

## Temporary Closure of PRowS and U6006

I should like to comment on the Applicant's Response to my OFH submission on the 09<sup>th</sup> December 2022

John Leitch 20030552

*According to the applicant "The construction schedule for the construction works (all working days) is:*

*1- Break open asphalt (2 days)"*

What asphalt? When we attended the ASI with The Planning Inspectorate and walked along the U6006 there was no evidence whatsoever of any asphalt surface.

Closure of the U6006, "Duration up to a maximum of one week" Reason for closure, "cable route construction and access to E12 and E24".

E24 is mentioned in the Applicant's response as having potential connectivity with W-257/003/0 which is planned for 3 weeks closure. This statement alone gives rise to the potential for a prolonged closure considering there are 3 cable crossings planned.

On Page 8 the Applicant states *"At this stage it is not feasible to provide an accurate programme for the construction programme of the cable route"*.

And on page 11 *"On the basis of the above the U6006 will not be closed for any longer than 21 Days"*.

But is conflicted by their construction schedule says working days which rules out week-ends, therefore 21 days is in excess of 4 weeks.

My argument still stands that any closure of one part of the U6006 effectively closes the whole lane. Part of the U6006 will remain accessible but it will no longer connect the villages of Badlingham and Freckenham to Worlington.

According to [APP-246](#) Sunnica East Site B (registered in the legend as Sunnica 3 24 months) is a 24-month construction period. The length of the U6006 being within the order limits of Sunnica East Site B is effectively locked down? The Applicant needs to explain their latest submission.

The proposed perpendicular access road will remain a site access road crossing for 40 years presumably for maintenance purposes?

I agree with Suffolk County Council that the removal of E12 would also take away the tunnelling effect on the U6006 of E12 and E13 and would preserve the integrity of the U6006 and safeguard the impact upon the nesting Stone Curlews in E12 and ECO3. Cable crossings across the U6006 should be drilled rather than trenched in order to reduce unacceptable impact upon trees and negate the need for an asphalt surface.