

**Issue Specific Hearing 2 Traffic and Transport Part 1 and Part 2 on behalf of  
Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council, Stop Sizewell C and B1122 Group  
Oral Contribution by Cllr. Paul Collins**

**Traffic and Transport Issues**

***Please note any text highlighted with bold and italic emphasis in the following submission represents additional information not conveyed in the oral submission.***

**2. Freight Management Strategy**

**Capacity and delivery of:**

- **Movement of freight by rail**

- Is the Sizewell Link Road railway bridge that is proposed part of the grip process as well? It was a clarification rather than anything else.
  - Richard Bull on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I can confirm that is the case. Just as a way of an update the actual bridge itself is currently undergoing design.
- Back to the number of trains. Regarding the two train paths that want to go in during the early years. When they will start and what is the impact going to be on the roads should those be delayed?
- That also travels on into when they want four trains in and out per day. It's interesting that Mr. Bull, for the applicant, just said that the seventh path during the day, which is currently an old path that was used by Sizewell A during de-fuelling, is to help out if anything gets delayed. However, I also understood he said, that they were going to do three outbound at night and then the last one during that daytime path. So that path is part of the rail delivery plan. So, the daytime path is either part of the plan or it is a contingency path, it can't be both.
- The plan has got to work properly. So, I hope that the deadline five will give us more on those details. But I am concerned that any disruption to those dates and timings is just going to come back to more HGVs on the road.
- Very concerned regarding the as yet uncertainty of what volumes and delivery frequencies will actually be practical given the constraints at Ely and in general on the East Suffolk line from Ipswich. The impact of the branch line to Felixstowe from Westerfield to support the existing port facilities and any increases that may come about as the Freeport development progresses in the coming years.

- **Movement of freight by sea**

- What proportion of AILs and Special deliveries will be brought through the permanent beach landing facility and when will those deliveries start?
- Will any AIL deliveries be required before the BLF and Sizewell Link Road are in place?

- **Movement of freight by road**

- Thank you for bringing up the whole point about the HGV caps. I do understand we'll go through these tomorrow, but I also agree that it's great to set a high cap and never reach it, but on the other hand, it doesn't really offer the control that actually we're looking for.
- The other thing which is becoming apparent is that in the early years, much heavier vehicles are going to be used and we haven't had a proper discussion about vibration damage. When we actually talk about vibration, particularly along the B1122, which has multiple listed buildings with minimal or no foundations or underpinnings, there will be potential issues of damage. However, there's no suggestion that any of these buildings should be assessed prior to this traffic using the B1122 in the early years. This has already been requested in B1122 SoCG.
- As a result, it's going to be very difficult for anybody to figure out whether damage is occurring, especially at places like Theberton Church which has an old tower, very close to the road.
- So, the whole issue about these larger vehicles, HGV and AILs using the B1122, we need, as you quite rightly say, a good profile to see what it is we're talking about and then look at what the cap should be because this is just bandying about 300 vehicles or 600 movements and around 300 vehicles in both directions is not very informative and a well-defined profile is needed for an appropriate cap to be set.
- ***We are also aware that the HGV limits originally set had to be increased at Hinkley Point and we would rather that caps were set that are based on a well constructed plan rather than set so loosely that they represent no real control at all. See [https://www.sedgemoor.gov.uk/media/3975/HGV-Variation-S106-Agreement/pdf/HGV\\_Variation\\_S106.pdf?m=636832535728730000](https://www.sedgemoor.gov.uk/media/3975/HGV-Variation-S106-Agreement/pdf/HGV_Variation_S106.pdf?m=636832535728730000).***
- ***Text from our evidence: From the drawings we have seen, ... At junctions it is clear that active travel infrastructure has been 'retrofitted' onto the proposed DMRB designs which owe more to prioritising motor vehicles than emphasising the role of active travel in reducing congestion, health and climate impacts.***
- ***The design of roundabouts and other junctions would leave vulnerable road users exposed to unpredictable, fast-moving vehicles on all arms, making it impossible to cross safely. There is no reason for junctions to be designed in a way that gives such a level of priority to motor vehicles that vulnerable road users are essentially designed out.***

- **Movement of freight by Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)**

- There's a lot of reliance on Tables 3.1 and 3.2 of the CTMP and the Hinkley Point experience.
- It does occur to me that having looked at these two tables, we have approximately 3000 or just over 3000 AIL movements in the first two years, which are the early years that we're concerned about.

