaken a some further, um, review of, uh, existing applications that have come forward and, um, have useful outside those and how so an example is galloper, which was um, for the operation and maintenance facility at Harwich, which employed 20 or would employ 20 operational staff and 50 maintenance staff which shift who are offshore, sorry, the 20 onshore and 2050 offshore and um again for Hornsea one um ten onshore and then 40 um offshore switching out every two weeks, 60 offshore switching out every four weeks and to heavy movements every two weeks in terms of, um, large components.

00:45:44:03 - 00:45:53:23

Um, the nature of offshore wind is, is such now that those types of uh, components are generally built in, um,

00:45:55:08 - 00:46:39:01

port centric facilities, and then they are shipped out. They don't generate onshore traffic movement. So that hopefully provides a level of clarification in terms of the types of movements that could be expected in terms of turning to the requirement for a port traffic management plan. So you've cited a number of projects where the Secretary of State has determined that a port traffic management plan wasn't required. But the applicant also does note, um, Suffolk County Council comments that a port management plan was required for a number of ports within Suffolk, uh, projects within Suffolk in terms of how, um, a base port would be brought forward, which may be more useful.

00:46:40:18 - 00:46:57:23

the applicant foresees two options. Option A is a preferred port is selected which has the requisite planning permissions. The second is a port is selected where permissions are not in place and new permissions would be granted or need to be sought and then granted.

00:46:59:09 - 00:47:36:15

So with regard to option A, that would be, the applicant would need to work within those existing permissions. And as part of those existing permissions, there would need to be a consideration of

traffic and transport matters. With regard to option B, um, those traffic transport matters would have to be considered as part of the application. I think it's also useful to provide two examples. Um, so the first is in Essex itself, which is and these sort of, um, I suppose, demonstrate how the port sector is responding to the need to service the offshore wind sector.

00:47:37:01 - 00:48:16:20

So Hutchison Ports, as a port operator, submit a planning application for the Port of Harwich to operate as a green energy hub, and the hub is intended to facilitate activities such as wind turbine storage, assembly and servicing. That application was granted permission in May 2024, and that was agreed in the scope of those traffic and transport documents. We agreed with National Highways and Essex County Council's local high authorities and National High authority for the strategic road network. As a second example in Suffolk for the lowest energy hub, again where ABP have submitted an application and the scope of scope of those traffic and transport documents were agreed with Suffolk County Council.

00:48:17:12 - 00:48:26:24

So in terms of how that process works, it's it's opposed consent. And the applicant doesn't consider that a port traffic management plan meets the test to be necessary.

00:48:32:24 - 00:48:35:09

Thank you. And on the statement of common ground.

00:48:47:22 - 00:48:52:12

Um, there is no we haven't entered into a statement of common ground with Suffolk County Council on this matter yet.

00:48:52:26 - 00:48:58:07

Okay. And what's your proposed deadline for drafting one?

00:49:05:19 - 00:49:17:22

Gordon Campbell, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we have a similar common ground. Um, we're in discussions with Suffolk at the moment in terms of a deadline, and we hope to be able to submit one. Um, the aim would be to have something we submitted for deadline for.

00:49:18:03 - 00:49:21:15

Okay. Thank you. Um, Suffolk County Council.

00:49:21:20 - 00:49:25:22

Sorry. Can I just clarify that it was intended to cover this. This matter?

00:49:28:06 - 00:49:30:18

Yeah. This matter is on the draft statement of common Ground.

00:49:36:26 - 00:49:45:21

Suffolk County Council, to avoid any confusion on the matter, proposed to, um, just consult my colleagues online. Mr.. Mary. Mrs. Cox.

00:49:52:21 - 00:50:25:18

Hi. Good afternoon. Uh, Steve. Mary, on behalf of Suffolk County Council. I'd just like to commend the applicants, uh, comments on that. They were actually concise and, um, subject to us examining that information. I see no reason to pursue the request report travel plan. I would at this time highlight, though, that we would still, um, be expecting something in the form of, uh, some at least enticement for sustainable transport at ports.

00:50:25:24 - 00:50:45:26

So something along the lines of a travel plan to, uh, basically drive people's behavior towards good but good behaviour, even if it's low figures, every little helps. In terms of statement common ground, yes, we do welcome engaging with that. But from what I've heard today and from what I've read, I think this issue will fall away on behalf of Suffolk County Council.

00:50:50:04 - 00:50:55:03

Okay. Thank you. Any other comments from any other interested parties?

00:50:59:05 - 00:51:04:18

I'm not seeing any any hands up. Okay. We'll move on to the next question then.

00:51:06:15 - 00:51:20:16

Um, so this is the second bullet point. Whether the proposed mitigation to limit heavy goods vehicle numbers would be sufficiently robust, precise and enforceable, or whether provision should be made for additional mitigation measures

00:51:22:12 - 00:52:06:27

in Essex County Council and Tendring District Council's response. Rep 2036 to execute Q 1.4.2. Tendring District Council has specific concerns regarding the outline Code of Construction practice app. 248 section 1.3.1 on working hours and timing of the works, and has proposed changes to align with local standards. The applicant's comments on written questions rep 3036 states that with regards to amending construction, working hours and timing of the works, the applicant is unable to accommodate Essex County Council and Tendring District Council's request.

00:52:07:19 - 00:52:23:10

The applicant's proposed working hours are standard for major infrastructure projects, including five estuaries, and provide a balance between avoiding the times which have the greatest potential to disturb people, and enabling the works to be completed in a timely manner.

00:52:25:20 - 00:52:34:26

Essex County Council and Tendring District Council respond to the applicant's response. Rep 3036 regarding working hours.

00:52:52:27 - 00:53:16:12

So Jacob, you are for Tendring District Council. Um, so I just want to be clear on. So you the panel is not asking us to respond to bullet point two. Under 3.3 as yet, but specifically asking us to respond to the applicants response to the to our working hours request. Right.

00:53:17:21 - 00:53:27:12

That's correct. There's a disagreement currently on the working hours, and I'm asking you for your response to the applicant's comments on that particular matter.

00:53:28:06 - 00:53:57:00

So. So we are tendering understand that the applicants are not willing to, to change from, um, sort of construction hours between 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., um, Monday to Saturday. Um, so in terms of, of, of HGV movements, uh, I think I'm going to start off by just commenting on, on that, first of all. So,

00:53:58:19 - 00:54:32:07

uh, the applicants themselves are acknowledging that, um, that, you know, even with those restrictions, it could mean that they could there could be vehicular HGV movements before 7 a.m. and after, um, 7 p.m. because of, um, because of the need to, um, you know, So it's just inevitable. They have mentioned that in in their construction management or one of one of their plans.

