

# TEXT\_ISH3\_Session4\_A47NorthTud\_0601202

## 2

00:10

Hello, welcome back, everybody, the time is now 350. And this issue specific hearing is resumed. Now I just like to move on to the next item on the environmental side of things, which is population and human health. And again, it's just some points of clarification that I am seeking with regards to matters that perhaps we sort of discussed before. And I just want to get an update on the first one relates to the planning application for new access to serve the food enterprise zone. And sort of understand where that application is at this stage if the applicant knows, or, or indeed, if the application applicant is involved in any discussions around that.

00:57

Good afternoon soft body offer on behalf of the applicant. We are continuing to engage with the representations of the food enterprise Park, and we have a meeting with them on site and two weeks to discuss a another element of the overall access issue around Mr. Austin's estate. With regard to the state of the planning application, I would defer to Mr. Paul Clark, if he's still on the call to give you an update. Thank you.

01:28

Thank you very much. Yes, Mr. Clark, if you're able to provide an update that be helpful.

01:37

Hello, Mr. Hunter, Paul Clark, representing the food enterprise Park. The we have submitted, as of yesterday, some amended plans which help to provide details on drainage. And we haven't been able to supply them to national highways, unfortunately, but I'm sure that they'll come to your applicants via broader District Council, I would have thought I'll be attending the meeting next week anyway, so I'll bring a copy of those plants along. If necessary. I can supply Barry with an email with the details if if that's suitable.

02:30

Okay, that's helpful. Thank you. That's useful update. Thanks very much. Mr. Johnson, as well. And so you've got your hand up and again, you'll be able to chat a little bit more light on where we are. Thank you.

02:43

Yes. Yeah. Charles Jetson Broughton District Council. And yes, just to really confirm what Mr. Clark has said amended plans was submitted yesterday. There'll be processed by our Business Support Team and will we we will read consult on those in the coming days. And that will hopefully progress matters.

03:03

That's great. Thank you that that's, that's helpful. I think that was all I was afterwards, just sort of an update on on where we are with those. Mr. Mr. Arthur.

03:11

Thanks, everybody, for on behalf of Africa, just to add so that we have reached a final position on applicants approach towards the access to the fairs and we will be submitting final statements of common ground for Breckland on South Norfolk at the deadline seven which will confirm that position so thank you.

03:31

Okay, thank you very much for that. Thank you. I don't have any further questions on under this topic. But has anybody else got anything that they want to raise at this point? No, I don't see any answer. That's great. Thank you for thank you for those that that's that that's helpful. Mr. Joslin.

03:57

I'm Jocelyn Popham, Pantaleon manual very hard to stay Thank you sir. On the population human health, I simply wants to flag that it does remain our view that holding 10 has been under assessed for the reasons given and in the way set out in our written representations which are at a P rep sorry, our EP one heightened 044 and in Mr metals witness statement at our EP 10045. We are in discussion of course as you know, so with with the applicant and be prospectively resolved the silage camp and reservoir issues only, but these only partially impact the agricultural enterprise which we have previously noted as being holistic in nature. And unless all the issues regarding that holistic agricultural enterprise can be resolved the viability See of the agricultural unit does remain threatened. And I mentioned this because it's directly contrary to the heritage management plan, the breach of which the appellant still has not accounted for in its in its proposals so far. I also mentioned in relation to the relation to the population, human health agricultural side that the I mentioned yesterday, the impact on the countryside stewardship scheme and the revenues from that and the implications on that. And that scheme has been renewed now for five years by Mr. Mandel. Not the one year which was recently mentioned by the applicant in in recent in recent submission, and I think that is a population human health matter. So I thought we should flag that up now that it's not yet resolved. Thank you, sir.

06:13

Thank you for that Mr. Joslin. Mr. Fries,

06:16

so yes, Michael fry for the applicant. Firstly, just to note that additional environmental information was submitted at deadline six application reference rep. 6019. And that, that updated ies chapter 12 which is ap 051 on population and human health to take counter some information that was erroneously excluded. The point Mr. Joslin has raised about the holistic nature of the variable estate will be addressed at a deadline seven so that isn't in the additional environmental information. And very briefly as to the countrysides steward scheme that is addressed in section four of the additional environmental information. One thing that I'm gonna have to take away and look at, sir, is that the, the renewal application for the CSS ought to have taken account of the fact that the scheme was currently under

examination, so I'm not sure what the position is there. But again, it's something that my team will discuss with Mr. Joslin, Mr. mandolin in due course, and we'll bottom that out. So other than that, what Mr. Johnson has said has been noted and will respond in due course in writing.

07:31

Thank you, Mr. Hawk. I can see you have your hand up.

07:37

Thank you, sir. Richard Hawker Winston Valley Alliance, and this is regarding footpaths and which I think is in this section. I made mention in the past of two aspects of stopping up points away, which I think are very detrimental to the whole area. Much has been made in the applicant's scheme, description of benefits of the new cycleways which are to go next to the new roads generally in the east west direction. But there are two north south routes which are to be blocked off. And that is from Sandy Lane Hawk room to Church Lane is Tottenham and gypsy lane to footpath the other side of the river Todd riveted crossing is would be effectively removed from people north of within hickory area. I don't believe I've had a complete answer as to why those have haven't been considered to be kept open. It's probably due to cost more than anything else. In one of the representations I made, I responded to the applicants statement, they've done surveys on these areas. And very, very few people were using those facilities. While of course the survey that was done was during the lockdown when unfortunately, not many people were using it using footfalls anyway. footpath number seven in Cochran was closed because it was one bridge was unsafe. And beyond all that, I just feel that we should be looking a bit further ahead. From what the current uses is towards the potential use and the health benefits of keeping routes like this open for use by cyclists and pedestrians. I'd be very pleased to have a response on that. Thank you very