- So, this is a quite a significant number of movements, big and small. I am concerned, this table is translated into something which has meaning for Sizewell, because it is going to be quite different.
- Heavy route 100, I presume, also means that once the Sizewell Link Road is built that any that route basic basically would get diverted along the B1122, initially to the Middleton Moor junction rather than sending materials all the way up to the beginning of the Sizewell Link Road and through the somewhat difficult set of junctions through Yoxford.
- So, I'd like that actually sorted out or at least told us what we're going to do on that point.
- Going back to these numbers in the CTMP, whilst I understand a lot of these loads are smaller and won't require escort by the police.
- When you look at the numbers for Hinkley Point, 832 in the first two years would require police escort, and that's 28% of those loads, that's over one a day for two years. That's a huge amount of escorted traffic to go down to B1122. And I'd be quite interested in whether that's what EDF are actually telling us.

- **3. Transport Strategy relating to Associated Development Sites**
- **Two Village Bypass – Implications for possible Four Village Bypass;**
- **Freight Management Facility - Alternatives and access arrangements**
- **Sizewell Link Road – Transport consideration of alternative routes, timing of delivery and legacy benefits**
  - In the middle of this session, we had a justification based on NPS EN-1 and EN-6, needing this project to be complete by 2035. The Committee for Climate Change provided a number of different scenarios as to what could be done to actually meet these targets and of course, I think the applicant has selected the one which most beneficially addresses their requirement or their need to build this power station.
  - So, I don't think that's necessarily the only view that you could take on that.
  - The second thing is that EN-1 and EN-6 as well as the other parts of the NPS are now well recognised to be out of date, and they are in the process or will be in the process in the next 12 months of being reviewed. In fact, EN-6 is 50% of the way through its review, which is currently parked by the government and this process needs to be started up again.
  - But enough of that, if we now go back to the Sizewell Link Road to B1122. On the issue that was raised about the widths of the B1122. In the early years and passing of HGVs, it is quite right there are about three places along the B1122 where this is going to be an issue and that is on the double bends near Middleton Moor, at the top of Mill Street where there's where there is a very poor visibility point and also as you come into Theberton at the pretty road junction where you have

a blind corner, which is always interesting when AILs come past because getting round the corner sometimes proves quite tricky

- The fact that within the early years, we now find out that actually we have a large number of articulated heavy vehicles coming in is only going to exacerbate that problem so that it really is an issue. I think the police were being fairly easy with their criticism of this, it is an issue, this road is not that wide.
- **Further examination of [APP-446](#) 2.4.29 reference a cut & fill balance from the SLR and 2.4.33 states that 90,800 tonnes of construction waste will be created presumably mainly soils and subsoils not required for the creation of embankments and other landscaping.**
- **Ms. Williamson in session 3 of ISH2 states that the SLR will be used prior to completion as a haul route for excavated materials from the SLR, Yoxford roundabout and the Two Villages Bypass, which will save in total 70,000 vehicle movements.**
- **So I assume from that statements that the SLR in its haul road guise will be the receptor for those same 70,000 vehicle movements as the excavated materials wont get to the Main Development Site by themselves.**
- **The thing with haul roads is that, in general, they do not have the sort of surface that road going HGVs can tolerate. Those larger earth moving vehicles are also not the sort of vehicles that we would generally like to see moving up the A12 from the Two Villages Bypass to the SLR entrance on the A12 and if they are not capable of using the SLR haul road, then presumably they will go to the B1122 at Yoxford and on to the site.**
- **Similarly, if haul road suitable vehicles are being used on the SLR development and travelling to the junction with the B1122 between Theberton and the Main Development Site entrance, the B1122 is also not the most suitable road for large earth movers, and we will have the other issue of the condition of the road if large volumes of any type of vehicle are exiting the SLR haul road on their way to the Main Development Site.**
- **Reference was made to the [AS-280](#) Freight Management Strategy, Plate 4.2 but that doesn't really answer any of these questions about what types of vehicles are coming from what Associated Development site, in what volumes, at what times in the development schedule, and which route combinations will they be using and for those which exit the SLR haul road onto the B1122, are they even counted anywhere in these early years.**
- I'd like to say, it has taken many consultations before the applicant has actually recognised the need to do something about mitigating the traffic on the B1122.
- It was interesting in the freight management facility discussion earlier, we heard that one of the things that they wanted to do minimises the travel distances and route diversions for HGVs getting to and from that site.
- I think this goes to what you were trying to bring out of the applicant a little bit a moment ago. The Sizewell Link Road is at the northern end

of a triangle, where 85% of HGVs and all southern Park & Ride buses have to come all the way up the A12, almost to Yoxford, before going back south and east again to the site.