00:54:33:08 - 00:54:33:23

Um.

00:54:36:19 - 00:55:08:28

So, so when I think it's important to remember when, when, when such additional HGV movements will occur as acknowledged by the applicant, it will it will occur on, on rural roads or, you know, a whole route that is in a rural location that's going to pass directly. Um, that's going to go directly past a, um, a little Bromley, which is a small rural settlement at the bottom of our settlement hierarchy.

00:55:09:22 - 00:55:32:24

Um, and then the, the applicants, the applicants also saying that HGV is projected to arrive on site before 7 a.m. would be would be required to to park at an appropriate lorry park services or other designated overnight parking locations. We accept that that's to be confirmed. But, um,

00:55:34:13 - 00:55:46:03

experience has shown us that such an arrangement would be would be unenforceable. Um, and difficulty, you know, to to police, so to speak. Um.

00:55:49:02 - 00:56:03:24

So yeah, we are disappointed to hear that, that, you know, the local you know, the impact that this will have on local residents will, will, you know, it's not something that the applicant is willing to, to consider at this stage.

00:56:06:18 - 00:56:14:15

Okay. Just before I go back to the applicant, um, could I just see if any other interested parties got a comment?

00:56:16:21 - 00:56:17:27

Carolyn Mason, Yardley.

00:56:17:29 - 00:56:41:28

Parish Councillor I think it's obvious to say that our community, Little Bromley, are and Ardley towards the substation end of the community are deeply concerned about construction intrusion on everybody's lives. Noise, light, um, and working within reasonable hours would seem to be, um,

00:56:43:21 - 00:57:13:17

their expectation and. Right. Almost. Um. There's another I don't know whether I can ask this question at this point, but there's another concern about where all these people, the people that are construct in the construction phase, where they're coming from, where will they reside while they're in the construction phase? There's going to be a knock on effect, I expect, on renting the properties, etcetera, etcetera. That might be a bit of a side issue. Wanted to raise it. Thank you.

00:57:13:29 - 00:57:19:01

Okay. Thank you. And I can see we've got Mr. Bloom online from, uh, National Highways. Would you like to come in?

00:57:20:02 - 00:58:05:10

Yes. Thank you sir. Jeremy Bloom representing National highways. So, um, National Highways, um, has made an observation in the code of construction that, um, when the contractor is brought on board, the working hours are subject to change. And, um, we would like to see a stronger, um, mechanism that an and stronger mechanism and, and stronger enforceability around, um, um, assessments that may need to be undertaken or mitigations put in place if those working hours change in and for those measures to be put in place before start of construction.

00:58:05:27 - 00:58:12:29

So we're less concerned about the the current hours, but we're concerned about potential for change.

00:58:14:20 - 00:58:22:02

Thank you, Mr. Bloom. Um, could the applicant comment on on those matters, please?

00:58:23:25 - 00:58:56:01

Sam Taylor for the applicant. Um, obviously a number of matters there. So, um, for things I miss, please, please let me know and I'll try and take them in some sort of some sort of order, um, in terms of, uh, traffic and transport. Um, I've taken the approach that, um, the working hours for the project are 7 to 7. Um, that but essentially the gates open at seven and HGVs can then start.

00:58:56:04 - 00:59:10:25

So it's not would be incorrect to prevent HGVs from travelling on the network before then because they need to be there and arrive. Um, and equally at the end of the day, um, the gates will close at seven, um,

00:59:12:10 - 00:59:20:29

and then HGVs again would leave and then be on the network returning to, to where they get their point of it. Um, point of origin.

00:59:22:23 - 01:00:03:03

Uh, I think there's a couple of points around that. So in terms of, um, vehicles arriving before seven, the within the outline construction traffic management plan. Uh rep 321 we've outlined, um, a range of measures in terms of how we, um, will instruct drivers in terms of their arrival and departure times. So they'll be reminded of the that they cannot enter site before seven so that in essence, the drivers will then plan their journeys accordingly so that they don't arrive prior to seven.

01:00:04:04 - 01:00:35:24

And for the majority of, uh, materials, um, for example, bulk materials, which make up over 80% of the materials, they would likely come from local suppliers, which would have similar restrictions in terms of their working hours, and it would be possible to plan a plan the point at which they leave to coincide with arriving not before seven. Um, that doesn't we're not though. Um, we don't obviously there are there will be drivers who have to travel from further afield.

01:00:36:08 - 01:01:16:21

And what we have said is we recognise that. So there's delivery instructions to say you cannot arrive before seven, but if you were to arrive, if you're, for example, you're just showing you that you will arrive before seven. You take, you then stop, for example, an overnight services, um lay bys. Um, we identify those en route such that they don't arrive, um, before seven. So that's kind of how we're looking to manage that. Um, in terms of, uh, noted comments about enforceability, um, we have identified working, um, Times as a non nonconformist zone.

01:01:16:28 - 01:01:19:09

A breach of those would, um,

01:01:20:25 - 01:01:54:12

would result in disciplinary measures being taken. And that's again outlined within the outline construction and traffic management plan. Um, there's I think it's also important to sort of recognize one of the reasons why we want to, um, include this option for people to drive is that it allows us to work around network peaks. So there are peak periods in the day, especially at the start, start of the day when there is more intense periods on the network. And it allows us to reduce our our effects upon those network peaks.

01:01:55:02 - 01:02:47:09

Um, I just pick up on one point that was made, um, in terms of Little Bromley. We have made a significant commit or commitment to, uh, there'll be no HGV traffic going through Little Bromley and that's captured and controlled through the um, outline construction traffic management plan. So it's it's Is incorrect to say that the those vehicles will pass through Little Bromley. Um, there is um within the update to the construction traffic management plan that we're discussing with Essex County Council that will come at deadline for the applicant has also agreed to um the Essex County Council's wording in terms of further use of GPS or vehicle tracking, which will help monitor um, vehicle routing and timing and equally, um, agreed to comments from National Highways.

01:02:47:24 - 01:03:03:20

Um, in terms of how that will be dealt with. So leave section 5.3, which deals with non-compliance of the outline construction traffic management plan. Um, I think that was all the points that I've made, but I've missed something. Please let me know.

