

Appendix 2 – ECC response to REP4-298

Applicant's Comments on any Further Information or Submission Received by Deadline 3, Doc 8.4.9 (REP4-298)

ID	Reference in Doc 8.4.9	Applicant's Comment	ECC's Response
1	P19, 5.2 Developer's Forum: LIR Ref 3.18.54 and page 158	The Applicant provided an updated in 7.3 Outline CTMP (Rev C) at Deadline 3. This updated included a commitment to engaging with the Developer's Forum in Section 6.6.2.	<p>The Applicant has not included the following in the Outline CTMP (Rev C) (REP4-174) that was proposed by ECC in response to ExQ1 (REP3-078):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) commit to joining and positively engaging with a Developer's Forum on the basis of the following high level principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Developer's Forum would be a regular monthly online meeting beginning as soon as the DCO is granted. It would be chaired by ECC with key members of the other NSIP Teams invited as well as other Strategic Site Teams, alongside relevant members of the Local Highway Authority and Planning Authority ▪ The Forum would be attended by National Grid as scheme promoter alongside their Main

		<p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with Essex County Council on the requirements for the Developer's</p>	<p>Contractor(s) constructing the scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At critical times where programmes overlap National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) will attend more regular weekly or bi-weekly meetings for urgent discussions on collaboration ▪ Funding will be provided for the time spent by ECC in organising and chairing the meetings over the life of the construction period of Norwich to Tilbury capped at £45,360 (based on monthly meetings) with any additional meetings charged at £105 per person ▪ Commitment to provide flexibility to adapt to changing conditions as identified during the Developers Forum <p>ECC assume the Applicant is referring to the final version of the Outline CTMP and not the Final CTMP to be produced by the Contractor. If</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Forum, with detail to be provided within the Final Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Regarding funding, the Applicant committed in 8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030] to begin discussions with the host local highway authorities and National Highways on the recovery of appropriate costs through a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA).</p>	<p>this assumption is correct then ECC concur that further discussions should be undertaken to enable final wording to be agreed based on the high level principles set out above. If the assumption is not correct then ECC is not in agreement with the approach as the commitment should be included in the Outline CTMP.</p> <p>ECC have included the funding for the Developer's Forum in the list of s106 requirements [REP4-328]. This is to ensure that the funding is legally binding on the basis that this Developer's Forum is an important part of dealing with cumulative impacts in Essex. ECC welcome further discussion on this approach.</p>
2	<p>p20, 5.2, Table 3.23 TRO</p> <p>p22, 5.2 Article 12 TRO</p> <p>p24, 5.2 Table 3.23, TRO</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that Essex County Council's comments demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of the relevant provisions included within the 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [Revision D]. The exercise of powers pursuant to Articles 49(1) and 49(3) (Traffic regulation) in respect of those Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) specified in Parts 1 to 4 of Schedule 13 is not contingent upon the prior agreement or otherwise of Essex County Council. The inclusion (or otherwise) of those particular TROs within Schedule 13 will be a matter for the Secretary of State to determine, taking account of</p>	<p>The points raised by ECC have been around how the timescales of the TRO should be matched to the Permit Scheme as they are part of the same standard process used by ECC. As engagement with ECC on the TROs will occur during the Permit Scheme application (which have up to a 12 week timescale) then it is unclear why there is resistance to matching the timescale as they will be undertaken in parallel.</p>

		<p>submissions made by Essex County Council and other interested parties during the course of the Examination and, ultimately, the recommendations of the Examining Authority. Whilst the Applicant would, of course, seek to engage with Essex County Council prior to the exercise of those powers, any attempt to use such engagement as a means to re-examine the acceptability or otherwise of a TRO included within Parts 1 to 4 of Schedule 13 would run contrary to the provisions of the draft Development Consent Order and the foundational principles upon which the NSIP regime is predicated. Further, and whilst the Applicant is agreeable to utilising existing Permit Scheme processes in respect of the construction and maintenance of the authorised development (in accordance with Article 12 (Application of the Permit Schemes)), it is noted that Article 12(2) provides certain safeguards which are intended, in part, to ensure that Essex County Council or other local authorities cannot, through the Permit Scheme process, frustrate the exercise of powers pursuant to Article 49. The Applicant would also observe that the structuring of powers within the draft Development Consent Order (including the interrelationship with existing Permit Scheme processes) mirrors that which the Secretary of State recently considered to be acceptable in the context of the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement.</p>	<p>From the response provided by the Applicant in terms of how the TRO is implemented it appears their points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TROs included in the DCO are for the SoS to determine whether they are acceptable based on input from ECC and other interested parties • There will be no ability for ECC to review the TROs through the Permit Scheme using our standard approach. <p>On the basis of the above, the following should be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has not been possible for ECC to give input through the Examination as there is a lack of detail compared to what is usually provided during standard TRO discussions as part of the Permit Scheme (see REP3-078 at response TT 1.38 for details requested). It is unclear how the SoS can determine the acceptability when the consultees are unable to make informed comments due to lack of detail and the SoS has no details to make a judgement • As already stated in previous submissions (REP3-077), the TRO
--	--	--	---

			<p>considerations are included in the Permit Scheme process. The Applicant has stated in their Outline CTMP (REP4-174) that they will be following the Permit Scheme (and so it follows that this includes reviewing/discussing the TRO proposals). However, the Applicant has set out in this recent response that ECC are unable to review the acceptability of the TROs during this period based on the current DCO wording. There is a discrepancy between the two approaches taken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paragraph 16 (5) of the DCO sets out that <i>“The undertaker must not temporarily close, alter or divert- (a) any street or public right of way specified as mentioned in paragraph (4) without first consulting the street authority”</i>. In our view, if ECC is unable to agree the TROs through the examination process (due to lack of standard information) then any consultation will result in ECC re-examining the information as ECC won't have had the opportunity to agree the TROs. As this relates to highway user safety ECC will be severely compromised if ECC have to take account of the SoS decision on the TROs
--	--	--	---

			<p>(if approved through the DCO). On the basis of highway safety alone the DCO wording should be altered to allow for a full review of the TROs if they cannot be agreed with ECC during the Examination and ultimately the SoS due to lack of sufficient information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In relation to the final point made by the Applicant on mirroring the TRO wording in the Bramford to Twinstead DCO, it should be noted that each application is considered on its own merits. Both Norwich to Tilbury and Bramford to Twinstead are very different projects in terms of scale and impact on highway users with Norwich to Tilbury affecting lots of areas of the county (including cumulative impacts in certain locations and varying road types). Through experience, ECC have become more aware of issues relating to NSIPs and so it is reasonable that ECC learn from and alter approaches that do not serve Essex well.• Notwithstanding the above, TRO discussions and review will be required as part of the Permit Scheme as both parties will need to take account of road
--	--	--	---