- So, the overall journey times, pollution and the sustainability of that route has to be seen in the context of the entire length of the journeys that they're proposing.
- It is also the case that, whilst the AECOM report did look at those smaller bypasses, and the applicant keeps telling us how they want to minimise and mitigate the effects on Middleton and Theberton, if you look at something like the D2 or W North routes, or some variety thereof will mitigate just as well. It takes 85% of the HGVs away, it takes all of the southern park and ride away. And it would only leave the 15% of HGVs coming from the north, and buses coming from the park and ride at Darsham.
- ***As far as the "Peer Review of Option Selection for Sizewell Link Road" (April 2019) by Aecom on behalf of EDF Energy report is concerned, SCC and ESC stated that in their opinion the process used was inadequate without foundation in normal practice, and was not supported by evidence.***
- In reality, those numbers aren't that big for that long. It might have been acceptable to the local community to have them travel, the B1122 rather than go through all of this nonsense.
- For the applicant to say for route W North that they would send everything down to the route W entry onto the A12 is a nonsense, you wouldn't do that. I don't think anybody would have expected that.
- I think that's something that was never really looked at or talked to the communities involved as to whether that would be an acceptable compromise.
- As it is we end up with the SLR, which now seems to be required as a haul road, for fill material that is going down to the main site. And I can only think that the fact that they've chosen a route that requires plenty of cuttings into the landscape is how they are going to get their fill material onto site and seems a very poor reason to actually build the SLR where it is.
- If you look at the W north route, which incidentally, I think was proposed to be joined to the A12 in the most ridiculous place halfway through a site where East Suffolk council want to build a rather large housing development at some point. If they'd moved it further south towards Benhall, they only have to cross the valley, south of Saxmundham, then they come on to flatland, which goes almost all the way to the site and joins the B 1122 at almost the same position that the SLR currently is proposed to join it.
- Incidentally in their description in work. Number 12B the description says the SLR has a 3.3 finger round about at the end of it. Well, it doesn't and it never has on any of the maps and plans I've seen so I think that's just an error on their behalf and it should be changed.
- What else do we have? Rat runs on, and the whole business about the dog leg. If people find the B1122 and the SLR to be impacting traffic on the A12, then you will get people rat running on the southerly parts and coming across through Saxmundham and other areas through the

Aldeburgh and Friston area. So I think there are issues not necessarily with really applicants workers, it will be other people who are doing this. I know and they don't have any control over those. But the effect of what they're doing is going to produce that.

- What else do we have? Yes, the B1122 mitigation in the early years. But I don't know whether this is the right place to put it. But in the in the section 106 yesterday, which unfortunately, I wasn't able to stay till the end, there is a whole section about the B1122 Highway conditions, survey and contributions. And the only thing that seems to be being done is they are going to resurface it or at least improve it.
- In fact, all the mitigations that were going to be proposed when the B1122 was going to be the main route to site have been removed. So, there are no improvements.
- At Middleton Moor, there are no improvements.
- There are no improvements in the village at Theberton. Most of the children in the Theberton village live on the west side of the village. So, any children who need to cross the road or if they want to get to the playground, which is on the east side of the B1122 just beyond the church hall, there is nothing to help them get across that road with this level of traffic running on it.
- So, there's a whole issue about what mitigations are being provided on the B1122 for the early years. These are not good enough.
- I think we'll be talking about noise and air pollution at another hearing, so will leave those to another time.
- A point on from Mr. Bull's, discussion of route W and the fact that he said the W would actually come down after passing over the rail line would come to a roundabout on the B1121 which is ridiculous. When you consider the B1121 joins the A12, just south of where any link route W would join, there would be no point in doing that as it would have to elevate once again to cross the valley just below that. It would seem ridiculous to come all the way down there and then go up again, across embankments or whatever to climb again, across the Fromus Valley and up onto what is basically flat land all the way to the to the site.
- There was also a suggestion in one of their documents, and I can't remember which one but I'll try and find it, that there would have to also put a flyover across the branch line that goes to Leiston LEEIE and the green rail route. When you consider the number of trains that will be going up and down the branch line even when it's been re-laid and fully operational at the height of construction, I'm sure the applicant can manage those movements so that it could just be traversed with a level crossing.
- Mr. Bowles use refer reference to the SLR as being within green space. Well, I'm sorry, but pretty much any other of the alternatives that were considered are within green space as far as this is concerned, that's what we mainly have around here. It is open fields and whatever else we have. So it's not a special area. And in fact, once the applicant is finished with it, it will be a green space full of holes and embankments.

