

Sea Link

Volume 6: Environmental Information

Document: 6.3.3.7.B
Part 3 Kent
Chapter 7 Appendix 3.7.B
Traffic & 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

Meeting name
Transport Scoping
Discussion (KCC)

Meeting date
12/04/23

Time
11:00 – 12:00

Location
Microsoft Teams

Project name
Sea Link

Prepared by
[REDACTED]

Attendees

[REDACTED] (CC), AECOM, Terrestrial EIA Lead
[REDACTED] (CB), AECOM, Transport
[REDACTED] (MA), AECOM, Transport
[REDACTED] (JW), [REDACTED] Engineering (FEED)
[REDACTED] (SC), [REDACTED] Engineering (FEED)
[REDACTED] (MB), KCC Highways, Development Planning
[REDACTED] (EW), KCC Streetworks (Thanet)
[REDACTED] (PV), KCC Highways (Thanet)

Apologies

[REDACTED] National Grid, Consents Lead (Onshore)
[REDACTED] National Grid, Terrestrial (Transport)
[REDACTED] (MW), AECOM, Transport
[REDACTED] Engineering (FEED)
[REDACTED] Arup, Stakeholder Engagement
[REDACTED] KCC Highways
[REDACTED] KCC Highways

Circulation list

As per attendees

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.</p> <p>CB summarised purpose of call, to agree scope of work, encourage feedback on transport and access, and to discuss reports for the PEIR and ES stages. A presentation would form the agenda to the meeting, in order to share information over a series of slides.</p>	-
02	<p>Presentation – Key Emerging Parameters</p> <p>CB presented the key emerging parameters for the proposed development, including proposals to assess the peak construction phase scenario (2029) to capture peak activity at the A256 access and to adopt an average of 2.0 occupancy factor (persons per vehicle) for construction staff. The majority of trips will use the A256 access compared to the secondary accesses which will be used for a shorter period earlier in the construction programme.</p> <p>CB stated that agreement is sought on peak hours for assessment, on the basis of forecast construction worker travel patterns and by adopting a flat profile of both LGV and HGV trips throughout the day.</p> <p>MB requested that both development peak hours and network peaks are assessed.</p> <p>CB agreed that both development peak hours and network peak hours would be considered.</p> <p>In terms of distribution, CB requested views on the proposed approach, which involved the use of 2021 Census data for construction staff.</p> <p>CB stated that 100% of HGV trips would be distributed to/ from the west on the A299 to provide a worst-case assessment.</p> <p>MB questioned this and it was agreed that the HGV distribution would be revisited to include a small proportion of HGVs to/ from the south and east on the A256. A suggested distribution of 80% HGVs to/ from the west, 10% to/ from the south and 10% to/ from the east was viewed as reasonable, matching the proposed LGV distribution.</p> <p>AIL routes were set out by CB.</p>	<p>KCC to confirm suitability of the proposed construction staff occupancy figure (K1), the proposed assessment year of 2029 (K2), and the assessment focus on the main A256 access (K3).</p> <p>KCC to confirm that in addition to the network peaks, whether the typical 'shoulder' peaks should be assessed as a worst-case for construction staff travel patterns, or whether adopting the anticipated development peak hours would be acceptable (K4).</p> <p>AECOM to review HGV distribution and to update the initial impact assessment (A1).</p>

