

# TEXT\_ISH1\_Session1\_A47Thickthorn\_171120 21

00:12

Good morning and welcome. Can I just confirm with a member of the inspectorate case team that they can see and hear me please? Good morning,

00:24

I can say confirm.

00:26

Thank you very much. Can I also confirm that with the case team that the live streaming and recording of this event has started, I can confirm that the live stream has commenced. Thank you very much. It's now 10 o'clock and I would like to welcome you all to this issue specific hearing on environmental matters relating to the examination for the A 47 a 11 fix on junction improvement scheme. My name is Matthew Shrigley, I'm a charter town planner. I'm employed by the planning inspectorate, and I am the appointed examining authority for the application, the notice of which can be found on the scheme project page on the national infrastructure website. You may have already spoken and heard from the case manager Louise Evans for the project. Louise is being supported by all the team members Harpriya Kaur , which you may have also met. If you do have any questions, during the course of the examination itself, those contacts should be? Well, those should be your first point of contact. Their contact details can be found on the top of any letter you've received from us on the project page or on the project page of the national infrastructure website. For those people watching the live stream, can I also advise you that should I adjourn proceedings this morning, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us a clear recording file, you might have to reset your browser page to view the restarted stream if that happens. Before I consider the items on the agenda for this hearing, I've got some housekeeping matters to deal with in tandem with those raised in the regents conference. parties who have already attended hearings may be aware of what I'm going to say Nevertheless, I still need to cover all relevant points for the avoidance of any doubt. As far as I'm aware, no requests would be made for any special measures or arrangements to allow participation in this hearing. Can I just check with the inspectorates case team that that is correct? Yes, that's correct. Thank you very much. As I've already mentioned, this advance is being both live streamed and recorded. The digital recordings we make are retained and publish they form the public record that can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulations applies. The inspectorates practices to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision on a development consent order. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it is important that you understand that you will be recorded and therefore you consent to the retention and publication of the digital recording. The planning Inspectorate will only ever ask for information be placed on the public record that is important and relevant to the planning decision. It will only be in rare circumstances that we might ask you to provide personal information of the type that most of the others would prefer to keep private or confidential. Therefore, to avoid the need to add it to the digital recordings. What I would ask is that you try your best not to add information to the public record that you would wish to be kept private or is that

as confidential. Finally, can I also request that in order to minimise any background noise, can or hearing participants make sure that mobile phones are switched off and that you stay muted unless you're actually speaking? I may also use the mute function during the hearing just to minimise any background noise there is a traffic red noise outside died. So I might use that. Given that this is a virtual event, you may see me from time to time look away from the screen.

05:14

Or perhaps look at my notes in front of me in that context. And just for the avoidance of any doubt, I can assure you that I will be listening to the proceedings, I do have a screen to my right. But as I say, if I look away, I will be listening to all relevant responses throughout. If you do need to raise something during the hearing itself, you can either use a hand raise function on Ms teams and a loop to invite you in at the appropriate time. Given that there's a low number of hearing participants, if you signal to me during the course of a discussion, let me know but the hundreds function would be the best way to do that. can also remind parties that the chat function on teams will not be enabled or in use. Therefore, please don't try to use that avenue for questions or comments. Okay. The purpose of today's issue specific hearing on environmental matters as to allow me to further examine some of the written submissions to the examination orally. With any questions that deem appropriate. It will enable me to have a clearer understanding of some of the issues being broached prior to the close of the examination process. And my recommendation to the Secretary of State. I wish to point out that the number or nature of relevant questions being posed within the hearing does not indicate I've made my mind upon a particular issue, nor does it lessen the importance of any topic or issue not subject to questioning or covered on the agenda today. I've not sought to allocate any specific time ins. However, I would. I do intend to follow the running order of the agenda, which has been published on the project page of the national infrastructure website prior to the hearing. It would aid parties to have a copy of that to hand if that is possible. In the unlikely event that it transpires that the agenda items or topics cannot all be accommodated in today's meeting. I do have the option to potentially defer discussion points to a further round of written questions within the examination timetable, taking written submissions or conducting a further hearing or hearings later in the examination if I deem it appropriate. With respect to the latter, the week commencing the 31st of January 2022 could facilitate that. But I'm not expecting deferral to be the case. But if it was those would be the options available to me if the agenda for any reason is unable to be completed today. I will aim to allow discussion to facilitate refreshment and screen breaks as a guide. I'm looking to do that probably roughly around an hour and a half at a time. Or if an agenda topic permits. I'll signal to parties that I would love to have adjournment for a refreshment, or restaurant the screen. As we move forward through the agenda, I will invite parties to come in at appropriate times to make contributions. If you feel I am moving too quickly, or you wish to raise a specific point do let me know. And again using the hand raise function, I'll invite you and to make your contribution at an appropriate time. You may well have seen from the agenda probably start the hearing will be following a topic based format. The hearing is a structured discussion which I shall lead based on those particular topics.

