

## **Deadline 8 Written Submission – SZC a deliverable project?**

Ian Galloway #20025801

At Deadline 7 I responded to ISH9 (Policy and need) [Rep7-193]. In the synopsis at 3.2, I indicated how difficult it was for me (as a Project and Programmes professional of more than 30 years) to clearly discern how the project is to be successfully delivered.

In this connection, I have not received a response from the Applicant. Nor have I been able to identify anything other than a wholly inadequate Plate 2.1 (Assumed construction programme) within the Applicants document - 6.3, Volume 2 Main Development Site, Chapter 3 Description of Construction, Appendix 3D of the Environmental Statement [Rep7-015], published in September 2021.

To illustrate the inadequacy of; Plate 2.1, the continuing opacity of the Applicants project plans and in the absence of being able to discover anything more substantial, how should an interested party easily discern: when the proposed 2 Village Bypass; and Sizewell Link Road both commence and conclude construction simultaneously, exactly how 'back-fill transfers' to the Main Development Site will be routed from the former development through the latter (whilst it performs the expressed role of 'haul-road' for circa 70,000 HGV transfers)?

Moreover, how will 'haul road' HGV's; join/leave or cross the public carriageway (whether the B1122 or proposed SLR) in order to enter the Main Development Site, at what frequency, over what period and with what impact on normal traffic flows and residents going about their everyday lives?

This single illustrative example raises a considerable number of potential matters of interest to residents (KcC, McF, Theberton & Eastbridge to name a few) as they heavily rely on this route and the surrounding road network for connectivity to; shops, services, neighbouring communities, access to the A12 and beyond. Plus of course access to domestic and business premises by couriers for the purpose of delivering or picking up parcels and freight.

It seems almost inevitable that many solutions contemplated by the Applicant during the planning stage may require traffic control interventions (road closures, traffic signalling, re-routing, etc.), yet specific instances seems unmentioned throughout.

It is noted that it is the intention of the DCO to give the Applicant authority to close roads, suspend access, install traffic control measures, divert traffic, etc. throughout the duration of construction. However, it remains unclear how individuals will be given timely notice of these changes, in order that their daily plans are not thoroughly disrupted, potentially leading to frustration, extended journey times and missed appointments. In extremis it is possible that lives may be threatened; either by delays, through 'blue light' services not being aware of restrictions and/or non-blue light interventions being delayed in 'held traffic' or queues.

This raises further questions as to how exactly residents, businesses, tourists and visitors will be aware of the access restrictions in force on any particular day and the potential impact on their planned daily activities and journeys.

Without wishing to stray far from the fundamental issue of; the absence of detail of the Applicants Project Plan; in respect to the latter I maintain the Applicant should be obliged (within the DCO) to provide a 'real-time' multiple layer, multi-format information service on; road closures, traffic management schemes, traffic queues, delays, incidents and other disruption within a twenty mile radius of the Main Development Site (for the duration of construction). Such a service should be available nationally to; sighted, non-sighted, hearing, non-hearing, internet enabled and non-internet enabled individuals, thereby providing full disclosure of planned disruption in advance and also real-time updates of unplanned events, as they unfold.

Returning to the critical issue of the Applicants Project Planning and the detail contained therein, as stated in my previous submission at Deadline 7, it is essential that the Applicant place in the public domain their Project Plan, identifying; the overall project architecture, a sensible and detailed portrayal of the 'key milestones' for the project (possibly at L2/L3), the projects singular critical path, a detailed schedule of dependencies and interdependencies both; within discrete work-streams/disciplines and betwixt work-streams/disciplines and linked through a sensible project resource plan, reflecting the manpower and potential traffic movements on any particular day, on any specific route or road.

Moreover, where there may be significant changes in methodology throughout an activity (i.e. the routing of back-fill transfers from the 2 village bypass/Yoxford Junction, via the B1122 potentially migrating to the proposed SLR), the target transition window(s) should be identified with any inter-dependencies.

Whilst I appreciate this activity may appear daunting to the uninitiated, the reality is that any Project of this scale should have all of this information readily to hand, being dynamically monitored and updated throughout the day-to-day execution of project activities.

It is my view that without this level of detail being made available, it is highly unlikely any potentially impacted communities could say with a degree of confidence that; they knew what was likely to be impacting their daily lives, when and for what duration.

This gives rise to a totally unacceptable situation and places the independence and everyday freedoms of thousands of people in and visiting Suffolk at risk, with seemingly little or no recourse.

By the same token, it is difficult to see how the ExA could, with confidence, advise the Secretary of State that the robustness of the Project Plan has been rigorously explored in order to establish whether the portrayed 'urgency of need' could be adequately addressed by the Applicant's detailed project plan, or not.

I would appreciate it greatly if, even at this late hour, the ExA could probe these particular topics and elicit a response from the Applicant to address a significant shortfall in the information available to Interested Parties prior to the completion of the Examination.

Yours in anticipation

**Ian Galloway - #20025801**