



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Norwich to Tilbury
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Day 3 – Part 1
<b>Date:</b>	1 May 2026

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

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

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

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:28 - 00:00:45:05

Good morning. Can I confirm with the case team that everybody can hear me clearly, and that live streaming event has commenced. Thank you. It is now 10:00, and it's time for this second issue specific hearing into application for development consent for the Norwich to Tilbury project made by National Grid electricity Transmission. It is now resumed. I would like to welcome all those back who were here in over in Colchester on Wednesday and for the benefit of any additional participants who were not present on either Tuesday or Wednesday earlier in the week, will do some introductions and some brief housekeeping and preliminary matters.

00:00:46:16 - 00:00:58:03

My name is Susan Hunt, and I've been appointed as the lead member of the panel to examine this application. I'm now going to ask the other member of the examining authority to introduce himself.

00:00:58:09 - 00:01:02:22

Good morning. I'm Matthew Sims, I'm a chartered civil engineer and also a planning inspector.

00:01:04:22 - 00:01:36:22

Thank you. The other members of the examining authority who have been participating in the other hearings have been taking place this week. Our Chris Butler, John Hockley and Ken Stone, and they will watch the recording after the event. The case team here today are Louise Haraway and Jessica Dunlop, and online is our case manager, Sean Evans. And it is them who you should contact. If you've got any issues regarding the arrangements for today or any online connection issues.

00:01:40:02 - 00:02:12:27

So just running through a few preliminary matters just to just as a reminder and also for those that weren't present earlier this week, I'll keep them brief. Can everyone please settle their devices and phones to silent? There are no more fire alarm drills today. So if it goes off, it's the real thing. There are emergency exits both at the front and the back of this room, and you will need to go into the South Stand car park and congregate at the fan zone. We understand there are representatives of the media here today.

00:02:13:00 - 00:02:38:26

You can see them there, and you've made yourselves known to to the people in the room and to the case team. And just to say, we don't mind them filming, um, as long as it doesn't cause any disruption to the proceedings. Anyone who doesn't wish to be filmed, please let them know, let the case team know, and leave your camera off if you're online only. And that goes for our recording of the event as well.

00:02:41:05 - 00:02:49:03

If anyone needs any special measures or arrangements to help them participate in the event today, please speak to the Case team.

00:02:50:21 - 00:02:56:07

We'll have a short break around 90 minutes into the hearing, and we'll aim to finish by 1:00.

00:02:58:01 - 00:03:12:05

And just a reminder for all participants to keep your responses as concise as possible. Keep to the advertised agenda and not strain to other matters which we haven't sought to ask questions on today.

00:03:14:01 - 00:03:32:18

Participants should avoid repeating what has already been submitted in writing, and if any participant is affecting the efficient running of the event or taking up too much time in their submissions, they will be invited to submit their comments in writing at deadline four, which is Tuesday the 12th of May.

00:03:34:13 - 00:03:51:06

And likewise, if we've asked you a question and you can't answer it right now, or if you need a bit more time, you can also put that in writing to us at deadline four and just to remind you again, written comments have no less weight than those made verbally.

00:03:53:05 - 00:04:20:21

The event is being live streamed and recorded. The General Data Protection regulations apply and there's information about that in our rule six letter dated the 13th of January, which also has details of our Privacy Notice. And again, please do not refer to private information in submissions today. Things like addresses, illnesses or any private details that we would have to redact on the recording.

00:04:23:12 - 00:04:38:27

Today's discussion, as is the rest of this week, it will be focused on those matters that we seek further clarification on, mostly from the applicant, in order to further our understanding of the application and to inform our recommendation to the Secretary of State.

00:04:41:19 - 00:05:05:20

We won't publish the we won't display the agenda on the screen, so it'd be helpful if you had it in front of you. And that's an examination library reference every 2006, and we're currently on item ten of the agenda for issue specific hearing two. And I'll shortly pass to Mr. Sims to take item number 11. And that's traffic and transport issues.

00:05:09:08 - 00:05:42:20

So I explained in full on Tuesday morning the purpose of this week's issue specific hearing. And so I won't go through it all again now. So those who weren't present may wish to refer back to that recording which which has now been published on our website. Um, however, I'd just like to highlight again the projects. This project in particular is of a significant scale in sight in terms of the size of the project itself, the amount of material submitted, and the geographical area which it covers.

00:05:42:26 - 00:06:15:22

There is simply insufficient time in the six month examination to hold hearings on every issue which the transmission route is proposed to pass through. And again, another reminder. Sorry, but this examination is primarily a written process and it's for the for us for the examining authority to decide

what issues will be discussed during hearings. We've already received a good deal of submissions in writing through deadlines 1 to 3, and we have seen them all.

00:06:15:24 - 00:06:21:04

We do read them, all of which have been or will be responded to by the applicants.

00:06:24:07 - 00:06:29:02

Does anyone have any questions on these matters before I move on? I.

00:06:31:14 - 00:06:36:28

Can't see any hands up. I'll now pass over to Mr. Sims.

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

Uh, thank you, Mrs. Hunt. Sorry. Yeah, no problem at all.

00:06:50:02 - 00:07:20:03

So we took instructions from the main parties who are participating today on Tuesday. We won't go through them all again given most of the same people are here again today. We do have a list in front of us of everyone who has registered to speak today, so I will. Although, having said that, I will just ask for the main highway authorities and the police to introduce themselves so I know who are referencing because, um, a lot of the discussion in item 11 is going to be with the highway authorities, other people that have registered to speak. I have got you on a list.

00:07:20:05 - 00:07:33:08

And as and when it's opportune time for you to speak. If you do speak, I'll ask you to introduce yourselves then, rather than everyone introducing themselves today. So, um, can I just have, um, uh, the the main speaker from the applicant, please?

00:07:34:27 - 00:07:59:00

Russell. Harris. Casey. For the applicant, I will be taking the lead, particularly on 113 abnormal loads because of the nature of the issues and the agenda. Anthony James and Kirsten Simpson will field the other questions and will allocate the answers to members of their team and the. Those are sitting to my left, to the left of Mr. Drage.

00:07:59:06 - 00:08:02:14

Thank you very much indeed, Suffolk County Council.

00:08:04:25 - 00:08:21:26

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, King's counsel for Suffolk County Council. And next to me is Mr. Steve Mary, who is the highways manager for Suffolk County Council. Um, depending obviously on the level of detail, you're more likely to hear from him than necessarily from me.

00:08:21:28 - 00:08:27:24

I wonder if that might be the case. And Norfolk County Council, do you have Norfolk County Council online or in the room?

00:08:28:18 - 00:08:41:05

Yes, sir. Good morning. Online. Um, I'm Richie parish council instructed for Norfolk County Council. So it'll be primarily me speaking today. But obviously if we go into more detail, alcohol on officers is required and introduce them at that stage.

00:08:41:18 - 00:08:44:13

Thank you very much. Um, Essex County Council.

00:08:49:13 - 00:09:08:21

Good morning sir. Emma. Ring of council for Essex County Council. Um, I will have in attendance, I think in the room. Um, Fay Murray, who will probably deal with any kind of technical detail questions. Um, but I'll also be here to assist. Um, depending on the nature of the question.

00:09:08:23 - 00:09:12:19

Thank you very much. Thank you. Do we have a repetition of Thurrock Council?

00:09:15:18 - 00:09:27:15

Um, hello? Yes, it's Neil Wisher here. Uh, from Tetra Tech. I'm representing Thurrock on items 11 and 12. Uh, for this, uh, for this hearing.

00:09:28:09 - 00:09:55:29

Thank you very much. And, um, representing, um, Suffolk Constabulary and Essex Police. Um, today. Good morning sir. My name is Ben Stansfield. I am a solicitor at Gowling WG, representing Essex Police and Suffolk Constabulary. I'm joined by Superintendent Chris Hignett from Suffolk Constabulary, and I have a team of operational officers behind me, if that should be helpful. Is there an easy way to refer to the Sussex Constabulary, Essex Police, that you're happy with the Joint forces? The joint forces? Thank you.

00:10:01:26 - 00:10:33:17

Thank you. There the introductions I'm going to take, just for now. As I say, I do appreciate that there are other people in the room. And when we come to the points where we need to talk to you, I'll ask you to introduce yourselves. At that point, um, if there is people that are going to talk that are not assisting and say, well, there is a roving microphone for those participants not seated around the table. So if you do speak, raise your hand and wait for the microphone to come to you before saying anything. For those at the table, there's a red button in front of you and a red light will go on. Um, usual for these sort of events.

00:10:34:16 - 00:10:47:28

And finally, please note that for virtual petitions participants, we may be able to see your name on the screen, but please refer to your name fully when you do come online. I do have a hand up online. Um,

00:10:49:21 - 00:10:52:06

although it might have gone back. No, it hasn't gone back down.

00:10:52:19 - 00:10:55:27

Good morning sir. So you also have National Highways in the room?

00:10:56:03 - 00:11:03:19

I apologized profusely, I didn't put you down on my list of people to introduce, and I absolutely should have done, I apologize. Thank you. Thank you for jumping in, Mr. Fowler.

00:11:03:25 - 00:11:16:18

Thank you. Thank you, sir. So, Mrs. Vicky Fowler, partner and solicitor at Gowling W CLG, and I will be calling on Jeremy Bloom, um, who's National Highways DCO lead for the East region. Thank you.

00:11:16:21 - 00:11:20:09

Thank you very much. And apologies for missing you off my list.

00:11:24:00 - 00:11:55:17

Thank you for those introductions. So you'll see from the agenda, there's quite a lot to cover today. And depending on how we get on, I may defer some matters to further written questions or simply ask the applicant to supply us with further information. In writing the substantive part of this morning will be in relation to item 11, as this is where I have need for and the examiners authority have me for most of the further information in terms of the examination. Um, just for further information up front, I will be swapping agenda items 11 at 11.2 and 11.3 around.

00:11:55:19 - 00:12:27:29

This is due to requests by the joint forces to cover items earlier in the agenda if we can, which we will be able to do, and we have advised the applicant of this in advance. So in this morning, my intention is to cover aspects of traffic and transport, which I either need further explanation or to try and understand where differences still lie. My expectation is most of the traffic and transport matters will be directed at the applicant and highway authorities. But I do appreciate, as I've said already, that there are a number of other people that may wish to speak on certain agenda items, and some of those have given me advance information of where they are.

