



Hearing Transcript

Project:	East Park Energy
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Part 2
Date:	18 March 2026

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.

AUDIO_EASTPARKENERGY_ISH2_SESSION2_180326

Fri, Mar 20, 2026 10:39AM • 2:01:27

00:10

The time is now 330 and this meeting is restarting. Please, could a member of the case team confirm that it can be heard clearly and that live streaming and recording has started.

00:26

Okay,

00:29

so if I could move on to Item five, construction traffic and ask the applicant to explain so overall approach to this item, please. Thank you. Uh

00:44

Tom rosebag, on behalf of the applicant, we're just preparing for loading up a figure to share on screen, which will be available in a moment.

01:32

Good afternoon, sir. My name's Lee Kendall. I work for axis on behalf of the applicant.

01:40

So I've just shared a screen

01:44

PDF onto the screen, rather that shows

01:48

a single overview on one plan of the overall construction strategy.

01:56

This will be shared with you in due course.

02:00

I hope it makes things easier to see.

02:06

So the main site tax, the main site construction compound, will be situated within Site D,

02:18

which is here on the right hand side of the image

02:22

in yellow.

02:26

This this is also taken from the Indicative construction access and compounds plan, which is a PP, 125,

02:36

access to this compound will be taken via a new priority junction to be constructed onto the B, 645,

02:46

which is labeled as access sa, 16, as illustrated on the proposed site accesses plan, which is a, p, p, 124,

02:58

this is referred To within the submission as the main site access.

03:04

Now,

03:06

as a general overarching principle, the majority of construction related traffic will access the site via this main site access, sa 16, and then effectively fan out westwards through a series of internal tracks,

03:23

only needing to go back on to and off the public highway in a few isolated areas, so situated mostly away from nearby settlements. As far as practicable,

03:36

there will be a number of smaller satellite compounds in sites A, B and C, the details of which are also shown in a P, P 125,

03:46

and which are discussed in the outline construction traffic management plan. Which is a P, P 156,

03:57

the nine satellite compounds would be smaller in scale and nature than the main construction compound in Site D, and would provide additional offices and welfare facilities that are more localized to the areas of activity in each site area

04:14

turning back to the main site access, it is proposed to all Construction traffic, including HGVs and construction staff vehicles will be routed to the main site access along the B, 645,

04:28

from the A, one at Sun yet. So I don't know if you can see my cursor, sir. It comes along here to here.

04:40

No construction vehicles will travel to the site from the A 14 or from any other junction on the

04:49

A one. And at the request of Cambridge, a county council Highway Authority, all HGV traffic will be directed to use the northbound exit and entry slip road at.

05:00

Only at the A one junction, so as to avoid passing through the residential areas that Eaton Ford. So it's effectively the western side of the A one the unbound and off slips,

05:17

as mentioned earlier, in order to minimize the impact on neighboring settlements. In particular, Stoughton highway and Grace daughton, a series of temporary access roads will be constructed through the site to allow construction traffic to access this access sites C, B and A from Site D by routing through the main site access

05:39

without requiring wide scale use of the public highway as far as practicable, and the connection between Site D and C will require a single crossing point over more road, which is accesses sa 14 and sa 15, which is here,

05:59

from Site C, which is here.

06:03

And in order to avoid large volumes of construction traffic passing through great Stoughton, a temporary access track will be constructed, which will connect to the existing access junction with the xantra Business Park. We're labeling that as sa 12. So

06:21

that is there where I'm pointing. Now on my cursor, I'll try and zoom in a bit.

06:31

And now that connects to great Thornton road to the west of great Staunton village. Therefore construction traffic will bypass that village. This access is of a suitable standard to accommodate HGV movements

06:45

from Access sa 12, the vehicles will travel westwards along great Stoughton road for approximately one kilometer as far as Spring Hill Road here,

06:58

they would then travel south along a widened Spring Hill Road for approximately 330, meters as far as access sa 10,

07:10

which goes into site access into site area B, rather

07:18

now

07:21

between Site B and Site A,

07:26

vehicles would be routed westwards via the internal access roads crossing green end close to lodge farm, which is accesses sa seven and Sa eight here

07:40

and as far as the b6 60 Kim Bolton Road, which is SA two

07:48

here

07:49

at the b6 60 vehicles will travel northwards along the public highway for approximately only 70 meters before accessing Site A using the existing Manor farm access junction, which is SA one here,

08:04

so they do come onto the highway for 70 meters there.

08:20

Now departing vehicles would obviously follow the same route in reverse.

08:27

Site B also has a number of

08:31

other site accesses which would be much well, which would be much less well used, and which would require construction traffic to use short sections of the public highway along green and

08:44

access sa oh nine and great Stoughton road via green end, which is accesses sa three,

08:52

sa four,

08:54

sa five and sa Six. So this blue area here

09:02

in order to minimize the number of construction staff members around the site, it is proposed that a fleet of mini busses will be provided to transport workers from the main construction compound in Site D to the outlying site areas, and by maximizing use of the internal system of tracks

09:19

in terms of construction traffic, trip generation, the assumed breakdown of the numbers of HGVs and construction staff that would be required throughout the construction phase has been calculated based on the estimated materials required. Basically a first principles approach the

09:36

trip generation, for calculations forecast that HGV movements would be greatest during the first three months of the construction phase, and this would be associated with the delivery of aggregate for the construction of access, tracks, compounds and foundations, and peaking in month two

09:55

during this period, there will be a maximum of 62 way he view movements.

10:00

Per day along the B, 645,

10:03

26, two way movements along great Stoughton Road in Spring Hill and 10. Two way movements along the b6 60,

10:12

there would be a requirement for approximately 500 construction staff per day on average across the 430 month construction period,

10:21

the period of activity requiring the maximum number of staff on site would occur in month 12, when there would be a maximum of approximately 854 staff per day.

10:33

Construction activity would occur between 8am and 6pm on weekdays and 8am and 1pm on Saturdays with no activity on Sundays. In this way, construction traffic would be taking place outside of the typical highway peak hours of eight till nine, and five till six.

10:52

And the current draft of the outline construction traffic management plan, which is a PP, 156,

11:00

sets out the manner in which construction traffic would operate and be managed in the more more detail. I should note that this document is currently under review in response to some of the relevant representations, and is due to be updated by deadline one. And

11:18

that concludes the initial presentation.

11:25

Okay, thank you.

11:29

Just in terms of your comment about the majority of

11:35

site vehicles heading towards Site D

11:42

and then being dispersed through different routes and accesses. So could you put a percentage on the overall number of vehicles that will principally just Visit Site D,

11:59

rather than the whole of the site?

12:03

Yeah, it's the overwhelming majority.

12:10

The aim is generally to avoid impacting settlements as much as possible. So there will be some movements that have to go directly to the other accesses. And we think that these will be at the initial stages of the construction program,

12:29

and they will be engaged in activities such as the initial improvement or formation of site accesses where needed, or the opening and closing of security gates and setting up of traffic management, that those things, I mean, the aim is to get to a position where,

12:46

whilst all of the movements are going in and out of the main site access and therefore avoiding impact on local people.

12:55

Okay, thank you.

12:59

Just in terms of setting updating the outline construction traffic management plan,

13:07

section 4.5, provides details of sustainable travel options for construction workers.

13:17

And note the noted that construction workers will be encouraged to use or consider sustainable travel measures.

13:28

And I also note references to say sustainable travel options

13:34

in table 16.3,

13:37

of chapter 16,

13:41

where it says promoted or provided.

13:50

Will it how will it be enforced? Is really my question,

13:56

to limit the numbers to the absolute minimum

14:02
and so

14:05
this, this may actually be something that the update to the ctmp will assist you with, right? Okay, we are proposing to provide a new appendix to that document, which will be an outline construction workers travel plan,

14:22
which will hopefully provide reassurance

14:27
on how we will try and encourage and enforce

14:32
Yes. Thank you.

14:35
Yeah. Sorry. Just to add, we have already shared a draft of that document with the local highway authorities and national highways. The document has been prepared principally in response to the relevant representation from national highways. Okay, thanks.

14:55
Paragraph 4.211,

14:57
of the outline construction traffic.

15:00
Management Plan also refers to the abnormal load route and management

15:08
I know it states that has been appropriate due diligence made for structures along the route.

15:15
However,

15:17
could you please confirm that route has been tracked when geo vehicles can maneuver around tight bends without damaging hedgerows

15:26
and any other vegetation,

15:33
just one second. Please do

15:43

so

15:45

appendix, a of the ctmp document, contains a report produced by a specialist sub consultant called wins, who are one of the UK's best

15:58

consultants of this sort of thing, and

16:04

they have not produced a tracking diagram of the ai ai I vehicle, because they've essentially concluded that that isn't needed based on their route assessment.

16:19

I can't pretend to summarize the entirety of that document here,

16:25

so all of the abnormal loads heading towards Site D,

16:32

and is that why they Haven't been tracked,

16:36

essentially. So okay, thank you.

16:42

Section 3.2 of the outline construction traffic management plan references the establishment of a Community Liaison Group, which it says membership to include parish councils, businesses and local community groups. But I'd just like ask if, how would individuals be included within the establishment of such a group like that might be something you want to take away, and think about how that can be

17:13

facilitated.

17:20

I think we would like to take that away, please, sir. But,

17:25

I mean, my initial reaction is that local individuals will be represented by their parish councils.