			<p>conditions at the time of the works. Flexibility and changes to approach may be required due to changes in the network circumstances and surroundings to ensure that the proposed TRO is safe and suitable for all highway users.</p>
3	<p>p23, 5.2 Article 16, TROs and wording of DCO for PRow requirements p42 5.2, 4.5.99, TROs p44, 5.2, 4.5.104 TROs p45 5.2, 4.5.106 TROs p46 5.2, 4.5.108 TROs</p>	<p>The Applicant will provide the Local Highways Authorities with further detail on the reason for each TRO, the construction activities these are likely required for, and anticipated durations. This will be provided at or before Deadline 5.</p>	<p>It is noted that the Applicant is providing a summary of these details cross referenced against the schedule of TROs for clarity. However, note that ECC have asked for the following details to be provided to allow full consideration of the TROs – these detail requests were provided previously to the Applicant through informal comments sent on 25th June 2025, following a meeting with the Applicant via email on 18th March 2026 and set out in the response to the Inspector’s Questions (ExQ1) in relation to TT 1.38 (REP3.077):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>TROs to be reviewed when the following information is available:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing baseline traffic on diversion routes ○ Existing baseline traffic on the route that is to be temporarily closed ○ Proposed construction traffic (volume and traffic makeup) for diversion routes

		<p>The Applicant assumes that ECC’s reference to “the wording allowing for bridleways to be wider (4m)” relates to paragraph 5.1.2 of 7.6 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [Revision B]. The Applicant considers that the most appropriate place for this wording is in the management plan itself as it relates to a management measure, however it will keep this under review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Speed surveys for mitigation works</i> ○ <i>Parking demand surveys for parking restrictions</i> ○ <i>Timescales for each TRO listed in the DCO Schedule</i> ○ <i>Statement of reasons for each TRO proposal</i> ○ <i>Parking data to support the parking restrictions</i> ○ <i>Speed data associated with the mitigation designs</i> <p>The Applicant assumes correctly and it is agreed that the most appropriate place for this wording is in the Outline PRow MP. It is agreed that the wording in the DCO does not preclude for a higher standard to be required as the Outline PRow Management Plan includes wording to deal with local requirements for specific situations.</p>
4	P23, 5.2, Article 18	<p>The Applicant notes that the maintenance and dedication provisions in Article 18 of the draft Development Consent Order mirror those included within the made Order for the Bramford to Twinstead Reinforcement Project. Given that Essex County Council is a host authority in the context of that other project, and noting that Essex County Council did not seek to raise similar points of concern during that very recent Examination, the Applicant is somewhat</p>	<p>The point raised by ECC on this provision relates to the situations where the Applicant is providing infrastructure (Bentley Road and Ardleigh Road footway/cycleway) that is not being adopted. These points were not raised in relation to Bramford to Twinstead as the situation did not occur for this project. ECC concern is that the DCO wording does not allow for this type of situation where multiple DCOs</p>

		<p>surprised by the Council’s particular submissions on this point. In any event, the Applicant notes that Article 18(1), (2) and (3) already provide for an alternative arrangement to be agreed on a case by case basis as regard future maintenance and dedication of street or highway works carried out pursuant to the draft Development Consent Order. The Applicant will engage with ECC to understand if it has any concerns about the maintenance of specific streets. The Applicant assumes that ECC’s second point regarding “discussions happening with the other DCO applicants” relates to maintenance of the proposed temporary footway/cycleway along Ardleigh Road and Bentley Road. The Applicant has and will continue to engage with ECC on this matter to provide greater clarity</p>	<p>may or may not overlap with maintenance, and the maintenance period may require extension as it is not offered for adoption.</p> <p>The Applicant previously stated in REP2-030 that Articles 18(1) and (2) each include an “<i>unless otherwise agreed with the street authority</i>” caveat to the maintenance provision for streets, constructed, altered or diverted under this Order.” ECC has suggested an update to wording in the DCO to ensure our concern is taken into account - for clarity the relevant Articles have been replicated below with additional text in red and strikethroughs on removal of text:</p> <p><i>18.—(1) Any street (other than any private streets) to be constructed under this Order must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority and must; unless otherwise agreed with the street authority; be maintained to the same condition (including any culverts or other structures laid under that part of the highway) by and at the expense of the undertaker for a period of 12 months from its completion (unless otherwise agreed or required by the street authority) and at the expiry of that period by and at the expense of the street authority or other authorised third party.</i></p>
--	--	---	---

			<p><i>(2) Where a street is altered or diverted under this Order, the altered or diverted part of the street must be completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the street authority and must, unless otherwise agreed with the street authority, be maintained to the same condition (including any culverts or other structures laid under that part of the highway) by and at the expense of the undertaker for a period of 12 months from its completion and at the expiry of that period by and at the expense of the street authority.</i></p>
5	P25, 5.2, 4.4.40	<p>The Applicant has updated the Outline CTMP to include text similar to that from Essex County Council Appendix 1 – ECC Response to Examining Authority’s Written Questions 1 [REP3-077]. The updated Outline CTMP has been submitted at Deadline 4. At 5.3.13 the following text has been added after as a new paragraph: <i>‘Variable Messaging Sign (VMS) boards will be implemented at locations agreed with the Local Highway Authority and National Highways to communicate upcoming ALL movements and/or other disruptions to PARs.’</i> Additionally, a new paragraph has been added at 5.3.15 to state: <i>‘Information will be made available to the wider community on what ALLs are, why they are needed and how they impact the local/strategic road network along with links to find further information.’</i></p>	<p>ECC had requested that information should be provided on how people’s journeys will be impacted without people needing to consult multiple sources of information.</p> <p>The Applicant has included that links will be included to find further information (it is assumed this relates to further information on how people’s journeys will be impacted). It would be useful to understand if these links would be to third party information (and if so what websites and what would they cover so ECC can review how useful they will be to residents in understanding impacts) or if the links would be to information produced by National Grid (perhaps with an interactive map or fixed graphics showing the full routing of the ALLs for people to be able to understand easily +</p>