01:03:05:07 - 01:03:36:12

In the opinion, just to build on that point about, um, enforceability And the management plans are a requirement in the in the DCO, and a final version of the management plan will need to be submitted for approval prior to commencement. That final version will need to be in accordance with the outline plans that, um, Mr. Taylor was just mentioning. Um, I just felt it's probably worth reiterating that failure to comply with the management plan that's secured in a DCO is of itself an offence.

01:03:36:23 - 01:04:04:16

Um, and so therefore there is, um, certainty that can be applied that these measures will in fact be followed because the consequences of non-compliance are very serious, um, and more serious in a DCO context than, than there would be in a under a town and country planning Act. Um, planning permission. Um, so just to add to the points being made about the enforceability of these, the applicant's position is that all of the measures that are being put forward would be enforceable. Thank you.

01:04:08:09 - 01:04:11:09

Thank you. Could I just go back to Essex County Council?

01:04:11:11 - 01:04:42:03

Mrs. Wallace Wallace, Essex county council. Um, we haven't got our environmental health colleagues from Tendring here today, but I just try to elaborate upon why we have the previous comments in terms of restricting the working hours. Um, the current wording within the outline of construction practice is about working hours. The problem is, in reality, there's a lot of subcontractors tend to arrive before seven.

01:04:42:16 - 01:05:17:08

So it's very difficult, even if you say the gate of the construction site is not open until seven. It just means a lot of the actual workers will be piling up around the area from like sixth stage. So it is very difficult from district one of will to to enforce if they are arriving early, having discussion or like site briefing. So a lot of the contractors at the end will argue with with the environmental health team that they are only having some meetings outside of the site before 7:00.

01:05:17:10 - 01:05:56:05

So I think that's the bit that we want to the reassurance that, like, nothing noisy is going to happen before 7:00 every day, especially like even Saturday as well. So that's why our colleagues has proposed, like the high impact and noisy activities to be restricted between 8 to 6 p.m.. So that's the bit I just just want to clarify. So it might be something you can incorporate in into the final version. But that's that's the concern about how our colleagues can like if there's any complaint, it is very difficult to to enforce on that point.

01:05:56:07 - 01:05:56:25

Thank you.

01:06:00:12 - 01:06:08:22

Okay. Could I just ask as well that that this matter is addressed in the statement of common ground. And would you be able to provide an update on when that will be issued, please?

01:06:20:12 - 01:06:30:29

Gordon Campbell, the applicant, in terms of common ground covering this matter. Um, the aim is for us to submit an updated statement of common ground, um, for a deadline for as well.

01:06:35:27 - 01:07:10:28

And some of that can just come back on the point of, um, employee parking as it relates to traffic and transport matters. Um, again, employee parking or overspill parking outside of outside of the site is again identified as a non-compliance. And we've set out how that would be monitored or we will set out. We've been discussing with the county council. Further clarifications within the outline and update to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, which will be submitted at deadline for. In regard to how the potential for overspill parking outside of the site is monitored.

01:07:14:14 - 01:07:17:20

Thank you. Um, I've got a hand up. Um, Mr. Blythe?

01:07:19:04 - 01:07:36:08

Yeah. Um, employees going to the construction site. Will they be, uh, travelling to and from purely the entrance of the Hall Road? Or will they be able to drive all the way through the country lanes to get there?

01:07:47:28 - 01:07:50:12

Yeah. Could you respond to that point, please?

01:07:53:09 - 01:08:09:19

Um, Sam Taylor for the applicant. Um, again, the point of access from the highway for construction employees will be the point of access from from the highway. So they will be essentially driving to

01:08:11:08 - 01:08:23:26

the to where the whole road meets the points of access there are. Um, I'm not sure if that answers your question or not. Um, but they would use use the use the road network to, to access those points of access.

01:08:27:07 - 01:08:28:18

But not from both ends.

01:08:28:24 - 01:08:31:19

And if you could just ask the question to me and then.

01:08:31:21 - 01:08:34:26

Yeah sorry. Is that from both ends.

01:08:36:05 - 01:08:37:20

Could you respond to that please.

01:08:45:05 - 01:09:08:18

Deputy of the applicant I not clear what we're saying is they're not able to drive along the whole road outside. Is that is that the is that the question you're asking? Are you saying are they allowed to drive? Drive along the Hall Road outside of those hours? Or are you asking if people are allowed to drive on the on the public highway network? Outside of those hours, I just try to clarify the question.

01:09:09:03 - 01:09:16:12

I think that was my understanding that you were asking if they were going to be driving along the public road network to get to the site.

01:09:18:11 - 01:09:20:23

And I think the answer from the applicant is yes.

01:09:22:06 - 01:09:29:22

Yes. So in order to arrive at site for 7 a.m., they will be traveling along the public network prior to them.

01:09:30:11 - 01:09:34:00

Thank you. And a question from Councillor Fairlie, please.

01:09:34:24 - 01:09:35:21

Thank you sir.

01:09:36:05 - 01:10:18:06

Um, the applicant stated that traffic would not be going through the village of Little Bromley, and I just feel it's very important for the residents that live outside of the immediate, the nucleus of the village. As such, there are outlying properties and the haul road does go directly behind several properties between Bentley Road and the substation site, and I for my residents. I just want to make sure that that is fully understood and that the applicant does do what they can to mitigate that, and the working hours would be helpful in line with what Essex County Council have said.

01:10:18:23 - 01:10:19:12

Thank you.

01:10:20:21 - 01:10:22:27

Thank you. Can you respond on that, please?

01:10:31:27 - 01:10:58:14

David Reed for the applicant. Um, so what we're looking at at the moment is making sure we keep the traffic on the south side of the cable route. So it's as far away from those properties. The property is just at the south of Payne's Lane. The properties, um, along Sprats Lane, I think it is. So we're looking to keep any of those heavy, noisy vehicles that are going to be, uh, running along the, the, the haul road as far away from, from those properties as we physically can do within the red line boundary.

01:11:03:20 - 01:11:34:10

I'd like to move on to the next question now. Um, in Essex County Council and Tendring District Council's response. Rep 2036 to excuse 17 .1.2 assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts. They are looking for a number of changes to the outline construction traffic management plan to include clarity on what pre commencement works will be covered by the plan. Approval of the plan would be by the Highway Authority.

