

A47 DUALLING – NORTH TUDDENHAM TO EASTON

Scheme no. TR010038

APPENDIX 11 to
STATEMENT OF A.C. MEYNELL of the [REDACTED]

IP reference 2002/8353



ACM 03.11

1 September 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications : Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

The A47 North Tuddenham to Easton
Development Consent Order 202[x]

STATEMENT OF ANTHONY CHARLES MEYNELL

APPENDIX 11

Application reference: TR 010038

Interested Party reference: 2002/8353

Document reference: ACM 03.11

Date: 1 September 2021

APPENDIX 11

A47 North Tuddenham to Easton consultation timeline with copies of published plans

List of Plans in Annex A

<i>Plan no.</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Document taken from</i>	<i>Date</i>
1	Option 1 consulted	Consultation brochure, pp4-5	Mar 2017
2	Option 2 consulted	Ditto, pp6-7	Mar 2017
3	Option 3 consulted	Ditto, pp8-9	Mar 2017
4	Option 4 consulted	Ditto, pp10-11	Mar 2017
5	Plan 5 “respecting the environment	Ditto, pp12-13	Mar 2017
6	Option 2 as consulted	HE Public Consultation report, para 2.3.3, page 9	
7	Option 2 amended (preferred route)	Preferred route announcement Aug 2017 – second page	Aug 2017
8	- Ditto -	EIA Scoping report PCF Stage 3 – Sept 2019 page 2	Sept 2019
9	- Ditto -	Junction & Sideroad strategy – Feb 2020 page 6	Feb 2020
10	Wood Lane Junction 1 st design	- Ditto – page 33	Feb 2020
11	Wood Lane Junction 2 nd design with compounds added	Project Update Winter 2020 – 6 th page	Dec 2020
12	- Ditto -	Sent with Mr Powis’ email to Savills 9 Dec 2020 (ACM 03.8 / 52 -52A)	Dec 2020
13	Wood Lane Junction 2 nd design	DCO Application plans March 2021 (copy of composite plans of junction)	Mar 2021

A47 North Tuddenham to Easton dualling

Timeline re development of design options and [REDACTED] consultations.

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
1	2014	The Government's Road Investment Strategy (RIS) ¹ is published setting out a £15.1bn investment for 2015-21 ² to improve journeys on England's major motorways and A roads. The RIS packages includes 6 schemes to improve journeys on the 115 mi stretch of A47 between Peterborough and Gt Yarmouth. ³ The A47 North Tuddenham to Easton dualling forms one of the schemes. ⁴⁵	
2	2016	14 potential alternative options were considered as part of the scheme development process. These options did not perform well against the objectives and therefore were not pursued further. ⁶	

¹ Dept of Transport, Road Investment Strategy, Overview, December 2014, available on assets.publishing.service.gov.uk by internet search

² Ibid at page 32 (pdf 32/42)

³ Ibid, investment plan, East of England, page 36 (36/42)

⁴ Ibid, item D3 in table on page 37

⁵ Information also taken from 2017 Consultation brochure available at Highways England Website www.highwaysengland.citizenspace.com/he/a47-north-tuddenham-to-easton-dualling Find in Overview tab; then at the very bottom, in "related docs"; see Para 1, Introduction, Page 2 "about the A47 improvement scheme"

⁶ A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, Scheme Assessment Report, v1.0 (bearing date 15 December 2017 but approved and issued 5 February 2020) available at Highways England website under Consultation 2017 documents (options considered at para 9.2.1 *et seq*)

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
3	13 Mar to 21 Apr 2017	<p><i>Initial non-statutory consultation</i> by Highways England (HE) on 4 options⁷.</p> <p>None of the options considered showed any intermediate junctions between one end and the other of the proposed new mainline.</p> <p>The general comment before the options are describes says “<i>where we propose to build a new road, the existing carriageway will be retained for access to fields, farms, properties and for non-motorists</i>”⁸</p> <p><u>Option 1</u> runs north of the existing A47 opposite [REDACTED].</p> <p><u>Option 2</u> follows the existing A47 except for a bypass running south of Hockering to rejoin the existing road at Sandy Lane.</p> <p><u>Option 3</u> runs south of Hockering and north of Honingham, crossing the existing A47 at Sandy Lane by an over/under bridge.</p> <p><u>Option 4</u> runs south and crosses [REDACTED] meadows just south of the River Tud.</p> <p>[Note that plan 5 to the brochure⁹ headed “respecting the environment”, marks the [REDACTED] Ice house as a listed building but omits [REDACTED] itself.</p>	<p><i>Plan 1</i></p> <p><i>Plan 2</i></p> <p><i>Plan 3</i></p> <p><i>Plan 4</i></p> <p><i>Plan 5</i></p>
4	Aug 2017	<p><i>Consultation report</i>¹⁰ prepared issued by HE stating that option 2 was the most supported. The report confirms that while the preferred route preliminary design is being developed, detailed consultation with landowners and stakeholders will be undertaken which will help shape its preliminary design, with consultations expected late 2017 and early 2018¹¹.</p>	<i>Plan 6</i>

