



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Hearing:	Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Day 1 - Part 2
Date:	25 March 2026

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

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

File Name: SEAL_25APR26_ISH3_PT2.mp3

File Length: 02:02:37

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:16:14

Good afternoon. The time is now 345 and we are continuing to issue specific issues. Specific hearing at agenda item 3.3.

00:00:24:04 - 00:00:34:14

So moving on to the next agenda item which is Water Framework Directive. And firstly I have some questions to explore with the Environment Agency, if I may.

00:00:36:00 - 00:00:58:28

I'm aware that at previous examination deadlines, including deadline for the Environment Agency, didn't believe that the development would meet the objectives of the Water Framework Directive in respect to the relevant river basin management plans. Can I invite the Environment Agency, please, to explain their current position with respect to what they said at deadline for? Thank you.

00:01:09:12 - 00:01:12:27

I would say we'd have to get back to you on that matter in writing.

00:01:16:26 - 00:01:34:01

Okay. Thank you. Um, are you able to comment on the EA position at deadline five? Um, that identified, um, in your deadline five submission at appendix B that there were five unresolved matters with regards to water quality.

00:01:39:17 - 00:01:44:29

I think we'll have to get back to you on writing with that, because we don't have our water quality specialists available.

00:01:46:00 - 00:02:46:12

Okay. Yeah. I think it would be helpful if you could get back again as an action point with a position statement produced with the applicant. Um, And in that position statement, please can you set out the position with respect to meeting all? Um, we set out all outstanding matters with respect to the proposed development meeting, the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. And in responding, if you could please cover off the five outstanding unresolved items that were signposted by the EA at deadline five, which were water quality items, EA 0408041, E0438045 and EA 046 please.

00:02:47:15 - 00:02:48:24

Yes, sir. Thank you.

00:02:51:26 - 00:02:57:20

Does the applicant have anything they wish to say with regards to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive. Thank you.

00:02:57:28 - 00:03:30:20

Thank you sir. I appreciate, uh. Uh, for the for the applicant. So we appreciate the EA. Don't have their relevant expert, but, um, we can assist. Um, and just so that you have some update. Um, as far as, um, the objectives of the Water Framework Directive are concerned. As you know, at DL five, um, the EA was satisfied in relation to the design of the bridge. Um, they had also raised issues, as you've highlighted just now, five other, uh, water quality issues.

00:03:31:00 - 00:04:03:03

Um, so we believe those are in fact, um, resolved now. There have been discussions and solutions. Agreed. Um, one issue in relation to heat pollution, which was um, EO 53 that's been resolved and that's confirmed by email by the EA on the 20th of March. Um, the other four matters we have sent, um, commitment updates and shared the wording with the EA and they have confirmed to us. Looks good to us. Please incorporate this into your submission.

00:04:03:05 - 00:04:37:15

So it seems as if that is all progressing in the right direction. Um, we believe that covers all of the matters, um, in relation to EO 40, which is a pollution risk from firefighting water. Um, a new commitment W 36 was added to the Reac. Um, and the EA have indicated by email that they're happy with that. EA 41 pollution from contaminated construction and concreting water, as well as rainfall runoffs from the batching plant areas.

00:04:37:19 - 00:05:17:22

Again, this the Kent drainage strategy has been updated and GG 17 GG 14 have been updated. Um in the reac and um, the wording now aligns with the Suffolk strategy, which was one of the issues. W 32 was also updated in the reac to include specific measures for concrete paws and dealing with concrete washout. And again, the EA have indicated to us by email that they're happy with that and asked us to include it to incorporate this, um, EA 43, which is a pollution risk from dewatering, and the Environment Agency have been included as a name consul T for this requirement.

00:05:17:24 - 00:05:48:28

Six um, specifically for the construction drainage Management Plan and Operational Drainage Management plan. Um GJ 15 has been updated into the Reac. Um W 20 and W 24 have been updated and included into the Reac as well. Um, and that'll all be formalized at deadline six um e a 45, which was the silt pollution due to over pumping. GJ 15 has been updated and the new wording shared with the EA on the 19th of March, and we'll incorporate that into the react deadline.

00:05:49:00 - 00:06:19:04

Six um, and we understand again that the EA are satisfied with that. Um, insofar as pollution of the firmus in the hundred River EA 46 water quality monitoring W 20 W 26 has been updated to address the EA's comments on monitoring frequency and to include post construction monitoring, and that wording will go in the deadline. Um, six as well. And we believe that that addresses, um, the EA's issues as well.

00:06:19:13 - 00:06:34:00

Um, I don't know if there's anything that wants to add. So. So hopefully that's helpful to you. Um, and uh, you'll have the update from the EA in any case. But as far as we understand it, these matters are now resolved.

00:06:34:02 - 00:06:52:18

Thank you very much. That was helpful. Um, before we move further down the agenda, please, could I just invite anyone else, either in attendance virtually or in the room, to contribute, if they wish? On what we've just been discussing with regards to the Water Framework Directive objectives.

00:06:54:16 - 00:06:59:19

I'm not seeing anyone in the room. I'm seeing one hand online which is EA.

00:07:05:01 - 00:07:37:20

Thank you, Sir Edward. On behalf of submits the marshes. So the applicant submitted a march uh document 6.9 Water Framework Directive Assessment, in which they, at stages 1 to 3, concluded there was potential negative effects. Stage four assessment, however, concluded residual effects would be negligible following implementation of embedded and good practice measures, which led to an overall assessment by the applicant that the project would be compliant with directive.

00:07:39:06 - 00:08:09:28

And then on that basis, they said no further assessment was proposed. Now, of course, it's that's the applicant's position and it's a matter for the for the panel to be satisfied that the Secretary State has sufficient information to decide whether the project has implications for the obligations under the directive. And in same as the Marcia's view, we don't consider that sufficient information has been provided at this juncture to meet that obligation. If I could just highlight two particular points for now.

00:08:10:19 - 00:08:50:00

One is that the appellant's appendix to that document I just referenced, that directive assessment refers to relying on certain measures and aspects of mitigation. Those are particularly generic in nature, vague, often unenforceable. So it's not clear to us that these sufficiently demonstrate that the deterioration will be prevented. So from our point of view, if I could put this through through the panel, if maybe a particular action point could be proposed, which is that all the measures relied upon by the applicant, could be drawn together into one place.

00:08:50:17 - 00:09:20:20

Um, apologies if that's been done already. If that could be clearly provided or signposted to us, we'd be grateful. The other point on this is. So say Mr. Marsh has provided a hydrogeological assessment at deadline one that's rep 1248, covering a range of different matters the impact of silts, phosphate, nitrates, pesticides on river bodies and also construction impacts on the River Stour.

00:09:21:22 - 00:09:44:27

Well, from our perspective, many of these concerns have either been ignored or inadequately rebutted. So similar to my last request, if we could be signposted to where these have been addressed, because we consider they are relevant to this question of whether the obligations on the directive are complied with. Thank you.

00:09:45:00 - 00:10:02:13

Thank you for that. If I could invite you to submit all of those concerns fully in writing. That would be very helpful. And that will give the applicant a chance to respond to the written submission. I'm going to invite them now if there's anything that they wish to respond to based upon what they've just heard.

00:10:04:25 - 00:10:09:29

The Secretary for the applicant. Thank you for that indication. When we see them, we will of course respond.

00:10:11:12 - 00:10:20:26

Thank you very much. Is there anybody else, either online or in the room, that wishes to comment on what we've been discussing with respect to the Water Framework Directive?

00:10:24:07 - 00:10:31:25

Not seeing any hands. So at this point I will hand over to Mr. Ranney and item four on the agenda. Thank you.

00:10:34:24 - 00:10:52:23

Thank you. Um, I should now ask questions on the matter related to traffic and transport. Uh, my questions are mainly from the applicant and highway authorities, but I will open up things for others to comment on what they have heard so far at regular intervals. Um, do you want a few minutes just to.

00:10:53:12 - 00:10:53:27

Yeah.

00:10:53:29 - 00:10:54:14

Yes, please.

00:10:54:18 - 00:10:55:24

Just just to move around a little.

00:10:55:26 - 00:10:58:16

Yeah. That's fine. Um.

00:11:01:05 - 00:11:05:16

My first question actually is for Kent County Council. Are they on line at the moment?

00:11:10:00 - 00:11:11:05

No, sir. Yes. I'm here.

00:11:11:14 - 00:11:12:10

Afternoon.

00:11:14:26 - 00:11:20:05

Just a couple of minutes now. Well, just a minute. Just, uh, just. The applicant can hear the question, too.

00:11:37:00 - 00:11:49:25

Okay. Um, firstly, can I have some comments from Kent County Council KCC on the junction Mödling um to start with. Is the council in agreement with the junctions that were modeled?

00:11:50:23 - 00:11:51:27

Yes we are. Yes.

00:11:52:06 - 00:12:02:09

Good. Okay. And what do the results tell you about these junctions, particularly in terms of driver delay when considered cumulatively with other developments? I think Manston Airport was one of them mentioned.

00:12:03:05 - 00:12:44:03

Yeah. We believe that that that is the that is a significant contributor. Um, I mean, so speaking specifically in relation to the actual, um, proposal itself, um, the actual impact is quite small. Um, and yes, it has been acknowledged that worst case scenario, looking at all the factors, um, all the cumulative, um, impacts, then, yes, you know, there is um, there are issues, these, these junctions. But we believe that they can be effectively mitigated, um, through the, uh, transport traffic management plan, construction management plan, and uh, generally speaking, I mean, the period of overlap is relatively small.

00:12:44:05 - 00:12:57:18

And as I said, they are worst case scenario. They're factoring in every possible cumulative impact on, on on those junctions. But yes, it's certainly in in in relation to cumulative impact. The airport is a significant contributor.

00:12:58:28 - 00:13:11:21

Yes. And you've talked about the mitigation through the TMP. Is there anything additional that you would want to see within the CMP to um, address the capacity of these junctions?

00:13:11:28 - 00:13:41:29

Uh, well, I did make hard making suggestions. Um, I to be honest, I mean, I've only seen this updated, uh, junction modeling within the, within the last week or so. So it's a relatively fresh, really, but, uh, I have gone back to the applicant and made some suggestions about what we would like to secure through this DCO. Um, so I don't know necessarily if, um. Um, I mean, they have they they haven't reverted back to me yet. They might well want to comment on what I have to say here now, but, uh, you know, I they they should be aware of it at least.

00:13:42:01 - 00:14:15:19

Anyway. But I did make a suggestion about the, um, the HGV, uh, potential HGV cap, um, on Sundays and bank holidays, um, even with um, highway approval for the bank holidays, um, this will need to be given on a case by case basis. Um, especially, you know, it, you know, as I said, bank

holidays. And when there are events on the and the coastal towns, um, you know, significant events which would draw, you know, particularly high, um, high peaks, high, um, spikes in on the network.

00:14:16:01 - 00:14:51:00

Um, I would expect a full travel plan monitoring scheme with the highway authority, the cost of which to be borne by the applicant. Um, we have suggested restriction to LGV only using accesses K, BMO four and CBM oh five. And I would welcome further comments from the applicant on that. Um, we have made, we have suggested that um, pre commencement highway condition surveys should also include a full scheme safety assessment of the Ramsgate tunnel, uh, the A2 99 and Sandwich Road as supervised by the Highway Authority.

00:14:51:18 - 00:15:21:18

Um, with further suggested potential provision of passing places. Uh vehicular passing places of Ebbsfleet North were required. Um and the proposed delivery management system and traffic management and monitoring um should also be, you know, well, we we think that, uh, an investigation should be made into how this could be potentially responsive to real time network conditions and potentially adjust the movement of PDBs as required.

00:15:21:20 - 00:15:27:06

But obviously, again, we would welcome further comments back from the applicant in relation to that.

00:15:27:21 - 00:15:47:03

Okay. Thank you. And if those um forms of mitigation were implemented. Would you therefore consider that to overcome any sort of, uh, capacity issues at the junction, there wouldn't be significant impacts?

00:15:48:06 - 00:15:56:25

Uh, yeah, we believe that would have the that would have the the ability to successfully mitigate any, any, um, any adverse effects.

00:15:57:10 - 00:16:02:16

Okay. Thank you. Um, come across the applicant. We'd like to respond to what you've heard there.

00:16:02:27 - 00:16:03:12

Yes.

00:16:03:14 - 00:16:03:29

Thank you.

00:16:04:01 - 00:16:04:16

Sir.

00:16:04:18 - 00:16:05:03

Keith Flanagan for the applicant.

00:16:05:05 - 00:16:06:02

I'm grateful to Mr. Bembridge.