10:02

I acknowledged that the examination of the application is largely a written exercise. And I'm aware of all the information received to date which forms the application within the examination. With that in mind, I would ask that all contributions are as focused or to the points as possible, avoiding unnecessary

repetition and reading directly from examination documents. This will enable the best use of examination time, whilst also allowing you to make your points on the various matters we are discussing. If you do wish to draw my attention to any specific documents, what I would ask is, if you could highlight those with full title and point to the examination Library Reference number that will also help any other parties in attendance to look at those on the infrastructure planning website if they need to. As always, as the case with hearings, if I consider any points being raised to be repeated, or the issues being introduced and not appropriate to hear, I do reserve the right to ask you to bring your contributions to a close.

11:46

In terms of the documents most likely to be referred to during the hearing today. I anticipate these will be the applicants responses to the essays first written questions. That's Library Reference Number rep two double 06. The local impact reports from Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council received that deadline one, those are Library Reference Numbers, our EP one double 08 and our EP one, zero 10. Alongside the applicants responses to those at deadline two, which is document reference rep. 2008. I also intend to refer to the general arrangement plans reference a PP 005 The engineering drawings and Sections A pp 10. The agricultural impact assessment a pp 085. And possibly well, not possibly I will be referring to the environmental Master Plan A pp 123. So that's a broad indication of the document. So I'll be looking at today just to help parties in the background and get them giving you advance notice of that. The digital recording of the hearing will be placed on the project page of the national infrastructure website as soon as practicable after the hearing formally closes. It will be beneficial for the record. If each time you speak you could state your name. And if you're representing somebody the name of the organisation you represent. Please also bear in mind that the only official record of today's proceedings will be the digital recording which does involve transcription, tweets, blogs and other similar communications arising out of this hearing will not be accepted as evidence in the examination. Okay, with that said before I move on to the relevant parties who wish to speak. Are there any questions or comments on the management or the conduct of the hearing at this point? I'll just throw it open. If there are let me know. I'll take that as a no thank you. Okay, turning to the attendance list that I have for today. When I indicate to you could you please turn on your camera microphone and introduce yourself confirming your name, who you represent. And if you want to speak whether or not you have any particular requests of when you'd like to be heard. There are a small number of participants, so perhaps that won't be such an issue. But if there is anything in particular can you let me know that I've been provided a list of the interested parties attending. I also have the names of interested parties who have expressed a wish to be heard orally today. So looking at less turning, firstly to Mr. Michael fry for the applicants team, if you could just firstly introduce yourself, and indicate how would you like to deal with the introductions of your team? If it is better placed, but those introductions were made, on the agenda topics, let me know.

15:45

Circuit like counsel for the applicant. So as you've indicated, I think the most efficient way to introduce my team who are all on this call would be each relevant agenda item, if that meets with your approval. I'll simply introduce him as you move to each topic.

16:01

Yes, that's reasonable. I have no problem with that. Very grateful

16:05

for that, sir. So I'm not co located with my experts. So I'll apologise now and once for any slight miscues or delays in communication, but we are communicating by by phone and email. But we ought to be able to run things relatively smoothly. So so that's all I propose to say by way of introduction.

16:27

Thank you very much. I'm grateful. Yes, I appreciate the might be a delay in communications. But yes, that that's no problem. Great. Thank you very much.

16:45

Okay, I have the local authorities presence is not listed as wanting to speak. Having said that, I do anticipate certain questions could be posed at various stages. On that basis. Norfolk County Council, I believe Mr. David Cumming is taking the lead, if you could just introduce yourself, and any person who any questions should be directed to please.

17:13

Yes, thank you. So it's David Cumming on the strategic transport team manager for Norfolk County Council. I'm joined today by my colleague Miss Catherine Dew, I think so? If you could direct any comments to me, I'll answer them as best I can. Or we might need to take some away. But yes, I can confirm that we don't have any points that we specifically want to raise.

17:35

Thanks for confirming that, I'll bring you in and come back to you as per your request. Thank you for that.

17:43

Okay. I also have local councils being represented, again, not listed as speaking. South Norfolk and broadland district councils, again, is likely that questions could be posed to you. Starting with South Norfolk Council, could I just ask you to introduce yourself in terms of the lead person to direct questions to and perhaps you would then point to another person if need be. So South Norfolk counsel, please, if you could just introduce yourself.

