

**Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Hearings**

**CAH1 Session 2**

NCC as landowner

As a landowner, NCC is supportive of the proposals. However, we have a legal duty to ensure that best value is achieved for the acquisition (or use) of any NCC land by a third party and would expect our land acquisition to be acquired at the market rate.

**ISH1 Session 1**

Norfolk County Council and County Farms

Although seemingly one organisation, there is a separation between our statutory functions (in this case planning / highways) and our role as a landowner. There are clear barriers between the respective roles of the organisation and the need of all sides to meet their (often separate) legal obligations.

**ISH1 Session 3**

Statement of Common Ground

The county council is in dialogue with the promoter and the statement of common ground is progressing

**ISH2 Session 1**

Surveys

The county council accepts that additional surveys will need to be undertaken after the Examination process.

**ISH2 Session 2**

Design quality of structures

The county council has no comment to make on this matter. We are however concerned about provision across the structures, eg carriageway width, and cycle and foot provision, and have made representations on these issues separately.

Flood and Water Requirement in the DCO

See below, under ISH3 Session 3

Lead authorities for consultation

The county council is the lead authority for flood and water so should be directly consulted on these matters. Other authorities are the lead on other matters and should be directly consulted. They might consult with the county council, but we are happy that we are not consulted directly where we are not the lead or responsible authority

Cultural Heritage

NCC are broadly content with the nature and extent of both the geophysical survey and trial trenching and their results and have signed off on reports for both.

NCC concur with the applicant's assessment of impacts and effects in relation to below-ground archaeology and have in general terms agreed priority areas for post consent mitigation.

NCC have already discussed mechanisms for dealing with unforeseen or unexpected discoveries with the applicants and this will be covered as part of the post-consent mitigation set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation.

### **ISH3 Session 2**

#### **Walking and Cycling Provision**

The county council has made written representations on the issue of crossing the A47 and the lack of provision proposed in the centre of the scheme in the DCO application. It is acknowledged that few people cross the road at this point, as shown in the surveys, but this is likely because the existing road already forms a barrier to movements. However, the proposal will prevent anyone crossing at this point as there will be no provision. We consider that the scheme provides an opportunity to significantly improve the provision. Without any provision in the centre of the proposal, there would be a diversion of around 1500m to the nearest crossing facility; approximately a fifteen minute walk.

We accept that the majority of users are likely to be recreational users.

We welcome and support the provision that has been proposed. We support changes to the proposal that would allow cyclists as well as walkers to use the proposed provision running parallel to, and south of, the proposed scheme.

Overall we support the scheme as proposed but would like to see it improved by additional north-south pedestrian and cyclist facilities to directly link on the desire line between Burlingham and Lingwood. The proposed facilities on the overbridges represent an improvement to existing crossing facilities particularly in respect of safe provision, but for some potential users would result in longer distances.

We would support – subject to the detail – future funding for pedestrian and cyclist facilities that we have advocated and would work with National Highways to pursue any opportunities.

### **ISH3 Session 3**

#### **Local employment and local training**

The county council would support a commitment from National Highways to local employment and local training

#### **Cucumber Lane Roundabout**

The county council supports the proposed scheme.

We note that the analysis of the roundabout junction shows some fairly substantial queues at the junction on both the trunk road and the local roads. As well as the delays predicted, it is likely that journeys through the junction would become less reliable as the junction neared its capacity. We have expressed concern about the ability of the junction to accommodate predicted traffic flows.

The county council would support continuing dialogue with the promoters with a view to establishing a future monitoring regime to assess impacts at this junction so that

assessment can be made of whether an improvement is needed. We accept that the promoters cannot commit to a scheme at this time.

#### Cycle facilities

The county council has made written representations on cycle provision. We support three metre widths for shared use rather than the 2.5m that has been proposed.

The county council acknowledges that additional guidance has been issued by the Department for Transport since the proposals were first mooted.

#### Property at Waterlow

Norfolk County Council has requested that the applicant maintain and improve upon the management to surface water on the flow path, which they have done. The proposals are designed to a one in 10 year standard, which we acknowledge is not the same as the one in 1000 year flow path.

However, it will see some betterment for the lower flow periods, and will ultimately provide some relief. The county council considers this provides an improvement over the current situation albeit not a significant one.

#### Flood and Water Requirement in the DCO

The LLFA would like the draft DCO to be updated to recognise the right organisations by naming them rather than the planning authority (who does not normally get involvement in these aspects).

Please see the proposed wording below.

#### Proposed wording

##### Requirements

##### Surface and foul water drainage

8.—(1) No part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part written details of the surface water drainage system, reflecting the drainage strategy and the mitigation measures set out in the REAC including means of pollution control, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority on matters related to its function as statutory consultee.

(2) No part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part written details of the foul drainage system, reflecting the drainage strategy and the mitigation measures set out in the REAC including means of pollution control, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with Anglian Water on matters related to its function.

(3) The surface water drainage system must be constructed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with the Norfolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority on matters related to its function as statutory consultee,

provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments to the approved details would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.

(4) The foul water drainage system must be constructed in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Secretary of State following consultation by the undertaker with Anglian Water on matters related to its function, provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that any amendments to the approved details would not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement.

In addition, we noted that there was no mention of the ordinary watercourse consenting process. Therefore, we would like to include the proposed wording below into the DCO.

Works in a watercourse(s)

x.—(1) No stage of the works involving the crossing, diversion, alteration, replacement and installation of new structures of any designated main river or ordinary watercourse may commence until a scheme and programme for any such permanent or temporary crossing, diversion, alteration, replacement and installation of new structure in that stage has been submitted to and, approved by the Secretary of State in consultation with Norfolk County Council, the Environment Agency, relevant drainage authorities and Natural England.

(2) The designated main river or ordinary watercourse must be crossed, diverted, alteration, replacement and installation of new permanent or temporary structures in accordance with the approved scheme and programme.

(3) Unless otherwise permitted under paragraph (x.1), throughout the period of construction of the works, all ditches, watercourses, field drainage systems and culverts must be maintained such that the flow of water is not impaired or the drainage onto and from adjoining land rendered less effective.

Furthermore, we note that there is no mention of the need to involve the LLFA in relation to the review of the temporary surface water drainage plan as part of the EMP. This needs to be addressed. Please can we add a requirement for this to happen, maybe as a part 3 to 8 for the temporary works.