

From: [Cathy Pye](#)
To: [A47 Blofield to North Burlingham](#)
Cc: [Chris Gates](#)
Subject: A47 Blofield - North Burlingham
Date: 15 August 2021 22:32:06

Dear James,

Re A47 dualling Blofield - North Burlingham

Apologies - I will not be able to make either of the on-line meetings on 16th August, 2021. However, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council has formally authorised Chris Gates to speak on our behalf.

Please may I make a couple of previously unaddressed points, if it's not too late?

1. Concerning the footpath on the proposed eastern overbridge at the B1140 junction, Highways England has said this was incorporated, 'after consultation with Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council'. This is true, but it was never suggested by the Council that this footpath should be built instead of a WCHR underpass at FP3!!!

At a meeting with local parish councils a year or two back, Highways England presented a map showing a 'traffic only' overbridge. When I queried why no footpath was incorporated, we were told it was because there was no existing footpath to link into Acle Road/Lingwood Lane on the Lingwood side of the overbridge. I mentioned Lingwood is an expanding village and, at some time in the future, there will almost certainly be a footpath along the road towards the overbridge, by which time it would be too late for Highways England to incorporate one. I was trying to save Highways England money and hassle in the future, NOT suggesting an alternative place for a WCHR crossing!

2. Highways England has promised a new permissive path south of the A47 between the B1140 overbridge and Lingwood Lane. Presumably, Highways England considers this to be a safer route into Lingwood for walkers, cyclists and horse riders coming off the overbridge, rather than using Acle Road/Lodge Road which has no footpath. However, this route is much longer than the direct route along Acle Road/Lingwood Lane. Also, in the end, this route will deposit the walker/cyclist/horse rider onto the most dangerous bend on Lingwood Lane!!! (Please see previous submissions.)

As far as the parish is concerned, there is no alternative route between Lingwood and North Burlingham for walkers, cyclists and horse riders except across the A47 at the point of FP3 (or close).

3. I am aware Highways England carried out an independent survey of the number of beet lorries turning off the A47 at the B1140 White House junction. This survey was carried out over a very limited period of time. Did Highways England also request British Sugar to supply relevant details of all lorry visits to its Cantley factory? The Planning Inspector has my reply from British Sugar regarding the potential number of lorries which will cross the eastern overbridge in peak periods. British Sugar gave this information to me freely.

Yours sincerely,

Cathy Pye
Chairman, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council

From: [Cathy Pye](#)
To: [Bunten, James](#)
Cc: [Chris Gates](#); [Sonya Dickinson](#)
Subject: A47dualling Blofield - North Burlingham
Date: 09 September 2021 23:16:40

Dear James,

Re:- A47 dualling Blofield – North Burlingham

Many thanks for your advice in this matter. Please can you pass this on to the Inspector.

As you are aware, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council is extremely concerned about people's free movement throughout our parish on foot, cycle or horse-back because the A47 acts as a barrier between our constituent communities.

I don't think anyone has spoken on behalf of disabled people? I am disabled myself and hope I can speak on behalf of other disabled parishioners. I claim DLA and have a Blue Badge. There are days when I can walk up to a mile or so, and days when I find it almost impossible to get out of bed.

One of my favourite places for dog walking is Burlingham Woods, which is within my parish and just over a mile from my home. I used to walk to the woods from my home in Lingwood regularly until it gradually became impossible to cross the A47 as the volume of traffic increased. Now, like all my neighbours, I am forced to drive there, even though the woods are part of our parish and well within the statutory walking distance.

I have a mobility scooter which I use occasionally but the battery range is only around 6 miles. I would be able to access the woods easily on my scooter if there was a safe crossing over the A47 at the point of FP3, but the extra distance over the proposed overbridge at the B1140 would make the journey impossible for me. (2 miles to/from the A47, plus a 2 mile detour back and forth across the overbridge, equals approximately 4 miles. That would leave me an absolute maximum of 2 miles exploration in the woods.) Also, my scooter might not be able cope with the gradient on the proposed overbridge. And I would flatly refuse to travel alongside the beet lorries!!!

I am sure there will be other disabled people who need to access their designated facilities within the parish of Lingwood and Burlingham. In failing to provide a safe WCHR crossing, Highways England is, effectively, discriminating against disabled people by preventing us free roaming within our parish.

Further to Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council's previous submissions, I wish to emphasise a couple of points:-

Highways England's Report - A47 Blofield-North Burlingham Preliminary Environmental Information Report - HE551490-MMSJV-ENG-000-RP-LX-00005, August 2018, 12.4.1 states - 'This assessment relies on desk-based studies'.

Since that statement was made, nothing has changed in any of Highways England's subsequent reports. Thus, we are led to assume all of Highways England's reports rely upon 'desk based studies' rather than upon consultation and documented fact.

Indeed, it is obvious a faceless employee sitting behind a desk with a map and a pin has decided arbitrarily - and wrongly - that ALL our essential local facilities are situated in Blofield and not in Lingwood or Acle!!!!

No-one from Highways England ever contacted Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council to ask where our essential facilities and amenities were situated. Consequently, Highways England's reports are deeply flawed.

No-one from Highways England ever asked the Parish Council how the proposed dualling of the A47 might affect the life of our local community, which will be further severed by the scheme. No-one from Highways England ever contacted local cyclist and horse-riding groups for their opinions. Yes- meetings were arranged with local parish councils, but the meetings to discuss the WCHR reports were scheduled well after the plans had been cemented by Highways England. The local parish councils were simply told what was going to happen. We were never consulted about what, in the opinion of the local communities, SHOULD happen!!!!

As a matter of interest - Highways England mentioned it had agreed to include a footpath/cycle path on the proposed B1140 overbridge after consultation with Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council. This came about because, originally, the overbridge was designed for traffic only. We were told at a meeting this was because there was no footpath on the Lingwood side of the bridge for any footpath/cycle path to link into. I suggested this was short-sighted because Lingwood was an expanding village and, at some time in the future, there would be a footpath up to the overbridge, by which time it would be too late for a pedestrian/cycleway path to be included in the overbridge plans. As I read it, Highways England may have now claimed the remark suggested an acceptable alternative pedestrian crossing over the A47.

An addition of a footpath/cycle lane to the proposed B1140 overbridge is NOT an acceptable alternative to a dedicated WCHR crossing of the A47.

Best wishes,

Cathy Pye

Chairman, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council