

[REDACTED]

My name is Andrew McDonald and I am speaking for Snape Parish Council

1 Here's a short example of how we as a Parish Council differ from the conclusions reached in the Sea Link DCO application. I draw your attention to Table 7.1, which follows para 7.2.6 of APP-054 – 6.2.2.7, in which reference is made to requirements for DCO applicants in NPS- EN1 Part 5 14.18; The applicants' statement at this rather deeply-dug point starts with this admission - 'Whilst **the Proposed Project is not a new energy generating facility...**' and goes on to claim 'mitigation measures' that are further outlined in chapters 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11 of the same APP-054, document 6.2.2.7 and further yet in Application documents 7.5.1.1 and 7.5.9.1.

We *agree* – it's not a new energy generating facility, it's a bootstrap, and it's not currently needed, nor will it be by 2030, so there is no rush. NG (or the Examining Authority, dare I say) could stop this now and wait for NESO's Strategic Spatial Energy Plan to be published and only then bring forward a more sensible proposal, properly integrated with other projects, certainly offshore, and therefore not as part of the torrent of NSIP applications that are overwhelming the resources of local representative bodies. On this we agree with another 35 town and parish councils in East Suffolk.

2 Snape PC has its own priority issues with the Application. Our Relevant Representation focused on 5 deficient areas – strategic sense, poor engagement, local employment impacts, drastic environment and ecology effects; and **especially** the dangers we will face from the overwhelming of our local road and travel infrastructure, which will not cope with the cumulative impact that Sea Link's construction activity would add. We will focus on this issue, on which we ask for an Issue Specific Hearing. [2.25]

3 NGET claims that¹ there will be no significant transport implications, and therefore has ignored the updated NPPF's requirement for a full traffic assessment – that is, where a development generating 'significant amounts of movement...should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment...'² There is of course a transport Assessment Note, at Appendix 2.7.A of the document quoted, but this is in much less detail than required, and quite inappropriate for the added volume of (say) the 346 HGV movements forecast each day on our local roads at their peak. This is of course 'a significant volume'. [3:05]

¹ 'The Proposed Project is not expected to have significant transport implications and the approach to prepare Application Document 6.2.2.7.A Appendix 2.7.A Transport Assessment Note has been agreed with Suffolk County Council and National Highways'

² NPPF Dec 2024 Para 118

4 To add a little detail to this – we are very deeply concerned about the impact of still more construction traffic, poorly managed and controlled, on the A1094 and the B1069. They meet at Snape Church, a dangerous and busy junction, where the NSL drops to 30 mph only 30m from the junction in one direction. The B1069 already functions as a diversionary route for traffic from and to Leiston, Tunstall (with its dangerous and constricted junction at Snape Rd/Orford Rd) and Rendlesham. The B1069, where traffic has built up straight away as SZC construction preparation activity has started, is also of course the principal route to Snape Maltings. We also have local concerns about two Quiet Lanes, Gromford Lane & Priory Road, that will undoubtedly become dangerous and destructive A1094 rat-runs, especially for knowledgeable drivers.[4:00]. The impacts and the dangers, of course, are becoming *cumulative*, and not simply *additive* as each new NSIP demands its place on our road system.

5 Based on these concerns and our Relevant Representation, we make three requests to the ExA:

ONE Sea Link's Transport Assessment Note is based on traffic surveys carried out at the wrong time of year, and ignores the major increases in traffic peaks in July/August, especially on roads to Snape Maltings and Aldeburgh. We ask that the ExA requires Sea Link to carry out further, better specified traffic analysis, including detailed junction surveys, and to do this through close working with SZC and SPR; and to make any consequent changes to their traffic planning a requirement of the DCO; this would include ensuring that they are accountable for and remain in close control of their and their contractors' vehicles and routes throughout the construction stages; this too should be a requirement of the DCO;

TWO On roads recognised as being most at most danger from rat running, Sea Link where individual communities ask, be required to fund signage to discourage use of unsuitable, easily damaged and potentially unsafe roads and lanes by rat running, and also required to fund the introduction of additional traffic calming or Quiet Lanes.

THREE We join with other parishes to ask that the Applicant be required to fund and resource local Town and Parish Councils to manage the vast pressures they face with this quite unmanaged NSIP onslaught.

FINALLY We repeat that this cumulative and complex matter should be the topic of an Issue Specific Hearing. But given the **other damaging, dangerous and unacceptable** consequences of the Application, including particularly the disastrous establishment of the connection hub at Friston, we ask that the ExA simply refuse the Application; and that the Authority recommend that any reintroduction later is linked to a sensible and integrated offshore strategy.

Addendum

We suggest that the ExA review and take careful note of the excellent presentation made by the last speaker in OFH1 Session 1 Part 2, Will Wright.