⁷2017 Consultation brochure, *ibid.* para 4, with plans at pages 4 to 11,

⁸ *Ibid*, last para of para 4 introduction, at page 4

⁹ *Ibid*, at page 12-13

¹⁰ Highways England, A47 corridor improvement scheme, Public Consultation Report, A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, August 2017, para 14.2.4. Available at highwaysengland.co.uk under “A47 North Tuddenham to Easton”, documents tab, Consultation 2017 documents

¹¹ *Ibid*, paras 14.12.5/14.12.6

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
5	Aug 2017	<p><i>Preferred Route Announcement</i>¹² issued by HE with an “amended version of Option 2” as the Preferred Route, which is said would be kept to the north side of the corridor as it passes Honingham.</p> <p>This element, among others given, it is said “<i>will make the road easier to construct and will retain a significant amount of the existing A47 for local access, cycling and walking</i>”¹³</p> <p>The preferred option it is said “will now be developed further before statutory consultation”¹⁴.</p> <p>The plan shows the amended version of Option 2 on the Announcement running offline south of Hockering (west to east) and crossing to the north side at Sandy Lane (the same place as Option 3 had been shown crossing the existing A47 by an overpass). The plan includes two dashed boxes on it said to depict the location of the new proposed junction at the crossing point. No explanation for or details of the junction are given. There is no junction at Wood Lane.</p> <p>From the crossing point eastward the new road is shown as running closely to the north of the existing A47 past [REDACTED] and Honingham.</p>	Plan 7
6	Early 2018	Expected period for statutory consultation as per preferred route announcement. No more consultation takes place until Feb 2020 (see below, item 12)	
7	July 2019	<i>Preferred route for Norwich Western Link (NWL) announced by Norfolk County Council (report in Eastern Daily Press 5 July 2019, of imminent announcement in forthcoming NCC Cabinet meeting to be held the following week). The route is Option C of the four options considered for the NWL and is planned to join the A47 at Wood Lane.</i>	

¹² Highways England Preferred Route Announcement, a47 North Tuddenham to Easton, August 2017, available at highwaysengland.co.uk under “A47 North Tuddenham to Easton”, documents tab, Consultation 2017 documents

¹³ Ibid, second page, right side “The preferred Route – Option 2

¹⁴ Ibid, first page left side at top, under the heading “What happens next?”

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
8	Sept 2019	<i>EIA Scoping Report (PCF¹⁵ stage 3)</i> ¹⁶ issued by HE to the Planning Inspectorate, showing the proposed scheme on plans as being exactly the same as the amended option 2 route planned when the preferred route announcement was published two years before in August 2017, with the same box shown for a junction at Sandy Lane / Church Lane (Fig 1-1 on page 2).	<i>Plan 8</i>
9	Nov 2019	<i>Inspector's Scoping Opinion</i> ¹⁷ issued, based on the 2017 preferred route. The Inspectorate request full details of the junctions and the construction compounds and storage bunds as they had not been provided by HE in the Scoping Report (paras 2.3.2 and 2.3.3). The Inspectorate also at para 2.3.4 required that "the Applicant provides "A description of the reasonable alternatives relevant to the proposed design <u>and its specific characteristics</u> and an indication of the main reasons for selecting the chosen option(s), including a comparison of the cumulative effects". [underlining added] At 2.3.9 the Inspectorate invited the Applicant, if the proposed Development were to materially change, to consider requesting a new scoping opinion. The documents appended to the opinion included a letter from Natural England dated 18 October 2019 ¹⁸ with an Annex A listing all the relevant issues it wished the Applicant to deal with including. under the heading "Heritage Landscapes" ¹⁹ requesting the Applicant to consult www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm , <u>consultation of which would have revealed the [REDACTED] designation.</u> There is no record of any further scoping Opinion being given.	
10	27 Jan 2020	<i>James Powis of HE visits [REDACTED]</i> when a new plan was shown to Mr Meynell for the first time showing what appeared to be an advanced design of a large new grade-separated junction at Wood	<i>Plan 10</i>

¹⁵ Project Control Framework – see Project Control Framework Handbook, Highways England, v4 2018

¹⁶ A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, EIA Scoping Report, PCF Stage 3 (HE551489-GTY-EGN-000-RP-LX-0001 P04), Sept 2019 available on Ex A website under pre-examination documents

¹⁷ Scoping Opinion: Proposed A47 North Tuddenham to Easton Case ref TR010038, November 2019, available as for the Scoping Report on Ex A website under pre-examination documents.