			<p>dates/times of the AILs). The concern is that National Grid relies on external information which may be piecemeal making it difficult for people to navigate easily or not detailed enough making it difficult to understand impacts. In which case, a commitment from National Grid to produce suitable graphics showing the routing and dates/times would be required.</p>
6	P25, 5.2, 4.4.41	<p>The Applicant has consulted with all LHAs, National Highways and local constabularies to ensure decisions and resultant impacts are considered across authorities/organisations.</p>	<p>ECC continues to reiterate that wider discussions should be undertaken with all relevant stakeholders involved rather than National Grid speaking to individual parties in isolation. This is to ensure there are viable AIL routes and that decisions made on mitigation in one authority do not impact on other locations in other authorities.</p>
7	P26, 5.2, 4.4.53	<p>Road safety on the Primary Access Routes, including the interaction of construction traffic with vulnerable users was considered with the 6.16 Environmental Statement Chapter 16 – Traffic and Transport [APP-271] and 7.11 Transport Assessment [APP 333]. Therefore, the Applicant does not consider that a formal Road Safety Review is required on the PARs prior to works commencing. However, the Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by Essex and will complete a drive through of all the PARs with the LHAs to identify any issues that may need to be rectified prior to use. Prior to AIL movements, a review of structures will be completed to ensure suitability of</p>	<p>ECC accept the wording in the Outline CTMP in relation to the drive through of all the PARs but require text to be included on review of structures on the PARs and diversion routes to ensure they are still appropriate for the intensification of use. It is anticipated the focus would be on the rural network. ECC would suggest that discussions are held between the Applicant and ECC's Asset Management Team to agree an approach.</p>

		<p>the route. The Applicant has updated paragraph 5.2.3 of the 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-028] as follows: <i>“Prior to works commencing, the Main Works Contractor(s) will undertake a drive through survey of all PARs with the relevant LHA (unless agreed otherwise), with a focus on highway condition including pre-existing issues; road user safety including signage; vegetation clearance and locations where ‘siding out’ to remove debris/dirt/mud overspill could be used to increase the effective width of existing narrow footways. It is anticipated that the rural routes will be the focus of the drive through survey. This drive through survey will form the basis of any agreements for further mitigation measures – such measures to be necessary to the Project and reasonable – along with the parties responsible for delivery of any measures. The final mitigation measures will be agreed with the LHAs as part of the final CTMP.”</i> The Applicant has already committed to undertake pre- and post-construction condition surveys on AIL and HGV routes. It will also commit to carrying out targeted condition surveys on the PARs on a quarterly basis during construction and has updated 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-028] accordingly</p>	
8	P28, 5.2, 4.5.66	<p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with Essex County Council on the proposed junction mitigation measures for Site 58 (A120 Braintree Bypass/A131 Great Notley Bypass, Site 69 (A1060 Roxwell Road/Lordship Road), Site 71 (A414 Greenbury</p>	<p>It is noted that Junction modelling of Site 48 (A120 Braintree Bypass/A131 Great Notley Bypass) is missing from the list of junctions mitigation measures to be discussed. This</p>

		Way/Highwood Road), Site 73 (A127 Southend Arterial Road/A176 Noak Hill Road), Site 74 (A176 Noak Hill Road/Wash Road) and Site 82 (A129 London Road/Mountnessing Road). A meeting is to be arranged with Essex County Council in advance of Deadline 5 to discuss the proposed mitigation.	junction should be included as set out in bullet point 1 of section 4.5.66 in the LIR (REP1-161) .
9	P29, 5.2, 4.5.68 P34 5.2, 4.5.75 P49 5.2, 6.21.5	<p>The Applicant's position, regarding the coordination of construction vehicle movements outside the AM peak period at junctions leading to multiple Primary Access Routes, is set out in 4.5.68 in 8.8.2 Applicant's Comments on Local Impact Reports [REP2-030] and TT 1.13 in 8.9.1 Applicant's Responses to First Written Questions (Final Issue A) [REP3-074].</p> <p>The traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant for Site 58 - A131 Great Notley Bypass / Main Road roundabout and Site 63 - A414 Three Mile Hill / A1114 London Road roundabout has not identified any severe traffic impacts. The Applicant clarifies that it does not propose to implement AM peak restrictions at these junctions as such restrictions would delay works across multiple sites simultaneously and impact the overall Project programme.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with Essex County Council on the potential mitigations discussed, including the proposal of a mini-bus and opportunities to phase work activities. The Applicant and ECC have agreed to schedule a meeting about mitigation.</p>	<p>Coordination of construction vehicle movements will be discussed at the forthcoming meeting on mitigation as ECC believe this is an important way of mitigating impacts.</p> <p>ECC note that the proposal for a mini-bus is to be discussed as part of the mitigation.</p> <p>As previously mentioned (REP3-077), ECC are requiring a mini-bus as a committed measure in the CWTP. ECC do not believe that travel</p>

		<p>Additional text has been added to 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] submitted at Deadline 4 at 5.13.2 to note ‘when the travel patterns of construction workers is understood, the Main Works Contractor(s) and Travel Plan Coordinator will explore the feasibility of a mini-bus to site, including a review of whether one could be provided from public transport hubs (such as railway stations)’.</p>	<p>patterns are required to commit to it. A firm commitment to implement a mini-bus(es) is required in the CTMP and as such the proposed wording provided by the Applicant is not acceptable. It is however, reasonable that the details of how the mini-bus will operate will be determined at a later date when the travel patterns of construction workers are understood.</p>
10	P36, 5.2, 4.5.77	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the additional proposed text provided by Essex County Council Appendix 1– ECC Response to Examining Authority’s Written Questions [REP3-078] and their comments regarding pre- and post- condition surveys and has updated 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] submitted at Deadline 4 accordingly. The second sentence of 5.2.2 has been amended to read ‘The scope of these surveys (in terms of the routes covered and the methodology of these surveys) is to be agreed with each LHA, prior to the start of the pre-commencement works.’ and new text has been added as 5.2.4 as follows: ‘The Main Works Contractor(s) will use the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) process for planning AIL movements. This will include a review of the suitability of structures along AIL routes prior to AIL movements.’ The Applicant can commit to carrying out condition surveys on the Primary Access Routes during</p>	<p>It is noted that the Applicant has taken some of the text ECC proposed on board but has excluded the requirement to review the structures for HGV intensification of use on the PARs. ECC notes the applicant has committed to reviewing structures for the AIL routes but this needs to be extended to non-AIL routes that have higher numbers of HGVs using them. The focus would be on the rural road network.</p>

