

WICKHAM MARKET PC TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT MEETING MARCH 2020
NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Minutes

Project Title and Ref: Wickham Market Parish Council **Meeting Type:** Traffic and Transport Meeting

Attendees: Cllr David Chenery, Cllr Anne Westover - WMPC
 Shane Field, Colin Owens, Cllr John Horsnell, Geoff Cosby, Peter Tinsley WMP Traffic & Parking Grp
 Cllr Sonya Exton, Arthur Stansfield – WMPC & Sizewell Working Group
 Richard Cooper – Marlesford PC, Jeffrey Hallett – Pettistree PC, Klaus Fortman – Campsea Ashe PC,
 Stephen Leech and Adrian Revell – Hacheston PC,
 Tom McGarry, Richard Bull, Steve Henry, Tracy Hateley - EDF
 Steve Merry, East Suffolk Council - Chair

Apologies: Dick Jenkinson WMPC Chair **Meeting Held on:** Monday 9th March 2020
 Jo Peters WMPC Clerk

Actions from Previous Meeting – Monday 9th December 2019

Action Ref	Minute Ref	Actions	Status	Who	By when
	2.	Working Group to be set up with Terms of Reference	Open	WMPC/ parishes	Asap draft pre next meeting
	2.	WMPC to go back to EDF with proposals for an Integrated Working Group	Open	WMPC/ parishes	Asap pre next meeting
	2.	EDF agree to take the lead on administrative roles for this group	Closed	EDF	Ongoing
	4.	Specific modelling on Fiveways roundabout	Open	EDF	Next meeting
	5.	Integrated Meeting date to be arranged in diaries.	Open	WMPC/ EDF	Pre next meeting

Meeting Agenda

1. Present and apologies
2. Opening remarks by Chairman
3. Agree role of minute taking
4. Minutes from 9th December 2019
5. Matters arising
6. Parishes concerns relating to SP&R site and impacts (ref site notes 29/11/19)
7. DCO Submission and outline of process
8. EDF feedback from first meeting 09.12.19 and mitigation measures proposed to address the WMPC Problem Statement and surrounding issues raised relating to the highway network.
9. SP&R Site EDF proposed Integrated Transport Working Group: aims, TOR, membership, meeting schedules
10. AOB
11. Date for next meeting

Meeting Minutes – Monday 9th March 2020

WICKHAM MARKET PC TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT MEETING MARCH 2020

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Agenda Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
1.	Introductions and apologies		
2.	<u>Opening Remarks - Chair</u> First meeting in Dec was positive. Encourage all to maintain a positive working relationship between parties. Aim to develop a small working group to address transport issues and present workable solutions for discussion and present them back to the wider group. Integrated group for discussion further on.		
3.	<u>Minute taking</u> EDF to take minutes and send in draft to Jo Peters, WMPC Clerk to circulate for comment. Final agreed minutes to be sent to Clerk for parish distribution. Agenda – SM to coordinate agenda, items to be sent to SM 5 days in advance.	TH/JP All/SM	Ongoing Ongoing
4.	<u>Minutes from 09/12/20</u> Some actions covered in later items (Integrated Traffic Group). Admin role covered above. Note to look at specific modelling of Fiveways roundabout. RB confirmed this has been done, no issues with regards to capacity, done at peak hours and didn't show any particular issues. SM asked is this included in the DCO or are EDF happy to release modelling? RB no problem releasing the modelling. Amendment requested to previous minutes by Cllr Horsnell. Under Note 2, RB stated funding would be available for traffic mitigation measures with discussion, this was omitted from minutes. RB happy with amendment and added that this is a commitment from EDF that stands.	RB TH	Next meeting
5.	<u>Matters arising</u> R Cooper asked SM about Seckford Hall and Dobbies roundabout. SM gave update.		
6.	<u>Parishes concerns relating to SPR site and impacts (ref site notes 29/09/19)</u> <i>Note SPR on agenda – will be referred to as SP&R for minutes</i> A Westover gave update following 29/11/19 meeting and notes sent through (also incl with letter to Paul Morton). A Westover asked for guarantee that EDF were looking at addressing these in the DCO submission. RB confirmed a Landscape and Visual Impact assessment, whether the submission addresses the specific concerns is not clear, however EDF can bring a colleague in once DCO material is public to have a discussion with WMPC on these aspects. Issues with PRoW, which Annette Robinson is happy to discuss with WMPC. R Cooper raised concern if RB hadn't seen notes, that the DCO would not take these into account. TMc said these had been fed back to the team and are points the team are familiar with as they were in responses to formal consultation. The report on consultation will list issues raised by respondents and how EDF responded to them. Over 3,000 separate issues have been responded to.		
7.	<u>DCO submission and outline of process</u> SM's understanding that this is now quite close. The application goes to PINS who have 28 days to validate and publish on PINS website. In terms of future actions SM suggested a meeting after this time has lapsed and the DCO is available. A Westover gave a list of mitigation impacts. RB: Pulling together final submission now. Done in terms of content, and has gone through rigorous legal and peer review. SM suggested worth looking at the Scottish Power PINS process for information. An important deadline is for any interested party to register. TMc: On DCO submission EDF will give an indication of what has been submitted in a newsletter to 40k homes/businesses within a 10mile radius. This will summarise the thousands of pages of the application and direct to detail on the PINS website. The independent Chair of the Community Forum has invited PINS to attend a meeting towards the end of the month, (this may be PAE) to present their role of support through the process and explain clearly/answer questions on the process. LA's will have the opportunity to explain their role in the process. Possibly the last Community Forum in that format. This will be subject to possible Covid-19 restrictions. Parish and Town Councils will be kept informed.		
8.	<u>EDF feedback from first meeting 09.12.19</u> WMkt problem statement and Traffic & Parking Group report looks at all the transport issues facing WMkt - a good starting place and will be a major input for the process. The		

