



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Lime Down Solar Project
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 6 (ISH6) - Part 4
Date:	16 September 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.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:10:12 - 00:00:12:22

Okay, everybody. Welcome back.

00:00:14:17 - 00:00:29:28

So we're on to item six, construction traffic management plan. We're on the homeward stretch, but we definitely won't finish by five, so apologies to anyone who had somewhere to be at five. Let's get straight into it.

00:00:31:23 - 00:01:03:14

I've got a number of points I want to raise. And then I think at the end of those points, I may then come around and just ask if there's anything else on the construction traffic management plan. I don't want it to just be let's go through all of the plan unnecessarily, but certainly from the reading that I've done and some of the comments, I've put down some of the points which I think we could address today. So the applicant's plan for dealing with movements is largely a booking system and contractual penalties if breached.

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

Can the applicant explain how it can be guaranteed that the chosen delivery contractors will have or will be prepared to adopt appropriate technology to allow real time tracking and booking? This question was posed in the EXQ2 TT two point three, but the answer was sketchy.

00:01:34:13 - 00:01:57:11

James Darrell from the applicant. I'm sure that'll be part of the onboarding process, so that's something that IGP will have to undertake when they get their contractors on board. It's not something that is unusual to have a tracking or GPS system for deliveries to construction sites.

00:01:58:26 - 00:02:01:22

Right. But how can it be guaranteed?

00:02:02:00 - 00:02:34:29

Cloud Project for the applicant. Yes, because we've obviously said in the outline plan that a booking system will be set up. The final plan will need to be substantially in accordance with that. And then, the contractor that is appointed will be, contractually compelled to comply with the DCO and its subsequent management plans because it's an offense not to comply with them. So mister Daryl has mentioned that it's not unusual commitment to make, so it's not that we'd be asking contractors to do something completely out of the ordinary.

00:02:35:01 - 00:02:49:09

It's a standard system that's put in place for these larger infrastructure schemes, and therefore, we consider it to be perfectly feasible to get our contractors to comply both contractually to commit to complying with it, but

00:02:49:11 - 00:03:20:14

then also to comply with it in practice as well. Thank you. So in respect of HDV HCV management, paragraph 4.7.2 states that incoming vehicles would contact the site manager when approaching the site and departing HDVs would be held back. This would mean that HDVs would need to be held back from all compounds were that operational at the time. Does this not significantly increase logistical difficulties in implementing an effective HGV management system?

00:03:25:08 - 00:03:59:06

James Darrell for the applicant. It's an example of how it can be used and it's, as I say, that's the real time tracking and delivery information. It is a way of reporting vehicles coming site to and holding back vehicles on-site if that's required. So it's a management process. It doesn't mean that it's going to happen for every single delivery because as I've stated earlier, the numbers we're talking about are on the peak days, but on peak days we'll expect that to be carried out.

00:04:02:07 - 00:04:07:13

So only on peak days do you plan on holding back HGVs?

00:04:07:15 - 00:04:10:14

James L. Flapkin, that'll be anytime that it's needed. Yes.

00:04:10:16 - 00:04:11:01

Okay.

00:04:31:13 - 00:04:36:09

Does the applicant know how many banksmen it would require for the whole construction period?

00:04:38:18 - 00:04:50:15

James Darrell, the applicant, a banksman is a health and safety requirement for construction sites. So I can't tell you the exact number, but we've said that there'll be one available at each access in our CGMP.

00:04:51:16 - 00:04:54:17

So one for each access all of the time?

00:04:55:09 - 00:05:16:05

So they won't be standing there all of the time, but Bangsam will be there for any manoeuvres that, for example, I think we've said especially on the cable route access junctions where there's limited visibility rather than chopping the whole hedge down, we'll have a banksman or essentially someone with stop go boards that will come out and make sure that the vehicle can exit safely.

00:05:16:07 - 00:05:41:18

Okay, so given the banksmen are quite a significant part of your arrivals and departures, how are they coordinated to communicate with the operator of the booking system? So I guess I'm thinking about when you're ready to receive a booked delivery or an AGB is ready to leave the site, if the banksman's not there, because you said they're not standing at the access to the site all the time, how is that coordinated?

00:05:42:10 - 00:05:49:04

That's all coordinated by the principal contractor, so they're in control of that, also they're in control of the booking system.

00:05:50:12 - 00:06:05:12

How does it work in reality? I've not worked on a construction site, so I'm trying to understand. If you've got a peak day and you've got to hold back HDBs to stop another one coming, but you've already, you know, this is how is the banksman communicated with?

00:06:05:14 - 00:06:16:06

Yeah, so you do need people at the access for security reasons. You can't just let anybody drive into the site. So there will be people at the access pretty much all the time. So that's just we'll

00:06:16:08 - 00:06:17:24

be But they're not banksmen?

00:06:17:26 - 00:06:23:21

Well, some of them will be, depending which access it is. So the Cobre route access junctions, yeah, they'll be banksmen.

00:06:24:15 - 00:06:32:09

Okay. I'm not quite sure, maybe I'm not getting my point across, but I'll leave just it there for a moment.

00:06:41:03 - 00:06:43:27

Why don't we just come back to your tracking

00:06:57:11 - 00:07:06:10

to Wilshire Council's query on route monitoring. The applicant referred to the possibility of logistics routing apps being available.

00:07:07:28 - 00:07:16:22

But what I'm hearing is that they are available and you will be guaranteeing that they're used, but it just seems odd that you referred to them as being available.

00:07:19:23 - 00:07:26:27

I mean, are different to things me? We're trying to determine, are the rate HGVs following the routes? How are we able to monitor that?

00:07:28:15 - 00:07:34:08

And obviously, it's a tracking system or a logistics routing app system, I don't know if there's a difference.

00:07:34:20 - 00:08:07:04

Will throw for the applicant. I'll give you real time knowledge that I have of how these have been used. We've been speaking to, obviously I've been in touch with various contractors about existing schemes that we have. I've had a specific conversation with a principal contractor in regards to transport and also the project manager for that scheme about the use of their system. So vehicles were fitted with a tracking system and essentially this particular one that they used, forgive me, I cannot remember the name from the top of my head, it almost operates as a real time, almost like an Uber system.

00:08:07:11 - 00:08:57:07

So you are able to see exactly where your lorries are. There are various techniques that were used, as I understand it, in particular with convoys, for example. It may be that you place one tracker on a convoy and the whole convoy comes in together. We've obviously referred to that in terms of larger movements and things like that. It will completely depend on the contractor, but what we are saying we will do is they will be compelled to use a booking system with this real time monitoring. There are a few different options available. There are ones being developed, but the way that anywhere can sort of provide security of this is we will make sure that they do use this to be able to, as James says, if you've got holding areas, you've got lorries arriving and we need to hold them back, that management can all be done in real time by somebody who is A) the principal contractor or the manager of it, and then they will be supported with a team.

00:08:57:22 - 00:09:04:18

What that team looks like would all be dealt with and how we would, appoint the contractors as to who could best meet that.

00:09:04:20 - 00:09:35:07

The booking bit of it, I get. I get that you get called in advance or you've got something on a tracker that, know, they know what time they're delivering. It's... I'm still just need to be absolutely clear that the routing of those HGVs is tracked. Because if I'm just... The council should be able to request, you know, some way of verifying those routes are being followed. And and I think particularly the point being made is from the council's perspective,

00:09:37:29 - 00:10:18:02

anything that's coming through Bradford Cottages, you'd expect a lot of traffic on that route. They... So, you know, if they were to get calls people saying from there's loads of HGVs, it would be, well, that's okay because it's all going to Lyme Jamm D. But as we've heard today, there's potential for traffic also to route HGVs as well to route up to A to C by going up through Badfield Cottages and coming across from Norton. So how would the council be able to be assured that your construction vehicles are using the construction routes which are designated in your documents? And the only way to do that is a is is a live routing app so that you could interrogate that to be able to demonstrate they're following the routes they should be.

00:10:26:24 - 00:10:51:22

We'll throw for the applicant. So the system that I've been way way aware of sets the route. So you have, it's a GPS route that you follow like you would do to, you know, your Uber takes you home, it is following a route. So was a predetermined route. So any decision to go off that route would be

completely on the driver at the time. Now obviously there's penalties and all sorts of things involved, particularly on the contractors who manage them. So that's how

00:10:51:24 - 00:10:52:09

they

00:10:52:11 - 00:10:52:26

would

00:10:54:04 - 00:10:55:22

follow the route.

00:10:56:01 - 00:10:58:04

Yeah. Is the

00:10:59:20 - 00:11:19:00

commitment in section six point one four of the OCTMB sound enough to ensure that a route mapping system is incorporated with booking your system. Not just about people arriving at site at the times that they're specified. It's about how they get there.

00:11:19:17 - 00:11:38:03

Clever, if the app can... We can... That... That's definitely the intention. That... That's what we meant by the system that would be in place. We can look at clarifying the wording. What I think what we're trying to say is we can't... There are a lot of... You know, some contractors have their own bespoke system, others use ones that are more widely available, so we can't commit to the No.

00:11:38:05 - 00:11:41:04

I'm not spec... Asking to specify a particular product.

00:11:41:07 - 00:11:58:07

Yeah. But I think the functionality of it functionality of it. We can add a bit more specificity there. And I think we've already said that we would provide the data outputs of as that part of the monitoring to the council. I don't think we can necessarily provide access to the live tracking No. No. No.

00:11:58:09 - 00:12:27:03

To the council. But they did be able to interrogate if they said, you know, we wanted... We wanna see the, you know, the routing for that for that day because we had x number of complaints. There would be a way to interrogate that to be able to determine, you know, h g v number ten. Actually, no. Should have come in through junction seventeen. Actually, he came in through junction eighteen, and he went... Didn't follow the route. Well, the only way you're going to know that is by that type of system, and that's what I I guess.

00:12:28:01 - 00:12:40:28

Kleproshka, yes. That that point's understood, and that's my understanding is that that data will be made available Okay. To the council, obviously, in terms of what has happened that day or that week rather than access

00:12:41:00 - 00:12:43:01

to the To the live stream. No.

00:12:43:03 - 00:12:52:27

Stream as it were. But we will have a look and just see whether we can, just elaborate on the functionality of the booking system so that it's clear what's included.

00:12:59:19 - 00:13:11:26

Still on monitoring of routes, paragraph 6.14.7 states: The CTMP will be monitored and revised to ensure that contractors are complying with the document.