		construction and will update 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] accordingly	
11	P39, 5.2, 4.5.89	<p>The proposed removal of street furniture on Spa Road at Constraint E7, as shown on Sheets 5 and 6, Section E of 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C], Appendix C Indicative Highway Mitigation Plans, submitted at Deadline 4, is intended to facilitate the movement of Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) vehicles to site, rather than the movement of general HGV construction traffic.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the mitigation plans included within 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] are indicative only. They have been prepared to demonstrate the type and extent of potential mitigation that may be required. These matters will be determined by the Main Works Contractor during the development of the detailed design. Given this, the Applicant considers that it would not be appropriate or proportionate to submit detailed mitigation plans or include commitments within 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] at this stage</p>	<p>The drawing referenced by the Applicant shows a constraint at this location that requires temporary works in the form of “<i>modifications to existing highway features, including vegetation removal/cut back where required.</i>” The Applicant has suggested this is in relation to facilitating AILs.</p> <p>The point raised by ECC is related to whether HGV movements can be facilitated on Spa Road (rather than focussing on AILs). ECC requested tracking analysis of HGVs to understand whether the existing highway facilities are suitable for the uplift in HGV movements and if mitigation was required then a concept design produced by the Applicant. This concept design would then be discussed in more detail with the Contractor through the detailed design process. The reason this has been requested is that ECC has concerns with the uplift of HGVs regularly using this route in relation to maintenance at this location which in turn could lead to road safety issues for pedestrians. For example, an increase in vehicles overrunning the kerb which could lead to kerb or footway damage impacting on pedestrian users.</p>
12	P40, 5.2, 4.5.91	A new paragraph has been added into the 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C]	ECC welcome the addition of this paragraph but note that some of the wording required (as set

		<p>that states: <i>Before carrying out any works with a potential to affect access to the Essex County Council Depot in Ardleigh, National Grid/the Main Works Contractor(s) will develop and agree with Essex County Council details of measures to ensure that access is maintained at all times to the depot; or where this is not reasonably practicable, that a suitable alternative access is provided and operational prior to any interruption of the existing access. National Grid/the Main Works Contractor(s) will provide reasonable advance notice of any proposed temporary road closures or traffic management measures that may affect access to the depot, including details of anticipated impacts on access and response times.</i></p>	<p>out at in response to TT 1.36 in REP3-078) has not been included. Essentially, ECC requires wording that states the importance of minimising delays (ie it will impact on ECC's response to emergency incidents) and that the road closures and traffic management measures should be discussed and agreed with ECC to minimise impacts (rather than "notified").</p>
13	P46, 5.2, 4.5.75	<p>The Applicant notes the request from Essex County Council on proposed actions for non-compliance. The Applicant has added paragraph 6.3.2 of 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C] to detail that further sanctions will be included within the final version of the CTMP.</p>	<p>It is assumed the final version mentioned is in relation to the Outline CTMP and not the version that the Contractor is to provide post DCO. If the latter, then ECC do not agree to this approach as ECC requires some points that can be discussed with the Contractor.</p>
15	P46, 5.2, 6.20.4-6.20.6	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a review of all schools listed by Essex County Council and provided a detailed response within 8.4.1 Applicant's Comments on Relevant Representation [REP2-030]. Due to the low expected Project construction traffic during the predicted peak weeks of the construction programme and the risk associated with the level of interaction between construction vehicles and vulnerable users, the Applicant considers that restricting HGV</p>	<p>ECC would require a commitment in the Outline CTMP to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • undertake the site observations and agree the outcomes with ECC prior to construction. • Any agreement following the site observations should be included in the Detailed CTMP produced by the Contractor.

		<p>movements during school drop-off and pick-up periods is not necessary. However, the Applicant has agreed to undertake site observations at the schools listed by ECC during school drop-off and pick-ups to confirm site conditions. Applicant will continue to engage with ECC and will keep this matter under review</p>	
16	P47, 5.2, 6.20.10	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the proposed text in Appendix 1 - ECC response to Examining Authority's Written Questions 1 (ExQ1) [REP3 078] and cannot find any proposed text relating to Contingency Routeing. The Applicant will liaise with Essex County Council to discuss this matter.</p>	ECC and Applicant to discuss.
17	P50, 5.2, 6.21.9	<p>The Applicant notes the request to include the following text in 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP3-028] after paragraph 5.5.5 to ensure parking provision is in line with the assumptions in the assessment: 'As part of the access design approvals details of car parking supply and demand for compounds will be provided along with cycle parking'. However, sufficient parking for construction workers is expected to be provided at work sites and the level of provision will be refined during the detailed design phase. 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan - Appendix B - Outline Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-311], notes that staff parking at the construction compounds for the Project will be limited and all spaces will be allocated. Dedicated visitor parking spaces are expected to be provided at all compound</p>	<p>ECC need to understand what solutions will be available if overspill parking were to occur. If there were issues then a quick response is required to deal with them. Monitoring does not offer a solution but simply provides the data showing the problem.</p>

		<p>locations. It is anticipated that these will be clearly marked and monitored by the Travel Plan Coordinator to ensure they are not used by construction staff. However, the final levels of provision will be determined by the Main Works Contractor. As noted in Section 5.2 of 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan - Appendix B - Outline Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-311], the Travel Plan Coordinator will monitor parking utilisation at each compound site, reviewing the split between cars, vans and minibuses. To ensure that the final CTMP is effectively enforced, construction workers' overspill parking on the public highway is defined as a matter of non-compliance that would be investigated. On receipt of a report of potential non-compliance, the EnvCoW(s) and Transport Coordinator would follow the procedure noted in Section 6.3 of 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C]. With regard to cycle parking, the Travel Plan coordinator will encourage cycling as an alternative mode of travel to work and will work with the LHAs to ensure individual cycle parking standards are met. Due to the principles and procedures set out above, the Applicant does not consider the additional wording is necessary</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix 3 – ECC response to REP4-299

Response to Applicant’s Comments on Responses to ExQ1, Doc 8.4.10 (REP4-299)

