

WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL ('WTC') WRITTEN SUBMISSION – PROCEDURAL DEADLINE 1

Comments on Relevant Representations (RRIs)

1. WTC wishes to particularly endorse the comments in certain RRs submitted by the following other Interested Parties.
 - RR - 0164 Bucklesham Parish Council
 - RR - 0170 Campsea Ashe PC. We particularly highlight the comments in sub-section 2.3 and 2.5 but support all of the representations made.
 - RR - 0780 Melton Parish Council. We particularly highlight the comments on rat runs and noise issues with night-time freight trains.
 - RR - 1162 Stop Sizewell C. Whilst the RR contains many aspects that have no direct impact on Woodbridge WTC endorses Stop Sizewell C's views on rail noise and road traffic and associated infrastructure away from the Applicant's site, as well as aspects relevant to the general environment and business setting for residents and businesses of Woodbridge such as the impacts on existing businesses, tourism and the stability of the coast.
2. WTC is not in agreement with RR-0342 of East Suffolk Council on the principle of supporting an additional nuclear power station at Sizewell but does endorse that council's representations on noise assessment in section 1, particular those in the sub section Rail Noise on the underestimation by the Applicant on noise impact. We do not agree with comments on the acceptability of the current proposed mitigation of rail noise but do agree on their being an ongoing dynamic assessment during the development and operation of the night-time freight train movements. WTC notes ESC does not comment at all upon the impact of noise on residents and others sleeping in properties abutting the A12. WTC supports the requests in paragraphs 1.84 and 1.85 in relation to air pollution at locations where trains may idle as this is particularly important for the area around Woodbridge station. WTC also supports the ESC comment and request for details as given in paragraph 1.202. WTC notes ESC comments in paragraph 1.204 and WTC agrees that A12 Improvements, which SCC now are proposing as an option, are unlikely to fully mitigate against the negative impacts of congestion, non-Sizewell traffic diversion onto already inadequate other roads, poor air quality and severance of communities on either side of the A12. WTC agrees with the comment in paragraph 2.188 on the lack of capacity at the A12/A14 Seven Hills roundabout and believes this will adversely impact on its residents who travel this route on a regular basis.
3. WTC agrees with the RR-1174 of Suffolk County Council in respect of the overall assessment that the disbenefits of the proposed scheme in the DCO application outweigh the benefits but is not in agreement with SCC on the principle of supporting an additional nuclear power station at Sizewell. With respect to the freight management strategy the RR relates to the pre DCO Application Change proposal and acceptance by the ExA but we agree with the sentiments in paragraph 5 of the Executive Summary as these issues remain. We particularly highlight the aspect with respect to an upgrade of the East Suffolk Line as despite assurances by the Applicant that Network Rail precluded this WTC consider it has not been adequately investigated and pursued. We await SCC's further Representation on the DCO application accepted Changes to the freight management strategy for further comment. WTC consider

that as the B1438 through Woodbridge town centre is likely to be significantly impacted by diversion traffic, both during police organised diversions and during general peak hour periods, SCC should have required a mitigation package for that route.

4. WTC endorse paragraph 10 of SCC RR Executive Summary as we consider the Applicant has failed to consider the impact of night-time rail traffic on the Deben Valley SPA and RAMSAR areas to the east of the railway line through Woodbridge and Melton.
5. WTC further endorses paragraph 12 e) i) and vi). With respect to the former we agree on the lack of clarity with respect to emergency planning provisions as the rail freight strategy risks periodic severance of emergency services' assess to the riverside properties and residents in Woodbridge and no contingency plans have been presented. With respect to the latter WTC agree and consider it imperative that a continuous monitoring programme is instituted with trigger levels set for further mitigation or remediation where they are exceeded.

Summary of our RR to date

6. WTC's RR submission on the original DCO documentation did not exceed 1500 words and thus no summary is provided.

Comments on Applicant's draft itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspections (ASIs)

7. Applicant's draft itinerary for ASIs issued as document PDB-5 has been reviewed by WTC and WTC notes that there is no proposal for inspections in the vicinity of Woodbridge. We have no comments on the inspections proposed in that document.