¹⁸ Ibid, At page 160./184 of the pdf Scoping Opinion

¹⁹ Ibid, At para 3 of Annex A, second sub-heading ((page 165/184 on the pdf)

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
		<p>Lane (instead of Sandy Lane) in order to connect the dualled A47 with the now proposed NWL²⁰. The plan is the same as then produced for the 2020 Statutory Consultation due to start in the next few weeks.</p> <p>The A47 would be elevated at the junction and the junction below. The plan shows a road coming off the south dumbbell southwest across the Estate's land leading to Church Lane to the south of the new mainline. Access off that road is shown to Berry Hall's old back drive and to Hillcrest. There is an underpass beneath the mainline at Church Lane but limited to pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>This iteration of the Scheme for the first time requires land to be taken from [REDACTED]. No indication is however given of any temporary works compounds or storage bunds.</p> <p>Mr Meynell was told that the statutory consultation on this proposal would be in spring 2020²¹. HE also wanted access in Feb 2020 for 8 weeks to drill boreholes.</p> <p>.</p>	
11	Feb 2020	<p><i>HE's Junction and Sideroad strategy Report</i>²² is issued.</p> <p>This confirms that the earlier preferred amended route 2 had been published (fig 1-1 at page 2) (the "PRA alignment") and that the central junction had then been shown at Sandy Lane / Church Lane (para 1.1). It continues (at para 1.2), to say that the purpose of the Report is to provide a technical recommendation on the Junction layout "<u>at the 3 proposed junction locations announced at PRA</u>", with allowance for the NWL scheme which had announced Preferred Route Alignments in July 2019.</p> <p>The rest of the report then describes just <i>two</i> junctions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A central junction not at Sandy Lane but at a new location at Wood Lane (paras 2.4.1, 2.5.1 and 2.6.1) with the options considered for it being at grade, compact grade separated and fully grade separated. <p>No mention is made of the change of location;</p>	<i>Plan 9</i>

²⁰ Meeting note at ACM 03.8/1

²¹ Appendix 8 to AC Meynell Statement at page 8 (ACM 03.8 /8)

²² A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, Junction & Sideroad Strategy, PCF Stage 3 (HE551489-GTY-EGN-000-RP-CH-30001) February 2020 P01, available at highwaysengland.co.uk A47 North Tuddenham to Easton under Consultation 2020 documents

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
		<p>- An eastern junction at Norwich Road;</p> <p>The original first new junction at the west end was left out as an existing junction was said to be deemed sufficient</p> <p>he grade separated choice for the Wood Lane junction is shown in drawings at paras 5.4.6 to 5.4.9 (at page 6) (as it was to Mr Meynell on 27 January) with a two-dumbbell layout and an access road to [REDACTED] rear drive and to Hillcrest running west from the south dumbbell of the junction.</p> <p>No other grade separated alternative designs were shown or discussed.</p>	<i>Plan 10</i>
12	Feb 2020	<p><i>Statutory Consultation brochure issued</i>²³.</p> <p>This brochure explains a number of changes from the Aug 2017 announced amended option 2 to reach the “revised option 2”, but not the moving of the location of the central junction. It shows the two new junctions at Wood Lane and Norwich Road as per the Junctions and Sideroads report of Feb 2020 (with no alternative options shown or described). Still no compounds or storage bunds are shown.</p>	
13	24 Feb 2020	<i>Statutory consultation begins, on the revised option 2.</i>	
14	1 April 2020	<p><i>Savills’ letter for Mr Meynell to HE</i>²⁴ responding to the statutory consultation.</p> <p>The letter confirms the Heritage designation of the Estate and that there had been no previous consultation on the now proposed junction at Wood Lane. It goes on to say that the Scheme has had a material change and that given that, its suitability should be reassessed. It also proposes that the junction be moved approx. 100m to the north to avoid impacting the Heritage Asset (being the whole Estate). There was no substantive reply from HE to Savills’ letter.</p>	
15	Summer 2020	HE carry out investigations on the Estate’s land ²⁵ .	

²³ A47 North Tuddenham to Easton, Public Consultation, Have Your Say, February 2020, available at highwaysengland.co.uk under “A47 North Tuddenham to Easton”, documents tab, Consultation 2020 documents

²⁴ Mr Meynell’s Statement, Appendix 8 (ACM 03.8) page 3 (ACM 03.8 /3)

²⁵ Mr Meynell’s Statement, Appendix 8 (ACM 03.8) page 5 to 35 (ACM 03.8 /5 to 35)