00:16:06:06 - 00:16:07:01

It's a, I think, a fair.

00:16:07:03 - 00:16:08:12

Summary of what he said, and.

00:16:08:14 - 00:16:08:29

I'm.

00:16:09:01 - 00:16:09:16

Grateful.

00:16:09:18 - 00:16:13:01

He's obviously confirmed that the the modelling that we've done does show that the impact of Sealink is.

00:16:13:03 - 00:16:13:18

Small.

00:16:13:20 - 00:16:20:19

Bainbridge confirmed. And it's right, as Mr. Bembridge says, that, um, since that modelling was issued to Kent, I think fairly.

00:16:20:21 - 00:16:21:13

Recently.

00:16:21:15 - 00:16:55:12

Kent have come back, um, and provided some feedback along the lines you've just heard with some requests arising out of that in terms of, uh, Measures mitigation, which Mr. Bembridge outlined. The position to update you is that we've got those relatively recently. We are at present currently reviewing them. We will obviously go back to both Kent and also to the to you, sir, to provide our position on whether we consider those are justified and if so, how we're going to secure them.

00:16:55:14 - 00:17:02:01

So that's a sort of overview. Um, if you've got any more detailed questions, Mr. Dortch is here to, to answer them. But that's the overview, sir.

00:17:02:04 - 00:17:17:27

Thank you. I mean, is there any particular points that he's made there about the cap for bank holidays, for example, things like that? And is there anything that you mentioned which you think are even at this stage the applicant would have a issue with providing?

00:17:21:11 - 00:17:21:26

Jeremy.

00:17:22:00 - 00:17:37:03

The applicant. Um, we received the very helpful comments last Friday. Mr. Bembridge, um, we're going through those for a suitable response and we obviously need to consider them. um, yeah, we'll revert in in due course as soon as soon as we can.

00:17:37:10 - 00:17:51:01

And so it's sort of anticipated that a deadline six. Um, we could see a revision of the submitted like control document TMP if necessary, with those with what they've suggested incorporated.

00:17:52:12 - 00:18:06:22

Oh, we would look to revert to KCC. Yeah. Before deadline six. Um, and yeah I probably can't predict if it's going to be some sort of twig and throwing there, but we'll certainly look to agree on on where we can say, yeah, as soon as we can.

00:18:06:24 - 00:18:07:09

Okay.

00:18:07:11 - 00:18:07:27

Yes.

00:18:08:04 - 00:18:38:27

Thank you. Um, another point for the applicant. Uh, also, you said that the average construction traffic levels through the three Kent roundabouts during the peak construction phase, which is 2030, would be between 41 and 54% lower than the levels which have been modelled for the busiest day. Um, further reducing the potential impact from the proposed development. Um, would those junctions, um, have remaining capacity left. If it was that 41 to 54% lower.

00:18:40:22 - 00:18:42:18

Would that make a particular difference?

00:18:42:20 - 00:19:07:12

Jeremy. Applicant. Um, whether it's sort of capacity issues already that the council Kent County Council know about obviously you know is still is some additions. Um, but our impact on those junctions is, you know, it's pretty negligible compared to total traffic flows. But you quite rightly cites that our average day in the business year is sort of 40, 50% lower than what we've modeled. We you know, we've modeled very much worst case in all scenarios.

00:19:07:21 - 00:19:15:00

And that worst that worst case that you mentioned. Can you give me a sense of of how long a period that would be? Um.

00:19:17:12 - 00:19:30:02

Jeremy. Actually. Applicant. Yeah. The worst case is very much the single busiest day of the year, which you rightly cites. So is 2030. Um, the average day, um, traffic in that year is, you know, 40 to 50% lower.

00:19:30:04 - 00:19:39:24

And how many? Roughly how long would it be? Maybe not at that busiest level, but close to that sort of level. Is there a peak of that year which might last a month or so? Something like that?

00:19:40:01 - 00:19:43:00

Yeah. That's correct. So it's about about a month a month.

00:19:43:02 - 00:19:44:01

Yeah. Okay.

00:19:50:09 - 00:20:13:25

Okay. Um, can I, uh, now, um, speak with, uh, Suffolk County Council? Um, now, at the moment, we haven't got the junction modeling before us. Uh, I think that's due at the next deadline. Um, but, uh, from Suffolk County Council's position, are you also in agreement with the junctions chosen for modeling.

00:20:15:12 - 00:20:48:13

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council? Uh, so our position on this is that we have previously asked on a number of occasions for a wider selection of junctions to be modeled. So we set this up most recently in our response to excuse to question two TT one. That's rep five 204. Um, and effectively our position on this hasn't really changed since our local impact report. Um, we set out our junctions of particular concern in rep three 101 at appendix A where there's a table.

00:20:48:15 - 00:21:13:12

Um, and we've communicated this to the applicant in a number of discussions outside of the representations process. Um, so we do recognise that the junctions that have been chosen are the three, uh, set out at page 49, in rep 5135. Um, we would have liked to see would still like to see junction modeling for a wider range of junctions. Um, but we would have obviously comment on the modelling that we do receive once we've received it.

00:21:13:14 - 00:21:20:05

So at the moment you haven't seen any results from the modelling or anything like that at this stage?

00:21:20:25 - 00:21:22:07

Um, no we've not.

00:21:22:09 - 00:21:46:02

Okay. Um, can I just ask them, maybe for an update from the applicant about that modeling and when it could? I mean, ideally we wouldn't want that to go to the county council before deadline. Six I think, and the questions we published their day is asking for almost like a joint position statement rather than it being submitted a deadline six, then waiting for deadline seven to get a response on it.

00:21:46:17 - 00:21:47:16

Yeah. So Hugh Flanagan.

00:21:47:18 - 00:21:50:27

For the applicant, we hear what you say on that. And we've obviously reflected.

00:21:50:29 - 00:21:52:04

On your, uh.

00:21:52:06 - 00:21:52:29

Written question.

00:21:53:01 - 00:21:53:17

On Monday.

00:21:53:19 - 00:22:23:00

And that sort of timeframe in that process. So the intention now in light of that, um, is although we sort of committed to deadline six, we're going to bring it forward and share the modeling with Suffolk. Our intention is to do it by the middle of next week. So that would be Wednesday the 1st of April. Okay. Which provides time then for that process of, um, discussion to happen and feedback to be provided, um, by deadline six.

00:22:26:18 - 00:23:04:00

So that's the position in terms of the modelling. It's being it's being finalised at the moment. So it can be shared in that time frame. Um, so we hear what Suffolk have to say about a wider selection of junctions. Um, I mean our position is that the, the wider selection of junctions is, is a really very long list of junctions. The effect on most of which is minimal. Um, and the assessment has to be proportionate. So we've, we've chosen the three which have we'll provide this in writing obviously, but about 96% of the construction traffic is going through these three junctions, which gives you an idea about the rest of them.

00:23:04:11 - 00:23:24:03

Uh, so that those are the junctions which are proportionate to model. Um, and so that's what we've done. And we will obviously justify that in writing. But we, we feel very strongly and clearly based on the evidence that what we've done is going above and beyond what's necessary, but certainly not justified to go even further. So that's the position.

00:23:24:05 - 00:23:32:28

Okay. Um, and how would that work for the council in terms of getting the information middle of next week?

00:23:35:21 - 00:23:47:04

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council I might defer here to Mr. Steve Berry, who is online from the local highways authority. Um, because I don't want to commit him to anything that he does not have capacity to do.

00:23:48:22 - 00:24:24:00

So. Good afternoon, Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council. That would place a significant, um, uh, burden on us if it's three junctions, as the applicant has said, probably less so, but our position still remains is we think there should be a wider selection of junctions modeled in Suffolk. We are in a quite a unique place at the moment is it is the cumulative impact of all of the we are concerned about, not just Sealink. Um, so in proportion Sealink is similar to Scottish Power in terms of HGV traffic and worker traffic.

00:24:24:13 - 00:25:02:29

Um, with that and also with Sizewell, they both undertook a sensitivity test of the A12, in particular to look at the impacts of the cumulative traffic on that network. And we are concerned that if the applicant continues and only looks at their impact, we will miss the greater impact and deadline for we did provide some information to show that it is not just peak on peak. Is that if you actually aggregate construction traffic from a number of projects, you do find that there are peaks outside of those peak on peaks? Yes.

00:25:03:26 - 00:25:42:11

So our concerns remain on. My understanding is that there's been sort of sort of reference to Bradford of two incidents of, um, the way that was handled. But I would point out that that particularly in terms of Caps, is a completely different scenario. It is used in part of the network that until. Norwich Tilbury was submitted, was not affected by any other major projects. Uh, this is um, you know, we have, uh, Scottish Power, two projects, we have, uh, size or with a major project and potentially one of our projects, the A12, coming along in 2027, 28.

00:25:42:13 - 00:25:48:00

So, uh, at the moment, no, we are not in agreement with the applicant in the scope of the modelling.

00:25:48:10 - 00:26:16:05

Okay. And, um, just to mention the A12, um, uh, the examiners authority were there the other day and, um, they looked at, um, the we were at the 81094 Friday Street junction with the A12. There was works going on there now. Can you just outline for us exactly what the intention is there? Um, ultimately, because I obviously there was a lot of discussion yesterday, I think about road closures around that point.

00:26:16:17 - 00:26:55:08

Yes, I can, I can. In the immediate a few days. It will be closed over this weekend, and the roundabout will be open on Monday morning at around about 5:00. Uh, that is the program. The works are likely to carry on into July because there's still the dual carriageway elements to be tied in, and there will be landscaping to be done over the next winter. So I will provide a written summary of it, but in very, very high level terms, the size will see numbered works projects with the exception of the two village bypass, southern roundabout and the SLR West roundabout joining into 12.

00:26:55:15 - 00:27:41:24

Those works will be completed by this summer. Yes, there are a number of Deed of Obligation environmental mitigation schemes, which will be delivered through 2026 and possibly into early 2027, which may affect the A12, the two village bypass roundabout. The southern end is mostly

offline. We haven't got a program for that yet, but we'd be expecting them to tie in sometime in the next two years with a opening in quarter three quarter. Sorry, quarter 420, 27, quarter one 2028 and the same for the SLR West round about south of Oxford is that that would be open sometime before quarter four 2027 quarter one 2028.

00:27:41:29 - 00:28:16:01

Okay. There are other works on the B11 22, the A10 94 and the B10 69. But again, we're expecting the majority of those to be delivered in the next 12 months. And the final one is the A12 MRN scheme, which is Woodbridge south to the A14. That's in the planning process. That's obviously on hold because of elections now. So the decision has not been made. The original intention was to commence in 2027. I suspect that has been deferred by and this is just my personal opinion about six months.

00:28:16:18 - 00:28:42:12

Okay? I mean, as an action point, it would be useful to provide that update for us exactly what's happening when. And like you basically just mentioning there and I mean, I understand therefore, that, um, looking at the sort of construction program for Sealink, um, Sealink is likely to benefit from some of those roadworks on the A12. That'd be right.

00:28:42:15 - 00:29:09:03

Yes. Correct. Yeah. Some of the work. Well, the majority of the works are beneficial to the A12 directly, some indirectly in terms of safety improvements. And there are two roundabouts from park and ride sites. There's like one roundabout for park and ride site and one priority junction, which will have some negative element on journey times, but that's offset to a degree by reducing workers going to site as well. So there's sort of indirect benefits.

00:29:09:16 - 00:29:20:29

Okay. And um, we've also asked previously as examiner authority about journey time analysis as, as has there been any progress on on that from your perspective with the applicant?

00:29:21:21 - 00:29:27:21

Uh, we have we have had conversations about it, but we have not received any sort of updated information on that.

00:29:28:22 - 00:29:34:27

Mhm. Okay. I mean, in your in your view, is that still something that um is progressing.

00:29:36:11 - 00:29:44:25

Yes. Um we haven't got any meetings I'm aware of booked but we're sort of open to further negotiations. Certainly.

00:29:46:04 - 00:29:52:01

Thank you. Uh, could I get the applicant's response on those points you just heard from? SEC.

00:29:52:03 - 00:30:22:10

Thank you sir. And for the applicant, um, I'll deal with them at the high level. Mr. Dortch might come in on the detail. So, um, a 12 schemes. I think it's actually helpful for Mr. Mary to clarify there, as you picked up so that, um, the A12 schemes generally are coming forward well ahead of the ceiling construction program and certainly the peak and adding beneficial additional capacity to the A12, which the assessment actually doesn't take into account because it's conservative.

