



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Event Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Event:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Day 2 - Part 1
Date:	29 January 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. 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 event.

File Name: SL_29JAN_ISH2_PART1.mp3

File Length: 01:31:23

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:04 - 00:00:35:29

Morning. Before I begin, can I just confirm with the case team that I can be heard clearly and that the live streaming of this event has commenced? Thank you. The time is now 10:00, and I'd like to welcome you all to this continuation of issue specific hearing to the application by National Grid electricity transmission and an order granting development consent for the sealing project. My name is Sarah Holmes. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of the panel to examine this application.

00:00:36:06 - 00:00:43:15

I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members, who have also been appointed by the Secretary of State to examine this project to introduce themselves.

00:00:44:17 - 00:00:49:21

Good morning. My name is Nancy Thomas. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered town planner.

00:00:51:23 - 00:00:56:12

Good morning. My name is Doctor Richard Hunt. I'm a planning inspector in the Chartered Environmentalist.

00:00:58:06 - 00:01:02:16

Good morning. My name is Steven Rennie. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered town planner.

00:01:03:11 - 00:01:08:13

Good morning. My name is Luke Regan. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered transport planner.

00:01:09:18 - 00:01:47:15

I can confirm that all members of the examiner authority have made a formal declaration of interest, and there are no known conflicts of interest. With regard to us examining this application, together we constitute the examining authority of the Isa for this application. There are other colleagues from the Planning Inspectorate with us today. You'll have all spoken to Caroline Allen and Harper Kerr, our case officers in the joining conference. I'd also like to introduce Louise Haraway, the case manager for this project. She's supported by a case officer, Stella Clark. We're also joined today by two inspectors, Claire Taylor and Patricia Cuervo, who are observing the hearing for training purposes and have no role in this examination.

00:01:47:21 - 00:02:02:11

In addition, there are technicians from CV international who are attending solely for the purposes of managing the recording and live streaming of the hearing. If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, I could ask that you please email the case team who will be happy to help.

00:02:04:21 - 00:02:41:25

For those of you who are not here in the hearing yesterday, I will quickly go through a few housekeeping matters. Can everyone attending please make sure that your phone is switched off or turn to silent? For those in the room, no fire test is planned for this morning. Should an alarm sound, it is an emergency and we will need to vacate the building. Emergency exits are located on the side of the room, and the fire assembly point is outside the western entrance to the building. If anyone needs assistance, can you please let the team know? Toilet facilities, including disabled facilities, are out through the doors and left post room 20.

00:02:42:15 - 00:03:25:13

As far as I am aware, no requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this meeting. If anyone does need a break or extra support later on, then please do let the case team know for those attending the satellite venues to minimize background noise, please make sure your phones are switched off or turn to silent. If you want to speak, please raise your hand and a roving mic will be brought to you. For those attending virtually, can I repeat the request made in the arrangements conference that to minimize background noise, you make sure your phone is switched off or turn to silent and that you stay muted with your camera turned off unless you are speaking.

00:03:26:01 - 00:04:04:09

I would also ask that if you want to speak, you switch your camera on and either use the raise a hand function or ask to speak at the appropriate time. Can I also remind people that the chat function on teams will not work? So please do not try to use this to ask any questions or post any comments. This event is being live streamed and recorded. Our letter of the 19th of September, which we refer to as the rule six letter, explained that because we retain and publish the digital recordings, they form a public record to which the General Data Protection Regulation, or GDPR, applies.

00:04:04:20 - 00:04:45:00

The Planning Inspectorate publishes and retains recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on the Development Consent Order. So if you participate in this meeting, it's important you understand that you'll be recorded and that you consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. We will only ever ask for information to be placed on the public record. That is important and relevant to the planning decision, to avoid the need to edit the digital recordings. We ask that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you would normally wish to be kept private or confidential, such as your address, financial circumstances or medical conditions.

00:04:45:06 - 00:05:01:16

If you do feel the need to refer to something that is private or confidential, could you please discuss this with the case team first to explore whether this could be submitted in writing and redacted. Does anyone have any questions with regard to this matter, either in the room

00:05:03:10 - 00:05:04:18

or online?

00:05:07:05 - 00:05:09:17

I can't see any hands up.

00:05:11:28 - 00:05:30:15

For those people watching the live stream, when we adjourn proceedings today, we will have to stop the live stream to give us clear recording files. As a result, at the point at which we start the meeting and the live stream, you will need to refresh your browser page. We will remind you of this again should we need to adjourn.

00:05:32:04 - 00:05:36:04

Are there any comments or questions regarding any of the points I've just made?

00:05:38:06 - 00:05:43:10

So can I ask the applicant to display the agenda again please?

00:05:50:03 - 00:06:09:13

As an update to the agenda. We will be dealing with marine physical environment this morning, so it's likely that socioeconomics, tourism, health and well-being will be covered this afternoon. So we start today with items 12 and 13, traffic and transport and public rights of way. And I'll know. Now pass over to Mr. Rennie.

00:06:13:07 - 00:06:47:26

Thank you. Good morning. Um, I shall cover the items for both traffic and transport and public right away. Basically together. Um, starting with the traffic and transport matters. Um, for the applicant, um, firstly, the examining authority in our first written questions asked for junction modelling. Uh, we also asked that this is produced in consultation with the highway authorities at the county councils. Um, can the applicant give an update on when the modelling may be submitted? And has there been engagement with the councils on this matter so far?

00:06:48:07 - 00:06:57:10

So. Good morning. Sarah. King's counsel for the applicant. So if you don't mind. We'll just do a bit of shuffling around because we we had a public rights of way people.

00:06:57:12 - 00:06:59:16

Yes. Sorry. Yes we will get to that. But yeah.

00:06:59:19 - 00:07:01:18

No problem. We'll make sure we've got the right people.

00:07:01:20 - 00:07:02:09

Thank you.

00:07:24:12 - 00:07:50:22

Thank you sir. So if I just introduce who we have here, um, we have got Mr. Jeremy Douche, who's traffic and transport consultant for the applicant. Um, that's my second left. Um, there is a mr. Chris Burton who is also the traffic and transport consultant for the applicant. Um, there's Ali Leader, who's

the DCO consent officer behind him. And we also have Mr. James Buckley, who is the onshore engineering expert.

00:07:51:05 - 00:07:54:12

Thank you. Welcome. Do you want me to repeat the question, or.

00:07:54:16 - 00:07:56:02

If you don't mind? I don't think.

00:07:56:04 - 00:08:20:20

That's the case. Are you ready? Yes. Yes, sir. Okay. Um, firstly, the examining authority and our first written questions asked for junction modelling. We also ask that this is produced in consultation with the highway authorities at the county councils. Can the applicant give an update on when the modelling may be submitted? And has there been engagement in the county councils on all highway authorities on this matter? Thank you sir.

00:08:21:00 - 00:08:55:29

Um, Jeremy Deutsch for the applicant. Um, yes we are. Um, we've done a lot of assessment, obviously, on the traffic impact of the scheme at the busiest times, very much worst case. And we do not feel, given the, um, negligible impact on the on the local highway. We do not feel that junction modelling is required. However, we have engaged with the authorities, the highway Authorities. And we've engaged with National highways about the A14, A12 junction, sir, and they have agreed that no further modelling is required.

00:08:56:03 - 00:09:26:15

Okay. We have engaged. We had a meeting with Kent County Council a few weeks ago. Um, very useful meeting. And we have um, we are going to model three junctions in Kent, namely Ebbsfleet Minster in Severn School. So we are progressing that now in collaboration with Kent County Council. And just last week we had a meeting with Suffolk County Council, um, whereby um we presented again.

00:09:26:17 - 00:09:54:13

Again, we don't feel that modelling is required because we're not going to have an impact, but we have put forward the case of, um, 2 or 3 junctions that are on our construction traffic routes. Um, it currently sits with Suffolk. They've gone away to have a think about that, and we will collaborate with them closely over the next coming weeks to look at junction modelling in Suffolk, and report on that during the examination process. Thanks, sir. Okay.

00:09:54:15 - 00:09:59:22

Any idea what sort of deadline that would be? We'd be looking at to get that modelling done.

00:10:00:21 - 00:10:26:25

The chairman is actually the applicant. We're progressing the modelling as we speak, for example. We can't. So we're underway. Um, we need to have a formal meeting with Suffolk again, and we will expedite that, um, as quickly as we can. But obviously we're a bit reliant on the third party, on the authority to, um, come back in timely manner and, and have discussions with them. But, you know,

we're a fair way and we're comfortable that we will be able to carry this out during the examination period, sir.

00:10:27:03 - 00:10:57:26

Okay. Yes. I mean, that's why I think we pushed forward, particularly for the, um, early engagement with the councils, because what we didn't want is something to be submitted. And the council saying, well, we would prefer this juncture in that production. So considering where we are in the process, I think that's very helpful. So, um. Yeah, happy with that. Um, can I just, um, go to the council's maybe Ken Council first? If anyone's here from Ken Council, um, to, uh, update us from their perspective.

00:11:02:15 - 00:11:06:14

From Kent Council, uh, Suffolk county council, then highway authority.

00:11:07:04 - 00:11:38:10

Thank you, sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk county Council. Uh, I think what you've heard is a fair summary of the position. In overall terms, yes, there has been a meeting, there has been discussion about, uh, appropriate junctions. Um, I think I just bring in Mr.. Steve. Mary, uh, who is the, uh, highways manager, uh, for the county council. Uh, just for any comments on whether the ball is in our court, which I think was being implied or or not.

00:11:38:12 - 00:11:43:03

So perhaps if, uh, Mr. Merry could just comment on that. Thank you.

00:11:43:28 - 00:11:45:00

Okay, Mr. Murray.

