

Great Glemham Parish Council
The Village Hall
Low Road
Great Glemham
Near Saxmundham
Suffolk IP17 2DH
Email address: nicholas.redman@dlapiper.com

26 January 2017

EdF Energy Limited

FREEPOST SZC Consultation

Dear Sirs,

Sizewell C - response to Stage 2 Pre-Application Consultation

Thank you for consulting Great Glemham Parish Council.

1. Great Glemham Parish Council

- 1.1 We held a meeting on 6 January to discuss and agree a response to your consultation.
- 1.2 Since 2013 two of our members, John Cross and Argus Gathorne-Hardy, have worked with the Community Forum with a view to mitigating the impact of the Sizewell C proposal on Great Glemham.
- 1.3 Great Glemham is about 1.5 miles from the A12 at Stratford St Andrew and is home to over 200 people.

2. Travel and transport: our principal concern

- 2.1 We strongly feel that that your plans relating to travel and transport are not genuinely strategic. They do not address the effects of a very sizeable number of vehicle movements (including many by HGVs) over a significant area which includes Great Glemham and the market towns which serve it for a significant period of time.
- 2.2 We note that a formal travel and transport plan is to form part of your stage 3 consultation.
- 2.3 We ask that such plan:
 - 2.3.1 addresses **all** travel and transport issues affecting the Suffolk Coastal district in a genuinely strategic and holistic way covering not just the construction of the C station but also the ongoing decommissioning of the A station and, in time, the proposed decommissioning of stations B and C; and
 - 2.3.2 comprehensively deals with:
 - 2.3.2.1 lorries needing to be put into the right order of arrival at the site (we understand that "just in time" deliveries are common on

- major construction projects);
- 2.3.2.2 vehicles that break down or get involved in an accident en route to or from the site;
 - 2.3.2.3 the maintenance of effective emergency services during the construction period (we note that fire engines and ambulances called to Great Glemham commonly need to cross the A12 and that the A12 is routinely used by ambulances taking patients to Ipswich hospital); and
 - 2.3.2.4 effective and robust measures against the use of alternative routes as rat-runs by Sizewell traffic.
- 2.3.3 The point made in paragraph 2.3.2.4 is one that needs to be vigorously addressed due to the prevalence today of satellite navigation systems.
- 2.3.3.1 These systems would not have been available when deliveries were made to the construction sites at Sizewell A or Sizewell B. They frequently direct traffic aiming for IP16 and 17 postcodes travelling from the A14 via the A1120, B1078, B1079 and by-roads (such as Church Lane in Earl Soham). See, for example the AA Autoroute search result for a journey from Cambridge to Sizewell.
 - 2.3.3.2 The situation is exacerbated by the widespread practice of lorry drivers using vehicles badged with a company name but owned by the individual drivers themselves. This leaves the companies concerned with fewer disciplinary options.
- 2.4 We also note that the A12 is a key conduit in East Suffolk used by vehicles of all sizes travelling long distances as well as vehicles driven by local people and businesses. Parts of it have long been judged inadequate for the volume of traffic carried by it: a four village by-pass (protecting Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham) was approved in principle in 1994.
- 2.5 Many electors commonly require to turn right onto and/or from the A12 and their ability to do this promptly and safely is of critical importance.
- 2.5.1 For example, electors and their families need to do this routinely to effect the school run, to get to or from work, get rail transport at Campsea Ashe/Wickham Market station or to get access to medical and retail services or visit to care for nearby relatives. The issue will become acute at peak times.
 - 2.5.2 A detailed survey effected in 2000 by us showed that electors and their families used a range of towns for such services including Saxmundham, Aldeburgh, Wickham Market and Woodbridge. Journeys to each of these towns from Great Glemham require the use of or the crossing of the A12. There is no evidence that the information gathered by such survey has become inaccurate.
- 2.6 Many villages straddle the A12 and inhabitants do need to cross that road on bicycles and on foot. No means of protection for these persons is to be provided under your plans. At the very least, illuminated refuges could be provided in such villages.

We seek your assurance that the additional pressure of traffic caused by the Sizewell C project, especially at peak times, will be imaginatively addressed and carefully

managed in the preparation of the travel and transport plan in phase 3 of your consultation.

3. Transport by means of rail and sea-going barges (pages 23 to 25 of your Consultation – Summary Document)

- 3.1 We are highly supportive of these means of transport.
- 3.2 As to the rail proposal, option 1 is preferred as it would reduce need for onward road transport of very large loads and of bulk supplies and disposals and have lower impact on local residents and roads.
- 3.3 We note the growing use by passengers of the Ipswich to Lowestoft service and the significant use of the Ipswich to Felixstowe line by freight trains serving the docks. Steps should be taken to minimise disruption to these services.
- 3.4 As to the sea option we support the use of sea barges and have no preference as to the two options.

4. Southern park and ride (page 26 of your Consultation – Summary Document)

We agree with this detailed comment made by one of our electors, Patrick Wilson. Mr Wilson has lived in Great Glemham for around 30 years and has worked within the nuclear industry for most of his 37 year career. He is making his own response to your own consultation and we resolved (with his kind permission) to reiterate many of his points.