00:30:22:12 - 00:30:53:12

So that's a we say that's a positive thing. To the extent there is overlap in the A12 major road network, we say that won't be a problem. So that's that's the A12 the journey time analysis. Um, sir point you raised um, the position on that is that, uh, there will be journey time analysis through the junction modelling that because that will produce a delay drive delay, um, analysis.

00:30:53:27 - 00:31:29:25

Um, we, we don't think it's either feasible or necessary or proportionate to do journey time modelling through a strategic transport model because essentially the commissioning of that work and the timescales would be very significant and it hasn't been requested previously. Suffolk. Aren't asking for it. We don't think it's necessary. But you will get somewhere through the junction modeling. Okay. Um, so that's that point at a relatively high level. And the the third point, obviously. Mr. Mary talked about the scope of the modelling and there's, um, uh, some disagreement there.

00:31:30:00 - 00:31:39:29

Um, so Mr. Louch has got any extra comments on the scope of the modelling? Obviously, we'll we'll justify the scope of our modelling, uh, in writing, just in case there's anything further Mr. Dash wants to say.

00:31:42:18 - 00:32:14:00

For the applicant. Um, I think, um, uh, it's been sort of proceed pretty well. The other point I would say outside, Mr. Flanagan said about 96% of the traffic goes through the routes where we model the junctions. So very small, sort of three, 4% goes elsewhere. And if we just put that into sort of perspective, um, just think it's worth to say you take the over roundabout Saxmundham signalized junction. You're talking less than ten HGVs a day going through there, so less than one an hour. I think in Saxmundham it's four.

00:32:14:03 - 00:32:38:00

So you know, in terms of um, you know, proportionate impact and you know it's certainly well below any sort of thresholds, industry thresholds where you'd normally undertake further investigation of capacity at junctions. So I think we've been pretty thorough in the um, three junctions that we're, we're modelling and we'll get the results out. As Mr. Flanagan said by the first. Okay. Thank you.

00:32:38:29 - 00:32:40:21

Um, yes, Mr. Burton.

00:32:42:20 - 00:33:13:18

Thank you sir. James Burton, for sees as the panel know, my instructing members of dip deep into their pockets and instructed a transport consultant expert, Mr. Richard Elam of Phil Jones Associates,

who you heard from last time. Of course, we couldn't possibly justify bringing him to this hearing because as regards Suffolk, it appears we're no further forwards.

00:33:13:20 - 00:33:47:15

Could I check though, that through you? That we are indeed where I believe we are? Mr. Elam, in his report of June as long ago as June 2025. So that was one attached to our relevant rep, raised a number of really fundamental deficiencies with the transport assessment. And of course, um, some of them Mr. Mehri has just reminded us of, namely, one of our great concerns, lack of proper cumulative assessment.

00:33:48:01 - 00:34:18:04

Um, one of Mr. Evans particular points you may recall is that the applicant has used non neutral month baseline data. We don't understand that position to have changed. But if it has I'd be very grateful if the applicant could tell us and point us to where that has changed. Um. Final point regards. Junction modeling. We entirely agree. And you'll know this from Mr. Elms reports.

00:34:18:06 - 00:34:34:11

And he's made about more than one report over the course of this examination. We agree with Suffolk County Council that the three junction scope is too narrow, but there's no point me repeating what's already been said there. Thank you.

00:34:35:14 - 00:34:49:04

Thank you. Um, I do believe there has been a response from the applicant previously about the one about the months where the baseline, um, data was taken from. But, um, would you like to respond to Mr. Burton?

00:34:49:18 - 00:34:55:09

So, yes. Mr.. Mr.. Chris Burton will respond on that if I can pass over to him.

00:34:56:10 - 00:35:29:00

Uh, Chris Belton, on behalf of the applicant, uh, thank you for your comments there. Um, and yes, we are able to provide an update on the modeling that we've been carrying out. Um, so so yes, the modeling and there's a it's a fairly thorough process that we've followed to carry that out, which includes utilizing the baseline data that we've collected and carrying out a validation exercise against the Q links that are recorded at the time. Um, so that's in terms of the baseline data that we've utilized, um, and the scenarios that we've modeled as part of the modeling do include cumulative developments.

00:35:29:07 - 00:35:59:19

So that includes the raft of schemes that we've previously talked upon, including during the previous hearings. So, um, peak construction traffic levels for Sizewell, um SPR and line link, for example. So we we believe that the junction modeling that is being currently undertaken, which we will share the results imminently, does include the, um, the cumulative scenario, as Steve Mary also pointed out, as an important factor as part of the work that we're carrying out. So, um, that's kind of the update that we're providing with respect to that.

00:35:59:21 - 00:36:00:06

Thank you.

00:36:00:08 - 00:36:07:10

And the points as well about the baseline figures coming from it was January, February, that sort of time of year.

00:36:08:00 - 00:36:42:20

Uh, yeah. So the the surveys that were carried out in January, February 2024, um, included the 14 junctions within our study area. So we have, you know, used those um, survey results to inform the, the modelling that we have carried out. I then included on top of that for robustness, you know, the peak single busiest day for Sealink in combination with the peak days for the cumulative scheme. So with that in mind, we do consider the, you know, the attributed impacts that the modelling may show to other schemes as well as Sealink to be robust because we are reflecting a single busiest day for us for Sealink.

00:36:42:22 - 00:37:08:07

Sorry. Um, as well as the, you know, the peak forecast for those other schemes. So, um, you know, if we were to consider a seasonality factor. Yes. For the, for the, for the baseline survey results, that wouldn't change the outcomes of the impacts as a result of our schemes or the community schemes that will just push, you know, the baseline slightly higher potentially. Um, but we are using, you know, the survey results that we've we've used it. It's underpinned the assessment work previously.

00:37:09:01 - 00:37:10:15

Okay. Um.

00:37:13:03 - 00:37:17:22

And um, just come to the there's person on line to see if they would like to.

00:37:22:00 - 00:37:47:09

Thank you. Hello. Johnson. District council. Um, hello. Thank you. We understand the points that have been made, and capacity is obviously a concern for the district council in terms of the project cumulative effects. Can it be confirmed whether for completeness, the junction capacity modelling will be updated once the list of cumulative sites is updated as planned at deadline six. Just to take into account consideration of developments post March 2025, please.

00:37:48:14 - 00:37:50:12

The applicant would like to respond to that.

00:37:54:12 - 00:38:41:15

Um, Chris Belton on behalf of the applicant and see the modelling for Kent has been completed and shared with them. We've received the feedback from them. Um, as you as you've heard, and for Suffolk, we are intending to now share the results of the modelling based on the current list of schemes that we previously assessed on the 1st of April. Um, so that's what we can comment on. But in terms of reviewing additional community schemes that someone will have to take away and understand whether or not that could materially change the assessment work that we've previously

carried out. Um, but in the interest of the examination, we've had to proceed based on the work that we've carried out to date in order to be able to deliver the results in time, so that both Kent and Suffolk have time to review those that review those results, and for us to consider whether any further measures are needed within the construction traffic management plan.

00:38:41:17 - 00:38:50:22

So if they felt there was anything additional needed in terms of the calculations, then they could respond to you and you could update the modelling. Is that essentially it?

00:38:50:24 - 00:39:11:28

Um, well, yes. There's a there's an opportunity for us to review the results of the modelling following the following feedback. Hence why we're trying to supply this. Yeah, as soon as we can. Um, and we've already received Kent's feedback on that. And there's opportunities there to update the MPs as we have done previously throughout, um, the examination process to include additional measures. Should they should we consider those to be needed.

00:39:12:00 - 00:39:15:25

So thank. Thank you, Mr. Maki.

00:39:16:24 - 00:40:02:15

Thank you sir. David Mackie, Aldeburgh Town Council the applicant mentioned something that I was going to raise at 4.5, namely the number of vehicles going past and through Aldborough roundabout. The, the of course, that is in addition to all the other vehicles including Scottish powers. But the point I wanted to raise and strictly it's under 4.5 but it's convenient to raise it now, is that there is a commitment given by the applicant that it is quite expected, indicates that there will be less than ten vehicles per day going past that roundabout.

00:40:03:03 - 00:40:34:00

The issue we have with that, and I noticed that the county councils also picked it up, is that we're unaware of any where that commitment, which should be more than an expectation as far as we're concerned. It should be an obligation. It's not in the RAC. We don't understand why it's not an embedded measure in the RAC, and I just want to flag that as I'm not not sure it's been addressed.

00:40:34:03 - 00:40:50:15

I think we'll be coming back to that when we talk about caps of, of, um, HGVs and construction traffic on certain roads, I think that's something that the councils want to discuss as well, the highway authorities. So we'll come back to it then. Okay, Mr. Burton?

00:40:52:05 - 00:41:27:16

Thank you sir. James Burton for seas, sir. We're grateful to Mr. Bolton for his answer. But peeling away the layers, the position, as I understand it, appears to be clear the applicant is not updating its baseline data. That's what I have understood. I believe that's what is coming across. Yes. And that means. And I know the panel have this, but I need to say it to make absolutely clear to everyone.

00:41:27:19 - 00:41:50:10

That means the applicant is feeding in data from January and February, notoriously low traffic flow months in our area. And it is applying that including, as we've heard from Mr. Bolton to the modelling that it is now finally carrying out at the junctions, the.

00:41:52:09 - 00:42:24:06

Applicant's suggestion that it is sufficient, appropriate, proper in any way, shape or form, but its suggestion is that it's appropriate to, um, keep that as the only data being fed in rather than representative months, let alone peaks. Because all you need to bear in mind is that if the baseline was higher, which clearly it would be in a neutral month, let alone in the peak.

00:42:24:08 - 00:43:02:17

Well, that means that the impact of the sea link traffic, and indeed other cumulative project traffic would be in percentage terms, smaller is consistently missing the fundamental point. If you have baseline data from a representative month that shows a junction at or near capacity. It's not a question of percentage increases from the applicant's traffic or other projects traffic as a question of whether in raw numbers, the applicant and cumulative project traffic pushes that junction to or indeed over capacity and at the moment.

00:43:02:19 - 00:43:36:12

And it appears going forward, the panel are simply not going to be provided with the information that you need to reach your view on that. The result has to be, and we've come across this on other topics, of course, but where there's an absence of data, you have to take a precautionary approach. You have to take a worst case approach. And that's where, given particularly where we are now in this examination, that's where it seems we are going to be so far as traffic impacts are concerned.

00:43:37:20 - 00:43:38:14

Thank you sir.

00:43:39:03 - 00:43:45:06

Thank you. Um, I get the applicant's response on again on Mr. Burton's points.

00:43:46:06 - 00:43:46:21

Yes.

00:43:46:28 - 00:43:47:18

Well, I was actually.

00:43:47:20 - 00:44:18:15

Just because it's been raised now. You. You're certainly right. Sorry. Keith Flanagan for the applicant. Um, Mr. Mackey's point. So, as you say, probably properly belongs under item five, but just as it's raised. Yeah. Mr. Mackey. Eagle eyed is right that he won't find yet, uh, specific commitment to that reference to, uh, ten movements, ten HGV movements at the obra roundabout. We are we've we've heard the request for that.

00:44:18:17 - 00:44:47:21

We are reviewing that. So that is something actively under review about whether that gets committed to uh, so that's that point. So on on seasonality in the baseline. Um, I mean, to be clear, we we have responded to this. It's not as if Mr. Burton's points are being, uh, floated without answer by any means, but Mr. Dowd can provide a further response now, if that's useful. Jeremy. The applicant. A couple of things there. If the argument is the seasonality factor.

00:44:47:23 - 00:44:48:12

The surveys were.

00:44:48:14 - 00:45:20:29

Done in the winter of 2024. That gives more difference between the the impact of the scheme because you've got a lower baseline. So actually, although the conclusion is no significant effects, if the baseline is higher, it would be even less effect. So in a way, in a way we've again worst case. And the other part of the question is if when you're looking at the scheme, we've modelled worst case scenario for all the cumulative projects. So it's irrelevant about the baseline. We're looking at the flows from the peak.

00:45:21:02 - 00:45:23:14

The peaks of all these schemes. Thanks, sir.

00:45:28:20 - 00:46:16:19

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council just a short pointer. And forgive me, Mr. Flanagan, if I misheard what you said in relation to journey time analysis. But just to note that I think it was said that that couldn't be provided within the timescales of the examination and that we hadn't asked for it as the county council and. Our position on that is set out in our response is as part of Q2. So it's rep five 204, page 27, where we effectively said that we we have a strategic transport model, and we were keen to work with the applicant on a joint approach to commissioning a study of changes of journey times across the network, so that it wasn't strictly true to say that, that we'd not asked for that modelling or that we had not brought up that point.

00:46:16:21 - 00:46:20:01

But sorry if that wasn't what was. In fact, uh, stated.

