

## Issue Specific Hearing 1

I was unable to join the whole of issue specific hearing 1. When I did join it would not have been appropriate to interrupt the flow of the meeting at that point to make the point I wanted make, so I am submitting it in writing now instead. My point is regarding the discussion on the nature of the efforts the applicant should commit to make to deliver the mitigation measures identified in the application. The applicant appeared to want to the ability to negotiate delays in the delivery of the mitigations in case they encountered delivery problems. The grounds for this were that the timeliness of the overall project was so important that it could not be delayed by late delivery of the mitigations. Further the applicant argued that firmer commitments to the timely delivery of the mitigations were not needed because the applicant had a vested interest in delivering the mitigations as they helped with the timely delivery of the overall project. I would like to make the following points:

1) The mitigations should be delivered before the problems that they mitigate begin. There should be no concept of "early years" when HGVs and, later, the southern park and ride buses use the A12 in Yoxford and the B1122 to access the development site. Mitigations like the A12 link road should be completed before there is a need for HGVs and significant numbers of workers to access the development site.

2) If the Examining Authority is minded to recommend that the Secretary of State approves the development with the concept of "early years" for the completion of the mitigations, there must be no potential for the problems being mitigated to continue beyond the point in the project when the mitigations are due to be delivered. For example, if the problem of HGVs from the south using the B1122 is due to be mitigated within two years of the project start, the applicant can achieve that by timely delivery of the link road, ceasing HGV deliveries and delivering more by sea and rail (within the agree constraints for each) or ceasing HGV deliveries to site with an impact on the timescales for the overall project. Late delivery of the mitigation and the problem continuing cannot be an option.

3) The applicant argued that they already have an incentive for delivery of the mitigations as they help with the overall project delivery, and therefore there is no need for a firmer commitment for their timely delivery. Of course that logic works two ways. If the applicant has a strong incentive for timely delivery of the mitigations then there will be no issue with making a watertight commitment to achieving the timely delivery. Furthermore, if the applicant has total control over the means for delivery of the mitigations and the local population being impacted has no control. Who should be impacted by a late delivery? To Yoxford Parish Council it seems clear it should be the applicant and not the local population.