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
03	<p>Presentation – Study Area</p> <p>CB presented the proposed Study Area extents. Firstly for the quantitative assessment for the purpose of undertaking traffic surveys. Secondly for the qualitative assessment and for the purpose of reviewing collision data for example.</p> <p>CB sought views on the study area from KCC.</p> <p>MB responded that KCC would review the presentation once issued, to determine whether the proposed study areas were considered to be reasonable.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the presentation would be shared after the meeting and that the traffic surveys and collision data would be procured once the study areas were agreed.</p>	<p>AECOM to share the presentation with KCC (A2) – <i>note: this was issued on 12/04/23 after the meeting.</i></p> <p>KCC to confirm whether the proposed study areas for quantitative and qualitative assessments are reasonable (K5).</p>
04	<p>Presentation – Scoping Opinion Feedback</p> <p>CB briefly summarised the feedback from PINS and KCC as set out within the Scoping Opinion, with the key matter that operational effects should be scoped out, with focus on effects during the construction phase.</p> <p>CB presented information on Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and walking/ cycling routes and requested details of any additional walking/ cycling routes which should be considered.</p>	<p>KCC to confirm whether any additional walking/ cycling routes should be considered (K6).</p>
05	<p>Presentation – Deliverables</p> <p>CB described the deliverable reports to be prepared, with the proposal to incorporate the Transport Assessment as part of the PEIR (rather than as a standalone report), to minimise duplication across multiple reports given the construction focus and requirement to prepare an Outline CTMP as a standalone document.</p> <p>CB welcomed views on the proposed approach.</p> <p>MB indicated that the approach to incorporate the Transport Assessment within the PEIR seemed reasonable and that KCC would review this proposal and confirm. In addition, it was noted that the KCC Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Officer should be included in any discussion regarding the management of PRoW such as information to be contained within the PRoW Management Plan and/ or Outline CTMP.</p> <p>CB mentioned that a number of cumulative schemes would be considered as identified within the presentation and asked for feedback on this once the presentation had been shared.</p>	<p>KCC to confirm whether the Transport Assessment can be incorporated as part of the PEIR rather than forming a separate standalone report (K7).</p> <p>KCC to provide feedback on/ confirmation of the proposed approach for the Outline CTMP and PRoW Management Plan (K8).</p> <p>KCC to advise whether any additional cumulative schemes should be considered (K9).</p>
06	<p>AOB – Access Points</p> <p>MB raised point regarding the A256 and how it will affect the adjacent roundabouts, including potential number of U turn movements. Also raised point regarding visibility at construction bellmouth points.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the A256 and the two nearest roundabouts to the proposed site access (K-BM02) would be included as part of the study area. In addition, CB mentioned that a package of drawings</p>	

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>had been issued to KCC by Mott Macdonald earlier that morning (12/04/23).</p> <p>MB acknowledged receipt of the drawings for review.</p>	<p>KCC to review additional material received on 12/04/23 and to provide any comments (K10).</p>
07	<p>AOB – Next Steps</p> <p>MB stated that no further feedback would be made until KCC has reviewed the presentation in more detail.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the presentation would be shared after the meeting so that feedback and agreement could be sought on a number of items.</p> <p>CB stated that the aim is to progress the PEIR and supporting data collection. A further meeting could be held if beneficial to resolve any queries or agree any key points, unless these could be resolved by email following KCC's review of the presentation.</p> <p>MB asked whether PV or EW had any further comments. No further comments were made, other than the need to review the presentation after the meeting.</p> <p>CB confirmed that the presentation would be shared with KCC following by these meeting notes.</p> <p>Meeting ended.</p>	<p>AECOM to share the presentation with KCC (A2) – <i>note: this was issued on 12/04/23 after the meeting.</i></p> <p>KCC to review presentation and provide feedback on items (K1-10) as identified as Actions above, as well as to provide any further comments as necessary (K11).</p> <p>AECOM to review KCC responses once received, to determine whether a further meeting should be held (A3).</p>

Meeting name Transport Thematic Meeting (KCC, TDC and DDC)	Meeting date 16/04/24	Attendees (CB), AECOM, Transport (MA), AECOM, Transport (MW), AECOM, Transport (JW), [REDACTED] Engineering (FEED) (SC), [REDACTED] Engineering (FEED) (FP), KCC Highways (TB), KCC Highways (SN), KCC (HB), National Grid (IL), TDC (HJ), TDC (RM), DDC
Time 10:30 – 11:30	Location Microsoft Teams	
Project name Sea Link	Prepared by [REDACTED]	
		Apologies [REDACTED] AECOM, Environment [REDACTED] KCC [REDACTED] KCC Highways [REDACTED] KCC PRoW [REDACTED] KCC [REDACTED] DDC