10:06

Mr. otha

10:07

thank you sir by offer on behalf of the applicant, we have responded on several occasions to various comments along this line sauce or what I will propose to do is summarise those in a written response for ease of reference for yourself. The high level notes to this are that the the applicants proposals include approximately eight and a half kilometres of new and improved walking and cycling facilities, including the provision of for grade separated segregated crossing points along the length of the scheme. It should be noted that there are no grid separate facilities along the single carriage resection as it currently stands. So, this following information provided within the case for the scheme which is EPP 140 M have also responded at the examiners fostering questions as well, which was rep 2014. What I will note is that we have engaged through the process with Norfolk County Council, the public rates of the officers and the approach to the provision of walking cycling infrastructure has been agreed and approved from from that console T and the confirmation that that salt is included within the statement of common ground when Norfolk County Council which we have already submitted the deadline for just get the references rep for 003. And we're working towards a finalised stimulate common ground within pleasant way to submit before the end of the examination, but the walking cycling elements are already agreed and closed out. So.

11:44

Thank you very much for that. Mr. hawkers. I must apologise my neighbour decided this decide to start drilling. So I will keep tending my microphone off. And hopefully he will stop soon. Mr. Hawker if I could come to you.

11:56

Thank you, sir. I would I understand what Mr. Arthur has said regarding a statement of common ground and so forth. And he reiterates again, that all new footpaths to be created and and I accept that, of course. But there's nothing like well established, good looking foot paths that people are that they've been established over a long period of time. And in particular, as I mentioned earlier, virtually all the new footpaths that have been created on the east west direction. And there are none in the north south direction. In fact, as I mentioned, this particular route will be blocked completely. And that's a dis benefit to the the the walking and cycling public.

12:59

Thank you, Mr. Hawkman. Mr. Arthur, any final comments anything?

13:05

None other than to say we have no further comments, or we will confirm in writing the previous responses for you to take a review of Thank you.

13:13

Thank you for that Mr. Alpha. And Mr. Hawk, I see you still got your hand up again. I'm not sure that's a further point. Not Thank you. Are there any other further points on this population in human health element? Okay, again, I'm not seeing any, any hands or any anybody. So I will I will move on. So thank you for your input on that. And allow that just to move on to transport if I could. And again, it's some points of clarification that I will be really seeking to do to get here if I could. And there's only one real point which is in relation to the applicants response to third round questions, which is our EP 6018. And I think I have in this instance pre warned my team exactly which bit I'm looking for. So this won't come as a surprise to them. If they could, they could share that document please. And I'm looking for it's Appendix C of that document and is which is the response that was provided to West Western Longville parish council. And there we go. Thank you very much. And it's really just to help me understand some of the one set of numbers in there in particular, which is under the do nothing 2025 scenario. And it's the difference between location number four which is hunting and road Western green and Number 500 GM road near Western longfield because there's this sort of a 2000 jump in traffic numbers in there. And I was just wondering where those 2000 vehicles have come from none of the others exhibit in fact they're only the base exhibits a graph but none of them exhibit a graph anywhere near that much it was just really, really trying to understand where that that increases come from.

15:28

Thank you sir, by the offer on behalf of the applicant so I think I can answer that and if not, I'll defer to my my traffic modelling specialist but the do nothing 2025 numbers take account of the knowledge

distributor wrote which was not included in the base model so that's been included in the Do Nothing scenario.

15:48

Okay, so that explains because when I was sort of reading that press practice meet reading it wrong, but it's saying that location for they'll be 2300 vehicles, but location five, which just seems further up the road to be 4300 vehicles, but perhaps that's me resort correctly.

16:08

Sorry, so that's apologies for over speaking though. The knowledge distributor road, the MDR is the road that connects to the fakenham road north of Western Longville. So with the inclusion of that, after the base year 2015, the traffic numbers have increased which is why there are mitigations as a result of the traffic flows that are in western long Volta. So that that explains the jump from the basic 2015 to the 2025 Do nothing scenario. Okay, I'd also allow for background growth and such like as well.

16:42

Okay, that that, that explains that okay, that's, that's helpful. Thank you for that. And okay, that that deals with that so that we can stop sharing the screen. Thank you very much for that. Appreciate that. The other question I had on Rafiq was actually the question that was raised earlier by Mr. Joslin with regards to cycle traffic through the cycle access through the wood Lane junction. And Mr. Joslin I'm not sure whether I've summarised your question correctly, or whether you just want to phrase it perhaps better than than the notes that I have written down in front of me.

17:25

George Joslin, on behalf of Mr. Mandel of the very Hall estate. Thank you, sir. Yes, the question now was that work 26 A, comprise the taking of a cycle path run which which runs in the no NWSL situation run the northern side of the North dumbbell. And it leads from the eastern end leads from the north side of the new hall farm underpass, Westwood's run the North dumbbell to join wood lane and then follows a cycle path Westwoods along the north side of the new link road which goes from wood lane to Sandy lane. And that that is the way in which the applicant has provided a dedicated cycle network running east west. And of course, the cycle path across the berry whole estate between deer and road and berries lane is that is the bottom end of that if you're travelling from from the southern side. And, as I understand it, that this if n WL is constructed, there's there was an issue between Norfolk County Council and N WL and the and the applicant about the provision of a bridge across the very southern extremity of N WL to carry that cycle path across the end WL. And, as I understand it with with that work now being omitted, it seems uncertain as to how the cycles will reach from the from the from the eastern side of the North dumbbell going westwards how they will get to the cycle path at Sandy lane without actually having to go back to whole farm underpass and negotiate the junction itself, which was one of the points that we were trying all trying to avoid cycles having to negotiate the junction. So the question was, how does the cycles get east west, absent being able to get round the north side of the of the dumbbell.

