Proposed NDR
Has this inquiry been prejudiced?

(1)
BDC Planning Committee Wednesday 17 August 2011

Lothbury Trust Planning Application 20090886 TG REF: 628115/310478
Recommendation: Condition 4 states:
Prior to the commencement of development of the hereby approved scheme, the upgrade works to the Postwick A47 interchange as set out in drawing reference R1co93-R1 2001 Revision D with associated drawings and forming part of the Broadland District Council planning application reference 20081773, shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and the County Planning Authority in consultation with the highways Agency on behalf of the Secretary of State” end quote.

Note: is it this drawing number that is the current HUB design, if so they have specified the design prior to any enquiry and make it a specific requirement of the large Brook Farm/Laurel Farm Business park expansion. This application was given approval (why did BDC then allow Lothbury Trust at a later date to extend the 5 year approval to 10 years?

Recommendation (5) states
Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the link road between Peachman Way and Plumstead Road East as indicated in principle on drawing number 2718R/01/15 Revision A shall be submitted to the Council and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The detailed link road as may be approved shall be completed and available for public use prior to the occupation of any parcel or phase of development.

Was it to delay the required inner link? Because any expansion over 85000 sq metres (the current Business Park size) automatically triggers the agreement for the construction of the inner link to Plumstead Road C874.

Officers Recommendation.

Delegate authority to the HoDM&C* to grant planning permission subject to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government not calling in the
application for his determination and the satisfactory resolution of the S106 Agreement and subject to conditions.

(2) In our SOCG rebuttal you can observe the HA highways authority stated the approval of NCC design for the Postwick hub could be seen to prejudice any alternative route or start options. It is this design (R1co93-R1 2001 Revision D) that is progressing.

**What is the alternative?**

The better option is for the inner orbital designed to a class A road Specification with separate cycle and Pedestrian ways completed to Norwich Airport.

Note: An inner orbital has always been in the local Plan

**Why is an inner Orbital important?**

The AAP area action plan for the NET is currently out for consultation this comprises of 3 docs:

(1) Proposed Submission (Reg 19) Growth Triangle Area Action Plan June 2014


What is the AAP (area action plan?)

An area action plan is specific to an area identified within the JCS (Joint core strategy) in our case the North East Triangle (NET)

Note: for the first time the AAP shows the inner link to the Airport (which was always in the Local plan, but has been changed to suit various lobby groups and kept quiet, so it was not and is not seen as an alternative to the NDR.)
It is worth noting that the communication concerning the JCS/NDR/Postwick hub always insisted that each of these major developments were not linked and were to be seen and judged as independent and stand alone applications.

Clearly this was and is an untruth.

Why do we consider our option of an inner orbital to Norwich Airport meets the needs of the NET (north east triangle?) and what are the impacts?

**AAP NET MAP**

This Map shows the areas with GT references (Growth Triangle) that have and are proposed for Business and Housing Development.

It is worth noting they all are adjacent to the protected inner Link.

With the following already Granted planning permission.

(a) [GT10] Broadland Gate Business Park 47 acres
(b) [GT9] Expansion of Broadland Business Park

(c) [GT6] 600 houses Dussindale

(d) [GT5] North of Salhouse road 1400 houses linking with [GT7]

(e) [G12] the massive Beyond Green development of 3500 houses Note we strongly object to the removal of the Sprowston Park & Ride and the site re allocated for a Secondary School.

The following have been given residential status:

(f) [GT11] 1400 Green Lane South

(g) [GT7] 1400 land South of Salhouse road.

(h) [GT8] 45 houses adjacent Thorpe End

(i) [GT13] adjacent GT12

(j) [GT14] adjacent GT 12

Finance.

1) The debt that dare not speak its name:

2) National Debt is now 1.422 trillion but if you factor in all liabilities including public sector pensions the real debt is 4.8 trillion (source National debt clock.co.uk) Government is now borrowing £5170 per second !!!!

It is important to understand the lack of funding for the NDR, whilst the Government has said it will contribute £86 million there remains a £62 million shortfall. Norfolk County Council budget deficit 2015/16 NCC_CC Ian Mackie says he is now advised the gap is £17m. 2016-17 shows a projected shortfall of £18 million which will grow to £51.7 million in 2017-18 and a further £61 million budget savings will be required up until 2020 this further highlights the importance of our cost effective alternative!.

The incoming MD states Norfolk County Council is facing immediate cost savings of £71 million (Source in coming MD) and a whole range of measures are being looked at. Can I suggest the BUDGET committee looks to scrap the NDR?

3) Given the proximity of the developments to the inner link. Then S106 Monies and CIL funding will apply for the inner link. Note: GT 10/GT9/GT6/GT5/GT12 already has planning permission.
4) It also has the benefit of linking directly to (a) the Postwick Hub BRT (b) the Postwick Hub (c) Broadland Business Park (d) Salhouse Road Industrial Estate (e) Tesco Superstore, (f) Sprowston Park & Ride BRT (g) Norwich Airport. All of which requires HGV access.

6) This option would reduce radial movement which would otherwise increase as the result of the proposed NDR.

7) Given there would be no expensive flyovers then by nature it has to be more cost effective!

8) Given it is a shorter route by nature it has to be more cost effective.

9) Our inner orbital terminating at Norwich Airport preserves the old rail City line that could be reopened in the future. A train / tram solution could be considered in future which may not be incompatible with the bike route and park.