00:11:45:22 - 00:12:22:00

Good morning, sir. Madam Steve Murray, Suffolk county council. Uh, just to elaborate on that, we did have a meeting with Sealink on the 22nd of January. So last week, and we did discuss traffic modelling. I would also point to our deadline three submission, which I think is rep three 101. In appendix A, we did provide a list of junctions that we thought were relevant. I would add that, uh, just to add also that the previous meeting with Sealink was in August 2025, where we did discuss traffic modelling.

00:12:22:02 - 00:12:54:03

And I will apologize. There's a document that's been brought to my attention this morning, RET 364, which I need to look at, I haven't actually picked up. There is some information in there about traffic modelling and traffic modelling, which we will do so and respond to in our response to this meeting. What I'd just like to do is take the opportunity to maybe elaborate on what our specific concerns are. So specific concerns are primarily the cumulative impact of all of these concepts. And this is on a particular route. So it's the A12 where all of the HGVs congregate.

00:12:54:06 - 00:13:26:27

And it's also the main through route for workers. And it is also the A10 94 specifically with the interaction of Scottish Power, uh, some of the size of the light traffic, but also this project's traffic and also the Future Line Link project and the B11 21, in relation to Sealink and then following on line

link. So they have particular concerns. Uh, I'd also add in our local impact report, we did provide a summary of the traffic modelling information that was available to us from other insects.

00:13:26:29 - 00:13:43:10

So it doesn't do attention to that. And I think that's where our position is. So in our view, there is still more to be done. We are happy to work with the applicant to do so. And as I have said, but just to repeat it, it is the curative impact of all the concepts that we're particularly concerned about.

00:13:44:08 - 00:14:02:02

Yes. Thank you. And that sort of leads on to my next question for the applicant. Really? Um, uh, obviously it's important for junction modelling and, and capacity assessment to be able to factor in that cumulative impact. How is the applicant looking to incorporate cumulative traffic into its modelling.

00:14:04:09 - 00:14:37:26

Uh Chris Belcher for the applicant. Um, so yes, as part of the uh part of the junction modelling, um, will include the cumulative um schemes as one of the, as a couple of the scenarios there. So we'll have obviously scenarios with and without ceiling because as well as with and without committed developments. That sounds good. Yeah. Um, we we've already, um, obviously done a lot of work on the cumulative assessment work to date. Um, so looking at Sizewell and the East Anglia scheme, the one North East Anglia two and line link. Um, so we have their traffic flows that we've already looked at.

00:14:38:05 - 00:15:13:03

Um, but it's part of the junction modelling itself, which is obviously what we've talked about just now. We'll also include community development as part of that modeling exercise. So that will be captured as part of the junctions that we're proposing to model. Good. Thank you. Yes. I mean, as you can see from Suffolk County Council, that seems to be of particular importance to them. Um, and we'll also, will the applicant also be factoring in improvements to the highway network which is programmed in? I think there's some works for the A12 enhancements. Is that going to be part of what's being looked at? Uh, Chris Belzer for the applicant? Um, yes.

00:15:13:05 - 00:15:49:23

We're aware of the schemes that are currently under, well, um, happening at the moment. So obviously the improvement, the A12 1894 roundabout, for example. So the two village bypass that's due to come forward and the A12 major road network scheme. But we talked about Suffolk last week um, as well as the cumulative schemes themselves in terms of the additional traffic that will Generate. Um, so, um, you know, as part of the cumulative assessment work that we've carried out, we've we've obviously considered the peak construction traffic flows of those schemes. Obviously, we're aware of the embedded mitigation that they'll also be bringing forwards that we've also obviously considered as part of our part of our work.

00:15:50:01 - 00:16:04:09

Um, and that's obviously informed the scope of the junction modelling as well, in terms of which model, which junctions we feel that we should be looking at. And as part of those improvements that are already being carried out on the network. And just to, uh, basically follow on.

00:16:04:11 - 00:16:04:26

From we just.

00:16:04:28 - 00:16:50:25

Said, is the plan to model the junctions based on when they are individually considered to be subject to the most Sealink and most cumulative traffic? Because I would imagine that might vary from junction to junction. Uh, Chris, for the applicant. Yes. So, um, each junction we're looking at specific peaks for those parts of the network. So, um, we've looked at, um, for our own program. We've looked at where different accesses will be used at different points. Um, And we've obviously looked at the airport for the junctions themselves, where certain peaks will be carried out, because that will differ because we've got two main routes really the A12 by 1121 junction for the converter station site and the A12 1094 junction for the landfall for the cable works and for substation.

00:16:50:27 - 00:17:18:11

And so clearly there's different points in the programme that those could happen. But as part of the work we've done as worst case, we've obviously we've assumed that the peak of scenic will overlap, overlapped with the peak of other schemes. And we have also done we've done a lot of work in a cumulative traffic note, looking at the potential overlap between Sealink and other schemes, and which we can provide a bit more clarity on if you'd like it. But I can go into that if you'd like me to, but that's up to you if you want me to do that.

00:17:18:21 - 00:17:30:24

I mean, that would be good to have. Maybe when you're submitting this, to have that in writing, any further clarification you can on those sort of matters would be would be good. So thank you on that. That sounds like the sort of thing that we are looking for and hopefully that the council is looking for.

00:17:32:22 - 00:17:39:18

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Can I just raise a point which I think needs to feature in the

00:17:41:14 - 00:18:20:06

work that's being undertaken for the junction modelling, which is this, as we understand it at the moment, the applicant's previous input data that it's relied on for the other project have been taken from the relevant transport information provided with the environmental statements for those other projects, which is not an unreasonable position in terms of the starting point. But as you know, both of the main projects in terms of Sizewell C and East Anglia, um, two are progressing.

00:18:20:08 - 00:18:57:12

And so more information is coming forward from the promoters of those projects, which is updating some of their traffic information. And whilst no doubt the full detail is a matter more for a technical discussion offline in terms of the various highway teams, we would be anxious to ensure that the most appropriate, up to date information is being used in the further modelling work which is to be undertaken so that you have the best picture of the position.

00:18:57:16 - 00:19:25:17

And for example, I just mentioned this as a for example, the Construction Transport Management plan for East Anglia to provide new information on their construction, traffic numbers, etc. and that's the sort of thing we would expect to be taken into account. So I'll just highlight that and I hope I say the the discussions and the technical detail will grapple with that. Thank you. Do you want to come.

00:19:25:19 - 00:19:26:21

Back on that please.

00:19:27:17 - 00:20:01:01

Thank you. Ali, leader for the applicant. Um, yes. Thank you for bringing that to our attention. Um, I mean, from a cumulative perspective, we have very much assessed the worst case scenario in terms of the peaks and in terms of what's secured in the other dsos. We do have the latest information from SBR that's obviously been submitted to discharge their requirements, and that's relatively recent. So we are looking at that. But from an initial look at it that is likely to be better than our our worst case scenario as you would expect.

00:20:01:03 - 00:20:26:03

Um, so I think we will do the we are doing that assessment to confirm that it's um, that it's not worse than our worst case scenario, but we wouldn't want to update the assessment with those numbers because that's actually it's better we have less overlap of our peaks in their programmes. And we also potentially have have lower traffic numbers than is there is secured in their DCA.

00:20:26:08 - 00:20:31:03

Okay. Thank you. Um, I got a hand up for the Suffolk hub.

00:20:46:14 - 00:20:49:24

Your camera isn't working. Do you want me to proceed or not?

00:20:49:26 - 00:20:51:24

Yeah, I can hear you. Fine. That's. That's no problem.

00:20:51:26 - 00:21:21:25

All right. Thank you. My name is Robin Sanders. I'm from the East Suffolk Community Energy Partnership. We represent some 30 plus parish and town councils in the area. The. I'm pleased to hear what you're saying with regard to the potential further junction assessment. Um, and I would like to acknowledge that there is a transport assessment available on the Suffolk County Council planning site for the MRN scheme.

00:21:21:27 - 00:21:52:12

However, the peak shown in there, and possibly the peaks that are being shown, uh, or being considered by the applicant may not consider some of the issues that we as locals anticipate. Uh, that is in particular with regard to the junction on the for the Grand for road junction on the A12 at CB 1169, I think, um, where the peak appears as the normal peaks around seven at 5:00 and 8:00, at 5:00 and 6:00 in the evening.

00:21:52:14 - 00:22:23:23

In fact, the peak there is generally around about 3 or 4:00, because we have two major schools emptying out onto the A12, and we have considerable problems there at the current stage. Um, we are finding at that time of day the junction is completely gridlocked because the current single carriageway south of that is beyond capacity, which is shown up in the MRN report anyway. Um, and so that is one particular aspect that we, have concerned about.

00:22:23:25 - 00:22:47:15

There are other concerns that we have. About further up the network with regard to T junctions, where there are already issues developing with access out of T junctions, where obviously it's a lot more difficult. Increased traffic reduces the number of gaps available for traffic to pull in and out completely when they're pulling out to cross the carriageway on the A12.

00:22:47:28 - 00:22:53:00

Mhm. I understand. Thank you. Does the applicant want to respond on what you've heard there.

00:22:54:29 - 00:23:28:25

Uh, yeah. Chris for the applicant. Um thank you. Yes. We um had a meeting with Suffolk last week and um, similarly they raised their comments. Um, that they recently provided, um, on the A12 scheme, um, as well as kind of the junctions along that part of the network where they would like to look at those in a bit more detail based on our traffic forecast. So that's something that we will be looking at. Um, and in terms of the school, um, afternoon peak that you mentioned three till 4:00. Um, obviously, our working hours are designed to avoid our construction workers travelling on the network at those times.