17:34

Some people don't necessarily align themselves to a group. I'm just, I take the point entirely. We'll take that away. So okay,

17:42

thank you.

17:44

Think you've hinted on this already.

17:48

Terms of interface with national highways,

17:54

they're asking for providing additional explanation concerning the expected impact on that A, one junction with the B, 645, during peak hours

18:05

to confirm if further modeling is required,

18:12

again, just an update on the progress of providing that additional information and analysis would be useful.

18:21

Sure So, unless national highways

18:25

correct me, otherwise, I think there's two main points that they made. One was in relation to the outline construction workers travel plan, which

18:33

is, we have a draft of and it's being developed.

18:37

The second point is, you rightly mentioned is in relation to impact at the the A, 1b,

18:43

645, junction, which may help everybody, for me to show that

18:49

where that is,

18:51

it's there.

18:55

We have recently commissioned baseline traffic surveys of that junction which we've just received the results of,

19:04

we are going to take those surveys and create a capacity assessment model using preparatory Picardy software, and assess the capacity performance of that junction with the development, construction traffic development in place at the peak of month 12,

19:23

we're going to add on the cumulative development that we've assessed, and we're going to grow the base, ground base baseline traffic up to a year of 2028

19:33
or 29

19:37
and provide the results. I should say, though, sir, that we have undertaken high level review and do not anticipate that there will be any capacity issues.

19:52
Okay, thank you.

19:56
Look into the council's councils and council.

20:00
To take the Councils first.

20:04
Thank you, sir. Daniel Steadman Jones for the host authorities,

20:09
I'll invite Mr. Stapleton to contribute

20:16
Ralph Stapleton Bedford Borough Council as

20:22
a strategic level in terms of the routing of the HGVs, it would be helpful to see a routing plan showing the designated routes that HGVs will be

20:36
using, and in order that the monitoring strategy. Can then look at compliance with those routes

20:46
in the plan, in the flow diagram, shown in a PP, 102,

20:53
the traffic movements. It currently shows all traffic entering the site, all HGV flows entering the site

21:05
via Site D. So this is figure 14, which is representing the month to maximum HGVs situation.

21:18
So on the basis of this plan,

21:21
all the HGVs will be entering the site via Site D, and will use the internal roads, noting that there is some use of public roads, but they will be avoiding the villages

21:34

along the length of the site, if some of those vehicles are actually going direct to site B, A, B or C, there will be some impact on those routes and potentially HGVs going through those villages. So it'd be useful to see the routing plans and how those

21:57

change at the different phases of construction, so that we can understand

22:03

the the overall routing of the HGVs, and a lot aligned to that, possibly, sort of straying into Item six is, sort of is the

22:15

monitoring strategy that needs to sit alongside that

22:20

in the outline, ctmp, as it stands, a PP,

22:28

156,

22:29

it makes reference to identification of vehicles associated with the

22:37

construction. I think that we need to be firming up on that commitment to a strong mitigation monitoring strategy through measures such as an PR cameras to make sure that vehicles are entering and departing the site via the right access point, noting that we've Got these sort of pop outs onto the public highway along the route, and to make sure that those vehicles are using those appropriately and entering and departing the site via D before they return to the strategic highway network

23:19

that obviously needs to be accompanied by a strong

23:26

set of management measures to ensure reporting of non compliances actions and remedial measures that will be taken should there be

23:37

any disruption or lack of compliance with those routes,

23:46

looking at the routes through the site and the haul roads crossing

23:54

the public highway, and where we Have these pop outs onto the public highway,

24:01

the

24:02

update, updated draft version of the outlines construction traffic management plan that's been shared provides some additional plans of showing the a bit more detail of those accesses. It provides junction visibility space and sweat paths

24:22

based on

24:24

previous comments that have been provided through the relevant reps, the visibility displays at those junctions have been amended from those based on manual for streets to

24:37

design manual for roads and bridges requirements at most, but not all junctions. Our position is that the visibility space should be based on design manner for roads and bridges at all locations. And so a number of those splays would need to be

24:57

updated as well. And the.

25:00

That we also have some sort of minor comments on the displays in terms of the tangent of the display to the

25:10

radius of the bend, where access points are on the outside of the bend. And both these points also link to the points of making sure that we're clear on the impact in terms of hedgerow removal, the plans are shown on OS based mapping, which, by its nature, doesn't show the hedgerows. It doesn't show the planting and what have you. So for the purposes of impact on ecology and agriculture and those sides of things, we need to be clear on the extent to which hedgerow removal or trimming is required in order to achieve those visibility space,

25:54

and alongside that, any other management measures where

25:59

visibility space might be shorter than dmrbr requirements if it is proposed to implement additional management measures during the temporary use of those

26:14

on sweat parts.

26:17

On sweat parts, there are a number of locations where the

26:23

haul roads, where they meet the public highway,

26:27

are

26:29

typically around about four to four and a half meters wide, I think, as they approach the highway, which is insufficient for vehicles to pass, and the sweat parts demonstrate that once within The public highway, there is some space for vehicles to pass, necessarily.

26:45

So I think

26:47

we need some more detail on how that will be managed,

26:52

if holding areas or passing places can be provided on the haul roads using marshals and management measures to avoid any opposing HGVs meeting each other whilst on the public highway, that might be a resolvable

27:09

measure.

27:15

Then I'll also

27:18

have some comments on the outline travel plan included

27:24

in the as an appendix to

27:29

the the updated outline construction traffic management plan. But I don't know whether I should comment on it now or under agenda item six,

27:41

if you leave that

27:43

please,

27:49

sir, I don't know if you want to go back to the applicant now, or Mr. Tuttle, who's online, also wanted to contribute on behalf of Cambridgeshire. So

28:01

there's quite a lot there, yeah, of the applicant to respond to, so I'd like to give them the opportunity now, again, lot

28:09

of it in writing, but high level response, please. Thank

28:15

you certainly Kendall, for the applicant.

28:19

Thank you, Mr. Stableton, as you say, quite a few points there, taking them in order. We can, of course, provide you with a version of this plan that's on the screen, which I think may tick the box,

28:31

satisfy your request

28:37

in terms of

28:38

monitoring and enforcement, will take away the point that you've made, or the points rather that you've made about ANPR, cameras and

28:49

management measures and auditing, etc,

28:53

and review those are and discuss them as an applicant team

29:02

in terms of the junction visibility and sweat path plans, we are aware obviously of your views as expressed in the relevant representations on these matters,

29:16

I would say in regard to The application of manual for streets versus dmr based visibility, stopping, site, distances and standards.

29:27

It is the case, and perhaps we are straying into the next agenda item here slightly, but it is the case that we are going to impose temporary reductions of speed limits at many of the access locations, which I think will have the effect of basically reducing the stopping site distance and visibility requirements.

29:50

I fully take on board your point about measuring the visibility space to the tangent point. That's entirely sensible and reasonable. I.

30:00

And also, similarly, the point about hedgerow removal, I would like to think that we are not impacting any hedgerows, but we will take that away and check it.

30:13

Yeah, as I say that, I think maybe the comments on the travel plan are

30:20

perhaps one for the next agenda item.

30:23

Okay, thank you. Hand over to your colleague on line. Yes. Thank you, Daniel stubborn Jones, for those authorities. Can I invite Mr. Tuttle to

30:36

to speak now? Please.

30:40

Thank you, and thank you sir for letting me speak. I think we would echo a number of the points that our colleagues in Bedfordshire have raised.

30:52

Our understanding was that all HGVs would be going through into Site D,

30:57

and there appears to be some sort of illusion, you know, case that that may not happen. So I think we, we do need clarification on the hdb's, whether they are all going in through Site D as that was our that was our main assumption.

31:13

We also have some questions in terms of traffic monitoring.

31:18

I've been involved in a few of these construction management plans, I wondered whether the applicant considered the geo fencing as to be a potential way forward for the monitoring of vehicles. It's sort of slightly easier than putting a and PR cameras everywhere.

31:40

Also the current construction management plan seems to advocate a three strikes and you're out procedure if vehicles aren't doing what they are supposed to be doing, I

31:54

was wondering if that could potentially be tightened. I know that there are other construction management plans that are effectively saying one strike and you're out,

32:05

ie if you do anything. And I think that tends to focus people's minds on where they're going and what they're doing.

32:15

Thank you.

32:17

Thank you. Mr. Tuttle

32:20

applicant, like to respond to that?

32:23

Yeah? Lee Kendall, for the applicant. Thank you, Mr. Tuttle,

32:28

just to reconfirm

32:31

the point I tried to make earlier, which is that we are committed to sending

32:39

almost all construction traffic through Site D, with the exception of those isolated vehicle movements that will need, inevitably to go

32:48

across the rest of the network in order to set accesses up and

32:55

and the like, at the very initial stages.

32:59

In terms of monitoring again. Thank you, Mr. Tuttle, for your comments about geofencing. That's actually a very interesting idea. I've not been involved in any schemes personally that have involved that technology, but I am aware of it, so we'll, we'll take that away

33:19

again. Three strikes and you're out. I think

33:24

again, we'd like to take that away, but I would just say,

33:28

generally, in my experience, it's, it's, it's quite harsh, I would say, for wanting a better word to impose a one strike and you're out policy, just for the reason that people can make mistakes.

33:43

It

33:46

would be, yeah, quite punitive to to impose on one strike and you're out policy in my personal view.

33:55

Okay, thank you for that response. Councilor Sarah, thank you for being patient.

