

# Sea Link

## Volume 6: Environmental Information

Document: 6.3.2.7.B

Part 2 Suffolk

Chapter 7

Appendix 2.7.B Traffic and Transport Thematic Meeting Minutes

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020026

Version: A

March 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(a)

**Page intentionally blank**

<b>Meeting name</b> Transport Scoping Discussion (SCC)	<b>Meeting date</b> 09/06/23	<b>Attendees</b> Chris Burlton (CB), AECOM, Transport Mike Aronson (MA), AECOM, Transport John Weeks (JW), Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED) Mark Watson (MW), AECOM, Transport Scott Cumming (SC), Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED) Steve Merry (SM), SCC Highways Joseph Hough, SCC Highways Annette Robinson, SCC Highways (PRoW Officer) Julia Cox, SCC Highways (NSIP & Projects)
<b>Time</b> 13:30 – 15:00	<b>Location</b> Microsoft Teams	<b>Apologies</b> Charlotte Clinton (CC), AECOM, Terrestrial EIA Lead Louise Lewin, National Grid, Consents Lead (Onshore) Patrycja Pikniczka, National Grid, Terrestrial (Transport) Evert Jan Van Iwaarden, Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED) Matt Broad, Arup, Stakeholder Engagement
<b>Project name</b> Sea Link	<b>Prepared by</b> Mike Aronson	<b>Circulation list</b> As per attendees plus James Buckley

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	<p><b>Welcome and Introductions</b></p> <p>All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.</p>	
02	<p><b>Feed Team Presentation</b></p> <p>SC presented proposals developed by the FEED team in terms of the proposed access points, for the favoured Emerging Preference Site 3 option.</p> <p>SM asked if team could label permanent and temporary accesses</p> <p>JW stated that one of accesses 12 or 9 will be the main construction access.</p> <p>JW noted that in cases where a construction access is used for an extended period of time, temporary accesses can be laid out to permanent standard. This approach is welcomed by SM.</p> <p>SC suggested that this scoping meeting should be the first of numerous meetings with SCC.</p> <p>AR (SCC PROW) query on obstruction references and she wants to know where these are. JW has confirmed that these need to be worked up and discussed with SCC. AR would like to see maps for all of these. JW agreed to provide this. AR asks for SCC map data to be used; SCC shapefile is available.</p> <p>JW asks for format for AR. SCC use MapInfo and she can import our information into MapInfo. AR would like to see a rights of way network on shape file and a set of plans as well.</p>	
03	<p><b>Key Emerging Parameters</b></p> <p>SM states that Sizewell C and Scottish Power are significant committed schemes to consider. CB responded with the list of cumulative schemes for consideration, although noted that the Cumulative Impact Assessment chapter will be prepared separately and cover all topics. Agreed that the cumulative schemes should be subject to further discussion.</p>	<p><b>SCC to provide feedback on cumulative schemes for consideration (S1)</b></p>



Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
04	<p><b>Presentation – Study Area</b></p> <p>Study Area and scope of assessment presented by CB. The updated study area is proposed as consistent with East Anglia 1 for PEIR stage.</p> <p>Traffic surveys and collision data to be collected on this basis subject to agreement of SCC.</p> <p>Scope to include turning counts, speed, and ATC, with data collection during time periods 06:00-10:00 and 16:00-20:00.</p> <p>CB noted that the surveys were 2018 so new data would be collected.</p> <p>SM noted that SCC has collected traffic counts which could potentially be shared with the Sea Link project team.</p>	<p><b>SCC to confirm whether the proposed study areas for quantitative and qualitative assessments are reasonable (S2)</b></p> <p><b>SCC to provide a schedule of traffic counts carried out as part of strategic modelling (S3)</b></p>
05	<p><b>Presentation – Scoping Opinion Feedback</b></p> <p>CB set out PINS scoping opinion which stated that assessment of operational and maintenance phase could be scoped out.</p> <p>CB reiterated that data sources, as approved by SCC, including PRoW, would be used.</p>	
06	<p><b>Presentation – EIA Methodology</b></p> <p>CB set out set out the methodology for assessment, which will accord with IEMA guidance.</p> <p>CB Introduced the expected scope of the PEIR document (of which Transport will be Chapter 8).</p> <p>Chapter structure set out, with the key points being baseline conditions, study area, assessment scenarios.</p> <p>EIA mitigation categories to be set out in the PEIR.</p> <p>CB states assessment methodology is as IEMA and based on 2029 peak.</p> <p>Sets out the main 5 points of access. Assessment will cover all of them but main 5 subject to quantitative assessment.</p> <p>HGV and AIL routes set out.</p> <p>CB introduced the co-location scenario. This refers to the capability of the project to accommodate Nautilus and LionLink, in terms of the capacity to co-locate elements of these other projects.</p> <p>JW – Clarified that co-location scenario is for additional ducts but not extra converter station which would be subject to a separate DCO.</p> <p>Proposed PEIR submission October 2023. CB noted that we seek to have surveys agreed before the summer holidays.</p>	<p><b>AECOM to liaise with SCC re their data and agree surveys. (A1)</b></p>
07	<p><b>Presentation – Deliverables</b></p> <p>CB sets out proposed approach, to incorporate the content of the required TA within the PEIR, in order to reduce duplication.</p>	<p><b>SCC to confirm view on proposed reporting approach. (S4)</b></p>

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>SM stated that road safety needs to be included, and that the above approach (incorporating TA in PEIR) can be accepted as long as all of the assessment typical of a TA is kept.</p> <p>Anticipated that details on PRoW will be included within the Outline CTMP at PEIR stage but set out within a separate PROW management plan at ES stage.</p>	
08	<p><b>Comments on Presentations/ AOB from SCC (JH/ SM):</b></p> <p>SCC expect monitoring and controls on this type of project,</p> <p>Car occupancy assumption at 2.0 would need to be supported by controls or evidenced. Alternatively, reduce car share ratio.</p> <p>Shift patterns need to be secured within the DCO.</p> <p>Flat profile of HGVs unrealistic, more in AM generally. Confidence is required on accuracy of profile of HGV movements.</p> <p>Concern with B1119 flagged up which is proving problematic in relation to access for the Sizewell C project. Monitoring of use of routes needs to be considered.</p> <p>In terms of assessment, broadly agree on use of staff census and 60 mile catchment area, with note that SCC has seen multiple similar studies for the same population on other projects so some concerns re labor pool.</p> <p>Accepting of IEMA Guidance but also recommends use of DMRB guidance in relation to human health.</p> <p>Need to take account of Saxmundham South Residential development in cumulative study.</p> <p>Data has been collected in the same area for SCC strategic model. Project team should gain access to those survey datasets</p> <p>Sizewell C is a significant consideration from a cumulative assessment point of view.</p> <p>CB notes the comments and will schedule notes and follow up work to fine tune the assessment. JH welcomes opportunities for early meetings on this.</p> <p>Notes that there are lots of projects in the area, all of them using/ assessing a 'shift' peak (outside network peak). Risk that 'shift' peak could soon be more of a concern than network peak. Cumulative consideration. Some scepticism about whether all staff arriving pre-7am and departing post 7pm realistic.</p> <p>In terms of AIL, the A1094 bridge has a weight limit which would be of concern.</p> <p>The IEMA guidance is about to be updated.</p>	<p><b>AECOM to review and refine methodology (A2)</b></p>