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	Welcome and Introductions All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.	
02	Project Update CB provided an update on the project, as set out in the presentation slides. Key updates were that traffic surveys had been completed, feedback had been received on the PEIR, and that the design is being progressed ahead of the proposed design freeze (DF3) for the ES. The indicative timeline was set out, including submission of the DCO application in late 2024.	
03	Statutory Consultation CB summarised the feedback received on the PEIR from KCC, TDC and DDC in relation to transport and access. Consultation events took place at the end of 2023. An interim Statement of Common Ground is being developed, alongside liaison trackers.	
04	Deliverables CB set out the list of reporting items and management plans for the transport topic area. These documents include the ES Traffic and Transport Chapter and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The scope of the Outline Public Rights of Way (PRoW) Management Plan will be subject to a separate meeting in order to ensure that all interested parties are in attendance. CB outlined the proposed content for the Transport Assessment Note (TAN), which forms the agreed (alternative) approach to providing a full TA and stated that this document would include additional information where necessary (i.e. elements that aren't covered in the	AECOM to arrange the PRoW meeting (A1) – NOTE this has now been arranged for 2nd May

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	ES or CTMP) but will otherwise direct the readers towards those associated documents in order to reduce duplication between them.	
05	<p>FEED Update</p> <p>SC provided an update on the emerging design through the change request process through to design freeze (DF3). Nonetheless, the bellmouth locations are largely the same as presented at PEIR stage, although the bellmouth access for Jutes Lane has now been removed.</p> <p>The crossing of the A256 has been changed from a trench proposal to a Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) method which will have significant benefit in reducing the potential for disruption.</p> <p>An additional access has been marked up for Sandwich Road, which is for monitoring and maintenance purposes. There will not be a requirement to use this link for cable drum deliveries.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been carried out and a Response Report has been prepared by FEED to cover outcomes of a review meeting.</p>	
06	<p>Liaison Trackers/ Statements of Common Ground</p> <p>CB provided an overview of the liaison trackers which are being drafted for the host authorities, including a record of engagement, the key comments/ issues raised and the status of these (agreed/ under discussion/ not agreed). The liaison trackers will ultimately become Statements of Common Ground.</p>	
07	<p>AOB</p> <p>CB sought confirmation of attendees for the next PRow meeting.</p> <p>In respect of timeline, IL asked whether there would be opportunities to provide comments/ advice on the TAN, A256 junction layout and RSAs at each stage, as well as whether KCC had been consulted.</p> <p>CB responded with some additional details on the programme and previous meetings with KCC.</p> <p>SC confirmed that meetings had previously been held with KCC on RSA outcomes and the response report would be shared with TDC for context.</p> <p>SN noted upcoming changes in KCC personnel which should be considered when arranging future meetings.</p> <p>Agreed between the parties that a follow up meeting should take place in May or June 2024, following design freeze (DF3).</p>	<p>FEED to share RSA response report with TDC (F1) – NOTE this was completed on 18th April</p> <p>KCC to confirm attendee changes (K1) – NOTE this was confirmed after the meeting</p> <p>AECOM to arrange next meeting (A2) following the PRow meeting</p>

Meeting name Transport (PRoW) Thematic Meeting (KCC, TDC and DDC)	Meeting date 02/05/24	Attendees [REDACTED] (CB), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (MA), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (MW), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (DW), AECOM, Economic Development [REDACTED] (IB), AECOM, Economic Development [REDACTED] (HB), National Grid [REDACTED] (KB), KCC PRoW [REDACTED] (RM), DDC
Time 10:30 – 11:30	Location Microsoft Teams	
Project name Sea Link	Prepared by [REDACTED]	

