

I write to respond on behalf of Snape Parish Council to the Applicant's responses to Relevant Representations, **RR-5044** submitted on 19/06/25.

We submit our views on the Applicant's responses in Paras 1-4, and draw your attention to the procedural issues noted in para 5, 'Procedural Issues'.

1 General Comments on the Applicant's responses.

1.1 Without doubt NGET has failed to address any or all of our specific points, which is disappointing, given that the ExA had asked for specific clarification NGET's failure to provide a Traffic Assessment rather than a 'Note'. Their response consists entirely of reference back to their own documents submission on which we were commenting, which is unsatisfactory and a breach of trust in the procedure.

1.2 We set out below in further detail issues on which we asked the Applicant to comment. They have not addressed the mitigation measures we suggested, nor made any explanation of the restricted study area, which excludes the consequent significant pressures that our village and the surrounding minor rural road network will face. These issues have been raised in consultation and engagement with the Applicant over the last few years.

2 Specific Issues without response from the Applicant at Deadline 1A

2.1 We noted in our RR and OFH1 WR that NGET were making a completely unrealistic claim¹ that their project will have so little impact on traffic and transport issues that they do not even need to prepare a Transport Assessment. NGET's error was at least partly due to their using a study area that excludes from consideration local roads south of the A1094 that are already bearing the pressures of diversionary tactics by drivers trying to avoid traffic pressures from SZC and SPR construction. This situation allows us to make very accurate predictions about where the further pressures that Sea Link will be adding will be felt.

2.2 Whilst our concerns centre on the dangerous and already overburdened junction A1094/B1069 Church Common junction, the wider picture includes four traffic 'nodes' where diversionary tactics, mostly by local drivers, will have significant impacts. These are Church Common itself, Friday Street, the Tunstall junction(s) of the B1078 and B1069, and the roads around the station at Wickham Market. Not all of these are 'Snape' roads, but they are all (excluding of course Friday Street) 'attractors' for traffic wishing to find a 'practical' route away from the A1094 and towards either the A12 south or the A1152 towards Rendlesham and Woodbridge; and all of them will bring traffic directly through Snape Village and Snape Maltings.

2.3 As traffic increases, a series of alternative routes open up, as we know from diversions for roadworks or flooding. There are five feasible junctions with the A12 south of the B1121 that affect Snape roads – Friday Street, Farnham, Tinker Brook, Church Road at Little Glemham and the Lower Hacheston junction via Campsea Ashe; and the B1069 leads to the A1152 at Rendlesham and leads on to Woodbridge. If we assume that for the foreseeable

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'

future the Friday Street junction (and indeed the A12 between Lower Hacheston and Kelsale) become options to avoid, then we will certainly have increases in:

- Traffic from Saxmundham and north-east of Saxmundham using Sternfield Road, crossing the A1094 at Church Common to the B1069 south for access to the A1152 and the A12;
- Traffic on the A1094 from Leiston, Aldeburgh and eastern villages, turning left initially at the B1069 junction but then perhaps eventually via the quiet lane Priory Road, to join the B1069 in Snape Village, again for access to A1152 and A12;
- Traffic *from* the A12 using the A1152 through Eyke and Rendlesham to join the B1069 northwards and then on to cross the A0194 at Church Common or via a quiet lane ratrun.

All of these routes are already well known to local drivers, and Snape residents have seen traffic increases through the village steadily over 2025. None of the routes mentioned, however, falls within the 'study area' and therefore we reject the claim of 'no significant transport implications'.

3 The critical impacts for our Parish will include:

3.1 Increased risk to drivers and pedestrians and settlement separation at the Church Common junction, which has poor visibility and has already been identified by SPR's EA1N/EA2 project as requiring safety upgrade; Snape PC's view is that at a minimum the A1094 speed limit between Snape Watering and (at the closest) the B1069 Leiston junction should be reduced to 40mph throughout, and signage at the junction adapted to the new stress on the junction that 346 daily Sea Link HGV movements will bring;

3.2 Traffic congestion through the village will have negative impacts on air quality, noise, severance and road safety - Bridge Road, between the Village and Snape Maltings will be particularly impacted, affecting tourism and local employment;

3.3 Specifically, increased, heavy traffic will have a severe impact on the safety of children and parents at Snape Primary School, Church Road – it is essential that the present national speed limit between Church Common and the entrance to the village is reduced to a maximum of 30mp, preferably 20mph through the upper Village;

3.4 Rat-running through the minor rural road network cannot be eliminated entirely, but on behalf of all villages with Quiet Lanes, we feel strongly that action should be taken to preserve this amenity, and to save at least one opportunity for village residents not to be driven out of their rural environment by industrial pressures on local traffic;

3.5 Local residents have already reported serious damage to local roads used as diversions whilst SZC preliminary works are carried out; this damage to verges, hedgerows and the local ecology will become a permanent scar on our environment if we allow this project to add yet more to the pressure on the local network.

4 Mitigations required

4.1 For the record, we repeat here in summary our requests made to the ExA at OFH1:

- We ask that the ExA requires Sea Link to carry out 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;
- On roads at most danger from rat running, Sea Link should be required to fund signage to discourage use of unsuitable, easily damaged and potentially unsafe roads and lanes by rat running, and required to fund the introduction of additional traffic calming or Quiet Lanes;
- We join with other parishes to ask that the Applicant be required to fund local Town and Parish Councils to manage the vast pressures they face with this quite unmanaged NSIP onslaught.

5 Procedural Issues

We strongly object to the procedural and administrative failings in the Applicant's responses to our Relevant Representation, on three grounds:

5.1 With vastly less resource than the Applicant, we have made Relevant Representation, OFH1 presentation and Written Representation on time, in accordance with the Examining Authority's published timetable. The Applicant has treated the timetable as optional, and their late submission has removed more than half of the time the Parish Council had counted on for review and agreement of our response to their views. *That* has been permitted, and yet the Parish Council is aware that the ExA will give Interested Parties no permission for late submission. This is inequitable.

5.2 The Applicant claims to place some importance on the views of local communities, and is aware of the roles played by Town and Parish Councils in gathering and reflecting the views of local people. With five months at their disposal to review our submission, however, they have chosen instead to group all local Parish, Town Councils and local community groups together with over 5,500 members of the public, and to prepare one single response on each of an arbitrarily selected set of 'themes'. The selection and allocation of responses has been based on a crude word-search, and thus 'answers' to Snape PC on two topics which we did not actually raise. This is undemocratic and unbusinesslike, and exemplifies the Applicant's dismissive attitude towards this Examination..

5.3 The Applicant's administrative treatment of the documents has been terrible, and has cost us wasted time trawling through unmarked pages of lists and searching for potentially updated versions of files. **Shown below** is the completely unhelpful 'Contents Page' of 9.34.6, 'Applicant's Thematic Responses to relevant Representations', REP1-117. This is the complete page, and we wonder how this level of slipshod drafting has not only been accepted, but accepted at your discretion well after the due deadline. We must therefore reserve our position on 'wasted costs', in line with the ExA's Rule 17 letter of 28 November 2025.

Contents	
1. Thematic Responses to Relevant Representations of	1
No table of figures entries found.	
No table of figures entries found.	
Table 7.1 Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations that raise Agriculture and Soil	2
Table 7.19 Applicant's Response to the Relevant Representations that raise Fish and Shellfish Ecology	121
No table of figures entries found.	
No table of figures entries found.	
No table of figures entries found.	