# EDF Energy Sizewell C/Wickham Market Parish Council Traffic & Transport Meeting 22 March 2021

Attendees:

*Steve Merry, Suffolk County Council (Chair)*

*Richard Bull, EDF*

*Stephen Henry, EDF*

*Tom McGarry, EDF*

*Stuart Holmes, EDF*

*Nick Cottman, WSP*

*Stacy Dowding, WSP*

*James Longkwang, WSP*

*Cllr Alexander Nicoll, Suffolk County Council*

*Carolyn Barnes, East Suffolk Council*

*Cllr Carol Poulter, East Suffolk Council*

*Cllr David Chenery, Wickham Market Parish Council*

*Cllr Ivor French, Wickham Market Parish Council*

*Cllr Dick Jenkinson, Wickham Market Parish Council*

*Jo Peters, 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 PC*

##### Those Present and Apologies

Apologies were noted from Sonia Lambert, Philip Ridley, Annette Robinson, Cllr Anne Westover and Klaus Fortmann.

##### Matters Arising from Meeting 22 February 2021

Steve Merry suggested the proposals for Little Glemham, Marlesford and Hacheston be added as an agenda item for the surrounding parishes. EDF provided further detail on the signage strategy during the meeting. The traffic monitoring proposal had yet to be reviewed, as Steve Merry awaited visibility of the new management plan. WSP had provided updated drawings to Wickham Market Parish Council (WMPC) and the surrounding councils, and Tom McGarry had circulated a proposal for consultation.

##### Update Following Wickham Market Design Workshop

1. *Discussion on Buildouts*

Nick Cottman reported that the drawings had been provided, though there were no significant changes. James Longkwang highlighted concerns relating to the buildouts and gateway features provided in unilluminated areas. Following a review of the lighting levels it was proposed that there be illuminated signage in the said areas, and this was reflected within the updated highway layout designs. The overall signage to support the highway improvements had also been reviewed, including WSP highlighting locations and signage specification provided throughout the entire highway layout. In response to concerns pertaining to a gateway feature on Border Cot Lane, the gateway feature had moved further to the west, prior to the Cross Road junction.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson highlighted that the village gateway on Border Cot Lane remained in the incorrect position. Cllr Dick Jenkinson uploaded an image demonstrating the proposed location. Steve Merry suggested that WSP review this. Cllr Sonya Exton requested that the buildout changes be circulated to WMPC members. James Longkwang responded that he would circulate the changes.

James Longkwang uploaded an image detailing the layout of the western end of Border Cot Lane. Both the gateway feature and the terminal speed sign had been moved. Regarding lighting concerns, the terminal speed signs would be illuminated, providing increased visibility in the dark. The warning signs would also be illuminated. Steve Merry asked WSP if it intended to extend the system street lighting. James Longkwang responded that only the street signage would be illuminated.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson acknowledged that James Longkwang’s latest image included the gateways in the correct position. Having raised the concern during a speeding seminar, participants had expressed serious concerns regarding the gateway design. It was felt that a village gateway that extended along one carriageway would not be an acceptable way forward. James Longkwang responded that WSP would look into this. Steve Merry stated that he would provide a response regarding objections to the gateway design.

Cllr Sonya Exton voiced her concerns in relation to the gateway/buildout road layout and curb height. She asked if it was possible to omit the raised edge in order to allow cyclists to continue across the buildout without having to position themselves near oncoming traffic. There needed to be a range of alternatives. Steve Merry acknowledged Cllr Sonya Exton’s concerns.

1. *Broad Road*

Nick Cottman stated that the standard of pedestrian features along Broad Road was quite good. However, the footway along the southern end did narrow down to beneath one metre. James Longkwang explained that WSP had reviewed improving the footway width from the Market Square further up Broad Road. Nick Cottman said that the proposed footway widening would result in there being a pinch point at the northern end, though the buildout could be extended further north. James Longkwang had undertaken vehicle tracking to ensure safe property access.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson explained that cars would normally park along the left-hand end of Broad Road, which would cut off the footway. It was hoped that a resolution for this issue could be identified. James Longkwang responded that this could be reviewed. However, it would likely necessitate reviewing the parking. Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that WMPC wanted to maintain a status quo of parking for Broad Road and the High Street.

Nick Cottman highlighted that there was a concern of speeding on Broad Road. He proposed the implementation of speed humps or raised tables along Broad Road, which would act as a speed control mechanism. Cllr Alexander Nicoll highlighted concerns about fast‑moving vehicles on Simon’s Cross and Broad Road. Rather than speed cushions, something more conventional, such as a speed indicator device (SID), was required.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson explained that the figures provided to EDF included two locations on Broad Road where traffic speed had been measured, and no problem had been identified at either location. However, many Broad Road residents had commented that traffic would consistently speed. Cllr Dick Jenkinson added that small hatchbacks regularly entered and exited the village via Simon’s Cross.