01:11:34:25 - 01:11:56:13

Confirmation that the timing of heavy goods vehicle movements will be monitored and reported. Confirmation that a high proportion of the heavy goods vehicles will be equipped with Global Positioning System, or another suitable method to monitor routing from the applicant's response to local impact reports. Rep 2023. Item

01:11:58:12 - 01:12:24:05

4.3. We understand a meeting was proposed between the applicant and Essex County Council, and the latest update from Rep 338 was that the meeting was scheduled for 20th of March. Essex County Council advised whether the proposed changes to the outline construction traffic management plan for heavy goods vehicles were discussed at the meeting with the applicant, and, if so, has agreement been reached.

01:12:30:11 - 01:13:04:00

Joseph Hoff on behalf of Essex County Council. Um. Yes, I can confirm that. We had a meeting on the 20th of March and we had a subsequent meeting, um, on, uh, yes, Monday this week, I think either Monday or Tuesday. Um, did it further discuss some of the elements that we had talked about at the first meeting? Um, I would say we've requested some, um, amendments. We understand that generally those amendments will be made. There may be require some further discussion following those amendments to make sure they achieve what we think they will.

01:13:04:02 - 01:13:13:22

But as a general point, we are. We think we are close to reaching agreement on the document, subject to. A little bit more work, essentially.

01:13:15:26 - 01:13:20:03

Thank you. And will those matters be covered in the statement of common ground?

01:13:23:05 - 01:13:31:20

Within this. I chase it off on behalf of the county Council. Yes. The statement of common ground will cover the position with regards to the CMP.

01:13:34:18 - 01:13:35:08

Thank you.

01:13:38:05 - 01:13:41:08

Any other comments from interested parties?

01:13:45:08 - 01:13:48:05

Um. Could the applicant respond on that, please?

01:13:50:10 - 01:14:23:25

Sam Taylor for the applicant. Just to reiterate what my staff said, we've had productive meetings on the 20th and, um, we provided a sort of detailed response to points raised by Essex County Council and a further meeting on the 31st. And I think we're, uh, broadly aligned on most matters now. Um, Essex obviously requested, um, updates and updates to the outline construction traffic management plan, as have National Highways. Um, we've been making those, um, updates in the background.

01:14:24:06 - 01:14:32:14

Um, uh, and we will submit, uh, updated outline construction traffic management plan at deadline for.

01:14:35:08 - 01:14:41:28

I should say we'll also, um, include to include the latest additions in an update to the statement of Common Ground.

01:14:43:18 - 01:14:44:07

Thank you.

01:14:46:24 - 01:15:30:14

Um, next question then, uh, National Highways Response Rep 2049 to SSC 17 .1.2. Assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts. Includes a request for a mechanism to be put in place so that both heavy goods vehicles and light vehicle flows can be managed should be assessed, worst case scenario be exceeded, i.e. avoidance of peak hours, etc.. Furthermore, National Highways comments on responses to SSC rep 3053 proposes four changes to the outline construction Traffic Management Plan reference app 251, which includes comments on heavy goods vehicle trips.

01:15:31:13 - 01:15:43:02

Um, what is the applicant's response regarding these proposed changes for the HGV trips? Sorry, those heavy goods vehicle trips being incorporated into the outline construction traffic management plan.

01:15:48:13 - 01:16:21:18

Some say for the applicant. We've, um, we've reviewed National Highways comments. We believe, um, there are minor, um, wording updates that National highways are requested to. A number of bullet points, um, which again, we've um, we've been tracking in and um, proposed to submit an update to those at deadline for to incorporate those comments. Um, we will also try to seek a meeting with National Highways prior to that to, um, to just confirm agreement on those matters.

01:16:23:03 - 01:16:28:15

Thank you. Thank you. And can I invite Mr. Bloom online if you if you have any further comments?

01:16:30:11 - 01:16:56:26

Jeremy Bloom, National Highways. Um, no, I think I'm confident that we'll reach agreement. Um, as Mr. Taylor said, I think we're looking at relatively small changes to the, um, TMP, um, and I welcome, Um, the comments about the changes, um, to be submitted for divorce and would welcome a meeting in advance of that as well to discuss those changes.

01:16:57:24 - 01:17:02:14

Thank you. And are you able to provide an update on the progress with the statement of Common Ground?

01:17:04:15 - 01:17:10:10

Um, yes. We we haven't got a statement of common ground in place yet

01:17:12:10 - 01:17:14:24

formally. I think there's a draft.

01:17:15:15 - 01:17:21:19

Okay. And could I ask the applicant when when they envisage the draft will be issued, please?

01:17:23:07 - 01:17:35:19

Gordon Campbell for the applicant. Um, uh, our intention is to to transmit a draft. The deadline for. But noting there's the meeting beforehand. It might be the case that's submitted by deadline five, but we'll seek to submit it. Deadline for.

01:17:36:07 - 01:17:36:26

Thank you.

01:17:38:27 - 01:17:41:18

Any other comments from interested parties?

01:17:44:20 - 01:17:45:08

Okay.

01:17:49:06 - 01:18:03:17

So the third bullet point then is whether the personnel travel measures identified in the outline construction traffic management plan would be sufficiently robust, precise and enforceable to support the assumptions for single occupancy vehicles.

01:18:05:24 - 01:18:07:11

Occupancy vehicle trips.

01:18:09:19 - 01:18:49:11

In Essex County Council and Tendring District Council's response. Rep 2036 to excuse 17 .1.2 assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts. They refer to changes they've requested in their Local Impact report. Rep 1065 to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan. App 251, which include further commitments towards monitoring of staff mode share and commitments towards achieving at least the 1.5 persons Car share ratio or equivalent sustainable travel percentage with aspirations for higher proportions.

01:18:49:28 - 01:19:00:23

A review process to ensure the staff exhibit the shift patterns or if they do not, the impacts are not material. Provision of monitoring reports to the Highway Authority

01:19:02:09 - 01:19:16:18

Essex County Council advise whether the proposed changes to the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan for personnel travel were discussed at the meeting scheduled with the applicant for the 20th of March and, if so, has agreement been reached.

01:19:18:27 - 01:19:56:29

Joseph, on behalf of Essex County Council. Yes, this item was discussed. Um, we we I, we haven't reached agreement on the end point, but I think we've reached agreement that on the that there will be some form of process, uh, to or mechanism that the applicant will propose to us that will, um, achieve the thrust of, I think, of what we're trying to achieve. And then for us to review and comment on, um, as appropriate at that time, I think we're in broad kind of agreement on the general principles of it, but the exact, um, kind of process or mechanism is to be, um, further discussed.