00:46:21:00 - 00:46:57:21

I think that the best idea in terms of the journey time analysis would be for a discussion on meeting between Suffolk County Council and the applicant on that point, um, because it seems like Suffolk County Council has got some data that can be used. And um, and also with the junction analysis modelling as well, I think that would feed into it positively. Um, so maybe if we could have an update at deadline six as an action point of where we are with the journey time analysis, that would be useful and what we could expect within the examination time frame as well.

00:46:59:16 - 00:47:28:18

And for the applicant. Thank you. So yeah. So that's noted. Um, and we will once we share the, the modeling next, uh, we will do that to clarify this lane's point. Um, there has been, as I understand, prior to round two, questions, obviously quite a long way through the examination, no specific requests from Suffolk to start using their strategic transport model to do to commission work off the

back of that. So I think that is factually accurate, what I said in that respect. But so we've heard your request and we'll take that away. So that's.

00:47:28:21 - 00:47:31:23

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Burton.

00:47:32:23 - 00:48:23:03

Sir. Apologies. This is the last contribution I'll make on this. But, Mr. Deutsch, and thank you for his answer. It's repeating the applicant's consistent response, which I'm afraid is just not getting the point. Regarding the importance of proper baseline data, maybe if I try to explain it using a very simple example, if I, hypothetically speaking, have a junction where the baseline traffic is one and the capacity is 100, and the project being factored into that junction is adding one, I'm increasing the traffic of that junction by 100%, but I'm well clear of the capacity.

00:48:23:19 - 00:48:55:13

If I have a capacity, a junction where the baseline is 99 and the capacity is 100 and I'm increasing it by one, then I'm bringing that junction to capacity. That's a problem. This is why the the applicant's consistent attempt to present this data baseline data problem as solved by the response that well, if the baseline was higher, our percentage increase would be lower. Doesn't meet the issue in any way, shape or form.

00:48:55:21 - 00:49:06:11

And that's for EIA right? The way through the merits. And I know you have this panel, but I'm deeply concerned that the applicant doesn't have it because we've had this same response all the way.

00:49:09:25 - 00:49:14:07

Let me give you an opportunity to respond to the point.

00:49:14:09 - 00:49:32:15

The same point is being made possibly three times now that we we've given our answer, we'll obviously provide further further response in writing in our written summary. Well, submissions deadline six I'm not sure that anyone would benefit from further ventilation of the issue now, so if that's acceptable, I'll leave it with Mr..

00:49:32:19 - 00:50:05:25

I think that's fine. And I think maybe to to put that in writing and also that particular point about how that's factored in with the modelling? Because I would imagine as well as taking the busiest time for the various different projects, that's going to be added to the baseline. Our anticipated baseline at that time as well, because you're looking at 2028 or 2030, depending on which county it is. Um, so just an explanation of that would be useful as well. Please. Yes. Okay. Um, there is a hand up on line.

00:50:05:27 - 00:50:11:09

I haven't got any initials next to it, but, um, if you got your hand up online. Yep.

00:50:11:11 - 00:50:47:04

Yeah. Thank you. Uh, Charlotte Fox, on behalf of Pentland Stanfield Parish Council. Um, just a small point to, um, uh, just highlight the fact that, um, as a community and as councils, we are grappling to keep on top of this whole DCO process. And, um, I just wanted to say that, um, there are nine working days between the modelling being released and deadline six and then there are 22 days. And that's not just working days, that's days between deadline six and the end of the DCO examination.

00:50:47:06 - 00:50:59:19

I cannot understand as a mere mortal why, at this stage of the DCO, we're still having these sort of discussions. Surely this should already have been sorted out.

00:51:00:29 - 00:51:08:16

Okay. Thank you. Um, just. I've got a couple more questions for the applicant. Um,

00:51:10:01 - 00:51:36:03

well, one more here. For example. Um, something that we noticed on our site inspections recently. There is that tight corner between the A1 094 going on to the B1 121. That's the road to Friston. Um, could you outline for us approximate traffic usage of that junction in terms of turning off one road and onto the other? Um, and does there need to be works to that junction to help with any HGVs.

00:51:40:03 - 00:51:40:25

You know the junction.

00:51:40:27 - 00:52:13:13

I'm Chris Belton on behalf of the applicant. Yes I know the junction you make and it's one of the junctions that we're carrying out junction capacity modelling as well. So the modelling results will include the of the particular and single busiest day for that junction. Yeah. The number of movements through the junction which would include turning movements as a result of our um scheme. Um I don't have the numbers on top of my head, but the number of vehicles turning at that junction are minimal. The majority of those trips are travelling straight ahead through to the A10 69 junction. Yeah. Um, so that's where that's why we've also modelled that junction as well.

00:52:13:15 - 00:52:22:02

But in terms of turning movements at the junction as a result of the Sealink scheme, um, it's a minimal level of movements, but I don't have the number to hand at this moment in time.

00:52:22:04 - 00:52:32:24

And in terms of the actual tightness of that junction, if you're driving east and you're turning up to Friston, it's quite a tight corner. Is that sufficient for HGVs?

00:52:37:13 - 00:52:38:05

The applicant.

00:52:38:11 - 00:52:39:25

The likelihood of vehicles.

00:52:39:27 - 00:53:04:19

Turning coming from the A12 into Friston is negligible. The likelihood is more likely to be vehicles coming back from the side yard to go up to do the overhead line works, which we've put a restriction in to the latest TMP. So the traffic will come down to the Snape Road into the next junction, and then be turning right across the oncoming traffic and up into Friston, not turning left at that point.

00:53:04:21 - 00:53:10:11

Okay. Thank you. And any point that Suffolk County Council wants to make on that question.

00:53:11:25 - 00:53:15:00

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council. I'll defer to Mr. Mary on this one.

00:53:16:11 - 00:53:53:27

Yes. Good afternoon, Suffolk, Steve Morris, Suffolk County Council, apologies for the lighting. Got the sun shining through. Uh, yeah. You did pick up on a junction that has caused us concern. I am hoping we mentioned it in our local impact report. Uh, to turn HGVs in there. And I used to be an HGV driver. I'd give them a licensing, but yes, it's a very tight journey. A tight turn in there so it's not suitable for HGV. The concern would be that if any HGVs or large long vehicles need to get in there, such as cable drums or anything like that, they would have to go up to the site compound on the B10 69 Snape Road, turn around and come back down again.

00:53:53:29 - 00:54:08:22

Or they'd have to use a B11 22 and come down through Leiston, which I understand is the potential route for some of the abnormal loads. So I totally agree with you on that point. It is very difficult juncture to manoeuvre even in a car.

00:54:09:14 - 00:54:17:28

Yes. So I think it would be useful to get, um, a bit more of a response on that. Maybe that would go along with the model and that it's been submitted.

00:54:18:06 - 00:54:32:14

I can offer something else which may help is that that is part of a speed limit that is due to be implemented by Sizewell and Scottish Power. So there will be a change to that junction.

00:54:34:02 - 00:54:35:25

Okay. Do you know what that change would be?

00:54:35:27 - 00:54:38:19

It's to reduce the speed limit to 40 miles an hour.

00:54:38:26 - 00:54:45:14

Okay I understand. And just another question for for you, mister. Mary, what? Are you there? Um.

00:54:47:06 - 00:55:01:26

Yeah. Yeah. Um, you from your submission, you have suggested, uh, this is the deadline for submission, that though 2020 8th May be the construction traffic peak. The HGV peak could be at different times. Could you just explain that to us a little bit more?

00:55:02:27 - 00:55:42:11

Uh, I can I'm probably easier to do it in writing, but it's, uh. So basically what we've done is we've taken the applicant's data and also data from Scottish Power's, um, discharge requirements for their CMP, where they updated their traffic figures, superimpose the two, uh, on a quarterly basis, and the cumulative peak is actually not at the it is not at the Scottish ScottishPower peak, nor is it at the ceiling, the peak. It is somewhere in between. I think it's something like two thirds of the peak for one, added to two thirds of the peak of the other makes one and one third, if I can put it as simple as that.

00:55:42:13 - 00:55:49:15

Yeah, no, I understand. And is there something that you would require the applicant to do taking into account that sort of information?

00:55:51:05 - 00:56:22:20

I would be expecting them to have modeled that as a realistic worst case, because that is the cumulative impact, at least as a sensitivity test. And again, it will be covered by the cap. So the cap would be to their peak. But it would be to understand that cumulative impact. Uh, and it's particularly sensitive along the 1094 and would be 1069 because the data we're getting in is that that's taking more traffic than was expected from previous forecasts and modeling.

00:56:22:28 - 00:56:28:15

Okay. Thank you. Um, there's a hand up. Uh, I think it's at the supper club.

00:56:29:09 - 00:57:00:14

Yes. It's me again. Sorry. Charlotte Faulk, Spindle and Stanfield parish council. Um, talking about the junction from the, uh, a 1094. Um, back towards, uh, Friston. Um, that is very difficult, even in a car. I can tell you from personal experience. Uh, I also know that the, um, proposed Scottish Power Ale route is to go up the A12, turn right onto the B1 one, two, two, then turn right through Leyton.

00:57:00:16 - 00:57:33:14

Come down the A 1069, turn right at the Blackheath junction and then access the junction between the A 1094 and Friston. From the way that it is actually uh, more amenable to a um a heavy goods vehicle. But we are talking about ales and the plan is for ales to be driven down that road through Friston to Stanfield and then to be reversed through the ScottishPower permanent access route up to site.

00:57:34:03 - 00:58:19:14

Just thinking about things cumulatively and a coordinated approach. We. There was a lot of mention yesterday of Suffolk County Council's proposed northern approach route to the converter station site, and I would just like to suggest that maybe ScottishPower will be interested in coordinating on that route as well, if they are already going to be coming up the A12, turning right onto the B1 one A22, then taking a turning across the Leiston, the old Leiston airfield to site would be a very doable thing if it can be, um, uh, you know, constructed as a useful access route for the converter stations.

00:58:19:16 - 00:58:23:18

I would suggest that it could also be used to access the SBR site.

00:58:24:06 - 00:58:52:20

Okay. And we're going to talk a bit more about that later. The, the you know, the alternative access that Suffolk County Council has put forward. Um, but, um, can I just get a response from the applicant, particularly on that point about the HGV peak and the information that came in at deadline five from Suffolk County Council on that, and how that could be brought into the model. And that's been submitted and the information that's been submitted so far.

00:58:53:24 - 00:59:25:10

Uh, Chris Belton, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. So we've reviewed the the Suffolk's, um, deadline for submission. Um, and following the information we supplied to them following a meeting we had with them in February, which was the forecast for Sealink, which included motor vehicles, HGV. Um and and what Suffolk had provided is um they've compared that with the similar forecast for East Anglia one North and East Anglia two. Um and and the point there was that the. Whilst the individual peaks for the two projects may vary.

00:59:25:12 - 00:59:56:22

The actual overall peak may actually be somewhere in the middle, or it might be at a different period, so that that's the case where you've got two thirds of one project and two thirds of another has come into 4/3. But as part of the work we've carried out, we've always modeled the the worst case, which would be the full the peak with the peak, which would essentially be 6/3 or two. So one of each. So the the situation is in terms of the cumulative work that we've undertaken, it's it's above that worst case position. And the scenario that's been outlined by this information is below the level that we've assessed.

00:59:56:24 - 01:00:05:17

So in fact it's an improvement over the modelling that we've we've carried out. But it doesn't mean we'll obviously revise that. We'll keep the modelling as it stands because it remains a robust position.

01:00:05:19 - 01:00:33:28

Yes, yes. I mean, it sort of links in with the question that was in our recently published third written questions, where, um, we raised the point about the table that talked about worst case, well, numbers for 2028, But, um, it was sort of our view that maybe for all those roads and all those junks in 2028 wouldn't be the peak because of the different phases of development. Um, have you got any comment to make on that at this point?

01:00:34:00 - 01:01:08:03

Um, Chris Belson, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, yes. So we've reviewed your, uh, the third written questions and, um, we'll be able to update those sets of tables. Um, because you're right. Different parts of the network will have different localized peak years, depending on when the traffic associated with the projects expects to use each access point, and also the different peaks associated with the cumulative scheme. So you've got a set of tables that exclude Sealink. Um, so what we can do for the first set of tables is identify the likely peak year for the cumulative schemes, excluding Sealink, depending on which projects coming forward and the part of the network that they'll be utilizing.