Cllr Sonya Exton asked if a pedestrian crossing could be situated near the primary school. Steve Merry noted the proposed pedestrian crossings by the buildouts. If a speed ramp were to be inserted it could be combined with an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing. Regarding ramps, Suffolk County Council would be willing to consider ramps if the benefit were to outweigh the disturbance. Steve Merry acknowledged that there would always be a risk of fast-moving vehicles travelling through Wickham Market. It was a case of identifying the right solution. Cllr Alexander Nicoll proposed using a combination of measures.

Cllr Sonya Exton restated the idea of a standard 20mph speed limit for the entire village. Steve Merry responded that this remained a consideration.

Steve Merry suggested that any comments pertaining to the drawing be provided within two weeks.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson highlighted that there were errors and inconsistencies on Drawing 310. James Longkwang acknowledged Cllr Dick Jenkinson’s comments. Cllr Dick Jenkinson stated that WMPC would provide additional comments in writing.

##### Consultation: Review of EDF Proposals

Tom McGarry reported that he had not read the feedback in detail, and as such he did not intend to go through it. However, he noted that WMPC had stated that it should be able to disagree with the proposals. If WMPC were to disagree with the proposals, Tom McGarry was unsure how EDF could pursue the proposals. To take this forward to consultation, all parties had to be aligned on the proposals.

Cllr Sonya Exton explained that WMPC had been of the opinion that EDF had been suggesting that the document would be published. Tom McGarry clarified that the paper had focused on how to run a public consultation for the proposals. It was purely a discussion document on how a consultation could potentially be delivered and it did not aim to be a public document. Tom McGarry added that he would not propose that EDF draft the content alone. Cllr Sonya Exton acknowledged that WMPC had misunderstood the document.

Fiona Judge thanked Tom McGarry for the clarification. Cllr Alexander Nicoll stated that he had understood that Tom McGarry had helpfully offered to provide a document on how consultation might be carried out. It had to be decided who would consult with whom and on what.

The collective aim was to achieve the best outcome for the village, regarding potential impacts, if Sizewell C (SZC) were to be approved. The citizens of Wickham Market had to have one suggestion for their input. WMPC and EDF had to be honest over to what extent Wickham Market residents were being consulted.

WMPC, in conjunction with EDF and the authorities, had to decide to what extent it could deliver consultation. Steve Merry echoed Cllr Alexander Nicoll’s comments. He did not believe that the use of the word ‘consultation’ was appropriate. It had to be made abundantly clear that there would only be one option. Tom McGarry suggested it is possible to consult on one option and receive opinions on how to improve it.

The date for consultation was to be determined. Steve Merry was keen for consultation to take place earlier rather than later. Tom McGarry highlighted the possibility of consultation commencing after 21 June, enabling it to take place in person. However, if it were to take place after 21 June it was likely that there would still be restrictions in relation to COVID-19. Consultation could also take place online.

Steve Merry considered 21 June an appropriate date. Cllr Alexander Nicoll was keen that the community be engaged as much as possible. Steve Merry suggested that a decision be made on consultation at the next SZC/WMPC meeting on 26 April. The group had to commit to whether it would take consultation forward. Stephen Henry stated that there was a need to properly engage with the community.

Steve Merry asked WMPC if it would reflect on Tom McGarry’s paper. Cllr Sonya Exton stated that WMPC would need to review the document. Cllr Ivor French seconded Cllr Sonya Exton’s comments. However, he also believed that the consultation paper had to be circulated to the entire Parish Council.

Tom McGarry stated that, if WMPC was unhappy with the proposals that would be the subject of consultation, he was unsure how it would form part of the consultation group. Cllr Ivor French said that the group had to move forward, with the support of the entire Parish Council, and convince residents that the right action was being taken.

Cllr Dick Jenkinson voiced his support of Tom McGarry’s suggested approach to communication. He felt that consultation should focus purely on the mitigation work in Wickham Market. WMPC needed to back the proposals agreed upon by the group, and those who disagreed had to accept the fact that a decision had been made.

Stephen Henry stated that the southern park and ride had to be mentioned due to the mitigation work being financially linked to it. Steve Merry clarified that the mitigation in Wickham Market was necessary due to the additional traffic caused by the presence of the southern park and ride. However, consultation would not focus on the park and ride.

Cllr Alexander Nicoll observed that a debate on the southern park and ride would likely cause more confusion than clarity. There had to be a complete focus on material considerations and how these would impact residents. WMPC would have to approach public consultation with a sense of unanimity.

Tom McGarry highlighted the importance for WMPC and EDF to provide context for why it had come together, and it was unlikely that the group could not refer to SZC and the southern park and ride.