00:13:13:28 - 00:13:17:26

So what parameters will applicant use to determine compliance?

00:13:21:18 - 00:13:29:06

Is it just they followed the route, they arrived within the time set? How do you judge whether they comply or they don't comply?

00:13:31:28 - 00:13:58:28

MS So obviously there's booking times and arrivals, they can't turn it too early or too late, so that's quite easy to manage. It's difficult on an individual HDB basis, but for the route app it will have data which basically records all of the routing, you'll be able to see over that time period and who is delivering it in that time period. And then you can take further action essentially. So

00:14:05:10 - 00:14:42:16

my next point is paragraph 3.2.1 states that for the solar PV sites there'll be a small number of abnormal load deliveries associated with the substation transformers and the abnormal load movements are discussed separately in section six. I think actually it's section five, not section six, but that covers abnormal loads. But there's information at all on the best abnormal road deliveries. So I think in light of Mr. Banver mentioned very early this morning about the fact that when we were looking at the HTV numbers, the best in terms of its weight now has become an abnormal load.

00:14:45:22 - 00:15:00:12

That's not captured in there. But also, does it mean that the applicant to has agree the process for delivering the best units now with the council and the police in the normal way that it would have to agree abnormal loads?

00:15:02:00 - 00:15:37:00

James, Darryl for the applicant. Yes, the best movements need to be added in. Are abnormal loads and they go through the same abnormal load process, which is a special order license and agreement with the council and also the police and also traffic management measures at the same time. What happens in that process is the haulage companies, given the stuff that we've done, the sweat path analysis, and then they determine looking at the constraints actually what vehicle that they want to use for that route. So what we've done is we've tracked the absolute worst case vehicles through our routes, is this massive girder vehicle for the substations, for example.

00:15:38:06 - 00:15:45:29

But when comes it to the actual license it's probably going to be a smaller vehicle, but we wanted to look at a worst case assessment for this submission.

00:15:46:01 - 00:15:49:22

Yes, it just needs to be captured in the document.

00:15:51:19 - 00:15:57:22

Are there any weight restrictions on the Line Down D route that would need to be revisited in light of

00:16:00:04 - 00:16:00:26

that?

00:16:01:05 - 00:16:03:05

James Abercrombie, not that I'm aware.

00:16:09:15 - 00:16:28:17

Table four and paragraphs 3.2.3 to 3.2.5 all relate to peak numbers of HGV movements, but given our earlier discussion about peak movements, with obviously the numbers and the changes to the HGVs and so forth, it just needs revising. I'm sure you will pick that up.

00:16:32:07 - 00:16:54:14

So next on my of list matters, paragraph 3.2.7, apologies for jumping around, states the deliveries to and from access points one hundred twenty three to one hundred twenty seven, Gastard to Melksham substation will avoid school start and finish times. This appears to avoid impacting the Shore Primary School to the eastern side of the a three six five.

00:16:56:00 - 00:17:11:07

Your paragraph three point four point three then states workers will be advised not to travel past the school start/finish at times, but the applicant hasn't sought to avoid any such restrictions through Acton Tervill at the school finishing times, and I just wondered why not.

00:17:13:14 - 00:17:16:11

James, just because the

00:17:17:26 - 00:17:23:17

route past Acton Terrible doesn't actually go directly in front of the school, so that the other route is much closer.

00:17:23:19 - 00:17:28:15

But isn't the Shore Primary School off to the east of the route? It's actually not on the route.

00:17:30:17 - 00:17:32:17

Sorry, it's slightly off to the east.

00:17:32:19 - 00:18:03:15

Yeah, but that would be similar to the Acton Turbo, which is not on the main route either, but slightly to... So you would still have school crossing. I think for Acton Silver, there's no school... There's no crossing points anywhere within that section of that small little hamlet where the Fox and Hounds pub is, and you will have people off Tormaton Road. Schoolchildren would have to cross there, but you haven't made a similar concession for that part of the route as you have done for Shore Primary, which is, again, not on the main route.

00:18:03:17 - 00:18:06:14

It's off the side of the route. I just wonder why.

00:18:06:21 - 00:18:24:24

James, that often happened. Yeah. The school is further away from the route, that's why. And then also the B403 line carries more HDVs, and it's just more of a suitable route for HDVs along there, so it's nice and wide with the center line as well. We didn't feel the need that needed to state that.:

00:18:28:21 - 00:18:36:21

But the route nearshore primary school, and I'm sorry to keep pressing it, but that's an A road, the A365, but similarly you've

00:18:38:16 - 00:18:43:17

we've considered that's a more sensitive location for the school than this one off the B Road.

00:18:49:08 - 00:18:53:22

Anyway, I'll leave it with you to review, and just I'll carry on.

00:19:03:13 - 00:19:05:08

Six root- Sorry, sorry. Oh no, Go ahead.

00:19:05:10 - 00:19:14:19

I think Shore is actually directly on the route, isn't it? So Shore is actually directly on the route. It's not off to one side.

00:19:17:08 - 00:19:25:11

Okay. Well, we'll we'll we'll check that, but we'll park it for a moment. So turning to section six point six, in the penultimate bullet point,

00:19:27:11 - 00:19:39:14

it states, If roads on the construction routes are closed in the case of an emergency, and we were touching upon this not so long ago, construction traffic would use the formal diversion routes put in place by emergency services where suitable.

00:19:41:02 - 00:20:14:25

The requirement for construction traffic to use formal diversion routes may be entirely inappropriate because of the size of most construction vehicles. So I guess I'm just slightly concerned that just

because the diversion route's been put in, that it means that it's suitable for your vehicles. So I just wondered if there needs to be a firming up some sort of wording in the OCTMP which says actually you seek, you need council consent to confirm that those diversion routes are appropriate as opposed to, well, it's diversion, we can follow it.

00:20:16:10 - 00:20:43:29

Clare Bordech, the applicant. I think there's obviously... There's a difference between using them on an ongoing basis and HCVs being on the road and it being closed because there's an emergency and and vehicles needing to utilize another route they're because actually on the road at that point in time. We can have a look at the wording, but we wouldn't obviously be able to agree. We wouldn't want an HTV to just wait there until it's No. No. No. Approvals. If you

00:20:44:01 - 00:21:14:02

if you get to the start of the day and the construction vehicle's got to site, but by the end of the day it's closed, it can't be stuck on some part of the network. But if the road is closed for a period of time, could be an oil spillage and it's closed for a week or that needs resurfacing and the hasn't got to it, doesn't necessarily mean it would be acceptable for your HDBs to follow the diversion route to bring in deliveries in and out, over that period of time, but it doesn't seem to me to be any sort of dialogue required there with the council.

00:21:14:09 - 00:21:24:28

I mean, some of these diversion routes could be extremely narrow, just suitable for light vehicles, and you find yourself with an SUV stuck down a diversion route that shouldn't be down. Absolutely.

00:21:25:00 - 00:21:35:11

And I think that where we put where suitable, we thought we had covered But it's particular a side suitability. Sewer to me. Yes. We'll take that point away and see if I

00:21:35:13 - 00:21:54:14

can add any further clarification. All right. So I've got a question now from Wiltshire Council. In response to EXQ two DCO two. One and that was this was the question where I asked for you know, if if you if any IP had issues with any of the management documents.

00:21:56:12 - 00:22:18:12

Wiltshire said it remained concerned that road condition surveys would be covered by the outline construction traffic management plan rather than a separate section fifty nine agreement. And I just wondered if the applicant could explain its reasoning why amendments to the construction traffic management plan would not address its concern regarding condition surveys and why it's got a preference for section fifty nine.

00:22:33:18 - 00:22:52:26

David Daley, Wiltshire Council. I think the reason we wanted to because because we've got such a concern about the highway damage to the network, we were a bit concerned having something that was so important to us to shoehorned into into this document. I

00:22:55:08 - 00:23:26:26

mean, we consider the traffic to be extraordinary over the network, and we were... I think we were somewhat taken back by the applicant's response. I think it was deadline four, where it just was that they're not... In their view, that the thirty five thousand or thirty seven... Thirty six thousand HGVs over a two year period on this network, which is the current... Which is their current forecast, was not extraordinary. And I think we would I think our opinion will differ on that.

00:23:26:28 - 00:23:31:24

And obviously, examination authority, can can take your own view. But

00:23:33:20 - 00:23:54:01

notwithstanding that, the outline construction management plan as it stands, most of the things that we've asked to be included in there in terms of precondition survey, interim surveys, defects to be considered would probably give me some comfort that it's all there.

00:23:56:29 - 00:24:04:02

Effectively all those are all the things you would probably want in an agreement. It's governed. I think my one concern at the moment

00:24:07:03 - 00:24:08:24

is there's a comment

00:24:10:12 - 00:24:39:00

where it basically says in paragraph six twelve-one which talks about I'll read it out, Any identified highway defects or construction carriageway structural failures resulting from construction activities associated with the site will be corrected to the satisfaction of the local higher authority either on completion of the construction phase or if required for safety reasons prior to or during the construction phase, we're happy with that, which kind of gives us the scope for preemptive works that that we had talked about.

00:24:45:04 - 00:25:21:28

Then it goes on to say the highway authority will be allowed to recover any additional costs incurred over and above its existing responsibility to maintain in a steady state which seemed to me to be a bit grey. I thought, well, why are we recovering costs from you? Because effectively we would require you to address the damage, not we're not doing the work and recovering the costs. Secondly, it uses the its existing responsibility to maintain. So is there going be an argument of whether, well, you should have done it anyway, or it's somebody else's responsibility? I think our position throughout,

00:25:25:05 - 00:26:04:00

and I've said this in response to us, the Council view is that all the identified roads shall be required to be returned to a condition which is at least as good as the pre construction highway survey state or better, and that all for costs doing so must be borne by the applicant. This removes any ambiguity as to what will be expected and liability for remedial costs. So that's a bit stronger, and it basically says we will do it. I think Mr Burrow the made point and we all saw when we were on-site that some of the roads are damaged now, you're not going to return it to the state it was in to start with, so repairing it will a be betterment.

00:26:04:05 - 00:26:45:06

So we accept that. You can't take something that is damaged and say, actually, it's more damage. We'll put it back to a least damaged state. You are going to achieve betterment. But I think that's our one concern at the moment. It... It's not definitive. And given the applicant has also said, well, we actually don't consider our thinking, is this a get out of jail is it a get out of jail clause? And we're gonna have lots of arguments about it, coupled with fact the that the applicant, in their mind, doesn't consider thirty six thousand on HCV movements over a two year period on that particular network to be extraordinary trafficking, which is not about volume, it's about weight as well.