Suggested locations for other Accompanied Site Inspections (ASIs) and Unaccompanied Site Inspections (USIs)

8. WTC is aware from page 4 of PDB-5 and the PINS document EV-002 that on 18th February Edmund Maund of the ExA undertook Unaccompanied Site Inspections (USIs) *"To view residential areas near the railway line to appreciate concerns expressed through Relevant Representations."* WTC however is not aware of the precise locations visited as no map accompanied the PINS record.
9. In PM Pt 1 it was recommended by the ExA that Interested Parties ('IP's) could also recommend itineraries for ASIs or for USIs in their written submissions for Deadline B. WTC included such details in its written submission for Deadline B. WTC notes that for Deadline 1 it is requested that justification for such further inspections should be provided.
10. WTC refers the ExA to its written submission for Deadline B for details of proposed inspections and WTC gives justification below for these inspections.
11. WTC stated in its written submission for Deadline B that it and/or its representative Robin Sanders, as an Interested Party in his own name, would 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. WTC has subsequently had meetings with the Applicant and now intends to submit that report for Deadline 2 to take account of the matters discussed and further information provided by the Applicant and given orally at its meeting with the Applicant.

12. In the third paragraph in the section commenting on ASIs and USIs in our written submission for Deadline B we suggested a site inspection to various level crossings, the railway station and viewing the properties, including houseboats, between the station and Lime Kiln Quay Road – see Annex A for route referred to as ASI/USI 1.
13. The justification for this inspection is summarised below:
 - to note the difference in provision of controls for public access over the railway line, in particular the lack of such controls at the crossing at the south east corner of Kingston Recreation Ground, which we understand is called Kingston Farm crossing by Network Rail.
 - to time the inspection to hear the level of sound of the train klaxons
 - to see the manual control of the signals for down trains to Saxmundham which require a train driver to dismount from a train to operate preventing trains passing through the station at the Applicant's proposed constant 10mph.
 - to note the position of the upline signal at the station and that for properties riverward of the railway freight trains of the length proposed by the Applicant will mean that if halted at the signal no available vehicular access is feasible for normal or most importantly emergency police, fire or ambulance vehicles until the train is cleared to exit Woodbridge.
 - If not viewed already, to view all properties between Lime Kiln Quay Road and Woodbridge station.
 - To note the difference in track alignment between the Applicant's noise and vibration monitoring station and that adjacent to residential properties along Station Road, Tide Mill Way and Quayside.
14. WTC suggested a further site inspection in the fourth paragraph in the section commenting on ASIs and USIs in our written submission for Deadline B as this area has not been covered by any previous ASI or USI undertaken by the ExA. See Annex A for route referred to as ASI/USI 2.
15. The justification for this site inspection is to see the proximity of residential properties and guest house accommodation adjacent to the A12 and the current crossing arrangements for Woodbridge residents, particularly school children, living west of the A12. As stated in our written submission for Deadline B it would also enable the ExA to appreciate the changes proposed in the SCC's proposals for the upgrade of the A12 which it has requested the Applicant to comment upon in relation to its road freight strategy.
16. Finally, WTC also suggested in the fifth paragraph in the section commenting on ASIs and USIs in our written submission for Deadline B we suggested a USI/ASI along the B1438. Our justification for this inspection was to view the constraints and risks along this route, in terms of road width for cyclists and pavement widths for pedestrians, which would form the diversion route for vehicles on the A12 if the latter is suddenly closed between Woodbridge

and the Southern Park & Ride. Further WTC believe it likely that with additional HGV traffic on the A12 a higher volume of traffic will opt to divert via the B1438 to reach the A1152 at Melton particularly at peak periods when A12 traffic queues southwest of the A12/B1438 roundabout. We are currently unsure if the Applicant will permit its HGV traffic to operate on police defined diversion routes such as the B1438. As this is along an existing classified highway we have not included a route view in Annex A.

If any of these inspection is undertaken as an ASI WTC would wish to attend.

Notification to speak at the Open Floor Hearing (OFH)

17. WTC has submitted the requested form for its representative Councillor Robin Sanders to speak at an Open Floor hearing next week.

Notification to make oral representations at Issue Specific Hearings ('ISH's)

18. WTC wish to make oral representations at the ISH meetings covering the following topics as a minimum.
 - Freight management strategy specifically rail and road
 - Noise and vibration

Annex A



Aerial view of route for proposed AS1/USI 1



Aerial view of route for Proposed ASI/USI 2