00:12:28:06 - 00:13:03:10

But please raise your hand if we do need to. At the end of each agenda item, if you would like to cover something. Um, so I'm going to state from the outset that we're close to halfway through the examination. And there does appear to still be some concerns and differences between the applicant and various highway authorities, which I hope are coming swiftly to a resolution as we are already halfway through. My plan for this morning to ask the applicant to give a brief update on the main topics that I detailed in the published agenda, after which I'll be asking questions and allowing the highway authorities and the joint forces to also respond.

00:13:04:29 - 00:13:29:07

I appreciate there may be some repetition from the questions we asked in our first written questions. This is partly intentional and will allow me to understand the differences in approaches between the five different highway authorities. As we've said many times, this is a very large scheme covering lots of different authorities, and there is not necessarily a complete synergy on responses. So it may allow me to understand a little bit more. Um,

00:13:30:25 - 00:13:56:24

just just in general after my question about how to refer to the joint forces. We're very good at using acronyms all over the place. So if we can kind of try to reduce the acronyms for the people that might be watching. And just in terms of that, when we come to abnormal load in indivisible loads, I probably will just refer to them as abnormal loads rather than ales or abnormal individual loads. So. So for reference, I'll probably be referring to abnormal loads.

00:13:59:09 - 00:14:39:29

So okay, let's kick off with with the agenda. Then I'm going to cover the first two bullet points together. And this is relation to the status of modelling and assessments and matters that may not be agreed with highway authorities and also outstanding information requested by highway authorities. So I just want to start with the fundamentals to try and clear up any lingering issues and concerns regarding the baseline assessments and modelling. So I'm going to ask the applicant to outline where the current differences are between themselves and the highway authorities in terms of modelling from their point of view, and also where they are with requests for additional modeling from the highway authorities, because I know there are a number of additional requests.

00:14:40:14 - 00:15:11:16

It's noted that, with a few exceptions, the statement of common ground with the highway authorities lists some aspects and many aspects not agreed, and I'm keen to understand the timescales providing that information and the what the assessment and the discussion is to allow agreement to be formed from the highway authorities within the examination timetable and in the deadlines shown. So, as a heads up, I'll be then asked the applicant. I'll be then coming to the highway authorities to respond and add any further details that may not have been covered by the applicant.

00:15:12:05 - 00:15:16:22

I hope that's clear, Mr. Harris. So I'll add over to you, please. Thank you.

00:15:16:24 - 00:15:18:23

And I'm going to hand it over to Mr. James.

00:15:20:27 - 00:15:54:01

Good morning everyone. Good morning. Panel Anthony James for the applicant. So I'm going to give a brief introduction on this matter, and I will then hand over to Peter Smith and Mr. Smith and Miss Thirlwell to my left. Thank you. So as part of the DCO submission, we undertook extensive junction modelling and have held a series of meetings with the local highway authorities and National Highways to discuss the results of the modelling and mitigation since DCO submission.

00:15:54:03 - 00:16:28:12

We undertook further surveys and modelling to address concerns or queries raised by the local highway authorities and National Highways regarding the representative of the survey data, and we have shared recently that the findings of that work. Um, we also made some updates to the modelling to address, um, new data on permitted development. So to make sure that we were in line with the latest information, we aim to close out remaining comments as soon as possible.

00:16:28:14 - 00:16:38:27

And we are, uh, we have, um, arranged a series of meetings with the local highway authorities going forward to try and resolve outstanding matters.

00:16:40:18 - 00:17:16:00

National highways has, in terms of additional modelling requests. National highways has requested that we build or use existing models to build an additional five junction models. Um, so we have reviewed these requests and we are positioned that is that it would be appropriate to model one of these junctions and that is the A12 junction 25. Um, our view is that local modelling would be appropriate and proportionate to assess the effects of the project at that junction.

00:17:16:07 - 00:17:52:22

Um, so that junction, as you may, may know, uh, there was a previous scheme, the A12 Chelmsford to A120 widening scheme, which was cancelled recently. So that is why we didn't model that junction originally. So I think the decision came in around the time of Ildiko submission. Um, so in terms of the the junctions that National Highways has asked us to model recently, um, our position is that it is neither proportionate nor needed for the project, but we will continue to engage with national highways and keep this under review.

00:17:53:06 - 00:18:27:03

Um, National Highways has asked for some of those junctions that we undertake busy modelling which we do not believe is proportionate, um, or needed for the project. Um, and particularly because we are creating temporary impacts only and these types of models do require extensive inputs and take quite a while to prepare, um, potentially up to several months. So in the event that so should we agree that these models do definitely need to be undertaken.

00:18:27:11 - 00:18:57:16

We would seek to agree if we can't complete them within the examination timeline. We would seek to agree a timescale with National Highways. What we would be prepared to do as well is to include a commitment somewhere in the DCO, most likely in our outline construction traffic management plan, and we would also seek a mechanism to agree any mitigation. We do not believe that at these junctions and other junctions.

00:18:58:00 - 00:19:33:23

Um, there isn't a solution that we can find. So we're fairly confident that we can find a solution. And that's something we will seek to agree with the relevant authorities. So as I said earlier, Mr. Smith to my left can provide further detail on these matters if you would like. If not, I can hand over to Miss Thirlwell who is going to cover um matters not agreed with high authorities. So I will take your lead panel on whether you like more detail on the modelling now or.

00:19:33:28 - 00:19:52:11

No, I'm happy. I'm happy with that statement at the moment. I'm obviously going to allow the highway authorities to come back in their own right. So rather than me trying to answer for them from what they've said in air, sorry, local impact reports and statement of common grounds, I'll let them respond in their own right, because I think it applies to more than just the national highways as well. So yeah, so happy to carry on. Thank you.

00:19:52:26 - 00:19:58:27

Thank you. So I will hand over to Miss Thirlwell who will cover matters not agreed with highway authorities.

00:20:00:27 - 00:20:02:26

Samantha Thirlwell for the applicant.

00:20:03:04 - 00:20:09:05

Um, I like my colleague. Mr. James has identified that we had our meetings with the local authorities.

00:20:09:07 - 00:20:13:16

And can you just get the microphone a little bit closer to you or the other way around, whichever.

00:20:14:26 - 00:20:15:22

Is that better?

00:20:15:24 - 00:20:17:17

Slightly. You might need to clean.

00:20:17:19 - 00:20:18:04

Okay.

00:20:18:06 - 00:20:19:04

Better I think so.

00:20:19:06 - 00:20:19:23

Let's do that.

00:20:21:16 - 00:20:55:01

Sorry. I'll repeat what I said. Samantha Thirlwell for the applicant. We've had a range of meetings with the local authorities and National Highways to understand their agreements on mitigation and the modelling undertaken. Um, we have um, had information received from National Highways as well with technical details, and we understand that there are um consultants appointed for the local authorities who are reviewing the modelling, and we are yet to receive those responses in terms of some of those junctions.

00:20:55:03 - 00:21:32:26

But we will be providing having a meeting with them. As my colleague Mr. James said, we will be having further meetings with them to run through those modelling, um, items that they have identified. Um, in terms of outstanding mitigation, as my colleague said, we are going to submit an addendum to 7.11 Transport Assessment Application 33 at deadline five and this will provide the updates of the modelling, but we are sharing that modelling with the local authorities prior to that time, so that we can get a good understanding and work together to resolve any issues that they still may have.

00:21:34:11 - 00:22:13:29

Thank you very much. Um, so rather than me asking any questions just at the moment, um, I will turn to the to the relevant highway authorities. Um, and I'll, I'll start with National highways and then I'll probably come north to south just so that just for convenience. Um, so I'm going to ask the highway authorities to just respond to what they've heard, but also to give me an indication of whether they feel that they are getting closer to resolution. So, um, you know, I appreciate there may be some still outstanding matters now. Um, but, um, as I said, with with three months ago and quite a lot of touring and, you know, backwards and forwards in terms of assessments, these assessments don't take two minutes to do.

00:22:14:01 - 00:22:29:18

Um, I'm conscious that, um, time is ticking away. So I do want to understand from the highway authorities where they where they are in terms of their feeling about about resolution. So. And just for time, just as brief as we can to cover the matters. Thank you very much. Mrs. Fowler.

00:22:30:27 - 00:22:42:23

Mrs.. Vicki Fowler, on behalf of National highways. So I will call on Mrs. Jeremy Bloom, if I may, to deal with the modeling questions of Mr. Bloom's there.

00:22:42:25 - 00:23:23:04

Thank you. Thank you, Jeremy Bloom, on behalf of National Highways. So I think I would like to acknowledge, um, you know, the positive messages that Mr. James has, uh, has just articulated. And I think, you know, we also, um, are appreciative of the efforts that the applicant and the applicant's team have gone to in providing national highways with additional information that we have requested. Um, some of that has been sent to us very recently, It is under review and I think there are some further, um, matters that still need to be dealt with and information required.

00:23:23:07 - 00:23:55:27

Uh, but um, hopefully that that should be forthcoming shortly. Um, in terms of the junction modeling. Um, what I would say is that, um, of the additional locations that, um, National Highways raised with the applicant, um, we're now, um, content that, um, that the four of the five do not need to be modeled. And we've taken a pragmatic approach to that. Um, regarding the A12 junction 25, that is a sensitive location that does need to be modeled.

00:23:56:00 - 00:24:26:23

Um, and we did um, we did raise an issue about the type of modeling that should be provided there. But we're now having reviewed the matter. We're content with the applicant's proposal to, to, uh, deploy a local junction model. So we're satisfied with that. Um, the one area that that I think we are in disagreement about, and Mr. James did mention it is, um, where we believe that micro simulation modeling visit modeling is required.

00:24:26:25 - 00:24:58:18

So this is particularly at Gullies Corner on the A120 near Braintree where the network there, there are um, 2 or 3 junctions that are in close proximity with one another and uh, queuing at one junction can, can feed back to another one. And we don't believe local junction modeling, um, will sufficiently provide, uh, provide a sufficient understanding of the impacts and therefore the mitigation needed at that location.

00:24:58:20 - 00:25:32:12

And in addition, at the junction to the north of Gullies Corner, which um, interacts with, it hasn't been modeled. And from the information we've received, there are Significant numbers of of increased vehicles predicted associated with the development, and well above the threshold where National Highways requests modelling to be undertaken. So we think that needs to be addressed. In terms of timescale, we recognise that micro simulation modelling, um, can take some time.

00:25:32:24 - 00:26:02:24

Uh, I do have, um, a proposal that I can discuss with the applicant next week. Um, based on a model that National Highways has been developing with its own consultants. And I understand there is a baseline, uh, model that National Highways has agreed for that location. And it may be possible to come to an arrangement with the applicant to progress that further. And the modelling would probably take a matter of weeks and not months.

