

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Our Ref. 20026207

Snape PC - DCO Sizewell C EN010012 – Response to Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) 12 and 14

Impact on communities

- All of the issues that were raised at ISH 3 and 4 around traffic and transport and cumulative impact remain at the point of the ISH 12 and 14 as largely unaddressed in our view, and will all have a direct impact on Snape and all the surrounding communities both north and south of the proposed site. The 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. The view of the Applicant within the most recent hearings is clear that they can manage their own specific traffic but cannot be expected to manage any wider impacts other than through the Traffic Review Group (TRG). The details of which are still being debated as reflected by the Suffolk Constabulary input to the ISH. Impacts on the resilience of the A12 as the main north-south corridor in East Suffolk seems still to be underestimated by both the applicant and SCC. In our view and as previously raised SCC, ESC 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 TRG. We note again 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 as it is currently structured.
- To that end as again stated at ISH 12 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 and that despite earlier assurances the Applicant still appears reluctant to directly involve the police. 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 with frequent reference to, "best endeavours".

- The major concern remains for communities on and served by the A12 is specifically that of “rat-running”. As far as the Applicant is concerned, and this appeared again at ISH 12 to be confirmed in the hearing, they regard “rat-running” as a largely non SZC local traffic issue and therefore outside their control. We remain concerned that SCC and the Applicant are being insufficiently robust in seeking solutions to what could become a major problem to local communities with a very significant impact in terms of quality of life, noise, traffic delay, pollution, access to local schools and amenities. 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 limited work on this particular issue had been undertaken by all the parties. The proposed traffic contingency fund of £1.6 million seems an extremely small amount of money given the potential costs of any remedial work. Similarly the £30 million Community Fund appears to be structured as a fund into which communities can bid rather than a fund that is used to directly address the real and predictable impacts on the most directly affected communities; which we regard as potentially unfair. As stated at ISH 12 and 14 the local communities have had no input into how that mechanism for compensation and mitigation would work despite asking ESC repeatedly.

Tim Beach
Snape Parish Council