Apologies
[REDACTED] AECOM, Environment
[REDACTED] AECOM, Environment
[REDACTED] AECOM, Landscape
[REDACTED] AECOM, Landscape
[REDACTED] Engineering (FEED)
[REDACTED] Engineering (FEED)
[REDACTED] National Grid
[REDACTED] KCC Highways
[REDACTED] TDC

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.</p> <p>CB shared a figure of the existing walking/ cycling network (including PRoW) and the draft Order limits (PEIR) to provide context for the meeting.</p>	
02	<p>Outline PRoW Management Plan Discussion</p> <p>CB outlined the proposed scope and structure of the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (OPRoW MP) to be prepared in support of the ES.</p> <p>KB provided some initial comments (see below) but stated that full comments/ feedback on the proposed scope would be provided following the meeting (to allow sufficient time to review).</p> <p>KB requested that the mapping/ details shown on drawings should be clearer (compared to the version shown during the presentation). CB confirmed that legible GIS drawings would be prepared for ES submission.</p> <p>KB acknowledged that previous feedback on the National Trail had been addressed and offered to share details of a National Trail point of contact.</p> <p>KB queried how any changes from the PEIR to ES would be picked up and addressed. CB noted that whilst it is typical for a design at PEIR stage to be similar to the ES stage, proposed design changes are currently being reviewed. A summary of the design changes (as these relate to PRoW) would be covered at a future meeting following design freeze.</p> <p>KB recommended that PRoW should be its own topic due to crossover between multiple disciplines. Notably as amenity of a PRoW is linked not just to its accessibility but the likelihood that they will be used given changes to the landscape. CB agreed to report this to the EIA team for discussion.</p> <p>KB reiterated that KCC PRoW is the highway authority for PRoW, rather than KCC Highways.</p>	<p>KCC PRoW to provide feedback on Outline PRoW MP scope (K1)</p> <p>KCC PRoW to share details of National Trail point of contact (K2)</p> <p>AECOM Transport to communicate request to EIA team regarding a standalone PRoW assessment (A1)</p>

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
03	<p>PRoW Feedback/ Considerations</p> <p>CB outlined the feedback from PEIR stage but noted that this was in response to an earlier stage of design and does not necessarily reflect the emerging design. These design matters are to be discussed at a later meeting.</p> <p>KB requested that details are provided regarding the decommissioning period, acknowledging that these are likely to be the reverse of the construction phase.</p> <p>KB reiterated that the ES should recognise the importance of the PRoW network and consider/ acknowledge the impact that the construction phase would have on the amenity of routes including the potential to deter people from using these.</p> <p>KB noted that one form of potential mitigation would be a contribution towards a community/ legacy fund for PRoW improvements. CB noted that this would be relayed to the project team for further consideration and to inform future discussions.</p> <p>CB asked for feedback on the presentation in terms of the proposed scope/ content of the Outline PRoW MP.</p>	<p>AECOM to advise project team of potential PRoW legacy fund for consideration (A2)</p> <p>See K1</p>
04	<p>AOB</p> <p>CB suggested that the next meeting would be held in June or July following the design freeze for the ES.</p>	<p>AECOM to arrange next meeting (A3) following design freeze</p>

Meeting name Transport/ Public Rights of Way Meeting – Kent	Meeting date 23/07/2024	Attendees [REDACTED] (CB), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (MA), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (MW), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (TW), AECOM, Transport [REDACTED] (IM), AECOM, Socio Economic [REDACTED] (RM), AECOM, Landscape [REDACTED] (JW), [REDACTED] Engineering (FEED) [REDACTED] (AH), KCC [REDACTED] (PV), KCC [REDACTED] (MB), KCC [REDACTED] (SS), KCC [REDACTED] (FP), KCC [REDACTED] (KB), KCC [REDACTED] (MR), KCC [REDACTED] (HJ), Thanet DC [REDACTED] (RMO), Dover DC
Time 14:00 – 15:00	Location Microsoft Teams	
Project name Sea Link	Prepared by [REDACTED]	
	Apologies [REDACTED] AECOM, Environment [REDACTED] AECOM, Socio Economic [REDACTED] AECOM, Landscape [REDACTED] FEED [REDACTED] National Grid [REDACTED] National Grid	

