

Andrew McDonald [REDACTED]

Project: SEA LINK EN020026

Deadline 4 Submission – Written Representation on Traffic and Transport issues as examined in Issue Specific Hearing 2

In registering for Issue Specific Hearing 2, I listed these topics that I hoped to raise:

The Study area; Cumulative impact; Impact on minor roads and quiet lanes from diversionary pressure; insufficient and incorrect baseline and modelling.

I was unable to contribute during the hearing itself, but submit here in writing my concerns over the Applicant's attitude to these issues during the ISH, specifically in the first part of Day 2, under the agenda headings 13.1 to 13.5.

1 **Negligible impact.** This was the Applicant's choice of phrase in response to the ExA's questions on junction modelling. Despite repeated requests for details and a timetable of further modelling from both the ExA and SCC, it was clear that it is the Applicant's determined view that the Sea Link project would have '...negligible impact on the local highways'. This misrepresents the situation.

1.1 The Applicant continues to suggest that the impacts of their own project's traffic should be treated in isolation, although they may in fact represent the last straw for an overburdened local road system. This leads to the fallacy that the 'embedded mitigation' of SZC and other project impacts will never be in conflict with their own assumptions or mitigations;

1.2 The Applicant assumes that the mere delivery (however late) of junction modelling on the major roads is the end of the argument, and will satisfy policy requirements. Their spokesman emphasised this: 'We don't feel that modelling is required, because we're not going to have an impact..' – which leaves the commitment to carry out any modelling clearly labelled as a token gesture. SCC and National Highways have both disagreed with this statement. NGET met with SCC Highways in August 2025, and not after that until a week before ISH2, which hardly demonstrates a clear focus on getting this issue dealt with in accordance with its importance. **NGET must be held to the timetable for junction modelling, and for any actions that will follow the conclusions of that modelling.**

2 **Secondary impacts.** Nowhere in the discussion at ISH2 was there any detailed treatment of second-order, cumulative impacts on local roads outside the study area. Interested Parties (notably East Suffolk Communities Energy Partnership in REP2-047) have pointed out that cumulative, long-term traffic congestion affecting commuters, local businesses and schools transport will undoubtedly lead to voluntary diversions along unsuitable roads and lanes. This is a matter for *all*

of the NSIP projects contributing to the traffic load, and not merely the biggest contributor. The limited initial impact of SZC construction preparation is already making itself a grim and heavy burden on local villages outside the study area, and this should be taken as **a clear signal for NGET to be held to detailed assessments and mitigations for their own contribution, and their share of the cumulative impact, especially on local roads and quiet lanes.**

February 10th 2026