10) Given point 4/5/6/7/8 the CBR (cost benefit analysis must be FAR better than the NDR) unfortunately we do not have access to taxpayers money to employ expert Witnesses.

11) We maintain the inner Orbital to Norwich Airport should be an A Class road with separate cycle way and pedestrian footpaths. Why cannot this be achieved?

12) **Design**

Design, you can observe from the AAP Map (area action plan NET) that the current protected route for the inner link to the airport is far from achieving efficient traffic flow, this is because Green Lane south is earmarked to be closed and the route passes through the expanded Business park onward through the new Dussindale housing development then through [G8] and a dogleg occurs at the Sprowston Park and ride (have we not learnt anything from the Romans?) The AAP proposes to close the Sprowston Park and Ride and a Secondary School put in its place.

Note: We oppose the closure of Green lane South, this should be kept open and the route pass through the very end of Racecourse plantation not [G8] which makes the Road very close to Heath Road at Thorpe End Garden Village, then through the edge of the current Sprowston Park and ride and onward to Norwich Airport (see dotted route on the AAP Map.

**We strongly oppose the closure of Sprowston Park and Ride.** This currently provides an effective (BRT) Bus rapid transport into Norwich.
We do not accept the statement in AAP Proposed Submission Version (Reg19) GT3: Transport that option 2 (through the end of Racecourse Plantation) cannot be achieved because a) this is the most direct route and b) land is available at the top of Dussindale c) any habitat can be moved within the 202 acre Thorpe plantation.

(Please note the proposed NDR requires at least Three habitat sites to be removed and placed else ware.)

We do not agree that option 3) i.e. Business as usual - new road links through from the C874 Plumstead Road to the B1140 Salhouse road as this would mean traffic a much longer route i.e. increased traffic west to Woodside Road and Salhouse road to rejoin the New Inner link at the Racecourse Inn approximately 66% longer with all the associated pollutions and increased cost in time and fuel.

**Opportunity Cost:**

The considerable saving of taxpayers’ money (taking account of the dire National debt and budgetary constraints’ of Norfolk County Council) can be targeted for the real need for Roads of National Infrastructure Importance i.e. accident prone A47 and the totally congested A14.

The enormous savings could also be used for other purposes as identified by Norfolk County Council.

**Environment Impact:**

**Historical Parkland, listed Buildings landscape 7 agricultural impacts.**

Our inner orbital will have much less impact and in most cases none at all on these Historic assets listed in the Local impact report. These Include:

- South Lodge Cottage, Low road Gt & Lt Plumstead
- Bridge 100m north east Rackheath Hall, Rackheath;
- Rackheath Hall, Rackheath
- Gateway to Rackheath Park
- St Andrew Hall, Beeston St Andrew;
- Poplars Farm, Dog Lane, Horsford.

We would further assert that the proposed NDR would inflict long term damage to the integrity of the Broadland landscape that is an important transient zone between the edge of the City of Norwich and the unique Broads characterised by historic estate parklands laid out in the early 19th century and served by very historic arterial routes into city. The integrity of these historic landscapes and routes which are a fundamental element of the attractiveness and tourism offer of the Broads will be seriously jeopardised by the proposed NDR.
Economic and social impacts.
We consider no evidence has been provided by Norfolk County Council to support the statement (stated in 3.2.1.14 in the preliminary Environmental Information Report)- that not proceeding with the NDR would pose a serious economic risk to Norwich City and the regions.

As shown our previous comments show our Inner Orbital to Norwich Airport with all the key links meets the needs of the NET.

Cllr A N Townly. Ward member Thorpe End Garden Village
Questions to NCC

Subsequent to yesterday’s hearing (Alternative Options and Alignment; impacts) could I have the following confirmed?

1) What road substrate composition and surface finish were used by Mott MacDonald to forecast noise pollution along the proposed NDR?
2) Should the proposed NDR obtain planning consent, will the complete road be to this specification and if not please define the areas that will not and what will be used for each.
3) Is there a better substrate composition and surface finish that would lower the noise emissions on a permanent basis? If so what is it and what is the cost difference?
4) Could you confirm the Question asked by Mr Birch of Brown and Co that should the NDR proceed would NCC have written into the agreement an assurance to maintain/resurface the Road surface to the original noise emissions levels as quoted.
5) It is evident from the Mott MacDonald Environment statement Volume 2 Chapter 11 that the Plumstead’s will endure blanket noise pollution 200 metres from source (NDR) and Thorpe End Garden Village (having conservation status) will be seriously affected.
6) Could you also confirm what levels of air pollution – carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous nitrogen oxides, will occur within the Plumstead’s arising from the proposed NDR and what distance source from would they extend to.
7) As requested by Councillor Boswell, could you provide the Map for the location within the JCS where and what type of business are assumed to locate to justify the huge Capital cost of the proposed NDR.
8) Of these could you please quantify those that would not relocate to the JCS area if our alternative modified inner orbital constructed to A Class standard with separate cycle ways and pedestrian footpaths.
9) Why was the Postwick Junction decided as the best starting point (prior to 2003)? How was that decision reached? What alternatives were considered prior to 2003.
10) Light Pollution. We are told that the proposed NDR will be unlit even at junctions. As Mr Cawdron stated it will only take one serious accident and the request to have the NDR to be provided with Lighting. Will the proposal have built in facilities? If not does it mean extensive additional cost to provide it in response to pressure because of likely accidents?

Kind regards

Cllr A N Townly