00:26:46:00 - 00:27:02:16

So we would we will challenge that. We don't agree with that, that it's not extraordinary. And I think most of what we see now in the CTMP is fine, it's just we don't want to see any wiggle room.

00:27:02:21 - 00:27:15:21

Yeah, I think I can appreciate where you're coming from, Mr. Dear. Be sitting in the applicant's corner for a moment, though, they won't be responsible for every bit of damage on the highway network. But I guess,

00:27:18:06 - 00:27:51:06

when we were looking at the flow diagrams before and the number of uplift on some of those sections of the route, even by the applicant's numbers, one hundred and thirty percent uplift on Bradfield Cottages is still is one hundred and thirteen percent uplift and albeit on a peak day, if we took that back to average days that, you know, across the network, it wouldn't be as severe, but it would still be a significant uplift. So chances are there will be a lot you know, there will be a lot of if there's a damage, there'll be a lot of that could be attributed to the construction vehicles, but I do take your point.

00:27:52:05 - 00:27:52:29

It's a difficult point to

00:27:53:01 - 00:27:53:16

prove, though.

00:27:53:18 - 00:28:06:02

It's difficult point prove. So you wanted something that's firmer, but then the applicant doesn't want to be bound to be responsible for having to repair bit every of road which happens not to be their fault.

00:28:06:04 - 00:28:39:00

I mean, obviously if something within those tiers happens, another application goes in, there's another somewhere else in the area causing lorry movements and it's clear some damage is actually not down to the applicant. I mean, we're going be fair and reasonable about that. But what we don't want is to get to an argument, we get to the end the job and goes, well, actually, you know, that's not us. It has nothing to do with When that's the only significant change over those two years in the way that network has been trafficked, there's a high likelihood, and no one can be one hundred percent,

00:28:41:10 - 00:28:46:29

that curb's falling apart and it was definitely your lorry. But there's a percentage high chance it would be. So I

00:28:47:01 - 00:28:48:19

think It's not there's one lorry, it's multiple lorry.

00:28:48:21 - 00:29:22:09

There's a willingness, basically, but at the moment, is this space to go over and above our existing responsibilities to maintain? It might be convinced very well, yeah, over those two years, you would have probably spent X on maintenance. And we may do, but I don't know how much we spend on maintenance on those roads. I mean, they're not perfect. I'm not going to say that the roads are perfect now. Otherwise, could go straight in and say, well, actually, Bradford Cottages is perfect. You can traffic away and we are in a position where we do have some existing damage.

00:29:23:05 - 00:29:33:17

The problem with existing damage is when the road's already damaged, it's going to break up a lot faster. So I understand the point, but that's my main.

00:29:35:05 - 00:30:07:08

And there are some other points you raised earlier about the booking system was an interesting one. I think we made the point that we, I think it's at the case council we're not going to be we're not going to be looking at you know we've got lots of other things to do we're not going to be looking at the council at the applicant's tracking data on a day to day basis for two years. We think it's relatively easy for the applicant to say a lorry arrives at our site, time in, registration number, the supplier.

00:30:07:10 - 00:30:14:09

We'll know what lorries have been to that site. That's an easy for the applicant. You have a booking in system booking log.

00:30:14:11 - 00:30:16:16

When you do that on minerals and waste sites all the time?

00:30:16:18 - 00:30:19:14

The only way we'll know that lorry, we'll

00:30:21:17 - 00:30:29:07

probably react complaints as is often the case. The network management team will get a complaint saying lorries are driving through the street of Lavington.

00:30:30:23 - 00:31:04:03

Provided we know what that supply, provided they cover registration numbers. Those are the obvious ways. If you think about the ways it could be non compliant. If lorries from routing from the A through basically routing across to Limestone A and are using they're not going by in the West. They'll be picked up at Norton because they shouldn't be there. And anything going through Griddleton to the street will pick up. Those residents will be they'll be phoning us every day, and we'll soon know the lorries and the registration numbers.

00:31:04:05 - 00:31:25:04

And if the applicant keeps a log of... You know, I'm thinking of how this practically works. We're not gonna be looking at at GPS data, GPS logs to say, well, course, he came in from the west here, but hang on a minute. Why was he seen here? And he's actually arrived at your site. So I think why the site log's being kept? And as we do, the

00:31:26:20 - 00:31:39:21

residents will be looking for every transgression that occurs and we'll soon know about it and we will be able to take it up to the site team. So that's the way it will probably work in practice.

00:31:39:26 - 00:31:46:10

Okay. Right. I want to back to the come applicant on points around

00:31:48:27 - 00:32:02:14

the issue over maintenance of the road. We started about whether it should be a section fifty nine but it seems we're getting close to the fact that CTMP is an okay place to park it.

00:32:04:12 - 00:32:07:16

But it's around that what is reasonable.

00:32:10:05 - 00:32:40:07

Clare Bordeaux of the applicant. Yes, I think it sounds like the principle has been accepted and we do appreciate that CTMPs in a DCO go much further than a CTMP that you would find on a different type of planning application. I think in terms of the wording here, we've been... You know, we do need to allow there to be damage that is caused by somebody else that we're not responsible for, which is why we have said it needs to be reasonably attributable to us.

00:32:40:14 - 00:33:10:18

So, we feel that the con... The the initial construction, condition surveys, sorry, and then the requirements to, do interim, condition surveys will establish that sort of evidence pattern in terms of helping to make that decision. Obviously, would be for the applicant to demonstrate why it doesn't consider damage to any be attributable to the scheme and have to provide some evidence, for that.

00:33:11:00 - 00:33:44:28

The last sentence there, we had added to try and be helpful, but I I it may think have caused some further concern. What we were saying is, well, we... If we identify some damage, then we will be responsible for for fixing that damage and the and the cost. But what we were trying to say was, well, there could be situation where, the highway authority is carrying out general maintenance, and it has to do some extra work as a result of the scheme, and it then does those works. And we're saying that the costs would be payable by the applicant in that scenario.

00:33:45:00 - 00:33:54:28

So obviously, we're doing to repair, we would, do those works ourselves, pay the cost, protective provisions, which have now been agreed between

00:33:56:22 - 00:34:35:29

applicant and the local highway authority. So we'll be putting those agreed versions in the deadline seven version of the draft ECO. If the applicant is doing repair works, then it has to provide things like commuted sums and a bond to make sure that the, the council is able to, have confidence that those works will be created to the appropriate standard, and then they have the the monies available to maintain those, works going forward. I think that's that last sentence we were trying to, cover a scenario where it's not the applicant that does the works because Vulture is doing some other works and has to do a bit extra because of our scheme that that would be covered.

00:34:36:01 - 00:34:43:29

But we are happy to consider if there's any specific drafting changes that the council would like to see to that particular paragraph then so we can

00:34:44:01 - 00:34:56:02

take those into account. So the wording which mister Lear had read out his preferred wording, you're not willing to go as far as that, so you're only looking for a change to the last sentence?

00:34:57:27 - 00:35:33:03

Double check. The applicant... Well, the the last sentence we... As I'd understood it was was causing some confusion, so we're happy to look at changes to But it... We still feel it's fair and reasonable that we only are paying for for damage that is caused by our scheme and that other vehicles do... It's not a scenario where there's no other HGVs using the roads. So if it's... If it if it can, if there's some other word, we're happy to consider maybe some other wording, but we do feel that just a blanket obligation for us to repair any damage on any of the routes that we use is is not fair and proportionate.

00:35:33:05 - 00:36:13:18

So I I I would agree with you to to to that extent. I I don't I think if you'd... Michelle, I'll come in a moment, but I think if you are looking at somewhere like the a four two nine, it carries a lot of vehicles without a doubt. Being able to attribute damage to your scheme would be almost impossible to say this was all caused by by Lyme Downs traffic. But when you're looking at certain parts of this route and you were... And I'm looking at Bradfield cottages particularly when when you look at your numbers and your flow and your line base numbers. And and I think, you know, I think mister Darryl this morning pointed once you get beyond the flying monk and you go north, actually, the numbers of HGVs moving that section on the baseline are quite low.

00:36:14:00 - 00:36:53:23

If there's damage in that section, chances are it is attributable to your development because there's so little other HGB maneuvers going through there. So I think it's those roads, probably, the FOSS Way, where your vehicles will be the main vehicles on that network. I don't think it's the... It's it's not everything that comes from junction seventeen to junction eighteen across the route. I think they're they're they're probably less of a concern for the council and I will definitely come to you in a moment. But I can I can see council why would want some protection over particularly those more minor rural sections of the route? But Miss Broderick I don't want you to to come back on it but I will come to the council.

00:36:54:02 - 00:37:25:19

Odette Shadowby, Welsh Council. So just to start with what Mister Lear was said was not what Miss Broderick just said, which is that, the applicant should be responsible for all works to all highways, all damage. That's not at all the council's position. We're in a scenario here where that passage of the construction management plan says that defects have occurred caused by the applicant. So it's been established that they've caused by the applicant. All the council is seeking is that in that scenario, the applicant has to put it back into the position it was, but the precondition survey.

00:37:26:01 - 00:37:31:00

So it's it's not a it's not an overly onerous request, essentially.

00:37:31:02 - 00:38:03:11

But my point was slightly further than that, which was actually that paragraph's all well and good, but there's always an element of proof that it's a causation. My point is a little bit wider, which is actually on certain sections of this route where damage may occur. It is likely to be the construction traffic because that is really the primary traffic on that part of the route. So I'm wondering if that's almost too narrow in its wording. But I also don't think the applicant should be bound to pay for every bit of highway network, which I know is not what you're seeking.

00:38:03:19 - 00:38:39:29

I think I would add actually within the wording of the construction management plan as it stands, we're not looking at roads like the B roads, the A roads, where it's almost impossible. So we have actually targeted, you will see, that's a listing precisely what sections because obviously we have to do the surveys, surveys aren't we're and not going to be surveying the A321, we're not going to be surveying we're not going to be asking for highway condition surveys of the A49 and major roads because as you say, there's lots of other traffic there.

00:38:40:01 - 00:39:05:24

Theirs is a small proportion, and they already carry weight already in terms of HGVs. So we have surveys that we've been agreeing to as to where we will do the surveys are Dyson roundabout to Bradfield cottages, they are the Foss Way, they are the section up to Lymedown A, Sherstone. So they're specifically named within there. Could to do that we to define the extent of the surveys.

