

Sizewell C/Wickham Market Parish Council

Traffic & Transport Meeting

24 May 2021

Attendees:

Steve Merry, Suffolk County Council (Chair)

Richard Bull, EDF

Stephen Henry, EDF

Tom McGarry, EDF

George Buxton, WSP

Nick Cottman, WSP

Stacy Dowding, WSP

James Longkwang, WSP

Chris Arscott, LDA Design

Cllr Alexander Nicoll, Suffolk County Council

Carolyn Barnes, East Suffolk Council

Cllr Dick Jenkinson, Wickham Market Parish Council

Cllr Anne Westover, Wickham Market Parish Council

Cllr Sonya Exton, WMPC & Sizewell Working Group

Fiona Judge, WMPC & Sizewell Working Group

Arthur Stansfield, WMPC & Sizewell Working Group

Richard Cooper, Marlesford Parish Council

Cllr Adrian Revill, Hacheston Parish Council

Klaus Fortmann, Campsea Ashe

Cllr Jeff Hallett, Pettistree Parish Council

I. Those Present and Apologies

Apologies were noted from Cllr David Chenery, Cllr Ivor French, Jo Peters and Annette Robinson.

II. Matters Arising from Meeting 26 April 2021

- *Steve Merry/WSP to discuss whether the preliminary design audit should take place before consultation; Steve Merry suggested that the preliminary design audit take place before consultation.*
- *WMPC to comment on the village mitigation drawings by 7 May; completed.*
- *WMPC to comment on the consultation paper and signage strategy by 7 May; completed.*
- *Steve Merry to comment on the drawings, buildouts and cycle lanes by 7 May; completed.*
- *Steve Merry, Richard Bull and Richard Cooper to discuss Marlesford and Little Glemham; completed.*
- *Richard Bull to circulate the updated modelling at Fiveways roundabout; completed.*

Richard Cooper asked if he could circulate comments to EDF pertaining to the signage strategy. Richard Bull responded that he could.

Klaus Fortmann felt that concerns relating to potential increased traffic movement on the B1078 eastwards had not been addressed. There was also a concern regarding local residents avoiding the A12 due to heavier congestion, thus making use of side roads. He asked if any traffic monitoring would take place. Steve Merry replied that this would be addressed later in the agenda.

III. Review of Matters to be Resolved Prior to Informing Public of Project Details

Cllr Anne Westover queried the statement, 'Informing public of project details'. She had been under the impression that it would be called a consultation. WMPC had clearly articulated that it wanted to seek the views of the public on the final scheme. Steve Merry explained that the aim had been to set out what proposals would be put forward. If the word 'consultation' were to be used, it was likely that individuals would believe there was an opportunity to renegotiate the proposals.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that, whilst many proposals were extremely good, there were several that many residents had concerns over. 'Informing public of project details' implied that a decision had already been made.

Tom McGarry stated that the aim was to put forward workable proposals and take on board the views of the local community in order to ascertain what was and was not acceptable. He remained puzzled on the position of WMPC. If WMPC did not support the proposals, it suggested that WMPC expected EDF to take forward the proposals. If so, WMPC had to inform EDF.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson reported that, during the last SZC/WMPC meeting, WMPC had been asked to clearly specify what changes should be made to the proposals in order for them to be taken forward to public consultation. The WMPC Traffic and Parking Working Group had circulated a letter on 7 May, endorsed by the Chair of WMPC, detailing suggested amendments to the proposals. Some WMPC members and local residents disagreed on some of the proposals.

Tom McGarry stated that EDF was endeavouring to understand how the group could consult on consultation. A question remained regarding whether WMPC wished to consult as a group alongside EDF. Cllr Anne Westover's language suggested that WMPC was happy for EDF to lead the consultation, though this decision could only be reached if WMPC felt it could not endorse the proposals. A point would arrive where the proposals would be accompanied by a cost, which would have to be reflected within the s106. WMPC had to state whether it was willing to support the consultation process.

Steve Merry asked WMPC if it were willing to participate in the consultation process. Cllr Anne Westover felt WMPC had to be involved. Cllr Dick Jenkinson said WMPC had had a significant role in moulding the proposals, and as such it should feel proud to participate in the consultation process.

Cllr Alexander Nicoll did not believe that public consultation should be led by EDF. However, a lack of clarity of a total opinion within WMPC made it difficult for WMPC to act as the consulting body between its residents, the county authority, and EDF. If EDF were to lead consultation, the process would likely result in there being a division between those who were pro and anti-SZC. Cllr Alexander Nicoll had hoped that there would be more concerted leadership in WMPC, given its work, to lead the public consultation.

Cllr Sonya Exton supported the use of the word 'consultation'. Concerns remained, and she would hesitate to state that she fully endorsed the proposals. Cllr Sonya Exton wanted to know the views of local residents. She was against stating that WMPC fully supported the proposals.

Stephen Henry seconded Cllr Alexander Nicoll's comments. There had to be acknowledgement and recognition of the work of the overall working group.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that WMPC was extremely reticent to lead consultation due to there being some contentious proposals.

