

From: [George Josselyn](#)
To: [A47 NorthTuddenham to Easton](#)
Cc: [Anthony Debbie Meynell](#)
Subject: A47 North Tuddenham to Esston (TR010038) Consultation 3 - Comments by Mr Anthony Meynell [REDACTED]
(IP ref 2002/8353)
Date: 26 July 2022 23:45:10

Dear Ms Dominey

I am writing on behalf of Mr Anthony Meynell (the Owner) of [REDACTED] with comments on the responses received on the following two of the SoS's questions at Consultation 2.

1. Question 2 - response by National Highways (NH) on 8 July 2022 to Natural England's (NE) reply to Question 2 dated 7 July 2022.

(a) first para of NH's response.

NH make a false inference from NE's reference to the Land designated by HMRC, that the Estate's buildings were not included in the designation. NE do not say that the Land excludes the listed buildings on it. It is clear from the documents referred to in the Owner's response at Consultation 2 and documents lodged earlier during the DCO process that they are included. The Owner nevertheless invited NE in his response on 8 July to confirm the position but if they do not do so the SoS is invited to accept the clear evidence which the Owner has provided and if necessary to seek confirmation from HM Treasury.

(b) second para of NH's response.

NH refers at the end of this para to Requirement 5 in Schedule 2 Part 1 to the draft DCO (REP9-008). This requirement as worded does not appear to oblige NH to consult with NE (or anyone other than the planning authority) concerning landscaping, nor does it oblige NH to have regard to the HMRC designation of the Estate when designing it, which NH had throughout the DCO process denied required any additional attention than as part of a wider landscape area. Further, if the SoS does not approve NH's proposed landscaping scheme within a set timetable, Schedule 2 part 2 of the draft DCO contains a deeming provision for its acceptance. On the current wording this offer of NH to consult with NE cannot be enforced. Further, the offer does not address the other concerns of NE mentioned in its response (that its suggestions for mitigation were "the minimum", that it would take at least 20 years for the planting to have the desired effect (assuming it had been properly maintained) and that no mitigation had been offered for the interim period, and the effect of the temporary compounds on the HMRC designation (as the Owner commented in his 8 July response to NE's 7 July submission)). The proposal of NH does not therefore appear to satisfy NE's even minimum suggestions in any meaningful way.

It seems however from NH's second paragraph where it says that it "acknowledges the concerns..." of NE that NH should now accept that the Estate has a special landscape. If that is the case NH should also acknowledge that it ought at the outset to have considered alternatives to the precise location and design (whether by size or position or both) which it has proposed for the Wood Lane Junction and its proposed south dumbbell roundabout in order to avoid impacting the special landscape, which it has never done. See most recently the final submissions of the Owner referred to in his Consultation 2 response of 8 July.

2. Question 3 - Habitats regulation assessments - NE's response dated 19 July with attached completed form LON1 - Bats.

In Para 2 of its LON1 form NE comment that it has not seen from NH any maps clearly showing "...bat roosts, commuting / foraging routes / areas". and requires these plus "details of the bat lines". NE go on to mention the proximity of the river Tud as a foraging area and its concerns over the lighting proposed by NH (which is principally at the proposed Wood Lane and Norwich Road junctions).

The Owner has pointed out on several occasions to NH during the DVO process the existence of significant bat roosting in the roofs in the Estate buildings, principally at the Hall, which is less than 200 m from the proposed Wood Lane Junction south dumbbell roundabout. The Hall is on a direct route from the grade A and veteran

trees on Wood Lane north of the existing junction which are proposed to be felled and which provide an obvious route from the north across the A47 to the deciduous tree cover and river landscape by the Tud close to the south of the Hall, which is attractive foraging landscape both for more common species of bat and the rare Barbastelle bats found to the north.

Despite this and several invitations to NH to permit its surveyors to inspect the Hall's roof, no approaches have ever been made by NH or its bat consultancy to do so.

The Owner is not therefore surprised at NE's comments on 19 July and invites NH again to ask its bat surveyors to inspect the Hall roof to assist to establish more clearly the roosts, bat lines and foraging areas in the vicinity of the Proposed Wood Lane junction to assess its likely impact.

The Owner hopes this is of assistance to the SoS.

Kind regards
George Josselyn



Sent from my iPhone