19:52

Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Cheslin. For embellishing the points that I was trying to make. Thank you for that. Mr. Arthur,

20:02

thank you so much for on behalf of the applicant, I think there's a slight misunderstanding and misconception here saw around what that section of cycle trackers is looking to achieve. It was never a permanent feature and it was never a bridge. It was an accurate link on the premise that the end who was significantly delayed or is not consented to provide an additional connection. It's not required as part of the applicants assessment for the walking cycling strategy. The the applicants response and position on this has been agreed to Norfolk County Council and forms part of the statement of common ground in regards to that. So, the the N double yil has are a wider strategy that Norfolk County Council are also looking at in terms of the walking cycling connectivity around the area, the applicant has engaged through the whole process to ensure that the works we are providing also fit into that way the plan that the council has in mind the intent there the end of the year was to provide a crossing follow up the the link road around the connection with a Broadway which will then connect them to RB one. Now RB one is the route that the applicant is required to maintain connection of art we have done so in the design. So the permissive route that was shown across the stub is very much that side of the end that was consented then goes ahead as planned and the timeline then it would not be delivered. Just to follow implement that obviously I touched on earlier that there are currently no segregated crossing routes of the 47 an applicant scheme does provide for crossing routes, which provides that north south connectivity linking into the existing east and west connection points along the Route corridor. And the the approach that the applicant has taken has been reviewed and consulted on with the probably sorry, public eraser we officers in Norfolk and that position has been agreed so as our as our provision for that of that service, so I can get my word so it's been a long Thank you.

22:05

Thank you, Mr. Arthur. Mr. Joslin, does does that help me some information

22:11

very date. Thank you, sir. Um, I think the crossing Mr. Arthur refers to is about a kilometre north of the of the woodland junction. So that probably means a round trip of approximately two, two and a half kilometres. To get east west if you were wanting to cycle east west along the 847. And I think that's the case and Mr. artha will correct me if I'm wrong there. However, one of the main points of the book of the of the alternatives which had been put forward on behalf of Mr. Mandel was to allow the cycles to travel east west along the existing a 47 without having to travel around the junction at all. And the applicant has responded to that in the most recent appraisal of the alternatives. By criticising the alternative saying that people will not follow the cycle path through the ladies Grove underpass, or if that's not built, will not follow it through to the sandy lanes cycle path, and will therefore have to negotiate the junction. However, what Mr. Arthur appears to have said now is that the applicants actual proposal would send the tribe would send the cyclists on a far longer diversion than anything that we have proposed. And the result of that would be that cyclists will actually end up negotiating the wood Lane junction to go east west. And if the traffic from the end WL is as heavy as it is supposed, it seems to us on behalf of the very holder state, that proposal is being made by the applicant, which will result in extremely unsafe cycle movements, integrating with traffic around the junction for the future, and that

cannot be the preferred result for local authorities who are promoting cycling as as a better means of transport. And I wanted to make that point in relation to this particular cycle route as as it's such a critical point for people going east west and I don't think that the barriers cycle cycle organisations have really cottoned on to that. And and Norfolk County Council have not proposed any any better alternatives. So I think it's something that needs to be borne in mind unless a very good solution can be found by the applicant with its current proposal. Thank you, sir.

25:18

Thank you, Mr. Arthur. Is your to come back on on that.

25:22

Thank you. So by offer on behalf of the applicant? Yeah, there's there's a couple of points. So first of all, I would struggle to agree that there's a large volume of cyclists travel east west along the single carriageway 47 At this point in time, I think we've all been down there and see no extremely busy and then dangerous it can be. Cyclists are predominantly on the local road network, and that's what the applicants proposals will maintain. The the applicants proposals will include signage, which will direct the cyclists, users, walkers, runners, etc, to the relevant routes. Just to touch on the alternatives. Norfolk County Council have reviewed the alternatives provided by the landowner in question. And they provided a response at deadline sex which is RTP six, dash zero to three. And not the statement at the end is as a result, the county council can confirm that it supports that applicants proposal for this junction. Now that statement aligns with the support provided by the three district councils who found the local planning authorities in the area, and the statements contained within their statements of common ground supporting the proposals and the positioning and the importance of the wheedling junction. So that's all I'd like to come back on anything else will be in writing. So thank you.

26:48

Thank you very much, sir. Mr. Arthur. So in terms of transporting traffic, I don't have any further questions myself. But are there any more comments from interested parties at this stage? Mr. Hawker.