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>Although screened out, maintaining and decommissioning should be planned for, including retention of access rights for haul roads.</p> <p>SM noted that surveys approaching busy period (summer). Surveys should be undertaken as early as possible ideally given pre-commencement works are starting soon for Sizewell (which will impact survey data)</p> <p>Swept paths/ visibility required at each new access/ junction.</p> <p>Access plans are well developed (welcomed) for this stage of the project. Would like to see highway boundary and order limits so that access arrangements are either under control of the applicant or within SCC highways land.</p> <p>Raised query with regard to routing near to Saxmundham. JW responded to say that they have options open. Bell Mouth 12 or 9, north and south of Saxmundham. The bypass for 12 if built would need to either be removed or re-purposed. SM is interested in a continued conversation on these links and if they could be reused for wider benefit in traffic terms. JW is in agreement and reiterates the optionality of the approach.</p> <p>Access BM13 is required for AIL movements so will be required.</p> <p>For AIL parts of the project will need continued access for operation stage which needs consideration. JW confirmed that the project would secure a right of way on these to allow re-mobilisation.</p> <p>Noted that collision data in 2020-21 to be excluded (covid).</p> <p>Notes lots of weekend holiday traffic in this area, hence a Friday PM peak should be considered. (Junction) modelling would need to be Mon -Thurs (AM), Fri (PM)</p>	
09	<p><b>AOB – Next Steps</b></p> <p>JW would like written comments from SCC.</p> <p>CB to share presentation and meeting minutes.</p> <p>SCC to review potential to share traffic data with project team.</p>	<p><b>AECOM to share presentation slides with SCC (A3) completed on same day as meeting</b></p> <p><b>SCC to review presentation and provide feedback, as well as any further comments as necessary. (S5)</b></p> <p><b>AECOM to review SCC responses once received and to determine matters for discussion at a further meeting (A4)</b></p>



<b>Meeting name</b> Transport Thematic Meeting (SCC and ESC)	<b>Meeting date</b> 28/02/24	<b>Attendees</b> Chris Burlton (CB), AECOM, Transport Mike Aronson (MA), AECOM, Transport Mark Watson (MW), AECOM, Transport Kai Solheim (KS), AECOM, Environment Scott Cumming (SC), Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED) Steve Merry (SM), SCC Highways Graham Gunby (GG), SCC Highways John Rozier (JR), SCC Roland Arbon (RA), SCC Julia Cox (JC), SCC Annette Robinson (AR), SCC Highways (PRoW Officer) Carolyn Barnes (CBA), ESC
<b>Time</b> 10:00 – 11:05	<b>Location</b> Microsoft Teams	
<b>Project name</b> Sea Link	<b>Prepared by</b> Mike Aronson	

**Apologies**  
John Weeks, Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED)  
Laura Harrad, SCC  
Andrew Woodin, SCC  
Emma Devereux, ESC  
Naomi Goold, ESC  
Helen Bailey, National Grid  
Tim Dawson, National Grid

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b> All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.	
02	<b>Project Update</b> CB provided an update on the project, including traffic surveys, receipt of feedback from the PEIR, and to note that the design is being progressed ahead of the proposed design freeze DF3 for the ES expected in April. The indicative timeline was set out, including submission of the DCO application in late 2024.	
03	<b>Statutory Consultation</b> CB summarised the feedback received from SCC, ESC and Parish Councils in relation to transport and access.	
04	<b>Deliverables</b> CB set out the list of reporting items and management plans for the transport topic area.  GG and AR noted that whilst PRoW are covered multiple times within a wide range of ES topics that this omits a collective assessment of impacts relating to amenity/ user experience, which could result in different conclusions to those under the various (individual) topic areas. AR suggested a similar approach to Sizewell C.  CB and MW provided detail of the typical structure of an Outline PRoW Management Plan. AR responded that her query was more specific to the assessment rather than management of impacts. AR also stated that pre-commencement activities should be considered. MW offered to refer this to the wider team. KS confirmed that this would be taken away as an action.	<b>AR to send through further details based on the methodology used by Sizewell C (S1). Note: this was sent through shortly after the meeting.</b>  <b>AECOM to raise points made by AR with wider project team regarding how PRoW are assessed (A1)</b>



Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	GG welcomed that the Outline PRoW Management Plan will be outline and there will be a need to discharge a condition for a detailed submission at a later stage.	
	SM confirmed that travel planning measures relating to construction workers could be incorporated within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (as proposed) and suggested that this report should subsequently be renamed Construction Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan. SM also confirmed that pre-commencement works should be captured in the CTMP or a pre-commencement management plan.	<b>AECOM to update the CTMP to incorporate travel plan elements where required (A2) and confirm where details of pre-commencement activities will be provided (A3)</b>
	CB outlined the proposed content for the Transport Assessment Note (TAN) (previously proposed and agreed with SM/ SCC as an alternative approach to producing a full Transport Assessment) and noted that the document will include additional information on road safety, junction modelling and access routes where necessary but will otherwise direct the readers towards associated documents in order to reduce duplication between documents.	
	SM raised a few queries on the approach for the TAN and offered to liaise with AECOM regarding chapter headings for the transport documents that are to be prepared, suggesting that the TAN should focus on overall (peak hour) impacts on the network, given that the ES focuses more on proportionate impacts on people.	<b>AECOM to engage with SCC regarding structure of transport deliverables (A4)</b>
	SM suggested that the provision of an Access Management Plan (as provided for the EA1N project) may be helpful to review. CB responded that these details including access routes, abnormal loads and design would be set out in the CTMP. The TAN would include information that is not already set out in the ES chapter or CTMP, such as further details on road safety or junction modelling for example. SM.	
05	<b>FEED Update</b>  SC provided an update on the emerging design although these are not yet finalised for design freeze (DF3). Nonetheless, the bellmouth locations are largely the same as presented at PEIR stage.  For Saxmundham Converter Station, the southern access option has been selected, subject to revised positioning.  For Friston Converter Station, construction traffic would use the main haul road to avoid passing through Friston. Therefore, the only access considerations relate to the operational phase.  SM had hoped for a legacy bypass for Saxmundham and notes that this won't happen (given that the northern option is no longer to be pursued).  SM noted that the proposals should seek to co-ordinate access arrangements with other energy projects in the vicinity to reduce impact.  GG raised concern regarding a Friston property which is likely to be affected by construction routes and requested that accesses used by Sea Link and EA1N are the same where possible to avoid new/ multiple routes.	

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>On PRoW, AR raised that there is at least one PRoW that is scheduled to move due to EA1N project. The project team needs to ensure that PRoW affected by Sea Link reflect the most up to date or emerging PRoW positions.</p> <p>SM provided indication of proposed alignment for routes and noted that FEED is in discussion with SCC in relation to abnormal loads travelling across the railway bridge at Main Road.</p> <p>SM raised that a Road Safety Audit will be required for access designs. SC noted that Mott Macdonald undertake these but from another of their offices to ensure independence.</p>	<p><b>AECOM/ FEED to review EA1N proposals when considering potential impacts on PRoW (A5/F1)</b></p> <p><b>FEED to provide CVs to SCC to commence RSA process. (F2)</b></p>
06	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p>SM queried whether any details on traffic movements were available to understand likely HGV numbers. SC confirmed that these were shared earlier in the year. SM acknowledged this.</p> <p>SM queried programme for submission. CB confirmed late 2024 submission.</p> <p>Agreed between the parties that a follow up meeting should take place in mid-April 2024, following design freeze (DF3).</p>	<p><b>SCC to review details of traffic movements which were shared at the start of the year (S2)</b></p> <p><b>AECOM to arrange next meeting (A6)</b></p>

<b>Meeting name</b> Transport/ Public Rights of Way Meeting – Suffolk	<b>Meeting date</b> 16/07/2024	<b>Attendees</b> Chris Burlton (CB), AECOM, Transport Mike Aronson (MA), AECOM, Transport Mark Watson (MW), AECOM, Transport Tom Walker (TW), AECOM, Transport Isabelle Martin (IM), AECOM, Socio Economic Dave Widger (DW), AECOM, Socio Economic Charlotte Williams (CW), AECOM, Landscape John Weeks (JW), Mott Macdonald, Engineering (FEED) Annette Robinson (AR), SCC PRoW Andrew Woodin (AW), SCC PRoW Sam Bye (SB), SCC PRoW Graham Gunby (GG), Suffolk County Council Roland Arbon (RA), SCC Highways Emma Devereux (ED), East Suffolk Council Carolyn Barnes (CBA), East Suffolk Council Bethany Rance (BR), East Suffolk Council
<b>Time</b> 14:00 – 15:00	<b>Location</b> Microsoft Teams	
<b>Project name</b> Sea Link	<b>Prepared by</b> Mike Aronson	<b>Apologies</b> Betsabe Sanchez, AECOM, Environment Kai Solheim, AECOM, Environment Ruth Mauritzan, AECOM, Landscape Scott Cumming, Mott Macdonald, FEED Louise Lewin, National Grid Daniel Sweeney, National Grid Steve Merry, SCC Highways Julia Cox, SCC Highways Naomi Goold, East Suffolk Council

