



Snape Parish Council

Written Summary of statement made at Open Floor Hearing 3, 24/3/2026

We have *four* points to make in amplification of earlier submissions, and introduce *one* additional topic. Whilst our concerns as a PC are wider than traffic impacts alone, we restrict our comments mainly to this area.

1 **Baseline data** – the construction of a baseline of traffic movements has been an issue since the original application documents revealed that the baseline months chosen by NGET were far from neutral, and completely ignored the seasonality of tourism and agricultural traffic movements across the local network. This matter remains unresolved and disqualifies calculations based upon this faulty baseline.

2 **Junction modelling** – the information received up to deadline 5 on traffic impacts excluded any junction modelling, and we are still after 5 months of examination waiting for any modelling of Suffolk junctions. The commitment at last made by NGET to provide this critical information excludes a number of key junctions, including from our point of view the A1094/B1069 Snape Church junction. Providing this important information only at deadline 6 reveals a startling lack of interest in their stakeholders' feedback from the applicant.

3 **Access to the proposed Saxmundham site** – the options for access to site for AILs have all been heavily criticised, and we are concerned that these options are only now being 'finalised', despite NGET's public claims of strategic forethought. Each option in CR1 has severe impacts on the road and rail networks and we therefore identify ourselves at this point with the proposals made by Suffolk County Council to explore the use of the SZC northern relief road.

We agree with Suffolk County Council in [REP4-149] that NGET haven't paid enough attention to the provision of alternative access solutions, especially as regards maintenance and operational access, with the impact of consequent road closures (A12 & B1121) on the A1094 and our own local roads left out of consideration. We also consider Sea Link's arguments in [REP5-179] once again unsatisfactory and repetitious - bringing the original case back to the debate unchanged in no way respects the feedback that NGET claim to value from their stakeholders. to do). The environmental impacts set out in [APP-044] 3.811-3.816 that NGET take to disqualify the Relief Road proposal contain nothing at all that is not brushed aside in other contexts.

4 **Rat Running** – we have previously asked for more detailed attention to be paid to the second-order impacts of heavy traffic on major roads, and we make this request once more. Those responsible for the cumulative impact of traffic diversion into unsafe and fragile rural roads and quiet lanes should be paying for TROs to reduce speed limits, and effective signage to protect smaller roads from the pandemonium and verge destruction that we have already seen with only one project in place, and which will be repeated over the next decade unless action is pre-emptively taken through DCO obligations.

5 **Needs case** - We would also like to note that the points made by other organisations about the actual need for this project seem at last to have received a considered (if not satisfactory) response from NGET; and in that context we also welcome the ExA's questions in **ExQ3** on the requirements of national policy EN-1, where claims of Critical National Priority are, especially in protected landscapes and environments, required to be supported by a rigorous application of the mitigation hierarchy – which of course starts with the option of 'avoiding' altogether.

The Applicant has been ignoring the needs argument throughout, relying on appeals to the Clean Power 2030 'mission' document for the *assumption* of support for a so-called 'critical and urgent' – but clearly very general - need for reinforcement of the grid. They should of course have first considered more efficient and cost-effective methods of meeting both locational and general need for renewables, especially when proposing to build industrial infrastructure in a National Landscape with an extraordinarily high incidence of protected and preserved landscape, ecology and heritage.