18:29

Good morning. I'm Claire Curtis. I am the area team manager representing South Norfolk Council. We do cover both SAF Norfolk and broadland as a one team approach for two autonomous councils. However, broadland will not be making any representations today. With me, I have my landscape architect Robin Taylor, who any questions in relation to the trees, landscaping can be directed to? We don't want to make any specific points other than answer any questions. Thank you.

19:05

Understood. Thank you. Thank you very much for confirming that. Okay. In terms of the interested persons registered to speak, I have Mr. Richard Hawker listed and I've got a note of the topics you wish

to raise. Again, Mr. Hawker if you'd like to just introduce yourself and just confirm a few you are speaking.

19:38

Good morning, Mr. Shrigley? My name is Richard Hawker. I'm a member of the Winston Valley Alliance. And also I live in in Hong Kong a private individual. And I'd like to make some points regarding traffic and transport Climate change?

20:03

Okay. Yes, that's absolutely fine. Well, what I would like to do or suggest is that the topics you would like to cover, if those could be slotted into the broad topic areas have indicated on the agenda that will a discussion. If you if you're able to do that,

20:23

yes, of course, that's I think that's

20:28

okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for confirming. And as we go through the topics, I'll, I'll bring you in at relevant times. Thank you. Okay, can I just confirm I have the names of everyone who wishes to speak at today's hearing? Is there anyone I've missed? No one's confirming otherwise. So on that basis, I'm going to move on. That's great. Thank you.

21:15

Okay. Looking at the agenda, we're going to move to the first topic for discussion. And that's agenda item to transport and traffic. What I would like to do just to set the scene on this, I do have a number of questions, and maybe comments from all the parties. But I would like the applicant just to set the scene in terms of the range of suggested benefits being cited, including those from a traffic, public rights of way, and cycle route perspective. Within the overall topic of transport and traffic, if I could just ask about the applicant. Firstly, just set the scene on that. And that will then facilitate discussion.

22:16

So yes, Michael Fry for the applicant. So if I could introduce the examination to Mr. Ben Williams, Mr. David Battershill and Mr. Mark Duckworth. They will between them be answering your point starting with Mr. Williams, who has just unmute himself. So. So with your permission, what I'll do is I'll hand over to Mr. Williams now and the others will introduce themselves as they speak to you, sir.

22:38

Yes, that's fine. Go ahead. And

22:42

Thanks, Michael. Ben Williams for the applicants. So chapter two of the case for the scheme. A PP one to seven describes the scheme development and the options considered. This summarises the scheme development history three stages of feasibility study, options identification and assessment, public consultation, and the preferred route announcement in August 2017 26. Potential route options were

initially identified and assessed comparatively in terms of their engineering, environmental transportation and economic suitability. Further information on this assessment is contained within section 2.2 of the case of the scheme. A single option was taken forward for a more detailed assessment and presented for public consultation between March and April 2017. As detailed in the case for the scheme section 3.1. The thick floor junction experiences high levels of congestion during peak hours, acting as a bottleneck and leading to longer and more unreliable journey times. Details of these delays can be found under Section 4.5 of this document. The scheme assessment report published in 2018, reported collision data for the fifth junction have changed between the first of April 2012 and the 31st of March 2017, and showed 39 collisions in total recorded in this period. None of these were fatal. Three were serious and 36. Slight these 39 collisions resulted in 54 casualties and involved a total of 72 vehicles. The high rate event the high rate of accidents in the areas of key safety challenge for the scheme. Since the A 47 is currently ranked second nationally for fatalities on a roads and the accident severity ratios above average. Improving the junction would improve the current levels of congestion experienced and reduce the number of accidents and will also allow for economic growth in the area. The applicant has developed the scheme in line with a scheme objectives listed within section 3.6 of the case of the scheme, these are supporting economic growth, a safer and reliable network. A more free flowing network improved environment, and accessible and integrated network and value for money. Table 3.1 of the case of the scheme sets out how the scheme will meet these objectives. But in In summary, the scheme will provide additional capacity and improved journey times to encourage economic growth in the local area, as well as across the a 47 and 11 corridors. This will help contribute to sustainable economic growth by supporting employment and residential development opportunities. The scheme will improve safety and operational issues by upgrading the junction and creating the new a 11 a 47 connector road. The scheme improves road safety by reducing the number of accidents and consequentially the number of casualties. Operational traffic modelling shows the scheme will reduce traffic congestion and journey times with an increased growth of traffic expected by 2000 or 2040. The scheme provides an improved junction with a design that supports mitigation of environmental impacts the environmental statement, which is a app 38 through to one to four assesses and proposes mitigation to minimise any impact on biodiversity heritage, climate, air quality, flooding, geology, and also the cumulative effects. Junction provides a street stage at road network between Peterborough, Cambridge, London, the Midlands and the North of England. It provides a vital role in supporting the economy, which relies on strong transport links along the a 47 and the a 11. The schemes also considered local community access to the road network, providing safer routes between villages for walking, cycling and horse riding and vulnerable users. The economic benefits of the scheme include travel time savings and less vehicle operating costs and accident savings. Increased rail capacity will encourage investment in housing and support. employment growth I'll just briefly go on to outline some of the the walking cycling and horse riding benefits. Is it okay if we use the acronym? WC H, sir?