00:23:29:00 - 00:23:45:03

Um, so we're looking at the shoulder peaks, but the other side of those network peak hours. So in the afternoon, that would be between 6 to 7, um, in the afternoon rather than 3 to 4, um, in the afternoon. So that just to respond on those couple of points. Thank you.

00:23:45:05 - 00:24:08:00

Okay. Thank you. Um, I don't think there's anyone here from Kent Council, but, um, from Suffolk Highways. County Council. Um, are there any other projects, um, that need to be included into the traffic, uh, coming to traffic assessment, or are you content with what's been included so far?

00:24:09:11 - 00:24:15:01

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council I think I'll ask Mr. Mayor to respond to that question. Thank you.

00:24:15:25 - 00:24:48:11

Hey, Steve. Mary. Uh, Suffolk County Council. I would have to go back and check what is in there. But the the schemes we would expect to see in there obviously, uh, Scottish Power, um, Sealink itself obviously, uh, Sizewell and line link and the one we're a little bit unsighted on is any solar, uh, power around the fishing area. So Helios, there's no information on that. So we're aware of it. I think we'd struggle or see that we'd struggle to find information to put into it.

00:24:48:19 - 00:25:19:24

The one that's come forward most recently is the Essex and Suffolk Water pipeline from the north. There's been a consultation in December, so if any information is available for that, again, we'd like to see that because that does overlap with this project towards the end. Uh, somewhere in our notes we have put together, um, sorry, I probably I'm trying to run two computers and I'm rubbish at this. So in our response, we will put together a roughs a time on the way we see these projects interacting.

00:25:20:06 - 00:25:22:08

Okay, if that's helpful.

00:25:22:15 - 00:25:37:14

Yes, yes that's fine. And maybe this could form part of the continued dialogue between yourselves and the councils. Uh, just to make sure that everything's being captured. That needs to be captured on that. Um, thank you very much. Um. Yes, sir. Please

00:25:39:07 - 00:25:41:06

come over here. First of all, sorry.

00:25:42:01 - 00:25:47:25

Thank you, Sir James. Thank you. Sorry. By all means. You were youth before beauty. Okay.

00:25:48:18 - 00:25:49:24

All right, Mr. Mackie.

00:25:50:14 - 00:26:24:26

Uh, David Mackie, uh, I'm here as a trustee and former chair of the Aldeburgh Jubilee Hall in support of the position taken by Aldeburgh Town Council and many other businesses generally, I should disclose, because others have done so yesterday, that I, too, am a Queen's and then King's Counsel. Although that was a long time ago, as it were, in a different galaxy. Um, the what I wanted to say about this is two things.

00:26:24:28 - 00:26:54:29

One, um, it's all very well to have the county and the district councils doing their valuable work, but the town council, I know, would value much more input itself, because there are innumerable things that trouble Aldeburgh and its council about the traffic. I won't waste your time. I'll just give you one example.

00:26:55:06 - 00:27:26:19

And that is, uh. Leaving aside the question of visitors, Aldeburgh has the old one of the oldest communities in terms of age in the country. The nearest accident and emergency is in Ipswich, which is about 24 miles. There is uh, as I understand it, an average mileage for people in England of about 6 or 7 miles from AOA. Uh, we've not heard what special plans that will be made.

00:27:26:22 - 00:28:04:06

Uh, to take account of that need, regardless of how attractive the modelling may appear to be. But I also, in order to avoid wasting time by repeated attempts to intervene on this subject and on coordination and tourism, urge the inspectors to pay particular regard to the submissions. Written

submissions by Aldeburgh Town Council and r t j r Mayor and county councillor, which went in just a few days ago.

00:28:04:11 - 00:28:36:16

Because by reading I know you've read it, but those of us who have been in this business for a while know that all tribunals and all judges at every level. I assure you that you read it, but it is our duty or the duty of the lawyers, of which I am not any more, to make sure you really have and have really understood it. So forgive me for for suggesting that there are three particular reasons why you should do that with Aldeburgh. The first is the interests of the town council and the county council and the district council are not always identical.

00:28:36:22 - 00:29:18:09

I will spare you a lecture on Suffolk local politics. You jump in the Thames if I did that for very long. Secondly, these issues are crucial for the town. And thirdly, we have a sense, and it is only a sense, and it is no sense a criticism of the inspectors and in moral terms, not a criticism of the applicant. But we have a sense of the applicant taking no notice at all of our position as a time and the local authorities necessarily have a reactive response to that, to the application.

00:29:18:11 - 00:29:37:22

And we have a sense of being left out in the cold just to give one. I'll stop in a moment. I'll just give you one lighthearted example of that. Last December, the inspectors produced, if I may say so, a tour de force, 78 pages of pertinent direct questions.

00:29:39:20 - 00:30:10:15

If you look at those questions and you're an older resident, you search for Aldeburgh. You're pleased to see for the dormice that they get six references, but you're disappointed to see that we get none at all. So it's against that background that we do urge the tribunal to have regard to the town, as well as to the county and the district. Having said that, I will try not to intervene more than is absolutely necessary from now on. Thank you very much.

00:30:10:17 - 00:30:33:25

Thank you very much. And just to mention as well, it was we have read all those representations that you mentioned in, and we do expect the applicant to respond on all those as well. So even if there's not a specific question that we've, that we've submitted or even talking about it today because of restrictions on time, it's still things that we are considering. If I come across to the gentleman from SES.

00:30:34:09 - 00:31:06:04

Thank you sir. James Burton of Council, on behalf of Suffolk Energy Action Solutions. Uh, so, as you know, um, traffic transport is an issue of acute concern for my clients. I'm, I'm here primarily to introduce to you, Mr. Richard Elam, who has provided a number of reports that I know that you have all read. Um, and he has, I think, a fair few points to pick up from the discussion so far just before I do so, though, um, a clear request, really.

00:31:06:06 - 00:31:50:02

It would be very helpful for us to know which are the I think I understood it to be three junctions that are being proposed for modeling in Suffolk, but I don't believe we actually caught the identification of the junctions, and I'm grateful for that information. Um, and the other point I noted, I heard, um, the applicant tell us that, um, National Highways have told it that it doesn't require any junction modelling. Um, I'm probably missing in the many documents the latest iteration, but, um, as far as I'd understood it, the latest bit of written evidence we have was rep 2131 from National Highways, which was expressed as you've read it.

00:31:50:04 - 00:32:20:21

So a lot of concern about the A12 14 junction. And as I read it asking for junction modelling or at least strongly suggesting it. So if we could be pointed to where matters have actually got to in writing on that would be wonderful. And anyway, um, I'll hand you over to, to Mr. Edelman, I should say you have. I'll just remind the panel you have CVS from all of these experts attending today, which came in a package to you, I think, on, um, Tuesday, um, at some fairly late on Tuesday.

00:32:20:23 - 00:32:22:28

Anyway, over to you, Mr. Fitzgerald. Thank you.

00:32:23:22 - 00:32:24:07

Good morning.

00:32:24:09 - 00:32:25:10

Everybody. Um, my name.

00:32:25:12 - 00:32:42:04

Is Richard Elam. I'm a chartered engineer and a member of the Institute of Highways and Transportation with over 27 years professional experience. I'm a director with PJ, PJ. We're appointed by Suffolk Energy Action Solutions to carry out our technical review of the transport evidence prepared in.

00:32:44:12 - 00:33:27:12

Um, in respect to the application. Um, in terms of what we've heard already this morning, it's obviously welcome in terms of the comments I've made previously about the junction modelling. Um, I mean, these are very fundamental pieces of work in understanding the impacts of the development and if mitigation required. And obviously, that exercise hasn't got to a conclusion yet. But what I would add in terms of that approach, the work that's been done to date in respect to transport has been about the relative impacts, not the absolute. What's really important in that exercise of junction modelling is to understand the baseline position, how those junctions and the network is performing now, how they'll perform in the future with the vast array of committed development and also the scheme in particular, not just the scheme's relative impact.

00:33:27:26 - 00:33:59:23

Um, but also there's a quite a substantial amount of work to get to that position in terms of understanding the needs and the impacts on key locations like the A12. Um, so that's welcome, but again, hasn't reached its conclusion. Um, and also in terms of pick up on it being the worst case, um, the base information that this the work that's been done to date is based on surveys done in non

neutral months, the lowest time of the year. Um, as the evidence I've prepared shows, there's in neutral months flows of reasonably higher and much higher in the summer months.

00:33:59:25 - 00:34:04:09

So we're concerned that that that exercise hasn't picked up those concerns.

00:34:05:17 - 00:34:35:22

Okay. Thank you. Um, the, uh, a couple of things there, I think, on the National Highways. Um, I remember the, uh, the deadline to submission. Um, I've we've heard back from the applicant that conversations have, uh, carried on. And I think from your perspective that there seems to be some sort of solution there or, uh, or at least the national highways aren't particularly concerned anymore. Uh, however, I haven't heard from National Highways.

00:34:35:24 - 00:34:46:21

I don't think myself. So hopefully I will do a deadline for for that. So anything that you want to add on that point. No that's. Yeah. Yeah. I don't think there's anything else since deadline to from them.

00:34:48:04 - 00:34:53:25

So there could be a shake for the applicant. Yes. We do have an update. Uh, just to confirm National Highways position.

00:34:55:24 - 00:34:58:25

Jeremy Dortch for the applicant. Um, yes, we you.

00:34:58:27 - 00:34:59:12

Know, we got.

00:34:59:14 - 00:35:01:18

Minuted notes of our meeting with National Highways.

00:35:01:24 - 00:35:02:09

If I.

00:35:02:11 - 00:35:05:08

Could just come back to the gentlemen on the three junctions, we're.

00:35:05:10 - 00:35:06:02

Proposing.

00:35:06:04 - 00:35:06:23

Something useful.

00:35:06:25 - 00:35:07:10

That.

00:35:07:12 - 00:35:07:27

People.

