

A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling

Scheme Number: TR010040

Volume 9

9.27 Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submission by Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council (Addendum to Document 9.21)

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010
Rule 8(1)(c)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

November 2021

Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning
(Applications: Prescribed Forms and
Procedure) Regulations 2009**

A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling
Development Consent Order 202[x]

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO LINGWOOD AND BURLINGHAM PARISH
COUNCIL DEADLINE SUBMISSION (ADDENDUM TO DOCUMENT 9.21)**

Regulation Number:	Rule 8(1)(c)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference	TR010040
Application Document Reference	9.27
BIM Document Reference	HE551490-GTY-LSI-000-RP-TX-30078
Author:	A47 Blofield to North Burlingham Dualling Project Team, Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
Rev 0	November 2021	Additional Submission

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	LINGWOOD AND BURLINGHAM PARISH COUNCIL	2

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham scheme was submitted on 30 December 2020 and accepted for examination on 27 January 2021.
- 1.1.2 The purpose of this document is to set out Highways England's (the Applicant) response to the Deadline 4 submission by Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council (email dated 9 September 2021). The full response was omitted in error from the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (**REP5-015**).

2 LINGWOOD AND BURLINGHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Reference	Deadline 4 Submission (Email 9 September 2021)	Applicant's Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>As set-out in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-060) (RR-005-2):</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the overall package of Walking, Cycling and Horse-Riding is appropriate and the two overbridges crossing the realigned A47 provide appropriate crossings to meet the needs of such users. The Applicant has undertaken a survey and an analysis of the results, which supports the Applicant's conclusion, is set out in Appendix A of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-060).</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>-</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Burlingham FP1 is a promoted circular walk and is one of the recommended starting points for the Burlingham Woodland Walks (as indicated in the map and guide), which commence at its southern end in the St Andrew and St Peter Church car park. The mobility access paths forming part of the network also commence at this location. The car park can only accommodate a small number of vehicles but on street parking for users is available on Main Road in North Burlingham.</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>Burlingham FP3 is an un-surfaced, part field edge/part field footpath. The Applicant does not consider that FP3 is of a suitable condition to be trafficked by a mobility scooter. Refer to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-060), Appendix A, paragraph 2.2.8, Photographs 1-6.</p> <p>Burlingham Woodland Walks map identifies the paths that are suitable for mobility access and these are located to the north of the car park at St Andrew's Church, at North Burlingham. Burlingham FP3, which lies to the</p>

Reference	Deadline 4 Submission (Email 9 September 2021)	Applicant's Response
	<p>on the proposed overbridge. And I would flatly refuse to travel alongside the beet lorries!!!</p>	<p>south of the existing A47, is not identified as a mobility access path. The scheme provides two new grade separated crossings of the A47 at Blofield Overbridge and at the B1140 Overbridge, which, coupled with the cycle track to be provided to the south of the new A47, provide safe routes to cross the A47 for pedestrians, cyclists and those wishing to drive to Burlingham Woods.</p> <p>The gradient on the approaches to the proposed overbridges is less than 5% (see Engineering Drawings and Sections (REP4-005) (Side Road Long Sections) Sheet 3 of 4) and therefore suitable for the mobility impaired.</p> <p>The cycle track across the A47 will be separated from the running carriageway of the B1140 at the Overbridge and therefore from the HGVs.</p>
	<p>I am sure there will be other disabled people who need to access their designated facilities within the parish of Lingwood and Burlingham. <u>In failing to provide a safe WCHR crossing, Highways England is, effectively, discriminating against disabled people by preventing us free roaming within our parish.</u></p>	<p>As set-out in the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-060) (RR-005-2) and Appendix A to that document:</p> <p>Although Burlingham FP3 will be diverted, a new cycle track running east west and to the south of the new A47 alignment will provide onward connections to pedestrian and cyclist facilities provided at both the Blofield Overbridge and the B1140 Overbridge. These facilities will provide for the safe north south crossing movements across the A47 thereby reducing the severance effect. The Applicant's assessment indicates that Burlingham FP3 is used primarily for recreational walking trips and is not a practical route for utility walking trips due to the quality of the footpath and the walking distances between North Burlingham and local facilities and amenities in Lingwood. The additional walking distances required to access the crossing facilities at the B1140 Overbridge from Burlingham FP3 are unlikely to deter recreational trip makers.</p>
	<p>Further to Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council's previous submissions, I wish to emphasise a couple of points:-</p> <p>Highways England's Report - A47 Blofield-North Burlingham Preliminary Environmental Information Report - HE551490-MMSJV-ENG-000-RP-LX-</p>	<p>The PEIR was produced in 2018 to support the statutory consultation held later that year.</p> <p>More detailed information has been presented in the Environmental Statement which was submitted with the application for a DCO, in particular within Chapter 12, Population and Human Health (REP4-023)</p>

Reference	Deadline 4 Submission (Email 9 September 2021)	Applicant's Response
	00005, August 2018, 12.4.1 states -'This assessment relies on desk-based studies'.	and the Walking Cycling and Horse Riding Assessment and Review (REP2-011). Further information was submitted in Appendix A to the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (REP1-060). Annex B sets out the results of on-site WCH surveys.
	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.	See response above
	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!!!!	As part of the Environmental Impact Assessment, the Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the effects of the proposed Scheme on land-use and accessibility in accordance with DMRB standard LA 112 Population and human health. LA 112 (section 3. 6) recommends that the study area for the assessment of the effects on land use and accessibility shall comprise the construction footprint/project boundary plus a 500 metre area surrounding the project boundary. It goes on to state that where likely effects are identified outside of the 500 metre area, the study area should be extended accordingly.
	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.	The Applicant has undertaken statutory and additional consultation for the Scheme. Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council responded to the consultations and the Applicant's response are provided in Annex O (Table Evidencing Regard had to Consultation Responses) to the Consultation Report (APP-037).
	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!!!!	See response above regarding consultation.
	As a matter of interest - Highways England mentioned it had agreed to include a footpath/cycle path on the proposed B1140 overbridge after	The Applicant notes Lingwood and Burlingham's comment, however remains of the view that the overall package of Walking, Cycling and

Reference	Deadline 4 Submission (Email 9 September 2021)	Applicant's Response
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Horse-Riding is appropriate and the two overbridges crossing the realigned A47 provide appropriate crossings to meet the needs of such users.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>