01:01:08:09 - 01:01:38:28

And then what we can do is the second set of tables include Sealink. So for those we can include the peak year for Sealink. And then whether the whether the cumulative year for that part of the network will change as a result of that, or whether it would remain as it was previously. Um, so, for example, if it's driven by Sizewell C, it's likely that the cumulative year would be driven by that. But if the cumulative year were to be SPR, then there's a chance that the community view may change when you when you consider Sealink on top of that. So we'll be able to provide that at deadline things.

01:01:39:00 - 01:01:51:06

It does make everything a bit more complicated, but at the same time, it probably gives a bit more realistic view of where the worst case is. At what point. Um, is there any comment from, uh, Suffolk County Council on what you've just heard?

01:01:54:05 - 01:02:00:16

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council I can't. Oh, I can see Mr. Mayor turning his camera on. I don't know if he wishes to comment.

01:02:01:18 - 01:02:04:07

Only that we'd be very interested to see that data.

01:02:04:21 - 01:02:05:22

Good. Thank you.

01:02:05:24 - 01:02:07:07

Look forward to reviewing that.

01:02:07:09 - 01:02:23:10

Good. Um, and it might be useful before even submission if it's because Suffolk County Council is particularly hit with a cumulative side of things to to share that information with the county council. And before it's submitted into us, um, anything like that is always useful.

01:02:25:04 - 01:02:25:19

Okay.

01:02:26:21 - 01:02:27:27

So if I may.

01:02:27:29 - 01:02:28:14

Yes. Yeah.

01:02:28:16 - 01:02:29:01

Please.

01:02:29:03 - 01:03:00:28

Um, I just wanted to comment on, um, this the issues around the A1, A1 094 and B1 121 junction. You focused on the. Sorry, I said Michael Mahony from Preston Parish Council. Thank you, Mr.

Burton. Um, the conversation was about geometry and that there are clearly you've seen the clearly issues there. It's not just about geometry, it's the road layout. Because in fact, um, the 809 for going east as it approached Stokes Junction goes around a bend which is also on a hump.

01:03:01:00 - 01:03:31:06

And in fact, as I'm talking to you, I'm suffering slightly from post-traumatic stress syndrome because when you turn right there, cars and I note the speed limit reduction cars, which are not visible, come round that bend very quickly. So if you have a slow moving HGV turning right, Um, that could well cause a very serious accident. I'd be welcome, Steve. Mary's comments on that. I mean, I think it doesn't need to be 40. It needs to be 20. And then you might have a chance of surviving, but I just it's it's not just about geometry. It's road layout and safety as well. Thank you.

01:03:32:01 - 01:04:02:04

If if the parties could the council and the applicant take those comments into consideration as well with your response on that junction, that would be very useful. Thank you very much. Um, a couple of questions on the Ken side of things. Um, there have been comments from people in Kent suggesting there would be a vast amount of aggregates and many thousands of HGVs brought to Minster Marshes to form the foundation base of the proposed converter station. Um, how would you respond to that? Because it's it's still the point that's being raised with us.

01:04:15:15 - 01:04:48:04

Chris Belson on behalf of the applicant. Um, from our perspective, in terms of what we've assessed, uh, the single busiest day for the Kent Henshaw scheme, um, is 108 HGVs and not the thousands that were mentioned there. Um, that's for the single busiest day. Again, um, average levels for the peak year would be 50% roughly below that. But nonetheless we've we've assessed and modelled including for the junction modelling the single busiest day. Um, and those 108 HGVs would be distributed across the network.

01:04:48:06 - 01:05:02:02

So they wouldn't necessarily all be using the same route. It'll depend on which access point they'd be travelling to and from will be. We acknowledge that the main access points on the A25 six, and that's where the majority of the vehicles will be travelling to and from.

01:05:02:04 - 01:05:07:15

Yes. In terms of those, the numbers which have been mentioned, you don't recognise those as something that you would anticipate.

01:05:08:09 - 01:05:11:11

And presuppose for the applicant. Um, no I wouldn't.

01:05:11:19 - 01:05:21:21

Okay. Um, is there any comments from Kent County Council on the point about, um, HGTV's through the sort of Ramsgate area?

01:05:23:13 - 01:05:34:24

Yes. Matt Bembridge, KCC highways. Um, much like the applicant, it said, I don't see anything to that effect in the, in the any of the work that's been done to date. So I'm not quite sure where those figures are coming from to be honest.

01:05:35:17 - 01:05:53:11

Okay. Thank you. Um, so, um, what I'd like to do now is just ask the applicant to just to revert back to the Ben Railway Bridge issue. Um, could you just have an update on where the applicant is in terms of the structural investigations?

01:05:56:18 - 01:06:44:03

Even ongoing for the applicant? The the headline response is that the, uh, it's the approval in principle process is ongoing. Um, we, uh, Network Rail have come back to us. We're currently waiting for Suffolk, to come. Suffolk County Council to come back with us with a report which they've going to provide to us. So that approval in principal process is ongoing and we'll continue to, uh, take its course essentially, um, which will then feed into, as you know, which option is chosen, uh, in terms of the mental bridge, um, so that there has been, uh, discussions over the last 2 or 3 months on that, um, and liaison, uh, and we can provide those details in writing more precise chronology if you, if that would be of use.

01:06:44:05 - 01:06:46:24

But that's the sort of where we are at the moment.

01:06:46:26 - 01:06:59:05

So from the real perspective, you've had feedback and, um, maybe consent to do the investigative works, but you're still waiting back from the council perspective, is it to, to take.

01:06:59:11 - 01:07:08:14

Yeah. So we are we are waiting for the council perhaps. Mr.. I'll hand over to Mr. Buckley to be, uh, explained precisely what we're waiting for from the council, but.

01:07:10:08 - 01:07:41:09

Yeah. So the feedback we've had from Network Rail is they require some method statements for access, which once we've got the applicant agreed, we will provide. Um, so if the council had provided their comments on the report, uh, the AP, but in their comments they refer to a report from January 2000, which we've yet to be provided with. So we've requested that report and we're awaiting, um, a copy of that report. From that, we can then update the AP and agree access to carry out the survey.

01:07:41:11 - 01:07:55:03

Okay. And so at this point, you won't know when you could actually undertake this assessment or whether it's likely to be submitted within the examination period.

01:07:56:15 - 01:08:32:17

Well, it's not likely it won't be in time to submit within the next six weeks. Um, I just take this opportunity to point out that the bridge at 46 tons, is suitable for 90 odd 90% of our construction traffic. It's only the ales, so it's not a major issue to the project. We have proposed the other routes.

Option two and option sorry. Option two and option three. Option three was always in the TMP. This isn't a new route and this use is largely the consented route. Um, as Steve mentioned for the um a1 A2 projects.

01:08:32:24 - 01:09:08:01

Okay. And ask as well. I think this has been raised by the county council. Um, is it potentially due? Is it potential that they would have to be further closure of the B1 121 if, for example, using the mini bridge. So the section between the actual bridge itself and the main access to get the the structure, say the mini bridge structure from the access to the bridge to use it would have to be further closures on that stretch of road.

01:09:08:09 - 01:09:23:20

No, the closure would be localised to bridge the Church Street, not Church Street from the Wetherby 1121 heads off to um Preston so that that junction would remain open. Um, the connection would be localized bridge.

01:09:26:18 - 01:09:29:14

Um, is, uh. Yes.

01:09:30:24 - 01:10:17:23

Last night Suffolk County Council so desperate to jump in on that, sir. Um, so I'm reliably informed by Mr. Murray that we sent back technical comments on the approval in principal document on the 19th of March. Uh, so if there is another report that is outstanding, or if there is something else that the applicant is waiting on from us, uh, would be grateful to know what what document that is. Um, but we've sent back technical comments on that. Um, and then uh, just to, to flag although this perhaps is trespassing slightly into other issues, but part of our concern about the the temporary bridge option remains that it's not only Sealink that might potentially need to use a temporary bridge option, it's also potentially line link down the line.

01:10:17:28 - 01:10:30:15

And therefore there's obviously uncertainty about potential future impacts from a mini bridge option, whereas obviously our strong preference would be for structural repair, which then would would endure for the lifetime of other projects as well.

01:10:30:27 - 01:10:42:01

Yes. Um, does the council accept? Given the several weeks we've got left, that it's unlikely that we're going to have any more information within the examination?

01:10:42:19 - 01:10:52:27

Um, yes. It seems very unlikely. Well, virtually impossible that we're going to have the outcome of those structural surveys during the the process of the examination.

01:10:52:29 - 01:10:57:22

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

01:11:01:23 - 01:11:40:15

Thank you. Sir. Joan Ellis from Fennel Green in reference to Ben Bridge and the Promise Crossing. Would it be useful for an independent assessor to do a cost benefit analysis comparing the Suffolk County Northern Route proposal to the applicant's preferred route? Taking into account the project, the project duration, issues of cost, speed and flexibility against the project. Effects of traffic diversion during construction. Permanent effects of upgraded railway bridge forever accommodating oversized loads and the permanent adverse effect on Herts Hall and the so-called Promise Bridge.

01:11:40:17 - 01:12:14:25

The crossing, which now apparently, according to Luke Taylor, might have to be raised even more because of the flood risk. I understand that the applicant previously deemed this route not viable based on Sizewell C road not being complete, which is no longer the case. I understand, and that traversing the lakes and airfield would have an adverse effect on the cakes and ale holiday home, also no longer an issue on 9th of March, BBC article outlines the effects of current short term limits to Ansip workers upon the the long standing park owners.

01:12:14:27 - 01:12:21:21

So I don't think Cakes and ales isn't, um, an opportunity to resist crossing Layton Field. Thank you.

01:12:21:24 - 01:12:38:24

Okay. Thank you. We're going to come a bit more to that alternative access route shortly, but so we'll keep those comments in mind. Um, and there's another hand up so I can I don't I've got your initial sorry, but, uh, if you want to make your point.

01:12:39:17 - 01:13:10:06

Uh, yes, it's, uh, David Sims. Sorry. This is going back to a point a little while ago, but, uh, okay, pick up on the thousands of lorry movements, um, for aggregate at the Minster Marshes site. Um, just some clarification, really. The. There was a figure mentioned of 108, uh, lorry movements a day. Does that figure of 108 a day include lorries delivering aggregate? Because obviously over a ten day period that gets us into the thousands of movements.

01:13:10:12 - 01:13:12:28

It seemed to be dismissed out of hand. Thank you.

01:13:13:16 - 01:13:16:22

Okay. Do you want to clarify on the point the gentleman just made?

01:13:22:03 - 01:13:30:16

It not. It appears now, but perhaps we can deal with that in writing when Mr. Burton has had time to reflect on it. That's acceptable.

01:13:30:18 - 01:13:33:22

Okay. Yeah. So they respond to that enlightened, sir. Okay.

01:13:36:04 - 01:13:36:24

Um,

01:13:38:16 - 01:14:02:04

just talking about the options for the bridge, actually. And this is for Suffolk County Council. Um, the applicant says there's a preference for option one, which is the repairing, repairing or strengthening the existing bridge. Is preference a strong enough word in the council's opinion? Should it maybe be that if option one is available, then the applicant commits to taking this option ahead of option two, for example with the mini bridge.

01:14:03:07 - 01:14:51:16

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council We would certainly like to see it made a commitment. We think that there's a as we've set out across a whole number of representations now that there's a considerable difference between repair, which would have wider community benefits and which would have a more clearly defined single period of disruption, as opposed to the mini bridge with its sort of long term uncertainties. Um, and we'd certainly be quite concerned that if, if preferences, if the only thing that secured is a preference, um, then in effect potentially nothing is secured and that concerns about cost or uh, particularly it might be used further down the line as a reason to, to resort back to the mini bridge option, which we don't think would be appropriate, or we think it would have considerably greater potential cumulative effects.

01:14:51:18 - 01:14:52:16

I understand.

01:14:55:01 - 01:15:18:28

So for the applicant, if you would like to respond on that. And it is that that word of preference, um, rather than, uh, commitment. I understand, um, the applicant would want to definitely commit to option one, but if option one was available, is that something the applicant would be would be happy to fully commit to rather than have it as a preference.

01:15:20:09 - 01:15:37:21

Uh, James Brooking, on behalf of African, I think we need to take it away. But our initial thoughts are like, excuse me, you be committing to something which is two third parties have have an input over which is Network Rail and Suffolk County Council, which means that we could commit to it but then not be able to implement it.

01:15:37:23 - 01:15:42:16

So I think that's the point about committing to it. If it was an available option.

01:15:43:12 - 01:15:58:15

It may be an available option, but it may be that the timescales that are allowed to us by the third parties don't allow us to actually implement it, which means we're then in breach of a DCO, which we don't want to be. So we'll take it away and have a think about what the wording might be able to be, if it's possible.

01:15:58:17 - 01:16:01:14

Okay. Thank you. Um.