The idea was to create a legacy within Wickham Market, and the temporary park and ride would be an important element of the process to delivering that long term legacy. Cllr Ivor French stated that WMPC had to be unified.

It was agreed that a date for consultation would be agreed upon at the next SZC/WMPC meeting on 26 April.

##### Update on Adjacent Community Issues (B1078 Campsea Ashe, Pettistree, Hacheston, Marlesford and Little Glemham)

Richard Bull reported that Marlesford and Little Glemham continued to progress and would be included within the s106-funded scheme.

Richard Cooper highlighted Hacheston. He asked if there was an update regarding modelling at the Fiveways roundabout. Richard Bull replied that he would circulate this. The strategic model had been broken down for the location and junction, detailing traffic movement over a 24-hour period.

##### Signing Strategy and Control of Vehicle Movements

Richard Bull highlighted that EDF’s delivery team was now engaging with service providers of vehicle movement control technology. The specification of the technology would feed into the management plans.

Nick Cottman presented a slide deck for the signage strategy. Further consideration had been given to a wider signage strategy, covering Suffolk, while scheme drawings for Wickham Market had been progressed. Traffic modelling had been undertaken for the early years and during peak construction in order to identify the key routes, as predicted by the strategic modelling.

Goods vehicles would be controlled according to fixed routes. During peak construction the routes would be diverted onto the Sizewell link road. Large vehicles would be well-controlled, and the proposed signage along the routes would be supplementary to the controls in place.

The exercise had focused on the 10 to 12-year construction period and reviewing directional signage. The signage would target workforce movements as well as SZC goods vehicles.

The proposed signage strategy is to provide yellow-backed temporary works signage throughout the network, guiding traffic along the A14, A12, B1122, two-village bypass and SLR, picking up traffic from the A144, A1120 and A145. There would be a more localised network of temporary signs on approach to key locations, as well as detailed messaging close to Wickham Market. Black-backed goods vehicle signs would be proposed at permanent locations, though lorry and goods vehicle drivers would be controlled on these routes. There would be dynamic signage around the Wickham Market park and ride to allow the use of the traffic incident management area.

It was proposed that there be supplementary directional signage, on a permanent basis, around the Sizewell link road, two-village bypass and Yoxford roundabout. There would also be a network of temporary signage around the main development site, Lover’s Lane, Abbey Road and the B1122.

Nick Cottman presented mock signs and locations.

Arthur Stansfield asked what the numbers on the first slide pertained to. Nick Cottman responded that the numbers detailed the hourly vehicle flows. Arthur Stansfield asked what route individuals, who lived in the triangle north of the A14 and A140, were expected to follow to Sizewell. Nick Cottman replied that there had been no proposal to include any signage on the A140. It would likely be appropriate to include this in a further extension up the A14.

Richard Cooper asked if the hourly vehicle flow numbers pertained to one or two-way traffic flows. Nick Cottman responded that the numbers were vehicle flow for both directions but as separate numbers. Richard Cooper asked if vehicle flow numbers for westbound from the park and ride had been modelled. Nick Cottman replied that up to seven hours of the day had been modelled. Richard Cooper felt that this required revisiting. Nick Cottman explained that the traffic modelling flows had been produced in order to identify the typical routes. There was a question regarding whether there should be signage along the B1078, though currently this had not been proposed.

Richard Cooper asked Nick Cottman if he could circulate the signage strategy slide deck. Nick Cottman responded that he would. Richard Bull noted that the slide deck remained a work in progress.

##### Agreed Actions

The agreed actions were as follows:

* Steve Merry to provide a response regarding objections to the gateway design;
* WSP to review the location of the suggested village gateway on Border Cot Lane;
* WSP to circulate the buildout changes to WMPC;
* Traffic monitoring to be a standard item on future agendas;
* WMPC to provide a response to the proposed buildout signage within two weeks;
* WMPC to reflect on the proposed mitigation measures and whether they support taking this forward to local consultation;
* Steve Merry, Richard Bull and Richard Cooper to discuss Marlesford and Little Glemham and its inclusion in the s106 funded scheme;
* EDF to set up a meeting with Marlesford;
* Richard Bull to circulate the updated modelling at Fiveways roundabout;
* Nick Cottman to circulate the signage strategy slide deck.

Action carried forward from the previous meeting:

* Steve Merry to review the traffic monitoring proposal and how it would fit into the transport review group.

##### AOB

Cllr Alexander Nicoll asked if Suffolk County Council would opine on whatever went out to public consultation. Steve Merry responded that, whilst this was his intention, he would need to confirm a final decision with the portfolio holder.

Arthur Stansfield asked if an update had been provided regarding monitoring. Steve Merry understood that there would be an updated construction traffic management plan. Richard Bull confirmed that work was taking place in this area. Once he had further information he would provide an update.

##### Date of Next Meeting

Monday 26 April 2021.
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