

Submission for Deadline 8

Written Summary of Oral Case – Issue Specific Hearing 13 Traffic and Transport (ISH13)

Friday 12th March 2021

Submitted by Richard Cooper (Lead for Marlesford Parish Council on Infrastructure Projects)

Registration identification numbers 20024395 and 20024397.

These are the comments of Marlesford Parish Council following ISH13:

1. In the event that AILs have to be imported at Felixstowe, they will have to pass through Marlesford on the A12 just north of Wickham Market. The bridge over the River Ore in Marlesford is likely to need strengthening in order to allow the passage of the 280t transformer loads. It is anticipated that this could be achieved with a temporary bridge deck laid over the current roadway. Even if the arrangements for the bridge are temporary, they should be carried out so as to minimise disruption to traffic on the A12 through Marlesford and Little Glemham. They should be conducted outside the main holiday summer months and summer weekends avoided.
2. Marlesford residents live close to the bridge and if evenings and night times are to be used to make temporary alterations to the bridge deck, contractors will need to be mindful of noise and vibration impacts on nearby properties.
3. We urge Scottish Power to make a decision on the port of entry for the transformers at the earliest opportunity in order to provide some clarity for local residents and the landowners on whose land the laydown area would be sited.
4. Community severance is already an issue in Marlesford and Little Glemham with fear and intimidation from current traffic levels being a real concern. We echo the ExA view that Marlesford is “the first unimproved section of the A12 after the dual carriageway section [north of Wickham Market]”. We would ask the Applicant to continue its work with Suffolk County Council to ensure the provision of appropriate and proportional mitigation within the village of Marlesford. The Parish Council believe that both stretches of proposed foot path should be on the north side of the A12. Mitigation should take place before construction works begin on the Friston site.
5. We argue that Marlesford and Little Glemham will both be severely impacted if construction of Sizewell C and EA1N and EA2 go ahead at the same time. We accept that neither consideration of EDF’s proposed Two Village Bypass, nor our preferred Four Village Bypass form a part of the Applicants’ DCO application, but we strongly argue here (and will do so in the Examination of EDF’s plans for Sizewell C) that traffic on the unimproved stretch of the A12 through Marlesford and Little Glemham is already at a level where it causes fear and intimidation. With a likely 115% increase in HGV daily movement at the Sizewell peak, it is unlikely that mitigation alone could address the adverse impacts. The bypassing of

Marlesford and Little Glemham has been on the table since its route was approved in 1995 and most recently a Four Village Bypass was promoted by Suffolk County Council as SEGway (the Suffolk Energy Gateway), but desperately needed funding has not been forthcoming and Marlesford and Little Glemham residents seem destined to have to suffer an intolerable increase in traffic along with its associated noise, air quality and vibration impacts. An additional consideration is that the current design of the Two Village Bypass is likely to preclude a “retro-fit” of a Marlesford and Little Glemham bypass. We urge the ExA to recognise the need for a full, Four Village Bypass to be delivered as one project to address the cumulative impacts of Scottish Power Renewables and Sizewell C traffic and the future forecast traffic increases.

Richard Cooper

On Behalf of Marlesford Parish Council

25th March 2021.