01:19:57:22 - 01:19:58:11

Thank you.

01:20:01:22 - 01:20:12:17

Thank you. And, um, you mentioned before about, um, the statement of common ground, um, covering the any changes to the traffic management plan as well.

01:20:14:10 - 01:20:25:06

Yes. Joseph, for the rest of county council. Yes. Um, I, um, although I'm not involved in the drafting of the statement of common ground, it should cover the whether the we reached agreement on the TMP.

01:20:26:22 - 01:20:30:24

Okay. Thank you. Any other interested parties have any comments?

01:20:34:23 - 01:20:35:08

Uh, Mr..

01:20:36:27 - 01:20:48:06

Sir, any incentive, uh, going to be offered to your employees to use, um, electric vehicles. Considering what we're dealing with here.

01:20:50:29 - 01:20:52:25

Could the applicant respond, please?

01:21:06:02 - 01:21:10:15

Um, I think that's one we'll take away and come back to you in, in, uh, in writing on.

01:21:14:29 - 01:21:16:05

Uh, Mr. Blythe again.

01:21:16:08 - 01:21:27:26

I asked the question, given the fact that we were transported around the site yesterday in a diesel engine bus that was hired and came from Cambridge, not a local one.

01:21:31:14 - 01:21:33:12

The applicant respond to that, please.

01:21:35:09 - 01:21:55:00

The applicant am conscious that this agenda item is about vehicle sharing and the measures that are to be put in place to, um, encourage vehicle sharing and reducing the number of vehicle trips. So we've made a note to come back in writing in relation to, um,

01:21:56:21 - 01:22:09:06

the use of electric vehicles by contractors and, and staff on the project. So we'll come back on on that particular point. I'm not sure the arrangements for the accompanied site visit are relevant to that particular point.

01:22:11:09 - 01:22:12:10

Thank you, Miss Broderick.

01:22:16:04 - 01:22:51:14

And the next question then, is National Highways Response Rep 2049 to SSC 17 .1.2. Assessment of Onshore Traffic and Transport Impacts includes requests for more targeted and robust travel plan measures and incentives to be incorporated into the Outline Construction Traffic management plan. If the principal contractor does not, sorry. If the principal contractor does require more employees to travel during peak hours, national highways should be consulted and the scope of any required further capacity assessments agreed.

01:22:52:04 - 01:23:28:23

A mechanism to be put in place so that light vehicle flows can be managed should be assessed, worst case scenario, be exceeded by avoidance of peak hours, etc.. As discussed in question five. National highways comments on responses to SSC one Rep 3053 proposes four changes to the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan, which includes staff trips. And so, following on from the earlier question, does the applicant have any specific comments in relation to the proposed changes for personnel travel being incorporated into the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan?

01:23:34:09 - 01:23:37:13

Sam Tyler for the applicant. I think I'll just reiterate that, um,

01:23:39:03 - 01:24:15:21

or maybe make the point that, um, the construction traffic or the outline construction traffic management plan includes travel planning measures, um, that would be applied to, um, reduce the number of single occupancy vehicle trips. Um, just for sort of some context, we've applied that, uh, a ratio of one and a half employees per vehicle, um, which is equates to a 67% car driver percentage and some that's, uh, greater than that applied for tendering or that's achieved for tendering in general.

01:24:15:23 - 01:24:49:07

So we've gone beyond, um, in terms of commitments. What what's established baseline and the outline construction traffic management plan then includes details of how, um, of the range of measures that would be adopted to, to achieve that. Um, I know again, there was, uh, National requested some minor, um, updates to the outline construction traffic management plan, and I think I've already sort of responded on that point. Happy to again, to sort of clarify matters if there's something else.

01:24:51:05 - 01:24:54:24

Thank you. And, Mr. Bloom, did you want to have any comments?

01:24:55:20 - 01:25:17:12

Um, Jeremy Bloom, National highways. Um, I don't think there's anything further, um, to add at this point, but obviously look forward to seeing the, um, changes that have been made to the OC, TMP and, and for the meeting, to the meeting that we're going to have with the applicant. Um, hopefully, um, our concerns have all been addressed.

01:25:19:02 - 01:25:22:20

Thank you, Mr. Bloom. Any other interested parties?

01:25:24:09 - 01:25:24:25

Um.

01:25:30:00 - 01:25:35:16

Sorry I've lost a piece of paper. Um. Tendring district councillor, Mr..

01:25:35:22 - 01:26:07:29

Mr. Yasmin Jacob for Tendring district council. So, um, I mean, I'm mindful that we we're not going to return to this, to this item and, um, just on behalf of the of of the local residents, there are just two areas that we just want clarity on. Um, so in terms of the question under bullet point two, on the 3.3, the question is whether the proposed mitigation to limit heavy goods vehicle numbers would be sufficiently robust, precise and enforceable, or whether provision should be made for any additional mitigation measures.

01:26:08:01 - 01:26:38:01

So the we in consultation with local people, we've picked up two areas that I just want to highlight to the panel, if I may. Yeah. So one is the booking system. Um, so in the in the outline construction management plan, the applicant's referring to a booking system that will but that booking system only deals with Deliveries. Um, so HGV movements, um, so it doesn't deal with, with like general construction traffic.

01:26:38:03 - 01:26:52:25

So um, HGV movements that will be generated both individually and collectively when the other projects are taken into account, will, will not all be to do with deliveries. Right. So so we um.

01:26:55:18 - 01:27:28:27

So so so basically that's an area of preciseness or uncertainty for locals. Um, and then in, in response to the booking system and what it is seeking to achieve. Um, again, the applicant states in the construction management plan that if there if any potential exceedances of the delivery numbers outlined in appendix B are identified the the TMC or TMC. Oh, I think that's the coordination officer for them. Um, for North Falls will then liaise with five estuaries only.

01:27:29:06 - 01:28:05:06

Not. It says, well, liaise with five estuaries to reschedule deliveries to ensure the cumulative numbers are not exceeded. So there's another unknown there for locals because, um, you know, the, the authority responsible for enforcing, you know, heavy goods vehicle vehicle numbers, uh, will not know if there's going to be an exceedance in delivery numbers unless unless there is a specific requirement in place to inform the responsible authority, um, you know, responsible for enforcement.

