

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)  
**Subject:** Deadline 2 Response  
**Date:** 15 November 2020 15:57:03

---

Dear Examiners,

I wish to respond for deadline 2 to an extract from SPR's Public Rights of Way Clarification Note, page 9 published for deadline 1, as below.

I was absolutely incensed to read the following:

"In assessing the sensitivity (section 27.6.1.4.4) of the local population, there is a higher proportion of older people in the site-specific populations than district and national averages but they are also relatively less-deprived and have a high proportion of car ownership (Table 27.17). Adult activity levels are reported at a similar level to national averages indicating that a larger proportion of older people than average are physically active in this area. This suggests that they would be resilient to potential changes in availability of recreational assets and would temporarily use another location, thus their health would not be affected"

RESPONSE:

Above is one of the most arrogant, insensitive, outrageous and unjustified statements I have seen, even by SPR standards. Suggest 'resilient' is changed to RESISTANT. We do not wish to get in our cars to have to drive to find another location in pursuit of recreational activities, that is not why we moved here. Given the duration of previous SPR intrusive projects the closures probably cannot be described as just temporary. And yes, health most definitely will be affected, not least from the noise disturbance, traffic loading, machinery movements, loss of public rights of way and possibly road closures too at times. All unacceptably stressful!

I hope the Examiners will due consideration to the correctness of SPR's conclusion.

From Julia Wheeler, Friston  
20024293  
20024294

Sent from my iPad