

## Sizewell C May 2021 - Open Hearings Notes

KF – Clerk Campsea Ashe

Before I commence our statement, I would like to state that CA has over the past 2 year worked with 10 other PC's to assess and discuss local impacts of the application.

We therefore will focus on the issues immediately affecting CA, as partnering PC will have made – or have made - statements that includes our position.

In the words of a local County Councillor - A tsunami of traffic is coming our way

Those words sum up C A grave concerns about the current proposals in front of us – the traffic impact on our community, especially with regards to the eastern part of the B1078.

If a tsunami disperses freely, it doesn't create problems.

But the already busy A12 corridor, **with only a minor parallel road (A1152)** - which the B1078 is one of 2 feeder roads from the A12 into - does not allow for such dispersion. **These anticipated volumes of traffic literally enter a funnel from Woodbridge to the actual site.**

These roads are already - at times and in key locations - barely coping with current volumes, but will certainly not be capable to cope safely with those anticipated future levels of traffic.

And it is not just the Sizewell related impact.

The Examining Authority needs to look in detail at the complete potential influx, the cumulative impact of other LARGE ENERGY and HOUSING projects, some of which are already progressing at various stages of the planning process.

I will elaborate on our main concerns with the current application,

Firstly, (1) the general traffic impact on local residents and our village, compounded by the SouthPark&Ride,  
Secondly, (2) the actual location of the SPR,  
Thirdly, (3) the proposed increase in night-time rail movements and finally  
Fourth, 4 the cumulative impact of traffic in the area

### **1 Traffic impact**

CA is located on the B1078, leading eastwards from the A12 to Tunstall, and is an alternative route - or rat-run - to Snape/Leiston/Aldeburgh.

Whilst SZW C signage might restrict official contractor traffic to the site, it will increasingly become **an 'alternative' route for local users** to avoid the A12 - and not just when actually congested.

**The B1078 has over 7 width-restricted pinch points**, where passing is difficult if two cars meet each other, and often impossible when tractors or HGV's meet oncoming traffic or each other.

I will now raise a few specific issues relating to our local traffic concerns;

A - Local road users, avoiding the heavy daily **Congestion at Melton's Wilford Bridge Rd** - the A1152 - & linked predominantly to A12 related usage, has over the past 5 years increasingly resulted in heavy peak time commuting traffic through CA via the B1078. This is likely to get worse – not a subject acknowledged by the proposal ...

B - The B1078 is also a **main artery for farm distribution traffic linked to the Bentwaters** Base Park, with those traffic levels **already regularly exceeding limits** set at the application stage for that development.

Whilst official Sizewell contractor movement might be subject to monitoring, we are also **gravely concerned about subcontracting companies most likely locating in the Bentwaters & Debach areas**, and with **that** generated traffic - affecting several villages along the B1078/A1152 - not being subjected to any official control measures.

CA and surrounding parishes have for years raised the acute subject of rising unsafe traffic levels in the area with E S D C – yet have been totally ignored.

C - The **B1078 is also an official diversion route, in case of closure of the A12** north of WM/Hacheston, which - considering its width limitations – seems a rather surreal or rather impossible choice.

When for example building works start for the A12 2VillageBypass, closure or reduced capacity of the A12, will inevitably lead to a major increase of traffic on **this utterly unsuitable road**.

The inevitable increase of instances of closures or congestions on the A12 will lead to increased traffic levels. I STATE AGAIN – THERE ARE AROUND OVER 8 LOCATIONS ON THIS ALTERNATIVE ROUTE, WHERE 2 HGVS CANNOT PASS – THERE IS THEREFORE NO FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVE ROUTE IN THE APPLICANTS PROPOSAL

It fundamentally underlines the regions inadequate infrastructure provision for a project of such scale.

**The additional impact of Sizewell related traffic** on the B1078 - combined with that of subcontractors and potentially other major developments – will create at the very least an unacceptable and unsafe level for our residents, and at the worst repeated actual blockages at those earlier referred to pinch points.

D We agree with our neighbouring PC's and regard the substantially increased level of vehicles going through Wickham Market as unsustainable. The – in one of the rare occasions of EDF engagement - proposed design to mitigate will - in our opinion - not create a substantial benefit or alleviation of already existing problems.

