

Tuddenham St Martin's Parish Council

NOTES FROM the PUBLIC MEETING held on Tuesday 20th August 2019 at 7.30pm in Tuddenham St Martin Village Hall.

1. Welcome, with introduction and outline of the meeting, and Apologies Over 100 member of public were in attendance, and their home village or town location was recorded on entrance to the hall. Mr Pipe welcomed everyone to the public meeting about the Ipswich Northern Routes (INR) consultation and gave an outline of the meeting ahead, inviting views in the public forum session later in the meeting. Apologies were received from Mr Vickery (County Councillor), Mr Hicks (Leader of Suffolk County Council) and Mr Lugo (Parish Councillor). Mrs Ellinor (Parish Councillor) had also sent apologies as she would be arriving later in the meeting.

2. Presentation from the Parish Council on events to date The Parish Clerk gave a brief overview of the consultation sessions held so far and explained that County Council representatives had been invited to speak at the meeting. They had however declined and the email response in declining the invitation to this public meeting was read as follows:

Further to my email yesterday, I have spoken to the project team in terms of an officer from Suffolk County Council attending and I am sorry that we have to decline the offer. The Ipswich Northern Route Project including the current consultation into the three route proposals, is being jointly led by Suffolk County Council, Ipswich Borough Council, East Suffolk Council and Babergh and Mid Suffolk District councils. It is also supported by West Suffolk Council. Therefore, it would not be appropriate as just one of those councils to attend your Parish Council meeting to speak about this project.

During July, Suffolk County Council hosted a number of public consultations. Those events were at Grundisburgh, Needham Market, Woodbridge, Kesgrave, Witnesham, Coddendam, Ipswich, Sroughton, Henley, Martlesham Heath and Claydon and Barham. These events were publicised in advance, with details provided to all 40 Parish Councils and attracted over 2,000 residents, who were able to speak to officers from all authorities about this project and ask questions.

The best way of having your say on these proposals is to go online to the Ipswich Northern Route project website where all the materials that were available at the public events are provided. Suffolk County Council encourage all members of your council and your parish to have their say online by visiting <https://ipswichnorthernroute.org.uk/have-your-say/consultation/>.

The Clerk reported that details had been received from the Ipswich Northern Route body that consultation materials were now available at various unmanned locations in the area and details of the dates and locations could be found on the Ipswich Northern Route website, and the Parish Council website.

The Clerk reported that Woodbridge Town Council had supplied details of their public meeting, which would be held in Woodbridge Community Hall on Thursday 22nd August 2019 (starting at 7pm). Dr Poulter MP, Representatives from the Stop! Campaign and Professor Peter Hobson (Ecosystems Guru) would be speaking.

The Clerk also reported that the Stop! Campaign had emailed details of various public meetings being held by Parish Councils in the area about the Ipswich Northern Routes consultation.

3. Update from the Stop! Campaign Nick Green thanked the Parish Council for the invitation to speak and introduced himself. He gave an overview of how the Stop! Campaign was launched. He explained that the campaign was to bring people together rather than individual responses and separate interest groups putting forward comments to the consultation. The Stop! Campaign was a way of bringing all stakeholders together to put in place an infrastructure to fight the INR as a whole rather than individual objections to the least favoured option.

Nick Green explained that the failure of the Orwell Crossing was due to figures being wrong, and the INR consultation was to detract from criticism of the wet dock scheme. A lot of money had already been spent on the consultation and it had been assumed that the northern route proposal was to reduce Ipswich congestion, but it was to support additional housing in north Ipswich in the region of 20,000 homes. The consultation green document was full of flaws.

When the Orwell Bridge is closed it gets busy in Ipswich, but the bridge was only closed for 18 hours a year over the last 5 years. A transport study was being carried out to check how to improve the impact of the bridge closures. Possible solutions could include: cars allowed to use the bridge rather than it being closed to all traffic? Especially when cars are 60% of the bridge traffic. The bridge remaining open to car traffic, and using 'Operation Stack'. Retro fitting the Orwell Bridge with higher sides. In addition to these, Felixstowe port is closed when the bridge is closed so there should be less HGVs needing to use the Orwell bridge.

The CO² emission data in the consultation does not take into account the building of the INR and would only save the equivalent of 25 lorries per year. Felixstowe Port and the Chamber of Commerce were not calling for INR, but were calling for improvements on vehicle pinch points and rail improvements.

It would take 5 to 6 years to build an INR and this would impact on the quality of life in the area. There would also be an impact on the value of housing in the area and Nick Green gave an overview of estimates provided by a local estate agent on this matter, especially as Tuddenham was in the region of ¾ of a mile of the proposed inner INR.

Nick Green went on to explain how members of the Stop! Campaign had attended every INR consultation and demonstrated at Endeavour House. The Stop! Campaign had established a website with a live petition, and guidance on how to complete the consultation questionnaire if opposed to the INR. The Stop! Campaign needed to raise funds for transport specialists and legal help in the battle ahead in the event of a judicial review.

Over 110 people had attended the recent Stop! Campaign meeting calling for volunteers and now there were sub committees to deal with different areas of the campaign. These were Funding, Research, Events, Stakeholder Engagement and Door to Door Campaigning. More volunteers were needed though in order to encourage as many people as possible to take part. Attendees of this public meeting were encouraged to take a look at the Stop! Campaign website and see how they could contribute and take part in the campaign.