01:16:09:18 - 01:16:47:09

Given the this is for the county council as well, actually, um, looking for your view, given the issues with diverted traffic, if the bridge was closed, whether it be for a month or for several times, and with the sort of mini bridge option. Um, would it be beneficial to, um, for if it was option one, for example, for it to take place before the rest of the suffer gone through a construction work? Or if that wasn't possible, for there to be some sort of break in the, um, use of HGVs at that time.

01:16:50:00 - 01:16:59:22

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council um, I We might need to pick this up in writing, sir, but I'll just see whether or not Mr. Mary's got any thoughts on it online first.

01:17:01:09 - 01:17:30:05

Thank you. Um, I'd say the clear preference is obviously to get it built before the construction traffic for sealing starts. Yes. Um, I think to be fair to the accident applicant, they did rightly point out you are trying to herd both Suffolk and Network Rail to deliver this and environmental surveys and the like as well. So the strong preference, yes, would be to get it built. I would just add that it does also add legacy benefits. So one would hope that repairs would make that access available for the future.

01:17:31:11 - 01:17:47:03

And Mr. Mary, would you be looking. Would it be beneficial if there was some sort of restriction on HGV use while the while the bridge was closed, basically to stop further the sealing traffic being added to the diversion routes?

01:17:47:14 - 01:18:09:15

Yeah, obviously they they can only be accountable for their traffic but yes a restriction on their HGV traffic would be, I think, essential. Um, what was not mentioned was the concerns we have about the junction in Saxmundham, about the capacity there and adding additional HGVs to that would be a concern, particularly where they come out on the A12 on the BLM 19 junction.

01:18:09:21 - 01:18:21:29

Um, I mean, it would be useful to have a bit more of that in writing and maybe if you're thinking that should be something that the applicant should commit to, then have that in writing for the applicant to respond to. Thank you.

01:18:22:03 - 01:18:25:29

And to be fair to me, was something that was discussed at the last meeting as well.

01:18:26:03 - 01:18:27:29

Good. Okay. That's good to know.

01:18:30:02 - 01:18:45:13

Um, just for clarity as well, from the applicant, I think this is probably somewhere in the documentation, but, um, if the mini bridge was used, could other HGVs use that at the same time, or is that just going to be for ale use and nothing else within that time?

01:18:46:01 - 01:19:14:29

Uh, James Booker, on behalf of the applicant, we would look to coordinate any movements over that. It may be majority ails, but we would it would obviously be our construction traffic, but depending on timings with the project, potentially line links construction traffic at the same installation time. So we would look to maximise the installation. So go in one day, be used for a day and then come out. So if we could get 7 or 8 loads over it in a day then yes.

01:19:15:14 - 01:19:30:12

I think what I was thinking about is if the mini bridge was there and it was closed, the general road was closed for a few days while it was there. Then whether rather than Sea link or line link traffic would have to use the diversion routes. The HGVs could still use the the Mini bridge.

01:19:30:29 - 01:19:41:12

Sir James Brooklyn Path that we have committed to not sending HGVs through the diversion routes during the installation and use of the mini bridge so that we would have no other HGV going to site.

01:19:41:15 - 01:19:42:22

Fair enough. Okay.

01:19:48:15 - 01:19:56:03

Uh, is there any other comments? Oh, there's a few I can see online here, des. I've got a David Stevens.

01:19:59:25 - 01:20:02:12

Sorry. My mistake didn't I? Didn't take my hand down. Sorry.

01:20:02:14 - 01:20:05:23

That's okay. No problem. Um. Okay. GB.

01:20:10:12 - 01:20:42:14

Yes. Geraldine Barker from Saxmundham town Council. Hello there. Um, a very quick point on traffic diverting through Saxmundham. Views are not suitable in Saxmundham. The they be um 1119 is actually goes through a reservoir of two residential areas. There's no way you can get HGV is along there.

01:20:42:18 - 01:20:45:15

They would have to divert then to

01:20:47:27 - 01:21:30:12

Further north to come along the BW 121. Then they are traveling through Saxmundham at one point. There is only single carriageway traffic that you can get in town. It is not suitable to have HGV through, so whatever method you use to strengthen Ben or Bridge or diversions have to be kept in a minimum. And I totally agree with your suggestion that there should be no HGV traffic at all to site at that time, so perhaps a work should be done if it's going to be you are going to strengthen the bridge, that it should be done sooner rather than later.

01:21:30:14 - 01:21:47:02

And obviously you don't need to sort out, um, or stop the deliveries to Sizewell C, because that would delay that contract and increase the cumulative effects To our area. Thank you.

01:21:47:04 - 01:21:47:25

Thank you.

01:21:51:08 - 01:22:15:16

Okay. Um, I just come across the applicant. Um, just clarify about maximum HGV numbers on Sundays and bank holidays. Um, the I can see TT zero four within the latest Reac talks about a maximum of 30 HGVs per day on Sunday and bank holidays. Uh, is that still the case or is that something you'd like to update me on that?

01:22:15:18 - 01:22:31:15

James Brooklyn Park applicant that's in association with the, um, works that are outside of the core working hours where we would perhaps be doing HDD or cable jointing. Right. So it's a restriction on HGV for those areas outside of the core working hours.

01:22:36:19 - 01:23:00:19

Okay. I just wanted that clarified. Thank you. Um, so first of all, if I come back now to the Suffolk County Council, um, this is about the use of caps on, um, on the traffic, construction, traffic. So the question is, do you feel that there should be more caps secured on various road links and junctions during the construction phase?

01:23:02:19 - 01:23:36:16

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council so yes, we've set out our our high level position on this in response to question 5T7 as part of Q2. So that's rep five, 204, pages 31 to 32. And effectively, yes, we do support HGV movement caps, um, either within the DCO itself or in an associated control document, um, on specific routes in the same way that they were considered appropriate at Sizewell. Um ScottishPower renewables and um, East Anglia one North and East Anglia two.

01:23:36:18 - 01:24:15:26

Um, I know it's been mentioned the fact that this wasn't considered to be appropriate in Bramford to Twin stead. And essentially we'd say that obviously every every project is different. And you've already heard earlier this afternoon, I cannot now remember from whom. But obviously the context of Bramford to Twin Stead is very different in terms of the fact that this project is taking place in an area with a lot more other projects nearby, and potentially a lot greater cumulative effects. Um, I don't know whether or not Mr. Mary wants to come in on any more specific detail on this point, but in in high level terms, we are supportive of HGV caps for the reasons we've set out in response to ask.

01:24:15:28 - 01:24:17:25

And would that just be HGVs?

01:24:18:24 - 01:24:19:12

Um.

01:24:22:25 - 01:24:26:24

I'm just going to double check with Mr. Mary. I think that's all we've said in writing so far.

01:24:27:03 - 01:24:57:24

And yes, Steve Mary, Suffolk County Council, um, past experience from previous DCOM was that it was considered in practical to place restrictions on lighter vehicles, and in this case they are three and a half tonnes and above. And despite probably wanting to, I think realistically it would be very difficult to place restrictions, particularly on workers cars. They're driving in their own time. It's their own car. So I don't think that's that's reasonable. We would strongly support Caps.

01:24:57:26 - 01:25:09:09

And again, in the recent CMP there was a move towards that with putting restriction on. I think it was HGV through Saxmundham which would be welcome.

01:25:09:16 - 01:25:19:01

Yes. And could I ask if, um, Kent County Council has any um thoughts on the use of caps, whether they feel it's necessary or not?

01:25:20:13 - 01:25:54:22

Yeah. Matt Bainbridge, KCC highways. Um, for sake of brevity, I pretty much echo the comments that been made by, um, Suffolk County Council. Really? Um, I do feel it's I do feel it's appropriate, especially, um, in relation to, um, seasonal peaks and bank holidays, um, when there's events on in the in the coastal towns of Barnet. Um, I don't believe it would, um, you know, I believe that it's, you know, it can be, um, you know, quite easily monitored, certainly, as opposed to light traffic, um, or, um, staff vehicles per se.

01:25:54:25 - 01:26:27:02

Um, for example. Um, so, yeah, that is, that is quite feasible. And, uh, you know, it certainly if it's, uh, if it's feasible, it should it should certainly be enacted, um, for the sake of, uh, you know, reducing impacts at key junctions at busier times. And, um, yeah, um, I believe that can be done. Um, and especially, um, in relation to, um, to preventing, um, passage of HGVs through Minster Village as well, um, to, in order to reach access.

01:26:27:04 - 01:26:30:25

I believe that would be CBM. Oh for as I've already stated previously.

01:26:31:19 - 01:27:05:25

Okay. Thank you. And so coming back across to the applicant, um, I think under TT zero two of the reac it says about the applicant is going to monitor traffic numbers. Um, so, um, would the traffic, would the applicant be, um, resistant to the captain of vehicle numbers? Um, at a kind of I suppose you're looking at those sort of numbers where you're thinking there's going to be the worst case scenario numbers, um, within certain junctions or, um, road links.

01:27:05:27 - 01:27:15:03

Um, is therefore what is your response to the council's comments on capital vehicles if they're being monitored?

01:27:16:12 - 01:27:57:28

Yes. So so we are we are resistant to it. We say that there is a suite of controls that you've got in the TMP for both, um, counties, which provide a mix of timing restrictions and some caps which, which provide the controls that are necessary. There is obviously policy on when you impose caps. In the National Policy statement, there's also the more general policy in the national Policy Statement about not imposing requirements unless they are strictly necessary and justified to avoid imposing excessive regulation on projects which are urgent in the national interest.

01:27:58:04 - 01:28:29:12

And therefore, it said, well, you've assessed these numbers. It's feasible. What's wrong with imposing a cap? What's wrong is that policy says you shouldn't do it unless it's necessary and justified. And and we say where they're at. The assessment shows there are not significant impacts. It simply isn't justified to start imposing this extra level of regulation on us. Um, so so that's our position obviously. But we do rely on what you do have in the TMP, which we say goes goes a long way in terms of control and restriction that you referred to a moment ago said.

01:28:29:15 - 01:28:30:03

Yeah.

01:28:32:27 - 01:29:09:11

And so within TT zero two, it says that the contractor would be expected to monitor the number of construction vehicles between the site and the road network, deviations from the authorised routes, or changes to the traffic levels that are higher than the TMP assumptions, would require discussion with the relevant highway authorities to determine whether additional mitigation measures are needed, so that, in a way sounds almost a bit like, um, using a sort of cap system where if numbers are in excess of what was anticipated, then you're going to have discussions with the highway authority.

01:29:10:29 - 01:29:18:21

So in those circumstances, how would the applicant address the matter if HGVs were to certainly be greater than forecast within the ES?

01:29:19:14 - 01:29:38:28

They said, uh, I'll ask Mr. Barclay to come on how we would address it. But the the first point is we say that is what you see there. The commitment we've signed up to is materially different because it provides a level of flexibility which as a straightforward cap, doesn't. So that's what we say is different. But Mr. Buckley can comment on how we might address that in practice.

01:29:40:09 - 01:30:19:08

James Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, just pick up on a point from KCS traffic officer. We wouldn't be working on bank holidays anyway, so it shouldn't be an issue. Um, we are offering caps, as I said in previous, in some junctions, and we'll assess the request for caps in some of the junctions and roadways in, um, Kent. Um, in terms of how we would manage the, uh, the process, we will be appointing a traffic coordinator, which is a requirement. Um, a traffic coordinator would be coordinating with all the other end CIPs and with the highways authorities, and we would review what the appropriate method might be.

01:30:19:10 - 01:30:48:03

And it may be that, um, a slight change to programme or a slight moving out of an activity to, to, uh, look at those, those issues and then reduce the number of lorries. Um, at that point, if that was causing an issue on site. I am involved in the discharge of the Scottish Power DCO process with Scottish Power, and Caps are proving issues in some activities which are elongating the programme, which is something we're trying to use.

01:30:49:13 - 01:31:09:06

And in those situations under TT zero two said about, I think, speaking to their discussions with the relevant highway authorities. Um, but who would get the final say over what sort of you mentioned? Again, there's mitigation. Is the wording used, who would get the final say of over whether mitigation is required and what form that mitigation may be.

01:31:11:08 - 01:31:43:03

Changed booklet on behalf of the applicant. I think it would have to be looked at on a case by case basis. In terms of what was the issue, is it vehicles going away from the, um, routes that we've planned, in which case we would then be looking at additional signage and additional tracking movements if it was numbers of vehicles going above the anticipated rates. We could have a look at why that was. And then would it be a case of actually it's just a mini peak because of X activity, therefore it won't happen again. And like I say, we can have a look with the contractors at the program.

