

From: [REDACTED]
To: [A47 Blofield to North Burlingham](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: A47 Blofield-Burlingham
Date: 07 December 2021 23:47:25

Re: Dualling of the A47 Blofield – North Burlingham.

On behalf of the residents of the Parish of Lingwood and Burlingham, and on behalf of all ramblers, cyclists and horse riders. Further to previous submissions.

We are disappointed to note Highways England has not yet included an underpass, and a cycle path between Burlingham and Acle, in its plans.

1. A year or two ago, we were led to believe funding for an underpass or a bridge over the A47 for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, and a cycle path to Acle, might be available from 'designated funds'. In October 2021, our Clerk and I were invited to an on-line meeting with representatives of Highways England (Sweco) to discuss our entitlement to designated funds. This offer extended only to the support of biodiversity, but we were assured someone would contact us to explain other funding opportunities from designated funds. No-one has contacted us since. (We are still passionate about the preservation of the natural world in our parish but no-one from Highways England has been in touch since the meeting to further discuss designated funding for biodiversity!)

2. In the Inspector's 'Second Written Questions' published 28.09.2021, the Examining Authority asked the Applicant:-

“The ExA will need to consider, amongst other things, as to whether the Proposed Development would be acceptable or not without the provision of either a footbridge or underpass around its central point. Should the ExA consider the Proposed Development unacceptable in this regard, or should the ExA consider it acceptable, but the SoS takes a different view, how would the Applicant advise that such a situation might be addressed / overcome - for example, might there be a suitably worded requirement which could be inserted into the DCO to secure a central crossing point in one form or another?”

Perhaps I have missed it, but I cannot find a direct response to this question from Highways England. Please could someone advise.

3. Please would the representatives of Highways England who are responsible for deciding the ultimate fate of our local community, and the needs of ramblers, cyclists

and horse riders who pass through our parish and enjoy our woodland paths, explain:-

a) Why was Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council not consulted about the community's needs before the publication of the original WCAHR document? We were never consulted; we were simply told what had been decided by Highways England after publication of the report.

b) Why were no ramblers', cyclists' or horse-riders' groups consulted before publication of the original WCAHR document? Why were local stables never contacted? None of these groups has ever been canvassed for their opinions.

c) Why did the Parish Council have to twice request a copy of the WCAHR document? We knew nothing of this report before the so called 'consultation' meetings between Highways England and local parish councils. When the document finally arrived after weeks of requests, it included a secrecy clause preventing disclosure to third parties!

d) Why has Highways England consistently ignored the evidence in our several submissions but rather persisted in stating - time and time and time again - blatant untruths about amenities in our local villages? The false assertions made in various documents are obviously generated by desk-top exercises based upon misguided conjecture, incorrect sourcing and out of date information. Despite our evidence, the errors have never been amended or retracted by Highways England in its updated documents, thus it is assumed they are designed to deliberately mislead.

e) Why has Highways England ignored the Petition started by Chris Gates, and the excessive number of comments in the Inspector's Library made by members of the public who want a dedicated WCAHR underpass or bridge?

f) Why has Highways England never commented upon the feasibility study presented by Create Consulting Engineers, Ltd.? This report embodies everything we have requested from Highways England and suggests that a viable low-maintenance underpass can be built for around £660,000. This budget would increase four-fold if an underpass is not included at the A47 construction stage. Likewise, the report considers a durable cycle path between Lingwood/Burlingham and Acle would cost around £389,000. (So, what is this budget as a percentage of the total estimated cost of dualling the A47 between Blofield and Burlingham???)

g) Why does Highways England believe it is acceptable for a community to be physically divided from its friends, designated amenities and local parish facilities?

h) Why does Highways England believe it is acceptable for walkers to be forced into a two-mile detour off country paths to walk alongside heavy traffic?

l) Why did Highways England not consult with the local community when carrying out its survey of footpath users? Local people could have explained WHY people don't cross the A47, and why footpaths north of the A47 are used more than those to the south. (Highways England spent nine days (?) on a camera survey which will affect a parish forevermore?)

j) Why does Highways England believe senior school children should be denied the right to cycle to school by a direct route?

k) Why is Highways England intent on forcing people to drive around their parish rather than walk or cycle?

l) Why has Highways England ignored the advice of Jerome Mayhew, MP., Norfolk County Council and Broadland District Council?

Our parish NEEDS an underpass for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, and a cycle path to Acle, but Highways England obviously thinks it knows better! Previous submissions on behalf of the local community and other footpath users have been ignored by Highways England and, it seems to us, we have been treated with disdain and indifference from the start.

Cathy Pye

Chairman, Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council