4. Update from Dr Poulter MP Dr Poulter thanked the Parish Council for the invitation to speak and for everyone coming to the public meeting. He explained a lot of work had been done to raise awareness already about the INR and he did not wish to repeat information already given that evening so he would briefly outline his thoughts. There was nothing good or positive about the INR. Concerns had been raised about the Ipswich Garden Suburb when Dr Poulter was here before and now there was further expansion of Ipswich proposed as a result of the INR. It was important to protect the Fynn Valley. It was also important to protect against Tuddenham becoming a suburb of Ipswich. Dr Poulter also disputed that East Suffolk Council were in support of the INR.

Orwell Bridge closure statistics show that it is closed for 15 to 18 hours a year so the INR is disproportionate. The Chamber of Commerce and Felixstowe port are not supporting the INR. Other improvements are being sought. Regarding decongesting Ipswich, the INR will do nothing to relieve this. There were much better ways to improve congestion. Regarding the additional 20,000 new homes, there is no evidence based need for this and East Suffolk Council have already put forward a housing supply to 2037. Dr Poulter explained that if a good case had been put forward he would have supported it but no evidence had been put forward. He had grave concerns about the INR and he would not support it. He asked those present to support the Stop! Campaign.

5. Public Forum – those present were invited to give their surname and village or town location before giving their views and question attending representatives on northern routes issues. The Parish Council would listen to these views and questions so that in a formal Parish Council Meeting immediately following the public meeting they could:

- Decide whether the Parish Council should support any of the three routes, or oppose all 3 northern routes, and formally sign up to the Stop! Campaign
- Decide whether the Parish Council should consider donating funds to the northern route opposition and the Stop! Campaign

Views and questions were as follows:

Ipswich – How many signatures were needed? Also the planning process is broken. Does it need changing? Nick Green replied that this was not a government consultation so as many signatures as possible were needed in opposition to the INR to demonstrate the strength of feeling. Dr Poulter replied that there have been changes to the planning process and now housing targets are set locally. East Suffolk Council has identified housing to 2037. There may be a challenge by judicial review as there is no reasonable evidence for an INR. Dr Poulter added he was worried about Ipswich Borough Council expanding into the countryside.

Tuddenham – Can visitors complete the consultation questionnaire? Yes, as they are stakeholders. A question was also asked about the Impact Assessment on the INR. Suffolk County Council would need to bring this forward as part of the Business Case.

Ipswich – The INR scheme is a revival of the biggest road building initiative. It would result in 32% more cars in Ipswich and 29% more cars in the Suffolk Coastal District area. 80% of traffic over the Orwell bridge was cars and the INR scheme would be devastating for north of Ipswich. Nick Green replied that road building schemes usually generate more traffic and do not reduce it. A traffic study is on the Stop! Website.

Tuddenham – What is the Sizewell C influence? Dr Poulter responded that there was none. He was unaware of any discussions from Sizewell C raising support for the INR. They were instead looking for East Suffolk train line improvements.

Tuddenham – A question was asked about the INR appraisal report. Traffic modelling data had been requested several times but the Stop! Campaign had been advised that 'software issues' meant it was not available. Issues

about the appraisal report included figures that needed challenging and statements that an increase in bus services was less feasible than INR.

Tuddenham – A resident had completed the INR survey but was annoyed that the details completed could be misconstrued and the resident had concerns at the questions on the first few pages. There was a lack of an adequate bus service for instance to a local school which forced unwanted car journeys on the resident but this was not reflected in the questionnaire. Nick Green agreed that the questionnaire was an atrocious document but the INR was still in the consultation stage so could not yet be challenged. He urged residents to still complete the questionnaire but not to be forced into completing all questions and that there was guidance on the Stop! website as to how to complete the consultation questionnaire if opposed to the INR.

Westerfield – A Freedom of Information request had been submitted to Suffolk County Council Highways and their response had been emailed to the Stop! Campaign.

The Clerk asked if everyone present could be asked if there was any support for any of the 3 INR routes proposed. There was none.

Witnesham – 613 signatures had been seen on a Change.org site in support for INR.

Tuddenham – There would be a large number of residents, including mature villagers, who did not have internet access and who are not being represented by the consultation. Nick Green agreed it was important to seek views from everyone and the Stop! Campaign were organising volunteers to reach people in need of help when completing the questionnaire, including when the forms needed to be completed manually. More volunteers were needed though and offers to help with this should be directed via the Stop! Campaign website or email address.

Tuddenham – The Parish Council were committed to keeping villagers up to date where possible.

Tuddenham – There was a call for volunteers in Tuddenham to muster.

Tuddenham – A consultation from a public body should behave in a proper manner and this had not been done with the INR consultation.

Tuddenham – New homes were being proposed in the village. It seemed inconsistent that the Parish Council object to the INR but agree to additional homes in the village proposed by the District Council Local Plan? The Clerk replied that the Parish Council had not supported the housing allocation proposed in the District Council Local Plan and that Mrs Ellinor was representing the Parish Council at the Local Plan Examination Hearings to ensure that Parish Council objections were taken into account.

6. Next steps

Nick Green gave an overview of the evening and thanked everyone for attending.

Everyone present was asked to show if they opposed the INR by a show of hands, which was unanimous.

Dr Poulter thanked everyone for attending and briefly reiterated the actions to take in opposing the INR.

There was no support for any of the 3 routes. There was support for the Parish Council supporting the objectives of the Stop! Campaign. The issue of a donation arose and it was queried by several people why a donation could not be agreed that evening. The Clerk explained that the donation would be considered at the Parish Council meeting immediately following this public meeting, taking into account the views put forward this evening, as well as opinions already received from villagers by Parish Councillors. The Parish Council would also seek a village majority decision that it agreed with the consensus of opinion at this public meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.10pm.