34:04

Apologies, sir. Could I, Daniel stubborn Jones for the host authorities again? Can I just pass to my colleague, Mr. Dyke house, okay. Sorry. Make a comment. Apologies. Thank you. Peter Day case for bid for Borough Council, sir, we need some clarification on some of the terminology used in that the applicant uses a term outline, construction traffic management plan. I need clarity on whether that is the

construction phase management plan or is it a construction management plan, because this is a 40 year scheme, and we have highlighted the fact that there is also a replacement phase and there's a decommissioning phase. Is this the intent of the applicant, that this, this construction management plan covers a blanket across all those phases, or are they going to nuance each phase individually, because the.

35:00

Traffic impact might be considerably different during those different phases. We need some clarity in terms of the strategy, the mitigation and enforcement of each of those different stages. Thank you,

35:14

and that the applicant. Tom rose blade for the applicant, so the outline construction traffic management plan is for the construction phase.

35:24

The outline Operational Environmental Management Plan includes measures in it in relation to traffic and transport, but noting that the number of traffic movements in the operational phase would be much more limited,

35:39

aside from as was discussed this morning's session, in relation to if there was a particular replacement campaign

35:49

to replace solar panels across the scheme, in which case the provisions of the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan require that if above a certain threshold, which was a set of 20%

36:01

panels are to be replaced, then there would need to be a traffic

36:08

management plan agreed with the local highway authority to undertake those works.

36:16

And then for the decommissioning phase, we have an outline decommissioning environmental management plan,

36:22

which includes a commitment within it to prepare a decommissioning traffic management plan at that point in time, which 40 years from when construction is concluded. We can't easily say yet exactly how that decommissioning traffic would be would be undertaken.

36:46

I suppose the overarching principle would be to follow that taken in the construction traffic management plan. But it's very difficult to say

36:54

what the status of the local landscape would be 40 years from now, due to matters that would be outside of the applicant's control, which is why that document, the decommissioning traffic

management plan, would need to be prepared and approved by the local highway authority at the time Before decommissioning commences.

37:17

Yes, thank you.

37:20

Probably did your comments, sir.

37:25

Daniel Stedman Jones, for the host authorities, can Mr. Daycare make a comment?

37:33

Peter Day case, Bedford Borough Council, the applicant uses the word for all construction traffic in their presentation for the construction phase is quite a solid commitment in terms of road impact, we simply highlighting the fact that during the potential replacement phase, and we hear a figure of 20% but it's not defined, and we simply recognize that during the decommissioning phase, there will be considerable impact on The highway network. We would want a similar commitment that all traffic would follow the same as the current outline set out. Thank you,

38:13

sir. If I can Sorry, just just

38:18

apologies,

38:19

sir. Daniel studman Jones for the host authorities, if I could just just add finally, to what Mr. Datehouse has just said, You'll remember that yesterday, we've

38:32

put in a request effectively for hearings on highways, public rights of way, mitigation. Obviously, there'll be a second the draft DCA hearing as well. All of these matters, perhaps will be from our from the post authorities perspective, matters to be considered further in within those hearings, as well as in the written submissions.

38:56

Thank you. Yes, I'd like to think that from today's hearing,

39:03

it been pretty unequivocal about the potential impact of

39:10

construction activities or traffic during the operational phase, and I'm sure the applicant will take that away look to amend relevant

39:21

management plans, and also the relevant environmental statement chapter as well to reflect

39:29

the discussion study,

39:32

and we can

39:35

have updated progress at the next set of hearings or and sorry and at each deadline as well.

39:44

Thank you,

39:48

sir,

39:52

if I might just make a couple of comments on that particular point on replacement items.

40:00

Us specifically, in so far as they relate to traffic matters.

40:09

There is an outline Environmental Management Plan, which is document a, p, p, 157,

40:17

and on page 13 of that document, there is a table, table 2.2

40:22

which outlines various items of equipment that may require replacement during the course of the 40 year lifetime of the development. And this is not just solar panels, although solar panels would be the principle of item dissolve, sort of transformers, inverters, better units, cabling and fence lines and the like.

40:44

Now we are currently looking at preparing some figures to you and writing so that will set out how many movements might be generated by those replacement activities. And we're looking to adopt the worst case interpretation of the frequency of each replacement item that's anticipated within table 2.1, of that document,

41:05

and assuming a reasonable timeframe for that rolling replacement.

41:12

Now, as I say, we will provide this in writing, and it could be through the documents you just mentioned

41:19

by I should just say, our preliminary calculations indicate that in the replacement phase, even at the worst case, we are looking at a very, very small number, around two HGVs per day. Now I appreciate that might seem pretty counter intuitive to everybody in this room, but

41:38

that's actually reflective of the fact that the solar panels and the other replacement items only make up a very small proportion of the overall traffic that's forecast for the initial construction phase, so that when they come to be replaced, it's a much smaller proportion. The majority of the initial construction traffic actually goes into the construction of the access tracks and the compound foundations and the importation of aggregate materials and the like.

42:06

I should also point out that, as alluded to just just now within the outline environment management plan,

42:17

section 2.4, point 10, includes a provision that where more than 20% of the panels are proposed to be replaced, the notification must be given to the relevant LPA for approval

42:29

identifying the proposed management measures that were put in will be put in place rather for the duration of the replacement activities. Those measures will be consistent with the principles of the Kemp, the public right of way, management plan, the ctmp and the and the oemp.

42:51

And you know, I hope, and I'm optimistic, that through our discussions with the host authorities, that we will be able to agree common ground

43:02

on these matters.

43:06

Okay? Thank you.

43:09

Okay,

43:12

move to councilor. Sarah, please do

43:27

it someone doesn't want me to speak.

43:33

Thank you. Councilor Sharon gypsy are representing why Boston Ward as elected councilor,

43:42

residents are extremely concerned about the suitability and current condition of the local road network to accommodate construction traffic associated with a project of this scale. Many of the roads within why Boston and the surrounding areas are rural roads that are already under strain with existing wear and deterioration, limited width and structural resilience, edges that are particularly vulnerable to heavy vehicle overrun.

44:10

The introduction of frequent and sustained HGV movements will, in the view of residents, lead to accelerated road service degradation. I don't know if I said that word correctly, but damage to verges and road edges increased pot holing and long term maintenance issues. This is not theoretical. It is well understood consequences of heavy construction traffic on rural roads.

44:36

There is also a wider public impact that must be considered. The deterioration of these roads will not only affect residents safety and daily and daily travel, it will also place additional financial pressure on the local authority, who will ultimately be responsible for maintenance and repair. In effect, there is a concern that the infrastructure cost of this development is being indirect.

45:00

Transferred to the public sector and local taxpayers.

45:04

These roads are actively used by commuters, school, transport and local businesses. Increased. HGV presence will slow traffic movement, increase safety risks at junctions and narrow sections create conflict between large vehicles and everyday road users,

45:23

I would therefore ask what independent assessment has been undertaken on the structural capacity and current condition of the local road network, what specific mitigation measures are proposed to prevent road damage, not just manage traffic flow,

45:41

and will the applicant commit to pre construction road condition surveys and full remediation of any damage caused secured through enforceable agreements, and crucially,

45:54

most importantly, I think, how will this be monitored and enforced over the duration of the construction period? I would just like to add that we are concerned these roads are not built for sustained Hi GV use, and without proper safeguards, the cost of that damage will fall on residents and the council and not the applicant or developer. Thank you.

46:20

Thank you. Thank

46:29

you. So yeah, hand over to the applicant. To some of it may be a little bit repetitive from what you've already said, but again, high level, please, sure. Thank you. Certainly. Kendall, for the applicant,

46:45

will take away some of those points and respond. But just to reiterate,

46:50

we're not intending to send material or amounts of traffic

46:57

anywhere on the local network other than between the A one and the main site tax assess on the B, 645,

47:06

so

47:07

the traffic that will actually route along some of the types of roads that you've you've discussed, should be minimal and will be associated with, you know, localized access to Some of the the accesses I described in the initial presentation.

47:28

I don't remember which document it's in, but there is a commitment to precondition surveys. I think it's in the ctmp.

47:37

And

47:39

in terms of the independent assessment of structural highway,

47:45

I think that's two sides of the same coin. Perhaps

47:54

we'll take it away.

47:57

Yes, thank you. Happy with that. The applicants will take away and come back with further information.

48:04

Okay, if I could go around the table,

48:09

Mr. Lacey and Mr. Pike.

48:12

Yes, I'll Mr. Pike. You want to go first, and then I'll follow up.

48:17

Thank you. Mr. Lacey, Mr. Andy Pike, resident of Hale Weston and nominated spokesperson for stop East Park energy.

48:27

It's very interesting that the applicant has just pointed out that there will be a amount of traffic that has to bypass sa 16 to start going through great Stoughton and the associated villages to get to sites before the main part of construction starts.

48:46

I would ask the applicant, have they actually driven the route down the B, 645,

48:52

down past the site entrance, and especially through great storeton, where you go over a small bridge over the river Kim into a 20 mile per hour traffic controlled zone through great Stoughton, which is completely unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles.

49:11

The route through great stores and would then take you through probably the oldest part of great Staunton, again, across numerous old bridges to access to Site C, unless, of course, the traffic was diverted further around the B, 645,

49:32

down through the village of stoneley and then turning South on the b6, 60,

49:40

up towards Purton Hall and the cross, where they're indicating they'll be using the route

49:49

the road network in this in this area, it's a rural road network. It's it's a B road in the absolute term, lowest term of B.

