



Hearings Action Points

Application by Highways England for an Order Granting Development Consent for the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham project.

Actions arising from the Open Floor Hearing 3, Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 and Issue Specific Hearing 4 held virtually on Tuesday 9 November 2021.

Abbreviations:

BOR Book of Reference

CAS Compulsory Acquisition Schedule

dDCO draft Development Consent Order

DMRB Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

EIA Regs Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017

EMP Environmental Management Plan

ES Environmental Statement

NNNPS National Networks National Policy Statement

NSIP Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project

oLEMP outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

Pt Part

REAC Record of Environmental Actions and Commitments

RoWA Plans Rights of Way and Access Plans

Sch Schedule

	Action	Party	Deadline
Open Floor Hearing 3 - Tuesday 9 November 2021			
1	Respond to Ms Jones concern regarding highway safety issues due to proposed changes to the layby and field access.	Applicant	Deadline 7
Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 2 - Tuesday 9 November 2021			
1	Clarify why two names appear in the CAS [REP6-005] at Ref No 34 with interests in Plots 5/1b, 5/1e and 5/1g but only one name appears against these plots in the BoR [REP6-002].	Applicant	Deadline 7
2	Provide justification for the removal of 'Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council' and 'Unknown' from the BoR in respect of Plots 5/1b, 5/1e and 5/1g, ensuring all interests previously identified, with associated dates, are addressed.	Applicant	Deadline 7
3	Ensure consistency between the BoR and CAS in respect of Plots 5/1b, 5/1e and 5/1g.	Applicant	Deadline 7
4	Clarify: a) whether any underground apparatus between the existing Cadent Block Valve Site and the proposed Cadent Block Valve Site (associated with the change request [REP6-007]) would need to be removed or could stay	Applicant	Deadline 7



The Planning Inspectorate

	in situ; and b) if it would need to be removed, the effect this would have on Lingwood Community Woodland.		
5	Clarify the Applicant's options and implications for the Application in the event that the change request is declined.	Applicant	Deadline 7
6	Consider whether Ref No 10 in the CAS Table 1 should also appear in Table 2 given submission have been made by this Affected Person.	Applicant	Deadline 7
7	Clarify meaning of entry '(c) N' in CAS Table 1 (6 th column) and Table 2 (10 th column) given that Compulsory Acquisition of rights is requested.	Applicant	Deadline 7
8	Provide updated CAS and Statutory Undertakers Schedule.	Applicant	Deadline 7
Issue Specific Hearing 4 - dDCO and Environmental Matters - Tuesday 9 November 2021			
<i>dDCO [REP5-002]</i>			
1	Sch 3, Pt 6, relating to Sheet 4 of the RoWA Plans [REP4-004] makes reference to a 'footpath'. On the RoWA Plans this is shown as a green dashed line whilst footpaths are shown in the key as brown dashed lines. Rectify accordingly.	Applicant	Deadline 7
2	Sch 4, Pt 1 relating to Sheet 5 of the RoWA Plans refers to a 'new public footpath'. This should instead refer to a 'cycle track'. Rectify accordingly.	Applicant	Deadline 7
3	Sch 7 refers to 'construction of a new footpath' in relation to a number of plots, including 3/2c, 3/2d, 4/7e, 5/1a and 5/1c. This should instead refer to a 'cycle track'. Rectify accordingly.	Applicant	Deadline 7
4	Remove words 'shared use' from Work No. 17 in Sch 1.	Applicant	Deadline 7
5	Masterplan [REP5-006]: a) correct sequence of and errors on the Key Plan; and b) correctly identify 'cycle tracks' and 'footpaths' on the drawings and within the key.	Applicant	Deadline 7
6	Further justify the control of working hours through G1 of the REAC within the EMP [REP4-040] and the level of detail provided (ie little mention of type of work required outside normal working hours and no mention of Bank or public holidays), rather than through a specific requirement of the dDCO. Indicate whether such an approach has been taken in other made DCOs.	Applicant	Deadline 7
<i>Climate</i>			
7	Clarify how the assessment is 'inherently cumulative' given that the 'Difference (DS-DM)' figure in Table 14-9 of ES Chapter 14:	Applicant	Deadline 7