00:35:07:29 - 00:35:38:03

Um, it's the A12, b1 one, two one. The a1, a9 for B1 069 Snipe Road and the a1 A9 for B1 121 Aldborough Road. Now these are the routes that are construction uh traffic are taking. However, as stated we're in collaboration with Suffolk County Council. So we're going to you know that's not totally confirmed. We're we're having dialogue to firm that up in the next few weeks. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

00:35:38:18 - 00:35:39:19

Um, Mr. Barney.

00:35:40:15 - 00:35:41:03

Thank you.

00:35:41:05 - 00:35:41:20

Uh, Michael.

00:35:41:22 - 00:35:43:03

Mahoney from Friston Parish.

00:35:43:05 - 00:35:43:25

Council.

00:35:43:27 - 00:35:48:05

Um, yes. I noted that Steve Mary from Suffolk County Council mentioned the Helios.

00:35:48:07 - 00:35:49:11

Energy Park, which is being.

00:35:49:13 - 00:35:53:01

Brought forward. Um, as you're aware, the statutory.

00:35:53:03 - 00:35:53:21

Consultation.

00:35:53:23 - 00:36:19:19

For Line Link has started. And in their documents, they have referred to the fact that they are working closely with the developers of a number of projects, including the Helios Energy Park. So it sounds as though things are moving on there. I appreciate that might not include traffic, but I don't know, so I'd be interested to understand what matters are being discussed by line link with Hellas Energy and to extent that's involving in jet as well.

00:36:20:26 - 00:36:29:22

Okay. I mean, I can ask the applicant if you'd like to have a response about the the information you have at the moment about Helios Energy Park and how it can be incorporated.

00:36:29:24 - 00:36:33:12

sub-Saharan shake for the applicant. I think Mr. Buckley can assist with that.

00:36:33:14 - 00:36:33:29

Oh, yeah.

00:36:34:01 - 00:36:34:16

James Buckley.

00:36:34:18 - 00:36:36:24

On behalf of the applicant, um, we have a.

00:36:37:04 - 00:37:08:28

Monthly meeting with all of the developers, including Helios. Um, and I have a meeting with Helios in three weeks time specifically to talk about their project, um, where they are with their offer from the NIS. So in terms of connection to the network and what their next steps are. Um, I don't know any more than that because they haven't let any more than that in the conversations that we have, we have an SOC with them, which is agreeing the positions within that and that has been submitted, I believe a deadline three and a slight update to that will be submitted at deadline five.

00:37:09:09 - 00:37:12:03

Okay. We know from Helios at the moment. Thank you.

00:37:12:23 - 00:37:21:05

Um, there's a couple of more hands up. So I'll get through these. Then I'll go back to the questions. Um, at the supper club. I believe there's someone there.

00:37:24:29 - 00:37:25:15

Good morning.

00:37:25:17 - 00:37:26:10

Sir. My name is.

00:37:26:12 - 00:37:26:27

Richard.

00:37:26:29 - 00:37:28:27

Cooper. I'm chairman of.

00:37:29:08 - 00:37:29:24

Ford Parish.

00:37:29:26 - 00:37:37:02

Council. And could I just ask the applicant when they're looking at junction modeling.

00:37:37:06 - 00:37:37:26

To.

00:37:37:28 - 00:37:38:13

Consider.

00:37:38:15 - 00:37:39:00

Bell.

00:37:39:02 - 00:37:39:20

Lane Mulford?

00:37:39:22 - 00:37:41:05

Because Bell Lane.

00:37:41:07 - 00:38:22:19

Mulford is already a very difficult junction to negotiate, particularly if you're turning right. I across the traffic. Suffolk County Council have already recognized this as a potentially dangerous junction and I think reference it in their leer. Um, and I think, um, because that junction is taking increasing amounts of traffic from, uh, development going on around Framlingham. Um, it's it's not only being affected by, um, traffic from the applicant using the A12, but it's also being affected by, um, residential traffic.

00:38:23:01 - 00:38:40:19

Um, and I think as a parish council, we're concerned that frustrated drivers will take risks in getting into the narrowing gaps between the vehicles. And therein lies, um, considerable potential danger.

00:38:42:04 - 00:38:53:09

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. And, uh, can I just, uh, move on to Gerald? Uh, Geraldine Barker, I think it might be. Sorry. My eyes on going from you. I think that's my guy says.

00:38:53:24 - 00:39:28:18

Yeah. Good morning. Uh, yeah. Geraldine Bacher, representing Saxe-Meiningen town council. Um, may I please, um, add for consideration to the list of projects, one which isn't a nationally significant infrastructure project, but the 800 houses, um, adjacent to the A12 and also the works or commercial area, which is opposite, which would lead to having a new roundabout installed.

00:39:28:20 - 00:39:58:21

Now, we understand that the planning application for outline planning will be submitted very, very shortly. Perhaps you could refer to East Suffolk Council on that. Uh, that will increase traffic on the A12 between the B1 one, two, one um, at which is south and the um the, the 1119, uh, sort of roundabout to Saxmundham.

00:39:58:26 - 00:40:33:08

Um, we also very, very concerned about the B117. Uh, this is the random road junction. I, we have spoken and we have sent our concerns to users, but it is a very dangerous junction and we've just had a fatality. And we consider that as this junction is down for the diversion route, uh, when the uh B1 111, two, one from then all bridges closed, that this needs to be part of a junction that is remodelled.

00:40:33:10 - 00:40:40:07

It is incredibly dangerous. We had a fatality in December. Thank you very much.

00:40:40:15 - 00:40:44:16

Okay. Thank you. Um. If you. Yes, sir.

00:40:46:01 - 00:41:04:08

Yeah. Richard Allen, on behalf of the. Yes. Again. Yes. Just just in a similar vein, I'd agree with the junctions the residents have, but another one that was of particular concern to ourselves was the A12, A10 94 junction. One that was already directly signed as an accident site would be of concern and suffers from capacity issues already.

00:41:04:15 - 00:41:15:18

Okay. Thank you. I'll come back to the applicant on these points in just a second. I think there's just one more Ed Suffolk and then we'll we'll let the applicant come back. Then we'll move. Move on with some more questions. So for the Suffolk hub.

00:41:16:22 - 00:41:49:15

Robin Sanders, Woodbridge Town Council. Um, the there is actually another person here as well wishing to talk. However, I shall move on to what I was going to say. Um, my concern is that the junctions which are affecting Woodbridge are not being considered with regard to the, uh. Sorry. Um, there is a noise. Um, there are we have concerns in Woodbridge with regard to the fact that you are not looking at the potential diversionary traffic, not potential highly likely diversionary traffic between 2027 and 2029 for the MRN.

00:41:49:17 - 00:42:33:13

We know from experience that when there are traffic works on the section of the A12 there, we have massive diversionary traffic and there will be even more so through this phase of the construction period of Sealink. And our real concerns is that the town cannot take that traffic. We have very substandard roads in the town. The reason why the bypass was built pre-World War two, and that is something of considerable concern, and we would like to see some assessment of that diversionary traffic, the effects and what mitigation the Sealink may consider to assist in avoiding the considerable and prolonged delay that would occur.

00:42:34:29 - 00:42:49:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, I know there might be another question in Suffolk at the moment. I'll come back to questions. At the moment, I just want to give the applicant a chance to comment, and then I'll go for a few more of my questions and we'll come back for for any other questions? Yeah.

00:42:50:02 - 00:43:25:23

James Buckley, on behalf of the applicant. Um, my colleagues have made some notes with those additional junctions, and we'll continue to work with Suffolk Council on junctions that they feel need modelling on the point around the diversionary traffic along the B11 19. There is no intention to send HGVs along the B11 19 during those diversions. So the diversions will occur in the case that we, um, repair the vinyl bridge or we put the mini bridge in over the Bennell Bridge. And at that point the only traffic Sealink will look to use the B11 19 diversion would be light goods vehicles.

00:43:25:27 - 00:43:29:07

Okay. Um, to move on then, um,

00:43:31:06 - 00:43:52:27

I what I wanted to do is just it would help me if the applicant could have a look at the submitted documents. 6.3. 2.13 point B, which is your preliminary Cumulative Highway Impact assessment is app 142 on the Electronic Library Reference.

00:43:54:19 - 00:44:01:28

What I'm looking for is just for the applicant, just to briefly talk me through what's before us on this. Um,

00:44:03:18 - 00:44:04:12

and.

00:44:07:12 - 00:44:12:00

It's quite a lot of information on there. I don't think it probably needs to be displayed particularly, but, um.

00:44:15:21 - 00:44:16:27

You got that to hand.

00:44:18:01 - 00:44:52:29

Uh, Chris, for the applicant? Yes. Um, I have that to hand. Um, so this, um, appendix shows the, uh, total level of traffic cumulatively, um, of all the schemes that we assessed as part of the original work that supported the environmental statement. So it doesn't include, see links, traffic, the columns in green. Yeah. Includes, um, Sizewell C, East Anglia one, North East Anglia two. line link, which are the four major schemes that we've talked about. These. These numbers also include several other schemes in the area that I can mention if we as.

00:44:53:03 - 00:45:24:20

Several others are residential schemes and so, so forth. Um, but this is a total cumulative scenario. So it's um, then it's combined with the baseline, um, traffic to give you your total and then your percentage increases. Um, this, uh, information was used to inform the cumulative assessment when we looked at the potential cumulative effects of Sealink in combination with all projects combined. But of course, bear in mind that this assumes that all of these projects peaks will all happen at the same time, which is very unlikely to happen.

00:45:24:22 - 00:45:35:20

In fact, we've got a cumulative technical note that proves otherwise. Um, so this is, um, a scenario that's very unlikely to actually happen with these numbers. Um, but it is just the busiest period of every project combined.