00:26:02:26 - 00:26:38:25

So I think that that's something that I think we, we do need to discuss and is a potential option. Um, in terms of, um, more so moving away from the juncture modeling, um, we do have still some concerns about the, uh, the essentially the demand forecasts and the methodology that underpins that around the trip generation, um, and trip distribution and assignment. Um, some of that requires a bit more clarification from the applicant, some of it further information.

00:26:39:01 - 00:27:13:11

Um, I think we can get to, um, a clear position relatively quickly on that, but as of now, we're not in a position not sure how is not in a position to, uh, to be able to confirm, uh, the levels of impact at, um, the different junctions and therefore whether, uh, the mitigation proposed is adequate or whether additional sensitive locations will require some mitigation so that we believe that does need to be resolved.

00:27:13:17 - 00:27:14:19

Thank you very much.

00:27:14:27 - 00:27:15:21

Thank you.

00:27:15:24 - 00:27:22:13

Thank you very much. Um, I'm going to ask, therefore to go to Norfolk Council.

00:27:27:11 - 00:27:59:01

For Norfolk County Council. So nothing specific to say on modeling injunctions. We had one comment about, um, our more up to date traffic and collision traffic collision data. Um, so we have received some of that updated assessment from the applicant. I think there's some 2025 data that perhaps isn't released yet. So we're still waiting for that. But as things stand, we consider that these matters can be resolved and we'll seek to resolve them through the statement of common ground at the next deadline.

00:27:59:12 - 00:28:07:10

Thank you very much. I was going to ask about that traffic data because I know it's something that you'd asked for. So thank you for covering that. That's very helpful. Okay, I'll move over to supper, please.

00:28:09:05 - 00:28:43:09

Thank you. Sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. In terms of modeling, we've received some recent information on junction modeling from the applicant, which we're still in the process of reviewing. We hope to respond to that as soon as we can. This isn't, as it were, an excuse. But can I just remind you of a point that I think we mentioned earlier in the week? Obviously, the Suffolk team has been heavily committed to the Sealink examination, which, you know, has its imminent closure next week.

00:28:43:11 - 00:29:17:22

And to an extent, there's only so many personnel within the county council that can deal with these matters. I'm afraid some of the priorities had to go to that project simply because of its more immediate deadlines, but say that will soon be, as it were, off the books, and we will then be more able to engage, I think hopefully more fully with the applicant on some of those outstanding highway matters. I'll just briefly ask Mr. Mary whether there's anything specific that is worth bringing to your attention, or whether it's merely a matter of dialogue is progressing.

00:29:20:03 - 00:29:37:10

Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council Just an update on where we are in terms of reviewing the modelling. We've employed M-group or our term maintenance contractor to look at that, and the current estimate is the mid to the end of May will be when we start getting results back. But in the meantime we'll carry on our dialogue with the applicant.

00:29:39:06 - 00:29:57:17

Thank you very much. Yes, I think we do understand that and appreciate the pressures there. And hopefully that that information that comes back will be of great use and hopefully resolution of any concerns will happen swiftly after that. Thank you very much. Okay. I'll turn to Essex, please. County council.

00:29:59:24 - 00:30:30:25

Thank you sir. Essex County Council. Um, just in terms of an update on these matters, we obviously responded to, um, uh, a question. The the first set of written questions, I think it was TT 1.38 with a list of matters that were still outstanding. Um, but I think I'll need to pass over to Fay Murray to, to sort of update you on, on where things have got since then because obviously there's constant discussion taking place. So if I can pass over to Fay, I think she's in the room with you.

00:30:31:13 - 00:30:32:06

Thank you.

00:30:34:08 - 00:30:35:00

Hello.

00:30:35:09 - 00:30:37:21

Fay Murray from Essex County Council.

00:30:37:25 - 00:30:39:03

Um, so.

00:30:39:12 - 00:30:40:00

Yes.

00:30:40:02 - 00:30:40:27

We're continuing to.

00:30:40:29 - 00:31:12:18

Discuss with National Grid. They've provided a technical note recently. I think it was last week, um, on the modelling, which we need to review, which I anticipate will be, um, during May, um, perhaps 2 to 4 weeks if we said that. um, I obviously haven't looked at it yet, so I don't know how much information is there, but it looks quite short, so it should be not too much time. Um, the main points really are we haven't agreed mitigation.

00:31:12:27 - 00:31:45:29

Um, my sense on that is that it's a bit slow going, but I'm hopeful that, um, when we look at the technical note, it can be a bit more focused on the mitigation. Um, one of our concerns is that we want to make sure that the assumptions in the ES and the Ta are adhered to, um, because that's the what's been assessed. Um, so we want to make sure that the mitigation, um, deals, deals with that.

00:31:46:01 - 00:31:55:06

Yeah. We're going to be covering that this morning as well. So we will be looking into that. So I appreciate those comments. Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. And lastly Farooq.

00:31:58:27 - 00:32:31:11

Thank you. Neil representing Thurrock. Um, there's there's been, um, a couple of concerns and, uh, um, that sort of dictated our discussions with, uh, the appellant, uh, on the matters. Thurrock being, uh, a smaller area highway authority. Obviously we're, we're, we're concerned that whatever impacts they are certainly in terms of congestion and safety are adequately addressed. And it's as much to do with the impact on the overall network.

00:32:31:24 - 00:33:09:08

Um, we've been in discussion with, um, the, the appellant to, uh, obtain further what their, their raw traffic data. So we understand the flows on, on the sort of key corridors, uh, and uh, and the junctions which they've assessed, uh, it. And, uh, we're still looking for further Information. A few more assurances that what they have been appraising is, is fair and reasonable. So I'm hopeful that outstanding pieces of traffic data will be coming through in the next couple of weeks or so.

00:33:09:11 - 00:33:49:06

And and that leads on to the modeling. I was interested to hear the National highways comment about their junction impacts, and noted that the M25 junction 30 wasn't particularly raised. Um, we've noted

it as being, uh, overcapacity marginally over capacity within their assessment scenarios. And, uh, we may be looking to, to ask for what the mitigation signals, uh, optimization, as the case may be for that junction to help assist in such a way.

00:33:49:14 - 00:34:26:08

Maybe it's, uh, perhaps it's a conversation I should have with the National Highways representative in that regard. But certainly the other junction, which is of a significant concern is the Asda roundabout junction, which the way it's been modeled so far is predicting, uh, sort of future heavy congestion, which, um, the, uh, the works would only add to, um, and while we're not quite certain as to how it could be mitigated, we want to be get better assurance for the actual impacts on that roundabout.

00:34:28:18 - 00:34:29:15

Thank you very much.

00:34:30:18 - 00:34:31:05

Thank you.

00:34:31:18 - 00:35:08:25

Thank you. Um, I'm not proposing that we, um, we try and resolve each individual issue that's been raised, um, here, but is there anything the applicant would like to respond to? Um, in particular. And the one thing I didn't pick up with Norfolk that I just, I, I didn't know exactly where to cover it. One of the big issues about Norfolk was the Thetford, this split of traffic issue. I'm happy to pick that up now because I don't know whether that's really related to modelling or outstanding information, but um, for want of a better place to cover that off, I would be interested to know if there's an update on that, because that was a very specific thing that was coming out.

00:35:08:27 - 00:35:13:14

But apart from apart from that. Is there anything that the applicant would like to respond to?

00:35:13:22 - 00:35:46:13

Russell Harris KC. Um, can I deal with the generality? Um, we are very grateful to National Highways for taking the robust approach that they have and a realistic approach in relation to A12 junction 25. Um, we reserve our position on micro simulation, but would be very keen to see and to discuss the information which was spoken to, um, to see whether that changes our position on proportionality. For example, um, in terms of demand forecast, um, yes.

00:35:46:15 - 00:36:19:00

We are engaging with um, National Highways in that and will continue to do so. Confirmation that there may be a resolution that's weeks rather than months away is very helpful. Um, in terms of the other local authorities, in particular, those that are seeking further information from us that they haven't already sought. Um, could we ask through you, if that's at all possible, that that be provided by deadline for because we share your concerns about, uh, time moving on. But, um, it's just a request from us.

00:36:19:05 - 00:36:20:08

Uh, please.

00:36:20:10 - 00:36:34:29

I was going to cover. I was going to come to, um, deadlines and swapping at later points. So, um. Um, it is on my notes to, to cover. So, um, but it's a good head's up to get the responses. Thinking from from the from the the highway authorities.

00:36:35:01 - 00:36:43:11

Thank you. We we we do have a team ready to speak to this. And I agree that this would now be an appropriate time for that to happen. So I'll pass you back to.

00:36:43:13 - 00:36:46:01

Yes. Only. Only briefly please. Yes.

00:36:47:17 - 00:36:49:07

Kirsten Simpson for the applicant.

00:36:49:09 - 00:36:50:10

I'll ask my colleague.

00:36:50:12 - 00:36:51:06

Miss Caldwell.

00:36:51:08 - 00:36:52:28

To provide an update on this.

00:36:54:16 - 00:37:34:18

Emily Caldwell, on behalf of the applicant, we provided a comprehensive response to this in the written questions. We have noted Norfolk's response to the deadline. Three responses where leaves are now, um, able their happy leaves to go through this. And we welcome that. And the key issue with restricting all HGVs through deaths is that there could be the instance where HGV deliveries need to deliver to both Dis and the site south of this, and if they were to do that, they would have to take approximately a two hour diversion to come back up to this and then back down again.

00:37:34:24 - 00:38:13:22

Um, through the mitigation that we've had with Norfolk, um, we have managed the mitigation would reduce 295 HGVs during the peak day. Um, so then our proposal is that 100% of HGVs don't go through deaths during the Am and PM peak hours. Um, with the inter peak defined by Norfolk between 10 and 3. Um, and in that 10 to 3 period, we would route 50% of our construction traffic through deaths. Um, the details of the HGV volumes are in that written question, but it is approximately seven vehicles an hour with the 5050 split.

00:38:13:24 - 00:38:25:20

Thank you very much for that confirmation. I did do appreciate I did read obviously, your responses to the questions. Um, just, uh, Norfolk if you, um, got any comments on that. Um, Mister peach.