00:39:07:12 - 00:39:12:28

We're not looking for damage. We're not looking for any remediation or monitoring beyond that.

00:39:13:02 - 00:39:17:08

Yeah. Ms. Brojek, did you I have no further points

00:39:17:10 - 00:39:53:29

to press on that. Fairbodger Kaplan, I think our view was just that the wording can reasonably be attributable was sufficient to cover a scenario where even along the specific roads, if it's clearly caused by somebody else, we can say, well, this damage wasn't caused by us, here is the evidence Yeah. To show that it's not reasonable to attribute the damage to us. So that... That's... We felt that that wording, provided us with that opportunity, but then obviously made it clear that if it's reasonable for the council to say, you know, it is our damage, then we would have to be able to repair it.

00:39:54:01 - 00:40:07:08

And just just to be clear, the... Picking up the point that Lear miss made before, it's not... We're not necessarily repairing it to the precondition survey in the sense that if the precondition survey says it's it's broken and gravel, we're

00:40:07:10 - 00:40:07:29

not gonna about.

00:40:08:01 - 00:40:19:08

Yeah. Bash it up to make it the same as it was before. So, but I don't think we needed to necessarily make that specifically clear that... But if if you like us to, then we can I don't think I don't think

00:40:19:10 - 00:40:21:08

we need to go that far? Okay.

00:40:23:03 - 00:40:32:02

Sorry. One not exactly sort of connected point on the construction management plan, if I can, just one second.

00:40:32:04 - 00:40:39:06

I am coming to stop lying down on the council on wider points in a moment. Just wanna go through my point, so unless it's related to something we've already said.

00:40:39:08 - 00:41:16:09

No, sort of is, which is why I'm... So it just goes back to the point you made earlier about the options available to the council if the routes turn out not to be suitable. And because this is one option in that scenario work that can be done to the road. You were asking about highways legislation and powers the council has. So there is the power to remediate the road and try to seek recoverable costs, but that doesn't really help if the road is fundamentally unsuitable for the reasons you identified earlier. We had a look in the break. The only other sort of statutory powers the council have are really extreme and sort of TROs under the Road Traffic Regulation Act.

00:41:16:11 - 00:41:48:03

So there really aren't powers, and those those would apply to all users of the road, all HGVs. So the council doesn't have statutory powers to stop these HGVs using these these roads if it turns out not to be suitable. So that's why the numbers do have to be precautionary and correct. And if if there is going to be... Given the the level of dispute and concern about the numbers, it probably does make sense to include something in the CTMP on that point as to what happens if the road turns out to be suitable not and not in accordance

00:41:48:05 - 00:41:59:07

with the raised, you know, what what seemed to me a reasonable suggestion about including some wording in there that allowed the council, you know, to to almost be a proactive

00:42:01:21 - 00:42:21:10

participant seeking in changes to the the CTMP on the light of unsuitability and I thought we had sort of resolved that the applicant was going to look at some wording because as miss Broderick said, the the powers that would be available to the council would would preclude all road users if you were stop to an HGV on a route, not just your own.

00:42:22:26 - 00:42:23:17

I'd actually be able

00:42:23:19 - 00:42:27:10

to go. If the applicant's going to go away and do that, that's fine.

00:42:27:12 - 00:42:37:24

Thank you. Yeah. And this is really to capture hypothetical scenario, which I wish I hadn't opened up in this forum, but I thought the applicant was willing to have a look at some wording.

00:42:38:11 - 00:43:09:15

Clubbudgets, the applicant. Yes, that's correct. I I guess the point, just to be clear, is obviously the construction outline traffic management plan has been based on, our estimated numbers. The final construction traffic management plan will contain the actual numbers required. So so the suitability of the road network will be determined by the precondition surveys and the final numbers. So what we're trying to cover here is something unexpected, that doesn't accord with the more detailed information that will be available.

00:43:09:17 - 00:43:12:10

It's for me. It's about trying cover something to unexpected. Yes.

00:43:13:04 - 00:43:32:04

So I I think we... It's not... The the final plan will have considerably more information in it that will allow the council to have comfort that it's... The measures are suitable, and then we will look at that, including something if circumstances happen to change during the construction period.

00:43:33:26 - 00:43:44:28

My last substantive point, just from my notes, was it was in relation to a network rail... There's two network rail assets.

00:43:47:00 - 00:44:27:19

One is SWBBninety sixforty seven, and that's a bridge on the Fos Way. And then they've got another asset, which is SWMBninetyforty, which is a bridge near Kemble on the A four twenty nine. And I actually had to look up where Kemble was because I'd never heard of it. During the consultation stage for this project, the applicant wrote to Network Rail and asked it to confirm the structural stability of its assets. And the reason I have these numbers is because the correspondence was included in Annex F of the original construction outline traffic management plan APP027.

00:44:28:25 - 00:45:01:00

Now, that correspondence exists still in Annex F, but it seems to either be redacted or sections have been wiped out. Because with regards to the Fosse Way Bridge, Network Rail advised that this

structure has an indicative capacity of fifty four tonnes gross vehicle weight for STGO Category III loads, and that is meaningless to me. Hopefully the traffic people in the room understand what an STGO Cat III load is.

00:45:01:22 - 00:45:37:24

It stated that any heavier loads will require further assessment on a by case case basis and it asked the applicant to supply the axle weights and spacings of the proposed load to enable assessment. Now that information, let's say, is in the original Annex F of APP twenty seven. Then with regard to Kemble Bridge, Network Rail advised that the structure has an indicative capacity of one hundred and fifty four tonnes gross vehicle weight for STGO Category III loads, and it said that any heavier loads, again, will require assessment on a case by case basis, and it similarly asked the applicant for axle weights and spacings.

00:45:39:12 - 00:46:04:04

Now, I don't know if those weights and spacings have been supplied to network rail and whether they've confirmed suitability of travelling over their assets with your loads. It would seem an oversight to me if that original consultation response from Network Rail hasn't been dealt with. So I'm wondering if the applicant could give me an update.

00:46:07:07 - 00:46:08:25

James Alf, the applicant, yeah.

00:46:10:13 - 00:46:22:04

There is further correspondence with them after that, which is obviously not in the document, so we add can that in. The final load and vehicle type is obviously a matter for the special order license.

00:46:24:01 - 00:46:32:07

But do you know at the moment if any of your vehicles go beyond what they've stated? So based on your indicative vehicles, because you've already Yeah,

00:46:32:29 - 00:46:55:28

not the axle loads, because we're using a girder vehicle, so it spreads the load massively, the actual axle loads are way below, that's the same on the other bridge as well, we've used a girder vehicle. As I say, when it comes the to special order license, the vehicle might change, but at least they know what the constraints are. The haulage company will know those two areas and what the constraints are there, and that determines the vehicle type.

00:46:56:03 - 00:47:32:04

Okay. So I want to issue an action for the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan to be clear on this matter, because say Annex F, the latest version, seems to be missing Network Rail's original response. I don't know why that is the case, but it isn't there. And I just think the council needs to be aware of it because it also connects to their root network. So I'd like Annex F to be reinstated in its original form with anything, any other information from network rail.

00:47:32:09 - 00:47:36:06

So the council's got it. Cleveridge the upkeen.

00:47:36:09 - 00:48:04:08

Yes, we will double check it and and look at that. I think the the the redactions, I believe, are the are the ones done by pins to just remove you. It's completely white. That's what... Yeah. I think that it has disappeared while we've... It's behind a a redaction, which I believe are just to remove the the purse... The names of the people who were sending the Yeah. Emails and things like that. We will, yeah, double check that. And as mister Daryl said, to the extent that there's been further correspondence,

00:48:04:10 - 00:48:45:04

then we can have that added in. Alright. So while we're just on the issue of bridge weight limits, the relevant rep stage, in relevant rep nineteen eighty, there was an IP who raised a concern about weight limits on Forlorn Bridge in Sherston, F O R L O R N. Now, I looked up Fulham Bridge, I can't find it. I don't know where it is, so I don't... I couldn't check if your routes go across this particular bridge, but the IP's concern, was whether the bridge was strong enough to take the impact of the eight wheeler tipper lorries.

00:48:45:21 - 00:48:55:18

They said during the recent floods water was at the top of the arches, so can the applicant or the council advise me if the bridge is on the route and if the weight has been assessed?

00:48:56:03 - 00:48:58:15

James Dahl for the applicant, that's not on the route.

00:48:58:22 - 00:49:28:02

Thank you. I looked it up for Lorne Bridge on Google and Bing Maps, I couldn't find it. So I thought I'd just better check because it was raised by the IP, and I wanted just to make sure it was covered. Okay. So those are my points. I want to come now to stop lying down, construction traffic management plan, any of the things that we've already discussed. Happy take to submissions on or if there are other things within the construction traffic management plan.

00:49:28:04 - 00:49:38:12

Okay. Thanks. Bruce Bamba, stop lying down. I think you've picked up most of the points. Thank you for that. Couple of

00:49:40:04 - 00:50:10:15

points to be made. On the issue of banksmen that we touched on briefly, I am slightly concerned that, well, this could be added to the CTMP. Banksmen need to be trained and qualified. They can't just be people standing at an access, taking details of vehicles. They need to be separated in terms of their function from other responsibilities because when they're called upon to do their duty, they need to be there.

00:50:11:02 - 00:50:52:18

And they need to be trained and qualified because obviously they don't have any powers on the highway to stop vehicles or make vehicles give way. So I think it's worthwhile just making it clear that if banksmen are being relied upon, that they should be trained. And if there's only one per access, then the question arises, well, what happens at lunchtime or when they need to have a comfort break?

Obviously, needs to be a consistent or there needs to be a system in place where, if they are required for the safe ingress and exit of vehicles, then they are always available.

00:50:56:01 - 00:51:02:00

Just as a comment on the system that's being proposed to manage HGVs.

00:51:04:00 - 00:51:23:24

It's a question of just the complexity of the whole system. If this site were a single site and we have identified, say, there's an A road and there's one or two accesses off that A road, then I can, you know, it's very easy to then manage, those vehicles because,

00:51:25:14 - 00:51:59:29

you can identify them if they go on inappropriate, routes. We're talking not about that here. We're talking about a site with fifty access points. So we have an immense complexity. We also have complexity in terms of all the different subcontractors suppliers. And we've also got the complexity because we've got these solar array areas and we've got the cable route areas. And we have also this added layer, the necessity to and try manage the timings themselves.