01:28:06:11 - 01:28:13:25

Um, so again, there's, there's an area there that's imprecise and unenforceable unless there is that requirement.

01:28:15:13 - 01:28:15:28

So.

01:28:19:17 - 01:28:52:24

Uh, then in terms of HGV movements, again, we've picked up in the applicant's Submission that the, uh, in terms of HGV movements along the A120 and Bentley and the Bentley Road improvement work. So they are, uh, saying, um, during the peak there will be 50 HGV trips per day, um, and otherwise an average of 20 uh HGV trips per day and then under, under a separate eating called associated pig movements and routing.

01:28:53:05 - 01:29:17:07

This is for landfall onshore cable route and onshore substation. Peak HGV movements will be 605 HGV trips per day. That's inclusive of contingencies for incidental deliveries. Uh peak LV movements that will be 1346 employee trips, uh, and 898 LV trips per day.

01:29:19:24 - 01:30:06:00

So the Tendring do not dispute these numbers, but I think it's clear to everyone that that these, that the HGV movements will be considerable. Um, and there's, there's again confusion um, in terms of there will be a great deal of confusion for locals. Um, in terms of the combination effects, I know we're going to talk about that tomorrow, but I think it's important to to just mention it now. Um, because it will be impossible for, for, for the responsible authority or the, the authority responsible for enforcement to, to determine or to differentiate between HGV numbers for this project in combination with other projects.

01:30:07:01 - 01:30:18:02

So, so to conclude and to bring this to, to bring this to a real, real life experience for, for locals, um.

01:30:21:22 - 01:30:22:09

Let's say.

01:30:25:17 - 01:30:58:29

We accept that HGV movements won't go straight through Little Bromley. That wasn't the point I was trying to make earlier. But if you are a local resident living in Little Bromley or on the outskirts of Little Bromley, or to the east of Ardley, or anywhere in that countryside in between, I think it's fair to say you've got no idea what's coming in terms of vehicle numbers and HGV numbers, and that that in itself makes those, those HGV movements, um, imprecise and unenforceable.

01:30:59:20 - 01:31:00:12

Thank you.

01:31:01:09 - 01:31:24:21

So just for clarification, Mr. Asma, have you put forward or will you put forward say in writing at deadline for any additional mitigation and specific requirements or, uh, drafting changes to management plans that you believe are necessary to make what? What is anticipated enforceable.

01:31:25:23 - 01:31:41:06

Jake, if you are tendering the city council. So so we have made all these points in our local impact report. And this is, you know, the clarification and the elaboration just provided is in response to, to the question under bullet point two.

01:31:41:12 - 01:31:44:29

But that's that's right. So is there any any I mean that

01:31:46:23 - 01:32:06:22

sorry. That bullet point refers to additional mitigation measures in addition to what you've already set out in the list. Are are there any other drafting changes or requirements that you are seeking, or do we refer back to the lawyer for what you are seeking?

01:32:07:03 - 01:32:14:29

We yeah, you need to. Sorry, Jacob. You are from for Tendring District Council. Uh, yeah. We would request you to refer back to our local impact report.

01:32:15:01 - 01:32:20:29

No. Thank you. I just wanted to clarify, there was no additional Drafting or requirements that you were looking for.

01:32:24:11 - 01:32:29:22

Thank you, Mr. Yasmeen. Um, could the applicant respond to the points raised, please?

01:32:39:17 - 01:33:18:21

Um, Sam Taylor for the applicant again. So I see a number of number of points raised, and I'll try and, um, remember that. I'll try and cover each of them. Um, in terms of sort of firstly in terms of employees, um, the outline construction traffic management plan includes, uh, appendix A and B, which uh, outline targets for um numbers of HGVs but also um employee vehicles. So and the outline

construction traffic management plan again includes details of how those those numbers for both employees but also employee vehicles and heavy goods vehicles will be monitored.

01:33:19:05 - 01:33:56:26

So I think that's that point. And equally, um, how any nonconformity would be, would be addressed just in terms of the booking system. The, the intention of the booking system is, is there to proactively, um, prevent exceedances by um, planning deliveries in advance. So by framing, um, the targets in terms of number of uh vehicles that would be permitted, the, the contractor is then able to plan deliveries and advance to effectively, uh, proactively prevent that.

01:33:56:28 - 01:34:43:07

But uh, any any exceedance but equally, it's that's one part of the process. The others are about monitoring those numbers at gate um, through, for example, uh, automatic number plate recognition, uh, vehicle tracking or gate counts Accounts and that information. Um, we again, we've made within the outline construction traffic management plan, made the commitment to producing a monthly monitoring report. And those in that information on vehicle numbers, HGV employees would be shared with um the highway authorities, um, to allow them to, to audit that, that um, so there is a the process in there to, to manage numbers, to monitor them and to report on them.

01:34:44:05 - 01:35:24:16

Um, and then that's the thing that sort of deals with the point around informing authorities and equally enforceability, um, those that includes, um, we recognize that there is, uh, no falls and sort of five estuaries are number of scenarios sort of intrinsically linked in the elements of shared shared infrastructure. So, um, that that is the point in terms of um, speaking to five estuaries to make sure that, um, there is alignment so that the, the so appendix B is the scenario within sorry within the outline construction traffic management plan.

01:35:24:18 - 01:35:41:04

To be clear, there is an appendix B which includes traffic numbers for a scenario where um, North Falls and five estuaries are constructed concurrently. So allows um the two contractors to um liaise to make sure that there aren't exceedances,

01:35:42:23 - 01:36:19:15

uh, in terms of comments about differentiating HDTVs. Again, we've made commitments in terms of, um, vehicle tracking. So there's a way of that. Equally, there are other things within the construction traffic management and in terms of, uh, vehicle identification, so that vehicles can be identified from one another and allow people to report, um, the other point I would note is, um, within a update, within the proposed update to the outline construction and traffic management plan we have been discussing with Essex County Council as a local authority.