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant’s Response	ECC Latest Response
TT.1.20	Cumulative impacts: Are there any specific impacts from other projects which you consider could cause additional impacts and risk to the proposed development and do you consider these have these been addressed adequately by the applicant?	Therefore, ECC will want to ensure that the applicant commits to joining and engaging with the Developer’s Forum on the basis of the high level approach set out in our response to TT 136 below and commits to flexibility to adapt to changing conditions.	The Applicant has committed to joining and engaging with the Developers Forum in paragraph 6.6.2 of 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [Revision C].	The Applicant has not committed to the high level approach set out in our response to ExQ1 for TT 1.36 (REP3-078) in their latest Outline CTMP, Rev C (REP4-174). For clarity ECC required the following wording to be added to the Outline CTMP (APP-309): <i>“National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) commit to joining and positively engaging with a Developer’s Forum on the basis of the following high level principles:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The Developer’s Forum would be a regular monthly online meeting beginning as soon as the DCO is granted. It would be chaired by ECC with key members of the other NSIP Teams invited as well as other Strategic Site Teams, alongside relevant members of the Local</i>

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
				<p><i>Highway Authority and Planning Authority</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The Forum would be attended by National Grid as scheme promoter alongside their Main Contractor(s) constructing the scheme</i> ▪ <i>At critical times where programmes overlap National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) will attend more regular weekly or bi-weekly meetings for urgent discussions on collaboration</i> ▪ <i>Funding will be provided for the time spent by ECC in organising and chairing the meetings over the life of the construction period of Norwich to Tilbury capped at £45,360 (based on monthly meetings) with any additional meetings charged at £105 per person</i> ▪ <i>Commitment to provide flexibility to adapt to changing conditions as identified during the Developers Forum”</i>

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
				ECC request that the above is included in an updated version of the latest Outline CTMP, Rev C (REP4-174).
TT.1.20	As above	ECC has raised concerns around a co-ordinated approach to workable AIL routes and that ECC would expect the review to have been completed prior to the end of the Examination so that workable AIL routes are defined. The applicant has confirmed their Contractor is aiming to complete this by the end of Examination assuming all relevant information is provided from the asset owners in a timely manner. Whilst ECC understand the caveat around ensuring sufficient information is available ECC believe that a position statement could be provided showing the routes on a map along with constraints as currently known (if not all information is available). This will enable an understanding of where there are particular	The Applicant notes ECC's request for maps showing the AIL routes and constraint locations, and draws their attention to 7.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan Appendix C - Indicative Highway Mitigation Plans Sections A-B and D-G [APP-312 to APP-319] and Sections C and H [Revision B] which contain the information requested. The Applicant has and will continue to engage with ECC on this matter.	The point that ECC was trying to make was around having a complete route map from port to site to understand the wider constraints across all authority areas. This would then show any specific issues on the route as a whole and illustrate whether there is a viable route or if not what are the key blockers. In this way, all parties would have a full understanding of what needs to be fully resolved and have an understanding of any mitigation that has been agreed to determine whether this will impact the individual local authorities. For example, mitigation in the form of restrictions on strategic road or rail bridge structures may then impact on the local road network.

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
		<p>issues on the network that need further work and how this impacts the various authority areas.</p>		
TT 1.36	<p>Outline construction traffic management plan - 2</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, please detail any matters in the outline CTMP [APP-309] which you consider requires amending and your proposed amendment. This could be in the form of a schedule or tracked changed version of the outline CTMP.</p>	<p>ECC provided proposed wording on a number of items to be included in the CTMP (APP3-078):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting school drop off/pick up at a list of schools • High level principals relating to the Developer's Forum • A drive through review of the PARs prior to construction and review of structures in relation to HGVs • Variable messaging boards and commitment to providing more detail on AILs and associated impacts to the community • A commitment to review movements against the assumptions in the TA 	<p>The Applicant has reviewed and included some of the wording but has omitted a large proportion of the requirements.</p>	<p>A comparison table has been produced which shows the wording that ECC proposed in REP3-078 for the CTMP (APP-309) against what has been included in the latest version by the Applicant (REP4-174). ECC has then provided a response next to each point. This is included within the Deadline 5 response at Appendix 3A.</p>

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
		<p>and ES to ensure no additional impact occurs beyond what has been assessed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update to Table 5.7 to include restrictions on HGVs using routes past schools (as identified above) • Commitment to review and discuss ways of reducing freight by road with the Local Highway Authority including a list of items for discussion • Add details of staff working hours and commitment to restricting access to staff during peak hours • Commitment to reviewing potential impacts due to inappropriate HGV parking associated with lack of nearby rest facilities for drivers • Inclusion of car parking supply and demand 		

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
		<p>information in the access design approvals and cycle parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to reinstate land to previous condition unless agreed otherwise • Comprehensive investigation of carriageway construction where permanent road widening is to occur • Table 6.1 to include monitoring of HGVs and construction workers (rather than just vehicles) • A list of potential corrective actions to be included • Update to wording on construction traffic operating outside of agreed hours to include workers • List of non compliance at section 6.4.1 to include construction traffic (worker traffic and HGVs) 		

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
		beyond those assumed in the TA and ES		
TT 1.38	<p>In the SoCG with National Highways [REP1-048] a number of statements suggest that you are awaiting further information following requests to allow you to further consider the applicant submission. Please can you state if this additional information is now available to you and if not, what timescales you require to ensure an adequate response to any outstanding matters or concerns. Please can all local highway authorities address this same question.</p>	<p>ECC is waiting for the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TROs to be reviewed when the following information is available: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing baseline traffic on diversion routes • Existing baseline traffic on the route that is to be temporarily closed • Proposed construction traffic (volume and traffic makeup) for diversion routes • Speed surveys for mitigation works • Parking demand surveys for parking restrictions • Timescales for each TRO listed in 	<p>TRO information: The Applicant has agreed to provide further clarification on the reasons for and anticipated durations of each of the TROs provided within Schedule 13 of 3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [Revision D]. This information will be provided by or before Deadline 5. The Applicant would welcome further discussions for reaching agreement on the TRO proposals with ECC following provision of these clarifications.</p>	<p>ECC has received some of the information set out in our response to ExQ1 (REP3-078) but there is still an amount outstanding as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant does not appear to have committed to including all the information requested for the TROs. We require all the information to be able to provide a detailed review. ECC then need time to be able to review the information. • Details of shift worker patterns – this is required to include in the CTMP • Alternative designs for Wick Lane and Ardleigh Road <p>Note the Applicant has provided the traffic modelling and survey Technical Note</p>

