Dear Sir,

Consultation response on the implications of H30, H31 and H32 for my position

My earlier objections focussed on the failure of the final draft local plan to
- adequately address the climate emergency and
- provide for sustainable transport (especially for improved public transport in urban areas).

My objection today builds on all of that.

I strongly object to the proposals in H30, H31 and H32 because they take the Local Plan in an even more unsustainable direction.

H30, H31 and H32 run contrary to NPPF policies:
- Chapter 2: Achieving Sustainable Development paragraph 7
- Chapter 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport Paragraphs 102, 103, 104.
- Chapter 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change: Paragraphs 148, 149,

We need to reduce traffic growth, not accommodate or increase it.

I note Suffolk County Council’s Statement on Matter 2, part F – Infrastructure & Appendix 1 Transport Mitigation Strategy seek modal shift of 6% across the district.

I note H31 confirms that the local plan will deliver a 34% increase in traffic in the local plan area

“Traffic growth between 2016 and 2036 was calculated at 40%, reducing to 34% as result of the demand changes”.

This is unsustainable and not fit for purpose at a time of climate and health emergency when:

- 36% of carbon emissions in Suffolk are from the transport sector and we urgently need to reduce these, not increase them.

- In October 2018 the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change SR15 report gave us until 2030 only to radically reduce carbon emissions.

- The higher than expected rate of sea ice / glacier melt and the increasing frequency of extreme weather events globally since 2018 suggest we are on course to reach a climate tipping point much sooner than 2030 and need to act far more urgently than the IPCC advised

- 400,000 people a year currently die as a result of air pollution.

We need to urgently stop all work that accommodates or encourages car use.

Instead of H30, H31 and H32 we need a properly costed and funded Local Sustainable Transport Strategy.
We need a Local Bus Strategy, a Local Rail Strategy, A Local Cycling Strategy and a Local Walking Strategy with specified targets for increasing modal shift to these modes.

Electric car use (approx 3% currently) has a limited role in reducing emissions

Overall modal shift needs to be far higher than 6%. Local plan policies need to deliver development that is at least carbon neutral and preferably carbon negative.

It’s clear from Suffolk Coastal Travel to work figures there is good potential for modal shift:

- 30.6% of travel to work journeys are less than 5km in distance (around 3 miles).
- 46% of travel to work journeys are under 10km (around 6 miles)

Local people want to walk, cycle and use buses - current infrastructure is overcrowded. We need additional and better provision for walking, cycling and bus travel.

Housing developers need to demonstrate that their proposals will not increase car travel. They need instead, to fund infrastructure improvements for walking, cycling and bus travel.

In my verbal evidence I also asked that Travel Plans require developers to provide a commuted sum to cover the costs of providing for sustainable transport for 25 years after their properties are built. This long term investment is essential. The Highways Authority doesn’t have this money so it needs to come from housing developers. It needs to be calculated to cover costs such as future maintenance requirements for walking, cycling and bus routes/ networks and future subsidies to support socially necessary bus services.

This is where the money from housing developers should be going rather than into schemes that support car traffic growth. I ask please that H30, H31 and H32 are thrown out and replaced with a properly costed and funded Local Sustainable Transport Strategy and implementation plan which is practical for the 21st Century.

H31 page 10
“Ipswich Radial Corridor Route improvements - Kesgrave Ban of right turn from A1214 onto Dr Watson Lane. Signalised junction of A1214 / Bell Lane changed to priority controlled roundabout”

I strongly oppose the proposal to put a roundabout at Bell Lane/A1214 junction.

- This scheme does not promote sustainable transport use
- It allows increased vehicular flows along the A1214 at increased speeds where pedestrian and cyclists use the road and where they cross the road.
- It would impact negatively on existing sustainable transport users and create a local safety hazard.

The A1214 has a shared cycle/footway running alongside it with significant flows at peak times when youngsters also walk and cycle to school. They currently cross Bell Lane adjacent to the A1214 at traffic lights and we need to retain traffic lights to enable cyclists and pedestrians to cross the road here.
We also need to widen the cycle/footway alongside the existing A1214 road by the Bell Inn Public House/junction of Bell Lane and A1214 to safely accommodate high flows of pedestrians and cyclists.

We need pedestrian crossings of the A1214 itself to provide access to A1214 bus stops and to Kesgrave’s new cemetery off Doctor Watsons Lane.

We should not have to rely on our local vicar standing in the middle of the road after funerals to hold up traffic whilst people cross from All Saints Church to the cemetery. What kind of society do we live in where people cannot safely cross a road?

A roundabout will make matters worse for sustainable transport users.

In my verbal evidence at the Inquiry hearing I noted that retail development in nearby Martlesham generated significant additional traffic movements along the Cyclists Priority Route Old Felixstowe Road. The development caused a safety hazard for cyclists.

It is one of many examples which demonstrate very clearly that the needs of vulnerable road users are not being taken into account when new development is delivered.

The new Local Plan needs to address all these issues

Thank you for your consideration

Yours sincerely

Sue Hall
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