

Your ref: Our ref: DD: E: Date: TR010037 JEC/JB51570 Bidwells.co.uk

The Planning Inspectorate Temple Quay House Temple Quay 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Sir

THE TRUSTEES OF THE MACKINTOSH TRUST – APPLICATION BY HIGHWAYS ENGLAND (NOW NATIONAL HIGHWAYS) FOR AN ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR THE A47-A11 THICKTHORN JUNCTION PROJECT

I write, on behalf of my client – The Trustees of the Mackintosh Trust – to provide you with a written submission for your consideration, focused on matters relating to the Project that impact my client and which we believe remain outstanding.

1. Highways England's proposal provides for two new agricultural access onto my client's agricultural land to either side of the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road. Highways England have kindly amended the positioning of these accesses to better meet the requirements of the farmer. The presently proposed locations for these field accesses are shown on drawing HE551492-GTY-LSI-000-DR-CH-31005, enclosed, as providing access into two compound / material storage areas that will be returned to my client once the project is completed.

At the same time as making our request to Highways England regarding the positioning of the accesses, we advised that – further to testing of the proposed design's geometry – both access points would require widening of the bell mouth radii and access road to accommodate standard farm vehicles and machinery. Highways England have advised they will complete their own analysis later in the design stage for this project and so it remains outstanding at present.

In addition to concerns regarding the dimensions of the access points, we are unable to locate within the application documents, any detail regarding the positioning and specification of the gates that will be required to secure the two new accesses. It is important the security of my client's property is not jeopardised by this project. Equally, it is important any gates are set back sufficiently from Cantley Lane Link Road so as to allow farm vehicles to turn off and onto the public highway safely. We should be grateful to receive this detail.

Elsewhere in the application, Highways England advise that the installation of these access points will negate any severance issues. Whilst the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road will certainly make it more time consuming and difficult to farm the land either side, this could be accepted if my client was assured that everything possible was being done to reduce their inconvenience as far as could be reasonably achieved. We cannot presently confirm that to be the case given the points raised, above.

2. On a related point to the above, we still have deep concerns regarding the form of junction being proposed where the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road shall meet with the B1172 Norwich Road. It is understood Highways England have carried out traffic modelling to inform their design and are satisfied the proposed T-junction will be capable of meeting the demands placed upon it safely but our own daily experience of turning eastward onto the B1172 from the Thickthorn Estate, or turning onto the Estate from the eastward lane of B1172, is this is already a very time consuming and potentially dangerous manoeuvre that will only become more so as the population in this area increases.

If, as we predict, the T-junction results in vehicles experiencing difficulty getting onto or out from the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road, it could also negatively impact upon my client's ability to move across the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road. We therefore respectfully ask that the Planning Inspectorate please looks in detail at the data on which Highways England's decision has been based because it does not fit with my client's lifetime of experience.

- 3. Also related to the above, we note that despite our requests throughout this process, the speed limit on the proposed Cantley Lane Link Road remains set at 40mph. Due to the type of vehicles that will be making use of the farm accesses, if the speed limit was set at the requested 30mph it would make it easier and safer for my client to access and egress their property. We would like to understand why a 30mph limit is not acceptable to Highways England.
- 4. Despite assurances from Highways England that the area of land to be acquired permanently from my client will not be as great as shown on the earlier land plans, we believe the Additionally Submitted Plans from December 2021, enclosed, still show: a land take area that should be significantly reduced; and still show parcels 3/3d; 3/3f and the land under the underpass for the existing A11 (within 3/1a) as being land to be acquired permanently. Generally, the land to be acquired permanently should be restricted and in relation to the above referenced parcels in particular, these should either be shown on Highways England's plans as "land to be used temporarily" or as "land to be used temporarily and rights to be acquired permanently".
- 5. On a related point to the above, the Additionally Submitted Plans from December 2021 continue to show sections of public highway (e.g. 5/1a) as being sections where my client will lose all interests. Whilst we realise the Planning Inspectorate is not responsible for overseeing the matter of compensation, it is the case that Highways England do not currently believe my client should be entitled to any compensation whatsoever in relation to these areas. If no value is attributed to the interests of my client, there should be no reason why those interests need to be transferred to facilitate this project.
- 6. Of fundamental importance to my client is the specification and future ownership and access rights over the proposed accommodation track, shown on drawings HE551492-GTY-LSI-000-DR-CH-31003 and HE551492-GTY-LSI-000-DR-CH-31006, enclosed. My client is losing their existing access to the fields north of Cantley Wood as a consequence of this project, this being an access and track over which they have complete control and security, and across which two vehicles can pass side by side. We realise there may be no alternative route for the proposed accommodation track than the long one proposed and that Highways England will need to retain some rights of access and maintenance over it in the future. That being accepted, where possible my client should not be left in a worse position after this project than before it and thus should be granted ownership of the new track without any restrictions on their use of it, and it should be the case that the new



Application by Highways England (now National Highways) for an Order Granting development Consent for the A47-A11
Thickthorn Junction Project

route is properly secured and capable of accommodating two cars side by side. We await confirmation that these requirements are being facilitated.

- 7. We await meaningful engagement regarding how my client might work with Highways England to deliver any mitigation measures required in relation to matters such as carbon emissions (during the construction and operational phases of the project); the local community; trees and habitat. My client is keen to work with Highways England on these points, where possible, and looks forward to progressing those matters in due course.
- 8. Finally, whilst Highways England have agreed to pay for my client's professional fees where these relate to discussions with Highways England themselves, they have refused to pay any fees related to my client's engagement with the Planning Inspectorate, such as this letter. Whilst we understand Highways England need to have a robust position on this point and should not be obliged to pay for every person or organisation that chooses to engage in the Development Consent Order (DCO) examination, my client is an interested party who will be significantly impacted by this project and who should be encouraged to participate in the DCO process. We would welcome the Planning Inspectorate's opinion and guidance on this point, please.

Many thanks

Yours sincerely		
John Coates		



