The Planning Inspectorate

	Climate [REP2-002] (and therefore the figures in Table 14-10 which are assessed against the national carbon budgets) appears to include only greenhouse gas emissions associated with the Proposed Development.		
8	Clarify whether, if the baseline in Table 14-9 includes end-user greenhouse gas emissions from other planned projects, including two other A47 NSIP schemes and the Norwich Western Link road, there has been an assessment of the Proposed Development against the current baseline without these projects, as suggested should be the case in para 14.7.1 of ES Chapter 14 and DMRB LA 114 3.10.	Applicant	Deadline 7
9	Explain how DMRB LA 104 3.21(2) and Schedule 4 para 5 of the EIA Regs have been complied with in terms of cumulative assessment relating to climate.	Applicant	Deadline 7
<i>Population and Human Health</i>			
10	NNNPS para 5.216 states that 'Where development would worsen accessibility such impacts should be mitigated so far as reasonably possible', and following on from this, that 'There is a very strong expectation that impacts on accessibility for non-motorised users should be mitigated.' NNNPS para 3.3 similarly expects applicants to avoid and mitigate environmental and social impacts. In light of this, further justify how the Proposed Development would comply with the policies of the NNNPS, given that the Applicant identifies a residual moderate adverse effect and thus in EIA terms, a significant one, on users of footpath Burlingham FP3 due to severance caused by the Proposed Development [REP4-023].	Applicant	Deadline 7
11	Explain how cycle tracks with a minimum width of 2.5 metres would be secured?	Applicant	Deadline 7
12	Clarify the reason for not providing a cycle track between point SU8 on Sheet 6 of the RoWA Plans and the vicinity of the tie in point with the B1140 to the northeast of this to allow cycle segregation from traffic accessing and leaving the proposed B1140 overbridge (ie between the D3 points), and comment on cyclist safety without this (noting that Appendix B of [REP2-012] appears to indicate a proposed cycle track in this location).	Applicant	Deadline 7
13	Ref 5.2 of the Applicant's hearing summary [REP4-051] states that due to a pinch point	Applicant	Deadline 7



The Planning Inspectorate

	near Hall Cottages, there would be insufficient width to provide a 'footway / cycle track' of the required standard to link North Burlingham with the footway in the vicinity of the Windle which travels towards Acle along the A47. Clarify whether this is referring to a (shared use) cycle track or whether a 'footway' on its own was also considered and if so, provide further justification as to why the Applicant considers one could not be provided.		
14	Provide a response to the second part of Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council's post hearing submission [REP4-059].	Applicant	Deadline 7
<i>Ecology</i>			
15	Incorporate reference to or provision for the effective translocation of important hedgerows into the oLEMP at Appendix B7 of the EMP, in addition to reference to or provision for general landscape planting and retention.	Applicant	Deadline 7
16	Correct first page of oLEMP to refer to correct requirement numbers of the dDCO.	Applicant	Deadline 7
17	Correct Sheet 2 of the Hedgerow Plans [APP-012] to show the Order Limits.	Applicant	Deadline 7
<i>Cultural heritage</i>			
18	Explain to what extent the fields to the immediate south of the existing A47 in the vicinity of North Burlingham contribute to the setting and significance of the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew and the Grade II listed Church of St Peter (both in North Burlingham).	Applicant	Deadline 7
19	Explain to what extent the introduction of a dual carriageway and associated works onto these fields would impact on the setting and significance of the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew and the Grade II listed Church of St Peter (noting also that views towards these listed buildings, including the tower of the Church of St Andrew, are attained across these fields, including from the permissive footpath / bridleway which runs west from Lingwood Lane).	Applicant	Deadline 7
20	Explain to what extent the field to the north of Owls Barn and House at Owls Barn, and the trees along this field's northern boundary, contribute to the setting and significance of these two Grade II listed buildings.	Applicant	Deadline 7
21	Explain to what extent the introduction of the Proposed Development, including lighting around the Yarmouth Road junction, road works within the field to the north of Owls Barn and House at Owls Barn and the Blofield	Applicant	Deadline 7



The Planning Inspectorate

	overbridge would impact on the setting and significance of these two listed buildings (noting also that views towards Owls Barn and House at Owls Barn and towards the site of the Proposed Development beyond can be attained from Blofield BOAT 11, as demonstrated in ES Figures 7.6.8a and b – Viewpoint A [APP-065]).		
22	Provide copies of the Historic England's listing descriptions for the Church of St Andrew (North Burlingham), the Church of St Peter (North Burlingham), Owls Barn and House at Owls Barn.	Applicant	Deadline 7
23	Photomontages (on reflection, the Examining Authority does not consider these necessary at this point).	N/A	N/A
<i>Other</i>			
24	Confirm how the removal of lighting columns along the existing A47 in the vicinity of North Burlingham would be secured (as indicated in paras 7.10.7 and 7.11.9 of ES Appendix 7.8: Lighting Assessment [APP-085] and in Table 7-4 of ES Appendix 7.6: Representative Viewpoints [APP-083], relating to 'Operational effects'.	Applicant	Deadline 7
25	Address Richard Hawker's concern relating to impacts on public transport use.	Applicant	Deadline 7