00:52:00:01 - 00:52:45:18

So rather than just monitoring the routes that are being taken, there is a requirement to actually control the times at which these vehicles arrive and put in place some kind of system that can achieve that. And that system itself relies on the availability of marshalling areas, which again haven't been demonstrated to be constantly available. So although, okay, there can be wording put in place that requires legally the applicants to ensure the that system is implemented and there are safeguards put in place.

00:52:46:29 - 00:53:09:03

The sheer layer upon layer of complexity required in this situation, I think, both makes it essential that the system that is secured is as reliable as possible, but also demonstrates just how sensitive this whole scheme is, because

00:53:11:10 - 00:53:22:06

access to almost every part of it is constrained, and there are potential severe implications if that management doesn't work and isn't secured.

00:53:26:19 - 00:53:40:23

The other point, which I've I've... Oh, dear. We've gone over this previously. This point about the school in Yatenkinaw, I've seen schoolchildren crossing over that road during

00:53:41:03 - 00:53:42:12

Acton Sorry. Acton

00:53:42:14 - 00:54:17:10

Acton Turville. Yeah. Sorry. Acton Turville crossing that road, between, where the pub is and the other side. Mister Dowell, you know, stated, well, it's nice and wide. It is wide, and that's what makes it difficult to cross. He said, well, this road also carries a significant number of HGVs. It does carry

HGVs. But as we talked about this morning, we are looking at a hundred percent increase plus in HGVs, and that is a significant change. That's a high level of increase, which will make it more difficult and more dangerous to cross that road.

00:54:17:17 - 00:54:27:22

So I do think the applicant needs to think carefully about the timing of impact of construction traffic at that point in the network.

00:54:40:25 - 00:54:42:11

That's it for me. Thank you.

00:54:42:13 - 00:54:43:03

Thank you.

00:54:43:05 - 00:55:16:02

Thank you, madam. Two, I think, very, very small points from me. One, it's been with raised us by, people who, sort of, you know, give give us concerns and information about... A specific concern about annoyance effects arising out of reversing HGVs. I think it's one of one the things that we flagged in our, rep five submission was whether it might be possible for, controls to be placed on the noise that HGVs make, particularly reversing noises.

00:55:16:04 - 00:55:33:11

I've seen this done before in planning permissions. I've not seen it in a DCO requirement for where in certain settings there isn't reversing noises because it causes basically amenity effects on people who are nearby and whether that can be controlled in some way.

00:55:33:13 - 00:55:36:00

Are there particular receptors that you're considering?

00:55:36:02 - 00:56:01:10

It's generally residential receptors nearby to, compounds, and the like. And I know as well, I think it's possibly relevant at a place like Grittleton House, and the location of Grittleton House has been quite close to numbers. We can provide some more specificity if that... I mean I mean, it may just not be feasible. So I I I I raise it because I was... I've I've been asked to raise it. Actually might... Wasn't...

00:56:07:05 - 00:56:11:27

Yeah. No. Great. Sorry. It's just about one very minor point, which I've spent quite a lot of time explaining.

00:56:15:01 - 00:56:16:11

That was it. Okay.

00:56:16:26 - 00:56:32:06

Council, please. Oh, dear. Chad Bee, Council. The only other point left from the council is really an ecology point related to the woods that will be discussed under the next item. So I don't know if you want us to raise it now during the construction traffic management panel or leave it over.

00:56:32:25 - 00:56:47:15

Is this about Robborn? North Binkham Wood? Yeah. Let's just park at a moment because we will be coming on to that. Thank you. Okay. Miss Brody, did you want to respond to anything to stop my hand or are you happy to move forward?

00:56:49:08 - 00:56:51:11

Deal with any responses in writing.

00:56:56:16 - 00:57:02:13

We've taken on board the comment about the school, so we will have a look at that and

00:57:04:27 - 00:57:31:28

note the other comments made, think all we would say is obviously NSIP scale projects are complex and logistically complex projects, and the people undertaking them will have suitable systems in place. So we don't consider the complexity of this particular project to be in any way particularly unique or a certain type of project that couldn't be managed in the way that these large scale infrastructure projects are typically managed across the country. Okay.

00:57:33:25 - 00:57:40:14

All right, nearly there everyone, nearly there. Other traffic matters, item seven.

00:57:42:28 - 00:57:50:29

I just want to look at just two points on abnormal indivisible load movements.

00:57:56:00 - 00:58:12:29

Mister Bamba, you expressed concern again in AS twenty eight about Fowlswick Lane. These concerns have come up before, and one of the parish councils has obviously raised concern. We've asked a number of questions in EXQs about that.

00:58:14:16 - 00:58:31:26

I wonder if it would be helpful if we had a plan on screen, and then it would be helpful if you could take me through your concerns still about it. So maybe access plan eleven of twenty three on Rep five thousand and nine might help. The applicant's team could share that.

00:58:48:02 - 00:58:53:22

Is that the plan I was thinking about? Plan eleven, does that show Fowlswick Lane?

00:59:00:27 - 00:59:01:21

Nope.

00:59:03:19 - 00:59:07:09

Oh, no. Maybe down there to the... Keep coming down.

00:59:14:16 - 00:59:15:07

Up.

00:59:17:29 - 00:59:18:14

Up.

00:59:22:06 - 00:59:24:25

Oh, no. All right. Let's scrap that plan.

00:59:26:13 - 00:59:34:24

Maybe I've written down the wrong number, but there's also PL one hundred nine B in Annex D of the transport assessment, which is REP six thousand fourteen.

00:59:37:09 - 00:59:41:09

I'll try and open up those works plans and maybe I can find it myself, the access plan.

00:59:52:22 - 00:59:53:28

Internet's very slow.

01:00:05:10 - 01:00:08:28

Yeah, one hundred nine B. I'm getting all these numbers wrong.

01:00:10:18 - 01:00:14:26

Yes, that's it, but that's actually into the site, isn't it? And that's not coming off

01:00:17:15 - 01:00:22:21

the main roads, it's actually up at the access point into the compound.

01:00:23:15 - 01:00:45:28

Yes, Proust Bamba stop line down. So there's a number of issues that I've raised, and yeah, the parish council has also queried exactly how this is going to work. The section of Foulswick Lane between the B four thousand thirty nine and the access point is quite narrow.

01:00:47:28 - 01:01:18:02

The junction of Falzwick Lane with the B4039, which is down to the southwest from where we're looking on that plan there, that hasn't been tested. It's quite a tight junction. And as you can see there, there's, a requirement to take abnormal loads in there. So it's not clear whether it's possible to get vehicles onto Foulswick Lane, then the question of what happens on Foulswick Lane when you've got the vehicles on there.

01:01:18:14 - 01:01:21:10

And then when we have the access

01:01:23:17 - 01:01:54:14

you may be familiar with this access point, but the road is again, it's very constrained with hedgerows tight on both sides as you sort of go around the bend, and the visibility around the bend is very poor.

So it's been suggested suggested that a banksman would be there, but it's difficult to envisage exactly how this would work, because a banksman by themselves wouldn't be able to know what was coming around the bend, because you just can't see around the bend.

01:01:54:16 - 01:01:58:09

So there'd have to be a more complicated arrangement in some way.

01:02:00:14 - 01:02:02:09

And there was also a point about

01:02:04:04 - 01:02:43:27

the impact on which I think a point that might be brought up tomorrow about the impact that this would have on the hedgerows along Foulswick Lane, because the abnormal load there is seen to be taking out quite a long stretch of the hedgerow there. Whereas in the landscape assessment, the ecological impact, I think it is only a small section, essentially the section allowing HGVs to turn in and out has been allowed for. And also there is a again, if you go to that point, there's quite a level difference between Valjouk Lane and the site itself. Itself.

01:02:43:29 - 01:03:02:25

Itself. So it's not clear how that would kind of operate. So I think there's a whole series of details and potential impacts that haven't been thought about and haven't been sort of put out there for people to consider,

01:03:04:17 - 01:03:08:10

and there is a risk that this gets overlooked.

01:03:09:16 - 01:03:17:14

Thank you. Yeah, I think Chippenham Without Parish Council's Rep five thousand one hundred fourteen reiterated similar concerns.

01:03:21:21 - 01:03:37:05

Could someone from the Africans team just take us through this stretch? If you can find it in the works plan, it might be helpful to take us back to the main highway and maneuver along this route.

01:04:11:28 - 01:04:14:13

I'm just locating it on the works plan now.

01:04:23:01 - 01:04:28:07

Yeah. It definitely was plan eleven. Sheet eleven of of twenty three.

01:04:33:15 - 01:04:35:08

It was access one zero nine.

01:04:37:13 - 01:04:40:24

It was the big square we were looking at as we were going up and down that plan.

01:04:57:02 - 01:05:09:11

Okay, James Darrell for the applicant. So the bottom right corner of that red box is the junction with Falsett Lane in the B4039. So

01:05:10:27 - 01:05:42:12

the idea is that traffic, HDVs and the aerial, to get to the site, will travel north up the B4039 and turn right at that junction. Then they'll travel along the Folzwick Lane and then turn left into the site. And then on exit, they'll do the opposite manoeuvres. They'll come along Folswick Lane and then they'll turn left and come out. We have tracked that access or that name B4039 Junction with the AIL that's being used.

01:05:42:19 - 01:05:49:11

The AIL it works and it works fine, but it's not in the submission, so we're happy to provide that.

01:05:49:13 - 01:06:19:19

Yeah, you... I'm surprised it's not in the submissions because we've talked about this particular access quite a few times now and say we keep receiving representations about it. We visited site because I think my question, was back in ish three, I couldn't understand why we had works number running up as far as the cottages when the access was coming from the B four thousand thirty nine and didn't understand the extension the highway high work...

01:06:19:21 - 01:06:36:24

Improvement works north of the actual access, particularly when you said on-site, you would turn your you would take the cab off and, you know, turn your load around within the site and therefore didn't need to use any further part of Fowlswick Lane.

01:06:37:16 - 01:07:13:22

So the AIR vehicle would come up and then turn left into the site, and we've shown the vehicle track and the access in PL109B. So the work that's required to get the vehicle into the site. To turn around, obviously it can use the site area to turn around and then come back out. But we're not proposing to remove of lots hedgerow there or anything, and we're proposing a banksman, maybe stop go boards to manage the HEVs as they leave the site.

01:07:13:24 - 01:07:33:09

The LEL is a different thing because it's followed in and out by But another for the four HGVs, so this is a cable route, it's in operation for ninety days. There's four HGVs in and then they have to leave again, that's eight movements. And over that's the whole course of the day. So it's quite a low number of movements.

