

**Dear Planning Inspectorate,**

**Our Ref. 20026207**

**Snape PC - DCO Sizewell C EN010012 – Response to Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) 3 and 4**

- We note Suffolk County Council's (SCC) view expressed in the Local Impact Report that "Construction traffic HGVs, AILs, abnormal loads, buses, cars and LGVs will increase delays across Suffolk's highway network, specifically, along the A12". This reflects the concerns of Snape and other nearby parishes as outlined in our joint village submission for the OFH. It is inevitable that the increase in traffic on this strategic corridor will lead to delays; particularly during the construction of associated development. We believe that the delays will lead to driver frustration and that drivers are likely to take risks in order to overtake on unsafe stretches of road. There is therefore the likelihood of an increase in road traffic accidents and the delays being further compounded. Impacts on the resilience of the A12 as the main north-south corridor in East Suffolk seems still to be under estimated by both the applicant and SCC. In the hearing Mr Humphrey on behalf of the Inspectorate observed that the traffic impact could be "the straw that broke the camel's back", in terms of the fragility of the road infrastructure in East Suffolk. Which is precisely the concern of Snape PC and other communities. SCC and EDF need to be more proactive in anticipating these problems and the related issue of "rat running" or as EDF preferred to phrase it in the hearing "driver choice of routes" – it is acknowledged by SCC that "rat-running" will happen, but we consider that it is not good enough to leave the issue until it becomes a significant aggravation to local communities and then address it through the Transport Review Group (TRG). We noted with concern as did others that the TRG as currently envisaged did not appear to be capable of proactive traffic management nor with any direct communication with impacted local communities.
- To that end we would support the presence of the local police on the TRG and were surprised that the original proposal for the group did not include them; a significant oversight which needs to be rectified. We did note with concern that despite reassurances about the level of control that EDF will exercise in a previous discussion with Snape PC, in the hearing itself the Applicant seemed to move away from that claimed high degree of traffic management. We remain concerned about the real time management of traffic and related issues through the proposed GPS, ANPR and contractual controls which have been variously raised.
- A major concern for communities on and served by the A12 is specifically that "rat-running". As far as the Applicant is concerned, and this appeared to be confirmed in the hearing, they regard "rat-running" as a largely non SZC local traffic issue and therefore outside their control. We feel that SCC and the Applicant are being insufficiently robust in seeking solutions to what could become a major problem to local communities. SCC seem to accept that "rat-running" will occur when they say, "SCC considers that it is likely that many workers and local drivers will switch to minor routes 'rat running' through local communities." Again we noted with concern that in the hearing the applicant conceded that

whilst traffic modelling had been done no work on this particular issue had been undertaken. Primarily it seemed because it was not a problem for EDF.

- Snape shares the concerns of Campsea Ashe and Marlesford that the B1078 and B1069 and surrounding minor roads will face particular problems with “rat-running” – the problem will be compounded if Bentwaters is used as a distribution point for material destined for the SZC development sites. In Snape this will have particular impact at the junction of the B1069 and A1094 at Snape Church Common. There are existing problems with queuing traffic at that junction during periods of high traffic volume and queues up to a mile long when the A12 is obstructed in any way. Snape PC is currently working on plans with SCC Highway engineers to mitigate the existing issues which can only be made worse by the existing DCO proposals for both SZC and Friston.
- On that specific issue of cumulative impact Snape PC did not feel that there was sufficient exploration at the hearing of the impact of SZC taken together with the parallel projects for Friston. Again there appeared to be no modelling of the potential impact on traffic and therefore consideration of possible mitigation.
- An ancillary issue for Snape and other communities will be the increased level of damage to road surfaces on many roads if the projects are consented. Currently the lack of maintenance on roads large and small is a constant issue of complaint and concern to parish councils.
- Experience from Hinkley suggests that “rat-running” will occur – it is therefore up to the Applicant and SCC to anticipate the problem on our roads, rather than waiting until communities become frustrated by it and solutions have to be found by the TRG.
- Parts of the road network in East Suffolk already have low levels of resilience and can be heavily impacted by traffic incidents. Snape PC urges that the Applicant is made to deliver the maximum amount of highways mitigation as early in the construction programme as possible – later delivery risks conflicting with ever increasing SZC, EA1N and EA2 traffic flows.
- As a village Snape has made the point consistently with other nearby communities without a full four village bypass, covering Marlesford to Friday Street, then the B1069 and linked roads such as the A1078 will effectively become at times of road stress the de facto by pass. This issue remains unaddressed by both the Applicant and SCC and will be greatly compounded by all the parallel development at the Friston substation if that is consented.

Tim Beach  
Snape Parish Council