- The second thing that was just raised was about heritage impacts. And I'd like to rebut that too, because actually, the number of heritage impacts and listed buildings on the on the SLR route are considerably more than in fact than you'll find on the W or D2.
  - The last thing is timescales of development. For the D2/W versus the SLR, are not going to be dissimilar. So, let's stop kidding everybody that the SLR is some sort of fast route to Nirvana.
- **North and South Park and Ride sites – size and modelling coverage.**

#### 4. Transport Assessments approach and modelling

- Regarding the comparisons that were being used between here and Hinkley Point and the places that they were doing those modelling comparisons. The road networks here are very, very different and I wonder as to the validity of thinking about the motorway junctions off the M5 and what is happening going through Bridgewater versus what happens at Wangford and Woodbridge or elsewhere on the A12 as they're vastly different. I'm not sure that those comparisons are really appropriate.
- ***As for early years traffic modelling we are dismayed that the interactions between the A12/A1120/B1122/Yoxford roundabout, Darsham and Middleton level Crossing do not appear to have been properly modelled***
- Just one other question actually and that's to do with particulate monitoring at the Yoxford junction with the B 1122 and the A12. The applicant seems to indicate that particulate levels will fall during the early years and fall further still once the Sizewell Link Road is open. This seems pretty inconceivable considering the increase in traffic that's going to be going through that junction and I think perhaps requires further explanation and expansion by the applicant please.
- ***If PM emissions exceed those modelled by EDF, what measures will be available to reduce them?***
- ***Need contribution towards safety improvements for the early years transport along the B1122, including new footpaths, especially in Middleton Moor. Mere highway maintenance is simply not enough.***
- ***The s106/Deed of Obligation states;***
  - ***6.4 Following the opening of the Sizewell Link Road to traffic, Suffolk County Council shall execute or procure the execution of such works as are necessary to make good any damage to the B1122 caused by Sizewell C construction traffic.***
- Buses
  - No comments on this issue
- Park and Ride sites traffic modelling
  - No comments on this issue

### Detailed Agenda for Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH 3)

#### Traffic and Transport (Part 2)

#### 2. Continuation of Agenda Item 4 from ISH 2 (not required)

#### 3. Monitoring and Control Mechanisms for Traffic and Transport.

- Early Years controls in the DCO
  - I was very glad to hear what Mr. Brock actually brought up there, because it was something I was going to raise.
  - On the note of urgency, we had a long discussion about urgency yesterday. So I'm not going to talk about that and EN-1 and everything else again, because we've been through this and the changes that are involved in that.
  - Going back to this business about the TRG and three-monthly meetings to potentially review and look at these issues, particularly in these early years. Let's face it, the early years only last for roughly two years, all things being equal. So, it's a very, very blunt instrument to get anything done when Mr. Brock quite rightly says there could be a real issue on the ground that day, that week or whatever else it is, and waiting for three months for the next meeting to come around or for some action to be taken is not going to be very good. For those who are living alongside the B1122 an all that it implies.
  - The other thing that did occur to me was this definition of the main site and perhaps the applicant can state something here and that is the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate part of the main site or is it an associated development site? Therefore, when they have this geo fence for vehicles coming down to B1122, does it then get reconciled or that one actually went in the main site? And this one went to the associated development site. I'd like that answered. I'm not clear on that.
  - The other thing that occurs to me about the comparison here between what's happening at Sizewell and Hinkley Point, as I'm sure all the inspectors are well aware, when you go to the Hinkley Point site, there is nothing beyond it. It is the Hinkley Point site for A, B and C. There is nothing else there. The only traffic that goes right out there is Hinkley Point traffic. The only traffic that comes back is Hinkley Point traffic on the whole. That is not the case with the B1122. It is a through road that goes down to Aldeburgh and all sorts of other places. It's also the road that's going to take all of the cumulative impacts from the Scottish Power proposals should they be approved and I note that the examination finished the other day, whilst we were all having a long chat.
  - I think these issues are real issues. It's not easy to say that Hinkley Point and Sizewell C are comparable.
  - The other thing that I noticed in this mode share assessment target. And perhaps this, the applicant can explain this as well is that we have 600 people on Park and Ride bus in this but as I understood it, the early years will have no Park and Ride bus unless it is the small one that goes from LEEIE into the main site. So perhaps the applicant can explain that one too.
  - There seem to be an implication that in the geo monitoring of HGVs, they couldn't tell the difference between something that's going to Sizewell B versus what's going to Sizewell C.
  - How easy is it for the local people to actually submit issues on an urgent basis into this (TRG) group and get them examined? Because, despite anything else, whilst I understand regarding the HGVs on a



