

From: [REDACTED]
To: [SizewellC](#)
Subject: Procedural Deadline B - Representation from Woodbridge Town Council
Date: 07 April 2021 13:20:04
Attachments: [Procedural Deadline B - Woodbridge Town Council response.pdf](#)

Good afternoon,

Please find attached Woodbridge Town Council's (IP Reference Number 20025891) written submission on the Examination procedure and timetable in response to matters raised orally at the Preliminary Meeting Part 1.

If you can please confirm receipt of this submission we would be grateful – if this is not the correct way to make such a submission please advise how this should be done.

Kind Regards

Greg

Mr G E Diaper
Acting Town Clerk
Woodbridge Town Council

[REDACTED]
W - www.woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents. If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

To view the Woodbridge Town Council privacy policy please click [here](#).

Woodbridge Town Council encloses with this letter its written submission on the Examination procedure and timetable in response to matters raised orally at Preliminary Meeting Part 1. The written submission also comments on the Applicant's draft itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspections (ASIs) and cites other itineraries it considers the Examiners should make either as ASIs or Unaccompanied Site inspections (USIs).

Woodbridge Town Council also requests that its representative, Councillor Robin Sanders, is heard orally with respect to any item that is discussed which relates to points raised in this written submission.

WOODBRIIDGE TOWN COUNCIL ('WTC') WRITTEN SUBMISSION – PROCEDURAL DEADLINE B

Comments on Examination Procedure

1. WTC view the backroom management of the Preliminary Meeting ('PM') utilising Microsoft Teams as sub-standard throughout the two days of PM Part 1 ('Pt 1') when compared to similar events, including those held by PINS on other recent DCO applications. This was orally advised by another Interested Party during PM Pt 1. The lack of fluidity to the event was reflected in the frequent loss of some of the Examiners during the meeting and of a significant number of Interested Parties ('IPs'), some of whom are highly experienced in using Microsoft Teams e.g. Suffolk County Council ('SCC').
2. WTC recommends that consideration is given to enhancing the IT systems and cameras of many of the Examiners as the quality of image and haphazard focus left a lot to be desired, causing marked eye strain for participants.
3. WTC agrees with the oral comment by Stop Sizewell C spokesperson, Alison Downes, that the characteristics of Microsoft Teams, in particular its higher demands on Interested Parties IT infrastructure than comparable platforms, is hindering, and potentially compromising, the Examination. WTC requests PINS consider adopting another platform for the rest of the Examination.
4. WTC Representative at PM Pt 1 requested via email, during the latter part of the first day of the PM, that breaks in the PM were held at hourly intervals as recommended by HSE for use of Display Screen Equipment ('DSE'). WTC is perturbed that this request was ignored and reiterates its view that breaks should be at a maximum of hourly intervals during any further virtual meetings.
5. The written transcripts of the PM Pt 1 are of very poor quality. Whilst WTC recognises it is not intended to be a verbatim account there are frequent, and regular, misspelling and missing transcripts. They are thus neither reasonably complete nor, at times, an intelligible record of the PM Pt 1. WTC thus recommends that PINS review the methodology of transcription and the quality of the transcribed report, including a thorough proofread, before their issue.
6. WTC is aware the DCO Examination for East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) has been extended by a period of three months i.e. from April 6 to July 6. The impact of that extension on Interested Parties engaged on both that and this Examination, is likely to be severe. There will be adverse impact on such Interested Parties with respect to involvement in PM Pt 2, Open Floor Hearings, the June Accompanied Site Inspections, the July Issue Specific Hearings and to meeting Deadlines D1 to D4. WTC strongly requests that in the light of the extension to the DCO Examination for East Anglia One North (EA1N) and East Anglia Two (EA2) the Sizewell C Examination be similarly extended by a delay to proceedings of three months. PM Pt 2 should be postponed for a period of three months and a new Examination Timetable issued as a matter of urgency so Interested Parties can plan their future commitments and comment on a new Examination Timetable for a postponed PM Pt 2.
7. WTC consider the above approach will also meet the many requests at PM Pt 1 that proceedings be delayed until hybrid and/or traditional in-person meetings can be held. WTC thus recommends that PM Pt 2 is held on, or around, 24 July 2021.