50:00

See, as the councilor has just pointed out, this road is crumbling in places past Hale Weston. There are numerous potholes at the moment, and that's without the 10,000 HGV movements that the applicant is going to be driving from the A one down to the site entrance.

50:22

I would also ask

50:24

specifically, in relation to sa 16,

50:28

how they intend to construct the access to that site. At the moment, there is a significant drainage ditch that abuts the road barrier to sa 16, which they will have to cross, and no doubt they will have to reinforce significantly if it's going to take all of the construction traffic into the site that will take considerable time on what is a single carriageway Road,

50:55

therefore,

50:57

a significant amount of temporary road measures will be required just to access Site, Site D. And I'm just wondering, have they actually considered that, how long it will take, and in the meantime, whilst they're accessing that site, before they build their internal construction roads, how much traffic they term as immaterial that will be put through great Stoughton and the surrounding road network.

51:29

I'd also invite the examining authority to seek clarification from the applicant on whether the construction routes relied upon in the environmental statement will be secured through binding requirements in the development consent order,

51:44

including explicit prohibition, prohibitions on alternative routes and alternative enforceable obligations on all contractors and subcontractors,

51:55

what safeguards would prevent diversion through nearby villages not assessed within the baseline if congestion or disruption occurs on the primary corridor, and what enforcement mechanisms would apply if such diversion nevertheless occurs.

52:11

And also, why does the draft development consent order not include an explicit no through routing schedule for sensitive settlements if avoidance of those areas forms part of the assessed mitigation and the material component of the impact assessment,

52:29

rural communities are going to be affected by by this project and prevention through enforceable routing controls is far more effective than the mitigation after impacts actually occur.

52:43

Stopease, Park energy, therefore, respectfully submits that the adequacy of construction traffic routes depends not only on their identification, but whether they're secured in the order itself with sufficient precision to enable that the assessed impacts represent the maximum reasonably foreseeable impacts. Thank you.

53:02

Thank you. Mr. Pegg, the applicant. Like to respond,

53:07

yeah, thank you, sir. I'll try and keep it brief. There's a few points to go over in response, in response to the question of, have we actually driven the route, I can confirm that yes, we have driven the route, including through great storms and past Hale Weston. We did so this morning, in fact, and just on that point,

53:29

we have collected video footage you sir, because I am aware that you may have wanted to see a fly through dash cam footage. So yeah, that's correct. It is our intention to take that footage and edit it into a notated, easy to follow fly through, which I hope will assist you due course,

53:53

moving back to the points, I mean, on the great Stoughton point, I

54:00

just want to reiterate again. I mean, the intention is to send all the construction, almost all the construction traffic, in through Site D and through Westwood, through the Cyprus system of internal tracks, which will therefore bypass Grace Lawton. We recognize the constraints in great stores, and absolutely do not want to send any construction traffic up through there

54:25

in terms of how we construct the access that will be a matter for the appointed contractor. But it's, in my personal view, it's just, it's an engineering challenge that can be overcome in the normal way. I don't think there's anything especially unusual about the formation of an access. It will be formed, I imagine, in exactly the same way as any other access. New access is formed onto the adopted highway whereby there'll be traffic management put in place to form the junction Bell mouth and the works will proceed from there into the site.

55:02

I can't comment on how long it will take, but I

55:06

imagine more than a matter of weeks.

55:13

In terms of the comments on enforcement of routes, I think we'd be meeting a discussion that we had earlier,

55:22

so we'll take that away.

55:26

Thank you.

55:30

Very briefly, Mr. Pegg, I'm conscious. Thank you. Thank you, sir. I would just urge you, sir, if you are doing an accompanied site inspection, to a particular notice to the route from the A, 1b, 645, junction, all the way through to Great Stoughton to assess that impact for yourself, rather than from a third party's desk cam footage. Thank you. Okay, now I did,

55:56

Lacey, thank you Good afternoon. My name is Christopher Lacey, and I live close to the project. I object strongly to the proposal. Encourage the inspector to recommend it for refusal. Key concern on construction. According to the applicant's construction traffic management plan, construction phase involves 5278

56:14

GV deliveries, equivalent to 10,556

56:17

two way HGV movements, plus 790 light goods vehicle deliveries, or 1582

56:25

way movements over a 30 month construction period. In addition, during the 18 month peak period, there could be between 708 154 the figure mentioned earlier, daily two way trips associated with the workforce. Those worker trips rely on very ambitious instructions about construction worker car sharing and means of getting to the site. Construction workers typically travel from a wide geographical area in individual vehicles. If the applicants assumptions do not materialize as modeled, the number of daily vehicle movements could be significantly higher than predicted. Even taking the applicant's numbers at face value, they represent many 1000s of additional vehicle movements on rural roads and

a network that was never designed for this level of heavy construction traffic. It is unlikely that the workers would use the B, 645,

57:20

b6, 6661,

57:22

to access the proposed sites, instead using Sat Nav to find the most direct route, causing major disruption, increasing accident risk, the key corridors identified are now

57:36

b6, 645, b6 60 and B 661, are narrow roads used by residents, cyclists, horse riders, agricultural vehicles, school busses, serving secondary schools, Kim Bolton, school long sounds Academy and st Nia, several primary schools, the B, 645, is already well known as a dangerous road with tight ends limited visibility and sections where larger vehicles already struggled to pass a real world example of this cleave hill the NSIP there restrictions known as Golden hours. Periods when construction traffic was banned from local roads were built into the construction arrangement from the outset. Despite those measures, residents living nearby described the experience of construction phase as a nightmare with large numbers of heavy vehicles moving through rural communities for prolonged periods, causing disruption and damage. This example demonstrates that even where a mitigation plan exists, the scale and duration of construction activity can still impose significant negative impacts on the surrounding communities. The applicant would need to build many miles of temporary internal roads within the site to accommodate the inefficient, strong, eight nature of the four sites making up the EPE scheme across a six mile span

58:57

the EP scheme, the scheme would also require significant enabling infrastructure works by the national grid and the UK Power Networks in the vicinity of the grid connection at Eaton, soaking this would generate additional traffic at the same time, and I'm not sure they have been incorporated into those movement plans, and I would like some reassurance on that,

59:19

If I may, ultimately, these issues highlight a more fundamental problem. The scale of construction traffic required for a project of this magnitude is simply incompatible with the narrow rural network that serves these villages. Risk to road safety disruption, potholes and the pressure of local infrastructure will be a direct consequence of placing vast industrial scale energy development in this rural landscape, lacking the transport infrastructure supported based on the construction traffic impacts alone, this location is fundamentally unsuitable for a development to this scale, and if those impacts cannot be safely increased.

1:00:00

Incredibly mitigated, which I've not heard

1:00:03

the apple with the applicant's plan, and they do not demonstrate this, then only a responsible conclusion says that scheme should not proceed. This is the wrong project in the wrong location. Thank you,

1:00:16

Mr. Lucy. We've heard today that the applicants have taken a number of those issues on board and are in active dialog with local authorities, local highway authorities, and looking to

1:00:32

revise outline construction traffic management plan.

1:00:37

But if Steph egg wants to

1:00:41

respond very briefly,

1:00:44

very briefly. Yeah, we recognize that the

1:00:48

car sharing ratio is is ambitious, and it's a challenging target in a in a rural location, but that's been set deliberately.

1:00:58

It's a deliberately ambitious approach that's just in accordance with the government's

1:01:04

decide and provide, or sometimes known as vision led approach, which is advocated in the NPPF.

1:01:13

As I said earlier, we are intending to publish a an outline construction workers travel plan by deadline, one which will hopefully provide more

1:01:25

detail. But having said all that, we have done a bit of a sensitivity test, if you like, to assess the

1:01:32

implications, if you like, of assuming a different car sharing occupancy ratio of 1.4 rather than two. But we think that would result in an additional 366,

1:01:48

two way calf movements over and above the Asian 54 at peak. It's worth just noting the 854. Number is the peak of the peak. It's actually going to be, you know, 500 on average throughout the course of the 30 month build period.

1:02:05

But even so, having done that sort of sensitivity test, then the numbers would still not

1:02:12

increase along the section of the B, 645, between the main sites access and the A, one, they would still not increase above the 30% threshold, which is identified in the IEMA guidelines,

1:02:28

which is the relevant guidelines we have to adhere to in the preparation of the transport Chapter within the ES.

1:02:39

Thank you.

1:02:41

Any other comments within the room on that particular matter?

1:02:49

Thank you. James Jubilee, great stored in parish council. I think lot of points have been made already. Just want to say great Staunton parish council is very concerned about access to the site. What's the rural location with corresponding rural road network? It's in some extent, encouraging to hear that there are kind of clear plans in place that all construction and worker traffic should avoid the villages. But I think that, you know, we would sort of echo the concerns to have a, you know, really clear plan and enforcement and transparency associated with that. There's been some comments already about sensitive areas in great stalking which, which are the, you know, the village, past the school, past the doctor's surgery, through the town. So we wouldn't want to see that plan slip just a couple of things that people haven't mentioned quite so much. I think we have concerns that the entrance point on the B, 645,

1:03:41

which is sa 16, has the potential to become a sort of blockage for the whole local community. That's, if you like, the kind of access route the village has to go to work, to school, shops, backs and forwards. And if there's, you know, if there's traffic lights there, if there are blockages there, if there's speed limits there that has a real economic cost to the community.