00:45:35:22 - 00:46:08:01

Thank you. So that's what I was going to ask about actually, is, is what developments were included with it within it and which you've, you've um outlined and also which you would this actually be for because the different peaks at different times. So what you've essentially done is taken all the peaks, merged them together as one. And then what would be useful is just make a maybe a quick note as an action point just to go along with this document. Uh, just to explain those, those points in, in writing. Um, I didn't quite get that from what was submitted so far.

00:46:08:05 - 00:46:17:29

I thought that was probably the case, though. Uh, could also is was there any particular reason why Sealink wasn't incorporated into that as a kind of worst case scenario?

00:46:19:07 - 00:46:51:15

Uh, Chris Bilson for the applicant and the Sealink was included as part of the assessment. But the purpose of this appendix was just to outline the traffic flows associated with the cumulative schemes so that, um, it was clear what traffic was associated with other developments versus what traffic's associated with Sealink for the Sealink specific information. So it was in chapter seven, and the appendix is supporting that. This is supporting chapter 13, which is the project effect. So if you. Combine the numbers in this appendix with the equivalent appendix for chapter seven, you would get the total with Sealink plus these schemes.

00:46:51:17 - 00:46:55:08

And obviously that has underpinned the cumulative assessment work that we carried out.

00:46:55:14 - 00:47:06:25

Yes. I mean could could is that a table that could be submitted to us, whereas basically this table but with Sealink as well, that would be useful. And just to sort of split them apart so you can see what kind of different contributions that would be.

00:47:08:12 - 00:47:10:21

That would be very useful as an action point. Thank you.

00:47:20:00 - 00:47:52:08

Um, more generally, the peak times for Sealink and other developments are set out in the applicant's documentation. But does the applicant know when the kind of overall peak traffic would be for both Suffolk and Kent considered cumulatively? I think it's like 2028, for example, for Suffolk, for Sealink. But what would what do you think would be the overall? Taking into account the other developments going on there? When do you think it would be busiest overall, taken cumulatively? Is that something that's been calculated?

00:47:53:27 - 00:48:40:06

Chris Belton for the applicant with respect to Sealink. You're correct in that MLP is expected to be in 2028, and in combination with other schemes, there's likely to be some partial overlap with Sizewell C, which we expect to be 2028 2029, in terms of their peak. Um, but in terms of the other two, um, we think, well, we know that line link will follow two years after our project, and the peak for that project is likely to be 2030. And for the SPR schemes, East Anglia one, North and East Anglia two, and the recent information that was mentioned earlier about the construction traffic management plan that's reasonably been submitted for East Anglia to um, identifies a peak of 2026 for their scheme, so that will likely happen before out of the peak for Sealink and East Anglia one North.

00:48:40:08 - 00:49:10:05

That's I think, 2028 2029. So in terms of a year, um, and also concerning. You know, on the basis that we're looking at, um, Sealink and we would say that 2028 is probably in terms of our key focus for our cumulative assessment work. But that's not to say that all of those schemes will happen at that time. There will obviously be some schemes taking place before that. Um, and there'll be um line link taking place after that. So we don't expect there to be a scenario where all four of those will all have their peaks during the same period.

00:49:10:07 - 00:49:25:09

It sounds like the, the, the busiest traffic in cumulative effect over the next several years will probably be about 2028 when you've got Sealink and Sizewell run that sort of time.

00:49:25:17 - 00:49:44:08

Uh, Chris Bowles for the applicant, I think, um, we know that Sizewell, um, Sizewell sees, uh, traffic forecasts are a lot higher than the other schemes. So I think you're correct. It is driven by Sizewell C rather than a Sealink or others, so I would expect that to largely follow the programme for Sizewell C, so yeah.

00:49:44:10 - 00:50:15:01

Okay. Thank you. Um, can I ask, um, the council's I know there's there's some hands up. I will I will come back to those. I just want to go through a few questions first. Um, for the for Suffolk County Council. Is there also any benefit in obtaining some journey time analysis? Um, maybe as part of the A12, for example, taking into account cumulative traffic. Is that something that's been discussed? Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council I'll ask Mr.

00:50:15:03 - 00:50:15:20

Mary.

00:50:15:27 - 00:50:16:12

Uh.

00:50:16:14 - 00:50:20:15

For his view on whether that's a either a.

00:50:21:01 - 00:50:21:21

Necessary.

00:50:21:23 - 00:50:23:13

Or an appropriate and helpful piece.

00:50:23:15 - 00:50:24:00

Of.

00:50:24:02 - 00:50:27:05

Information that he'd like to see. Okay. Thank you.

00:50:28:15 - 00:51:00:25

Good morning, Steve and Mary. Suffolk County council. The answer is yes. Um, journey time information would be very useful. Um, particularly again, it comes back to the cumulative impacts. One of the issues that has been raised with us by others is not just the traffic up and down the A12 and the A10 94, but it's also the disruption of routes across the A12. This is particularly from the health service and the ambulance service where they have concerns about delays. This is mostly something raised through the Suffolk, the Sizewell transport review group.

00:51:01:02 - 00:51:33:24

Um, could I be able to just add a couple of other things on the conversations being going through? One of them is that while we are comfortable with that, the applicant is assessing the peaks with the traffic distribution associated with each of these projects. They are not just a single peak. There is obviously a highest peak, but there are several other peaks. So take for example Scottish Power. They have a peak at the beginning of the, the uh, substation where they put the whole road in, and there is another peak towards the end where the the whole road is taken away.

00:51:33:26 - 00:52:03:09

So it's not a secure profile or anything like that that's important to realize. Uh, also noting the dates 28, 20, 20, 28, 20 and 29 is quite a key date because that is when sites will move from their early years to their peak years. So probably I probably should know this, but, um, it's been a request to the applicant about which of the two sets of size of data have been assessed. Is it the earliest scenario or is it a scenario? There are subtle differences between them. Thank you.

00:52:03:28 - 00:52:07:15

Okay. Thank you. Does the applicant want to come back on those points?

00:52:08:21 - 00:52:31:23

Uh, Chris Belcher for the applicant. Thank you for the for for your comments there, Steve. Um, yes. Uh, we've we've modeled the peak construction year for Sizewell and not the early years. So that concludes the higher forecast for their scheme. And and yes, that was 2028 that they identified as being their peak year within their submission documents. So that's what we based our assumptions on. Thank you.

00:52:32:11 - 00:52:45:04

Just also, at that point, I think it's quite an interesting point about the fact that it's there's not just one singular peak usually with these constructs. I think even looking at the Profile summit for Sealink, there's almost like two peaks maybe. Um.

00:52:47:17 - 00:53:05:18

How does that feed into trying to work out the worst case scenario? Um, because it might be that, um, two slightly lesser peaks could end up with something of a worst case scenario than an overall peak. For example, in one of the developments. How was that taken into account?

00:53:07:05 - 00:53:44:01

Uh, Chris Potter for the applicant. So, uh, the cumulative traffic note that we have produced, um, identifies for several of the, uh, parts of the road network where our peaks are expected to arise. And you're correct in that in some cases, there may be more than one peak. There may be two that are spread apart. Um, as part of that exercise, we then identified the duration over which that peak could arise for. I then compared that to the cumulative scheme to see whether or not there was a potential for an overlap with with with that scheme, and then if there were to be a potential how long in duration that effect could arise for.

00:53:44:11 - 00:54:18:06

Um, so that has been considered. But you're correct in that that varies depending on the part of the network that we're looking at. So 1121 Main road at the access to the converter station would be, uh, have a different profile, um, to the movements along the 1894 for the works, for the cable corridor, for example. So we, we we've considered that. So not only we haven't just looked at the busiest single day for the overall projects, we've looked at, you know, peaks within, um, within that for different parts of the network based on the various access points that will be be used by our traffic throughout the four year construction periods.

00:54:19:21 - 00:54:25:03

Okay. Thank you. Um, if you come to the hub again, there's a hand up there.

00:54:29:06 - 00:55:03:21

Okay. Thank you very much. Mariam Fellows, Oba resident. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Um, in response directly to the issues that the applicant has commented on this morning. Um, first of all, the modeling should not just be the three main junctions because as you've heard from others, the feeder roads, the local roads to the hall roads, the converter station, the substation site, the landfall as you saw yourself as some distance from the A12. Um, secondly, the applicant talked about a split, a projected split between the junctions.

00:55:04:09 - 00:55:37:02

Um, local knowledge and expertise. I can tell you that, um, the size of C forecast for the north south split of traffic coming to those junctions has changed. It was very it's very different now to what was predicted. And as you're aware, until contracts are placed, which is post approval. You don't know where supplies are coming from. There's no prediction as to where workers will be traveling from north or south or west. Um, so it is all hypothetical.

00:55:37:04 - 00:56:08:14

So we must encourage you to go down the Rochdale approach of having the worst case scenario and actually perhaps doubling up the numbers because you don't know if the all 90% will come from one direction, ten from the other, 8040. So you have to go with 100 coming from each direction. You

won't know. The next point is the scheme timelines again. Size will see increased worker numbers have changed month or month. And there's no way we can predict that.

00:56:08:16 - 00:56:50:28

So the numbers and swell will have to be, um assessed at the maximum. And also the applicant currently in um part two of chapter seven of the traffic and transport documents has only um counted one trip to and from a camp, a compound by a worker or a vehicle. And that's not the reality. People just don't go to work and they're not travel during the day at all. Uh, you'll see on table 5.1, the forecast for the peak daily construction vehicle movements in 2028 is 319 vehicles a day.

00:56:51:16 - 00:57:24:01

I urge you to remember that this is a rural area. So where is 390 maybe negligible in an urban setting? It is certainly not here. Um, the other thing to raise is that the documents don't include the traffic and transport required during the management years, and how they will interface with future projects. And also we have not touched upon the decommissioning. So the numbers and the impact will be again into the future.

