

**Further submissions following Issue Specific Hearings 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021– Snape PC**

**(EN 010077/78) Ref 20023749/50**

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I spoke at the hearing on the 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021 on traffic and transport issues. I was very aware of the constraints on time and have therefore added some additional comment specifically relating to the responses of parties on behalf of the applicant at various points.

Also throughout the hearing counsel for the applicants has outlined the experience and qualification of those providing oral submissions on their behalf. Community representatives have not always done so. On reflection I thought it reasonable to reflect my own experience that I felt relevant to both Snape specific traffic issues, but also the wider strategic traffic issues.

I was a police officer for 30 years in Suffolk in ranks from constable to chief superintendent. During that period I dealt with many road traffic collisions including fatalities. In more senior roles I also on occasion dealt with strategic traffic and transport issues. Since retiring I have remained a police volunteer as part of what is called Community Speed Watch which entails monitoring and reporting to the Constabulary speeding vehicles. We undertake that activity at approved sites on the A1094 and B1069. I can therefore make a legitimate claim to having an intimate understanding of the road network across the County and a particular knowledge of traffic patterns and behaviour in Snape based on many hours of observation. Given that context I felt that the concerns we have raised around traffic issues directly with SPR but also in written and oral submissions remain unaddressed.

The consultant Mr Ross for SPR dismissed the issues of road width on the A1094 and congestion at the A1094/ B1069 junction by asserting that the A1094 was an approved route for HGVs and that the traffic assessments based on average figures had not identified congestion as an issue. We would submit that from March 2018 onwards we have asked for detailed research and analysis on both issues on the basis that our understanding is that the guidance on traffic analysis should where necessary reflect site specific issues and we submit that has simply not taken place. Similarly the assertion that because the A1094 (and the B1069) are approved routes fails to reflect our direct experience and arguably that designation is in fact more about necessity than design and capacity. Suffolk is singularly badly served in terms of the capacity of the road infrastructure and this point still has not been properly addressed SPR within the DCO and the hearings and responses.

Regards

Tim Beach

Snape PC