1:04:05

Also just on the stretch of road by

1:04:09

called people called referred to as great storton Road, which is the kind of stretch of road by S 12 in that's that's only five meters wide.

1:04:21

And people haven't mentioned but zantra, which is where the access is, also got planning application for two new warehouses, so there'll be additional vehicles going through there.

1:04:30

So those, I think, are areas for concern for us, if there's going to be two way traffic going on a road that isn't wide enough to cope with two HGVs. Just also briefly wanted to take issue. There's some comments in some of the documentation in the transport assessments on the safety record of the roads, and the kind of conclusion that there was no existing highway safety issue,

1:04:54

as I understand it, the data is a kind of five years of data that cuts off in March 2025,

1:05:00

Just from a great Staughton perspective, in the immediate vicinity of great Staughton, that being three serious or fatal incidents in the last three years involving HGVs and a car. So it kind of looks a bit

different to the to the local community, and you'll have seen in the comments coming back from people that that the b6 will five, and particularly where that s 16 entrances is, is is, you know, a real kind of noted danger spot. People perceive the danger there. And there's a access is kind of by what looks like a chicane to many motorbikes,

1:05:35

yeah. So I would just, those are my comments. So I would just add to the kind of requests for, you know, you know, really kind of concrete enforcement, not just of the HGVs, but of worker traffic, and kind of clear, whether it's a sort of one strike and you're out, or kind of fine system for making that happen, a clear kind of road survey, so that the point was made earlier on, so that when the verges are all destroyed by the traffic, there's a kind of mechanism for putting it all back in place and repairing the work roads and this kind of issue of a proper kind of width audit and understanding of where two HGVs can pass properly in the in the planning process. Thank you very much. Okay, thank you. Think that's pretty much been noted by the the applicant. If

1:06:19

I could just ask one further question of the applicant in terms of

1:06:23

accident data, will that be updated by the end of the examination?

1:06:31

Yes, sir,

1:06:33

thank you.

1:06:35

Okay, one final question,

1:06:40

right? Very quickly,

1:06:43

you've got first Thank you, sir.

1:06:46

Vivian Hitchen, local resident. I live near the a one junction with the b6 445,

1:06:53

there are many accidents both ways at this junction. I see them regularly.

1:07:00

The B, 645, is widely recognized locally as dangerous with tight bends and poor visibility, there have been many fatalities on this road. The risks to road safety, disruption to daily life and pressure on local infrastructure are not incidental impacts. They are the direct result of placing an industrial scale energy project in a rural landscape without the transport infrastructure to support it. For that reason, my submission to the examining authority today is the construction traffic impacts alone demonstrate that this location is fundamentally unsuitable for development of this scale and should not proceed in this location. Thank you.

1:08:02

Thank you.

1:08:08

Tracy Stokes, resident of great Staughton. I agree, obviously, with what has gone before. There are a couple more points to make about the A, one and the B, 645, which haven't come out.

1:08:21

I'm not clear whether it's intended that all goods will be delivered south to north on the A one. If not, there is a main problem with a overpass at Hale Western which cannot take any abnormal loads because there is not the height, nor the width, and those abnormal loads have to be diverted off the a one through Perry and great Stoughton from one junction to the other. So that's another reason why this road network is not suitable the B, 645,

1:08:56

floods in particular, along the section that is intended to be the main access, and further along into great Stoughton and pools with water, which is extremely dangerous for things like Aqua planing, for people who are unaware of it when, particularly when it's dark.

1:09:15

And there is a bend called pig's Hill on the B, 645,

1:09:21

before you get to Site C, which is extremely dangerous. It's not wide enough to take two HGVs in opposition, and once you've taken your line on that bend, it's impossible to change it. And that's where a lot of the accidents happen, where vehicles are over the center line. And in fact,

1:09:42

many of us will have had experiences where we have missed important meetings, wherever they may be, including trying to take the train to come to London because there has been a fatal accident or other accident blocking that B, 645, so it's really got to be looked at the.

1:10:00

There are also, in terms of taking any vehicles through great Stoughton, a lot of heritage assets on that, B, 645, both through the village and in the town, grade one, grade two listed. They're extremely close to the road great Stoughton parish church, St Andrews place, house, for example. So that I would suggest you should look at very carefully, because again, the experience of Cleve Hill was that structural damage was caused to heritage assets by Heavy Construction Vehicles traveling along sections of roads that they weren't supposed to take. So the only answer to this is either don't permit this development and or make sure that all of this is put in the development consent order and made enforceable, including via the highways and local authorities.

1:10:54

Yeah, thank you. Terms of the B, 645, a, one, modeling,

1:11:01

will a lot of those issues be picked up?

1:11:07

Yes, well, on the first point

1:11:10

raised by Mrs. Stokes, I can confirm that the

1:11:16

routing strategy will involve all traffic approaching from the south.

1:11:21

So hopefully that addresses that point.

1:11:26

The modeling will assess the capacity performance of the junction

1:11:31

the A, 1b, 645,

1:11:33

the point at which the offslip

1:11:36

and non slip joins on to the B, 645, that's the purpose, I think the purpose, I don't want to put words in national highways mouths, but I understand the the impetus behind that

1:11:51

representation is to ensure that queuing doesn't occur or won't secure occurs, rather back onto the a one main line. So them.

1:12:03

So that's the purpose of that exercise. And then, just lastly, sorry on the point about accidents,

1:12:12

my understanding is, and you may wish to ask Cambridgeshire county council about this, is that it's not defined as a accident cluster site.

1:12:25

Thank you.

1:12:29

Cambridge county council want to come in on that. Thank you, sir. Daniel Stedman Jones for the host authorities, my colleague to my left will speak to that. David

1:12:43

carford, Cambridge county council, yes, we've had queries about safety on the b6, 545,

1:12:50

just to confirm it's not considered a high casualty route currently. But as we do with all our highway network that's always under continual review and the data as it comes in, and we continue to collate all

data and analyze annually, the safety of roads, and we will continue to do that, but the applicant is correct, is currently not considered a high casualty route.

1:13:17

Thank you. It's one further person in the room for a question. And notice that is somebody online with their hand up, yeah, just les Rand resident from great stalton. Just a question as to which route, when you took the drive through on the B, 645, were you going east or west? Because if you were going west, there are two points near Hale Western at the moment where you actually have to drive on the wrong side of the road to avoid large potholes. And one of those, you have to cross the double yellow line in the center of the road to accomplish that.

1:13:59

I drove both directions. I think I saw the potholes you referred to. I mean,

1:14:05

that's a matter for the local highway authority to address as part of their section 41 responsibilities to maintain the highway.

1:14:15

Yeah, thank you for that. Those holes are substantial. They're at least four inches deep in places, yeah, so construction will not begin until some considerable time from now, and

1:14:28

one would like to think that the issues will be remedied by the local higher authority by then. And of course, any damage caused by the development will be remedied by the applicant.

1:14:39

Thank you.

1:14:41

Thank you. If I could ask the person online initials. JB, sorry, I can't see your name.

1:14:48

That's okay. Thank you, sir. Jeremy bloom for national highways, yes, I just wanted to say make a couple of points in relation to what's being discussed. First.

1:15:00

Honestly, absolutely, we welcome the applicants

1:15:05

intention to model the junction of the A, one with the B, 645, and, and, yes, I can confirm that our principal concern is queuing back on the slip roads onto the main line carriageway, which is big safety concern for for national highways.

1:15:26

I just wanted to emphasize though a point on the chip trip generation, and particularly around the car share ratio, assumption of two that does seem particularly high. I do understand that the applicant has explained that, but on several recent DCOs for similar projects in similar types of locations, 1.4

1:15:55

was the figure that was used and accepted by national highways. I understand about the sensitivity test, and I assume that that will be modeled alongside the two figure, because that could have a significant impact. Do you think the construction worker vehicle volumes are significant and are a concern to us.

1:16:25

Thank you. Mr. Bloom,

1:16:28

anything from the applicant? Very briefly, yeah, thank you. Mr. Bloom Lee, I'm for the applicant. We will consider the 1.4 in our assessment as a sensitivity test. And

1:16:41

yeah, thank you for your other comments.

1:16:45

Okay, sorry, I need to move on in terms of time. If you could put your whatever you were going to say in writing, please, we've got two agenda items to finish off, conscious that the venue closes at 530 and really need to give an opportunity to explore the other two items.

1:17:08

If we could move on to the next agenda item, please, in terms of

1:17:15

management,

1:17:20

thank you, sir. I'll try and keep this brief.

1:17:23

So the proposed traffic management measures are described in schedule eight of the draft DCO, which is document as dash double oh eight. And they are illustrated in the traffic regulation measures plan, which is a PP, 011, in

1:17:42

summary, there are temporary speed, ridiculous restrictions proposed at the following locations, or sorry traffic regulation measures. So the B, 660, Kim Bolton road to the south of site, access to

1:17:59

great Stoughton road between accesses so three and so six. Green end in the vicinity of accesses sa Oh, seven to sa oh nine.

1:18:11

Spring Hill between great Stoughton road and accesses sa 10 and sa 11.

1:18:17

More road around the temporary access road crossing point, sa, 14 and sa 15,

1:18:24

the B, 645, around the main site access point, sa 16, doula Lane around the temporary access road crossing point, sa, 17 and sa 18, and then bushmead road around the temporary access road crossing Point, sa, 19 and sa 20. Temporary traffic signals will be deployed to manage vehicle movements across the p6 60 more road, julo Lane and bushmead Road, as well as in other areas where necessary to facilitate the installation of cable connections and the delivery of highway improvement works.