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
01	Welcome and Introductions All attendees introduced themselves and their roles.	
02	Presentation CB presented slides on Targeted Consultation and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) in accordance with the agenda.	
03	Discussion MB highlighted that Thanet typically experiences high levels of bank holiday traffic and wanted to understand how this would be considered in the Transport Assessment. MB also raised a concern that level crossings and routes previously designated as ‘green routes’ were to be used, and that some would not be suitable for traffic. CB informed that route plans including level crossings and potential interactions with green routes will be prepared. MB reiterated request that working hours, most notably bank holidays, should be addressed within the assessment. CB responded that details of construction vehicle numbers on Sundays/ bank holidays would be provided within the ES and that baseline traffic flows recorded on a Sunday would also be reviewed. MB noted that the new access from Sandwich Road near Pegwell Bay could trigger a review of the study area. JW responded that the Sandwich Road access is intended as a maintenance access for the operational phase, for use during periods of emergency repairs and provides access to the bay if needed. KB raised concern on Sunday and bank holiday working with respect to PRoW usage, and that the proposed compound at the former hoverport site would be in close proximity to coastal walking/ cycling routes.	

Ref	Note	Action (Ref)
	<p>MB requested an update on the left in/ left out site access junction with the A256. JW confirmed that the design has been subject to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. MB and SS requested a copy of this.</p> <p>CB outlined the proposed temporary diversion to PRoW TE39 and explained that the crossing of the haul road (near the access) would be managed.</p> <p>JW noted that with respect to the A256 site access, cycle routes were not shown on the drawings given that they are not part of the PRoW network, but should be considered. KB recommended following up with highways colleagues.</p> <p>KB raised query regarding a potential permanent PRoW diversion as part of the works. CB responded that this related to PEIR stage only as there is no longer any requirement to permanently divert any PRoW as a result of the design changes proposed as part of the targeted consultation.</p> <p>PV highlighted that the former hoverport site has become a popular recreational site and would require measures to restrict use (this was seconded by MB).</p> <p>KB raised question on position of TR15 and TR33 on mapping shown on screen, and how they relate to Viking Coastal Trail and King Charles III England Coast Path. CB assured that these would be checked and amended where necessary.</p> <p>HJ raised questions on the use of the former hoverport for the construction compound. JW stated that this space would only be used as a temporary compound if necessary for repairs before being removed. Rights to use the access and install the temporary compound would be applied for when necessary. KB requested clarity on notice period for such works. JW responded that this was a matter for National Grid to confirm but that there would be incentive to resolve network problems as quickly as possible.</p> <p>JW responded to a query from HJ regarding the use of the Sandwich Road access during construction as well as operation, to the effect that the route may be used for inspection purposes but would not be required for HGVs.</p> <p>CB requested AoB and stated that the presentation would be shared. The meeting was then ended.</p>	<p>FEED (F1) to share the RSA 1 with KCC.</p> <p>AECOM (A1) to send through details of the cycle route diversion at the A256 access. <i>Note: a drawing was shared after the meeting</i></p> <p>AECOM (A2) to update the WebGIS to show the correct alignment of PRoW in this area.</p> <p>AECOM (A3) to share the presentation slides. <i>Note: the slides were shared after the meeting</i></p>
04	<p>Post Meeting Note</p> <p>KCC to respond to targeted consultation by 11th August 2024.</p> <p>CB shared a plan showing the proposed access on the A256 and the associated indicative cycle route diversion for KCC to review internally (this was shared with KB on 24th July 2024).</p>	<p>KCC (K1) to provide comments as part of the targeted consultation process.</p>

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