00:38:30:04 - 00:39:00:27

Richard Barrett for Norfolk County Council. So, um, yes, that is um, sort of that that's an accurate representation of where we are. I think in terms of Norfolk County Council's position, we still have concerns about that split and about, um, um, movements going through dis, I think, um, we are due to meet again the highways, um, teams. And so we propose that that is discussed in a bit more detail. And perhaps if we can revert in writing at the next deadline, that's probably the best way to take this forward.

00:39:01:00 - 00:39:08:21

Thank you very much. I would like to understand an update to the next deadline. Thank you very much. Um, before I close this item, is there any further comments from anybody?

00:39:10:28 - 00:39:53:18

Thank you very much. I shall move on to the next item on the agenda, which is just regarding monitoring of junction performance and what intervention will look like. So I'm just covering this. It relates closely to modelling, although it could easily be parts of the other agenda items in terms of the the construction traffic management plan or even mitigation. I just want to understand how these junctions that we're concerned about and we're talking about in quite a lot of detail in modelling terms, how they're how they're actually going to be monitored for performance during construction phase and really importantly for me as well, what intervention levels look like and what measures may be considered at certain locations that may have been of concern.

00:39:53:20 - 00:40:22:26

I think it's just highlighted with a response from National Highways, where they're talking about about how robustly monitored the traffic movements and mitigations will be. So just information from the applicant is what they see as the commitments in there for further mitigation, monitoring and really important. You'll probably hear this repeated a number of times from me during the day. What intervention levels look like in reality, rather than just saying we will monitor.

00:40:24:25 - 00:40:29:28

Kirsten Simpson for the applicant, we responded to this question.

00:40:30:00 - 00:40:30:15

In.

00:40:30:17 - 00:40:31:19

TT 1.36.

00:40:31:21 - 00:40:32:06

Where we.

00:40:32:08 - 00:40:33:10

Have committed to.

00:40:33:12 - 00:40:33:27

A monitoring.

00:40:33:29 - 00:40:43:29

Framework to be developed and the inclusion of the final CMP. That commitment will be included in an update to our outline TMP at deadline. For.

00:40:44:26 - 00:40:45:29

We will implement a.

00:40:46:18 - 00:41:27:21

Booking management system, which will compare against the numbers assessed in the tabs. This will enable that comparison of the flows within the junction assessments. In addition, we've committed to a proactive three month look ahead on forecast traffic flows in advance. This will allow potential issues to be identified and mitigation considered before those impacts arise. Um. The applicant will update the outline CTP tmp to include a commitment to detail the provision of a framework which will detail potential mitigation measures that will be implemented that we would look to implement in response to those forecast traffic flows.

00:41:27:23 - 00:41:31:17

And again, that will be discussed and agreed with the local highways authorities.

00:41:31:27 - 00:41:53:04

So just to confirm, you've just said that the the next update, the TMP or the Construction Traffic Management Plan will include potential mitigation measures, if required, for the junctions that look like they could be over capacity so that you've got something in your back pocket that you've agreed so that you can, you know, take out if needed.

00:41:53:07 - 00:42:10:07

Kirsten Simpson for the applicant, the outlined TMP will include a commitment to develop a framework that will outline and identify potential mitigation measures, including traffic management measures and such an agreement with the local highways authorities that will then be committed to and the final TMP.

00:42:10:16 - 00:42:26:05

Thank you. And in terms of actually monitoring the junctions, are you in. Are you planning on on actual monitoring of traffic flows at junctions continually. What is the what is the current thinking in terms of what monitoring would actually be?

00:42:32:17 - 00:42:37:15

The booking system that we'll be using will allow the monitoring of the vehicle flows through those junctions.

00:42:37:17 - 00:42:39:21

When you say booking system, what do you mean by the booking system?

00:42:39:26 - 00:42:51:05

Every vehicle that arrives on site will be I am sorry. The booking system will capture every vehicle that arrives on site and leaves from site at the time that they arrive and depart.

00:42:51:07 - 00:43:01:29

That's what I thought you meant. Yeah. So you're not proposing to be having, you know, traffic counters and etcetera at junctions that are potentially going to be over overcapacity.

00:43:02:01 - 00:43:04:21

Okay. And Simpson, for the applicant. Not at this stage.

00:43:06:11 - 00:43:25:10

Sorry. Sorry. Another microphone. Go on. No that's okay. Okay. Thank you very much. Um, I'll just open up to the highway authorities, um, for any responses they may have on that in terms of their understanding of how they feel that the junction should be monitored during construction.

00:43:30:20 - 00:43:34:16

Okay. I do. Yeah. So, Mr. Fowler.

00:43:35:04 - 00:44:09:18

Yes. Mrs.. Vicki Fowler. On behalf of, um, National Highways. Um, so my understanding is that in terms of the processes that are going to be set out in that outline construction traffic management plan, um, they are considered acceptable by National Highways. I will just get Mr. Bloom to confirm that. Um, and I think the main, the main point between us is just in terms of, uh, where national highways are actually consulted. So their particular concern, for example, is naturally with areas that impact the SRN, uh, such as monitoring associated with the new East Anglia connection node substation.

00:44:09:28 - 00:44:18:07

Um, and we would want to agree the controls that are also included within the construction worker travel plan. Uh, I don't know if you've got anything else you'd like to add to that.

00:44:20:01 - 00:44:52:01

Uh, Jeremy Bloom, National highways. No, I think you've you've just just explained the position very clearly. Um, we don't have any further concerns. Um, we simply want to, um, agree the, uh, the detail and when it's provided and ensure that, um, National Highways is properly consulted and, and has the ability to, um, to influence, um, intervention or influence the point at which interventions are required.

00:44:52:25 - 00:44:53:21

Thank you.

00:44:53:28 - 00:44:59:19

Thank you very much. Um. Just final. Yes, Mr. Bedford.

00:45:00:02 - 00:45:46:21

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So we weren't seeking that. There should be, as it were, real time monitoring of junction performance. But what we see the the way forward is to ensure that the TMP does include things like caps on particularly HGV numbers, so that there is, as it were, a regulation of what the applicant is generating. Uh, and obviously we we've taken the view that if the applicant's assessment in either the transport assessment or the environmental statement is

robust, there shouldn't be a problem for the applicant in then committing to keep the traffic levels to those that have been assessed, which is, I say, what we want to see controlled.

00:45:46:23 - 00:46:25:12

We are very conscious, as indeed is the applicant, that the applicant is under a certain amount of time pressure to deliver the project. And whilst we can understand that, we can also see one consequence of that could well be to try to compress activity, which could mean that you come up against the ceilings that have been assumed in the transport assessment. Yes. And that's why it's very important to ensure that there is those adequate controls in there, so that we don't end up with the situation that the environmental assessment assessed one state of affairs, but the reality turns out to be very different.

00:46:25:14 - 00:46:35:17

It is a matter we're going to be covering later. So I appreciate that. Thank you very much. Okay. Um, I'll come back to the applicant for any further. Any final right of reply, but, um, yeah.

00:46:36:12 - 00:47:11:01

Anthony James for the applicant. Thank you. Uh, just just on the point of, um, mitigation, we, um, we have included a commitment in the latest version of the outline construction traffic management plan to join a and participate in a developer's forum that Essex County Council would set up. We can commit to a similar forum if other local authorities would also welcome that mechanism. Um, and we also that can be captured in in the code construct code of construction practice commitments.

00:47:11:03 - 00:47:44:17

It was going to be a question I was going to ask anyway about, because I saw that you're committed to that for Essex, but it didn't know it was wider. So if it's an offer that you can put out to the the other highway authorities and maybe even a forum across the old highway authorities might be useful. Um, because that's something. Unless you tell me otherwise. That's something I haven't necessarily seen. Um. Uh, so that there may be potential for joined up. Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you for that. That's, um, covered off another one of my points, which is excellent. Um, so, um, lastly, in this, this batch, we just I just want to cover, um, walking, cycling and horse riding assessments.

00:47:44:20 - 00:48:11:08

Uh, and just I'd just like to applicant to explain where these are being undertaken and what they've included. And please reference the design manual for roads and bridges as appropriate. Um, I have asked the highway authorities in questions where they consider assessments are still needed, and we've had some comments. So you're happy to. I'm happy for you to respond to those. I just wanted to make sure that I understood, um, you know, the principles of where these had been undertaken.

00:48:12:03 - 00:48:43:28

Anthony James for the applicant. Um, our interpretation of this agenda item was the design manual for road, which is GT 142, uh, walking, cycling and horse riding assessments. I will hand over to Miss Thirlwell to talk to this point. I also want to highlight that we have carried out an assessment of the significance of effects on walkers, cyclists and horse riders as part of the environmental statement. Chapter 16 and the Transport Assessment. I will now hand over to Miss Thelwell.

00:48:46:24 - 00:49:18:13

The farewell for the applicant. We have undertaken walking, cycling, horse riding, assessment and review for the DMR. DG 142 um at two locations that were requested by National Highways that are connecting to the strategic road network. These are the A12, B 1070 Hadley Road in Holton, Saint Mary Junction and also the A120 Bentley Road junction in Essex. Um this has these reports have been prepared.

00:49:18:15 - 00:49:50:03

An assessment report identifies opportunities to improve the proposed scheme. In this case it is the proposed scheme. It's going to be in place for more than six months hence. National highways have asked for an assessment to be undertaken on this. These junctions both junctions are being undertaken because they do have walking, cycling, horse riding facilities. And we've found that the, um, mitigations that have been put in place in terms of the provision for walking, cycling, horse riding at those locations are sufficient.

00:49:50:05 - 00:49:55:26

And these reports will be submitted to National Highways for review and for a meeting to be arranged to discuss them.

00:49:55:28 - 00:50:05:06

Okay. Yeah, yeah. So, um, so you're saying that, um, those assessments have been taken, undertaken in two locations on the National Highways and also on the Bentley Road junction?

00:50:05:21 - 00:50:17:19

That's correct. We've also, um, had an exemption note as well for one of the junctions. At the moment, I can't I can't remember which one it is. I just have it on my notes. But I can come back to you to tell you which one that is.

00:50:18:01 - 00:50:33:20

And, um, you would have noted from the questions I asked. So this was a quite a brief, um, a bullet point really, because obviously the higher authorities have responded. Um, have you got any comments now about their request for any further.

00:50:34:29 - 00:50:39:21

Samantha Power for the applicant? I was going to cover that in the section for primary access routes and mitigation.

00:50:39:23 - 00:50:56:21

Okay. That's fine. I'm happy to do that. That's fine. Okay. Um, just, uh, I'll say it was a it was quite a brief question I had. Is there any comments from the highway authorities? First, in terms of walking, cycling, horse riding assessments, in addition to what you've already answered in your questions to me?