00:57:24:03 - 00:57:52:18

And lastly, I ask you to remember that your colleagues for East Anglia, One North and East Anglia two said that on the approval of that project, that the benefit of this benefit balance had only just been tipped in favour of the public interest versus the disruption locally with that amount of infrastructure, with that amount of traffic and transport. Thank you.

00:57:53:00 - 00:57:56:27

Okay. Thank you. The applicant like to respond on some of those points.

00:58:01:07 - 00:58:02:29

Jeremy. Doubts for the applicant.

00:58:03:01 - 00:58:03:16

Um, I'll.

00:58:03:18 - 00:58:04:03

Try.

00:58:04:05 - 00:58:34:01

And call most of the points, but one of them on um, distribution where workers and HP are coming from. And we've done some sensitivity tests around that. Now, standard transport planning convention with the workers is something called a gravity model. And but we've also where most of the workers are coming from the south on the A12. We've also done some scenarios where it's sort of 5050 north and south, and we've we've obviously through the sort of travel planning, the traffic management plan.

00:58:34:03 - 00:59:04:18

We have facilities on site whereby workers on the, you know, don't need to travel to and from site during the day. Apart from the extraordinary, um, requirement. Um, so I'm just trying to sorry, staff trying to just record some of the points, but, um, we we've um, the very everything we've modelled is

very much worse case. Um, in terms of, you know, that peak construction period. Um, so, you know, sort of worst case on worst case scenario.

00:59:05:08 - 00:59:15:20

Um, and we're we we're very much looking at the modelling around our, our key construction routes. But as I said, we're in collaboration with the, with with the authority at the moment. Sorry. Sorry if I missed it.

00:59:15:22 - 00:59:39:22

No, no. It's fine. Yeah. That's okay. Um, I'll need to move on anyway. Um, I wanted to discuss abnormal, indivisible loads. So I'll say ales, um, traffic. Um, for the applicant, the proposed routes of ales to the site have been submitted. Um, though at this time, what level of assessment is being undertaken to ensure these routes are feasible?

00:59:40:11 - 00:59:44:12

Uh, so for the applicant, I think this is something that Mr. Buckley can assist with.

00:59:45:20 - 01:00:30:05

Uh, James Buckley, on behalf of the applicants. Um, just to set a bit of context into the ales for this project, National Grid has around 470 transformers across the network, and we've replaced over 100 of those in the last ten years. So it's very much business as usual moving, um, abnormal loads around the network. We have, um, with our contractor, Siemens, assessed the routes from the northern ports and the routes from the southern ports, um, both to site. But we have yet to carry out a full Ale assessment that is generally done just prior to the delivery because, as was pointed out in the earlier from Suffolk Council, the network is changing on a regular basis.

01:00:30:07 - 01:01:02:12

In terms of the structures along that network. So in the initial assessment, we identified the vernal bridge. We identified a couple of other structures to the north and to the south. Um, there's another 8 or 9 structures that Suffolk have made us aware of that have changed recently. And obviously the deliveries of the main area, which will be around 2029. So there's a lot of change in the network between now and then. So we will carry out an assessment at that point, and then we will work with Suffolk and the constabulary around the special movement orders to move those.

01:01:02:28 - 01:01:22:25

But could it transpire that alternative Ale routes might be needed at the time of construction? We've got a plan submitted at the moment showing where they're likely to be or should be. Um, but but are you suggesting that it could be that because of the change in circumstances, completely different groups might need to be found?

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

Um, it's unlikely that the network will get to a point that we have to sort of completely different routes. It's more likely that we'll have to consider measures to cross structures. So there is structures on the A12 are aware of where speed limits apply for those vehicles. Um, and we have we are aware of a situation with Sizewell where they took an ale in and then couldn't take it out because the structure changed in that time and you come up with a plan to change it. But the companies we use,

the likes of Alkalis and Winds, they deal with this on a daily basis for not just ourselves, but everybody across the country that moves abnormal loads.

01:01:55:26 - 01:02:03:27

So it's not something that we consider to be anything different to any other project, whether it be an n CIP or just a routine maintenance on one of our substations.

01:02:04:27 - 01:02:19:19

Okay. Thank you. Um, can I ask if Suffolk County Council. Um, imagine this as well is mentioned about discussion there. Um, are there any response? Any response on what you've heard today regarding that? Thank you sir. I'll bring you Mister.

01:02:19:21 - 01:02:29:16

Mary, but could I just before I do ask, um, if we could clarify. I'm assuming you probably want to talk about the Bennell Bridge as a separate topic.

01:02:29:18 - 01:02:31:06

That's pretty much the next question.

01:02:31:09 - 01:02:41:18

Well, I was going to say, because obviously LS does impact on the mental bridge, but if I can ask Mister Mary to put Bennell Bridge on one side and comment on the other issues in relation to.

01:02:42:06 - 01:02:44:15

The more general routes? Yes, at the moment.

01:02:44:17 - 01:02:45:07

Thank you.

01:02:46:18 - 01:03:30:22

Uh, good morning, Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council, we've raised several of our concerns in the local impact report. The major concern is that at this time, we are uncomfortable that the applicant doesn't have a feasible abnormal load route, particularly for special order movements between a port and the sides. Uh, there's been no assessment of any of the structures on the A12 outside the study area. And if my memory serves you right within the TNP or any equivalent documents, do we actually have some recommended EHL routes for the project, as we have with similar projects, for example Bradford to Winsted, Sizewell and ScottishPower? So there are concerns.

01:03:31:08 - 01:04:04:04

We have weak structures on. The one I'm most familiar with is there's a culvert a little Glenarm which has an SG1 restriction on it, so you can only move it up to and including stones across it. There's been a relaxation with lower speed limits to allow up to seed03 if there's no other vehicle going the other way, and the load goes across a five miles an hour, that is relaxation. We are concerned that that is not being complied with, so I'm aware our structures team may be reverting to SG1 restrictions.

01:04:04:06 - 01:04:37:12

So that just highlights some of the issues we face. On a positive side is we are working closely with Sizewell. They are undertaking assessments and structures on the A12 between Seven Hills, the A14 and Lowestoft. They have completed the southern route, which has identified several structures of concern, and they have some work left to do on the northern roads. I would add that they are only assessing those structures up to three loads, because their special order movements will come across the beach at Sizewell.

01:04:37:19 - 01:05:15:07

So any applicant. Be it Scottish Power Sealink line link, will need to satisfy themselves that they have a feasible abnormal road route. But also there are other structures off the network that hopefully won't be impacted by these these projects. For example, the Ostrich Creek on the A1 57/8, which affects the access to Belford substation. I also intrigued with a comment made about a regular replacement of transformers. One of the issues we've had with other insects is and to some extent with this, we'll come on to it with Burnell Bridge is future proofing.

01:05:15:26 - 01:05:48:01

Is that at the moment it is only the construction phase, abnormal loads that are considered. It is assumed that special the movements are not necessarily through the operational life of the of the project. That is something that was raised in the Scottish Power Exam examination. From an authorities perspective, we would really like to work with all applicants being national groups. Scottish Power, Sizewell to futureproof our network. Obviously there is a capacity issues about how we do that and potentially funding issues about how repairs could be done.

01:05:48:03 - 01:05:58:18

But I think the last thing is a high authority we would want to see would be a plethora of temporary structures, particularly on the A12, in a similar way to Ben, or

01:06:00:04 - 01:06:02:12

so I think. I think I'll leave it there. Thanks.

01:06:02:15 - 01:06:06:29

Okay. Thank you. The applicant want to come back on those few points.

01:06:08:28 - 01:06:09:18

Okay.

01:06:10:08 - 01:06:14:12

James, quickly for the applicant. Know I take on board Steve's comments and we continue to work with.

01:06:15:00 - 01:06:33:11

Yeah, I think that's it. I think what we'd like to see is, is some working together because obviously there's still some concerns from the council. I know we're 2029 is feels like a long time away if consent is given. But I think obviously and that point about future proofing and you know maybe future changes for that that way we would like to see that.

01:06:33:16 - 01:07:02:10

James Butler, on behalf of that, I will point out we have had conversations with Siemens and Adelaide's and Adelaide use a specific bridge engineer for their specific trailer movement. So once we know the transformer details, we can know the trailer details and then we can assess structures on a specific basis rather than what would be now would be a generic, um, transport assessment. But we'll take on board the point that there's no real, um, roots within our CTP and just review that point as well.

01:07:02:12 - 01:07:33:17

Okay. Thank you. Um, what I'm going to do. I just got some questions about Ben Aldridge, which follows on. Then I can come back to the supper club. And you might there might be points that people want to make on Ben Aldridge as well. Um, so linked with the ale movements is the issue of Benwell Railway Bridge, near Saxmundham in Suffolk. Uh, the examiner authority acknowledged that this has a weight limit which would support HGVs but not the abnormal loads. However, it is proposed to be crossed by the abnormal loads for for the applicant to get to one of the main access points which is off main roads.

01:07:33:19 - 01:07:55:22

The B1121. Um, firstly, can I clarify, is it envisaged that the Network Rail Network Rail would need to close the bridge to rail traffic along the line under the bridge if work was to be done to strengthen the bridge, as is one of the two options proposed by the applicant, I couldn't. I wasn't quite sure from the comments at the last deadline.

01:07:56:13 - 01:08:32:08

James Barclay, on behalf of the applicant, um, we need to carry out further surveys on the bridge to understand what the nature of those repairs are. But there is a potential that, yes, some access to the bridge from below and Network Rail positions will be required. We have sent our scope for our survey across the Network Rail, which they have provided comments on. Um, the document is currently with Suffolk Council for awaiting their comments. Um, and our transport team, um, in our engineering side, have started to engage with some consultants to start preparing ramps for that survey.