Ref	ExQ1	ECC Response	Applicant's Response	ECC Latest Response
		<p>the DCO Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of reasons for each TRO proposal • Parking data to support the parking restrictions • Details of proposed shift patterns for workers • Junction mitigation proposals • Further consideration of Wick Lane proposals as the principle of using Wick Lane temporarily between the two proposed haul road access points is not accepted based on current option provided • Alternative design of Ardleigh Road based on passing bays (permanent) 		<p>which ECC are to review. This will lead to discussions on junction mitigation.</p>

Appendix 3A – Appendix table to ECC response to REP4-299

CTMP Text Updates Comparison with DL 4 version of the report (REP4-174) against our requested wording in REP3-078 – Appendix to ECC’s Response to REP4-299

CTMP Ref	Original ECC Comments provided at REP3-078	Wording in CTMP Rev C (REP4-174)	ECC Comments
Paragraph 2.3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Contractor(s) commits to restricting HGV movements during school drop off/pick up times on PARs where there is school related activity for the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quilters Infant & Junior School, Billericay, A129 and A176 ▪ Billericay School (secondary), A129 and A176 ▪ Cressing Primary School, B1018, Tye Green ▪ Maltings Academy (secondary) and Powers Hall Academy (primary), Spinks Lane/Spa Road, Wickham ▪ Margaretting Church of England Primary School, B1002, Margaretting ○ A further review will be undertaken and agreed with the LHA prior to construction to consider restrictions on routes where any new schools have been built. 	<p>The Applicant has not included text in red, but has committed to review of routes where new schools have been built (text in blue).</p>	<p>The Applicant has agreed in REP4-298 that they agree to undertake site observations at the schools listed by ECC during school drop-off and pick-ups to confirm site conditions. They have also stated that they will continue to engage with ECC and review this matter.</p> <p>ECC would accept the site observations being undertaken prior to construction and the outcome discussed and included in the CTMP produced by the Contractor (if restrictions are agreed as necessary). On this basis our response to REP4-298 states the following:</p>

			<p><i>“We would require a commitment in the Outline CTMP to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>undertake the site observations and agree the outcomes with ECC prior to construction.</i> • <i>Any agreement following the site observations should be included in the Detailed CTMP produced by the Contractor.”</i>
<p>After Section 3.3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) commit to joining and positively engaging with a Developer’s Forum on the basis of the following high level principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Developer’s Forum would be a regular monthly online meeting beginning as soon as the DCO is granted. It would be chaired by ECC with key members of the other NSIP Teams invited as well as other 	<p>The Applicant has not included text in red on the high level principles of the Developer’s Forum. They have stated the following at Section 6.6.2 (italics show the updated text): <i>“National Grid has committed to join and engage with a Developer’s Forum to be set up by Essex County Council, subject to agreeing suitable</i></p>	<p>It is unclear if the Applicant means the final Outline CTMP or the final CTMP to be produced by the Contractor.</p> <p>As set out in ECC’s response to REP4-298 ECC requires the principles to be set out in the Outline CTMP as the approved document in</p>

	<p>Strategic Site Teams, alongside relevant members of the Local Highway Authority and Planning Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Forum would be attended by National Grid as scheme promoter alongside their Main Contractor(s) constructing the scheme ▪ At critical times where programmes overlap National Grid and the Main Contractor(s) will attend more regular weekly or bi-weekly meetings for urgent discussions on collaboration ▪ Funding will be provided for the time spent by ECC in organising and chairing the meetings over the life of the construction period of Norwich to Tilbury capped at £45,360 (based on monthly meetings) with any additional meetings charged at £105 per person ▪ Commitment to provide flexibility to adapt to changing conditions as identified during the Developers Forum 	<p><i>terms of reference</i>, to continue to formalise project coordination.”</p> <p>The Applicant set out how they will continue to liaise with ECC on the requirements for the Developer’s Forum with detail provided within the Final Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p>	<p>the DCO. ECC would welcome further discussion on the principles to include in this document. ECC do not accept that the principles are discussed later with the Contractor if this is the approach that the Applicant is suggesting.</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>Paragraph 5.2.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pre- and post-construction condition surveys of the existing highway network are proposed to be undertaken on AIL and HGV routes. The scope of these surveys (in terms of the routes covered, and the methodology of these surveys) is to be agreed with each LHA. The results of these pre-condition surveys will be shared with the LHA prior to works commencing, including pre-commencement works relating to the highway. In addition to condition surveys, a road safety review including structures should be undertaken prior to works commencing. This would include a drive through of all the PARs with the LHA to identify any issues that may need to be rectified prior to use and a review of the structures used to ensure they are still appropriate for the intensification of use. It is anticipated that the rural routes will be the focus of the safety review. 	<p>The Applicant has included a version of the text in blue (black text was original text) but not the text in red. However, they have included a version of the red text at 5.2.3 as follows:</p> <p><i>“Prior to works commencing, the Main Works Contractor(s) will undertake a drive through survey of all PARs with the relevant LHA (unless agreed otherwise), with a focus on highway condition including pre-existing issues; road user safety including signage; vegetation clearance and locations where ‘siding out’ to remove debris/dirt/mud overspill could be used to increase the effective width of existing narrow footways. It is anticipated that the rural routes will be the focus of the drive through survey. This drive through survey will form the basis of any agreements for further mitigation measures – such measures to be</i></p>	<p>ECC welcome the inclusion of the text but note the requirement for a review of structures has been excluded for PARs. The Applicant states that a review of structures will be undertaken prior to AIL movements. However, as set out in the response to REP4-298 ECC require text to be included on review of structures on the PARs and diversion routes to ensure they are still appropriate for the intensification of use. It is anticipated the focus would be on the rural network.</p>
------------------------	---	---	---

		<p><i>necessary to the Project and reasonable – along with the parties responsible for delivery of any measures. The final mitigation measures will be agreed with the LHAs as part of the final CTMP.</i></p> <p><i>The Main Works Contractor(s) will use the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL) process for planning AIL movements. This will include a review of the suitability of structures along AIL routes prior to AIL movements.”</i></p>	
<p>Paragraph 5.4.17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The construction and construction workforce traffic movements will be managed through the monitoring and management mechanisms outlined in Section 6. The movements will be reviewed against the assumptions included in the Transport Assessment and ES to ensure no additional impact occurs beyond what has been assessed. 	<p>The Applicant has included a version of the red text proposed as follows: <i>“The Main Works Contractor(s) will develop a booking/scheduling system to schedule HGV deliveries to site throughout the construction period. This system will enable a three-month look ahead, to understand the predicted HGV deliveries (movements), per</i></p>	<p>ECC has responded to the Inspector’s Questions ExQ2 on this particular point which relates to whether a HGV cap should be included. The full response and any outcomes should be taken into account on this point. ECC has responded that a cap would be more definitive rather than the approach</p>