01:31:43:05 - 01:31:55:03

It may be that there are two contractors for um of slightly changed their programmes and that's created a slightly bigger peak. And we can then talk to those contractors about realigning their programmes.

01:31:55:06 - 01:32:36:13

Yes. So I mean, I think at this point, looking at what the applicant has worded as A202 and also what Suffolk County Council and Kent County Council are suggesting as highway authorities, it seems that there's it's there is subtle differences, but at the same time, it might just be a case of who's got the control, but whether there could be flexibility built within it. And what I would suggest is a meeting or discussion may be between the highway authorities and the applicant to to discuss that particular point of caps of vehicles.

01:32:36:15 - 01:33:14:26

Um, because obviously there's there's some concern within the, within the communities. And I think with the highway authorities that that there is going to be some of the traffic levels might exceed what is being proposed or suggested that at the moment and what could be done in those circumstances. So I think it might be a case of getting together and maybe working on some wording. And if you could have that as an action point and for a sort of some sort of a joint statement or something like that between the two highway authorities and the applicant about maybe wording and what could be agreed and what maybe can't be agreed.

01:33:15:22 - 01:33:22:07

Um, the same for Suffolk County Council. So, yes. Um, I know that Mr. Murray is keen to just come in on this point briefly.

01:33:22:14 - 01:33:23:18

Okay. Mr.. Mary.

01:33:27:05 - 01:33:28:00

Maybe not that keen.

01:33:29:00 - 01:34:06:07

I should have put my steam over and stuff. Yeah, just. Just to provide a bit of clarity from the way we are looking at it. Is the the number of HGVs are calculated, estimated by the applicant and they are telling us that that is a realistic worst case. Yeah. So in our view we are struggling to see why they can't form some form of caps. And to hear that, uh, there may be issues with the, the program might need to be squeezed and the numbers go up and it's like, well, that's not what's being told to us.

01:34:06:09 - 01:34:38:06

So I think, you know, it's a high we thought we you know, we do have to look to our communities and try and explain to them how we are managing this traffic. And I think it's fair to say we do not see it as unreasonable to have caps in a similar way to Scottish may have and if it is causing them problems. I'm sorry, but that is self-inflicted. Um, that. Yeah, they gave us those numbers and that's what we are working to. So I'm afraid from a county perspective, I think I'm going to take a hard line on this is that.

01:34:38:08 - 01:35:10:06

Yeah, we we really do think caps are justified. Yeah. We're open to discussions about what those numbers look like. Yes. But if if you don't have them and the other concern is enforcement is the way it works at the moment is we may find out several days, weeks, months after there's been a breach of the cap. Uh, and it's too late to do anything about it. I'd also mention that, um, the experience we've got from ScottishPower, from Sizewell is from a local authority perspective. We do spend quite a lot of time actually looking at the data and then working with the applicant to manage it.

01:35:10:12 - 01:35:32:19

I'd also add that to their credit size. Will see. Have got a very good delivery management system. They do manage it. They tell me within 24 hours if there's a breach and they usually come back with a reason for it and what action they have taken to do it. So if a big project like Sizewell can deliver something that we do not see, why a smaller project such as this cannot do so too.

01:35:34:07 - 01:35:48:06

Okay. Thank you. I mean, that is very useful and I think, you know, working if you could form some wording, hopefully in conjunction with the applicant, that would be very useful. Does the applicant one of us bond on the points made by Mr. Mary then.

01:35:48:16 - 01:36:15:12

Yes, sir. Thank you for the applicant. And we'll take away your suggestion about whether looking at TT zero two could be amended in some way to provide more control or matters of that sort, but I think it is important. Mr. mayor, I think again reiterated. Well the applicant's assessed it. Why can't they

commit to a cap? Because the answer is because national policy says that's not the right approach. Just because you assess something in AA does not mean you impose a comprehensive suite of controls.

01:36:15:14 - 01:36:43:21

To limit you to everything you've assessed. So it has to be justified in terms of necessity and and likewise the comparison to size well is simply not a fair comparison, which is a much longer construction program, a much bigger project in terms of construction worker numbers 8000 or so. So the project's got to be looked at on its merits. And we say looking at its merits, what we proposed is sufficient. Um, but notwithstanding all that. So we will take it away.

01:36:43:26 - 01:36:45:27

Okay. Thank you. Yes, sir.

01:36:47:04 - 01:37:23:16

So could I just go back to the question of the roundabout, because it was my understanding from what my learned friend for the applicant said, that they were going to do something about the fact that currently the expectation of the ten HGV a day was not enforceable. And I was contending I appreciate outwith the agenda that we see.

01:37:23:18 - 01:37:56:27

This commitment should be, um, in the rack and be an embedded measure. I understood it to be suggested that that was sort of being addressed. Yes, but I now understand that the position of the applicants remains, that they don't want to have caps. And the question of whether you have a cap or not depends upon whether or not it's necessary to extend the programme. Well, that's nothing to do with enforcement. These are not matters that should lie in the control of the applicant.

01:37:56:29 - 01:37:57:18

Thank you sir.

01:37:57:28 - 01:38:11:18

That's okay. I think there is. There is some caps on certain junctions which the applicant has put forward. Um, and I think that's as it mentioned, that you are looking into whether that's going to be a commitment for that particular junction.

01:38:11:20 - 01:38:20:18

Yeah. So chief of the applicant, uh, apologies if there's no clarity. We are we've heard the request. We are reviewing it and we will provide a response in due course.

01:38:22:03 - 01:38:23:22

Okay, Mr. Burton.

01:38:24:17 - 01:39:08:23

Thank you sir. James Burton for sees the problem with respect to my friend Mr. Flanagan for the applicant, is that because its traffic transport assessment has proceeded on the basis of wrong data, artificially suppressed, as we've discussed, data coming from January and February. The applicant cannot, nor can this panel apply the policy tests and the basis of the assessment presented by the

applicant. Because it's not precautionary, it's the opposite of precautionary the applicant's assessment, which means firstly, of course worst case scenario must be adopted, which actually means it follows logically the policy tests have failed.

01:39:08:25 - 01:39:23:23

But then when we come to this sub question, if you get there of what mitigation approach should be taken, again, it has to be worst case. And that does mean on this sub issue it means it means caps. Thank you.

01:39:23:27 - 01:39:24:15

Stand.

01:39:26:29 - 01:39:27:27

Yes Mr. Barney?

01:39:28:03 - 01:40:05:03

Yes. Michael Marney from Friston Parish Council. Um, this may be an obvious point, but obviously the question of caps and traffic relates to working hours as well. And where you are proposing to work all day Saturday and all day Sunday. Heavy traffic is directly related. I think the two has to be looked at hand in hand. Um, the other point I want to make is a literally a parochial one, which relates to obviously, you've seen submissions we've made on the use of the B1 one, two, one, and we discussed the junction earlier. Um, I mean, our concern relates to the designation of the B1 121 as a, as a construct, as an HGV route, which is clearly unsuitable.

01:40:05:05 - 01:40:37:08

The road has already been trashed, trashed by displaced traffic. And um, I think caps may relate to that, but I think Don't repeat what I said in my submission at deadline five, but the traffic management plan has not been updated. I think there's a very strong argument that that road does not need to be designated as an HGV route at all. I think if National Grid could adopt that, they might win some friends and influence people. Um, it was already just said that the use is negligible and I understand that there is no need for HGV at all.

01:40:37:10 - 01:40:56:14

So issues around another HGV being being used if the ban all bridges shut and all the rest of it, that issue all goes away. So I really would hope that National Grid would say we don't need to take any HGV along the B1 one two, one through through Friston and um, I think that would help matters considerably. Thank you.

01:40:57:20 - 01:41:05:09

Okay. Does the applicant want to respond on that point about whether there is indeed necessary for any HGVs along? There'd be one, one, two, one. I think that's it.

01:41:06:27 - 01:41:39:03

For you, Flanagan, for the applicant. And I do draw attention to the commitments Recently added to the TMP, um, uh, in respect of only using the, uh, the route along the B11 21 Oba road and BLM 21

six London Road through Filton, um for overhead line towers and pilot works. So we have specifically taken on board that point. I understand potentially in response to Mr.

01:41:39:05 - 01:41:54:21

Mahoney's, um, concerns. Uh, so it is it is limited in that respect. Um, so we've we've tailored our controls to that. I'll just see if Mister Barclay's got. Yes. I could just hand over to Mr. Buckley as well. Briefly. Thank you.

01:41:56:15 - 01:42:10:13

Yes. On the overhead line point, we did take on board your comments, and we have reflected that in the latest, um, react commitment to only HGV associated with the overhead lines coming from into Friston and to the overhead line.

01:42:11:27 - 01:42:30:15

About right to question. But but are you capping the number of HGVs for that purpose and to two points. Why are you capping the TVs? And secondly, are you saying you won't use that HGV route for any other purpose, even if there are road closures change happening?

01:42:30:17 - 01:42:36:20

Yes, we are capping that at 30 hubs and we won't use that road for any diversion purposes.

01:42:36:22 - 01:42:38:12

Well, 30 HGV's A day.

01:42:38:17 - 01:42:40:15

Nice. Just let me check.

01:42:40:17 - 01:42:41:03

Okay.

01:42:44:11 - 01:42:47:17

James working on behalf of applicants. 30 construction vehicles total.

01:42:48:27 - 01:42:58:10

Michael money for us and parish council. So that will be the total for all pylon works and and no use of the route for any other HGV's.

01:43:00:16 - 01:43:14:08

James Buckland boss applicant I'll clarify the point on the 30 because it but it won't be used for any other HGV. It's purely for the works associated with the overhead line works. Okay.

01:43:14:28 - 01:43:15:13

Thank you.

01:43:15:15 - 01:43:16:00

Thank you.

01:43:16:02 - 01:43:39:10

Can I just come back on a point? Yes. Made by Stace. Earlier on the fact that the baseline data affects our total traffic. Um, irrespective of whether we agree or disagree on the baseline data of the survey monitoring, that has nothing to do with the total number of HGVs that are assessed on the network. That is only relevant to the junction modelling of whether a junction is over capacity or not.

01:43:41:19 - 01:43:52:15

Okay. Thank you. Um, just a few more questions. Just to finish up today on the the traffic issue. Um, first of all, um.

01:43:55:14 - 01:43:56:25

Let's get to where we are. Sorry,

01:43:58:20 - 01:44:12:19

just for Suffolk County Council. You've there's been a lot of talk about, um, abnormal, indivisible loads, aerials on the routes and, um, some concern that there hasn't been enough assessment yet on those routes. Um.

01:44:14:23 - 01:44:43:17

Does the council still have some concern about their vehicles getting to the site in Suffolk if they are using the A12 and the old bridge? Um, but also potentially the option three that was put forward by the applicant. I mean, if there are issues, are these issues actually surmountable, such as reinforcing structures, temporary temporarily removing street furniture and lighting, for example? That seems to be the key point is whether it's surmountable or not.

01:44:43:19 - 01:45:15:13

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council So we do still have concerns about the the southern route, the metal bridge route. Um, in essence, because so much is still likely to be outstanding at the close of the examination. Um, we are concerned about the feasibility of both, potentially the repair option and the mini bridge option, We are concerned that there's still potential outstanding issues around access to white House residential Park and all of the points that we've effectively raised.

01:45:15:18 - 01:45:51:22

I'll defer in just a moment to Mr. Marion on option three specifically, but at a high level are suggestion um, preference are arguments about the the the northern alternative route. Um, the size of the link road route remain broadly unchanged. Um, the applicant has characterized that as just a preference. Uh, it's it's I think the answer to your question, though, is that at this stage, we cannot confidently say that we consider the issues with the southern access route to be surmountable.

01:45:51:24 - 01:46:06:29

That's not to say they definitely won't be, but we just don't have enough information to be satisfied that they necessarily can be. Um, and if I don't know if Mr. Murray does want to come in specifically on option three, If not, then that's something we will pick up in writing.

01:46:09:22 - 01:46:34:04

Hey, Miss Barry. Um, so, yeah, that's my real point is, is whether if they're going to if they're going to use the route, which is mainly proposed at the moment, which is down the A12 and across Ben Bridge. Is this feasible for AIL routes? I know there could be still be issues. There could be um structural issues there, but are these sort of issues surmountable?

01:46:35:27 - 01:47:10:24

Uh, Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council, we've spoken with the engineering hat on is pretty much everything is surmountable in terms of engineering terms. It's usually costs and delays and things like that and environmental issues. Um, I was going to break it down into possibly three different parts. So the general bridge, I think, to be fair, we have discussed we've put our, um, preferences in writing, um, if that could be made capable of carrying abnormal loads, it is a logical route into the converter site directly from the A-12, so it does have merits and transport terms with very clear about that.