01:07:33:11 - 01:07:35:06

And would you still have a banksman for those?

01:07:35:08 - 01:07:43:28

Yeah, that's what the banksman's for is for those, yeah, absolutely. The reason for that is it means we don't have to cut down any hedge, which is obviously an

01:07:45:14 - 01:07:53:06

ecological impact. We don't want to cut down any hedge. It's a low number of movements, so therefore it can be managed by banks when we stop go boards.

01:07:53:08 - 01:08:25:23

Okay, so we'll give you action an to submit those documents, that sweat path into examination. What would also be helpful because Chippenham without parish are not here is if you directly corresponded with them and provided the same information to them and almost really if you could do that before deadline seven because that may give the parish council an opportunity to comment at deadline seven on that submission. So, there's a obviously, whatever submit you to them, you submit into evidence to us, but it would be helpful for them to have it early.

01:08:26:10 - 01:08:37:21

And likewise for Mr. Bamba because he has raised this as a point. If we could distribute some of this information early before it hits examination library, that would be really good.

01:08:40:08 - 01:08:48:24

So then I wanna come on to Grittleton Crossroads, and I've still got a concern about this left turn into Alderton ton Road,

01:08:50:15 - 01:09:24:01

as you come from Burton. So I specifically asked a question at EXQ2 TT two point eight about the adequacy of this AIL swept path in Annex H of the transport assessment because it didn't show a left turn. And I queried if the AIL then would turn right to Yatun Kanal and have to unhitch and rehit the cab and then how that maneuver would happen on that stretch of road. The applicant's response in Rep five thousand and ninety seven was that the AIL vehicle would have a tractor cab at either end, eliminating the need to unhitch and pass.

01:09:24:20 - 01:09:54:08

But I've got to call that into question because the drawing in the sweat path doesn't show an AIL vehicle with a cab on both ends, and it certainly doesn't in the little description of the vehicle on the top of that plan either. So that leaves me again with serious doubt if that manoeuvre can be undertaken, without any further loss of trees, or any other highway works that need to happen at that crossroads. So Mr Darrell, can you shed some light on that?

01:09:54:15 - 01:10:23:11

Yeah, James. The truck or the tractor as it's called on the rear of the vehicle, it sits within within the red lines and green lines of the track of the sweat path analysis. So we should have shown it on there, but it's not on there. But it sits within the track, the existing track, so it doesn't make the turning any wider or create any more, doesn't run over additional any land or anything like that.

01:10:25:16 - 01:10:30:05

Could we have an updated swept path? Because I think this is quite important. This critical is

01:10:32:03 - 01:10:41:27

junction in a really sensitive area, and the plan that we've got in doesn't reflect what you're saying elsewhere in writing.

01:10:43:24 - 01:10:46:09

Yes, SB twenty one.

01:10:47:17 - 01:10:58:27

If you can show it show us what you mean. Because when I looked at that plan, it wasn't clear to me. Indeed, I looked at the right plan.

01:11:26:04 - 01:11:30:04

We're just having a technical issue with sharing of plans. Yeah. Know, the Internet's

01:11:30:06 - 01:11:42:18

really slow. Trying to open up the plans, so I do appreciate it. I I would go on to my next point about Rodbonne, but that's also about sharing some plans on the screen. So, we can't really proceed.

01:12:01:27 - 01:12:25:10

The applicant, having looked at this... At the plan just now, it does look like in the little diagram in the top right hand corner that shows the indicative drawing, then we need to just show there being a CAB at either either end. So that's something that can be added to the drawing. Can I just be clear that the swept path also shows it because it doesn't look obvious to me?

01:12:25:12 - 01:12:35:22

Yes. So it's Annex H. It's The cab will fall within the red lines, you can't see it, so I'm going to make it clear in the resubmission of this.

01:12:35:24 - 01:12:36:09

Thank you.

01:12:36:11 - 01:12:39:03

But it just falls within the red line, it doesn't create any additional works or anything like that.

01:12:39:05 - 01:12:40:16

Yeah, no, that would be

01:12:42:06 - 01:12:48:03

something that would be required and it would helpful because our concerns then could be

01:12:49:25 - 01:13:03:23

hopefully overcome. All right, so I'm on to the last substantive point under this item, and this is about Rod Bourne. And the question I have is what is happening here?

01:13:05:15 - 01:13:51:03

I have to say I'm still really confused around what's happening around Rodbourne and Line Down E. Dead Line four, the OCTMP, REP four thousand fifty eight included an additional column to Table two to identify works required to Rodbourne, referred to in the document as north and south of Cabbage Lane. So I wasn't aware it was called Cabbage Lane, but that's what it's referred to in the OCTMP. And then a new table seven was also inserted to identify a description of temporary highway works, and it states for Rodbourne, section of existing highway serving access eleven to eighteen, if required, repairs to existing carriageway, e.

01:13:51:05 - 01:14:22:19

G, repairing potholes. Adjacent to North Binkham Wood, any upgrades to existing carriageway will specialist no dig construction methodology and specification to avoid the need to excavate and potentially incur root damage. If an upgrade is required, the upgraded carriageway surface will be built on top of the existing ground level with no digging into the ground for a subbase. Then at deadline five, the applicant includes an additional paragraph in Rep five thousand eighty four at paragraph two point one one one.

01:14:22:28 - 01:15:00:05

It in states relation to the existing highway between Rodbourne Road and the fork in the road approximately two seventy meters to the west, this section will be used to route to accesses eleven to seventeen during the operational phase only. Then goes on to say: Vehicle movements will be associated with occasional maintenance as well as replacement of panels and equipment when required. Vegetation clearance will be limited to the trimming of the hedgerow. In this location there will be no hedgerow removal refer to Annex A of the OEPMS, and no street furniture or lighting added.

01:15:00:24 - 01:15:21:05

So that's a lot of information, and it was helpful and long overdue. The extent of work numbers 8A and 8B in this area, sheets six and seven of the work plans, and what is happening needs explaining to me because I think the aid of some plans and talking me through what's happening operationally, what's happening during construction,

01:15:23:29 - 01:15:35:10

will serve two purposes. One, for my colleague who's going to be covering ecology next week and what's happening with North Binkham Wood and from a highway's perspective, what is happening in this whole section.

01:15:42:07 - 01:15:44:02

It changed out for the applicant.

01:15:45:11 - 01:15:47:25

If you've got a plan to put on the screen, it would be really helpful.

01:15:56:10 - 01:15:58:22

Six and seven of the works plans, will that? Yeah,

01:16:00:29 - 01:16:06:11

but we just don't have... currently Not able to access access to any plans. Share the plans at the moment.

01:16:06:13 - 01:16:09:00

I'm just trying to come to to

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

see whether we can have a workaround and get somebody else to have access to share plans. We can obviously

01:16:19:06 - 01:16:23:18

I don't know whether the PINs case officer is able to share the plan on the basis that we've

01:16:23:20 - 01:16:24:05

been able to.

01:16:24:07 - 01:16:27:11

So if we can point them in the right direction, so we'll just see whether we can

01:16:27:13 - 01:16:30:27

do that instead.... If you're on watching the live stream, you see...

01:16:34:27 - 01:16:40:07

James, I can give you a sort of overview without referring to any plans, if that's okay.

01:16:40:09 - 01:16:53:02

Yeah. Well, give us an overview, but I think then we... And my colleague, Mr North, said we could all bring up a section of Robborn on our screens. It doesn't help anybody watching on livestream because obviously when we share, they can see what we can see. Okay.

01:17:02:23 - 01:17:15:01

Odetta shall be wheelchair council. If we use the very specific application reference numbers and are clear what pages, I guess people watching online could bring it up on their own screens as well, if we're very, very clear what documents it is.

01:17:16:00 - 01:17:27:29

Chris Jansen, behalf of the applicant, and Rep five thousand forty two is probably one of the clearest drawings to explain the scenario at Bincam Wood, which is the updated LEMP plans that have been submitted.

01:17:29:24 - 01:17:31:00

And load that.

01:17:32:03 - 01:17:43:17

Yeah, Rep five zero four two. Obviously, it's separate from the works brands and it's only illustrative, but I think for the purpose of the conversation we're about to have, it will be quite useful.

01:17:59:19 - 01:18:07:10

Yes, I've that got open on my screen. Has everybody else managed to open Rec five zero four two?

01:18:12:16 - 01:18:14:08

Yes. A real struggle. Had it on PDF.

01:18:16:15 - 01:18:19:09

I can get the preview on the left but not the main

01:18:21:07 - 01:18:21:22

screen.

01:18:44:23 - 01:18:49:05

You can't you can't from the library because the library only opens up in browser. Can't

01:18:49:10 - 01:18:50:09

Yeah. I I

01:18:51:22 - 01:18:53:05

downloaded it in advance.

01:18:54:02 - 01:18:59:27

That's alright.

01:19:01:20 - 01:19:07:11

Yeah. Dutch have you want to cancel. If you do download it from the library, it seems to work. So I I have it now.

01:19:09:08 - 01:19:11:23

See other members of the team do as well.

01:19:14:21 - 01:19:16:29

As long as we've got one per party

01:19:18:14 - 01:19:19:11

between us.

01:19:22:11 - 01:19:30:02

So we've got Wiltshire Council have it open. I have it open. Mr Northover has it open. Mr Jackson has it open.

01:19:32:24 - 01:19:38:00

Okay. So are we comfortable to proceed with us all having a document open?

01:19:42:17 - 01:19:43:15

That shall have been one of

01:19:43:17 - 01:19:59:17

reps again. Stop lying down. Yeah. Okay. Mr. Jackson or mister Daryl. Just... Somebody's just to take me through the accesses, what was happening with the works here and in relation to North Bincam Wood as well.

01:20:05:10 - 01:20:16:11

Will Peralful for the applicant. I'll try and give you the high level changes and then there are some more specifics I think that just relate to particular management plans and stuff like that. So

01:20:18:01 - 01:20:47:26

the major thing that we've done is obviously originally we had the access coming from the A four twenty nine and coming in towards E1. Was where you can see just north of E1, circumnavigates a pond there. So that's hence that curve. And then we had the track running up using the existing access there against North Bincumbod, which is where concerns are raised by British Council on Polish grounds, aboricultural grounds and such. So

01:20:49:14 - 01:21:25:05

we have done with the main access is take that into field E2 in terms of a construction access. So now to reach E6, which is where transformer would be located, that is essentially the AIL route that passes through e two, e three, sweeps around that, northeastern boundary of e three and then into the transformer. So for a construction access, that's the main route. The the the route that remains around the pond around the outside is where we've tried to limit its uses as as much as possible.