1:18:58

Temporary traffic signals are also proposed during periods of construction activity at the main site access, which is Sh 16.

1:19:07

We're also proposing temporary speed limits to protect the workforce and address some of the comments made by the local highway authorities in relation to visibility displays from some of the accesses as discussed earlier.

1:19:22

Our um, I'll keep it. I'll leave it. I'll conclude there. So I'm happy to answer any questions. Okay, thank you

1:19:30

from a local authority perspective, as there any comments questions on

1:19:36

traffic management,

1:19:39

thank you, sir. Daniel Thurman Jones for the host authorities, I'll hand over first of all to Mr. Stapleton again.

1:19:50

Stapleton Bedford Borough Council

1:19:54

just picking up on comments on the outline travel plan and.

1:20:00

That weren't covered under agenda item five.

1:20:05

I mean, we welcome the inclusion of a travel plan in the latest version of the ctmp, the draft version that's coming out. And the ambition of achieving two two people per car through that travel plan is obviously commendable, but the impacts of not achieving that have the

1:20:29

have a give the potential to have a significant increase in the level of car traffic generation beyond that assessed in the EIA.

1:20:42

So not just in terms of traffic impacts, but also in terms of the related noise and air quality impacts.

1:20:51

So it's

1:20:53

it's good to hear that there's a sensitivity test being undertaken with with the higher or at the lower level of counter occupancy.

1:21:03

I think we're just, I mean, keeping it brief, I think, I think the one thing that we need to be careful of is the 30% test or 30% rule in the

1:21:14

iscp

1:21:17

guidelines isn't specifically related to peak hour network, peak hour impact. And so I think that we just need

1:21:29

to be mindful of that in reviewing the impacts of the scheme with in this in the sensitivity test context, that just because the impact is lower than 30% in the peak hour doesn't mean that it doesn't necessarily meet the threshold for assessment.

1:21:51

And then I won't repeat the comments in terms of management

1:21:56

measures related to HGVs and which I think we've recovered

1:22:03

any other colleagues.

1:22:05

Thank you, sir. Daniel Stedman Jones for the host authorities again, just to check whether Mr. Tuttle wants to make any comment if he's online.

1:22:21

Okay, thank you, sir. Okay,

1:22:27

sorry, apologies, sir. I don't have any further comments to make at this

1:22:32

this time. Okay, thank you. Okay, if we could

1:22:38

move around the room,

1:22:40

Councilor, Syra, thank you. Councilor Sharon Duncan, Sarah representing why Boston ward.

1:22:51

So while mitigation measures are often outlined with the documentation, residents remain concerned about the real world, deliverability, enforceability and accountability of those measures, the lack of clarity on monitoring and enforcement specifically,

1:23:09

if you could please advise who is responsible for ensuring compliance on a day to day basis, what mechanisms are in place to identify and respond to breaches in real time, cumulative disruption over time. So even if impacts are presented as manageable on a daily basis, the prolonged construction period results in sustained disruption for residents.

1:23:34

From a local perspective, this is not solely about traffic flow. It is about the totaling, sorry, totality of impact on residents daily lives, including increased noise levels from sustained HIV activity or otherwise, deterioration in air quality, particularly along rural routes not designed for this volume of Heavy traffic, ongoing disruption to normal daily routines, including access safety and general amenity.

1:24:07

This concern is amplified when considering overlapping infrastructure activity in the area, including the East West rail development, Black Cat roundabout improvements and the residents are concerned that traffic management plans are being developed in isolation, rather than as part of a coordinated strategy across all major projects. There is a lack of clarity on whether construction, traffic timing, routing and peak activity periods are being aligned between schemes. Without that coordination, there's a real risk that even well intended traffic management plans will fail in practice due to combined pressure on the same local network. I would therefore ask

1:24:51

what robust and enforceable mechanisms will be in place to monitor compliance with traffic management measures on a continuous basis.

1:25:01

Who will be responsible for enforcement

1:25:04

and what powers or controls will they have to intervene if measures are not adhered to,

1:25:11

what remedial actions will be triggered if traffic limits are exceeded, routes are not followed, or disruption exceeds assessed levels. These are real big issues in rural areas

1:25:27

in relation to cumulative coordination.

1:25:31

I mean, I know we're going to talk about this in the next agenda, please.

1:25:40

Well, it's cross cross referencing this one's there. May I, may I still very briefly. Thank you very much. 32 points.

1:25:49

What active liaison has taken place with East West rail and the Black Cat project teams in developing traffic management plans? Is there a shared or coordinated traffic management framework to ensure that multiple schemes do not operate in conflict with one another. I believe that traffic management plan is only as effective as its enforcement, and residents need assurance that this will work in practice, not just on paper, particularly in the context of multiple major schemes operating at the same time. Thank you.

1:26:21

Applicant, like to briefly respond on that.

1:26:24

Thank you, sir Lee Kendall, for the applicant in terms of who ensures compliance, the

1:26:31

host authorities in

1:26:35

terms of

1:26:37

how will ensure monitoring. I mean, I think that's the kind of repetitious discussion that we had earlier. We're going to develop that plan and

1:26:47

then cumulative development, I think that does sit squarely in the next agenda item.

1:26:56

Thank you.

1:26:58

Any other comments questions within the room, specifically on this agenda item, not the last one. This one.

1:27:10

Sean Woodward, local resident, I'll be

1:27:14

brief. The flexing of the staff on site to construct has been quoted as 500 average, which is correct, but there are very few at the beginning of the end that the mean is about 600 so for the majority of the construction, it will be higher than 500

1:27:32

that's the only point I needed to make. Yes. Thank you

1:27:37

to like the

1:27:39

sorry. Lee Kendall, for the applicant, the documents are quite transparent about the phasing and the number of construction workers that will be

1:27:48

anticipated on a month by month basis. We're not trying to dress it up in a

1:27:55

in a way that conceals and it's,

1:27:59

it's, it sets out in more than one document.

1:28:04

Yes. Thank you. Mr. Pike, very briefly, sir. Thank you very much. Andy Pike, resident of hell, Western and nominated spokesperson on behalf of stop East Park energy,

1:28:15

time based HGV embargoes during school, school and peak periods, routine mitigation in major infrastructure projects where construction traffic interacts with sensitive communities. So I'd be grateful if you can ask the applicant

1:28:30

whether the applicant will commit to enforceable restrictions on construction traffic during school travel periods and peak commuter hours, and if not, what evidence demonstrates that such protections, protections are unnecessary in this location. Thank you.

1:28:49

But the applicant might respond on that and comment on any discussions with the local authorities on that particular aspect.

1:29:00

Thank you, sir. Lee kettle, for the applicant, I'm not aware of that we've specifically discussed hours with the local authorities, but the working hours are, as mentioned earlier, eight till six, which are outside of the normal way peak hours. Therefore you would expect traffic movements to arrive before the peak hour and after the pm

1:29:24

peak, we have not we'll take away the point about school working hours.

1:29:31

Sorry, I forgot. Was there another point?

1:29:36

It was Andy pike on behalf of stop East Park energy.

1:29:40

It was more to do with the fact that none of these enforcements are

1:29:46

in the development consent order at all, and therefore to go back to the development consent order, then we would respectfully request that more detailed and controls are put on the face of the order itself, rather than being real.

1:30:00

Client on a management plan. Thank you.

1:30:05

Thank you, sir. We'll take those words away.

1:30:08

Okay, thank you.

1:30:10

Anybody else in the room on that particular I just very quickly James Jubilee from great Staunton parish council. I didn't see it in the documentation, but I think you're aware that opposite s 16, which is the main site access, there's a fairly major farm access. So just to make sure that factored into that, there'll be kind of, you know, during harvest combines and farm vehicles and things like that will need to be considered because it's used by that. Thanks.

1:30:39

Thank you. Any comment or just acknowledge, okay, thank

1:30:44

anybody online.

1:30:48

Okay, so we'll close that agenda item and move on to

1:30:56

cumulative impacts from other projects,

1:31:01

if you would. If have the applicant prepared anything particular on this particular aspect,

1:31:09

specifically referring to construction traffic.

1:31:14

Good afternoon. Sir Martin Pollard, on behalf of the applicant, we felt it would be helpful and instructive if we set out just the general approach that the applicant's taken to the assessment of cumulative effects before Mr. Kendall talks more about the actual numbers and the cumulative assessment that's been carried out, I think it will be instructive in helping everybody to understand what we've done, what we arrived at, how we arrived at that before then having that discussion. So with your permission, I'd like to just briefly introduce let's do that. Please proceed. At the scoping stage, the applicant set up their proposed methodology for the assessment of cumulative effects, and at that stage, we didn't prepare an initial long list of sites for cumulative assessment.

1:32:07

The scoping opinion was commented upon by the planning Inspectorate and others, and it was confirmed that the use of the planning Inspectorate advice note 17 and guidance on the assessment of cumulative effects was appropriate, and the planning Inspectorate also advocated that the applicant established a defined zone of influence around the development within which there's potential for significant cumulative effects to occur. That is also a requirement of the of the advice note so in preparing the cumulative effects assessment, the applicant has followed the guidelines and approach contained within the planning inspectorates advice note 17, the last version was in 2024

1:32:53

specifically ensuring that a zone of influence is established for this assessment of potentially significant cumulative effects, agreeing the zone of influence in cumulative schemes in consultation with the host authorities and other statutory bodies, following the four stage assessment process that is establishing a long list, a short list information, gathering on the shortlisted schemes, and then carrying out an assessment of cumulative effects. The assessment is the other requirement is that the assessment is focused and proportionate with relevance to the zone of influence.