**Most worryingly, the cumulative traffic impact** of other commercial and residential developments, which will add to Sizewell related traffic volumes in the area, have - so far - been totally ignored.

LET US CONSIDER OUR CHILDREN – 90% OF WHICH GO TO FARLINGAYE AND KYSON SCHOOLS BOTH OF WHICH SIT TENS OF METRES FROM THE MAIN HGV ROUTE. OUR CHILDREN WILL BE POISONED BY DIESEL PARTICULATES AT HOME AND AT SCHOOL, SOM OF THEM FOR THE DURATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS MORALLY INDEFENSIBLE

## **2 Location SouthPark&Ride**

The location of the SPR will not only add significantly to the pressures onto the B1078, as outlined above, but also to the NW-tern A12 stretch around Woodbridge.

We regard the location of the SPR as unsuitable, **especially as it is located on the most elevated part of the landscape in the area.** It will cause a major visual impact on a rural landscape. We regard mitigation measures re bund height and planting as not sufficient to shield the neighbouring villages from noise and night time light pollution. We strongly disagree with the zoning and subsequent impact level assessments within the applicants documentation.

CA PC has worked together with neighbouring parishes in responding to the consultations and is partner in the commissioned Landscape Review of the SouthPark&Ride. Marlesford PC will be elaborating on shared concerns regarding the impact of the P&R in our rural environment.

### **3 Night time Rail movements**

CA favoured a rail-based strategy, based on increasing the day-time capacity of the East Suffolk line, **additionally** creating a potential long-term sustainability legacy.

We do favour an approach, that would maximise day-time use for deliveries via rail.

As 70% of our residents live within 300 yards of the line, we regard the impact night time freight movement would have on residents as unacceptable in our quiet, rural location. Noise & air pollution as well as vibration impacts will be felt by a majority of our residents, and we have not seen acceptable mitigation measures to alleviate those concerns. Again, we are puzzled by inadequate zoning and impact assessments.

### **4 Cumulative Impact**

As mentioned before, we are gravely concerned that the cumulative impact of all potential projects has not been taken adequately into account.

We stated earlier the unsuitable road infrastructure north of Woodbridge, with a minor B road the only alternative route northwards, should congestion or closure occur on the A12. **Roads, that at specific locations, do not even allow cars to safely pass each other.**

All those proposed projects together will have massive impacts on our and other communities around us and threaten to irrevocably change our area – a recreational destination within 90 minutes of London, a unique rural & coastal area of outstanding natural beauty – one of the last remaining relatively quiet, coastal and countryside environments so close to London.

To finalise our submission today, CA remains opposed to the proposed application not only on the few selected local issues raised here today, but also on multiple other issues raised by other PC's during the hearing so far.

We are disappointed with the lack of meaningful engagement by EDF to fundamental issues affecting our residents, disappointed that after nearly a decade of engagement, so much detail remains opaque or missing.

We join other PC's in expressing disbelief at the last minute final 'consultation', offering multiple choice options rather than carefully examined and reasoned possible propositions.

We have not been presented with feasible or acceptable mitigations to the numerous impacts on our area, **fundamentally because it is impossible to mitigate the issues raised earlier. It is impossible to mitigate traffic impacts etc, when the infrastructure is basically not there to accommodate it.**

The Tsunami effect of traffic hitting East Suffolk will be felt strongly and directly – and not only by Campsea Ashe residents.

Whether it is cars, vans or HGV's, or night time rail movement, the subsequent pollution of our air, the noise and the illumination of our dark skies, but fundamentally the destruction of our unique area of outstanding natural beauty, the impact will be profound and - in many instances - irreversible.

We are disappointed by a local district council, which is basically putting financial short term health over serious long term environmental health, damage that will become irreversible.

We would also like to echo the near unanimous sentiment of participants in this hearing. The current paradigm (paradime) climate change and environmental awareness makes this a totally flawed project, not just because of its location on a fragile shingle beach subject to rising sea levels.

Sizewell C will increase energy costs for the entire population of this country, nuclear waste is a pernicious threat for the next hundred generations, and the building of the reactors will produce vast levels of climate destroying pollution during the precise 20-year window, when climate scientists say we must be reducing our impact.

It makes a mockery of any government claims to be serious about leading the global response to climate change.