8. Further postponement of PM Pt 2 should enable the ExA to advise Interested Parties, at or preferably before that meeting of their decision on the acceptance of any, or all, of the Changes that the Applicant has sought to be included in the Application under Examination.
9. If no postponement of PM Pt 2 occurs and/or if the ExA, as advised at PM Pt 1, does not issue its decision at PM Pt2, on acceptance of the changes submitted in January 2021 by the Applicant, WTC agree with other Interested Parties that a PM Pt 3 is required so that the impact of the decision on the Examination Process can be commented upon by Interested Parties before the 6 month period for the Examination commences.
10. At PM Pt 1 Interested Parties were asked to advise on their views on hybrid (mixed) or in-person meetings when national restrictions allow such alternatives to be viable. WTC's view is that in-person meetings are the preferred approach and that these should be enabled as soon as national and/or regional COVID related restrictions allow. WTC believe hybrid meetings would be a viable alternative if full in-person meetings were not viable. WTC considers it would require considerable planning and IT support with large display screens for all Interested Parties and the ExA to view Interested Parties connecting into the meetings. To achieve this, and as local bandwidth/speed issues exist in many parts of Suffolk it would be preferable if ExA set up local hubs where such problems could be overcome, manned by IT support provided by PINS. WTC has concerns that, based on PM Pt 1, PINS has not demonstrated it has the capability to run such complex meetings successfully.
11. WTC, along with other town and parish councils, sought consultation with the Applicant on issues that impact the various councils but the request for meeting the council together was rejected. This matter was raised by Councillor Fellowes, of Aldeburgh Town Council, and Tim Beach of Snape Parish Council, at Day 1 of PM Pt1. WTC has now sought a consultation with the Applicant on matters that impact on Woodbridge and awaits its reply. If that request is denied WTC would ask the ExA to request that the Applicant holds meetings with WTC to agree a Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG').
12. SoCG and Section 101 agreements are being sought via the Examination process between the Applicant and East Suffolk District Council. Where those SoCG and Section 101 agreements relate to specific issues that will impact people or the environment in, or adjacent, to WTC boundaries, WTC would wish to be able to respond at a hearing with the ExA as to whether the issued SoCG/Section 101, reflects the view and opinions of WTC. It would wish this to include the type and level of mitigation/ compensation and which body administers the funds for mitigation and/or compensation. This is in response to Mr Humphrey of the ExA indicated that requests for the ability to include community impact statements for specific town and parish councils be sought by Deadline B.

Comments on Accompanied Site Visits (ASIs) and Unaccompanied Site Visits (USIs)

13. The Applicant's draft itinerary for ASIs is to be issued by Deadline B and thus WTC has not seen that itinerary to comment upon it. Comments on that Applicant's itinerary are to be made by May 12 by Interested Parties.
14. In PM Pt 1 it was recommended by the ExA that Interested Parties could also recommend an itinerary for ASIs or for USIs in their written submissions for Deadline B.