01:08:32:23 - 01:09:04:14

Um, we have indicated that there's a potential 28 day closure of the road for the works on the bridge, but that wouldn't be a 28 day closure on the railway. Yes, that would be just possessions. And that would be done in conjunction with Network Rail at points where the um network was suitable to be closed. In the conversation we had with Suffolk Council last week. Uh, it was mentioned that there is a couple of, um, level crossing upgrades being done on that line in the next 12 to 18 months, and there'll be closures and blockades, and we may be able to, um.

01:09:04:16 - 01:09:27:14

Suitability, timing and positions and mesh permissions use those um, Network Rail positions at the same time to do any work that's required. Okay. Um, I'll also point out that the design load for the bridge is 132 tonne axle weight, and we will not be anywhere near that with our eyes. Or should we be able to repair the bridge? Sorry. Bring the bridge back up to its original design standard.

01:09:27:16 - 01:09:43:15

Yes, yes I understand. Um, is there any possibility, therefore, that Network Rail could deny access to do any of this work? Or is it a case of as long as it's done in the right manner, then they would accept that.

01:09:43:17 - 01:10:18:02

Uh, James Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, um, we will go through the process with Network Rail of a backer and Annapolis for a basic asset protection agreement and an asset protection agreement. Um, and we will agree positions. It may be the case that those possessions are not available in the short term or medium term, and their more long term planning, with all of the additional traffic for sizeable on the network. And in that case, we would look at using a hybrid of the mini bridge option to get Ayios in in the early years, and then do the bridge repair at the appropriate time to suit Network Rail and Suffolk Council.

01:10:18:04 - 01:10:46:15

Okay. Um, I mean, what would be useful maybe is, is for some sort of, um, signed document between the two that, you know, there isn't a problem and that we really did submit some comments at the last deadline. There seemed to be some level of concern there from Network Rail about how this could work in practice. So I think some sort of whether it's a, um, statement, common ground or something like that would be useful for Network Rail. Um.

01:10:47:00 - 01:11:19:10

James, quickly, on behalf the applicant, we have started or we have a prepared statement of common ground which has been sent to Network Rail, sent in November last year. We're awaiting their comments, but we have had several meetings with their asset protection team, and they have indicated that as long as the Rams are correct and the possessions can be gained, there isn't a problem. If it's just surface repairs to the bridge and nothing underneath. They don't even need a possession for that. So as it's a Suffolk asset, it would be left to to that. So we are in good conversations with the technical teams.

01:11:19:12 - 01:11:28:11

It's the socks stuck within the legal team at the moment in terms of coming back to us. So we are working with them closely on on getting that in place.

01:11:28:16 - 01:11:50:28

And um, for the option of the, um, mini bridge over or over bridge. Um, where would this be stored when it's not in use? And also, I wasn't clear where any sort of compound for works would be. Uh, if, if, if that was to, well, for any of those scenarios, basically, um, the.

01:11:51:06 - 01:12:12:25

Mini bridge will be stored, um, at the compound adjacent to the crossing of the Primus, um, just off the bell mouth on the access. And that would be where the accommodation would be. We would most likely have, um, some form of Groundhog cabin up on site to the side of the mini bridge, um, during the operation. So.

01:12:12:27 - 01:12:17:24

So you wouldn't need any storage, uh, or anything particularly sizable near the bridge.

01:12:17:26 - 01:12:40:06

Itself, within the road boundary or down at that site. It wouldn't be local land. I mean, we may look to get a voluntary agreement with the local landowner. Um, and one of the local landowners has indicated an area, um, in general that would be suitable should we need it. Um, but we didn't. We don't need it necessary to put it into the red line boundary.

01:12:41:05 - 01:13:04:10

Okay. Um, can I move across to Suffolk County Council? Um, on this one, the. I want to ask about the diversion routes and any comments that you might have on the diversion routes, which were, outlined to some extent by the applicant in their I think, the change request, um, submission. Um, yeah. On that point, if there's any concerns.

01:13:04:16 - 01:13:39:06

Thank you sir. Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Obviously we've responded to, um, the change request with a submission at deadline three, setting out our views on all of that, which you've got, um, just before coming to Mister Mary and any comments on the diversion routes? Just two points. First, uh, you would have noticed that you did ask, obviously, a specific question both to the applicant and to Network Rail in relation to whether closure of the railway line would be needed.

01:13:39:20 - 01:14:44:18

Uh, and certainly the Network Rail response to your question, 1 to 3 was that if the repairs option, option two, were to be followed, they do consider that there would be closure. That seemed that the initially the applicant's response to the question suggested that they didn't think there would be a need for closure. But I think from what you just heard this morning, the applicant position has evolved from that, presumably in the light of their dialogue with Network Rail. And, uh, so for us, our, um, position, um, on the issue of compounds, we had noted, I think, in our, uh, comments on change for in a rep 3A0 31, we had noted that at the earlier stage of the, um, intimation of a change application, it was being suggested that there would be a compound on that section of the 11, um, 21, which is obviously now being removed.

01:14:44:26 - 01:15:13:06

Um, and we know the applicant is now saying that they effectively consider they can deliver their project without that. So that's their assessment. But we are just slightly curious that obviously they first of all identified a need for it. And now they say there isn't a need for it, but that's a point. But then going back to your point. So if I can bring in Mr. Merry, whether there's anything specific he wants to now add on the diversion routes that the applicant is proposing.

01:15:16:00 - 01:15:53:03

Morning, Steve. Mary, Suffolk County Council. But the thing the answer is we still have residual concerns. Um, I am actually sitting in front of a rather large spreadsheet with a load of traffic data on which refers to traffic redistributed. If the B11 21 is closed for the old bridge. Uh, I do need to unpick it a little bit more, because it actually seems that closing the road is beneficial to the whole road network. Looking at the figures, I would like to ask one specific point of the applicant is the news about having a compound near the from US rail bridge is new to us having a look at this data.

01:15:53:05 - 01:16:29:09

It appears to be that what's actually been assessed is only closer to Ben or Bridge. One would presume that if the bridge has to be moved from a compound next to the promise that the B11 21 would need to be closed either side of the T junction in Bennell. So I just asked that that is actually reflected in the the modelling we've been provided to review. The other point I'd make is the it is the peak hours that have been assessed, so I'm just quickly looking through it. There are also 12 hours. One of the concerns we have is the diversion route goes through the centre of Saxmundham, through the traffic signalized junction.

01:16:29:15 - 01:17:03:01

That junction is as we provide in our local impact report based on previous junction assessments, is it's certainly over capacity in the peak hours and the shoulder hours. We have concerns being a local person. So I know no, no this is I we have concerns that it's actually at or close to capacity during the off peak hours between the two morning and afternoon peaks, so pushing all of the 1121 traffic through that is a concern. The diversion route actually does. If you go away from Vernal Bridge, it'll do a left at the traffic lights up.

01:17:03:03 - 01:17:35:26

I think it's Mill Lane across the level crossing. That's quite a narrow road with parking. The junction at the top of that hill is quite a steep junction. And then you're going past the zebra crossing. Past, um, quite a built up area with a school to the right down Brook Lane, and then has been mentioned onto a 12 B 1119 junction, which we've all heard about the safety concerns, including the fatality. So as a as a diversion route, we have concerns about it in terms of safety, not just capacity.

01:17:35:28 - 01:18:06:08

Capacity. Um, could I just also add a couple other things on the bridge itself? Just just to bring you up to to the latest news. So, uh, the applicant has provided us with an enough approval in principle for the investigation of the mental bridge, which we are in process of commissioning one of our consultants to review and comment on. So hopefully that when that comes back, we can agree that and move on with the inspection. As the applicant also says, we're more than happy as a third party to help them and Network Rail.

01:18:06:10 - 01:18:39:15

And because a lot of the work is done by Network Rail oversight or to help all parties work together to make use of possessions. I did refresh my mind yesterday. Had a quick look through the latest bridge inspection for that structure. The. As an authority, we cannot commit to the repairs being done in 28 days until we've seen the investigation as fairly logical engineering supposition to take. The applicant has mentioned that their concerns are particularly the waterproofing and the joints due to water ingress.

01:18:39:21 - 01:19:11:11

I did notice reading of the report of potential corrosion of the deck beams, which I think is quite something quite important to come out of the investigation. But the main point is we cannot commit to that 28 day closure until we see them. Any further information? I would add, obviously, from a high risk perspective, option two is preferable to us because we haven't seen much information for option

one. So in our minds, judge it's feasible and acceptable for the higher authority. It has potential impacts on the the right arts estate and the rights of way.

01:19:11:13 - 01:19:44:14

The footpath along the bridge and the B11 21 A12 junction. The final point I'd make, and is something we have raised with the applicant, is at the moment they're saying for the temporary bridge there's only like to be 15 movements. We have concerns about that. Is that experience from other incidents suggests there are a lot of, for want of a better word, smaller abnormal loads that use the network. We're talking particularly of cranes, uh, haulage and moving sort of earthmoving equipment, which is obviously necessary to get into the the west side of the promised bridge.

01:19:44:16 - 01:20:20:23

So again, we would just like that confirmation that we are really talking about those 15 movements. There's also be a conversation about multiple moves. Again, we you know, we had encouraged that we're aware of size of moving piles in tandem at the A12 with police escort. So that's work. So I would just caution that particularly special order movements, it is unlikely they would be able to be moved other than singly if nothing else, because the want of suitable trailers in the country. But also we'd need assurance from the Suffolk Constabulary that they are happy to move multiple special order movements.

01:20:20:26 - 01:20:26:07

So I went a little bit off the question, so I hope you'll accommodate that. Thank you.

