



National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000

e-mail: A47BlofieldtoNorthBurlingham@
planninginspectorate.gov.uk

To the Applicant

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR010040

Date: 16 December 2021

Dear Sir / Madam,

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 (as amended) – Rule 17

Application by National Highways for an Order granting Development Consent for the A47 Blofield to North Burlingham scheme

Request for further information from the Applicant

1. Please clarify whether the Drainage and Surface Water Plans [APP-010] should be included in the list of certified documents in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and referred to in Requirement 8 (surface water drainage).
2. Requirement 3(3)(b) of the dDCO (Deadline (D) 9 version) states: "*providing a cycle track 2.5 metres in width would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reports in the environmental statement,*". Please amend this to "*providing a cycle track 2.5 metres in width would give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects in comparison with those reported in the environmental statement,*".
3. It appears to me that Refs 9, 88 and 115 within Table 1 of the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) Schedule (D9 version) should also be included within Table 2 of the CA Schedule given that Relevant Representations (RRs) were received from these parties ([RR-019, RR-047 and RR-071]). Please update the CA Schedule accordingly, or alternatively, justify why these parties should not be included in Table 2, should the Applicant take a different view.
4. The Applicant should be aware that s135 of the Planning Act 2008 sets out that an order granting development consent may include provision authorising the CA of an interest in Crown land only if: it is an interest which is for the time being held otherwise than by or on behalf of the Crown; and the appropriate Crown authority consents to the acquisition. Please provide evidence that the appropriate Crown authority consents to the acquisition in this case. If the Applicant cannot provide

this evidence, please explain how it intends to satisfy s135 of the Planning Act 2008.

5. A D9 submission by Anna Randlesome, a Category 2 Affected Person (AP) who attended a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing, relates to matters around the Applicant's lack of communication and incorrect assertion that other family members may be acting on her behalf. Please clarify / rectify the situation, particularly given that I should be satisfied that the Applicant has engaged with all APs with a view to acquiring their land interests by agreement.
6. The project cost in the Case for the Scheme [REP1-042] is cited as £46.4 million, whereas in the Funding Statement [APP-020], it is cited as £89.5 million. Please clarify the reason for this discrepancy.
7. Please explain why additional hedgerows in Schedule 8 of the revised dDCO (D9 version) have been categorised as 'important' when paragraphs 8.7.58 and 8.7.60 of ES Chapter 8: Biodiversity [REP4-021] and ES Appendix 8.13: 2020 Botanical Report [APP-098] indicate that only two hedgerows fall into this category and, furthermore, given that some are identified as 'species poor'.
8. Please confirm whether or not agreement has been reached with Norfolk County Council in respect of the transfer of assets, and if so, in what form? If not, is agreement likely to be reached by D10?
9. Please explain why the 'Third River Crossing' (identified within ES Appendix 15.2: Cumulative Effects Assessment Shortlist [APP-114]) does not appear to be included within the Transport Assessment [REP1-044] modelling uncertainty log?
10. The final paragraph in Appendix B of the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Hearings [REP7-025] (pg 55) states that "In summary, the Applicant considers that overall, the scheme is likely to cause a very small amount of less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of Owl's Barn and the House at Owl's Barn." This seems to contradict the Applicant's other statements that the residual significance of effect during construction and operation would be 'neutral' for these designated heritage assets. Can the Applicant please definitively clarify its position on this matter.

Please provide the information requested by **Deadline 10 (21 December 2021)**.

If you have any questions about the content of this letter, please contact the Case Team using the details in the above header.

Yours faithfully

Alex Hutson

Examining Authority

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.