WICKHAM MARKET PC TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT MEETING MARCH 2020

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Agenda Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
	<p>T&PG are happy to share this with EDF after it has been through WMPC. J Horsnell asked RB if any meetings had taken place between EDF/SCC re. future traffic & parking mitigation measures and funding for WMkt. RB confirmed none, because the first step is to try and set up meetings first for discussion. S Exton said the T&PWG was thinking EDF would come up with some examples used around other villages just to show what could be possible, rather than nothing.</p> <p>RB said that the EDF approach had previously been more focussed on an increase in capacity and the throughput of traffic rather than the people that lived there and ensuring that people were safe. EDF are keen to work positively with WMkt taking a different approach to the issues and also trying to see if there are ways to encourage traffic to use A12/A14 rather than coming across country.</p> <p>RB: The key for EDF is engagement to deliver something that the Parish is happy with and could be left as a legacy. In terms of funding EDF have ability within the DCO application to create the funding that can be justifiably allocated to deal with impacts that the project delivers. If there is a way to deliver a scheme, this could be funded partly with SCC. Dependent on good engagement and progression, an element of trust. SM is happy to carry on with technical support, but ideas necessary from WMPC to help deliver. It would be ideal to use the report being pulled together as the basis of how to move forward, not EDF coming up with schemes. RB said this report would be key input to be able to come up with something complimentary. A Stansfield commented what would be the best for the local parishes is if the SP&R isn't there, that is the best solution. TMc said following consultation and two proposals that were not popular, the wording at stage 4 was to encourage these groups – EDF could impose the mitigation and spend s106 money, or all could work together to arrive at a solution. Integrated Transport Working Group (ITWG) – exactly what's needed to arrive at solutions.</p> <p>SM Key to note that EDF only have to mitigate the impact from the SP&R, but can provide a legacy for the area.</p> <p>RB: A small working group in place to have that engagement, productive and agreed at tonight's meeting, this could then be taken forward. Quite difficult in a big group to achieve solutions. The s106 agreement is where obligations and contributions are listed, this then needs to be agreed. There is a tight deadline in place, RB confirmed approx. 6 – 9 months.</p> <p>A Westover said that parish councils need to represent all the residents in the Parish, hence the letter sent to Paul Morton to highlight all broader issues.</p> <p>Discussion regarding how more traffic to be encouraged to A14/A12. Orwell Bridge – SM gave an update of meteorological study of the bridge with possible changes to speed limits. To have a temporary measure in place by Winter 2020.</p>		
9.	<p><u>SP&R site – EDF proposed Integrated Transport Working Group: Aims, Terms of reference, membership, meeting schedules.</u></p> <p>SM: How to take this forward? Gave example of Leiston TC group now in place - would this be something that WMPC thinks would work for them specifically for the traffic issues?</p> <p>C Owens: Sees the aim of this group to identify the impact on traffic and parking resulting from SP&R, to agree mitigation actions and identify what can be supported by funding. The T&PWG has very good data on traffic numbers, but nothing on airborne contamination.</p> <p>RB: regarding DCO submission we also submit draft Heads of Terms for the S106, there is no financial detail but does categorise where EDF will provide funding and mitigation in different areas, one of which is Wickham Market, this is within visibility of the board and has been endorsed in principle but detail necessary to sign off the agreement. RB: Approximately 6-9 mths and what we need to have by then is a common agreement between RB/SM that the numbers are adequate – this is all time critical. SM: It needs to be feasible and deliverable. SM will remain involved from a Highways perspective, cannot promise major resources, but would be looking for the following for the High Street:</p>		

WICKHAM MARKET PC TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT MEETING MARCH 2020