		<p><i>site access point in advance. The construction vehicle and construction workforce traffic movements will be reviewed against the assumptions (construction traffic forecasts) detailed within the Transport Assessment (document reference 7.11) and the Environmental Statement Appendix 16.4 - Traffic and Transport Construction Effects (document reference 6.16.A4). Should the three-month look ahead identify any predicted potential exceedances compared to the construction traffic forecasts reported in the above documents National Grid April 2026 May 2026 Norwich to Tilbury 35 and National Grid's EnvCoW considers that these would have the potential to introduce materially new or materially different residual effects, the Main Works Contractor(s) will discuss with National Grid and the relevant Local Highway Authority, and National</i></p>	<p>taken in the wording proposed by the Applicant. Notwithstanding whether a cap is introduced, a summary of the specific issues with the current wording is replicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total HGVs should be compared with TA/ES (not just deliveries) • Workforce vehicle numbers should be compared with the TA/ES • Information should be provided every three months at all times to the LHA and a
--	--	--	---

		<p><i>Highways where appropriate, suitable steps to avoid or mitigate such effects. The Applicant and its appointed Main Works Contractor(s) will develop a monitoring framework, which will include potential mitigations, as part of the final CTMP.”</i></p>	<p>discussion undertaken to agree whether there is a material impact and if so what corrective action should be taken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential corrective actions are required in the Outline CTMP (rather than the final version produced by the Contractor)
<p>Paragraph 5.4.11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timescales for the implementation of these schemes is subject to change. The CTMP will need to be reviewed and amended in agreement with the relevant LHA should planned highway works or other external factors have a material effect on the agreed 	<p>The Applicant has not included the text proposed in red</p>	<p>ECC believe the red text provides more detail. External factors include emergency works for example that would not be covered by planned</p>

	<p>construction routeing strategy. In this way, the Contractor is providing a flexible approach to respond to changes in conditions.</p>		<p>highway works. The last sentence provides some context and shows that there is flexibility in the approach when needed.</p>
Table 5.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table 5.7 to be amended to include commitments to restrict the use of construction routes during school drop off/pick up as set out above. 	<p>The Applicant has not included the red wording.</p>	<p>This omission is acceptable on the basis that the above paragraph 2.3.5 is updated to reflect ECC's response.</p>
Section 5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Contractor will review and discuss ways of reducing freight by road with the Local Highway Authority. This will include (but not restricted to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consolidation centres; shared delivery logistics with other scheme promoters/developers; wider considerations of the Multi Modal Strategy using rail and port facilities to replace long distance road freight; and review of 'just in time' scenario (Scenario 2) set out in Appendix G of the Transport Assessment. 	<p>The Applicant has not included the red wording. They have referred to REP 3-074 detailing the design decisions to reduce HGV movements and developed a multi-modal strategy.</p>	<p>The Applicant has not included any wording to compel the Contractor to discuss ways of reducing freight by road. This is a national policy requirement and so is important to include in the CTMP to ensure the subject is discussed at a practical level.</p>
Section 2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update Section 2.3 Working Hours to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff working hours will be <INSERT> 	<p>The Applicant has not included the red wording. The Applicant has referred to REP3-074 to question DCO1.S10 however this does</p>	<p>ECC require these details to be included in the CTMP as they underpin the assumptions in the</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Staff will be unable to access the on site parking areas between the hours of 0800 and 0900hrs, or leave between the hours of 1645 and 1800hrs 	not include staff working hours.	assessment in relation to staff working.
Paragraph 5.4.10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● After paragraph 5.4.10 include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To reduce the potential for impacts on the local highway network due to inappropriate HGV parking associated with lack of nearby resting facilities for drivers, baseline conditions will be collected prior to works commencing. The conditions will be monitored and reviewed using parking usage surveys for areas defined with the LHA through a scoping process. This will include laybys and industrial estates where clusters of HGV parking are identified, along with observations of other local roads where HGV drivers park and rest. This would be in areas on the local highway network along or within close proximity to the construction routes to determine any potential HGV parking issues. Mitigation would be considered in advance of construction works where necessary and agreed with the LHA. Depending on the results, the mitigation could either be implemented or a monitor and manage 	The Applicant is considering the request and will continue to engage with ECC on this matter.	ECC welcomes further engagement to determine some appropriate wording for the Outline CTMP.

	<p>approach adopted with regular reviews at the key locations undertaken during the construction period.</p>		
Paragraph 5.5.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include after paragraph 5.5.5 to ensure parking provision is in line with the assumptions in the assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As part of the access design approvals details of car parking supply and demand for compounds will be provided along with cycle parking. 	<p>The Applicant has not included the red text on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient parking is expected to be provided and the level of provision will be refined during detailed design phase • Parking at compounds will be limited and all spaces allocated • The TPC will monitor use of visitor parking bays 	<p>Essentially, ECC need to understand what solutions will be available if overspill parking were to occur. If there were issues then a quick response is required to deal with them. Monitoring does not offer a solution but simply provides the data showing the problem.</p> <p>ECC requires that the red text is included or alternative wording that sets out what solutions will be implemented if overspill parking occurs. ECC would welcome further discussion on this point to agree some wording for the CTMP.</p>
Paragraph 5.8.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include after paragraph 5.8.4: 	<p>The Applicant has included the following text which</p>	<p>ECC has responded to REP4-298 and require</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access is required 24/7 to the Ardleigh Depot in Essex without hindrance for all vehicle types including a snow plough as worst case. It is noted that there are to be no delays to access/egress or on the surrounding local roads leading to the wider network as it will impact on road safety where ECC respond to emergency incidents on the local highway network. 	<p>excludes the red text proposed by ECC: <i>“Before carrying out any works with a potential to affect access to the Essex County Council Depot in Ardleigh, National Grid/the Main Works Contractor(s) will develop and agree with Essex County Council details of measures to ensure that access is maintained at all times to the depot; or where this is not reasonably practicable, that a suitable alternative access is provided and operational prior to any interruption of the existing access. National Grid/the Main Works Contractor(s) will provide reasonable advance notice of any proposed temporary road closures or traffic management measures that may affect access to the depot, including details of anticipated impacts on access and response times.”</i></p>	<p>that the additional wording (red text) is included in some form. The relevant commentary on the response given to REP4-298 is replicated below: <i>“Essentially, we require wording that states the importance of minimising delays (ie it will impact on ECC’s response to emergency incidents) and that the road closures and traffic management measures should be discussed and agreed with ECC to minimise impacts (rather than “notified”).”</i></p>
--	---	--	--