01:47:11:03 - 01:47:41:28

It also provides long term legacy is that it provides a link from the A12 into the site, and possibly the wider site as well. The concerns are taken. The next part is the option of using the B11 22 and the B10 69 to access the site. We've raised concerns about that in that the structures on that route have not been assessed. So we are aware there are restrictions in terms of abnormal load.

01:47:42:00 - 01:48:12:17

So we're not talking of CNU 44 tonnes mass. These are restrictions on abnormal loads. And we have put those in writing in past submissions. So there are issues with a couple of structures on that route. Probably even more critical, which again, we have raised in writing and we've explained to the applicant Is seismic, have undertaken an assessment of structures south of Oxford to the A14. They have assessed them on the basis of StG three moves.

01:48:12:22 - 01:48:41:23

So at the moment, and bear in mind, structures do change with time. They are, with two exceptions, cleared for StG three use to Oxford. The two structures are Little Glenarm and Kelsall, both culverts. Little Glenarm has gone one restriction on it and Carlson is to go. So that basically means that they accept loads up to that loading. In terms of weight,

01:48:43:13 - 01:49:16:05

there's been a temporary relaxation of that to allow moves up to StG three to be, um, permitted based on the vehicles travelling at very low speed and no vehicles coming in the oncoming direction. We are having difficulty to find out whether or not that has actually been complied with. So that is going to undergo a risk assessment in the middle of April. I'll put all this down in writing as well. So it is problematic to get abnormal loads up the A12.

01:49:16:07 - 01:49:45:09

Now what has not been assessed is any special order movements. So we're talking transformers. They have not been assessed by Sizewell. And also they have not finished the assessments from Lowestoft to the south to Oxford. So at the moment, as it stands and it would depend on individual assessments, it may be highly likely there would be restrictions on moving special order movements on the A12 to even get to the river from US bridge.

01:49:46:21 - 01:49:47:16

Understand?

01:49:48:12 - 01:49:54:09

So that's where we are. With that, I'll put all this in writing in our submission. But most of it we've mentioned before.

01:49:54:22 - 01:50:16:18

Okay. And can I just go over to the applicant on those on those points, then whether, I mean, obviously there's something that would need a lot more assessment. I think the applicant said things change over time and you have to look at it at that time rather than now. But is anything that's been raised by a county council a concern that it might not be surmountable?

01:50:17:02 - 01:50:48:06

So Keith Flanagan, for the applicant, we say, no, you know, we've got three options. Um, out of an abundance of caution, obviously, we hear what Mr. Mary has to say. And it's important firstly to recognise that the the option three route is the SPR consented route and that has got through examination been consented. And they haven't surveyed yet but they've it's they satisfied the examining authority and secretary state that it's appropriate. So there can be confidence in that respect. And and we do say that it's entirely normal for surveys to happen post consent.

01:50:48:11 - 01:50:53:19

So that's a high level. I'm just going to hand over Miss Leader to add anything she wanted to add please.

01:50:56:26 - 01:51:26:29

Alison, leader for the applicant, and I just want to come back on a couple of specific points. Um, first of all, I know it's a while ago, but we are happy to agree the cap at all bre that was being discussed that is going into the reac and it will be in at deadline six. I'm aware that was a while ago, but uh, just to commit to that, um, the second thing on the timing, um, around the Ben Hall bridge and the preference, um, I mean, we we have discussed this quite a lot with Suffolk County Council and we are fully on board with it being the preference.

01:51:27:08 - 01:52:00:00

And the documents were submitted to Suffolk County Council, um, and to Network Rail, um, on the 13th of November to get their approval for this survey. And we did have the approval back from a Network Rail on the 2nd of December. Um, we have obviously now had information back on the 19th of March from Suffolk County Council. So we are fully committed to the survey, but we are fully in the hands of Suffolk County Council to to do this survey. So, um, yeah, I'll just kind of please do keep working with us.

01:52:00:02 - 01:52:11:27

Um, and yeah, let's let's get on and do it because we, we agree it's the best solution. And we're very happy to deliver those additional community benefits if we can get this approval in time.

01:52:12:08 - 01:52:12:29

Okay.

01:52:13:01 - 01:52:32:12

Thank you. Um, I just want to move on to basically close. There's a couple of just some other questions that I want to put through before we finish. Um, so I could see someone's got their hand up online. Um, do you want to come in at this point? And then we'll move on to just, uh, close this topic?

01:52:32:14 - 01:53:09:09

Thank thank you very much for the opportunity. Charlotte Fox, on behalf of Bennell and Stanfield Parish Council. Actually, I've had my hand up for a bit because, um, I'm going back to the, uh, approach taken by National Grid to capping vehicles, uh, and how, uh, falling back on critical national, um, priority infrastructure status, Meaning that they don't have to put a cap, takes Sealink out of the cumulative impact problem, and the cumulative impact problem is very, very real. I am living in the middle of it and the cap for Sizewell C is 600 per day.

01:53:09:11 - 01:53:39:24

So Sealink may say ah ah, um, contribution to that is very minimal. But as a community, if we're putting a layer on layer on layer of additional HGTV's, um, you know, at some point, uh, we are going to, um, have a real problem. And also, um, uh, farm vehicles haven't really been taken into account. Farm vehicles pass through our region a lot, especially during the summer months.

01:53:39:26 - 01:53:54:06

And they can be very big and they can be incredibly slow. Um, so we're talking about, you know, yet another layer of disruption of our journey times and yet another layer of cumulative impact.

01:53:54:14 - 01:54:00:11

I understand, thank you very much. Um, so just to say.

01:54:01:01 - 01:54:03:00

Forgive me, sir. I have one.

01:54:03:02 - 01:54:03:17

Point.

01:54:03:19 - 01:54:04:11

To raise.

01:54:04:13 - 01:54:41:23

Which I thought was going to come up a little earlier in the agenda under 0.2. It's very short, if I may raise it. At the time of relevant representations, we had all made the point that there is a hospital in Aldeburgh, but it has no emergency facilities. People who suffer accidents, particularly the elderly population. No comment, but also the visitors who sometimes get hurt by the various perils of the sea, the marshes, the rivers and so on.

01:54:41:25 - 01:55:20:28

The nearest accident and emergency is in Ipswich Hospital, which is 26 miles away. I don't want to repeat a submission that we made a year ago, but my trouble is, I'm not aware of anything having happened with it. But the short point is that what's going to be done to look after the fact that it's a 25 mile journey to Ipswich Hospital if there's an emergency? I had imagined that people would come back with suggestions, or perhaps even maintaining an additional helicopter for the ambulance helicopter would be much appreciated.

01:55:21:00 - 01:55:34:12

Something of that kind. But it's a submission that's been made. I don't want to repeat, but unfortunately I'm not aware that having been addressed, it may be that it has been, in which case I apologise. But can I leave it there?

01:55:34:14 - 01:56:05:13

Yes. Thank you. I think it has been addressed previously, but, um, in your, uh, submission following this, uh, hearing, if that could be included as a response to that point as well. That'd be good. Thank you, thank you. um. Can I just quickly speak back to Suffolk County Council? Um, whether it's yourself or Mr. Mayor. But, um, given the information you have so far, and obviously we've heard a lot. Got a lot more information submitted through the appointment of the examination.

01:56:05:20 - 01:56:26:21

Would you consider the likely impact on driver delay and congestion or any other aspect of highways, both for Sealink alone and then cumulative, uh, with other large projects to be significant? I mean, it's getting to that point where we have to sort of think what would the conclusions would be?

01:56:27:24 - 01:57:01:00

Uh, Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council, um, I think so. At the risk of kicking the can down the road yet again, it is somewhat hard without junction modeling data, and without that there is still a lot of information outstanding. Uh, it certainly in all of our representations, The general thrust is that we consider at least very least, the cumulative impacts have the potential to be significant. Um, whether or not the project's impacts are potentially significant in isolation is harder to nail our colours to the Marsden.

01:57:01:02 - 01:57:25:05

Um, but at the very least, uh, yes. I think the, um, it we hopefully will be in a position if we're receiving junction modeling data in the middle of next week, uh, to provide some firmer commentary on that. Uh, at deadline six. Um, but at this stage, I would be reluctant to make a final call on that just because there is quite a lot outstanding.

01:57:25:07 - 01:57:58:14

I think that those are the points about potential gaps that we were talking about, and the junction modeling at that stage, whether you think there would be particularly on the drive of delay, I think that's what most people are discussing, whether you consider it to be a significant impact and if so, what mitigation would you be suggesting or potentially compensation? I think there has been some suggestions in recent submission about the sort of thing that could do. Not in detail, but, um, I think that's the sort of information that we would need to see at this late stage of examination.

01:57:58:25 - 01:58:13:18

Lois Lane, Suffolk County Council. Yes. Um, we put in some high level thoughts on driver delay mitigation, which I didn't mention under agenda item 4.2. So that's rep 5204. Page 56. Um, we can we can provide more detail on that.

01:58:13:20 - 01:58:27:22

Yes. And how such things would be secured as well. Um, and the same question for Kent County Council. So whether you think whether alone or in combination, um, there would be significant effects.

01:58:32:13 - 01:58:38:07

Um, yeah. I mean, that's all going to be summarised, um, for deadline six. Really? Um, so yeah.

01:58:38:24 - 01:58:42:21

Okay. We'll wait for it then. Then. Thank you very much. Um.

01:58:51:01 - 01:58:55:17

So I think there's, I think there's one hand up in the Suffolk.

01:58:56:22 - 01:59:30:06

Sorry. It's me again, Charlotte Fox, on behalf of Fenland Stanfield Parish Council. I meant to say just now, um, how incredibly lucky we are to have somebody like Steve. Mary. Um, on top of all this, he is working so hard, I cannot tell you. And he is so well experienced. So when Steve Murray says there is a problem with this route, to hear the comeback response from National Grid that the SPR ale route has already been consented, I don't think it's a very constructive response.

01:59:30:08 - 01:59:42:25

Surely if Steve Murray is saying there may be problems with that route, it has no certainty just to say it's been consented. So it's all right. It doesn't make sense to me. I don't know, Maybe I'm wrong.

01:59:43:15 - 02:00:14:09

Okay. Thank you for your point. Um, so for the highway authorities, if there is anything else you consider necessary to be included within the DCO. DCO, please include this with your deadline. Sixth submission. Um, if you feel monitoring and potential mitigation is needed, then please provide reasoning for this and wording for the Secretary of State to consider. Um, so maybe put that down as an action point. Um, to be submitted a deadline six. I think there's questions also to that effect that we submit that on Monday.

02:00:14:11 - 02:00:50:21

So very similar. Um, I would also like to see a joint submission from the applicant and Suffolk County Council on the junction modeling. Um, something I've mentioned earlier with a conclusion of how this influences the overall cumulative traffic assessment for Suffolk and whether this indicates the need for any mitigation. So that's with the time that we've got left. Um, that would be very useful to have a deadline. Six something to come in from both parties. And finally, we would advise that the applicant and Harry authorities meet to discuss matters and try to discuss a way forward to progress on these matters.

02:00:50:23 - 02:01:20:26

I think we saw some positive progress to do with the water environment earlier after a recent meeting, so anything like that would be we would like to see also. Um, so thank you very much. Um, that's all the questions I've got. Um, I don't think we'll be going on to socioeconomics tonight, so that will have to wait for the morning. Um, so in that case, I'll look to adjourn the hearing for today. Um, if there are.

02:01:21:24 - 02:01:54:02

Uh, sorry. Um, yeah. If there are any other items that are relevant to your topics today. Um, raised today at issue specific three, may I remind you that the timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline six, which is Monday the 13th of April, 2026, may also remind you that the recording of the hearing will be placed on the inspectorate website as soon as practicable after this hearing. Before we adjourn, we would like to say thank you to all of today's participants for the time and assistance.

02:01:54:20 - 02:02:11:15

Um, the time is now 547, and this issue of specific hearing for the proposed ceiling project is adjourned for today. We'll be back at 11 a.m. tomorrow. 10 a.m. tomorrow? Says 10 a.m.. I bet I was 11 and.

02:02:11:17 - 02:02:21:18

And, sir, could I check that you are following the agenda at the moment and, um. No, no. At the moment changes to the order of business.

02:02:22:02 - 02:02:30:11

I think we'll be starting with, um, what we missed out today, which was. Yeah. Which was. Yeah. So we will follow that.

02:02:30:13 - 02:02:30:28

Thank you very.

02:02:31:00 - 02:02:32:20

Much. Yeah. It will be following that. Thank you.