15. WTC has examined the details of the USIs already undertaken by the ExA on 18 - 20 August 2020 and 16 – 18 February 2021. WTC note that on 18 February 2021 Examiner Edwin Maund viewed residential areas near the railway line in Woodbridge to appreciate concerns expressed through Relevant Representations, the precise locations are unrecorded. He further went to Melton Railway Station and took the riverside walk to the residential and commercial areas adjacent to the railway line and observed the operation of a level crossing, which given the description was assume is the crossing on Dock Lane, Melton.
16. Woodbridge is the most southerly town to be significantly affected by construction traffic, both road and rail.
17. WTC and/or its representative Robin Sanders, as an Interested Party in his own name, will be submitting for Deadline 1 on 12 May 2021 a technical review of the Applicant's assessments of the impact of railway noise and vibration on Woodbridge residents, visitors and the adjacent Deben Estuary SPA.
18. To enable the ExA to appreciate the matters that will be raised in that review WTC requests that a ASI or USI is undertaken encompassing the following:
 - the level crossings at Jetty Lane (sometimes referred to as the Avenue) and the level crossing upline of that crossing at the south east corner of Kingston Recreation Ground at the time of passage of a train. Both can be examined over a short period by being at the Jetty Lane crossing for an upline passenger train at circa 18-20 minutes past the hour and a downline train at 28-30 minutes past the hour.
 - Woodbridge Railway Station and the arrangement at the northern end of the downline platform for train passage beyond Woodbridge to Saxmundham. At that same location the proximity of the bedroom windows of the Station Guesthouse to the railway line. On crossing the line to the upline platform the location of the signal at the southern end.
 - walk out at the northern end of the upline platform to view the proximity of the first floor window to the Malthouse residence, the proximity of the residential house boats and other residential properties on both sides of the railway line.
 - walk along the quay towards the Tidemill turning left on Tide Mill Way to the level crossing of Tide Mill Way to view the housing on both sides of the railway, the rail track layout both up and downline and the distance from this level crossing to Woodbridge station and the absence of any access upline of this crossing for vehicles to access housing, the Grade 1 listed Tide Mill, the yacht marina and commercial businesses riverward of the railway line.
 - Return towards the Tidemill taking the footpath on the left towards Lime Kiln Quay noting residential properties between the footpath and railway line.
 - At the level crossing of Lime Kiln Quay look downline to the approximate location of the Applicant's noise and vibration survey location.
 - If time allows visit the location of the Applicant's noise and vibration surveys by walking up Lime Kiln Road and along the Thoroughfare and down the side of the former Suffolk Coastal (now East Suffolk) Council offices.
19. Further WTC would wish the ExA to undertake an ASI or USI to the A12 walking between the B1079/A12 Grundisburgh Road roundabout and the pedestrian crossing at Hasketon Road

used by school children and resident of Woodbridge west of the A12. For safety reasons a return walking on the footpath beside the northbound carriageway to cross the A12 at the roundabout is not advisable. Parking is possible at Bilney Road. We recommend this is undertaken after examining SCC's proposals for the upgrade of the A12, recently consultation upon with the public, and which is planned, but cannot be ensured to constructed in full prior to use of the A12 by Sizewell construction traffic.

20. Finally, a USI/ASI along the B1438 from its roundabout junction with the A12 south west of Woodbridge through the town to Melton and thence Wickham Market. This is the only possible diversion route for HGVs to reach the Southern Park & Ride/Sizewell C site if the A12 is closed at any location between the junction and Wickham Market or if queuing on the A12 backs south of the junction.

Issue Specific Hearings ('ISH's)

21. WTC considers that if the item coverage in the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues, as given in Annex C to the Rule 6 letter, forms the basis of the coverage of ISHs on those Principal Issues much of the detail WTC would seek to be examined will be considered in the ISHs. Councillor Sanders representing WTC raised a few specific additional items which WTC wish to be covered in his oral presentation at the PM Pt 1. The only additional specific additional items are given below.
22. WTC supports SCC request that the ExA considers the issue of deliverability of the various freight management strategy options put forward by the Applicant both in its original Application and its proposed Changes to the Application. To that end WTC specifically requests that, if the proposed Changes to the rail strategy are accepted, that detailed consideration is given the matter raised by Clive Lovelock at PM Pt1 as WTC considers that the Proposed Changes are likely to both impact on the passenger services and on noise and air quality issues in the vicinity of Woodbridge Railway Station.
23. WTC notes that for the road freight transport strategy or waste strategy no mention has been made of how the Applicant will manage and mitigate against an increase in littering of the A12 from Sizewell C lorry drivers disposing litter and bodily fluids in bottles as they drive to and from the construction site. The issue of such waste is an issue of considerable local concern throughout Suffolk and WTC would wish Examiners to note the prevalence of littering on the roadside when they travel to and from their ASI and USI, assuming they use cars to do so.
24. Councillor Robin Sanders of WTC raised specific item coverage of certain Principal Issues coverage in the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues at the PM Pt 1. WTC would request such items are included as part of the ISH on those Principal Issues.
25. WTC support the request of Mr Richard Cooper of Marlesford Parish Council that on the ExA identified Principal Issue of Traffic and Transport consideration should be given to the impact of the use of offsite centre, such as possibly at Bentwaters, on traffic and safety along local roads including, but not be limited, to the A1152 and B1438 through Melton and Woodbridge.