daily basis, the TRG are going to have very good statistics and a knowledge of any breaches of those restrictions, that's not going to be the case for other issues, which are much more soft and difficult to actually understand. So, if we have an issue of lots of traffic, particularly back in these early years when the B1122 is so badly affected, how on earth are we going to actually make our voices heard in those in those cases?

- And yes, I would also support the idea that the police have a role to play in the TRG. I think that is something which is missing.
  - Just a simple question really, I suppose. I heard the applicant say that some of these groups are already set up and running. I'm not aware of any of these groups having actually existed at all, or their existence having been informed to the local authorities or the parish councils.
  - Yes, we are talking as Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council rather than the other two groups. We are talking to EDF about mitigations and various aspects of the project, understanding that that was part of the development of the project cycle and where we are right now, not that this was going to evolve into something which is quite different.
  - I noticed the discussions about community groups. There are other community groups that have different types of concerns about the development of this project, which might require some thought as well. I mean, I know they are going to look at things with the RSPB. Suffolk Wildlife Trust in some of those areas. But there are other groups which are not in those sorts of areas, dealing with coastal effects likes Suffolk Coast Action for Resilience and MLSG and others.
  - So, I am still slightly puzzled by the fact that some of these working groups are already up and running without any knowledge or any visibility whatsoever.
  - So, it's a bit of a mixed bag and what Mr. Galloway said I think was about the community working group that hasn't met since 2019. This is despite the fact that it is supposed to be meeting throughout the development and the planning process which has been denied. So not exactly a good scorecard as far as we're concerned.
  - Miss McMillan said that if they needed to implement an LGV app, which would be at the gift of the TRG, presumably as this was something that wasn't in the DCO, this comes out of the contingency fund. And therefore, what happens if the implementation costs go beyond whichever of the two contingency funds it would come out of? So that's my concern.
  - **Vibration and pre-project surveys of all buildings before start to set baseline - Postponed to future ISH**
- **Issues with numbers of HGVs and effect on pollution especially at Yoxford junction Construction Traffic Management Plan**
    - Postponed to later hearing
  - **Construction Worker Travel Plan**
    - No comments on this issue
  - **Traffic Incident Management Plan**

- On that point about the northern traffic. And if we did have an incident either on the B1122 or the Sizewell Link Road, at some point as those that traffic comes out, they will also not have been through the freight handling facilities. So, all of those vehicles will effectively be coming in invisibly, I presume, because they will not have had a slot and I don't see where they get a slot and therefore, how are you going to get in touch with them to tell them not to pile down to the B1122 or stop somewhere. So, it seems to be an area that is completely bereft of any planning.

- **Operational Travel Plan**

- Whilst I recognise that the applicants may not know what's going to happen in 12 years time, if and when Sizewell C is finally built. They have obviously made some sort of plan, because they have a car park, which actually fits a certain number of vehicles.
- So, they've made some assumptions, and they've made some plans. But I think, despite the fact that none of us know what the rural transport situation will be or the sustainable transport situation is going to be around here, given the nature of the roads around here **and the current lack of much public transport**, I think they can make a pretty good guess as the vast majority of people who work at Sizewell B come by come by car if they're not very local.
- So, I suspect that's going to be exactly the same in 10 to 15 years time, if and when this thing gets built. So, I'm surprised that there isn't at least an indicative plan at this point, which everybody can look at. Whether they have lots of electric charging points or otherwise, is an interesting point. And probably they'll have more than they think. They certainly have some idea of what this looks like and it's surprising they aren't actually coming up with that right now.

