

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
7.	<u>Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</u>	
7.0.14	NCC	Art 12(1): It includes wording 'the highway including any culverts or other structures laid under it must be maintained by and at the expense of the local highway authority from its completion with the exception of the culvert to be delivered as Work No. 5' – are NCC happy with this?
	NCC response:	The county council remains in discussion with the applicant regarding the transfer of assets – including new assets – to the county council following the works. We have asked that the applicant produce a schedule list of the physical parameters of new highways and the assets they contain, including structures or culverts it intends to construct under the highway; and similar for existing assets to be transferred on completion of the scheme. A discussion can then take place with the intention that Norfolk County Council, as local highways authority (LHA), adopt unless the LHA states in writing why a specific item should not be adopted. The county council is seeking existing assets to be brought up to a suitable standard and for a suitable commuted sum provided by the applicant in respect of future maintenance for both existing and new assets to be transferred before assets are transferred to the LHA.
13.	Population and Human Health	
13.0.4	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.11 are parties satisfied that the data is sufficient to enable the Applicant to state that they are representative of the average use?
	NCC Response:	The surveys do not take account of latent demand. The current A47 forms a barrier to north-south pedestrian and cycle movements: there are likely to be more potential users than shown by the survey if A47 crossing provision were available. One 14 week period of data collection is limited and does not take into account seasonal variation.
13.0.6	NCC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] are NCC satisfied that the proposed footpath closures and proposed diversions are justified and that the proposed alternative routes are acceptable? If not, why not?
	NCC Response:	Fp12: Closure is accepted as this is a cul-de-sac PRow. Fp7: A north/south crossing in the immediate vicinity of Fp7 would be supported. The diversion / alternative route to get to the same point replaces a rural off-carriageway recreation route with a significantly longer on-carriageway travel route. RB1: The route of the diversion is generally accepted although further conversation is needed to finalise details of facilities, width, appropriate surface treatments, and other details.
13.0.7	NCC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] paragraph 12.4.26, are NCC satisfied that the concerns raised by Norwich Cycle Campaign have been address through the proposed scheme? If not, why not?

Norfolk County Council

Identification No: *TR010038*

Registration identification number: 20028295

	NCC Response:	The county council has no comment to make whether the concerns raised by the Norwich Cycle Campaign have been addressed. This question should be directed to the cycle campaign.
13.0.11	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] Table 12.5 are the parties satisfied that this represents an accurate list of all receptors? If not, please explain why.
	NCC Response:	Yes
13.0.12	NCC, BC, SNC, BDC	ES Chapter 12: Population and human health [APP-051] Table 12.6 are the parties satisfied with the sensitivity levels attributed to each of the receptors? If not, please explain why.
	NCC Response:	Hockering Fp7: Disagree. The heading of the table is 'Sensitivity of WCH routes to changes in journey length'. The lack of a crossing being provided for the severance of Fp7 should therefore make this high sensitivity not medium as PROW users will have a significant detour to gain the same point.