01:21:26:21 - 01:21:32:11

I think what we then have is between where E6 is leading up to

01:21:33:26 - 01:21:54:24

the if you go northeast from E6, up that access track between E4 and E7, that is the area that we would use for operational purposes which you referred to in terms of being able to get to the substation from the highway just a little bit further off map there up onto the Rodbourne Road.

01:21:56:17 - 01:22:00:19

The the actual specifics of why we've retained

01:22:02:09 - 01:22:27:12

work number 8B, 8A, sorry, I forgot, I've not got the work number in front of me, on the North Bingham Road is purely for those limited uses that we've tried to define. It's worth noting that that route would still be used by existing agricultural machinery. I'll pass over to, I think, Mr. Jackson just to explain a little bit more on that side of things.

01:22:28:15 - 01:23:02:06

Thank you. I'm Chris Jackson, behalf of the applicant. We've got the land or the track route between Binkum Wood and E2 and E3. And obviously, the intention is that we will continue to use that to be able to maintain the hedgerow. So the external hedgerow essentially that faces that track that we've walked down on our company site visit. So we've got to be able to get into there to maintain that hedgerow and obviously just face it up and trim it as and when it's needed.

01:23:02:13 - 01:23:35:19

And and that's what that that ongoing operational period of the of the requirement is what what it's looking for so that we can continue to maintain that. And as Mr. Frelful just described, there is an existing agricultural use farm access route up and down that, recognizing that that is located within the fifteen meter offset from the Anjum woodland. But if we are going to look after that, that hedgerow, maintain that hedgerow, we need to be able to get access up and down that track to be able to maintain that maintenance.

01:23:37:27 - 01:23:52:16

Okay. just So coming back at stage for construction period, I mean, was clear from the last ish, you were coming in off the a four two nine. I think it's... Is it the Evises land, which is where you would come into e one. So

01:23:55:08 - 01:24:26:01

I was comfortable with that. We were then talking about how you then cross the railway track with all the materials that you needed. The discussion was that it would all be offloaded to the north side of the railway track and then ferried with smaller little vehicles over the track to take south of the railway. So that's not changing. That's exactly as we've been told. Yep. So there's just some around changes North Binkham Wood.

01:24:28:01 - 01:24:33:00

Christian Hathadkin. Correct. Correct. And it's really just the the arrangement of

01:24:35:00 - 01:24:52:04

construction and what tracks have been used for what purposes. One thing we've been mindful of is obviously we've got the existing farm access track that's within the fifteen meters of the ancient woodland, and we very are aware that we don't wanna be doing any

01:24:55:03 - 01:25:23:00

reinforcements, repairs, for want of a better word, enhancements to that to allow greater machinery or greater movement along it. When we start looking at, you know, dig solutions and all of that complexities would come with that. So, obviously, we just need to be able to provide access to, especially, maintain internal edge of that that... This would be external face of that edge around. And then the construction access, as as mister Frafel described, through E2, E3 and then into E6.

01:25:23:12 - 01:25:38:17

Yeah. So operationally, the section that goes right up towards the Rob Borden, south of the village there or west of the village, long red line where we parked on our ASI and we walked down that whole length.

01:25:40:12 - 01:25:53:00

Are you not maintaining a route through mister Evis' land through the operation period. So you're... So that access route in for maintenance and replacement is gone.

01:25:55:00 - 01:26:01:17

Just wondering why we need... Why you need to come

01:26:03:03 - 01:26:05:08

through Rod Born at all.

01:26:08:14 - 01:26:11:22

It's on the... That whole section of red on the east side of e four.

01:26:17:01 - 01:26:28:05

James Darwin for the applicant. So we're talking about access eighteen, which is construction access, which is that road that goes through Ipsys Land. That is construction only,

01:26:40:02 - 01:26:40:19

Ives' Ebers'

01:26:40:21 - 01:26:43:06

Ebers' land again. Right. Okay.

01:26:45:04 - 01:26:50:15

Germany queries, mister Leff, before I come to Wiltshire Council and and,

01:26:55:27 - 01:26:58:18

Ms Tate, do you want to come in?

01:26:58:21 - 01:27:32:20

Kate Tate, Royal Leucher Council. Yes, we've had various meetings over the last couple of weeks. We had one on Monday where it was discussed that this access track at North Binkenwood would not be used for any vehicles other than the farmers that are currently using it at the moment to access their land and for probably just an annual row hedge trim, which is probably only gonna have to happen once a year, if that probably doesn't even need to happen that often. And no other purposes at all whatsoever.

01:27:32:22 - 01:27:45:21

No other access. There will not be any other vehicles other than the existing vehicles that are being used by the farmers and whatever vehicle needs to be used to carry out the hedge row.

01:27:45:23 - 01:27:48:10

And you've secured that document?

01:27:49:02 - 01:27:53:09

I wouldn't say secured is quite the right word right now, but I'm certainly,

01:27:54:27 - 01:28:06:15

were it's like I said, it was on Wednesday. Was two days ago, and so it's something that is under discussion at the moment. However, I would like to point out that even on these plans, on the

01:28:08:11 - 01:28:33:05

outline construction and traffic management plan, transport plans, the works plans, it shows that there is access into the I'm going find out which one it is, sorry, I've left the plan into E2 from that track, which would result in a loss of headroom. So I'm not sure why that is there. And also, the

01:28:34:25 - 01:29:02:14

exit from E6 shows a visibility splay to the left, which is ninety meters by two point four meters, the visibility splay to be reduced to six hundred millimeters, which considered part of the woodland as well. So, I mean, it depends this really depends on

01:29:04:23 - 01:29:15:09

what results from our meeting on Monday, but I would like to see this track actually removed completely from the plans so that it is acknowledged that it's not going to be used

01:29:16:25 - 01:29:21:09

at all by any operational, for any operational, legal, statutory

01:29:23:08 - 01:29:30:00

works for the authorized development apart from, sorry, apart from hedge rate reduction.

01:29:30:02 - 01:29:30:26

If

01:29:32:14 - 01:29:36:11

the applicant were to do that, what would be the implications?

01:29:37:02 - 01:30:11:10

Operationally. And Claire project the applicant. So as mister Jackson said, we need to be able to access along the road for the, hedge road maintenance, which I think has been accepted that that's, a purpose for which the track could be used. Obviously, we need to make sure we can actually access down there. So to the extent that that becomes track impassable for whatever reason, we would need to then do whatever work may be required in order to be able to utilize the track, and that's, I think, where the no dig methods were coming into place.

01:30:11:12 - 01:30:48:11

So if if, I don't know, there was an incredibly hole large there and it meant a vehicle for the hedgerows couldn't go down it, we would be able to to repair that such that we could then still go up and down to do the hedgerow maintenance. That was my understanding of why we needed to allow for the potential to do some works, and that's why the the wording was made clear that any of those works would be the the appropriate no dig methods. I don't know whether the conversation that was more

recently had has taken it beyond that, but was that my understanding as as to why the plans had been previously left as they were.

01:30:48:13 - 01:31:06:06

Because in order to commit in other documents to maintain that hedgerow, we have to be able to have sufficient access to maintain the hedgerow. So it was just trying to tie it tie it all together, But my understanding is that the access requirement is for the hedgerow maintenance purpose.

01:31:09:02 - 01:31:51:23

Will Ferrell for the applicant. Due to being at hearings, I wasn't on this meeting, but I appreciate that Ms. Tate has shared a note with us, and it looks like we've got some revised wording, which I think covers Ms. Tate's point. We haven't formally agreed it because I wasn't on the call, but I've... I I will... Well, we can catch up maybe after this just just to just to look at it. But I think the wording that that is being suggested here suggests the level of limitation that miss Tate is afterwards. I think if we were to update the SOCG, on this basis, given that we've managed to close off another a few matters, I think it looks like we're almost there in terms of demonstrating the wording which says this is all it will be used for.

01:31:51:25 - 01:31:58:15

So that would go into the construction traffic management plan and presumably one of the ecological management plans as well?:

01:32:02:06 - 01:32:05:16

There's OM and the CTMP points here, I think, to cover.:

01:32:07:24 - 01:32:25:04

Kate Tate for Water Council, yeah, OCAMP as well, and yeah, the OCTMP and OOEMP thing. So it's probably an awful lot of the documents that it will be going into, obviously then there'll be revised

01:32:26:19 - 01:32:31:16

plans as well within the OCTMP as well.

01:32:31:18 - 01:32:39:24

Yeah, just the applicant aware of that, so it will be a bit more than just some wording. Some possibly planned revisions.

01:32:41:27 - 01:33:24:28

It would also be the visibility displays, anything identifying with that area of that track, really. Understand and appreciate that the applicant needs to have access to it, but to cut a hedgerow, we've talked about infilling of potholes, which is not a problem, you know, because it can be done in a certain way that's not gonna be detrimental to the woodrow. The woodlander is an ancient woodlander that is in the fifteen meter buffer. So really appreciate fact that the this has really been taken on board by the applicant. So, yeah, we'd like to see everything removed with, you know, with just the infill of the potholes required in order for the applicant to access the hedgerows.

01:33:25:00 - 01:33:40:08

So like I said, hedgerows in that circumstances probably won't need to be reduced more than once every one or two years. So because it's really not gonna cause the farmers that much of an issue to access their fields with their own vehicles.

01:33:42:20 - 01:33:45:11

Mr. Darling, you've got your mic on.

01:33:45:23 - 01:33:48:27

I was just James Darling from the applicant. Was just going to say that PL

01:33:50:18 - 01:34:03:24

D includes the junctions twelve and thirteen and shows the vis space and also shows it doesn't interact with the Binkenwood hedge row. We wouldn't need to update our drawing in that case.

01:34:05:10 - 01:34:07:17

Can you give reference that again for Ms.

01:34:08:02 - 01:34:16:11

Yeah, it's PL12 D, access location twelve, and it's Annex C of the TA

01:34:17:15 - 01:34:18:28

Transport Assessment.

01:34:20:14 - 01:34:25:25

Eight April Watch councils. Yeah. So it shows... We're coming out of e six

01:34:28:07 - 01:34:56:20

on access twelve. It shows a visibility display to the left as you're coming out of two point four meters by ninety meters visibility display existing vegetation to be trimmed, cut back so that the retained height is not greater than six hundred millimeters. But that won't be required that truck is not being used any as access other than to be a head row maintenance.

