

A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction

Scheme Number: TR010037

Volume 9

9.35 Applicant's Responses to Submissions at Deadline 9

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

March 2022

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**9.35 APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS
AT DEADLINE 9**

Rule Number:	8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010037
Application Document Reference	TR010037/EXAM/9.35
BIM Document Reference	HE551492-GTY-LSI-000-RP-ZL-40911
Author:	A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	March 2022	Deadline 10

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	Key Abbreviations	1
3	Ian James	2
4	Norfolk County Council	3

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction was submitted on 31 March 2021 and accepted for examination on 28 April 2021.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this document is to set out Highways England's (the Applicant) comments on the following submissions at Deadline 9 published 15 March 2022:
- Ian James (**REP9-033**); and
 - Norfolk County Council (**REP9-028**).
- 1.1.3 The Applicant acknowledges that other submissions were made at Deadline 9 but is of the view that these do not require a response on the basis they summarise what was said at the hearings and have already been responded to in submissions at Deadline 9 'Applicants Response to Submissions at Deadline 8' (**REP9-022**) and 'Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at ISH2'(**REP9-018**).
- 1.1.4 The following sections present the responses where concerns or requests are made warranting provision of additional information or clarity by the Applicant.

2 KEY ABBREVIATIONS

- 2.1.1 The following common abbreviations have been used in the Applicant's submissions to the Examination:
- dDCO = draft Development Consent Order
 - DMRB = Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
 - ES = Environmental Statement
 - ExA = Examining Authority
 - NPSNN = National Policy Statement for National Networks 2014
 - NWL = Norwich Western Link
 - the Scheme = the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction

3 IAN JAMES

3.1.1 The below submission made on 15 March 2022 (see below link) from Ian James has been examined and the responses to the questions and concerns raised are provided in the table below.

- [REDACTED]

Comment	Applicant's Response
<p>1. Recognise July 2020 Traffic survey data as unreliable due to Coronavirus restrictions leading to Station Court business park being largely closed.</p>	<p>It is correct that the traffic survey was undertaken in July 2020 to collect data on the volumes of traffic using the Station Lane North junction, and that this was used to inform the traffic modelling and performance of the proposed Station Lane North/A11 entry taper that is included in the current proposals. However, given the drop in normal traffic movements as a result of the national lockdown, the survey data was adjusted using a conversion factor derived from 2019 vs 2020 traffic survey data on the Station Lane junction on the South of the A11. The result of the survey shows low level of traffic in both directions across all time periods of the day.</p>
<p>2. Review the options for traffic to safely enter Station Lane from the A11 Northbound, including Side Roads Strategy 'Option 5' for new access road.</p>	<p>As detailed in the Case for the Scheme Section 2 (APP-128), Option 5 of the side road strategy was considered but discounted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • properties on Cantley Lane South requiring additional detours of between 4.7km and 5.3km, depending on the options chosen in order to access the existing A11/A47 Thickthorn Junction. • the detour noted above leading to adverse response times for emergency services, accessing Cantley Lane South. • access to properties on Cantley Lane South being restricted by the low railway bridge. With a headroom of 13 <p>The Applicant can confirm that this position has not changed and that the Applicant does not propose to reopen a review of the side road strategy as that would not be appropriate at this stage of the examination.</p> <p>To improve driver awareness, junction warning signs 305m in advance of the junction in the verge and central reserve will be provided in conjunction with 'SLOW' warning road marking at the location of the signs. Advanced direction signage for the A11/A47 connector road will be placed 270m downstream of the Station Lane junction exit, to avoid confusion and road users misinterpreting the Station Lane exit for the A47 link road diverge. The position and design of these signs are in accordance with the DMRB."</p>
<p>3. Considering whether safety will be increased by re-allocating Acceleration Lane funding towards changes that permit vehicles to safely slow down on the A11 before turning into Station Lane.</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken safety risk assessments in accordance with DMRB GG104 for this junction and these have concluded that the proposed design offers the greatest risk benefit.</p> <p>A merge taper for vehicles entering the A11 dual carriageway from Station Lane (acceleration lane) has been included in the scheme proposals as a DMRB GG104 safety risk assessment of the junction highlighted the potential minor risk of side swipes and rear end shunts related to vehicle joining the A11, due to the relative proximity of the proposed A11/A47 connector road, and a further GG104 safety risk assessment identified that the merge taper included in the Scheme design provides the greatest risk benefit.</p>
<p>4. If no design changes are possible to assist vehicles to safely enter Station Lane, consider a reduced speed limit on the vicinity of Station Lane.</p>	<p>Based on the safety case and works already proposed at the Station Lane North Junction outlined above, the Applicant does not deem a speed reduction on the A11 carriageway to be necessary.</p>

4 NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

4.1.1 The below submission made on 15th March 2022 (see below link) from Norfolk County Council has been examined and the responses to the questions and concerns raised are provided in the table below.

- [REDACTED]

Comment	Applicant's Response
<p><u>NCC's response to Thickthorn ISH2 Draft DCO Action Point</u></p> <p>Action 4: Responses to the ExA's suggestion to remove Article 3 (4) from the dDCO concerning the disapplication of legislative provisions and modifications to existing section 106 agreements. Acknowledgement of the legislative options / scope available to deal with historic agreements directly between the main parties it covers.</p> <p>Article 3 (4) relates to the dedication of land to the county council for a slip road. The land for a slip road has been transferred to the County so it is considered that those elements of the section 106 agreement has been discharged. Therefore, there is no practical difference to the county council whether Article 3 (4) remains in the agreement or is removed, as proposed by the ExA.</p>	<p>The Applicant is grateful for the NCC response and is content for the Examining Authority and Secretary of State to make the final decision on whether or not to include Article 3(4) in the DCO.</p>