Table 6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 6.1 at “Monitoring of vehicles and road network” to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monitoring vehicle movements of HGVs and construction workers. 	The Applicant has not included the red text in the table. They have stated that they have committed to the monitoring of vehicles in paragraph 6.2.6.	ECC would suggest that as the Table 6.1 is a summary of all the site checks relevant to the CTMP that this point is included for clarity.
Paragraph 6.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant should set out some examples of corrective actions that could be taken. ECC have included some in the proposed wording below to be provided after paragraph 6.3.1. <p>Proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Where needed corrective actions will be agreed with the relevant LHA and/or community members prior to implementation. These actions could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ extending the programme of works to reduce the impact of traffic; ▪ warnings given to drivers who do not adhere to the routing strategy or those waiting or parking at inappropriate locations in the vicinity of the site;and further disciplinary actions as necessary for repeated incidents 	The Applicant has not included the potential corrective actions in the Outline CTMP (as shown in red text). They have instead stated that further sanctions will be included in the final version of the CTMP.	It is assumed the final version mentioned is in relation to the Outline CTMP and not the version that the Contractor is to provide post DCO. If the latter, then ECC do not agree to this approach as ECC require some points that can be discussed with the Contractor.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ closure of compounds/on site parking to prevent staff arriving/departing during peak hours on the local highway network; or ▪ implementing additional shuttle buses to reduce worker traffic. 		
Section 6.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The list of non-compliance at Section 6.4.1 to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Construction traffic (both worker traffic and HGV movements) levels are beyond those assumed in the Transport Assessment and ES 	The Applicant has not included the red text in the CTMP. They have noted that the requirement to monitor and manage vehicle movements against those in the TA/ES are captured as a commitment in paragraph 5.4.18.	As Section 6.4.1 is a summary of all the non-compliance then it should be included for clarity.

Appendix 4 – draft DCO requirement for an Ecology and Landscape Working Group for Norwich to Tilbury

Appendix 4

Ecology and Landscape Working Group

Draft Requirement / Terms of Reference

Requirement

(1) Prior to the submission, in accordance with requirement 4(1)(c), of the first landscape and ecological management plan, the undertaker must establish the ecology working group to discharge the role of that group in accordance with the provisions of Schedule [X] (membership, role and protocol of the ecology working group).

(2) The membership, role and protocol of the ecology working group must be as set out in Schedule [X] and the group must be administered by the undertaker, and operated, in accordance with the provisions of Schedule [X].

(3) The first meeting of the ecology working group must be held before the submission of the first landscape and ecological management plan and it must continue its duties until the authorised development has been decommissioned, in accordance with requirement 13 (decommissioning), unless otherwise agreed by the ecology working group.

Schedule [X] (membership, role and protocol of the ecology working group)

1. — (1) The ecology working group (“EWG”) will comprise -

(a) two representatives to be nominated by the undertaker (one of whom must be a suitably qualified ecologist);

(b) one representative to be nominated by each of the following local authorities –

(i) Babergh & Mid-Suffolk District Council;

(ii) Broadland & South Norfolk District Council

(iii) Colchester Council;

(iv) Essex County Council;

(v) Norfolk County Council;

(vi) Suffolk County Council; and

(vii) Tendring District Council.

(2) The EWG shall encourage participation at its meetings by representatives of the Environment Agency, Natural England, any relevant National Landscape team, any relevant Wildlife Trust, and such other person whose attendance representatives of the EWG may from time to time consider to be beneficial.

2. — (1) The undertaker is responsible for convening and holding meetings of the EWG.

(2) The EWG must meet at least annually, either virtually or in a convenient location to be identified by the undertaker and agreed by the representatives of the EWG.

(3) Meetings will be –

(a) chaired by [the undertaker];

(b) quorate if at least [five] representatives are present.

3. — (1) The undertaker must consult the EWG on –

(a) the development of any landscape and ecological management plan, to be submitted in accordance with requirement 4(1)(c) (construction management plans), and each plan must explain how this has been done;

(b) the implementation of the ecological aspects of any approved landscape and ecological management plan, including monitoring;

(c) the provision of adaptive aftercare, in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan; and

(d) the development of any habitat management and monitoring plan to be developed, in accordance with the outline landscape and ecological management plan.

4. — (1) In addition to responding to the consultations mentioned in paragraph (3), the role of the EWG will be to –

(a) advise on the achievement of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement in respect of the authorised development;

(b) advise on the way in which the undertaker communicates on biodiversity matters to the EWG representatives mentioned in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1(1) and those bodies mentioned in sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph 1;

(c) advise on the co-ordination of any [biodiversity-related] research project [arising from] [related to] the authorised development, the dissemination of any outcomes, and the provision of feedback to the undertaker and to relevant stakeholders;

- (d) review the monitoring undertaken in accordance with any landscape and ecological management plan;
- (e) determine whether the ecological commitments and outcomes set out in the outline landscape and ecological management plan are being met; and
- (f) if the commitments and outcomes in the outline landscape and ecological management plan are not being met, to agree reasonable actions that the undertaker must implement in an agreed time, in order to meet those commitments and outcomes.

5. — (1) The undertaker must pay for –

- (a) all reasonable costs arising from the attendance of attendees at any meeting of the EWG (which shall include reasonable transport and preparation costs); and
- (b) such other costs of the EWG representatives, provided these have been agreed in advance by the undertaker.

6. — (1) In this requirement –

“a suitably qualified ecologist” means an ecologist with appropriate academic qualifications, relevant experience of tree species selection, habitat reinstatement and arboricultural good practice, and membership of an appropriate professional body such as the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

“any relevant Wildlife Trust” and “any relevant National Landscape team”, means any Wildlife Trust, or any National Landscape team, as the case may be, located within the administrative area of any of the local authorities mentioned in paragraph 1(1)(b).