01:36:20:00 - 01:36:24:03

Um, a transport working group, which would, um,

01:36:26:00 - 01:36:28:13

effectively look to, um,

01:36:30:02 - 01:36:52:20

opportunities for coordinating between projects and managing sort of cumulative effects. Um, so establishing that group and inviting um, for example, five ish five estuaries, uh, Norwich, Tilbury to, to that group, a method of uh, sort of managing those, those cumulative effects moving forward. Um,

01:36:54:18 - 01:36:55:07

I think,

01:36:56:28 - 01:37:15:21

I think that sort of covered most of the points that are made, but, um, probably be helpful if they were to have those in, in writing, we can respond to those and how they're there. Um, so noting that I think we're close to alignment with Essex County Council highways on on matters in the construction traffic management plan.

01:37:16:02 - 01:37:16:17

Okay.

01:37:16:21 - 01:37:42:03

Thank you. And just to add, um, we've obviously mentioned that we're updating the outline construction traffic management plan for deadline for, um, if Tendring District Council have some specific drafting that they would like included once they've seen those updates that we're making to take into account comments from Essex and National Highways, then if they could provide that, then we'd obviously more than happy to consider any specific drafting changes that they would like to see. Thank you.

01:37:44:27 - 01:38:21:03

Sam. I love that. Apologies. One more point I noted. Um, and that was just in relation to needing to understand vehicle numbers. Um, I'd just direct, um, the council to table 20 716 of the, um, Traffic and transport chapter, which is, which includes details of the peak and average numbers of construction vehicles for every link within the study area and equally. Table 2730 of the Environmental Statement Track and Transport chapter, which includes details of the numbers of vehicles and HGVs.

01:38:21:05 - 01:38:32:15

Again, for every link within the Traffic and Transport Study area for the construction of North Falls and five estuaries currently and the in that app. Zero 41.

01:38:36:15 - 01:38:44:11

Thank you. Um, Mr.. Yasmin, um, the question about whether you wanted to provide any additional comments.

01:38:47:22 - 01:38:51:10

Jacob, you are from Tendring District Council. No further comments. Thank you.

01:38:54:02 - 01:38:58:06

Uh, sorry regarding providing those comments in writing.

01:38:58:23 - 01:39:07:18

Apologies, Jacob for tendering district Council. Yes, we will be submitting our comments and our suggestions as part of the deadline for.

01:39:07:24 - 01:39:12:16

Okay. Thank you. Um, I think rather than go on to the next section.

01:39:15:00 - 01:39:28:02

Okay. That's fine. Um, so we'll continue on to the next bullet point then, which is whether the mitigation would be adequate for the outstanding risks associated with abnormal indivisible load proposals.

01:39:30:08 - 01:40:01:13

National Highways Response Rep 2049 to excuse 17 .1. 11. Um. Update on the level of risk in respect of the use of heavy, abnormal, indivisible loads on the A120 from Harwich. Includes that a more detailed assessment would be undertaken by the applicant's consultants of the expected loadings, and the potential mitigation that could be provided to assure National Highways that the proposed abnormal indivisible loads would be able to operate safely on the A120.

01:40:02:14 - 01:40:25:12

In the applicant's comments in response to written questions. Rep 3036. It states that further information needs to be submitted to National Highways, and this will be discussed in future meeting on this topic during examination, and a further update will be provided at an appropriate future deadline. Could the applicant provide an update on when the detailed assessment

01:40:27:07 - 01:40:32:26

will be available, including any insights if a draft version of the report has been completed?

01:40:39:08 - 01:41:00:29

David Reid for the applicant. So myself and my counterpart at Five Estuaries have been holding regular meetings with Mr. Bloom from National Highways and other members of the National Highways staff to try and understand the mitigation measures required from that. A report has been provided to National Highways, and we're just discussing any of the comments associated with that report at the moment between ourselves.

01:41:02:19 - 01:41:06:01

Thank you. Mr. bloom, do you have any comments on that?

01:41:08:24 - 01:41:42:00

Um, yes. Well, no, nothing further really. Apart from we're close to agreement on, um, on this issue. Um, I don't foresee any problems going forward. We've we've reached agreement with, um, five estuaries, and I think we just need to formally close this out with, um, with the applicant here. Uh, and, um, we'd also like to see some, um, some words in the, uh, the act MP along the lines of what, um, what was inserted for five estuaries.

01:41:42:02 - 01:41:44:23

But I don't foresee any further issues.

01:41:46:03 - 01:41:51:09

Thank you. Um, could we have an update at deadline for on this matter? Yeah.

01:41:52:27 - 01:42:24:15

Um, sometimes the applicant, again, just to pick up on Mr. Bloom's, um, point. Um, we're aware of the, um, revisions that went into the CMP for five estuaries. And again, we've tracked that into the working version of our CMP and are proposing to submit that at a deadline for clearing. And we'll just discuss that with National Highways. Make sure we're happy, happy with that before that's submitted. And that will be captured within the update to the construction traffic management plan deadline for and also the statement of Common Ground.

01:42:26:03 - 01:42:29:04

Thank you. Any other interested parties? Any comments?

01:42:33:13 - 01:43:08:00

Okay. Uh, next question. In Essex County Council and Tendring District Councils response rep 2036 to execute 17.1.2 assessment of onshore traffic and transport impacts. They refer to changes they've requested in their local impact report. Rep. 10652 The Outline Construction Traffic management plan An AP 251, which include timing of any abnormal, indivisible lobe movements through Colchester to be off peak.

01:43:08:19 - 01:43:21:03

Could Essex County Council advise whether the proposed changes to the outline Construction traffic management plan for abnormal indivisible loads were discussed at the meeting on the 20th of March and, if so, has agreement been reached?

01:43:23:14 - 01:43:48:23

Joseph Hall on behalf of Essex County Council. Yes, this matter was discussed. Um, they the applicant talked us through the process that is kind of already set out in the Oct MP. We've requested what what we think is um, fairly minor amendment to that text relating to consideration of structures, which I don't think will be an issue for either party. And the subject of that, I think we're we're content on this matter.

01:43:50:25 - 01:43:54:26

Thank you. Any other comments and other interested parties?

01:43:58:04 - 01:44:01:01

And as the applicant got any further comments?

01:44:03:25 - 01:44:15:07

Sam Taylor for the applicant, just again, to reiterate what Mr. Hoff said, um, I've had those discussions with um align broadly aligned on that. I'll be submitting that update to the outline construction traffic management plan deadline for.

01:44:16:05 - 01:44:17:01

Okay. Thank you.

01:44:19:00 - 01:44:42:10

Um, last question before the break then. Um, Suffolk County Council, in its response. Rep 3068 regarding the outline construction Traffic Management plan reference app 251 we'd like to see updated wording which commits the applicant to stakeholder engagement and route assessment prior to notification of abnormal indivisible load deliveries.

