A47 Thickthorn Junction TR010037

Written Representation – Richard Hawker Yr ref no: 20028387

I have made many points in my Relevant Representation 5 July 2021. As there are no responses to these points yet available on the PINS website (I understand they are due at deadline 1, as is this submission), the text below may reiterate some of those points. I have used the ExA's headings in his 'List of Principal Issues'. I trust this is detailed enough as a reference in most cases.

General

I cannot find any part of this application with which I agree. The government's policy is to encourage modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport, such as foot/cycle or public transport. This scheme does nothing to aid such travel; its aim is clearly to make travel by car swifter, so it must surely be contrary to that policy. The government is committed to reducing carbon emissions dramatically; this scheme will inevitably increase them, certainly in the medium to short–term.

1. **Air quality.** The WHO has recently reduced considerably its recommendations for maximum pollution of air regarding PM2.5 and NOx. Petrol and diesel-driven vehicles will be in use for a many years to come, even if take-up of electric vehicles increases substantially. The traffic assessment reckons that the building of the scheme will result in an increase in vehicle use in the two peak hours of around 9% by 2025, and 15% by 2040. I can see no assessment of the contribution to air quality of the different classes of vehicle; it is difficult to predict the uptake of electric vehicles and those with less-polluting engines, but it is unlikely that substantial numbers of the heaviest, most polluting vehicles will have been converted to electric by 2040, and certainly not by 2025. Therefore air quality is likely to deteriorate, certainly below the new guidelines of the WHO, due to this scheme.
   I have not seen any suggestion in the scheme for how poor air quality can be mitigated-for, nor can I imagine any system that could achieve this.
2. **Biodiversity and Ecological conservation.** Any such scheme will inevitably involve destruction of natural habitat, and there is huge concern over the diversion of the Cantley Stream. The scheme effectively enlarges the area taken by the junction by the building of the Cantley Road link; it is known that all such roads are likely to cross natural routes used by birds and animals, which will inevitably suffer.
3. **Climate change.** The adverse effect on climate change is addressed by renowned expert Dr Andrew Boswell elsewhere.
4. **Compulsory Acquisition**. No comment.
5. **Development Consent order**. This may, as HE states, conform with the requirement of the relevant planning act, but I do not see why it needs to have so much repetition and why it is arranged in such a confusing way, with numerous sections and sub-sections, with similar numbers. It is extremely difficult to find things one wants. For instance, who would imagine that the 'Book of reference' lists compulsory purchase orders ?
6. **Geology and Soils**. No comment.
7. **Historic Environment.** No comment.
8. **Landscape and visual effects**. As far as I can see, the design of the WCH bridge and the overbridge for the Cantley Road link has not been presented. It is difficult to make a comment other than ANY new bridge will have a significant effect on the landscape, surely detrimental. The road bridge will be a huge invasion into the area. The vegetation, trees and shrubs which have grown around the area since the southern bypass was built has softened

the appearance of the road, the pedestrian bridge, and, to a large extent, the roadways themselves. Much of this will, it seems, have to be destroyed, and replaced with plants which will take a long time to grow. Two mature trees are to be removed to allow the Cantley Road link. This should be avoided.

9. **Material and Waste.** No comment.
10. **Noise and vibration.** The Cringleford residential extension is being built very close to the road (admittedly the location of this estate is not the responsibility of HE). The proposed A11N – A47E underpass will require significant widening of the A47, putting traffic which is accelerating and climbing out of the underpass, so in the noisiest possible situation, next to a main residential area. The detail claims that there will be no increase in noise for this area. This needs to be checked again; the increase in nearness of the slip road and its increased length must surely increase noise here.
11. **People and communities.** There is an unnecessary increase in pathway length of the new foot/cycle bridge across the A47. It would not be necessary if the underpass were not built, or made shorter.
12. **Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment.** The baseline traffic data is from 2015, six years out of date. The NATS 2019 is available, so there is no justification for this not having been used. In various places, change has been assessed as that resulting from enacting the 'do something' scenario (which includes this scheme, plus the other road schemes in the area, i.e. A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, Blofield to North Burlingham, and the Norwich Western Link), compared with 'do minimum' (which is 'do something', less this scheme). The 'do something' should also be compared with a 'do nothing at all' scenario to fully assess the cumulative effect of all that is being proposed.
13. **Transportation and traffic.** Comments above, under (12.) are relevant for this topic also.
    It is disappointing that with all the resources at their disposal, the Applicant has not offered a clear flow diagram of the junction, showing turning counts. I can find no turning count data anywhere. The lack of proper origin-and-destination details do not allow analysis of the true 'desire line' of vehicles, and possible assessment of promoting other routes which would avoid this apparently-congested junction.
    The two largest, most expensive and potentially-destructive roads are the Cantley Road link, and the A11 – A47 underpass. I cannot find any justification in the text for the Cantley Road link. Access to Cantley Road could be retained from the new slip road proposed.
    The underpass is proposed because of hold-ups caused by excess traffic on the roundabout. Little attempt has been made to provide a way of reducing the numbers of vehicles entering the roundabout (apart from the segregated LH turn sliproad A47W to A11S. Lack of turning counts make analysis difficult; how many vehicles entering the roundabout from A47 in the west are actually heading for the Park and Ride or B1172? Could these be re-routed via a new slip road off the A47W, north of the junction, taking some pressure off the roundabout? Ideas such as this do not appear to have been considered. In a consultation, I suggested this, but I can find no reference to this in the documentation, and I received no response from HE at the time.
14. **Water, drainage and flood risk**. No comment

END R Hawker