Tom McGarry explained that the aim was to arrive at a set of proposals that left a legacy and dealt with the traffic issues. He supported Cllr Alexander Nicoll's previous comments. EDF's intention had always been to engage with WMPC via a working group. EDF and WMPC had to come together to jointly present consultation.

Cllr Anne Westover said not all WMPC members would endorse the scheme. Although it was not being stated that the public should not be consulted, council members were bound to have differences of opinion regarding different elements of the scheme.

Richard Cooper felt that WMPC had to lead consultation and present a united front to its parishioners. Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that while this was the most logical approach, WMPC would be unhappy to promote consultation. Richard Cooper suggested that WMPC present consultation in a neutral manner.

Klaus Fortmann believed that WMPC had to lead the consultation process.

Cllr Alexander Nicoll said the proposals had to be communicated to the body by WMPC in order to inspire confidence in Wickham Market residents. This need not involve WMPC binding itself to some form of view. It was important to avoid an imperfect solution being enforced.

Steve Merry asked WMPC how it planned to proceed with consultation. Cllr Dick Jenkinson felt it was best that consultation was led by WMPC, Suffolk County Council and EDF. Within the next few days WMPC would provide a response on the best way to move forward.

Steve Merry asked who should develop the consultation framework. Cllr Sonya Exton stated that the consultation paperwork might reflect what WMPC wanted to add. Steve Merry asked Cllr Sonya Exton if she would be interested in drafting something. Cllr Sonya Exton said she would attempt to.

Tom McGarry stated that consultation could be structured in a manner where WMPC would not need to worry about being too closely associated with EDF and the proposals, with the narrative drafted in a sensible way. WMPC was not being asked to lead public consultation.

IV. Update on Adjacent Community Issues

a. B1078 Campsea Ashe, Pettistree, Hacheston

Steve Merry stated that issues pertaining to rat running and local traffic would be managed by the transport review group. All information would be circulated via the construction transport management plan.

Klaus Fortmann asked what action Campsea Ashe, Pettistree and Hacheston would have to undertake for its concerns to be addressed within the transport review group. Richard Bull explained that everyone would have access to the construction management plan, the worker plan, and the instant plan. There would be a defined process that allowed communities to escalate issues to the transport review group. There would also be a contingency fund that would deal with any mitigation measures.

Alexander Nicoll remained unclear on whether there would be a community representative within the transport review group. Steve Merry explained that the transport review group would consist of three individuals from EDF and one each from East Suffolk, Highways England, and Suffolk County

Council. Communities would be able to feed into the transport review group via the transport coordinator, who would collate information from the community review group.

Tom McGarry stated that every clerk in East Suffolk received regular updates. A question remained as to whether SZC should acquire a DCO order and funding. Many parishes were accountable to their electorate for the impact of the development within their parish boundary. EDF wanted to establish a forum where individuals could engage with EDF and the transport review group.

Richard Cooper highlighted the contingency fund. He asked who would act as the final arbiter within the transport review group regarding any financial decisions. Steve Merry understood that it would be the transport review group. If there were a split vote, the county, as the chairperson, would get the deciding vote. This remained a matter under discussion.

Cllr Jeff Hallett stated that there had been no progress on the issue pertaining to rat running on the B1078 across Pettistree. There was also a concern regarding Pettistree's access to Wickham Market. He had not had visibility of any plans to relieve the congestion by the post office on Wickham Market High Street.

Steve Merry responded that the aim had been to ensure pedestrian safety by the post office rather than relieve any vehicle congestion. He welcomed any suggestions to address the rat-running issue. Cllr Jeff Hallett expressed disappointment that greater priority would be given to pedestrians.

Richard Bull stated that EDF would circulate the signage strategy to Cllr Jeff Hallett. It was hoped that the signage strategy would deter vehicles from taking an earlier turn off the A12 and then taking a de tour to get back onto it from the park and ride site.

Klaus Fortmann supported Cllr Jeff Hallett's comments. The working group had to agree upon monitoring any rat running at an early stage. Steve Merry said Suffolk County Council had attempted to address such issues.

b. Marlesford, Little Glemham

Steve Merry reported that Suffolk County Council, EDF, and Marlesford and Little Glemham Parish Councils had met. It had been agreed that additional mitigation would be provided to Marlesford and Little Glemham. There were some matters that still needed to be resolved, and EDF were assisting in attempting to identify a solution.

V. Traffic Monitoring/Management Plans

Steve Merry requested an update on the management of LGVs by the southern park and ride. Richard Bull clarified that EDF had agreed to review how it could manage LGVs travelling to the main construction site. However, it would be extremely difficult to be prescriptive on the journey a courier would take to a postal consolidation centre. Richard Bull agreed to report back on this at the next meeting.

Cllr Jeff Hallett asked how traffic monitoring would be applied to issues such as vehicles travelling through Pettistree. Steve Merry responded that traffic monitoring would likely be managed by the transport review group, though a solution had yet to be determined.