27:34

Yes, that's fine. As long as you spelled it out what it what it is, that's fine. Yes, yeah. So

27:39

WC H is walking, cycling and and horse riding. It's sort of superseded the use of the term nm use. So, a walking cycling and horse riding assessment and review is undertaken in accordance with the dmr

standard GG 140 that identify potential opportunities for new and improved facilities for the inclusion in the scheme. Summary of this assessment is included in Section 4.13 of the case of the scheme. And further details are also provided in chapter 12 population human health. These documents demonstrate how the scheme will provide new WCH facilities improve accessibility for users in the local area and provide an opportunity to choose active travel modes for example walking and cycling. The WCH facilities provided as part of the scheme shown on the the rights of way and access plans, which is ap 008. So currently, the scheme will stop up and divert the crinkle furred footpath known as FP four a to a new WC h over bridge spanning the A 47. To link candy lane and currently Lane south. The new overbridge have Broadway status and be suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and, and horse riders. Whilst the overbridge slightly increases the journey length from the existing route by approximately seven metres for pedestrians. It will result in a large reduction in Journey lengths for cyclists and equestrians. The scheme will also remove the redundant Pegasus crossing facilities at effect on junction. And it will the scheme will also provide a cycle track on the eastern frontage of the Cantley of the proposed candy Lane link road. So in conjunction with the new WC H O Bridge. This new infrastructure provides an alternative route between Cantlie lane and the blue pedal way cycle route, which is on the the B one 117 Norwich road. An uncontrolled crossing facility incorporating a pedestrian Island is included on the on the B 1172. Norwich road east of the junction with the canny Lane link road. This will facilitate safe crossing between the shared footway and the existing provision on the northern frontage of the Norwich road. The new cycle shared cycle facility will be designed in accordance with dmr standard CD 143, which is designing for walking, cycling and horse riding. And the proposed shared use facility is also supported by Norfolk County Council.

31:03

The section of candy Lane south to the east of the junction with candy Lane link will become a cul de sac and its speed limit will be reduced to 20 miles an hour. As such future traffic flows will be significantly reduced. And cyclists pedestrians in questions will share this section of candy Lane south. Overall, we think the scheme provides a reasonable and proportional package of new WSH facilities to mitigate the social environmental effects of the scheme. I hope that's answered your questions. If you have further questions, either myself or David and mark should be able to assist you.

31:48

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Yes, that does set the scene for the application. Very well. Thank you for doing that. That's helpful. I would like to bearing in mind those broad areas you've just describe, I would like to touch on the baseline modelling position. And what I mean by that the county council in local impact reports appear to query or at least imply some question as to what growth factors have been applied to button ground traffic and the case for the scheme. If I could just throw out the question maybe I'm not sure if it's you, Mr. Williams, who respond or perhaps your colleagues but what what is the applicants response to that in terms of what growth factors have been taken into account?

33:02

Thank you, sir. I think I will defer to my colleague, David Battershill

33:09

Hello, Sir David Battershill on behalf so yes, we have a base a year troll base yes strategic model, which is the Norwich area traffic study model nats model that represents a year of 2015. Let's say the opening year for the scheme in modelling is 2025. And then we have a forecast year 20 For a design year or 2040. After that, in terms of the growth, the traffic between the base year 2015. And those future years, there is sort of a process where we take both. First of all, we create a core scenario, which has a uncertainty lock, which backs up the assumptions in the core scenario. So we look through from Norfolk County Council, we derive all the developments that occur in the area, both housing and development as well as transport, transport our schemes going on in the area. So we create our uncertainty law which informs our core scenario. And that derives what we call the do minimum and do something scenarios from that. Say, it's up to the traffic growth, we take in the development assumptions, which we derived from our uncertainty log. And on top of that, we take what's called the temporal growth derived from DFT which so we cover the local area traffic growth from our local area development assumptions are which is highlighted in case the scheme and includes development in Windham. adverset and critical third, amongst others. And yes, as well as temporary traffic growth which covers the world area traffic growth. So what's your question, sir?

35:04

Oh, yes, it does help. The issue I would like to focus on is that the St. Giles is park or the Kringle food, Kringle food residential development is also being referred to. It is anticipated for completion by 2023. Just like clarification, and the in the modelling that you've described, describe to me and in the application, has that been factored? Or covered in the actual modelling, you're referring to?