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>  All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.	
02	<b>Presentation</b>  CB presented slides on Targeted Consultation and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in accordance with the agenda. AW asked CB to share the presentation slides. CB confirmed the slides would be shared after the meeting.	<b>AECOM (A1) to share the presentation slides.</b> <b>Note: the slides were shared after the meeting.</b>
03	<b>Discussion</b>  AR noted that a portion of land to the north of Saxmundham converter station had now been removed from the Order limits as part of the proposed design changes. JW clarified that this land would no longer be required for Sea Link and had been removed accordingly given that the DCO for Sea Link must only show land required specifically for Sea Link (rather than for co-location).  AW requested assurance that open access, which has been previously discussed, would be maintained. JW responded that open access would be maintained around the converter site itself and that land would also be retained by the landowner if not required for the project. CW informed that plans are made for open access as part of the landscaping proposals. AW requested more details of the proposals, which CW informed would be supplied.  GG asked whether the landscaping scheme would be coordinated with the co-location schemes. CW responded that the scheme will be Sea Link specific.	

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>GG responded that he had concern on sequential impacts on PRoW from the different schemes and has seen this on other projects. JW reassured that co-ordination is taking place. CW added that sequential impacts would be covered as part of the cumulative assessment.</p> <p>AR highlighted a PRoW to be diverted due to a construction compound. JW noted that potential diversion routes have been identified and wishes to agree a preferred option for diverting it (either north or south of the Converter station). A query was raised by AR whether the reduction of land from the Order limits would result in a reduced capacity / potential to deliver PRoW mitigation works. AW reiterated this same point. In response, JW responded that there are mechanisms for a community benefit approach that can be secured later in the process.</p> <p>SB requested that clearer drawings are provided to show a better representation of the PRoW diversions. CB responded that these would be available as part of the Outline PRoW Management Plan.</p> <p>GG asked if there would be a separate PRoW chapter within the Environmental Statement (ES). CB responded that an Outline PRoW Management Plan will be prepared with collective input from various disciplines, to identify any necessary mitigation. IM also stated that in terms of socio-economics, a PRoW Technical Note has been drafted and will be shared once reviewed. AR confirmed that they look forward to receiving this note.</p> <p>CW reminded that the Targeted Consultation finishes 11<sup>th</sup> August, and JW suggested that this would be the final consultation ahead of submission of DCO. GG noted that there is likely to be some concern raised by SCC regarding the extension to core working hours. CB noted this and that restrictions would be considered where necessary.</p> <p>CB stated that any further feedback on the presentation and design changes covered by the targeted consultation process would be welcomed. The meeting was then ended.</p>	<p><b>AECOM (A2) to share the technical note with SCC.</b></p> <p><b>SCC (S1) to provide comments as part of the targeted consultation process. Note: initial comments were received from Steve Merry (SCC) following the meeting.</b></p>
04	<p><b>Post Meeting Notes</b></p> <p>AW provided clarification on the topic of open access that SCC will expect that land within the Order limits that is deemed unsuitable for agriculture, is dedicated for open access under the Countryside &amp; Rights of Way Act 2000.</p> <p>AW also noted that SCC would wish to be content that sufficient land will be retained within the Order limits in order to secure PRoW related mitigation measures, for example the delivery of new routes, as part of the DCO.</p> <p>CB provided a response to the comments received from Steve Merry (SCC) when these updated meeting notes were shared on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2024.</p>	

**Page intentionally blank**



National Grid plc  
National Grid House,  
Warwick Technology Park,  
Gallows Hill, Warwick.  
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales  
No. 4031152  
[nationalgrid.com](http://nationalgrid.com)