

**REF: EA1North EA2.**

**16<sup>th</sup> Tuesday March**

**Re Traffic and Transport Hearing Friday March 12<sup>th</sup> 2021**

From the outset of this examination the inspectorate has endeavoured to ensure all Interested Parties were able to engage fully in the process. For this I applaud them. Despite the unique circumstances due to COVID restrictions throughout the process of this examination The Planning Inspectorate has made every effort to accommodate open and fair hearings .

It is unfortunate that not every hearing reflected this. In my view Friday 12<sup>th</sup> of March, Traffic and Transport was less than satisfactory. It is regrettable that the hearing did not have the same rigour as in earlier ones. Many of the interested parties, not of professional bodies have taken on the challenge of understanding what is required to contribute to these hearings and done so in a professional manner. Months of in depth research have been involved to prepare and present representations. As a result the Inspectors have recognised and acknowledged the quality of input from this community. Friday 12<sup>th</sup> March did not represent the same rigour afforded to other hearings, failing to explore important areas.

For example.

The movement of AIL's are significant, the likely occurrence is a one of event. Regardless of the detailed documents available and discussions which have already taken place between SPR, Wynns, and Highways, a whole morning was

spent on this one subject, and again in the afternoon. The SPR Representative laboured points, searched through documentation revisiting issues covered in previous hearings. As a result time given to this subject meant other important Traffic and Transport issues were not explored adequately.  
ie

- A1094 and its junctions. (Snape crossroads, Blackheath Corner, B1121 and A1094 junction, A1094 at Aldeburgh)
- Additional traffic on the A1094 relating to:

The pre -construction roads, their purpose of use, timings and length of use, access routes to and from these “roads”. Preparation works and lack of inclusion in the DCO. The use of actual numbers of vehicles and conversion to averages used to inform HGV movements thus resulting in flawed projections.

It was regrettable that whenever an Interested Party other than Suffolk Highways had the opportunity to speak they were unsettled by the pressure put upon them to “not waste time” or being asked to “move on” “ it is Friday and we need to finish” The result was these parties sometimes were not able to fully present their case and are now required to write further lengthy documents to ensure their views will be presented adequately.

We, living here in Suffolk experience the traffic issues on a daily basis our information is not desk based but real. Combined with the detailed study we have made of the various aspects of SPR’s submission we are in a strong position to challenge and question their plans on Traffic and Transport. I do not feel this was the case of Friday 12<sup>th</sup>

March. As the applicant one would expect SPR Traffic and Transport representative to be knowledgeable about any submission without using up hours of the hearing trawling through documents. In contrast the non-professionals presenting having prepared for the hearing were rushed by the Inspector and left feeling that all information had not been fully presented. In my opinion that particular hearing at worst was biased in favour of the applicant and at best not given full exploration of the issues on the agenda.

Kind Regards

Elizabeth C Thomas