27:18

Thank you. So Richard Hawker Winston Valley Alliance. In I put a submission deadline six sets our deadline five, which has been replied to by the applicant in some length. effectively saying that that already answered my questions. And basically the the the nub of my main question is regarding traffic modelling and my understanding of how it works, how it is intended to work. The reason for this, of course, is that this is a transport scheme. And it seems to me that getting an understanding of transport, the transport modelling, and believing units results are pretty crucial. I asked right, many, many months, six months ago, probably years ago, how traffic modelling was to work. And we have had a meeting with experts, which which was mentioned in the applicants response. I required a further meeting requested a further meeting which has been denied, which I hopefully would have answered a lot of these questions. And now, the applicants response most recently, I'm afraid really doesn't help. And it's referred me to the fact that all the modelling has been done. And it conforms to the tag guidelines, the transport appraisal guidelines from the government. Well, that may satisfy some people. But I mean, I'm alignment on this, as I think many people are, who inhabit the villages who are going to be affected by a change in trance in traffic. I mean, I liken it to go to your doctor within an ingrown

toenail. And the doctor saying, Well, I think the the answer really is to have your leg amputated. And then what would you do you get Would you go along with that? No, you'd want to a little bit more advice, even if the doctor took a second opinion, which was the same for such a major operation. You'd want to have chapter and verse solid, what are the options? How is how is it always all being decided? is the same with this traffic modelling. The words calibration and validation had been mentioned many times. I've asked what what they mean. And I don't think I've had a clear response. I have now spent some time reading the parts of the tag, which have been referred to, namely, M 3.1, which is only a very small part of that tag document. I know. And it seems quite clear that that validation is the comparison between what is predicted to be traffic counts, particularly traffic counts, also journey times, but traffic counts are what we've dealt with mainly, and actual values, recorded, measured. Calibration, which is often spoken in the same breath, as validation is effectively tweaking the model, the computer model that's been used, so that the difference between the predicted and the actual, it is within acceptably low limits. Now, I don't know why that couldn't have been explained to me, you know, many months ago. But I'm quite clear that that is the case. So validation comes first. And I've been told many times that this this traffic modelling for the both the 847 and the N WL has been validated to a high level and calibrated to a lie level. I don't know how that how high that is. It's never been explained to me. But what has been quite clear, came out of the first meeting we had was that the validation limits in other words, the difference between what's predicted and what's the actual measurements on the ground must be within certain limits. And I was quoted the Jeffrey havia statistic. Now, two things here, really, first of all, in my submission on

32:18

deadline five, in my appendix I list the the predictions that were made materially not by highways England, that prediction were made by what I understand to be a similar traffic modelling computer system for the MDR. And subsequently, the actual figures of traffic counts that that were recorded when the MDR was up and running. And the difference is, in most cases are very, very large. Now, there's been no comment from highways England, or, for that matter, Norfolk County Council regarding that, but I think that is due. Now, that was quite clear, there was a prediction, and there was actual measurements after the event. And so validation can be assessed. What I'm unclear about is when the highways England talks about a base model in 2015, and how it's been validated. Now, that isn't, to me indicates there's a prediction, and there's an actual result. What is the prediction? And what results were actually recorded to make the statement that the validation is very good? I am not at all clear how that's been done. In other words, what is what information is put into the traffic modelling computer? And what information is fed out? To and to compare with what? I don't know if that's something that I could have an answer on, but I think I'm not the only person who might be interested in in knowing how this all works. And exactly what this high level of calibration and validation is. I noticed also that according to tag, there will be a local model validation report, which may include this sort of information. And if there is one for this scheme, it will be very nice to have a reference to that if I could, please. Thank you, sir. But I have I do have some more specific information on real numbers that I'd like I like to ask further questions on if I may. Thank you. Mr. Prime,

35:04

so local five, the applicant is going to be familiar to you, sir from this morning. My comment would be that it's for the examining authorities to examine this application in accordance with the NNPS. And the



statutory duty under the Planning Act 2082. Mr. Hawker has evidence that the traffic modelling is incorrect or should be done in a different way, then he should bring that forward and the applicant will come into it. The difficulty here is we are trying, he's trying to hold us to an impossible standard to meet which is gold plating the tests in the relevant documents against which this application must be assessed. So it's largely irrelevant to go on if I may put it with the greatest respect a fishing expedition in respect of further data and further transport assessment. For the benefit of Mr. Hawker the impacts on transport networks is dealt with at paragraph 5.201. And onwards in the NN. NPS that sets out the tests on which the applicant must assess transport. The other thing to draw examinations attention is of course, that the traffic model has been validated and agreed with the local highway authority. And that's all confirmed in the statements of common ground. So the the assertion that the applicant needs to do more, in my respectful submission, it is just not borne out by the actual position in the law that the applicants meant to do. And I've got nothing really further to add sir, apart from these issues have been canvassed at length over the course of examination and the applicants have responded in writing on repeated occasions. We of course, listened to what has been said today and we will respond in writing further but I imagine that those responses will simply be references to answers that have already been given.

37:00

Thank you for that Miss Mr. Frey. Mr. presented as you wish to add, having having I am sort of conscious that I have the information is with me. So it's really here, it's in front of the examination. And the applicant will will review that and provide comments as they as they see fit and wherever they sort of have too much or sort of further, lengthy discussion. But I know there's a couple of other points that you wanted to to highlight here.

37:34

Yes, thank you, sir. Richard Hawker. From Sun Valley Alliance. I'm extremely disappointed that the applicant considers they've answered my questions already, because I think what I've said just a moment ago, makes it clear that the information I needed I asked for was not provided. And really is, as I've mentioned, it is this is an examination in public and I think it those people like myself, laymen, not experts, but people who will have to live with the results of this very expensive scheme really have a right to be able to question the basis on which the calculations have been done. And we shouldn't have to just take it that the experts have got together whether they're Norfolk County Council and highways England and say it's alright mate, it'll be fine. It's all done according to the agreed standard. Well, I think it's reasonable for me and anyone else to ask for proof of that. And I thought that's what this local validation report might provide. But But let me move on to a particular worry for local residents and that is across valley the increase in in traffic as a result of this scheme and the fact that Church Lane in Lower East and is closed and that the the without a doubt there will be increasing traffic going through table road to join what is called the Norwich road junction on the A 47. And it just seems to me they've been very very many different statements of exactly what the predicted levels will be levels of traffic will be. I have in front of me. Alexei if that console submission Vyas h2, which indicates a base a dt. And again, I don't know whether that is a theoretical A statement from the output of the computer, or whether it's actual measurements on the ground, but it says in Tavian, rode 600 600 vehicles a day. Now, how is it referred me? And thank you very much in their last submission? In answer to a question, they referred me to an email from them in early June. In fact, I have already got that. And in fact, I have

