

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc for an Order granting Development Consent for the National Grid Norwich to Tilbury Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: EN020027

Deadline 5: Examining Authority's Written Questions 2 (ExQ2)

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document is submitted for Deadline 5 on behalf of National Highways ("**NH**") in respect of an application by National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc ("**Applicant**") for an order granting development consent for the National Grid Norwich to Tilbury Project ("**DCO**"). The Applicant seeks development consent for proposed authorised development described in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO ("**Authorised Development**"). This document sets out the Examining Authority's Written Questions 2 (ExQ2) that are directly specifically to NH and NH's response to the same.

EXQ2	Question to:	Question:	NH Response
TT 2.2	<p>National Highways</p> <p>Essex County Council</p> <p>Thurrock Council</p> <p>Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>PARs 2</p> <p>Please highlight any residual concerns you may have regarding specific PARs which you believe have not been adequately addressed by the applicant and where you may have concerns about ability to address them either during or after the examination.</p>	<p>NH is unable to determine whether any/all concerns regarding specific PARs have been addressed until the trip generation, distribution, and assignment (and therefore the development traffic impact at all impacted SRN junctions) have been agreed.</p> <p>Further information and clarifications are required for NH to be able to agree the expected flows at the SRN junction and therefore to understand fully the impact of the proposed development. Therefore, NH may have concerns about the impacts and mitigation proposals at some of the SRN junctions which form part of the PARs.</p>
TT 2.4	<p>National Highways</p> <p>Essex County Council</p> <p>Thurrock Council</p> <p>Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>Outline CTMP 2</p> <p>Following ISH2, at DL4 the applicant updated the outline CTMP [REP4-174] with regard to community engagement with councils, parish councils, other developers and the public. Please provide comments on this updated proposal.</p>	<p>NH has no comments about these updates.</p> <p>It should be noted, however, that NH is unable to agree the oCTMP fully until the impacts of the development on the SRN have been fully understood, as per the response to TT2.2 above.</p>

TT 2.9	<p>The applicant</p> <p>National Highways</p> <p>Essex County Council</p> <p>Thurrock Council</p> <p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>Outline CTMP 6</p> <p>In their response action points at ISH2 [REP4-336] at paragraph 11.5.d, Suffolk CC propose a quarterly report on the key transport parameters, some of which they go on to list. Does the applicant consider this appropriate and how would this be secured in the DCO. Please can the other highway authorities comment on this proposal.</p>	<p>The proposed parameters listed at 11.5.d are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HGV numbers and distribution • Exceedance of assessed volumes (or caps) • Non-compliance with routing or timing • Compliance with key mitigation e.g. avoidance of school start / finish (Stowupland) or shift times • Worker numbers • Car share ratios <p>NH supports the proposal and considers the parameters listed above are appropriate to report on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>Once the impacts of the development are fully understood (as per the response to TT2.2 above), NH may request further measures to be added to the list.</p>
TT 2.10	<p>National Highways</p> <p>Essex County Council</p> <p>Thurrock Council</p> <p>Suffolk County Council</p> <p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>Cap on Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)</p> <p>Please can all highway authorities who have not done so already, provide comments on whether you consider a cap on HGVs is required or if the applicant's proposals to provide a three month forward view is acceptable. If you have commented previously, please signpost the ExA to your latest position on this matter.</p>	<p>The need for any caps on the number of HGVs is dependent on the impact of the development traffic. Therefore, from NH's perspective, any caps on HGVs would need to be agreed once the traffic impact on the SRN has been fully understood and agreed.</p>

TT 2.12	<p>The applicant</p> <p>National Highways</p> <p>Essex County Council</p> <p>Thurrock Council</p> <p>Norfolk County Council</p>	<p>Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) 1</p> <p>Thank you for the updates on structural assessments for AIL routes provided at deadline 4. For clarification, please explain the expectation for undertaking the remaining structural assessments on AIL routes and outline what measures will be taken, and how they are secured in the draft DCO, if structural assessments fail.</p>	<p>NH have advised the applicant to submit its proposals via the formal ESDAL process as this is the most efficient and effective way in which to identify the structures which will need to be assessed.</p> <p>The passage of AIL's can be arranged in line with NH's usual processes for the notification for AIL movements on the network, with any resulting highway works authorised by way of an agreement, having followed the procedures in its template protective provisions. Accordingly, it is not clear why any measures required would need to be secured in the DCO, since the applicant will need to address them in order to be able to utilise those routes or, alternatively, use a different route.</p>
---------	---	--	--