01:34:57:17 - 01:35:02:21

No, but they still need to gain they still need to be able to use it for construction. They'll...

01:35:05:01 - 01:35:28:12

I hate to take from the council, but display would only be for them to look left, wouldn't it? And they wouldn't be looking left because there would not be anything coming left. So they can still access it from E3. Yes. But they wouldn't need to look left down towards the top, the Bincum access track. They would only need to look forwards or, I suppose, right. Yeah. Because you'd only have the

01:35:28:14 - 01:35:30:18

odd farm vehicle on that end of the track. Yes,

01:35:30:20 - 01:35:36:06

Yes, so you wouldn't need to reduce anything down on the left hand side down to six hundred millimetres.

01:35:36:08 - 01:35:38:18

Yes, I think that's a point well made.

01:35:39:19 - 01:35:46:18

James Darrell from the applicant. Yes, it's a very good point. It is public highway that part of the network there.

01:35:47:22 - 01:35:54:21

But if you put a banksman there, would need to remove all that hedgerow for what is one small component of your works?

01:35:55:27 - 01:35:57:22

Yes, we'll do that.

01:35:57:24 - 01:36:09:12

So if we could make those changes, for deadline seven and let miss Tate have a look at those as well, that would be very useful.

01:36:11:05 - 01:36:14:21

Mister Love to wants come in on a point as well.

01:36:17:01 - 01:36:18:26

Thank you. So

01:36:20:21 - 01:36:29:01

as we've got as we've got things up on screen, etcetera, let's just bottom all the issues with out respect to North Binkenwood. And, hopefully,

01:36:30:19 - 01:36:48:21

when it's brought up on on Tuesday, we can just say, yes. That's been agreed. So I wanna test my I wanna test my understanding, though. During maintenance operations, operations, cutting of hedgerow, how will you access the site to wash panels and for small scale maintenance?

01:36:53:08 - 01:36:58:14

James Dowell for the applicant, so you're talking about operational access into the other parcels?

01:36:59:11 - 01:37:03:11

Yeah I mean into E4, three and two etc.

01:37:03:13 - 01:37:14:24

So if you're coming from Robbourn which is operational access route, you can turn right into e four on that brown line. And if you keep moving forwards, get to junk access, twelve and thirteen, you turn right there.

01:37:14:26 - 01:37:28:23

Okay. So you're you're coming in... Test my understanding. You'd be coming in via Rod Baughan, as you say, turn right into e four on that track, and then that's how you get in for the small scale maintenance stuff, washing of panels, etcetera. Yeah. Okay.

01:37:30:28 - 01:37:33:08

Is that set out in the OAMP?

01:37:39:12 - 01:37:47:23

Cloud project for the applicant, I don't think it's positively set out. What we've said is we're not using the other access in order to

01:37:47:25 - 01:37:51:13

access negatively set out. So... Okay. No. That's fine. Thank you.

01:37:52:24 - 01:38:00:12

And, miss Tate, are you aware of that? Obviously, they will still need some maintenance in those

01:38:01:20 - 01:38:02:07

Absolutely.

01:38:04:00 - 01:38:24:01

I'm very aware of that. It's more about changing the composition of the track and the additional vehicles and also the reasonability and necessity. Def definitions of those sometimes are a little bit miss, ambiguous. And so, yeah, I'm just... It's just to be sort of bit more clarity really through

01:38:24:03 - 01:38:26:08

the Woodlands side of things. That's fine. I'll come back to you.

01:38:26:10 - 01:38:40:00

Yeah. Sorry. My second my point then, if I come to you, miss Tate, you're happy with the proposed maintenance works on the track. You're filling in the potholes, and you're you're content that won't adversely affect or potentially adversely impact on the ancient woodland.

01:38:40:04 - 01:39:12:17

It take full launch council. Yeah. So I would expect to see the materials and the methods used to fill the potholes in within the AMS, the detailed AMS. And we have had discussions previously about the type of materials that would be used, though there wouldn't be anything that would have, any fines. So anything that would hold water, no no chemicals, that would just all be adverse with the woodlands. So, yeah, we we have had that conversation. It's something that we can move forward on, definitely, but it will...

01:39:12:19 - 01:39:17:02

Should be within the detailed agricultural method statement. Right. We're we're happy with that.

01:39:17:04 - 01:39:29:10

Okay. Thank you. I'll come to the applicant. Can we expect then the council will see that in the detailed AMS? Am I correct? So it's somewhere within the outline AMS. Mister Jackson, you're you're nodding helpfully.

01:39:29:12 - 01:39:42:00

Christian, I'm smart. Yeah. I'm not gonna be able to give you the exact paragraph reference, sir, but my understanding from speaking with my agricultural colleagues is that, yes, it's contained in the the draft AMS as worded, which is secured through the

01:39:43:28 - 01:39:45:11

CMP, I believe.

01:39:45:13 - 01:39:58:02

No. That... That's fine. Yep. From what I've heard from from you and and missus Tate... I'm... Sorry, miss Tate. I'm I'm happy with that. That's fine. My final question then is coming to the applicant, and it's to do with the access of the a four two nine.

01:39:59:27 - 01:40:07:12

Is there an impact on on footpaths that we need to consider further, or are you quite content that's already been considered through the current documentation?

01:40:16:26 - 01:40:21:28

Is this access... Sorry. James Darwin for the applicant. Is this access eighteen you're talking about?

01:40:23:01 - 01:40:43:19

Yes. I've I've I've scribbled down eighteen, but, yes, coming from the a four two nine and accessing through to the solar panel sites, the the construction access that you outlined earlier. So I'm just wondering if considering change that in the original ES submission, if there needs to be an update to documentation relating to footpaths.

01:40:47:26 - 01:40:53:16

James, I'm for the applicant. It is included in the Prowl management plan. It's referenced as a Prowl there.

01:41:10:08 - 01:41:26:01

We believe that my understanding, but we can double check-in writing is that the, if anything, impact is less as a result of the the changes. So, obviously, the the construction traffic was always coming from the

01:41:28:15 - 01:41:55:26

west, and then, instead of, that construction traffic then going past e one and having an interaction with that footpath, which you can see dashed blue below e one, there is no, then, no interaction with

construction traffic down there because it's going along the north of e two and e three now. So, that's my understanding of the the position, but we can confirm that in our

01:41:56:03 - 01:42:03:20

No. Some some just commentary on that point would be helpful for for deadline seven. Thank you. No further questions from me. Thank you, missus Labour.

01:42:03:22 - 01:42:16:27

Okay. Thank you. Right. I have no further matters to raise, under other traffic matters. I was going to come to the other party so mister Bamba got there. Got his hand up. So.

01:42:17:00 - 01:42:17:24

Thank you.

01:42:17:26 - 01:42:18:11

Over to you.

01:42:18:13 - 01:43:16:29

Bruce Bamba, stop on lying down. Just point of clarification really. This is the first time I've seen this plan. I saw that the access into E6 had been changed, but I raised the question, well, what's happening with the AILs to get there? And I can see now that the route has been defined. So two questions. First of all, does this mean that there is a greater length of access track within the site? And secondly, I may have missed something, but is the intention to remove the access, the construction access from the A-four twenty nine after construction? Or is it just to be left unused during operation? Because understand if it's still there, why it wouldn't be used rather than taking all the vehicles through Rodbourne.

01:43:28:19 - 01:43:43:02

Claire Pochick, the applicant. Yes, so the intention at the moment is to remove it and that's been as a result of conversations that have been had with the landowner whose land is going through that access route. So that's the...

01:43:43:04 - 01:44:18:24

That was my understanding from the discussions from the CA hearing and the subsequent discussions. Obviously, mister and missus Evis, I believe, are due to speak again at compulsory acquisition hearing next week, so we may find out a bit more about that. But my understanding was it was leading to the access being removed and then reinstated at replacement stage so that the Evises could continue to carry out their farming operation. But the point about whether then it elongates the access track, I don't think it's been answered.

01:44:20:09 - 01:44:24:12

James Daraf, the applicant. Obviously it's a reconfiguration of the access there.

01:44:28:06 - 01:44:34:03

There is a slight extension yet to the access track which I haven't defined so I'll have to do that for deadline seven.

01:44:35:12 - 01:44:57:10

Bruce Bamba for spotlight limedown. There needs to be allowance in the HGV trip generation for the removal of this, because it is the AIL, it's the highest standard of access tracks, so there will be a significant number of HGV movements associated with the removal of that, which haven't been taken into account.

01:44:58:09 - 01:45:09:15

All very good points, Mr. Bamba. Thank you. Don't need a response, Mr. Darrell. Obviously, it seems clear that there will need to be a revisiting of that, for the next deadline.

01:45:11:00 - 01:45:12:10

Okay. So those

01:45:13:28 - 01:45:17:14

bring us to the end of any other traffic matters.

01:45:20:03 - 01:45:39:10

Item eight on the agenda, was there any other environmental matters? I don't have any to raise, particularly as we've got plans management tomorrow, socioeconomics and biodiversity next week, and then we've obviously got development consent and CA. So unless anybody has a burning need to take us to seven o'clock,

01:45:41:12 - 01:46:08:28

no? Okay. So we move on from item eight. Item nine is actions. There are a few. We need time to go away and properly formulate the wording of those. We will try to get those out quickly because the time is of the essence. You've been taking a note of most of them, so have we, but they will need writing up. So I'm not going to go over them now. Miss Broderick, did you have anything to say before I move to close?

01:46:10:11 - 01:46:19:26

Claire Broderick, I need to say some of the actions were for us to try and do things sooner, so we've made a note of those and we will do those without waiting necessarily for the formal action Yes. Be put forward. Wonderful.

01:46:19:28 - 01:46:51:03

Thank you. I wanna thank miss Tate who's waited patiently, to the whole end the of day just to talk about Robborn. Thank you very much. It was most useful. So post hearing notes, documents, ANSAS prepared in response to the hearing, actions which will follow deadline seven unless we have asked for them sooner and the applicant is helpfully going to distribute some of those sooner. I thank you all for your patience. Long day, twenty past six. Thank you very much for staying the course. Can't promise it'll be early finish tomorrow.

01:46:51:05 - 01:47:00:23

It depends how much you want to talk. But I will now proceed to close issue specific hearing six. The time is now six twenty one. Thank you.