in front of me a, a complete database, or spreadsheet, I should say, from James Paris, of highways England, and it lists peak hour flow into peak hour flow PM, peak out flow for various roads, and one of which is table road. And when we're talking about adding the southbound and northbound values, I get a total of 157 vehicles. Now, whether that doesn't include outside the peak hours, in other words, at nighttime, I'm not sure, but I don't believe it could ever reach 600, from including nighttime vehicles. So 150 657 from one sheet based data I've got from 2015. And yet, on another scenario, have a DT summary. As I've mentioned, it's 600. And that's just two figures. I know there have been other figures elsewhere that have been brought out, I don't understand how that can give us confidence that this traffic modelling system is going to give us the right answers. Believable answers.

41:54

Thank you. Okay, thank you. Mr. Work, I think I think the one thing I would say is, is that it's an issue that I'm aware that you've raised, it's an issue that I will have to deal with in terms of sort of how I make my recommendation to the Secretary of State in terms of if there are other points that you've raised that we'll need to sort of deal with and address. So yes, and I understand that

42:21

Misurata thank you so body offer on behalf of the applicant. I find that somewhat disingenuous so that Mr. Hawker reveals himself as a layman when it comes to traffic modelling given the volume of meetings we have had with him, which have been combined with the NWSL in his previous role as a counsellor of hocking parish, the clearly a distinction between em peak and PMP, which records the short durations and the the peak and the short durations and the pm peak, and then a definition between what is EDT, which is your average annual daily traffic. The figures for a given route have been discussed on several occasions and have been the subject of many discussions at the local user group which is the combined multi partnership local using group that is formed between the applicant and the promoters of the knowledge Western link scheme. So, we have provided the figures for the existing traffic on the local network and we provided them for the Do Nothing scenario in the 2025. And then looking at the DO SOMETHING scenarios and the scenarios where we have mitigation in place such as the closure of cooling on when in the temporary situation until the opening of then that will that was provided. Off the back off is each two hearings and again was provided as Appendix C to the examiner's foot written questions that modelling has been undertaken by the applicant. All modelling that we undertake is reviewed independently by the transport planning group which is are part of the safety engineering and standards group within highways England. Now that group sits independently and is responsible for the governance around everything that we deliver to ensure that we are delivering in accordance with the relevant standards, guidance and best practice. It has also been assessed and modelled by the knowledge Western LinkedIn which is again another independent team and also reviewed and assessed by Norfolk County Council's traffic modelling team. So it has been through a thorough governance review process in terms of the robustness of the calculation. So I don't believe we have anything fall off the earth on it. We have provided all the information to the examiner. And obviously we we have provided the support of Norfolk County Council to our traffic modelling and that they have reviewed it and our content that aligns with the required their governance. Hopefully that actually the onset of a fun song. Thank you

44:55

Thank you, Mr. Arthur, for those for drawing attention to those mr. anything final that you wish to say on this?

45:06

Yes, if I may, Richard Hawker once in Valley airlines, I don't expect I get an answer to this now. On past performance, maybe I never will. But my question about table road being having a figure of 600 vehicles allotted to it, and yet a total of 157 in a different document. I just don't understand how that can happen. And my question remains, the figures that were given, it is not clear whether those are predicted figures for for 2015, based on some computer input ons, or all the acronyms that I've been given the mobile phone information as ser TM, and so forth, which gives an output of traffic counts, or whether they are actually counts on the road. There's so many questions and answer them afraid. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Thank you,

46:17

Mister. Thank you. So I've had a bite off on behalf of applicant. So just to point out that the approach taken to traffic modelling is contained within section four of the case for the scheme, which is EPP 140. The applicant has no follow up comments, Dad. Thank you. So

46:38

thank you, Mr. Arthur. Mr. Carroll, I'm quite conscious of the timing and things moving on. Is there anything else further that you wish to bring to my attention on this matter? Again, like I say, I have, have seen both your submissions five, and six and numerous other ones. So please be sure that I have seen and read and understood the points and comments that you have made and the issues that you've raised to me now. But if there's anything else,

47:08

thank you very much. I appreciate your comment that you've taken on board. The difficulties I've had over this and still inconsistencies. I'll feel the need to be resolved. Thank you very much.

47:24

Thank you, Mr. Hawk. Good. Thank you. And finally, just before I move off, this is are there any other sort of final last comments with regards to traffic issues? Okay, I'm not seeing any hands or or anything like that. So thank you very much for that. So that brings to the end item five. Mr. Joslin, you just popped up on my screen

