

Messing-cum-Inworth Parish Council (Mcl PC) and Messing and Inworth Action Group (MIAG)

Written responses to Examining Authority Questions 2;

Conservation Area

In response to the ExQ2 question raised as further commentary, the two groups, whose interests are totally aligned in this matter, respond as follows;

National Highways have responded at Para 88 REP3-012.

This is not a response and is a re-run of incorrect statements already made;

1. NH have paid no attention to the Conservation Area at the heart of Messing;
2. This is manifestly so as NH expert statements are incorrect as they cite the properties concerned as being 'near' the road. After the ASI the ExA will know that many of these buildings are on the road, and in fact are less than one brick width to the 'tarmac' highway';
3. These same NH experts admitted, much to the distress of their legal advisors, that of the 123 'SOAEL' definition severely affected houses on this entire plan for the A12/A120 widening, 71 are in Messing. This encompasses all properties in the Conservation Area and many outside the conservation area.
4. NH knew nothing of the Conservation Area. Their reliance on a spurious 'buffer zone' of 1.6km allows them to escape the consequences of their fatally flawed plan for Junction 24;
5. Mcl PC and MIAG do not accept the demarcation of the buffer zone. Mcl PC and MIAG cite the Parish records of the curtilage of village properties both within the 1.6km 'buffer' and outside it;
6. NH have made no attempt to respect and address the historic nature of the Conservation Area, and the buildings and monuments within it. This includes the Village War Memorial (on the roadside), the village church wall – an ancient and dangerously exposed structure to HGV and LGV swept path difficulties – ignored by NH, and to the many other ancient and historic sites in Messing.

NH have cited that the figures used for SOAEL are for noise not vibration. NH cite that no assessment was done for vibration as the Conservation Area is 'outside' their fictitious buffer. However, in contradiction, NH also cite that vibration was 'assessed and found not to be significant'. They either did, or did not, make appropriate assessments. And having assessed many properties within the Conservation area as being severely affected for noise, NH's stance to advise that noise assessments were carried out but vibration was not is asinine and indefensible.

Neither Mcl PC nor MIAG are aware of any published findings and strenuously affirm that if these were done, vibration damage and potential increases in vibration damage would be found to be likely;

7. Mcl PC and MIAG demand that NH publish these results, if they exist, and make clear who carried out this study, with and what terms of reference.