00:50:58:11 - 00:51:04:26

No. Okay. Um, and, um, I note that, um, are you

00:51:06:17 - 00:51:12:06

wanted to potentially comment on this? So I'll just give, um, Mr. Zwart an opportunity.

00:51:14:08 - 00:51:47:18

Thank you sir. Chris, your answer for council a you recall, the X-ray indicated that you express its concerns to this H2 traffic and transport rather than land use. And therefore, in that context, we've described that we think that there's a gap in the EIA baseline in relation to horse, uh, traffic on the highway. We think it's soluble and resolvable by DCO terms. Um, but in a nutshell, the environmental statement indicates assessments of public rights of way horse riding.

00:51:47:20 - 00:52:19:05

And that's its focus if you track it through the environmental impact assessment process. But there's essentially a gap in the evidence and the assessment baseline existing of the A through Writtle facility. And we have concerns over the interface of horse traffic with vehicle traffic on the highway of Cow Watering Lane. Um, there's about 90 horses at Eru which are integral to their function. And they cross that lane, uh, during every hour of the weekday and I'm going to hand over please to Mr.

00:52:19:07 - 00:52:30:02

Joseph Hoch, spelled HOUGH of kms transport Planning, who's just going to summarize the situation. So you're appraised of it. Thank you, thank you.

00:52:31:00 - 00:53:02:26

Oh, yes. Joseph, on behalf of are you, um, as a result of the fact that we have a large number of horse crossings in this area, um, and it's becomes obviously particularly sensitive to changes in traffic levels and new road users, um, particularly ones who maybe are less familiar with the area and the presence of the facility. And I think as a result of that, there's a concern that this route, the increase on traffic on this route, particularly as a result of the TTR, the Temporary Traffic Regulation order that would result in a closure of newly green, would increase traffic along here.

00:53:02:28 - 00:53:23:15

And as a result of that, there would be an increase in the potential level of conflict. We think it's pretty resolvable in terms of implementing some form of traffic management. Uh, probably a temporary crossing facility to manage that level of crossing, either through signals or a tier 15. But it is a level it is of concern to the facility.

00:53:24:25 - 00:53:25:28

Thank you very much.

00:53:26:12 - 00:53:27:02

Thanks, sir.

00:53:29:28 - 00:53:35:27

Hey, sir. Oh, thank you very much, both of you. I'll ask the applicant just to respond on that. If that's possible, please.

00:53:37:14 - 00:53:56:04

Can we do that in writing, sir? Um, the the, um, the points made are similar, if not exactly the same as the points that were made at D3. And we've already got a response being drafted. And we will provide a response to what we heard today and to the D3 comments at D4.

00:53:56:06 - 00:54:09:25

Thank you very much. That's, um, very acceptable. Okay. So, um, that's 11.1 done. Um, just checking that there was no one else that wanted to speak on that last point about walking, cycling and horse riding assessments.

00:54:11:20 - 00:54:13:27

So if you'd like to put your microphone on, please.

00:54:14:14 - 00:54:21:20

Chris Whitfield, Parish councillor, Ardley. Um, would just like to, um, to ask whether.

00:54:21:22 - 00:54:22:19

Evaluations have.

00:54:22:21 - 00:54:24:01

Been done in terms of.

00:54:24:08 - 00:54:26:13

Um, roads within villages.

00:54:26:19 - 00:54:27:13

Um, there.

00:54:27:15 - 00:54:30:07

Are indications that virtually.

00:54:30:16 - 00:54:31:18

All of our roads.

00:54:31:20 - 00:54:32:16

In Ardley.

00:54:32:18 - 00:55:04:02

Will be the temporarily closed or, um, managed closed. Um, and obviously, um, we're very, very interested in when that will be. Um, but we can't find any details of how frequently it will be. Um, and potentially there are some properties that would be completely blocked. Um, so there's very little information that we can see that gives us, um, comfort in terms of how this is going to be managed.

00:55:04:04 - 00:55:09:15

Is that in terms of road closures in general, or particularly in terms of walking, cycling and horse riding?

00:55:10:20 - 00:55:15:06

Well, it's walking. Cycling. Horse riding and driving.

00:55:15:08 - 00:55:45:27

Okay. Yeah. So. So in terms of what I'm trying to understand, I'm just they're kind of separate items. And there is an item further on about traffic regulation orders, which is the mechanism for closing roads, which I was going to cover at that point. So if it's okay with you, I just I just accept your question and defer it to a bit later on in the in the conversation. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. In that point, I just wanted to, um, uh, confirm finalizing timings.

00:55:45:29 - 00:56:01:25

As I said, I would do, um, for the outstanding modelling. Um, I your suggestion. Um, uh, miss, Mr. Harris was to have final comments from highway authorities by deadline for. Was that correct?

00:56:02:01 - 00:56:04:00

Yes, it was Russell Harris KC.

00:56:04:02 - 00:56:52:07

Can I just get a nod or a shake of the head from. I've got a big shake of the head from Suffolk County Council, and I think that we've been. We've been given the reason why that might be the case. I mean, I don't believe that deadlines are necessarily the most appropriate place for exchange of information to be. Having a deadline, I think in terms of what we need in terms of deadlines is we need some surety. Well, before the final two deadlines that matters are being drawn to a close. So for me, and this is purely selfish, I'd like to see an update on the statement of Common Grounds in deadline four and deadline five, as we're asking for anyway, um, with an expectation that by deadline six, I'm expecting most things to be sorted in the statement of Common Grounds.

00:56:52:09 - 00:56:52:25

Okay.

00:56:54:27 - 00:57:26:02

Because these matters, as we've said already, as um, representative from Essex said, these matters about modelling resolve in matters about mitigation and matters about mitigation are very important for us to understand. So on the you know, broadly, modeling is modeling the mitigation measures that I need the councils to be convinced are acceptable. And what I need, we need later in the day. So as I say by deadline six, I'm hoping these statements are common ground are very much in the green.

00:57:26:04 - 00:57:30:20

In the meantime, don't wait for deadlines in terms of exchange of information. Does that make sense? Mr. Harris?

00:57:30:29 - 00:57:32:29

Russell. Harris. Casey. Yes.

00:57:33:05 - 00:58:11:00

Perfect. Thank you very much. I'm going to jump on. So as I said, we are going to swap the next two agenda items around. So I'm going to start. We're going to go on to abnormal individual loads, which I've already said I'll be probably mentioning as abnormal loads. Um, firstly, can I just ask the applicant to summarize, um, the abnormal load routing strategy where they are at the moment. I don't need a full background history because time just doesn't permit us to do that. But I would like to understand things like number of deliveries, expected timings and the indicative programme, when deliveries will be required and when they might be needed to start in the programme.

00:58:11:02 - 00:58:24:07

Those sorts of kind of key bits rather than what you've done and I appreciate there's an abnormal load route strategy document, um, but a kind of high level summary of the points and where you are at the moment would be just very helpful. But only a couple of minutes, please.

00:58:24:09 - 00:58:50:19

Thank you. Um, I'm very happy to do that. And I'll pass on to those who will do that. Um, I had a useful discussion with the joint, um, uh, forces advocate beforehand, and we thought it might be helpful, if very briefly, I try and encapsulate, uh, where the applicant has reached in relation to the, uh, uh, response to your questions from the Joint Forces.

00:58:50:21 - 00:59:13:22

I think that'll be very helpful, because the response from the joint Forces was very clear. Yes. You know, it was very clear in terms of where we're not at. Yes. And and I if you've had some positive suggestions that would put my mind at rest, but I was going to be asking the joint forces to to remind us very clearly where they are. But if there's been some positive news that would be, that would be really good to hear.

00:59:13:24 - 00:59:17:27

We take. We think this is the most important thing on the agenda. Frankly.

00:59:18:07 - 00:59:21:04

It is the most important thing on the agenda for me today as well.

00:59:21:10 - 00:59:52:26

Russell Harris KC, we take liaison with the Joint Constabulary extremely seriously for obvious reasons, not least because we understand that their cooperation and close working collaboration is essential to the earliest and I mean literal delivery of the project. Can't get it there without them. We recognize their concerns and we are committed to addressing them as fully as possible at the earliest possible time. And that's what I underline. And on a proactive and in a positive manner.

00:59:53:03 - 01:00:27:19

Um, the joint Forces have got two real legitimate concerns. The first I can summarize as certainty of detailed arrangements, certainty of detailed arrangements, and the second is certainty and adequacy and surety of appropriate funding. So certainty and funding. I'm going to address both of those, I hope, in a very positive way, on certainty of arrangements relating to the routes, the numbers, the precise nature of abnormal loads, the ports at which they come in.

01:00:28:00 - 01:01:02:10

Um, that depends on matters which so simply, reasonably cannot be known at this stage. Clearly National Grid cannot, in the public interest pre-purchase or indeed pre-order equipment for which there is a massive international demand at risk without a DCO in place. If the DCO is granted and contracts are let, it will then be able to procure the relevant equipment, which indeed is yet to be finalised as you know from other documentation, it'll need to go into the international market to do so.

01:01:02:12 - 01:01:36:04

And that equipment will come from China, South Korea, Europe. It'll come on vessels which can come into some ports but not others. Um, and we will do that in a way which is efficient and economically appropriate. Having regard to our schedule nine duties, until such a time as those procurements and their associated manufacturing timetables, including how many can be shipped at once, what particular type of cable is going to be purchased and what drums it sits on, etc.

01:01:36:06 - 01:02:16:22

simply will not be possible meaningfully or accurately. Notwithstanding the fact that we understand the forces need to know as soon as possible the logistical implications of those until that time, a meaningful, detailed schedule of the type that they refer to in their response. Is is simply not a sensible proposition with respect. It's it's a it's an ask to which we can't provide a reasonable answer, that the forces are right, that knowledge of the ports which it's coming in, the actual delivery payloads, etc.,

01:02:16:27 - 01:02:55:12

need to be with them as soon as possible. But I'm afraid they are not wrong, but simply misunderstanding. If they suggested that can be provided now because it can't. Um, that raises the concerns of them having sufficiency of time in which to organise themselves. And we really do appreciate that. Um, what we say in relation to that is on the most likely accelerated path to delivery, and government is pressing us to accelerate to this degree on the most likely accelerated path to delivery.