35:48

Um, I can't quite reference your name or Charles development. But in the case for ski, we outline a total of six development sites in critical third, which covers a large number of dwellings. I can't answer specifically, which one of those covers your our jobs development, sir.

36:15

It's referred to in representations of St. Giles's St. Giles Park. But it's also more more commonly referred to as well as the Kringle food residential development. Yeah. I mean, it if, if, if my question if you'd like to defer an answer to the question, by all means, say that I don't want to raise anything that you know, that you might not be able to answer here. And now. So I mean, if that is something you would like to come back, or perhaps a written question, and the examination timetable could be posed?

37:05

Yes, sir.

37:06

So Michael Fry the applicant? Just just to help Mr. Battershill, I think the development you're referring to, is also known as the Big Sky development, and that that's how I think we have been referring to it internally. It is, it is certainly assessed in the cumulative cumulative chapter of the yes. But I'm afraid I can't help you on where the transport and traffic assessment of that development is. And it may be that we need to write to you on that unless Mr. Battershill now, now that I've identified it for him, that does know, but I'll pause there.

37:39

So I'm sorry, that's just different sort of naming conventions of say yes. Best the fly, defer? And answer.

37:50

Okay. Understood. It is one in the same development, I think we're all referring to it is referred to as The Big Sky development. I'd like to turn to the county council, and just ask them about the local impact report. If I could just turn to Mr. David Cumming With respect to particular growth factors, I mean, these are broadly referenced, by the way in your local impact report. But are there any other specific growth factors you would, as a council wish to be covered or feel haven't been covered? Or are you of the view that the growth factors have have in fact been covered in the modelling?

38:48

So it's David Cumming forward? Norfolk County Council? I think that the comments earlier by Mr. Battershill would were helpful in clarifying what what has been covered, but I would need to take that away and get some expert advice on on that particular question.

39:07

Understood. Okay. As I say, I will be there's likely to be written questions as well in the examination, therefore, yeah, that that's absolutely fine. If you give a holding response on that, perhaps that will be dealt with in a written submission later on. Yeah, thank you for that. Are there any other comments on modelling matters anybody wishes to raise? I when we were discussing that I did notice a hand raised but I couldn't see from which party.

39:47

So that was Robin Taylor, South Norfolk counsel. I was just going to try and help clarify the development you're talking about by just by just by just giving some local references, but I think you've sorted that out now.

40:00

Thank you. Thank you for that. Yes, I'd like to move on from the, from the modelling. Now, are there any other comments? Anybody wishes to raise and Mr. Hawker, you had some discussion points on transport and traffic issues.

40:20

Yes, thank you, sir. I would I note in the case of the scheme, the applicant has mentioned actually in response to my written representations as well, regarding the the traffic modelling, and it's it mentions the many manual classified turning counts. But I can't see anywhere any results from that survey back in June 2015. Now, bearing in mind that the the main raison d'etre, if you like for the schemes, the congestion occurring at this roundabout, and it would seem to me fairly basic, that we should know where vehicles are currently coming from and going to, so that one can, can deal with that. That's one point and the other is that have other means of taking traffic from the roundabout rather than making it bigger and, and having these large road schemes have been looked at? I did ask this question in particular, regarding taking that a 11 traffic is going to the park and ride scheme directly to that, that

area, and also improving the link from 847 Going west, to the A 11 going south. But my main point is on the modelling is I haven't been able to find results of the manual classify traffic, traffic counselling counts, which will be very useful.

42:07

But thank you, Mr. Hawker. Mr. Battershill, would you like to come back on those points? Or if it's another colleague to speak on those? Could you could you indicate that

42:21

I can outline Yes, in case of scheme. Sorry, David Battershill path applicants in terms of the case for scheme. In chapter four, we outline the locations and the durations and the nature of the traffic surveys have been undertaken. There is quite a large number of traffic surveys. So the individual results aren't included in the documentation. I would have to refer to a colleague as to Yeah, sort of what sort of you're calling to provide that if necessary.

42:55

Okay, I again, not that's okay. If you if you need to defer to that. I do note the issues raised and if a written question follows or if a written submission follows that that may well cover off the the point being raised. I don't have any further questions on modelling type issues. I'd like to just if I may just turn to some of the impacts of the scheme in terms of the A 11 Approach from Norwich is being identified as the worst performing arm if the scheme now I'm drawing on again, responses from Norfolk County Council's local impact report, deadline won in the response at deadline to from the applicant. Seemingly there is some agreement that the throughputs of the A 11 Approach from Norwich is anticipated to be the worst performing arm in terms of future capacity and delay. With respect to that, and you're just seeking clarification, whether or not that in terms of what the county council is saying is that post the scheme change is being applied in terms of what they're referencing. In the local impact report if I could just bring Mr. David Cumming in

44:51

says David Cumming for Norfolk County Council. So yes, you're quite correct so that we did raise the issue about the approach from the garbage being the worst The Performing arm. And we are, as indicated in the response from from the applicant in continuing discussions about that. I don't have any more to say at this time on that unless you've got any specific questions you want to direct.