01:44:44:11 - 01:44:52:05

Um, what is the applicant's position regarding this proposed change being incorporated into the Outline Construction Traffic Management plan?

01:44:54:18 - 01:45:34:04

Sam Taylor for the applicant. Um. We have, um, included a revision to the outline construction traffic management plan that was, um, was submitted to revision two, which includes, um, a commitment by the applicant to, um, go beyond the, um, established processes. Uh, so that's beyond the established process. Um, so that would include an initial step where the contractor would consult with, uh, Essex Police, the relevant highway authorities, and Network Rail to agree appropriate timing routes and asset protection measures for the type of load.

01:45:34:06 - 01:46:19:16

And that process applies. And we've ensured that that process applies to the administration areas through which the loads will traverse. So that would include, um, for example, if an abnormal load was to come from Suffolk, that would require the contractor to first consult with um, Suffolk County Council, um, as well as Essex and National Highways to understand, um, any, any concerns, any um, for example, there's any structures of concern if there are any, um, routes they wish not to use or any particular restrictions on timing, that process would then, um, feed into the formal, um, process, which is the Arsdale.

01:46:19:18 - 01:46:46:07

So electronic service delivery for abnormal loads, it's normally shortened to um, which is the process prescribed by um National Highways who administer abnormal load movements on behalf of the Secretary of State. So we believe what we've added in is an additional, um, step before sort of formal added our process, which, um, we believe um, addresses the comments made by Suffolk County Council.

01:46:47:19 - 01:47:04:25

Clare, the applicant. And just to confirm that that was in the deadline three version of the GMP, which is what the tracked version is. Rep 3-022. And that additional wording went in. What is a new paragraph 43 in case you're trying to find the reference.

01:47:07:12 - 01:47:10:05

Thank you. Any comments from Suffolk County Council?

01:47:11:13 - 01:47:17:19

Thank you sir. I think I'd like to bring in my virtual colleagues now at this point. And they've got their hands raised as well. Thank you.

01:47:21:16 - 01:47:54:08

Hello. Good afternoon. Steve Merry on behalf of Suffolk County Council. So firstly, we welcome the additional evidence that the applicant has put before us, particularly the abnormal load abnormal invisible load access report wreck 108, which suggests the route the movements will be from Harwich to the site. And that that encompasses all non-essential movements. So we welcome that. And we then also welcome the changes to the wording that the applicant will consult Suffolk if loads are to travel through Suffolk.

01:47:54:20 - 01:48:28:05

But I would caution that with a few matters. Yesterday I was very much a booking process. What it does not do is it does not assess any impacts associated with those movements. Uh, the critical thing from our perspective is if loads are moved from the West Dock in the Port of Ipswich, they travelled down the A1 37 across a bridge called Ostrich Creek that is subject from memory to a restriction. Any movements over studio3 in terms of weight require an overbridge.

01:48:28:22 - 01:48:45:23

So we have an A-Class road which requires an overbridge each time a load is moved, which requires closure of that road for around about 24 hours. So while we welcome the changes, um, to the wording, we will add some comments in our response to this deadline just to

01:48:47:21 - 01:49:10:09

elaborate on our concerns and why we have raised this issue. And I'd also just point out that, again, Estelle is a booking system. However, authorities can and do refuse to accept meetings on their network if there is a problem with the structure. And I would add that it's actually been an issue we've experienced with movements to and from sites or in recent weeks.

01:49:14:20 - 01:49:19:10

Thank you. Any other comments from interested parties?

01:49:23:25 - 01:49:26:10

It's the applicant. Got any comments on those points?

01:49:28:21 - 01:49:54:06

The applicant just before I hand over to Mr. Taylor again, what I would say is if Suffolk County Council would like to see some specific drafting, then be grateful if they could provide that instead of I know they're going to set out their their concerns in writing, but if they would like to see specific drafting changes to the outline. CMP then be grateful if those could be provided as well. Thank you. Detail and argument.

01:49:55:29 - 01:50:33:05

Sometimes for the applicant just to, um, maybe clarify. Um, I accept Mr. Merit points in terms of, uh, SDL being a sort of booking process and that that is, um, the reason for the inclusion of the additional,

the additional paragraph. So, um, whilst I suppose my experience and reality of, um, consenting abnormal load movements pose concern is that hauliers are very much aware of the need to, um, get agreement in principle before movement of abnormal loads to understand if there are structures, um, of concern.

01:50:33:17 - 01:51:07:04

Um, this is what these paragraphs are seeking to do. So um, highlights that they also would need to engage with, for example, Suffolk County Council structures to understand if there are structures of concern And along the affected routes, and what mitigation may need to be put in place. Or equally alternative routes, uh, need to be put in place. So I would reiterate Miss Broderick's comments, if there are particular changes required to those paragraphs, would be keen to understand. But we believe we've we've addressed Suffolk County Council's comments with with those additional points.

01:51:07:06 - 01:51:18:17

But equally, there are alternative routes we've shown to work that avoids Suffolk County Council's network and, um, the bridge. Bridge, that's for example, that's been noted as a concern.

01:51:20:09 - 01:51:31:05

Thank you. That's helpful. Could I just clarify then if if you need to receive further comments from from Mr. Mary, what would you believe that you you're fully aware of all the issues he's raised.

01:51:32:15 - 01:51:54:03

The budget for the applicant. Um, we believe we're aware of the issues that have been raised and are drafting at paragraph 43 was intended to address those. So for if, um, Suffolk County Council would like some further drafting added to. To that then we happily to. To consider that but our. Our position is we feel we've addressed the point. With that new drafting okay.

01:51:54:05 - 01:52:00:10

Thank you. And could we just go back to Mr. Murray just to check that his understanding is the same?

01:52:04:24 - 01:52:16:01

Uh, Steve Murray, on behalf of Suffolk County Council, we will take that away if we consider we need to or suggest any changes to the Oct MP. We'll do so at the next deadline.

01:52:17:16 - 01:52:20:19

Okay. Thank you and Miss Broderick, any further comments?

01:52:23:20 - 01:52:24:06

Okay.

01:52:26:24 - 01:52:39:18

Um, let's reach the end of that section. So we're going to take we're going to, um, adjourn for a 15 minute break. Now. Um, so we'll be back at 1558 or thereabouts.