

DEADLINE 8 SUBMISSION – JONATHAN RUSH OF BROWN & CO – AGENT FOR MR JAMES ALSTON
(the ‘respondent’)
SUMMARY OF POSITION WITH NATIONAL HIGHWAYS AND UPDATE ON DEADLINE 7 SUBMISSIONS
RR - 059

<p>Background Information</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. James Alston is the chosen respondent as he holds shareholder, director and partnership roles within the collective business owned by the Alston family, headed by Ian Alston. These include, and are not limited to, Alston Farms Ltd, Honingham Farms Ltd, William Young (Dereham) Ltd, Ebony Holdings Ltd, Food Enterprise Park Ltd and Honingham Thorpe Farms (partnership). 2. We refer parties to Background Information contained within the Deadline 4 Submission.
<p>Discussions to Date</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The respondent has made multiple detailed submissions on the matter of how the closure, temporary or permanent, of Honingham Lane will disrupt the effective management of their business and cause significant disruption to the local highways network and residents. 2. The respondent has made multiple detailed submissions on the matter of how the permanent closure of Blind Lane will disrupt the effective operation of the business and cause significant disruption to the local highways network and residents. 3. Detailed discussions have been ongoing with the applicant since the submission of the scheme for consideration by PINS. Discussions have been constructive throughout the application process, but with very limited progress until post Deadline 4 submissions. 4. At Deadline 4 the respondent submitted a proposal to allow Honingham Lane to remain open and as adopted highway up to a permanent barrier to be erected opposite Ringland Estate Yard. 5. At Deadline 4 the respondent submitted proposals for creation of a new access from the Norwich Road GSI Honingham spur to the FEP and into Honingham Thorpe. 6. Detailed discussions on this proposal have followed and culminated in a meeting on 18th January at the respondents’ offices. 7. Present for the applicant were representatives from National Highways, SWECO, Galliford Try, Norfolk County Council, Breckland and Broadland Council and the VOA. 8. Present for the respondent were representatives for Honingham Thorpe Farms, Alston Farms Ltd, Food Enterprise Park Ltd and advisors. 9. The site meeting on the 18th January was preceded by multiple digital communications with the applicants team, all constructively working around the proposals submitted at Deadline 4 for Alston Farms Ltd and Food Enterprise Park Ltd.
<p>Honingham Lane</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The respondent understands the position of the applicant and Norfolk County Council but maintains an objection to the closure of Honingham Lane. 2. The respondent proposes that, should it be determined that Honingham Lane should be closed to through traffic, the means of closure be by way of blockage at a point opposite the estate yard on the Ringland Estate. The location of this closure is shown in Deadline 4 submissions. 3. Under this scheme the respondent would be able to continue with the effective operation of their business by using Honingham Lane for private estate access through use of a diversion via the estate yard to by-pass the road blockage. 4. The respondent would lose valuable yard space, must upgrade/create a roadway, install security measures, and suffer an element of inconvenience to make this option work, but it would achieve the goal of the applicant to close Honingham Lane and the goal of the respondent to maintain access. 5. The respondent considers this proposal to be a reasonable compromise, subject to agreement of terms with the applicant on matters of compensation and works. 6. The applicant has engaged with the respondent, carried out initial scoping for the proposal and has agreed to carry out a detailed survey of the site to assess suitability.