45:22

I do have a couple of specific questions. They may perhaps involve the county council, but also the applicant as well, if the applicant could perhaps come in on these parts. It's Mr. Battershill again. But what are the known impacts of that? Assuming it would be the worst performing and what are the note impacts of that? For example, would would that result in any safety issues? Or is it just a matter of delays? The applicant could first of all, come back on that.

46:14

Davif Battershill and half the applicants. I'm sorry, sir. So the question is, we're talking about the age 11. Coming from Nauru, as westbound direction has been the worst performing arm?

46:30

Yes, that's right. It's referred to by the county council as the well it's identified as going to be the worst performing arm from the A 11 Approach from Norwich.

46:47

In the sort of in the basic scenario,

46:51

this is post delivery of the scheme, I believe the the county council have clarified that

47:01

I mean, in terms of safety benefits the scheme we are reducing the total number of accidents. And yes, we've undertaken cobalt analysis, which includes all of the traffic growth and include the cut the situation modelled would be included in the scheme. And we'd look at the result in benefits from Jason accidents. So that would be included within our cohort analysis of the scheme which derives our total as total improvement or Tejal 42 accidents and 26 ksi is in terms of traffic growth, and delays on that on in the junction.

47:58

From our analysis, I don't see that as being from the numbers we've got in the case for scheme, section four. So section 4.8 are we've got analysis of the all the arms, the junk or the approach on the junction, we don't see significant amounts of delays in our modelling work on the left and westbound are as part of that analysis. I have a job

48:41

that is post delivery of the scheme you're referring to. Yes.

48:44

So that would be odd do something scenario.

48:48

So to do so, you're just to clarify your response is that there would be no significant

48:59

effects. Our response is according to our do something modelling arm when we look at the delays on the 11 westbound we get a reduction from the de Miniland to do something

49:22

and that's those results are highlighted in Section 4.8 of the case of the scheme.

49:31

Fund. Thank you. It the question does arise. My side in terms of the county council have indicated discussions are ongoing about the a 11 approach from Norwich develop this. They have specifically

identified that in terms of future capacity, they've referenced delay I just in terms of the applicant's views on that, are there any measures that could be introduced to improve that situation? If that if that is a problem.

50:20

So Michael Fry for the app and apologies, Mr. Battershill, for just intervening. I'm looking at the LIRR, sir. And I think the the key point and a mist coming probably will confirm this for us is the County Council's not recommending any objection to the scheme. And then it follows on in that paragraph 437 in the LIRR to say that, based on the assessment, that it's the worst performing item, it's not saying it performs badly, or it isn't an improvement from the scheme. So I might need to write to you, sir, about this. But I think the the applicants case in that written representation will be simply that there is a big improvement. But there are scales, of course of what we can do, as Mr. Williams has set out, there are improvements to Safety Scheme wide as a result of the scheme, which is a single a single scheme in in a single location. So the improvements are there, we will take it away and consider what we can do in respect of improving that if possible, but I suppose the submission would be so there were improvements that could easily be made in respect of that arm they would have been made, it may just be that that is what we are stuck with. I think we will have to take it away, sir. And write to you on that specific point. And this is special has anything that he can add. Now in terms of that arm, it's not something that I certainly discussed much with with my team, sir. But as I say, we will take it away. And we're right to sir. Perhaps if the council are able to clarify what they would wish and expand on that that point. But as has been noted, so we are in discussions with them. There's a seemingly common ground, which I'll update you on tomorrow, sir. And I imagined it is something that the applicant can discuss with the council and then present something to the examination in due course. So in writing,

52:09

understood Mr. Fry, and that's reasonable. The approach you've just described, what I would just be interested in is part of that. And whilst we are actually on this particular issue, I just like to the issue that we've just discussed, I understand you're making the point, there's going to be an overall improvement. But just in terms of whether or not the court or maybe any enhancements to the worst performing arm. How the function of the new overbreadth over the A 47 would relate to that. And whether or not there is an enhancement there or not to cover that in any response given to the examination.

53:06

I don't have any further points to make on this particular issue. I'm going to again, throw it open to other parties if they wish to come back on anything that's been expressed so far.

53:22

Can't see any hands raised? Okay, I'll take that as a no, there are no further points. So I just like to. Again, just to give a little bit more context, I'd just like to ask the Norfolk County Council and perhaps South Norfolk Council. A couple of questions. Just as background information. Mr. Cumming. The County Council's local impact report. It talks about opportunities for investments in well, it does refer to missed opportunities, missed opportunities for investment and walking and cycling. Could you expand on those please?