1:33:26

So just, excuse me, sir, just one second.

1:33:30

So during the production of the PIR and prior to carrying out our statutory consultation, the applicant agreed individual zones of influence for each of the environmental topics to be included in the assessment of cumulative effects. These were discussed and agreed with the statutory consultation bodies as part of the discussions on the assessment methodologies and with the three host planning authorities. The latter also provided input into the initial long list of sites that the applicant had established for the assessment. Following that process, a zone of influence of 10 kilometers was established for the project, and that has been used for the assessment of cumulative effects. I should state that whilst a 10 kilometer zone of influence has been established, that's not relevant to every environmental topic, with many having a much lower zone of influence than 10 kilometers, the individual zones of influence are set out in table 4.2 of the environmental statement. That's a P, P 40.

1:34:29

During statutory consultation, the applicant received further commentary on the adequacy of the cumulative effects assessment. This included a request from the host authorities that the applicant adjusted the zone of influence to include everything within 10 kilometers of the order limits. Previously, it had been set at 10 kilometers from the center of the site, but it was deemed more appropriate to carry out the assessment that way that was accepted by the applicant, and resulted in a change in the extent of the zone of influence and the addition of further development schemes in our long list. So.

1:35:00

Other schemes were also suggested for inclusion in the assessment, and where relevant, the applicant had added those schemes in as identified by the host authorities and other consultees. At that point in time,

1:35:13

the applicant, after the after the statutory consultation, the applicant continued to monitor development schemes within the zone of influence to ensure that the long list, shortlist and assessment of cumulative effects were up to date upon submission of the development consent order application. The final list

and associated assessment of effects are set out in ES, chapter 17, a, pp 53 Es appendices, 4.4 and 4.5 that's a. Pp 67 and a. Pp 68 and in ES, figure 4.2, A, PP, 123,

1:35:45

the sites that were ultimately shortlisted by the applicant for cumulative assessment comprise Highwood solar farm, Cobb Holden solar farm, the A, 42 a, four to eight, Black Cat decaks, and give it east, west rail and Cobb Holden farm, bed scheme, bear scheme, pardon me, the detailed assessment of cumulative effects between the scheme and the other short and the shortlisted sites has been carried out in relation to landscape and visual effects, cultural heritage and archeology, ecology and nature conservation, hydrology and flood risk, traffic and transportation, which we'll talk about in A minute, noise and vibration, air quality and ground conditions

1:36:24

within the relevant representations that we've received from the host authorities and statutory bodies. We've had no concerns over the methodology that's been adopted or the zone of influence that has been established for the assessment of cumulative effects.

1:36:41

And

1:36:43

or indeed the conclusions of the cumulative effects assessment, as set out in ES chapter 17 a, pp 53

1:36:51

we've received some comment from bestfriction County Council on certain sites and their inclusion within the assessment, and we will respond in writing, but can confirm that they were included in our long list, and one was included in the shortlisting. It is relevant to note that other relevant representations from the public and other stakeholders have commented upon the adequacy of the assessment, including commentary on other schemes that should be included, and those comments will be addressed by the applicant in our response to the relevant representations, and if appropriate, any sites will be added to the assessment process with that in mind, and as set out in our ES, chapter 17 a, pp 53

1:37:34

the applicant is committed to maintaining an up to date cumulative assessment following submission of the DCO, and It is our intention to submit an updated long list with associated assessment and identification of any other sites for shortlisting. Deadline, one, I would hasten to add as a final point, an initial review of the schemes at this stage hasn't identified any further schemes for shortlisting within the zone of influence. I'll hand you over to my colleague, Mr. Kendall, to talk about the specific assessment of transport. Thank you.

1:38:09

Thanks, Lee Kendall, for the applicant, as Mr. Pollard has just mentioned,

1:38:15

the assessment of cumulative impacts identified the appraisal of traffic and transport effects should take account of the Highwood solar farm, the Cobb Holden solar farm and best schemes, as well as the a four to eight Blackhat to Caxton gibbet scheme and East West Rail. So that was the initial list that we had to have a look at.

1:38:41

Now if you look through section nine point 11 of the

1:38:47

traffic and transport chapter of the ES, which is a PP, dash, 045,

1:38:57

and we've looked at this more closely, we noted that the Cobb hold and solder solar and best scheme does not share any direct sections of construction traffic access route with the application scheme.

1:39:11

The only slight overlap between those two schemes is in the fact that the main access of the Cobb holding site would be located on bushmead Road, which is about 300 meters to the west of the cable connection route of the proposed development.

1:39:27

And then, based on the information provided in the plan application for the Cobb holder site, the development was anticipated to be operational by the end of 2027

1:39:39

so due to the likely limited or zero overlap between the construction phases and construction traffic access routes of the two schemes, no further assessment of the cumulative impacts of the cob holding site was deemed to be necessary for traffic transport assessment purposes.

1:39:59

In terms.

1:40:00

The firm construction of the a four to eight black hat to Caxton gibbet scheme. I think the MP mentioned this yesterday, that schedules to be completed with the road open to traffic in spring 2027 which is well before construction on the application would begin

1:40:19

so they don't cross over. In terms of East West Rail, stage three between Bedford and Cambridge is still subject to government funding and approval, and so has no committed status. And in any event, is not expected to start construction until 2030

1:40:37

well after the applicant scheme would be completed. I mean that DCO application is only at the initial consultation stage with the application not due to be submitted until spring 2027

1:40:50

as such, there's no detailed information available for that project

1:40:55

that we could even possibly include within a cumulative impact assessment.

1:41:01

Therefore, we think it's highly unlikely that any construction activity associated with East West Rail could start until well after construction of the proposed development has been completed.

1:41:13

So you know, through this process of looking at the fine detail of all these schemes, it's deemed that there's really only the high wood solar farm scheme from the initial list would actually have potential overlap and material cumulative traffic impacts with with the application scheme.

1:41:35

So therefore, we've taken the traffic from the transport assessment work associated with that scheme. We know that it would be constructed over a period of 40 weeks, and it would be accessed from a private track, which is about 700 meters to the west of the A, 1b, 645, junction. It would be accessed through a track was that was previously used to construct an existing solar farm.

1:42:07

So the actual area of overlap between the traffic impacts of the two schemes would would be

1:42:16

just on that 700 meter section.

1:42:20

As I said earlier, we are intending to model the cumulative impact of that scheme with our with the applicant scheme. When

1:42:31

we do the capacity assessment,

1:42:34

we have already obviously accounted for it within the the ES chapter on traffic and transport.

1:42:40

So and

1:42:43

having said that, I should point out that the actual forecasts of traffic associated with high wood scheme are quite low in absolute terms, the peak period for the peak amount of traffic that was forecast to bring that much smaller Solar Farm Forward is 42 way vehicles a day.

1:43:06

So you know, whilst the impacts of that of the solar scheme are relatively low,

1:43:12

Section Eight of the construction traffic management plan on the outline version does set out details of the applicant's willingness to participate in a working group with any with that developer and any other developer that may come forward subsequently

1:43:29

to you know, for example, program non coincidental working or delivery patterns or AI movements that help mitigate The impact and minimize

1:43:41

effects on the on the local community.

1:43:46

Just said earlier, we are taking account of that.

1:43:49

I would service farm scheme within the

1:43:53

capacity assessment work that we're doing.

1:44:00

I know that other schemes in the region have been mentioned by interested parties, including Luton Airport, Thompson, New Town and Universal Studios. I think what Mr. Pollard was trying to say earlier is those schemes fall well outside of that zone of influence, therefore have not been counted.

1:44:20

Thank you. Okay, thanks.

1:44:24

The section nine, point 11 of chapter nine,

1:44:29

relating to traffic and transport, which is exam library references, double 09

1:44:38

reports on traffic flow information for the cumulative schemes that have been assessed. I just want to ask, has a worst case scenario been employed for those assessments?

1:44:54

Yes. So the as I say, the high wood solar farm scheme was the only one that can.

1:45:00

Of made it through the filtering process. And

1:45:05

as with any other solar scheme, including the application scheme, there's a bell curve of traffic movements that occur over the duration of construction starts slow, rises up, goes down again at the end, the peak construction movements associated with asking is 42 week movements per day, and that's what we've assumed for the basis of our cumulative assessment.

1:45:31

Okay, thank you.

1:45:35

Did have a question on Highwood, but you've answered it in in the presentation, so I'll move around the table, starting with the council. So if you do, you have any comments or questions on

1:45:51

Stevenson, Bedford, lower Council,

1:45:56

as he, as you mentioned in APB, 156, the airline, construction, traffic management plan. In Section Eight, you've referenced a construction traffic construction traffic management plan working group.

1:46:11

I think in paragraph 8.1, point two you refer to they could implement that group. I think we just need more commitment

1:46:21

to actually will establish the group. Should there be an overlap between schemes, either those that are known about now or those that might become known about in the future? And also as part of that, more detail about who would be involved, how those groups would work, and who they would report to.

1:46:48

Okay, thank you.

1:46:51

Do you like introduce any other colleagues? Yes, if I, if I can introduce Mr. Tuttle to speak on the same issue. See.

1:47:03

Thank you.