	<p>7. The applicant has adopted a highly cooperative and constructive approach to seeking a resolution to the issues faced by the respondent.</p> <p>8. Discussions between the parties continue to take a positive trajectory.</p>
Third Party Interests	<p>1. The respondent is aware that the closure of Honingham Lane will have a significant impact on the effective management of the Easton Estate.</p> <p>2. The respondent and the applicant have discussed opportunities for the respondent to assist in the alleviation of the severance impact on Easton Estate.</p> <p>3. Easton Estate and the respondent are in the process of documenting an agreement to ensure a mutually satisfactory outcome regarding Easton Estate utilising the Alston Farms Ltd yard at Ringland to gain access to their satellite farm at Ringland.</p> <p>4. The applicant has actively encouraged and facilitated discussions between the respondent and Easton Estate so that a tri partite position of satisfaction can be reached.</p> <p>5. It is envisaged that agreement will be reached between the applicant and respondent to facilitate access for Easton Estate through the Ringland yard.</p> <p>6. It will be for the applicant and Easton Estate to agree terms, assuming that the applicant will be able to offer Easton Estate the right to use the Ringland yard, having secured said right in commercial terms with the respondent.</p>
Blind Lane	<p>1. The respondent understands the stated position of the applicant on the matter of closing Blind Lane but maintains a position of difference and objection.</p> <p>2. The respondent understands the stated position of the applicant on the matter of not providing an access point to the FEP but maintains a position of difference and objection to the removal of the 'FEP spur' as previously detailed on pre submission road layouts.</p> <p>3. The respondent, in his role as Shareholder and Director of the Food Enterprise Park (FEP), has stated that he considers it appropriate for the applicant to provide and construct an access from the FEP to the new road from the Norwich Road GSJ to Honingham. Such an access was detailed on pre submission plans of the A47 but removed later.</p> <p>4. It is the respondent's position that the provision of a connective point to the highway will alleviate costs to the FEP, thus enhancing its ability to invest in and develop the local economy.</p> <p>5. The provision of a link from Red Barn at the south end of Blind Lane to the Norwich Road GSJ will alleviate pressure on the local highway's networks by through containment of farm, estate, and business park traffic to private roads. The cost of realising this improvement to local highways networks and reducing traffic in Easton will be entirely borne by the respondent through the construction of the new infrastructure detailed below. It is felt that this cost and the saving in compensation should be reflected in investment by the applicant.</p> <p>6. The respondent has submitted a Planning Application for the creation of a new highways access to the Honingham link road and associated private road, constructed to adoptable standards, to serve the FEP. The associated businesses of the respondent, being Honingham Thorpe Farms and Honingham Thorpe business park (with over 600 vehicle movements per day) will then be served by a private extension of the FEP road down to Red Barn and joining the existing Honingham Thorpe private road.</p> <p>7. There is no obligation on the respondent to construct the private link road from the FEP access to Red Barn and the existing highways network could continue to be used, however the respondents' proposals will alleviate highways congestion in the area and reduce disturbance in Easton.</p> <p>8. The road to the FEP will be a private road where access can be controlled if necessary. The road that will spur off the FEP access road to serve the business park and farmstead will be 'gated' either physically or electronically to give the respondent control of use. This will deter public use and attempts to join Church Lane at Red Barn.</p> <p>9. The junction at the south end of Blind Lane with Church Lane is a possible source of vulnerability to public intrusion, albeit only to the FEP junction where they will be stopped by controls, and works will take place to alter the highway furniture at this point to deter traffic from turning into or out of Church Lane.</p>

	<p>10. It would be desirable for secure delivery of the applicants aim to stop rat running and the respondent and FEP's aim of providing secure private access, if the applicant could seek the closure of, or reclassification to Bridleway of, Grange Lane which runs from Colton Road at the West end to Church Lane at the East.</p> <p>11. There is no vehicular requirement for this route, it is unmaintained so has a poor surface and could better serve the public as a safe and secure bridleway and footpath linking Easton (via Church Lane) to Honingham and Colton.</p> <p>12. The closure of Grange Lane to vehicles would also allow the respondent to completely secure the Red Barn link to Church Lane with a permanent barrier. Thus, achieving the stated aims of both respondent and applicant.</p> <p>13. Constructive discussions have taken place with the applicant, including a site meeting and detailed assessment of proposals for continued utilisation of a route alongside and, in part, on Blind Lane for private, controlled, access.</p> <p>14. The applicant has received the respondents' proposals positively and has engaged with the respondent on matters of design, security, and drainage. Such discussions continue in a positive manner and whilst parties do not currently agree entirely on each other's position, there is very clear and real progress to an agreeable position.</p> <p>15. The respondent would like it noted that recent communication with the applicant and their responsiveness to the respondents proposals has been very positive and constructive and, whilst differences remain, there is an appreciation and respect for efforts that are being made to find a satisfactory compromise.</p>
	END OF DOCUMENT