54:20

says David Cumming forward the county council just referencing where we set that out. So in AD submission, they mainly relate I think to the provision that has been proposed in relation to Cantlie lane.

54:43

The I believe it is currently Lane Yes.

54:47

So yeah, so So what we see is walking cycling, horse riding provision being provided over a new footbridge over the age 11 which we do support. I think that that is a an improvement over the existing grade crossing on the slip road which we understand is not very well used particularly by horse riding. So the the alternative route now would be via Cantlie lane. The issue that we raised was that there was no provision between that footbridge etc over the a 47 at Cantlie lane and the new link road towards the the south of campy lane. So there is no dedicated provision proposed there as part of the application. And I think we saw that as a missed opportunity. In in in terms of joining up dedicated provision, we understand from from the applicants submission in terms of the comments that they made on on our local impact report, we do understand. So just looking for a reference number for for that submission. So, so that is

56:08

rep two.

56:19

Sorry, sir. So that's the applicants comments on the local impact report, which?

56:42

Means, yes, so it says rep. 2008. So in that document, the applicant is saying that, in terms of can't be lay in, if there were to be on that dedicated provision, it would require some vegetation removal. And I think that, you know, that that is the balance that needs to be struck, and I think Norfolk County Council would would probably accept that that point.

57:15

Okay, thank you. Just, again, purely, is context. I just like to understand whether or not it it's just a background matter that I'm posing, are there any capital spends or planned initiatives in place separate to the DCO scheme? Book potentially complimentary to any anticipated benefits proposed by the county council.

58:01

This David Cumming Norfolk County Council said, I am not aware off the top of my head of any but I think I would need to take that away and and confirmed that to be the case. On certainly in terms of funded improvements, as I say, I'm not aware of any but I'll take that away and respond in writing.

58:21

Thank you. Yes, that's helpful. I have a question for self. Norfolk counsel. If I could just bring their representative in. Again, just purely as context, just like to ascertain whether or not there's a community infrastructure Levy, charging shedule in place, and the local authority area or any known plans to introduce a levy,

58:59

Claire Curtis South Norfolk Council, I can confirm that we do have a cell infrastructure levy in place for the district.

59:08

So the question I posed to Mr. Cumming was whether or not there are any projects or planned initiatives separate to the DCO scheme, but potentially complimentary to any anticipated benefits. I was just trying to understand a bit more of the background of the area, the context, are there any such capital spends or projects, planned improvements that, you know, are will can refer to for the benefit of the examination?

59:47

Claire Curtis South Norfolk Council? Not to my knowledge, sir, but certainly we can take it away and investigate that. And I'm assuming your request you request is in relation to perhaps funding that might be About through the cell for enhanced, perhaps biodiversity or connections within the area.

1:00:07

Yes, it could be wide ranging. I mean, we are discussing at the moment, transport and traffic topics, but it's purely as context. Okay. Thank you, sir. Sir. Yes, sir. That could be a written response on that. Thank you. Okay. There are a couple of more things in relation to transport and traffic, I'd just like to now just move to some discussion on the classification, or proposed classification of the new link from currently Lane south to the B 1172. As a Class B road, just like, again, I'd like to go back to Mr. Cumming the county council. Could you just expand on that issue from your perspective, and the specific reasoning for that concern, please.

1:01:12

So it's David Cumming for Norfolk County Council, in terms of the road network in the area, the A 11 and the A 47 are the main roads within the area. And much of the rest of the network, certainly to the south of thick Thorn and across to the east, it is very much minor road network and katni lane is, you know, essentially a minor country lane to put it in lay people's terms. And we have I mean, we know that people obviously live in that area and use that area for for recreation, etc. We have had concern expressed to us by some of the local residents and the representatives through the parish councils of the proposed scheme with the link crow bear, potentially drawing traffic up through Cantlie lane and the new link road. We don't expect that to be a significant impact of the scheme. But the classification of the road as a B road, the new link road as a B road would indicate to motorists and also to things like Sat Nav systems on that it is part of a more sort of major road network, then as the size of the minor road network that it leads to down at Cantlie. Lane. So in terms of that, we feel that the classification as a B road would, in itself start to attract traffic to it. And there are no real major destinations down that

link road. So we felt that had lower classification, whether that's a C Class road or unclassified road is a better designation and classification of that road than it is as a B road.

1:03:07

So in terms of your response, Mr. Cumming, you've just given is there any particular data or evidence on the side of the county council to support the assumption that that would influence traffic movements? Or is it a case that it's it's a reflection from experience as it were?