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
16	25 Nov 2020	<i>James Powis emails Mr Meynell asking for the opportunity to meet him to update him on the current status.</i>	
17	Early Dec 2020	<i>HE issue to public “Project Update Winter 2020”²⁶</i> The leaflet explains changes made from the first Wood Lane Junction design in Feb 2020 to reach the current proposed DCO design and shows for the first time the proposed works compounds, including two on the [REDACTED] land west of Berry’s Lane (as now proposed) but not the compound to the east of Berry’s Lane now required in addition.	<i>Plan 11</i>
18	9 Dec 2020	<i>James Powis sends plan to Mr Meynell/ Savills²⁷ to inform the meeting requested on 25 November- this plan is the same as already published and included in the Winter 2020 project update.</i> The plan shows the current DCO proposal for the Wood Lane Junction still in the same location but amended in some respects from the Feb 2020 revised option 2. The proposal now includes stopping up the estate’s north drive to the A47 without an alternative being provided and also removes the previous connection from Church Lane to Berry’s Lane. The proposal includes for the first time two construction compounds and one minerals storage / processing compound on the Berry Hall Estate land, taking together a significant proportion of the Estate’s arable land. Mr Powis apologises in his email for not sending this plan to Mr Meynell before the publication of the Winter 2020 Project update leaflet.	<i>Plan 12</i>
19	14 Dec 2020	<i>Meeting between James Powis, Mark (?) Galliford Try, Mr Meynell and Joshua Spink²⁸.</i> They spent one and a half hours looking at all relevant parts of the estate and discussing the impacts which the latest plans would have. The lack of prior consultation on the new proposal, in particular concerning the closure of the north drive, the addition of	

²⁶ Highways England website for the project, assets.highwaysengland.co.uk under the headings Documents / Newsletters

²⁷ Mr Meynell’s Statement, Appendix 8 (ACM 03.8), email at page 52 and the plan at 52A (ACM 03.8 /52 and 52A)

²⁸ Savills’ note of meeting with Mr Meynell’s Statement, at Appendix 8 (ACM 03.8), on page 55 (ACM 03.8 /55); See also Mr Meynell’s Statement

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
		<p>the compounds, their extent and the overall effect of the proposals on the Estate was emphasised by Mr Meynell and the existence of the Heritage designation repeated. During the meeting Mr Meynell suggests again that the problems for the estate could be resolved by moving the junction 100m north. Mr Powis replies that this would not be possible because the “red lines” were fixed and they could not move it outside them.</p> <p>Mr Powis brings a laptop to make notes of the meeting but the battery is flat. He has no paper or pen and so takes no contemporaneous notes²⁹.</p>	
20	4 Jan 2021	<p><i>Letter Savills for Mr Meynell to HE</i>³⁰ following the meeting, making the points made at the meeting, emphasising the additional impacts of the latest variation of the proposals and again reminding HE of the heritage status.</p> <p>No response was received.</p>	
21	15 Mar 2021	<p><i>Application letter sent to the Planning Inspectorate by HE with DCO application</i>³¹.</p>	<i>Plan 13</i>
22	March 2021	<p><i>The Statement of Reasons</i>³² in its Schedule of Representations and progress of negotiations (para 9.2 , Annex B (Version 1 -March 2021) at page 75 (pdf page 80/120) states in relation it is believed to Mr Meynell [name redacted] under Representation no. 4 (as category 1 owner/occupier of the plots commencing at (a) with 8/3c, (b) at 8/5a and (c) at 8/3f) .The full wording of the report is as follows:-</p> <p>“No formal agreement in place to date.</p> <p>“The Applicant consulted with [redacted] as part of the consultation held during 2020 and meetings were held throughout 2019 and 2020</p> <p>“A meeting was offered during January 2021 to discuss the scheme and the affected land parcels, further engagement will continue during 2021.</p>	

²⁹

³⁰ Mr Meynell’s Statement, Appendix 8 (ACM 03.8), at page 56 (ACM 03.8 /56)

³¹ APP-002

³² APP-021

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Plan in Annex A</i>
		<p>“[redacted] has raised concerns over the shelterbelt of trees advising that they <i>should be protected as they are historic and of national importance</i>³³. There were also concerns raised regarding the use of the land marked as a construction works area in the project winter update due to proximity to sensitive neighbours. [words in italics a misstatement – see footnote 33]</p> <p>“Highways England position: we will look to protect the trees as much as possible only removing what is necessary and will plan mitigation where severe impacts occur. We have removed all non-essential works from the construction works area to reduce any impact on receptors.2</p> <p>“18 Jan 2021. [redacted] sent Highways England the response to the recent Public Consultation on behalf of [redacted]”</p>	

³³ This statement in italics is incorrect . Mr Meynell had told Mr Powis again on 14 December 2020 (see item 19) of the Heritage designation of the Estate. Mr Meynell believes that the Applicant’s assertion in the Statement of Reasons that Mr Meynell had said that the northern trees were historic arises from Mr Powis’ misunderstanding of what Mr Meynell had said at the 14 December meeting, at which Mr Powis had taken no notes. Savills had repeated the correct designation in their letter of 4 January 2021 (item20).