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Agenda Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
	<p>Topographic survey, roadside parking\pavements, idea of what the parking demand is, traffic figures. And following on with options for discussion to get the best result for WMPC. Discussion followed on the report and requirements. A Westover wanted a wider view to include cycle ways and footpaths to the SP&R.</p> <p>TMc: Important at the end of the whole PINS process in late 2021, to note that we would not want to stop and disappear from the local community. Whatever is put in place to look at the traffic and parking it should be a group that evolves and moves on ready for when there are unknown unknowns. At HPC there is a review group with a transport fund – if WM volunteers continue EDF will be totally in support of this.</p> <p>SM: Important for Parish representation throughout the DCO and construction process and to use T&P Group report as a starting point for this.</p> <p>SM said there are some things that would be reasonable to expect as a responsibility to EDF. Need to prioritise what is looked at.</p> <p>A Revell: How does a small focus group help the local parishes with wider impacts? SM sees the transport group feeding back to surrounding parishes. Important to understand the issues of the surrounding parishes. There needs to be a way of pinpointing the wider impacts and looking into wider effects.</p> <p>J Hallett requested it be recorded that the surrounding villages felt very unhappy with the way this process has gone, saying since first community meetings about the worry of rat runs through Pettistree, not just from SZ vehicles, but traffic pushed onto B1078. 'We have said this at every meeting and have recorded it in our responses, we heard nothing about it in stage 4 at all and now we hear that it's too late with the DCO coming out and now told that you are throwing us into the darkness'.</p> <p>S Field: Other parishes could adopt a similar approach and evidence/fact find to highlight where the issues are. Then collate the information together effectively.</p> <p>Discussion on levels of impact on surrounding parishes and parish involvement. Other parishes may be unable to carry out such specific work. Agreement that parishes must work together.</p> <p>TMc: EDF here at these meetings to take on responsibilities and want to understand what the issues are from a local perspective. EDF don't want to exclude anyone, but don't want to have a situation where there are big meetings where detailed issues and experiences are not properly addressed. How it is organised needs to be arrived at amongst those in the room. EDF are not pushing anybody away but are happy to try and find other solutions for other parishes – there could be some sort of governance structure included to share the information between WMPC and parishes. Addressing J Hallett's statement directly, DCO submission is not a full stop. There is still opportunity to influence. All responses are addressed in the DCO application in the report on consultation. Interested parties can raise their concerns to PINS if they feel their issues have not been addressed.</p> <p>R Cooper: Understands that EDF not worried about how the group is constituted from their side, as long as it is not a big group – some discussion required by current attendees. Should be discussed outside this current meeting?</p> <p>SM: Was this a useful meeting? Useful to take these meetings forward?</p> <p>Discussion: SM asked would those present want to have a SP&R forum group? To have a smaller WMPC specific group who meet and then feedback to neighbouring parishes, a specific SP&R forum to include other parishes, but not quite so WMPC heavy? Need to establish a way of looking at the wider areas and wider impacts of SP&R. Other issues noted with Charsfield and Coddendam – both with B1078 traffic.</p> <p>Purpose of bigger meeting is to include other parishes and communities. EDF feel it is important that other parishes are not feeling excluded.</p> <p>Traffic & Parking Working Group – Integrated group for EDF traffic issues with WMkt and this group should feed back to WMPC and other parishes to share information and work together Needs to be trust that Integrated group will report back for parishes to act on.</p>		

WICKHAM MARKET PC TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT MEETING MARCH 2020

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Agenda Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
	<p>Agreement to have discussion directly after meeting without EDF in attendance between the parishes with Steve Merry. EDF to be informed of outcome and who they should be talking to for these.</p> <p>SM: Actions: Parish Meeting afterwards to decide groups and involvement also draft ToR which can then be forwarded to EDF. Discussion followed. Mitigation aims for Integrated Traffic & Transport: Identify impact on traffic and parking in WM Parish and to inform and involve surrounding Agree mitigating actions and support from EDF. Legacy (meeting agreed to add this as an additional aim). Who would be present to attend these meetings from EDF? RB this would evolve, would need technical input then look at what the scheme to be delivered and specific design options and costs. A consultant from the transport team could be drawn on as required to attend along with EDF and provided secretariat.</p>	SM/ Meeting	Following meeting
10.	<p><u>AOB</u> Campsea Ashe: B1078 Concerns linked to SP&R is that traffic will use additional secondary routes which are not suitable. Traffic impact main concerns. Hacheston: Noise issues – not satisfied by responses. Pettistree: Concerns of rat runs/HGVs using side roads. Not considered how advise on the road is transferred to satnav – think about informing satnavs of unsuitable routes and roads, might be worth considering. Marlesford: Question to TMc about air quality/noise/vibration. TMc confirmed 23 air monitors. 13 on A14 and A12 since 2010. Noise surveys at 92 locations in and around the associated sites. All this information will be contained in the Environmental Statement in the DCO. SM: This is district function, ESC do air quality surveys, SM to look into air quality surveys. AW to send through notes for discussion at next meeting.</p>	SM AW	
11.	<p><u>Date for next meeting</u> To be informed following further meeting between WMPC\surrounding parishes\SM.</p>	SM/ meeting	
MEETING CLOSED at 18:55			