'Whilst park and ride schemes are very good in principle and my own experience of many such around the country has always been good, as a busy working person I would have found it too time consuming for daily commuting to and from work. This reality suggests that many of the workforce heading for Sizewell C may be disinclined to use the park and ride service, unless forced to do so. Despite it being said that construction workers will not be allowed to park on site the reality is EdF will not be able to prevent a "rat run" to the close environs of the construction site, with consequential indiscriminate parking in all roads and lanes thereabouts.

Notwithstanding these reservations about the effectiveness of the proposed park and ride site option 1 for the site of a southern park and ride could be appropriate, provided substantial revision of the plans for the road layouts are made to ensure an "accident black spot" is not created at that point on the A12. The current proposal shows the park and ride site's access/egress point on a single carriageway road that carries two way traffic, which includes agricultural machinery travelling to and from the adjoining farm land. Other traffic using the road to connect with the northbound A12 joins it where the public right of way crosses that road (see the public footpath shown on Ordnance Survey Explorer map no. 212), that is, near to the top of the incline and very nearly within the sliplane.

Northbound traffic on the A12 approaches this point travelling up the incline, often filling both lanes and travelling at speeds up to 70 mph, with drivers "jockeying for position" just before the end of the dual carriageway section of the A12 and reaching the single carriageway 40 mph stretch starting just over the brow of the incline. This situation is particularly prevalent at busy times. Drivers' view of the merging of the three lanes at this point is not helped by the curvature of incline.

Additionally, drivers leaving the park and ride site and preparing to join the A12(N) may be tempted to accelerate to 70 mph as soon as possible so as to

blend in with the fast moving traffic, but that risks a serious accident with farm traffic coming out of the field, turning across the road to travel south. On the other hand, drivers travelling too slowly in the sliplane create the risk of just as serious an accident when joining fast moving north bound traffic on the A12. This latter risk would be particularly relevant in the context of heavily laden park and ride buses, which would only have had a very short distance to accelerate to reach a speed suitable to merge safely with the main road traffic.

In summary, the inadequacy of the current option 1 proposal is the intention to merge three lanes of mixed traffic, each travelling at widely differing speeds, into a single lane (currently limited to 40 mph) over the brow of a hill within distance of 100 to 200 metres – a recipe for disaster. Nothing other than a continuation of the dual carriageway and extension of the sliplane would make option 1 an appropriate location for a southern park and ride site.'

5. Lorry management (page 29 of your Consultation – Summary Document)

We agree with this comment made by Patrick Wilson:

'Without having a lorry management facility where HGVs could be held up, how would the inevitable worsening of congestion resulting from a RTA (particularly on the A12 where there are already frequent occurrences) be prevented? Would the Park and Ride sites, possibly already filled up with cars, be able to accommodate all the lorries sufficiently to prevent the whole area becoming "grid locked"? Is a remote "stack area", like that instituted for Felixstowe Container Port, being planned as a contingency measure? If so where?'

We would add that a breakdown (even a mere puncture) of an HGV could cause significant congestion and disruption. We are concerned at how necessary diversions would be managed and routed.

6. By-pass of villages on the A12 (pages 29 to 33 of your Consultation – Summary Document)

We agree with this comment made by Patrick Wilson:

'None of these options is appropriate, adequate or acceptable. This is the strongest factor countering the declared overall transport strategy. EdF's transport strategy is unacceptable here owing to its apparent indifference to the impact on the wider communities in the area through its denial of the need for the construction of the long awaited A12 four village bypass. This need was identified more than 20 years ago and passed the planning stage (refer to the environmental impact reports of 1994, etc.), and the growth in traffic since, together with the further increase because of construction traffic, reinforces the case. The proposition of merely tinkering with the A12 in and around Farnham is not acceptable to communities living in the villages along and around this section of the A12.'

The most we can say about the options set out in the stage 2 consultation document is that option 4 is the least worst option.

7. Route D2

We note that route D2, which was proposed in relation to the construction of the B station and mentioned in the phase 1 consultation, was to run broadly from Saxmundham to Leiston. Though it was not built, such a road would constitute an effective relief road for the B1122. We feel that such route should be fully re-

considered as part of the genuinely strategic plan referred to in paragraph 2.1 alongside a full review of the necessary works to the A12 to cater for increased traffic volumes both for the building of the C station and the decommissioning of the B station.

8. Local services and amenities

Another issue facing our electors is how the proposal for Sizewell C will affect local services and amenities. For example, Framlingham already has around 400 additional dwellings coming on stream which will impact on services, but your stage 2 consultation does not consider the impact of the proposal on schooling, health provision and so on. We fear that such impact may be severe as we understand your own figures show that most people working on the project will be between 30 and 49 years old and so likely to wish to live with their families within a tolerable commuting distance. We would welcome your comment in this respect.

Would you please confirm safe receipt of this letter. Many thanks.

Yours faithfully,



Nicholas Redman (Honorary Clerk)

cc Dr Daniel Poulter MP

Councillor Stephen Burroughes, Suffolk County Council

Councillor Carol Poulter, Suffolk Coastal District Council