01:02:55:18 - 01:03:31:00

The first abnormal loads will not be scheduled until quarter three, 2028. They will be cable drums. They will be cable drums to the AoNB, where there are only 1 or 2 routes, and we can start giving that information to the police as soon as possible. If and when a DCO is granted with the statutory timetables and reasonable expectations of post examination procedures, the present anticipated DCO date is early 2017.

01:03:31:08 - 01:04:07:02

And we think, as we've said in some of our representations, I will say in response to what we've received from the police, we think that will allow reasonable post procurement certainty and accuracy as to the number of deliveries, the number of abnormal loads, the nature of the vehicles upon which they sit, which will depend upon the specification of the equipment which is yet to be identified. It will allow routing to be better understood in a proportionate and timely manner.

01:04:07:09 - 01:04:28:12

Prior to that first set of cable drum deliveries in 2028, those detailed matters then can in a meaningful, robust and collaborative way. And I'd say a little bit a bit more about that when we come to funding. Um, b be agreed at that time in an appropriate way with the Joint Constabulary.

01:04:28:21 - 01:04:47:29

Um, sorry, Mr. Harris, I know you're in full flow. Yes, but just to stop you, um, can you just confirm what you said about the, uh, about the timescales? Because I think you said 2017, uh, which I think you did. I know you meant 2027, but I was I was just computing in my head and then missed what you said about which quarter in 2027.

01:04:48:01 - 01:04:49:09

Yeah. I'm terribly sorry.

01:04:50:14 - 01:04:51:29

I should at least 2027.

01:04:52:05 - 01:04:54:01

None of us working on the other timetable?

01:04:54:12 - 01:04:57:12

Absolutely. So which quarter in 2022?

01:04:57:14 - 01:04:58:07

Quarter 320.

01:04:58:09 - 01:05:01:08

Quarter three. Okay. Thank you very much. Sorry. I'll let you get back into your flow.

01:05:01:10 - 01:05:34:21

Yes. And of course, that then isn't the entire timescale that we'll be liaising with the police. It will be happening for reasons I'm going to indicate very shortly, much sooner than that, on a very regular basis. As soon as anything is known about the ports, the equipment, etc., we will liaise with the police so it can be done then and there as opposed to having to wait. Uh, that's what I wanted to say about, um, certainty in a in a nutshell.

01:05:34:23 - 01:06:18:28

We can't give them the certainty they seek now, and if we did, it would be wrong because, um, uh, specifications, factories, uh, timelines in South Korea. We simply don't know them in terms of funding. We accept formally the need for in-principle assurance to the police that their costs of non-core policing duties will be funded, and I formally accept here that that we will be required to fund all reasonable and proportionate costs of the joint constabulary in the delivery of this project.

01:06:19:01 - 01:06:53:26

Insofar as they aren't normal core policing activities, which of course are paid for by the public, the escorting of multiple abnormal loads is identified as an additional activity above and beyond core

policing. In the National Police Chief Council's guidelines on the charging for police services. I don't think it's in the examination yet, but it should be. It was updated to include 2025 costs recently.

01:06:54:14 - 01:07:10:24

Ironically, that document came about as a result of a legal case in 2017 as to what constituted the core police duties. And it is extremely ironic because the name of the case is Ipswich Town Football Club

01:07:12:22 - 01:07:14:17

against the Chief Constable of Suffolk,

01:07:16:16 - 01:08:07:02

and so we accept that that need um, that document recommends good practice and recommends that the forces put in place a formal binding contractual arrangement with the relevant body. That's us requiring their service, and that would be required in this case and will be put in place that binding contract or contract because the contracts could be rolling depending on when the information comes in, would be able to reflect the precise unknown details of the abnormal loads, the port they come into, the size of the equipment, and anything else that needs to be specified for the good services of the forces.

01:08:07:10 - 01:08:40:26

We note the request for a section 106 agreement to be in place in relation to these, and we'll consider that, but we don't think that that's either necessary or appropriate, because for the reasons set out just now, what section 25 of the Police Act says and what the guidelines say, um, we will, at the relevant and appropriate time, have a binding contract with the police, which will mean that the test of necessity is not passed.

01:08:40:28 - 01:08:56:08

Uh, we all know that we're always told not to put stuff into the section 106, which is dealt with under other legislative regimes, and that binding agreement which comes pursuant to the Police Act, will be one such other um, um

01:08:57:24 - 01:09:32:23

regime which is binding on us. Um, we are, however, interested in going further because of the way in which the response is based, and we are interested in discussing with the force exactly how and whether we need to add to our construction management a construction traffic management plan. Further, um, uh, elements, further um, duties on us, if you like.

01:09:33:00 - 01:10:05:27

Uh, and we are thinking, based on what they've said, that the following might usefully be added to the outline construction management plan. First, the in-principle acceptance that the forces will be fully funded for its reasonable and recoverable costs associated with non-core police activities. We can't go further than that because we've got our own statutory duties and our own statutory duties don't allow us to subsidise the police or indeed other local authorities.

01:10:05:29 - 01:10:43:03

It would only be that which was necessary, proportionate, etc. and would come to a mechanism for dealing with that in a moment. Second, a framework for sharing information on a regular basis as the ports of entry are established and the other specifications relevant to the abnormal loads, either weekly or ad hoc, or as part of a liaison group, that sort of, um, process is something that we were discussing with the police very briefly before the hearing started.

01:10:43:05 - 01:11:14:10

Third, a proportionate method for the resolution of disputes, if any, which was something that is mentioned by the police in their response. Um, and finally, any other non abnormal load matters. I've just dealt with abnormal abnormal load matters now, but I am aware that in the written representations of the police, other matters are raised. And that could be a forum for, for those um

01:11:16:03 - 01:11:58:06

so that that's what we suggest in relation to the construction management traffic. There will need, as I've said, to be a formal binding contract with the police to allow them to recover their costs, um, pursuant to the mechanism set out in the Police Act. So we think, having looked at the very clear response, which we've felt it necessary to give really careful consideration to, that there is capable of having a way of ensuring that the details that they seek are provided as soon as practicable possible, and in any event, with enough time to allow.

01:11:58:08 - 01:12:21:10

They are looking for an 18 month lead in um, and we think that can be done. And in terms of the costs, we think that can be dealt with by a section 25 binding agreement in the way that I've just outlined. Uh, there are other things which I mentioned that that's the nutshell response that we put before you and that I've mentioned to Maloney.

01:12:21:15 - 01:12:35:04

And I think that was incredibly useful to to have you summarize that, um, rather than just blindly going through my questions. Um, so, um, I'll ask the joint police forces to, to respond.

01:12:35:06 - 01:12:54:27

Thank you. Thank you sir. Ben Stansfield, on behalf of the Joint Forces. Thank you, Mr. Harris, for taking time before the hearing to go through that with me. And thank you for explaining so clearly the proposals from the applicant, um, and taking each of the joint forces concerns as seriously as you have.

01:12:55:03 - 01:13:00:18

Um, so can you just bring the microphone? I think we've got a constant question to to bring a microphone closer. Thank you.

01:13:00:20 - 01:13:37:14

Okay. Um, so no, thank thank you to Mr. Harris and the applicant team for, for such a considerate response, which addresses, um, the vast majority, if not all, of our concerns very satisfactorily. What I would like to do is just to emphasize for your benefit, the 18 month stand up period, which Mr. Harris referred to, which is essentially for the joint forces to recruit, train, Vet applicants and procure the

necessary equipment. You will appreciate the very specialist nature of the role and the limited pool of appropriate candidates.

01:13:37:16 - 01:14:17:02

To do that, it is not something that the either joint force or any constabulary in the country can quickly snap their fingers in and get appropriate stuff. So. So the 18 months really is important to the forces and that has a cost. Um, so, so the, the, the, the 18 month period is important for us. And ensuring the appropriate funding for that is really critical to as well as the ongoing cost. Um, Mr. Harris kindly acknowledged certain escorts can only be done by the police, and we're very happy to provide a little bit of sort of legal background as to sort of some of those legislative powers that Mr.

01:14:17:04 - 01:14:47:08

Harris referred to. Um, and then just to sort of again, reiterate the point that the, um, although we talk about the joint forces, you know, they have interests that are aligned, clearly they do very similar work, but they have Nuanced, they have different needs and so forth. So we will need to work very closely with the applicant to understand all the data points that Mr. Harris refers to, because a solution for Essex would not be the same solution necessarily for Suffolk, depending on ports of origin.

01:14:47:15 - 01:15:38:15

Um, and in terms of the, the, the non-core duties, again that's recognised both constabulary are under significant strain through tips. There are currently a good 7 or 8 inserts in Suffolk, a good sort of 4 to 6 or so in Essex as well. So there is really no capacity at the moment to do this as business as usual. If it were business as usual, we'd be looking at sort of 1 or 2 escorts a week. It would take many, many years to be able to support the applicant through um, er and yes, as to the appropriate mechanism, um, certainly Suffolk Constabulary has achieved funding through a section 106 agreement in relation to Sizewell C, but we also have achieved we've entered into funding agreements on other steps outside the 106 process.

01:15:38:17 - 01:16:21:15

So we are quite comfortable. We're very sure there is an appropriate legal mechanism to to to do that. We would like to engage earlier with the applicant. Sorry, we would like to engage as soon as possible with the applicant's legal team, in particular, to talk about the right mechanisms for these, whether their requirements, what goes into construction manager plan, if there needs to be restrictions in the 106. But just to make sure that that everyone is, is, is, is fully aware of what's necessary in relation to the DCO being granted with a fair wind in quarter 127 and the earliest Ale being quarter three 2028, that is 18 months, so there is no fat in that timetable.

01:16:21:17 - 01:16:51:08

So again, if we could encourage the applicant to, um, to take Mr. Harris's word seriously in terms of that early engagement. We would be very happy to have discussions around early stand up prior to DCO being confirmed as well. So, um, yeah, I think that captures all the points. We I don't think we have a great deal more to say. I do have operational officers with great experience of AI movement for for size. We'll see if that's useful.

01:16:51:15 - 01:17:32:22

And it's a very kind offer, but I'm just, you know, for for me, I'm, I'm just trying to make sure that the discussion that we've just had is something that is far more positive than I feared would be when I, you know, when I sat down here at 10:00 this morning and taken account of the responses that you've given, um, into the examination. Um, so I think I'm going to probably leave it there. In terms of your discussions, I think, Mr. Harris, I would be very grateful for an updated statement of common ground by deadline for with the joint forces, even if it's even if it's a mild a minor progression.