VI. Statement of Common Ground/Responses to Examiners Questions

Steve Merry stated that the working group would provide a response to questions posed by the Examining Authority. One question pertained to disabled parking, and this would be addressed during consultation. The working group had also been asked to quantify the potential loss of parking spaces.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson said there were no marked disabled bays on the high street. WMPC required data in order to ascertain which residents, who required disabled parking, would be affected by the proposals.

Cllr Anne Westover stated that WMPC had to know how many on-street car parking spaces would be lost and where EDF would try to provide replacement parking.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson explained that EDF had previously indicated how many car parking spaces would likely be lost. EDF had also suggested that this was unlikely to pose a problem. At the previous meeting it had been made clear that, between 18.00 and 08.00, parking spaces were scarce.

Steve Merry asked if EDF and WMPC intended to have a statement of common ground. Cllr Anne Westover did not believe there would be a need for a statement of common ground. Richard Bull did not see the benefit of a statement of common ground.

VII. Agreed Actions

The agreed actions were as follows:

- WMPC to reflect on whether it is happy to lead consultation;
- WMPC to draft a scene-setting preamble for consultation;
- WSP to carry out a safety audit on the design proposals;
- WSP to incorporate the changes suggested by WMPC into the consultation plan;
- Richard Bull to report on plans to monitor LGVs travelling to the main construction site at the next meeting.

VIII. AOB

Cllr Sonya Exton asked who would be responsible for maintaining the roads should the proposals go ahead. Steve Merry responded that Suffolk County Council would be.

George Buxton highlighted the village mitigation drawings. WMPC's submitted comments had been reviewed. Regarding the 20mph zone, this would require input from Suffolk County Council. WSP continued to design on the basis of a 30mph zone. If a 20mph zone were to be introduced there would be localised changes. Cllr Dick Jenkinson believed that the current buildout and gateway design would create a 20mph zone.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson asked if the gateways could be accompanied with wording, alerting vehicles that they are entering a 20mph zone. Steve Merry responded that if they were to opt for a 20mph zone, there would be a sign for the zone.

George Buxton said the design would remain as is, with a 30mph limit. If the limit were to be reduced to 20mph, the subject would be revisited.

George Buxton noted that WMPC's letter had stated that EDF had agreed to provide a cycle lane between Rackham's Bridge and Fiveways. He believed that the previous minutes had made mention of a cycle path rather than a cycle lane. WSP had reviewed design options for connecting Wickham Market to the southern park and ride.

Stacy Dowding shared the provision for a cycle link between Wickham Market and the SZC southern park and ride. The potential cycle link would only be required whilst the southern park and ride site existed during the construction phase. It was understood that there were 20 cycle spaces at the park and ride site.

As part of the LTN 1/20, the most appropriate cycle facility would be determined by the speed limit and number of vehicles. The most ideal scenario involved there being a segregated cycle lane during peak periods.

One proposal included a shared cycle/footway on the north side of the carriageway with another option being an advisory cycle lane. However, both options were potentially not LTN/120 compliant.

Cllr Anne Westover voiced her preference for created lanes within the highway.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson suggested that a shared cycle/footpath would not be ideal for cycling groups. He preferred that cyclists utilise part of the carriageway rather than the pavement. Stacy Dowding proposed inserting an advisory cycle lane on the carriageway.

Cllr Sonya Exton queried the regulations that large cycling groups had to comply to. Stacy Dowding stated that a more experienced cyclist would likely remain on the carriageway regardless of whatever provision was stated.

George Buxton noted that there had been a query regarding whether the road south of the Co-op was wide enough for two vehicles to pass. WSP had determined that two cars could pass, and as such it proposed that the design remained as is. Cllr Dick Jenkinson said the white centre line needed to be removed.

George Buxton highlighted the footway width between 99 and 115 High Street. WMPC had asked for an adequate pavement width to be provided and the single lane carriageway section to be removed. Currently, the carriageway was 3.5 metres wide and the footway 1.6 metres at its narrowest point. If the carriageway were to be made two-way, the footway would be reduced to 1.1 metres. The plan was to retain the wider footway. It was not possible to widen the carriageway and maintain a widened footway.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson expressed a preference for the footway not being widening. George Buxton suggested reverting back to the proposal where the footway was not widened.

George Buxton highlighted 186 High Street. There had been a request to shuffle around the start and end points of the parking blocks. It was felt that the current proposal should remain.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that the current proposal would result in a significant reduction of parking spaces on the south side of the street. He felt it would be best to completely remove the buildout. Cllr Anne Westover was of the view that some of the proposals in this area were unworkable.

Chris Arscott explained that the gateway proposals had been updated. The gateway to the south of Rogue's Lane had no existing streetlights. There was a physical narrowing of the carriageway, as well as a gateway-featured signage. The gateway was accompanied by a wide grass verge on the west and grass and planting on the east. Cllr Anne Westover felt there needed to be a surfaced material rather than grass or planting.

IX. Date of Next Meeting

TBC.

This Executive Summary was produced by Ubiquis UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370
<http://www.ubiquis.com> / infouk@ubiquis.com