47:53

of Jocelyn on behalf of actually Middlebury Hall estate is so Sorry, I keep pressing the little hand I'm not sure if it flashes up but your end on on the traffic, I wish to say a couple of points so that you're aware, firstly, that we will be intending to respond in writing to the updated applicants updated response to alternatives and to the traffic part of the response to execute three, which I think was 14 point 3.1 on traffic aspects and also to the NCC responds to the alternatives. I'd say in relation to the NCC response, they have mentioned that they were under the impression that we will be submitting some more revised alternatives to which they would then respond. And on that basis, they have not really responded to the existing ones. And I have pointed out to them that we filed a paper with the technical

view on on the initial response to alternatives after the last hearings or stage two, and we have never stated to anybody that we will be filing any revised alternatives. So I think one thing I would just say to the benefit of Mr. Coming and his clients is that no we're not and we never did intend to reply to submit some more alternative students. So as far as NCC are concerned, they should be providing a technical response to the existing ones, which they have not really done in their current response. And a couple of other things I suppose, really inside we do share, Mr hawkers frustration. With the traffic modelling which has been carried out and that has been echoed by our experts on it, the inconsistency between the end WL and the A 47 figures which are the figures of course, which have driven the applicants to design the dumbbells in the in the woodland roundabout to the to the very enormous size which they now have been designed in which is which is which is extremely apparent from the sections which we have just received to see exactly how large the dumbbell is compared with the size of the container Laurie has been put on on the pictures. And I think one just wants to mention that there and in the course of responding the other point is that it is in relation to the size of the roundabout the and I should have mentioned this earlier perhaps under the population human health but I apologise I didn't the impact which that size roundabout will have on your state from headlights swinging round it as they will from east to west. And without it seems much or any restriction for quite a lot of the swing and the impact that will have not only on human receptors but on the wildlife etc within the remaining estate. And I think that needs to be that needs to be catered for. Both in considering the alternatives, which will bring the roundabout further north and into the cutting which it says it's meant to be in and also without prejudice without in relation to any mitigating measures that need to be thought about in relation to the existing one or any revision of that which might come up in discussion with the applicant in our future discussions.

52:14

Thank you, sir. Thank you Mr. Joslin. Mr. Author, is there anything that the applicant just wishes to add in response to any of that? All right. All right. Move on to the next item.

52:31

Thank you. Sorry, no, sir, please feel free to move on. Africanus no further comments.

52:36

Thank you very much. Okay, thank you for that. That takes us on to item six, which is statements of common ground and bag of goods. The applicant really just first sort of an update on these now I understand I think. Mr. Frey, thank you.

53:01

So yes, Michael fry for the applicant. I will just give you a brief update, sir, on each the status of each of the statements common ground. And again, this will be provided in writing with the relevant document reference numbers for you, sir. Historic England document reference rep. 1009. That's final in submitted sir. The Environment Agency, the last version provided was rep 4002. That's ongoing, but there are no concerns that we're aware of. So that should be completed shortly. Similarly, Norfolk County Council rep 4003 last version, ongoing again, no concerns Breckland District Council rep. 4004 And that's the final version that's been submitted to the examination. broadland District Council has now been completed the final version should be submitted to the examination deadlines seven.

Similarly, South Norfolk District Council is final and should be submitted deadline seven. There is a draft seven common Grant Still with Natural England. So that is ongoing. But similarly there are no current concerns. The Euro from yesterday's hearing, sir, the standard common ground with variable estate and Mr. Metal is in draft. We hope it will be submitted deadline seven and I know Mr. Joslin has said he will get his response to the draft to us as soon as possible. This may be a good place or also just to draw to your attention that I have had discussions with Miss Clutton Who can't attend today. As you will be well aware as well aware that there are still in principle objections from Mr. Metal to the scheme. I have agreed with Miss Clinton that she will put in submissions in due course to the examination, and the applicant will respond to those submissions before the close of the examination. And what I will do is seek to create a timetable with Miss Cotton in due course, just so everyone has enough time to make those, I would hope very short submissions on the points we just aren't ever going to reach agreement on. Thank you. And then the only other similar Common Ground is, as you heard this morning, sir, is there's a draft Semonkong grant with Ofsted. And the cooperation agreement is quite advanced. And you'll be updated on that, sir, in due course. And the last statement of commonality that was submitted to that application to the examination was rep 6011. And that is obviously still ongoing, sir. And so far as I'm aware, those are all the same. It's common ground that you should expect.

55:56

That's great. But that's helpful. Thank you very much. Does anybody want to make any comments on any of those Miss regard? I appreciate you've been waiting almost all day to get us points. So yes, thank you for your patience.

56:15

Wow, thank you very much. It has been a long day. The the issue I want to comment on is the common ground statement between Norfolk County Council. And what I'm going to call highways England, because that's how it's referred to in the document. And it's the section which deals with the delay to the Western link, and Western Longville. We are following our meeting with highways England and the county council in October. There was a minute of the meeting. And we were expecting that there will be a chance for us to comment on the statement of common ground before it was submitted. But we didn't actually see that. So what I want to raise now are our issues in relation to that statement. And the first one in relation to Norfolk County Council. What we would like to see is Western longer actually acknowledged as a significant player in this respect. And we would like to see the submission under Norfolk County Council which currently implies that the agreement as to what might happen in terms of mitigation is between if the Western link is delayed, it's between Norfolk County Council and highways England and we would like to see the text amended to read Norfolk County Council has been working with highways England to identify appropriate arrangements for local communities. I in particular, in particular Western longer should the delivery of the Western link be delayed. And we would like to add here or not go ahead. Norfolk County Council would welcome the opportunity to settle the approach to agreement with highways England and Western long will parish council and to commit to a mutually acceptable solution. I think given the approach to Earth highways England to other interested parties, this would it would seem a reasonable expectation that we would be much more closely involved not just as a continuity. So the change would recognise the possibility that the Western link might fail to be delivered. And the Western Paris counter is a key stakeholder in this decision making process. My

second comment relates to highways in the highways England submission. And what we're looking for in the DCO is a wording which acknowledges the seriousness of the consequences for the parish if the Western link is delayed or doesn't go ahead. And yet da 47, is jewelled. And it's not easy at this point in time to predict what might cause a delay of a few months or derail the Western link project completely. However, the current political and economic situation is sufficiently volatile we feel to make this a real risk and to undermine a cheesy assumption that the Western link is ours England rights have a proportionate response in relation to mitigation measures. But the question of what would be proportionate as a response to a few months delay is quite Different from the measures that will be required to mitigate the consequence of years of delay. If they're not, if Norfolk County Council has to go back to the drawing board and find another two, to establish an alternative.