01:20:26:14 - 01:21:01:00

Yeah. Thank you. Um, there's quite a lot there. In the interest of time, I think probably best to respond in writing to those points. Um, obviously there's a lot going back and forth, I think, between yourselves and Suffolk County Council. Um, so it'd be good to, um, get a written response to what is what was said there. Um, can I ask as well with the investigation? When when are we likely to know whether it is indeed feasible to strengthen the bridge? Um, obviously the work's being carried on quite recently, I think.

01:21:01:10 - 01:21:26:03

Yeah. Uh, James Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, um, we are trying to plan in as soon as possible to do that. Um, subject to the comments coming back from Suffolk Council. Yes, we've engaged a contractor. We'll engage with, um, Network Rail and look for a suitable position, because we will need a procession to get under the bridge and carry it out. We are hopeful that can happen. Maybe in the next 2 to 3. Sorry. Two months, but, um, we'll keep you abreast of timings.

01:21:26:12 - 01:21:35:03

Yeah, I think it's something we would really like to see within the examination, because I think the feasibility of that as an option is, is going to be quite, quite crucial.

01:21:35:05 - 01:21:50:11

And just to touch on one point that Steve Mary made there around the White Arch Residence Park. We did meet with those two weeks ago, and we've assured them that they'll have access to their park, and emergency vehicles will be able to access their park during all times of the works on the bridge.

01:21:50:13 - 01:22:13:27

Okay. And can I also ask with regard to the sort of phasing of the proposed bridge closures, say you were doing the strengthening of the bridge. Could that be programmed in to be before, uh, the rest of the construction works for Sealink to avoid sort of worsening cumulative impacts on the diversion of roads?

01:22:14:06 - 01:22:40:20

Uh, yeah. James Buckley, I'm part of the applicant. That is our intention, but it will largely depend on possessions of network rails. So if we need to use those positions. So that was I alluded to earlier where we would use the hybrid solution where we maybe would need the, um, overbridge solution to bring in the piling rigs to build the bridge over the from us. Um, while we find a suitable point, uh, with Network Rail to do the bridge repairs. So yeah.

01:22:40:22 - 01:22:59:29

Okay. I mean, that's as I said, I think the fundamental thing that we want to see is the feasibility of both those options. I can also understand the Suffolk County Council point that there's a preference to the strength of the bridge, because that is a longer term benefit for the local communities as well. Um,

01:23:01:18 - 01:23:03:18

so yeah, thank you for that.

01:23:04:05 - 01:23:34:12

So, Sarah, for the applicant, I mean, I'm just to reiterate, um, in terms of the, um, documentation that is, in fact sitting with Suffolk County Council at the moment. Yeah. Um, and I think that Mr. Mary very fairly said he's looking to have that assessed now. Um, so that's with him. And um, the other point, we will respond to all the points made by Mr. Mary in writing to you. And although there were a lot just to reassure the panel that we are aware of all of those points, and there has been dialogue back and forth. So they weren't new in a sense. Um, when Mr.

01:23:34:14 - 01:23:39:04

Mary was mentioning them. Now, there's been quite a lot of discussion going on behind the scenes, as you would expect.

01:23:39:06 - 01:23:40:21

That's good. Thank you.

01:23:41:14 - 01:23:42:16

So at one point, quickly.

01:23:42:18 - 01:24:12:24

If I may. Yes, sir. Very quickly. Um, our concern relates to the terms of the outline construction traffic management plan, and I heard Mr. Mary's comments on the diversionary routes, but at the moment, um, both options involve significant numbers of road closures. Under the plan. Paragraph 7.4. 13. It says that any HGV route effectively can be used in exceptional circumstances. But then that goes on to say due to road closure.

01:24:12:26 - 01:24:44:17

So I think we need to be clear on the outline construction management plan to extent. There are road closures for the Benwell Bridge that that won't involve other HGV routes. The particular concern here is in fact a construction route is designated through Friston Village and my understanding is that is only due to relatively short term pilot works, but Arkansas as it is designated HGV, we wouldn't want that route to turn out being used to be used when the road is closed. The ban or bridge works whether it's, um, 45 days or 28 days.

01:24:44:19 - 01:24:47:24

I do think that point needs to be clarified in the in the plan.

01:24:49:00 - 01:24:56:18

Okay. Thank you. Um, and I just want to go to the Civic hub, and, um, I think there's a few people waiting to comment there.

01:24:58:12 - 01:25:29:06

Good morning. Chair. Uh, we've not met before. I'm Julia Ewart. I am the councillor for Kelsall, and the Oxford warden is, of course, coming in almost last. My. My notebook is full of all sorts of things, so catch the bits that belong to you. First of all, I don't believe there are any other county councillors that are speaking today. I'm with the East Suffolk Council, therefore that's housekeeping. But because of the issues that have happened with the roads and I have to say, Mister Mary has been exemplary in working so hard with regards to Friday Street and others.

01:25:29:08 - 01:26:04:15

I'm the person with infinitely more the anecdotal experience and the one that's sweeping up behind at the moment. So let me just explain to you how the public are like water and the trucks are just like water. They're all going in the directions that they can go to get to where they need to get to. It's really important to remember that the B 1121 sits between Bernal and Kelsall, and Saxmundham is the fulcrum. It's like a Venn diagram of families. And therefore we must think about that in how we work this out, because people's habits are changing.

01:26:04:17 - 01:26:35:26

If they know that Bernal is closed, then everybody will go. It's like a show of fish. Everybody will go in a certain direction. And the concept of using the three roads that run through Saxmundham as access is a nonsense. And if you run one through Carlton Road, which is where the school is in Kelsall, we really will come unstuck because we have a school that is very vulnerable. We don't have the money to be able to put a new roadway in for safety for the children and therefore that won't work. Mrs. Fellowes came up with a very important point.

01:26:36:00 - 01:27:06:12

There is a complete imbalance in where the traffic is coming from for Sizewell. It's coming down from the north currently. The new relief road is not built. So at the end of the 1121, which the gentleman said earlier was going to be modelled, but I suspect that's the Bennell end, not my end. And that means that the junction which is on the corner. It has no lights. It has nothing. You literally have

to come up a ramp and then take a right or a left onto the A12. That is going to become quite treacherous.

01:27:06:14 - 01:27:38:25

It's on quite a difficult corner. People who are on the A12 and going to Lowestoft put their foot down. And if you're sitting there, although it's got a large play for those coming out, you can see what's going on. There's indifference by the people from the people who are driving on the A12. When you go up the A12, the next turning will be, once finished, the relief road that goes down to Sizewell. So it's likely we're going to have a lot of traffic coming through there, and particularly when Bengal is going to be closed, it means that therefore those big trucks are going to come that way.

01:27:38:27 - 01:28:11:25

Because regardless of what you will say in this room today, truck drivers will do what truck drivers do. And that's what we're learning about Sizewell. The other day the A12 was closed and every bit of traffic came through the the main road. Can you imagine what that was like going through Saxmundham? So the question and I would like to just bring the elephant into the applicant's room is why Kelsall wasn't tackled. And I want you to rethink this because I'm listening to you all. Is it professionals talking about rebuilding bridges and doing whatever? But I'm not hearing any community benefit.

01:28:11:27 - 01:28:32:08

And the community benefit would be, frankly, if it is that we're going to take the hit of the traffic coming onto the B11 21 at the top, which frankly, is going to happen, then maybe we need to look elsewhere. So can I ask therefore my question is can there be 1121 be modeled at the top as well as the bottom, north as well as south? Thank you.

01:28:32:17 - 01:28:39:28

Okay. Thank you. Um, and I can take one more comment before we have a break.

01:28:42:15 - 01:28:43:15

Someone else in the Suffolk.

01:28:44:26 - 01:28:45:11

I'd like.

01:28:45:13 - 01:28:46:03

To speak, uh.

01:28:46:05 - 01:28:46:27

Charlotte Fox.

01:28:46:29 - 01:29:25:22

Uh, Ben Stanfield parish council. Um, I'm going to start with, uh, the notes that I took when the applicant first began, um, saying that there was no need for junction modeling because the traffic impact from sealing would be negligible. Uh, he then went on to say that sealing would have no impact on traffic, which I think is quite extraordinary in view of the discussion we've just had about

Bethel Bridge. Um, I went on to take notes about, um, peak, um, times, and I got, uh, the peak for Sea Link is predicted to be 28.

01:29:26:03 - 01:30:04:05

Size will be predicted to be 2028 2029. Lion link 2030 E2 2026 E1. North wasn't mentioned. The 800 houses at Saxmundham weren't mentioned. Helios, you know, there's so much going on here and these are projected programs. Who's to say that the peaks will actually happen when they're meant to happen? I can tell you, as a resident of Stanfield sitting in Suffolk in 2026, we are already being significantly impacted by the works that's happening at Sizewell.

01:30:04:13 - 01:30:36:09

There are 2000 workers on site at Sizewell at the moment that will go up to 10,000. We are already seeing huge potholes developing in our roads. We follow road diversions and they end up in road closures. We can't even attempt to read the diversion signs because there's so much information on them. Uh, and I would, um, just say that going through all those peak times and everything that's going on.

01:30:36:14 - 01:30:38:17

Do you know what it's like living here?

01:30:41:17 - 01:30:58:03

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for all your comments. Um, sorry we haven't got time for any more questions now, unfortunately, to the traffic and transport. If you've got anything else anyone wants to say, you can put it in writing, uh, afterwards. But we need to move on to other subjects this morning. Sorry. Um.

01:31:00:09 - 01:31:16:25

Also for the applicant to add some extra comments there. If you can respond to those in writing, that would be very useful. Um, what I want to suggest now is a break, because we've been going for an hour and a half now for 15 minutes, so will adjourn for 15 minutes. Thank you very much.