1:47:05

Thank you, sir for letting me speak. Yeah, I would concur with Bedford. There is a fair bit of in the in the travel plan, everything else, a bit of we could do this. We could do that. I think we just need a bit more commitment on those areas, rather than we could, but we will. I think that would, that would be a lot better.

1:47:26

Thank you. Okay, thank you. Mr. Tuttle,

1:47:30

the applicant. Like to respond on that just briefly, sir, yeah. Thank you. Lee Kendall, for the applicant, I don't see any issue. We will take it away, but I don't foresee any issue with us converting the word could to will. Of course, we do have to be aware that to

1:47:49

use an expression, it takes two to tango. We We cannot force anybody else to join the group, but we can certainly push and make efforts from our side.

1:48:03

Okay, thank you.

1:48:07

Anybody in the room like to make comment still? AC, yes, an absolutely fundamental point the applicant's plan has not considered this project is likely to be taking up resource and generating construction traffic the same time as the projects at, you know, Universal Studios, theme park, east, west, rail, possible housing developments at Thompson, Denny Brook,

1:48:30

the applicant department, transport, national highways, surrounding regional and local authorities and the planning inspector should consider the impact of these major developments taking place at the same time. It has not been done. And it must be wrong to consider this project in isolation from the other NSIPs, because I just think this really is going to be a nightmare. And to look at 10.6 miles, bear in mind the scheme is six miles in itself is actually not taking account of the other factors which are going to generate enormous traffic. So I would ask that this is looked at by national highways and the transport as well as the regional and local authorities. Thank you.

1:49:18

Thank you. As the

1:49:22

applicant, wanting to respond on that?

1:49:28

Martin Pollard, on behalf of the applicant,

1:49:33

thank you, sir. The as I said out set out earlier, the zone of influence has been set to be a proportionate assessment of of the requirements, and it was agreed with all of the all of the bodies it is there to assess the cumulative effects of this scheme, where, by this scheme, because, cumulatively with other schemes, generate significant environmental effects. And

1:49:58

that is why, as earner Vincent.

1:50:00

Influences is carried out with regard to Universal Studios, we, as in our scheme and our order limits weren't within their zone of influence, and nor is their assessment of traffic using any of the roads that we're proposing to use, and that's their assessment. So I

1:50:21

can only apologize that was, that's what's contained in there.

1:50:26

Similarly,

1:50:29

thamesford Newtown

1:50:31

is a proposed new town, that's absolutely correct, and there's one of 12 that are proposed in the UK.

1:50:37

However, it is not a firm proposal at this stage, it's going to consultation, along with the other 11 new towns in April, upon which the conclusion of which there'll be a decision made as to which all of those new town schemes are going to come forward at such a time as the scheme becomes a firm

commitment And there is information available for us to assess the in combination effects that site would be included in our in combination effects assessment.

1:51:09

Turning to some of the other schemes,

1:51:14

as we talked about earlier, East West Rail

1:51:20

is phase three is not committed yet, and based on the information that East West Rail have published, construction of that scheme that that phase, and bear in mind that that phase includes is all the way from Bedford to Tempsford, including the new Tempsford station.

1:51:38

It won't start until 2030 which is when our construction is going to be concluded. So that process won't start. That's the information that's available on their website. Similarly, with Thamesford, going back to that, the whole principle of Thamesford is based predicated upon the rail link being constructed, which, as I say, that process isn't going to start until 2030 if indeed it's ever funded by the government.

1:52:09

I also know there was other other references in relevant representations to the likes of Luton Airport Expansion, that's over 30 kilometers away from our site. And as as with our scheme. Universal Studios also dismiss Luton Airport Expansion within their zone of influence, and bear in mind that is an approved scheme

1:52:29

on the basis that it was too far away to give rise to cumulative effects.

1:52:35

Thank you, sir.

1:52:38

Thank you.

1:52:39

Can I ask if Mr. Bloom still available online from national highways.

1:52:48

Jeremy bloom, national highways

1:52:51

now I concur with the comments that have just been made. National Highways

1:52:57

is engaged in, has been closely engaged in the universal

1:53:02

development and is very closely engaged with East West rail, and will consider construction impacts as part of that engagement,

1:53:13

and on any of any other DCO that's brought forward, or Templar Newtown, for example, very much engaged with the Department of Transport, on on that, that development.

1:53:26

They're not committed at the moment, but each each of those individual projects will have to consider the cumulative impacts with other projects, and they get fully, thoroughly reviewed by national highways, as for Black Cat roundabout and the catstone gibberts scheme that's been through DCO process as well, and national highways will have been will have had to have demonstrated the cumulative impacts

1:53:55

of that scheme with others. So national highways does thoroughly assess and review the impact of

1:54:04

the construction of all these schemes across the network. In this particular case, I would concur

1:54:12

that the majority of the schemes either will be constructed later than this particular project or outside its zone of influence.

1:54:25

Okay, thank you. Mr. Bloom.

1:54:28

Any further questions on this agenda item?

1:54:34

Thank you. Just

1:54:37

sorry.

1:54:39

Thank you. Sean Woodward, local resident, I note that the construction accommodation for construction workers on the site radius out to 50 kilometers in the application that certainly will impact on things like Universal Studios, if they have any overlap at all, and maybe on site.

1:55:00

Some other developments that are much further out from the ones we've been discussing. And my concern is about the pressure on accommodation for staff, they'll all be fighting, and it may end up with staff being much further away from the site, and therefore arriving at particular slots and times to the site may become difficult if workers are much further away,

1:55:23

that's the only point. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Any response from the applicants on that we did hear yesterday at the open floor, hearing concern about construction workers living in vehicles as well.

1:55:39

Duncan comment on both of those,

1:55:44

yes, Thomas, both of the applicant. The

1:55:47

assessment, the socio economics assessment, which is

1:55:54

es chapter 14, a PP 050,

1:55:59

includes an assessment of our scheme in terms of local accommodation,

1:56:04

we can take away the point and look at cumulative impacts with with the silver scheme. So

1:56:11

we'll take that one away as an action.

1:56:15

Sorry.

1:56:18

So Martin pod on behalf of the applicant. The other schemes, national infrastructure schemes, like Universal Studios, have also done a socio economic assessment on the same basis. So we'll take that away and have a look at how they can fit together. Yes, thank you.

1:56:35

Okay.

1:56:37

If there are no further questions on this item, I'll move on to next steps.

1:56:44

The applicant has been keeping a list of action points which we can run through now if you are in a position to do

1:56:59

so for the applicant for the BNB hearings, we have applicant to respond in writing to points raised by Mr. Pike relating to BNB and soil quality. Applicant to clarify what our impact of scheme on regional national supply of BNB. Mr. Lacey to share Derek Wilkinson report relating to food security, applicant to follow up with additional detail of analysis relating to solar farms and food security. Applicant to respond in writing to clarify solar road map figures. Then second session on construction traffic, applicant to confirm in writing who would be included in Community Liaison Group, as set out in paragraph three two of the outline construction management plan. Applicant to share proposed construction access strategy plan with local highways authority, authorities, sorry. Applicant to respond in writing to points raised by Mr. Stapleton, including relation to cameras and management measures. Applicant check and confirm in writing

1:58:07

any heteros impacted by visibility space and management measures. Applicant to respond in writing to points raised by Mr. Turtle, including relation to geo fencing and one strike out point. Applicant to provide traffic figures for replacement activities. Applicant to respond in writing to councilor Syria, including in relation to impacts to local roads monitoring and enforcement. Sorry. Applicant to prepare and submit fly through footage of construction routes. Applicant to respond in writing to Mr. Pike in relation in relation to construction traffic matters, including relation to enforcement and management.

1:58:49

Applicant to update accident data by the end of examination, and then on this final session on

1:58:57

cumulative impacts, applicant to consider strength in the committing to construction traffic management plan working group, sorry, that's probably the previous one applicant to consider cumulative impacts of other projects relation relating to socio economic matters.

1:59:15

We can circulate that in writing. Okay, thank you.

1:59:20

Does anybody have any comment on that action list? Anything that wasn't mentioned that they thought should have been?

1:59:33

Sorry, I've also got

1:59:37

that you're going to take away the issue about school times and commuting times, and consider putting that on the DCO, maintaining an up to date list of items to be considered, considered under the zone of influence in the 10 kilometer zone, take away could to will in the traffic management schemes. Add temps for it when it becomes a commitment.

1:59:59

And.

2:00:00

Look at the community of impact of pressure on accommodation and the socio economic assessment on Universal Studios, and combine those.

2:00:09

Thank you. I think it did cover

2:00:12

that socio economic point.

2:00:14

Thank you for that.

2:00:19

Okay, so sorry.

2:00:24

Sean Woodward, local resident, thank you, sir.

2:00:28

I was unable to engage because of time constraints, which I fully understand, and I will submit this in writing as you requested.

2:00:36

Just could I ask that, if there are any points in what I submit. Could they be added to the list that we've just heard? Please? Thank you. Okay,

2:00:47

okay, thank you.

2:00:49

Item nine is now the close of this hearing. I believe that I've now covered all of the items on the agenda.

2:00:57

Thank you all for your assistance and contributions during this hearing.

2:01:03

I conclude this hearing, and all of the hearings scheduled for this week, there may be further hearings needed during the course of the examination. And I programmed days for the week, beginning of eighth of June, 2026

2:01:18

a notification of these, if needed will be sent in due course. I now close this issue specific hearing. Thank you. Thank.