1:00:20

So, it seems to me that the highlighting and responsibility remains the same, whether the Western link is delayed or doesn't happen at all. Because the impact on Western will be the direct result of the side road choices that highways England has made. So highways England made the choices, and we have to live with the consequences. And it's worth remembering that getting it right now matters because as other local speakers have said, we will be left living with the consequences of these decisions long after SWACO and highways England and everybody else has kind of moved on to their next project. And you know, we just become a line in somebodies curriculum Vita. So the current approach, which seems often of a case of acting, putting forward a proposal, delivering it, and monitoring it, and then if it doesn't work, trying something else is along the lines. If it doesn't work, let's see what else we can try. And my years in a parish, as a parish councillor, suggests that often what this means is that the can gets kicked down the road. And this can happen over very long periods of time. And that is our worry that we're at the moment we do not have sufficient safeguards. Especially I think we're concerned because it isn't, doesn't involve just one authority, but to. And so the whole question of who would pay and how work would be divided up is something which, as far as I'm aware, hasn't been yet resolved. And so for this reason, what the parish council is looking for, is in the statement of common ground is an outcome, which is capable of being measured, and contains a commitment from the highways England to fund the necessary measures to ensure that at no time, traffic through the parish will increase by more than 10%. Over the 2022 baseline level figures is the word Western link is delayed, or not delivered. So we're looking for a measurable outcome, not a kind of proportionate response. And this thing, this statement is in line with the agreement reached at the meeting between highways England, the county council and Western, and at the meeting in October 2021. The minutes of the meeting include a timetable for action, if the initial mitigation measures prove inaccurate or inadequate. But we think that this the statement of common ground should also include a deadline by which the further measures should be completed. But it would really work best if we could get the if we could get it right now, and not have to spend a very prolonged period of time working with monitoring, assessment going back, etc, etc. Because one knows just how many years that can involve we would also request that the highways England position been amended to read implementation only in the scenario of a delayed or non delivery of the Western link. And this is a change which to ensure that both possible scenarios are covered. So essentially, what we're looking for is a stronger safeguard with more detail about what the commitment is, and the words we've chosen may not be the best words and they could be improved. But essentially, that's what we're after. We want to focus on outcomes, and we want an enforceable

timetable. And we're more than happy to talk to the county council and highways England about the wording in the statement of common ground that would achieve this. Thank you very much.

1:04:42

Thank you for your submissions. Again, thank you very much for hanging around tilde to the end of the day to make those really appreciate us. Mr. Arthur,

1:04:51

thank you very much starts by the offer on behalf of the applicant. Foster like to dispute some of the comments made by roof journal so many there. I was pleasant Are they meeting with Western law Council along with David all three from Norfolk County Council whose IT infrastructure Delivery Manager, it was clearly communicated at that meeting that there will be no requirement inserted into the DCO in this manner, and it will be addressed with a statement of common ground, which I confirmed sort of the last issue specific hearings. If you recall, that the second part of the the my response will be the fact that the statement of common ground there's an agreement between Norfolk County Council and highways England the applicant is not for a parish council to instruct how the one thing should be between those two parties. If you recall back to the issue specific hitting two, I explained at the time that Norfolk County Council had no standing requirement from the NDR DCO because the traffic levels should Western Longbow had been breached in terms of the agreement of that DCO which is why you will see in the one thing from highways England in the statement of common ground towards the end, and it's documents. So just for your reference is RDP, four dash 003. And it's under response and WL five. In paragraph two of that towards the end, you will see that the scheme of traffic mitigation measures for Western longboat will be instructed by NCC to be delivered that as applicants agreed position with Norfolk County Council as a local highway authority. So that's all I'd like to add on that. Thank you.

1:06:28

So I just checked that reference they gave me where there's no Wi Fi. Sorry, is that correct?

1:06:35

Yes. So in Wi Fi, delete the NWA delivery on Western Longville. And it's paragraph two of the applicants response towards the end section of that night as the agreement that is in place between ourselves and Norfolk County Council. The funding part of that will be part of the overall part of discussion. So between the when you consider every element between the applicant and the local authority.

1:07:04

Thank you for that. Thanks for that clarification. Ruth got all.

1:07:14

That's really disappointing, actually. Because I think what it doesn't answer is the question of How To what extent the wording, as it currently stands, is a sufficient safeguard against the kinds of problems that we've that I've outlined. And I would, it seems to me that the the wording that was achieved with Nautica, Norfolk County Council, following the NDR was actually much more specific than what is being

worse than what has been offered in this statement of common ground. So where, where is it going to be? Where will we see the detail of what will happen? And how it will happen? So it is disappointing, because at the moment, it just it seems not really to be taking account of what are substantial concerns or not, unrealistic concerns.

1:08:27

Thank you, Mr. Arthur.