1:03:33

David Cumming Norfolk County Council, I think it's more a reflection from experience.

1:03:41

And I do note, the traffic su uplift SUV that you're setting out in relation to the designation. I do note that road signage may be an option. Could I just ask you just to clarify your your views on that and what how successful that would be in managing any traffic uplift issues.

1:04:16

David Cumming for Norfolk County Council. So I think that we would need to to monitor the situation, I mean, that that road network, and the link road would become part of the local road network, so managed and maintained by the county council following construction of the scheme if it is to go ahead. So there's a say I think that in terms of signing of it, we would want to start off with what we've considered to be appropriate signing. And that that I'm not aware of exactly what the proposals are there that that would be dealt with by somebody else within the county council. So and I believe those discussions are ongoing, but certainly poster schemes or say any thing that that comes to light would then be a matter for the county council to reflect on whether that signing at that junction is correct. And whether it does need to be changed. But, you know, as I said, I think it's probably better to get it right. First time rather than to carry through that process.

1:05:22

Understood, thank you. Okay, well, we were just on the issue of road signage, just like the applicants response to how they would deal with any mechanism for for dealing with road signage, whether or not they can point to any particular provision, just to secure that if there is a a traffic Su, uplift issue that could be managed in that particular way, or could just invite the applicants team just to respond to that

1:06:09

so Michael Fry for the applicant, one one of my team may well intervene, but I believe this issue was dealt with in response to the the LI Rs 442. Just checking with my team, I'll just see what is said, sir, but it may be that page one, apologies, I'm getting messages in my ear. Now, that's it. 442, which it's a comment on classification. So as has already been explored, that is a matter for the County Council and the applicant is discussing matters with Norfolk and we we will essentially follow Norfolk's lead in in respect of that, and it will be captured in the statement common ground. As the signage, I will need to defer to one of my experts on the actual the way in which signage is decided, sir, but even not, it's something that we will we will write to the examination. Mr. Williams is going to help me sir.

1:07:22

Okay, Mr. Williams,

1:07:24

Ben Williams for the applicant. I can confirm that we've been working with Norfolk County Council, through the preliminary design of the signage in the development of a signage strategy report. And we will continue to work with the council throughout the detailed design development of the of the road signage strategy, and the details of the road signs.

1:07:54

And that will be information that feeds into the examination. At some point at the later deadline for an update, presumably.

1:08:04

I'll have to refer back to you on whether that will become part of the examination process or not. Okay, okay, sir.

1:08:15

Yes, that's fine. Mr. Fry did and indicate discussions are ongoing with the county council. So perhaps all of what is being raised is wrapped up together and dealt with in that way, that would be the most practical way. In terms of the examination. I do have just a few brief questions on acid asset transfer issues that are being raised in the examination. And it's just again, this is an issue that Norfolk County Council are raising the they have mentioned, they're seeking a data exchange in terms of maintenance provision, etc. From the applicants perspective, is there any further update or more detail to give on that particular topic? The asset transfer? Data Exchange matters is Could I just invite the applicant perhaps starting with Mr. Fry, or an appropriate colleague?

1:09:40

So Michael, prior to the applicant, I'm not aware of any any update that I can give you now, sir. Again, I'm afraid it won't surprise you that it is a matter that's being discussed and will make its way into the stable a common ground in due course. I'll pause briefly just to see if anyone from my team wants to intervene. But as I said, I'm not aware of any Update says I'm not expecting anyone to, to intervene. And no one has that. I'm afraid it will be one that I take away and we deal with unstable Congress.

1:10:10

Okay. With that in mind, Mr. Fry, that that is that's absolutely fine. But I'd be grateful just to have some understanding. In terms of the examination material, I'd like some understanding of the see if there was an in the event of an impasse, or it couldn't be transferred. It wasn't a smooth process, just in the event of that the applicant. I'd like them to just explain how that would the effects of that on the DCO and whether or not they would just retain the assets or not, but perhaps just clarifying those areas,

1:10:55

if possible. So absolutely. I think I know the answer that but I'm not I'm not going to dare it now. And I will write to you on it. That Thank you very much. I'm grateful.

1:11:03

Thank you. Okay, it's just gone past 10 past 1111 minutes past. Just it might be a good time to have a quick break. If that would be useful.

1:11:29

No one's indicating whether or not they wish to have a break. But I think it might be useful just to have a short break, and then we'll come on to the remaining items. We should be able to deal with those within probably an hour and a half. wouldn't anticipate that so if we have a short break for 15 minutes, would that be suitable? Mr. Fry?

1:11:56

Yes, sir. Thank you.

1:11:59

Okay, on that basis, we'll just have a quick adjournment. So the hearing is adjourned and we'll reconvene. We'll reconvene at half past 11. Thank you