01:17:32:24 - 01:17:49:27

I know we only had it at deadline three, but I think based on what you've said today, rather, you know, obviously you'll put some of those comments, those comments in your written representations of the oral hearing, but I think an updated statement of common ground would be hugely beneficial by deadline for so we can understand where we are going forward into the examination.

01:17:51:13 - 01:17:55:26

Um, but yes, I think sorry, I'll come back. Did you just before Mr. Harris comes in, do we.

01:17:56:00 - 01:18:12:06

Need to know if I could speak just simply to request that we could we could leave early. We appreciate examination etiquette would be that we would wait for a tea break. But I've got officers who are interested in today's proceedings, but they do have, um, important activities that they would like.

01:18:12:18 - 01:18:26:14

This was the entire reason I haven't quite finished that. The only thing I want to talk about is with the highway authorities about assessments of structures, etc. so if you wanted to stay for that, you're more than welcome. But actually, if you need to get back, obviously, please feel free to.

01:18:26:16 - 01:18:28:03

To discuss the intended to you.

01:18:28:05 - 01:18:33:29

Not at all. We were fully expecting it. That's not a problem at all. Okay, Mr. Harris.

01:18:36:09 - 01:18:46:07

I was then going to. Going to deal. Russell. Harris. Casey I was then going to deal with the the balance of your question, which I sort of rather rudely hijack to bring you up to date with that.

01:18:46:11 - 01:18:49:26

You're very welcome to leave at any point you feel that you want to. You won't be disturbing us.

01:18:50:19 - 01:18:51:19

So I was going to.

01:18:52:12 - 01:18:56:26

Ask Mr. Harris, do you think that we just you want to be a response from.

01:18:56:28 - 01:18:59:29

Well, maybe just just on one point. Um, sorry.

01:19:00:01 - 01:19:01:23

Thank you very much for the dancing. It's great.

01:19:03:07 - 01:19:34:06

After you brought the, um, the stand up costs, uh, I listened and heard and understood what was said. We'd need to be careful. And this is why some sort of mechanism is going to be necessary. We need to be satisfied that, um, they are justified Fide and necessary to our scheme. So for example, our regulator would not look kindly on us funding a new cadre for the next 20 years of officers in both in both forces.

01:19:34:08 - 01:19:46:21

So just just that little word of caution in mind that we can only do that which is necessary and proportionate for the purposes of the CIP. Thank you. Thank you.

01:19:46:23 - 01:19:48:21

Thank you. Yeah.

01:19:48:27 - 01:20:16:07

I can just come back on that point. Ben Stanfield for the Joint forces. Yes. There will be a dedicated team for the project. As I explained very briefly to Mr. Harris earlier. First and foremost, they will be police officers. If when they are escorting an abnormal load, there is an incident which they need to attend to, which is outside of the project. They will deal with that, but they will get back to supporting, you know, to their escort function at the earliest opportunity. So it will be a dedicated resource. Yes. Thank you. Okay. Thank you sir.

01:20:16:24 - 01:20:20:09

Mr. Harris, are you okay for the Joint Forces. People say.

01:20:20:17 - 01:20:22:28

Yes, we'll all be safer with them out of the room.

01:20:23:12 - 01:20:24:05

Exactly, I think.

01:20:26:09 - 01:20:30:19

I gather there's a big game here tomorrow, so maybe there's some additional work happening tomorrow as well.

01:20:31:25 - 01:20:35:21

And I'm now going to ask my team to answer your original question.

01:20:35:23 - 01:21:05:21

No. And that's fine. And to be totally honest, I'm happy for you to truncate your response because because it was ultimately to get to the point that we were talking about there. So to be honest, I don't need any further information at the moment just to save time. The only thing I will ask is, is about structural assessments, etc. on those routes. So. So forget the flannel that I was asking for at the beginning. It was let's just concentrate on where we are with with those. I know the highway authorities were picking them up in some of their comments. Thank you.

01:21:08:05 - 01:21:45:12

William Salter for the applicant. So I do give a quick summary of where we are in terms of our structural assessment. but this is also supported by the responses that we've provided to TT 1.15 and 1.16. Um, so uh, structures within uh Thurrock, Norfolk, Suffolk and Network Rail. Um, we are broadly almost complete with all of the structural assessments, and we have a number of IPS which have been, uh, agreed.

01:21:45:23 - 01:22:16:20

Um, the area where we are outstanding and missing information is with National Highways and Essex. Um, at the moment we are aware of three structural assessments that are required within Essex which have been completed. Um, however, there are still 23 structures which we are awaiting confirmation of suitability of whether a structural assessment is required. Um, and out of those 23, nine of which were waiting on records.

01:22:17:02 - 01:22:46:14

Um, with National highways that we're waiting on about 82, but 82 stretches. However, um, from discussions with them, their preference was rather than do, uh, structural assessments ahead of the er style process, it was just to put put in straight on for hours down. They could then pull the records out that we need to undertake those assessments. Um, but that process would only be done by the haulage contractor once they are on board.

01:22:46:19 - 01:23:00:16

Okay. Thank you very much. I didn't want to drag this out too long, but if there's any highway authorities that do have. And I know that, um, we did have some responses in the written questions, so you don't need to repeat those. Um, Suffolk.

01:23:02:21 - 01:23:33:01

Good morning, Steve Mary from Suffolk County Council. There's a couple of points I just wanted to make. Firstly, we still have some apps to do. I'd also like to thank the applicant is actually they've been one of the most proactive applicants we've had dealing with this, this issue abnormal loads with no tips. Because that also raises a point is that, again, it's possibly not for the examination panel, but I feel I have to make it on the authority's behalf. Is each sip washes his own face. It looks his own abnormal loads.

01:23:33:05 - 01:24:04:12

We are finding as an authority that is very difficult to manage all of these, and there is a lack of coordination overall for securing resilient routes. Again, we are only looking at the construction phase for this project, and while we are repeatedly told in operational terms there are no movements, we

have certain substations in Suffolk I would use as an example where we do not have a resilient transport access to it, let alone abnormal load access to it.

01:24:04:14 - 01:24:35:13

So that's the main point I was going to make in terms of where we are. The applicant has given us a lot of information. We're in the process of trying to set up a contract with our in-house consultants to review those assessments. And yes, we are looking forward to move forward. But I was also just to mention an incidental impact as well, which wasn't actually brought up by the forces, but both ourselves and the police have a backroom staff that have to book these, these routes in.

01:24:35:15 - 01:24:58:09

And we are increasingly having a problem where if a route is not available, as is happening on the east coast on the A12, and what we have happens is the hauliers then start searching for other routes. So they send in repeated notifications for other routes, and that is placing a burden on both our resources and the police backroom staff. So again, just points I feel I have to make.

01:24:58:11 - 01:25:30:29

Thank you very much. Do you have any other comments from highway authorities before? Okay. Nothing I miss Harris. Any final comments? I did have a question about cumulative impacts and how it was being managed. So that was that was going to be my next question. Um, but I'm not going to in the interest of time, I'm going to probably just ask you to just respond on that point about how you are actively working with other insights to make sure that what was just mentioned, there is something that we don't see or is allowed for in the DCO in some way.

01:25:31:01 - 01:26:09:15

So if you could just give a response to that, that would be great. Um, I'm conscious it's 11:25. I'm going to try and just squeeze in the, um, the agenda item about cumulative impacts just before we have a break. And I'm hoping to do this in five minutes, partly because I think I've got a lot of the responses anyway, but I just wanted to give the opportunity for airing it, um, today. Um, so I did ask the authorities where they considered that they had some concerns still to be addressed with cumulative impacts, and actually there was less issues emanating from that than I may have been expected, which was very pleasant.

01:26:09:23 - 01:26:28:05

But just in the light of the number of projects, I just wanted to understand from the applicant. Um, if there's any if you consider there's any residual comments, uh, or issues outstanding with highway authorities about cumulative impact, particularly within CIPs. Um,

01:26:29:28 - 01:26:33:17

before, you know, just that you're still looking at.

01:26:40:08 - 01:27:15:26

Uh, Anthony James for the applicant. No, there's no residual matters. Um, from our perspective. Um, just one thing I wanted to you did ask a question about working with other CIPs. So we have included a commitment in the latest version of our outline construction traffic management plan to work with other CIPs to coordinate movements. And we have also committed to joining the Developers Forum

in Essex. And as we said earlier, we'd be happy to make a similar commitment for other local authorities. Typically, these would meet once a month, but they could meet more regularly when, as and when needed.

01:27:16:03 - 01:27:16:21

Thank you.

01:27:16:23 - 01:27:17:24

Thank you very much.

01:27:19:13 - 01:27:20:01

Um.

01:27:22:08 - 01:27:39:20

Yes, I did know that, um, there was going to be some another question. I was just going to close out with the highway authorities first, and then I shall come back to you. Um, so any any further comments from local highway authority or the highway authorities about cumulative impact that they haven't already raised in response to my questions?

01:27:42:24 - 01:27:46:19

So, Mr. Fowler, were you was it an accidental sudden pop up?

01:27:48:04 - 01:28:06:17

Mrs.. Vicki Fowler, on behalf of National Highways. Um, so I just have a query in terms of I think National Highways had requested and were keen to see the turning movements, um, associated with each of the SRN junctions associated with each of the committee developments. I don't know whether that's been resolved, Mr. Bloom.

01:28:07:15 - 01:28:18:24

I believe they were sent through to us yesterday. So we'll we'll review those as soon as we can. But other than that, yeah, we don't have any concerns about cumulative impacts.

01:28:19:12 - 01:28:26:26

Thank you. Excellent news. Thank you very much. Hopefully I'll see some greens in the statement of common ground going forward. Thank you very much. Yes, sir. Um.

01:28:28:05 - 01:28:48:14

Christopher Field, oddly, in Little Bromley. Um, clearly we have a serious issue in both of the parishes and at least one of the neighboring parishes because of the, um, attraction of the other substations for the wind farms, North Falls and five.

01:28:48:16 - 01:28:49:03

Estuaries.

01:28:49:05 - 01:28:53:05

And also the proposed.

01:28:53:07 - 01:28:53:22

Uh.

01:28:53:26 - 01:29:08:13

Interconnector token, um, which will obviously attract a huge amount of traffic and so on. And we have no real understanding of how that will impact in relation to this project as well.

01:29:11:12 - 01:29:45:23

I do understand that there's a there's a practical or modelling aspect where the applicant has taken account of the the other traffic in their modelling for their, their um, for their needs. But I think I understand where your what your question is, which is what is this actually going to look like. You know it's okay for National grid in this city in this situation sitting here to talk about your own. But but and it's obviously a a comment to to others as well as National Grid.