#### 4. Consideration of local transport impacts.

- **Difference in proposed mitigations identified in the Transport Assessment and those required by the Councils**

- I'm glad to come back to the B1122. I did try to raise this issue yesterday, but it was clearly not in the right space.
- What is in the current deed of obligation is just basically preparing the B1122 for a lot of traffic and when you look at the Scottish Power mitigation, that is proposed inside Theberton is pretty minimal. And in fact, one of the proposed changes was actually in a somewhat dangerous position. Now, I haven't been back to look and see if that has been changed, which I should go and do. But the fact of the matter is, the amount of traffic in the early years that is going to go through the village is going to be quite a significant increase. But most of it, let's be honest, 80% of it is due to the Sizewell C development operation. It's not due to the Scottish power plan at all.
- So, we would look to see some more mitigation, certainly some sort of temporary crossing, if the SLR goes ahead and temporary if the SLR remains as a permanent fixture. But there is no mitigation. Basically, it is completely absent as far as this proposal is concerned. Now I know

we are due to have another meeting with EDF about it and I have been told that they want to talk about mitigation in Theberton and Eastbridge, but at the moment, as far as the deed of obligation is concerned, it's got nothing in it at all **as below**

▪ **B1122 HIGHWAY CONDITION SURVEY AND CONTRIBUTIONS**

- **6.1 On or before Commencement, SZC Co will:**
    - **6.1.1 undertake a highways condition survey of the B1122; and**
    - **6.1.2 pay the B1122 Pre-SLR Contribution to Suffolk County Council.**
  - **6.2 Upon the opening of the Sizewell Link Road to traffic, SZC Co will:**
    - **6.2.1 undertake a further highways condition survey of the B1122; and**
    - **6.2.2 pay the B1122 Post-SLR Contribution to Suffolk County Council.**
  - **6.3 Suffolk County Council shall maintain the B1122 in good repair prior to the opening of the Sizewell Link Road.**
- 
- **Approach to assessment for impacts in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement**
    - I'd like to go to severance of public rights away and support some of the comments that have actually been made by other participants and other IPs. It would appear that we have something like 10 different public rights away that are severed by the SLR. Some of the some of those diversions are quite long, some of them up to 270 metres. And they're obviously along the side of this roadway, which is not going to be very attractive to the users of that. One of these is a recreational circuit that is promoted by Suffolk County Council also local policy plan SDLP 7.1. So, these are, important tourist routes, people use them quite a lot. We do think that what is being proposed in these diversions doesn't really match up to the sort of area that we expect and the severance that's occurring there.
    - On another issue, we've heard on several occasions, the new Sizewell Link Road is actually being produced to DMRB standards. DMRB standards also require that cycle lanes be provided, or a cycle lane be provided alongside that in CD 195 and also, it's consistent with government guidance LTN 1/20. So, none of that is appearing in this Sizewell Link Road proposal. So, we also have an issue now with cycle routes along that so they're not really encouraging cycling to work along those routes. Now, it might be that the B1122 gets eventually downgraded and made into a cycle route, but it's certainly not providing that sort of level of encouragement from the get-go. And if you look at what's been happening down in Hinkley Point, there have been some fairly extensive cycle routes put in to try and encourage people to get to the Hinkley Point sites by cycle at quite a quite a distance from the site. So, I'd like to hear what the applicant has to say about those.

- We are told that DMRB standards are also the reason why the SLR needs so many cuttings and embankments – they can't have it both ways
- Just a minor point that actually I omitted to say. And that was that it's interesting, they're going to do this, looking about how to put cycle routes in but I'd perhaps remind you that one of the big one of the Sizewell Link Road connections goes through the new Yoxford roundabout and then uses the existing B1120 to get to the SLR through the other link prior to Middleton Moor. However, the current Yoxford roundabout doesn't really facilitate cycling, according to the to the plans. If you wanted to come from Darsham station, for instance, and cycle, that really precludes that actually being a potential route. I think we accept there are still some issues.
- Consideration of cumulative impact on local roads of the Proposed Development and the Scottish Power applications
  - No further comments on this issue