1:08:29

Thank you. So by therefore, on behalf of the applicant, I like to draw your attention to the first paragraph of the the highways England position. That has been agreed the applicant will continue to support and work collaboratively with Norfolk County Council, and Western Longo parish council on the development of a proportionate scheme of mitigation works for the scenario whereby the a 47, improvements are completed on the end that we always delayed. We have always stated our position, which was clearly communicated at the meeting with Western one will punish council that we will continue to engage and support until such point as the baseline traffic salaries have been undertaken. And we can work through our proportionate scheme of mitigation. It is not feasible to provide a level of detail around that and that was what was agreed at that meeting. And that was communicated and agreed in the set of minutes, that there will be future meetings going forward. There's a working arrangement that will define what that schema mitigation watch would be, and would be agreed between the parties. And then it becomes a discussion between Norfolk County Council on highways England between the funding arrangement of that, but that's always a private between the two parties. But that's certainly what was agreed. I know David coming from Norfolk County Council was on the call as well, I believe we'll be able to confirm that position.

1:09:47

Thank you, Mr. Othman. Mr. Cohen.

1:09:50

Yes, it's David. For Norfolk County Council. I wasn't present at those meetings as Mr. I've said that that was my question. Big David all three. I think on this one, what I would have to do is to take that away the points away that have been made by all parties and respond in writing at the next deadline if that's okay, sir.

1:10:17

Yes, that's fine. If that if that's preferred that than making a response. Now, that may not be quite correct, or whatever. I think, as I carry out it at the start, I think that would be my preference. So yeah, that that's fine. Ruth girl,

1:10:34

only finally to say that, you know, I think I'm relying on on you as the examining inspector to judge whether the safeguards are sufficient. And to comment accordingly.

1:10:50



That's fine, I think I to reiterate the points that I made to Mr. Curry to yourself, the SFC and everything that's been submitted. I've read everything that's submitted. And I will read everything that comes in following today. So yes, I can assure you that I see everything. And that's, that's the way it will, it will it will go forward. So yeah, that's fine. Thank you. And then anybody else got any further? comments? Mr. Fry?

1:11:19

So yes, microphone fry for the applicant. one brief comment on the discussion you've just had. So and then one, one amendment what I've had said before, the first is obviously the purpose of the statement of common ground is to assist you, sir, in establishing what the issues are your examination and where agreement has or has not been reached. And that's the overall purpose of those documents. I think it's important that is set out to the examination. The second point was I'm afraid I missed one statement, common ground in my earlier summary. So as you were told earlier, there is going to be a statement common ground with Anglian Water, which is largely agreed. But there are a few points still at issue, which we referred to earlier, which was we're seeking to resolve.

1:12:03

Thank you, Mr. Pratt, for that clarification. Thank you. I'll add that to my list. And we've got I see your hands up. No, that's fine. That's okay. Thank you for that. Okay. Well, that brings to the end item six. Thank you for all your comments on that. And moving on to item seven review of issues and actions. I've caught a number of points an action sort of the that are written in terms of sort of responses to myself. And just as sort of very, very quickly sort of run through these response with regards to barn owls from the biodiversity discussion and a response with regards to the noise side of things with regards to the construction compounds and then response with regards to the countryside stewardship scheme and just reviewing the information that was submitted in the last deadline in the rather than as chapter and updating the the process of dating is the wrong word. But the looking again at the sections just provide some additional information on those perfect clarity and then also provision of a number of written responses with regards to matters on climate change and matters of cultural heritage. So then the main ones that I recorded Mr. Frey, I suspect there may be those that you may have captured as well, but you're sort of passed around your team as well.

1:13:28

Mike, of course, those are all noted and we of course taken a note and we will respond in writing do courser

1:13:35

That's great. Thank you. moves me on to Item eight, which is any other matters. Is there anything else anybody wishes to raise before I move on to the close of the hearing? Mr. Joslin?

1:13:58

George, just send on behalf of Mr. Mandel. Mr. Mental has one small one short thing he would like to say before we close, which didn't really fall into any of the particular agenda matters earlier. So if I could swing the camera around to him, made me he may he said no. Thank you.

1:14:20

Thank you, sir. Thank you for allowing me to microphone controversial. My only one of the day. Yes, Anthony mantle owner of the barre Hall of state. So having heard all the things that have been said today, particularly about bat, and also I have great sympathy with what Richard Hawker and Ruth Goodall said. It does seem to me that the prospects of the NWSL being permitted to go ahead on its currently planned route are diminishing. While so I know you will make up your own mind what to recommend to the Secretary of State. I cannot help wondering. It might not be sensible. to delay this whole section of the A 47 duelling until such time as the precise root of the end WL, if it goes ahead is determined. Otherwise, we could end up with an enormous, costly, very environmentally destructive junction and wood lane, when something very much smaller might have suffice. And I would also add to that, that the applicants response to your question about maintaining the size of the proposed junction, even if the end WL was not delivered, were in the views of a layman like me, very weak indeed.

1:15:46

Thank you for that. Does anybody else got any final comments? Mr. Fry?

1:15:54

like fried napkin. So just to acknowledge Mr. Metals comments, and of course, they will be taken away and considered in due course and will respond in writing in the summaries of the hearings.

1:16:05

Thank you, Mr. Frey. I'm not seeing any further hands up or anything like that. So I'll assume that there is enough further issues, anybody wants to raise that and that just takes me on to the close of the hearing. So thank you very much for your participation in this hearing today. And it's been extremely helpful and useful to me thank you appreciate it's been a bit a long day. And as I mentioned at the start, a digital recording of today's proceedings will be available on the project website and national infrastructure website as soon as possible. And in addition, if you could submit in writing the points that you made today for publication on the website with a deadline for those being deadlines seven, which is Monday, the 17th of January. The time is now seven minutes past five again, thank you for staying with the process for the whole day. And I declare this third issue specific hearing for the first pay 47 subtenant to Eastern project is now closed. Again. Thank you very much and good evening.

1:17:06

Thanks so GOOD EVENING.