01:29:45:28 - 01:30:18:15

Um, so I do understand the question I will ask the National Grid to give me some view, and it may be that the commitment they've just made of in updating the the construction traffic management plan, which ensures that they talk to others. May be that there's a growing potential for them. I know that North Hills and five estuaries do have a joint. A joint working group, and it would be interesting to know how National Grid, in terms of this project, are looking at being part of that community.

01:30:24:04 - 01:30:54:09

Anthony James, on behalf of the applicant, I will hand over to Miss Thirlwell to address your points. One thing I wanted to propose is that the the developers forum that we mentioned, would there be a potential to include relevant parish councils on that, to give them an opportunity to hear proposals and input? That's just a thought from us perhaps to take away. Thank you. So I'll hand over to Miss Thirlwell.

01:30:55:04 - 01:30:55:28

Thank you.

01:30:57:03 - 01:31:28:28

Samantha Thirlwell for the applicant. Um, this kind of touches on the committed development section for the next item, but we have obviously undertaken a review of all the planning applications, um, which would overlap with our project in terms of using our primary access routes and our same as the time frame as the project works. Um, these are only for ones which we actually have the information or a status in the planning application that we could actually we reference to work on. We don't have any traffic information presently.

01:31:29:00 - 01:32:05:01

So the assessments that we've undertaken do not include that project at this stage. But we are aware of the impact that that could have a letter at a later stage. Um, in terms of the effects we've monitored the effects in, um, the s appendix 16.4 Traffic and Transport Construction effects in application 2.75. And that looks at the combined flows of our project and other developments, and within the identifies the level of mitigation in terms of what was required if there was an impact.

01:32:05:08 - 01:32:35:12

So we do look at the impact on driver delay, severance immunity, fear, intimidation, road safety for all of those aspects. So as my colleague Mr. James is identified, we will be working with the North Poles and five estuaries and group and working with those other agencies as well. And we also will be looking at the Essex Development Forum so we can have a discussion within them. If anything comes to light when we are looking at that cumulative traffic.

01:32:35:18 - 01:33:10:06

Yes. I mean, I'm reading between the lines in terms of the question because I think I understand the question. It's okay because you obviously have to, for modelling purposes, take your worst case scenario and model that worst case scenario. I think that the parish council is saying that's fine, but what's it going to look like in terms of, you know, weekly traffic, you know, is there suddenly going to be this a peak of everyone coming up there in your worst case scenario, or is actually going to be you're going to be there for one day, you know, three vehicles a day, and somebody else is going to be for ten vehicles a day. And when you put them together, what's it going to look like? So I think I and I know you can't answer that now and I but I understand the point.

01:33:10:08 - 01:33:44:18

But I think the comment you made about, you know, working together in a forum, I've seen this before where those forums actually really bring parish councils and, and local communities together to actually understand more. And I think there's a where understanding is good. There's potential ability to work with you rather than continue to worry about, you know, who am I? Who should I be talking to? So I think with, you know, I know this isn't part of the development consent, but the commitment that we've heard today of working with others in a forum, I think is a really good first step.

01:33:44:20 - 01:34:00:09

And how you and I'd like some, you know, a little bit more information submitted into the examination of how you believe that could work, Because I've heard some really nice and good things today. Let's see how they can be worked on to to start to alleviate some concerns and work with with others.

01:34:01:09 - 01:34:02:13

Could it give you a little more on that?

01:34:02:15 - 01:34:03:07

Thank you.

01:34:03:10 - 01:34:28:16

Um, Anthony James for the applicant. I, we also wanted to highlight, sir, that, um, the securing mechanism for this would be appendix E of our Code of construction practice, which sets out a stakeholder communications plan and sets out how information would be shared with local residents, parishes and other key stakeholders. Thank you. Thank you.

01:34:31:27 - 01:34:34:25

I do have a hand up online a BBC.

01:34:36:19 - 01:35:08:16

Thank you sir Brian Curtis for Mid Suffolk District council, Labour district council. Um, I feel as though we're getting to the point that our districts are interested in with the conversation that I've just heard, but just to make the point that, um, the cumulative traffic impact not just from NIPS, but from other large scale, particularly energy projects which do require, um, ale deliveries. Um, on a relatively constrained network across Suffolk, it must be said, has a significant impact on our residents and communities and businesses.

01:35:08:22 - 01:35:44:04

The road closures can result in, in very large, um, diversion rates, and I think there needs to be. I think I've heard it a little bit from the applicant just now, but we feel that there needs to be more responsiveness to development that starts to emerge, um, as a result of other projects such as Branford Twin said and Norwich Tilbury, with the capacity on the network increasing and how the um, connections queue progresses. So if that can be picked up, um, as part of the um, the management plan documents for delivery, that would be helpful.

01:35:44:06 - 01:35:44:27

Thank you.

01:35:46:04 - 01:36:00:17

Thank you very much. Um, is there any further any other final questions or comments? Nothing online. Nothing. Yes, I do have a hand up in the room. Could we have a microphone or. You're very welcome to come and take a seat so that you can use a microphone. It might be quicker.

01:36:04:24 - 01:36:06:05

Just to press the button. Yep.

01:36:06:07 - 01:36:09:09

Thank you. Kate. Kate. Hotchkiss, little.

01:36:09:11 - 01:36:10:03

Bromley.

01:36:10:08 - 01:36:11:10

Um, connected.

01:36:11:12 - 01:36:50:07

To the questions. Um, and, uh, the cumulative impact. Um, looking at the information that National Grid has already provided about traffic numbers. Um, I'd like to explore that or get some more information about that, please. So at the moment, I live on a road that has a 7.5 tonne weight limit. Um, we don't see a lot of HGV traffic. Um, but the, the, the diagram that is shown in the information, which is document 7.1 Transport Assessment, appendix E, image e30 um shows a peak heavy traffic of 45 per hour.

01:36:50:21 - 01:37:25:24

That's an HGV of every 1.5 minutes. And for eight. Sorry. Yes, every 1.5 minutes. And for eight months of the year we would expect to see an HGV every three minutes. And that's just HGVs. There are plenty of other traffic that will be coming down the road. Now that is a massive impact on Little Bromley and if we don't yet know what the air and traffic is going to be, then do we need to question the HGV figures too? How can how much reliance can we put on those currently?

01:37:25:26 - 01:37:27:01

Thank you very much.

01:37:28:25 - 01:37:30:20

I'll ask the applicant to respond to that.

01:37:30:26 - 01:38:03:03

Anthony James for the applicant. Thank you, madam, for your question. I will hand over to my colleague, Miss Thirlwell to cover this point. I did want to, though, stress that the numbers that you see are very much a worse case, and that the mitigation we've developed is based on that worst case. Um, the numbers will be refined by our contractors who are now on board. Um, but as I say, there's very much a worse case that we have presented. Um, so I'll now hand over to Miss Thirlwell.

01:38:05:07 - 01:38:43:27

Samantha Thirlwell for the applicant. Um, as I previously stated, we have looked at the effects on Bentley Road and Ardley Road as a result of the combined, um, uh, traffic in terms of the project and other developments. There will be within those roads on, um, an increase in traffic. And we appreciate that because we have those, um, North halls and five areas and ourselves on there. Um, we will obviously be making use of the Hall Road as well for the project to alleviate any issues through the, long mountain range of the village.

01:38:44:24 - 01:39:19:04

We've got a one week peak of the worst case. And as my colleague Anthony James said, we are looking at refining those numbers to try and bring them down. Um, but in terms of significant effects on the primary access routes, where we have provided mitigation in the form of a pedestrian cycling share of road carriageway facility, the sensitivity of the receptors against the high number of HGVs that we're using there actually generates a drive delay of a slight delay.

01:39:19:25 - 01:39:27:19

And we've taken that's because we've taken the way that they assess. It's because we're looking at the interactions between receptors and the flow.

01:39:28:11 - 01:39:29:11

Thank you very much.

01:39:31:13 - 01:39:37:29

Do you have any further response to that that you'd like to add now that that is a brief explanation of your question?

01:39:38:25 - 01:39:57:17

I think I think it is very, just very difficult at the moment with the amount of information to fully understand the impact that we will have on the area and residents, and we are incredibly concerned. So the more information you can provide in one location so that everybody can more easily understand the impact of the better.

01:39:57:19 - 01:40:00:06

Thank you. I think that's I think that's a

01:40:01:24 - 01:40:23:24

sensible request. And I think the forum we talked about, I think has the opportunity from just from sitting here. It's, you know, it's it's down to the applicant to put this forward to, you know, to us and secure it in the DCI. That's what I'll be looking for. It sounds like it's a positive way forward to start to answer some questions, some actual real questions now that more information is being gathered as we as we progress. Thank you very.

01:40:23:26 - 01:40:53:27

Much. May I just make one more point about the recycling? So there is a risk that that cycling and and other traffic could be pushed onto other roads. And so whilst there might be a provision for cyclists alongside the route, which may involve cyclists crossing from one side of the road to another, which I don't think would be ideal. Um, you know, it might be that there is a possibility for collisions with traffic and cyclists on other parts of the route, not just on the primary access routes.

01:40:54:21 - 01:40:57:29

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Last comment. Thank you.

01:40:58:17 - 01:41:18:14

Can I just say that there are there is a planning and infrastructure working group, which is supported by the Ardley and Little Bromley parish councils, and we meet regularly. We have members from the parish council and residents from Little Bromley and Ardley.

01:41:18:16 - 01:42:00:04

Thank you very much. Any further final comments from the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. I'm conscious of time and, um, uh, as I anticipated, the the abnormal load discussion did take quite a lot longer than I know. Probably about the same time as I was expecting. We've still got quite a lot to cover and we need to be finished by 1:00. So we're going to take a 15 minute break. Um, and I'm going to, during that break, consider how I can reduce the final bits of item 11 to half an hour, which will mean that we need to be reasonably brief all around to give at least a half an hour for the public rights of way discussion on item 12.

01:42:00:15 - 01:42:30:09

So that's just a fair warning that I'll be looking for some brevity, and I'll be looking to probably hone in on some of the important bits for me, which is ultimately what this hearing is about. But I would also be given the opportunity for highway authorities to comment on some of the bits that they feel important, especially those two items in particular that I have said that we will cover later. Does that

make sense? Okay, I said 20 or 15 minutes, but let's go for we will adjourn and resume at 12:00. We will come back at 12:00. Thank you.